

NATIONAL SCHOOLS OF IRELAND

DEFENDED,

IN

A LETTER

TO

THE REVEREND DOCTOR THORPE,

MINISTER OF BELGRAVE CHAPEL.

By FRANC SADLEIR, S. F. T. C. D.,

ONE OF THE COMMISSIONERS OF NATIONAL EDUCATION IN IRELAND.

DUBLIN:

MILLIKEN AND SON, GRAFTON-STREET,

BOOKSELLERS TO THE UNIVERSITY.

M.DCCC.XXXV.

NATIONAL SCHOOLS OF IRELAND

DEFENDED,

IN

A LETTER

TO

THE REVEREND DOCTOR THORPE

MINISTER, BELFAST CHURCH.

BY FRANK SADDLER, B.T.C.D.,

ONE OF THE COMMISSIONERS OF NATIONAL SCHOOLS IN IRELAND.

DUBLIN:

MILLIKEN AND SON, GRAFTON STREET.

BOOKSELLERS TO THE UNIVERSITY.

R. GRAISBERRY,
Printer to the University.

M. DECCEXY

Houses of the Oireachtas

LETTER,

&c. &c.

DUBLIN COLLEGE, *July 27, 1835.*

REVEREND SIR,

I HAVE lately seen a Sermon preached by you on the 17th of last May in Belgrave Chapel, and printed with an Appendix, which you state to be the substance of what you delivered at the time when entering on the subject of Irish Education. I had hitherto been in the habit of paying no attention to the almost daily attacks on the System of National Schools under the care of the Commissioners which appear in the public prints, because that, for reasons which will appear from what follows, I considered them rather as the noise of the petty warfare of political party, than as the voice of persons who were sincerely interested in the subject which they discussed. Of you, I have no such suspicion.

If you have mistated facts, you have done so in ignorance, and because you have been misled. If you have reasoned wrong, you are worth being set right. I am persuaded I can do so very easily. You and the public must judge of my success or my failure. Did I think the question at issue between us was even dubious, I would abstain from the advocacy of the National Schools, and withhold myself from all participation in their management; as no earthly consideration shall ever induce me to do any thing which would have even a chance of preventing the people of Ireland from reading the Bible, or of excluding it, as you say, altogether from their education.

On this charge, however, rests the entire strength of your argument. The Government, you say, "prohibits the Bible in their schools,"—"removes the Bible from them."—"Under the new system no school can be patronized which shall continue the use of this Book. The Bible must be banished, before the school can be adopted." And, though you profess to think, that "the Administration, which framed this measure, had formed no design hostile to the use of the Bible," yet the whole tenor of your Appendix goes to represent the system of Education which they have introduced as wholly calculated to discourage the use of the Bible, and prevent its being read by the rising generation of Ireland, or at least of the poor

of Ireland ; and yet you admit that their opponents, when in office, sanctioned this measure, by continuing to support it ; that is, that all the statesmen of Great Britain were equally blind as to its consequences ; and, as you express it, “ did not see to the end of their own system.” Is this indeed true ? Are they all so ignorant and short-sighted ? If so, what will become of our poor country ; where shall we find a wise and provident administration ?

A little consideration will, I trust, show us that they have not been thus grossly mistaken ; that on this, their almost only point of agreement, they are right. Let us take a detailed view of what the probable effects of the system, if put into full and well managed operation, will be on the children of the two denominations ; first on the Protestant, next on the Roman Catholic.

It is estimated, that there are about a million and a half of Protestants in Ireland ; of these, on account of the large proportion of the wealth of the country, which is in Protestant occupancy, not more than half a million are in such low circumstances, as to depend on gratuitous education for their children. Of this half million, there must be less than one-fifth of a school-going age ; so that if we estimate the number of Protestant children in Ireland, who require gratuitous education, at one hundred thousand, we shall be near the truth, at least not below it. Of these, the far

greater proportion is to be found in the north of Ireland, there being very few poor Protestants in the south. In a similar way,—taking into consideration, however, that among the Roman Catholics, the poor bear a very large proportion to the rich,—the number of Roman Catholic children, who require gratuitous education, may be estimated at more than a million. So that, in the north of Ireland, the proportion of Roman Catholic to Protestant children would be nearly ten to one, and in the south much more than ten to one in each of the National Schools, if established, and generally approved of by both parties. Here then we should have, in every school of one hundred and ten children, ten Protestants. For these ten Protestants there are one or two days of the week, besides Sunday, set apart for exclusively Protestant religious instruction. There is also one or more hours before or after the commencement of the ordinary business of the school, which may, if the managers of the school, or the parents of the children, or the clergymen of the parish, so wish, be devoted to the same purpose, and the Bible will naturally be the basis of this instruction, and is virtually recommended, and would, if necessary, be insisted on by the Board of Education. It is the bounden and legal duty of the clergyman,—he has solemnly pledged himself to it at his admission into the parish,—to give this religious instruction, or at least to take care, that it shall be

