

10
NOT PUBLISHED.

THE
DERRY AND RAPHOE PROPOSITIONS,
THE
CHURCH EDUCATION SOCIETY,
THE
NATIONAL BOARD SCHOOLS,
COMPARED;
WITH REMARKS.

DUBLIN:
PRINTED AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS,
BY M. H. GILL.

1849.

These pages are not published, and are printed only to avoid the trouble and expense of writing out a sufficient number of copies. Should it fall into the hands of any for whom it was not intended, and should that person be candid enough to examine for himself, the statements therein contained will need no recommendation. He will see that they are *true*. Should he be of a different spirit, and inclined to represent them, either to himself or to others, as one-sided and unfair, it may be of service to tell him that the persons who formed the "Provisional Committee," and who were unanimous in giving the answers which may be read at page 4, were not advocates of the National Board. Two-thirds of them were either secretaries or ex-secretaries to branches of the Church Education Society, and all of them were patrons of schools under it at the time. Instead, however, of inquiring what any man says, or has said, it is much safer to examine for ourselves what all men ought to say, what any man can say with truth.

THE evils arising to the country, and to the Church, from the serious differences of opinion which prevail upon the subject of education, and from the anomalous position of the Established Clergy in regard to the National System, are obvious to all. It cannot but be felt to be our common duty to aim at their removal. It is also manifest that no real progress will be made towards this object, until we have before us a just statement of the facts of the case. No present unanimity, however general, can be permanent, which is based upon a misconception of essential facts. It will gradually crumble away as that misconception is discovered. This, however, may not be discovered until after it has engendered a misdirection of effort, whose effects may prove much more permanent than their cause. Those who wish for an abiding unanimity of sentiment, a solid basis of combined action in the matter of National Education, will strive to give, in the first instance, a dispassionate consideration to the facts of the case; and on these it is but too evident that there prevails most serious misapprehension.

Influenced by such sentiments, six clergymen met in Derry, early in the present year, and it was agreed:

1. That a Committee (composed chiefly of the known friends and prominent advocates of Scriptural Education in both dioceses) be formed, in order to consider the education of the poor in Ireland.

2. That this Committee be requested to reconsider the propositions made by the clergy of Derry and Raphoe in 1836; to compare them with the principles and present state of the Church Education Society, and of the different classes of National Schools; and to report to the clergy at their convenience.

The Committee, provisionally selected, met in Derry on that day week, and proceeded to consider the practicability of giving effect to the second resolution, by ascertaining how far they were likely to agree in a report. As a rough analysis of the whole subject, the following questions were proposed, and the annexed answers given *unanimously*.

1. Does the constitution of the Board preclude us from treating with it at all? Is it an insuperable barrier to our accepting Government aid on any conditions?

No. We may have some objections, and real ones, but we cannot regard them as insuperable; they are those which, it appears, must meet us in dealing with any government in the present constitution of these kingdoms.

2. Suppose the Board offer two classes of schools, the one class objectionable and the other not, are we precluded

No. Provided that our protest against objectionable parts be not compromised.

from accepting the one class, in consequence of real objections which lie against the other?

3. Suppose the Board offer a class of schools in which, within certain limits, the goodness or badness of the religious instruction will depend upon the patron, are we precluded from establishing good schools by the fact that others have it in their power to establish bad ones?

4. How does a non-vested National School, such as a Protestant patron may establish, differ from such a school as he may have under the Church Education Society?

5. And how from such a school as the Derry and Raphoe propositions contemplate?

6. Any further objections to the National System?

No. As before.

Since both have *time-tables*, in the principle of *compulsion* or *non-compulsion*.

In making the principle of non-compulsion complete, by *permitting* the retirement of those children who are "not to be compelled" to receive the religious instruction.

Besides the want of uniformity, supposed in questions 2 and 3, none other of any weight was mentioned, *which could be sustained(a).*

(a) There were mentioned :

1. The loss of the school-rooms for the purposes of religious

7. There may be a certain amount of objectionableness under some one or more of the above heads, not separately sufficient to prevent our accepting aid, yet, when all put together, strengthening each

Then a fair mind will view *also* the objections to not accepting aid ; and reflect upon the immediate and remote consequences of our resigning our natural position as superintendents of the general education

lectures ; it being forbidden, by Rule IV., to use any National School-house for the purposes of "public worship."

This is a real objection. Its weight, however, which would have been, to clergymen of the Establishment, very considerable, has been almost, if not altogether, removed by a recent "Document explanatory of Rule IV." By it the Board expressly sanctions "religious lectures, whether accompanied by prayer and singing or not, being delivered, in the school-rooms, *to the children, their parents and connexions* ; attendance upon such lectures not being compulsory."

II. It is wrong to give secular instruction without religious. This objection is purely imaginary. Whatever be its solidity considered as an abstract principle, there can be no doubt of this, that, viewed as an objection to the National System, it is wholly without foundation, and can only be urged in good faith by those who are totally ignorant of both its books and rules.

Those who will examine will find,

1. That the secular, or, as it is called, the "literary and moral instruction" provided by the Board, involves within it a *general* religious instruction. The literary parts being illustrated by a continual and most interesting reference to the Scriptures themselves ; and the moral duties being enforced by the religious, in the form in which these last, and, indeed, both together, are developed in Christianity.

2. That, besides those of literary and moral instruction, the Board have published some directly religious works :—four volumes of Extracts from the Scriptures ; a volume of Sacred Poetry ; "Easy Lessons on Christian Evidences ;" and "Lessons

other, and presenting a serious aggregate: what then?

of the poor, and forcing that most important of influences into other and very inferior hands. He will endeavour to lean, of course, to the less objectionable alternative.

on the Truth of Christianity." These works they "earnestly and unanimously recommend," and furnish gratuitously to those patrons who desire them.

3. Judging this general religious instruction to be, *however necessary, still insufficient*, the Board expects and provides for *special* religious instruction to be given in their schools, at specified hours, by such religious teachers as may in each case possess the confidence of the parents.

Such is the applicability of this objection to the National Board! Yet such is the misapprehension and misrepresentation prevalent, that it is, of all others, perhaps, the one most commonly relied on. Two classes of persons are found to urge it, either directly or by implication:

1. Those who know all this, yet whose zeal in opposing the anti-scriptural Board prevails on them to suppress this knowledge. Of such men we can say nothing.

2. Those who ought to know it, and yet do not. Many of these are honest men. Yet it is no pleasing "scriptural" characteristic to be found "speaking evil of those things which we know not."

A fair objection to the Commissioners, under this head, would be to point out *what more they could have done*, short of adopting the principle of compulsion, in endeavouring to impart religious along with their secular instruction.

It seems to be forgotten, and so may be mentioned here, that the reason why the Scriptures themselves are not supplied by the Commissioners to their schools arises from the difficulty of finding a VERSION of the Bible which will not be reckoned "SPECIAL" by one of the leading divisions of the population. Why,

Those present having been, though divided in opinion upon some topics, unanimous in giving the foregoing answers to the proposed questions, it appeared practicable to comply with the second resolution.

It was therefore agreed that a Report based upon these answers should be drawn up, and be submitted to the private consideration of the clergy throughout both dioceses ; and one of the members present was requested to attempt it.

then, are not several versions given, or two at least ? The following extract from the examination of Anthony R. Blake, Esq., before the Commons' Committee, in 1835, will probably explain :

“Have you found from the Catholic clergy any opposition to the diffusion of the Bible ?

“The Roman Catholic members of the Board were willing that the Scriptures, Protestant and Roman Catholic, should be supplied by the Board to the different schools ; the Protestant authorized version for the Protestant children, and the Roman Catholic authorized version for the Roman Catholic children,—but to be used only at the periods of religious instruction. The Protestant Ecclesiastical Commissioners did not think that they could with propriety be parties to circulating the Roman Catholic version of the Scriptures, and therefore it is that the Scriptures are not at all supplied by the Board. Dr. Murray, the Roman Catholic Archbishop, was perfectly willing that they should be applied in the way I have mentioned.”

Meantime, the Board are translating anew some of the most important sections, which are offered by it, “not as a substitute for the sacred volume itself, but as an introduction to it ; and they have been compiled,” they add, “in the hope of their leading to a more general and more profitable perusal of the Word of God.”

FIRST SKETCH OF A REPORT.

It is to be distinctly understood that this Report has *no manner of joint authority whatever*, except in so far as it may be seen to embody the letter and spirit of the above unanimous answers. The individual who was requested to draw it up is alone responsible for any statement, sentiment, or expression contained in it, and, indeed, in any part of this paper, with the exception of those answers, and of the two propositions in page 4.

I.

It is remembered that the propositions urged by the clergy of the dioceses of Derry and Raphoe, in 1836, were based upon the principle of "no restriction, no compulsion." No restriction upon imparting instruction in the Scriptures to those children whose parents were willing that they should be taught them. No compulsion with respect to those who, upon alleged conscientious grounds, might decline this instruction.

It was, therefore, required by the propositionists:

1. That there should be, in every National School, a daily Bible class, or classes, taught during the ordinary school hours.

2. That attendance upon these classes should not be compulsory in the case of those children whose parents might express conscientious objections thereto.

3. That such children might occupy themselves with their other school business during the time that these classes were taught, but should not be at liberty to retire from the school-room.

The object of the third proposition is explained to have been, to make it clear that the Bible classes were part of the regular and ordinary school instruction, as being held during those hours at which all the children were obliged to attend. But it does not seem to be essential to the principle of the propositions; rather the contrary. It will appear to most that the principle of no compulsion would be more fully and honestly carried out by permitting those children to retire whom we have made up our minds *not to compel to receive* our religious instruction. (See question 5.)

It is further explained (though scarcely with unanimity) that by contending for "no restriction," the propositionists did not intend to exclude the operation of a time-table, or to advocate disorder, either in reference to the religious or the other parts of the school instruction; but merely that they should have full liberty to use the whole Scriptures, in what manner they might each think most judicious, in the instruction of their Bible classes.

Such having been the tenor of these propositions, it may be well, before comparing them with the two rival systems at present in operation, to place the principle on which they are based more distinctly before our view. Is then the principle of non-com-

pulsion a just one? Does it state a general duty to which we ought to conform, as far as we can, both ourselves and our circumstances; or is it some maxim of the day, some temporary concession to prejudice? Is it to be regarded as a *policy* which unfortunate circumstances force us to tolerate, but which we will seek the earliest opportunity to withdraw; or does it, on the other hand, claim a cordial acceptance on its own merits, as a just and enlightened *principle*, the embodiment of a religious and moral truth itself.

Have we a right to compel others, or the children of others, to read the Scriptures, not to say the Scriptures in any particular form, and to be instructed in them by us?

Has God given to any one person this right over any other individual, that person's own children, while they are children, being alone excepted?

As this is urged *as a principle*, let us state it abstractedly, by using general terms:

Has A the right to compel M or M's children to receive his (A's) instruction in the Scriptures?

A negative would be given by each of us with sufficient cordiality were we to substitute for *M* our own name, and for *A* that of some person *either of our own* or any other communion, whose opinions or characters we disliked or suspected,—Dr. Pusey, Archbishop Whately, or Archbishop Mac Hale; and this without adding to the question, “*although M has conscientious scruples to submit himself or his*

children to A's instruction." And, either with or without this clause, Protestants generally will decide the principle, with tolerable distinctness, by answering "no."

It is the right, they will say, of *A* to read the Scriptures himself; our fathers have died in defence of this right, and with God's help we will perpetuate it; and it is his duty to train up *his own children*, by compulsion, if he finds it necessary, in both the knowledge and practice of them. It is further his duty to offer the Scriptures to *M*, and by all earnest moral influences—example, advice, warning—to induce him, or, if you will, to compel him to receive them. And, lastly, it is his duty to be ready and willing to instruct *M* and his children, to assist them to read, to understand, and to obey them. But he has no right to compel him to receive this teaching,—to compel him, that is, by other than moral means; to compel by *external* coercion, by persecution in any degree, by exclusion from civil rights, by deprivation of public and national advantages.

Let *A* be a Protestant clergyman, *M* a Roman Catholic peasant, whose ignorant and prejudiced conscience dreads, we will suppose, for himself and his children, the Scriptures, *in any form*, as a heretical and dangerous book; or let it be another, who is so far prejudiced that he fears to allow his children to be instructed by the Protestant clergyman in the Protestant authorized version of the Scriptures, and yet so far unprejudiced, that he is anxi-

ous that they should receive, even from Protestant hands, a better education than he has himself received, and so become better qualified than he feels himself to be, for judging between light and darkness. Surely, in such a case, it is the duty of the clergyman to endeavour to remove these conscientious fears by showing that they are groundless; and for this he will embrace every opportunity, and be earnest in season and out of season. But, whether he succeeds or not in this endeavour, who will say that, *in the mean time*, he should compel the parent to forego them,—compel him, not by moral suasion, but by external appliances? Or who would recommend the Government to place an engine of compulsion in the clergyman's hands, by enabling him, much less by commanding him, to afflict the continuance of these conscientious scruples with the wholesale penalty of exclusion from all advantages of the public education provided at the national expense,—advantages, to many of the peasantry, both for time and for eternity, of perhaps incalculable value?

