

EDUCATION IN IRELAND;

A

COMPARISON OF THE ADVICE

GIVEN

IN TWO ADDRESSES,

RECENTLY ISSUED BY

HIS GRACE THE LORD PRIMATE OF ALL IRELAND,
& THE LORD BISHOP OF OSSORY, FERNS, & LEIGHLIN.

BY

JOHN GARRETT, B.A.

VICAR OF ST. PAUL, NEAR PENZANCE;

SOMETIME

INSPECTOR OF SCHOOLS

UNDER THE

CHURCH EDUCATION SOCIETY FOR IRELAND, &c. &c.

LONDON:

RIVINGTONS, WATERLOO PLACE.

DUBLIN: HODGES, SMITH, & Co., GRAFTON STREET.

MARCH, 1860.

Price One Shilling.

PREFACE.

I APPEAL to the good sense of the Christian Laymen of Ireland, for a calm consideration of the following pages. I appeal to the Merchants, Bankers, and Professional Gentlemen; to the Magistrates, Landed Proprietors, and all those classes of Gentry and Nobility, to whom the Loyalty and intelligence of the poor of Ireland is so precious. I ask them to let it be felt in their various spheres, that, while they will assist and strengthen a Society which proposes to promote the Education of the people, they will not uphold any Institution which aims, not only at being itself a narrow instrument of School controversy, but also at thwarting the efforts made by others for the removal of ignorance from the land.

EDUCATION IN IRELAND.

CHAPTER I.

A VINDICATION.

Very slight reflection upon the history of those controversies, in which ardent political zeal has been mingled with Religious sentiment, will bring to mind the sad truth that no cause has ever led to more painful errors than man's improper use of Divine Revelation. To force upon the human mind the dogmas of superstition, framed by man's device as additions to Revelation necessary to be believed, has at times called forth exercises of power in deeds of deadly tyranny shocking to reflect upon; and the alleged desire to break such superstitious bonds has, upon the other side, led men to hold the sacred Scriptures in their hands while perpetrating crimes of no less magnitude. Happily, we live in days when Cromwell's iron heart can no more crush its victims under the garb of professed Religion, than the agents of Queen Mary can enact the horrors of Smithfield.

But, while British laws protect us now from such scenes of cruelty, a kindred spirit may still be plainly felt as actuating the two extremes. No source of personal bitterness and animosity is, even now, so strong to pervert men's

mutual feelings, as an exaggerated zeal either for the suppression or spreading forth of the Word of God; and too frequently the noisy advocates of the unremitting study of the *letter* of the Scriptures are, unconsciously it may be, the most prominent examples in breaking the very essence of the *spirit* which is breathed upon man's soul in the charity, affection, and peace contained in their sacred pages. Verily, no weapon is more keen. Let any man, or body of men, resolve to make a difference with them, however slight, on the subject of religion, a cause of personal reprobation against their fellow-men, and a weapon is handled which must exercise a fearful dread upon the minds of those whom they can reach. To be treated as a "traitor" by brethren with whom he must be thrown in contact, to be branded as "unsound" by those who sit in judgment upon him, to have evil motives imputed to him, and his very words distorted from their real meaning, and to see all this before him with the Scriptures as the chief instrument by which it will be inflicted, raises before a young man's mind a terrorism almost greater than the Inquisition. Still those who exercise it will start back from such a system of intolerance as contrary to all their principles, place it before them as the necessary accompaniment of the course they pursue, and the very idea will be received with angry indignation.

Strong and deep has been the prevalence and exercise of this most baneful influence during the Education controversy in Ireland. A generation of earnest, pious men, both Clergy and Laity, animated with a conviction that the Government of the day designed a dangerous system of irreligious Education, and filled with a hope that united exertions would lead to a re-modelling of what they dreaded, effected an organization of a vigorous and wide-spread nature, to establish and maintain scriptural schools, until the Government system should either be altered or developed so as to prove itself safe for a Christian and Religious country; that generation, bent upon the practical work of educating the poor,

and resolved to vindicate the right for Scriptural and Religious teaching to hold its due place, supported a large supply of efficient schools all over Ireland, and pressed upon the nation the vital importance of upholding the proper use of the Scriptures. By degrees the Government system was brought to give the *utmost facilities* which could be given for Religious teaching, consistent with keeping the Schools assisted by the State open, for some reasonable portions of time, to pupils of different persuasions, as places for ordinary Education, and so a great number of the reasons which led to so extensive a Church organization gradually disappeared. During the same period, the great majority of Schools, originally established by the Church organization, either became altogether extinct, or were allowed to fall into a melancholy state of inefficiency. A fresh generation of Clergy and Laity took the place of the former, as it gradually passed off, but those succeeding, being individually absorbed within an organization which they had no part in establishing, felt the force of a traditional separation from the Government system, as they became surrounded by those who had themselves become committed to that separation. In this way the great bond of practical utility dying out, those who refused Government aid came to the position of being held together much more by a repugnance to break through a chain of union which they had inherited, than by fellowship in working a Society felt to be of national value and importance.

It had been my privilege and happiness to hold intimate intercourse with a large number of the Clergy and Laity who founded and worked the CHURCH EDUCATION SOCIETY during several of its early years of true national usefulness and importance; I knew well their great exertions and desire to fulfil their solemn duty of educating the poor; and although I know there was a great deal of conservative feeling united with scriptural principle in the early working of the Society, I am able to testify that a narrow spirit of political faction had no place in the hearts of those who led

the movement in establishing the Society; they were actuated by large and earnest views for the national good, and not by any petty captious feelings of personal enmity and party spirit. It became also my privilege to revisit Ireland during several months last autumn, and to enter again into close intercourse with some who remained from the former days, and with many who had entered upon positions which they had not been instrumental in producing. I will not conceal how my heart was grieved within me at the altered state of matters, the body of the great organization I had assisted to work was indeed visible in the country, but the fine spirit, which had animated it with mutual affection, confidence, and activity, was gone; the various parts and members were scattered, isolated, and decaying; while, at the same time, the form of the previously healthy organization, bearing upon it the names and memory of its revered founders, was being used by a few as an instrument of political faction, and as an association which could not be broken through without letting fall the ban of personal reprobation upon whoever might act as his real conscience directed, in giving the children of the poor around him the blessings attending upon Government aid in Education.

After taking careful counsel with long tried friends, and after receiving earnest requests that I would open out the position into which I perceived the Church of Ireland to be falling, I issued the address which I attach to this paper, and subsequently Appendixes I. and II., which I also subjoin. I well knew I was laying myself and what I advanced open to criticism. I invited discussion, because I knew that when the true state of matters became known, universal opinion would call upon the Clergy to take some species of action in the matter; but I did hope, as I avoided expressing even the appearance of personal blame as attaching to any one, that what I wrote would be fairly considered, and acted upon or not as might appear desirable by persons variously concerned. I felt that, in touching so deep and difficult a question, those whom I addressed might reasonably require

some explanation of my social and professional history, in order to justify them in giving credence to the strong statements I laid before them, and I accordingly gave the smallest information of that kind which could effect my object. Most gladly would I now ask consideration for the remarks I think it valuable to make on the present state of the discussion, avoiding a single personal allusion, except that I am persuaded they would fall powerless, in the quarters where I think a calm consideration of them would be of greatest need and value, if I did not in some measure vindicate myself from the rude personal reflections which were cast upon me in the *Christian Examiner* of last month.

I wrote to the clergyman who was represented to me as the chief editor of the *Examiner*, and requested him to inform me whether I might consider the articles reflecting upon me in that publication as written by himself, or as proceeding from some anonymous writer whose name and station must not be known; I am sorry to say that clergyman has not felt it right to answer my letter; I must therefore proceed, considering Dr. Stanford as giving the sanction of his name and position to an anonymous publisher, who has endeavoured to press on a forced sale of his paper, by holding up my name in a series of advertisements issued specially on that occasion;—how far it is right to do so I leave my clerical brethren and the public to judge. After a very angry article, in which doubts are expressed as to the length of time during which I was an Inspector of Schools, and the minds of his readers are led away, by insinuations on that point in direct variance with the plain information which he had before him, the writer thus endeavours to weaken the effect of my statements by personal reflections,—

“We think it no common sample of self-sufficiency, that such a raw, inexperienced man, should think himself a fit person to stand forward to warn, admonish, rebuke, &c., &c.”

As to this class of unfitness, I beg attention to the following testimony:—

FROM HIS GRACE THE ARCHBISHOP OF YORK, TO THE
REV. JOHN GARRETT.

"London, 41, Belgrave-square, February 21st, 1856.

"Rev. and dear Sir,

"I remember with much pleasure the zeal, activity, and success with which you administered the affairs of the parish of St. Mary's, Beverley, during the three years previous to July, 1849. Owing to the serious illness and the absence of the Vicar, the whole responsibility fell on you, and very worthily and wisely you discharged your duties; so much so that I recollect offering you the place of Senior Curate to my brother, Archdeacon Musgrave, Vicar of Halifax, which you declined, owing to an engagement elsewhere. And I was glad to learn that in the curacy to which you removed you were held in the same high esteem as at Beverley. You are at liberty to make use of this expression of my good opinion where and when it may be of service to you.

"I am, Rev. and dear Sir,

"Your faithful servant,

"T. EBOR.

"The Rev. John Garrett."

I hope it will be felt that I could not be so "raw and inexperienced," since so long ago as 1849, so good a practical judge of a clergyman's efficiency as the present Archbishop of York felt me to be qualified to fill a post in Halifax, where, in his brother's frequent absence, the entire onus of a parish with over 30,000 people would have devolved upon me.