given; and, if he have been an active and zealous minister of the Gospel, he will find many of his affluent Protestant parishioners, who, though not thus legally obliged, will consider it as their Christian duty to assist him, and to share with him this work of mercy. When I speak of clergyman, I mean of the Established Church. I know not whether the dissenting ministers are bound by a similar promise. What their practice has been, I do know. They have never yet fallen behind the Established Clergy, in the care of the religious instruction of the children of their poor. Every good man must love and respect them for it.

Now, will any one in his senses maintain, that, under these circumstances, the ten Protestant children are not likely to receive a Protestant education? or, that the Government system prevents them from receiving the principles of Religion, by instructing them at the same time in the general principles of morality, or hinders them from reading the Bible, by teaching them to read? If, indeed, the influential Protestants of the parish, as an impotent means of showing their hostility to the existing administration, set themselves in opposition to these schools; if the clergyman, forgetful of his legal, as well as his Christian duty, through a foolish apprehension, or a false pretence, that the Protestant children may be perverted by associating with Roman Catholics; if he will neither teach them to read himself, nor permit the

Board of Education to teach them for him, it is those influential parishioners, and that clergyman, not we, who prevent these poor children from reading the Bible. We give them the power of reading it, by teaching them to read; we give them the opportunity of reading it, by allotting a certain portion of each week to the purposes of exclusively Protestant instruction; and we leave it to the Protestant clergy, who are solemnly bound to this duty, and paid for it by their country, to superintend this Protestant instruction, to induce them, and, if necessary, to compel them to read the Bible. What more can we do? The time we allot for this purpose is greater than what has ever been so applied in any seminary of education. The persons who were last year clamorous for increasing it, so as to interfere with the ordinary business of the school, and were unwilling to submit to our prudent regulation of having "a time for all things," never themselves, in any school, of which they had the control, employed an equal portion of time in religious instruction. And yet in this, namely, in our not allowing religious instruction to be given, while the other business of the school was going on, lies the only even shadow of foundation for the charge, which has so often been repeated against us,—of prohibiting the use of the Bible. Is it not a strong proof of the goodness of our system, that our enemies are obliged to resort to such folly for arguments against it.

Let us now turn to the case of the hundred Roman Catholic children, and see what care is taken of them. They are instructed in the various branches of an education suited to their future condition and probable rank in life,—perhaps beyond it,—certainly not below it. I fearlessly appeal to an inspection of our school books, which are now before the Public, and ask, whether a boy who was instructed in all that they contain would not have received a good, moral, and literary education? This education every young Roman Catholic in the neighbourhood of the school receives, in proportion to his talents and the time he can afford to devote to it,—and every young Roman Catholic in Ireland will receive such, when the Government system shall have been carried into full effect and operation.* Had not that system been introduced, nine-tenths of these children—ninety out of the hundred would not have received this education, nor any other in place of it, but would have been left miserable and mischievous savages, open to every delusion, and ready for every crime. It is useless to say, that it would be their own fault, and the fault of their

* It is to be observed, that though there are now about a million of Roman Catholic children of an age fit for going to school, who need gratuitous education, yet when the Government System shall have been carried into full operation, schools for half that number would be sufficient, as half the period of the *school-going age* is sufficient for general education.

priests. It is facts we are concerned with, not the reasons or causes of them. You well know, and every one who has any acquaintance with Ireland well knows, that the Roman Catholic children will not be suffered to go to schools, in which the Bible is forced on them, and that, for these some years past, the Roman Catholic priests have been unusually active, vigilant, and successful in this respect. It matters not to condemn them for this, the fact remains. The children remain uneducated, and would so remain, but for the System of Education introduced by Lord Grey, put into action by Lord Stanley, and supported by Sir Robert Peel. But for this, ninety children out of the hundred would have remained savages. What say the very returns to which you have appealed? This year's Report of the Committee of the Kildare-Place Society states, in the 11th page, that "during the last three years they cannot accurately ascertain the precise number of scholars (attending their schools), but can say, with great confidence, as far as their means of information extend, that the Schools were never more fully attended." The obvious meaning of this is, that the attendance is at present as great as it was in the year 1831, the number of which is stated to be 137,639. The first remark that offers itself here is, that since their numbers have not decreased, the children who now attend the National Schools are not persons who had left the Kildare-street