A few Protestants, perhaps a few Protestant clergymen, even in the north of Ireland, would recommend this. But they are few, and the number is diminishing; for the well-meant mediæval intolerance, of which such disregard of conscientious objection is a remnant, is vanishing before a better understanding of the spirit and nature of Christianity.

The Christian religion enlightens consciences; it loves not to violate or force them. It labours to instruct and to convince; it abhors to bribe or to compel. The propositionists ask for, they wish for, no power to compel any man's conscience. They require at the hands of Government perfect liberty to instruct—those, that is, who are willing to receive their instruction. No restriction; no compulsion. Is this a time-serving policy, or is it a manly and upright principle, a genuine lesson from the Book of Truth?

We hold it so, and judge—that, not the *principle* of non-compulsion, but the departure from it, requires special justification, and needs to look about for particular circumstances to establish its *expediency*.

II.

We turn next to the Church Education Society, and we find that its opinion is diametrically opposed to our's upon this very point.

It conceives that a Protestant Government ought to make the reading of the Scriptures, in the Protestant authorized version, compulsory upon every child admitted within its schools;—compulsory, that is, under penalty of exclusion. And far from condescending to justify this, as a temporary arrangement, upon the ground of expediency, it makes very light of expediency, and claims to stand upon principle alone. And so, perhaps, it does; but is the

principle a sound one? Those who think well of what has been written will fear that it is not.

We shall reserve any further remarks upon the principle until we have cast our eyes over the leading facts. It is then to be observed of the Church Education Society :

1. That it and the propositionists will cordially agree up to a certain point. They will go hand in hand in imparting scriptural instruction to those persons, of all denominations, who are willing to receive it. And in this, we presume, they will be alike anxious. *This much the two Systems have in common.* And when it is considered what a large number of persons, of all denominations, in Ireland, come under that description, it will be readily understood that there may be localities and circumstances found in which, practically speaking, the common part may comprehend the whole, and the distinctive principle of the Society may not be brought into operation at all. Localities may be numerous in which the whole population may be unanimous in a desire to be taught the Protestant authorized version ; and there may be others in which those who have objections are saved from inconvenience, by the existence of other and good schools, in which their objections are respected. In such cases it is manifest that the principle of compulsion will have no scope, it will remain a dead letter in the Society's books. And this, we must presume, is the explanation of the fact, strange enough at first sight, which is common

throughout these dioceses, and, perhaps, met with in the rest of Ireland,—that patrons of schools under the Church Education Society describe themselves personally to be propositionists; men who signed the propositions, and declare their then sentiments unchanged. But the distinctive feature of the Society does not *always* merge into the common outline. The *compelling* is not always lost in the *giving*. In the most of Ireland it stands prominently out, and would, perhaps, in these localities too, were it not for the existence of antagonist schools; the schools, that is to say, to which the Society places itself in antagonism upon this very principle of compulsion. (See question 5, page 5).

2. The Society agrees also with the intention of the propositionists, as explained above, in recommending a time-table; a time-table, operative in respect of the religious as of the other arrangements of the School. The propositionists are not very explicit upon this point, and hence the explanation, given in p. 10, is scarcely unanimous; but the Society is sufficiently explicit. There is appended to its furnished time-table a special request, that, should the hours therein mentioned as suitable for the Bible instruction be found inconvenient, and others, in consequence, be selected, those hours should, at least, be *specified*.

So far, then, there is agreement between the propositionists and the Society. This much may be called *their common part*; a part which, however important, is not the whole, and is not to be mis-

taken for it, except by those who are willing to misrepresent both the Society and its adversaries. To such misrepresentation would one be naturally led by such a mistake ; a moment's consideration might convince us of this. But as many, manifestly, are so led, and as this is, practically speaking, the point on which the controversy hinges, we shall make it more distinct at the risk of being thought tedious.

The common feature, then, of the propositions and the Society, leaving out the National Board for the present, is:

The right and duty of *giving* scriptural education to all who are *willing* to receive it.

The distinctive feature of the Society is:

The duty of *compelling* those to receive it who are, on alleged conscientious grounds, *unwilling* to do so.

This is the essential difference between the two bodies, and on this they are opposed, and, in fact, antagonistic.

Now let us suppose a person to lose sight of this essential difference, at the same time that he is fully aware of the antagonism, how will this person be likely to demean himself in the controversy into which he may, with very insufficient consideration, throw himself? Forgetting that the common fact is a common fact, he will regard it as his own peculiar side, and represent it as such. In doing so he will be under the unavoidable temptation—may we not say necessity?—of misrepresenting his opponent, as if he denied it, while it is, in truth, their common

sentiment, or rather his opponent's position in a much more peculiar sense than it is his own, for, while his opponent holds by that common part, he makes an addition to it, and, as we judge, an addition very unlike itself both in spirit and in effect. And such persons, if they be at all listened to, and happen to meet with others in the same predicament, will soon come heartily to believe their own misrepresentation, and wonder how any one can fail to think and speak as they do. Their own side will soon appear so clear as not to need any very explicit statement or close reasoning at all. In a vague and general manner he will argue with himself and to his neighbours thus:

"I am for scriptural education. This man is *my* opponent, *therefore* he is the opponent of scriptural education; he denies the inalienable right of every man to read the Scriptures; he shelves, degrades, despises the Bible, and makes the word of God bow to his abominable expediency. What a moral monster! How is he tolerated in a Christian land?" Into such deplorable misrepresentation may even a pure-minded man be led by a confusion of thought, by not placing distinctly before him the point in debate, and so by making an initial mistake both with regard to his own position and his antagonist's; in fact, by rushing into a controversy with the best intentions, but without sufficient conscientious *examination of the facts* of the case. "Brethren, let every man be quick to hear, slow to speak."

A is for scriptural education ; that is, *the right and duty of giving it.*

"So am I," answers his opponent *B* ; "this is our common ground."

"I am also," adds the first, "for the right and duty of the State to compel all men to receive it."

"I am not sure that I agree with you in this," says *B* ; "but let us understand each other : do you mean by 'all men' to include those who have conscientious objections to receive it, at least in the form in which you offer it ?"

"Yes ; they have no right to entertain such absurd and wrong conscientious objections, and it is surely my duty to remove them."

"To remove them, certainly ; but how ?"

"By reasoning with them ; inviting them to examine ; convincing them that they are wrong ; and, in fact, enlightening their false consciences."

"In all this," replies *B*, "I heartily go with you ; and if this be what you mean by 'compelling' I cordially approve of it. Let us, then, honestly set to work, and may the Holy Spirit bless and sanctify our endeavours."

"But," adds *A*, "there is something remaining behind which will be very useful to us. I would like a little compulsion of the other kind."

"Of what other kind ?"

"A little external compulsion,—compulsion by the secular arm,—compulsion under a penalty."

"A penalty ?"

“Yes; a slight one. We will induce the Government to exclude those who have the depraved consciences from the general advantages of National Education. This will soon bring them to reason, and a sense of their duty; form a valuable counterpoise to the tyranny of the priest; and greatly facilitate the success of *our moral means* for enlightening their consciences.”

Heu! quo promissa cadunt. Is this what we have come to? This, then, is your boasted *principle*. Did there ever exist a plainer case of recommending evil that good might come? Save us from such principles! However common they may have been in the past history of Christianity, they savour neither of it nor of Christ.

It is evident, too, both from inspection and history, that the expediency on which it rests is, as it ought to be, no better than itself. Such external appliances may accelerate the premature profession of what, being in itself, perhaps, true, is yet false to those who falsely profess it; but they will always be found, as they always have been found, when viewed upon a large scale, opposed to its genuine acceptance, antagonistic to its vital influence upon the understanding and the heart.

To find any of our brethren in the ministry inclined to adopt such views is distressing enough. To see the great body of the clergy throw themselves headlong into a public avowal of this principle; to see them make a stand upon it,—organize an op-

position to Government on the basis of it, and, in defence thereof, sacrifice their natural influence for good upon the coming periods ;—to see them force into inferior, not to say into hostile hands, the local management of the national instruction, the practical power over the education, and so over the future feelings and principles, of the masses,—is surely not the least astonishing fact which Ireland in the nineteenth century exhibits.

It is of less consequence, but still not less strange, that those who do all this should arrogate to themselves any very peculiar claim to Christian principle ; that they should turn round upon those who decline this compulsion, and, in no very measured epithets, but with the warmth which becomes an honest zeal, abuse their “filthy expediency.” The men who support the Church Education Society could not do this, and would not do it, but that they manifestly have fallen into the initial mistake we have indicated. They really lose sight of the distinctive feature of the Society. They regard the common part as their own peculiar side, and most grievously and most grossly misrepresent the propositionists *and the Government*, as if they were opposed to scriptural education, because, forsooth,—while they offer to the Established Clergy every facility for imparting what religious instruction they please to all persons, of all denominations, who are willing to receive it at their hands,—they refuse to enact that those who have conscientious objections thereto *shall be compelled by secular penalty* to receive in-

struction in the Protestant authorized version of the Scriptures.

That this confusion between the duties of *giving* and of *compelling*,—a confusion not suspected, and so not examined into by themselves,—is the genuine explanation of the course the clergy have adopted with regard to National Education, is most transparent. Examine any advocacy of the Church Education Society, in pulpit, platform, or Parliament-house: is not the whole effect of the advocacy directed to defend the duty of *giving* scriptural education,—as if that were a point in dispute,—while the distinctive principle of the Society, the duty of *compelling*, is either passed over in silence, or else, which is very often the case, *actually disclaimed by the advocate*? Yet many of these are known to be conscientious men. How is this? The explanation given above is obvious. They mistake the common points of the controversy for their own particular side of it, and this side, now supposed their own, being undenied and undeniable, appears so very plain to them that further inquiry were manifestly useless, or absurd, or worse; a denial of the plainest duties, an insult to virtue and religion.

Just as if an honest Mahometan should demolish a Christian's arguments by a triumphant proof of the unity of God,—or as a Jew might confute the Apostle Paul, by producing overwhelming evidence of the divine mission of Moses,—and then should work himself up into a virtuous indignation at the astonishing depravity of mind and heart produced

by Christianity ; and when the Christian replies, " My dear Sir, you quite misapprehend ; I hold these points as firmly as any one, and more purely than you do yourself ;"—should turn away with a pious sneer at his barefaced hypocrisy.

It is painful to represent the course taken by our brethren in such a light as this. What other explanation *can* be given, consistently with the facts ? The Church Education Society enunciates its principles distinctly enough. It stands up for the right and duty of giving scriptural education to all ; *and for* the duty of making its reception compulsory, under a state penalty, in spite of conscientious objections.

But the applause which greets the announcement of the first part of the sentence is so loud, and so long, that few of its friends hear, and still fewer, even of its advocates, *notice* the second clause, which yet is the only part peculiar to itself.

Let us repeat the questions from page 5 :

4. How does a non-vested National School, such as a Protestant patron may establish, differ from such a school as he may have under the Church Education Society ?

Since both have *time-tables*, in the principle of *compulsion* or *non-compulsion*.

5. And how from such a school as the Derry and Raphoe propositions contemplate ?

In making the principle of non-compulsion complete, by *permitting* the retirement of those children who are "not to be compelled" to receive the religious instruction.

