

838
with Ed.
vidence

4

D I G E S T

OF THE

E V I D E N C E,

BEFORE

T. M. Bay

THE COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSES OF
LORDS AND COMMONS,

IN THE YEAR 1837,

ON THE

NATIONAL SYSTEM OF EDUCATION
IN IRELAND.

LONDON :

PRINTED BY W. CLOWES AND SONS, STAMFORD STREET.

1838.

DIGEST

NOTICE

The publication of this Digest has been delayed by a variety of circumstances, which, notwithstanding the diligent and constant interest of the Editor, have prevented its earlier issue. The Editor is now, however, enabled to announce that it is at length ready for the press, and will be published in a few days. It is intended to be published in a single volume, and is designed to be a complete and accurate digest of the law, as it stands at present, and to be a valuable and useful work to all who are engaged in the study of the law. It is intended to be published in a single volume, and is designed to be a complete and accurate digest of the law, as it stands at present, and to be a valuable and useful work to all who are engaged in the study of the law.

Houses of the Oireachtas

NOTICE.

THE publication of this Digest has been delayed by a combination of circumstances, equally unavoidable and destitute of interest. The instructions given to the Compiler were to confine himself strictly to the evidence, to suppress his own feelings and opinions, to give such an impartial summary as an upright judge might be supposed to offer to an intelligent jury. So far as the incompleteness of the investigation allowed, the Compiler has endeavoured to adhere strictly to these directions; he even destroyed a considerable portion of his labours in which he had given abstracts of the evidence in his own language, lest such a plan should expose him to the charge of misrepresenting the statements of any witness, and he adopted what seems the less objectionable plan of giving the evidence on each point in the words of the witnesses themselves. He has added one or two observations to fill up gaps in the investigation, because, though the case against the Board was heard completely, the case for the Board was terminated rather abruptly. But these observations are also derived from tangible evidence, and care has been taken to quote the authorities.

The references to the evidence before the committee of the House of Commons are numbered by queries, those to the evidence before the House of Lords are numbered by pages, the queries not being marked in their Lordships' report.

The task of compressing nearly two thousand folio pages of evidence into the compass of this little volume, is one which could not be executed to the satisfaction of all parties. Much of the matter which the compiler of a digest must omit as irrelevant, will appear to the persons by whom it was brought forward, among the most essential parts of the enquiry. This

is unavoidable ; the Compiler can only say that he has not omitted anything which, in his conscientious opinion, materially affected the great question at issue. To those who differ from him, as such there will assuredly be, he begs leave to address the simple request contained in the old adage, " Blame not before thou hast examined the truth ; understand first and then rebuke." Perhaps had the aphorism prevailed very generally, there would have been no necessity for the Compiler's labours. It is necessary in strict justice to add, that beyond repeated injunctions to impartiality, no person connected with Her Majesty's government, or with the Irish Board of Education, has in any wise interfered in the preparation of this work. For its sins of omission and commission, should such be detected, the Compiler alone is responsible : anxious as he has been to state the facts and arguments on both sides as fairly as possible, he is conscious that on a subject which unfortunately has been mingled with party politics, it is hopeless to escape censure, and he therefore deems it an imperative duty to take care that others should not bear the blame of his real or imaginary offences.

London, May 24, 1838.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

Page

Origin of the Board of National Education 1

CHAPTER II.

Plan and Progress of the System of National Education 14

CHAPTER III.

General Objections made to the National System of Education 31

CHAPTER IV.

Special Objections to the National System.—The Scripture
Extracts 45

CHAPTER V.

Special Objections to the National System of Religious Edu-
cation 46

CHAPTER VI.

Special Objections.—Injury to Scriptural Schools 75

CHAPTER VII.

Special Objections.—Schools over which it is asserted that
Roman Catholics exercise unfair influence 82

CHAPTER VIII.

Miscellaneous Objections.—Charges of partiality, neglect, and
employment of improper persons 92

CHAPTER IX.

Special Objections.—Asserted increase of disunion between
Protestants and Roman Catholics 106

CHAPTER X.

Proposed Modifications.—The Synod of Ulster 114

	Page
CHAPTER XI.	
Proposed Modifications.—Propositions of the Clergy of the united Dioceses of Derry and Raphoe	123
CHAPTER XII.	
State and Prospects of the National System.—Education of the Teachers	152
CHAPTER XIII.	
Visitors and Inspectors	164
CHAPTER XIV.	
State and Progress of the National System.—Establishment of Schools	169
CHAPTER XV.	
General Results from the Evidence	187
CHAPTER XVI.	
Conclusion	208

LIST OF WITNESSES.

The names marked (*) are those of gentlemen examined before the Committees of both Houses of Parliament: those marked (†) only before the Commons: the rest only before the Committee of the House of Lords.

BELL, the Rev. ROBERT, Curate of Clonmell.

BISSETT, WILLIAM, Esq.

*BLAKE, the Right Hon. ANTHONY RICHARD, a Commissioner of the National Board of Education.

*BOYTON, the Rev. CHARLES, Fellow and Tutor in Dublin University.

BRIDGER, CHARLES, Steward of the Missionary Settlement in Achill.

BROWN, the Rev. JOHN, a Minister of the Synod of Ulster.

BURGH, the Very Rev. THOMAS JOHN, Dean of Cloyne.

*CARLILE, the Rev. JAMES, a Presbyterian Minister, one of the Board of Commissioners of the National Board of Education.

CARROLL, THOMAS H., B.A., Editor of the Carlow Sentinel.

COLQUHOUN, JOHN, Esq., of the County of Dumbarton, Scotland.

CONDON, the Rev. EUGENE, Roman Catholic Priest of Tallow.

†COOK, the Rev. Dr., a Minister of the Synod of Ulster.

CROSS, Mr. MAURICE, Manager of a Bank at Belfast.

CURROE, the Rev. DANIEL, Roman Catholic Priest, Parish of Drummaule.

DALY, JAMES, Esq., Subscriber to the Esker School.

DAWSON, the Very Rev. HENRY RICHARD, Dean of St. Patrick's.

DOMBRAIN, JAMES, Esq., Inspector-General of the Coast-Guard, Ireland.

DOYLE, Mr. JAMES.

†DUBLIN, His Grace the Archbishop of, a Commissioner of the National Board of Education.

DWYER, the Rev. GEORGE, Rector of Ardrahan and Beagh.

*ELRINGTON, the Rev. CHARLES RICHARD, D.D., Regius Professor of Divinity, Dublin.

EXETER, the Bishop of, a Member of the Committee.

FENWICK, WILLIAM, Esq.

FINN, THOMAS, LL.D., Inspector of National Board Schools.

GILDEA, the Rev. GEORGE ROBERT, Curate of Kilmain.

GRAHAM, the Rev. JAMES, Curate of the Parish of Templemore, Deery.

GRAHAM, the Rev. ROBERT DUNCAN, Curate of Kilconickney.

GREEN, the Rev. THOMAS WEBB, Curate of Tallow.

*GREY, Earl.

HAMILTON, CHARLES WILLIAM, Esq., Volunteer Assistant Poor Law Commissioner, Ireland.

HASTINGS, the Rev. ANTHONY, Vicar of Kilmacranan.

HENRY, the Rev. POOLEY SHOULDHAM, Presbyterian Clergyman of the city of Armagh.

INGHAM, ROBERT, Esq., M.P.

- IRWIN, Lieutenant JOSEPH, Commander of the Coast-Guard, West port.
- *KELLY, T. FREDERICK, Esq., Secretary to the Commissioners of National Education.
- KELLY, Mr. JAMES, Inspector of the National Board Schools.
- LLOYD, the Rev. WILLIAM EDWARD, Rector of Fenner.
- M'ARTHUR, ALEXANDER, M.D., Superintendent of the Male and Female Schools, and the Training Department.
- M'CARTHY, TIMOTHY, a Coast-Guard Man at Rossmore Point.
- M'KNIGHT, Mr. JAMES, Editor of the Belfast News Letter.
- M'NULTY, THOMAS, Bible Reader at Achill.
- MALCOMSON, Mr. HENRY, Proprietor of the Carlow Sentinel.
- MALONY, MICHAEL, Teacher of Curriglass National School.
- MATURIN, the Rev. WILLIAM, Curate of St. Stephen's, Dublin.
- MILLS, Mr. LEWIS, Inspector of the Kildare Place Society Schools.
- †MURRAY, the Very Rev. RICHARD, Dean of Ardagh.
- †MURRAY, Mr. JOHN FISHER, Inspector of the National Board Schools.
- MURRAY, Mr. DANIEL.
- NANGLE, the Rev. EDWARD, a Clergyman of the Established Church, residing at Achill.
- NIXON, the Rev. EDWARD, Rector of Castleton Kilpatrick.
- NOEL, the Hon. and Rev. BAPTIST WRIOTHESLEY, M.A.
- OSBORNE, Lady, residing at Newtown Anner, near Clonmel.
- PATERSON, the Rev. ALEXANDER, a Presbyterian Minister.
- PERRIN, the Rev. MARK, Vicar of Kilsallaghan.
- PRICE, JOHN, Esq., a Magistrate of Queen's County.
- RALPH, THOMAS, a Scripture Reader at Achill.
- REYNOLDS, Mr. FRANCIS, an officer of the Coast-Guard.
- ROBERTSON, Mr. THOMAS JAFFRAY, Inspector of National Board Schools.
- *ROBINSON, the Rev. LEONARD HORNER, Perpetual Curate of Kilcluney.
- ROGERS, the Rev. HUGH WALKER, Moderator of the Synod of Ulster.
- ROWAN, the Rev. ARTHUR BLENNERHASSET, of Belmont, county of Kerry.
- RUTLEDGE, JOHN, a Coast-Guard Man at Achill.
- †SHAW, the Right Hon. F., M.P.
- SMYTH, the Rev. PETER DOMINICK, a Roman Catholic Clergyman, a poor Friar of the Order of St. Dominic, at Esker.
- †STANLEY, the Right Hon. Lord, M.P.
- STAPLES, the Rev. JOHN MOLESWORTH, of Ennishowen, Donegal.
- STEWART, Mr. THOMAS.
- *SULLIVAN, ROBERT, M.A., Inspector of National Board Schools.
- WARRE, Colonel WILLIAM.
- WELLESLEY, the Honourable Captain WILLIAM.
- WICKLOW, the Earl of, a Member of the Committee.
- WOODWARD, the Rev. FRANCIS BLAKE, Curate of St. Stephen's, Dublin.
- YIELDING, WILLIAM RICHARD, Esq., a Landed Proprietor in the counties of Limerick and Kerry.

DIGEST,

&c.

CHAPTER I.

Origin of the Board of National Education.

THE education of the Irish peasantry has more or less engaged the attention of the British Government since the reign of Queen Elizabeth, and various plans have been devised for effecting so important an object. The acts 12th of Elizabeth and 7th of William III. were designed to enforce the creation of free schools, and all the clergy of the Established Church in Ireland were bound to take an oath that they would teach, or cause to be taught, an English school within their benefice, as required by law. These statutes fell into desuetude; it was generally supposed that it was sufficient if the rector paid forty shillings per annum towards the education of the children of his parish. And though this error has been exposed by the Commissioners of Education Inquiry in 1812, yet the Rev. Dr. Elrington, son of the late Bishop of Ferns, informs us that these ancient laws are very imperfectly observed.

I conceive that the clergy have, in most benefices in Ireland, what are strictly called parochial schools, and in others, in which they have not, they have been unable to build the school-houses themselves; and, having no grant from any public society, they have considered that they have fulfilled the words of the oath, by contributing, as they do, to some of the various schools that are formed under the Association for Discountenancing Vice, or the Kildare Place Society.—*Commons*, q. 1938.

The same gentleman mentions also an abortive attempt to enforce the establishment of a school under these ancient statutes:—

There was a most respectable clergyman in the diocese of Ferns, of which my father was bishop, who refused to keep a parochial school because the provisions of the Act were to teach the English language, and there was no person in his parish who knew what Irish was; and my father, fearing the example would be a bad one, attempted to proceed by law to compel him to keep the school; but he found it necessary to give up the proceedings; the clergyman

refused to do it on the principle that the law was at an end, that every child in his parish knew English.—*Commons*, q. 1941.

Struck by this anomaly, arising from the wording of the statute, the Bishop of Ferns

proposed in the Report of the Commission of Education in 1812, that the clergy should pay two per cent. upon their income for the purpose of education.—*Commons*, q. 1946.

For some reasons not explained in the Reports, this appropriation of ecclesiastical revenues to the general purposes of education was abandoned, and, until the establishment of the National Board, the education of the poor in Ireland was principally directed by two voluntary and self-elected bodies, the Association for Discountenancing Vice and the Kildare Place Society.

The principle of the Association for Discountenancing Vice is the necessary use of the Scriptures according to the authorised version, and the exclusion of all catechisms except the catechism of the Church of England.—*Lords*, p. 782.

This Association was incorporated at the time of the Union, A.D. 1800, and from that period until the year 1831 Parliament annually granted sums of money, in aid of its funds. Schools began to be established in 1806; the largest amount of Parliamentary grant was in 1824 or 1825; it was for two or three years the sum of £10,000. The numbers educated at the schools under the superintendence of the Association are thus stated by Dr. Elrington:—

In 1822 the numbers were 5479 Protestants and 4672 Roman Catholics. In 1828, which was the year immediately before our Parliamentary grant was withdrawn, there were 13,189 Protestants and 5494 Roman Catholics. And in last year up to the last return there were 10,014 Protestants and 3772 Roman Catholics.—*Lords*, p. 574.

It is unnecessary to show that such an amount of instruction was wholly inadequate to the wants of Ireland, and indeed the institution of a new association in 1812, called the Kildare Place Society, showed that a numerous and influential body felt that the exertions of the Association for Discountenancing Vice were insufficient. The services of the Kildare Place Society are thus described by the Rev. Charles Boyton:—

If your Lordships will carry your memory back you will find that there was no society for the diffusion of education that did not diffuse it upon the terms of requiring the catechism and the authorised version to be used. The charter schools were one class of schools; the Association was another class of schools; in point of fact all the public establishments in connexion with the Government were essentially and exclusively of a character that I think would neces-

sarily exclude the great majority of the population ; they were essentially Protestant. The Kildare Place Society saw the mischief of this, and they gave up all that they could consistently give up ; they did not require the use of the catechism ; they did not require the authorised version ; but in every respect that they could they accommodated themselves to the prejudices of the Roman Catholics, save only that they did require the Scriptures.—*Lords*, p. 1271.

Many of the Protestant clergy were averse to the Kildare Place Society from its commencement, and strongly opposed its progress ; but the opposition in point of time began to relax when the Roman Catholic body had made objections to it ; but the Rev. J. Graham states—

I believe it to be so, but I do not believe that to be the cause why the Protestant clergy took it up ; I think the cause of the Protestant clergy taking it up was that they saw it was doing good, prospering in the country, and extending its schools.—*Lords*, p. 135.

Although proselytism was strictly prohibited by the three fundamental rules of the Kildare Place Society, yet the Rev. F. B. Woodward, who, like many other clergymen of the Established Church, objects to the society as latitudinarian, assigns the following reason for preferring it to the National Board:—

My objection to the Kildare Place Society was to their leading principles ; but the fact is, that those principles are so general, that, if a Protestant clergyman had a school under that society, he really could convert it into an engine, without infringing upon their principles, of wide-spread dissemination of religious truth among the children.—*Lords*, p. 280.

The suspicion that the Kildare Place Society, notwithstanding its public professions, secretly aimed at proselytism, was not confined to Roman Catholic priests. The very reverend T. J. Burgh says—

I think that it was a proselyting society ; I do not think that it kept its faith with the public, and I never belonged to it further than what I said. I think it was decidedly a proselyting society. I do not say that it could be proved that, viewed in itself, there were instances of its proselyting tendency directly ; yet it was joined with three societies that were of a most decidedly proselyting character, that is, the Association in Capel Street for Discountenancing Vice and Promoting the Knowledge and Practice of Religion and Virtue, the London Hibernian Society, and the Baptist Society. It connected itself with those societies, and in doing that I conceive that it did indirectly transgress one of its principles.—*Lords*, p. 909.

The opinion that generally prevailed of the secret object of the society being proselytism was quite sufficient to defeat its

professed purpose, the introduction of a general plan of education. Dean Burgh says,—

I believe that that was the strong opinion of some of the most respectable of their own members, whose opinions are to be seen in the Appendix to Reports of the Commissioners; and I think they broke faith with the public also about the use of the Scriptures, for they asserted the use of what is called the integrity of the Bible, that is, the whole unmutilated Bible; they asserted that the Bible or Testament was always to be read. I think that it is very clear, from the evidence of their own servants and officers examined on their oaths, that the use of the Bible was not so, and that it was after all, in my humble judgment, a very uncertain reading of the extracts themselves.—*Lords*, p. 910.

But even were no such suspicion attached to the society, one of its fundamental rules, requiring the reading of the Scriptures without note or comment, was inconsistent with the established discipline of the Roman Catholic church, and the schools were consequently opposed by its priests, who frequently removed the children; and it was soon found that the society's system was inapplicable to the circumstances of Ireland. The Hon. and Rev. B. W. Noel strongly states—

As a proof how little such a system can prevail, I find that, when the Kildare Place Society came to Parliament annually for the money which they wanted, after ten years of exertions, they could only get 29,812 children in their schools out of half a million that ought to have been instructed; and this was at a fearful sacrifice, much greater than this board is called to make, for the religious education was often merely nominal, and the Bible was often not read. The Commissioners of Education Inquiry state that they found the reading of the Scriptures to be frequently a mere form, and, in the second place, no exposition was allowed; and, notwithstanding these fatal concessions, after all, in ten years they could only get, out of 500,000 Roman Catholic children, 29,812.—*Lords*, p. 872.

The nature of the objections felt, not only by Roman Catholics, but by many influential Protestants, to the system of the Kildare Street Society, is thus stated by the Right Hon. A. R. Blake:—

The Roman Catholics object to the use of the Scriptures without note or comment at any time; they object to any such use of them as might carry with it the notion that the reading of the Scriptures afforded sufficient religious instruction. I have often spoken to the Roman Catholic Clergy upon the subject, and it appeared to me that there was no difference in principle between what they stated in objection to the use of the Scriptures in schools and what I recollect was urged many years ago by the then Professor Marsh, now Bishop of Peterborough, against the Lancasterian system in England: he objected, and I understood at the time that the hierarchy

in England generally objected also, to the class of schools in which the reading of the Scriptures was enjoined, and the use of any catechism prohibited, because it went to imply that the use of the Scriptures was essential, but that the use of the catechism was not, and thus to create or encourage indifference as to creeds or articles of faith.—*Lords*, p. 69.

Under these circumstances the Government came to the resolution of substituting a responsible board for voluntary association; and Mr. Secretary Stanley, now Lord Stanley, stated the principles of its constitution in a letter to the Duke of Leinster, of which the following is an extract:—

Irish Office, London, October, 1831.

My Lord,—His Majesty's Government having come to the determination of empowering the Lord Lieutenant to constitute a Board for the superintendence of a system of national education in Ireland, and Parliament having so far sanctioned the arrangement as to appropriate a sum of money in the present year as an experiment of the probable success of the proposed system, I am directed by his Excellency to acquaint your Grace that it is his intention, with your consent, to constitute you the president of the new board; and I have it further in command to lay before your Grace the motives of the Government in constituting this board, the powers which it is intended to confer upon it, and the objects which it is expected that it will bear in view, and carry into effect.

The Commissioners, in 1812, recommended the appointment of a board of this description to superintend a system of education from which should be banished even the suspicion of proselytism, and which, admitting children of all religious persuasions, should not interfere with the peculiar tenets of any. The Government of the day imagined that they had found a superintending body, acting upon a system such as was recommended, and intrusted the distribution of the national grants to the care of the Kildare Street Society. His Majesty's present Government are of opinion that no private society, deriving a part, however small, of their annual income from private sources, and only made the channel of the munificence of the legislature, without being subject to any direct responsibility, could adequately and satisfactorily accomplish the end proposed; and, while they do full justice to the liberal views with which that society was originally instituted, they cannot be but sensible that one of its leading principles was calculated to defeat its avowed objects, as experience has subsequently proved that it has. The determination to enforce in all their schools the reading of the holy Scriptures without note or comment was undoubtedly taken with the purest motives; with the wish at once to connect religious with moral and literary education, and at the same time not to run the risk of wounding the peculiar feelings of any sect by catechetical instruction or comments which might tend to subjects of polemical controversy. But it seems to have been overlooked, that the principles of the Roman Catholic church (to which, in any system intended for

general diffusion throughout Ireland, the bulk of the pupils must necessarily belong,) were totally at variance with this principle; and that the indiscriminate reading of the holy Scriptures without note or comment, by children, must be peculiarly obnoxious to a church which denies, even to adults, the right of unaided private interpretation of the sacred volume with respect to articles of religious belief.

Shortly after its institution, although the society prospered and extended its operations under the fostering care of the legislature, this vital defect began to be noticed, and the Roman Catholic clergy began to exert themselves with energy and success against a system to which they were on principle opposed, and which they feared might lead in its results to proselytism, even although no such object were contemplated by its promoters. When this opposition arose, founded on such grounds, it soon became manifest that the system could not become one of national education.

The Commissioners of Education, in 1824-5, sensible of the defects of the system, and of the ground as well as the strength of the objection taken, recommended the appointment of two teachers in every school, one Protestant and the other Roman Catholic, to superintend separately the religious education of the children; and they hoped to have been able to agree upon a selection from the Scriptures which might have been generally acquiesced in by both persuasions. But it was soon found that these schemes were impracticable; and, in 1828, a Committee of the House of Commons, to which were referred the various Reports of the Commissioners of Education, recommended a system to be adopted which should afford, if possible, a combined literary, and a separate religious education, and should be capable of being so far adapted to the views of the religious persuasions which prevail in Ireland as to render it, in truth, a system of national education for the poorer classes of the community.

For the success of the undertaking much must depend upon the character of the individuals who compose the board, and upon the security thereby afforded to the country, that, while the interests of religion are not overlooked, the most scrupulous care should be taken not to interfere with the peculiar tenets of any description of Christian pupils.

To attain the first object, it appears essential that the board should be composed of men of high personal character, including individuals of exalted station in the church; to attain the latter, that it should consist of persons professing different religious opinions.

The Board was constituted on the principle thus laid down: its members are the Duke of Leinster, a Protestant of the Established Church, the Archbishop of Dublin and Dr. Sadleir of the Established Church; Dr. Murray and Mr. Blake of the Roman Catholic; and there are Mr. Holmes and the Rev. J. Carlile, who are Presbyterians, but of different denominations.—*Commons*, q. 19.

To the constitution of the Board objections were made by

several of the witnesses; some objected to the uniting of persons of different religious denominations in the same commission, but this was rather insinuated than expressed; the chief objection made was, that the Board, as at present constituted, did not possess the confidence of the Protestants of Ireland, and that the clergy of the Established Church did not repose trust in the members by whom that church was represented. This accusation was made by many, but it is stated in the most simple form by the Rev. Dr. Murray, Dean of Ardagh.

Mr. Lefroy.—Do you think that the Board, as at present constituted, has a single member in whom the Protestants of Ireland have the smallest confidence?—There is not one single member of the Board in whom the Protestants of Ireland can place the least reliance.—*Commons*, q. 4299.

But the same gentleman asserts that the Government was limited in its choice.

I do not think there is any Protestant Bishop of Ireland who would stand in the Archbishop's situation on that Board as at present constituted; and there was a very remarkable circumstance in proof of that: when the late Archbishop of Dublin died, it was offered to Dr. Bissett, the Bishop of Raphoe, an excellent man, and in some respects a liberal man, but a very good one, and he refused it exclusively from the reason that he could not sit on that Board, as it was constituted.

The circumstance here mentioned respecting the archbishopric of Dublin is stated by the same gentleman to have been one great cause of the unpopularity of the Board among the Protestants of Ireland.

There was a very unpleasant feeling created in the minds of the Protestants at that time by a very amiable man, who was long wishing for the Archdiocese of Dublin, refusing it; and there was a report current that he refused it in consequence of not accepting it on the terms proposed to him. That was the report that ran through the Protestants to a very great extent. As to the truth or falsehood of it I cannot affirm; but that created a very strong prejudice just upon the present Archbishop coming over.

The purport of the report was, that Earl Grey and Lord Stanley, aware that their plan of national education would be distasteful to the Protestants of Ireland, made support of it an indispensable condition of their grant of the archiepiscopal see. The charge appeared to be of so much importance that it was thoroughly sifted. Mr. Bissett, nephew to the late Bishop of Raphoe, the person who had mentioned the matter to the

Dean of Ardagh, gave the following account of the nature and grounds of the communication :—

Did you communicate to him anything respecting the appointment of the present Archbishop to the archbishopric of Dublin, or a refusal on the part of your uncle to accept it?—I merely in the course of conversation had told him about my uncle having refused the archbishopric ; I do not remember having said anything about the present Archbishop.

What did you tell about your uncle having refused the archbishopric?—The reasons why my uncle told me he refused the archbishopric were, that he was at too advanced an age for entering into such active duties ; and I believe I also said that he was unwilling to sit upon the Board with Dr. Murray, as he did not think they could ever agree upon it.

Did you make that statement from the authority of your uncle?—I have heard him say so ; I have heard him, when talking upon the subject with him of his refusing the archbishopric, express those opinions.

The account given by Mr. Fenwick, also a nephew of the late Bishop, differs from that of Mr. Bissett in one important particular.

Did he assign reasons to you (for refusing the archbishopric)?—The reasons he assigned to me were, that he was too far advanced at the time to accept the offer, which he thought would bring him much more into public business than he wished to be at his time of life.

Did he assign any other reason?—He assigned also his great attachment to the see of Raphoe, and those among whom he lived, and his then habits of life, rather than so public a sphere as Dublin.

Did he state any other reason?—No ; no other to me.

Did he state to you anything with respect to the Board of Education?—No.

Did he at any time state to you any objection to his being a member of the new Board of Education?—Never that I heard of.

Were you in constant habits of intimacy with him at the time?—I was at the time of the refusal. I do not recollect afterwards whether the Bishop might or might not have stated objections as to whether he would have liked to be a member of the Board, but, as far as his reasons for refusing the diocese of Dublin, it is not impressed upon my mind that he gave such a reason at the time.

Mr. Fenwick's last answer suggests the cause of the variance : it is probable that, when the Board of Education was formed, which was at a period subsequent to the appointment of a new Archbishop of Dublin, Dr. Bissett may have expressed satisfaction at his former refusal, as it relieved him from the necessity of sitting at the same Board with the titular Archbishop. No reference was made to the plan of national education in

the letter containing the offer of the archiepiscopal See to Dr. Bissett, of which the following is a copy:—

MY LORD, *Dublin Castle, 8th Sept. 1831.*

I HAVE the honour to inform you that your name has been submitted to the King for the Archbishopric of Dublin, and that his Majesty has been graciously pleased to approve the same: I would therefore request your Lordship, if you are not indisposed to the translation, to inform me of it, that the necessary measures may be taken to effect it.

I have the honour to be,

My Lord,

Your obedient and humble servant,

ANGLESEY.

To the Right Reverend

The Lord Bishop of Raphoe.

—*Lords*, p. 1169.

Neither was there any reference to the Board of Education in the letter offering the archbishopric to Dr. Whately, of which the following is a copy:—

(*Private.*)

REV. SIR, *Downing-street, 14th Sept. 1831.*

HAVING been ordered by the King to recommend for his Majesty's consideration the name of a person well qualified by his eminence in the Church to fill the vacant Archbishopric of Dublin, I have, after the most diligent inquiry, satisfied myself that I shall best accomplish the object which his Majesty has in view by proposing that you should be appointed to this high situation.

I need not point out to you the important duties annexed to it, more especially at this moment, when the most unremitting care, under the direction of a firm, enlightened, and conciliating spirit, will be required to preserve the Church of Ireland from the dangers with which it is surrounded.

An anxious wish to engage in this arduous task the qualities best fitted for its successful execution, and the persuasion derived from your high reputation that they will be found in you, have alone induced me to make this offer; your acceptance of which will afford me the sincerest pleasure.

May I request an early answer to this communication?

I remain, with great Respect,

Sir,

Your very obedient humble Servant,

GREY.

The Rev. Dr. Whately.

—*Lords*, p. 1071.

The Dean of Ardagh was still reluctant to abandon his charge; when pressed upon the subject he replied,—

The fact was contradicted, by showing that there were no terms in the Letter giving him the archbishopric. Now what struck my mind is, that that is a thing that would never be in the Letter; it would be a private arrangement made before or after.—*Lords*, p. 1067.

But even this gratuitous assumption was decisively refuted by Earl Grey.

Does your Lordship recollect whether you had any conversation with Dr. Whately with respect to the plan of education previously to forming the system now in operation?—I cannot say positively, but I rather think not.

Previous to the date of that letter?—I can answer that at once. I had never seen Dr. Whately before I wrote that letter, and had no personal acquaintance with him.

You had never seen him?—No, nor ever written to him, or authorised any letter to be written to him. I wish I had my papers here, for I am certain that the Archbishop's answer would at once negative the idea of any such condition. It was merely from his general character that I proposed his name to his majesty.—*Lords, 1071-2.*

And subsequently his Lordship confirmed this account by the incontrovertible evidence of dates.

I should add, that with respect to the condition said to have been made with Dr. Whately, that he should be a member of the Board of the Education Commissioners in Ireland, I am completely confirmed by the letter already before the Committee in saying, that no such condition was made; but, in further confirmation of this, Lord Stanley has furnished me with an extract of a letter which he wrote at the time to Lord Anglesey. My letter to the Archbishop offering the archbishopric, after I had taken his majesty's pleasure upon it, was dated the 14th of September; and on the 20th of October, that is, more than a month subsequently, I find from a letter from Lord Stanley, who was then in London, to Lord Anglesey, that the Board of Education was not finally settled, and that it was not certain who the members that were to compose it would be. In this letter, dated the 20th of October, Lord Stanley writes as follows:—"We must lose no time in naming the Commissioners for our new Board of Education. This will be a task of some delicacy. I propose, however, if you approve, to make them a Board of seven, of whom three to be of the Established Church, two Catholics, and two Protestant Dissenters. This will I think be a fair distribution. The names which have occurred to me are Dr. Whately and Dr. Sadleir (if they will accept), to whom we must add some liberal layman of the church of England; for the Catholics, Dr. Murray; and some layman for the Dissenters. Only one has occurred to me. I believe Mr. Holmes, the barrister, if he would take the office, would be unexceptionable. I am afraid _____ would not join, as he disapproves the plan. Perhaps you could suggest some additional names, or some which might be substituted for some of them. Pray let me know what you say to them. I am drawing up instructions, which shall be sent to you forthwith before I take any steps." This letter shows that on the 20th of October, above a month subsequent to the appointment of Dr. Whately, the Commission was not formed; that the names were not settled, and that it

was even then uncertain whether Dr. Whately would consent to be one.—*Lords*, p. 1170.

The Dean of Armagh also objected to certain opinions published by the Rev. Dr. Whately before he became Archbishop of Dublin, as a reason for his own want of confidence in that prelate; but as these opinions have no connexion whatever with the subject of education, it is unnecessary to enter on their investigation. The Dean of Armagh objected also to the Rev. Dr. Sadleir (the present Provost of Trinity College, Dublin). On this subject he gives the following evidence:—

Is it your impression that the Protestants of Ireland have no confidence whatever in Dr. Sadleir?—That is my impression.

You do not consider him orthodox?—The objection they have to him is, that they do not know what he is; that at one time he will be one thing, and at another time he will be another thing; they have no confidence in the stability of his judgment.

Do you mean that they do not know what he is in point of faith, or in point of morals, or in point of judgment?—In point of morals he is a very good man, a very amiable man; and I am very fond of him.

As to his orthodoxy?—I should say the opinion the Protestants have of him is, that it is no matter what the Government is, he is in with the Government, and is a supporter of the Government.

Then it is not in point of orthodoxy they do not know what he is?—No.

It is not in point of morals they do not know what he is?—No, but that the Protestants do not think they can trust him.

Does it come to this, that it is the politics of the man they cannot trust?—It is his politics acting on his religion.

Of course influencing his religion?—Yes.

Then it is the opinion of the Protestants that the politics of a man must necessarily influence his religion?—No, not at all.

But it is so in the case of Dr. Sadleir?—Yes.—*Commons*, q. 4398—4408.

The only grounds which the Dean of Armagh assigns for this very grave charge is, that he resigned the office of Secretary to the Hibernian Bible Society, which is thus simply explained by the Rev. Mr. Carlile:—

Mr. Lefroy.—With regard to the confidence supposed to be gained towards your Board on the part of the Protestants in Ireland in consequence of Dr. Sadleir being a member of it, have you ever heard that he had taken a part respecting some religious societies in Ireland, calculated to diminish that confidence?—No, I do not recollect it. He did take a part in regard to religious societies that displeased some parties and pleased others; but taking it with regard to the general Protestant mind of the country, I cannot answer that question.

With respect to the Bible Society in particular?—He was Secre-

tary to the Bible Society, and withdrew from it for reasons which many friends of that society thought not very good, but still he was going along with another influential party of Protestants in the country at that time in doing so.

Mr. Serjeant Ball.—You were asked whether Dr. Sadleir had not by his conduct in reference to some associations created in some degree a jealousy on the part of some Protestants against him; do you conceive there was anything political in the minds of those persons represented to have had that jealousy?—I think political feeling has mixed itself up with the whole opposition to that Board.

Including some jealousy against Dr. Sadleir?—Yes.

Mr. Wyse.—Did you ever hear that Dr. Sadleir withdrew from the Bible societies when they were generally condemned?—He withdrew in deference to the opinion of the primate, his superior, as a fellow of Trinity College.—*Commons*, q. 1431—1435.

No objections were made to the Duke of Leinster, or to the Right Hon. A. R. Blake; but the Dean of Ardagh, on the part of the Catholics, Presbyterians, and Protestants, stated his reasons for believing that Dr. Murray, tutelar Archbishop of Dublin, and the Rev. Mr. Carlile, a member of the Presbyterian synod of Ulster, ought not to have been included in the Commission.

Viscount Ebrington.—You mentioned that the Protestant clergy of Ireland did not feel confidence in Archbishop Whately; do you believe that a similar distrust is felt by the Roman Catholics of Ireland of Dr. Murray?—I think a consistent Roman Catholic ought to have exactly the same objection to the Archbishop of Dublin which I have.

The question respects Dr. Murray; do you believe the Roman Catholics of Ireland would have the same distrust of Dr. Murray, the Roman Catholic Archbishop, which you have stated the Protestant clergymen have of Archbishop Whately?—No, I do not know the opinion of the Roman Catholics respecting their own Archbishop; but I think that a conscientious Roman Catholic ought to have as great an objection to their Archbishop of Dublin being on the Board as Protestants ought to have; because it is directly contrary to the leading doctrines of the Roman Catholics, that a man should have anything to do with the education of children, who holds erroneous principles.

Do you not know that Dr. Murray is also a member of the Board?—Yes.

If you believe that he enjoys the confidence of the Roman Catholic clergy in Ireland, do you not suppose the sanction of his name and authority would lead them to view the National Board with favour?—I am sure it does, because he has great influence; but I am talking of the feelings of the educated, and I know that they object to the Archbishop of Dublin and Mr. Carlile having anything to do with the system.

Mr. Serjeant Jackson.—You have been asked whether you con-

sider that Dr. Murray, as a member of the Board, possesses the confidence of the Roman Catholics of Ireland?—Yes, I suppose he does, of most.

Do you think that he possesses the confidence of the Protestant inhabitants of Ireland?—No, the discussions as to Peter Dens' works have decided that question, certainly.—*Commons*, q. 4281—4285.

The Reverend Mr. Brown also says, that Mr. Carlile does not enjoy the confidence of the Synod of Ulster, (*Lords*, 172,) and the Reverend Mr. Cook says, that the members of the Synod are very much mortified at his conduct.—(*Commons* q. 4842.)

The Dean of Ardagh also objected to Mr. Holmes as a Unitarian; and stated that the limited numbers of that sect in Ireland did not entitle them to have a representative at the Board. These objections were not investigated by either of the committees.

CHAPTER II.

Plan and Progress of the System of National Education.

THE plan adopted by the Commissioners of Education, for giving effect to the designs of Government, is thus described in their official circular:—

The Commissioners appointed for administering the funds placed at the disposal of his Excellency the Lord Lieutenant, for the education of the poor of *Ireland*, are ready to receive applications for aid towards the building and fitting up of schools, the paying of teachers, and the obtaining of books and school requisites, on the following conditions:—

1.—They will require that local funds be raised: 1st, For the annual repair of the school-house and furniture. 2d. Towards a permanent salary for the teacher; the amount of such salary, in each case, to be settled with the approbation of the Commissioners. 3d, For the purchase of books and school requisites, at half-price.

2.—Where aid is sought from the Commissioners for building a school-house, they will require that at least one-third of the estimated expense be locally contributed: that a site for building, to be approved of by the Commissioners, be secured for the purpose; and that the school-house, when finished, be vested in trustees, to be also approved of by them.

3.—They will require, that the schools be kept open for a certain number of hours, on four or on five days of the week, at the discretion of the Commissioners, for moral and literary education only; and that the remaining one or two days in the week be set apart for giving, separately, such religious education to the children as may be approved of by the clergy of their respective persuasions. They will also permit and encourage the clergy to give religious instruction, either before or after the ordinary school-hours, on the other days of the week.

4.—They will require to have the entire control over all books to be used in the school, whether in the combined moral and literary, or separate religious instruction; none to be employed in the former except under the sanction of the Board, nor in the latter but with the approbation of those members of the Board who are of the same religious persuasion with the children for whose use they are intended.

[Although it is not designed to exclude from the list of books for the combined instruction such portions of sacred history, or of religious or moral teaching, as may be approved of by the entire Board, it is to be understood that the use of such books

is by no means intended to constitute a perfect and sufficient religious education, or to supersede the necessity of separate religious instruction on the days set apart for that purpose.]

5.—They will require that in all schools a register be kept, in which shall be entered the attendance or non-attendance of each child on divine worship on Sundays.

6.—They will allow to the individuals or bodies applying for aid, the appointment of their teachers, subject to the following restrictions and regulations:—1. All teachers (except of schools now existing, and which shall be approved of by the Board) shall have received previous instruction in a model-school in Dublin, to be sanctioned by the Board, and shall also have obtained from the Board testimonials of good conduct and general fitness. 2. All teachers shall be liable to be fined, suspended, or removed, when the Commissioners shall deem it necessary.

7.—The Commissioners, by themselves or their inspectors, to be allowed to visit and examine the schools whenever they think fit.

8.—They will particularly require that the principles of the following lesson be strictly inculcated in all schools approved of by them, and that the lesson itself be printed, and copies of it on paste-board be hung up in each school:

[Christians should endeavour, as the apostle Paul commands them, to “live peaceably with all men;” (Romans, ch. 12, ver. 18,) even with those of a different religious persuasion.

Our Saviour, Christ, commanded his disciples to “love one another.” He taught them to love even their enemies, to bless those that cursed them, and to pray for those who persecuted them. He himself prayed for his murderers.

Many men hold erroneous doctrines; but we ought not to hate or persecute them. We ought to seek for the truth, and to hold fast what we are convinced is the truth; but not to treat harshly those who are in error. Jesus Christ did not intend his religion to be forced on men by violent means. He would not allow his disciples to fight for him.

If any persons treat us unkindly, we must not do the same to them; for Christ and his apostles have taught us not to return evil for evil. If we would obey Christ, we must do to others not as they do to us, but as we should wish them to do to us.

Quarrelling with our neighbours and abusing them, is not the way to convince them that we are in the right, and they in the wrong; it is more likely to convince them that we have not a Christian spirit.

We ought to show ourselves followers of Christ, who, “when he was reviled, reviled not again,” (1 Pet. ch. 2, ver. 23,) by behaving gently and kindly to every one.]

As one of the main objects of his Majesty’s Government is to unite in one system children of different creeds, and as much must depend upon the co-operation of the resident clergy, the Board will look with peculiar favour upon applications proceeding either from,—

- 1st, A Protestant clergyman and Roman Catholic clergyman conjointly.
- 2d, A clergyman of the one denomination, and a certain number of laymen of the other.
- 3d, Laymen of both denominations.—*Commons, Appendix.*

The following document, explanatory of some of the foregoing conditions which have been misunderstood, having been drawn up by the Commissioners, as containing their views of them, has received the approbation and sanction of his Majesty's Government :

As some parts of the plan of education committed to the commissioners, to be by them carried into effect, have, as it appears, been misunderstood, the Commissioners beg to submit to Government the sense in which they have understood, and acted upon the instructions given in the letter of the Chief Secretary for Ireland, that the Government may confirm them in their mode of procedure where they are right, and correct them where they are wrong.

1.—In giving a control to individual members of the Board over books to be used in the particular religious instruction of different denominations of pupils, the Board do not understand that it was the intention of his Majesty's Government either to claim for themselves, or to vest in the Commissioners, any control over the use of the Sacred Scriptures, or over the standards of the established churches of Ireland, or of Scotland, or of the Roman Catholic church, but only over books composed by private authors; and that the control over these is required merely for the purpose of checking the introduction of books of injurious tendency.

2.—The Board do not understand that it is imperative upon them to edit all books used in the schools receiving grants from them; but that they are at liberty to sanction such books as may previously be in use in schools in behalf of which applications are made, or such as may be preferred by the local patrons and conductors of schools, provided that they find nothing objectionable in them. Under this view of the duty assigned to them, they require a list of the books used in the schools, which they are requested to aid, and have already frequently sanctioned the school-books issued by the Kildare Place Society, and also, after certain alterations, the school-books issued by the Catholic Book Society. The Board wish to remark that they have never conceived it would be expedient to render the use of any particular book or books imperative.

3.—The Board understands that the control over teachers of schools is vested primarily in their local patrons and conductors; and that the power required by the Government to be conceded to the Board, of fining and dismissing teachers, is to be exercised only in case of such local patrons and conductors, after receiving grants, seeking to protect teachers in violating the rules of the Board, or retaining teachers found, on trial, to be incompetent.

4.—The Board understands that they are to require a permanent submission to its regulations only in those cases in which grants have been made towards the erection of school-houses, to be vested in trustees, according to the directions of Government; and that in

schools receiving occasional or annual grants, such as salaries for the teachers, &c., they are to require submission to their regulations only during the period for which grants are made.

5.—By encouraging the pastors of different denominations to give religious instruction to the children of their respective flocks, out of school hours, the Board understands merely affording to such pastors facility of access to the pupils at the times specified, and not employing or remunerating them. And they understand that the parents and guardians of the children are to determine to what denomination they respectively belong; the Board taking no cognisance of the matter.

6. The Board understand that the times for religious instruction are to be determined by the local patrons and conductors of schools; the power vested in the Board on that subject being merely to see that, at least, one week-day in the week is set apart for that purpose; they also understand that the religious instruction given may or may not be in the school-room, the choice of the place being left to the pastors of the children; but that liberty is to be secured to them to assemble the children of their respective flocks in the school-room, if they see fit.

7. The Board understand that they are not, in ordinary cases, to exercise control over the use of the school-rooms on Sundays, that control being left to the local conductors of the school; but that if any use be made of them tending to contention and well-founded complaints between adverse parties, it is competent for the Board to interfere for the purpose of remedying the evil.

The Board beg leave to add that they do not regard these observations as altering or modifying in any degree, the original instructions communicated to them in the Chief Secretary's letter of October 1831; they offer them as containing views which they have always entertained of their instructions, and upon which they have uniformly acted since the commencement of their labours.

By desire of the Commissioners,

THOMAS F. KELLY, *Secretary.*

The most important regulations of the Board are those relating to the reading of the Scriptures and to religious instruction, which are thus explained by Mr. Carlile:—

Is there any thing in the rules of the Board which prevents or prohibits reading the whole of the Scriptures in school hours?—I conceive nothing whatever. There has been a good deal of discussion respecting what is meant by school hours. Conductors of schools may call the hours for Scripture reading school hours or not, as they think fit. I remember an important letter of Lord Stanley explaining what he meant by school hours. But the hour for Scripture reading must be the first or the last hour, not an intermediate hour, as that would oblige the children who object to the exercise to go out of the school while the Scriptures are read, and return again when the reading was over. We considered it not right that Roman Catholic children should be subjected to such annoyance, and we required that the Scripture reading should be either the first or the

last hour. A case requiring such a precaution happened with respect to a few Protestant children in the south. It was found that some form of Roman Catholic instruction was given at twelve o'clock, and that the Protestant children were allowed to remain or go out, as they thought fit. We directed that such instruction must be in the first or the last hour; that the Protestant children should not be subjected to that annoyance of being obliged to go out and wait while that instruction was given. Our rule therefore is, that conductors of schools may call the hour for religious instruction school hour or not, as they think fit, but it must be the first or the last hour of the attendance in the school.—*Lords*, p. 13.

To this regulation it was rather unfairly objected that the Scriptures were absolutely excluded from the schools, but subsequently the change was modified into their being excluded during school hours. This objection was urged by several witnesses, but by none more strenuously than the Rev. Robert Bell.

Should you consider a school in which the Protestant clergyman attended for one hour in the course of every day for the purpose of reading the Scriptures and expounding them to Protestant children as a school from which God's word was excluded?—I should say that was a school from which God's word was excluded where it could not be admitted during school hours, and where there was a certain class of children into whose hands it might not be put.

Do you consider that an entire exclusion of the Scriptures?—I think it an exclusion.

An entire exclusion?—I feel at a loss to answer that question. It is not an entire exclusion if they be read during the hours of the school, but if not within the hours of the school I should say that the Scriptures are excluded from the school.

Then if it was read during an hour, which hour was called a school hour, you would not consider that the Scriptures were excluded from that school?—Just so.

If it was read during an hour which was not called a school hour, but still equally read, you then would consider that an exclusion?—Certainly an exclusion from the school. I can only consider the school as existing during school hours.—*Lords*, p. 742.

The same gentleman was examined respecting the practice of reading the Scriptures in schools for the higher orders, and gave the following evidence.

Where were you educated yourself?—I was educated by my father.

Not at a public school?—It is a public school, an endowed school.

In school hours were you in the habit of reading the Bible?—Yes; not every day.

At any particular time, or at any time indifferently?—We generally had a fixed time.

Were there any Roman Catholics in your father's school?—At different times.

Were they required to attend those religious exercises?—They attended prayer; they were not required to attend the reading and explanation of the Bible.

The reading of the Bible took place generally you say in the middle of the day, and then the Roman Catholic scholars were not required to attend?—No.

It was imperative upon the others?—It was.

You did not consider the word of God as being excluded from that school?—No, I did not; but I consider a private school and a private arrangement as upon a different footing from a national system of instruction.

Then you think that that would be a total exclusion from a school that was under a national system which might not be called a total exclusion under a private establishment?—I should say that that might be admitted in a private establishment which was not admissible in a national one.

Then you think it less objectionable to exclude the Scriptures from a private establishment than from a national establishment?—I do; I think they are upon a totally different footing.—*Lords*, p. 742-3.

It is unnecessary, however, to dwell upon this objection, as the Commissioners have so far modified their rule as to permit the Scriptures to be read at any hour by those children whose parents desire it, provided they be not read in the hearing of those whose parents object to such a use of the Bible. Instead of insisting on the use of the Scriptures, the Commissioners recommended a series of extracts from the Bible; and as this was the prominent difference between the system sanctioned by the Board and that adopted by the Kildare Place Society, the attention of both Committees was directed to the relative merits of the two systems, more than to any other topic of investigation. The objections made to the extracts were twofold; first, general, as being a human compilation, and therefore an unworthy substitute for the inspired volume; secondly, special, as not being taken from the authorised version exclusively, as containing mistranslations and objectionable notes. We shall devote a separate chapter to the second class of objections, and shall here only examine the evidence respecting the general results of the system adopted by the Kildare Place Society, and that sanctioned by the National Board. The difference between both is thus clearly stated by the Right Hon. A. R. Blake:—

I do not conceive there was any means of religious instruction, according to the principles of the Established Church, provided in any schools formerly supplied by the State in Ireland, except the schools under the Association for the Suppression of Vice and the charter schools; there was none in the schools under the Kildare

Place Society. The course pursued as to religion in the schools of the Kildare Place Society was that which has been so decidedly, as I understand, objected to by the prelates of the Established Church in England. It consisted of the mere reading of the Scriptures, to the utter exclusion of catechism or exposition of any sort or kind. Now I think I could show that the system of the national schools in England, which I apprehend I may call the Church of England system, may be enforced in point of principle in every one of our schools which is attended by Protestant children, if the Protestant clergymen of the place desired it, but not in the schools of the Kildare Place Society. We insist on the right of clergymen approved of by the parents to give religious instruction in the schools; the Kildare Place Society did not, I think, do so.

I do not consider that the reading of Scripture in the way in which I have seen it practised in the Kildare Place schools does give so much of religious instruction to the children,—I speak solemnly and conscientiously,—as they get in general in our schools through our Scripture lessons. I found, when I was going through Ireland in 1824, 1825, and 1826, that in many of the schools the children went on reading over and over again the same part of Scripture, without knowing the meaning of what they read at all; I found them in other schools getting by heart particular parts of Scripture, and yet knowing nothing of sacred history in general,—knowing nothing of the great events that are recorded in Scripture, and very little of the precepts it contains.—*Lords*, p. 84-5.

Precisely similar evidence was given by the Hon. and Rev. Baptist Noel.

The Kildare Place Society nominally introduced the Bible, but in cases where there was a Roman Catholic superintendent the Commissioners of Education stated that it was often a mere form, and it was in fact excluded; but in all cases the Kildare Place Society did not allow of exposition, which was thought to be a mode of proselyting; but this system provides for it: while on the one hand it allows the Roman Catholic priests freely to give their own Roman Catholic instruction after school hours, it as freely and with just impartiality allows the Protestant clergymen both to read the Scriptures with all the children whose parents permit it, and to explain them freely, and in every other way to produce a religious impression upon their minds, which I consider a vast advantage.—*Lords*, p. 857.

Lady Osborne, who has for seventeen years devoted her attention to the education of the poor of Ireland, especially those on the Osborne estates, gives similar testimony.

I found that whenever I heard the children read (for you are not allowed to question them under the Kildare Place system) I observed that they did not read any book of Scripture consecutively. Sometimes it was a chapter in Luke and sometimes in John. I asked the master the reason, and he made no answer, but he followed me out of the school, and he said that "it was because the children, a great many of them, would not hold the Testament in

their hands; they have extracts, so that whilst I had the Testament they read the extracts that corresponded to the chapter that was to be read. That was one thing that led me to adopt the national system, because I thought it was infinitely better to read a book consecutively, and to have an opportunity of asking them questions upon it, than to run over the New Testament in that sort of way. I thought it was infinitely more profitable.

“I think (the Scripture lessons) quite sufficient. I have been often at meetings where I have heard that not only a single book was sufficient for the conversion of a soul, but a single chapter; and even a single verse; surely then I thought it would be very desirable to introduce a system which would give the Roman Catholics four books of Scripture; that I should have hundreds under my teaching reading four books of Scripture, where otherwise there would not be one. I have heard a meeting thunder with applause when it has been asserted that a single chapter of the Bible would be sufficient for the saving of a soul.

“I am quite convinced that my children* know more of the Bible than a great many Sunday schools in England, and what they know they know thoroughly.”—*Lords*, 1220.

I have often thought that the Scriptures would be better loved if they were not made such a party book as they have been. I was going to mention an instance of the master of a national school that I know, who was so much pleased with the Scripture extracts that he said he never rested till he got the Douay version of the Bible, and then he got the Protestant version. He has not become a convert. I think that if we did not so strenuously assert that the Bible would be the means of making people Protestants perhaps they would be more disposed to read it.—*Lords*, 1232.

In reply to this evidence, the opponents of the Board chiefly insisted on the superiority of the principle of giving the whole Bible, and deemed that excluding it during school hours was an improper concession to the Roman Catholics. This point was urged by several witnesses, but by no one so fully and so candidly as by the Rev. C. Boyton, late Fellow of Trinity College, Dublin.

I consider the operation of the present system is practically to pronounce upon the verity of that principle and the justness of that principle of the Roman Catholic church, because it actually adopts it. There is a permission, according to the rules of the Board, that the children may have an hour or portion of time set apart for the study of the Scriptures; and there is no doubt in the world, I think it is only right and fair to say with reference to it, that if we were entirely left to ourselves—if the question never had arisen respecting the prohibition of the Scriptures at all—I think under the arrangements of the Board there could be a portion of time given to religious instruction in the Scriptures, quite as much as any person having a free choice upon the subject would wish to give to the

* The children educated in the schools founded by her Ladyship.

children ; therefore I think that in practice this objection does not lie ; but I think the objectionable principle is set forth in the clearest possible way by the arrangements of the Board—it strikes me in this way ; that, supposing, for the sake of argument, the period in which the children are to be under instruction is six hours in the day ; then, according to the regulation of the Board, a person who wishes to have religious instruction in reading the Scriptures given to his child may have it done in one out of the six hours, so that the reading of the Scriptures is permitted for one hour and prohibited for five hours ; now it strikes me as a very clear thing, and I think the clergy generally think the same way, that the Roman Catholic principle is carried out clearly and fully during the five hours ; and that even with reference to the sixth hour it is the principle in another shape, because even in the sixth hour the Scriptures are only read under permission ; consequently in every way, as far as the practical action of any executive body can avow a principle, the Roman Catholic principle is avowed and acted upon by the Board, and the Protestant principle negatived ; and I consider everybody connecting his schools with the Board subscribes to this principle.—*Lords*, p. 1264.

The object of the Commissioners was to avoid wounding the conscientious scruples of those Roman Catholics and Protestants who object to the indiscriminate perusal of the Scriptures or the use of the Bible as a school-book. This might obviously be effected by appointing either a fixed place, or a fixed hour for the Scripture-classes, at which the attendance of those whose parents objected to that part of the educational course might attend. The appointment of a separate hour was obviously the most simple and convenient course ; but as this was objected to as a sacrifice of principle, the Commissioners, anxious to conciliate and to remove all grounds of complaint, have allowed the Scriptures to be used at all hours, but only stipulate that this should be done in a place set apart for the purpose.

Several witnesses, both in the Lords and Commons declared, that the Roman Catholic laity in general felt no objection to the reading of the Scriptures, but that the opposition to their use arose entirely from the priesthood. The evidence on this point is however very confused, from the use which the witnesses make of the terms “ Scriptural Education,” a phrase which may either signify education according to Scripture, or education directly derived from the Scriptures, used as a class-book. In the first sense, the evidence of Lady Osborne, Right Hon. A. R. Blake, and all the witnesses who have thoroughly examined the working of the National Schools, proves that the education given under the superintendence of the Board, is more extensive and effectual than that afforded by the Kildare Place Society ; they are instructed

in the great outline of the Scripture scheme of salvation, and made acquainted with the moral precepts of the New Testament. In the second sense it was asserted, that the objection to the use of the Scriptures as a class-book is one of modern date. Dr. Cooke says—

I am quite convinced it is altogether an artificial objection, got up within these few years. I was educated along with Roman Catholics, where the Bible and the Testament were invariably school books, and the Roman Catholics read side by side by myself, or heard the other classes reading; such an objection I never heard till within these comparatively few years.—*Commons*, 6843.