Schools; and, consequently, that the introduction of the National System has not lessened the efficiency of the Kildare-street Society, and that the children, who are now at the National Schools, would not have received Education, had these Schools not been in existence. The next resulting remark is, that if out of the 137,639 you take the probable number of Protestant children, there will remain only a very small proportion of the million of Roman Catholics, perhaps not more than one in every twenty. What is to become of the remaining nineteen? But you state, that "in the year 1832, there were 480,000 children receiving Scripture Education," and that "these accounts are, for the most part, extracted from the Reports of the Commissioners of Irish Education." Three-fourths of this number, you say, were Roman Catholics, that is 360,000. Even admitting this, I again ask, what is to become of the remainder of the million—of the 640,000? You must pardon me, however, for feeling some doubt on the subject of the 480,000; I fear you have made it out by reckoning in the number the casual and irregular attendants on Sunday Schools, which, however excellent institutions, and useful they may be, for persons who have not the power and opportunities of attending other schools, can scarcely be considered sufficient for giving general education, or being an adequate substitute for schools which are

open during the week. I have looked in vain for any authority for such a number in the Reports of the Commissioners of Irish Education, and can scarcely think you meant to refer to such for this part of your statement which concerns the year 1832, as the Commissioners' Reports have been published only up to March 25th, 1831. I suspect you will find, on farther inquiry, that the number of Roman Catholic children, who, in defiance of their Priests, attended schools where the Bible was forced upon them, never exceeded 100,000, and that the remaining 900,000 were left uneducated. This, if suffered to remain without remedy for any great number of years, would obviously leave nine-tenths of the poor of Irish Roman Catholics to all the evils of ignorance and barbarism.

The Government System of National Schools is in progress of preventing this. It gives the Roman Catholic children a moral and literary education; and, though it does not force the Bible on them, it removes the most powerful of all exclusions from it, namely, the inability to read; an exclusion which experience, and the very Reports to which you yourself refer, concur in proving, must inevitably rest on the majority of the poor of Ireland, but for the intervention of this System. And farther, it not only removes this exclusion, but it also gives them an introduction to the study of the Bible, the probable conse-

quence of which will be a taste and inclination for reading it in after life, by putting into their hands copious and well chosen extracts therefrom. It is well known that the Roman Catholic priests permit many of their people, who are educated and arrived at the years of discretion, to read the Bible. I myself have a labourer these many years in my employment, who, with the permission of his priest, is possessed of a Bible, reads the Bible, and is better acquainted with it than are many Protestants.

I am glad to find, that you have not repeated the charge, which has been so often made against the Commissioners of Education, of having mutilated the Bible, by preparing these extracts for the use of their scholars—a charge which has been made, in forgetfulness that the Commissioners of Irish Education, in 1812, recommended the use of extracts; that many of the heads of the Established Church had sanctioned and approved of the use of Scripture extracts in the education of youth; among others, the Bishop of Exeter himself; and, though last not least, in forgetfulness or in ignorance, that the Established Church herself has given to her people, in her appointment of lessons to be read in the daily service, not the whole Bible, but extracts from the Bible, having left a great number of chapters, which are not appointed to be read either on week days, or Sundays. But I will say no more on this topic, as

you seem to be already sensible of the weakness of the objection, by not having brought it forward.

The objection you have made to our extracts is, that in two places we have been guilty of error. I am glad to find that our extracts are so well made as to contain only two passages to which an adversary can object. The censure you pass on them is certainly severe. You say, that "the Protestant members of the Board have already made a surrender of the vital principles of Divine Truth to the Roman Catholic priest, on the one hand, and on the other, to the Unitarian." I cannot think you gave the full strength of your mind to the consideration of the passages in question, and trust, that when you do, you will change your opinion. In the first of the passages to which you allude, the Douay translation differs from the authorized version. We prefer the authorized version, and accordingly follow it nearly in the text. But, at the same time, we tell the pupil, that the difference exists. It is what he assuredly will be told some time or other—what every body knows,—and I cannot see what surrender there is of Divine Truth in telling it to him at once; particularly, when that telling is for the purpose of explaining to him, that his own church considers the meaning of their version as the same with the meaning of ours, namely, that the passage refers ultimately to our Saviour. And that we do, not in

the study of the Bible, the probable conse-

our own words, or on our own authority, but in the words and authority of the editors of their own version, given under the sanction of their own church. We did so, for the purpose of preventing them from being in future prejudiced against our version, by being told, that Protestants had altered this text. To such a charge their education in this respect will suggest to them an immediate answer, namely, that the editors of their own version have declared the difference not to be material.