Again, this writer, in his capacity of self-constituted pronouncer of what is infallibly right, informs his readers—

"But this Address shows that he is not only presumptuous and self-sufficient, but very ill informed on the subject which he handles."

From this charge I trust the following letter of special introduction will amply relieve me:—

FROM THE LORD BISHOP OF WINCHESTER TO LORD
GRANVILLE.

"Farnham Castle, January 27th, 1857.

"My dear Lord,

"I beg permission to introduce the Rev. J. Garrett, who, if your Lordship permits, will state to you his own business. I would not have

furnished him with this introduction if I did not consider his peculiar talents and aptitude for school inspection, taken in connexion with his experience in these matters, appear to me likely to make him more useful in the situation he wishes to obtain, than almost any one whom I have ever known.

"I have the honour to be, my dear Lord,

"Your Lordship's very faithful servant,

"C. WINTON.

"The Earl Granville, &c. &c. &c."

It is in my power to supply additional evidence to a very considerable extent, especially bearing upon that point of peculiar ill-nature, in which this *Christian* (?) writer directs his readers to think of me as actuated by those motives which he insinuates by quoting an announcement of my having attended a levée held by His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant; I might refer to the source of my promotion in life; I might ask why it was not made known at the same time that the London newspapers announced my having attended a levée held by Her Majesty the Queen under special presentation. But I will confine myself to one other point, in which I grieve to see this writer manifested an almost *malignant* feeling towards me. He says, referring to the great missionary cause which has led me to Ireland,—

"There were some few who doubted the soundness of both him and his fellow-labourers; and they will not be sorry that they stood aloof from one who has proved himself to be in principle so widely at variance with them."

The Report¹ of the Columbia Mission, which has just been issued, shows that in three months, after a visit by the Bishop of only eight days, the Church of Ireland has contributed the large amount of over 750*l.* to the funds of the Mission, showing that a goodly work may be done even

¹ A copy of this deeply interesting publication may be obtained by forwarding twelve postage stamps to Mr. Clay, Printer, Bread Street Hill, E.C., London.

without the aid of those who were so suspicious ; but as to my "soundness" I trust the following letter will bear sufficient testimony :—

FROM THE LORD BISHOP OF WINCHESTER, TO THE REV.
JOHN GARRETT.

" Rotherfield, Alton, February 23rd, 1856.

" Dear Sir,

" If you should have occasion, you are at liberty to refer to me as having known you in two Curacies in my Diocese, and one of them of a very important Suburban District. I shall be able to bear a willing testimony to your conduct in both, and that I have had every reason to be satisfied with your faithful and diligent discharge of your duties, especially in St. John's, Lambeth, in the midst of a very large and poor population ; I remember well your influence and usefulness were shown in the successful establishment of Schools—a much needed work, but very difficult to be accomplished.

" I am, dear Sir,

" Your very faithful servant,

" C. WINTON.

" Rev. John Garrett."

I have given this brief vindication of myself, because I know, the benefit I may be in some degree instrumental in effecting, in the greatest social question connected with the empire at the present time, would be lessened, if I could not repel the personal attacks which this anonymous writer made upon me. I am not insensible of the effects such articles produce, unfollowed, as I expect they will be, by a single word of acknowledgment that an undeserved injury was cast upon a clergyman to whom he had never spoken. Evidence has reached me of their effect. I give a letter here, not so much to show any injury to the mission I am advocating, as to make plain the existence of such a fear of reprobation, lying, as it has done, like a *nightmare* upon the spirits of some of the best clergymen in Ireland.

" The Rectory, February 18th, 1860.

" My dear Garrett,

" Your Address upon the Education question has reached me, and although I agree with you on that subject, and have held the same

opinions for about thirteen years, I deeply regret that, considering your connexion with that interesting mission, you should have decided on publishing your pamphlet. Alas! few are so very unselfish and catholic as to support a cause solely for its goodness.

"As you asked me to interest myself for the good work in this neighbourhood, I feel it right to make those remarks, assuring you at the same time, that so long as you continue its advocate, I shall be happy to welcome you here, and give you my pulpit. I must, however, decline to undertake any canvass amongst my brethren for meetings, &c.; such is the feeling against *you* at present, the attempt would be useless.

"The *Examiner* should be called *un-Christian* for its gross and personal attack upon you.

"Trusting our gracious God may overrule all our faults and ignorances,

"Believe me, my dear friend,

"Yours very sincerely,

"_____."

It so happens that my worthy, excellent, and valued friend lives in a district which had before refused to make any effort to join in the great National Mission with which I am connected. This does, however, reveal a very solemn truth, that, for thirteen years, this devoted clergyman has felt in his conscience that he and his brethren ought to be working with the Government System in educating the people, and he dare not join the Board from the dread of persecution, which the *Examiner* and its readers would entwine around him.

CHAPTER II.

A COMPARISON.

AT the moment when anxiety filled every one's mind, as to the course which the discussion would take, in fixing the position of that portion of the Church which had hitherto held aloof from the Government System; a well known voice was heard, speaking with the same clear, firm, and Christian tone, which, for half a century, has marked the

Primate's counsel with that peculiar emphasis which ever secured as cordial a respect for its author from those who felt bound to differ with him, as he could meet with from his most cordial friend. Rarely in the history of Christendom has the chief Prelate of any Church earned so unspotted a title to unfeigned respect; rarely have so noble an hereditary position, combined with the most tender Christian bearing towards all beneath him, been found to adorn any branch of the Christian Church; and still more rarely have such qualities marked a Prelate endued with faithfulness so unswerving, and judgment so sound. At a Patriarchal age, the Primate of all Ireland has been able to turn his still vigorous intellect on this subject of national moment; and, after an examination of returns, specially ordered, has convinced him that the Church was ignoring her position in the work of educating the poor, he has issued an address, every word of which is full of weight and meaning. I insert the document entire, that it may be present for the calm consideration of all who read this paper.

LETTER FROM HIS GRACE THE LORD PRIMATE TO THE
CLERGY OF HIS UNITED DIOCESE.

"My dear and Reverend Brethren,

"The difficulties in which the Education question is now involved are so great that I feel it incumbent upon me, after very anxious and careful consideration, to offer you my advice in reference to it.

"The Presidents of the Church Education Society having recently applied to her Majesty's Government for such a modification of the rules of the National System as would enable the Society's schools to obtain assistance out of the Parliamentary grant, an answer has been returned declining to make any alteration in the rule relating to the use of the Scriptures, which forms the fundamental difference between the two systems. All hope of a relaxation of this rule, so as to meet the views of the friends of the Church Education Society, must be relinquished. Successive Parliaments and successive Administrations, within the last twenty-eight years, have been applied to in vain. And the National System, introduced at first as a concession to the Roman Catholics, is now maintained in its integrity as a safeguard against the demands made by the Ultramontane party,—demands which, if conceded, would, in my judg-

ment, prove injurious to the interests of education, religion, and liberty in Ireland.

“It is under these circumstances we are to consider what our prospects are for the future, and the course which we ought to pursue.

“The Society’s schools, it is evident, must continue to be dependent for their support on their own resources. A considerable number of them, I am happy to say, are adequately provided for, are in an efficient state, and are diffusing the benefits of good education in their respective localities. These schools it is our duty to cherish, and to carry on in conformity with the principles on which they were founded; and we ought to endeavour to improve them still further for the advantage of the poor.

“It is to be regretted, however, that many of the schools are in a condition far from satisfactory. Several of them are quite inefficient, owing to the want of adequate funds; the salaries are not large enough to secure the services of properly qualified teachers; and the supply of books and other school requisites falls very short of what is called for.

“It is for the patrons of these impoverished and inefficient schools to judge whether, by renewed efforts, they can raise them from their depressed condition, so that the youthful members of the Church may not be left without the secular instruction which is needed to qualify them for competing with those of other communions in the struggles of life which lie before them. If exertions for this purpose can be made with any hope of success, they ought to be made promptly. But if all expectation of increasing the funds of these schools be at an end, and the evils attending a defective education of the children be imminent, then it appears to me that it would be advisable to seek for aid from the Commissioners of National Education, rather than allow the children of our communion to grow up in a state of ignorance, or expose them to the danger which would arise from their resorting for secular education to National schools under the management and influence of patrons who are hostile to our Church.

“Some of you have been endeavouring to keep up five, some six schools in your parish, to meet the wants of the large population under your charge. I am aware of the great difficulty of such an undertaking, and I cannot but admire the perseverance you have manifested under your discouragements, and the attachment you have evinced to the Church Education Society. I sympathize with you while I offer you my advice, and recommend you, under the pressing necessity of the case, to submit to the rules of a system which, in one important particular, we cannot approve of. But I am sure that those of you who may feel it requisite to have recourse to this alternative of connecting your schools with the National Board, will deem yourselves bound honestly to act in accordance with its regulations, and to keep faith with the Commissioners. And I would further suggest, that in every such case you should explain to your parishioners that it is from a regard for the interests of their children, and influenced solely by

that consideration, you are constrained to avail yourselves of this the only means by which you can provide a suitable education for them.

"No change whatever ought, I conceive, to be made in the fundamental laws of the Church Education Society. In connexion with it will remain those schools which are conducted on its principles, and which by their efficiency will do credit to those principles. And for their benefit the valuable Training Institution in Dublin will, I hope, be kept up in its present admirable order. Towards effecting this object, my annual contribution to the funds of the central society shall be continued.