Very conflicting evidence was given respecting the present extent of the objection felt by the Roman Catholics to the use of the Bible as a means of educating their children. The utmost extent, however, to which the witnesses who ascribed the opposition to its use solely to the exertions of the Roman Catholic priesthood went, was to assert that the laity had no insuperable objection to the book; this is what we find stated by a witness, on whom as a recent convert from the Romish Church, the adversaries of the National Board manifestly placed great reliance:—

From your knowledge of the feelings of Roman Catholics, are they themselves desirous to read the Bible?—They have no objection to read it; I do not say they are actually desirous, because it is a thing which in many instances they are not at all aware of; it is out of their sphere; they have no information of it but that derived from the priests, that it is a bad book; but they have no objection to the book when they know it.—*Lords*, p. 994.

The Rev. George Dwyer asserted that—

It is the temporal advantages accruing from education that they look to, and that any spiritual instruction that they would receive in the Bible would not be a bar to their sending the children.—*Lords*, p. 1249.

We have no means of determining how far the inducement of receiving temporal instruction would induce the Roman Catholic laity to resist their spiritual guides, and disobey their precepts. All the witnesses except the Hon. and Rev. Baptist Noel spoke very vaguely on the subject, and he says—

I think there is a servility on the part of the peasantry towards the priesthood, which would effectually hinder any very large number from attending such Bible schools.—*Lords*, p. 850.

The same gentleman is the only witness who has given an intelligible opinion respecting the possibility of making a system of education to which the priests object, the means of effecting such a breach between them and their flocks, as would

induce the latter to reject the domination of the former. On this point he gave the following evidence:—

Have you ever been apprised that there have been instances to a large extent of the Roman Catholic people showing their love of scriptural education so strongly as to make them overcome even the denunciations of the priests?—So far to overcome the denunciation as to persevere in sending their children to the schools, very many instances; I suppose a great number of those attending the Hibernian Schools have been so opposed.

Would you or would you not think it probable, that adopting a system of education the fundamental rule of which was, that the Scriptures should be excluded from joint education in the time of ordinary school hours, and avowedly because the Roman Catholic priests object to it,—would or would you not consider such a measure as tending to promote that tyranny on the part of the priest which you say so often meets with servility on the part of the people?—I conceive that to give the people any instruction which they would receive would be much more calculated to overcome that servility than introducing a system of instruction which, from the circumstances in which they were placed, they could not avail themselves of, and therefore upon the whole the effect of the opposite system would be, not to confirm that tyranny, but to destroy it.

The question still is, whether the adoption of that principle on the part of the State does in itself tend, without considering whether it may be counteracted by other causes, to confirm the power of the priest?—I think that if viewed as an abstract principle it does not, because it is merely a concession on the part of the Legislature which establishes such a system on the fact, that the Roman Catholic population are not now prepared to receive the Scriptures; and if I look at it, not as an abstract principle, but in its practical working, then I find it does not confirm that tyranny, because it conveys to them a degree of information they would not previously have had, and accustoms them to the use of their understandings and to some independence of thought.

Do you say that you have evidence from experience that the adoption of this system on the part of the State has led to that exertion of freedom of thought on the part of the people, and to the resistance of their priests?—No; it is merely matter of theory.—*Lords*, p. 859.

No evidence was given as to the propriety, prudence, or policy of endeavoring to effect such a breach between the Roman Catholic clergy and laity; indeed the subject seems to have been studiously avoided.

On the whole, there is a preponderance of evidence that scriptural education, meaning thereby such an education as conveys to the instructed a sound knowledge of the facts and doctrines contained in the Bible, is administered more efficiently by the Board than by the Kildare Place Society, or by any other institution, and that a great portion of the opposition

made to the Board arises from the confounding scriptural education used in this, its legitimate sense, with education derived from the Scriptures used as a class-book. Obvious and simple as is the distinction between these two meanings of the phrase, we find that they were constantly confounded together by those who spoke only from report or far-gone conclusions respecting the system pursued in the national schools, but that those who visited the schools and judged for themselves saw that the exclusion of the Scriptures as a class-book was by no means an impediment to the establishment and efficiency of a sound system of scriptural education. On this subject Mr. Maurice Cross gave the following interesting evidence:—

Will your Lordships permit me to state a fact which came under my own observation three or four days before I left Belfast, which will prove how powerful the prejudice has been, and how difficult it is to induce persons to free their minds from its influence? It was only three or four days before I left Belfast that a party of visitors came to see the national school; and the lady who brought the party mentioned to me, as the secretary, "I am very glad you are here to-day, for I have brought a friend who is violently opposed to the national system," (and very strange to say this person was originally a warm supporter of the Lancasterian School,) for we cannot convince her but that you have put the Bible out of the school, and that you are introducing popery here; and it was with the greatest difficulty that the lady could be prevailed upon to visit the establishment, though she was originally one of our most zealous friends, and though we had published all our documents and regulations in the papers. However, she came, and at the hour of Scripture reading I conducted her through every class in the school; I requested the master to examine the children before her, and they evinced an accurate knowledge of the Scriptures. She was highly gratified; indeed she was astonished; she could not have believed that in the national school the Bible was used at all, much less that it was understood; and that whilst she was a visitor before the old system of scriptural instruction was not so efficient, because at that time the Scriptures were more read than understood; and I have reason to know that that visit produced a complete change in her sentiments. That is not the only instance of the kind which has come to my knowledge.—*Lords*, p. 1165.

The evidence respecting the success of the Board in uniting Catholic and Protestant children under the same system of instruction is not quite so satisfactory as that respecting scriptural education. Little if any opposition has been made by the Romish priesthood; but Mr. Kelly states that there are circumstances which hinder the system from receiving a fair trial on the part of Protestants. He thus describes these circumstances:—

The circumstances to which I allude are political circumstances ; the combined system of education in Ireland not having been a system favoured by very influential persons in Ireland, being in extreme disfavour with them for many reasons, a very influential portion of them holding out against it, depriving it of all opportunity of fair play, and reducing it to its extremity.

Mr. Shaw.—Do you not think there is also a strong religious feeling?—I do think there is a strong religious feeling.

Sir James Graham.—Looking at the force of the circumstances to which you have alluded, into whose hands has it practically thrown the working of the system?—I think that the effect has been to throw it greatly into the hands of the Roman Catholics in Ireland ; naturally it has thrown it into their hands ; the practical effect of the opposition has been to throw the aid and patronage greatly into the hands of the Roman Catholics of Ireland.

Do you mean the Roman Catholics generally, or any particular class of the Roman Catholics?—Among the Roman Catholics generally. Men of the same class will take the lead as among any other body, namely, the clergy. The superintendence of education appears to fall as a matter of course to the cognisance of the clergy ; and I have therefore thought that where a large portion of the aid fell among the Roman Catholics, the clergy of that persuasion would be the patrons, equally as the clergy are among other denominations.—*Commons*, 3211–3214.

Several witnesses, but particularly the Rev. Dr. Elrington, asserted that it was impossible to establish a combined system of education in Ireland ; but the contrary opinion was supported by Dr. Kelly, the Rev. Mr. Carlile, and the Right Hon. A. R. Blake. Most of the Protestant clergymen examined objected to the compromises which should be made in order to establish such a system, and Dean Burgh gave in a letter from the Archbishop of Tuam, in which his grace declared that it was inconsistent with the articles of the Established Church for its clergy to support any system of education of which proselytism was not an immediate object. This is distinctly avowed in the following query addressed to the very reverend Dean by his grace the Archbishop.

At your ordination you have *solemnly engaged* “ to be ready with all faithful diligence to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God’s holy word.”

How then can you, in *perfect consistency* with your *principles* and *obligation* as a *clergyman* of the Established Church, *instead of endeavoring* to be so ready with all faithful diligence to *banish* and *drive away* all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God’s word, as you so *solemnly engaged to be* at your ordination, subscribe to and *adopt* a system of education for your people from which must be banished even a *suspicion* of *proselytism*, and which enjoins, that “ the most *scrupulous* care should be taken *not to interfere* with

the peculiar tenets of any description of Christian pupils," and which professes "to encourage the clergy to give religious instruction to the children of their respective persuasions?"

Is this, I would ask, a *faithful observance* of the articles of the religion you profess, and to which articles you have subscribed? Is it, I would ask, *Christian charity*, not only not to interfere to rescue the immortal souls of poor Roman Catholics from those doctrines which you have declared to be *superstitious and idolatrous*, but to *subscribe to a system* under which *encouragement* is to be given to instil into their minds those *very superstitious and idolatrous* doctrines? And is this a due and conscientious discharge of the *solemn engagement* into which you entered at your ordination, "to be ready with all faithful *diligence* to *banish and drive away* all erroneous and strange doctrine contrary to God's holy word?" *Lords*, p. 921.

To this interrogatory Dean Burgh made the following reply:—

Your Grace's objections to that measure are, "the absence even of a suspicion of proselytism, and the absence of the whole unmutated word of God" (*i.e.*) during school hours; and neither the one nor the other formed a condition on which an application was to be made to the Kildare Place Society, proselytism being absolutely excluded from both these institutions; either *Testament* alike eligible as the Bible. I hope your Grace may collect my answer to that part of your interrogatory which bears on proselytism, and in the schools, which confessedly is of all others the most unfitting place for it,—neither selected for that purpose by the articles, nor any of the principles of a clergyman of the Established Church.

As to the different modes of "banishing and driving away errors," I must adopt that which I am most equal to; I have no taste nor talent to qualify me for the arena of polemical controversy. Though the discussion of religious fundamental truths, in the spirit of meekness, candour, and prayer, would I hope tend to good, such is seldom to be met with. I have always adopted a plan which is more suitable to me; that of preaching the gospel of salvation, peace, and righteousness, and thus holding forth the light which God has set in our moral firmament to drive away all darkness, spiritual and moral,—not only the particular errors of one but those of all the churches. I have always been engaged in aiding and superintending education with more or less of the Scriptures combined with the approval of the Roman Catholic clergy, with much satisfaction to myself, and I do hope with some good effect.—*Lords*, p. 922.

No witness however went to such an extreme as the Archbishop of Tuam; several of those opposed to the Board believed that a combined system of education was possible, but objected to that which has been at present adopted. The general result of this portion of the inquiry was that the combined system of education had not succeeded to such an extent as could be desired, because the Protestants had in numerous instances

refused to share in its advantages, because it was opposed by several bishops, influential clergymen, and laymen of high rank belonging to the Established Church, and by a popular and powerful party among the Presbyterians. The evidence of Mr. M. Cross, however, shows, that where Catholics and Protestants have combined, as in the Frederick Street School at Belfast, the education given is truly scriptural, moral, and effective. He also says that the opposition is declining; and from the brief notice he gives of the nature and cause of this opposition, it is sufficiently obvious that it cannot be permanent.

Do you think the system, as it now operates, as far as your knowledge goes of its operation in the North of Ireland, is likely to unite all classes together in joint education?—I do not think the system has had a fair trial; the opposition has been so intemperate; it has been mixed up with so many other considerations not connected with education at all. The clergy of various persuasions, one or two in particular, have taken so decided a stand against the system, that their representations upon the subject have had a powerful influence, and it is only by the extraordinary exertions used by the committees and teachers of different schools that that prejudice has been abated or removed; and I have a personal knowledge of instances in which that prejudice has been completely overthrown, and in which schools that were literally ruined in the first instance by that factious opposition are now thriving.

In those schools are the Scriptures read?—They are.

Do you think the system, as far as you are acquainted with it, in all those instances in which the Protestant clergy have concurred in carrying it into execution, has proved calculated to produce that effect of uniting all classes?—I think decidedly so.

Do you consider that the Protestant clergy would be likely to assist in it in cases where the Scriptures are not read in the school; that is, where the extracts only, and not the Bible, are read?—I think the circumstance of the Scriptures not being used at all would prevent the Protestant clergy from co-operating, generally speaking.

Do you conceive that without that there would be any considerable support to be expected from the Protestant clergy of the North of Ireland, so far as you know?—I should beg leave to say upon that point, with respect to the sentiments of the Protestant clergy in the North of Ireland, it is somewhat difficult to ascertain precisely what they are. There are a few leading clergymen in the North of Ireland who have taken a very prominent part in opposition to the system. As I am bound to state my views freely and unreservedly, my candid opinion is, that a great number of the Presbyterian clergy would be satisfied with the National system were it not that certain leaders of their body have made a violent opposition to it, so that in fact they are afraid of coming forward openly in its support.

With respect to the clergy of the Established Church?—With respect to the clergy of the Established Church, I have not any ex-

tensive personal knowledge upon that subject, except the communications that I may have in the course of conversation with both laymen and clergymen.

Is it not very notorious that in the North of Ireland the clergy of the Established Church as well as the clergy of other Protestant denominations have objected to the non-use of the Scriptures in the National schools?—They have; but I believe even among the clergy of the Established Church the opposition made by particular individuals to the National system has had the effect of making many of the curates neutral who might otherwise have joined, as Mr. Hincks did, with our committee, and concurred with other committees in the establishment of the National system.—*Lords*, p. 1164.

Little or no evidence was given with respect to the nature and amount of the secular instruction given in the National schools, and very little respecting the system of discipline and moral training. The Commissioners, however, in their last Report, announce their intention of establishing agricultural and industrial schools, and also of adopting such an efficient system of inspection as will ensure the maintenance of proper discipline. The books of secular instruction, published under the superintendence of the Board, were warmly commended by all the witnesses who had taken the trouble of examining them: the following testimony to their merits is taken from the evidence of R. Ingham, Esq. :—

You have stated that you were acquainted with the system of education under the leading societies in England, and the books used in England; do you consider the books used under the National system in Ireland as equally good or preferable, or inferior to those you have seen in England?—I think they are far superior to any school-books I ever saw, and I have sent down some specimens of them to the towns with which I am connected in the North; and it has been so generally the persuasion of every one, that I know one schoolmaster of an extensive National school who at his own expense has sent up and bought a set of them.—*Lords*, p. 801.

The only objections made to these books were, that they did not combine religious with secular instruction, and that in the Summary of Modern History, the circumstances which gave rise to the spiritual and temporal power of the popes, have been omitted. It is not easy to discover how religion could be introduced into Treatises on such subjects as Grammar, Arithmetic, and Geometry, and the only evidence we have on the subject is from the Rev. Archdeacon Murray, whose acquaintance with science is shown by his mistaking the meaning of so common a phrase as pure mathematics.

Supposing an orthodox divine to write a commentary on the *Æneid*, do you think he is bound to allude to revealed religion?—It

would appear, if he was a man under the influence of religion, by the style of his writings.

By allusions to religion?—He might do it without any allusions.

Mr. Wyse.—Suppose his subject was mathematics; would you think it necessary to introduce religion treating on mathematics?—I do not understand the meaning of the question; I know, in respect to mathematics, when a relation of mine was professor of mathematics in Trinity College, Dublin, many of the juniors used to tell me that in his illustration he introduced some religious improvement.

Mr. Serjeant Ball.—It was a course of religious mathematics?—No, not quite so.

Would you call it pure mathematics?—Yes, I think the introduction of religion could not make it impure.—*Commons*, q. 4339—4343.

It is scarcely necessary to add that such objections were left without any answer. Measures have been adopted for giving the school-books prepared by the Board more effective circulation than they have yet obtained, and thus remedying one of the greatest evils in Irish education, the use of improper books by the children; an evil which arose chiefly from the poverty of parents, who, unable to purchase proper means of instruction, gave their children such books as chance threw in their way.

CHAPTER III.

General Objections made to the National System of Education.

THE persons who appeared before the Parliamentary Committees to state their objections to the National System of Education belonged to three different classes, or, in other words, advocated three different systems of education, and rested their objections to the Commissioners, and their plans on the discrepancies between the rules sanctioned by the Board and those which might be framed according to their ideal standard.

The first class consisted of persons who believed that the entire control and management of a national system should be under the control of the clergy of the established church. It was further required that the masters and mistresses should be members of the established church, and regular in their attendance on divine service. This was the system adopted in the schools established by the association for discountenancing vice; and it was advocated by the Rev. Dr. Elrington, and the Rev. Messrs. Nixon, Dwyer, Woodward, and Bell. The Rev. F. B. Woodward stated what may be regarded as the precise view this class takes of the education of the Irish children:—

I think it would be better for the Government to leave them (and I would apply the same to individuals) without religious education, or without any education at all, than to take a part in bringing them up Roman Catholics.—*Lords*, p. 285.

And in a subsequent answer he extends this rule not only to the Roman Catholic religion, but to all sects whose opinions differ to the orthodox standard of faith:—

I think it would be better for the Government to leave them without any education whatsoever than to take a part in teaching what I conceive to be religious error to them.—*Lords*, p. 285.

The gentlemen who advocated these opinions had the great advantage of possessing definite views respecting the nature and objects of the system which they desired to see adopted; they regarded national education as a department peculiarly belonging to the national church; and they believed that the transferring of the superintendence of the instruction of youth to any other body would be in effect furnishing the enemies of the

establishment with an argument against its continuance, or at least a recognition of the establishment of any rival church or sect represented at a mixed board. This latter opinion is clearly stated by the Rev. Mr. Rowan, in one of his objections to the national system :—

Speaking as a Protestant clergyman, I should say that the recognition, and in a manner the establishing of the Roman Catholic church in Ireland, which I think follows from the working and constitution of the national Board, is an objection to it.—*Lords*, p. 768.

The second class of opponents consists of persons advocating generally the system adopted by the Kildare Place Society; but their opinions seem more vague, and their objects more indeterminate than those of the preceding class, and consequently there are occasional ambiguities in their evidence, which it is not easy to explain. One of the most perplexing difficulties arises from the use of the word “Protestant,” which is sometimes limited to members of the Established Church, sometimes extended to all classes of dissenters, who protest against the doctrines of the church of Rome, and sometimes contracted to that section of Protestants, whether great or small, agreeing, or supposed to agree, with the peculiar views of the witness. The term “Scriptural Education” is also used in the different senses we have before noticed, and the same ambiguity is found in the phrase “Religious Instruction,” which is sometimes employed in a very wide, and sometimes in a narrow and almost sectarian signification. The Kildare Place Society was a voluntary association, to which any person might belong who paid a guinea annually : it professed that the appointment of managers and teachers should be uninfluenced by their religious denomination ; it allowed the Roman Catholic version of the Scriptures to be used in the schools ; it did not interfere with the religious education of the children out of school hours, but it insisted that the reading of the holy Scriptures either in the authorised or Douay version should be part of the ordinary routine of school business. The great difficulty in making an analysis of the evidence given by the class of witnesses attached to the system of the Kildare Place Society is, that every member of the society examined has some peculiar views of the society’s objects, and seems to have expected from it an increase of protestantism in Ireland, although each indignantly disclaimed that its purpose was proselytism.

To this second class belong the Presbyterian opponents of the Board ; but their plans were more definite than those of the Episcopalians, because they chose as their standard the system of National Education established in Scotland. The third class of opponents consisted chiefly of gentlemen, who

believed a combined system of education desirable and possible, but who believed that the rules of the Board conceded too many advantages to Roman Catholics and Sectarians, and who professed themselves anxious to see a national system of education established in the support of which they could conscientiously join.

It is not to be supposed that this classification is so accurate as to enable the reader at once to determine from which class each objection proceeds. The witnesses of the second class will be sometimes found adopting the rigid exclusiveness of the first, and at others professing the conciliatory spirit of the third; but, without this attempt at arrangement, it would be impossible to render the objections intelligible to persons unacquainted with the peculiar circumstances of the Established Church in Ireland.

The most common objections urged against the national system are thus stated by the Hon. and Rev. Baptist Noel:—

The Protestant clergy with whom I conversed dreaded giving any sanction to the ministry of the Roman Catholic priesthood, or giving them any facility for the instruction of the children. They dreaded also sanctioning a system in which the Bible was not made the basis of education. They expressed their dislike of mutilating the Scriptures, as it was termed. They also disliked the system of extracts, and had various objections to those extracts, which they said, upon principle, they could not employ. I found that they objected to the merely allowing the Scriptures to be used after school hours, or not used at all; and some of them seemed to be under a misrepresentation with respect to the use of the Scriptures in the schools. There were also other objections. One thing which was frequently said was, that they were opposing a hindrance to the establishment and extension of Scripture schools through the kingdom. Another thing objected to them was, that by the use of the extracts they disparaged the authorised version. It was said to be a fundamental objection which could not be got over, that they gave encouragement to popery. I think those are the principal objections which I have found to the system among the clergy with whom I have conversed.—*Lords*, p. 857.

The Hon. and Rev. Gentleman added that he did not acquiesce in the validity of any one of these objections, and in the course of his examination he replied to them *seriatim*.

Will you mention what you urged to any of the Protestant clergy or gentry in reference to their objections?—In the first place, they said that it was a sanction to the Roman Catholic priesthood to allow them to come into the schools. To which my answer was, that it could be no sanction to the Roman Catholic priesthood at all to allow to the children and their parents the right of seeing those whom they looked upon as their pastors. It was merely conceding that they should not be deprived by the school of their

natural liberty, but implied no sanction of the doctrine or profession of the priest.

You stated that to the clergymen with whom you conversed?—I have so stated at various times to different friends. To the objection of the facility afforded to Roman Catholics to teach mischievous errors, my answer has been, that the school afforded no facility whatever for the dissemination of error, since all the Roman Catholic instruction which they get now by catechisms or other means, they would have got with equal facility in the parish chapel or elsewhere if there had not been such a school established. With respect to the supposed dishonour done to the Bible, it seemed to me to be no dishonour done to the Scriptures if the legislature, perceiving that there were insuperable objections to the use of the Scriptures on the part of the Roman Catholics, had given them the best substitute they could in the volume of extracts, which will serve as an introduction to the Scriptures. With respect to the mutilation of the Scriptures, my answer was, that a system of extracts could no more be viewed as a mutilation of the Scriptures than any other use that we familiarly make of portions of the Scriptures when we cannot use the whole. It was never meant to say that that was the whole; but it was meant to serve as an introduction to it. When it was said that the authorised version was disparaged, it seemed to me that the use of the extracts would have the contrary effect, inasmuch as that those to lessen the objections of Roman Catholics, for whom the book is chiefly compiled, the Douay version is sometimes used, yet the Roman Catholic children, hitherto accustomed only to use their own version, if any, would now perceive the superiority of the other version, which is so freely used in the extracts. With respect to the encouragement given to popery, I have expressed my opinion that it has a direct tendency to destroy the unjust influence of the priesthood, founded upon ignorance. And with respect to the hindrance to Scriptural schools, though I could not but see, that in some places it had a disastrous effect of that kind, as in Achill and other places that I heard of, where it had actually destroyed Scriptural schools, still that the number of those cases would be small; that the consideration of them should not interfere with the immense object of enlightening so many hundred thousands of children.

Did you find upon any occasion that those arguments of yours had any effect upon the persons with whom you reasoned?—Not very often.

Did you find in any one case that they were successful?—I have found cases in this country.

In Ireland?—Not in Ireland.—*Lords*, p. 858.

Lady Osborne's evidence accounts in no small degree for the failure of these arguments in Ireland.

Has any objection been stated by friends and neighbours of your ladyship to the system besides the Protestant clergymen, whom you describe as being opposed to it upon principle?—Yes, a great number; but I think their objection begins and ends with the 'Christian Examiner.' Every body says, "Lady Osborne, have you read the 'Christian Examiner?'" In most countries reviewers are said to be

men who are paid for reading, but I think in Ireland they are men who are paid for thinking.—*Lords*, p. 1223.

The first objection noticed by the Honourable and Reverend Gentleman meets us in several forms, but it assumes its most tangible shape in the evidence of the Rev. Dr. Elrington, who objects to the national system, that the local management of the schools has fallen almost exclusively into the hands of the Roman Catholics.

Mr. Serjeant Jackson.—Speaking of the present system of education as it has worked in Ireland, do you conceive that, practically speaking, the Board schools are generally schools under the direction and management of one particular class of religionists?—Those with which I am immediately acquainted are exclusively under Roman Catholics.

Are they under the Roman Catholic clergy or Roman Catholic laity principally?—Under the Roman Catholic clergy, I should say.

Do you think that, with regard to the attendance of scholars in the school, the practical working of this system in Ireland at present is, that the schools are frequented by one religious denomination in a great degree exclusively?—So I judge, from all the reports I have seen.

Have you seen many reports?—I have, and have been in communication with the clergy in every part of Ireland upon the subject.

And that is the conclusion at which you have arrived from those means of information?—Yes.—*Commons*, q. 1962—1966.

R. Ingham, Esq. confirms this statement, and explains the cause.

Is it your opinion that, upon the whole, the national system does work commonly for the purposes of the Roman Catholics in the south and west of Ireland rather than the Protestants?—Inasmuch as it must be for the purposes of the Roman Catholics to be well instructed rather than ignorant it works for Roman Catholic purposes; but if it is meant that it works for any purposes exclusively Roman Catholic, then I should say certainly not.

You say that in fact the Roman Catholics do receive more benefit from the national system in the south and west of Ireland than the Protestants?—They make more frequent use of it.—*Lords*, p. 801.

There is superabundance of evidence that political or religious, but in all cases conscientious, motives have restricted the applications of the Protestant clergy; the fact is made at once the subject of boast and complaint; but as it is an undisputed fact, it establishes, that the cause of the management having fallen into the hands of the Roman Catholics arises simply from the refusal of Protestants to interfere. The cause of that refusal is a different subject of inquiry, but the fact of it at once explains the objection.

The question of restrictions on the use of the Bible has

been already investigated, and the great point at issue, under which system the most efficient scriptural instruction may be obtained, has been answered differently, according to the feelings of the witness. Most of those who have denied that scriptural knowledge is not efficiently communicated in the schools under the Board, argue from theory and preconceived opinions. Lady Osborne is almost the only witness who has personally examined the results of the systems adopted by the Kildare Place Society, and by the Board, and her evidence is decisive.

Have you any doubt that since they have been taught under the national system, as far as it has fallen under your observation, the language and precepts of Scripture have become much more familiar to the Roman Catholic poor than they had been at any former time and under any other system?—Much more.—*Lords*, p. 1222.

The objections arising from the use of the Scripture extracts will be discussed in a separate chapter. It is next our painful task to examine objections which have been made to the Board on political, factious, or mistaken grounds. In the first chapter we noticed that a report was circulated, that the support of the new system of education was made a condition in bestowing the archbishopric of Dublin, and have shown how completely the charge was refuted. But this is not the only example of a prevalent belief that the Board of Education was, for some unknown reason, considered an object of primary importance by a Whig administration; it was asserted that such was the importance attributed to it, that a clergyman having detected a fault in its management was afraid to have it known, lest the discovery should interfere with his promotion. This extraordinary statement was made by Mr. Yielding; he says that “a threatening notice was posted on some lands belonging to the Ladies Fitzpatrick;” the notice was seen by the Rev. Mr. Perrin (brother to Mr. Justice Perrin, late Attorney-General for Ireland).

He observed that it was ruled paper, and it struck him at once that it must have come out of some of the national education schools. Mr. Price was in the habit of occasionally going up to view those farms, and to look after the lands, and as agent to perform the various duties that he was bound to do to his principals. Mr. Perrin having a suspicion, from the notice being on ruled paper, that it came out of the school, went, as he told me, or led me to suppose, to a school adjoining the estate of the Ladies Fitzpatrick, which I believe to be the Errol school, about which there has been so much discussion. When he went in there he searched the copy-books, and in turning over the leaves he perceived one torn out; he took the notice, and he fitted it to the torn leaf, and it dovetailed into it. That incident made such an impression upon me, and the

thing struck me as so providential a discovery, that I can state positively and distinctly that he told me that, without the least apprehension of being mistaken, though it is nearly three years ago. In looking over the copy-books he told me that he found in one of the books what he considered was a "lament for the poor boys hung at Maryborough the other day." There had been five or six men executed for some outrages in the Queen's County some time before. Now, Mr. Perrin says it was "God be with the poor boys that were hung at Maryborough the other day;" but I am stating my impression of what he originally told me, that it was a lament; but I think that is of very little importance. Just as I intended to part from Mr. Perrin I said, "This is too serious an occurrence to allow it to go unexposed, and I will communicate the fact to some of the London papers." "If you do," said he, "you will ruin me." Said I, "How can it ruin you?" "Why," said he, "Mr. Price has been in communication with the Marquis of Lansdowne, with the object of procuring a living for me, and I expect to get it, and I will be disappointed in getting it in such event; for," said he, "Mr. Price will be annoyed if the thing should be printed and exposed, and it will produce effects that will be exceedingly injurious to me." "Well," said I, "if that is the case I will not do what will injure you, though I feel the necessity of exposing the transaction, and how much inquiry is called for into it." For the reason I have mentioned I did not expose it. Mr. Perrin has a large family of six children unprovided for. I knew he had been taking an active part in Whig politics in Ireland, and had been devoting a great deal of his time to promoting the objects of that party, and I saw he was on the eve of getting something for his services, and I did not wish to be his ruin, for I knew he had little else but his pen to depend upon. So the matter remained in that state. I have mentioned the thing often in the interim to persons that I knew would not take the thing farther, and would not repeat it; among others, I will name one, who is a Member for Parliament, and a gentleman who is considered a Liberal, Mr. Hector, the Member for Petersfield. I mentioned it to him, and to Mr. Smith O'Brien, the Member for Limerick, who is an acquaintance of mine; but I never mentioned it where I thought the feeling of the party was such as to lead to any disclosure that might be injurious to Mr. Perrin. I ascertained that Mr. Perrin got his living. I then thought that there was no ground for my longer preserving any mystery about the transaction, and I mentioned the thing to Dr. Gifford, the Editor of the 'Standard,' never contemplating that it would come to an inquiry of this kind, for I would not be the cause of submitting Mr. Perrin to an examination about the thing that I know must be painful to him. Those are all the facts, as far as I know.—*Lords*, p. 358.

This circumstance was published by Dr. Gifford in the 'Standard,' and made the subject of much comment; but Mr. Perrin distinctly denied all the conversation attributed to him respecting the living, which, if true, would only have proved that he was utterly ignorant of the character of the Marquis of Lansdowne. The evidence, whether true or false,

is only important so far as it shows the general belief that the national system was a favourite project of the Whig Ministers, and one on which their feelings were so peculiarly sensitive, that an attack upon it was the surest means of inflicting upon them severe mortification.

The following paper of objections need not be characterised:—

Having been requested by some members of my own congregation residing in county Down, in and about Ballymacarrett and Lagan Village, to state my opinion of the (so-called) national system of education, the following charges I am at any time or place ready to maintain against it, from the evidence of its own documents. 1. It was invented and imposed, not at the wish of *Protestants*, but to please the *priests of Rome*, in their dislike of Bible-reading in schools. 2. During *four hours* every day the *Bible* must be *excluded*, and to read it during that time would forfeit all assistance. 3. During *four hours a day* neither schoolmaster nor minister dare *pray* in the school, under the above penalty. 4. No minister dare *ever preach* in the school-house, under the like penalty. 5. The Romish priest is a visiter of the school, whether the committee will or not, and can turn out the Protestant children *one day* every week in the year, to teach that Protestants are *heretics*, and cannot, as such, be saved, being out of the pale of the church. 6. The Board publishes books that inculcate *popery*, and authorises their use in schools. 7. The Board has published, in one of their school-books, a well-known seditious song, *Erin-go-bragh*, and give it among their schools. I affix 'my name' to these charges, being ready to maintain them against any gainsayer.

(Signed) H. Cook.

We have anticipated the examination of most of these objections, as they were stated by the gentlemen who were examined before the two committees, and need not now revert to them in their intemperate form. The fourth and fifth charges are manifestly inconsistent, the reverend gentleman did not repeat the sixth when publicly examined. The seditious song described in the seventh is Campbell's well-known Exile of Erin, which is to the old Irish air *Erin-go-Bragh*, but these objectionable words, which signify, "Ireland for ever," were not at the head of the poem.

Mr. R. Sullivan furnishes us with some other particulars of the opposition made to the Board, founded either on misrepresentation or mistake.

Mr. Wyse.—When did the opposition to those schools commence?—It commenced, if I may so say, even before the schools were in existence. As soon as the system was announced by Lord Stanley, meetings were got up in almost every town in Ulster. The great meeting at Rathfryland, at which Lord Roden presided, was the first. The people were led to believe that the Government crew about to send round the police to take possession of their Bibles.

To this meeting they carried their Bibles, and flourished them over their heads, expressing their determination to die in defence of them. After this meeting, gun clubs were established, for the purpose of furnishing the peasantry with guns to protect their Bibles.

Was this connected with the establishment of the national schools?—There were no national schools established at that time. The system had been just announced. The teacher of the first national school established in that neighbourhood was expelled by an armed body from his school, and the manager, a Presbyterian minister, Reverend Mr. Porter of Drumlee, assaulted.—*Commons*, 7687-8.

Placards equally violent with Dr. Cook's letter were issued by the Reverend Dr. M'Clelland; but the most precious specimen of these attacks is the "Iambics of the Reverend Mr. M'Kay," part of which we shall extract from the Commons' Report,—

"Jerusalem's Expostulation with the Advocates of the New Education Board; by the Reverend William Kennedy M'Kay, Presbyterian Minister, Portglenone."

"Arise O Lord, into thy rest; thou and the ark of thy strength."—*Psalm cxxxii.* 8.

Shall Presbyterians yield the palm,
Won by the glorious victors
Who conquer'd Rome but to embalm
The truth taught by Scotia's doctors?

If thraldom shall the Bible bind,
In Church, or State, or General Synod;
Then darkness cover shall mankind,
That mark'd the reign of Ben-hadad! *

Let Prophets teach that Peace shall come,
And literature return to Erin,
If we but join the Church of Rome,
And for the Bible form a cairn.

Yet the Lord shall feed with wormwood
Baal's prophets, who cause to err,
And gall to them who him withstood:
He, as water, shall drink confer! †

Does the Bible teach the Pastor
That to gain the Brachminal caste,
He must support Hindoo shaster,
And for the Scripture form a taste? ‡

Or shall the legate of our Lord—
When travelling through ancient Charan
To satisfy a Mufti horde—
Hold the Bible and the Koran? §

* 1 Kings, xix. 20.

† Jeremiah, xxiii.

‡ Hosea, ii. 16, 17; 1 Samuel, vii. 4.

§ 1 Kings, xxii. 14.

The Word of God brands the system,
 And stamps it with the harlot's stigma!
 It's compromise in every item,
 A foul, anti-christian, dogma! *

The law of God is pure and good,
 And doth impart a light sublime;
 It to a child affordeth food,
 And is to him the theme of time. †

Commons' Appendix.

This political opposition was exhibited in the form of resolutions adopted by Orange Lodges, one of which we shall extract.

27th April, 1832.—At a numerous and highly respectable meeting of the Grand Orange Lodge of the county of Tyrone, Josiah Girder, Esq., grand-master, in the chair, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted (*inter alia*): 1st. That as Protestants we reprobate the new system of National Education, and that we will not listen to any pastor whom we see to encourage it, or whom we know to approve of it.—*Lords*, p. 4.

This declaration of opposition was something more than a mere threat. Mr. Carlile gives us a strong example of the opposition made by those who have political objections to the Board.

Have you yourself experienced any inconvenience or annoyance in consequence of having acted as a member of the Board?—I have, to a very considerable extent. I do not complain of it as far as I am individually concerned, but I would notice it as an illustration of the manner in which the Board has been opposed. In the first place, I was almost immediately under the necessity of resigning the situation I held for a number of years as secretary to the Hibernian Bible Society, being considered by some as unfit to hold office in a society by which the Bible was to be distributed. There were attempts to destroy the peace of my congregation, which however did not succeed. I was denounced in the public newspapers and elsewhere; I was under the necessity of defending myself by public controversy in four places at the same time, in Dublin, Belfast, London, and Edinburgh; and I have been from time to time assailed with exceeding bitterness by ministers from their pulpits and in public documents. I have been denounced as an infidel, and one that Barked the Bible. My character as a clergyman has been assailed most fiercely; and lately a resolution was passed by a meeting calling itself the Synod of Ulster, the object of which was to put me to the alternative of leaving the Synod or leaving the Board.—*Lords*, p. 45.

Landlords have also coerced their tenants to oppose the National Schools, and exerted the same influence to resist the

* Deut. vi.

† Psalm xix.

progress of the system of education sanctioned by the Board, which they would have employed in a contested election. Mr. Carlile stated,—

I hold in my hand a letter from a clergyman; he signs himself as vicar of Errigle Glebe, Aughnaclay, in which he transmits to us resolutions that were entered into by several landed proprietors, in which they declare their determination not to give encouragement to their tenantry who shall send their children to schools connected with the Board; this is a printed copy which I have of them. The letter came to us before the printed copy, by which the clergyman intimated to the Board that he was connected with it. The resolutions communicated to us in that letter have been printed and circulated in a hand-bill: "We, the resident landed proprietors of the parish, Errigle Trough, feel ourselves called upon to declare, 1st, That we view with regret the practical working of the new Board of Education in this parish: though we have ever encouraged and promoted a system in which all denominations did willingly unite, we find our schools opposed, a suspicion thrown on our motives, an unusual disunion produced, and a rival influence upheld which claims more than we can concede. 2d, That regarding the pure word of God as the only ground on which all parties as Christians can meet, we deem it dangerous, in an age of irreligion and infidelity, to throw aside that word, or even weaken its influence; we therefore declare, that none of our tenantry will receive encouragement from us who are opposed to schools founded on a religious basis. We look for moral and religious men; we value in them knowledge with principle, and would give a view of God's word to the industrious poor."—*Lords*, p. 44.

The opposition thus founded, has produced acts of violence and outrage, which we do not believe were contemplated by those who commenced the system of agitation. On this subject, Dr. Kelly, the secretary to the Board, gave the following evidence:

In the year 1832, which was the year after the Board was formed, the Dromlee school-house in the county of Down was wrecked by the violence of a mob, and, as I understood from the inspector's report, the day, or immediately after a political meeting had been held in the neighbourhood; in January of the year 1834, the Dressage school-house in the county of Tyrone, was burnt down; in the September of 1835 the Beltoney national school-house, in the county of Tyrone, was burnt down; in the month of November in the year 1835 the Armaloughy national school-house in the county of Tyrone was wrecked. There were other schools which were not destroyed, but closed, because of the intimidation from collected mobs of people; namely, Laymere, Clinty, Galgorn, and Bridge-end, in the county of Antrim, and Drummaway, in the county of Down. I have also letters from the correspondent of the Corbolly National School, county of Tyrone, stating that violence was used with regard to the schoolmaster there, to induce him to discontinue the school, and to prevent the children from attending it.

There is another case of intimidation with respect to the Upper Tannybroke School, in the county of Antrim, which occurred in the year 1834; the teacher of this school was beaten, and notices of a threatening nature were posted up; the teacher, however, brought the matter before the quarter sessions, where the person who assaulted him being found guilty was condemned to one month's imprisonment.—*Lords*, p. 94.

It was asserted that these advantages were not confined to one side, and in particular a complaint was made that the Roman Catholic priest of Roundstone had used violence in ejecting an obnoxious schoolmaster. The Board sent down an inspector to investigate the matter: the result, as stated by this gentleman, will show how incautiously gentlemen with the best intentions will circulate calumnies devised by the base and unworthy, when they happen to coincide with their own prejudices.

I recollect that I was sent by the secretary, at the desire of the Board, to investigate into a memorial forwarded by Mr. Brown, the Protestant curate of Roundstone. He wrote two letters on the subject, one to his Grace the Archbishop of Dublin, and one to his own archbishop, and a third, I think, to Lord Melbourne, in which he embodied the circumstances of the alleged violence. He stated that O'Flaherty, the teacher of the Roundstone National School, had been dismissed by the priest from the school unjustly, and that violence had been used to eject him from it for the purpose of putting in a monk as schoolmaster; and his letters were accompanied by a memorial from the teacher, purporting to be signed by a number of persons under the head "Roman Catholics" or "Protestants." I understood that my inquiry was to ascertain whether violence had been resorted to, and whether he had been deservedly dismissed or not.

The question is about the violence that was committed in getting possession; what was the nature of the mode in which they got possession?—First of all the master sent a petition to the Board, purporting to have been agreed to at a public meeting, at which it was stated Patrick King, Esq., of Anlybeg took the chair. This alleged meeting, through the chairman, petitioned the Board to raise the salary of the teacher of the Roundstone National School. On receipt of this petition the secretary wrote to the priest, the correspondent of the school, on the subject; and the priest replied that he was not aware of the circumstance, and that he had never heard that such a public meeting had taken place, and that he would feel obliged by the Board giving directions to an inspector to investigate the matter. The inspector of the district accordingly made inquiry, and reported that the petition had been got up by the schoolmaster, and that it bore the names of some of the worst characters in the parish; he added that the teacher was a person of bad character, and that he had been frequently seen intoxicated. On receipt of this report a letter was sent from the Board to the manager, directing him to dismiss this teacher from their school;

and the priest, acting upon this order, went to the teacher, and requested him to resign his charge. He refused to give up the school, alleging that there were arrears of salary due to him. The priest showed him the letter of the Board desiring his dismissal, and as he refused to vacate, he, as manager, took forcible possession of the school-house by taking the door off the hinges, and putting on a new lock. All this occurred prior to my inquiry. The Board wrote to Mr. Brown in reply to his communication, and even sent him a copy of the inspector's report, on which the teacher had been dismissed by their order. Mr. Brown impugned that report, and in consequence of this the Commissioners directed me to investigate the matter, which I did. On arriving in Roundstone I sent for the schoolmaster who had been dismissed; I produced the memorials and letters, and told him that as I was determined to wait, if it should be till Christmas, till I had seen every individual who had signed these documents, it would save time and be no worse for him if he would acknowledge to me what part he took in the matter, and whether those signatures appended were genuine or written by himself: I also told him that if I found reason for it I would recommend his restoration. He then acknowledged, greatly to my surprise, that most of the signatures were written either by him, or the chairman, Patrick King. I asked him who and where Patrick King was; that it appeared by the memorial that he was an esquire, and that I was determined to see him. To this he made no reply; and I repeated, "I must see this Patrick King, Esquire; I do not care how long it takes me, or to what expense it puts me." On getting no reply to this from the teacher, I asked him, "Is not this Patrick King, Esquire, of Anlybeg, the chairman of the meeting, at present on the treadmill in Galway gaol?" and he acknowledged that he was. Yes, my lords, this man who was described to be an esquire, and whose name was in the highest and most honourable place in the memorial, I found on the treadmill in Galway goal. Those facts I reported to the Board.—*Lords*, p. 706.

One more example of the outrages against the schools and schoolmasters under the superintendence of the Board may be quoted, to illustrate the nature and spirit of the opposition which the national system has had to encounter.

I remember stating in one of my reports that one of the schools that I visited had all the appearance of having stood a siege; that the board had been taken down and the windows injured, and that crosses and p's, for popery, were painted on the doors and windows. The master stated that Mr. M'Clelland, at the head of several thousands of persons, had come there and had used threats; indeed, I recollect, although I did not state it in my report, that some of them threatened to make soup of him if he did not give up the school; and at another school in that neighbourhood, Tannybrake, the master sent up an affidavit, which describes Mr. M'Clelland as coming into the school and dismissing the children, and taking down the Board upon which the words "National School" were painted, which he endeavoured to break; but finding that he could

not, he (Mr. M'Clelland) went into a neighbouring house and asked for an axe or a hatchet, which having obtained, he cut up the board and put it into the fire, and having asked for a pair of bellows, he (Mr. M'Clelland) blew up the fire till the fragments of it were consumed.—*Lords*, p. 682.

The Rev. George M'Clelland and his poetical associate the Rev. W. K. M'Kay are the leading agitators in opposition to the Board, among the Presbyterians of Ulster; the iambics of the latter, from which we have already quoted, explain the nature of their objections; the conduct of the other elucidates the spirit of their opposition. It is sufficiently evident that political motives must have instigated opposition in such a violent form—for religion could never have dictated violence and outrage. In classifying the objections made to the National system, it seems to us that, under the head of general objections, we should range those which were most influential, as they led immediately to action.

We shall conclude with one other example of political opposition, and of the unfair means used to excite a popular outcry against the National System of Education. A petition, purporting to be signed by the Protestant inhabitants of Ballinrobe against the Board, and its plan of education, was presented to the House of Lords. Dean Burgh, the rector of the parish, was surprised when he learned that such a petition had been presented, because he had not heard that any such measure was contemplated, and because many Protestant children were actually attending the National School. He inquired into the circumstances, and found that it was completely “a hole and corner petition,” the work of a few individuals, who had procured signatures by flagrant misrepresentations. One person assigned to Dean Burgh as his reason for signing it, that he was told that the Conservative Lords had met in Dublin, and agreed to give all who petitioned against the National System of Education a free passage to America; and specifically mentioned the name of Lord Roden, as the nobleman appointed to pay the passage-money. The Dean also mentioned, as an additional reason for his belief, that the opposition to the Board was mixed up with party politics; that he had a large school for two years in the diocese of Tuam, conducted precisely on the principles which the Board subsequently recognised; and that the Archbishop never made any objection to it, though he has since become one of the most decided opponents of the National System.—(*Lords*, p. 928.) The Dean also mentioned an example of opposition, which might be called fanatical rather than political; but this is a subject on which, for very obvious reasons, it would be inexpedient to enter.

CHAPTER IV.

Special Objections to the National System.

THE SCRIPTURE EXTRACTS.

ALTHOUGH the accusation of mutilating the Bible was very generally urged against the Board out of doors, there was no witness before either of the Committees who insisted on the expediency or propriety of reading the Bible regularly through from the first chapter of Genesis to the last of Revelations, and consequently there was no person who objected to the general principle of making selections from the Scriptures, provided that such selections were not put forward as a substitute for the Bible, and thus, in some measure, placed on the same level of authority as the holy volume. It was acknowledged that in point of fact, selections were always made according to the caprice of teachers, who chose for their pupils such portions as they thought suitable to be read as lessons; and consequently it appeared that the only question which could be raised on the point of principle was, whether the selections should be left to chance or caprice, or whether they should be made by a competent person, and sanctioned by proper authority. As the answer to such a question was by no means difficult, the Committees sought no direct evidence for its decision, but they inquired by whom the selections were made, what amount of care and caution was bestowed upon their preparation, and in what manner they had received the sanction of the Commissioners. On these points Mr. Carlile gave the following evidence:—

The Scripture extracts are subjected to a most careful examination. The duty of preparing the first draft of them devolved upon me, as they originated from my application to Lord Stanley, already noticed. I draw out the draft of them, placing the authorised and the Roman Catholic versions with the originals before me. I draw the original draft. They are then put in type, and proofs are sent to the Archbishop of Dublin and to Dr. Murray. When they have made observations upon them, if any alterations are suggested those are made, and new proofs are taken off and returned to these prelates. When they have passed through that revision, then proofs are sent to the whole members of the Board. If they are satisfied with them they then go to press. That has been usually the course; but while the Gospel by St. Luke was in progress, his Grace the Archbishop

thought I might be relieved by having some person to draw out the first draft, and a clergyman, whose name I forget, was employed; but I did not find that arrangement to save time, and it was done away with. In preparing the latter part of the Acts of the Apostles we had the satisfaction of receiving the assistance of Dr. Arnold of Rugby, and he is now, I hope, engaged in revising the rest, in contemplation of a Second Edition, both of the Gospel by St. Luke and the previous part of the Acts of the Apostles. We hope to have his very valuable assistance in issuing another Edition.—*Lords*, p. 41.

The Rev. Dr. Elrington made a preliminary objection to this plan in the following words:—

I should object in general to any version different from our own, without inquiring into the question whether it was faithfully translated or not, because I conceive that when you give the Scriptures to a child you present him with the word of God, and you should tell him that you are presenting him with an infallible Guide; and that any thing that shakes his opinion in that Guide so far mars the purposes for which you have given him the Book, and I cannot conceive any thing to do that more effectually than a diversity of translation of the Scriptures.—*Lords*, p. 582.

He did not, however, assert that the authorised version, or as it is usually called, King James's Bible, possesses the same rank as a standard in the Anglican church that the Vulgate does in Roman Catholic churches, for he recognised the version of the Psalms in the Book of Common Prayer, which is taken from the older translation. But he declared that it was inexpedient to raise difficulties in the mind of a child, by directing attention to differences in the translation or interpretation of a Book, which ought to be received with implicit credence as the foundation of faith. In fact, he believed that the variations had a tendency to suggest doubts. The Rev. Doctor explains his objection more clearly in his evidence before the Committee of the House of Commons.

Mr. Wyse.—Are you aware that the version of the Psalms used in the Church service is very different from that to be found in the authorised version?—I am.

Do you not think the child who hears them recited in the Church, and afterwards reads them in the authorised version in school, will naturally notice this difference of version?—I do not think there is one child in a thousand who knows of the existence of the difference, or ever has read the authorised version in the Bible; they read it in the Prayer-book. I am ready to go further, and say, I am very sorry there are two versions; I am very sorry that one was not altered at the time the Gospels and the Epistles were; but I do not see why, because there is this difference, that you should extend it.

Should this difference be perceived by the child, do you think any injury would arise from it?—I should think that a very troublesome question to answer to any child.

So that it is a matter of contingency only, depending upon the capacity of the child, his acuteness and opportunities, whether his mind may not be injured by this difference of version?—I think it can be explained to the child, but the fewer points of that kind there are to be explained to the child, I think so much the better.—*Commons*, 2248-2251.

No evidence was given respecting the amount of the variations, or the probability of their being noticed by the children who used the Scripture Extracts. It was universally conceded that the difficulties arising from a difference of version must have been felt more sensibly under the system of the Kildare Place Society, than under that of the Board; because in the Society's schools, children according to their religious denomination, read from the different versions in the same class, and consequently perceived the dissimilarity between them at every sentence, while in using the Scripture Extracts it is very possible that the variations may escape the notice of children, unless their attention is specially directed to the subject by meddling and mischievous persons. Before quitting this topic it is necessary to remark that some Protestant witnesses asserted that Roman Catholics ought also to object on principle to the Scripture Extracts, because they are not conformable to the Douay version of the Bible, and a Letter was produced before the House of Lords in which the Rev. Dr. Murray, titular Archbishop of Dublin, was directly charged with perjury, because he had sanctioned the Extracts, after having previously sworn that he would not approve of any Scripture Harmony which was not conformable to the authorised version of his church. The apparent contradiction was easily explained by the Right Hon. A. R. Blake, who stated, what indeed is sufficiently notorious, that the Vulgate and not the Douay is the authorised version of the Latin church, and consequently that the Roman Catholic Archbishop with perfect consistency, approved of Extracts which in all essentials agreed with the Vulgate.

Many witnesses who felt no objection to the use of selections from Scriptures, objected to those issued by the Board, not only because they differed from the Protestant authorised version, but also because the variations were, in their opinion, introduced to favour certain Roman Catholic doctrines, against which the followers of the Reformation have ever protested. On these points of objection the evidence was very rambling and desultory, and it will be necessary to introduce a few words of explanation to render some of the controverted passages intelligible.

The first passage to which an objection was made is the 15th verse of the 3rd chapter of Genesis.

This passage from Genesis is thus translated in the Douay :—"I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and thy seed and her seed ; she shall crush thy head, and thou shalt lie in wait for his heel." In the authorised version it is : "And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed ; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." In the Lessons it is put : "I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and between her seed and thy seed ; it shall crush thy head, and thou shalt lie in wait for his heel." To this is appended the Note which is in the Douay version : "It shall crush, &c., ipsa, she, the woman ; so divers of the fathers read this place, conformably to the Latin. Others read ipsum, viz., the seed. The sense is the same, for it is by her seed, Jesus Christ, that the woman crushes the serpent's head."—*Lords*, p. 886.

The first question arising on this passage is, "Whether of the two is the more correct translation?" The question was put to the Rev. Dr. Elrington, but he declined giving any answer. In fact, the original is susceptible of both translations ; because when the Pentateuch was written there was no distinction of gender for the third person of the pronoun. When punctuation was introduced at a much later period, the Rabbinical critics made a distinction by the points, but the Rabbinical decisions are not received as of paramount authority, because according to them the celebrated prophecy of the Messiah, "They shall look upon him whom they have pierced," should be read, "They shall look upon him like a lion." An unobjectionable rendering would be, "I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and thy seed and her seed ; *that same* shall crush thy head, and thou shalt lie in wait for his heel."

The objection urged against the note in the Extracts is, that it seems to sanction what Protestants consider the extravagant reverence of Roman Catholics for the Virgin Mary, because certain divines of the Latin church have referred the word *she* to the Virgin, though the obvious grammatical construction refers it either to Eve or the female sex generally. This objection was thus answered by the Hon. and Rev. Baptist Noel :—

I have never conversed with any gentleman connected with the national system upon this note, but it struck me at once, upon reading it, the reason of that note was this : they are accustomed in their Scriptures always to read "she" instead of it ; therefore, when a Roman Catholic came in the lessons to this passage, "It shall crush thy head," he would say the Scriptures are perverted ; there is a perversion ; and that in order to obviate the objection that would arise in his mind, the compilers of these extracts have put a note

which shows that, though the true word is "it," and they have introduced that true word into the text, yet there is some authority which the Roman Catholics appeal to for the word "she," the other reading to which they are accustomed. It seemed expedient to obviate their objections, founded upon the notion that the text was tampered with. Now, I see in this whole extract two great advantages gained to the Protestant cause. I see, in the first place, that by reading it with the context instead of reading it in their catechism they learn that the word "she" cannot possibly refer to the Virgin Mary, but must refer to "Eve;" therefore it will disabuse them upon that point first; in the next place, the Roman Catholics, finding, from its insertion in the text of the Extracts, that the true reading is "it," and that the false reading is "she," will learn for the first time that the text upon which they mainly depended to establish the Virgin Mary's supremacy really proves nothing of the sort. That, I think, is the whole effect of that extract and note. Now, I find this gentleman speaks of it thus: "There is a show of equity in quoting it, inasmuch as an acknowledgment is made that sometimes the seed is meant by the word in dispute, but still the note declares 'it is by her seed, Jesus Christ, that the woman crushes the serpent's head.' Still the victory is attributed to her, and the Saviour of the world is made the agent of a sinful woman. So that, in truth, all that could be said by the Commissioners, without an audacious acknowledgment of popery, is put forward, while not even the glimmering of Protestant light is allowed to interrupt the shining forth of the Virgin Mary in all her blasphemous deification." Now, I thought that was violent and unfair; and I think there is the same spirit shown in the way in which the extracts are generally treated.—*Lords*, p. 866.

He adds that he does not altogether defend the note, and that he would gladly see it altered.

Next, we have an objection to the translation of the commandments, urged by the Rev. C. Boyton:—

With regard to the ten commandments, your Lordships know the form of expression in our version: "I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage. Thou shalt have no other gods before me. Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image." That is our version. In the Scripture Extracts it is, "Thou shalt not make to thyself a graven thing." Now, the words "graven image," I understand to apply to the peculiar religious worship of the Roman Catholics, which every Protestant believes to be forbidden by this particular commandment. This is an instance of departure from the authorised version with a view of accommodating it to a false principle.—*Lords*, p. 1265.

Before the Committee of the Commons this gentleman gave the following additional testimony:—

Viscount Ebrington.—You feel no doubt which is the accurate translation?—I think "images" translates the word better than "graven thing."

Lord Stanley.—Did not you state that the Hebrew word meant “graven thing?”—Yes.

Why then should you not adopt that, if it is a fair translation?—Because I think the other more accords with the meaning of the commandment, and with the meaning commonly attached now to the English word “image.” I have not a doubt that the meaning of the commandment was to forbid this very species of worship we call the worship of images; and that in the minds of children of both denominations the word “graven thing” does not imply the meaning of the commandment.

You admit “graven thing” is the more literal meaning of the two?—I think that “image” is not in the original.