In all that has preceded we have viewed the Church Education Society in only one aspect—that which alone is pertinent to our present inquiry,—as expressing a definite opinion on the subject of National Education, as stating the principles which it conceives *ought* to characterize the Government system of public instruction. And this is its proper aspect, that which it has deliberately adopted as the ground of its existence ; antagonistic to the Derry and Raphoe propositions, and to the present system of the National Board ; anxious to comply with the views of Government, if it could, but requiring an alteration in that system ; and willing to retire, upon receiving a sufficient and sufficiently guaranteed modification of its principles and rules. It is, however, possible for it to place itself in a totally different aspect. It might, if it chose, regard itself as a voluntary association suited for the special wants of a particular section of the community ; not as antagonistic, but *supplementary* to some national system supposed, at least in measure, to be approved as applicable to the community at large. Such an association might say, with reason, “ the Government system, however suited or unsuited—for into this we do not enter—to deal with the mixed population of this country, is not capable of definitely supplying the higher wants of the members of the Established Church ; and we organize ourselves to meet this deficiency. We do not quarrel with the rest, we merely aim to educate our own ; though, of

course, we will rejoice to find that persons of other communions will receive our instructions upon our own principles, and even prefer it to what they can get elsewhere." This is reasonable, and it is distinct. But it is of extreme importance that it should be kept distinct. Interminable confusion will arise from our confounding these two aspects. For the arguments for and against the Society, in one aspect, are totally inapplicable as directed towards the other. In the one aspect it deals with the secular arm, administers the public funds, for public purposes, according to its best judgment—and it expresses that judgment—for the good of the nation at large. In the other aspect it merely says: "It is lawful for me to do what I will with my own. However you may disapprove of my views, you have no right to complain of them. It is kind and benevolent of me to admit you to my schools; but if you do not like my principles, you are at liberty to stay away. You speak of your conscientious objections, and I would help you if I could, for I really wish you well; but I cannot *sacrifice the education of my own people* in order to meet your unfortunate prejudices. You must go to the National School, since your conscience forbids you to avail yourself of mine."

All this is perfectly fair. And when the Society, following some of its advocates, places itself in this aspect, withdrawing her protest against the Government system, the objections we have so strongly expressed to its principle of compulsion

have no more applicability than if they were urged against the College of St. Columba. Whether objections of a different class may or may not lie against it, in this aspect, it is not our present business to inquire. The expressed views of the Society, in regard to *national not sectional* education, are those which we are appointed to discuss; and in order that our reasoning may be clear, it is only necessary for us to insist that these two aspects shall be kept distinct. As aiming to report, however, upon the principles *and present state* of the Society (Prop. 2, page 4), it is our duty to mention that it is in such a position with regard to facts, that a great and vigorous pecuniary effort will be necessary before it *can* keep these two aspects distinct. It must free itself from its Roman Catholic schoolmasters, we presume, before it can set itself forth as a machinery to supply the special wants of Church Protestants; and this it cannot do without such effort. For they, or at least the most of them, are saddled upon the Society by a positive compact, by its ill-judged and not very conscientious amalgamation with another Society, to which Roman Catholic schoolmasters in the most Protestant districts were not, we must presume, distasteful. Those who, upon candid examination of the whole case, find such a special machinery *needed* for Church people, and who believe the Church Education Society competent to supply that need, will surely have the honesty and energy to support it in such a genuine effort to uphold its prin-

ciples, and free it from a standing incongruity, which, so far as it is known, must lower it in its own esteem, as it certainly does in that of all sections of the community.

Waiving then the question whether the Church Education Society is competent, or could be made competent, to supply such a special machinery for the higher wants of Church Protestants, there remains the other question, is such a machinery needed, —additional or supplementary we mean,—to those schools offered us by the Government, schools which we all profess our anxiety to accept *if we could*?

We all acknowledge, at least in words, that it is *OUR special duty* to co-operate with the Government system, did not solid conscientious objections stand in our way.

Let us all then conscientiously examine it. Let us endeavour to see it as it is. Good can come to no one, harm certainly to many, from misrepresentation and one sided statement. The Commissioners have had a most difficult part assigned to them,—multitudes anxious to find fault, and other multitudes anxious to believe them. It is easy to press showy objections, much more easy than to suggest substantial improvements. Unthinking zeal may supply the one, wisdom and deliberation are needed for the other; and the zeal will not be useless.

We shall not waste time in entering into the question, whether the system has changed much, or changed little, or changed at all, since 1836. Who

needs care? It manifestly has been, at least in practical aspects, modified seriously since then. We will describe it as it now is, judging it as candidly, as impartially, and so as charitably as we can.

III.

We pass at length to an examination of the two classes of the National System. And, in the first instance, it is manifest that there *are* two classes. However desirable it might have seemed to the Government to establish a uniform scheme, the Commissioners have not, with respect to religious instruction, succeeded in it.

The administration of the Board endeavours to secure that the "literary and moral instruction," together with the amount of general religious instruction involved therein, shall be imparted with a tolerable degree of uniformity, and they require a competent portion of time to be given to this object in all their schools. But with respect to the special religious instruction required by the members of each Christian communion, the uniformity of the system does not exist, even in name. This is sometimes urged against the Board as an objection (question 6). He will think it a serious one who values highly *such* uniformity as, in receiving special religious instruction, *could be imposed* upon the different denominations actually existing in Ireland.

The hours for this special instruction are for each school appointed by the patron of it. They are ge-

nerally the last hour of each day (sometimes the first and last), the whole of Saturday, and sometimes a couple of hours on Sunday.

These hours are specified in the time-table ; and when they arrive the difference between the vested and the non-vested schools appears.

In both classes of schools the patrons have the "right of appointing;" but in the non-vested schools the patron of each has the *exclusive* right and control over the special religious instruction therein imparted. In the vested he has not. We shall describe them separately, beginning with the non-vested class, to which the questions direct our special attention.

I. The non-vested school-houses do not belong to the Board, but are the property, generally, of the individual patrons. By these they are built, furnished, and kept in order. The aid of the Board is limited to books, salary, inspection, and training for the masters.

A competent time must be given to the moral and literary instruction ; and in it persons of all denominations must be allowed to participate. The hours for the special religious instruction are appointed in each school by the patron, and over it he has the exclusive authority and control, subject, so long as he confines himself to the Bible and the standards of his Church, to *no restriction* or constraint whatever. He may fashion it to his own mind. Only there must be *no compulsion*. Whatever the reli-

gious instruction be, it can only be *required* of those children whose parents express no objection to their receiving it. They whose parents do object must be *permitted to retire*.*

For example. *D* is a school-house built and maintained by a dissenting clergyman, but receiving aid from the Board. A layman of the Established Church in the neighbourhood, for want of a better, or of any other school, sends his children to it. By the rules of the Board they must be admitted to the moral and literary instruction therein imparted, on the same terms as the Dissenters themselves.

It is optional with the parent to say whether he will have them to receive the special religious instruction appointed by the patron to his own mind, or not : in the latter case, the children must be permitted to withdraw.

And so with *R*, one built and kept in repair by the Roman Catholic priest.

And so with *P*, a non-vested school-house, built by or belonging to the Protestant clergyman, the religious instruction of which he arranges according to the views of his Church, and his own best judgment : there being no restriction, so long as he ad-

* There was some uncertainty about this until of late years, the rules of the Board seeming to require that such child should be *dismissed* ; the onus lying on the patron to enforce the prejudice of the parent. The late documents of the Board are quite explicit ; the active responsibility lies upon the parent. The patron must permit him to withdraw his child.

heres to the Bible and the standards of his Church. Dissenters and Roman Catholics come to his school; they are welcome to participate in its advantages. The hours of special religious instruction arrive; they are welcome to this also; and, if their parents be willing that they should be so instructed (which is, we believe, generally the case in these dioceses,*

* As far as we have seen, in the schools *D*, the Roman Catholic children generally do object to read the Scriptures. In the schools *P* they do not. We know a case in which, while the school was under the Church Education Society, some Roman Catholic children did not read the Scriptures; but when it was put in connexion with the Board they did. It is not now very unusual to transfer schools to the National Board, which, from poverty, &c., *could* no longer be kept working under the Church Education Society. Of course the aid and books of the Commissioners make it, in general respects, much superior to what it was before; and the Roman Catholic children generally participate in the religious instruction as before, or even more willingly. The disadvantage *or* advantage is in the principle of non-compulsion. Those Roman Catholic parents who before might be told by themselves, their neighbours, or their priest, that they were bribed by the secular instruction to let their children be taught heresy, cannot be told so any longer; they are not bribed, and they are above the appearance of it. Their conscience is respected, and they are free to follow its dictates. If they decline the instruction, the Protestant patron may remonstrate with them, as is plainly his duty, but he cannot compel them, as the Church Education Society thinks he ought.

Of course it is known that the priest is, like any other person, quite free to enter that school as a visiter; and, like all other visitors, he must be treated courteously as long as he merely looks on and listens, and writes his remarks in the visitors' book;

and perhaps in others also), *no interference whatever* is allowed to prevent or impede it. But there must be no compulsion whatever. If the parent require it, the child must be permitted to retire.

It is manifest, from inspection of the non-vested schools, that the nature of the special religious instruction given in each depends altogether on the patron of it; and one non-vested school will be extremely different from another in this respect. So much so that *the Government aid afforded to this class of schools virtually amounts to separate grants to the members of different denominations*. Two points, however, are gained by passing these grants through the hands of the Commissioners of Education.

1. A tolerably efficient system of literary and moral instruction is secured to be given in each school, which must be open, thus far, to all members of the community.

2. No person is allowed to convert the administration of these advantages into a means of bribing or compelling any individual of the community to forego whatever conscientious objections he may entertain to having his children instructed in the religious opinions of the patron.

We have said that these points "*are gained*;" and so they are, the first in degree, the second com-

but should any visiter demean himself differently, and attempt to interfere with or obstruct the school, it is the duty of the master, as courteously as may be, to insist upon his leaving it.

pletely. Many persons are dissatisfied that the first is not gained in a higher degree; and, we suppose, so are the Commissioners. But an objection on this score, surely, will come with a bad grace from those who, having enlightenment and local influence, and the power and opportunity of greatly enhancing the degree of moral, literary, and *special scriptural* instruction, which they are anxiously invited to assist in imparting, have been forbidden by their consciences(!) to act any part towards the Government exertions, except to slander and obstruct; who will not become patrons of them,—this were an abomination; who will not examine into them,—this were dangerous in the extreme, certain to compromise one's character, and not unlikely to sully the purity of one's "principles:" but who can cry "avoid it, avoid it;" "nail your colours to the mast;" "remember Achan, and touch not the accursed thing." This, at least, is *safe*, and it is creditable.

Ye fools and blind,—since there are those whom we must answer according to their folly,—ye can strain at a gnat, ye can swallow a camel. Ye have indeed,—creditably, if it must be so,—stood together; and ye have blindly run a course; and it is a wonder if both the blind leaders and the blind led are not, at this present moment, *deep* in a ditch.

But our Report is not addressed to such penetrating objectors. The reasonable and intelligent—those who must lead, and whom the rest must ultimately follow,—will mourn over the fact objected to.

For the sake of the country—for the sake of the Church—they will long anxiously to repair it. They will think it no credit to themselves that such a state of education is due, *from whatever intermediate cause*, to the existence, and avowed and hot antagonism of a body of men, who, by God's providence, have the power to mar and degrade any system of education that could be devised; and who have thought it right and expedient—or right and inexpedient,—for we must give them their choice,—to speak as they have spoken, and do as they have done.*

* How long Providence may continue to them such an influence and such a will, is unknown to man. There are surely those who have ears to hear, and eyes which, among other things, can discern the signs of the times, and which can recognise God's own hand in all the shiftings and changings, and encouragements and threatenings of this world of His. To these we whisper this aspiration. May it never be that the historian who records the last years of the Irish Church may have occasion to remark: "The first condition of a Church is usefulness,—active influence for good,—effective energy for improvement in man's eternal and his temporal affairs. The Church which fails, from whatever cause, to realize this condition, sins against its own existence. God's judgments seldom fall before they are deserved. He has appointed things to proceed here in a natural order; the antecedents appearing of themselves, at least to human eyes, to produce the consequent. The Irish Church made itself useless to Ireland as a nation; and, nationally, the Irish Church is not. To inquire what were its own views, its own reasons for this strange conduct, were but to explain the antecedent, not to explain away either it or its appointed consequent; and when the historian finds the reasons alleged still more strange than the antecedent

There are few things in this world unobjectionable ; perhaps none are perfectly so, not even the Church Prayer Book, or ANY *known* version of the Bible. But, for our own part—approving as we do of the principle of non-compulsion—willing to regard as an improvement on our propositions the permitted retirement of those children whom we have made up our mind not to compel—acknowledging the propriety of a time-table—and having lately received, by a formal document, distinct permission to lecture in our school-rooms,—for our own part, we repeat, we do not know one single objection, of such real weight that it needs be mentioned (questions 4, 5, 6), to our accepting the patronage of non-vested schools.

But we do know—who knows not?—and we cannot longer avoid feeling, and painfully, the multiplied and multiplying reasons why we should ; or, at least, why we should make some exertion, and that a vigorous and united one, to regain for ourselves and our people the ground we have lost ; to recover for ourselves the headship, for our people the first

itself, he can only fall back in wonder upon the doings of Him Who ‘ quos vult perdere, prius dementat.’ ”

There is one way of averting a consequent,—to alter the antecedent. God will then keep it in that eternal future from which it will never come.