"The upholding of a class of schools independent of State support, and unshackled by the restrictions which it imposes, is, in my opinion, of great importance to the interests of education in the country, and is in some places essential to the interests of religion.

"In reference to schools under your superintendence, the patrons of which are landed proprietors, I should wish you to submit for their consideration the suggestions which I have offered on this subject.

"If I were merely to consult my own ease, I should, at my advanced time of life, have allowed things to remain as they are, and have left this long agitated question to settle itself after my removal from the world. But if I were to do so, and to shrink from making this effort to place the education of the poor in my diocese in a better condition than it has been of late years, I feel that I should not be acting for the best interests of the Church over which I have been appointed to preside. I therefore determined to offer the advice conveyed in this letter. And, in conclusion, I earnestly pray God that we may all of us both perceive and know what things we ought to do, and also may have grace and power faithfully to fulfil the same.

"I remain, my dear and reverend brethren,

"Yours, very faithfully,

"JOHN G. ARMAGH AND CLOGHER.

"Armagh, 21st February, 1860."

"His Grace announces to the 'Armagh Diocesan Church Education Society,' that he will continue to pay the salary of the inspector of schools, for the benefit of those who may choose to remain unconnected with the National System, and on their own resources. His Grace has also communicated his views to the Bishops in a separate letter."

No man could have more reason to rejoice than I have at the contents of this address: it supports, with the highest authority, the statements I felt it right to put forward:—

1st. That a large number of the Church Schools had fallen into complete inefficiency.

2nd. That the Government System, so far as it goes with the Church, is good and righteous, and may be safely used by the Clergy.

3rd. That no hope can be entertained any longer, with the slightest prospect of being realized, that Statesmen can be induced to give public money to Schools which refuse their moral and literary advantages to children whose parents may object to their being taught the Scriptures in School.

4th. That the Government System is now found to be a safeguard against the Ultramontane party in the Church of Rome.

To those points on which I dwelt, his Grace has added the advice that the CHURCH EDUCATION SOCIETY should still be maintained, to supplement and stimulate the schools which receive aid from the Government; and he strengthens this advice by saying that none except efficient schools ought to be retained in union with the Society.

With all the weight of his high character, and all the solemnity of his advanced age, this touching advice has been given, with the unfaltering decision of a man who knew and felt he was right.

If the lines I am tracing should ever reach the eye of His Grace, I desire, with the profoundest respect, to convey to him the heartfelt thanks of hundreds of my brethren. No longer can I be taunted with disrespect for one so justly revered by those with whom I acted in former years; no longer can he be quoted as an authority in acts of bitterness and persecution, of a nature and extent which his spirit would recoil from if he could but know any thing of its nature; no longer will any clergyman be able to justify himself in standing idle in the work of Education, under the alleged sanction of His Grace, that it was wrong to use the Government aid. It is, indeed, well that before his removal this address has been issued, to break the possibility of so revered a name being hereafter used as a cover for either political faction or inactivity and neglect.

For some days there came, to those who regarded the scene from an unprejudiced position, many signs of a widespread result, fraught with incalculable benefit to the Church and Nation. The Bishop of Kilmore frankly communicated to his extensive Diocese his cordial approbation of the Primate's advice. Archdeacon Goold, addressing the Clergy of Raphoe, plainly told them,—

“It seems to me that, at this crisis, every man must be guided by his own individual conscience,—‘be firmly persuaded in his own mind.’ If then any brother heretofore connected with our Society, under the pressure of circumstances, should deem it his duty to seek aid from the National Board, I, for one, avow that I will not sit in censorious judgment on this act of his; I, for one, will not (as, alas! too often has been the case) attribute interested and unworthy motives. I never will be a party to taunting such an one with abandonment of principle.”

The Archdeacons of Cork and Cloyne, with several of their Clergy, followed in the same course. Notwithstanding the dogmatic dictation of the *Christian Examiner*, the names of men, long known and tried, as firm friends of Scriptural Education, became known in quick succession as throwing their influence into the scale with the Primate's advice. The Belfast Committee entered into a deep discussion, and when a majority resolved to continue the assertion, that a clergyman would be justified in taking no part in Education rather than use the Government System, some of the oldest and most influential of the Clergy resigned connexion with men who assumed so untenable a position. Thus, bright hopes arose that the baneful Agitation, which has so long made the Education of the poor not only an instrument of political party-strife, but also an engine of heart-burning recriminations amongst the Clergy, was about to be abandoned; inasmuch as the few who would gladly continue it would be left without leaders to whom the public would listen. Alas! such hopes were but a dream;—some letters quickly appeared in a Dublin newspaper, from clergymen of Proprietary Churches, whose calling has never been within the range

of the daily responsibilities of Parochial work,—men, who, to use an expression which a hard-working clergyman lately conveyed to me, “have been all their lives travelling in the first-class carriage of the Church,”—men, I say, who never teach a poor man’s child, and whose special congregations remove them altogether from so lowly a task;—some newspaper letters appeared from such men, putting forth abstract theories with subtle reasoning, and laying down, as an immutable “principle,” that, if the Government refuse to grant public money to a school, in which every child attending must learn the Scriptures, whether parents wish it or not, the Clergy are bound not to use the Government aid at all; so making it appear that an alleged error in the Government binds a clergyman by his “principle” to withhold inestimable benefits from nineteen out of every twenty of the children who acknowledge his pastoral care. I believe such reasonings, on purely speculative grounds, are not only unsound in their theoretical conclusions, but also contrary to the daily practice of those men’s lives, in other lines of duty of analogous nature.

Even such letters as I have referred to would, I believe, very shortly die away, except that they have received solidity by having similar sentiments put forth, in a formal letter from a Bishop, whose name and past history demand for him the utmost attention. The Lord Bishop of *Ossory’s* address is a feature in the discussion of a serious nature. His Lordship is very distinct in giving advice quite opposite to that of the Primate, and he does not hesitate to use strong language in designating His Grace, and those who join in the counsel he has given. He says to his Clergy, “*Be assured that they are bad advisers, and not true friends either to you, or to the Church.*”

We have thus before us two authorities in the Church, each of whom possesses his own special claims to confidence and esteem. Their advice is altogether irreconcilable; and it stands distinctly opposed on the most vital question in a clergyman’s sacred duty. The Primate, in concise and firm

language, gives his opinion that a clergyman may with propriety unite his school with the Government System, and charges his Clergy with the advice to do so where they cannot otherwise maintain efficient schools; the Bishop, by a long course of reasoning, arrives at the conclusion, that to act as His Grace advises would be "displeasing to the Great Head of the Church;" and he exhorts his Clergy—"Do not be persuaded that the Church's safety can be promoted by any course that is displeasing to her Great Head."

The gravity of this contradiction cannot be overrated; one or other of those high and valued men is under a most serious mistake and error. To know which of them is right, and which of them it is safe to follow, is a question of the greatest moment not only for the Clergy, but also for the Christian Laity.

I confess it is with the deepest regret I feel it a solemn duty to approach such a comparison of the advice given by the Bishop with that of the Primate, as must express my own opinion very strongly as to the seat of the mistake. The wisdom of lectures which I was privileged to hear in college many years ago filled me with a deep confidence in the correctness of his Lordship's reasoning and judgment. But, with all such respectful estimation, I must say that the great confidence I felt in the unerring judgment of his Lordship has broken down.

I believe that to convince the Church of the possibility of his Lordship being mistaken requires a class of evidence not necessary in almost any other case. And before I explain where the mistakes which press upon my mind lie in the address before me, I must adduce evidence of an instance of a very important nature, in which his Lordship was evidently under a serious misapprehension, such as will justify the idea that he may be the writer in this case whose reasoning embraces a mistake.

During the prolonged investigation before a Committee of the House of Lords in 1854, the Very Rev. E. N. Hoare was asked—

"6629. What was the measure of support afforded by the Clergy in Ireland to the Kildare-place Society?"

and he answered—

"The Clergy of the Established Church have never, as a body, supported the Kildare-place Society. . . . I believe it to be a fact, that no Bishop of the Established Church in Ireland ever contributed to the funds of the Kildare-place Society, till upon the establishment of the present National System the Lord Primate gave a donation of 100*l.*; certainly no name of a Bishop was among the presidents or patrons of the Society."

As this answer tended very much to make the support given to the Society appear to have flowed not so much from a genuine desire to assist Education through the Society, as to raise the Society into an organization antagonistic to the new system of the Government, Dean Hoare was further examined.

"6231. Lord Bishop of *Ossory*.] In the list of members for life of the Kildare-place Society, I find the Right honourable and Reverend Bishop of Kildare and the Right Reverend Bishop of Killala; that is inconsistent with your statement, is not it?"

"It appears to be so; my statement was not positive; I stated that I only had an impression upon my mind on that subject.

"6232. I find that His Grace the Lord Primate gave a donation of 100*l.*?"

"That I mentioned.

"6233. The Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of *Ossory* a donation of 10*l.*; the Right Reverend Lord Bishop of Killala gave a donation of 20*l.*; the Right Reverend Lord Bishop of Cloyne is put down for an annual subscription of 50*l.*?"

"I mentioned that the Primate gave a donation at the close of 1831 or commencement of the year 1832, upon the establishment of the present National Board; I apprehend those contributions may have been since then. My object was to show that till the establishment of the national system such support was not given; I do not know the date of the report from which your Lordship reads.

"6234. *Chairman*.] The date of that report, 1832?"

"It is, I see, dated 1832; it is the 20th Report. Lord Stanley's letter, which constituted the National Board, was issued in October 1831. The heading, I perceive, is, 'Donations and Subscriptions received by the Society in support of United and Scriptural Education, for the year ending the 5th of January 1832.' Three months after Lord Stanley's letter.