And that “graven thing” is the literal translation from the Hebrew?—Yes. The very next passage is, “Thou shalt not adore nor worship them;” now here I certainly think there is no improvement: our translation is, “Thou shalt not bow down to them;” and the child by the change may be misled; bowing down to them comes home to the Roman Catholic practice. In the Extracts it is, “Thou shalt not worship them, nor serve them;” in our translation it is, “Thou shalt not bow down to them;” it is not, “Thou shalt not worship them.”—*Commons*, q. 7595-7599.

Now “graven thing” is not only the more literal but obviously the more correct translation; first, because “the likeness of anything in heaven above,” &c., which immediately follows, renders the introduction of the word “image” a mere tautology; and, secondly, because the generic prohibition of “graven thing” was necessary in an age and country when not only images were worshipped, but blocks of stone cut into fanciful shapes, amulets, charmed rings, and ornaments, with many other objects of idolatry, which would not have been included in the commandment, if the prohibition were confined to graven images. Most persons will believe that the general word “worship” is more forcible than the specific “bow down;” but this variation is obviously of little importance.

The next objectionable passage was brought forward by the Dean of Ardagh, the very Rev. R. Murray:—

The passage is in the 14th chapter of the book of Genesis. I will first read it in the authorised version, and then read it in the Scripture Extracts. It is in page 39 of No. 1 of the Scripture Extracts. The authorised version is in these words: “And Melchizedek, King of Salem, brought forth bread and wine; and he was the priest of the most high God. And he blessed him, and said, Blessed be Abram of the most high God, possessor of heaven and earth.” Now the meaning, I take it, of that is this, that Melchizedek appeared here in a twofold character, as a king and as a priest; as a king, he entertained Abram and his servants with bread and wine, and, exclusively as a priest, he blessed him. This interpretation of it is borne out by the first verse of the seventh chapter of Hebrews, where it is

said, "For this Melchizedek, King of Salem, priest of the most high God, who met Abraham returning from the slaughter of the kings, and blessed him." The apostle's object there seems to be this: to show the superiority of the Melchizedek or the patriarchal priesthood over the Aaronic priesthood; and here he shows it by saying, that, being a priest of the most high God, he blessed him; but the apostle never says one word in his priestly character of the bread and wine that is mentioned in Genesis. He brings forward the proof here of Melchizedek blessing Abraham as a priest, to show the superiority of his priesthood over the Aaronic; because, says he, without all doubt, the less is blessed of the greater; that Melchizedek was a greater man than Abraham was; and Levi was in the loins of Abraham when Melchizedek blessed him, and therefore the Melchizedek priesthood is greater than the Aaronic priesthood. Now, in the Scripture Extracts, you find here, in page 39, "And Melchizedek, King of Salem, brought forth bread and wine, being a priest of the most high God." By this translation of the passage it makes it appear that Melchizedek's priesthood consisted in bringing forth bread and wine; and this is the argument universally used by Roman Catholic divines to prove the truth of the sacrifice of the mass. Here is the argument for the sacrifice of the mass in a Roman Catholic book, entitled, "The Catholic Christian instructed in the Sacraments, Sacrifice, Ceremonies, and Observances of the Church, by way of question and answer. By the Right Reverend Dr. Challoner."—"Have the servants of God, from the beginning of the world, been always accustomed to honour him with sacrifices?—Yes, they have. Witness the sacrifice of Abel, the sacrifice of Noah, the sacrifice of Melchizedek." Then, a little further on, he says, "Some were bloody sacrifices, in which the victim was slain; others unbloody, as the sacrifice of Melchizedek, which was bread and wine." Now, this passage here is translated in the Scripture Extracts so as to make it prove that the sacrifice of the mass is what was offered by Melchizedek, and that he offered up that sacrifice; whereas the true meaning of the Scripture is, that it was as a king that he entertained Abraham with bread and wine, and as a priest exclusively he blessed him. Blessing was the exclusive work of the priest upon that occasion. Here it is made use of by Dr. Challoner to show that the work of the priest was to offer up the unbloody sacrifice.—*Lords*, p. 844.

There is no doubt that "He was" is a more correct translation than "being," but it is not very clear how children could deduce such a doctrine as the sacrifice of the mass from such a trifling change. On this subject, however, the very reverend Dean was very positive in his assertions, and we shall therefore quote them and the reasoning by which they were supported.

Would the reading of this passage in the Scripture Extracts by a child of from 10 to 15 years old, in your opinion, suggest to him the sacrifice of the mass?—Decidedly.

Do you mean to say that you think it would decidedly suggest

Roman Catholic ideas of the Communion to a child of from 10 to 15 years of age?—I think it would.

The Roman Catholics deny the cup to the laity?—They do.

You observe that this passage states that Melchizedek, the King of Salem, brought forth bread and wine; would that suggest to a child the mode of administering the Communion according to the Roman Catholic faith, by which the wine is excluded from the laity?—The Roman Catholics are made to believe that both the bread and wine is included in the bread, so that it comes to the same thing in the end.

Do you think that a Protestant child reading this would be induced to believe that when Melchizedek brought forth bread and wine he only produced bread, which comprehended in itself both bread and wine?—I know that if the Protestant child, who is generally not so clever as the Roman Catholic child, did not comprehend it, the Roman Catholic child would soon tell him what it meant.

Are the Protestant children more obtuse than the Roman Catholic children?—In examining a class of children, I would know a child to be a Roman Catholic child from his better answering.

Do you think the Roman Catholic children are of quicker understanding than the Protestant children generally?—I do; I think the original inhabitants of the country are cleverer than the Normans that came over.

And that difference is so marked that you can distinguish a Roman Catholic child from a Protestant child?—I can, and I scarcely ever failed in doing so; I would know a child to be of Roman Catholic parents in examining them in the class.—*Lords*, p. 846.

We have given rather disproportionate space to this objection, because it was the best supported of any which were urged against the Scripture Extracts. It needs only to be added that the objectionable word “being” was not taken from the Douay;—in that version the passage is rendered, as Dean Murray informs us,

“For he was a Priest of the Most High God.”—*Lords*, p. 847.

The next objection of importance was made by the Rev. Dr. Elrington:

Can you mention any passages in those Scripture Extracts which are incorrectly translated?—The most prominent passage is the institution of the Sacrament, in which I must use a stronger word than “incorrect.”

What word would you apply to it?—I would say the translation was false.

What passage is that?—It is in the Gospel of St. Luke, it is in the 121st and 122nd pages.

Will you have the goodness to state what you think to be the false translation which occurs there?—The verse states: “Likewise also the cup after they had supped, saying, This cup is the New

Testament in my blood, which is about to be shed for you." I conceive that "about to be shed" is a false translation.

What do you conceive ought to be the translation?—"Which is shed for you."

What is the translation in the authorised version?—"Which is shed for you."

Do you know the translation in the Douay version?—"Which shall be shed."

Do you conceive that "which is about to be shed" is a false translation?—I do.

Do you recollect the original word?—*Εκχυνόμενον*.

The participle in the present tense?—Yes.

When you say that is a false translation, do you ascribe any motive to the giving of this translation?—I do not like ascribing motives, but a false doctrine has been founded upon this passage.

Is this a verse which has long been matter of controversial discussion between the churches of Rome and England?—Yes, from the reign of Elizabeth, from the publication of the Rheims Testament in 1584, it was a subject of controversy.

From that time down to the present this passage has been one of the texts which have been most cited in controversy; on what point?—On the doctrine of transubstantiation.

What was the distinction of the argument founded upon the two versions of this verse?—The Roman Catholics think to establish by the first of the two verses the real presence, and by the second verse the difference between the unbloody and bloody sacrifice: "This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me. Likewise also the cup after they had supped, saying, This cup is the New Testament in my blood, which is about to be shed for you." That referring to the bloody sacrifice on the cross, distinguished from the unbloody sacrifice.

And that version you consider to be favourable to the Roman Catholic doctrine?—Certainly.

Is another argument ever used in controversy upon this text, that it is favourable to the doctrine of transubstantiation, inasmuch as "shall be shed for you" would not necessarily imply a figurative meaning?—Yes.—*Lords*, p. 591.

To which Dr. Elrington subsequently added the following piece of evidence:—

Do you conceive the translator of those Extracts could have done that which he professes to do, namely, take his translation from the Greek?—No; any school-boy would know the difference between the two.—*Lords*, p. 592.

It is probable that many school-boys also know that the Greek of the New Testament is modelled on the Syriac idiom, and that in Syriac, as in Hebrew, there is no future participle, but that its place is frequently supplied by the present participle. Mr. Carlile thus explained his reasons for translating the Greek word by "which is about to be shed."

When you put the phrase "about to be shed," did you consider that it was a correct translation of the original?—The original is the present participle. The reason I put "about to be shed" is, that the expression "is shed" in the present state of the English language, implies past time or action completed. In the old state of the English language "is shed" would signify what is meant by "is being shed;" and this seemed to me to express what was the fact, "about to be shed," referring to our Lord's crucifixion the next day.

Are you aware that it has been from the earliest period of the Reformation a matter of constant recurrence in almost all the controversies that have taken place between Roman Catholics and Protestants, that the Roman Catholics have put the future tense in translating this word, and that the Protestants have said that it ought to be the present?—I do not recollect meeting with that, but I should think that in that case they have changed sides, for it appears to me that "is being shed" would be more consonant to the doctrine of transubstantiation than the future tense, because it might appear that at that very moment his blood was being shed.

In fact are you aware that the controversialists have used the contrary argument?—I do not recollect to have heard of it.

In reading the translation in the authorised version, "which is shed," did you ever suppose that that meant other than present?—I knew from my knowledge of Greek it could not; but I am quite persuaded that it is mistaken by many persons in reading it to signify the past.

Are you to be understood that your reason for introducing this change in the translation was to prevent that misunderstanding?—That was, I understood, part, and only part, of the reason. There was some conversation between the Archbishop of Dublin and myself upon the subject, and I think the conclusion was, that upon the whole the meaning of the text would be more distinctly expressed by putting it as it is here, "which is about to be shed," than by using the present tense.

Do you consider that the deviation from the authorised version in that instance seems rather to militate against the doctrine of transubstantiation, than to favour it?—I think it does.—*Lords*, p. 1385.

Dr. Elrington next objects to a note in the Scripture Extracts.

What notes do you conceive to convey false doctrine?—In the Gospel of St. Luke there is a very remarkable note, which asserts that the spirits in heaven know when men repent.

Will you have the goodness to refer to it?—In the 15th chapter of St. Luke, in the 85th page: "By this it is plain that the spirits of heaven are interested in our welfare; they rejoice at our repentance, and therefore they know when we repent."

In what respect do you consider this note to contain false doctrine?—I consider that is the attribute of the Deity; it is told us

by Scripture that the Lord himself only knows the hearts of the sons of men.

Which do you mean is the attribute of the Deity?—His knowing when we repent.

Do you know any Roman Catholic doctrine that seems to be specially favoured by this note?—I do; the doctrine which our articles well describe as “a fond thing vainly invented and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture,” the worshipping of saints and angels.

Is there anything in the note that specially looks to saints?—I think the change from angels to spirits of heaven does so.

Are you aware what the note is in the Douay Testament?—I am not quite sure, but I think I recollect they join both angels and spirits.—*Lords*, p. 591.

Subsequently Dr. Elrington added further objections.

Do you think the passage itself rightly understood excludes any reference to the knowledge by the angels of what is in the heart of man?—The whole application of the parable would be false if it was: “There is joy in the presence of the angels of God;” the reference must be to the Deity.

Does not the parable represent a shepherd who has lost a sheep, and when he has found it he calls his friends together and rejoices?—Yes.

Then according to the parable he gives notice to his friends and neighbours of what has happened. Would it not seem to be in accordance with the parable that the antitype should also give information?—Certainly; that was my meaning.

The antitype being, in this case, God?—Yes.

Then when the text says “There is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth,” your construction of it is, that the angels rejoice in the presence of God because God Almighty tells them they are to rejoice?—I do not say so; I think it an extremely difficult passage, remarkably difficult, and the commentators are greatly divided about the meaning of it; but I can prove, I think, that the interpretation given here is not a correct one—“There is joy in the presence of the angels of God.” It is the shepherd that rejoices, and therefore the joy in the presence of the angels of God must be the joy of God in the presence of the angels.

You exclude any rejoicing on the part of the angels?—That is not told us here.

Do you think there is in this note to which you object anything which, without a strained construction and a knowledge of the controversy before, would render it liable to the objection that you feel against it; to a plain reader, who is not aware of that controversy, do you think it would be objectionable?—I think the note is taken away from all controversy, because it alludes to an ordinary practice of the Roman Catholic church, which is the worship of saints. It says, “It is plain that the spirits of heaven are interested in our welfare; they rejoice at our repentance, and therefore they know

when we repent." And therefore they are proper objects to whom we should address our prayers.

Can you conceive any reason why this note is put in but to favour that particular doctrine?—I cannot.

Does it in the slightest degree tend in your apprehension to explain the passage?—It does not in the least.—*Lords*, p. 592.

To these objections Mr. Carlile replied in the following evidence:—

For what purpose is that note introduced?—For no purpose, except that it was illustrative or explanatory of the text.

Are you aware that such an explanation as is implied in this note has been objected to by many of the greatest controversialists and divines of the Protestant church, inasmuch as it unreasonably, in their judgment, favours the doctrine of the Roman Catholic church?—It would scarcely be possible to express a truth of any kind that has not been objected to by controversialists, and I should not have taken that into consideration. I intended to speak the truth in that note, and I conceive I did so.

Then in preparing these notes, of which there seem to be but few upon doctrinal points in it, you did not think it necessary to take the sense of those who are ordinarily considered the best commentators?—So far as they speak what appeared to me to be the truth I did. In this particular instance I must have read the note in the Douay version from the similarity of the expression; but it presented itself to my own mind, and I inserted it as illustrating the subject, without any view to the Roman Catholic church or any other.

You did not think it necessary to inform yourself of the different opinions of Roman Catholic and Protestant commentators upon doctrines of this sort when you prepared the notes for these Scripture Extracts?—I am quite aware that Roman Catholics give a certain degree of worship to saints and angels, and I could have no doubt that amongst other passages they would refer to such a passage as this; but it does not appear to me to be a legitimate mode of opposing error to withhold or to refrain in the slightest degree from speaking the whole truth upon the subject; it does appear to me that the angels must know people who repent, or else they could not rejoice in it.

Did it never occur to you that the passage does not really apply so much to the knowledge of angels primarily as to the knowledge of our Lord; and that whether he may tell the angels or not, and whether it is their joy or not, or whether it is only the joy of our Lord, is not mentioned in the text?—I think the text does imply that the angels of God rejoice; at the same time the note says nothing of the manner in which they may obtain their knowledge of the subject.

Have you any doubt that that note is put in the Douay version to confirm the worship of the spirits of heaven?—I do not remember that any use of that kind is made of it in the Douay version.

Have you any doubt that that note is put in the Douay version for the purpose of sanctioning the worship of saints? The note is, "By this it is plain that the spirits of heaven have a concern for us below, and a joy at our repentance, and consequently a knowledge of it."—I think the translators would have drawn the inference if they had intended it to be so. I cannot judge of persons' motives further than they state.

Will you state why you used the phrase in this note, "spirits of heaven;" is that phrase in the original?—I cannot charge my memory with any reason for it whatever; very likely, having read the note in the Douay version, I used the phrase without thinking of it any further.

Are you aware that the consequence of not thinking further upon the subject would very naturally lead to a very inclusive meaning being applied to "spirits of heaven," namely, that it would include saints, who are certainly not included in the text; the words in the text being "the angels of God?" Are the "angels of God" and "spirits of heaven" in your understanding equivalent words?—The angels are spirits and spirits of heaven; and very probably the idea of saints in glory did not occur to me at all.

Are you prepared to say that it did not occur to you that this might apply to saints?—I cannot recollect whether it did or not; I cannot venture to say; I think not.—*Lords*, p. 1386.

For the purpose of comprehending precisely the next objection of Dr. Elrington, it will be convenient to quote the note which he condemned. It is on the third chapter of Luke, and the third verse.

"The Greek word here rendered *repentance*, as well as the kindred verb rendered *repent*, is in this and several other passages translated in the Vulgate Latin by *penitentia*, and in the Rheims version by the English word (derived from that) *penance*, which is contracted from *penitence*. We shall render the Greek words in question by the English words *repentance* or *penitence* and *repent*; for Roman Catholics, including under the words *repentance* or *penitence* not only internal sorrow for sin, with purpose of future amendment, but also a disposition on the part of the penitent to manifest his inward sorrow for sin by penitential works, do in fact include in the word *repent* all that they mean by the phrase *do penance*; whereas, although the word *penance*, according to Roman Catholic doctrine, essentially implies internal sorrow for sin, it conveys to Protestants only the idea of certain austerities or voluntary sufferings, or at least certain exercises peculiar to the church of Rome. It is obvious, therefore, that while Roman Catholics are in no danger of being misled by the use of the words *repentance* or *penitence*, Protestants would be in danger of being misled by the use of the words *penance* and *do penance*."

Let us now see what are Dr. Elrington's objections.

Will you state in what respects you consider this note objectionable?—Because I think the clear construction of the note would

be that the Roman Catholic translation of *μετανοια*, "doing penance," was the right one; it gives part of what is the Roman Catholic doctrine of doing penance, and does not give what the Protestants object to.

What is the part that you understand not to be given here of the Roman Catholic doctrine of penance to which Protestants object?—The cause for which it is to be done,—satisfaction for sin.

Satisfaction to whom?—To the Deity.

That is not expressed here, and you consider that to be notoriously an important part of the Roman Catholic doctrine of penance?—Yes, it is in any common catechism.

But you say it is not expressed here?—No; this gives part of the Roman Catholic doctrine of penance; and I think on reading that note any one would imagine that the Roman Catholic translation was the right view of the subject, and not the Protestant.—*Lords*, p. 590.

On this subject Mr. Carlile was examined at very considerable length, but the following portion of his evidence will be sufficient to satisfy the reader.

Can the two distinct meanings given to the word in this note be both right?—I do not see two distinct meanings given to it.

The note says "For Roman Catholics, including under the words repentance or penitence not only internal sorrow for sin, with purpose of future amendment, but also a disposition on the part of the penitent to manifest his inward sorrow for sin by penitential works, do in fact include in the word *repent* all that they mean by the phrase *do penance*." Now do you mean that the Protestants by the word *repentance* mean all that the Roman Catholics mean by the phrase *do penance*?—I think as Roman Catholics explain it here, they do; I think that Protestants understand by the word *repentance* precisely what is stated here; not only internal sorrow for sin, with purpose of future amendment, but also a disposition to manifest that internal sorrow for sin by penitential works.

Then you understand the Protestants and Roman Catholics to be brought here to mean both the same thing?—The Roman Catholics were permitted to give their own view of what is meant by repentance, and they seem to agree with us upon that subject.

Then you understand in this note that repentance is stated in such a way that both Protestants and Roman Catholics are shown to mean the same thing in it?—I am not answerable for the Roman Catholic view of the subject further than they themselves have stated it in this note, and I have no objection to their statement of it in this note.

Was that note on repentance put in by you, or by any of the Roman Catholic commissioners?—That note underwent a considerable degree of consideration and discussion. I hoped that by a note somewhat such as that which has been adopted we might get rid of the word "penance" throughout the whole of the book that we were then editing. I wrote out a note for that purpose, and gave it to

Dr. Murray. He wrote out a note somewhat varying from that. I then made again some alterations in it. It was brought before the Board, and some further alterations were made in it, and after a considerable deal of care and discussion it was produced as it now stands.

Was it produced as it now stands with the full sanction of the Board?—It was. That was a note that occupied of course the careful and deliberate attention of the whole Board, and was again and again considered by Dr. Murray before it was sanctioned by the Board.—*Lords*, p. 1384.

Mr. Carlile was examined respecting the omission of ten verses in the first chapter of St. Luke's gospel, from twenty-eight to thirty-seven inclusive; for which the following reason was assigned in the third report issued by the Board:—

“An examination of the original verses will we think at once explain, to any person accustomed to prepare scriptural instruction for youth, why we thought it best to give a summary of them in a work intended for school lessons.”—*Lords*, p. 1381.

The purport of the inquiry was to ascertain whether the real reason of the omission was that which had been assigned. It was asserted that the Protestant and Roman Catholic Commissioners could not agree in the translation of the leading word in the verse; the former rendering the word addressed by the angel Gabriel to the Virgin Mary, “full of grace,” while the Protestants render it more literally, “highly favoured.” Mr. Carlile denied that there was any inconsistency between the two reasons; the former being one in which all the Commissioners agreed, the latter being merely an influential motive in his individual mind.

The last objection made to the Scripture Extracts was the form in which the Lord's Prayer is exhibited. Dr. Elrington says—

The part of it which I think the most objectionable is the mode in which they have given the Lord's Prayer, which would shake the faith of any child. In the sixtieth page half the prayer is put in brackets, to show that there were disputes about whether it was the genuine reading or not; so that a child who had been taught the Lord's Prayer, as soon as he came to this, would say, “perhaps what I have been taught is not the Lord's Prayer at all.”

Have the goodness to read the Lord's Prayer as it is given in the Scripture Extracts with the note upon it.—It is as follows:—“And he said unto them, when ye pray, say [our] Father [who art in heaven], hallowed be thy name: thy kingdom come: [thy will be done, as in heaven so on earth]. Give us day by day our daily bread: and forgive us our sins, for we also forgive every one that is indebted to us:—and lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil.” Then the note is, “the passages enclosed in brackets

in this prayer are not found in some manuscripts, and therefore are omitted by many modern critics, as Griesbach, &c. They are supposed to have been supplied from the parallel passages in Matthew the 6th. They are omitted in the Armenian and Vulgate translations. Origen says that Luke has them not, though Matthew has."—*Lords*, p. 563.

The objection will be variously estimated by different persons, according as they deem it advisable to make children acquainted with the fact that such a thing as Biblical criticism exists. Some will believe that such information may tend to weaken the authority of the Bible, and others will think it dangerous to leave youth open to the danger of first hearing of these variations from unbelievers, and being thus unprepared to meet the insidious arguments founded upon the imperfection of manuscripts by infidels and sceptics.

It is worthy of notice that the charges brought against the Scripture Extracts before the Parliamentary Committees bore no proportion in number or importance to those which the adversaries of the Board urged vehemently at public meetings, and published in a variety of pamphlets and periodicals. On this subject we have the following evidence from his Grace the Archbishop of Dublin :—

How many passages of the Scripture Extracts have been objected to on the part of the Protestant clergy?—I cannot say; but I think, on the average, about five or six in a page; but the Committee may see that more particularly by referring to the books which have been published by Mr. Todd of Trinity College, and by the Rev. Mr. Newland, and some others, in which there are objections taken to the putting of "has" instead of "hath," "to" instead of "unto;" and, in short, objections to every word, without exception, and every passage that varies in the smallest degree from the authorised version: and more especially to all the notes and questions in which there is mention of Peter; because it is stated that those passages will be used by the Roman Catholics to inculcate the doctrines of their church. But as to the number of objections, I doubt whether the authors themselves could enumerate them.—*Commons*, q. 4885.

Under these circumstances it would manifestly be impossible to prepare a volume of Scripture Extracts which would be beyond the reach of hostile criticism, and the Archbishop of Dublin argues strongly against the expediency of making any such effort.

Does not your Grace think it would be desirable to divest the works of any notes which might possibly give offence to any one denomination of Christians?—I think that, if that were attempted, the result would be that, in many cases, we should give more offence than we should remove; that any indication of a suspicion on our part that such and such a version, or such and such a reading,

favoured Roman Catholic tenets, when it is so far from doing so as in the controverted passage in the third chapter of Genesis, would be unwise; I think that it would be a sort of symptom of weakness and apprehensiveness which would impress them rather with an idea of our feeling less confidence in the truth of our own cause. Now I may be permitted, perhaps, to mention what I have heard often said in conversation on that point by some very intelligent and assiduous and useful clergymen of my own diocese, who told me they were in the habit of telling the children of their own flocks, in giving them instruction, what were the different readings, where there was anything beyond mere verbal differences between the authorised and the Douay versions; because, said they, where there are so many Roman Catholics, it is desirable that the children, while in the schools, should hear that which they certainly will hear some time or other; and we ought to show that we are not unacquainted with the distinction, and have faith in Scripture; and therefore we think it our duty, they said, to put before the children the knowledge of that which, sooner or later, they are likely to hear from their neighbours. We should say, "there are different versions and different interpretations; the Roman Catholics read this so and so, or interpret it so and so; we read it so and so; we think there is no ground for their interpretation." I think that if a very careful abstinence were shown from reference to other versions, that would show a timidity which would do harm to our cause. In our Scripture Extracts we have never put forth the different interpretations on controverted points, for that would be an obstacle to combined instruction: but we have never shrunk from saying there were differences of version, and that all translators had not agreed precisely, word for word, in their interpretation of the Scriptures, which we consider rather beneficial than otherwise, as indicating in a remarkable manner that of which the unlearned would not otherwise possibly be informed. I consider it to be, for them, an important point of Christian evidence to know that there is a general agreement in the main facts of Scripture history among those who differ the most widely, I am sorry to say, sometimes the most bitterly, in their religious tenets.—*Commons*, q. 4848.

His Grace also stated strong reasons for believing that no concessions whatever could reconcile some of those who are unfriendly to the Board.

I have no hope that any such concession would produce such an effect, recollecting, as I do, what many clergymen have confessed to me and to others, as to their real opinions; which it is my full conviction have influenced their minds and induced them to make objections to every part of the system. I may inform the Committee that some of them have acknowledged their persuasion that a scheme was on foot for gradually doing away the Protestant Establishment, and that this was the first step to it; they, therefore, felt a strong prejudice against the Government, against the Government measure, against the system of the Board, and everything proceeding from it;

which any one who knows anything of human nature would expect them to find, but which, in an unbiassed state of mind, they would not. It has been distinctly acknowledged to me, and to others on whose testimony I can rely, that that feeling led many strenuously to oppose the system of national education, who had been for many years before patrons of the Mendicity Institution, of which the school has been conducted on precisely the same principles; but many were induced to withdraw their aid altogether from the Mendicity Institution, as soon as they found it was about to be aided by the Board, though the principle of that school was in perfect accordance with it long before. I adduce these as instances of persons seeing objections where in an unbiassed state of mind they would have seen none; else they would have seen them in the schools of the Mendicity Institution long before I went to Dublin.—*Commons*, q. 4899.

The circumstances of the schools attached to the Mendicity Institution elucidate so fully the species of opposition which the Board has had to encounter in Dublin, that we shall extract the principal part of the evidence relating to them.

Your Grace spoke of persons withdrawing from the Mendicity Society; is your Grace aware whether those persons who so withdrew from the Mendicity Society were apprised of the fact that the Mendicity school has been conducted on the Board's principles before it became united with the Board?—Yes; I recollect many. I heard of some, however, who, being afterwards remonstrated with in private upon that point, consented to resume their former patronage, and said, "Well, here is my 10s.;" but I heard of many who threatened to withdraw. I understood that at a public meeting of the Mendicity Institution there were several cases of that description, and I was assured again and again that their knowledge of the plan on which the schools were conducted was avowed. And at one of those meetings (I did not happen to be present myself, but I sent one of my chaplains, Dr. Hinds, to attend, and there were others I could rely upon present) it was proposed by some of the Protestants not unfriendly to the system that, from the fear of injuring the Mendicity Institution, they should refuse the grant of the Board, for that on the whole they would be more likely to be losers; on which some Roman Catholics said they had no idea of yielding to such an unfounded impression, and that, if the grant was not accepted, they would withdraw; and thereupon the grant was accepted.

Does your Grace know, in point of fact, whether those persons who did retire from the Mendicity school, on its being enlisted under the Board, had been apprised previously of the fact that the Mendicity school had been conducted on the principles of the Board?—Yes, I am pretty sure they were; and I have already stated the grounds on which I know they were, because the matter was publicly debated, and that was put forward again and again in every shape; persons attended at those meetings who heard those discussions.

Is your Grace aware whether those debates had taken place

antecedently to the time at which those persons had paid their subscriptions?—The discussions were subsequent.

Does your Grace consider those persons as having been guilty of inconsistency in having supported the society after they were aware of that fact?—Yes, I consider there was inconsistency in objecting to a system under which they knew the schools of the society they supported to be conducted.

Mr. Serjeant Jackson.—Is your Grace certain that they were aware of the principle on which the school was previously conducted?—Yes.

And that they paid their subscriptions, knowing that fact?—Yes; I am not able to say that every one of them knew it, but many acknowledged they were fully aware that the school was conducted upon that principle.

Chairman.—Is not it a fair assumption that the persons subscribing to the society knew the principle on which the school was conducted?—I think it is a fair presumption, but many acknowledged that they actually did, and had been aware of it long previously to the acceptance of the grant from the Board.—*Commons*, q. 4935–4941.

It is thus evident that some of the opponents of the Board fell into the logical error of pronouncing sentence upon the conclusion after having adjourned the consideration of the premises, and, having first, in accordance with party or political bias, resolved upon a course of action, they next sought arguments and excuses to justify their conduct.

Before quitting this subject we must notice an objection made by Dr. Elrington to the other books published by the Board; it occurs in his examination before the Committee of the House of Commons:—

Lord Stanley.—Do you mean, broadly, to give it as your opinion, that the education and instruction conveyed in the books of the National Board is merely literary instruction, with nothing of religion in it?—I think there is nothing of religion in it.—*Commons*, q. 2086.

This evidence is rather inconsistent with that given by Lady Osborne before the Committee of the House of Lords, and there is little difficulty in determining the relative value of the opposite statements.

The children in my school sing the hymns of the Board, which are very excellent; they are most devout and pious; they are such hymns as you would be delighted to put into the hands of Protestant children; and it is a most delightful thing to hear those children lifting up their little voices in the praise of God. Amongst other hymns they sing Bishop Heber's Missionary Hymn.—*Lords*, p. 1224.

And again, her ladyship says,—

I wish to mention that I think the hymns are a very valuable part

of the system for conveying instruction; and now the children, instead of singing the common songs of the country, can be heard singing those hymns at home that they sing in the schools.

Do they occasionally sing those hymns at home?—Yes; they have been heard often.

So that in fact they acquire both a familiarity and a love for that part of their instruction?—Yes.—*Lords*, p. 1227.

Her ladyship adds a circumstance too gratifying to be omitted.

To show the good terms upon which they, the Protestants and Roman Catholics, are with one another, I may mention that there are some of the Protestants who live at a considerable distance, and we used to get them to come before school-hours to learn their Sunday hymns, and actually the Roman Catholics that lived near them came with them, in order to accompany the children; and I thought it was very kind and amicable in them to come half an hour before school-hours, merely to accompany the other children.—*Lords*, p. 1229.

CHAPTER V.

Special Objections to the National System of Religious Education.

THE great principle adopted by the National Board in providing religious instruction for the children, is to preserve parental responsibility inviolate. It is not the object of the Commissioners to disturb the peace of families by the introduction of religious controversy, nor to weaken the ties which unite parent and child, by encouraging the latter to choose a profession or a creed before the mental powers are matured. They deem proselytism neither possible nor prudent; they look upon the duty of public instructors to be to aid parents, but not wholly to usurp their place. The Dean of Ardagh was the only person who objected to this principle, which he seemed to think ought to be taken with great limitations in the present state of Ireland, because parents are subject to the influence of the Romish priesthood, and to an external pressure from the more bigoted part of the Roman Catholic population, which virtually deprives them of the power of making a free and unbiassed choice. The evidence respecting the extent of this influence was very contradictory; for while it was at one time asserted to prevent voluntary action, at another it was affirmed that Roman Catholics frequently sent their children to Scriptural schools in spite of sacerdotal prohibitions. The Rev. L. H. Robinson says, in answer to Mr. Shaw—

When you speak of what you consider the triumph of Scriptural education, is it an element, in the opinion you have formed upon that subject, that you think the parents of the Roman Catholic children cannot be induced to prevent their children reading the Scriptures?—Decidedly; cases have come under my own notice, where, in defiance to the prohibition of the Roman Catholic priests, Roman Catholics have sent their children to those schools; and I have known cases where Roman Catholics have withdrawn their children for a while, but have done it at the instigation of the priest, and in a very short time afterwards have sent them back again to the same school.

Mr. Shaw.—You have spoken of the right of the parents to prevent the children reading the Scriptures; but do you think it possible to prevent their exercising the power of doing so, if they think fit?—No, I think clearly not; but without at all entering upon the subject of the right of the parent to prevent his child from reading the Scrip-

tures, or at all discussing that point, I would observe that a Protestant state cannot fairly be called upon to furnish any other education for the lower orders than that education in which the Bible would be a fundamental part.—*Commons*, q. 7324-5.

A much higher view of parental responsibility was taken by the Rev. C. Boyton, who on this point adopted the principles of the National Board to their fullest extent. His evidence on this very important subject, which is too generally neglected in all discussions respecting a national system of education, deserves to be quoted at full length:—

Mr. Lefroy.—Are the Committee to understand that a great proportion of the Protestant clergy of Ireland, distinct from the diocese of Raphoe, think that the children would have free access to the Scriptures, provided the use of them were put under the direction of their parents?—I think the clergy have generally expressed themselves unfavourably to the option proposed to be given to the parents whether the children should read the Scriptures or not.

Have you an idea that the children would have access to the Scriptures if it were left to the option of the parents, under the influence of their clergy, or that the Roman Catholic clergy would not influence the parents to prevent their children reading the Scriptures?—My belief is that it is not only the readiest way, but, in my mind, the only way in which the communication of scriptural knowledge will take place among the Roman Catholics of Ireland; that connected with the diffusion of knowledge there will be a diffusion of the knowledge of Scripture, and in the present state of the country, as it appears to me, the only way in which the thing can be generally successful would be by the very system of instruction proposed to be introduced under the plan we have suggested.

Do you suppose the children, if it rests with the parent, will be likely to obtain the unrestricted use of the Scriptures?—No; I think the priests will prescribe to the parents, in the instruction of their children, whether the Scriptures may be used in the vulgar tongue, or whether they may not. I endeavoured to put forward strongly in my former evidence, that I think it desirable to look clearly to what is the principle of the Roman Catholic church; that it is that they shall not have the Scriptures in the vulgar tongue but under the permission of their clergy.

Would you, in a school where the boys had arrived at the age of fifteen or sixteen, and gone through a course of literary instruction, say they were not fit to decide for themselves whether they should have the free and unrestricted use of the Scriptures, without being controlled by their parents, who are in many cases both ignorant and prejudiced?—I think it is very hard to point out the period of a child's age at which he shall exercise a discretion, and the parents cease to exercise discretion on important matters; I should be sorry, therefore, to say that a boy at fifteen should not have arrived at a state of mind that the responsibility should rest upon him; but I should say that up to a certain period it must rest with the parent to judge for

the child on all important matters, and, as it appears to me, more particularly in matters of religion.

Mr. Shaw.—You do not say you acknowledge in the abstract the right of the parents of Roman Catholic children to prevent the reading the Scriptures, but that you think it would be impracticable to endeavour to prevent their exercising the power, if they chose to do it, of preventing their children reading the Scriptures.—I should be sorry to give any answer to the question which would lead the Committee to understand that I thought it clear that a parent had not the right to prescribe to a child of certain years; I think it is the right of the parent, not to say the duty of the parent, to prescribe to his children any point connected with their interest, both temporal and spiritual.

Mr. Lefroy.—Do you confine that to the teaching in schools?—I do not confine it; I think it applies generally on all occasions.

Suppose you were called on to attend a child who was sick, and he wished you to read the Scriptures to him; if a Roman Catholic parent objected, should you feel yourself bound to obey the parent if the child was in a dying state?—I think that is putting a peculiar case; my opinion is, that Providence has left the power in the parent to judge, in such cases, for the welfare of his child, and that the parent, in that view of it, is invested with the right to do so.

Then you must determine at what age the command to search the Scriptures will commence?—No, I think the principle may be very clear, and yet that not determined; there must certainly a change take place from one point of time to another, and yet it is very hard, and nearly impossible, to say at what point the change had taken place; every one knows the difference between night and day, and yet it is very difficult to say the point exactly at which the twilight ends and the night begins, or the period at which the child becomes personally responsible and the responsibility is entirely off the parent; it varies: one child is more precocious than another; and what is the period when the responsibility is shifted from the parent to the child himself it is impossible to say at what particular age the change takes place.

Does not the difficulty of ascertaining the period when that change takes place make it more important to take from the parent the power of restricting the child from exercising his own discretion with respect to the right of reading the Scriptures?—I do not think that the question is, whether the child shall read the Scriptures, but whether it shall receive instruction from the Scriptures in those schools. I conceive a Protestant might object to having his child read the Scriptures under Roman Catholic masters. If a Protestant conceives it would be injurious to his child to read the Scriptures under a Roman Catholic master, I conceive it not only the right but the duty of the parent to prevent such communication being made. I can imagine many cases in which the authority of the parent might be usefully exercised in preventing the reading of the Scriptures under peculiar circumstances. I would not, and I am quite sure many Protestant parents would not consent to have their

children receive religious instruction from the Bible through Roman Catholic teachers, whose principles they did not approve.—*Com-mons*, q. 7549-7557.

Parental responsibility having been secured, the next object was to adopt means for giving it effect, and the principle which the Board adopted was to make no direct provision for the religious instruction of the children, but to afford all possible facilities to the clergy of different denominations for teaching the children of their respective flocks. The principle is thus stated by the Right Hon. A. R. Blake :—

Have the Board taken any care to provide religious instruction in cases where the clergy have not applied for schools?—The Board are not allowed to interfere with what is considered to be the peculiar province and duty of the clergy; it was considered by his Majesty's Government, when it gave the system in charge to us, that it was the bounden duty of the clergy of the country to attend to the religious instruction of the children of their respective flocks. We do not presume that they abandon their duty to the public; on the contrary, we presume that they attend to it.—*Lords*, p. 83.

In accordance with this principle, the following rule has been adopted, modified a little from its original form, in consequence of representations made to the Board by the Synod of Ulster :—

One day at least in each week (independently of the Sunday) is to be set apart for the religious instruction of the children, on which day such pastors or other persons as are approved of by the parents or guardians of the children, shall have access to them for that purpose, whether those pastors have signed the original application or not. The managers of schools are also expected, should the parents of any of the children desire it, to afford convenient opportunity and facility for the same purpose, either before or after the ordinary school business (as the managers may determine), on other days of the week. Any arrangement of this description that may be made is to be publicly notified in the schools, in order that those children, and those only, may be present at the religious instruction whose parents and guardians approve of their being so. The reading of the Scriptures, either in the authorised or Douay version, is regarded as a religious exercise, and, as such, is to be confined to those times which are set apart for religious instruction. The same regulation is also to be observed respecting prayer.—*Lords*, p. 29.

The principal objection raised against this rule is, that it makes Protestants parties to the dissemination of what they consider religious error. Mr. Boyton's evidence on this subject is very valuable, both on account of its candour, and of its suggesting means by which the objection may be obviated.

The third objection you mentioned relates to the separate religious instruction; do you conceive that the clergy of the diocese of Derry

and Raphoe object to the authority given to the clergy of different persuasions, to give separate religious instruction in the school-house?—Yes. As to this objection, I do not think it is at all so strong in point of principle; but I think there is nothing that makes the system so unpopular in Ireland as the fact of the priests being in the schools at all to give religious instruction. I am very certain that the population in the north of Ireland will never tolerate it.

Would you not allow the Roman Catholic clergy to instruct their Roman Catholic flocks?—I would not prohibit them from instructing their flocks in their own places; but what I object to, and what the clergy in Ireland generally object to, is, that they should be parties to encouraging and recommending the teaching of what they believe to be error, and under that impression I am perfectly certain that it would be exceedingly wrong to encourage the inculcation of what they believe to be deadly error.

What do you mean when you say that they object to being made parties to it; in what sense are they made parties under the existing system?—It is part of the present system of national education; for the Board of National Education put it forward in the very front of their proceedings, that they encourage and invite the Roman Catholic clergy to give peculiar religious instruction to children in the school out of school hours; every person therefore connecting himself with that Board, more or less, subscribes to the principles of the Board, and therefore the clergy would consider themselves to be parties encouraging the Roman Catholic clergy to teach their religious opinions to Roman Catholic children.

Do you mean to say that by admitting the Roman Catholic clergyman to give instruction to the children of his flock, which you think expedient in itself, encouragement is given by the Protestant clergy to their doing it?—I do not put this objection to the same extent upon the ground of principle as the others; in truth, it does not appear to me so strong in point of principle as the other two objections, but I think it is more objected to; I think it creates a greater amount of hostility to the Board than any thing else does; and in our proposition to the Government which we intended to make, we should have proposed leaving the clergy of the different churches to give this instruction in their own places of worship. The Commissioners of 1812, in their fourteenth report, specially recommend that this peculiar religious instruction should be given in "other places" than the school-house; and Mr. Wyse, in his proposal to the Government in the year 1832, or 1831, proposes the same thing. He says, "indeed it might be given in the school-houses, but," he says, "it might perhaps be elsewhere." I think it is no essential portion of the present system, or of any system of united education, that this instruction should be in the school-houses. I am very certain that this thing has had a greater effect in disgusting the Protestants of the country against the system, than even things more solid in point of principle.

Do you think it would be less objectionable to the clergy and others to whom you have alluded, that the Protestant clergyman

should be excluded from giving religious instruction in the school, as well as the Roman Catholic clergyman, rather than have them both invited or permitted to give such instruction?—I would be very glad that a system could be adopted in which the Protestant clergyman would be allowed to give this instruction in the school-houses, but I do not see how that could be done, without giving the same privilege to the Roman Catholic clergyman; and upon that account, being aware of the great importance of having an union of opinion upon that point, and being aware that nothing so much obstructs an union of opinion as this very circumstance, I would give up the privilege of having peculiar religious instruction given by the Protestant clergyman in the school-room out of school hours, with the view of getting rid of what I know to be the stumbling-block in the way of any adjustment.

You mean that you would rather exclude both than admit both?—I would.

Though you object to the appearance of the Roman Catholic priest as the instructor of the children in religion in the schools, you would not object to his visiting the schools?—Certainly not.—*Lords*, p. 1268—1270.

On this subject, Mr. M. Cross stated, that it had been found a more convenient practice in the Belfast schools to send the children to their respective places of worship on the day appointed for separate religious instruction. It appears that many Protestant clergymen refuse to avail themselves of the opportunity of giving religious instruction in the national schools, and the very Reverend H. R. Dawson stated, that he considered it would be a violation of his duty if he attended the national schools. Mr. Carlile, in his evidence before the House of Commons, showed, that the principle of separate religious instruction sanctioned by the Board is precisely that which has been long and extensively adopted in the public institutions of Ireland, without any person having objected to its propriety or expediency.

Do you think that the term “national” being applied to the school-house may tend very much to mislead the people as to this separate instruction, and that they may be inclined to suppose that separate instruction is given by the Board as well as combined instruction?—We take as much care as we can to prevent that by requiring a strict adherence to our rule. I should think the tendency was the other way.

Have you not stated elsewhere, and before this committee, that in many cases the schools are misapprehended to be schools belonging to a particular denomination?—I do not think that that is in consequence of any particular instruction given in them, but in consequence of the persons who happen to be the patrons or managers of them. I think the same thing would take place if no instruction of a religious character were given.

Mr. Serjeant Ball.—I suppose the case of an hospital being called a national hospital, and that Catholic clergymen were allowed to go there, and attend the sick, and give them religious instruction, and that Protestant clergymen were also allowed to go there for the same purpose; would you consider that the denomination given to it of a national hospital would mislead any body to suppose that the Government which supported it supplied religious instruction to either of those parties?—No; I was going to say there are a number of institutions in the country in which religious instruction is provided, under the direction of the magistrates, such as hospitals and houses of correction; and not only that, but a Roman Catholic clergyman and a Protestant clergyman are provided, and yet neither the bench of magistrates, nor the Government of the country, are considered as parties to it.

It is so in the prisons, for instance?—Yes.

Mr. Gladstone.—Do you think the religious instruction occupies the same station in a school as in an hospital?—I think it ought.

Do you think it is as directly the object of an hospital as of a school?—When religious instruction is given, it is for the same purpose, and ought to be under the same guards.

Mr. Serjeant Ball.—Are you aware that by the Prison Act it is expressly provided that a Catholic clergyman shall be appointed by grand juries in Ireland, who shall attend Catholics at all reasonable hours at which they may desire to have his attendance for the purpose of giving them religious instruction?—Yes.

And in like manner that a Presbyterian chaplain should be appointed?—Yes.

And also a clergyman of the Established Church?—Yes.

Now the prisons are all national establishments, and do you consider that any one is misled by that circumstance to imagine that the Government of the country is a party to the religious instruction of any of the inmates of the prison?—Were I a member of the grand jury, or a magistrate, I should not as a Protestant consider myself as taking a part in the Roman Catholic instruction given in those prisons.

Mr. Gladstone.—Do you consider the state of prisons analogous to the case of national schools?—Entirely so.—*Com. q. 1493-1503.*

A great part of the objection made to the provision for separate religious instruction was based on the assumption, that the Roman Catholic catechisms and doctrinal works in ordinary use contain many passages offensive, and even insulting to Protestants. The following evidence of the Right Hon. A. R. Blake on this subject is worthy of attention:—

Will you have the goodness to read a passage in page 96 of the First Report of the Commissioners of Education Inquiry in the year 1824?

“The Commissioners then stated that they considered it of the utmost moment, that no books or catechisms should be admitted either in the course of the literary or religious instruction containing

matter calculated to excite contempt, hatred, or any uncharitable feeling in any class towards persons of a different religious persuasion. To this Dr. Murray cordially assented."

Do you adhere to that opinion?—Most decidedly.

Will you have the goodness to look at a book entitled "The Catholic Christian Instructed," and to read a question and answer marked in page 90?

"What if a person, through the absolute necessity of his unhappy circumstances, should be tied to a place where he can never hear mass, do you think he might not then be allowed to join in prayer with those of another communion, by way of supplying this defect?—No, certainly. It is a misfortune, and a great misfortune, to be kept like David, when he was persecuted by Saul, at a distance from the temple of God and his sacred mysteries, but it would be a crime to join one's self upon that account with an heretical or schismatical congregation, whose worship God rejects as sacrilegious and impious. In such a case, therefore, a Christian must serve his God alone to the best of his power, by offering to him the homage of prayer, adoration, contrition, &c., and must frequently hear mass in spirit, by joining himself with all the faithful throughout the earth wherever they are offering to God that divine sacrifice; ever sighing after those heavenly mysteries, and praying for his delivery from that Babylon which keeps him at a distance from the temple of God."

Having read this, I wish to observe, that I have no doubt there will be found in this book, and in other Roman Catholic books, matter that may give offence to the feelings of Protestants, and that nothing could be more gratifying to me than to see it utterly expunged; but I should also wish to see all offensive expressions expunged from every Protestant work; and I never can hope to have it expunged from Roman Catholic books so long as it continues in Protestant books. Acquainted as your Lordships are with the standard works of the Established Church, you must be aware that they contain matter, as well as the Roman Catholic books, which is both uncharitable and obscene. I do not wish to pollute your Lordships' minutes by reading from the Homilies of the Church of England passages which you would find as bad as any that may have been read to your Lordships during your proceedings from Roman Catholic books; nor do I wish to refer to the Catechisms of the Church of Scotland, but they contain expressions of the most virulent nature with respect to the Roman Catholic Church. I should be heartily glad if such matter were expunged from all books.

Do you find the Homilies in this list of books or tracts employed in schools for Protestant children approved by the Commissioners of that persuasion?—I do not find the Homilies mentioned here; but in a former return, to which my attention has been already called, and which was made by the Board, we expressly mentioned the standard works of each church; and I apprehend there can be no doubt that the Homilies of the Church of England

are amongst the standard works of the Established Church. I should beg to add, that amongst the cheap works published by the Association for discountenancing Vice in Ireland the Homilies are to be found.—*Lords*, p. 1376.

Connected with the subject of religious instruction, we may notice the observance of holidays. It was asserted by the Very Rev. Dean Dawson, that seven days were observed as holidays in the national schools; and he considered this an unworthy concession to Roman Catholic prejudices—insomuch that, as a Protestant parent, he would deem it a great dereliction of duty to send his children to a school where such a practice was followed. But the Very Rev. Dean's account of these holidays is far too remarkable to be omitted:—

Will you be kind enough to give a list of the names of the seven days?—They are not the same in all of them: the 17th and 25th of March, Peter and Paul, Ascension, Corpus Christi, Assumption, All Saints.

Do you mean that those are all exclusively Roman Catholic holidays, and not Protestant?—I consider them to be Roman Catholic holidays, almost exclusively.

You do not consider that St. Patrick's Day is kept by Protestants as well as by Roman Catholics in Ireland?—It is kept in a certain way as a holiday.

In this list of holidays you mentioned the Ascension; do you consider that exclusively a Catholic holiday?—I do.

If you were to be told that the Houses of Parliament are in the habit of not sitting upon the day of the Ascension, would you suppose that by this they were favouring Popery?—I conceived it to be a remnant of the old Popish system that was going on.

Are you aware that the Ascension day is a holiday in the Church of England?—It is not kept so in Ireland.

Are you aware that in the Liturgy it is a day of very solemn holiday?—I am not aware.—*Lords*, p. 956.

The Dean also objected to closing a national school on Good Friday. Several other witnesses also complained of the observance of holidays; and, as might have been expected, it was found generally that where the management of the schools had, through the reluctance of Protestants to join in the system, fallen into the hands of Roman Catholic patrons, they established the observance of the holidays sanctioned by their church. But no rule on the subject had emanated from the Board; the holidays observed varied in different schools, and were regulated at the pleasure of the local managers. It was also shown that most of the days were revered by Protestants as well as by Roman Catholics—such as All Saints, Ascension, Peter and Paul, Good Friday, and the Easter-days; that the 17th of March, the feast of the patron-saint of

Ireland, is regarded rather as a national than a religious holiday, and as such is kept in the higher classes of schools; and that the objectionable holiday, March 25th, is observed in the Church of England as the Annunciation of the Virgin Mary. The only holidays exclusively Roman Catholic are the Assumption and Corpus Christi Day; and the Rev. L. H. Robinson stated, that a Roman Catholic priest informed him "the master and I have been using all our exertions, but in vain, to induce the children to attend school on church holidays."—*Commons*, q. 5993.

Many persons will probably think that we have dwelt too long on a matter of very little importance, but as we find it among the charges most vehemently urged against the national system by several witnesses, we could not dismiss it as trifling and captious, without exposing ourselves to the suspicion of partiality.

CHAPTER VI.

Special Objections.—Injury to Scriptural Schools.

WE have already noticed the twofold use of the word "Scriptural," in the evidence given before both Committees, and we find the epithet, when applied to schools, converted into an argument. It is tacitly inferred that schools in which the Bible is used alone deserve the name of Scriptural; and hence the opponents of the Board use the epithet, to discriminate their favourite schools from those established under the National system. But as the evidence of Lady Osborne and others proved that a greater amount of Scriptural knowledge was obtained in the schools under the Board, than in those established by the Kildare Place Society, it is not to be supposed that the friends of the National system acquiesce in a classification, which would place their schools in opposition to Scriptural schools.

It was said that several flourishing Scriptural schools had been injured by the establishment of National schools, and generally that the Board had checked the progress of Scriptural education. This objection was thus stated by the Rev. Mr. Rowan.

Before this National Board was established was Scriptural education making progress, as far as your observation went, in Ireland?—Indeed I should say that it was, slowly, but still making way. I could refer to instances upon the subject.

Has that progress been checked by the establishment of the National Board, as far as your observation goes?—Certainly; checked completely as far as regards the Roman Catholic population, and checked as regards Protestants also.

By Scriptural education the reverend gentleman simply means, a system under which the Bible would be used as a class-book; he does not, however, deny that such a system provoked opposition on the part of the Roman Catholic priesthood; and he mentions circumstances, from his own experience, which prove that an obstinate adherence to such a system seriously injured the cause of education, and greatly disturbed the tranquillity of the community.

About ten years ago, upon my first connexion with my own parish, St. Anna, the Roman Catholic clergyman called upon me

with a proposition to establish a joint system of education very much similar to this; I think at the time there was a Government plan spoken of, something similar, but the basis of it was the exclusion of the Scriptures from the school, and I distinctly refused to join upon that ground. He then built a school himself, and both schools were going on, but the children were constantly coming from his school to mine, and as constantly driven back; it was a kind of constant flux from one to the other.

In what sense do you mean "driven back?" In this way:—In Ireland there are numbers of the poorer classes of society who are employed,—it is a kind of religious duty with them,—to give the priest notice of children attending those schools: as soon as they are known to attend schools the names of the parents are mentioned in chapel on Sunday, which is a thing that they have the greatest objection to and abhorrence of,—“shaming them,” as they term it. Then the children are driven away, and stay away for some time; then they come back; then, whenever the Roman Catholic clergyman is going to hold a confession station, the parents take away the children immediately before the station is held, and then send them back again. That is a thing which, within my experience, under my own immediate observation, has been going on for years, and is still going on, as between the national school and mine.—*Lords*, p. 769.

The evidence of the Rev. Mr. Boyton on this subject deserves attention, because he has taken great pains to acquire correct information.

Have you yourself lived in any of the country parts of Leinster, Munster, or Connaught?—I have resided a great part of my life in Leinster. I have been a good deal through the country. I have never been permanently resident in any part of the rural districts either of Leinster, Munster, or Connaught, but I have been both in Leinster and in Connaught extensively.

Are you, from your own personal knowledge, acquainted with the state of opinion on the part of the Roman Catholics in the rural districts of those three provinces, especially respecting the use or non-use of the Scriptures in the schools?—I think I am. I have been visiting in neighbourhoods where I have had constant intercourse with the clergy. I have visited their schools, and there are a large number of the younger portion of the clergy of the established church who are my acquaintances, and many of whom were my pupils in college; therefore I have a very general acquaintance with them, and I have been in no part of the country where I have not had communication with them, and I think I have some information as to the state of mind of the lower classes of Roman Catholics in those districts.

Can you state the result of the information which you have acquired respecting the feelings of the Roman Catholics of the lower orders in those provinces upon that subject?—I do not think the Roman Catholics of the lower orders have any objection to reading the Scriptures anywhere.

Are you aware that in a large portion of the Scriptural schools throughout those three provinces Roman Catholic children are freely sent by their parents to those schools?—I believe they are sent, but I doubt whether they are freely sent.

Do not they go to those schools in their excessive thirst for education?—My belief is the Roman Catholics would go to any school; that they have an exceedingly great desire to be informed, and they would go to the best school they could get. I think there is a strong desire for information, and I think the desire for information has brought them to those Scriptural schools, which were the best schools in the particular district; and I think, on the other hand, there have been great efforts made by the landed proprietors in Ireland to counteract the movement on the part of the Roman Catholic clergy to keep the children out of the schools, and that has been to a certain degree successful. But I am of this opinion, that a system which would not be objected to by the Roman Catholic priest, or at least which would not have, as the ground of objection against it, a fundamental part of the principles of his church, would be infinitely more attended by the Roman Catholics than any schools that have ever been in the country.

The Committee have had before them in evidence a schedule containing a statement of the number of Protestants and of Roman Catholics in the Scriptural schools in the different counties of Ireland. It appearing from this that, taking the province of Connaught, in the county of Galway, in 1833, there were 465 Protestants in schools under the London Hibernian Society, and 1822 Roman Catholics; in the county of Leitrim, 1405 Protestants and 2499 Roman Catholics; in the county of Mayo, 582 Protestants and 812 Roman Catholics; in the county of Roscommon, 895 Protestants and 2225 Roman Catholics; in the county of Sligo, 1181 Protestants and 2180 Roman Catholics; upon that statement of facts, supposing it to be correct, do you consider that that furnishes a strong proof of the inclination of Roman Catholic parents to Scriptural instruction for their children?—I do not know the exact condition in which each of those counties is placed with regard to other schools. I have no doubt that the Roman Catholic peasantry generally have no objection to the use of the Scriptures: I think, on the contrary, in many cases it is the object of their desire; at the same time, under the advice and influence of their clergy, no doubt they are kept greatly from those schools.—*Lords*, p. 1270.