But you seem to say, that the Vulgate reading is so false and indefensible, that it need not, and ought not, to have been brought under the notice of our pupils. You say, that the assertion "that divers of the Fathers read the passage so is false," because "none of the Fathers who had access to the original Hebrew, and understood it, read it so, because in the original it is not so." I fear you have here laid yourself open to an attack from the supporters of the Vulgate Version. Are you not aware, that many of the Fathers did not understand Hebrew, and that, therefore, your conclusion would not follow from your premiss; and that, nevertheless, the authority even of such Fathers, as to the text of the Septuagint or of the Latin Versions, must have considerable weight? Are you not aware, that even if they did understand Hebrew, they might

possibly have read the passage as the Vulgate has rendered it? If I recollect right, you are a good Hebrew scholar; and I ask you, is not the word spelled with the letters *He, Vau, Aleph*, although generally used as the masculine pronoun, frequently used as the feminine, if we leave the POINTS out of consideration, which are held by many of the learned not to have been an original part of the Hebrew Language? Is it not possible, that some of the Fathers might have read an Hebrew manuscript without points, suppose one of the Rolls which are used for reading in the Jewish Synagogues, which are always written without points; and finding this word used *in the very context of the passage in question*, namely, in the preceding speech of Adam, as a feminine pronoun, and knowing that it was so used in many places, particularly in the Pentateuch, might they not fancy, that it was so to be used here; and imagine, that as the last clause of the verse, "thou shalt lie in wait for his heel," obviously refers to the Seed spoken of in the second clause, so the third, "shall bruise his head," refers to the Woman spoken of in the first, that is to Eve? My own opinion is, that our Authorized Version is right, but I by no means consider the Vulgate reading so wholly indefensible as you seem to imagine, nor do I see any surrender of Divine Truth in noticing it. Even if we were wholly to ad-

mit it, and refer the "crushing the serpent's head" to Eve, the question would remain, as to whether she was to do so by the instrumentality of a male or female descendant? Here the Romanists admit, that it was by the ultimate instrumentality of our Saviour, though by the intermediate instrumentality of the Virgin, and they might have added, of every individual in the chain of the Sacred Genealogy. I may remark, that a similar question arises even on our own reading. There is nothing in the passage itself, which determines whether it is a male or female of the seed which shall crush the serpent's head. It is from other parts of Scripture that we know it was our Saviour. So that we surrender nothing by having noticed this difference, nor do the Romanists get any advantage from our having done so.

With respect to the other passage, which you find fault with, I am, if possible, still more surprised at your censure. You blame us for having passed over and omitted a suspected reading; Griesbach has marked it as such; as being absent from some manuscripts, as you have told us yourself in your note; but you have not told us, that among the *some* from which it is absent, are six of the oldest manuscripts in existence; nor have you told us that Griesbach states, that on the authority of Tertullian, Marcion is supposed to have been the first who introduced the word which is rendered

LORD into the text. And yet with this note of Griesbach's before your eyes, you charge us with having made a surrender of Divine Truth, by omitting this suspected reading. I tell you very candidly, that were it to do over again, I would do it. I never will recommend putting suspected readings into the minds of youth, as proofs of such an essential doctrine of our faith, as the Divinity of our Saviour; and the stronger the passage seems in support of the doctrine, the more cautiously will I avoid it, because that, by putting such into their minds, I would expose them in after life to have their faith assailed by the adversaries of this most material doctrine, by shewing them, that the Scripture authorities on which they had hitherto rested in confidence as fully conclusive, were suspected readings. We have abundance of Scriptural authority without the aid of such passages; nay, the very passage itself is sufficiently strong without the word Lord. No Unitarian ever even affected to doubt that by the "man from heaven," is meant the man who throughout Scripture is called Jesus Christ—the man who throughout the New Testament is called the Lord. The passage, when it states that he is from heaven, clearly asserts his pre-existence, just as clearly as when the word Lord is added; and the term Lord has been already so frequently applied to Jesus Christ, that