"6235. Lord Bishop of *Ossory*.] You will observe, that the list which I read is for the year ending 5th Januaay 1832 ?

"Therefore the subscriptions may have been given after Lord Stanley's letter appeared. The November and December of the year 1832 were months of great agitation upon the subject. That was the time when I alleged that I knew the Lord Primate had subscribed, and I do not know but that others did the like. I have not looked at the report since 1831. My point is, that they did not support it before Lord Stanley's letter was published.

"6236. This, however, does not establish the fact, because if the various prelates whose names I have read to you are included in the list of donations and subscriptions received by the society for the year ending the 5th of January 1832, those donations and subscriptions might have occurred from the 1st of January 1831, or any previous period ?

"Yes, as far as that list goes.

"6327. *Chairman*.] Nothing which has been read to you out of that report disproves the assertion you have made, which is, that as far as you know yourself, no Bishop had been a patron, or vice-president, or subscriber to the Kildare-place Society, before the national system was established ?

"It is not at all inconsistent with what I stated, but rather confirms it, and I still believe it."

The effect of this examination was to shake very seriously the truth of Dean Hoare's evidence, as it was clear his Lordship was under the impression, from the Report which was in his hands, that several prelates had been subscribers previous to the time indicated by Dean Hoare. But we find (page 827) when the Dean was again under examination a week afterwards, and the same Report was put into his hands, he was asked by Lord *Beaumont*—

"6391. Lord *Beaumont*.] Have you any thing further to add on that subject ?

"I have. This is the Report of the Kildare-place Society for the year ending 5th January 1832. I said on the last day of examination that I believed it possible, and likely, that the subscriptions of those Lords Bishops, as well as that of the Primate, were given subsequently to October 1831. I admitted to the Bishop of *Ossory*, however, on that occasion that I could not prove it. I never had this Report in my hands till Tuesday last ; but I recollected last night, when correcting my evidence, that I had seen some very important words here, and I wished to get this Report into my hands again. We have here two lists of sub-

scribers in this Report; the first is, 'List of Donations and Subscriptions received by the Society for the Year ending January 1832.' There is not the name of a Bishop in it. There is, however, a supplemental list; and though there is a Report dated 1832 for the year 1831, I call your Lordship's attention to this heading: 'Donations and Subscriptions received by the Society in support of United and Scriptural Education since 5th January 1832;' these were the words which struck me, and the names of the Bishops, which the Lord Bishop of Ossory read to me, as proving that Bishops supported the Kildare-place Society previous to October 1831, are all in that list, three months after the date of Lord Stanley's letter. Here is the Right Reverend the Bishop of Cloyne's 50*l.* promised, and no doubt paid; the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Killala, 20*l.*; the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Raphoe, 50*l.*; his Grace the Lord Primate, 100*l.*; the Right Reverend the Bishop of Ossory, 10*l.*; all since the 5th of January 1832. That is a supplementary list of subscriptions given to the Society 'for the Promotion of Scriptural Education.' If I had time to read that Report, I am certain that I should find the committee in it speak strongly of Lord Stanley's letter, condemning it, and that they state and boast of the favour shown to their society by the Church since the issue of Lord Stanley's letter. It was to Lord Stanley's letter that they were indebted for those subscriptions, and they have never received any since, I believe."

Now, here, it appears, that at a most critical time, when Dean Hoare was being examined on oath, surrounded by all the summary discipline of the House of Lords, the Lord Bishop of *Ossory*, examined him strictly, when under a serious misapprehension, on a point of great importance, even while he held in his hands the Report which contained the Appendix stating the exact time at which the several Bishops became subscribers. I think this shows that it is possible his Lordship's mind may misapprehend a subject on which it dwells.

It is impossible, from its length, to insert here the whole of his Lordship's letter, but I select the following paragraph, which is one of the most forcible in the address, and one which is most calculated to prevent a patron from even making inquiry as to what he may do in his school.

"But if you connect your school with the National Board all this liberty is at an end. You will not only engage to restrain your teacher from reading the Bible, or having it read, during the hours of the ordinary

business of the school, when all the scholars are assembled, but you will bind yourself during all that time to abstain from all and every use of the Bible in the school, either in the way of reading, or citation, or reference. You can neither instruct, nor advise, nor admonish, nor rebuke, nor warn those immortal beings who have come to your school to be taught, and who are all assembled before you. You must know that they all need to have the Word of God so applied to them. And you may know that some of them stand in special and urgent need of such a use of the Word. But you cannot minister it to them. You must keep the Book closed, and your lips closed, until the hour comes when the rule allows you to open them. And then you may see all those whose need of such instruction you know to be the most urgent go away without receiving it. And this may go on day after day until they pass out of your school into life, with all its temptations, and trials, and sorrows, without ever having been made acquainted with the Blessed Book, which was given for every child in the school, to be his guide through life, to shield him against its temptations, to support him under its trials, and to comfort him in his sorrows; without ever having heard a word from you of their guilt, and their pollution, and their spiritual wants, and of the Saviour and of His all sufficiency; without ever having heard one word from you, in fact, which they might not have heard, if Christ had never come down from heaven, or if God had not given us a Book to tell us He had come down; what He did, and what He said, what He suffered, and why He suffered while He was upon earth."

I am quite certain his Lordship in this passage, while drawing a painful picture of a speculative theory, misapprehends entirely the real state of the case; these words misrepresent the nature of the ordinary Education given, and indeed required in the Government System; in the reading books, there are lessons which supply ample opportunity for such Religious instruction as would well acquaint every pupil with the sacred truths which his Lordship enumerates; besides, the Ten Commandments, and other portions of Scripture, are suspended in the School during all hours of the day, and permitted freely to be used in such exhortations as any man, practically acquainted with Education, would desire, or allow his teacher to mix up with the literary parts of the instruction; I have not any doubt that every man, at all acquainted with the course of instruction allowed by the Government System, would exclaim at once with me that his Lordship has wrongly stated what he has so described.

But his Lordship writes strongly on the point that if the Clergy put their languishing schools under Government aid, their brethren in England will not only withhold contributions to strengthen the remaining portion of the Church Education Society, but that they will also withdraw all respect and confidence from the Clergy who do so. I believe few men have more extensive and ample opportunities than myself for knowing well the sentiments of the English Clergy and people on this question, and I do not hesitate to say, I am convinced his Lordship labours under a total misapprehension in the matter. The English Clergy and people love to assist whatever good cause is plainly opened out and laid before them; but they look with coldness upon statements which at one moment tell them the Government System is dishonouring to God, and displeasing to the great Head of the Church, and which with the next breath inform them that in cases of Model and Vested Schools, it is allowable to use the system, but that it is sinful to join it where the ordinary teachers, and generality of the people, would benefit by the Government allowances. They cannot comprehend the fine-drawn distinction, by which a Clergyman finds it consistent with his feelings of propriety, to receive a salary himself as chaplain to a workhouse, and enters into a compact to see inmates of other persuasions passing their whole lives without his ever saying a word to them about Religion, while he pronounces it to be sinful for another to agree that, under a parent's expressed wish, a little child may be admitted to his school for three hours each day, without being under direct Scriptural instruction during that short interval. They cannot join the reasoning by which conscience is held to free men from the responsibility of teaching children any thing at all during twenty-one hours, if the State will not assist them in disregarding the parents' wishes during the remaining three out of every twenty-four. Appeal for assistance towards sending itinerating teachers amongst the people, to find them in their cottages and the field, and your IRISH

SOCIETY will surely receive support. Ask for Aid in maintaining such valuable Institutions as PROTESTANT ORPHAN SOCIETIES, and many hearts will be found ready willingly to respond. Send out a plain straightforward case, the merits of which can be understood without so many speculative and difficult inconsistencies. Throw away mystery, and strong denunciations, and let the Church of Ireland make a united appeal for contributions towards a society to supplement, with Scriptural and Church teaching, the facilities offered by the State, and both at home and in England funds will not be withheld.

Again, his Lordship is manifestly mistaken in the argument he has founded on the assumption that the rule as to average attendance is not likely to be relaxed sufficiently to embrace very small schools. Would it not be better to exert influence to have the benefits as widely diffused as possible, than to speculate beforehand on the assumed probability that very small schools will be excluded, and then found a discouraging argument on that speculation? Until the authorities announce how far they think it right to relax the rule in question, any argument founded upon it is evidently a mistake.

Finally, as one of the two must be in error, and consequently his advice must be dangerous to follow, I believe sufficient has been said in the comparison I have drawn to establish the superior wisdom and propriety of the advice given by the Primate.

CHAPTER III.

PRACTICAL RESULTS.

It appears to me very desirable that a brief glance should be taken at the practical results which must flow from either advice as it may be followed.

First. So far as the Bishop's advice may be followed the Church Education Society will continue to hold out before the country a number of bad schools; it will form a small centre for continued agitation, and rapidly sink into a feeble agency for controversial purposes; it will lose all claim to represent the Church; and it cannot fail to die out, unregretted in its last years by any of the practical men who love Education for the great blessings of loyalty and happiness which it alone can secure to the land. At the same time, the Clergy, who maintain so painful a position, will see all influence in the work of Education passing entirely out of their hands; and, when it is too late, they will find that they were wrong in endeavouring to force the Government to grant them what power they wished to exercise over the few children whose parents might object, by visiting with the pains and penalties of serious privation all the children who are willing to learn every thing they may wish to teach. When a clergyman tells me his conscience forbids his teaching any thing to one child whose parent might object to Religious instruction, I am in the habit of asking if he has not another side to his conscience which presses upon him the claims of all the other children who make no objection.