Mr. Boyton unites with Lady Osborne in ascribing the opposition of the Roman Catholic priests to the use of the Scriptures in schools, to the fact of the Bible having been made the watchword of party; and he thinks that the Scriptures would have been very extensively used, if the reading of them had been left to choice, and not enforced by a peremptory rule.

How do you account for the opposition of the Roman Catholic clergy to the Scripture schools?—My belief is, that in a different state of things, and in a different state of society, the Roman

Catholic clergy act in a different way with regard to the prohibition of the Scriptures. In the early part of my evidence I stated that the principle of the Roman Catholic church was, that the Scriptures were not to be read in the vulgar tongue, unless with the permission of the ordinary; therefore it is in the power of the Roman Catholic bishops either to extend or to contract the license; and according to the state of the country this power is exercised. Accordingly, I understand that in the Highlands of Scotland, where there is not so great a pressure, they are much more liberal than they are in the Roman Catholic parts of Ireland. On the other hand, every body acquainted with the province of Ulster knows that the Roman Catholic priests there do not exercise at all the same compulsion with regard to the Scriptural schools that they exercise in parts of the country where party spirit is running higher, and where they feel much stronger; and therefore I think it is mainly the fact of the compulsion of requiring the Scriptures to be read that they object to, rather than the reading of the Scriptures themselves; for there is a great difference whether a thing is done by parties having power to do otherwise, or whether they merely come to conform to a rule that cannot be altered.

The question does not refer to two different states of society or two different periods, but the same period and the same state of society; and the question is, whether the opposition of the Roman Catholic clergy to the national schools, if the Scriptures were to be read in them, would be the same as to the Scriptural schools where the Scriptures are to be read in them?—I have no doubt, as far as conjecture can go, that the Roman Catholic clergy would not have the same objection to schools where it was matter of choice to read or not to read, that they would have where there was no choice. Indeed, on the contrary, from all I have heard in private, from most influential people connected with Ireland of that religion, I should say the reverse; that I think the Roman Catholic bishops would be willing to come into that arrangement.

Did not the Roman Catholic clergy about 1825 or 1826 very much oppose the Kildare Place Society's schools?—They did.

In those schools was the reading of the Scriptures made compulsory or was it optional?—It was compulsory.

Was not the foundation of the opposition of the Roman Catholic clergy to the Kildare Place system grounded upon the idea that the schools were an organ of proselytism?—That was stated generally, but it was not the ground put forward by them. The ground put forward was, the violation of the principle of their church.

In your opinion was not that the real ground?—I think some of them very likely thought that it would lead to shaking the opinions of the people of their own church.—*Lords*, p. 1273-4.

Lady Osborne confirms Mr. Boyton's evidence respecting the influence of landlords in procuring the attendance of children at schools where the Scriptures are read, and she also corroborates Mr. Rowan's testimony as to the fluctuation in

attendance, and consequent injury to the education of the children produced by the opposition of the Roman Catholic clergy.

You have often found that the priests have emptied the Scriptural schools of the scholars?—Yes, many times.

They were constantly in the habit of doing so?—Yes.

Then they being constantly in the habit of doing it, it must have become constantly necessary by the return of the children to the schools?—Yes.

So that the opposition would succeed for a short time, and then the scholars would return, and again the priest would interpose and turn them out?—Yes.

Then, after all, it showed considerable eagerness on the part of the children or their parents that they should go to these schools in spite of the denunciations of the priests?—Yes; but I am not sure how much it might have been owing to the clothes that I gave away.

Is your ladyship speaking of your own schools?—Yes. I was the only person in the neighbourhood I know that was able to have any thing of a school at all.—*Lords*, p. 1231.

Very contradictory evidence was given respecting the popularity of what are called Scriptural schools among the Roman Catholic laity. The Rev. Mr. Murray was of opinion that they would generally be preferred to national schools were it not for the influence of the priests. Lady Osborne took a very different view of the matter, and her account of it is given with such earnestness and simplicity that it must bring conviction to every unprejudiced mind.

Have you any idea that the attendance even in a town would be more continuous and more considerable of Roman Catholic children in a school upon the system of a National Board than upon one which called itself a Scriptural school?—I am certain it would, because the national schools are in the hearts of the people. I know the great delight it has been to the people to have them, and the pleasure they all find in my being on their side, as they consider it.

Does your ladyship continue your contributions of clothes to the school now it is a national school?—There are so many now; I just gave a few cloaks as premiums at first.

But not on a sufficient scale to account for the attendance of the children in consequence of the benefit they derived from it?—No; I only gave about 12 cloaks. The school is too large now for me to clothe them all.

Are the Committee to understand that the national system is so well liked that the children require no inducement to go there, while at other schools they were only induced to go in consequence of the benefit they obtained in the way of clothes?—Yes; for I always ob-

served that whenever they got the clothes they always went away, and I dreaded giving them.

Then the Committee understood your ladyship now as saying that in this contest between the priest and your school you were assisted by the clothing; do you think that the Scripture reading in the schools, independent of the clothes, was any inducement at all to them to resist their priest?—No, I do not think the reading was at all. I think they have a suspicion of our Scriptures, of our version.

Did you find that all the children had that suspicion?—I will not say all, but I think it was a most general feeling.

Would you be surprised to hear that in other parts of Ireland there was a real desire for Scriptural education on the part both of children and parents, being Roman Catholics, where there were no inducements of clothes?—Yes, I should, I think.

Would not the degree of success in bringing Roman Catholic children to what are called Scriptural schools necessarily vary in different parts of the country according to the degree of inducement held out by the proprietors on the one side, and the degree of opposition which might exist from different priests upon the other? Certainly.

But supposing you were told that there were districts where there was no exertion whatever on the part of the proprietors to induce the children to go to the schools, but that where there were merely Scriptural schools established there was great eagerness shown on the part both of parents and children, being Roman Catholics, to attend those schools, would you be still more surprised?—I think it might be owing to the goodness of the general instruction.

You have no conception that any where there would be a liking for the Scriptures merely on the part of the Roman Catholics?—I do not think we see that sort of love for the Scriptures even among Protestants.—*Lords*, p. 1233.

We have already said that to give schools the epithet of Scriptural does not make them one whit better or worse, and that the true question should be, under what system the children can obtain the greatest amount of Scriptural knowledge. Lady Osborne's testimony to the superior efficacy of the National Schools has been already quoted, and she has assigned the reason why her evidence should be received as conclusive.

You had an opportunity yourself of examining the children in the Scripture lessons?—Yes. I do not, as some people do, go to see schools without examining the children. There came Mr. Dwyer to my school, and he would not examine the children or look at the books. He found great fault with the system, and said that it would soon be put down.

Did you, upon examining the Roman Catholic children at that school, find them perfectly acquainted with the Scripture lessons?—

Yes; I was astonished at their answering. They repeated, without having books, numbers of facts and circumstances out of the Old and New Testament; they went on till we were tired.—*Lords, p. 1230.*

It is evident, however, that a great deal must depend upon the teachers, and we shall therefore return to this subject in the chapter on the Model School.

CHAPTER VII.

*Special Objections.*SCHOOLS OVER WHICH IT IS ASSERTED THAT ROMAN
CATHOLICS EXERCISE UNFAIR INFLUENCE.

SEVERAL of the schools aided by the National Board are under the superintendence of monks, nuns, and other religious confraternities; they are consequently viewed with great suspicion by zealous Protestants, and many complaints were made of the manner in which they are conducted. Mr. Lewis Mills gave evidence that the rules of the Board were violated in some of these schools, particularly that which prohibits the combination of religious with literary instruction. We shall quote a portion of his evidence.

Did you find, in general, that the regulations of the Board were observed in those schools, in as far as might suit the purposes of a system of common education of Protestants and Roman Catholics?—I think the schools under the direction both of monks and nuns have very much a leaning to the Roman Catholic Church, and very naturally so.

Can you state any instances of irregular practices which have a tendency to inculcate the Roman Catholic faith?—In the nun school at Middleton I saw the Roman Catholic Catechism taught.

Were there any Protestants in that school?—I do not think there was one.

Do you think that any converted Protestants would have sent their children to that school?—I think not. I visited some of the monks' and nuns' schools so far back as twelve or thirteen years ago, long before the board was established, and I noticed in those schools, that at particular periods, the practice of repeating prayers, and of the scholars making the sign of the cross, was adopted in them, and it seemed to me to give the stamp of a particular religious bias to them. I rather think, from the instance I have seen in King's Inn Street, and from that I saw in the Middleton Female School, where I witnessed the same thing, that it is a practice that is not altogether given up.

In the Middleton Female National School did you witness that circumstance?—I did.

Will you state when, and under what circumstances?—I have already given the date of my visit, which was the 24th of February, 1836; it was on a Friday; Wednesday is the day marked out in the

rules posted up in the schools for religious instruction. I saw several Roman Catholic Catechisms in use, and also a Roman Catholic Prayer-book, both which I examined. The clock struck at the time I was in the school.

Do you recollect what it struck?—It struck twelve, as well as I recollect.

What occurred then?—The scholars in my view made the sign of the cross, and appeared to repeat a prayer.

Did they in fact do it?—I did not hear them; I saw their lips moving.

Did you see them make the sign of the cross?—I did see them distinctly make the sign of the cross, and I saw their lips move as if they were repeating a prayer.

Many witnesses detailed similar circumstances, but in no instance were these abuses connected with the Board. Indeed the gentlemen by whom they were detected kept them concealed from the Commissioners, being anxious to make out such a case against the national system as would lead to its overthrow. There is no doubt that schools abandoned wholly to the management of Roman Catholics, will of necessity be exposed to the danger of being used to strengthen their creed. The Board has shown its sense of this evil by establishing a more efficient system of inspection than that used heretofore, and there never was a doubt of the anxiety of the Commissioners to correct any abuse which was brought under their notice. With respect to the Sectarian books, such as catechisms and works of controversy which were found in the school-rooms, Mr. Carlile stated that it was very difficult to get rid of objectionable books, and the Board has been forced to make gratuitous grants of their publications, in order to remove all excuse for the use of those which it could not sanction. But it is no easy matter for teachers or pupils at once to lay aside old habits. The Rev. T. W. Greene stated—

In the school at Youghal I saw on the desk a book, which I at once knew to be Butler's catechism, and the monk who was talking to me said, "Sir, that is one of the prohibited books; but though we threaten to beat the children for bringing it at school hours, they still do it." I said nothing, but walked away.—*Lords*, p. 1022.

Nunnery schools were brought under the Board by the direction of Lord Stanley, who was consulted as to the expediency of their reception. Their nature will be easily understood from the following extracts from the evidence of the Secretary of the Board:—

Were there many of those schools already established, or did the Board create any of them?—I am not aware that they created one; my belief is, that they had already been established for some time before.

Did you happen to hear that Lord Stanley said that those were useful schools, and working well?—At the Board I heard it mentioned, that in the conference between him and the Board he stated that he considered these schools useful, and that their being brought under the superintendence of the Board would be judicious upon principle.

In point of fact, are those schools within the precincts of the Nunnery?—I should say yes. The reason that I heard given for it was, that their rules prevented the nuns from leaving their own precincts, and therefore that there was a necessity for the school-house being within them.

In those nunnery schools are the children all taught by females?—They are.

What is taught?—Reading, writing, arithmetic, and the Scripture Extracts of the Commissioners. Their separate religious instruction I can give no reply upon, that not falling within my knowledge. Working with the needle and straw-plaiting are also taught, so as to make the children industrious and useful.

In what mode do the Board, or can the Board, superintend those schools in the nunneries?—By their inspectors.

How often do the inspectors go to visit the schools?—Once in a year.

At stated times, or at any casual period without notice?—Without notice always to the schools, but at stated times as to the Board, because the Board is necessarily aware of the movements of their inspectors.

But, in point of fact, the inspectors have no opportunity of knowing what course of education is pursued in those schools, except the once or the twice in the year that they go there under the orders of the Board?—They have no other opportunity. They have exercised those opportunities thus: they examine the register and the report-book of the school; they also examine the several classes of the children, and ascertain their proficiency; and by comparing it with that as recorded in the report-book and at the former inspection, are enabled to see what advancement is made by them. The books that are in the hands of the children, and which are in the habit of being used in the school, are also inspected; and upon all those things they report to the Board.

Is the practical system of education pursued in those schools open to the inspection of the public in any way, as in the other schools of the Board?—It is; and accordingly over them, equally as over all the schools of the Commissioners, a board with the words "National School" upon it is obliged to be hung up; and a rule of the Commissioners gives a right to clerical members of the different denominations, though they did not sign the application for aid, to visit the school.

Who are the patrons of the nunnery schools?—Those who sign the application for aid. I cannot give your Lordships a very accurate reply, because we assume that persons are the patrons of those schools, equally as of the other national schools, first, who

apply by signing the application to the Board for aid; and next, who are more active than the rest of the applicants, by conducting the correspondence.

But, in point of fact, who have applied for aid to those particular schools?—I think that the Catholics and Protestants conjointly have signed the query sheet.

In those nunnery schools?—Yes. The Roman Catholic clergymen almost always. The lady who is the superior of the convent, or religious house, becomes generally the correspondent in case of nunnery schools.—*Lords*, p. 98.

The Rev. Robert Bell directed the attention of the Committee to certain abuses in the management of the nunnery school at Carrick-on-Suir:—

You visited the convent school at Carrick-on-Suir?—I did.

What did you see there?—I entered the school, and found several of the ladies of the convent employed in teaching, and upon entering into conversation with one of them, I inquired as to the nature and conduct of the school. I found that there was no schoolmistress; that the nuns were the only teachers; and I was shown the order of business of the school. I found that in that order of business there were during school hours two opportunities for saying the Catechism, and that the school opened and closed with prayer, and that before it was closed there was what was called a spiritual lecture delivered. I was further informed, that at certain times there was an interesting ceremony in the school, for that the children appeared dressed in their best clothes, and that in a certain part of the room one of the priests heard the confessions of the children, and gave them tickets, upon which tickets they were received to the Communion; and that an altar was erected in another corner of the room, where the children brought their tickets, and received the communion, mass having been celebrated.

Who informed you of that?—One of the nuns who was teaching there.

Were the nuns in their habits as nuns?—Yes.

Were there any Protestant children attending that school?—No.—*Lords*, p. 736.

Indeed no one can doubt that nunnery schools must be more exposed than any others to the abuses detected by the Rev. Mr. Bell and other witnesses; still, unless these have been brought under the cognizance of the Board, it would be absurd to make the Commissioners responsible for them. But all the gentlemen who gave evidence respecting these violations of the rules prescribed by the Board, declared that they had not communicated them to that body. The Rev. Mr. Bell, indeed, completely exonerated the Commissioners of Education by the following part of his evidence:—

Do you know of any instance in which any abuse in any of the schools that have fallen under your observation has been reported to

the Board, and not noticed by them?—I am not aware of any.—*Lords*, p. 738.

A very weighty objection to schools conducted by confraternities was urged by Mr. Ingham:—

In the large towns of the south of Ireland, where the schools were in connexion with the Christian Brothers and the Sisters of the Presentation Nunnery, I should say that for the present, till Protestants of superior rank interfere in the management of the schools, that very fact that such persons are the teachers will keep Protestants away. You see them appearing in the dress of the Roman Church; I should think that to a Protestant parent of only moderate education that itself would be an objection. I think that as to some schools in the south, if I had been put myself in the condition of a Protestant parent there, I should feel some objection to sending my children to them: knowing the deference that a well-instructed child always contracts towards his teacher, I should object to having my child in a school taught by persons wearing the dress and being in the orders of the Roman Catholic Church; I should reasonably apprehend that it may grow up with something of a bias towards the authority of the person who had been its teacher.—*Lords*, p. 795.

But Mr. Ingham by no means intended to say that such schools should not be taken into connexion with the Board; on the contrary, he showed that it would be very desirable to have them placed under the superintendence of the Board. The evidence of this gentleman throws valuable light on another point, for it explains one of the difficulties which the Commissioners have to encounter in substituting their publications for the objectionable books formerly used in the schools:—

You stated some advantages that would arise from an increased number of masters educated in the Model School; do you conceive the principal advantage to be, that it would relieve the children from being under the education of those religious persons to whom you have adverted?—I should say that would not be the sole advantage. Another which I feel is this: there are a great number of schools, between eleven and twelve hundred—I think eleven hundred and eighty, in connexion with the Board. There has been an objection that some of the books issued by the Board are not in such constant use as they ought to be; now many of those schoolmasters receive but very small stipends indeed from the Board—they are persons of humble acquirements, and I dare say their objection in many instances to make use of the new books is not from any prejudice, but from incompetency. They do not like to trust themselves in dealing with any manual of education that they have not previously had in their hands; so that I think you would have the system more efficiently brought out than it can be at present.

But it would also be an additional advantage that the schools

would be no longer so much under the control of those fraternities as to deter the Protestants from attending them?—Certainly it would.

What books did you find in use in those schools besides the books of the Board?—I am not aware whether they are books issued by the Board. I frequently found works on mensuration and arithmetic. I rather think they are not issued by the Board. There is some popular work in Ireland upon arithmetic which I frequently found.

Did you find any objectionable books in any of these schools?—I did not find any objectionable book in any school in connexion with the Board, and I scarcely like to say that I found an objectionable book anywhere, without explaining the circumstances. What I am about to mention does not however illustrate the great benefit of the present system in giving a right of interference in the course of education in Ireland. There are very extensive schools at Cork, taught by the Christian brothers, not under the national system; they are called the Peacock Lane Schools; I believe there are as many as from 1,000 to 1,200 boys taught there. I went there with a Roman Catholic clergyman, and inspected all the schools, and certainly the advance of the children in literary progress was very satisfactory; but I found a class reading in one of the schools a book, which on looking at it proved to be a pamphlet upon Irish destitution in 1834. It was the evidence given by a gentleman of the name of Sheahan before the Commissioners for inquiring into the state of the poor; but looking at the preface, and a great many portions of it, it seemed really to be a pamphlet in favour of repeal. It was saying, "Let the motto of every County Cork man be, Don't give up the Repeal, and we must conquer;" and there were exposures of the names of all the absentee proprietors in the county. Now, I would scarcely like to mention this without adding the explanation that the gentleman gave: he said that Mr. Sheahan sent a great many of those publications when they were in demand, that they might be sold for the benefit of the school, and he told me that he put them into the hands of the class to vary their reading: the Roman Catholic clergyman with me remonstrated against the circumstance. There did not appear to be any consciousness on the part of the Brother that he was doing any thing wrong, for he gave me one of the pamphlets at once, which I took away with me. That was the only instance in which I saw any objectionable book in use in any school, and that was in a school not connected with the system; and it appeared to me to show the great benefit that resulted from the right of controlling the books used, because if I had seen that pamphlet in a national school, I should have felt it my duty to communicate the circumstance to the Board.—*Lords*, p. 798.

The confraternity mentioned by Mr. Ingham was founded in 1802, and was named the Congregation of the Brothers of the Christian Schools in Ireland.

The object of the establishment is the instruction of poor boys ; the Brothers take a vow of poverty (not to possess any thing of their own as an individual property), of chastity, and of obedience to their superior ; and, fourthly, they vow to teach children gratuitously during their lives, and are not at liberty to retire from any part of this engagement, unless by dispensation from the pope or from their bishop. The funds of this institute are supplied partly from the children and partly from subscriptions.

Several national schools are taught by the members of this confraternity, and must necessarily remain under their superintendence until the extension of the school for training and instructing teachers will enable the Board to supply their place with efficient masters.

Another accusation against the Commissioners was, that they had sanctioned the erection of school-houses in the immediate vicinity of Roman Catholic chapels, and in some instances, it was added, that the schools seemed to be actually portions of the ecclesiastical edifices, and two cases were mentioned of schools being kept in the chapels themselves. On this subject Mr. Kelly gave the following explanations :—

In some cases where schools have been placed in chapel-yards, have those applications come through you?—They have.

And have you been aware of the circumstances of the case before the grants have been made?—Always ; with the exception, I think, of two cases ; there were but these two, I think, of which I was not aware ; but I necessarily must be aware of that generally, for there is now a question which goes to that point in our queries.

Those queries are framed by the authority of the Board?—They are.

What are the two cases in which you state that applications of that sort were not brought under the cognizance of the Commissioners?—They happened, I think, very early in 1832 ; I do not remember their names, but they were cases of applications for salaries to schools, and not for building ; and they got the grant of salary without the Board having the knowledge of the schools being in chapels. At that time, which, as I stated, was early in 1832, the Board had not adopted the precaution which they afterwards did, of requiring the inspector's report in the first instance.

Are those salaries continued?—No ; the real circumstances were found out upon inspection, and the schools were immediately struck off.

Can such a case occur now?—It is impossible.

What do you mean by the schools being held in chapels?—The children in the two cases referred to were assembled in the chapel. The application to the Board was merely for a salary for a teacher and they described the dimensions of the school-room, and there was no previous inspection.

Have you not many applications in cases in which the school-houses are so attached to the chapels as to occasionally form part of the chapels?—We have had some ; I cannot say many.

Have the salaries been continued there after the inspection by the inspector?—They have in some cases, and in some cases they have been discontinued.

What is the reason for the distinction between the practice of the Board in those cases?—Where it was found that there was an internal communication between the school-room and the chapel, these cases were struck off; where it was found that they were separated by brick and mortar, or by a wall, that though they were part of the same building there was no internal communication, the salary was continued.

And those cases in which the chapel and the school are separated by brick and mortar are admitted freely?—Not freely; for this reason, there is always an intimation given to the applicant to procure a school-house not so connected.

If, upon applications of that description, you find that they are for school-houses in chapel-yards, do you yourself make any communication to the applicants, or do you bring it in the first instance before the Commissioners?—Where the application is for building a school-house, the general practice is to make a communication to the applicants to this effect; namely, that, the rule of the commissioners being against it except in case of necessity, they ought to try every means first to get a site for building a school-house elsewhere, and in some cases I have put the correspondent to a good deal of trouble in seeking for such a site.

Have you ever granted aid for the building of schoolhouses so attached to chapels?—Not to my knowledge or recollection.—*Lords*, p. 101.

Mr. Carlile confirmed Mr. Kelly's account of the difficulty of procuring proper sites, and of the reluctance of the Board to sanction the erection of schools in chapel-lands, except in cases where no suitable ground could be obtained. Landlords opposed to the national system would of course refuse their land to the Commissioners, and thus, no school would be erected unless the chapel-ground was made available. In some instances, it appeared that such schools had been erected before the Board came into existence, and it would consequently have been too severe a tax on the local managers, if they were compelled to go to the expense of erecting a second building. In such cases, however, precautions are taken to remove every reasonable ground of offence.

In those extreme cases where the Board are obliged to accept of chapel-ground, does the Board in all cases require that there shall be a separate access to the school from the high-way?—They do, and they require that a separating wall shall be built between the school-house and the chapel.—*Lords*, p. 103.

And we find that this rule was enforced not only in the erection of new schools, but also in the alteration of schools already in existence.

But you also stated that there were many instances of communication between the chapel and the school?—Yes; those were in existing schools.

Do not you require that the communication should be closed, and an entrance made from the road?—In those cases there was an entrance from the road, but we required the communicating door between the school and the house of worship to be closed.—*Lords*, p. 103.

We find that a national school is held in a part of the cathedral of Killaloe, and that there is no objection made to it on the part of the Roman Catholics. Mr. Carlile gave the following account of the Killaloe school:—

Do you happen to know of any national school held in a Protestant cathedral?—I do; in the buildings forming part of the cathedral the Protestant school at Killaloe is held.

Are there two schools?—There are two schools, for male and female children, which I inspected myself at the end of last year.

Are the Scripture Extracts read in that school?—I believe so; I found them there, and examined the children upon them. I have no doubt of their being regularly read.

Did you hear, on your inspection of that school, that any objection was taken, either by Protestants or Roman Catholics, to attendance in it?—I heard of no such objection. The priest of the parish accompanied me to the schools; and I believe, but I have not the same ground for knowing, that the Protestant clergy were also favourable to them.—*Lords*, p. 107.

The deficiency in Mr. Carlile's evidence respecting this school was supplied by Mr. Robertson, who stated that the Protestant clergyman is patron of the schools, and takes an active part in giving religious instruction to the children of his own profession, at the times specified in the regulations of the Board.

It is not necessary to pursue this part of the evidence further. The Board has given aid to schools taught by monks and nuns, because it was obviously of importance to establish a right of superintendence over schools which naturally possess great influence over the Roman Catholic population. Every precaution of regulation and inspection was adopted to prevent the abuses to which such schools were more peculiarly liable; every error reported to the Board was instantly investigated; and in the instances of violation of rule which were brought forward, the obvious cause of the evils was the refusal of the Protestants to take any share in the management, and the consequent abandonment of these schools to the exclusive control of Roman Catholic patrons.

It appears also that many of those abuses are being corrected, especially the use of objectionable books, and the

want of proper teachers. The former is an evil which can only be eradicated gradually, for the habit of supplying children with the first book that comes to hand, is almost inveterate with the Irish peasantry; and many of the teachers, whom the Board must necessarily employ until their arrangements for training a sufficient supply of masters are completed, are either incompetent to use new books of instruction, or reluctant to abandon ancient customs.

The Board has been driven to sanction the erection of some few schools on chapel-grounds, from sheer necessity. If this be an evil, the blame of it must rest on the prejudices or other circumstances which rendered it impossible for the Board to procure proper sites elsewhere.

CHAPTER VIII.

*Miscellaneous Objections.*CHARGES OF PARTIALITY, NEGLECT, AND EMPLOYMENT OF
IMPROPER PERSONS.

IT is sufficiently clear, from the preceding chapters, that the Board has had to encounter a very fierce opposition, and that too many of those who have opposed it have exhibited a violent and intemperate spirit, such as, in a country like Ireland, would have a tendency to generate many of the evils of which they have complained. If Protestants ostentatiously declare that the perusal of the Scriptures will convert persons from the Roman Catholic faith, they must not be surprised if their insisting on the perusal of the Bible exposes them to the suspicion of meditating proselytism, and provokes the hostility of the priests. If Protestants refuse to take any share in the local management of the schools, they cannot consistently complain of the Roman Catholics occupying the ground which they have abandoned. If persons are anxious to keep a pet grievance, and in order to indulge that pleasure, will withhold from the Board those instances of the violation of its rules which have come to their knowledge, they, and not the Board, are responsible to the world for the continuance of the evil. In strict justice to all parties, it is necessary to keep in view the peculiar circumstances of Ireland, where party violence has attained a height of which few Englishmen can form any conception. The most ordinary occurrence, the veriest trifle is pressed into the service of party, and affords a theme for crimination and recrimination, until at length it assumes an apparent magnitude and importance so disproportioned to its real nature, that it is often difficult to discover the naked, original fact. Personal and party animosities combine to produce these distortions on every side, and "trifles light as air" are received as "confirmations strong as proof of holy writ." These few observations seem necessary to introduce the consideration of some special objections brought against the Board, namely, those connected with the unfortunate controversies by which Ireland is agitated: of which the first in importance is the conduct of the teachers employed to superintend the national

schools in the island of Achill. Achill is an island off the coast of Mayo, in which the Rev. Mr. Nangle established a Protestant missionary settlement, about the middle of the year 1834, in order, as he has stated, "to relieve the extreme destitution of the inhabitants in every point of view, both spiritual and temporal." He gave the following account of the success of his mission:—

With what success were your endeavours crowned in the island at first; what were you able to do generally?—In reply to this question, I shall just describe the present state of the mission; we have now altogether connected with our mission thirty-four families resident at our settlement.

In one particular part of the island?—Upon our mission ground.

Which does not comprise the whole of the island?—Only a very small part of it: twenty-seven of those families are persons who have come out of the Church of Rome, and joined themselves to the Protestant Church, and either eighteen or nineteen of those families have been brought out of the Church of Rome within the last two years and a half since I went to the island; and we have now in our two schools, a male and a female school, eighty children receiving scriptural instruction. As regards temporal things, we have reclaimed about thirty-two acres of our land, which was all wild moor, and made it productive.

Are the houses that have been built of a very superior order to those which you found in the island?—There was never a slated house seen in the island till we erected them. Several of our buildings, our little church, our school-rooms, my own dwelling, are slated.—*Lords*, p. 379.

The schools of a mission, founded for the express purpose of making converts, were of course opposed by the parish priest, and a rival school was established, which was placed under the Board of Education. The teacher of this school was named James O'Donnell, and the Rev. Mr. Nangle presented a series of charges against him to the Board. The first of which was as follows:—

I beg leave to inform you, that James O'Donnell, master of the Dugort National School, in this island, headed a procession carrying flags and banners, which went to meet Dr. M'Hale on his arrival in this place. O'Donnell bore a flag with the inscription, "Welcome Religion and Liberty," which was sufficiently intelligible to all who knew that Dr. M'Hale is a bishop of the Church of Rome and the advocate of repeal. This illegal procession was mustered and marshalled by O'Donnell's exertions, for until his coming to the place the poor people were happily preserved from the evil contagion of party politics.—*Lords*, p. 381.

The conduct of the Board on this charge, the truth of which was acknowledged by O'Donnell, is thus detailed by the Secretary:—

I followed the course pursued in two cases of the same nature which occurred but one or two weeks previous to this very case. A report was received from our inspector in August, 1835, complaining of the teachers of two national schools in the north having walked in an Orange procession on the 13th of July, the month preceding, one of the teachers also being the standard-bearer. This report I brought before the Board on the 20th of August. The course the Commissioners directed me to pursue was simply this: to write to the correspondent of these two schools, stating to him that such conduct in the teachers was in direct violation of their rules, and requiring an explanation in respect of it. An answer was received from the correspondent admitting that the complaint was true, but that the teachers had acted through ignorance, and promising future good conduct. The Commissioners were satisfied with this explanation, and there the matter ended; the teachers being admonished. These two cases I considered to be good precedents when I received the complaint from Mr. Nangle, which came so immediately after them. I therefore followed them in my mode of treating his complaint, and followed them, as I thought, safely; being satisfied that the joining the procession with a banner inscribed "Welcome Religion and Liberty," as stated in the complaint by Mr. Nangle, was precisely the same species of offence as the joining the Orange procession and carrying a banner, as stated in the complaint made by our inspector. I therefore addressed the correspondent of this school, who, like the correspondent of the two schools alluded to, admitted the fact as alleged to be true, but stated that the men had acted through ignorance of the rule of the Board, and promising future good conduct on the part of the teacher, as he had admonished them. There the matter ended in reference to this, as it had done in reference to the two former cases to which I have alluded.—*Lords*, p. 446.

The second charge was:—

Dr. M'Hale, before his departure from the island thought fit to curse some of the peasantry who had left the Church of Rome and joined themselves with us as members of the Protestant Church. He forbid their Roman Catholic neighbours to speak to them, or hold any intercourse with them in the way of courtesy or traffic. O'Donnell is a zealous agent for enforcing these unsocial commands. On Sunday last, seeing one of the islanders conversing with one of our people, he reprov'd him for holding any communication with an accursed heretic, asking him, "Was he not aware that he himself came under the priest's curse for so doing?"—*Lords*, p. 382.

This charge was not investigated, because Mr. Nangle declared that he would not produce the witnesses to support it at the time that the inspector from the Board visited the island. (*Lords*, p. 382.) But O'Donnell explained that he had been forced into controversy by some Scripture readers whom Mr. Nangle employs as an inferior kind of missionaries. The conduct and language of these Scripture readers, as reported

by the inspector, Mr. James Kelly, is such as might provoke angry controversy and lead disputants to use unchristian expressions.

As Mr. Connolly (who accompanied me to all the schools) and I proceeded, on Tuesday last, from Keel to Dugort on foot, not having been able to procure horses, we met two of Mr. Nangle's Bible readers, who followed us a distance of a mile and a half, discussing in our hearing various controverted subjects, such as would be likely to exasperate and wound his feelings, but of which he took no notice; they managed their distance so well, that, no matter at what pace we walked, we could not lose one word of their conversation.—*Lords*, p. 459.

The Rev. Mr. Connolly, parish priest of Achill, gave the following account of Mr. Nangle's assistants in a letter to the Board:—

Mr. Nangle since his connexion with Achill for the last few years, has exerted himself in every possible way to proselytise the unfortunate uneducated natives; he has employed, at a salary of 20*l.* a-year for each; a posse of ignorant fanatical preachers, who are sent through the parish, armed with fire-arms and Bibles, abusing the religion of the people, and heaping calumny on their clergy, promising bribes in the shape of clothes and money to the naked and half-starved people of Achill, exhibiting pictures representing a mouse gnawing the sacrament of the Eucharist, supplied with scales for the purpose of weighing the consecrated host (a new experiment indeed, and worthy the enlightened mind of the saintly Nangle), forcing controversy on the ignorant peasants, &c. &c. &c., until Mr. Nangle has by these and similar unwarrantable means, completely succeeded in destroying the peace, harmony, and Christian feelings for which Achill, until his arrival, in the worst of times, was remarkable and distinguished.—*Lords*, p. 375.

Under these circumstances the Board recommended, in general terms, that O'Donnell should be informed of the necessity of adopting conciliatory conduct. Mr. Nangle's charge, though grave, was loosely worded, and founded apparently on the report of one of his Scripture readers. Besides, it would be manifestly unjust to scrutinise severely the terms employed in a religious controversy, which it appears was forced upon O'Donnell by men whose zeal was rather greater than their discretion.

Mr. Nangle brought a third charge against O'Donnell, in the following terms:—

I have now to complain, that he has endeavoured, by the use of the most violent and threatening language, to hinder children from coming to my school: with a knife in his hand, he threatened 'to take the head off one of our scholars, because he came to our school.'—*Lords*, p. 384.

On investigation, it appeared that this charge rested on the unsupported testimony of a child about nine years old, who communicated the circumstance to his father on returning home. O'Donnell denied the charge, and offered to make an affidavit that he did not even know the child by sight. The father of the child was stated by Mr. Connolly to be a miserable pauper, who was 'about to change his religion and his rags;' and the inspector made the following comment on the evidence:—

The evidence of the parties on the third I should be inclined to receive with much caution, as I am sure that slight inducements would be sufficient to cause the people of this island, where party and political feeling rages to such an extent, to deviate from the truth.—*Lords*, p. 385.

The fourth charge was—

That O'Donnell sent a message by one of his scholars to his sister, declaring that if she went to Mr. Nangle's night-school he would be before her, and thereby endeavour to prevent her so doing.—*Lords*, p. 455.

On which the Inspector reported—

This charge has not been sustained; as, on my questioning Edward Mangan or Lavelle, he declared that O'Donnell did not say so, but that he told her from himself, in order to deter her from attending Mr. Nangle's school.

But Mr. Nangle insinuates that Mangan was intimidated into giving this account:—

Edward Mangan equivocated very much, and was evidently unwilling to tell the truth. As we were speaking to him his sister (not the female who attended our school) came to the door of the cabin, and spoke to him in Irish; she called him in, and told him not to answer any of our questions.—*Lords*, p. 386.

A fifth charge was, that O'Donnell had been once employed in the coast-guard, and had been dismissed on account of being implicated in Ribbonism. Considerable difficulty arose in the investigation of this charge, because it referred to a transaction which took place so far back as the year 1831, and because O'Donnell was not regularly in the coast-guard, but only employed as an extra boatman. While in the service he was reported to Lieutenant Irwin, for using seditious language and for insolence to his superiors. The steel-boy system was rife in the country at the time; and Lieutenant Irwin, fearing that O'Donnell might have joined that seditious association, dismissed him without a trial (*Lords*, p. 414). The seditious language is thus described by the coast-guard M'Carthy, who gave the information to Lieutenant Irwin:—

What did you report of him?—Rebellious speeches, and saying

that the tithes should be done away with—that no tithes should be paid, and that Ireland should be free and flourish once more: and himself and a man of the name of David Kelly made a great noise. He came out of his house into mine: there was only a thin wall between his house and mine, and we had one roof for both houses. I told him it was a great shame of him to make the noise he was making—to make the speech as he was making; and he told me he would have no thanks to me, and called me an informer. At the time he called me an informer I went out to the chief boatman and reported him; he was standing on the road, and told me to go in to Mr. Irwin and report it.—*Lords*, p. 419.

Lieutenant Irwin did not mention anything respecting the charge of sedition to O'Donnell, but only told him that he was dismissed for insolence. How far the language reported by M^r.Carthy supports the imputation of ribbonism is a matter on which readers will find no difficulty in forming their own opinions.

Mr. Nangle also brought the following charge against Cassidy, the teacher of another national school in Achill:—

I have also to complain of the conduct of Cassidy, the teacher of the national school in Duiga, also in this island. When my colleague, the Rev. Mr. Baylee, was assaulted in that village and pelted with stones, the pupils of the national school came out of their school-house and took an active part with the assailants, Cassidy's own son being amongst the most forward; and, though Cassidy himself stood by, he never attempted to reprove or restrain them. The same individual set on a number of men to hoot after me, with most abusive language, when I travelled along the public road at the village of Cashel.

The Board voted this complaint, after it had been fully investigated, frivolous and unfounded—a decision which Mr. Nangle did not attempt to impugn.

The last complaint made by Mr. Nangle which we have to notice was respecting the conduct of Mr. Connolly, the parish priest of Achill, who was the patron of one of the schools. It is not explained why Mr. Nangle applied to the Board respecting a person over whom it possessed no authority or legitimate influence; and it is not stated why he deemed the Board of Education a fit body to investigate criminal charges. The following is Mr. Nangle's letter:—

I have also serious charges against the patron of national education in this island, the Rev. Martin Connolly, P. P. I can prove that he has ordered the people to shout after me and the members of my congregation whenever they see us; that he has endeavoured to establish, to our injury, a system of exclusive dealing; and that he commanded the members of his congregation to assault any person connected with this settlement who should attempt to speak

to them with the first weapon which came to hand—either “to knock them down with a spade, or stab them with a pitchfork;” and that he particularly marked, as an object for popular vengeance, a man of most unblemished character, employed by me as a schoolmaster, saying from the altar of his chapel, “There is that devil, Murray, going through the island, a man who would not be suffered to live in any place but Achill.”—*Lords*, 389.

The charge was re-stated and amplified in another letter:—

Permit me again to repeat what I urged upon the attention of the Board in a former communication, that, while the Board intrust the administration of its affairs in this island to the Rev. Martin Connolly, P. P., the present patron of their schools, they can only expect a succession of similar persons in the capacity of teachers as Hoban and O'Donnell are proved to be. This is no hasty assertion; the Board is already in possession of the grounds on which it is made; the importance of the matter will, however, excuse repetition. Again, I distinctly state that I am prepared to prove that the Rev. Martin Connolly ordered the people to shout after me and the members of my congregation in general; that he endeavoured to establish, and did for a while establish, a system of exclusive dealing, to our annoyance and injury; that he commanded the members of his flock to assault any person connected with this settlement who should attempt to speak to them with the first weapon which came to hand—either to knock them down with a spade, or stab them with a pitchfork; and that he particularly marked, as an object of popular vengeance, a man of most unblemished character, employed by me as the teacher of a scriptural school, saying from the altar of his chapel, “There is that devil, Murray, going through the island, a man who would not be suffered to live in any place but Achill.”—*Lords*, 390.

After some delay, the Board sent the following reply, through their secretary:—

“I have submitted to the Commissioners your letter of the 22nd August. They direct me to state in reply, that, as it appears to them to relate to matter properly cognisable by a legal tribunal, they have referred it to the consideration of his Excellency the Lord Lieutenant.”—*Lords*, 391.

Many persons will believe that we have devoted a very disproportionate space to the affairs of Achill; for it is sufficiently obvious that Mr. Nangle's complaints arose out of ancient contests and jealousies between him and the parish priest of the island, in which the Commissioners could not interfere, without great and obvious impropriety. He seems also to have lent too ready an ear to the reports of his Scripture readers, who related to him every expression which the Roman Catholics had used in moments of irritation, without mentioning the provocation which they had given, by coarse and intemperate attacks on the Roman Catholic religion. It is

unfortunately too evident that the Achill missionaries are not very measured in their language, and that they sometimes sully controversy by personalities and inconsiderate expressions. The charge of ribbonism against O'Donnell, the exhibition of caricatures ridiculing the Eucharist, and such expressions as "bare-legged bogtrotter," applied to the titular Archbishop of Tuam, must necessarily provoke retaliation; and the only wonder is, that, in the mutual exasperation of parties, the rivals could not make out much graver cases of crimination.

The next complaint we shall notice is that of the Rev. W. E. Lloyd. He stated that he had been knocked down by Murphy, a teacher of one of the national schools, whom he prosecuted to conviction for the assault, and also reported to the Board. The secretary instantly wrote to the patron of the school directing that Murphy should be dismissed, and another teacher appointed: with this requisition the patron promised to comply, and reported that he had superseded Murphy and appointed a person named Purcell in his place. Mr. Lloyd discovered that this was a mere evasion; that Purcell was a schoolboy, and that Murphy continued to receive the salary as Purcell's assistant. Mr. Lloyd, having had occasion to visit Dublin, complained of Murphy's being retained, and the secretary investigated the matter and detected the evasion. He then wrote the following letter to Mr. Lloyd:—

Education Office, 28th October, 1836.

SIR—In consequence of the visit which you paid to this office a few days since I caused an inquiry to be made whether Thomas Murphy was still employed in the Graigue National School, and I find that he has been serving there as usher or assistant to Thomas Purcell, the accredited teacher. No doubt can be entertained that an unbecoming evasion has been practised with respect to his dismissal by the Board upon the matter so properly represented to them by you; but, as it has been stated that in the interview alluded to you had expressed feelings of kindness towards this man, scarcely deserved by him, I take the liberty of requesting that you would state whether it is your wish that Murphy should be altogether and totally removed from this sub-office, so that the real intent of the original sentence of dismissal be carried out fully against him. You will have the goodness to reply at your earliest convenience.

I remain, Sir, your very faithful Servant,
THOMAS F. KELLY, Secretary.

We shall give Mr. Lloyd's reply in his own words.

To what effect was your answer?—Saying that I had totally forgiven the man, and that I was perfectly willing that he should continue, I having nothing to do with the schools; and Mr. Kelly naturally asked me why I had not something to do with the schools; and I told Mr.

Kelly that I was not in the slightest degree a hostile person to the schools, but that, my parish being most of it Roman Catholic, I would, if proper masters were appointed, visit them; and I told him circumstances about the improper conduct of most of them; and I told him that if they sent masters there totally unconnected with either the priest or the parson, and not connected in the country, I would visit the schools; and he told me that the Board were not in a situation to do so; and I told him that till they did so I would not go there.

You stated that you yourself applied for the continuance of that master, having forgiven him?—I did.—*Lords*, p. 760.

Mr. Lloyd stated that some of the teachers employed in the national schools were unfit for their situations, and added, that he had received a letter from one of them soliciting a contribution to the O'Connell rent; but he stated that he had not made any formal complaint to the Board, but had spoken of it so loosely to Mr. Kelly that he did not even mention the writer's name. It is difficult to discover what is the precise nature of Mr. Lloyd's complaint against the Board: he says that he is conscious that the Commissioners and their secretary were deceived in the case of Murphy and Purcell; he declares that Murphy was subsequently continued at his own request; and he acknowledges that he did not bring any of the other abuses which he discovered under the cognisance of the Board, but mentioned them casually in a vague conversation.

It is, however, sufficiently evident from this and similar complaints of the working of the system, that the Board had not established an efficient inspection, and that great difficulties were experienced in procuring an adequate supply of proper teachers. The Commissioners are exerting themselves to remedy both deficiencies so far as the limited means placed at their disposal by Parliament will allow; they have increased the number of their inspectors, and required from them more frequent visitations of the schools; and they are sedulously exerting themselves to train efficient masters in their model-schools. But such excellent teachers as some of the persons who object to those employed by the Board cannot be had for the trifling salary which is paid to schoolmasters at present.

Several complaints were made of improper expressions which were found in the copy-books of the children, but there was no evidence that the objectionable words were written by the sanction or permission of the teacher, and of course the abuses were in no way connected with the Board. It was also said that a threatening notice, sent to Mr. Price, was written on some of the paper supplied to the national schools; but the evidence on this point was far from being conclusive, and it

certainly in no way touched the schoolmaster or the Board. It would assuredly be monstrous to expect that the Commissioners should be responsible for everything which boys please to scribble in their copy-books, or for the ultimate destination of every scrap of paper supplied to the schools.

Esker school was made the subject of a very long investigation, which may be very conveniently abridged. This school was built by some Dominican friars out of the contributions which they raised by begging round the country. Before the school was brought into connexion with the Board, an altar was erected in a little recess for the celebration of divine service, but during school-hours the recess was covered by a red curtain. The arrangement was designed to be merely temporary; for the friars were endeavouring to raise funds for the erection of a separate chapel. Complaint was made to the Board, and a peremptory order was sent down for the removal of the altar. The Rev. P. D. Smith, the patron of the school, applied to the Board for permission to retain the altar in the school until the chapel, which was being roofed, should be completed. Not being able to get an answer from the Commissioners, as the Board was not sitting, Mr. Smith continued the altar in the school-room on his own responsibility until the roofing of the chapel was finished, when he caused it to be removed. The school was built and supported by the Dominican friars three years and a half before it was brought into connexion with the Board. It was asserted, but rather as a matter of suspicion, that efforts had been made to pervert some Protestant children who attended the school; this however was decisively refuted by James Daly, Esq., of Dunsandle:—

You have been asked whether you ever heard of any Protestant children being perverted from their religion at this school; did you ever hear of mass having been performed in that school in the presence of any Protestant children?—I never heard in my life that it had been done; I heard the contrary. None of the Protestants ever told me that they had heard mass; and since I went over, about a year ago, I inquired, and if I was asked my opinion I must say that I do not think it ever was done.

You believe that such a thing never occurred?—I do not believe that Catholic prayers were said before the Protestant children.—*Lords*, p. 1297.

There are no Protestant families resident in the parish of Esker, but the school was for a time attended by some Protestant children from a police station, and of course the attendance ceased when that division of the police force was removed. There were some additional particulars respecting the school of Esker elicited in the course of the investigation which are too

interesting to be passed over. We quote from the evidence of Mr. Smyth:—

Do you clothe any of the children in the school?—I clothe thirty children every winter.

Do you make any difference in the clothing between any Protestant children there may be and the Roman Catholic children?—I cannot make any difference, because there are no Protestants in it.

What sum does the Board pay you?—It is 50*l.* a-year; it is too little for such a number, and to clothe thirty every year.

Do you understand that 50*l.* to be given towards clothing the children?—No; it all goes in the salaries of the teachers.

Then what did you mean by saying that the 50*l.* a-year which you receive from the Board is too little for such a number, as you clothe thirty of the children?—I mean that I have but 8*l.* a-year to support such an establishment.

How much does clothing the thirty children cost?—The thirty children cost me 31*l.* 3*s.* 7*d.* last year.

Then in fact the annual expense of clothing is rather larger than the amount of the annual contribution?—It is. I am obliged to go begging for the rest.

Have you then no more for the teachers' stipends than what comes from the Board?—It does not reach the salary of the teachers. I am obliged to go from place to place to beg for the rest.

What salary do you give those teachers?—I have four teachers employed. I give 17*l.* to one, 17*l.* to another, 16*l.* to another, and 6*l.* to another,—to the one that teaches the lower classes, the alphabet and spelling.

Have you besides aid in books from the Board?—I get books at half-price from the Board, and I have to beg that too.

In clothing those children do you select the poorest for clothing, or do you give clothes as a reward for good conduct?—I clothe the thirty annually by merit. I could make no distinction, for they are all so poor; God help them! There is hardly a shoe or stocking in the school. It is a lamentable state of things.—*Lords*, p. 1295.

Complaint was made that the national school-room at Youghal had been used for a political meeting and a public dinner to Mr. O'Connell. The Board passed a vote of censure on the master, and directed that he should be mulcted in a month's salary. The Rev. Mr. Russell, then Roman Catholic curate of Youghal, gave the following explanation to the Secretary, Mr. Kelly:—

SIR,

Youghal, 2nd December, 1833.

I received a letter from you this morning, misdirected to the Rev. Mr. Sheehan, in which you state that the Commissioners of Education have determined upon withholding a month's salary from the teachers of the Youghal national schools, in consequence of the school house having been used for the purposes of a political dinner, and that a repetition of that offence or any other misappropriation of the school-house will subject that establishment to a forfeiture of the

aid voted by the Commissioners for its support. I beg leave to state, in my own exculpation,—for it rested principally with me either to give or to refuse the use of the school-house,—that I do not recollect having received any instructions whatever to refuse the use of that house for a few days to the parishioners for any occasion either of a parochial or a political nature. If I had received such instructions, or any intimation to that effect, I would not have suffered any political dinner or any other political meeting to take place within its walls. It is true indeed that, from the expressed solicitude of the Commissioners to conciliate all parties, I might have easily conjectured that the use of the school-house for political purposes would be offensive to them, still I did not consider that mere conjecture would justify me in refusing to the parishioners the use of a house for a few days which they themselves built. It would not serve the interests of that school for me to offend them; though 30% a-year voted to the school does indeed diminish the burden of its support very considerably, yet it is far from being sufficient for the entire expenditure; it is on the parishioners I must depend to supply the deficiency. When it is not expressed in any copy of the regulations or in any letter I had the honour to receive from you that the use of the school-house for political purposes would be offensive to the Commissioners, I did not consider it prudent to refuse it. I regret very much that the establishment which I myself formed, and to the advancement of which I devoted many an anxious hour, should have fallen under any censure; but I have the satisfaction to think that if I erred it was in endeavouring to promote its interests. There is a small room in the house, intended originally as a school committee-room, which is now made use of as a news-room by some of the benefactors of the school. As the word misappropriation is very comprehensive, perhaps the keeping of such news-room in the school-house would be displeasing. If it is, and that you are kind enough to mention it to me, I will have it discontinued. There is no one superintending any of the national schools more anxious than I am to comply with the wishes of the Commissioners.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

your obedient servant,

JOHN RUSSELL.

To T. F. Kelly, Esq.

The Secretary then, by the direction of the Board, sent the following letter to the gentleman who had made the complaint, the Rev. Mr. Swanzy, Protestant curate of Youghal:—

Sir, Office of Education, 4th January, 1834.

The Commissioners of Education, in reply to your letter of the 26th ult., desire me to state, that, immediately after the receipt of your letter of the 21st of November, they directed the inspector of that district to visit the National School in Youghal, and officially report to them as to the circumstances which you had had the goodness to communicate. The inspector reported accordingly; and, it having appeared by such report that the school-room had been used for a political dinner, as you had stated, and also that the school had

been in consequence discontinued to be held for some days, the Commissioners immediately directed me to inform the managers of this school that, in consequence of such violation of their rules, one month's salary of the schoolmaster should be forfeited, and the school itself should be struck off the roll of national schools should any such misappropriation again occur. The reply to this communication from the managers proved so clearly that the violation complained of had occurred through total ignorance of the rule, and evinced such a spirit of candour and contrition, that the Commissioners felt themselves justified in rescinding their vote of the forfeiture of the salary, and in forgiving the whole transaction. The Commissioners have thus directed me to state what they had done in this matter as due to you, who had the goodness to draw their attention towards it, and desire me to add, that they spare no labour to keep the national schools appropriated to the legitimate and usual purposes of schools only, and will never fail in removing from their list such as may, under knowledge of the rule, be made subservient to any other purpose whatever.

I remain Sir,

your very obedient servant,

Rev. H. Swanzy, Youghal.

THOMAS F. KELLY.

Complaint was made that Maloney, the teacher of the national school at Curryglass, was dismissed by the local manager, the Rev. Mr. Hogan, a Roman Catholic clergyman, in consequence of his having become a convert to the Protestant faith. When the matter was investigated, Mr. Hogan averred that the attendance on the school had fallen off under Maloney's management, and that he had in consequence resigned his situation. Maloney averred that the diminished attendance was caused by the exertions of the priest himself, and denied the fact of his resignation. The evidence established the fact of the diminished attendance, and left the question of resignation doubtful; but it appeared that Maloney had sought employment as a teacher, or Scripture reader, under the Irish society, from the Rev. J. W. Greene, Protestant curate of Tallow, about the time when he was said to have resigned—(*Lords*, p. 1005); and, as such an employment was clearly incompatible with his continuance as a teacher in a national school, it seems probable that he at least contemplated tending his resignation.

A variety of complaints were made respecting the conduct of teachers and managers, which were all more or less connected with party politics and local disputes. We have selected all the prominent cases.

From a careful review of all the instances of misconduct in the masters and patrons of national schools, it will immediately appear that the establishment of a Central Board of Education

was a boon of no ordinary magnitude to the people of Ireland ; for when such abuses are found to exist, notwithstanding all the precautions of the Commissioners and superintendence of the Inspectors, it is evident that far worse evils must have prevailed when the schools were left without control. The hedge-schools of Ireland were of the worst possible description, in fact they were generally hotbeds of vice : the teachers were frequently the principal agents in agrarian insurrections—they wrote threatening letters and notices, and acted as secretaries to Captain Rock. When the Board was instituted, it could not create schoolmasters—it was only possible to train proper teachers gradually, and it was therefore necessary to employ such persons as the country afforded. These facts seem to have escaped the notice of the witnesses, else they would not have brought forward instances of abuse as objections to the national system of education, when in fact they are the strongest arguments in its favour, because they reveal portions of the vast amount of that bad and perverted education which the Board was instituted to prevent and remove.

CHAPTER IX.

*Special Objections.*ASSERTED INCREASE OF DISUNION BETWEEN PROTESTANTS AND
ROMAN CATHOLICS.

ONE great object contemplated by Government when the National Board was instituted was to unite the children of different religious persuasions together, and thus in early youth lay the foundation of future conciliation and good will. Mr. Ingham stated that this highly beneficial object has not yet been obtained.

Upon the whole I should say, that I think in the south and in the west of Ireland the system of the National Board was operating somewhat differently from what it did in the north. In the south and the west, wherever I saw it, it seemed to me that it fully satisfied one object of its institution—namely, that it was giving to the children, as far as my means enabled me to judge, very sound useful education; but I think, in the south and west of Ireland, that it for the present fails in what I consider to be one object for which it was instituted—that is, the bringing the children of different religious persuasions as class-fellows into the same school. I found in the south and west of Ireland, with perhaps some exceptions, that the general rule was that the schools there were exclusively attended by Roman Catholic children; but still the masters seemed to be conducting themselves in strict conformity to the rules of the Board. Whenever I entered I found the children attending to the business of the school with great cheerfulness and alacrity; I always heard some portion of them examined, and they seemed to me to be profiting a great deal by the instruction they received. Of course your Lordships are better qualified to judge of the value of the instruction from the books that have been published. I found the books universally in use, and I never saw any school-books that seemed to me so admirably prepared for their object. I think the instruction the children received from being examined and taught in those books must of necessity be very valuable to them. I believe I did not mention that I was at Killaloe; therefore, when I said that I found universally in the south and west of Ireland that in the schools there were only Roman Catholic children, I ought to have excepted that school, because in the school at Killaloe I found an average attendance of boys and girls of about one hundred and twenty, and they told me there were forty Protestant children. I stayed in that school for some time, and certainly it was impossible,

from anything that took place in the examination, to distinguish whether the child was a Protestant or a Catholic. They were reading the Scripture Extracts, and I heard almost all the classes, both boys and girls; and there no doubt the system has succeeded in both respects.—*Lords*, p. 795.