In reference to education, and in reference to our other means of usefulness, may He give us the grace, the good sense, and the courage, to do this—and to do it in time.

place, in the cultivated intelligence of the coming generations; not to speak of the higher and more general duty of availing ourselves of the system to make our influence be felt in the education of the masses—of throwing ourselves into that which must become in our hands, whatever it may be without us, a vast and effectual machinery for imparting solid literary, moral, and direct scriptural instruction, to all sections of the population. All acknowledge it to be *our plain duty* to do this, were there no sacrifice of principle; and there certainly must a principle be sacrificed by those who will side with us; but it is the principle of compulsion,—compulsion, under a Government penalty, of acknowledged conscientious objection. For our part we are willing to let this principle go along with the rest. It is not worth preserving by itself. Let it sleep with the spirit and principle of the other penal enactments, which have disgraced and deranged the social condition of our country; which have stifled and strangled, and almost nullified all genuine exertion to introduce and nurture an intelligent and conscientious, a self-diffusing and self-reforming Christianity.

Are we then all at once to strike our colours and join the Board? Nay, not so precipitate. After hesitating for thirteen years, whatever we do now we will do it deliberately.

We have approved of the school *P*, a non-vested school under our own patronage. It is our own fault if it be not excellent and unobjectionable.

But what about the schools *D* and *R*, over which we have no control whatever. Do we approve equally of them? The Presbyterian and the Roman Catholic clergymen receive them from Government as we do our's, on the principle of a separate grant. They can exclude us from interfering with their schools, and we can exclude them from meddling with our's. We may, or we may not, like the principle of a separate grant, but the fact is, the Government do give it; and we certainly do disclaim both the principle and the expediency of refusing to lay out some of it well, because, forsooth, others, whether we refuse it or no, will lay out some of it worse. We approve of no such wisdom, though, practically speaking, we have been adopting it for a long time. We hold it right and conscientious to appropriate to good purposes as much of it as we can; to occupy the grant, to *preoccupy the ground* with good "scriptural" schools, instead of forcing both grant and ground into inferior hands.

Still, without arguing the PRINCIPLE of separate grants, we cannot but regret to see so large a portion of the education funds totally withdrawn from our control and interference, and spent upon schools from which we are excluded; schools, many of which,—in the class *R* we mean,—however superior to the hedge schools which preceded them, are yet notoriously bad, and very inferior to what even they well might be.

As a class, then, the non-vested schools, the ag-

gregate of the schools *P, D, R*, are not entirely to our mind, any more than the aggregate of the houses of public worship in Ireland, including churches, meeting-houses, and Roman Catholic chapels. We would like to see at least another class, in which *as a whole* we might have a greater power of interference; and over which we might, if we could in an upright and liberal spirit, without violating our neighbours' conscience or our own, exercise a more extended and directly beneficial influence. We shall suppose for the present the Commissioners to be of our own mind, for, as a class, they do not favour the non-vested schools; they give them only a limited assistance. They reserve their chief benefits for a different class, which now falls to be examined.

II. The vested school-house may be said to belong to the Board itself, having been *chiefly* built at its expense, and is vested either in it or in trustees for its use. In all such schools the Commissioners require that facilities shall be given to the teachers of the different religious denominations to instruct their own children—meaning by “their own”—the children of those parents who desire that their offspring shall be so instructed.

For example. Let **R** be a vested school, under the patronage of a Roman Catholic, situated in a district in which there are but few Protestants residing. The want of another good school, or of any other school, may induce a Protestant parent to send his children to that provided by the Government.

The patron of that school is obliged by the rules of the Board to admit those children to all the advantages of the literary and moral instruction therein imparted; and is not allowed to compel them, either by exclusion, or by any other penalty, direct or indirect, to receive the special religious instruction appointed to proceed in that school. On the contrary, the Protestant clergyman of the district, or some teacher appointed by him, with the sanction of the parents, is at liberty to enter the school-room, with his Bible, and Prayer Book, and Catechisms, at the hours indicated by the time-table, and directly to instruct those children, to his own mind, in the doctrines of Protestant Christianity. And further, in this Protestant scriptural instruction, all children, of all denominations, may and shall participate, whose parents choose to direct that they shall receive it.

And, similarly, let **P** be a vested school, under the patronage of a Protestant clergyman, to which, for whatever reason, Roman Catholic children are sent. If their parents desire it, these children will receive the special religious instruction appointed for the school by its Protestant patron; and *no one* will be allowed to interfere with their receiving it. Some parents, however, may desire the contrary; and for these the Roman Catholic clergyman will enter the school-room, if he thinks it judicious, with his Douay Bible, and his other standard books, and instruct all those children, of every denomination,

whose parents confide their children to his instruction.

And similarly with **D**, a vested school, under the patronage of a Dissenter.

Such is the other class of the National Board schools, the class which we must presume to be most in accordance with the wishes and principles of the Board itself; for these are the schools which belong to the Commissioners, and on which they confer their greatest pecuniary benefits.

Impartial, absolutely impartial, it aims to be, in offering its advantages to the different denominations in Ireland; so absolutely impartial as to be distasteful to each of them. At least the great bulk of individuals connected with each communion exhibit a practical aversion to it by declining to become patrons of such schools. Can it be that no denomination in Ireland is able to appreciate such impartiality in the administration of the national funds? This might partly account for, but, we are convinced, is not the full and proper explanation of the aversion. An important fact—a condition of the Board—seems fairly to account for it.

The vested school-houses are built *chiefly*, but not altogether, at the national expense. The Commissioners require that a portion of the money—one-third at least—shall be locally contributed, thus demanding of the several patrons not merely a *passive submission to this impartiality*, as coming from the administrators of a national fund, but the *active*

adoption of it for themselves and their people, in the allocation of their private funds.

Let us distinctly consider it, first, as the principle of the Board, and next as that of a patron.

The object of the Board is the instruction of the people supposed to need it. The condition of its existence is respect for conscientious differences of opinion acknowledged to exist among separate denominations.

They administer the public funds, to which all these denominations indifferently contribute.

It would seem, then, that *from it*, in its corporate capacity, this impartiality must be required. The opposite were plainly to be condemned. But have the Commissioners no individual preferences themselves? Are they called on to sacrifice their own consciences for the public good? Perhaps not. We may suppose them each to reason thus:

“Such impartiality, being a withdrawal of those external appliances which prevent a dispassionate judgment, must be favourable to calm and unprejudiced inquiry, and so must ultimately tend, under God, to the gradual defeat of error, and the cordial reception of truth. Truth,” they may say, “and eminently the Christian truth, needs not this world’s weapons, nor the foreign aids of bribery and force. It labours to make, or find for itself, a fair field and no favour. Its native energy, under the Spirit of God, will, even against the odds, enable it to work its effectual way, and in its own time to vanquish its

antagonists. It only asks to be fairly heard, to be dispassionately judged of, in order to command approval and compel conviction ; and all external force and unfair inducement which urge its premature reception, its insincere profession, are really contrary to its spirit, subversive of its genuine influence, and obstructive of its ultimate success." And so each member may say: " Let us enlarge, by solid instruction, the minds of the bulk of the people, and thus qualify them for judging intelligently of what God's providence may bring before them. Let us impart to them what moral and religious knowledge they will receive at our hands. Let us urge the parents to have their children specially instructed in Christianity by those in whom they have confidence. Let us afford them all facilities for so doing. If we can administer the public funds so as to advance, even in degree, these objects,—if we can promote the capability (hitherto, among the masses in Ireland, little or none) of judging between light and darkness,—teach, without injuring consciences, the general outline of the Christian religion, and cause the peculiarities of the different denominations to be laid as impartially as may be before the public view,—we shall have wrought everlasting good. We shall have facilitated the forming of a dispassionate judgment, and that is enough for us. By the ultimate effect of that unbiassed examination, we are each willing to abide. In the honest and earnest battle-field of truth, with God for His own side, let him conquer who can, we shall all share the victory."

Such we may imagine the views of Archbishop Murray or Archbishop Whately, in becoming members of a Board engaged to carry out this absolute impartiality.

Let the reasoning, for argument sake, be esteemed conclusive, and the sentiments to be most just; and by these, and such as these, let the Commissioners themselves be justified. Still it must be acknowledged,

I. That they are very far in advance, if it be an advance, of what the public mind in Ireland has been accustomed to, and of what it is as yet prepared to accept.

II. That they are sentiments extremely open to mistake and misrepresentation, on the side of latitudinarian carelessness and religious indifference.

Even where honestly adopted, they will, to multitudes of the best-minded of the people, wear the appearance of serious evil.

Can it be wise, then, in the Commissioners to require of the patrons of vested schools not merely a passive submission to them, as administered by the Board, but that pastors and people should actually adopt them in a form much more objectionable than does the Board itself? For, the portion of the expense which must be locally contributed the patron will generally raise by subscription, and generally, of course, among those of his own communion. Now, though all sections might be fairly expected soon to understand the impartiality of the Board in giving,

out of the public treasury, equally to each denomination (as in the non-vested schools), is it to be expected that *any* section will soon be able either to understand or approve of this indifference, as expected from themselves? That the people of the Protestant clergyman, for instance, should be soon brought to understand that they ought to contribute towards building a school **P**, in which, equally with their own pastor, the Roman Catholic priest may teach his "special" errors? Or that the Roman Catholic people will understand their clergyman, when he asks them for aid towards erecting a school-house **R**, in which, in despite of the priest, the Protestant clergyman may inculcate his "special" heresy? Can it be expected that the conscientious members of either communion in Ireland will be, for many years to come, if indeed they ever will be, or ought to be, so far "advanced" in candid and unprejudiced views of religious differences as to be able to appreciate and enter into impartiality like this? Nay; is it to be expected soon that they will so far understand these views,—so far be removed from the rank of "little ones,"—that they will not be positively offended, scandalized, injured in their consciences, by seeing their clergyman adopt them, and hearing him recommend them to do the same? And, last of all,—a point of less personal, but greater national importance,—is it to be expected that they will not view with dissatisfaction, dislike, suspicion, that National Board of Education itself, which makes the positive recep-

tion of such views the preliminary of its assistance to its best, its own class of schools ?

It seems clear that the Commissioners, in requiring this, require too much. They require what few conscientious men in Ireland are prepared to give, the active adoption, in the most distinct form, of views which may be true, indeed, perhaps, are true, but which, true or false, are too far in advance of our present position. Most patrons fear them, many reject them ; and it is surely supposeable that some clergymen who could conscientiously adopt them for themselves, might yet as conscientiously shrink from inviting their parishioners directly to carry them into practice. “New wine is not to be put into old bottles, *lest the wine be spilled, AND THE BOTTLES perish:*” and this, though the excellence of the wine were by no means doubtful.

Let us, if only for argument sake, approve of this courageous impartiality of sentiment. Let us regard it as a sort of consummation which it were most desirable to produce. Yet, look at Ireland, as it has been, and as it is; we ask, is it not plain folly in the Commissioners to expect, to require, the end at the beginning ?—to make that the condition of building a school, which can only be expected as a far-off result of its operations ? They must reconsider this. They cannot willingly subject themselves to misconception, and condemn their system to be so far neutralized by offending the genuine consciences of the people. The Commissioners can have no wish

to do so ; and had they sufficiently considered the difference between their own position and that of a clerical patron, or his local subscribers, they would not, we are satisfied, have insisted upon this condition.

In return for his extra liberality of sentiment, the local patron has advantages in the school,—appointment of the master, general control, &c. Let those whose conscience is clear, and whose circumstances admit of it, secure to themselves these advantages.

But if the Commissioners wish *a better class* of schools than the non-vested to come into extended and effectual operation,—if they wish the conscientious clergy of any denomination to give their active assistance,—if they wish ourselves, particularly, to do what we are truly anxious to do, throw our influence and our energies into some plan for improving the literary, moral, and religious education of the masses,—they must find for us, and for all, some mode of entrance which shall not be closed up by so serious an obstacle,—an obstacle which they must see has prevented, and which they must fear will long prevent the patronage of vested schools being acceptable to any denomination in this country.

We do not condemn the impartiality of the Board; we object to their requiring it, in a more objectionable form, from the local *patrons*.

Our reasoning entitles us to insist upon two points:

I. That the most complete justification of this indifferency, as exhibited by the Government, and

as administered by the Board, is no proof whatever that persons could, or should, individually become patrons of vested schools on the terms proposed.

II. That the most complete condemnation of this principle in the Government, Board, and patron, is no justification whatever of those who, *when a vested school has once been built*, neglect to secure for themselves and the public the advantages it offers in the name of the Government.