But, *secondly*, if the wise counsels of the Primate prevail, the Church Education Society may become an Institution supported by the Church at large, for the purpose of aiding in the Religious instruction of National Schools; and it may show to the Nation many valuable Schools retained under its own organization. Thus, by Government aid where required, and by voluntary contributions where they can be obtained, the Church may soon regain much of her lost ground. At all events, no clergyman will in future be at liberty to quote the authority of His Grace for allowing his School to perish, while aid is offered by the State. And I sincerely hope, when appearing at the annual meeting in April, the advocates of the Society will not try to fix any invidious stigmas on those who join the Government System.

I will conclude with a suggestion as to the extent to which

I think the Government might safely extend their aid to meet the cases of Schools now seeking assistance:—

1. Grant a small retiring allowance to deserving Teachers, on the same scale as if they had hitherto been receiving Government allowances. The State having hitherto borne none of the expense of a School is rather a reason why the Teacher might fairly be assisted in retiring.
2. Grant two years of grace before requiring Teachers to undergo examination, giving Probationer's salary until the qualification could be attained; always keeping the way open for a Teacher to come up for examination sooner than two years if desirable.
3. Take sufficient guarantee that each School is under a *bonâ fide* Patron, and will be efficiently maintained; grant Books, requisites, and inspection, without reference to any fixed average attendance. I submit that it is not a sound principle to withhold suitable apparatus and supervision during the stage when a School is first developing its standing.
4. Grant 15s. each, as capitation allowance, from the time the average attendance reaches 15 until it amounts to over 19.
5. Give *Probationer's* salary where an average of from 20 to 25 is attained. *Third class* salary when the average attendance reaches from 25 to 30. *Second class* from 30 to 35. *First class* from 35 upwards.

If such an arrangement as this can be promptly announced by the authorities, I fully believe it will be received by the Patrons of Schools, and by the Nation at large, as a great and liberal boon, in favour of a class who are highly deserving of wise and kind consideration.

J. G.

3, Waterloo Place, London, S.W.,
20th March, 1860.

AN ADDRESS
ON
EDUCATION IN IRELAND

TO THE
ARCHBISHOPS, BISHOPS, AND CLERGY

Of the Church of Ireland,

WITH APPENDIX I. AND II.

CONTAINING AN EXAMINATION OF THE "PRINCIPLE" INVOLVED,
AND REMARKS ON SOME PLANS SUGGESTED
FOR REMOVING THE DIFFICULTIES HITHERTO EXISTING IN THE WAY
OF THE CHURCH SCHOOLS BEING PLACED UNDER THE
NATIONAL BOARD.

Houses of the Oireachtas

PREFACE.

I KNOW I have written warmly in some parts of this publication. It may be I have snapped asunder ties of agreement with some whom I regard with affection and respect. And it has been felt by a few, that "after leaving the Church of Ireland," I ought to be silent as regards her action in such a matter. Most of those who think so may, I hope, be led to look kindly upon the expression I have given to my thoughts, when they reflect that, although I have spent my ministry in England, receiving every where kindness and success, and although my family is of English origin, yet for two generations, extending over a period of more than one hundred years, my parents succeeded each other in the vicarage of one of the largest union of parishes in the west of Ireland, my father speaking the Irish language from his infancy to his grave. So that I trust I may seem justified as a brother, on revisiting my native branch of our united Church, in dropping some words which tell with feeling, how it grieveth me to see her in danger of losing her rightful position in the momentous work of educating the poor.

2nd January, 1860.

PREFACE TO THE ADDRESS

WHEN ISSUED CONFIDENTIALLY.

THE accompanying Address was originally put in type with a view to its insertion in the Public Press; but the subject seems hardly suited for Newspaper discussion at the present moment; I therefore put it forth more privately, under encouragement from some valued friends, who are impressed with a feeling of its importance, and who have kindly intimated their appreciation of the manner and spirit in which it is written. I shall rejoice to receive expressions of opinion which may reveal the true state of your mind on the question involved.

J. G.

3, Warerloo Place, London, S.W.,
14th December, 1859.

EDUCATION IN IRELAND.

To the Archbishops, Bishops, and Clergy of the Church of Ireland.

MY LORDS AND REVEREND BRETHREN,

I FULLY hope I may not be considered as acting with presumption, when I express to you a few thoughts which appear to me of intense importance at the present moment. No reflecting man can take an impartial survey of the present position of matters in Ireland, respecting the vital question of Education, and not feel moved with a deep feeling of the grave consequences which must flow from the course the Church of Ireland may pursue within the next few months; and I declare to you, I venture to touch this great question with lively feelings of the solemn responsibility I incur by doing so.

But I conceive few men could be more suitably circumstanced for addressing you at this crisis than myself; and in order to give my words such weight in your estimation as they may deserve, I will briefly state some points in my history which seem to fit me for being able to form sound opinions in this matter. Brought up in youth amongst clergymen of acknowledged piety and Christian zeal, and surrounded by men from whose example and counsel my opening character could not fail to receive the best impress which your Church could be the instrument of imparting, I came out of Trinity College, Dublin, with my Divinity Tes-

timonium, and all other papers, ready for Ordination, at the age of twenty-one—two years too young for Holy Orders. Under satisfactory testimonials, and the recommendations of many friends, I had the high privilege of being elected to fill the office of Inspector of Schools under the CHURCH EDUCATION SOCIETY for Ireland, at a time when, as I was informed, there were seventy-four candidates for the appointment. For two years I filled the office of one of the Society's Inspectors; examining into the schools of eastern and southern counties, as well as penetrating the mountains of Connemara and districts of the West, so that I had ample opportunities for holding most intimate communications with Clergy and supporters of Scriptural Schools in every variety of position. My Ordination in 1845 terminated my connexion with the Society, and I was led to devote myself to the ministry in England. Since then I have been privileged to pass through scenes of incessant activity, ministering in large rural parishes, and also amongst masses of people in London and other places of dense population, carrying with me every where the fruits of my educational experience, and taking no small practical share in the vast work which has been so wonderfully progressing in England of late years, until under patronage of high order I have been called to the vicarage of an important and populous parish.

With such a preparation, which I trust will commend itself to you as calculated to enable me to look judiciously into such a matter, I have had occasion to revisit several parts of Ireland during the last four months, under circumstances which have placed me in close and direct intercourse with a very large number of the Clergy and Laity of your Church. I have received impressions of a vivid character, and, after careful consideration, I am brought to the conclusion that no feelings of delicacy would justify my shrinking from addressing to you a few earnest words, which I trust will be received in the spirit of brotherly affection and regard, by which I am sincerely actuated.

The faithful stand which was made by the Church of

Ireland for the principle of the free use of the Holy Scriptures in education, has commanded as well as deserved the respect and admiration of the whole kingdom, even of those who have thought it would be more expedient to accept and make the best of the pecuniary assistance provided by the State ; and the serious sacrifices made by the Clergy and Laity, have told of the deep piety which your Church possesses, and of the sincerity of the motives by which they have been guided. I have no doubt that impartial history will bear testimony to this.

When originally established, there were features in the National System of Education which demanded the careful consideration of the Church of Ireland ; and its introduction was also accompanied by a measure which gave the friends of Scriptural Education a severe shock ; I refer to the withdrawal of the grant previously made by the Government to the schools of the "Kildare Place Society." Look calmly back to the first years of the National Board. There was a prevailing opinion that the direct teaching of Holy Scripture was decidedly discouraged by the Government of the day, because of their taking away the Kildare Place grant. I well remember the alarm that measure caused as to the expected intentions of the Government, and how seriously men reflected upon their solemn duties in the matter ; and I also remember how sorrowfully, and yet how firmly, earnest, loyal men resolved that they could take no part in a system of education which held forth as its leading rule the use of a "Book of Extracts," which was considered a "mutilation of the Holy Scriptures." The aversion to introduce such a book, immediately after the withdrawal of the previous grant, caused a universal feeling of repugnance to the National Board. This feeling was strengthened by an expectation that the Board would interfere with the appointment of teachers, so as to assume a large control in that matter : and it was strongly felt that with the design, as it appeared at the time, of putting the Holy Scriptures in the background, the Board would probably cover the

country with a class of teachers, who would only be in earnest in such branches as did not affect religion. Added to all this, there was the belief that the Clergy were required to submit to assist the Roman Catholic priests in withholding the Word of God from some of the children attending school.

The resolution formed of acting independently of the Government aid, under the causes, which I believe I have correctly, though briefly stated, was firmly and liberally supported by the Irish Church for several years. In 1844 the CHURCH EDUCATION SOCIETY had a considerable staff of Inspectors, continually and zealously employed, and a large number of schools were efficiently supported all over the country. The condition of these schools was at that period encouraging. They were superior to those under the National Board, mainly because the men who superintended them were hearty and sincere in their wishes to educate the children who attended. A considerable proportion of the pupils were Roman Catholics; and I am able to state, from careful investigation, that the best answering in Holy Scripture was found in children of that persuasion, when compared with other children of similar age and standing in the schools. This feature was strongly marked in the East, South, and West, where I inspected; and I believe it resulted from the fact that such subjects, being forbidden fruit at home, as the mind of the child opened into vigour and intelligence, were eagerly grasped, and led to a greater proficiency than could be found in the mind, which met in the religious teaching in school a repetition of what was placed before it in the course of conversation with the parents at home. Whether I am right in this explanation of the cause or not, the remarkable circumstance I hold to be indisputable, that the Roman Catholic pupils were better answerers in religion than their companions under similar circumstances.