In the north of Ireland the system has succeeded wherever the Protestant clergyman has taken a part in the management of the schools. On this subject Mr. Ingham gave the following evidence:—

Independently of any question with respect to Scripture education, will you state what opinion you formed of the comparative efficiency of the schools not under the National Board as compared with those under the National Board?—The only schools that could at all compete with them were those taught by the Christian Brothers. The Christian Brothers are a society of about sixty, who bind themselves to the gratuitous instruction of the poor: they seem to be very skilful teachers indeed.

You think the Erasmus Smith's schools and the Hibernian schools could not compete with them in point of efficiency?—I should think not. I observed that generally in the Hibernian Society schools a great portion of the attention of the mistress is given to articles of female work, so that it is not merely literary teaching. They seem to be very well conducted. With respect to what I saw in the north of Ireland—I visited schools in Sligo, Belfast, and Ballymena;—at Sligo I found the children actually reading the Scripture Extracts; at Belfast the school I visited was kept by Mr. Dunning, which is one of the two schools under the Education Board; and there, and also at the school at Ballymena, I found great numbers of children, of whom fully one-third were Catholics, the other two-thirds being Churchmen and Presbyterians and Protestant Dissenters.

Did they read the Scripture Extracts there?—Universally. At Belfast, in the school of Mr. Dunning, where there are eight hundred and fifty children, of whom one-third are Roman Catholics, there was put up in the school-room a notice that "The Bible is read here every day from two to three o'clock," which was in conformity with the regulations of the Board, being after the school-hours. I stayed there some time, and I was so much gratified with the school that I returned to Belfast, and saw Mr. Dunning again, and inquired whether he had in any instance found an objection on the part of the Roman Catholic parents to their children remaining there during that hour. He said that there had not happened a single instance of any child having been withdrawn. He mentioned that when he first commenced the Scripture reading some of the Roman Catholic children rejected the Bible, and said it was an heretical book; but instead of punishing them he produced their own version, and showed them how small the difference was; and he explained that they both intended to give the most faithful representation of the same revealed word; and he says that in practice

now the Scriptures are read in the authorised version, although, if ever he comes to a passage where there is any particular variation in the translation, he has a copy of the Douay Bible in the school; and it is explained to the children to show them to how little extent the variation goes. There is one circumstance he mentioned which will be gratifying to the committee to hear: he told me he was satisfied that from the Scripture Extracts, and from their occasional reading an hour after the school broke up, the Bible was becoming much more familiarly known than it had been to the families of those whose children were there. He said it had repeatedly occurred to him, that when he was engaged in reading any interesting Scripture narrative, and the hour was nearly expired, he would say, "There is not time to finish this to-day," and a child would answer, "I will get my mother to read it with me when I go home;" and it is becoming more and more the practice every year. At Ballymena in the national school there is the same notice that the Bible was to be read every day from two to three o'clock. I attended that school two days, and the second day they actually were reading it; the first day they concluded with reading the general lesson.

Was the reading of the Bible superintended by the ordinary master of the school, or was there any clergyman of the Church of England attending at the time?—When I was at Belfast, I was struck with seeing the mixture of children of various persuasions more complete than I had found it elsewhere; and, on inquiry of the master, I heard that the Protestant clergyman of St. Ann's (I believe his name is Mr. Hincks) frequently visited them. At Ballymena there was a Protestant lady visited the school, but I should think that the clergyman of the church did not. Mr. Waugh, the Presbyterian clergyman, I believe, visited, but I think not the clergyman of the church.

Do you know the proportion of Protestants and Roman Catholics in the Ballymena school and at Belfast?—At Belfast out of 853 there are 252 Roman Catholics, and at Ballymena one-third of the children were Roman Catholics.

Did you understand whether the priest attended those two schools at Belfast and at Ballymena upon the days of separate religious instruction?—I am not aware whether he did at Ballymena, but I think he must have done so at Belfast, for I remember hearing Mr. Dunning mention what had occurred the last time that Dr. Croly, the Roman Catholic bishop, was there, that he had been there and attended with the priest in the school during the hour in which the Scriptures were read; and the master said that he purposely went to a greater length in his exposition than usual, to see whether or not any objection was likely to be made on the part of the Roman Catholic bishop to him as a layman and a Protestant undertaking the exposition, and that no objection had been made; but that the bishop addressed the children, telling them the gratitude they ought to feel to the patrons of the school for giving them this instruction.

—*Lords*, p. 800.

The evidence of the Hon. and Rev. Baptist Noel on this subject is equally important:—

Are you rightly understood as having said that in your opinion joint education is not obtained by the national system?—I think it is not; and, as far as I can judge from conversation with others, not in the least likely to be, except in one way. If the clergy generally could be induced to take it up fully, I think they would secure the attendance of the Roman Catholic children, and certainly secure the attendance of the Protestants.

Do you think, from your experience of the feelings of the clergy in Ireland, that their co-operation can be obtained?—I think that the clergy with whom I have conversed were really not acquainted with the educational statistics of the country; they judge by their feelings, and by what they had seen in their neighbourhood, but were not aware of the amount of destitution and of the difficulties in the way of effecting a scriptural education throughout the country.

Do you think that the objection on the part of the clergy was or was not mainly because of the exclusion of the Scriptures from the schools during school-hours?—I think that was one very prominent objection in their minds, but that, like the others, founded upon a complete misapprehension of the state of the case; for instance, I found clergymen believing that the Scriptures would be wholly excluded, believing that the Scriptures could not be read by the Protestant children in the school, or that if they were read at all they could only be read one hour, when the children were tired; whereas the state of the case is this, that these Scriptures may be read an hour before school, when the children are fresh, or they may be read two hours at the close of the school, as part of their regular employment, and before they can be much fatigued, and with advantages greatly superior to those which the old Kildare Place system afforded for the means of producing a powerful religious impression upon their minds.—*Lords*, p. 866.

The Rev. Dr. Elrington and the Rev. Mr. Rowan declared that any scheme of united education is impracticable in Ireland, because it would impose upon the Protestant clergy the necessity of recognising the Church of Rome, and Mr. Rowan stated that he considered the invitation to the priests to instruct the children once a-week at the schools was not only a recognition but a sanction of that church. It is sufficiently evident that the existence of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland is a fact that needs no recognition, and that permitting the Roman Catholic clergy to instruct the children of their own flocks on the day appointed for separate religious instruction is no more a sanction of their doctrines than the similar permission to teach prisoners in a gaol or sick persons in an hospital.

The practicability of establishing a united system was not only proved in Belfast, but also in the county of Donegal,

where the Rev. J. M. Staples has five schools connected with the Board. The evidence which he gave respecting these schools fully proves that the co-operation of the Protestant clergy is alone wanting for the complete success of a united system.

Will you state the number of children in each of the schools?—In one school there are seven Protestants and fifty-one Roman Catholics; that at Drung. At Carrickmaguigly school there are twenty Protestants and seventy-seven Roman Catholics; in Ballyratton school there are forty-nine Protestants and forty-eight Roman Catholics; in Terryroan school there are twenty-one Protestants and seventy-six Roman Catholics; and at Cabry thirty Protestants and twenty-three Roman Catholics. They attend pretty much in the proportion of the surrounding population. I have here the population in 1831, and, taking the town lands surrounding the school, the attendance is pretty much in proportion to the population.

Can you state the average attendance at the Kildare Place schools; the only schools which existed before the national schools were established?—I cannot, from memory.

Was it at all to be compared to that which you have stated as the attendance at present?—It was, at first; but there were some proceedings at the Committee at Kildare Place which gave umbrage to the Roman Catholics, and they would not come.

In point of fact the attendance of the children was very much discontinued?—It was entirely discontinued, which made me bring over that man I have mentioned to be the schoolmaster.

In those schools are the Scripture lessons in constant use?—They are, in all of them.

Do you attend yourself occasionally in those schools, for the purpose of giving religious instruction to the Protestant children?—I do; but in general I give religious instruction to my own children, away from the schools.

But you give it to the children that attend the schools?—Yes.

Then they have the advantage of religious instruction from you, in addition to that which they receive in school from the Scripture lessons?—Yes; my curate and myself collect them in houses which are most convenient for the purpose, and give them instruction.

Does the Roman Catholic priest instruct the Roman Catholic children attending the schools?—Not in the school; they told me that they did not; and their names are never found in the book. They told me that they would never visit the school unless when I ask them to go with me; which I do once or twice a-year, for the purpose of showing the children that there is no animosity of feeling.

Have you reason to believe that he gives religious instruction to the children at other places?—I have.

Has the Roman Catholic priest ever expressed or acted upon any objection to the system of the school with respect to those under his influence?—Never in the least, that I could discover.

Have you experienced from him cordial co-operation?—Perfectly.
—*Lords, p. 932.*

Similar evidence was given by the Rev. A. Hastings, and he added some particulars which are of great importance.

Have you any schools in your parish under your superintendence, or within the sphere of your observation?—I have.

Will you be so good as to describe those schools, and under what system they are conducted?—I have three schools at present under the National Board, and there are three schools under the Kildare Place Society, and one school which is a parish school.

With respect to those schools which are under the National Board, do you find them to answer the purpose of joint education, and to be well conducted?—I do consider them useful for joint education, and they are well conducted.

Have you had any reason for complaining of the manner in which any of those schools have been conducted at any time?—None whatever.

Are you the patron yourself of those schools?—I am.

And you have found that the system has worked well in the schools, and answered your object in promoting them?—It has.

What is your opinion of the system pursued in the schools as compared with the other schools which you state have fallen also under your observation under the Kildare Place Society?—I think that those schools under the National Board work much better than those under the Kildare Place Society, because the majority of the people, being Roman Catholics, are more fervently inclined towards those schools.

What is the number of children in those three National Schools that you have?—They vary according to the season.

How many are there on the books?—There is one of them that I think averages from seventy to one hundred, and perhaps the other two from fifty to seventy each.

Can you state the proportion of Roman Catholics and Protestants in those schools?—There is one of the schools in which all the children are Roman Catholics; there is another of them (which is the largest) in which I should imagine that about one-half are Protestants.

You have three schools now under the Kildare Place Society?—I have.

Why did not you connect them with the National Board as well as the others?—There is one of the school-houses built in the yard of the Presbyterian meeting-house; the Presbyterian minister would, I feel certain, be very willing to join with me in putting the school under the National Board, but he would, I fear, thereby give offence to the Synod of Ulster, and I should be very sorry to press him to do anything that would bring him into any kind of trouble or annoyance. There is another school where I have been memorialised by almost all the Protestant inhabitants convenient to it to put the school under the National Board; and, upon applying to the landlord, the person upon whose property it is, he told me that he never would consent to it, and I could not think of bringing the landlord and the tenants into collision upon the subject, and there-

fore I gave it up. The other school is circumstanced pretty nearly in the same way. The inhabitants around it memorialised me to put it under the National Board, but the gentleman upon whose property it is has been abroad, and I have had no opportunity of communicating with him; he has now returned, and I do not know whether he will approve of it or not.

You have had experience of the two systems?—I have.

Which do you like the best?—I approve of the present system, because I think there is less objection made to it throughout the country on the part of the Roman Catholics; and, as the Roman Catholics are the majority of the people, I consider it of great importance to have a system which they do not object to.

You consider that it most effectually answers the great purposes of the education of the population of Ireland?—In my opinion it does.

Do the Roman Catholic clergy generally co-operate with you in the management and inspection of those schools?—They always have done so.

And you find it beneficial?—Of course. If there was not that co-operation amongst us we could not get on with the same satisfactory results.

And you have never had any material difference of opinion with the Roman Catholic priests upon the management of the schools?—Never in the least: we have always made it a point to avoid that in every respect.—*Lords*, p. 1379.

This evidence fully proves the practicability of establishing a system of combined education by those who sincerely wish to do so; and when the nature of the national system is more generally understood, and the effect of the misrepresentations so industriously circulated against it dispelled, there is every reason to hope that many parishes will exhibit results equally gratifying with those which have been produced in the parishes of the Reverend Messrs. Staples, Hastings, and the Dean of Cloyne.

The Hon. and Rev. Baptist Noel attributes most of the hostility to the Board, displayed by clergymen of the Established Church, to ignorance of the system which the Commissioners have sanctioned; and the very Reverend Dean Burgh declares that much of the opposition of the Protestant laity has arisen from political motives. These impediments to union cannot, from their nature, be permanent, especially when the opponents of the Board fairly inquire into the expediency and practicability of the systems which have been proposed as substitutes.

The Very Rev. Dr. Murray asserts that there was already sufficient provision made for the education of Irish children, and proposed that no public grants should be given for such a purpose.

The Rev. Dr. M'Hale, the titular Archbishop of Tuam, proposed that a sufficient sum for the separate education of the Roman Catholic children should be placed at the disposal of their prelates, or the trustees of the College of Maynooth, and evidence was given that some of the Roman Catholic clergy were favourable to such a plan.

The Rev. Dr. Elrington expressed a wish that the Parliamentary grants to the Association for Discountenancing Vice should be renewed, and the friends of the Kildare Place Society intimated a similar wish for that institution.

The objections to such plans are so numerous and so obvious that they need not be discussed: it is a much more pleasing task to examine the plans of conciliation which have been proposed. It is indeed truly gratifying to find a very large portion of the Protestant clergy impressed with the importance of their taking an active part in the great business of National Education, and proposing such alterations as would remove their scruples, not in a spirit of captiousness, but with a sincere anxiety for union and conciliation.

CHAPTER X.

Proposed Modifications.—The Synod of Ulster.

IMMEDIATELY after the constitution of the Board the Synod of Ulster deputed a portion of their body to enter into communication with the Government on the subject of national education. The circumstances of this negotiation are thus related by the Rev. Mr. Brown, who has filled the office of moderator to the synod.

So soon as the present Lord Stanley's letter (he was then chief secretary for Ireland) appeared, it excited universal alarm over the north. We very seldom have special meetings of the synod, and it is to be observed that no moderator has the right of calling a meeting of the synod, unless he has been requested by, I believe, four presbyteries to do so; we have taken that special care to prevent any moderator acting improperly by bringing us together, and unless he has the sanction and the direct request of four presbyteries he has no authority to do it. So soon as Lord Stanley's letter appeared, four presbyteries sent to the moderator to request him to convene a meeting; they met at a time that I can discover if I am permitted to refer to the minutes; there was a special meeting held at a very inconvenient time of the year, in Cook's Town, and resolutions come to upon the subject; there was a committee appointed to wait upon the Government, and to make an effort to have the system modified. Mr. Carlile attended our meeting, and his statements, together with the high respect we felt for him personally (for we all respected him very highly), induced us to entertain a strong hope that the matter would be amicably arranged. We passed certain resolutions, and a committee was appointed to wait upon Lord Stanley, and to communicate our views. The explanation given to us was not satisfactory, and in consequence of that a deputation waited on Earl Grey and other members of the existing Government in London; a long conversation took place with Earl Grey; I was a member of that deputation; I never met a more candid or more intelligent individual in any rank in life than Earl Grey; we were met with the most conciliatory feeling. In consequence of the communication that then took place, although there was one circumstance unfortunately that impeded that—a communication made by Mr. Carlile, addressed to Earl Grey, stating that we were not authorised, while, in fact, we were duly authorised to go upon that errand—that communication was calculated to throw an obstacle in our way; but, when the matter was explained, Earl Grey addressed to me a communication, saying that there was nothing in our propositions that was disagreeable to the Govern-

ment; and we did entertain the strongest hope that the thing would be adjusted.—*Lords*, p. 169.

The following were the four resolutions of the synod submitted to the consideration of the Government:—

1. That the ministers and people of this church, without the necessary concurrence of the ministers or members of any other church, should enjoy the right of applying to the Board of Education for aid to schools, accompanied with an engagement to adhere to them; but in this proposition we recognise the right of the Board to consider the regulations, and decide accordingly. 2. That it shall be the right of all parents to require of patrons and managers of schools to set apart for reading the Holy Scriptures a convenient and sufficient portion of the stated school-hours, and to direct the master, or some other person whom the parents may appoint and provide, to superintend the reading. 3. That all children whose parents and guardians so direct shall daily read the Holy Scriptures during the period appointed, but that no compulsion whatever be employed to induce others either to read or remain during the reading. 4. That every use of school-rooms be vested in the local patrons and committees, subject in case of abuse to the cognisance of the Board.—*Lords*, p. 173.

When these resolutions were submitted to Earl Grey he sent the following reply to the deputation:—

I have read with great attention the four resolutions extracted from the minutes of the general Synod of Ulster, assembled in June and July, 1833, and am happy to say I see nothing in them which may not be agreed to as in perfect accordance with the general principles on which the new system of education is founded. I trust therefore that, all objections being now removed, we may look forward to the full attainment of those benefits for which that system was introduced.—*Lords*, p. 171.

The deputation then entered into a negotiation with the Board, and while it was pending Mr. Carlile addressed the following circular to the members of the synod:—

Office of Education, Merrion Square, 10th Sept., 1833.

Dear Sir,

I have the satisfaction of transmitting to you the following extract from the minutes of the Board of Commissioners of National Education, by which you will see that the Board have acceded to the four propositions agreed upon by the synod at its meeting in June and July last.

I am yours truly,

Lords, p. 172.

J. CARLILE.

It appears from Mr. Brown's evidence that this proceeding gave offence to the deputation, and in some degree contributed to defeat the negotiation.

What is the enclosure?—The resolution in which the Board say

that they have acceded to the propositions of our synod; they professed to have done so.

They considered themselves to have acceded?—So they said.

Did you consider yourself, in consequence of what passed with the Board, taking into account that letter, dealt with unfairly?—We thought it improper, because there was an express provision made in our minutes, that so soon as the arrangement was completed the moderator should transmit an official letter to the moderator of every presbytery, requesting him to give notice to his brethren that the negotiation had terminated favourably. We thought it therefore an interference with us for Mr. Carlile to take upon himself the right of doing that, and particularly when, after the matter was examined, the moderator was forced to write in these terms, by instruction of the committee to whom it was intrusted:—"The moderator was instructed to notify to the moderators of the respective presbyteries that the negotiation of this committee with the Board of National Education had, for the present, terminated unsatisfactorily; and they then referred the consideration of the whole case to the next synod."—*Lords*, p. 174.

The opponents of the Board in the synod contended that the first resolution was contravened in the query-sheet transmitted to applicants for aid in the building of school-houses or the maintenance of schools. The query No. 15 in the sheet was one of those to which an objection was made:—

15. Have the clergymen of the different denominations in the parish, or in the neighbourhood of the school, been applied to in order to obtain their co-operation and their signature to this application?

Answer this specifically.

This query was supposed to intimate an anxiety, and almost to impose a necessity, that Presbyterian applicants should co-operate with ministers of other religious denominations in their applications for schools. Great reluctance was felt to the adoption of such a measure, principally from the dread of favouring Roman Catholics. But Mr. Carlile and Mr. Blake stated that the Synod of Ulster received from the Board a right to make application without consulting the members of any other denomination; and, after the explanations given by these gentlemen, it is difficult to conceive how any misapprehension on the subject could continue.

Mr. Shaw.—It would appear from the minute of the Board, printed in page 17 of the three reports of the Board published by them, that the Commissioners considered the propositions of the Synod of Ulster, which were submitted to them, did not contain anything inconsistent with the principles of the system of education committed to them?—Not inconsistent in principle, but the acceding to those propositions rendered a modification of the regulations necessary.

Lord Stanley.—In what way did the acceding to these propositions render any modification of the regulations necessary?—That they claimed a right to apply without asking any others to apply with them.

Chairman.—On an application from a minister of the general Synod of Ulster, do you make an inquiry why the names of no Roman Catholic clergy are signed to that application, and whether the Roman Catholic clergy of the parish have been applied to to sign as in other cases?—The query is put to them, “Have the clergymen of the different denominations in the parish or in the neighbourhood of the school been applied to in order to obtain their signatures to this application? If not, state the cause.” The same query is put to them as to any others; at the same time I should conceive, if those queries had been repeated, the answer to such question would have been simply, because they did not choose to apply.

Mr. Shaw.—How does it appear that those propositions made by the Synod of Ulster were acceded to?—There is a minute of the Board stating that they have been acceded to by the Lord Lieutenant, but I have in town Earl Grey’s correspondence, both with the synod and with us to that effect.

Do you conceive that those propositions did involve a modification of the principles or the rules of the society?—I conceive that it involves, not a modification of the principles, but merely a modification of the form of the rules, and there is a modification in the mode of carrying into effect our rules.

Chairman.—The same query is put in the case of the members of the Synod of Ulster as in other cases?—Yes.

Mr. Lefroy.—You have said that you have given up putting this question, as it would probably give offence after the Commissioners have acceded to the propositions of the Synod of Ulster?—The query is here, and is put to all alike; but if, on the answer, the names of Protestants or Roman Catholics did not appear, and we inquired further, I should apprehend it would give rise to apprehensions that we were not dealing fairly with the members of the Synod of Ulster upon that point.

Lord Stanley.—Did the members of the Synod of Ulster make any further condition than this, in your opinion, that without the concurrence of any of the members of any other church, they should possess the means of procuring assistance for their schools —I should understand by their right to make application, it would imply that if they did make application they would have a right to be listened to.

Would there not be a right to be listened to on the part of any Roman Catholics who made application without the name of any Protestant being added?—I conceive that since that proposition was granted there would, but that previous to that we should have judged in each case whether there was a good reason for their not having such names; but I apprehend both Protestants and Catholics are on the same footing.

Mr. Shaw.—What do you understand by the concluding part of the extract of the Board minute, dated August 26th, 1833, and which runs thus: “His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant having approved thereof, they will receive applications from the patrons of schools, in conformity thereto, and grant aid upon having such queries as they shall deem necessary to put satisfactorily answered?”—There having been a communication from Lord Grey to the Board with respect to these propositions, and the propositions having been considered by the Board, we were of opinion that they did not clash in any degree with the principles laid down for the direction of the Board by Lord Stanley; but before we stated anything to the synod, we thought it right to have a communication with the Lord Lieutenant. Dr. Sadleir and I were directed to wait upon the Lord Lieutenant and state to him our views of the subject. We conferred with him, and a minute was made accordingly. I never understood those propositions to imply that we should depart from the principles of Lord Stanley’s letter in order to comply with them.

Did you understand that you were to grant aid to the members of the Synod of Ulster upon the ordinary terms simply?—That we were to grant aid to the Synod of Ulster according to the principles laid down in Lord Stanley’s letter, and I recollect particularly saying, that the query in respect to signatures, from persons of different communions, should go to them as well as to all others.

What do you understand by that portion of the extract which says you were to receive applications from them, and grant aid upon having such queries as they shall deem necessary to put satisfactorily answered?—That was a reservation of our right. I should not suppose they were to lay down such principles as they thought proper, and demand aid from us, but that we should put queries to ascertain how they meant to carry their plans into effect.

Did you make any alteration in the queries?—In consequence of a communication with the synod, and knowing a great deal of misapprehension was prevalent with regard to the principles of Lord Stanley’s letter, we thought it necessary to frame new queries applicable to all in case of an application from the synod; we required those queries should be answered by them as well as other persons.—*Commons*, q. 42–54.

The next queries regarded as objectionable were the following; they form part of the queries to be answered by applicants for aid towards the building of school-houses:—

8. In the event of aid being granted, will one day at least in the week, exclusive of Sunday, be set apart for the religious instruction of the children by the clergy or others approved by the parents?

9. Will you take care that no children be present at any religious instruction or exercise except those whose parents consent to their being present?

10. How many days in each week, and how many hours in each

day, will be allotted to a literary and moral education, including reading, writing, arithmetic, grammar, geography, and history?

And in the queries to be answered by applicants for aid towards the fitting up of schools, the paying of teachers, and other school requisites:—

7. What arrangement is made respecting the imparting of religious instruction to the children?

State particularly what day or days of the week are set apart for that purpose, and what hour or hours on any other day.

State also whether public notification is given of this arrangement, and whether or not parents are left at liberty to withhold their children from religious instruction which they do not approve of.

8. How many days in each week are employed in instructing the children in the common branches of moral and literary education, and how many hours in each day; and state particularly at what hour school commences, and when it closes?

The objection to these queries was the same as those which were made to the system of separate religious instruction, namely, that affording opportunities for inculcating the peculiar tenets of the Roman Catholic religion would be taking an active part in the dissemination of error. This objection has been fully considered before, but, from the peculiar nature of the concessions made to the synod, it appears even more weak in their special case than in the general system, for those clergymen who excluded Roman Catholics from a share in their applications would not be likely to find the priests anxious to share in their schools; while those who invited Roman Catholics to join in their applications would of course have no objection to their participation in the education of the children.

The second and third resolutions of the Synod seem to be so perfectly embodied, both in spirit and letter, in the rule of the Board, which set apart the first or last of the school-hours for reading the Scriptures, that it is difficult to comprehend the nature of the objections which were urged by some of the witnesses. It is, however, unnecessary to enter upon any discussion of this topic now, because the rules of the Board have been so far modified as to permit the reading of the Scriptures at any hour. It is, however, only just to give Mr. Car-lile's reasons for restricting the reading of the Bible to the first or last school-hour, namely, that inconvenience had arisen from leaving the hour unsettled. The point at issue is admirably explained by Lord Stanley in his letter to the deputation from the synod.

His Majesty's Government fully recognises the right of all who choose it to read the sacred Scriptures; but the exercise of this

right in the case of infants must be subject to the control of their parents and natural guardians; and, in point of time, in the national, as in all other schools, it must be limited by the appropriation of certain hours to certain other branches of study. The proposition that any child at any hour, and in the midst of any other allotted employment, should be permitted to read the Bible, is a proposal so perfectly novel and unheard of, and so totally impossible, as it appears to me, to be reduced into practice, that I should not have noticed it, but that such appears to be the express sense of the words of the proposition No. 2, and seemed to be sanctioned by some, at least, of the deputation from the synod. The National Schools are not so much the schools of the Government as of local patrons and managers, who submit voluntarily to certain regulations in order to entitle them to receive aid from the Government. They are therefore at liberty to lay down their intended course of study; they are free to appoint certain hours during which certain studies are to be carried on, in some of which Roman Catholics and Protestants may, in others of which they cannot, object to join. There appears to have been a considerable ambiguity in the use of the expression "school-hours," which has given rise probably to some misconceptions. The phrase might (and perhaps in strictness ought to) apply to all hours in which instruction is given to the children. In this sense the portions of time set aside for religious instruction may be called school-hours. These hours are (as I have already observed, and as may be seen by the printed regulations) not exempted from the control of the Commissioners; and the Scriptures, as well as the authorised Catechisms, &c., of any church are expressly permitted to be used at these times. But the expression "ordinary school-hours" has been generally employed to denote those portions of time which are devoted to the combined instruction of children of various persuasions, and at which all the children belonging to the school are expected and required to attend. Those hours, be they more, or be they fewer, will be allotted to other studies, and in them, of course, neither the Bible nor any other book could be employed to which the parents or guardians of any of the children could object on the grounds of religious scruples. To introduce the reading or hearing of any such book during the ordinary school-hours, viz., those during which all the children of all denominations are expected to attend, would be a palpable violation of religious liberty of conscience. But there is not (nor ever was) any objection to the reading of the Scriptures, or the giving of any other religious instruction on days and hours to be specified by the local patrons to those children whose parents choose that they should attend. Those days and hours, however, must be specified, in order to remove from the mind of the Roman Catholic parent the possibility of a suspicion that his children may be influenced to join in studies of which he does not approve. Nor is there any objection to the application of the term "school-hours" to these portions of time, provided they are distinguished from the hours of universal and necessary attendance.

—*Commons*, q. 1493.

The difficulty arising from the fourth resolution is thus stated by the Rev. Mr. Porter.

Upon the fourth proposition, "That every use of school-rooms be vested in the local patrons of committees, subject, in case of abuse, to the cognisance of the Board," do you understand the Board to have departed from the concession of that proposition?—If the regulations of the Board still render it binding upon the local patrons or committees of the National Schools to make arrangements for the admission of parties to teach doctrines such as I have spoken of, I conceive that every use of the school-rooms is not vested in the local patrons or committees in the light in which I took the concession to the proposition.—*Lords*, p. 217.

For reasons already stated, it seems very improbable that any practical difficulty could have arisen on this head; no member of the synod expressed a wish to exclude Roman Catholics altogether from the benefit of a system of national education. The objection seems to rest on a supposed case of interference on the part of the Board with local management, and from a jealousy of central power. On the other hand, most of the opponents of the national system contended that the Commissioners were too lenient in the exercise of their control, and connived at occasional violations of their rules. Under all the circumstances it is impossible to discover, from the evidence before us, why the negotiations between the synod and the Board terminated so abruptly and unsatisfactorily; and we are equally at a loss to find out on what grounds the synod adopted a resolution of so violent a character as the following, which was passed at Belfast in 1836:—

That inasmuch as this synod has unanimously agreed to establish a system of Scriptural education upon Presbyterian principles, and inasmuch as it has repeatedly lifted up a testimony against the new system of national education, which testimony it has now reiterated in the statement that its mind on the subject remains unchanged, it shall be most earnestly recommended to the ministers, elders, and people of this body, that, for the purpose of advancing the interests of religion and securing the peace of this body, none of them shall in future remain patron or correspondent for any school under the new Board, or be in any way connected with the system.

It appeared, indeed, that many Presbyterian clergymen did not share in the hostility of the synod to the Board: the Rev. Mr. Browne gave in a list of fifteen who were returned as correspondents of the Board of National Education for schools under the superintendence of the Board, and from this list he had carefully removed every name to which there was even a shadow of objection; and he presented a much longer list of clergymen who had applied for grants.

There is every reason to hope that the recent concessions of the Board, respecting the reading of the Scriptures, will satisfy the greater part of the Presbyterians; for it is very improbable that they will persevere in objecting to receive the Roman Catholic priests as visitors to the National Schools, or refuse to them the right of giving religious instruction to the children of their own congregations.

CHAPTER XI.

Modifications of the National System.—Propositions of the Clergy of the united Dioceses of Derry and Raphoe.

A VERY important part of the investigations undertaken by the Parliamentary Committees, and perhaps, practically, the most important of all, was the inquiry whether it might not be possible to remove the scruples of the Protestant clergy, by adopting certain modifications in the national system, which, at the same time, would not afford any reasonable ground of objection to the Roman Catholics. The basis of the inquiry was certain propositions made by the clergy of the united dioceses of Raphoe and Derry, and the circumstances which led to these conciliatory proposals are stated with great clearness and force by the Rev. C. Boyton.

The subject of the system of national education, as it is at present established under the Government Board in Ireland, has been one of much anxiety in the diocese that I belong to for many years. At the time that the system first was promulgated, and its principle became known, the diocese of Derry (one of the two dioceses now united under the Bishop of Derry, but at that time separate) took a very active part in protesting early against the principles upon which the National Board was established. The system has recently become again a subject of consideration and great interest to the two dioceses. At the last visitation in the month of August, which was the first visitation held by our bishop since the death of the late Bishop of Raphoe (for by the demise of the late Bishop of Raphoe, under the recent Act of Parliament, the two dioceses came under the care of the present Bishop of Derry),—it was the first meeting of the clergy of the two dioceses; and after the visitation some of the leading members of the diocese of Derry felt pressed with the difficulty in which we all more or less perceived ourselves to be, in reference to the subject of the education of the poor of our parishes, and they accordingly signed a requisition to the Bishop to convene a meeting of the clergy on the day subsequent to the day of visitation. There were then certain resolutions brought forward in regard to the subject of education. The clergy generally felt that the means they had of carrying on the business of the education of the poor were quite incompetent to the task they had to discharge. There is a great portion in both Derry and Raphoe that comprises a mountainous district, with a very poor population, with hardly any great proprietors resident, the clergy themselves having small in-

comes, and in consequence the means of conducting the education of the poor are extremely limited. I think it was this circumstance that led them, upon the occasion of last August, to take the subject into their consideration. A plan was proposed to apply a sum of money, which the Bishop was good enough to forego requiring from his clergy, namely, some of the visitation fees usually paid to the Bishop:—it was proposed to apply this sum to the establishment of some society that would comprehend in its operations the two districts included in the dioceses; but when the clergy came to discuss the matter, and when they came to consider the extent to which this fund would be required, they found it was quite inadequate to the object; and then came on the question, what our circumstances were with respect to this National Board; and I think, besides the great want of funds to conduct education in this district, the clergy were generally impressed with the dangerous position in which the Church itself stood with regard to the question of education in Ireland; I think they considered it a very unfortunate thing for the country at large that there should be a division between the constituted Government of the country and the clergy of its Established Church upon a question of such extreme importance. They thought it also dangerous to the Church to have matters in this state; and then began the inquiry as to what means could be adopted to extricate us from the difficult position which we were placed in; then commenced the renewal of the old discussion as to the points which we objected to in the system of national education; and then, after the appointment of a very large Committee, comprising generally the influential clergy of the diocese, they came, after a lapse of eight or ten weeks or three months, to the determination that it was possible that such a change might be made in the system of the National Board as would admit of their taking a share in its proceedings; and accordingly that Committee which had been appointed submitted these particulars to a meeting of the clergy convened by public requisition. The clergy, by a large majority, came to a determination to throw the matter out for the consideration of the clergy of the rest of Ireland; and accordingly a discussion commenced upon the subject, and a pamphlet, which was published by the direction of the dioceses, was drawn up; and that pamphlet contains an enumeration of the principles upon which we object to the national system,—which we found rendered it quite impossible for us to take a part in it; and also it enumerates certain changes which might be made in it, and which, if made, we thought would admit of our connecting ourselves with it.

Then the Committee are to understand that a great majority of the clergy of the united dioceses assembled to consider this subject?—Yes, a very large majority.

Was this meeting called at the instigation of the Bishop of the diocese?—I am very glad to have an opportunity of having the truth put on record with respect to that circumstance; not that it could signify to your Lordships whether it originated in that quarter or not; but your Lordships may know enough of Ireland to know

that it may be of great consequence there. The Lord Bishop had no previous communication whatever with any of the parties who drew up the requisition for the meeting. The parties who drew the attention of the meeting of the clergy to the position in which they stood with regard to the Education Board, never had any conversation with the Bishop whatever. It never was instigated, either directly or indirectly, by the Bishop, or by any person who might be presumed to speak his opinions. It entirely originated in persons who had no communication whatever with the Bishop, and certainly had little community of feeling with him with regard to any question of a political nature.

Then it originated with some of the clergy of the diocese themselves?—It originated with some of the clergy of the diocese themselves.—*Lords*, p. 1260.

A Committee was chosen by the clergy of the united dioceses to prepare a statement of the terms on which they were willing to join the Board, and this Committee presented the following report:—

Your Committee, having been appointed to consider the position in which the clergy of the Established Church are placed with respect to the system of national education, to what extent they are barred from co-operating with it by any obvious hindrance of principle or conscience, and how far it might be advisable to suggest to the clergy, and to the Protestant people generally, the propriety of applying to Government for such a modification of the system as might remove such hindrance without violating the just rights of conscience in themselves or others; have come to the determination of recommending such an application to be made.

In coming to this determination, your Committee were influenced by the following considerations: we feel it to be a great evil that the Government of the country and the clergy of the Established Church should be divided upon a question of such importance as that respecting the education of the lower classes. In fulfilment of the duty assigned to us, we have diligently considered whether such an adjustment might not be made as will render a reconciliation of this difference practicable, and we have approached the subject with a desire to yield up our own opinions to those of others to the utmost limit consistent with what we believe to be conscientious principle, with the sincerest desire on our parts to reconcile differences, and with the trust that we shall find others equally anxious with ourselves to effect that reconciliation.

We do not undertake to be responsible for the abstract principles by which the acts of the Government, respecting this education question, have been guided. We assume them as we find them, as those for which others are responsible, but with which we have practically to deal. We have accordingly set out on the principle founded on reason and Scripture, and in theory recognised by the legislature and Government, that in any system of national education the rights of conscience should be respected towards all classes

of his Majesty's subjects, so that the system may embrace the widest possible extent of numbers, and the children of all denominations be educated together.

This we think greatly to be desired, both because of the advantage to be expected from the early association of the youth of different religious persuasions on terms of good-will and amity, and because of the mischief likely to ensue from an apparatus of separate systems, each attached to a peculiar religious denomination, the tendency of which would be to increase the disunion in this divided country, and to render each system more liable to be abused, from the difficulty of extending vigilant conduct over all. While we allow that, in any system adopted by the Government for the joint education of the people, a provision should be made to admit the exercise of the civil right of parents and guardians to require the Bible or New Testament not to be made a school-book for their children, we claim, upon the part of a large section of the population, to have their conscientious principles respected also. They feel in conscience bound to require that the Bible for their children shall be unrestricted. They cannot admit the proposition, much less can they join in carrying it out into practice, that their rule of life, their standard of faith, the study of which they hold to be of moral obligation, and all admit to be the civil right of every man, shall be excluded from the instruction of their children during any assigned portion of the day. It appears to us that, in arranging the experiment of a system of national education, the Government did not take into account that, by withdrawing the right of access to the Holy Scriptures at stated seasons, and absolutely excluding them from the schools at certain assigned periods, the system infringed upon a principle dear to the heart, and imperative on the conscience of the Protestant people.

Your Committee, therefore, propose that no force be put upon the conscience of any body of religionists: that from the children of those parents who object to the readings of the Scriptures the reading of the Scriptures shall not be required; that from those children whose parents require the use of the Bible in the school, the Bible shall not be withdrawn; that there shall be no coercion and no exclusion. The co-existence of these two methods, each upon the grounds of religious toleration, unexceptionable in the abstract, is a question of practicability. We are persuaded they can co-exist; in fact, they do co-exist in many schools in the north of Ireland.

It does not meet our objection to have certain assigned portions only of the school-hours, of which previous notice must be given, set apart for the use of the Bible by the Scripture-reading children. If this be done, while the others are dismissed, the practical effect is to make the reading of the Scriptures a task of peculiar irksomeness to the children who are to be confined in the house to this duty, while their fellows are out at play. But the objection to it on the grounds of principle is more serious still: it would be on our part a denial of the moral obligation to the use of God's word during a certain number of hours in the day. It would be more; it would be to

Modifications of the National System.

affirm, not merely that it may not, but that it shall not, be used ; whereas we cannot, by joining in any arrangement of the kind, recognise a power of lawfully withholding it from the children during any portion of the ordinary school-hours. The command to us is : "These words which I command thee this day shall be in thine heart, and thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children ; and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up. And thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thine hand, and they shall be as frontlets between thine eyes. And thou shalt write them upon the posts of thy house, and on thy gates." We cannot evade the stringency of this command ; we cannot circumscribe it in respect either of time or place. It is obligatory everywhere—always.

While we put forward a claim to have our conscientious convictions respected, we do not deny that those who differ from us may be equally conscientious, and have an equal right to claim a tenderness for theirs. But we conceive that we who require the Bible for our children should be equally considered with those who refuse it ; that the conscience which says give should be respected as much as the conscience which says take away ; that the conscience which says shut should not be more tenderly dealt with than the conscience which says open. That, if it be permitted to other religious persuasions to shut the Bible upon their own children, it be also permitted to us to open it for ours, and to open it on such terms as will not commit us, either explicitly or by implication, to the recognition of a principle to which the clear dictates of conscience will not permit us to assent.

Your committee are however aware, that in claiming the unlimited use of the Holy Scriptures in the schools for all who are willing to read them, an objection may be, and has been as we believe, urged, that in this way an undue proportion of the ordinary school-hours may be devoted to purely religious instruction, to the interruption of general literary acquirements. We are persuaded that this is very unlikely to occur, since we, and all who with us maintain the unrestricted use of the Bible, do also acknowledge ourselves no less bound by the equally scriptural principle, "Let all things be done decently and in order ;" "God is not the author of confusion, but of peace." We can appeal to the general practice among us hitherto, which affords no ground for supposing that to give such interruption is our disposition ; and when we consider how calculated such a course is to defeat its own end, how opposed it may be to the wishes of parents and guardians, and particularly how fully it is in the power of Government to suppress it, by diminishing or altogether withdrawing the assistance given in such cases, we are persuaded that it never can become a permanent abuse.

For these reasons, we are of opinion that the free use of the Holy Scriptures, and the due order of the schools, are sufficiently guaranteed by the following stipulations :—

1st, That there shall be a Scripture Class in all the National

Schools, to be composed of those children whose parents or guardians wish them to read the Bible.

2d, That it shall be part of the daily education given in the schools, that such class shall read the Bible at suitable times during the ordinary school-hours.

The execution of these stipulations we think will be provided for by the following modifications in the rule at present regulating the conduct of the Board of National Education.

In the regulation No. 3, under the head of "Regulations of the Schools as to Tuition, Attendance," &c., the first rule shall be altered to stand thus:—

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 Holy Scriptures by those children whose parents or guardians consent to it.

The concluding clause of the same rule, relating to the extracts from Scripture, shall be expunged.

The 2d, 3d, 4th, and 5th rules shall also be expunged.

In the query-sheets corresponding alterations shall be made to render them consistent with the principles here stated.

We are convinced there is no difficulty in making a satisfactory adjustment on these points, but what may be overcome by an honest desire upon both sides to have the difficulties removed; the principle being once admitted, that the consciences of both parties shall be respected.

Your Committee would therefore respectfully recommend to the clergy of the united dioceses to arrange some plan for inviting the clergy of the other dioceses to join in their object, as preparatory to a general application of the Protestant clergy of Ireland to Government for a modification of the system of National Education conformably to the above principles.

Your Committee would, moreover, suggest, that in case the proposed negotiation with Government should unhappily prove unsuccessful, and our conscientious objections to the present system be disregarded, an earnest and affectionate appeal be made to our brethren, lay and clerical, who may have formed a connexion with the Board of National Education, to dissolve that connexion without delay, and to unite with us in unceasing and strenuous efforts with the Legislature and the British public, for the removal of a system which, while it remains unchanged, must ever present an impassable barrier to our co-operation with it, and must continue to exist as a fruitful source of jealousy and disunion in the land.

In conclusion, your Committee would unite their prayers with those of the Universal Church to Him who hath the hearts of kings and their delegates in His rule and governance; that all things in this matter, as in others, may be so ordered and settled upon the best

and surest foundations, that peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety, may be established among us for all generations.
—*Lords, Appendix.*

The secretary to the committee, aware of the influence which the opinions of the Bishop of Exeter have over the minds of most of the opponents of the Board among the Protestant clergy in Ireland, communicated the preceding report to his Lordship, with the following letter :—

MY LORD,

Derry, 4th October, 1836.

I AM desired by my rector, the Rev. George Scott, to furnish your Lordship with the accompanying copy of the report agreed to by a committee of the diocese of Raphoe and Derry. Being desirous that your Lordship should be early possessed of it, I am obliged to send an uncorrected copy, that I may not lose a post; but there are no corrections except verbal and literal ones necessary. The report, though printed, is yet subject to revision previous to its being presented to the public meeting of the dioceses summoned for the 19th instant, and is therefore only a private document.

I have the honour to be,

My Lord,

Your obedient servant,

ROB. HENDERSON.

To this communication the Bishop sent the following reply :—

REVEREND SIR,

I AM much obliged to you and Mr. Scott for the communication which you have had the goodness to make to me of the report of the committee of the dioceses of Raphoe and Derry. *It is in my opinion a highly important document, very judicious, and remarkably well timed.* I shall consider myself much obliged by any further information which you may have the goodness to give to me on the subject of the system of national education in Ireland, especially of any instances of the abuses of the system, and perversions of it to the purposes either of popery or agitation, in your neighbourhood. My address will be Exeter, whence my letters will be forwarded to me if I am from home.

I am, Reverend Sir,

Your very obedient Servant,

H. EXETER.

And the postscript is, “I shall be very desirous of knowing the result of the applications of your committee to other bodies of clergy in Ireland.”

Mr. Scott, who was personally acquainted with the Bishop of Exeter, also wrote to his Lordship on the subject in the following terms :—

MY LORD,

I TAKE the liberty of forwarding to you a document on the

subject of the national education in this country. It is wished by many of our clergy that an attempt should be made (by petition) to induce the Government to modify the regulations of the National Board. It is felt to be a very grievous thing that Protestants should be excluded from a share in funds granted by the Legislature for national education. This grievance presses the more heavily as the national schools are multiplied. The children taught in them are withdrawn from the superintendence of Protestant ministers; and as the secular instruction afforded in those schools is better than Protestant ministers, unaided by parliamentary grants, can provide, parents are exposed to the temptation of violating their consciences by sending their children to anti-scriptural schools. Hitherto the temptation has been nobly resisted. But, if the controversy between religious principle and self-interest be protracted, it is to be feared that the latter may prevail. Under this apprehension, we think it might be good to rouse the attention of Protestants by a renewed attempt to get the system modified. It is thought advisable in making this attempt to go as far in the way of concession as conscience will permit. There is much reason to believe that Government will persevere in disregarding our intreaties, but we anticipate some advantage even from failure. Our proposal may tend to prove that we do not oppose the national system in a political spirit, or with that obstinate and fanatical bigotry which has been laid to our charge. We are also sanguine in the hope that our clerical brethren who have countenanced the system, may be induced to abandon it, if they see on the part of its supporters a determination to disregard the reasonable and moderate claims of conscientious Protestants: should any change of Government give us rulers more friendly to the cause of truth and righteousness, it may be well that they should know what modification of the system would satisfy the minds of those by whom it is now conscientiously opposed. If it were not too much to expect, I would greatly desire to know whether your Lordship thinks that the stipulations suggested in this document would guarantee the free use of the Scriptures in the national schools; and whether the execution of the stipulations would be sufficiently provided for by the proposed modifications in the rules of the Board. We are to have a general meeting of the united dioceses of Derry and Raphoe on the 19th instant. It would be a great gratification to me if I could have your opinion before that day. I feel that I take a great liberty in seeking it; but I know your Lordship's zeal for the spiritual good of our poor country, and I have seen something of the courtesy which characterises your conduct towards the feeblest of the inferior clergy.

With much respect,

I remain, your Lordship's obedient Servant,

GEORGE SCOTT.

To this communication the Bishop of Exeter made the following reply:—

DEAR SIR,

Exeter, 15th October, 1836.

My visitation did not suffer me to return home till late last

night. I have only a moment to thank you for your communication. I entirely and warmly approve the measure to be proposed to the Derry meeting. I fear losing the post.

I am, dear Sir,

Your faithful servant,

H. EXETER.

Reverend George Scott.

—*Lords*, p. 1310-15.

These letters were read to the general body of the clergy of the united dioceses, under circumstances which are candidly stated in the evidence of Mr. Boyton, who was anxious to vindicate those two gentlemen from having unfairly made private and confidential communications public.

There is another point that I am anxious to state, because I was asked a question yesterday in reference to the gentlemen who corresponded with the Bishop of Exeter from the diocese of Derry. I think I should be blamed very much if I left the impression which I think would be made naturally against them without endeavouring to meet it, as I think I can meet it, by telling the facts that have come to my knowledge about it. I was asked whether I did not know that these gentlemen had written to the Bishop of Exeter to state that they regretted very much that they had made use of a private communication, and that they had admitted the error; I stated that I had not heard that, and I stated nothing more. I have, however, come to the knowledge of some facts, in thinking them over during the past evening, in reference to the letter, which I think will remove a good deal of the blame from those gentlemen which might attach to them in consequence of the admission which they were stated to have made. I am certain that they did not think they were using any private document when they read those letters. I ascertained afterwards that Mr. Henderson was quite unacquainted with his Lordship, and he wrote to him, a stranger. He was our acting secretary. He inclosed a printed document; and in reply to that letter he got an expression of his Lordship's approbation in the terms that I mentioned. I am sure, from the conversation I had with him afterwards, that the feeling that influenced the minds of Mr. Scott and Mr. Henderson in making use of the letter on that day was, first, a conviction that it was in no respect a private document; and secondly, an anxiety for the success of the measure which they thought interested the country very much, and which they conceived, no doubt, would be greatly promoted by having the favourable opinion of a person standing so prominent as his Lordship did with respect to this very question. I have also a personal knowledge of some of the circumstances which happened afterwards in reference to the correspondence with his Lordship. Mr. Henderson, our secretary, wrote to me to say, that Mr. Scott had had a letter from the Bishop of Exeter, requesting him to contradict the statement that had gone abroad in reference to his Lordship favouring our views. I wrote back to Mr. Henderson to say, that I thought that Mr. Scott would act improperly by us if he did so with-

out publishing his Lordship's post letter at the same time. We had stated, many of us, the fact of his Lordship supporting our views, and we should be very much implicated if there was a public denial of what we had stated in private; and that I thought he ought to write to his Lordship to say, that in case his Lordship wished that contradiction to be given, the previous letter should be published also: and I heard afterwards from Mr. Henderson that Mr. Scott had written to his Lordship to propose the publication of both the denial and the original letter, and it has terminated in that kind of way. I am very sure that neither Mr. Henderson nor Mr. Scott then thought the letter to be a private one. The reasons for supposing it to be a public document were, I think, such as might justify them in a great measure from the blame of lying under the imputation which they would have lain under if I had not made this explanation to go out with the view thrown upon their conduct yesterday; and I hope I have not been improper in pressing this upon your Lordships, for it concerns very much the personal character of two among the most respectable, diligent, and laborious clergy in our diocese; and being here, and no one to take into consideration what might be their interest about the matter, I thought I might presume to give this explanation.—*Lords*, p. 1299.

Mr. Boyton assigned the following reasons for regarding the Bishop of Exeter's letter to Mr. Henderson as a public document:—

What I meant by its being a public letter was not with reference to the Bishop of Exeter's intention in writing it, but with reference to all the circumstances attending the letter which I detailed before; that it was a letter to a stranger, in answer to a printed paper sent by the secretary to a body of persons anxious to obtain authorities upon the subject, and that its substance evidently was in reference to a very important public subject upon which his Lordship had been taking a public part prominently. It is simply from these reasons that I infer the document to have been of a public character; and there was nothing in the letter, as far as I could see, which established any impropriety in publishing it.—*Lords*, p. 1303.

Mr. Boyton was further examined as to his understanding of the purport of the Bishop of Exeter's letters, and particularly whether he thought that "entire and warm approval" meant merely approbation of one or two points.

After the letter in which the Bishop of Exeter was supposed to have expressed his strong concurrence in your proposals, was it not apparent from his subsequent correspondence that specific questions had been put to him besides the general question, and that his attention had been particularly given to those specific questions in the letter that he had had from Mr. Scott?—I did not see any part of the subsequent correspondence; but what I understood from those gentlemen was this—that his Lordship considered the questions put in the letter written to him in reference to some point or points in

the documents—not the whole document itself; and that his Lordship's approbation was given to those one or two specified points, and not to the entire. That is what I understood his Lordship conveyed to those gentlemen in his subsequent correspondence.

Do you consider that that specific point was the single point which involved the alteration which your Society were about to suggest?—I considered his Lordship's approbation to be most unqualified with reference to our whole system. The expression was, his approbation of the "timely and judicious movement of the Derry clergy." The movement we all supposed referred to the whole proceedings, not merely to the principles we brought forward, but to the act of bringing them forward at that particular time, which is the meaning I supposed to be conveyed in the words "timely and judicious."—*Lords*, p. 1301.

It appears from the evidence of the Bishop of Exeter that when he approved of the measure he hoped that it would be rejected.

You stated in your letter that you considered that the proceeding of the clergy of Raphoe and Derry was particularly well timed; to what did you particularly refer?—As far as I recollect, the impression upon my mind was, that that was just the time. I have no hesitation in avowing frankly that I had no expectation whatever of the Government acceding to the proposal; I had not the slightest expectation of it at that time. On the contrary, I was satisfied that they could not do it; but it seemed to me that it was very judicious that the proposal should be made, inasmuch as it would show on the part of the Protestants a disposition to be reasonable, and would show upon the part of the Government that they were not ready to concede even what was reasonable.

You referred, then, not to the probability of its being adopted, but to the probability of its being rejected?—I fully expected that it would be rejected.—*Lords*, p. 1321.

His Lordship explained the inconsistency of his being now opposed to a measure which he had so recently "entirely and warmly approved," by having written both notes in a hurry; that to Mr. Henderson, while confined by illness at the seat of Lord Fortescue, and that to Mr. Scott, when fatigued by the duties of a laborious visitation. He also dwelt very strongly on the fact, that the whole correspondence was of a private and confidential nature.

The Earl of Wicklow, through whose exertions the correspondence had been brought before the Committee, deemed it necessary to assign his reasons; and as his Lordship's evidence was of grave importance, we shall extract it entire.

It certainly is painful to me to have it imputed to me that I thought it necessary to bring forward documents before the Committee which I was informed were considered by the persons who wrote them to be of a private nature. I was aware that the Bishop

of Exeter had written letters or a letter in approbation of an alteration in the system of national education proposed by the Derry and Raphoe clergy. I thought that approbation consistent with his recorded speech in Parliament. I felt interested myself in the subject, because I thought I saw in those proposals an opening for the establishment of a system of education that might promote harmony and good-will amongst the people. It gave me great pleasure to think that there was a possibility of succeeding, and I saw a hope in that proposal. I also felt gratified to believe that a person who had taken so prominent a part in his opposition to the system as the Bishop of Exeter had done was likely to acquiesce in the proposed modification, and I felt that his acquiescence (such was his influence with the clergy of the kingdom generally) might very naturally be expected to lead to their concurrence with it. I heard, however, that this proposed modification had met with decided opposition on the part of that portion of the clergy which may be called the ultra portion in Ireland; unfortunately perhaps the majority of the clergy. I heard that it met with their disapprobation; and I heard that subsequently to the Bishop having written his letter in approbation of it: he had written to desire that that letter might be withdrawn upon the ground of its being a private communication. I shall now state that it was gratifying to me, without having communicated with this body of clergy, to find that they intrusted their cause to my hands, having sent to me their petition to present to the House of Lords. I found, however, that upon presenting that petition, immediately on my sitting down in the House, the right reverend prelate got up to present a counter petition from the clergy of the same diocese. The right reverend prelate also stated that his petition bore the signatures of a great majority of the clergy of the diocese. I was not prepared to contradict that statement; but after some days I received a letter from the Lord Bishop of Derry, inclosing me a report of the Bishop of Exeter's speech, containing that assertion, and assuring me that it was not the fact, for that the majority of the clergy of the diocese were in favour of the proposals of the Derry and Raphoe clergy. I wrote then to the Bishop to tell him that I regretted I was not informed of that fact when the petition was sent to me, as I should then have had an opportunity of contradicting the statement, but that I thought the matter was not of sufficient importance to bring the subject again before the House. I, however, in this committee-room stated it to the Bishop, and I think showed him the letter of the Bishop of Derry, when the Bishop of Exeter told me that he did not so express himself. I said I think you did, for it is reported in your speech, and my own recollection bears me out in that opinion. He then replied, that if he had so expressed himself it was inadvertence, for certainly he did not think it authorised. However, I felt the impression was made at the moment in the House that the petition counter to that which I presented had the concurrence of the great majority of the clergy of the diocese. This circumstance of finding the hostility of the Bishop manifested by presenting that petition, and also by the facts that I heard with

regard to the letter, determined my mind, that when I examined those clergymen whom I should summon upon the subject I should require the production of the letter which they received from the Bishop, because I thought it due to the cause that I consider myself called upon to advocate, as well as to the clergy themselves, that having received such a letter, and being thereby misled as to the opinions of the Bishop, I thought it but just, I say, to them, that when he retracted that approbation, their cause should be protected as much as possible from the injury which it might suffer from such a circumstance. I accordingly wrote to Mr. Boyton, to desire that when he came here he would bring with him that letter, "provided it were not a private communication." When I saw Mr. Boyton I asked him if he had brought it: he told me that he had not; that it was not in his hands, but in the possession of the secretary, Mr. Henderson. I then questioned him with regard to the letter, because the opinion in my mind decidedly was this, that the Bishop of Exeter had written that letter in approbation of the proposed change; but that, finding the clergy of the country hostile to it, he was apprehensive of losing that influence which he possessed amongst them, and that prominent position which he held in Parliament as the champion of the party adverse to the new education system; and that, therefore, he was desirous of withdrawing the acquiescence which he had in the first instance given to it. I considered that to be an unfair proceeding, I candidly declare, towards the Derry and Raphoe clergy, and I also thought it was unfair of him to evade the position in which he had placed himself by endeavouring to make that letter appear to be private, which in my conscience I believed it not to be. My reason for not admitting that one of these letters could be considered private was, that it was addressed to the gentlemen who wrote to him as the secretary of that Society, inclosing their printed resolutions. This was so stated to me. The other letter, that written to Mr. Scott, he might have more ground for considering private, inasmuch as it contained other matter with regard to information which he wished to obtain; but as those letters were written immediately after the application made to him for his acquiescence upon the subject, and as they were not marked "private" by him, I thought it quite natural for those gentlemen who received them to feel gratified by them, and to communicate that gratification to the gentlemen with whom they were then acting, more especially as the meeting of the clergy took place shortly after at which those letters were read. When I became fully satisfied in my own mind upon this matter, I said to Mr. Boyton, "I will not permit these letters to be considered private; they are not so in my opinion, and I consider that justice to your cause requires they should be produced." Those were the feelings which influenced me in asking Mr. Boyton those questions which led to the production of the letters.