While we may address the one point to the Commissioners, it is surely our duty to press the other upon the attention of the clergy. As the Board seem to have overlooked the difference between a Commissioner and a patron, so, on the other hand, the clergy plainly forget the difference between a *patron* receiving Government aid on certain terms, and *those other religious teachers* in the neighbourhood, to whom, whether they have “applied” for the school or not, the Government has secured the right of entering the National School in their proper capacity, as religious teachers, and of instructing to their own mind those children whose parents will intrust them to their care.

The vested school **R**, for instance, is built and in operation. There are a few Protestant children in it, and, perhaps, a few of other classes who may wish to receive the “Scriptural” instruction of the Protestant clergyman. The Government has secured, by positive rule, that the Protestant clergyman may, if he choose, enter it at the hours of religious in-

struction, and teach to those children whatever he thinks judicious.

One of the strange facts which this question of education presents comes now to be told. Will it be believed, at least by those who have no opportunity of actual observation, that the Protestant clergymen, generally, *do not choose*; that there is no scriptural, or other Protestant instruction imparted, even to the Protestant children, in such schools, at least with their consent or cognizance? They do not go near them at all! Perhaps there is some restriction imposed or some condition required, which, as gentlemen, or as Christian men, they could not well submit to? No such thing; farther than has been mentioned,—that they must go at the hours publicly set apart for religious instruction, and that they have no power to compel any child, except by his parent's wish, to receive their instruction,—there is no manner of restriction or condition whatsoever, direct or indirect, expressed or implied. They are forbidden by their “principles.” Tell it not in Gath,—whisper it not in the ears of the uncircumcised, all patent, and public, and notorious though it be,—they are forbidden by their principles,—the principles being, as might be expected, those which befit such practice; such as these:—“*We will not* teach Protestantism, because others may and will teach Popery. We will not have a church, because they may have a chapel. We will not *give*, because we are not furnished with the means to compel. It is essential to the purity and

the utility of scriptural instruction, that its reception should be made compulsory by secular penalty, in spite of conscientious objections ; and we, therefore, *will not teach* even those who are anxious to be taught, because the Government will not make our teaching compulsory upon the rest."

Upon those of our brethren who are lax enough, or courageous enough, to doubt such principles,—upon those who are anxious to preach the Gospel themselves, whether the secular arm will coerce its reception or not,—upon those who long for opportunities of reaching, in an upright yet earnest and missionary spirit, those whom, in this country, it is difficult to reach,—of directly teaching those who will be taught, and of leavening with what good we may those who refuse our direct ministrations,—upon these we urge the consideration of the vested schools. These men we call upon to repair, if possible, such grievous oversight, and to anticipate its consequences.

There are objections to our building and becoming patrons of vested schools. We have stated this as strongly, as fairly as we could. We must hope that, for the sake of education in Ireland, if for no better immediate reason, the Commissioners will alter the obnoxious conditions. We are prevented by these conditions from accepting the patronage of them ; and in this all communions, even those who freely accept the non-vested schools, manifestly

think with us. But those objections lie only against the initial conditions; they affect only the conscience of the patron and original subscribers. The other religious teachers in the neighbourhood are in a very different position. They are not asked to afford any facilities to any one. The school being built and in operation, they are invited to do their duty to those of their own children who may attend it. There is guaranteed to them by Government every reasonable facility,—the same, in fact, as that enjoyed by the patron himself,—for imparting such scriptural or other religious instruction as they deem judicious to all whom their parents wish to receive it. Now is it conscientious in us, is it our duty to our country or ourselves, to neglect such providential opportunity?

In a destitute Roman Catholic district, for instance, in which, perhaps, we have no other door of entrance,—no other opportunity even of indirect influence,—the Government and the priest have established the school **R**. We may dislike this; we may have protested against it, and may still; we may have had so much of Christian “principle” and of common sense, that we have exerted ourselves to prevent its being built, and we may have been in some measure successful. We may have prevailed upon the Protestant land-owners to refuse ground whereon to build it, and so have forced the Commissioners, contrary to their known wish, and ex-

press conditional rule*, to build it in a chapel-yard, thereby tending to bring them and their system into very deserved contempt, and to furnish a very respectable argument, *a posteriori*, against themselves: and all this is very creditable to us. Man and God, our conscience and our country, must all equally approve of it. Still, do our best, we could not prevent it; they built it, and built it in spite of us. On their own responsibility, in this Roman Catholic district, they built the school **R**; on their own responsibility, and in despite of us, they have guaranteed to us the opportunity of teaching the Scriptures to those who will receive our teaching, and, by the presence of ourselves and our Bible classes, to restrain and influence what might else be taught.

This may have been the climax of unprincipledness in them. It may have been the instigation of Antichrist or of the Devil himself, to build such a school in such a place, and to secure to us such opportunities. Yet, who is it, O wise man, that will regard *our* opportunities, however furnished, as *our* responsibilities, and can command even the powers

* "Although the Commissioners do not absolutely refuse aid towards the erection of schoolhouses on ground connected with places of worship, yet they much prefer having them erected on ground which is not so connected, where it can be obtained; they therefore require that, before church, chapel, or meeting-house ground be selected as the site of a schoolhouse, *strict* inquiry be made whether another convenient site can be obtained, and that the result shall be stated to them."—§ VII. Rule 3.

of darkness, if it must be so, not merely to furnish the opportunities, but also to note and punish their neglect?

It is scarcely needful to remark, that in both classes of National Schools there is a distinct time-table insisted on. The patron of each school arranges the hours of special religious instruction, subject, of course, to the approval of the Board. In this there is agreement between the Church Education Society and the Commissioners. It were scarcely worth noticing, but that some seem to mistake it, that the time-table is not, in either system, intended for the annoyance of the patron, or designed to hamper him in case of an occasional or extraordinary visit to the school. But, of course, a conscientious patron will always observe the *spirit* of the time-table, and will violate its *letter* as little as he can.

A special observation with regard to the time-table in non-vested schools, we have not thought necessary to make till now. It requires, however, to be distinctly understood. It is a rule of the Board that, in case of a school in which there are no children whose parents object to it, the Scriptures may be read *at any hour*, whether that mentioned in the time-table or not. Should a parent object, this practice must cease. This reading of the Scriptures, *extra* the time-table, is often confounded with that of the time-table. But it is quite a different thing, and has no connexion with it. We cannot suppose that the habit of keeping the Bible open at all hours is ac-

according to the wishes of the Board, any more than it is to the wishes of the Church Education Society. It is rather to be regarded as a concession to the feelings and habits of those who think it well to make it an ordinary school-book. The effect of a parent's objections to it is, that the concession ends, and the school is reduced to the regular order approved by the Board, by the Society, and by the most of serious and intelligent men. This practice commonly prevails, we believe, and generally unimpeded, in the class of schools *D*.

We are directed to compare the National System with the Derry and Raphoe propositions. It appears then, from our review, that, in neither *the non-vested schools, when under our own patronage*, nor in the *operation of the vested schools, when built, and under any patronage*, is there any departure, in the least degree, from the principle of no restriction, no compulsion. Thus while the non-vested schools will furnish us, if we accept them, with every reasonable machinery for the special instruction of our own people, and of those others who are willing to share it with them, the vested schools, under any patronage, would furnish us with an available and effective influence over the general education of the country.

We say *would* furnish us, that is, if they were built; but this they are not, and are not likely to be, to any great extent, while the Commissioners insist upon the initial condition to which, in common with all denominations, we seriously object. A

condition respecting which, it may not perhaps, appear affectation in us to remark, in conclusion, that it does seem to violate our principle of non-compulsion; that the administration of the Government funds becomes, through this condition, a species of *external* inducement and bribe to, or compulsion upon, a patron and his friends to adopt a principle of religious indifference, for which neither he nor his people are prepared. It is, however, only upon the patron and original subscribers that the compulsion is exercised; and it may be said with truth, that the National System respects every person's conscience in the community, except that of its best friends, the patrons of and subscribers to its own, its vested class of schools. These it certainly urges, and by an external, a secular, and locally an unfair inducement, to a premature adoption of certain views, which, even if supposed just, will be, in many localities, injurious, as a piece of new cloth sewed on to an old garment.

We have thus traversed the ground marked out for us (prop. 2, page 4), insisting, for distinctness sake, only on the main and essential features of the question.

What is the issue of our examination?

I. We have restated our principle of "No restriction, no compulsion," and restated our approval of it. Our deliberate conviction is, that it is Protestant because Christian, expedient because just.

We stated it in 1836; we urged it upon the attention of the clergy. They would not hear us. What they did hear they scouted. They thought "they could organize a nobler opposition,—we were weakening their hands, nullifying their protest, frustrating their good."

Outside our own dioceses, all were against us; within, there was a respectable minority. The Government system was new, ambiguous, and unimproved. What could we do? We do not disapprove of what we did. We did not withdraw our opinions; we could not; but we did forbear to press them to a division. A System was organized on a principle the reverse of our's. We permitted ourselves,—our circumstances generally allowed of it (p. 15),—to be enrolled as its supporters; as such we have ever since continued.

But how long is this to last? We cannot avoid seeing that, by so doing, we injure the education of the country, we impair the present, we endanger the future influence of the Church. We have contributed, and are contributing to place it in its present increasingly anomalous and unsafe position with respect both to the Government and the people. This growing effect of our conduct were startling enough, even if it came upon us in defending our own principles, how much more so when, against our personal convictions, we are fighting for the principles of others? The time has surely come when we are called upon to pause, to bethink us

of our own views again, to judge them strictly, and if, before God, we approve of them, in His name, for the sake of those who differ with us and for the sake of those who agree, to assert them with energy at last, to act them out on our own responsibility, and to try will they, even in degree, repair what their reverse has injured.

Before doing so we will state our principles again.

Will the clergy listen to us now? We wish not for disunion; the clergy know this. We have no wish to take the lead; they know this too: now as before we will follow, if they choose: but it must be *now* on our principles, not on their's. We have listened to them; we have stood by their side for thirteen years; with more of constancy than those hasty and not over-delicate or over-scrupulous tongues which despised our moderation. They must listen to us. Brethren, is it needful that we should use words to prove, or to press upon you, our doctrine of non-compulsion? We cannot think so. It is, it must be, your principle as well as our's. Notwithstanding your apparent unanimity in recommending a different course,—a unanimity which we have ourselves, rightly or wrongly, contributed to swell,—we believe of you generally, we know of very many individuals among you, that, if you will take the trouble of being explicit with yourselves, you will reject the principle of secular, civil, external compulsion, as distinctly as we do. Yet this

II. Is *the principle* of the Church Education So-

ciety. It is not merely "that she ought in her schools," but that "the Government *ought* in all its schools, supplied out of the public treasury for the use of the nation at large," to make the reading of the Scriptures, in the Protestant authorized version, compulsory, under penalty of exclusion, upon all the children in the community.

Brethren, is this the principle you ask us to abide by? It is impossible. Too willing a belief in misrepresentation of your antagonists has prevented your being sufficiently careful or distinct in examining your own position. If you will but look steadily at it, you will see that it is contrary to your own individual sentiments, and opposed to the principles of your preaching and your lives. Do not, in a hasty, because over-confident process of reasoning, confound some simple notions,—GIVING with COMPELLING; *compelling by moral suasion and influence*, with *compelling by deprivation of secular and State advantages; the regulations of a voluntary association*, with *the*, supposed impartial and universal, *law of the land*;—and we mistake you much, or you will, with us, distinctly decline this principle, and assert, instead of it, that which we have endeavoured to set forth as our's.

The Society might alter this. By withdrawing its National aspect, and purifying its details, it might enable itself to claim a supplementary position, as suited for the special wants of Church Protestants.

Suppose it did so, would it then be needed?

How would it then differ from those schools which we are offered by the Government?

Suppose our doctrine of non-compulsion to be, if not *right*, at least *allowable*, and then,

III.—1. The Government aid to *non-vested schools* is tantamount to separate grants passing through the hands of the Commissioners of Education.

We have the exclusive right and control over those which are under our own patronage. Other denominations have equally exclusive privileges in their's. They can exclude us from disturbing their schools; we can exclude them from meddling with our's. It is only necessary for us, then, to accept a portion of those separate grants, in order to have excellent and unobjectionable schools, conducted by ourselves, and on our own principles; a special machinery for Church Protestants, and the guaranteed right and opportunity of *giving*, to all members of the community, what scriptural, or other religious, instruction soever they are willing to receive.

Wherever we have or might have a school under the Church Education Society, we might have a much better school under the National Board,—the non-vested school *P*,—as much better in principle, to those who hold the doctrine of non-compulsion, as it will be in all practical details.