No language could convey an adequate idea of the contrast which the state of Ireland now presents to my mind

after an absence of fourteen years : the awful famine, with its attending consequences of a large decrease in the poorest class of the population ; the Encumbered Estates Court, with its severe remedy, and its wonderful effects in introducing and liberating capital throughout the country ; the introduction of railroads, and the partial effects of education, have, with other causes, introduced a revolution into the physical condition of Ireland. Not only are the results of a better directed industry already largely manifested, but the very aspect of the population is improved ; local prejudices have been greatly broken through by increased means of communication ; a more independent spirit is evident amongst the people, since a better system of wages has increased their comforts, and a desire for information upon various subjects may now be found in every direction. I cannot doubt that five years of active intelligent education would place the regeneration of Ireland on a foundation which no selfish interests could check or hinder.

In the midst of so general an improvement, one subject, which ought to be leading the way, is lamentably behind-hand, I refer to the education which is under the superintendence of the Church. All over the country there are clergymen of deep learning, earnest spirit, and warm piety and zeal ; but in the great paramount work of vigorous education they seem almost spell-bound. With a wonderful self-denial they maintain schools, in very many instances chiefly at their own cost ; the Laity are, in many places, changed, and originally liberal contributions have either fallen off altogether, or become seriously reduced. The wide-spread nature of the difficulties felt in keeping open the Church Schools is weighing as a heavy burden upon Clergy who have succeeded brethren who first made the protest against the withdrawal of Scriptural Education. I believe those who reside in the few leading cities have no knowledge or conception of the true state of the case ; it is felt considerably in towns of the second and third rate of

size and position, but in rural districts it is melancholy in the extreme. I could tell you of places in which I formerly knew of valuable schools, in which the seminaries now connected with the Church have neither teachers nor ordinary school requisites capable of imparting the merest rudiments of instruction ; and a general feeling is fast growing up that in the situations of clerks, and various positions in life where superiority of education secures employment, *the young people of the Church are thrown into a disadvantage*, and cannot compete with their neighbours of similar position and fortune in life. I believe firmly that if such a state of matters continues a little longer, the necessities of their position will draw away and force the children of the Church into the schools of other religious denominations, and bring about a loss of usefulness, from which all the learning, piety, and zeal of the Church will not be sufficient to raise her for years to come.

What then is the possible remedy ? The Church requires means to supply her schools with teachers and school requisites, which will enable her to retain her own poor in a suitable position in life, and which will commend her schools to all families around them.

While Ireland has been improving, I perceive the National Board have been in some measure altering, and to a great extent explaining, their practice and rules. All necessity to use the "Book of Extracts" has been entirely removed, even in appearance ; and in Scriptural instruction the Bible is free to be employed without any change or "mutilation." Hundreds of schools in England, and the best authorities on education, bear strong testimony, not only to the unobjectionable character, but to the excellence of the books supplied by the Board for every branch of secular instruction : the facility of teaching with the "Spelling-book Superseded," the English Grammar, Geography, and various stages of reading books, is only to be felt with delight by those who have practice in the work. I can speak feelingly on this point, having not

only superintended large schools in which they are used, but having had the privilege, and great advantage, under election by the "Coopers' Company" in London, of filling the office of Chaplain and Master of "Stroode's Charities" in Egham, where I taught single-handed a large school of 100 boys, and I can state without reserve, from full practical knowledge, that nothing can be more admirable than the books of the Irish National Board for secular instruction. But the great feature to be remarked, is that it is now placed beyond a doubt that *the patron of every school may select and appoint his own teacher*, without any interference or control on the part of the Board, so that every Church School in Ireland might be placed under the National Board, and retain the existing teachers, or change them at pleasure in cases of inefficiency. Surely this advantage cannot be overrated, as it removes all feeling that you would be patronizing schools in which the children might be under teachers with no heart in the work of religion. Again, there cannot now be the least fear that Inspectors under the Board would be sent to your schools, calculated to interfere in any way with plans for religious instruction; and what can any system of education effect without regular efficient inspection? and of what value can inspection be, if no means exist for carrying out such improvements as may be suggested? A school without inspection is sure to become a lifeless form; and inspection without means of improvement must be a mockery.

So far, then, union with the National Board would now respect your appointment of teachers, allow you to use the entire "unmutilated" Scriptures, supply you with salaries, and an unrivalled quality of secular books and apparatus, besides giving life and vigour to your schools, by an impartial and skilful inspection.

I am aware, however, that in a single point, you should forego what no doubt is of great importance. In case a child of a Roman Catholic should apply for instruction, your

teacher's duty would be to notify to the parent or guardian a rule, that if objected to, such a child would be allowed to receive secular instruction, and be at liberty not to study the Scriptures in school. You might, with full propriety, proceed with the education of the child without distinction, until such objection might be made. Is there a child under your instruction now whose parents would make any such objection? I fully believe not one in a hundred would; so that you are withholding all the advantages to be gained from Government aid from the whole of your Church children, under a vague idea that some parent might make such an objection. Is it wise or right to allow a doubtful possibility of the kind to be the cause of so grievous an injury to the children of the Church?

I would, however, look at this point in another way. If I had the superintendence of a school, where the great body of the children were receiving regular Scriptural Education, and on the notification of the rule in question an objection was made, surely I would still have the child in a Religious atmosphere. A teacher, with his heart in the cause, would take all proper opportunity for directing the mind to heavenly subjects, and companionship with children well stored in their own minds with Scriptural truths, could not fail to inculcate them in such a case; nay, more, the very making the objection would open the door for me to pay special visits to the parent. I would have good opportunities for sitting down and reasoning in a friendly spirit over such an objection. I might open out the Divine truths in the midst of the family, and who can tell the good results which might flow from such an objection? Of this I am persuaded, when a youth brought up under such a prohibition would come to years of intelligence, and find himself able to read and understand matters for himself, no influence could prevent his reading the Book of which he had often heard, yea! and reading it with avidity too.

And now may I notice a part of the subject of vast im-

portance, remembering the single point which now separates the Church Schools from Government aid ; would it be desirable to introduce the English system, and give to each religious community separate grants ? or, in other words, to extend Government aid to all schools, leaving the religious teaching entirely uncontrolled. I believe no thoughtful man, who knows both countries, can look at such a wish as involving, if carried out, any thing less than the suicide of your Church in the matter. The leading feature of the English plan has been giving grants in aid of local contributions. The Church has in England gained a high and advanced position by meeting the proposal in time, and raising her schools in every direction ; but when the schools are not under the Church, still they warmly uphold the study of the Scriptures, the number of Roman Catholic Schools being a mere fraction of the whole ; but how would it be in Ireland ? At this moment every where the schools are already in the hands of the Roman Catholics ; and to give them the power of teaching such religious books as they might choose, would throw an immense power into the scale of their interests, whereas it would require some years to establish Church Schools at all able to compete with them. This would surely place the Church in a fatal disadvantage in the work of education ; and still it must be felt universally that the Government can never give a grant in aid of Church Schools on rules which can be withheld from other religious communities.

Moreover, even if it was thought right, would the Government have the power of granting a privilege to the Church Schools which would open the door for similar unlimited control by patrons in the schools supported by the State, and under Roman Catholic superintendence ? I am strongly persuaded serious difficulties would meet them in such a course. The feeling of reserving a power of objection on the part of parents and guardians to have their children instructed in the Scriptures by any specific teacher, is a

feeling which would commend itself to a great majority of those who have the voting of such grants. This does not call in question the propriety of the wish on the part of the Church to carry out fully her mission of teaching the Holy Scriptures to all who come under her care: but it becomes a serious difficulty *when the Church asks for and requires* grants for education from the public funds. I believe it must be vain to expect this difficulty to be removed, and if the Church ever receives Government aid, it must be either under a separate system, which would be deplorable, or under a rule reserving the power to make such an objection for the parent; upon whose scruples, however, the patron of a school, where an objection might be made, would have every right to use persuasion and explanation to remove them. I cannot but think such an intercourse, held in an affectionate spirit, would be most beneficial.

Some may think the statements of the Roman Catholic authorities, that they will withdraw from the National Board if a separate grant is not made, and that they will not allow Government Inspection, even in secular matters, may become grounds on which the Government may relax the rule referred to in the case of Church Schools. I believe such statements are not made in any sincerity. I can, myself, now point to places in which the Roman Catholics have withdrawn from the National Board; but invariably where such is the case, they either have other schools under one of their own Religious Orders, or there is no other school into which the children can be received; and I can point to other places where they have no such special endowment, and where they firmly adhere to the grant from the Board; indeed, more than this, I can refer to a parish in which, *since the celebrated manifesto, they have applied to the Board for a grant to open a new school*. This does not exhibit a sincere intention to withdraw from the Board; and, of course, if they continue to receive grants, and apply for aid in new cases, the schools continue under

inspection. Sound judgment will look upon such threats as intended to draw from the Government fresh concessions calculated to give greater facilities for teaching their peculiar History of England, and other specially Roman Catholic books under the sanction and endowment of the State.

Such being the state of matters, what course should the Church of Ireland pursue at this trying crisis? Considering the difficulties and disadvantages education under the Church is now experiencing; considering the great and liberal advantages the Government aid would afford—above all, considering the severe pressure which is brought upon the Government by the Roman Catholic threats of desertion and abandonment, what should be done? Is it wise or right to continue rigidly to draw the cord of separation on the one remaining point, when no reasonable prospect exists of its possibly being granted? or would it be wise and right at this juncture to come forward in a body and give that support to the Government which would at once throw life into their schools, and give fit scope for their talents and energy in educating their own people at least, and all others as far as they could?