Now, my Lords, upon the second point, namely, the want of courtesy to the Right Reverend Prelate in not communicating to him my intention, I will frankly state my reasons, and it will be for

your Lordships to judge whether they are justifiable or not. I conceive that this is a part of the case of less importance than the other, because to divulge knowingly a private correspondence would be a serious charge : whereas, to be guilty of want of courtesy is in comparison one of a trivial nature, though certainly one that I should be very sorry to subject myself to. I will not say that it was done inadvertently, for I admit that I considered the matter, and at one time had a disposition to tell the Bishop that I meant to call for those letters ; and I will state why I did not do so. I knew that it was not like a charge against an individual upon which he would require time to prepare for his defence ; I knew that it related solely to the production of, or to an inquiry upon, letters that had been written by himself ; the first in approval, the next in disapprobation of the proposed modification. I thought therefore that there was no great necessity for preparation, nor any great chance of the individual being taken so unguardedly as not to be able to give an explanation, if explanation were possible, upon the subject. But I also thought that if I, knowing what the Bishop had expressed with regard to that letter, and his endeavour to make it appear a private communication, had informed him of my intention, I should have been met with this argument, "You are seeking to bring forward that which is private ; it is not fair of you to do so ; it will be unjust or unhandsome." I expected some such argument as that, and then I should consequently be obliged to enter into private altercation with the Bishop upon that point upon which I had previously made up my mind, and upon which I felt that he was not likely to persuade me to acquiesce in his opinion. I did not like therefore to subject myself to that kind of disagreeable altercation ; and, as I stated before, believing that there was nothing that required preparation on his part, I made up my mind to bring the matter before the Committee in the manner I have done. Whether or not in that respect I have acted as others would have done I cannot pretend to say. It is possible that had I communicated with any body who would have recommended the other course, I might have adopted it ; but it does not make, I conceive, much difference in the case itself. But certainly under that impression I determined to take the course which I have taken.—*Lords*, p. 1322-4.

When the Earl of Wicklow had concluded, the Bishop of Exeter gave the following additional explanation to the Committee :—

After having heard what the noble Earl has testified, there are three or four points upon which I wish to offer some further statements. With respect to my having said in the House of Lords that the great majority of the clergy of the dioceses of Derry and Raphoe had signed the adverse petition, I can only say at this moment I have no clear recollection of having so said. But I have no doubt, after what the noble Earl has said, that I did say it. I remember making the remark, and saying, "We must take this petition which I present as much more deserving of your Lordships' attention than

the petition that has been presented by the noble Earl, for his petition is in fact to be considered only as the petition of the bishop who has signed it." And I said also, "I do not want to drive that matter too technically; yet I must say that it is too much to say, that when I bring forward a petition signed by a large number that this signed by only one is to have a greater authority." But that subject is hardly worth noticing. But with respect to the petition of the other clergy, it being supposed that I took up this petition (which it was natural perhaps to suppose) in a spirit of partisanship, I will state what the facts really are. Archdeacon Monsell sent me that petition, and requested me to present and support it. In answer I wrote, that I would present it with pleasure; that they were entitled to my services in presenting the petition, but that I must decline supporting the whole of it, for I did not agree with them. They petitioned the House of Lords against the use of catechisms in the schools; they not merely said that they were content that catechisms should not be used, but they prayed the House of Lords that catechisms should not be used. Now, I said, "in my view the best scheme of national education would be to have a scheme of perfect education, not requiring all persons to take the whole of it" (considering what is done in Scotland as the best course), "and that I should prefer the introduction of catechisms. I cannot therefore support your petition so far, and therefore it is for yourselves to put it into the hands of some one who will support it entirely." I think that was the purport of my letter. There came back an answer entreating me to present it, and support that part of it which had my approbation. Now, as to this letter from the secretary of the Society, it was a very natural thing, I admit, to have occurred to others, this gentleman being the secretary, that he wrote to me merely as such, but in point of fact my full belief is that he did not write to me in his character of secretary; but, as he was the curate of Mr. Scott, I had had communication, mediately or immediately, with him in this character before upon the subject of national education, and he said that he was desired by Mr. Scott, to the best of my recollection, to send me this paper; and the reference to it in Mr. Scott's letter seems to confirm that notion. It was in my letter to him, however, and not in my letter to Mr. Scott, that I talked about "further information," and alluded to further correspondence upon the subject of the National Board, showing that I did write to him, not in the character of secretary, but in the character of an individual from whom I had been previously in course of receiving information upon the subject of the National Board. As to the want of courtesy on the part of the noble Earl, my feeling was this; I regretted that the matter should be brought forward, because it was impossible for me not to see that it would probably take the course which it has unfortunately taken. That occurred to my mind, and I told my Lord Wicklow so in this room. I said, "I think I have not been handsomely dealt with in your not apprising me of this matter, for if you had I should have been enabled to have informed myself by looking to my papers about it." The truth is,

that from the time when I received Mr. Scott's letter of the 12th December, after the one reading which I gave it at that time, up to yesterday, at a time subsequent to the last meeting of this Committee, I have never read the letter. I had not therefore more than a general recollection of the circumstances of the case; but I was satisfied that there had been a letter of Mr. Scott's to me which acknowledged so strongly my letter to him to have been really a private letter, and his regret at not having dealt with it as a private letter, that I felt thus. If Lord Wicklow had spoken on the subject previously to me, the production of the letter alone would have shown how the case stood, and rendered it unnecessary for him to trouble himself about it; but at the time the thing had not made that degree of impression upon me which it might fairly have made, and I was not aware that Mr. Scott had in his letter gone to the full length that he has gone of expressing regret, and putting it in terms that I should not have demanded from him, as to the extent of his regret. It was in that way that I lamented, and complained of the want of courtesy, and the unguarded manner in which it had been brought forward.—*Lords*, p. 1325.

Subsequently the Bishop of Exeter gave an explanation of his evidence, which must in justice be quoted:—

The Committee understand that your Lordship is desirous of offering some explanation of your evidence upon a former day?—In reference to the part of my former evidence in which I stated that I had not the slightest expectation that the Government would accede to the proposal made, and that I was satisfied they could not do it, I wish to state, that in using the words, "that the Government could not do it," I did not mean to say that they would be prevented by any impossibility or impropriety in the matter itself, but that they could not, by reason of the influence under which I believed them to be holden. I also wish to state, that in giving my approbation to the proposition sent to me by Mr. Scott and Mr. Henderson, I had no notion that it was to be understood, nor do I now believe that it was intended by those gentlemen that I should understand it, in the manner in which, so far as my impression goes of what Mr. Boyton said in his evidence, it was explained by him. If I had so understood it, instead of expressing approbation of it, I should have considered it, though I am far from supposing that Mr. Boyton considered it, as illusory or insignificant. What I contemplated as necessary, and what I understood their proposition to intend, was the establishment *bonâ fide* in every national school of a Scriptural class during a reasonable portion of the ordinary school hours of general instruction on every day on which the school was held. This, coupled with a regulation requiring the Scriptures to be used by all the children at the time of separate religious instruction, but not requiring any particular version, in accordance with the proposition made by Dr. Murray himself to the Commissioners of 1824-27, would have contented me. But then it was of course implied that due provision should be made to carry those principles into effect: especially that care should be taken to ensure the appointment in all

the national schools of good teachers—of persons able and willing to perform their part efficiently; above all, independent of all undue influence, whether priestly or any other. It would also be necessary that there should be an adequate and effective system of inspection, not only at the time of common instruction, but also at the time of separate religious instruction, so far as to ensure an actual and sufficient use at that time of the Holy Scriptures in some version, in all the national schools, by children of all denominations.

Are the Committee to understand your Lordship as stating, that when in your reply you expressed your hearty concurrence in the proposed change, and your high and full approval of it, that you accompanied that answer with any conditions such as you have stated in the answer you have now given?—I have already stated, that, in my letter to those gentlemen, I considered myself as not making any answer beyond accepting their proposal, so far as it went, which I considered to be, not as the whole of what would be necessary to be done to make the plan satisfactory—not, in short, that they were to co-operate with the Government if that were done. This was my misapprehension. I saw afterwards they had spoken of co-operating with the Government solely upon that being done; therefore I explained in my letter to them that that was not what I understood their propositions to be. In the hasty manner in which I was under the necessity of reading it, I thought it was more a proposition that they should make to Government, as a thing which would enable them to apply to Government for assistance to their schools; not as implying that they would be contented then to co-operate with the Government in carrying on the system of national schools, as if it were then perfect or satisfactory. The conditions which I stated in that letter were those which I have uniformly stated in Parliament, and which seemed to me necessary to make the schools acceptable, or even tolerable, to myself individually, with the principles which I held. That question having been put to me, perhaps I may be permitted to state farther, that there is at least one noble lord in this room who is aware that at a former period, when desirous of stating fully, for the information of political friends, the extent to which I could go, I made to him that reserve which I now make—namely, that nothing short of a Scripture class daily in school hours in the schools, and also requiring that the Scriptures should be placed entire in the hands of the Roman Catholic children, at the time of their separate religious instruction, could content me.

At what time was that communication made to which you allude?—It was made previous to my addressing Parliament—as well as I recollect, it was at the beginning of the year 1836; it was before I brought on the question in parliament in 1836. I had an earnest wish to find how far some noble lords, in whose judgment I had confidence, with whom I was in the habit of acting, and with whom I generally found myself agreeing in principle, could go; and to let them know how far I could go in concession to their views. To one of them, who is now present, I then stated the extent to which I could go, but that those two things were in my

mind absolutely essential to be retained, and I could not concede below that.

But it did not occur to your Lordship to make the same limitations in your communication to Mr. Henderson and to Mr. Scott?—I did not consider myself as discussing the question in the same way with them. I considered myself as being asked by them, for Mr. Scott's private information, what my opinion was of a specific proposal, and as to which he called my attention in a specific matter, which I noticed in the letter which I wrote to him; but I did not enter into a discussion with them then about this question.—*Lords*, p. 1368.

This evidence will be read with much pain; the Bishop's approbation of the Derry propositions was twice repeated in the most unqualified terms; and there was a sufficient interval between the dates of the two letters for him to read over so brief a report as that which was forwarded to him. It is perfectly inexplicable how the belief that the propositions would be accepted by Government could have been a motive for his giving them his "entire and warm approbation," since it would necessarily follow that the probability of Government giving assent to a conciliatory project must have been a motive for withdrawing such approbation. The explanation given by the Bishop of Exeter is before the reader; and he can judge for himself how far it can be regarded as satisfactory. The effect of the Bishop of Exeter's withdrawing his sanction, in terms nearly as unequivocal as those in which he had given it, was a great misfortune: he is regarded by the opponents of the Board as their champion; he possesses so much influence over them, that several undertook tours of inspection to detect errors in the administration of the national system, but not in any case, which is recorded in the evidence, to point out any of its merits; and his continued sanction of the Derry plan of conciliation would have consequently had a powerful effect in healing the divisions which the controversies respecting national education have produced in the Church of Ireland.

The conciliatory propositions of the dioceses of Derry and Raphoe were fiercely opposed by "the Reviewers," who, in Ireland, think for the people. On this subject Mr. Boyton gave the following evidence:—

Since it was ascertained that the Bishop of Exeter did not favour the present plan, has there been any drawing back on the part of the clergy that were at first disposed to support it?—I do not know whether any change has been produced in consequence of the Bishop of Exeter's opinion being understood to be different from what it was; but I think the clergy in general that took up the view at first adhered steadily to it. I have no doubt many persons have been deterred from taking an active part along with us by the outcry that

was made by the press. There was a great outcry made by the press. We did not consider that we were dealt with according to any ordinary rules of fair argument upon the subject, but we were for a time just as unpopular as the Board.

Did not the opposition that the press made to your proposal lead to the withdrawing of some of the clergy of your diocese who did at first co-operate with you?—One or two.

But are the Committee to understand that the great majority of the clergy of the diocese are now favourable to you?—I wish to adhere to facts. We have on two separate occasions summoned a meeting of the whole of the diocese, stating to them the purpose for which they were brought together; and upon both of those occasions we had commanding majorities of two or three to one.—*Lords*, p. 1285.

This evidence sufficiently proves that the adoption of the modifications proposed by the clergy of the united dioceses of Derry and Raphoe, would reconcile a large portion of the present opponents to the Board to the national system of education. But it is also of importance to inquire how far these modifications could be adopted without giving offence to Roman Catholics. On this very important point we have the following satisfactory evidence from the Right Hon. A. R. Blake:—

Do you recollect in the early part of your examination you were asked a question, to which you gave an answer, but which answer upon a subsequent day you requested permission to recall, upon the ground that, as you had not communicated with Dr. Murray, you did not wish to answer that question at that time?—I do.

Have you been in Ireland since?—I have been.

Have you seen Dr. Murray since?—I have.

Do you consider, as a member of the Board, that you would have any objection so to modify the system of education, if you found that by so doing you could conciliate and gain over as approvers of the system a large portion of the clergy of the Established Church in that country, and also so influential a body as the synod of Ulster, as to introduce a regulation that a Scripture class should be established in each school, where the children should read the Scriptures whose parents had no objection to their so doing?—I consider it perfectly consistent with the principles of the system as now existing, that there should be a Scripture class in any school in which the parents of the children shall desire to have one. And this I think is made clear by the correspondence that took place between the Commissioners and the synod of Ulster in 1833, and by what previously took place between Lord Stanley and a deputation from that body. I have now before me a letter addressed by Lord Stanley to a deputation that waited upon him in the Month of September, 1832, in which he says, “His Majesty’s Government fully recognises the right of all who choose it to read the sacred Scriptures, but the exercise of this right in the case of infants must be subject to the control

of their parents and natural guardians, and in point of time in the national as in all other schools it must be limited by the appropriation of certain hours to certain other branches of study. The proposition, that any child, at any hour, and in the midst of any other allotted employment, should be permitted to read the Bible, is a proposal so perfectly novel and unheard of, and so totally impossible, as it appears to me, to be reduced into practice, that I should not have noticed it but that such appears to be the express sense of the words of the Proposition No. 2,"—he is speaking of propositions that had been submitted to him by the deputation,—“and seemed to be sanctioned by some at least of the deputation from the synod. The national schools are not so much the schools of the Government as of local patrons and managers, who submit voluntarily to certain regulations in order to entitle them to receive aid from the Government. They are therefore at liberty to lay down their intended course of study; they are free to appoint certain hours during which certain studies are to be carried on,—in some of which Roman Catholics and Protestants may, in others of which they cannot object to join. There appears to have been a considerable ambiguity in the use of the expression ‘school hours,’ which has given rise probably to some misconceptions. The phrase might (and perhaps in strictness ought to) apply to all hours in which instruction is given to the children. In this sense the portions of time set aside for religious instruction may be called school hours. These hours are (as I have already observed, and as may be seen by the printed regulations,) not exempted from the control of the Commissioners; and the Scriptures, as well as the authorised catechisms, &c. of any Church, are expressly permitted to be used at these times. But the expression ‘ordinary school hours’ has been generally employed to denote those portions of time which are devoted to the combined instruction of children of various persuasions, and at which all the children belonging to the school are expected and required to attend. Those hours, be they more or be they fewer, will be allotted to other studies, and in them of course neither the Bible nor any other book could be employed to which the parents or guardians of any of the children could object on the grounds of religious scruples. To introduce the reading or hearing of any such book during the ordinary school hours, viz., those during which all the children of all denominations are expected to attend, would be a palpable violation of religious liberty of conscience. But there is not (nor ever was) any objection to the reading of the Scriptures, or the giving of any other religious instruction, on days and hours to be specified by the local patrons, to those children whose parents choose that they should attend. Those days and hours, however, must be specified, in order to remove from the mind of the Roman Catholic parent the possibility of a suspicion that his children may be influenced to join in studies of which he does not approve. Nor is there any objection to the application of the term ‘school hours’ to these portions of time, provided they are distinguished from the hours of universal and necessary attendance.” The synod of Ulster, at a subsequent period, submitted

four Propositions to Lord Grey, which were transmitted by him to the Archbishop of Dublin, and having been by his Grace laid before the Board were acceded to by it. The second and third were in these words—"That it shall be the right of all parents to require the patrons and managers of schools to set apart for reading the Holy Scriptures a convenient and sufficient portion of the stated school hours, and to direct the master, or some other person whom the parents may appoint and provide, to superintend the reading." "That all children whose parents and guardians so direct shall daily read the Holy Scriptures during the period appointed, but that no compulsion whatever be employed to induce others either to read or remain during the reading."

Have you read the Propositions of the clergy of Derry and Raphoe?—I have.

Do you see in those Propositions any material difference from those of the synod of Ulster?—I do not.

Then do you conceive that the Board would now accede to those Propositions, as you stated they did before to those of the synod of Ulster?—The Board considered that the Propositions of the synod of Ulster might be acted upon without any violation of its Rules; and therefore I conceive that the principle which the Derry clergy appear to me to have in view may in like manner be carried into effect. I should perhaps mention to your Lordships, that having lately visited the National Model School of England which is in the neighbourhood of this House, I found that the Bible class was taken into a room apart from the general school-room, and the children there read the Bible, and were examined in it; and although I am of a different persuasion from them, I must say that I was very much pleased with the manner in which they gave answers to such questions as were put to them upon the passages that they read.

Did you find any Roman Catholics in that school?—No; but it appeared to me that if in our school-rooms we had a slight partition thrown across, which might be done at a small expense, or folding-doors, separating one part of the room from another, that then the principle which we act upon as to religious instruction might be maintained, even though the time for it should not be the first or the last hour, for the children whose parents wished them to read the Scriptures might go into a separate room, as they do in the national school here, and there read the Sacred Volume, in the solemn way in which all your Lordships, I am sure, feel that it ought to be read.

Are the Committee to understand that there would be no difficulty in making it a rule of the Board, specially in respect to the use of the Scriptures, that in every school under the Board there be a Scripture class in the mode you have now stated?—I do not wish to commit the Board by any thing that I say. My opinion is that there may be a Scripture class in any of our schools without any violation of our Rules.—*Lords*, p. 1339.

Mr. Blake, however, argued strongly that this regulation should not supersede the religious instruction given to the

children by their respective pastors; and as his evidence on this point cannot be conveniently abridged, we shall quote it at full length.

Do you at present see any objection to making it a rule of the Board, that in every school under the Board there should be a Scripture class in the way that has been suggested?—I do.

What objection do you see to that?—In that case we should insist, as I understand the question, upon having the Scriptures read, but we should not insist upon any other species of religious instruction; and, as I think I stated to your Lordships upon a former occasion, to such a Rule I for one could not assent. It would recognise a principle which it might be very proper and quite consistent in Dissenters to act upon, but not for persons who belong to a church which has a Creed and Articles of Faith. I stated to your Lordships upon a former occasion, from recollection, that I thought such a system of education had been objected to by the Prelates of the Established Church of England: I mentioned at the time, I think, that I spoke with reference to a sermon that attracted a great deal of public attention—a sermon preached in the year 1811 by the present Bishop of Peterborough. That sermon I conceive may be considered as expressing, not merely the opinions of that very eminent and distinguished Prelate, but the general principles and sentiments of the bishops and clergy of the Established Church; for it was preached and printed at the request of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, which I apprehend I am not wrong in treating as to all intents and purposes a Church of England Society; and it is to be borne in mind, too, that it was immediately followed by the formation of the National School Society of England. It refers particularly to the system of education which is now in Ireland called Scriptural education; to the system of education which enforces the reading of the Scriptures, but excludes Catechisms and Expositions of Faith. That system, as your Lordships are all aware, was originally set forward in this country by Mr. Lancaster, who was himself a Dissenter; and the Bishop expresses himself of it as follows: “It is well known that a system of education conducted by a very intelligent and active Dissenter in this country, a system in which of course, as he himself conducts it, the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England form no part, has during the last seven years received very extensive patronage from men of all ranks and professions. This system he conducts on the avowed principle that ‘education ought not to be subservient to the propagation of the peculiar tenets of any sect.’ Hence no other parts of Christianity are there professed than what he terms its uncontroverted principles;” that is to say, the reading of the Scriptures, without any thing more, was required there. “Whether our religion when thus curtailed does not lose the character of Christianity altogether, or whether enough of it remains to satisfy the demands of any other religious party in this country, it is certain that the doctrines of Christianity, as taught by the Church of England, have no admission there; that

Dissenters, therefore, Dissenters of every description, should join in promoting such a plan of education is not a matter of surprise. To supersede the parochial and charity schools which our forefathers had founded on the maxim in the text of training up a child in the way that he should go, and to raise up seminaries in their stead where the children should not be trained in the way of the Established Church, was to them an advantage too obvious to be overlooked. If no predilection for any peculiar sect was thereby excited, one point at least was gained, and that an important one; that the children educated in such seminaries would acquire an indifference to the establishment, and not only indifference, but secession from the Established Church will be the final result. Education, on whatever principles it be conducted, must have some influence, either favourable or unfavourable, on the established religion. Even neutrality, however strictly observed, is in this case a kind of hostility; it is hostility to the establishment to deprive our children of that early attachment to it which an education in the church cannot fail to inspire, and which if lost in their youth can never after be recovered." His Lordship then, after arguing further very fully upon the subject, winds up this particular head of his discourse thus:—"When we further consider that this system of education has in other respects so much to recommend it; that the mechanical part has advantages which no other system possesses; that reading, writing, and arithmetic are taught by it under one master to hundreds of children at a moderate expense; that these useful arts are learnt also in so short a time as to leave ample leisure for manual labour, which in charitable institutions is so usefully combined in the acquirement of knowledge; and when we consequently consider that such a system is both likely to meet and actually does meet with almost general encouragement, we must clearly perceive that if the system is accompanied with such religious instruction as is calculated to create indifference and even dislike to the Established Church, the most powerful engine that ever was devised against it is now at work for its destruction." Now I could not be party to any system that should enforce in Ireland that which the Established Church I think I am warranted in saying condemns in England; I could not be a party to requiring that a system of education should be enforced upon the Roman Catholics of Ireland which their clergy object to, and which is equally objected to in England by the Established Church; because it holds, as the Roman Catholic Church does, the necessity of a positive Creed and Articles of Faith. My principle is, that there should be in every school a full opportunity given for instructing the children in the faith of their parents. If I were a party to desiring that the Scriptures should be read, but at the same time said nothing of catechisms or liturgy or particular religious instruction, I should be doing that which is here so emphatically condemned by Bishop Marsh; I should be doing that which might be perfectly consistent for Dissenters to do, but not for persons having a creed or articles of faith.

You do not suppose that their being Dissenters necessarily implies

that they have no creed and no articles of faith, though they may dissent from the creed of the Established Church, or may dissent from the creed of the church of Rome?—I speak merely of those Dissenters who are spoken of by the prelate in question; those Dissenters who do not recognise creeds or articles of faith.

Do you adopt the reasoning and argument which you have just read as applying it to the Roman Catholics of Ireland?—I view the principle of Bishop Marsh as the principle which, according to my understanding, the Roman Catholic prelates of Ireland act upon; that is to say, that there must be an opportunity not only for reading the Scriptures, but for instructing the children in their creed or articles of faith.

You mean in case any compulsory provision with regard to religion is adopted?—Yes.

That in case any rule is made which shall require the use of the Scriptures in the school by any part of the scholars it will be necessary to go further, and introduce into the school some arrangement which shall teach creeds in that school?—Which shall afford an opportunity for the teaching of creeds; and I think that the principle of our system may be so acted upon as that all persons who wish it shall have an opportunity of having religious instruction afforded to their children in the schools, according to their conscientious opinions. If parents desire that their children shall receive religious instruction by reading the Scriptures, and nothing more, they shall have an opportunity of doing so; and if they wish that the children shall learn catechisms, an opportunity shall be allowed for this also.—*Lords*, p. 1337-40.

The Rev. Mr. Staples also gave evidence tending to show that the proposed modifications would meet the concurrence of the Roman Catholic priests:—

Did you find that the only Roman Catholic clergyman with whom you had communication upon that subject assented to the proposed alteration?—He made no objection; I cannot say he went so far as to assent.

Who is he?—Mr. M'C.

Is he one of the patrons of the national schools in the parish?—He is assenting to all those in my parish.

You asked his opinion?—Yes; and he did not express great dissent from it. He seemed to think that the concessions might be made.

Do you believe that the Roman Catholic priests in that diocese would be induced to agree if they found that the members of the Board who represent their own religious belief acquiesced in it?—I have very little doubt that they would.—*Lords*, p. 936.

From Mr. Boyton's evidence it appears that the adoption of these modifications would satisfy a considerable portion of the opponents of the Board in the synod of Ulster. He states:—

When I was going into one of the meetings of the committee that was appointed, Mr. M'Clure, who was the moderator of the synod

of Ulster in 1835, sent me a little pamphlet, which was entitled, an "Address of the General Synod of Ulster to the People under their care on the subject of Education." It bears date 14th January, 1835: it is stated to be an outline of a plan of literary, moral, and religious education for the children of Presbyterians, drawn up by a committee of synod, and unanimously adopted by the whole body. The principles of this system of education are the exact principles which we are anxious to see established; and I have no doubt there would be an unanimous concurrence of the whole Presbyterian body in Ireland to the system that we propose. With your Lordships' permission I will read a passage of this address. The third rule that it lays down is this, that "The children of other denominations may avail themselves of the literary advantage afforded by these schools without being compelled to join in the religious exercises prescribed for our own children." That is commented upon in this manner:—"You will observe, brethren, that the above plan of education is formed as nearly as possible on the principles of God's providence, and the instructions contained in his holy word. God, in his providence, maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust; his goodness is great unto all, and calculated and intended to lead all men to repentance; but he physically constraineth or compelleth none. In his word also, he, in the Old Testament dispensation, required (Deut. vi. 6) that his people should teach his laws diligently unto their children; that they should talk of them when they sat in the house, and when they walked by the way. They were to bind them for a sign upon their hand, and as frontlets between their eyes, and to write them upon the posts of their houses, and upon their gates; but in no instance did he require that the stranger or the sojourner within the land should be constrained or compelled either to read or learn his laws; and in the New Testament the direction given to the disciples by their divine Lord, and implicitly followed by his inspired apostles, was to offer salvation freely to all, but when that offer was despised or rejected by one house or city to go to another; and in no instance do we find that they ever attempted to use constraint or compulsion to lead any to the knowledge of the truth. The above plan of education accordingly provides that the Bible shall be free in all its schools during every school hour; it shall, like the light of heaven, be open for every eye that is not shut against it; and all who attend the school may read in it, as much and as often during the day as may be thought consistent with their advantage and the other duties of the school. The children of our communion shall daily read such proportion of Scripture, and learn such portion of our standard catechism as parents, with the concurrence of the church session, may advise; but where the children of other communions attend our schools they shall be at perfect liberty to read the Scriptures, or not, as their parents or guardians direct. The Bible in all our schools shall be as free to every scholar as God in this world has made it to every creature; but should any choose to forsake their own mercy, we will use neither coercion nor compulsion, but leave them, as God does, to future re-

sponsibility. Our system of education will be strictly scriptural, and at the same time catholic, forbearing, and charitable."

From that address do you conceive that if that plan were adopted it would have the concurrence of the great body of Presbyterians in Ireland?—I have no doubt it would.

Would it have the concurrence of the Protestant clergy all over Ireland?—My opinion is, that if that system were adopted the Protestant clergy would connect themselves with it. Many people have drawn a distinction between asking for the system, and, if it was in existence, availing themselves of it. They cannot avail themselves of the present system, because there is an impassable barrier in the way; but if you remove this barrier away, although it is not the system they would like best, yet, as the second best, or third best, or fourth best, I have no doubt it would be generally adopted by the clergy at large. But I must be understood as giving this merely as my own opinion; not as authorised by anybody to say so.—*Lords*, p. 1322.

It must, however, be confessed, that a compliance with the Derry propositions would not disarm all opposition. Dr. Cook declared that he would not now be satisfied with the concession of the four propositions originally made by the synod of Ulster; and Dr. Elrington thus recorded his dissent from the Derry plan:—

Are you aware of the project of education generally known in Ireland by the name of the Derry project?—Yes.

Are you able to state what that is?—It is generally a Scripture class in every school, in which the Scriptures shall be read during the school hours, and that no children should be obliged to read in this class, whose parents object to their reading the Scriptures.

Pretty much of the same nature as the plan suggested by the Synod of Ulster?—I took a great deal of pains to make that out, but I was never able to make out the dispute between the National Board and the Synod of Ulster; there was so much about "in hours" and "out of hours," that I could not make out precisely what the points in dispute were.

So far as you are acquainted with the project called the Derry plan, do you approve of it or not?—I disapprove of it.

Will you state why you disapprove of it?—It is giving up the scriptural principle entirely; it is acknowledging that the Scriptures are not to be the foundation of religious education.—*Commons*, q. 1948-52.

In fact Dr. Elrington objects to giving the parents power to prohibit the use of the Scriptures to their children, and would even compel all to use the authorised version. It is sufficiently evident that no practicable plan of national education could be devised for Ireland which would overcome such objections.

The Bishop of Exeter proposed a modification of the national

system, which does not appear to differ materially from that of the Derry Committee, at least in principle :—

I will state to your Lordships the two particulars which, in my opinion, would go very far indeed to remove the objections to the system, and then all that would be necessary would be that the system so amended should be fairly and firmly carried into execution. One change I would suggest is founded on a demand made by the Synod of Ulster, namely, that during school-hours there should be a regular Scripture lesson every day—That the children should then read from the Holy Scriptures themselves for a certain time. At which lesson it should not be necessary that all the children should attend, nor indeed that any child should attend whose parents objected to it. The other particular was—That the Roman Catholic children should read out of the Scriptures the gospels and epistles for the week as in the breviary; these being in the Roman breviary far more numerous than in our prayer-book.—*Lords*, p. 1317.

The only thing objectionable in the proposal is, that it to a certain extent puts a force upon Roman Catholics, which would be likely to provoke opposition to any arrangement, however desirable. The Derry Committee objected to the second particular, which appears to have been originally proposed by Dr. Murray, the titular Archbishop of Dublin, and raised a difficulty about the translation of the epistles and gospels from the breviary. This difficulty, however, might be easily overcome, and as far as we can collect from the evidence, there would be little or no objection to the circulation among the Irish Roman Catholics of such a volume as the Bishop of Exeter desired on the part either of their prelates or their priests.

We must next direct our attention to the modifications which the Board has introduced in order to meet the objections of the Synod of Ulster, and the clergy of the united dioceses of Derry and Raphoe; they are stated in the following extract from the Report of the Commissioners, addressed to his Excellency the Lord Lieutenant :—

Having received your Excellency's permission to revise our existing rule as to religious instruction, we have anxiously considered whether we could effect such an alteration in the letter of it, without violating the principle, as might satisfy any of those who have been hitherto conscientiously opposed to us.

The principle of the system, and which we consider fundamental and unalterable is, that the national schools shall be open alike to Christians of all denominations; therefore that no child shall be required to be present at any religious instruction or exercise of which his parents or guardians may disapprove, and that opportunities shall be afforded to all children to receive separately, at particular periods, such reli-

religious instruction as their parents or guardians may provide for them. The letter of the rule is, that religious instruction shall be given out of the hours during which all the children attending a school are assembled for common instruction.

It has been considered by some that to limit the time for religious instruction in this way tends to discourage it altogether, and therefore that an opportunity should be afforded for giving it at whatever hour may be deemed most convenient.

The rule as to time was framed with a view to convenience, and to convenience only, and it never has been considered by us that we should violate principle if we allowed religious instruction to be given during the ordinary school-hours, provided such an arrangement were made as that children whose parents did not approve of it should not be required to attend or be present at it.

We therefore propose modifying the letter of the rule, so as to allow religious instruction to be given, and of course the Scriptures to be read, or the catechism learned, during any of the school-hours, provided such an arrangement be made as that no children shall take part in, or listen to, any religious reading or instruction to which their parents or guardians object. With these views we have framed the following regulations:—1st. The ordinary school business, during which all children, of whatever denomination they may be, are required to attend, is to embrace a competent number of hours in each day. 2nd. One day at least in each week, or part of a day, (independently of the Sunday,) is to be set apart for the religious instruction of the children, on which day such pastors or other persons as are approved of by their parents or guardians, shall have access to them for that purpose, whether these pastors have signed the original application or not. 3rd. The managers of schools are also expected to afford convenient opportunity and facility for the same purpose on other days of the week. But where any course of religious instruction is pursued in a school during school-hours, to which the parents of any of the children attending it object, an arrangement is to be made for giving it separately to those who are to receive it. 4th. Any arrangement of this description that may be made is to be publicly notified in the schools, in order that those children, and those only, may be present at the religious instruction whose parents and guardians approve of their being so. 5th. If any other books than the Holy Scriptures, or the standard books of the church to which the children using them belong, are employed in communicating religious instruction, the title of each is to be made known to the Board. 6th. The reading of the Scriptures either in the Protestant authorised or Douay version is considered as religious instruction.

We trust we have shown a sincere desire in what we have now proposed, to do everything in our power to conciliate and draw into common agreement all who desire to promote education in Ireland on the basis of religion, but free from every condition that might practically tend to exclude any denomination of Christian children from its benefits. And we are persuaded, that it is only by diffusing

such an education as widely as possible, and through it not only general information, but a disposition to peaceful pursuits and habits of industry and order,—that a thorough improvement can be wrought in the state of the country, and the poorer classes of the people raised from the misery in which they are now so generally sunk.—

These modifications appear calculated to meet all the objections made by the Synod of Ulster, the clergy of Raphoe and Derry, and the Bishop of Exeter. It is now a rule that a Scripture class should be formed in every school where the parents desire it, and the exception to the rule is only in cases where parents or guardians disapprove of the use of the Bible for the purposes of education. It is said that some persons object that under these arrangements it is doubtful whether the reading of the Scriptures is the rule or the exception; but such an argument is so manifestly a captious quibble, that it is utterly unworthy of notice, especially as the proposition of the Derry clergy is equally open to such a charge. The Derry committees of the united dioceses proposed—

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 Holy Scriptures* by those children whose parents or guardians consent to it.

The new regulations of the Board manifestly are designed to give full effect to this proposition both in the spirit and the letter.

CHAPTER XII.

State and Prospects of the National System.

EDUCATION OF TEACHERS.

IN many of the preceding pages it has been shown, that a great number of the objections urged against the working of the National System in particular, arose from the unavoidable necessity of the Board's employing such masters and mistresses as Ireland afforded, until measures could be organised for procuring a proper supply of competent teachers. The evidence of Mr. Colquhoun shows in a strong light the importance of choosing a proper instructor :—

I confess I should look very much for the success of the general system of education to the person who managed the school ; to the master, and the person to whom the master looked as his patron,—as his real and effective patron ; not to the Board, but to the local patron. I should take it that in all cases the master is the school. The school does not consist in the rules which a general Board please to lay down, for it is quite obvious that those general rules may be kept for a day or a few days, when the inspector of the Board is to make his tour, but that they may be laid aside to-morrow, and never used at all ; and in some cases, which I think I quoted to your Lordships before, I gave instances in which the rules of the Board were most flagrantly violated by the masters. Therefore, if any one asked the question, what is the practical point in a school ? I should say, "Give me the master." Regulate the school as you will by any system of rules or any system of books, I will venture to say, that however excellent the regulations may be, they will be perfectly ineffective if there is a bad master ; and however imperfect the regulations may be, if there is a good master he will work them well.—*Lords*, p. 562.

Mr. Colquhoun made these observations with the design of showing that it would be dangerous to give the appointment of schoolmasters to the Roman Catholic clergy ; but they are truths of more general application, for it is sufficiently clear that the best system of laws must be completely nugatory if they be not properly administered.

To secure a supply of competent masters, the Commissioners have established a training system in their model school, under the superintendence of Dr. M'Arthur. This

system is not yet so perfect as we would desire, but it is rapidly advancing in efficiency. Dr. M'Arthur gave the following account of the training system as it stood in April 1837 :—

Are there any regulations prepared by the Board as to the admission of persons to be trained for becoming teachers?—There have not been yet, because our object is to find out what material we have got in the country for teachers, and therefore we take up only those teachers that are in schools at present.

Do you mean to say that you have no teachers under training at present that have not been already teachers in schools?—None.

And they are recommended by the inspectors?—Not all. If the inspectors say, in their report of a school, that the master is a fit subject for training, we will take him up for certain; but there are never so many as to complete a set, therefore we take all under the age of twenty-five that are fit for training; but I know nothing of their religion, because that is not mentioned in the report. The inspectors never recommend so many as forty or fifty, so as to complete a set for training; so, to make up the number, I choose those under the age of twenty-five.

Suppose there are accommodations for not more than fifty persons to be trained, and then suppose the inspectors recommend thirty persons as fit persons for training; you take those thirty into the set that are to be trained, and you also take twenty more?—Yes.

How do you make your selection?—I have no means of making it, except by choosing those that I think of an age fit for training; that is, under twenty-five.

Where do you find those persons?—I take them from the inspectors' reports. If they say they are intelligent men I generally choose those.

But you were understood to say that you first take all those recommended by the inspectors?—I do. After that I choose those that I think, from the inspectors' reports, are most capable of being trained. We are able from our accommodations to take in but fifty. Looking through the inspectors' reports, I find perhaps only thirty recommended as fit persons for training; to make up the other twenty I myself select from the inspectors' reports those that I think can be made something of, and they are called up.

If you are limited as to room, it would seem that you would take those that are best fitted to be schoolmasters to train them?—I find that all require training.

Your object is to take those that are really effective?—Yes.

And that is best done by taking those whom the inspectors find upon the whole to be the fittest for your training, from whatever cause they may be induced to recommend them?—Yes.

What qualifications induce you to make your choice?—I should always like to have them under twenty-five; under twenty I should think better, if we commenced with them, and provided they are intelligent sensible men.

Do you make any particular inquiry as to their religious tenets?—

I know nothing about that till they come up; then when I take their names I ask whether they are Protestants or Roman Catholics.

When you find out whether they are Protestants or Roman Catholics, what do you do with them in order to their religious instruction?—When the day comes, which is Saturday generally, when the clergymen attend, I tell the different parties to go to the different clergymen.

Then, speaking broadly, what was the proportion between the Protestants in number, to the Roman Catholic teachers who were brought up to be trained?—We have trained 246; thirty-one of those have been Protestants, and 215 Roman Catholics.

As many masters as can be accommodated are received into the training school; they are chosen from the inspectors' reports on the recommendation of the head master; no distinction is made between Protestants and Catholics in selecting the masters who are to be instructed. It is intended, when the model school shall be in full operation, that no person shall be appointed to a national school who has not previously been trained in the national system of education at the normal school. Deficient as the means at the disposal of the Board are, there is abundant evidence that the training of masters at the model school has already produced highly beneficial results. Mr. Price stated that he was greatly pleased with what he saw of Dr. M'Arthur's system of instruction, and expected that by its operations the imperfections arising from a deficient supply of competent masters would in a few years be removed.

The Rev. Mr. Hastings gave similar evidence respecting the advantages that would result from the training of teachers at the model school.

What sort of teachers have you in the national schools; are they competent teachers?—They are competent teachers; they were originally under the Kildare Place Society. Two of them were instructed in its model school; and there is one school at present in which I have no master.

Do you think it would be a great advantage for the schools in Ireland under the national system, if teachers well trained at the model schools in Dublin could be supplied in sufficient numbers?—Most undoubtedly.

Do you think it would be an inducement to the establishment of more schools?—I am sure it would. It is very difficult to get good masters; it is almost impossible in any part of the country.

Mr. Ingham and Lady Osborne also impressed upon the Committee the necessity of making ample provision for the training and instruction of teachers, in order that the national system of education should effect the objects for which it was established.

The Rev. Eugene Condon also gave the following gratifying evidence as to the effect of the instruction received by the teachers who have been sent to Dublin for training :—

What kind of schoolmaster have you?—I have one schoolmaster who has been instructed under the Board, and that schoolmaster has been of such use to me that I find the greatest possible advantage, satisfaction, and comfort with his services. I have put other teachers, male and female, under his tuition for some time, and he has prepared them in the same manner that he has been himself prepared, and thereby I find the business of the schools carried on very well.

Was he educated at the model school of the national Board in Dublin?—He was there for three months.

Do you think he was much improved by that education?—He has been improved so far that it is a matter of astonishment to me how children, from the lowest ignorance of nature almost, are in three quarters of a year under his tuition not only able to spell and to write, but absolutely able to calculate with as much precision and accuracy as persons that have been for years at school before.

Where was he brought up?—When I got permission from the Board to send a person forward for tuition I advertised for persons that would be fit and proper. A number presented themselves. I selected this man, of the name of Casey. I sent him to Dublin, and he returned to me afterwards with the approbation of the Board, and with a token of their kindness in giving him some books.

Is Ballyduff school in your district?—It is.

Is that a good school?—He is the master of it, and I do not think there is in Ireland a better working school. I suppose at this moment he has above 300 boys in the school. It is a mountainous district, situated between the towns of Lismore and Fermoy and Tallow.—*Lords*, p. 1351.

English readers will be surprised to hear that such a number of scholars could be collected in a mountainous district. But the circumstance is explained by Mr. Dwyer in that part of his evidence in which he accounts for the very large attendance in the schools kept by the Christian Brothers :—

Those schools you say are chiefly in towns, and that they have large numbers; do they collect those large numbers of scholars merely in the towns?—I have reason to know that they do not. I expressed my surprise at the large mass and gathering of them in those places, and I was told that they had come, some of them, from ten and fifteen miles off; that the peculiar reputation and sanctity of the schools attracted them from ten and fifteen miles distant. And in convent schools I was told likewise that the girls came six and seven miles to them; that they became exceedingly attached to the nuns; so much so that they could mould them to what they pleased.

Do you mean to say that the girls that attended those schools came six and seven miles, and that the boys came ten and fifteen miles, and walked back in the evening?—I did not say so; that was

not my meaning. My meaning is, that the reputation and peculiar sanctity of those schools induces children to come to those schools and to live as poor scholars. That is a very prevalent evil in Ireland, and one of the most unpleasant character of the country. Those poor scholars who live in the country affix themselves near a school that has acquired a reputation; they live by mendicancy; they are lodged one night in the house of one farmer or neighbour, and another night in another, and taken in by the parents of the children resident upon the locality; they are brought from one house to another. The whole character of the domestic care over the child whilst he is receiving instruction is broken in upon, and they acquire the habits of vagrants.

You mean to say that all those children are children who live as poor scholars in the way you have represented?—Not all, but many do.

Do you think that many of the children that attend the schools are children who are living as poor scholars in the way you have described, and who support themselves by mendicancy?—I believe that many of them are under such circumstances.—*Lords*, p. 1246.

These circumstances, which are not generally known, sufficiently prove the anxiety of the Irish peasantry to obtain education, and show the great importance of providing proper teachers in sufficient abundance to meet the demands of the country. But this is a matter of no ordinary difficulty; a training system, well organised, cannot be established without time, labour, and expense; and unless sufficient salaries be paid to the teachers, there is a danger of losing them after they have been properly instructed. On this point Mr. Carlile gave the following evidence:—

Have you any measure in contemplation by which you hope to be able to retain the services of these men when they have been trained?—That is a point on which we have found great difficulty. From the small salary we are able to give, as soon as we have trained them we are in danger of losing them, and have lost some of the best of them. And we have made a representation to Government on the subject, recommending that they should enable us to increase their salaries. The recommendation of the Board was given in consequence of our finding that some additional inducement was absolutely necessary to retain our best masters.—*Lords*, p. 27.

The Annual Reports of the Inspectors of the four provinces dwell very strongly on the absolute necessity of extending the training system, and securing a proper supply and continuance of teachers. The following is an extract from the report of the Inspector of Munster:—

The present system of National Education being but in little more than its infancy, the increase only of the national schools is to be noticed, and the Board knows to what a gratifying extent this has

already taken place. These schools, as respects the buildings, are of all descriptions; from very fine spacious buildings they graduate down to poor cabins, ill lighted, ill ventilated, and by far too small for the number of children attending them. However, many very respectable buildings have within these few years been erected, chiefly by means of the exertions of the priests and their parishioners, generally contributed to by some others, and in some cases entirely built by individuals.

The teachers in these schools are of different descriptions also, but none so low in the scale as the houses in which they teach. I have not met with any who did not appear to me to be sufficiently adequate to teach, at least to such an extent as may be thought generally necessary in these schools; but in their attainments and manner there is much difference; some of them superior in each; generally, however, a great deficiency in method and classification, which, however, were the teachers sufficiently acquainted with, it would be impossible fully to carry into effect, from the general deficiency of books and other school requisites. Some schools of course are more free from this defect than others; and I may here mention the school at Youghal, wherein I saw, on the 18th of October, exactly 450 boys actually present.

All, however, profess, and indeed seem anxious strictly to follow the plan of instruction which shall be recommended by the Board; and I have little doubt that by judicious management all will be led zealously to pursue such plan. More management may in some cases be required than in others, from the difference of individual character; and I may here mention an impression which I understand is somewhat general among the inferior classes, that instruction by monitors, or even in classes, is not so good or so much worth their money as when the teacher instructs each child separately.

As to the system of the Board, I think I can confidently state, that with the great majority of the province of Munster it is quite an approved one. Most of the Catholic clergy approve of it altogether; but some, who say it is not that which they themselves would frame, not only do not oppose it, but concur in it, and conform to its regulations. It is however with much regret that I cannot say so as to the Protestant clergy; the great majority of them in the province are strongly opposed to it; some few of those whom I met with really did not understand it; were misinformed as to that which they opposed; but there are, however, exceptions to their opposition; amongst such I may mention the Lord Bishop of Killaloe, the Hon. and Rev. Ludlow Tonson, Rector of Comro, the Rev. Stephen Dickson, Vicar of Dungarvon. It is much to be regretted that unanimity does not exist among the respective clergy; but as the population of Munster is mostly Catholic it is of the less consequence here.

Improvement in the method of teaching can be effectually made only through the means of a model school, and that about to be opened by the Board will have its effect; teachers will therein be instructed on an approved method, and by some practice acquire

expertness in it. But as the metropolis is very remote from many parts of the kingdom (the most distant national school in Munster is 252 statute or British miles from it), and teachers ill able to bear the expenses of a journey to it, exclusive of their maintenance while in town, it occurs to me, that the selection of a few of the national schools as minor model schools in different parts of the province would be attended with much benefit; this might be done by appointing some of those schools whose teachers had been instructed at head-quarters, and who should appear to be persons of proper capabilities.—*Lords*, p. 1408.

Dr. Hamill, the inspector of Leinster, enters further into detail; and the following extract from his report will show that the Commissioners, so far from wishing to conceal any evils or defects in the working of the national system, are anxious to have them exposed, in order that they should be remedied:—

With respect to the national schools, it was to have been expected, that being till now unconnected with any society, under the control often of incompetent individuals, and debarred from receiving the public assistance, they would not give the inspector many opportunities of sending flattering reports; yet I must own in very many instances I was astonished to find the Lancasterian plan so well understood and acted upon, and the general efficiency of the schools so creditable to those connected with them. That few of the schools should be conducted upon national principles I was prepared to expect: indeed, with a few exceptions, I found they had been strictly sectarian—so that children of different denominations invariably resorted to different schools for instruction; but in every instance in which application had been made to the Board, and in others where I explained their rules and regulations, without previous application, I found the utmost readiness on the part of the local patrons, committees, and clergy, to carry forthwith into practical operation the intentions of the Commissioners. There are, however, a few schools in which the national system has been long adopted and adhered to: I may mention that of Bally-fin, Queen's County, and that of Ratoath, County Meath, both well attended and very efficient.

The defects I observed in the several schools, both connected and unconnected with the Board, were such as might have been anticipated, from the want of proper accommodation, the ignorance of the teachers, the poverty of the people, the absence of efficient superintendence, and the inability of the local patrons in many cases to understand and enforce the approved system of instruction.

The want of proper accommodation I notice first, as being the first thing to be attended to. I found schools in stables, in unroofed and seatless chapels, in the kitchens of the teachers, and in one instance, the master's house being too small to hold a sixth of the boys and girls, the desks and forms were placed at the shady side of the house, and being shifted from wall to wall as the sun or wind became too strong, in this way the poor creatures made an attempt

to get instruction. Any endeavour on my part to introduce system in such cases as these would have been quite useless. In my reports, however, I took care (as they will show) to recommend such cases strongly to the favourable consideration of the Board.

The want of proper books and requisites I may here observe is one of the main impediments to the diffusion of knowledge. Tablets are in many schools unknown, and books of very equivocal reputation used instead. It is not uncommon to see a house full of children squatted round the walls on the earthen floor, each with a dirty, dogs'-eared, illegible primer in his hand, gaping about and waiting all day for a chance of being taken up for a moment to the master's knee, and sent back again. When a little further advanced, the Universal Spelling-book is bought by those who are not too poor, and very generally used. I may observe, there cannot be a more objectionable book than this. The desks are usually few, and of a bad construction, the books seldom uniform, the slates bad, and the cutters or pencils put into the children's hands so short, that it is a miracle one out of a dozen succeeds in writing a legible hand. The slow progress in many of the schools is the best proof of their inefficiency; the children are allowed to remain for months and months at their A. B. C.; and if they do succeed at last in learning it, it is often without other assistance than that afforded by the primer. In many places where the monitorial system has been adopted, and not properly attended to, the children are in a worse condition than if no monitors were employed; and it is but too common to find the information of the monitor inferior to that of the class he attends to.

The ignorance of the teachers, generally speaking, is another barrier to improvement: to an arrogance and self-conceitedness peculiarly their own, many of the country schoolmasters and mistresses unite an ignorance of every thing except reading and writing, with occasionally a smattering of mathematics. I found few who knew anything of English grammar—fewer still who were acquainted with geography. However I might lament the limited extent of their information, I could not but regret the wretched judgment displayed by them in communicating the little they knew.

The method usually is, to bring up the children seriatim, hear them spell, and read the lesson of the day; and if the lesson be got by rote, though not a word of it be understood, they consider this amazing proficiency. I had too often to complain that the boys and girls, the latter especially, were not taught the use of the mind, but of the tongue—not to understand the meaning, but to know the words of their lessons, much in the same way as parrots are usually educated.—*Lords*, p. 1412.

These reports are sadly at variance with the Dean of Ardagh's declaration, that already abundance of provision has been made for education in Ireland. They show a frightful amount of ignorance, and what is perhaps worse than mere ignorance, a bad and perverted education. They show that the Commis-

sioners have not merely to introduce a proper system where none before existed, but that they have to introduce it where the ground is already pre-occupied by evil and pernicious systems, if indeed the name of system can be applied to any thing so rude and unorganised as the mode of instruction adopted by the untrained and untaught schoolmasters. There is no doubt that many abuses have been found in the national schools, but these prove only the necessity of giving the system such an extension as will enable it to grapple with evils which its limited resources have hitherto prevented it from encountering. It is now our gratifying duty to turn to the means by which the Board proposes to meet the evils which have arisen from the deficiency of teachers. We extract from the fourth report of the Commissioners of Education, presented to both houses of parliament by command of Her Majesty early in the present session :—

In a paper which we presented to the Irish Government, so long ago as in March, 1834, we proposed that Ireland should be divided into school districts ;—that there should be a model school established in each ;—that there should be a strict system of local superintendence ;—and that the existing plan of inspection, which we considered at once expensive and defective, should be given up. We noticed the incompetency of the teachers that were in general to be found in schools for the education of the poor ;—we pointed out the necessity of placing the national schools under persons of a superior class ;—and we showed, that to procure such it was necessary that a normal establishment should be founded, where they could undergo a due training ;—and that we should be supplied with funds that would enable us to afford adequate remuneration for their services.

The grants of 1835 and 1836 enabled us to proceed with the erection of model and normal schools in Dublin ; but we were not furnished with the means of commencing any other improvements until the close of the last session of parliament.

The grant of 50,000*l.* then made exceeds our existing liabilities. We have therefore a surplus at our disposal, which we intend applying to arrangements for increasing the efficiency, as well as extending the number of our schools.

Our views as to what ought to be done having been communicated to your Excellency, we have learned with satisfaction your Excellency's general approval of them.

We intend that our normal establishment, which we hope will be completed in January next, shall consist of two departments—one for elementary, the other for scientific instruction ;—and that the latter shall teach in particular those branches of science which have a practical application to husbandry and handicraft. We also purpose having a school for industry in the immediate neighbourhood of Dublin, with work-rooms, and a farm of from forty to fifty acres

annexed to it; and that those who attend it shall be practised at stated times in different descriptions of manual work, and in the general business of agriculture.

Our object is not to teach trades, but to facilitate a perfect learning of them by explaining the principles upon which they depend, and habituating young persons to expertness in the use of their hands.

Considering too the very backward state of agriculture in Ireland, and that it forms the only source of employment for a vast portion of the labouring poor, we think it particularly desirable that a better knowledge of it should be promoted, and that the schools under us should tend as far as practicable to bring forward an intelligent class of farm labourers and servants.

We intend that the whole of those who may be from time to time received at our normal institution from different parts of the country shall be boarded and lodged, and at stated times instructed at the school for industry. We shall thus have them under constant superintendence and discipline; and as we at present allow them 12s. a-week for maintenance, which is much more than it will cost to provide for them there, we calculate that the establishment will lead not to an increase, but to a diminution of expense.

We are taking measures for dividing Ireland into school districts, appointing a superintendent for each, and establishing in each a model-school.

We intend that the superintendent shall reside at the model-school; that he shall frequently visit the several schools in his charge; that he shall receive a report upon each from the teacher once a-month; and that he shall make a quarterly report upon the whole to us. He will also be required, from time to time, to inquire into such matters as we may refer to him, and to report specially thereupon.

We think that there should be twenty-five districts, as by this means the size of each may be such, that, by placing the model-school in a central position, the superintendent will in general be able to proceed from it to any school in his charge, and return in the course of the day.