the addition of it here as a proof of his Divinity is quite superfluous. You will perhaps be surprised to hear that Athanasius, when he quotes this passage as one of the authorities for the doctrine of the Trinity, does not use the word Lord in it. This you will see to be the case if you look at Bengelius's note on the passage; that is, that Athanasius thought the word Lord did not belong to the text; and that the passage without this word was a sufficient authority for the doctrine in question. The Board of Education then have, at the worst, made no greater sacrifice of Divine Truth than Tertullian, Athanasius, and six of the oldest manuscripts in existence have done. Your next charge against the Board of Education is, that they have given their extracts, "not in the authorized translation, but in a mixture consisting of the Douay, the authorized, and a translation of their own;" and that this cannot fail to shake the confidence "of the illiterate people of Ireland" in the authorized version. Here, I confess, I am at a loss to know your meaning, and on what grounds you make the assertion. Are we never to speak of Scriptural subjects, or to recite Scriptural incidents, except in the words of the authorized version? or if we do, will it shake the confidence of the people in this version? I appeal to the public, and will ask any unprejudiced person, whether he can see any such danger. If the words we use be

better adapted to the capacities and previous information of children than those of the authorized version, why should we not use them?—if they be worse, will not the inferiority, when pointed out by their religious instructors, serve rather to increase their respect for, and confidence in, the authorized version?

But you seem to forget for what purpose and for whose use these extracts are principally intended. They are not so much intended for the Protestant children, who we know will get the Bible itself on the days and hours of exclusive religious instruction, as for the Roman Catholic children, who perhaps may not; and I am not aware of any respect for or confidence in the authorized version which Roman Catholics have that is in danger of being shaken; would it not rather produce in them a favourable opinion of that version when they see that in general it agrees with their own; that in many cases the difference is so merely verbal that their own Prelate will allow it to be expressed in the words of the authorized version; that in other cases of difference the original admits of being rendered by so many various forms of expression, that one different in words from either their own or the authorized has been adopted; and that such is the opinion of a body of men whom (I can tell you) the people of Ireland reckon among their best friends,

and whose Institution they hailed as one of the most grateful gifts to this country. I have repeatedly heard Irish people of all orders say, when speaking of the establishment of the system of National Education—"Now we are sure of the sincerity of the professions of friendship which the English Government have made towards the people of Ireland."

I appeal to your own candour and well-known mildness of disposition, have you not been unjustly severe on us in these your three and only charges against us; and I submit it to the public, whether for a person of your candour and mildness, and at the same time of the ingenuity and research which you are well known to possess, for you to have made such charges, and no other, be not a decisive proof that you had no other to make; that you had been deceived by an interested hearsay into the opinion that our Board was a dangerous institution; that it was your duty to preach against us when you addressed a "congregation containing many members of both houses of parliament, and among them some of His Majesty's ministers," but that when you came to do so you found nothing to lay to our charge worthy of condemnation.

That I may not leave any part of your objections to our system unnoticed, I shall now turn to what you state "first claims your attention,"

namely, "the constitution of the new Board," which you find fault with for being composed of persons of different religious persuasions, and complain that the moral and literary education of Protestant children is placed under the direction of Roman Catholics; and you state also that "unanimity among its members can be obtained only by compromise." I can scarcely believe a person of your good sense and judgment serious in such an objection; I shall therefore reply to it in very few words. It was impossible to avoid having persons of different religious opinions as members of a Board intended for the purpose that ours was, because a Board consisting exclusively of members of the Established Church would never have obtained the confidence of the people of Ireland, which was absolutely essential to the success of the measure entrusted to its care. I cannot see any danger in abstaining from the use of any books on moral or literary subjects which our two Roman Catholic members would object to, because I am not aware of any difference on moral and literary subjects which exists between Protestants and Roman Catholics, more than among mankind in general, or between Protestants and Protestants. Our Protestant youth are in the universities and Protestant schools instructed in many books on such subjects written by Roman Catholic authors, and the Roman Ca-

tholics are in their schools and universities instructed in books written by Protestants. We never did, nor we never will, consider religious controversy as a branch of moral education; and with respect to the doctrine which you state to have been the ground of separation from the Church of Rome, namely, justification by faith, it is surely for that very reason not fit to be made the object of the combined moral instruction of the separated parties; and though I trust the religious instructors will, in the times for exclusive Protestant education, bring it in its general form before the minds of their pupils; yet, I believe the consequences to be deduced from it should be discussed not by children, but by men. It is a subject on which Protestants themselves are not perfectly agreed with each other, though I myself firmly believe the doctrine of justification by faith, and that "Christ is of God made unto us righteousness;" yet when we come to the explication of terms, and the deduction of consequences, there are many Protestants who would differ from me as much as I do from my Roman Catholic brethren; why then force into the moral education of children a controversy on which men cannot agree—a controversy which, though it has been going on for centuries, has not been yet decided?