We do not think it our duty to oppose the Government. We believe we ought to co-operate with it if we could.

What withholds, then, that we should dot the

country over with the schools *P*, confer the greatest benefit upon it, and place ourselves in our natural position?

It is inherent in the principle of separate grants, that there may exist also the schools *D* and *R*, from which we are excluded: and such do exist.

This may be an objection to the principle of *giving*, but it is an argument in favour of *our receiving*, separate grants. Our only practical mode of lessening the schools *D* and *R*, is to *pre-occupy their place* with the schools *P*. The best way we can take to multiply the schools *R* is to refuse our share of the grant.

2. The *vested schools* aim at united religious education, that is, in separate classes, and under separate teachers, but in the same school-house, and at the same time.

This may be right or wrong; wise or unwise;*

* It is not, at all events, the same kind of united education as that insisted upon by the Church Education Society. It is *not* Roman Catholic schoolmasters obliged to teach the Scriptures to Protestant children, nor Roman Catholic children obliged, even against their parents' consciences, under penalty of exclusion from all education, to be taught, with the Protestant children, the Protestant authorized version. "To be taught." It is a question not yet satisfactorily decided, whether this means "to be taught to read it, and made read it," or "to be instructed in its meaning." The decision of the question either way must entail serious inconvenience upon the "united education" of the Society. Yet it declaims—does it not?—against the united education of the Government! "Comparisons are odious," writes a Church Edu-

but surely *good classes, under good teachers*, are not wrong, and these it is in our power to add to the vested schools. Whatever be the patronage of the school, or whatever be our expressed opinions regarding it, we are free, by fundamental rule, to teach

cation advocate. Ah! too true. Might we not *learn* something, however, by getting a friendly hint that we carry a bag behind us as well as one before.

We have before us—it is in the parish of the writer of these pages—this case: In a decent and respectable Protestant neighbourhood, there is situate a large and populous townland, in which there is not a single Roman Catholic residing, except *one*—the Roman Catholic Church Education schoolmaster. And this is not the worst, nor the most trying case of the kind, in the parish. When we mention such trifles, *privately*, the Society, or at least its secretaries, will cry out “ungenerous!” There is a retribution even in this world. Appius appealed to the protection of law: the Society’s advocates ask for generosity. Well, they shall have it, for us. Let them keep such matters as quiet as they can. It is scarcely reasonable to expect, however, that those who can strain at a gnat and swallow things like this shall experience no present or subsequent inconvenience from the process. The Society’s “conscience,” however, is large enough to digest a great deal.

The most amusing—may we use the word to avoid a harsher?—procedure of the Society is, when it asks the Government to take *its conscience* into consideration, and complains that all consciences in the community are respected except its own. As if any other conscience could be respected if its were. Its fundamental position is, that it ought to be invested with the secular power to do what it thinks it ought to do, *compel* the consciences of others. Now, if it argued for this on the grounds of policy or expediency, it might make a brave show of reasons, and reasons which have, before now, been found successful; but it ap-

our special religious instruction there. In all the schools, **P, D, R**, *we may have our Bible classes*, with all their influence, direct and indirect; that is, if there be, attending the school, children, of any denomination, whose parents will allow us to teach them.

peals to the "rights of conscience," and the doctrines of Protestant toleration. "Other consciences in the community are indulged. Fair play then demands that mine shall be also. The particular conscientious scruple which claims to be indulged is, to be sure, a taste for not indulging, for coercing in fact, the consciences of others. But this is no business of your's. It is my conscience, and as such it is your duty, O reprobate Government! to indulge it, at least if you indulge any."

This is no caricature, it is the actual fact. Hear its best Parliamentary advocates: "Conscientious objections *being entertained* to the National System of Education, *and the principle of toleration being established in England*, it is reasonable and right that means should be taken for satisfying those conscientious scruples. The reasonableness or unreasonableness of those scruples cannot be admitted as a good or valid argument in the question."—(Mr. G. A. Hamilton). Similarly Mr. Napier complains: "You pay all attention to the conscientious objections of one party; you manifest no deference to the conscientious feelings of the other party;" and similarly insists, "it is not the propriety of the objection, but the fact that it is conscientious, which should govern your decision." In plain words,

M has conscientious scruples *against* having his children forced by secular penalty to be taught, by A, the Protestant authorized version.

A has conscientious scruples *for* forcing them.

M's conscientious scruples have been indulged by the State.

ARGAL—*A's ought also!!*

By all the rules of fair play they ought; by the principles of toleration, by the rights of conscience, they ought. "It is not the

What prevents that there should be our Bible classes in all these schools? The clergy generally have, until lately at least, overlooked it. We know of no justification, and no excuse, for the oversight.

reasonableness nor the unreasonableness, it is not the propriety of the objection, but the fact that it is conscientious, which should govern your decision." Good logic and pleasant statesmanship from the Members for the University.

We respect both these gentlemen sincerely. But have we not "painful evidence" in their case, as in the case of the Bishop of Ossory (see final note), and of the clergy generally, that they have never distinctly set before them *the point* of the question?

The fundamental position of the Church Education Society is untenable, because intolerant; it is based upon a denial of the rights of conscience to a certain class in the community; it asks the secular power to make these submit to what *its* conscience (not *their's*) thinks good for them. To appeal to the rights of conscience in support of this is a contradiction in terms; the same exactly, in point of absurdity, as if the court of inquisition asked to be established for *its* conscience sake. The difference between them is only in the *degree* of secular coercion which it is thought *expedient*, for the principle is the same, to resort to. We frequently hear such things upon Church Education platforms, and the explanation is simple.—(See page 22).

It is scarcely an exaggeration to say, that nine-tenths of all the speeches made in (supposed) support of the Society are directed *against* her principles, and for those against whom they are supposed to be delivered.

We are a "spirited people." Sooner than have any imputation cast upon our courage and *esprit du corps*, we will "fight first and examine afterwards," and no one will be more sorry than ourselves (for, with all our faults, we are really kind-hearted and sincere) to find that we had taken the wrong side, and wounded, with the best intentions, our friend in a mistake.

What, then, are we offered by the Government ?

I. We are offered—for ourselves and our people, in common with the rest of the community—the moral and literary instruction, without any reserve whatever.

As there can be no sound morality without reli-

The Irish *evangelical* clergy did this (it is a matter of history) for many years towards the Irish Society; they have found out their mistake, but not until the best opportunities furnished by the existence of the Irish language had vanished for ever. They are suspecting the same mistake in regard to the National Schools; it will only require them to wait a while longer, and it will be too late here also. The ground will be pre-occupied, and not by us.

The actual position of the clergy in respect to education is this.

Having in their hands a most inferior system, and one, both in its principle and its details, highly objectionable, they have by their own superior energy, industry, and intelligence, made up, in many particular cases, and more than made up, for its flagrant deficiencies, and have in practice generally covered and obscured, with their own good, its objectionable points.

Meantime they have forced a system really excellent and efficient, and *one much more* in accordance with their own principles, into the occupation of very inferior hands. These entail upon the National Education many local objections. In spite of these, however, it is working its way, and gradually wresting the ground and the people out of our occupancy.

It is manifest that it will continue to do so. *If we could* influence public opinion in our favour we might hope to hold our ground; but public opinion is not even as cordial as it was, and recent circumstances leave it out of the power of those who would support us to do it efficiently.

This is the actual fact. What is now to be done?

It is truly ungracious in such a juncture to rake up the fail-

gion, this moral instruction involves within it a general religious instruction. That furnished in the National Board books will be best judged of by those who will take the trouble of reading them.

II. In order to supply special religious instruction, which we are guaranteed the right of giving to all who will receive it, and refused the power to force, directly or indirectly, upon those who are unwilling to receive it, we are offered:

ings of the Society, to find out its past and present mistakes, and cast them up in its face. This were the part of Job's comforters, or worse. Well, then, shall we shut our eyes, and, as our old ship is going down, shall we go down with it? This were good policy and good principle too!

Brethren of Derry and Raphoe, on you rests the present crisis.

You can come forward in a manly and intelligible course, and the clergy can follow, in this juncture, and even with credit.

1. Stand upon your principle, no restriction, no compulsion.

2. Accept the Government facilities, *as far as they embody it, and enable you to carry it out.*

3. Protest against the rest, against whatever you think wrong in the whole system, and exert yourselves to have it altered and improved.

Is not this your *duty* to yourselves, your brethren, your country?

Let us give up contending, *fruitlessly* and most injuriously, for the power to compel.

Let us avail ourselves of all fair means of teaching without compulsion.

Let us hope (and is it not a reasonable and a Protestant hope?) that, if we do so, willing readers will quickly multiply, and compulsion, in theory and practice, soon be needless.

God Almighty bring this to pass! He will enable us to bear any present hardship that our course presents.

1. The non-vested schools *P*, exclusively to ourselves, including the right of holding our Sunday schools, and of "lecturing" in the evening to our children, their parents and connexions.

2. The opportunity for our Bible classes in all the vested schools.

III. We are offered, in common with all members of the community, the general and not uninfluential privilege of entering all schools, as visitors, and of writing our remarks in the school-books.

These several opportunities we recognise as so many responsibilities. Those who could have given us greater opportunities, and who have not done so, may have been right or they may have been wrong. This is their part. Let them answer for it. These, however, they have given us, and for these we are responsible. We hold it conscientious, we judge it to be no less than our plain duty to ourselves and to every one, to make all these advantages, so far as we can, available for the general good.

Any parts of the Government system which we judge to be wrong, *we hold it to be our duty to protest against, and to exert ourselves to have remedied*, as we would in reference to any other law of the land, or practice of the administration.

The public, we are satisfied, may be appealed to with confidence to support us in such a manifestly upright and straightforward and constitutional course.

It will not be very difficult for men to understand, for instance, that when we go and teach our Bible

classes in the vested schools **R**, we do so not in order to "withhold the Bible," and "foster Popery," but to give the Scriptures, even when we cannot compel their reception, and to teach them to those who, but for such opportunity, would have been left, as their fathers were, notwithstanding the visions which are indulged in of the times gone by, to live and die in unmitigated superstition and worse than semi-barbarous ignorance. Or, when we accept our portion of the separate grants, and multiply the non-vested schools *P*,—over which we have *exclusive* control, in which we give scriptural instruction to our own mind, hold our Sunday schools, and deliver our expository country lectures,—we do not seriously anticipate that the public will judge that we do so in order to multiply the schools *R*, in which the priest has exclusive control, and teaches Popery. Simple people will rather think, that if the schools *P* be good, and the schools *R* bad (question 3, page 5), the natural way, either to get rid of or to improve the latter, were to establish and work out as many of the former as we can; and they will prefer to see good citizens appropriating the public money to good purposes, rather than, in deference to their "principles," compelling it to be spent on worse.

We are asked, "does not a person who *accepts* one portion of the advantages offered by the Government, compromise, by so doing, his protest against the rest, or the abuses of the rest of the system?" (Answers to questions 2 and 3, page 5.)

“ Yes,—as much as the person who gives an upright vote under the Reform Act, compromises thereby his protest against anything in the Act, or its administration, which he thinks wrong, or against the misconduct of some one else who avails himself of its franchise to give a corrupt vote.” Considering the constitution of these countries, and the twofold position which we all occupy in it with regard to any law,—*as subjects*, and so bound to obey it while it is the law, and to make it productive of as much good as possible, and also as, each in our degree, *legislators*, and so bound to look after the law itself, and to improve it where required,—the question is puerile in the extreme, or even absurd.

If, indeed, the Government, or their Commissioners, were to require in any degree, directly or indirectly, either expressly or by implication, that, in return for these advantages, we should not protest against, and endeavour to have altered, anything whatever in their conduct or principles which we disliked, then, indeed, the question would be significant, and it would be grave.

But no such thing is even pretended, and the question, considered in itself, means—nothing. Were the whole subject of National Education new, and now for the first time brought before the public, no one would seriously ask it. But the subject is *not* new, and the public mind is *not* free to receive a fair impression, or to judge of things as they are; and the question is not puerile, but a very serious one,

“ Shall we be compromised *in the eyes of the public*, in the eyes of our own people especially, by taking, *de novo*, this plain course with regard to one of our chief duties, the education of the poor ?”

The question itself implies sufficient humiliation. With what is the public mind preoccupied, and by whom has it been abused ? We need not be more explicit. If we have not the courage, however, to look at it, whence shall we get the energy to redress it ? There are those who are delicate about compromising their past character, and present respect, by their future conduct in this matter. We believe they need it; we all need it; they need it most who most have caused the need. We shall all, for a while, find it difficult to call good, good, but they the most who have made it a chief business to persuade the public to call it evil.