We intend that each superintendent shall receive a salary of 125*l.* a-year; that he shall, in the first instance, be provided with a horse by us, but that he shall thenceforth keep himself provided with one, and pay for the forage, &c., out of his salary; that, until apartments are provided for him at the model-school, he shall have an allowance for lodgings; and that he shall receive 5*s.* a-day for each day on which he may be obliged to travel to a greater distance than twenty statute miles from his residence.

As we have at present eight inspectors, who, in consequence of the extraordinary expenses which they incur in travelling, receive each a salary of 300*l.* a-year; and as their services will be dispensed with when the superintendents are appointed, the increase of charge occasioned by the new arrangement will be, particularly when

compared with the advantages which may be expected from it, very inconsiderable.

We intend that each model-school shall consist of two departments—one for elementary teaching, the other for scientific, and for instruction in manual occupations. We therefore intend that there shall be a work-room annexed to each, and also a portion of land, which those children, whose parents may so direct, shall be taught to cultivate.

We further propose, when establishing each model-school, to make such an arrangement, if practicable, as may enable us afterwards to connect it with a model-farm of about forty acres, should we be authorised by a future grant from Parliament so to do.

The expense of providing the necessary buildings, implements of husbandry, stock, and crops for the model-farms, would probably amount to about 600*l.* each; so that the whole expenditure for providing these most desirable establishments throughout Ireland would come only to about 15,000*l.* No future grants would be required for the purpose of maintaining them. Our plan would be to let each farm to the head master of the model-school, at a rent proportioned to the value of the land and the outlay upon it; to bind him to a proper course of management; and to take security for having it rendered up to us when demanded, duly stocked and cropped.

We propose that the head master of each model-school shall receive a salary of 50*l.* a-year; that he shall have an assistant who shall have a salary of 20*l.* a-year; that there shall be 1*s.* 6*d.* a-quarter at the least, paid for each child who attends the school, by its parents or friends; that the money so paid shall constitute a school fund, and that it shall be divided, in such proportions as we may determine, between the head master, his assistant, and the most advanced of the monitors whom he may employ.

We are of opinion that the head master of each model-school should be authorised to receive a limited number of boarders, at such a charge to their parents or friends as we may deem proper, having regard to local circumstances.

It is our intention gradually to divide the national schools, in general, into two classes; the one to consist of primary, the other of secondary schools. The primary schools to afford elementary instruction; the secondary scientific, and instruction also in manual occupations. A portion of land for garden husbandry to be an indispensable adjunct to each secondary school, unless situated in a city or town. Instruction, however, in manual occupations, to be encouraged in the primary schools also; and a female department, under a female superintendent, to be annexed to each. The females to be taught work suited to their sex, in addition to reading, writing, and arithmetic.

The master of each primary school to receive 6*d.* a-quarter, at the least, for each child attending the male department, from its parents or friends, or from the patrons of the school; to have a salary from

the public, regulated as to amount by the circumstances of the school; and to receive a gratuity when favourably reported upon by the superintendent of the district. The amount to depend on the report, but not to exceed 1*l.* 5*s.* in any quarter. The female teacher to be remunerated in all respects in like manner as the master.

Every secondary school to have apartments for the master connected with it. The master to receive 1*s.* 6*d.* a-quarter, at the least, for each child from its parents or friends, or from the patrons of the school; and to have a salary of 30*l.* a-year from the public.

The teachers of primary schools to be promoted to secondary as vacancies occur. The persons so to be promoted, to be selected for merit; and only from teachers who shall have previously received quarterly gratuities for good conduct.

We propose having annual examinations in all the schools, and prizes awarded to the most deserving children, but no child to receive a prize for good answering unless reported for general good conduct.

We think it desirable that a certain number of free places should be hereafter established for boarders at each model-school;—that boys should be selected for them at examinations to be held for that purpose,—and that the head master should receive from the public for their board and instruction the same as he receives from the parents or friends of other children.

CHAPTER XIII.

Visitors and Inspectors.

THE office of a visitor to the national schools is fully described in the evidence of the secretary to the Board, and the distinction between the powers of visitors and managers clearly pointed out.

What do the Board understand by the term "Visitor?"—They understand by the term "visitor" what is generally meant by the term; a person who enters into a school-house and sees how the schools are going on, and who generally, as an evidence of his having inspected it, writes down his remarks in the report-book.

Would you consider the priest of any parish, or the Protestant clergyman of any parish, taking an interest in the school situated in that parish, as a visitor?—Yes; they are looked upon as *ex officio* visitors. The rules of the Commissioners provide that, whether the clergymen have signed the application or not, they have a right to visit the school.

So that any clergyman of either persuasion frequenting the school in his own parish would, without any selection or nomination by the Board, be considered by them as a visitor as a matter of course?—He would; the right is secured by this rule, and submission to it is required in the original application for aid, before aid is granted.

Are not all the gentry of the country permitted to visit the school if they think proper?—They are permitted. It was mainly for the purpose of inviting public attention and inspection that the inscription "National School" is put up outside on each national school-house.

Then in fact you do not consider the clergy more visitors in that point of view than any other gentry who choose to go there as visitors?—Not exactly so; the Commissioners consider the clergy as *ex officio* visitors, having thought it material to secure to them the right of access by express rule.

The Board considered it an invitation and an encouragement to the clergy of all persuasions to interest themselves in those schools?

—Yes.

Would the Board consider any clergyman so visiting those schools as entitled to interfere in the way of remark, expostulation, or advice, or otherwise, in the management of the schools?—Certainly, in the way of advice; but if your Lordships will turn to the rule upon that point you will find that they are not to disturb the school nor to interfere with it, out of respect for the authority and office of the master; but in each school there is a report-book, with a blank

space for the insertion of any advice or suggestion that the visitor may see fit to write.

They might advise or write their suggestions either in the book or to the Board?—Yes.

Your inspector is desired to be equally forbearing with regard to the master?—Yes, equally so.

And only to advise in the presence of the master?—Our inspectors have a degree of power beyond that which visitors possess; the instruction to the inspector is to examine the classes himself, and to act the part of a schoolmaster during the time he is visiting the school.

Is it not possible that an active visitor might exercise notoriously a very great influence upon the conduct or well-being of a school?—I certainly think so; therefore the Board have been very desirous, and would be most anxious, that the gentry of the place where the school is situated should interest themselves in it.

In case of the parish priest of Carlow, the administrator of the Bishop, Dr. Nolan, who is the correspondent of the Board, being the religious instructor of the school, and often going to visit it, should you consider that he was a manager?—Yes, I certainly should, in the popular sense of the word.

Can you under your rule exclude the parochial clergy from visiting the school?—No; on the contrary, the Commissioners secure to them the right of access.

Are they not visitors in right of being parish priests or being clergymen?—They are visitors in the right of being clergymen.

Of the parish?—The rule does not define it so narrowly as to say of the parish; it says clergymen.

Supposing them to behave ill in other respects, can you take their general conduct into consideration, and prevent them from visiting the schools?—Such a case has never arisen; I can imagine how the Board would act did it arise: if any immoral conduct were to be established against a manager—

The question refers not to immorality, but to any violent political feelings?—I think the Board is protected in two ways from evil arising from a visitor of that description. First, that he is not permitted to interfere or disturb the management of the school; he may write his suggestions in the report-book; and again, he may correspond with the Board in regard of what he wishes; and, in either of the two ways, whatever alteration he would wish would come before the eyes of the Board; whatever alterations were in these suggestions the Commissioners would at once put in a course of examination, in order to ascertain whether they were beneficial for the school or not; and if the suggestion had reference to the character of the teacher of the school, or anything connected with it, they would put it also into a course of examination.—*Lords*, 485.

The evidence of Dr. Finn, one of the inspectors employed by the Board, shows that visitors have it in their power to effect a great deal of good.

Did you observe a great difference in the degree of knowledge acquired, and the degree of regularity observed, in those schools where the neighbouring gentry and Protestant clergy visited and paid attention to them, and in those schools where they absented themselves?—From the general scope of my observations, I am disposed to say, indeed I may say with great truth, that, when I found a school not visited by the local patrons, the absence of such visits furnished me in a great measure with *primâ facie* evidence of the school not being under the most efficient government.

The question did not refer to the local patrons, but to the neighbouring clergy and gentry, who, though they might not be considered as the patrons, would have free and welcome access to the school. You have found that some were visited by those, and others not; and the question referred to the difference between those two classes?—I can have no hesitation in saying, as far as my observation and experience reach, that those that were visited by such as you name were under more efficient government than those that were not, taking for granted that the efficiency of the teachers in both cases was similar.

In point of fact, have you found many schools which the gentry and the Protestant clergy were in the habit of visiting?—I did not find many in which the Protestant clergy were in the habit of visiting, but I found very many which the Protestant gentlemen were.

Did you meet with any instances in which there had been any complaints made of rude reception given to the gentry and Protestant clergy visiting, and anything that tended to discountenance their coming to inspect the state of the school?—I do not remember a single instance in which there was anything of the kind, or bordering upon it.

You were not desired by the Board to inquire into anything of that kind during your journeys?—No, not directly; but I do consider it a portion of my duty to report to the Board if any such thing did occur to my knowledge.

Did you make such inquiries as would have brought any such instances to your knowledge if they had taken place?—I uniformly looked through the report-book, when there was a report-book, back to the period of the former inspection, for the purpose of ascertaining who were in the habit of visiting the school, as well as what observations they made at the periods of their visits. If I found none upon the face of the report-book, I asked whether any respectable persons had visited, and I have been frequently told that they did visit, and in all cases that they, the teachers and local patrons, were most anxious that respectable persons should visit. I asked them why it was that they did not solicit those visitors, whether male or female, to note in the report-book their opinion of the school, as well as the time of their visit.

Did you find in those schools visitors' books?—Generally speaking, I did find report-books, with a column for such observations.

Did you as a matter of course refer to those books?—Uniformly. Then, if any of those persons who have been alluded to were in

the habit of visiting, should you not have remarked it from seeing it in those books?—I found, in many cases, that the master himself stated the visits of persons, So-and-so. I was not satisfied with a visit being noted in the master's hand-writing. I would much prefer to have seen the visit noted by the visitors themselves; and I always recommended the masters of our schools to request visitors to note their observations upon the schools themselves.

Then, if you found that there were no signatures, or but few signatures, of persons in the visitors' book, should you not have thought it your duty to inquire from the master how that circumstance occurred?—Yes, I would ask the teacher; more especially if the school was in a district to which resident gentry were contiguous. With respect to many of our schools it is not so, the resident gentry residing far away.

We have given this evidence at full length, in order to show that those who are anxious to advance the moral improvement of Ireland may see that very simple means for promoting that great object is in the power of most persons, namely, frequent visits to the National Schools. Such visits stimulate good teachers to fresh exertions, because they feel that their efforts will be known and appreciated, while inferior masters will be urged by shame to strive for improvement, and the positively bad will be deterred from evil by the dread of detection. The moral effect of the superintendence of the neighbouring clergy and gentry over the schools can scarcely be exaggerated; but it appears from the reports of the inspectors that the duties of the visitors are too frequently neglected; and in some cases such inspection is withheld for the express purpose of permitting evils to attain such a magnitude as would admit of their being made ground of charge against the Board. Dr. Murray, the inspector for Leinster, says,—

The want of proper superintendence is also a great evil; the visitors at the schools are, I am sorry to say, few in number, and their visits of little use in increasing the general efficiency, however the interests of a pet class or pet child may be forwarded thereby. I respectfully submit that frequent inspection is the most certain method of increasing the general efficiency of the schools, as well as of ascertaining the cases in which the instruction of the teachers in a model-school may be required. To the training of the teachers and monitors in a model-school I look forward as the best means of eradicating old and bad habits, and remedying the above-mentioned defects; and I hope the inspectors will get directions to report the most urgent cases, and whether or no the teacher be too old or stupid, as is often the case, to become fit for his office even by training.

Lastly, the inability or carelessness of many of the local patrons is a serious loss to the interests of education; many schools are superintended only by one individual, who may exercise absolute control, and often introduces rules and regulations of little use. Where-

ever practicable, the establishment of active and efficient committees composed of persons of different religious persuasions will be of the most essential service.—*Lords*, p. 1487.

The duties of the inspectors are to examine the cases of all new applications, to visit schools actually in operation, and see that they are conducted according to the rules of the Board. They are also directed specially to inquire into complaints made against the teachers or managers of schools, to investigate the competency of masters, and report such as ought to be sent for training and instruction in the model-school, and also to diffuse the system established in the model-school as extensively as possible.

These duties are often exceedingly difficult, and require more than ordinary caution and delicacy in their discharge, especially when the subject-matter of a complaint is mixed up with topics arising from the violence or indiscretion of religious and political party. The Board therefore cautiously scrutinized the certificates and recommendations of the different candidates; and the very admirable evidence given by such of these gentlemen as were examined before the Committees of both Houses of Parliament is a sufficient proof that a very judicious selection was made. Indeed the opponents of the Board objected only to one of the inspectors, Dr. Finn, against whom it was urged that he was a relapsed Roman Catholic, and that previous to his connexion with the Board he had taken an active part in promoting the repeal of the Union. It appeared that the Commissioners were not aware of these circumstances, that Dr. Finn had been an assistant and lecturer at the Finnaiglean institution during four years, and that on his resignation he received the following testimonial:—

The managing committee of the Finnaiglean Institution certify that Mr. Thomas Finn has been in the service of the institution as a lecturer during four years; that he has by his zeal, talents, and information as a teacher, and by his strict attention to discipline and morals, given uniform and great satisfaction.

This appears to be signed by order of the Register,

EDWARD MATTHEWS.

—*Lords*, p. 1045.

His second testimonial was the following letter, addressed to him by Mr. Crampton, the Surgeon-General for Ireland:—

My dear Sir,—I beg your acceptance of the enclosed draught for twenty guineas, together with my warmest acknowledgments for the able and more than conscientious discharge of your duty towards my children while they had the good fortune to be under your tuition. Should the remuneration which I offer be inadequate to discharge the pecuniary part of my obligation, I shall esteem it as a favour if

you will allow me to correct my error ; and believe me to be your most obliged and faithful humble servant,

PHILIP CRAMPTON.

—*Lords*, p. 1045.

His third testimonial was the following letter, addressed to him by Lord Plunket :—

Dear Sir,—I have enclosed to Mr. Stanley your letter of the 19th, and have stated to him that I know you to be a person of integrity, talents, and education. I am, dear Sir, yours very faithfully,

PLUNKET.

These testimonials are sufficient to justify his appointment. How far his having taken a prominent part in the agitation of the Repeal question should, if known, have acted as a disqualification, will be differently estimated, according as persons are disposed to allow for human fallibility, and to pardon errors committed in the heats and animosities of political excitement.

CHAPTER XIV.

State and Progress of the National System.—Establishment of Schools.

THE number of National Schools actually in operation on the 31st March contained somewhat more than ninety-eight thousand boys and sixty-eight thousand girls ; the calls on the Board for assistance were then, and are now, increasing, and such remarkable success, in the language of the fourth report, places it beyond doubt, that the principles upon which the system is

founded are acceptable to the great body of the nation. The following table shows the number of schools, pupils, and teachers, in the counties and provinces of Ireland:—

Province.	County.	Number of Schools.	Average No. of Children.			Number of Teachers.		
			Males.	Females	Total.	Males.	Females	Total.
ULSTER	Antrim . . .	105	5,845	3,672	9,517	93	18	111
	Armagh . . .	34	2,030	1,367	3,397	23	16	39
	Cavan . . .	39	2,416	1,606	4,022	28	14	42
	Donegal . . .	35	2,122	1,192	3,314	37	2	39
	Down . . .	77	4,686	3,273	7,959	64	14	78
	Fermanagh . . .	30	1,883	1,054	2,937	30	..	30
	Londonderry . . .	43	2,434	1,525	3,959	41	5	45
	Monaghan . . .	45	3,345	2,266	5,611	41	6	47
	Tyrone . . .	76	4,383	2,581	6,964	69	7	76
		484	29,144	18,536	47,680	425	82	507
MUNSTER	Clare . . .	15	1,431	696	2,127	13	6	19
	Cork . . .	100	9,550	7,100	16,650	80	53	133
	Kerry . . .	27	2,849	2,713	5,562	20	13	33
	Limerick . . .	31	2,299	2,179	4,478	23	11	34
	Tipperary . . .	49	3,694	2,588	6,282	40	15	55
	Waterford . . .	33	3,498	1,397	4,895	32	9	41
		255	23,321	16,673	39,994	208	107	315
LEINSTER	Carlow . . .	44	3,214	3,028	6,242	31	19	50
	Dublin . . .	86	7,957	5,902	13,859	58	55	113
	Kildare . . .	32	1,906	2,032	3,938	21	14	35
	Kilkenny . . .	32	2,876	2,339	5,215	21	11	32
	King's County . . .	22	1,613	892	2,505	15	6	21
	Louth . . .	30	3,183	2,380	5,563	25	10	35
	Longford . . .	15	1,226	869	2,095	11	4	15
	Meath . . .	35	2,552	1,764	4,316	27	14	41
	Queen's County . . .	42	3,145	2,344	5,489	31	15	46
	Westmeath . . .	23	1,717	1,656	3,373	14	10	24
	Wexford . . .	28	2,174	1,637	3,811	23	10	33
Wicklow . . .	21	1,151	1,012	2,163	12	10	22	
		410	32,714	25,855	58,569	289	178	467
CONNAUGHT	Galway . . .	51	5,258	3,123	8,381	35	20	55
	Leitrim . . .	12	904	545	1,449	11	3	14
	Mayo . . .	50	4,113	2,029	6,142	47	5	52
	Roscommon . . .	11	941	757	1,698	8	4	12
	Sligo . . .	27	1,703	1,313	3,016	19	8	27
		151	12,919	7,767	20,686	120	40	160

THOMAS F. KELLY, Secretary.

Province.	Number of Schools.	Average number of Children on Roll.			Number of Teachers.		
		Males.	Females.	Total.	Males.	Females.	Total.
Ulster . .	484	29,144	18,536	47,680	425	82	507
Munster .	255	23,321	16,673	39,994	208	107	315
Leinster .	410	32,714	25,855	58,569	289	178	467
Connaught .	151	12,919	7,767	20,686	120	40	160
	1300	98,098	68,831	166,929	1042	407	1449

THOMAS F. KELLY, Secretary.

It is by no means asserted by the friends of the national system, that the administration of all these schools is quite so perfect as could be desired; on the contrary, for reasons assigned in the preceding pages, they admit that much, very much, remains to be done before the education of the Irish people will be brought to so healthy a state as to satisfy all true lovers of their country. But they assert that, wherever the system has been fairly tried, it has been found to work well, and that its failure in particular instances is mostly owing to the withholding of co-operation on the part of a large section of the Protestant clergy and gentry, and in some cases to their active opposition. This appears to be one of the most important points in the three volumes of evidence before us; for, if the evils of which complaints have been made owe their existence in whole or in part to the neglect or positive hostility of the complainants themselves, those gentlemen, not the Board, deserve to bear the blame, and must in fact appear to every impartial person as involuntary self-accusers. We have already shown that the schools superintended by the Reverend Messrs. Staples, Hastings, and Henry, and the school of Killaloe, have succeeded in effecting, in their respective districts, the main objects contemplated by the Government when the Board of Education was instituted. It is therefore reasonable to conclude, that, if the example of these gentlemen had been extensively imitated, a great amount of evil would have been prevented, and a great amount of good accomplished. The unexceptionable, we should rather say the admirable, evidence of Lady Osborne proves that the system of the Board is fully adequate to secure a sound scriptural education to the children, while it is free from all suspicion of proselytism. In no one school, regularly visited by Protestant clergymen or laymen, did it appear that the rules of the Board were neglected;

and, in the majority of those abandoned to Roman Catholic management, there was not a shadow of proof that the managers had taken advantage of the position thus relinquished by the Protestants, to forward the interests of the Roman Catholic church. The evidence of Mr. Maurice Cross tends to establish still more decisively the fact that the national system, when allowed full and fair scope for development, is perfectly adequate to fulfil the benevolent designs of the Government, as stated in Lord Stanley's letter to the Duke of Leinster.

Are you acquainted with the state of any national schools in the vicinity of Belfast?—I am.

What is the state of those national schools?—The national schools which I have visited are in a very prosperous state, both with regard to their management and to the quality of the instruction, and particularly with reference to the regulation respecting the reading of the Scriptures. With your Lordships' permission I will state some facts connected with schools I have visited; I have also information of a documentary kind concerning other schools.

Will you state those facts as briefly as you can?—I shall take first a school called the Lagan Village School, which is near Belfast, in the parish of Ballymacarret in the county of Down. I visited it a short time before I left Belfast. I found 119 children on the lists of the school, and the master ascertained for me the relative numbers of the various denominations; and it appears from his statement, the accuracy of which I have no reason to doubt, that there are forty-eight Episcopalians, forty-two Dissenters, and twenty-nine Roman Catholics, making a total of 119. Now there are some important facts with regard to this school which I should like to bring before your Lordships. It was very nearly ruined in consequence of the opposition made to it soon after its connexion with the Board of Education, and which arose principally from a document I have brought with me, which was circulated upon the occasion; and the effect of it was such upon the minds of the parents that the school, which had been previously in a comparatively prosperous state, was seriously injured; the children left it, and it was apprehended that the school would be utterly destroyed by the impression which this document made, together with other representations of a similar kind.—*Lords, 1172.*

The document to which Mr. Cross refers is Dr. Cooke's extraordinary circular which has been already quoted in a preceding page. Mr. Cross continued:—

This letter was taken to the neighbourhood to which I have referred, the statements which it contains were discussed, and amongst the humbler classes there, who are illiterate, generally speaking, it produced, I have reason to know, a very powerful impression against the school.

What is the date?—The date is December, 1834.

You say the publication of that document injured the school considerably?—I have no doubt that the publication of that document, and the discussion of its contents, combined with the opposition from other quarters, (for I have reason to know that the curate of the Established Church was also opposed to the national system,) produced an impression against the school. It declined in numbers; and in fact the committee thought they should not be able to revive it. But I will now state what has produced the present satisfactory state of the school, which the committee will perceive is most prosperous. Another master was appointed; the master they had was removed soon afterwards, and another was appointed; he brought the parents to the school, and afforded every facility to come and see the Scriptural part of the education of the children in operation,—to observe the manner in which they read the Scriptures at stated hours.

The children of both persuasions?—Of all persuasions. But the Douay version is not used there; it is the authorized version. The parents went to the school, and saw the practical working of the system, and many of the children who had been taken away returned again to the school, and in that way, by the exertions of the master, the numbers have been increased from less than thirty to 119.

Do the Catholic children read the authorized version?—I believe they do.—*Lords*, p. 1173.

Have you any information to give to the Committee with respect to other schools in the neighbourhood in which you live?—There is a school near Belfast, called the Ligoniel School, in the county of Antrim: it is in a very flourishing state; there are at present eighty-one Presbyterians, twenty-two Episcopalians, thirty-five Roman Catholics, and six of the Arian connexion; making 144.

Do the clergy of different denominations visit and superintend that school?—They visit. The plan adopted is this: the whole Bible is used as a school-book from two till three o'clock every day except Saturday, when it is read from ten till twelve. The Scripture extracts published by the Board are used during the ordinary school-hours. The committee is composed of ten laymen, principally Presbyterians, with the exception of two Episcopalians and one Methodist.

No Roman Catholics?—There is no Roman Catholic on the committee. The average attendance is very respectable. The patron of the school is Mr. Blair, an orthodox Presbyterian, a member of Dr. Hanna's Meeting-house: Dr. Hanna is the Professor of Divinity of the Synod of Ulster.

What is the schoolmaster?—The schoolmaster, I believe, is a Presbyterian.

Did you visit that school yourself?—Yes.

When?—I visited it before the present master was appointed, and it was then not so prosperous, on account of the conduct of the master; a new master has been appointed within three months.

Have you visited it since that?—I have not, but I had a letter

sent to me a day or two before I left Ireland, and I will read a few lines with which Mr. Blair concludes his letter.

Is he a clergyman?—No; he is a member of Dr. Hanna's congregation. Mr. Blair says, the average attendance is very respectable; I am quite sure that a still greater number would attend but for the prejudices excited in the minds of parents by the misrepresentations of certain political parsons, whose mistaken zeal has done a great deal of mischief to the children of the poor.

You have mentioned that Dr. Hanna is an orthodox Presbyterian; is his congregation orthodox?—Yes; his congregation is one of the oldest congregations in Belfast.

Have you anything to state respecting any other schools?—I made some inquiries with regard to seven schools in the neighbourhood of Larne.

Did you visit those schools yourself?—No; I received my information from the patron of the schools, who is one of the Presbyterian clergymen of Larne. He is the correspondent of the Board for seven schools in the neighbourhood of Larne, and he visits them. He says, in his communication to me, "with most of these schools I have been connected for about three years, and the experience I have thus had of the working of the national system enables me to say that it has been productive, within the sphere of my observation, of important benefits. With respect to the questions which you put in your letter"—(the meaning of that is, that I was anxious to obtain minute information, and I put certain questions to the patron of the schools connected with the management of them)—"I have to answer, that in this vicinity the progress of the national system has not been obstructed either by clerical or political influence; on the contrary, in both of these particulars it has had the height of fair play. Some of the clergy, especially of the Establishment, have co-operated in the management of schools; clergymen of all persuasions attend at the yearly and half-yearly examinations; and no clergymen of any denomination has made any formal opposition to a national school. As to the people, although the great majority of them are Presbyterian, they make no objection, when left to themselves, as they are at present, to sending their children to national schools. I think I am justified in saying that, of all the pupils attending the seven national schools with which I am connected, five-sixths are Presbyterian, and one-half the children of Orange principles; and this includes two schools in remote districts, where a great many of the people are Roman Catholic. Were I to include the schools in the town of Larne (for which however I am not correspondent, though a member of committee), the proportion of young Orangemen"—(I wished to know whether they were attended by any particular political party)—"the proportion of young Orangemen and Orangewomen would be much greater. In fact, no person here, so far as I have learned, thinks of objecting to a national school on the score of politics. The Bible without abridgment (in most cases the edition circulated by the Bible Society,—never the Douay

version) is used regularly at the hours appointed for separate religious instruction, viz., from two till three o'clock on ordinary days, and the whole of Saturday." The writer then refers to the often repeated assertion, that the benefits of the national system of education were confined almost exclusively to Roman Catholics; and he adds, "Certainly I could vouch for the fact of there being at least one district in Ireland where that system was patronized and liberally supported by Protestant magistrates, Protestant landlords, Protestant clergymen, Protestant gentlemen, and Protestant farmers; of course reckoning Presbyterians as Protestants."

How far is that from Belfast?—About twenty miles. In proof of this (as it appears to me) important position, I could furnish myself with abundance of striking facts, if necessary.

Are there any other schools respecting which you have information?—Yes; there is the White House School, about three miles from Belfast, a school which I visited myself; it was formerly in connexion with the Kildare Place Society.

In what parish is that?—In Carmony. The present state of that school is this: there are 120 on the books; of Presbyterians and Dissenters, seventy-three; Roman Catholics, forty-one; Episcopalians, six. This district is also almost exclusively Presbyterian; the Episcopalians are not very numerous amongst the lower classes in this district. The parents of the children who attend the school were at first prejudiced against the national system, but they are now perfectly satisfied, and those prejudices have been removed.

In point of fact do the Roman Catholics and the Protestants pull together there in support of the national system?—They do.

Have you any information respecting any other school?—I have some information here touching the schools about Dromore and Downpatrick.

In what county is that?—The Downpatrick school is in the County of Down.

Have you visited the Dromore School?—I have not visited the Dromore School, but I have some information respecting it from the Presbyterian clergyman.

Is he the patron?—He is connected with the schools; he was connected with the establishment of several. The reason they are included in the letter is, that the clergyman of Downpatrick now was formerly clergyman of Dromore, and he has combined information respecting both. He says, "While in Dromore I took an active part in building national schools, and putting some already established under care of the Board. I commenced operations immediately after the Commissioners had commenced their plan, and have since continued to introduce and support the system in all schools where I could exert any influence, in the neighbourhood of Dromore, Kilmore, Downpatrick, &c. My opinion as to the usefulness and value of the system not only continues unchanged, but is strengthened by experience of its working, as well as by the hollowness of the objections of its opponents. In Dromore, though the bishop and his curates, with others under his influence, used every means to thwart us, I had the satisfaction of seeing our

schools after some time attended by the children of many parents who had at first been loudest in their outcries against us, influenced as they had been, partly by an appeal to their religious prejudices, but still more by political party spirit. In Downpatrick, besides myself and the Roman Catholic clergyman, we have had the co-operation of the dean and one of the curates; the other having also said that he would give no opposition. Even the one I have mentioned is latterly afraid of taking so prominent a part as he would wish, in consequence of violent and insulting abuse, in public and private, verbally and in writing, from some of his own hearers. Experience everywhere confirms me in the opinion that the opposition to it in all free and honest minds is on the decline, and that many of the clergy of all denominations, and almost all the laity, would cease their opposition, and would have been cordial friends to the system, but for the intimidation and misrepresentations and calumnies so groundlessly set afloat against it. In most of the schools I have been connected with, the whole Bible is read at the hour set apart for religious instruction; read more fully, with more reverence and more profit, I am sure, than it generally was when used as a mere school-book at ordinary hours. I should mention, that even in those schools where the whole Bible is read Roman Catholic children are very generally permitted by their priests and parents to read it freely in our version and with our children, now that they are satisfied that there is no system of proselytising at work, and feeling, as they do, that they have the privilege of withholding their children, if they please to exercise it. I think the plan of the Bishop of Derry"—(the plan alluded to is to leave it to the local patrons, which I was anxious to obtain his opinion upon)—"I think the plan of the Bishop of Derry would be most unfortunate, would destroy the confidence and acquiescence now reposed in the system by many of all denominations, and would retard the progress of a system which only requires more firmness and vigour and pecuniary support to ensure its universal success."

This gentleman says that the Bible is read in one version, which you understand to mean the authorised version?—Yes.

Did you find that the Roman Catholic children in that district are in the habit of reading with the Protestant children the authorised version?—Evidently, by that statement; and the reason for it is assigned by Mr. Nelson, which is, that he conceives that the Catholics are satisfied that there will be no attempt to proselytise the children.

Are you aware whether, in all the schools in which there is a good attendance of children of all persuasions, the Bible is read from two to three o'clock?—In all or nearly all the schools with which I am acquainted the Bible is read at that hour. In this letter Mr. Maclellan gives an outline of the manner in which the school is conducted. "The school is superintended by a committee consisting of ten members, including the Rev. Rob. E. B. Maclellan, Presbyterian minister, and the Rev. — M'Conville, parish priest. Of the ten members of the committee six are Protestants and four Roman Catholics; of the six Protestants five are Unitarians and one a

Methodist. The 'whole Bible,' in the authorised version, is read for an hour after the termination of the ordinary school business on two days in each week: children of all denominations are present. The Douay version is not at all used in the schools. The Scripture extracts published by the Board are read during the usual hours of general instruction. None of the clergy assemble in the school-rooms with the children of their own communion at the periods assigned for separate religious instruction. The people, generally speaking, are now willing to send their children to the national schools. A great change in public feeling has taken place in this particular: as an instance, I may mention that one individual, a Serjeant Murdoch, who left my congregation because my predecessor was anxious for the establishment of the Dromore National Schools, has now sent his only child to the male school; and other similar cases have occurred. The principal causes of retarding the progress of the system in our neighbourhood have been the appeals of the clergy to the political prejudices of the populace. One of the curates of the establishment circulated the report that Mr. Nelson and the priest were to meet on a particular day, to burn the Bible. I know six or seven instances where the curates have warned the members of their flock in private not to send their children to the national schools, and where the parents have sent them, spite of repeated remonstrances. Some Presbyterian clergymen in our neighbourhood speak favourably of the system in private, but against it in public, from a fear of the Orange portion of their hearers."

Does that gentleman say how he knows all those things?—No. I give his statement, with his permission to lay it before your Lordships.

That gentleman in his letter states that the opposition arose very much from political feelings; is that gentleman a politician himself?—I am not aware that he has taken any part in politics since his connexion with that establishment or before it.

Should you know it if he was?—If he were very conspicuous I should know it.

Does he at all refer to a falling-off of the numbers in the school?—No, he does not. I have read all that is in his letter.

He states that the system is becoming more popular; does he state, or do you know, whether there has been any increase of schools in the neighbourhood?—I am not aware of the schools in that neighbourhood, except the information I have read as to Dromore itself; but I have some recollection of a very warm controversy about the national system in that neighbourhood at one time; perhaps he may allude to that. When the national system was at first put forward, the controversy upon the subject was much warmer than it is at present, and there is much less said about it when the people find out really what it is.

He does not state any instance of a Roman Catholic priest attending in the schools?—No. I believe that he states that religious instruction is not given in the schools on the separate day.

In the district of which you have been speaking to-day does the

Roman Catholic population bear a large or a small proportion to the Protestant?—It is decidedly a Protestant district.

Are you aware that there are very few, if any, districts in the kingdom in which the system appears to work so well as it does in that with which you are yourself acquainted?—I should say from my own knowledge that it works exceedingly well in the north of Ireland, and if I am to believe the statements I see in the periodical journals, it appears that the working is not so satisfactory in other parts with regard to the mixture of denominations; but that may arise from other causes.

Have you found or do you know that the objections on the part of the clergy of the establishment against the national system are very much diminishing?—My impression is that they are diminishing.

Is that your impression with respect to the whole of Ireland, or only with respect to your own district?—My impression is with respect to the part of the country with which I am best acquainted. I am in intercourse with persons in the south of that persuasion who were very much opposed before, and who, on seeing the plan in operation upon the principles I have explained, have become favourable to it.

What class of persons were those?—Persons in the most respectable class of life. Not long since we had a lady from Cork who was not aware how the system worked in the north of Ireland, and had conceived a most violent prejudice against it in the north, and she was undeceived on seeing the plan in operation. There was a Scotch clergyman in the same way, who came over the other day, a most violent enemy of the Board, a member of the Church of Scotland, and his prejudices were removed when he saw the plan in operation.—*Lords*, p. 1172-88.

To this valuable evidence we must add the testimony of Mr. Sullivan, one of the inspectors employed by the Board.

I have found in every case in which the landlord has encouraged the school it has been attended by the different denominations freely. I could particularise certain places in which the landlords have established national schools which are attended by all the different denominations of children in the neighbourhood. I have now in my mind an excellent school under the patronage of Sir Thomas Chapman, and I can mention others. Wherever the Protestant minister or landlord, or any person that could countenance and encourage the schools, have done so, those schools have been invariably so attended.—*Lords*, p. 642.

The Rev. Mr. Staples gives the following account of the beneficial effect of the national schools under his management:—

Has the harmony of the schools been in any instance whatever, during the four or five years that you have been concerned in them, interrupted?—Not at all.

No circumstance has occurred calculated to defeat the object of joint education?—No.

No dispute between the children?—None that I ever heard of.

No difference between yourself and the priests?—Not the least.

Have those schools under those circumstances produced a beneficial effect upon the morals and habits of the lower orders of the parish?—I think they have, as far as I can judge for the short time they have been in existence.

Do the parents appear to you to derive satisfaction from the circumstance of the children being educated in the schools?—They do.

Do they express upon every occasion a willingness to send them?—They send them very willingly.—*Lords*, p. 933.

The evidence which we have quoted needs no comment, it decisively establishes that the national system, when brought fully and fairly into operation, is adequate to all the purposes for which it was established, and that the principal defects discovered in its working are to be attributed not to the Commissioners but to their opponents. It is assuredly strange to find Protestant clergymen, who not only withhold co-operation themselves, but use their utmost exertion to deter others from joining with the Board, loudly complaining that the management of the schools has fallen almost exclusively into the hands of Roman Catholics; such a course necessarily exposes them to the suspicion of having fostered evil themselves for the purpose of charging it upon others; a suspicion in many cases unfounded, but which would not be destitute of plausibility. The Protestant clergymen who have taken a share in the management of the national schools have been subjected to obloquy as gross as it was unmerited; we have been compelled to quote some of the imputations cast upon them in the evidence on the objections which have been brought against the National Board; we shall therefore take an extract from the defence of himself and his brethren who joined in supporting the national system, which the very reverend Dean Burgh made in his letter to the Archbishop of Tuam.

The testimony of my conscience ought to be sufficient to make me bear the very undeserved charges of inconsistency, as a clergyman of the Established Church, yet it is pleasing to me to reflect on the members of my brethren of unimpeached character as churchmen who have been as fully identified with the Kildare Place Society by their applications as I am with the national system by mine; in such a case I may shelter myself beneath the canopy of their authority; I therefore copy as follows from the First Report of the Commissioners, "The recognition of the important principle applied to Irish education, and in the fourteenth and last signed by the Lord Primate, the Archbishop of Cashel, the Bishop of Killaloe, and the Provost," forming a distinguished model of ecclesiastical consistency. The

Commissioners state, "They had applied their efforts to the framing of a system which, while it should afford the opportunities of education to every description of the lower classes of the people, might at the same time, by keeping clear of all interference with the religious opinions of any, induce the whole to receive its benefits as one undivided body, under one and the same system, and in the same establishments." The Commissioners then state their confident expectations that such a plan would be cordially accepted of those to whom it should be presented. They add, "we conceive this to be of essential importance in any *new* establishment for the education of the lower orders in Ireland; and we venture to express our *unanimous opinion* that no plan, however wisely and unexceptionably contrived in other respects, can be carried into effectual execution in this country, unless it be explicitly avowed and clearly understood as its leading principle, *that no attempt shall be made to influence or disturb the peculiar religious tenets of any sect or description of Christians.*"

The Board, in permitting and encouraging the clergy to give religious instruction to the children of their respective persuasions, cannot be fairly considered as giving their sanction to the *errors* of all or any of the different churches or their pastors. It was impossible (composed as that Board necessarily was, of persons of different religious belief, though agreed on this subject) that they should sign a covenant of such mutual sanction and responsibility as could operate in their Board-room, much less extend itself to the religious opinions to be inculcated throughout Ireland by all persuasions. It was not necessary to disavow such a design: to repeat it is sufficient refutation. I am not restrained by the Board from instructing my flock in their principles, as always, while I afford to them, in common with the children of other persuasions in school, advantages alike important to all; nor am I accountable for the course the Roman Catholic clergyman may take towards his flock, nor he for mine, be it right or wrong—"to our own Master we shall each stand or fall." The Board could under the circumstances adopt no better plan. If religion had not been considered, the plan would be unsuited to a Christian country;—if the public money had been given to any church exclusively, it would be Sectarian;—if the opinions of any party were acted on, it could not be a system of national education. Then, no Bible, no Testament, proved acceptable to all, and therefore were the recognised ministers of every persuasion "permitted and encouraged" to exercise their pastoral office (not in school-hours, but at other times) to their own flocks; the Board not holding themselves responsible for the errors of any, following the rules of their churches and the dictates of their consciences. Instead of objecting to such a system, so recommended and recommending itself, I should, my Lord, rejoice, that we had found a spot on which we might erect a temple of Christian concord in at least one good work; and my earnest hope is, that there will be a feeling to avoid every thing that would tend to wound the kindly union and intercourse of all so assembling to reap the fruits of good education.

To your Grace I do owe canonical obedience, and I am happy to pay it in all things "lawful and honest." I do not think you are authorised by the canons to command me to withdraw myself from any system which I regard as of good and useful tendency, and with which I may connect myself; neither the ecclesiastical nor civil law will, I conceive, justify this. But excuse me, if I take the liberty of suggesting to your Grace that I cannot understand, either from the context or parallel passages, that the Apostle describes any other than the *civil power*, in the reign of Nero, by the words "the powers that be;" nor can I understand by what rule of Scriptural construction the Board of Irish Education can be intended by "the unclean thing." It appears to denominate heathen alliance by marriage, and eating things offered to idols, or with heathen idolaters at their festivals. I am aware that the passage has been figuratively applied, and have heard the epithet affixed to our own venerable church; but I know your Lordship could not have expected me to take so serious a step as you command (as to the National Education Society) on less grounds than the Scriptural sense of a text.

The attempt to establish a school for the admission of the Roman Catholic children on the principle of the whole Bible in school cannot be attempted by me. It would have not merely the issue of failure, but it would break up our school, which yesterday contained above one hundred scholars, though not a free school. At the same time I request your Grace may believe, that my not having consulted you about this or any other matter is to be imputed to any other cause rather than want of respect and attention.

I shall now conclude a long letter, which I hope you will pardon, by acquitting my conscience of a declaration which I feel bound by it to make to you on this important business of education. Believing myself to be accountable as a clergyman for the opportunities given me of usefulness to *all* my parishioners, I feel obliged to aid in every good work those who will admit of my aid, though we may differ in theology; and, when I can do so without sacrifice of principle, admissible in no case, to improve their condition of mind and body, "and thus do good unto all men."

How can I be expected, with this conviction, to take a part and petition against the means afforded for my assistance in what I consider a good work? Oh, my Lord! how far removed from the power of repentance, the faith which worketh by love even to *enemies*, and the obedience of the servant of God, may he be, whose creed is orthodox, and his renunciation of the Roman Catholic errors most decided! Liberality is a scriptural term applied to character and conduct: its sense is overlooked, because like other good things it has been perverted. Nevertheless it was Christian liberality that made the Apostle "become all things to all men." It led him great lengths. There is too little of that love which can bear with, forgive, receive, and help "the weak in faith." If the poor will not receive the Bible, they may learn, from a part of it, "whatsoever is pure, just, lovely, and of good report." They may

imbibe much from the Christian spirit, manners, and example. But alas for the spirit of party and the politico-religious zeal in Ireland! It is created palpably of difficulties in the way and progress of education, and making it more and more impossible for the clergy to take their part in teaching the multitude of the poor. It is rendering our Scriptural and venerable church more and more unpopular, and therefore ineffective.

I am, my dear Lord,
Yours obliged and very faithfully,

THOMAS JOHN BURGH.

His Grace the Lord Archbishop of Tuam.

It will be satisfactory to show, on the testimony of a Roman Catholic priest, that the national system of education tends to promote harmony and good feeling between the different religious denominations in Ireland, especially as he confirms what so many witnesses have stated—viz., that the co-operation of the Protestant clergy always leads to a beneficial working of the system, and that their opposition is the principal impediment to its success. The Rev. D. Curoe declared that he had four schools in connexion with the Board, of which he gave the following account:—

How long have you held them in that connexion?—One has been connected so early as the 29th of March, 1832; the second was opened some time in the harvest quarter of 1832; I could not precisely say the month.

Are those schools attended by Roman Catholics as well as Protestants?—Yes.

Will you state the date when the others were opened?—To make my evidence more satisfactory, I wish to mention that the county of Antrim, though a most Protestant county, yet it presents the peculiarity of some parishes being almost exclusively Catholic; and in some parishes there are town-lands almost exclusively Catholic, and other town-lands almost exclusively Protestant, in the same parish, taking Protestant in the more general designation of the term. I have succeeded in getting built three of these schools; and in two rural districts there were no schools previously to their erection; the third erection took place in the village of Randalstown, in the county of Antrim. But, previously to the erection of the school in Randalstown, in connexion with the National Board, there was no provision made for the education of the poorer children—that is, I was not aware that any were admitted without payment. Since that erection, all children are admitted without payment whose parents are unable to pay. I have also to inform your Lordships that in Randalstown, which has a more mixed religious community than the other districts with which my schools are connected, there is a growing feeling in favour of the new system of education from the increased number of Protestants and Presbyterians in attendance relatively.

Previous to the schools being established, was there much educa-

tion in the county that was common to Protestants and Roman Catholics?—In that particular part last referred to, there was no provision for education in the way of a school-house; there was a school kept in the house of the master, which was much too limited for any number; there scarcely was room for his own family. In another direction of the county, which is an almost exclusively Catholic district, there was no house and no provision for education sufficiently contiguous to the children; for I beg to inform your Lordships, that in the county of Antrim, being very much a manufacturing county, the children go to school extremely early, in order that afterwards they may apply themselves to different pursuits of manufactures and dealing, so that if the distances were made considerable in the county of Antrim children would not go such distances.

But in the school to which you alluded as having existed before did Protestants and Roman Catholics join in common education previously to its being connected with the Board?—Yes. I interrogated the master of that school, and learn that the school has been improving since its connexion with the Board. I asked him,—and independently of my putting the question to him I saw from my own observation how the fact was,—but I asked him was there any objection on the part of Protestants contiguous to send their children, and he answered me no. But, as I mentioned before, from the peculiar localities of the county of Antrim, those three districts of the parish are almost exclusively Catholic; whereas in other parts of the parish the districts are almost exclusively Protestant. It presents that peculiarity not only in different parishes of the county of Antrim, but in different town-lands in the same parish.

Are there any Protestant clergy residing in this part?—There are.

Do any of those attend to the schools?—I will give a history of my connexion, as far as schools are concerned, with the Protestant clergyman in Randalstown. On my first attempting to connect the school with the new Board in March, 1832, I applied to him for his co-operation; he replied, that he felt a delicacy and reluctance to co-operate with me in an application to the Board. He expressed no dissatisfaction with the new system, but he informed me that he apprehended incurring the displeasure of his ecclesiastical superior. Since that time he has met me, and talked about my school, and spoken well of the master; and on Saturdays he causes the children of his communion in Randalstown to assemble in the school as matter of convenience, and to go from that school to the church, there to be catechised by him; so that I look upon this as giving a kind of co-operation.

Do you know whether he visits the school?—I could not say that he has visited the school.

Are you speaking of the curate?—No; it is the vicar.

What proportion of Protestants are there in your school?—I think at present there is more than one-third in Randalstown; in the

other parts there could not be that proportion, because there is not the population.

Are the Scripture Extracts used in the school?—They are.

Do you examine the children in the school?—Not much; I do occasionally. Going in, I see how the master is getting on.

On the Saturday the Protestant children go to church to be catechised?—Yes; they assemble in the school-house at the request of the minister, and go after that to the church, which is very contiguous.

The Roman Catholic children, do you catechise them on Saturday?—I direct the master to do it in the school.

Do you know, to your own knowledge, that the master does not give religious instruction during school-hours in that school?—I will affirm, as a general principle, that I do think that no master under my superintendence gives any religious instruction. If any attempted it I should reprimand them, or caution them for doing it, and any tampering or trifling with children I should deprecate.

That you say with regard to all the schools under your patronage?—All the different denominations.

Do they use the books of the Board?—Yes.

Do you think the children advance rapidly in general instruction?—I think they have competent means for advancing; but I find a difficulty in impressing upon the parents of the children the necessity and obligation of sending them regularly; from their impoverished situation, and different trifling causes, they keep them at home.

Does the schoolmaster examine them in the Scripture Extracts, and does he explain any portion of the extracts to them during the examination?—Not to my knowledge, beyond merely asking them the question as it is there put down. I am not aware that he asks them anything doctrinal. If he does, it is without my knowledge and without my approbation.

If he did so, would it be contrary to any instructions you have ever given him upon the subject?—I think it would. I have always shown a great delicacy to the children of other denominations. I never found an inclination on the part of the masters to do it; they know it is my wish that they should not.

And, as far as you have been able to judge, you believe they comply with your wish?—I have no reason to think the contrary, and it is my impression that they do.

Are your schools closed on the Roman Catholic holidays?—No, they are not.

Instruction goes on upon those days?—Instruction goes on in the usual way.

Are you upon friendly terms with the Protestant clergyman of the parish?—I am happy to inform your Lordships that I am conterminous to a great number of clergymen of all denominations, and I am upon the most happy terms of cordial social intercourse; and I am happy that an opportunity occurs to bear testimony to their being equally ready to extend to me the hand of good fellowship and friendship.

Will you mention any facts that occurred to you as connected with other schools to which you have not hitherto alluded?—I have also seen three schools in one of the most Protestant portions of the county of Antrim, where there are what we call the respectable country yeomanry of Protestant Presbyterians. I have been told by the master that the Protestant clergyman comes and examines, and makes his entries in the school-book. I know that in one school there are thirty-eight Protestants under the more general designation of Protestants, and there is only one Roman Catholic. I also have the attestation of a respectable neighbouring Roman Catholic clergyman, that in three schools [which he has succeeded in connecting with the Board the Presbyterians have no objection in his neighbourhood to send their children to them; and I may affirm of this clergyman that he lives, I believe, in harmony with the Protestant clergymen of the neighbourhood.

Have you found the parents of the children that frequent those schools generally satisfied with the system of education carried on there?—Yes, I think that. I find that in general in Randalstown the Protestants and Presbyterians give the national schools the preference to other schools, and I have never heard any complaint on the part of any against them; and I also know that in one district a respectable country farmer sent his grandchild, and another of a lower class, to a great distance to a national school, in preference to a Kildare Place School more immediately contiguous. These are facts, from which I infer that there is rather a satisfied feeling on the part of the people respecting the working of the new system of education.

Have you ever heard of any complaint, on the part of the parents of children, of the minds of their children being estranged, in consequence of attending the schools, from the religion of their family?—There never was any foundation for it, and there never shall be, as long as I am the patron of those schools.

Have you looked at the several books issued by the Board?—I have not bestowed upon that part of the subject the degree of scrutiny that the subject demanded; but, as far as I have read the books, they appear to me of great utility, and likely to diffuse a great deal of useful knowledge amongst the poorer classes of society.

Upon the whole do you consider that the system of education now established has tended to bring the different sects more into harmony with each other than they were before?—I think it has not in the most distant manner tended to sever the bonds of society, or to disturb any good feeling previously existing. It so happens fortunately that I live in a very peaceful part of the county, and in which society is rather in a peaceful state, and there was not, I might almost say, occasion for the introduction of any system in order to improve the social tone.

Do you consider, then, the schools of which you have been speaking in your own parish so circumstanced in that peaceful part of the county to be a pretty good specimen of the general character of the

national schools in Ireland?—I consider them as a fair specimen of the working of the national system in a mixed religious community.

Do you think that those schools of yours may be considered as giving a good average notion of the conditions of the national schools in Ireland?—I do.

You mean in your part of Ireland?—*A fortiori* to give satisfaction in other parts, because if it gives satisfaction in the most mixed religious community, it is likely to give still greater satisfaction in other quarters.

Then you think the committee might fairly form an opinion of the national schools in general in Ireland, as being equally unobjectionable or equally objectionable as those which you have described?—I just give the Committee the facts; but it will be difficult for me to say how far in other parts of the country religious feelings or dissensions amongst the ministers might tend to render the system inoperative.

Observation on the facts detailed by Episcopalian, Presbyterian, and Roman Catholic witnesses in this chapter is superfluous, and would only weaken the effect which they must have on every candid and intelligent mind.

CHAPTER XV.

General Results from the Evidence.

It has not been possible, even within the narrow limits of this digest, wholly to exclude the irrelevant matters connected with the religious and political feuds of Ireland, which were forced upon the attention of both Houses of Parliament. The most prominent of these was the very general expression of reluctance on the part of the Protestant clergy to combine with the Roman Catholic priests in public works of common utility. Mr. Boyton declared that he believed this to be the greatest difficulty which the National System would have to overcome, although he fairly admitted that it involved no tangible principle. There seems to have been, on the part of the opponents of the Board, a latent suspicion that it was necessary in some way to account for this reluctance to meet Roman Catholic clergymen as gentlemen on neutral grounds, and accordingly evidence was given that several of that body were violent agitators at elections, and intemperate orators at anti-tithe meetings, and that Dr. M'Hale, titular Archbishop of Tuam, had used very unchristian and ungentlemanlike language in the island of Achill, which seems to be the battle-field for the extreme opinions of the Established, and of the Latin church. But this evidence left untouched the whole question of the prudence and propriety of treating such an influential body as the Roman Catholic clergy with studied neglect, if not with something like scorn and insult, by virtually asserting that they were not to be admitted to act on terms of equality with other gentlemen in matters affecting the general welfare of the community; and it was more than counterbalanced by the evidence of several Protestant clergymen, who declared that they lived in terms of amity with the Roman Catholic priests in their neighbourhood, and testified that they found them willing to live on terms of amity with Protestants, anxious to conciliate their good-will, and to unite with them in works of charity and benevolence. Hence it would seem that the rule of the Board, which by some of its opponents seemed to be regarded as most objectionable, is really one of the highest importance, not only to the success of any national system of education, but also to the general peace and tranquillity of Ireland.

The Dean of Ardagh and some others intimated the possibility of establishing a system of National Education, and working it in open defiance of the Roman Catholic priesthood, but this possibility was contradicted by the Hon. and Rev.

B. Noel, and many others, while no one denied that such an attempt would create new feuds in every parish, widen old dissensions, and generate a fresh amount of rancour, which, under the present circumstances of Ireland, might be attended with the most disastrous results. Indeed it was sufficiently obvious that the great object of anxiety was the management rather than the system of the schools. It was proved before the Commissioners of Education in 1824 that the objection to the Kildare Place Society was far less against their rule for a modified reading of the Scripture, than against the persons into whose hands the government of the Society and the patronage of its schools had fallen. Most of these gentlemen were remarkable for their zeal in proselyting; they were connected with reformation societies, tract societies, and other institutions established on principles of open and avowed hostility to the Roman Catholic church, and whose warfare was not always characterised by prudence, gentleness, and moderation. When a gentleman at one meeting declared that the mere reading of the Scriptures would convert the Roman Catholics to protestantism, and that another demanded that the Scriptures should be read in all the schools of the Association, his disavowal of proselytism was either scouted as an absurdity, or resented as a mockery and an insult. It is obvious that such evils must arise in every irresponsible and self-constituted body; whichever party obtains the majority in the committee or governing body must inevitably aim at securing its peculiar interests, and extending its own influence. If parties had been nearly balanced, the meetings of the Kildare Place Society would have been all but fields of battle; but when one party had an overwhelming preponderance, the other of course seceded, and the institution became essentially the property of a party; consequently, however liberal in its rules, it was decidedly exclusive in its administration.

The friends of the Kildare Place Society have confessed that their schools were fiercely opposed, and many of them acknowledged that in numerous instances their schools would have been destitute of pupils had they not balanced the influence of the priests by the influence of the landlords. It was not very consistent in these gentlemen afterwards to complain of this rivalry and almost warfare between priests and landlords as one of the worst evils of Ireland, seeing that on their own showing the system which they advocated produced such an opposition where it had not previously existed, and where unfortunately it had been formed added to it fresh strength and bitterness. There is no doubt that hostility between the priest and the landlord is a fearful evil, and therefore a system which

perpetuated such strife was a national calamity. Hence it necessarily follows that a national system of education, which would exclude the Roman Catholic priesthood from all share in its management, would be in many instances inoperative, in others mischievous, and useful only in the districts where education is least wanted.

No one can read the preceding pages without perceiving that the opponents of the Board did not sufficiently distinguish between what is abstractedly the best, and what is the greatest amount of good possible to be obtained under existing circumstances. Indeed some of the objections displayed an ignorance or forgetfulness of the circumstances of Ireland which in other instances would be positively ludicrous. It was gravely urged that the Roman Catholics derived greater benefit from the schools of the Board than the Protestants. How is it possible that this could be otherwise, unless the name of National, as applied to the system, was a mere delusion? In the first place, the Roman Catholics are more numerous than the Protestants in the proportion of about six to one; secondly, the Protestants are more wealthy than the Roman Catholics, and therefore better able to pay for their education; thirdly, several institutions have been founded by public and private benevolence for the exclusive, or nearly exclusive, education of Protestants; and, fourthly, the Protestants are for the most part aggregated in large towns, where they can take advantage of these educational institutions. If these considerations be fairly estimated, it will be seen that what has been urged as an objection is direct evidence in favour both of the fairness and the efficiency of the system.