You say, that "the constitution of our Board is such, that unanimity among its members can be

obtained only by compromise." To this I shall briefly answer, that it is absurd to press a conclusion concerning matter of fact on speculative premises, when experience declares the contrary to be true. We have been associated together now nearly four years; there has been perfect unanimity, and no compromise. Those who know the Archbishop of Dublin, and they are many, will be much amused at your supposing him to be a man likely to surrender his opinions to any one, or to sacrifice his love of truth to any consideration of worldly expediency. The Duke of Leinster, with all his suavity of manner, has, I believe, never been known to compromise any of his opinions: of myself I shall not speak. If I be weak or wicked I cannot do mischief, as I am not the majority, being only one out of three members of the Established Church at the Board.

It will naturally be asked, what have the Commissioners of National Education effected? What has been their success hitherto? Our answer is a very satisfactory one, and must be highly gratifying to every friend of Ireland. Though we have been less than four years in existence as a Board; though the first of these years was, and must naturally have been, employed in preparation, we have above 1300 school houses under our care; we are giving education to near 200,000 children of the poor; that is, to about one-fifth of those who require

it; and in this respect we have done more in our three years of operation than the Kildare-place Society did in their nineteen. The great majority of the children whom they educated were Protestants. They had comparatively failed with the Roman Catholics. The Board of National Education was instituted to remedy this failure, and are in rapid progress of succeeding most completely.

Now if this system succeeds, as there is every prospect of its doing, what will be the consequences to this hitherto unhappy country? Its poor will be no longer, as they have been, proverbial for their violence and hostility to the laws. They will know how to appreciate the value of civil order, and will have a taste for the enjoyments and occupations of peaceful and well regulated society. They will be no longer hateful to and hating their brethren, the poor Protestant deceived into the opinion that the Roman Catholic is his enemy, and the poor Roman Catholic fancying that the poverty and misery which he experiences are attributable to the oppression of the Protestant. They will be no longer an object of disgust and terror to the English settler, who but for these feelings would have long since carried into Ireland his capital, his industry, and his example. Were Ireland educated, her traders, her manufacturers would have wealth, and her poor would have employment. Is it not well known that the super-

abundant capital of England would flow into Ireland, if Ireland were fit to receive it : the only thing that prevents this is the state of her lower orders ; the only remedy for this state is education. If we apply the remedy in the way in which she will accept of it, we shall ensure her prosperity ; but if we attempt to apply it forcibly, as has hitherto been vainly tried, we shall assuredly fail.

There are some who think they see in the signs of the times that the power of the popular part of each state throughout the civilized world is on the increase ; that the people are in future likely to exercise a greater influence in the management of public affairs than they hitherto have been in the habit of doing. If such conjectures be right, if they be likely to be fulfilled, or if there be even a chance of their being fulfilled, is it not well to enlighten and to purify the rising generation ? When the cause of public happiness is at issue, is it not prudent to appeal from an ignorant, and consequently depraved, to an enlightened and moral people ? Will you, Reverend Sir, impede the progress of this by exerting your talents and your influence against the only system which has any chance of effecting it ? I trust, I would almost say I am convinced, from what I once knew of you, that you will not, but that seeing how unfounded are the charges you have brought against the instrument and means of this good to your

country, you will retract them as publicly as you have uttered them. Let me entreat you not to refuse to do an act, which you must feel to be one of justice ; nor suffer the hope of pleasing any political party to bribe you to be the enemy of the land that gave you birth.

Believe me, my dear Sir, to be, with much respect for your virtues, and admiration of your talents,

Your sincere well-wisher,

FRANC SADLEIR.

LETTER

TO THE MOST HONOURABLE

LORD COTTENHAM

CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE KING'S BENCH

IN

EXECUTIVE OF THE CROWN

IN RELATION TO THE

APPOINTMENT OF SHERIFFS

IN IRELAND

LETTER,

&c. &c.

Houses of the Oireachtas

Houses of the Oireachtas