The truth is, that in reference to that intelligent public opinion, past, present, and to come, our position is more anomalous than in any other respect whatever. Considering the course which the Irish clergy have adopted, the evils of the best course they now can adopt will not be small.

There is, however, one great fact in our favour. There is one body of men who can, at least in some great degree, save the past as well as the future position of the Irish clergy,—the Derry and Raphoe Propositions, and the men who carried them.

Brethren, will the public not approve of our principle of no restriction, no compulsion ? Will they

judge harshly, judge unfavourably, of our conduct in regard to it? They will not,—they cannot,—for they ought not.

Remember, then, brethren, in God's name, your own principles again. If ye be called together again, come in the same spirit of firmness and moderation; and when,—fortified by thirteen years' experience on the one side, supported on the other by the actual alterations and improvements in the National System, and encouraged in the distance by the known, the *necessary* wish of the Commissioners to conciliate you, and all conscientious men, by further improvements,—when, under these circumstances, you stand upon this principle again, those who feared and rejected it will stand by your side, the moderate and the thoughtful all over Ireland will support your movement, those who honestly mistook the facts will honestly acknowledge it, and we shall have room *and shelter*, in our interior ranks, for those of whom we shall only say that they never ought to have been elsewhere.

Houses of the Oireachtas

NOTES.

THE appearance of the Bishop of Ossory on the Church Education platform is an event in the history of this question, and must tend to a beneficial result. Among the multiplied contradictions upon the subject, a clear and luminous statement is absolutely required. If he know the facts, and cannot state them, who can? If he has not distinctly considered them, who, upon his own side, has? And some leading points of the question are most clearly and forcibly enunciated by his Lordship.

1. He places the Church Education Society in its proper aspect (see page 24). It is not a sectional or supplementary institution; it is a conscientious antagonism to Government upon the *principle* of *National Education*. *What ought to be the case in all Government schools? not what might be advantageously insisted on in the schools of a private society?* is the question in dispute.

2. He admits, though with some ambiguity of expression, that those who put their schools in connexion with the Board "may, so far as their own children are concerned, conduct them with little, if any, practical disadvantage arising from their rules."—(See page 31, note). The difference is in the principle on which the school regulations ought to proceed.

3. All this is clear and satisfactory. What we want now is a distinct statement of the principle itself, which, in the judgment of the Society, ought to be that of the Government schools; and if, when clearly stated, it be not axiomatic, we should wish a distinct proof of it.

It is not easy,—it is not possible,—in his Lordship's speech, as reported or misreported in the papers, to find either.

4. There is no mystery, and no indistinctness whatever about the fundamental position of the Church Education Society. All children in its schools who are able to read must daily read the Scriptures in the Protestant authorized version, else they must leave the school, not merely at that time, but at all times. If they will not, from any cause, read the Protestant authorized version of the Bible, they must be excluded, not merely from the Bible advantages of the School, but from all its advantages. This is, by the supposition, what ought to be the case in all Government schools. So that "THE PRINCIPLE" is this, *all children in Ireland ought to be excluded from all advantages of the National Education, unless their parents consent that they shall be taught the Protestant authorized version of the Scriptures.*

Now it is acknowledged, as a fact, that among those who need the Government assistance to educate their children, and for whom, indeed, primarily, the assistance was intended, there are many who have conscientious objections to submit to this condition.

"This arises from their being ignorant and prejudiced and priest-ridden." True. The Government plan, then, urged by the Church Education Society, for their relief, is to refuse them all and every education, until they can, by some means or other, relieve themselves. The very refusal of what they need, and what they see given to the rest of the public, will be of use to them.

We have stated this "principle" as *gently* as possible, consistently with really stating it at all.

Is it axiomatic? Is it tenable? Is not the bare statement of it a sufficient exposure of its unsoundness?

Is it the principle of the clergy, or of the Bishop of Ossory himself? We mistake them much if they will acknowledge it. Yet there can be no doubt, and there is no doubt, that it is the fundamental position of the Church Education Society.

5. "We have had painful evidence," says his Lordship, alluding to *former* supporters of the Society, "that many men went on with us for a considerable time, and took an active,

zealous, and apparently cordial share in the contest, *and all the while did not understand the real principles* on which the Society rests, or if it rest upon any principle at all."

Now this cannot have happened through any abstruseness of the above principle, or any indecision in the Society's rules, for neither one nor the other exists; but it must have arisen from this, that these men were not sufficiently *explicit with themselves*, as to whether this was their principle or not. During this considerable time the Society and they had not been very distinct, or "business-like", with each other. It had accepted their advocacy on principles more or less different from its own, and they had stated, to themselves first, and then to the public, its principle, so loosely and carelessly as to mistake, and cause others to *mistake it for their own*.

We have, with his Lordship, "painful evidence" that this was the case with those gentlemen while they did support the Society,—we have abundant evidence that it is still the case with those who still support it; and we much deceive ourselves if we cannot produce, even from the speech itself, considerable evidence that his Lordship is in the same predicament.

6. For, how does he execute his special purpose, of giving, for the sake of their friends and of their enemies, a distinct statement, and distinct proof, of the Society's principle?

His statement of the fundamental position is, that, we presume, which he habitually makes to himself, *our's considerably softened*—softened not by leaving out harsh expressions, this is what he and we ought to do, but by a loose and ambiguous wording.

"*They require that the Scriptures should be employed in the daily instruction of every child in attendance upon their schools who is capable of reading it.*"

A particular sense must be put on several words in this sentence, before it will actually be the statement required.

a. By "the Scriptures" we must mean "the Scriptures in the Protestant authorized version."

b. By "*their*" schools, "all National" schools.

c. By "attendance," "permitted attendance."

d. By "employed in the daily instruction of," "read by,"—"read by as the condition of this permitted attendance."

To screw his Lordship's statement up to the *bonâ fide* expression of the fact, we must make these substitutions, and then, as nearly as possible in his own words, it will be, "they require that the Scriptures in the Protestant authorized version shall be read, daily, in *all National Schools*, by all children capable of reading, as the condition of their being *permitted* to attend at any part of the daily instruction."

This may have been what his Lordship meant. We doubt it. If so, he would have stated it. Whether he did mean it or not will be made more clear by the pertinence of the proofs he adduces.

This rests, according to his Lordship, upon two principles, or rather upon a "two-fold principle."

I. "That the Word of God should be made the basis of all education furnished by the State."

II. "That it is the right and duty of all men to read the Word of God, and that no man, or set of men, no power, civil or ecclesiastical, has any right to forbid it to be read."—(*Great applause.*)

He gives no proof of these propositions. He could not feel any to be needed. And surely there is not. In the plain ordinary sense of the words, and in this we are confident the Bishop used them, they are truisms, most important and valuable Protestant axioms.

But in this sense they afford just as much support, and just as little, to the fundamental position of the Society, as they do to any other modified principle of the penal laws, or well-meant diligence of the Inquisition.

But if the words are to be taken "in the Church Education sense," so that by "the right to read" shall be meant "the right to compel other people to read, in spite of known conscientious objections;" so that "to make every exertion to *give* scriptural instruction," be, "if unaccompanied with this compulsion," "to forbid, or to help the priests to forbid the Scriptures to the peo-

ple"; if "to make the Bible the basis of all education" as it, that is, obedience to it (for the things are not identical, e. g. a Jewish phylactery), ought to be the *BASIS of all conduct*, be "to force, by State penalties, all persons to read it, and read it in a particular form;" and if "to decline doing so" be to degrade and disgrace it, and so-forth;—if this be the meaning of the words, surely a proof of the propositions, and a distinct one, *is* needed.

Viewed in this light, they are not proofs of the "fundamental position," but only loose statements of it in different (and both of them most unjustifiable) forms. And it will be found just as easy, and just as difficult, to prove one of them as the other.

7. *a.* A and M have a common right to read the Scriptures.

A is instructed in them, M and his children are not.

A has the right to teach M's children the Scriptures in any form he (A) pleases, with M's consent.

It is the duty of A to do so.

It is the duty of the State to furnish A with all reasonable facilities for so doing.

Let all this be granted. Let these be *fact the first*.

b. The State has furnished, and is still willing to furnish these facilities.

Along with them, it offers to A a very large and influential share in the administration of the general national instruction.

A is particularly anxious to attend to the scriptural part of the instruction.

As long as M consents to have his children instructed by A in the Scriptures, the State guarantees that no one shall be allowed to prevent or impede their receiving it.

Suppose M be unwilling, on alleged and intelligible conscientious grounds (the consciences of the people being ignorant and prejudiced and priest-ridden), A is left free to reason with him, advise him, warn him, and so-forth, to take all moral means of instructing and enlightening his conscience. But he is not allowed to convert the administration of the general educational advantages into a means of forcing, bribing, compelling,—call it what you will,—of "inducing" the man, *while still unconvinced*, to forego his conscientious objections.

He is not allowed, in fact, to exclude the children from *all other advantages* of the school, in consequence of their father's refusal to have them taught, by A, the Protestant authorized version of the Scriptures.

All this is also fact, above and beyond dispute.

Let it be *fact the second*.

c. A cannot "compromise his principles."

It is his *duty*, he acknowledges, to co-operate with the State, if he could, but he cannot yield to this novel iniquity.

He takes his stand upon the Bible. He cannot consent to have it degraded. He will not be a party to *withholding it* (withholding it from those who never saw it, who cannot read it, who, by the very terms of the question, *will not receive it*, and cannot be made to receive it, at his hands, except by the force or bribe* of *secular* compulsion or inducement); and sooner than even passively, or under protest, submit to have the Bible *withdrawn* (from such persons), he is obliged, by his conscience, actually to withhold from them, and from many others, all National Educational advantages whatsoever.

These three classes of facts, when put together, are strange enough, even for Ireland. But the last, and most astonishing of all, is still to come.

d. Believe it, brethren in the ministry!—believe it, Irish and British public!—A is—*not* the Popish *but*—the Protestant Bishop of Ossory, and M represents thousands and tens of thou-

* This is surely the distinct notion of a bribe. We do not say that a man is bribed when additional inducements are held out to him to do *what his conscience approves*; but we do use the word (and what other can we use?) when the external inducement is to do that which is, by the supposition, against his conscience. "This conscience is depraved by the combined influence of ignorance, superstition, and priestcraft." True. Yet it is his con-

science, and he cannot be compelled to go against it without violating him *such as he is*, and degrading him yet below himself. This is surely a Protestant doctrine, the inculcation, or at least the illustration of which, especially in connexion with some other simple rules, such as the first duty and feeling of children to their parents, were a possible "employment" of the Scriptures in the daily instruction of some schools.

sands of ignorant and destitute Roman Catholics, residing within his Lordship's three dioceses, and surely indirectly, at least, intrusted to his charge.

Sooner than violate these his principles, James Thomas O'Brien will have nothing whatever to say, nor, as far as he has influence, will he suffer his clergy to have anything to say, to the Government facilities. He will force them into the occupation of the priests. He will drive out of his own hands, and out of the hands of his clergy, *and out of the hands of his and their successors* (it were well he could think of *this*), the power and opportunity of teaching the Scriptures themselves to those that are willing, the general instruction and superintendence of the education of those that are unwilling, and all the consequent probability, certainty, of a growing and intelligent and conscientious willingness, on the part of them and their children, to receive all the scriptural instruction that they can get.

And now, in the year 1849, the "ablest man in Ireland" comes forward, justifies his conduct, and urges a continued adhesion to it on the part of the Irish Church, *by such a statement, and such proofs*, of the fundamental position of the Church Education Society, as those we have given above.

8. His Lordship's advocacy leaves us this alternative.

Either he believes the following to be a just argument:

It is the duty of A to give the Scriptures to M.

It is the duty of M to read them.

THEREFORE, *it is the duty of A to make him read them.*

A supposition with which we will not insult his Lordship, or else we must think that in his case too we have painful evidence that he has, for this long time, supported, and cordially, the Church Education Society, in all its good and bad, without ever *forcing himself distinctly to understand* what are the principles, or what is the principle, on which it rests.

When he does so he must do like the rest,—reject the Society's principles, and adhere to what even the speech assures us, if we did not know it in other ways, must be his own.

9. It is clear, upon inspection, that any shadow of *proof* pro-

duced by his Lordship in support of the position of the Society, rests, at bottom, upon the above argument. It only requires to be stated, of course, in that bald form, and steadily looked at, to be at once, and heartily, disclaimed by him. For those, however, who may have as good intentions as his Lordship, but not exactly as clear heads, and whom it might puzzle by presenting at least the semblance of an argument, we shall add a remark or two.

a. Every leading word in each of the three propositions is ambiguous. "Give to." Query, "offer to," or "force upon." "Scriptures." Query, "in a particular form." "Duty of M." Query, "whether M conscientiously believes so or not." "Make." Query, by "moral," or by "secular" persuasion.