When at Solferino one Emperor changed his tactics or position, the other would be unwise not to do the same, although in some point or other it might oblige him to do somewhat which he did not altogether like or approve. So now is the Church's best and greatest, perhaps her ONLY opportunity.

And oh! what results would follow from a hearty self-denying adhesion to the Government aid at such a time as this! How nobly would your Church stand forth before the nation when Parliament assembles! What healings of brotherly differences would take place in every diocese! What new courage and strength would it give your poorer brethren! Yea, what a body of independent Roman Catholic Laymen would it range on your side! May you have wisdom suited to this hour, and may you have no reason to

regret the few words I have felt it my duty to address to you.

I have the honour to be,

My Lords and Reverend Brethren,

Your ever faithful servant,

JOHN GARRETT,

Vicar of St. Paul, near Penzance.

3, Waterloo Place, London, S.W.,

1st December, 1859.

P.S.—It strikes me a practical suggestion may be considered valuable. Would it not be well to have meetings held in various districts throughout Ireland, at which delegates might be empowered to attend an aggregate meeting in Dublin before the end of January, to express the true opinions of the Church? I am persuaded, if this, and further available materials for reflection and information, could be impartially considered, a wise and sound resolution would proceed from the whole body of the Church of Ireland before Parliament assembles. In any such movement the voice of the Laity should be heard and felt.

Is there any good reason why the Church of Ireland, remembering her ancient, native, and hereditary position in the country, should not meet and tell the Government and the British nation, that, while valuing full Civil and Religious Liberty, she is ready to yield a point, which many of her members have held dear, in order to raise a powerful standard against the dictation of the Ultramontane party in the Foreign Community of Rome.

J. G.

APPENDIX I.

THE reception given to the foregoing Address has been full of encouragement, and more than justifies my proceeding to lay it before the public generally. In doing so some remarks and expressions of opinion may be added, calculated to strengthen the position I have taken up. More than TWO THOUSAND THREE HUNDRED copies have been circulated, one to each clergyman in Ireland, and twenty copies to the leading newspapers in London and Dublin. The result I feel to be highly satisfactory, giving me stronger grounds for believing the premises laid down were correct, and the conclusion drawn from them judicious and sound. It was published at length in the north of Ireland; and in the Dublin *Daily Express* of last week two able articles appeared, drawing the same practical conclusion from the present circumstances surrounding the question, while in no case whatever has an unfavourable criticism come to my notice. Thus I sincerely hope no injury has been occasioned by the anxious course I pursued. At the same time, my cordial thanks are due to a large number of brethren of every shade of opinion, and from every part of Ireland, for most valuable communications; among them I only received *five* letters in any degree regretting the publication of my Address. Four of them rather angrily question the propriety of *my* taking such a course, but make no suggestion of any plan to meet the difficulties which have been felt in the matter. The

fifth letter is from a friend, whose every word deserves to be carefully considered, and for whose opinion I entertain the deepest respect. His remonstrance, however, is more an explanation that the opposition to the National Board has been necessary as a matter of *Religious principle*, and a complaint that some of my statements referred to points already known, than a questioning of the correctness and soundness of what I advanced. Nothing contained in those five letters could lead me to alter or withhold from the public any part of the Address.

On the other hand, both by letters and in conversations, the warmest acknowledgments that I am right have reached me from men in every direction, whose character and history fortify their communications with the greatest value and highest importance, showing plainly that a chord has been touched which vibrates to the very heart of the Church of Ireland, and removing all the hesitation with which I might write when feeling myself comparatively alone. Not only have those who availed themselves of the Government aid, assured me of the safety with which Clergymen may adopt it, under the National System as it has now been developed, but practical zealous men, who have hitherto felt it right to work on without it, have given me such information, and expressed themselves so strongly in approbation of the views I laid before them, that I have no doubt the time is come when the judgment of the great body of the Clergy is in favour of connecting the Church Schools with the National Board. There still remain some difficulties, however, which I believe may be entirely removed; and in the earnest hope of contributing to so great and good a result, I will here endeavour to open out the subject still more, and to supply such considerations as the communications with which I have been favoured appear to me to render desirable, trusting the same friendly indulgence may be continued towards me.

Foremost in letters of weight and importance is the following communication from a clergyman, who for a quarter

of a century has faithfully advanced the cause of Scriptural Education.

"MY DEAR MR. GARRETT,

"I was duly favoured with yours of the 16th, and also your letter enclosed, which I had previously seen and read, with interest, in the public papers. I at once recognized in it a good deal which had formed the subject of your conversation and mine, when we talked over various matters here, with some additional points noted, which are of moment in the great question at present pending concerning Education. It is but honest to state that in your *premises* there is very much (as appears to me) undeniable. But whether or not you would gain many adherents in your conclusion remains to be seen. One great disaster to be seriously avoided, in any proposed settlement of the question, would be the breaking up of the powerful, and I trust I may add principled, party which has so long stood together on the Church Education platform. I trust we may be enabled to avoid this. But it is also (to me at least) plain, that should the alternative be offered us, either of helping to maintain in its existence the National Board, as also to endeavour to improve and amend it, or else to look out for a *separate* grant, thereby giving indirect aid to the Ultramontane party, I should certainly prefer the former. I think we are further agreed, that we ought to seek for a settlement of this vexed question on any terms which do not involve a giving up of *principle*. There certainly seems a *growing* disposition *here*, among both Clergy and Laity, to seek such a settlement."

No doubt it is of the utmost importance that the adhesion should be as unanimous as possible. The strength it would give to the Church, and the support it would give to the Government, must largely depend upon the degree of union observed in the movement; and it is because I heartily believe a sacrifice of "*principle*" would not be involved, that the hope presses upon me that the Church in a body may promptly be led to adhere to the Board. What is the *principle* involved? Surely it must be possible to look straight at a matter of so vital an importance. I believe I was able rightly to open out the only point now separating the Church Schools from Government aid: it is *NOT the uniting to withhold Scriptural instruction from any class of children*; but it is *consenting to allow the secular advantages of the schools to be enjoyed by such individual children as*

have parents or guardians who put in an objection to their learning Holy Scripture in school. The principle of every Church School would be essentially the free use of the Scriptures ; but in order to assist the Government, in affording all the education to the children which their parents are willing they should receive at the school, a rule should be observed of not forcing such children to read the Bible. What does this amount to, but leaving the study of Holy Scripture a voluntary matter with the people? Rejecting the advantages of Government aid, because such a rule is required, is nothing less than visiting the Church children with grievous injury and loss, and refusing other children any assistance in their education ; simply because, as a condition entitling to public funds, the State reserves an option for the parent as to whether the child shall learn Scripture or not. This was not the *principle* on which the Church took up her stand against the National System. A far greater *principle* was clearly enunciated in the address to Sir Robert Peel, signed by nearly 2000 clergymen, in 1842 : it said, " We would respectfully state our deliberate and firm conviction, that in a land blessed with a revelation from the Almighty, no system for the education of the people can be right, which shall not have for its object the communication of the great truths thus revealed, and which shall not adopt efficient means to ensure that object for those receiving instruction from the State." This was a *principle* indeed plain and distinct, and worthy of the Church to urge upon the State ; worthy to have every possible influence put forward in order to constrain the Government to adopt and carry it out ; but, whether rightly or wrongly, it stands before the nation now as a *principle* which no statesman could enforce. It has been rejected by the country at large as a *principle* not only impracticable, but contrary to the individual liberty in Religion, which forms the essence of the adopted laws of the realm. Is the Church in the present day to deny education in the fullest manner to her own people, and as fully as they will accept it to others, because the *principle* she advocated

eighteen years ago, and which she is at liberty still to consider right and to recommend, has not been adopted? Can the Church hope to impress her *principle* on the nation by standing aloof, ignoring her proper position in the education of the poor, and leaving to others the onus and the privilege of teaching the people? I think not. Looking at the state of matters from an independent position, and with a good knowledge of both periods, I do not hesitate to say, the *principle* which was contended for, and which was worth contending for, is irrevocably gone; in good theory it still may exist in the wishes of ardent Christians, but, as a practical object, it cannot be obtained.

And more than this, the *principle* on which opposition arose to the National System has not only thus been rejected by the State, but it has also been abandoned by the chief men who most firmly and enduringly adhered to it. Never were words uttered which needed more careful consideration now than those which fell from Lord Clancarty in the House of Lords on the 5th of August last. The position filled by his Lordship, during the whole period of the controversy, entitled him to speak with full authority; he said, "When I have argued in favour of assimilating the plan of education in Ireland to that in operation in England, the only objection that the friends of the National System urged against it is, that it would throw the education of the people wholly into the hands of the priests. I think such a view of the case extremely illiberal. Provided the people are free to avail themselves of whatever schools they prefer, I see no reason why the Roman Catholic Clergy should not be invited and encouraged to co-operate in the work of National Education, as well as the Clergy of other religious denominations; and, unless found to be inconsistent with the general interests of the country, the development of Roman Catholic Education should be perfectly free." I am unable to see in this language any thing less than an unqualified abandonment of the *principle* so long

contended for; to accept aid from the State on the plan here advocated would be a revulsion of every feeling which animated those who, in the days of real *principle*, "stood together on the Church Education platform." And his Lordship is not alone in abandoning the *principle* really involved. On every side the opinion is strongly expressed by those who still remain separated from the Board, that "the right plan for settling the difficulty would be for the Government to take cognizance only of Secular Education," leaving every Religious denomination to teach Scripture or not as patrons might choose. This would effectually overthrow every appearance of clinging to the *principle* on which the Church took her stand; and, in the present state of the matter, it would introduce an amount of direct endowment for Roman Catholic Education fivefold greater than what Maynooth receives. For my own part, I cannot conceive a nearer approach to the *principle* so earnestly desired than the privileges which union with the Board would now bestow, enabling the Church to give a vigorous Secular Education to all pupils who would attend her schools, and a full knowledge of Holy Scripture to every pupil whose parent did not object; recognizing her declaration of *principle* that her schools continue to be Scriptural Schools, and only asking her to be equally liberal with the Presbyterians and Wesleyans in respecting a right, which I would myself hold sacred in the case of my own child, that the parent should have a voice in directing whether his child should, or should not, be taught Scripture in the only school within his reach. Thus far it appears evident three conclusions must arise from examining the *principle* involved:—

1. The true and real *principle* which animated the Church in her stand against the National System has been decidedly rejected by the State, and entirely abandoned by Lord Clancarty and others.