The letter of the Archbishop of Tuam to Dean Burgh embodies some of the objections made by a powerful party in Ireland against the National System; his Grace complains that it has no tendency to proselytism. Now, granting that it would be desirable in the abstract to have a system which would protestantise Ireland, another question arises, namely, is such a system possible? The negative seems to be almost universally conceded; nay, more, the evidence before us goes strongly to prove that systems of education with a tendency to proselytism generally defeat their own object. It is unquestioned that the proportionate disparity between the Protestant and Roman Catholic population has been increased within the present century; yet during that period the Charter Schools, the Erasmus Smith Schools, and the schools under the Association for Discouraging Vice, were in active operation, and during a part of the time their exertions were aided by parliamentary grants of public money. In the latter part of the same period the Kildare Place Society, the Hibernian Society, the Irish So-

ciety, and many others, have established numerous schools, and yet the Roman Catholics have increased in a much more rapid proportion than the Protestants.

If a system of conversion then be clearly impossible, it is as clearly possible to effect a different good of vast though not of equal amount. It is possible to have a population of good Roman Catholics instead of bad Roman Catholics. On this point abundance of evidence was given to the Committees of both Houses of Parliament. It was shown that in the national schools when properly conducted, a truly scriptural, moral, and religious education was given to the children. Lady Osborne's account of the schools on her estates in Tipperary, confirmed as it was by the evidence of the Rev. Mr. Bell and the Rev. Mr. Dwyer, both firm opponents of the national system, sufficiently proves that by the co-operation of the Protestant clergy and gentry, the national system though it will not make proselytes, will make what is nearly as valuable, that is to say, good citizens and good subjects.

Abundant evidence was given to prove that the Irish are anxious for the education of their children. The Rev. Mr. Dwyer stated that "the desire for instruction is irrepressible;" the same gentleman declared that the instruction given in what are called the Hedge Schools, was either migratory or mischievous. The question then is not between education and no education, but between a good and useful training, and a bad and pernicious training. To say that ample provision is made for education by the mere existence of schools, independent of all considerations of their quality, is to speak sheer nonsense. Reading and writing are no more education than a hammer and saw are cabinet making; they are mere instruments capable of being applied to good or evil purposes, according to the amount of presiding intelligence and moral principle in the possessor, and the design of education is to teach the proper use of these and similar instruments. But the withholding of these instruments will not render the depraved powerless: he who cannot read, will learn a seditious speech or a treasonable song as well as he who can read; and ignorance of writing will not hinder the firing of a stack or the drawing of a trigger.

Mr. Dwyer's evidence shows that if the Government abandons the superintendence of public instruction in Ireland, there will be no want of Boards to supply its place. Captain Rock is ready to resume his superintendence of the Hedge Schools—Terry Alt has not forgotten his old system of education,—both are ready to supply candidates for local colleges in the county gaols, and proficients entitled to receive their degrees from the common executioner, who in such a state of things will have at

his disposal higher dignities than any Vice Chancellor, since his hand will confer the honours of martyrdom. "The system of national education" in the emphatic words of Lady Osborne, "lives in the hearts of the people;" if it be abolished is it credible that they will go back to the Kildare Place Society, which, whether deservedly or not, they have learned to view with suspicion if not with hatred? Will they not rather go to some other source whose danger to the stability of the institutions of the country both in church and state it would be utterly impossible to calculate? Legislative enactments cannot alter human nature; if we do not plant good seed in the fallow ground, there will assuredly be a very plentiful crop of weeds,—the enemy sowed tares while the husbandman slept, but he will sow more pernicious seeds when the farm is abandoned altogether—and to hope to check their growth by penal laws is about as wise as to legislate for changing the flow of the tides or directing the course of the whirlwinds.

It appears from the evidence that the efforts of the educational societies and institutions in Ireland were desultory and isolated, and that from the limited means placed at the disposal of the Commissioners, their exertions still bear too much of the same character, and as the witnesses truly stated, are so far imperfect and inefficient. An agriculturist anxious to improve his estate, does not cultivate one field to the utmost, and leave all around overgrown with thistles and darnels; should he do so, he would find that the favourite spot was sadly managed by the neglected vicinage, while that derived no benefit from its approximation to culture; but this parallel is not sufficiently strong, for an uninstructed population brought into immediate contact with an uninstructed population, must deteriorate physically and therefore morally. The man who possesses knowledge, however small, will be sure of a better price in the market than the wholly ignorant, and the latter, beaten in every attempt at competition, without knowing the cause, will have recourse to the only means of redress which the errors of the social system have left in his power,—violence and intimidation.

It is almost painful to find how few of the gentlemen who gave evidence against the national system had fully and fairly examined its operations. We can scarcely find a witness who has visited one of the schools, that has not been employed as a missionary for the detection of faults; and so far were these gentlemen impressed with the special purpose of their mission, that they would not allow the merits of a national school to be brought before them, as Lady Osborne has shown was the case when the Rev. Mr. Dwyer visited the school of which she is patroness, at Newtown, near Clonmel. There is no doubt that

those who look exclusively for faults and errors in any system devised by human wisdom will find enough to make out a one-sided case; and assuredly any national system of education in Ireland would be peculiarly open to hostile criticism, when at its commencement those intrusted with its administration had to provide new schools, to create a class of school-masters, and to teach a whole country the nature and importance of education, with means inadequate to effecting any one of these objects in any thing like tolerable completeness. From motives which it is neither our business nor our wish to scrutinise, several gentlemen declared that they had predetermined that the system must be a failure, and therefore they would not visit the National Schools, lest giving them even such countenance might destroy their claims to prophetic discernment.

On no incidental subject did the opponents of the Board dwell so strongly as on the influence which the Roman Catholic priests possess and exercise over their flocks. On no subject were the Committees of both houses of parliament offered so many vague generalities in the shape of evidence. The connexion between this influence and national education it is not easy to discover; except, perhaps, that the progress of education may be presumed to be a probable means of destroying all influence that is irrational. But we have looked in vain for any evidence as to the nature and extent of the evil produced by the existence of this influence, and Dr. Kelly is the only person who has attempted to trace its origin. He said, that the Roman Catholic priests interest themselves more in the temporal concerns of their flocks than the Protestant clergy; and this certainly seems to be nearly an adequate cause, for the Dean of Ardagh declared that the first impulse of one of his converts towards Protestantism arose from his having lent the man half-a-crown, after he had been refused a similar favour by the parish priest. Were the question at all connected with national education, it would be easy to show that the Roman Catholic priests by their parentage, education, habits of life, and ordinances of their church, especially the ordinances of celibacy and confession, must possess greater influence over their congregations individually, than any Protestant clergyman can hope to acquire under any circumstances however favourable; but such an inquiry has no connexion whatever with the question of national education, and it is not easy to discover for what purpose this influence was dragged into an investigation with which it had no necessary connexion.

The lamentable fact that national education, which ought to be regarded as an interest of the entire community, has been designedly made the pretext for stimulating the passions of

party, and gratifying the perverted feelings of faction, is unfortunately too clearly established in many instances. But the case of the Brown Street School in Belfast is so very flagrant that it must be quoted. We shall take the narrative from the evidence of Mr. M. Cross.

Do you know anything respecting the controversy about the school called Brown Street School?

Yes; I am acquainted with the history of that school, and I know something connected with the controversy which took place respecting the national Board.

Will you state what the circumstances of that school were, and what the controversy has been?

I cannot give a minute detail of the circumstances, further than that a proposition was made to connect the school with the board of education; and a very protracted correspondence ensued between the committee of the school and the commissioners; that several members of the committee were favourable to placing the school under the Board; that Dr. Cook was then a member of that committee, and at a particular stage of the controversy was favourable to the connexion. There were several meetings held both of the committee and the subscribers, but it was at length determined to submit the whole matter to the final decision of the subscribers, at a special meeting which was to take place. At that meeting a very violent discussion on the subject took place, and the result was, not to put the school under the Board. But from the character of that meeting, and from the nature of the opposition made upon that occasion, I have no hesitation whatever in giving it as my opinion that political feeling to the greatest extent prevailed, and that evidence can be furnished to your Lordships to prove that the influence of a political society in Belfast was brought into operation for the purpose of preventing that connexion; that a party was taken to the meeting with the design of intimidating those who might feel disposed to support a proposition to connect the school with the Board, and one of its fundamental regulations with regard to voting at general meetings was upon that memorable occasion violated for the purpose of obtaining a majority against the connexion. The original law of the school was, that, I think, ten shilling or five shilling subscribers (I am not certain about the precise sum) should vote; but whatever it was, the law in question was abrogated, and every person who subscribed on the occasion sixpence, or even a smaller sum, was permitted to vote. That motion was passed after a long discussion, and by that means a very considerable majority was obtained to defeat the proposed connexion with the Board of Education.

There are some curious facts connected with that correspondence which I am not prepared to bring before your Lordships, not having the documents, but I have no doubt the evidence can be produced to prove them. I may mention one important fact, which was elicited at the meeting. Your Lordships may be aware that the school was originally under the Kildare Place Society, upon the same principles

as the Lancasterian School, and it was ascertained at the meeting I refer to that, so far from the scriptural instruction of the children under the Kildare Place system having been satisfactory, the Bible had not been read in the school for some years before; and when the master was called upon to produce one, one was produced which was afterwards alleged to have been borrowed. There were no Bibles in fact in the school.* Though this was denied at the time, it was proved by a member of the committee, and it was brought forward to establish the fact, that in the system of instruction pursued under the Kildare Place Society, in that school the Bibles were not there to be exhibited.

Was that at the time it was under the Kildare Place Society?—The period I speak of was some time after the establishment of the Board, and the connexion was not dissolved formally with the Kildare Place Society, but the Kildare Place Society not having parliamentary funds, it was only a nominal connexion.

Was it under the Kildare Place Society when this absence of Bibles came out?—When the inspectors of the Kildare Place Society visited the school they must have been satisfied, I presume, with what they saw; they probably saw New Testaments there, but Bibles were seldom or never used.

You have stated that upon a certain occasion there were no Bibles in the school; was the school under the Kildare Place Society at that time?—The Kildare Place Society was not then giving any aid; consequently, though the school was nominally in connexion, it was deriving, I presume, no benefit from it.

What year are you speaking of now?—I think that annual meeting took place in 1833; I have the reports at home. I was going to mention another fact arising out of this meeting, as illustrative of the party spirit upon this occasion. The triumph, as it was called, of the friends of the Bible over Infidels and Papists who supported the national system of education, was celebrated in the Belfast Conservative Society on a subsequent evening; a toast was prepared for the occasion, and a violent speech delivered to commemorate the victory which the friends of the Bible had obtained that day in preventing the connexion of the Brown Street School with the Board of Education. That is a fact which I believe can be proved.—*Lords*, p. 1170.

To this evidence we shall add some extracts from the correspondence between Mr. Dickey, secretary to the Brown Street School Committee, and Dr. Kelly, secretary to the Board.

The first letter from the Committee was addressed to Mr. Carlile:—

Belfast, 15th August, 1832.

Rev. Sir,—I am directed by the committee of the Belfast Brown Street School Society to request information from you on the following

* The New Testament was used, and the Extracts published by the Kildare Place Society under the sanction of Mr. Troy.

subject, which I beg you will have the goodness to give in as explicit terms as you can.

Will the new Education Board take under their charge a school, in which the books of the Kildare Place Society are used, and in which there is a Bible-class during any of the ordinary school-hours, composed of those only who have received permission to attend from their parents or guardians?

To this letter an answer in the affirmative was returned, specifying the conditions of religious instruction according to the rules of the Board. A second communication was addressed to the Board through the secretary, in order to prevent any misapprehension or mistake.

I am instructed by the committee of the above Society to inquire if the Commissioners of Education will take the Brown Street School under their patronage, permitting us to devote any of the hours during which the school holds, say from 10 to 11 o'clock, or from two to three o'clock, to reading the Scriptures without note or comment? For your guidance I beg to say that the school-hours in Brown Street are from ten to three.

A third communication was made for the same purpose, which seemed to remove all possibility of future dispute.

The committee consists of 27 Protestants (being ministers and laymen of different denominations); the school opens at 10 A. M., and closes at three P. M. The committee have resolved that all children of sufficient attainments, and whose parents or guardians may so direct, shall, in addition to their other studies, daily read the Holy Scriptures in the authorised version, without note or comment. The time to be so employed will be determined with a view to the wishes of parents, and the greatest convenience of the children (say from 10 to 11, or from two to three). The time to be employed in reading the Scriptures will be notified in the public regulations of the school, and no child will be compelled by any penalty of deprivation or punishment, either to read or remain during the reading.

Finally, the committee, as hitherto under the Kildare Place Society, propose to retain the entire control over every use of the school-rooms.

I am now instructed to inquire whether, upon such statement of facts, and such application as that now made, and to a school so constituted and governed, the Board of Education can extend any share of the public funds?

To this letter, which seemed sufficiently explicit, the following reply was transmitted from the Board:—

Office of Education, 8th July, 1833.

Sir,—I had the honour of submitting to the Commissioners of Education your letter of the 2nd instant, in which you submit, on

the part of the committee of the Brown Street School Society, for the purpose of affording a more complete view of the constitution of that school, the following statement and query:—"The committee consists of 27 Protestants, being ministers and laymen of different denominations; the school opens at 10 A. M., and closes at 3 P. M. The committee have resolved that all children of sufficient attainments, and whose parents or guardians may so direct, shall, in addition to their other studies, daily read the Holy Scriptures in the authorised version, without note or comment; the time to be so employed to be determined with a view to the wishes of parents and the greater convenience of the children, say from 10 to 11, or from 2 to 3; the time to be employed in reading the Scriptures to be notified in the public regulations of the school, and no child to be compelled by any penalty, or deprivation, or punishment, either to read or remain during the reading; and further, that the committee propose to retain the entire control over every use of the school-rooms; and whether upon such statement of facts, and such application as that now made, and to a school so constituted and governed, the Board of Education could extend any share of the public funds?"—In reply, I am directed by the Commissioners to say that they can see nothing whatever in the constitution and statement of facts relating to this school, as above stated, which could disentitle it to receive aid from them out of the funds which are committed to their charge; but in respect of the government of it, so far as relates to the entire control over every use of the school-rooms, I am to inform you that the Commissioners deem it competent for them, when any use is made of the school-rooms tending to contention and well-founded complaints between adverse parties, to interfere for the purpose of remedying the evil, and that they have, in whatever instance has occurred, interfered to prevent any meeting for political purposes being held therein. Your letter of the 5th instant I had also the honour of receiving, and shall submit it, together with the query sheet of this school when returned, to the consideration of the Commissioners, in order that when exercising their judgment as to the amount of the grant which the circumstances of such an application would warrant, they may be in possession of every fact which may give them a complete view of the circumstances.

I remain, &c.

Alex. Dickey, Esq., Belfast.

THOMAS F. KELLY.

A grant was made to the school, for which the Committee returned thanks, in a letter which stated that they had resolved at their annual meeting to recommend their subscribers to transfer the school to the Board of Education. And certainly the preceding correspondence must have led all parties to believe that the negotiations which were conducted in so candid and honourable a spirit had been brought to a satisfactory conclusion. It is painful to find, from Mr. Dickey's next letter, that such was not the case:—

Sir,

Belfast, 30th August, 1833.

At the annual meeting of the subscribers to the Brown Street School, on Tuesday the 27th instant, I had the honour of submitting the several replies of the Board of Education to the communications of our Committee. The replies of the Board afforded much satisfaction to the meeting, until the reading of the part of your letter of the 10th instant, in which you state "that the Commissioners require a strict and faithful attention, upon the part of the managers and committee of this school, to their rules and regulations, as the grant in every case is forfeitable, should the Commissioners or their officers, upon inspection, discover any departure from, or non-compliance with them." Now, in relation to this paragraph, I am instructed to observe, that as several members of the Brown Street Committee understand the rules and regulations of the Board, there are in them certain points against which they and many of their constituents entertain conscientious objections.

The Committee had therefore hoped, that by submitting their own regulations to the consideration of the Board, and binding themselves to a full and faithful observance of them, they might, if their regulations were approved, receive for their schools a portion of the public funds. The Committee, hoping and believing that the principle was fully admitted by the Board, and that the absence of any official reference to it, and the substitution of another, arose merely from an oversight in transmitting the ordinary lithographed circular, instruct me to request that the subject be submitted to the Board, and that you will be pleased to communicate to me their decision on as early a day as possible.

A difference of opinion having been expressed in the meeting as to the regulations of the Board in respect to reading the Scriptures, I am instructed to state, that our Committee understand that the right of reading the Scriptures during the ordinary and stated school-hours is not necessarily confined to one hour in the day, but may be extended upon the following principle: viz.—

If parents apply to the Committee for a longer time than one hour in the day for their children to read the Scriptures, the request is to be considered, and the Committee may extend the time for the children of such parents, so far as may be consistent with the greatest average convenience of all the scholars, and the allowance of sufficient time for the other studies of the school, every such extension to be immediately notified in the public regulations of the school; while no compulsion, either by deprivation or punishment, is to be employed to induce the children of other parents to read, or remain during the reading.

Will you be so good as to submit our view of this matter to the Board, and say if it meets with their concurrence? As the meeting of the society was adjourned to the 17th September, I am anxious to hear from you in reply as soon as possible.

The best comment on this unexpected turn of affairs is the reply made by the Commissioners through their secretary:—

Sir,

Office of Education, 6th September, 1833.

I had the honour of submitting to the consideration of the Commissioners of Education your letter of the 30th ultimo, in which you state that you are instructed by the Committee of the Brown Street School to submit to the Commissioners their views as to the reference in my letter of the 10th ultimo to the rules and regulations of the Commissioners rather than to their own regulations, and also the understanding of the Committee that the right of reading the Scriptures during the ordinary and stated school-hours is not to be necessarily confined to one hour in the day, but that it may be extended upon the following principle—namely, “that if parents apply to the Committee for a longer time than one hour in the day for their children to read the Scriptures, their request is to be considered, and that the Committee may extend the time for the children of such parents, so far as may be consistent with the greatest average convenience of all the scholars, and the allowance of sufficient time for the other studies of the school, every such extension to be publicly notified; and that no compulsion be used in respect of procuring attendance. The Commissioners, with reference to the former of these two points—namely, the referring to the rules and regulations of the Board, desire me to say, that the rules of the Brown Street School Committee, as these were stated in your letter of 2nd of July ultimo, having appeared to them compatible with the observance of those by which they are governed, they therefore had voted the grant notified in my letter of the 10th ultimo, and that if they had not understood the rules of the school in this way, of course the grant in question could not have been made. The Commissioners, with reference to the extension of time for Scripture reading, being the latter point, desire me to say, that they understood, from your letter of the 2nd of July ultimo, that the time to be employed in reading the Holy Scriptures was to be from ten to eleven, or from two to three o’clock; this time to be publicly notified, and the attendance of the children therein perfectly uncompelled: the Commissioners therefore further direct me to add, that if any change be proposed as to the hours appointed for reading the Scriptures, it is essential that it should be communicated to them. Should such proposed change then appear to them to be consistent with the greatest average convenience of all the other scholars, and the allowance of sufficient time for the other studies of the school, it will be approved of by them; should it appear to be otherwise, it will not have their approbation.

I remain, &c.

—*Commons, Appendix.*

Taking this correspondence in connexion with the evidence of Mr. Cross, we see that the Commissioners were sincerely anxious to make every reasonable concession for the sake of conciliation: they had ratified every stipulation made by the Committee of the Brown Street School, and they had received the strongest expressions of gratitude and satisfaction from that body; consequently, the sudden determination to undo all that

had previously been done, and to open a new negotiation with fresh demands, urged in a peremptory and unconciliating spirit, could only be viewed as a proof that the managers of the school were seeking excuses for hostility.

But the political opposition to the Board in Ulster was not confined to packing meetings and organising such suspicious majorities as that which decided the fate of the Brown Street School—the Rev. Mr. M'Clelland issued a placard, which was posted in the village of Ballymena on the market-day, and extensively circulated in the neighbourhood. This production, however contemptible as a literary composition, deserves attentive consideration, as it is powerful evidence of the spirit with which too many carry on their opposition to the Board:—

RELIGIOUS PROCESSION.

The friends of the Holy Bible and true Christian principles are requested to attend public worship in the green of the Presbyterian meeting-house of the Rev. George M'Clelland, Ahoghill, on the morning of Wednesday next, the 24th instant, at the hour of nine o'clock precisely. The parents and children connected with the schools in the following districts, which have been emancipated from the prayerless and unscriptural system of the new Board of National Education, will be in attendance, viz. Bridge End, Galgorm, Tullygarley, Laymore, Clinty, Grange, Tannybrake, and Ballyeaston; to these, also, shall be joined the Ahoghill, Largy, Terrygowan, Cloughoge, Moyassit, and Tullybackey Holy Bible Schools, in which the Word of God has never been imprisoned. At ten o'clock the procession will be arranged, and will proceed forthwith to Ballymena in due order, and will attend a meeting of Presbytery, to be held in the Old Presbyterian meeting-house in that town, at twelve o'clock, noon, for the purpose of trying the trustees of Guy's Free School for excluding the Holy Bible from that place on week days, and for preventing children from reading either the Old or New Testament on the Lord's Day in that house. The amateur bands of Connor and Ballymena will accompany the procession, and the opening of the meeting will be announced by the sound of the trumpet. All are requested to observe secret and family worship before leaving their home, and after their return. It is also requested that they be supplied with pocket Bibles, and that they drink no distilled spirits during the day. Each school shall be supplied with a painted board, marked "Holy Bible School," to be carried on a pole in the procession, and to be afterwards put up on their respective school-houses, and to be preserved for a similar procession on the 24th day of September, 1835. The Rev. George M'Clelland proposes to preach against the new system of national education in the above meeting-house, at five o'clock, on the evening of Sunday next, the 21st instant; and the Rev. W. Wauchope may preach two sermons in favour of it on the morning of that day: and thus the people will be prepared to form their own decision. The

Rev. Alexander Patterson may also preach two sermons in favour of it on Sabbath next, as the Rev. W. K. M'Kay will preach against it on the evening of Tuesday the 23rd instant, in the New Presbyterian meeting-house.

(Signed)

GEORGE M'CLELLAND.

Ahoghill, September 19, 1834.

We learn from a second placard, equally worthy of notice, that this procession actually took place, and was attended by about five thousand persons.

RELIGIOUS DISCUSSION ON THE SUBJECT OF THE BOARD OF
NATIONAL EDUCATION.

It is proposed, as the Rev. George M'Clelland, the moderator, and other members of the Presbytery, were locked out of the old Presbyterian meeting-house of Ballymena, on Wednesday last, that, immediately after the Rev. William Wauchope and the Rev. Hugh W. Rodgers shall have preached in favour of the new system of national education, on Friday the 26th instant, he will address the members of that church, and have ready a petition for signature against that system, agreeably to the unanimous vote passed on that subject, on Sabbath evening last, by that congregation.

The friends of the Holy Bible and true Protestant principles in the congregations of Magherafelt, Tubbermore, Moneymore, Cookstown, Orritor, Stewartstown, Carlan, and Brigh, are requested to assemble at the new Presbyterian meeting-house of Moneymore, on Monday the 29th instant, at ten o'clock, A.M., when Mr. M'Clelland will preach against the prayerless and unscriptural system of national education; and the Rev. James Wilson, the Rev. William Brown, the Rev. John Barnett, the Rev. Mr. Magowan, the Rev. James Denham, the Rev. Robert Allen, and the Rev. Mr. Hogg, are requested and challenged to preach two sermons, in favour of this new system of national education, in their own meeting-houses, on the preceding Lord's-day, the 28th instant, and then their flocks will be able to decide on this important subject, and sign memorials to the synod, either for or against that system.

Mr. M'Clelland proposes that the friends of Scriptural truth from these congregations should meet near Cookstown, on Tuesday morning, with pocket Bibles, and proceed, as a religious procession, to the meeting-house in Cookstown, where he intends to preach on the same subject, at ten o'clock, A.M.—Synod to meet at twelve o'clock.

It is proposed that the moderator and his senior colleague, Rev. George Hay, will employ their great talents and eloquence in support of the new system, on the Sabbath morning of 5th October next, in Londonderry, as Rev. George M'Clelland intends, if the Lord will, preaching on same day, at five o'clock, P.M., in their meeting-house; but if the semi-Protestant proprietors outvote the zealous Protestants, it is expected the latter class will provide some suitable place for the proposed meeting, in that once Protestant city. On

the following day, Monday, there will be a grand religious procession around the walls of the city of Derry.

It is also proposed, that the Rev. Dr. Hanna will preach two sermons in his beautiful meeting-house, on Sunday the 12th October next, in the morning, in support of the new system; as the Rev. George M'Clelland proposes to preach against it there, if the Lord will, on the evening of that day, at five o'clock, if the proprietors grant him the house for that purpose; if not, it is hoped that another house will be obtained for the discussion of that interesting subject.

N.B.—A religious legal procession, of above 5000 friends of the Bible, proceeded from Ahoghill to Ballymena, on Wednesday last, for the purpose of returning thanks to the gracious Lord for the deliverance of His Holy Word from false confinement, in nine or ten emancipated national schools in these districts. Public worship was devoutly observed by the immense and respectable congregation in a field near Ballymena.

GEORGE M'CLELLAND.

Dated this 25th day of September, 1834.

Commons, Appendix.

For these and similar acts of violence, Mr. M'Clelland was cited before the Synod of Ulster at their next general meeting. He was strenuously defended by Dr. Cooke, but resolutions condemnatory of his "disorderly and unchristian conduct" were carried by a majority of 133 against 42. Sentence of suspension was pronounced against him, but through the influence of Dr. Cooke this was rendered inoperative, and the reverend gentleman still continues to exercise his pastoral functions as Presbyterian minister of Ahoghill.

The name of the Rev. Mr. Patterson is mentioned in one of Mr. M'Clelland's placards as among those favourable to the national system of education. That gentleman had a school in connexion with the Board, but he was compelled to withdraw from the management, in consequence of the prejudices excited against him. His evidence is necessary to complete the view of this very painful part of the subject.

What was the occasion of the interruption of the connexion with the Board?—Not any belief on my part that there was any breach of faith on the part of the Board, but from the conviction that it was my duty to yield to the wishes of my people rather than continue a connexion which would interfere with my usefulness as a minister.

Then the people wished you to break off your connexion with the Board notwithstanding that the Bible was used in the way you state?—Yes; from this understanding on their part, conscientious, I am aware, but in my opinion mistaken, that by the rules of the Board the Bible was placed under restriction.

The Bible was used in the way you state from half-past one till half-past three, and notwithstanding that the congregation were so dissatisfied that they wished you to break off your connexion with the Board?—Yes.

Did you not explain to your congregation that you had permission

from the Board to have the Bible read at those hours?—Yes, that was done; but at that time there was a violent excitement in the neighbourhood upon the subject, an excitement of a very extraordinary character.

Had you the regulations of the Board suspended in the school-room?—Yes.

Was not one of those rules forbidding the use of the Scriptures during school-hours?—No; that regulation was altered in conformity with the propositions of the Synod, by which we had liberty to read the Scriptures from half-past one till half-past three.

Will you state whether you have experienced any inconvenience or disapprobation in consequence of the part which you took at the Synod of Ulster relating to the National Board?—I mentioned in my former examination that my congregation had generally disapproved of the system of education, and I am now bound to state that in consequence of the part which I took in the synod at Derry, the great majority of my congregation most essentially disapproving of my conduct, and strongly disapproving of the system of education, I found myself in a very unpleasant situation.

What inconvenience were you subjected to in consequence?—A great number of the congregation became so dissatisfied, that for a considerable time they would scarcely listen to my preaching; they would scarcely continue under my ministry in the first place, and in the next place there were the public resolutions in the newspapers disapproving of the part that I took at the Synod of Ulster upon the subject.

Were there any placards or printed papers connected with the subject which affected you?—Yes. In the month of September the Rev. George M'Clelland, who was the moderator of the Presbytery of Ballymena, with which I am connected, commenced a course of agitation upon the subject, which considerably increased the excitement in my congregation.

Have you got a copy of those placards?—I have got a copy of very few of them. I was not aware that I should be examined to-day, but I happen to have two or three of them. I may state, in the first place, that Mr. M'Clelland denounced me and those who held the view upon the subject that I did, in reference to the acceptance of the synod's propositions, as the enemies of the Bible, and as persons who had joined for the purpose, in fact, of putting down Scriptural education in the country. This placard is in reference to a religious procession (*producing the same*, see page 200).

Mr. Patterson.—I have another placard in my hand which had a very considerable influence upon my own connexion—with my congregation,—which, with your Lordships' permission, I will read.

The witness reads the same as follows:—

“ Will you go to the Remonstrants ?

“ Now is the time to resist Arian influence and Tyranny in Ballymena.

“ Orthodox Presbyterians in the first and second congregations of

Ballymena, who are zealous friends of the glorious gospel of the blessed God, and are unwilling to join in Sacramental communion with new Board Ministers, or are opposed to the new system of national education, are informed that the Rev. George M'Clelland will preach, if the Lord will, in the New Meeting-house on to-morrow, Sabbath evening, the 28th instant, at Five o'clock; after which, Resolutions on the above subjects will be adopted, and Commissioners appointed to ask the advice of the general Synod, which is to meet at Cookstown on Tuesday the 30th instant.

"Ahoghill, 27th Sept., 1834."

"GEORGE M'CLELLAND."

Mr. Patterson.—The consequence of these placards and the excitement in the neighbourhood was, that at the first Communion afterwards not more than half my congregation would attend.

The term "new Board Minister" had relation to the Education Board?—"New Board Minister" was a term by which we were all designated at that period.

You consider that a kind of sentence of excommunication?—It undoubtedly was so at that period. Perhaps it might be right for me to state that the Synod of Ulster did not at all approve of Mr. M'Clelland's conduct. At a meeting of the Synod afterwards the subject was taken up, and Mr. M'Clelland was severely dealt with by the Synod in consequence of the part which he acted. Happily the subject has been forgotten, and there is now a return of peace and affection between me and my congregation. These circumstances occurred in a moment of great excitement, and I am prepared to make every allowance for them.—*Lords*, p. 1308.

This evidence satisfactorily answers an objection insinuated rather than distinctly made, namely, that the members of the Board were not sufficiently conciliatory; that they were too strict and uncompromising in requiring the observance of their rules, and that a little relaxation on their part would have disarmed opposition. On the contrary, it is manifest that concession served only to increase hostility, for men resolved to be angry are never so much vexed as when every reasonable cause for anger is removed. It would indeed be absurd to expect that any modification of rules would conciliate Mr. M'Clelland and his followers; the Board conceded every thing which could be asked by reasonable men, and it would be manifestly unjust to blame the Commissioners because their opponents chose to be violent and unreasonable.

In the most lengthened division of the investigation, that which related to the reading of the Bible in the schools, it will be seen from the evidence that the opponents of the Board confounded two things perfectly distinct,—the abstract right of the laity to read the Scriptures, and the expediency of using the Bible as a class-book in the ordinary routine of school instruction. This error was made not only by such persons as Messrs. M'Clelland and Kay, but by several of the most in-

telligent witnesses examined before the two Committees. It is, however, perfectly well known that many of those who have most strenuously maintained the great principle of Protestantism, the right of the laity to the unrestricted use of the Scriptures, have at the same time more than doubted the propriety of using the Bible as a book for the education of children. Locke, who cannot be accused of any tendency towards conceding the first principle of Protestantism, says, "As for the Bible, which children are usually employed in to exercise and improve their talents in reading, I think the promiscuous reading of it through by chapters, as they lie in order, is far from being of any advantage to the children, either for perfecting their reading or principling religion; that perhaps a worse could not be found. For what pleasure or encouragement can it be to a child to exercise himself in reading those parts of a book where he understands nothing? And how little are the law of Moses, the Song of Solomon, the prophecies in the Old, and Epistles and Apocalypse in the New Testament, suited to a child's capacity? And though the history of the Evangelists and the Acts are something easier, yet taken altogether, it is very disproportioned to the understanding of childhood. I grant that the principles of religion are to be drawn from thence and the words of Scripture; yet none should be proposed to a child but such as are suited to a child's capacity and notions. But it is far from this to read through the WHOLE Bible, and that for reading's sake."

But as we have before stated, the assertion that the Board excluded the Bible from the national schools was a misrepresentation so gross and outrageous, that it would be surprising how any rational being could be deluded by it, were not the fact notorious that nothing is wanting but a catch-word, a cant phrase, or a convenient appellation, to set Irish parties in a flame from one end of the island to the other. The meaning of the phrase, and the propriety of its application, are matters which neither leaders nor followers dream of inquiring into, and which it is not always safe to explain. The charges against the National System in the Rev. Mr. M'Clelland's placards were so absurd that it might be supposed such gross exaggerations would have defeated their own object. But such, we find from Mr. Sullivan's evidence, was not the case:—

Did those placards produce any feeling in the public mind?—Yes, in consequence of them, hundreds of people—Mr. M'Clelland himself states upwards of 5000 congregated. At the head of these mobs Mr. M'Clelland proceeded to all the national schools in the district, and turned the children out of them.

What schools particularly did they attack?—The schools are mentioned in the placards, to which the Committee can refer.

What occurred in the Laymore school?—The magistrate of Ballymena, Mr. Gihon, manager of the school, got there just in time with a party of police to prevent Mr. M'Clelland from getting possession; they then contented themselves by damaging the outside of the house, defacing the inscription National School, which was painted on the wall, and painting crosses and P's on the doors and windows to denote Popery.—*Commons*, q. 7717-19.

Abundant evidence was given to show that at the time the Board was constituted the whole mind of Ireland was partisan. "Can anything good come out of Nazareth?" was an argument as efficacious in Dublin as ever it had been in Jerusalem: there was not a public measure, from the Reform of Parliament down to the repairs of a turnpike-road, which did not give rise to heated discussions between angry partisans, who substituted passion for reason, epithet for argument, and downright abuse for logic. Education was unfortunately a topic on which years of controversy had already exasperated the bitterness of rival parties; no man would patronise any light which was not of his own kindling. The liberal professions of the Kildare Place Society as a body, compared with the polemical declamations periodically delivered by its leading members, were viewed with angry suspicion where they were not encountered by avowed hostility. Closed schools, rejected grants, schoolmasters without scholars, and scholars without instruction, testified against the system in almost every direction. The interference of landlords in many cases enforced attendance; but such compliance was obtained at a very disproportionate cost. Education, instead of being received as a boon, was regarded as a yoke imposed by hostile caprice or despotic abuse of power; it embittered the relations between landlord and tenant, which it ought to have improved, and where amity was of the utmost consequence both to the individuals and the nation, it generated enmity, the more inveterate in proportion as it was the more concealed. In many instances, where primary instruction was given better in the Society's schools than in those patronised by the priests, the children were removed to the priest's school as soon as they had attained any tolerable proficiency. There was thus a system which necessarily produced ingratitude, and fostered the worst passions of the human heart.

The apparent conformity with the requisitions of the Protestant patrons for the reading of the Scriptures by all the pupils in opposition to the dictates of the Roman Catholic prelates and priests, seems to have been regarded as a great step towards complete proselytism; but experience has shown that even a more decided conformity has very little practical value. The Rev. Mr. Dwyer gave the following account of Roman Catholic conformers in the Dublin University:—

When you were in Dublin College were you acquainted with any Roman Catholics?—I was.

Did you ever hear of any kind of dissension or acrimony excited by the difference of creed?—I do not recollect that I did; but I recollect a very remarkable fact, that Dr. Elrington, the late Bishop of Ferns, has made the observation, that there were a great number of those who were scholars in Dublin College,—who became scholars, having entered college as Protestants, who became Roman Catholics again.—*Lords*, p. 1250.

No evidence was given to prove that the occasional conformity at the schools of the Kildare Place Society produced the slightest effect in allaying bigotry, or weakening what is regarded as the anti-social tendency of some parts of the Roman Catholic creed. So far as any inference can be deduced from indirect admissions, the contrary effect appears to have been produced, for most of the witnesses declared that intolerance had greatly increased in Ireland within the last twenty years.

We have already noticed the evidence given to prove that education in Ireland must go on with the Board, or without it. The Dean of Ardagh adds, that the children of the Irish Roman Catholics are more quick, apt, and intelligent, than those of the Protestants, and several other witnesses in part confirm his testimony by giving them credit for deducing arguments in favour of their religion from the Scripture Extracts, the discovery and application of which would require the very highest exercise of refined ingenuity. If this be the case, it is manifestly unsafe to neglect such a people, and still more dangerous to trifle with them. The offer of a system of education to them, which they deem themselves, from motives, however mistaken, bound to reject, is to give a refusal in its worst form,—it is to insult as well as to deny.

It is worthy of notice, that, though several of the witnesses who appeared to give evidence against the Board, by no means agreed among themselves in opinion, yet almost every one of them was ready to answer for what would or would not satisfy all the Protestants of Ireland. This apparent claim to the office of representative of the Protestant body was made most frequently by the Dean of Ardagh; and yet his requisitions could not be reconciled with the proposals of such influential portions of that body as the clergy of the united dioceses of Raphoe and Derry; and while he approved of the Kildare Place Society, its system was condemned by the Reverend Dr. Elrington, Messrs. Woodward, Boyton, Bell, and others. This assumption, therefore, seems to rest on no very sure basis, and it is still uncertain whether the Protestants generally are not satisfied with the national system when they understand it.

From the whole of the evidence it appears that the duties which the Commissioners have to discharge impose upon them a task of no ordinary difficulty. Their proceedings are scrutinised with jealous hostility, their exertions are thwarted in every place where opposition can be organised, the aid on which they had for a time relied is withheld, and by a strange perversity they are held responsible for all the evils which this very opposition has produced. But there is also evidence that this opposition is declining; and that many who were opponents of the Board are anxious to place schools under its management. The propositions made by the clergy of the united dioceses of Raphoe and Derry are manifestly proposed in the best spirit of conciliation, and they have been met by the Board with corresponding feelings. But the obloquy which has been heaped upon the Derry clergy, and the unpopularity that the gentlemen who proposed the conciliatory plans have had to encounter, is a plain proof that party spirit and faction share very largely in the opposition made to the national system of education.

It is lastly necessary to remark that a spirit of exaggeration is very apparent in all the objections made to the national system, both in its principles and its details. This is particularly evident in the discussions respecting the schools at Youghal and Esker, and in all the controversies respecting the island of Achill. It is unnecessary to enter into the details which we have already examined, but we cannot forbear lamenting that all the circumstances of a man's past life should be raked up, and every action minutely scrutinised, the moment that he was employed either as a teacher or an inspector under the Board. These personalities rendered the Achill inquiry particularly painful, and tended to throw much suspicion on the prudence and judgment of the persons by whom they were employed.

CHAPTER XVI.

Conclusion.

THE investigations before the Parliamentary committees can scarcely be regarded as complete, because, though the charges against the national system of education were all heard, the inquiry terminated before the Board could enter fully on its vindication. Enough indeed was shown to prove that the charges against the system could not be maintained, that the errors of detail had been grossly exaggerated, and that means had been taken to correct them the instant that they were detected. But these were only incidental observations on the great question, the adaptation of the national system to the wants and wishes of the Irish people. The Board was brought to trial, but the case of the plaintiffs is the only one that has been completely heard. The defendants had not time to show that they had won the confidence of the Irish people, or at least of that portion of the people for which a system of National Education is required. At the risk of being charged with repetition we shall endeavour to set before the reader the real point at issue between the Board and its adversaries, which is hidden by the vast mass of details and digressions introduced into the Parliamentary investigations.

The first question is, whether any system of national education ought to be provided for the people of Ireland? The Dean of Ardagh alone answered this question in the negative, and asserted that education could be given more efficiently by voluntary associations than by a government institution. Most of the other witnesses felt that there must ever be one great defect in voluntary institutions, that is, the absence of responsibility; and several pointed out in the Kildare Place Society an evil which greatly weakened its efficiency, namely, that it was suspected to be an engine of proselytism. If then it be conceded that exertions should be made to give the peasantry moral and religious instruction, it seems almost self-evident that such exertions should not be left to chance or to caprice, but should be placed under the immediate superintendence of the state. Nobody denies that education for good or for evil is a matter of the highest importance to the peace and prosperity of the country; and to propose that such a matter should be left wholly to the guidance and guardianship of volunteers, is scarcely less absurd than a proposition for leaving the government of the police or the collection of the revenue to self-constituted associations.

The second question regards the constitution of a National Board:—as it must be appointed by Government, it ought and it must necessarily consist of persons possessing the confidence of Government. Now the National Board of Irish Education possesses this requisite more perfectly than any other department of the public administration, for it has had the approbation of three successive cabinets; it was formed under the ministry of Earl Grey, and continued without alteration under the ministry of Sir Robert Peel and that of Lord Melbourne. It is of course desirable that the persons appointed Commissioners of Education, like those appointed to any other public office, should possess the confidence of all classes of the community. But in a country where a powerful party is ranged in opposition to the Ministers, the same party will view with dislike every appointment made by the administration. The party which, with rather too much of the spirit of exclusion, has arrogated to itself the name of the Protestants of Ireland, declares that it has no confidence in her Majesty's Ministers, and consistently adds that it has no confidence in the Commissioners of Education appointed by those Ministers. Such an objection raises a question to be discussed by the representatives of the people, namely, the question of confidence in the Cabinet, and has little or no reference to the subject of education.

The next point to be determined is the System. Above all things it is necessary that such a system should not only be impartial, but removed beyond the suspicion of partiality. It appears, however, that some persons are unable to comprehend the meaning of impartiality. It has been gravely argued that if a system be acceptable to Roman Catholics, it ought for that reason alone be distasteful to Protestants. Such reasoning, in a country where party-spirit rages fiercely, may for a while succeed in raising a factious cry, but every person of cool mind will agree, that unless Protestants assign some better reason for dissatisfaction, their complaints will receive, because they will merit, very little attention.

It never was denied by the Commissioners that they framed rules designed to conciliate the Roman Catholics. Had they acted otherwise, their proceedings would have been partly nugatory and partly mischievous. The system of National Education was designed for the instruction of those who could not unaided procure instruction for themselves. Now we have shown that the Roman Catholics are more numerous, less wealthy, and located in less enlightened districts than the Protestants; they were, consequently, more in want of aid, in the proportion of at least twenty to one: a system therefore which in anywise tended to exclude them from its benefits would be

a mere mockery. It is not denied that the system ought to be such as would give the Roman Catholics no unfair advantage, while it subjected them to no unfair disadvantages: an examination of all the objections made against the Board will show that every precaution was taken to prevent even the suspicion of such unfairness. Let us just take a glance at some of the heads of the charges which were investigated in the preceding pages.

The Exclusion of the Scriptures:—The Scriptures were not excluded; the reading of them was sanctioned and encouraged, provision only being made that no conscientious scruples should be violated. The Scripture Extracts:—The use of the extracts was not compulsory. Separate Religious Instruction:—The opportunity was offered equally to all parties. The Nomination of Teachers:—It was vested in the patrons of schools, and those who refused to become patrons had no right to complain that their pleasure was not consulted. The Erection of Schools on Chapel-lands:—This took place only when no other sites could be obtained. Grants to Monastic Schools:—These schools could not be abolished; they were effecting much good, and it was desirable they should effect more: they possessed considerable influence, and it was prudent to bring them under the superintendence of the Government. The Injury done to Scriptural Schools:—It is no injury to give parents a choice in selecting the system of education which they deem best for the temporal and eternal welfare of their children; there were compulsory rules in these schools which destroyed the great principle of parental responsibility; and the fact of children having been withdrawn from them, and sent to the National Schools, sufficiently proves that their system imposed a yoke upon the conscience; for it is quite clear that an absolute injunction and an absolute prohibition are equally tyrannical. The Employment of Improper Teachers:—No better could be procured when the Board was constituted; but every exertion is being made to raise the character of the schoolmasters, by training at the Model-school, by prompt punishment of every proved abuse, and by holding out rewards for diligence and attention. Imperfect Inspection:—So far as this regards visitors, those who make the complaint have the remedy in their own hands, for they may visit the schools whenever they please. So far as regards the Board, the system of inspection has been completely changed and rendered more efficient while this inquiry was in progress. Inattention to Complaints:—Every case under this head completely broke down, and none more flagrantly than those of the schools in the Island of Achill, on which the opponents of the Board seem to have placed their chief reliance.

How far many of these charges, even if they had been established as decisively as they were confuted, could justify the imputation of unfairness, is a matter rather difficult to comprehend. The only tangible ground for the assertion that the National System is more favourable to Roman Catholics than to Protestants, is the undeniable fact that the former derive more advantage from it than the latter. The reasons are sufficiently obvious; we have already repeated them; but they are placed in so strong a light, and confirmed by so many additional and important particulars in the evidence of the Right Hon. A. R. Blake that we shall make an extract from his testimony:—

What opinion have you formed generally as to the progress of the system, and its prospect of ultimate success?—The system has been already adopted extensively. We had at the time of our last report about 1200 schools, attended by about 150,000 children. It has been said that the Protestants of Ireland repudiated us, but the fact is otherwise; we had in the most Protestant province of Ireland, in Ulster, 450 schools. The number of Protestants and of Roman Catholics in 373 of these has been ascertained, and there are, I understand, in them about 14,000 or 15,000 Protestants, and about 22,000 Roman Catholics. Assuming that in each county the proportion of Protestants to Roman Catholics in the schools that have not been reported upon the same as in the schools that have been, I understand it may be considered that we have altogether about 17,000 Protestants and 28,000 Roman Catholics. I have not myself examined the reports which show how many Protestants there are, and how many Roman Catholics; they were not made pursuant to any order of the Board; they were procured by Mr. Carlile; and I speak from information communicated to me by him. In Leinster, Munster, and Connaught, Protestants are principally to be found amongst the higher and middle classes; there are in general very few Protestants of the class for which our schools are intended, except in Dublin and other cities or towns, where there are Protestant schools supported by endowments, contributions from the clergy, collections after sermons, and so forth. The mass of the poor, particularly in the rural districts, is composed of Roman Catholics; therefore in these provinces our schools are principally composed of them. In Ulster, the proportion of Protestants to Roman Catholics in our schools approximates what it is in the mass of the population, but in the other provinces it does not, and the reason is, that in Ulster there is an extensive poor Protestant population, whereas in the other provinces that is not the case.

The peasantry and tenantry are more generally Protestant than in Leinster, Munster, and Connaught?—Yes; and I am under an impression generally that the proportion of Protestants to Roman Catholics in our schools in Ulster is as high as the proportion of Protestants to Roman Catholics in the ecclesiastical province of Armagh

appears to be, according to the returns of the Commissioners of Public Instruction.

Do you conceive that generally in those parts of the province of Ulster in which you understand the system to have worked well the clergy of the established church support the system?—Speaking from general recollection, my impression is, that in Ulster the clergymen of the established church who support the system bear to the Roman Catholic clergymen who do so nearly as high a proportion as Protestants of the established church do to Roman Catholics in the whole population. You will find a greater number of clergymen of the established church correspondents of the Board in Ulster than in any other province of Ireland.

But the clergymen of the established church are as numerous as the clergy of the Roman Catholic church in the country?—They are, I believe, in Ulster.

Then there is no necessity for a reference to the proportion of the population in giving the proportion of the clergymen of the established church to the Roman Catholic clergy supporting this system?—The way in which it bears upon the subject is this: the two proportions, when considered, show that the degree in which the respective clergy embrace the system is in some measure proportioned to the circumstances of their flocks. The Protestant clergyman does not probably take much trouble upon himself about the education of Roman Catholics, but he does about that of Protestants.

You have stated that the proportion of Catholics to Protestants in the present schools is more commensurate with the state of the population than the proportion which they bore to the Protestants in the schools of the Kildare Place establishment?—Yes.

Does that arise from there being fewer Protestants or more Catholics?—It arises from there being more Catholics; the Catholics, having regard to their amount in the mass of the population, formed a small portion of the children educated in the Kildare Place schools; they were absolutely more in number, but proportionally much less than in the mass of the population. The Roman Catholics are more than four to one in the whole population, and probably six to one, or more, among the poorer classes; yet in the Kildare Place schools they were little more than one to one; they therefore bore a much smaller proportion to the Protestants in those schools than they ought. If then they are in our schools six to one, I should say that the proportion approaches what it ought to be in a degree that in the others it did not at all.

But you are aware that that proportion may be effected in two ways, by the increase of the number of the Catholics, or by the decrease of the number of Protestants; are there fewer Protestants in those schools than used to attend the Kildare Street schools?—According to my recollection of documents that I have lately looked at, the number of Protestants attending our schools is greater absolutely than the number of Protestants that attended those that were solely in connexion with the Kildare Place Society. I think it appears, by a report of the Commissioners of 1825, that the number

of Protestants at that time attending schools exclusively connected with the Kildare Place Society was about 16,600, whereas I am led to believe that the number attending our schools exceeds 18,000.

Will you state what it is in each of the provinces?—I will. The number of Protestants attending the schools of our Board, so far as information has been obtained, is in Ulster 14,627; in those exclusively connected with the Kildare Street Society it was 12,124.

That was an increase of 2000?—The total number of Protestants in those of our schools in Ulster that have been actually reported upon, exceeds the total number of Protestants that were in the schools exclusively connected with the Kildare Street Society by considerably more than 2000.

Does that return take in all the schools in Ulster, or only those that have been visited?—This account takes in only the schools that have been already visited. Assuming that the proportion of Protestants to Roman Catholics in the schools not reported upon in each county is equal to the proportion in the schools that have been visited, there are in Ulster about 17,000 Protestants and 28,000 Roman Catholics.

Will you proceed with the other provinces?—In Leinster the numbers in our schools, so far as they have been ascertained, are 702 Protestants and 35,318 Roman Catholics. The numbers under the Kildare Place Society were 2,577 of the Established Church, 60 Presbyterians, one Protestant dissenter, and 7,180 Roman Catholics.

Then the number of Protestants is very much decreased in Leinster?—The number of Protestants is less in our schools in Leinster than it was in the Kildare Place schools in 1826. In Munster the numbers in our schools, so far as they have been ascertained, are 154 Protestants, and 19,108 Roman Catholics. In 1825 the numbers in the Kildare Place schools were 1106 of the Established Church, one Presbyterian, three other Protestant dissenters, and 3,269 Roman Catholics.

Then there has been a diminution in that province?—There is a less number of Protestants in our schools in that province than there was in the Kildare Place schools.

Then, comparing the Kildare Place schools in 1826 with your schools, the number of Protestants to Catholics has been decreased, not only by an increased number of Catholics, but also by a diminished number of Protestants?—The contrary. Take the whole of Ireland together, and the number of Protestants is increased; the number of Roman Catholics is vastly, but not I think in a degree greater than is proportioned to their number in the poorer classes of the population.

What was the total number of children in 1826 educated in the Kildare Place schools?—37,146 in the schools exclusively connected with the Kildare Street Society in 1826.

Then you state that the number of Protestants now educated in your schools exceeds the number of Protestants that were educated in those schools at that period?—I do.

Will you have the goodness to add the total up and state it?—I will. I ought to state that the information we have received extends only to a certain number of our schools. In these the total number of Protestants educated is 15,760; the total number of Roman Catholics is 90,949. From calculations which we have made we conclude that there must be 3000 or 4000 Protestants besides in the remaining schools, and of course a great many more Roman Catholics.

The Committee understand the nature of your evidence is to prove, in corroboration of your statement that this system is working better than any previous system which has been instituted, that you have now a greater number of Protestants in education as well as Roman Catholics than they had in 1826 under the Kildare Place system?—Yes, than the Kildare Place Society had in the schools exclusively connected with them.—*Lords*, 81.

This evidence incontrovertibly proves that the benefits which the Roman Catholics have derived from the Board is proportionate to their greater wants, and that the objection is not one whit more rational than opposition to poor-laws, because Roman Catholics would draw a greater amount of relief than Protestants, or to the repeal of a tax, because the majority of a nation would be more benefited than the minority.

Enough has been said to prove, that the national system ought to have been so framed as to conciliate the Roman Catholic population, and there is abundant proof that in this great object it has all but perfectly succeeded. The Dean of Ardagh indeed was of opinion that the Roman Catholics ought not, consistently with what he believed to be their opinions, to acquiesce in the system of the Board; but it is far from probable that the Roman Catholics of Ireland will impose upon that gentleman the task of thinking for them. There was also evidence that Dr. M'Hale, titular Archbishop of Tuam, opposes the Board just as violently as he opposed the missionary exertions of Mr. Nangle in Achill. But there is abundant evidence that Dr. M'Hale's example has had little influence on the great body of the Roman Catholic clergy and laity, none having withdrawn from their connexion with the Board since the publication of his letters.

The system of National Education has then the three great requisites which appear essential to its success; the Commissioners are responsible for the exercise of their trust;—they possess the confidence of the Government;—their system is acceptable to the majority of the nation, and contains nothing which could give reasonable offence to the minority. Moreover, there is evidence that the minority opposed to the Board is diminishing; the ranks of the opposition have been weakened

by the secession of the clergy of the united dioceses of Derry and Raphoe, whose conciliatory propositions have been accepted by the Board.

Before concluding, it may be well to notice an objection not directly urged in the evidence, but insinuated by several witnesses, namely, that a Protestant state ought not to contribute to the religious education of those who dissent from its principles. Without entering into any long discussion on the subject, it is quite sufficient to say that Great Britain is a mixed and not a Protestant state;—the people are mixed; the institutions are mixed; the electoral body is mixed; the legislation is mixed. Under such circumstances, to talk of Great Britain as an exclusively Protestant state is sheer nonsense; it ceased to be so, from the moment that Roman Catholics were admitted to the elective franchise, to the magistracy, and to grand juries; from the moment that the legal fiction which did not recognise the existence of a Papist in Ireland was abandoned. When Christians of every denomination sit in parliament, and are eligible to the highest offices of government, to call the state exclusively Protestant is more absurd than to revive the distinctions of the Heptarchy. The question is not whether the people shall be taught their own form of Christianity—that will be accomplished whether we please or not—but whether they shall be taught it faithfully, in a mild and tolerant spirit, with a due regard for the feelings of those who differ from them;—or whether they shall be taught it imperfectly, in a spirit of rancorous hostility to existing institutions and of enmity to those whom they must regard as persons banded together for the purpose of securing their degradation. It cannot be too often repeated, that the question is not between education and no education,—the progress of education is now beyond control—the question is between a good education and a bad one, and it is one which requires no great exertion of intellect to decide. There is one little fact which has been lost sight of in too many discussions on education, and yet it is one of some importance; it is simply that “we are now living in the second quarter of the nineteenth century.” Many things feasible in the reign of Queen Elizabeth are impossible in the reign of Queen Victoria, and foremost among them is a system of enforced proselytism.

The great object of government is to secure the perpetuation, the growth, and the moral influence of its institutions; and this can only be effected by making every individual in the community feel conscious that he shares in their benefits. National Education enlists on the side of good government the parent and the child; it extends its influence over the present and the

future; the generation gradually retiring from the stage of existence departs in the confidence of hope, ready to exclaim with Simeon, "Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, for mine eyes have seen thy salvation;" the generation advancing to supply its place comes forward with grateful recollections of the paternal care of the government which watched over the development of infant mind, and fixed the stability of youthful principle; their young hearts are pledged to the permanency of the constitution. Lady Osborne has said, with equal force and feeling, that the National System is now in the heart of the people of Ireland; if it takes root there, the fruits will be peace, prosperity, and social happiness;—it is even doubtful if it could now be advantageously superseded by a better system, were it possible that such a one could be devised. Ireland is weary of experiments, especially in education; the tree has been so often transplanted from soil to soil, that another removal may destroy it altogether, especially as it has now found the soil most congenial to its growth, "the hearts of the people."

Houses of the Oireachtas

Houses of the Oireachtas