Three at least of these ambiguities being of such importance as to involve a begging of the whole question.

b. Let the words be taken in what sense one may, the propositions constitute no argument; and it is impossible to put them even into the legitimate form of one, without supplying some suppressed premiss, to the effect that "it is the duty of A to reconcile the separate duties of A and M," "to reconcile them, by making M's duty coincide with A's": "making" having, of course, the same ambiguity as above, and this premiss being no more easily proved than the position itself.

10. It is not saying too much for his Lordship, nor too little for the Society, to add, that this his advocacy is the strictest and the ablest it ever has received, or ever will receive. Its fundamental rule, as applied to National Education, is *plainly untenable*, and never can or will be proved by any arguments, which, when examined, an intelligent Protestant public will not reject, as being those upon which rested, as far as they rested upon argument at all, the Protestant Penal Laws and the Romish Inquisition.

In scarcely a modified form, these arguments, belonging, properly, to the sixteenth, and not to the nineteenth century, are re-appearing in behalf of the Society. We need not mention names. The intention of the men who bring them forward is very far indeed from cohering with the course of their reasoning.

Yet these are the natural arguments in support of the conclusion, and the conclusion is a remnant of the principles they were used to support.

They may be put into either a secular or an ecclesiastical form.

We shall say a few words upon the latter. It seems necessary.

It is a pleasant *fiction* of the Church, to suppose every person, and the Church itself, *to be* what they ought to be.

The (Romish) Church *is* universal (in Christendom), and *is* infallible; because, of course, it ought to be.

All Christians,—all baptized persons,—*are, ipso facto*, and by their definition, members of her; because they ought to be.

Each (sound) member's individual conscience (if such thing there be) *is*, by his definition, in unison with that of the Church, for the same reason.

It follows that every (unruly) member, in disturbing this unison, disturbs and confuses equally himself. In going against the judgment and conscience of the Church, he *is* self-stultified by his own judgment, and self-condemned by his own conscience.

The Church, of course, cannot stultify itself, by becoming such as he. It cannot recognise, or be supposed cognizant of such gangrenes in the body of Christ, except in the way of wholesome discipline. Even this she cannot herself consistently administer, the obedient secular arm will do its duty.

Such arguments, *and such support*, have mightily confounded both the real and the supposed heretics, in times gone by.

11. Similarly, the (Anglo-Irish) Church *is* universal (in Ireland).

All the people *are*, as being baptized, *ipso facto* her members.

Their views *are* her's; their conscience her conscience, and so-forth, as before; because, as before, they ought to be.

A rumour reaches us from below, indeed, that there *are* unruly and unsound members who do not like what the Church thinks good for them. It is a great pity. The more so as these degenerate days will not endure, as was prophesied of them, either sound doctrine or wholesome discipline. We cannot now reason as strictly and severely upon our premises as we ought; but still

we cannot, on the other hand, come down from the rightful position of the Church. We cannot allow the Church, as such, *to be cognizant* of any such conscientious (conscientious, indeed! from priest-ridden heretics and schismatics) scruples. Nor shall we ever cease to protest against the State (which *is*, for it ought to be, only the Church in a different aspect) daring to make itself, independently of us, cognizant of such things, and daring to interfere in them. Daring to withhold (!) the Scriptures from those who *always had* them, because, as before, according to the views of the (Anglo-Irish, in this differing from the Romish) Church, they ought to have had them. Daring to *degrade the Bible* from the place it occupied (when and where? O theorizers of every class) in the (non)-Education of Ireland; daring to *deprive* of the bread of life, those (the Popish *recusants*, the word itself is actually reproduced) who always had it, and used it, because they ought.

12. Are we to reply to such senility?

A word may be useful.

An idea may be valuable, though but an idea. A fiction may be inspiring, though but a fiction. A picture of what ought to be is useful, and, for some most important purposes, necessary; to be so, however, it is requisite we should remember that it is what it is, only a fiction. It ceases to be either useful or innocent in proportion as it tends to keep out of view the actual fact. It is ruinous when it causes us to mistake the one for the other.

These things ought to be, with respect to the (we care not what) Church. Be it so. Let that Church be the more stimulated to elevate the actual fact up to the idea,—to elevate it, by the diligent use of those means which are suitable for the known and recognised state of those with whom it has to deal; not, *by supposing it already elevated*, really to impede the progress, if not to degrade the fact still lower than it is. The Protestant conception of the suitable means is surely such as this,—respect for the actual conscience in its actual state, combined with such present aids, especially of improved education, and such actual opportunities, as it can understand and use; thus, to help both

the man and his conscience to advance together. And the glory of any individual, as of the universal, Church, will be, not by a lazy fiction to suppose attained, but by a healthy and industrious missionary action to procure the attainment of, to *move* ALL, and especially her members, and so herself, *towards* the hoped-for consummation, *towards* realizing the ideal "ought to be."

We are *not yet* the Church triumphant; and God has not given the privilege, either to men or churches, to arrive at the end of a journey without travelling, in some way or other, over the intermediate ground; and among the various means which may be devised for accelerating the progress, that does *not* seem the most reasonable which bids us to suppose the end attained, and to act accordingly.

13. There is one advantage, at least, in the above line of argument, that it will enable us easily to see that the two aspects in which we have been careful to place the *Church* (!) Education Society, are, in the eye of the Church at least, only one. It is sectional, if you choose, because it is intended exclusively for the members of the Church; but, by being so, it is also National, for all members of the community *are* members of the Church, because they ought to be! We cannot be cognizant of others but as Popish recusants, and the Church is not to make herself a Popish recusant by acknowledging her members, and so herself, to be such! We shall follow this puerility no farther. It is better for either Church or man to begin with a genuine acknowledgment of the truth, *the fact*, whatever that be; and *if* all these people be her members, and *if* she be the aggregate of her members, the Irish Church is low enough. She could scarcely lower herself very much by any acknowledgment she could make.

We commend such churchmen to Simon Stylites. Eyes were given us to see, and limbs to move with. If we be wise we will come down off our pillars, and endeavour to use them in active life.

There is no other advocacy of the Church Education Society that claims a distinct notice in this paper. The bulk of its supporters are such as those for whom the paper itself was written,

—sincere men, who will find no difficulty in acknowledging that they really have not examined, as completely as they ought, either their own side, or that supposed opposed to them. These men are truly for Scriptural Education, and when they find that this can be as well, not to say much better *given* by using the Government facilities, will gladly fall back upon their acknowledged *and felt* general duty, and endeavour to co-operate with Government as far as they can.

As for those to whom it is sufficient to invest themselves and the society with a broad phylactery of “scriptural” and “unscriptural,” and “anti-Christian” and “infidel” epithets, we must leave them to time. The sooner they find out that it is but a phylactery, the better for themselves. At present they certainly are “scriptural persons,” in a Jewish sense. We would gladly find them so in a better sense when we look below their robes. At all events, it is our duty to help them to be so. This is what we are endeavouring to do.

14. The main question, after all, is a simple one, and if it were constantly asked matters would go much smoother.

What do we want? What modification will satisfy us? When we inquire this, each one seems confident that he knows, and each contradicts his neighbour.

One, for instance, is for having no legislation upon *religious* education at all.

All the rest cry out, “It is an infidel proceeding on the part of the State, as of an individual, to give secular instruction without religious,” and so-forth.

The answer naturally to be expected is, “adopt the principles of the Church Education Society.”

Yet when called distinctly to consider its principle of compulsion, *as applied to all* educational advantages, men invariably hesitate, their better self overcomes their advocacy, and they do not well know what to answer.

The propositionists alone are capable, as a body, of taking a manly and intelligible course.

We have a clear principle to stand on, and our practical rule,

“to accept and use the Government facilities so far as they embody it, to protest against, and endeavour to have altered, whatever we do now, or may at any time, think objectionable,” is distinct and just, and constitutional.

Is it not our plain duty?

15. Except those objections necessarily involved in the principle of separate grants, we have not seen occasion in our review of the National System to notice any objectionable part but one, to which we endeavoured to give its due prominence.—(Page 40, *sqq.*)

It is easier in this case, as in others, to find the objection than the remedy.

The first remedy that suggests itself is plainly a bad one. “Let there be no vested schools at all—let all be non-vested.”

Nay; the vested school, *R*, for instance, is much better in every way than the non-vested school *R*, and to reduce the former to the latter were a strange mode of advancing the public good.

The clergy will never make this suggestion, and the Board would never, we hope, consent to it, if they did.

The remedy must be looked for in some modification of the initial condition; and what this ought to be is not at all obvious at first sight.

Again. The Board does not furnish the Bible itself to schools. We know the reason.—(Page 8.) Ought we to ask the Board to reconsider this resolution? Difficulties lie both ways.

If we come together in a prayerful and practical spirit it cannot be but that we shall suggest solid improvements, and if so, it cannot be but we shall get them carried.

At all events, it is competent to us to prove our own sincerity and good will to both Government and people, by accepting that which we do approve of, and using it for the public good.

SINCE the above was printed, the parliamentary discussion and division has taken place. In the *discussion* itself there is nothing new. Well-intentioned and upright men mistaking facts, and by their own manifest sincerity influencing others.

Some enlarge upon the impropriety of giving secular without religious instruction; others on the impropriety of forcing united education.

On which side should these be urged?

Others show how grateful many Roman Catholics are for the actual benefits they receive in Church Education Schools.

True: they would receive much greater, however, if their local benefactors would adopt a better system.

Lord C. Hamilton, in a liberal and moderate speech, while showing, if he be rightly reported, from how miserably a one-sided source he draws his local facts, approves of the principles of the National Board, and complains that these principles are not carried out.

The complaint is just. How is it to be helped, *if those persons who can*, in each district of the country, will not assist, if they will thwart and prevent the assistance of others?

Mr. (G. A.) Hamilton's motion is, in its essence, fair and citizen-like. Assuming the administration of the National Education funds to be objectionable on conscientious grounds, he does *not* recommend a blind war against the system, but asks such a modification of it as may enable *us*, supposed anxious to do so, to co-operate with it.

This is the exact question. Let the clergy deliberate on what that modification ought to be.

How grievously does Mr. Hamilton mistake the principle of the Church Education Society, when he urges that the adoption of it should be the modification, and urges this *on the grounds of toleration*. The clergy will never deliberately propose that the principle of the Church Education Society shall be that of the National Schools, for that principle is based upon intolerance.

Mr. Napier eloquently demands that the "antecedent restriction" upon the use of the Scriptures shall be done away.

Let us be distinct. It is schoolboy-like to be sure; yet what can we do with such men?

There are *two* "antecedent restrictions" explicitly insisted upon by the Church Education Society.

1. That of *incapacity*: none are to read it but those who are able to do so. And

2. That of *order*: as embodied in the time-table.

To these the National Board adds one, *and one only*.

3. That of *toleration*: as involved in the non-compulsion of alleged and known conscientious objection: in the refusal to allow any patron to compel an unconvinced conscience *by means of exclusion from the other* advantages of the school.

The first seems *necessary*, the second *expedient*, the third *just*.

Which of these three antecedent restrictions does Mr. Napier wish withdrawn?

The principle he concedes, and two he directly asks for, by pleading the cause of the Church Education Society.

The third he also calls for, at least implicitly, for he bases his advocacy upon the doctrines of toleration,—on an appeal to the rights of conscience!

In the *division* there is a new feature. Upwards of 100 members voted with Mr. Hamilton. This is, under the circumstances, a genuine triumph *for scriptural education*. A supposed triumph for the Church Education Society.

It now depends on the use the Irish clergy may make of this success, whether it will benefit Ireland and the Irish Church or not.

They can, with a better grace, in consequence of this recognised success, consider *what the modification* ought to be. Whatever genuine improvements they *can* propose upon the National System will be all the better supported by public opinion, and *ought to be* the more willingly considered by the Board.

Let us, then, diligently consider these modifications.

They will not be, nor be tantamount to, the adoption of the principle of the Church Education Society.

If this small, and, after all, only apparent and superficial suc-

cess, will lure the Church of Ireland on to continue the course it seems to have marked out for itself, it will surely, some time, have reason to remember it as a bitter encouragement.

We gladly turn to the brighter side, and hope that, instead of tending to perpetuate a hostility highly injurious to the public, it may facilitate accommodation between those who ought to be agreed.

THE END.

Houses of the Oireachtas

Houses of the Oireachtas