2. The National System, as now developed, would aid the

Church in applying her *principle* freely to her own children, and not only offering but recommending it to all others.

3. Straining the point which now separates Church Schools from Government aid, is involving those who do so in a practical denial to the poor of a sacred parental right, and is asking the State to assist in a coercive interference between the parent and the child, contrary to the very spirit of toleration which our Church upholds. If we protest against the Roman Catholic priest interfering between the parent and the child on the one side, what right have we to ask Government to assist us in refusing to listen to *the parent's wishes on the other?*

No feature has been more prevalent during the discussions which have taken place, than the lightness of some reasons which many earnest men have allowed to prevent their union with the Board. A remarkable instance of this is disclosed by the following letter, which has appeared in the *Dublin Daily Express*, since the leading articles to which I have before alluded:—

“TO THE EDITOR OF THE DAILY EXPRESS.

“Sir,—I have read with deep interest your leading article of the 26th instant on the education question. With its main features I entirely agree, and if it be as you state, that the **FREE** use of the Bible for all willing pupils is conceded by the Board, there is nothing more that Protestants can desire. *Is this the case?* I apprehend not. There is the use, but not the *free* use, under the present rules. The patron is required to be active in excluding the Bible from the schools during the hours of united instruction, by the rule I subjoin, whose operation is to constitute the patron or teacher a shutter out of the Scriptures from the school for the greater part of the day. Besides, no pupil, however willing, can remain for Scriptural instruction against the express wish of the parents. However, this latter point I would not press. Let all the activity of refusing to permit the child to remain for instruction in the Scriptures rest on the shoulders of the parent, and let the rule, as below, be expunged, leaving the patron at liberty in this respect, and I feel the *vexata questio* would soon be set at rest. You intimate that *mutual concessions* should be made. Let this be granted on the part of the Board, and we may then yield the requirement that *every* child in our schools shall daily

read the Scriptures, admitting the right of the parent to decide whether he will accept our proffered aid to impart instruction therein or not.

"I am, Sir,

"A SCHOOL PATRON.

"December 27, 1859.

"RULE.—Part i., sec. iv., paragraph 6.—‘When the secular instruction precedes the religious instruction in any National School, there shall be a sufficient interval between the announcement and the commencement of the religious instruction; and whether the religious or the secular instruction shall have priority in any National School, *the books used for the instruction first in order shall be carefully laid aside at its termination, in the press, or other place appropriated for keeping the school books.*’ ”

Here it is gravely asserted that the rule of the Board constitutes the patron "*a shutter out of the Scriptures from the school for the greater part of the day.*" Now it is evident to me, that if the *secular* books are *the first in order*, this rule, according to the view of "A School Patron," will in truth enable him to be "*a shutter out of all SECULAR study for the greater part of the day,*" for it is the patron who has authority to lay down a *time table*; and if he puts secular books "*first in order,*" the rule of the Board calls upon him to constitute his school *purely and strictly religious*, as it requires nothing more than putting the books first used "*carefully into the press, or other place appropriated for keeping the school books.*" The entire impartiality of the Board, as to which class of books shall be "*carefully laid aside,*" is manifest at a glance. No wonder if the large body of nobility and laity, who united with the Clergy of twenty years ago in contending for a great principle affecting the position of religion in the nation at large, are found in the present day to receive appeals for contributions in what appears to such "*school patrons*" as this a silent coldness. To put forward such a reason for assisting in all the injury separation is producing, must appear to them not only frivolous, but vexatious. For what is the

true nature of this rule? Simply to prescribe that the *secular* and *religious* books shall not be mixed up at the same moment in the hands of the pupils. Where is the teacher who has witnessed the opening out of a child's mind under his instruction, who would not hail such a regulation as the most powerful means for enabling him to inculcate that respect and proper feeling of reverence with which all pupils should be led to approach religious instruction? Can it be expected that a young mind will enter reverently into worship, private or public, which in school is not taught to make any practical distinction between the learning of *arithmetic* and the study of HOLY SCRIPTURE? Let scenes of the two modes of education be realized to the mind. I have experienced both. Enter one school at any time of the day, and you will find monitors running backwards and forwards, carrying to the different classes bundles of books, and handing round indiscriminately spelling books, parables, table books, miracles, grammars, New Testaments, Bibles, and geography, all alike torn and soiled, all falling at times on the ground, and equally associated in the pupil's mind with the "*drudgery*" of school. Enter the other school at one time, and you will see actively going on the use of slates, pens, ink, and all the appliances for secular instruction. Come again a little later, and, all such varied materials having been "carefully laid aside," you may see every class using the Holy Scriptures, and books of religion, with an evident appreciation of the change. Is this constituting the patron "a shutter out of the Scriptures from the school for the greater part of the day?" If it is, I for one must rejoice that the authorities put so wholesome a barrier in the way of what, I doubt not, the religious feeling and good sense of the nation must consider nothing less than a DESECRATION OF THE SCRIPTURES.

From all the communications I have received, it appears evident the only real difficulty felt by the great majority of the existing Clergy to an immediate union with the National Board is of a purely *practical* nature. It is well brought

out by the following letter, which I select from several strong expressions of the same idea:—

“I have been much struck with your letter on ‘Education in Ireland,’ and quite agree with you that the Irish Church must now take some step in advance, or for ever give up all idea of educating the people of Ireland.

“I was a curate in the Queen’s County when you were an Inspector of the Church Education Schools, and can bear testimony to the facts observed by you, that the Roman Catholic children attending our schools (I had an average of forty Roman Catholic to six Protestant children) were in general better answerers in Scripture than the children of the Church.

“Your letter has, however, one defect, which I look on as fatal to your scheme. You do not seem to be aware that we may all be willing to join the National Board, and yet that in many a parish we may be obliged to continue without assistance from the Board. This would arise from the rule which requires an *average attendance* of, I think, thirty, to entitle the master to his salary, or the school to requisites and inspection. Now, in hundreds of parishes of the west, south, east, and central parts of Ireland, the children of the Church of a rank to attend the school do not amount to a sufficient number. And even supposing that at certain times of the year some Roman Catholic children did attend, yet their absence could easily be enforced by the priests for a period sufficiently long to close the school.

“Were this rule rescinded I for one would join the system to-morrow.”

This reveals an unanswerable reason for continued separation on the part of Church Schools all over the country districts, especially in Roman Catholic neighbourhoods; it also deserves most serious attention, coming from the Vicar of a parish who has devoted himself with practical zeal to the work of education. I can fully enter into its force. The step of uniting his school with the Board must itself be a serious matter with every patron of a Church School; but to do so with the dread before him that, by an exercise of spiritual tyranny, it would lie in the power of an adversary to destroy his school, on a simply practical point, presents an insuperable difficulty so long as a rule is maintained fixing a *rigid average number* as necessary to the reception and continuance of Government aid. My former experience convinced me that if a school is well taught, the parents will send their children notwithstanding the re-

monstrances of the priests; it was so when the Church Schools were good and efficient, much more would it be so if the parent, in reasoning with the priest, could justify his sending his child by pointing to a rule which gave him the power of objecting to Scriptural instruction being given in school. It should be remembered that the Government are not recognizing the voice of the priest or the clergyman in the matter, their principle is to reserve an option for the parent; and every one generally acquainted with Ireland now must feel, that the people are fast growing into a state of mind which will no longer yield a blind obedience to any teacher, but will assert for the parent the right to get his child educated in such a school as he may most approve. Let a patron but steadily supply a good Church School with Government advantages, and respecting the objections of such parents as think it right to interfere, and in a short time it will be out of the power of any one to keep the children from school.

The difficulty of a *rigid average attendance* being *necessary*, is however an effectual bar against a vast number of Church Schools being now placed under Government aid. Surely this may easily be obviated. The Chief Secretary has declared that, while adhering to the present National System, that is, while withholding public funds from schools in which the objections made by parents would not be respected, the Government are prepared to make such practical alterations, as may render the rules by which grants are made suitable to the present requirements of the country. What is this but an invitation that representations of such a difficulty as I have referred to should be made to the Government? No doubt, if the point is brought properly before the authorities, the rigid rule may be rescinded, and some general power reserved for the Board specially to consider cases of very small attendance, in order to protect the public funds from being uselessly expended. Will the Church of Ireland leave the meeting of this invitation to all other Religious denominations, and refuse her part in adapt-

ing the practical rules to the wants of the country? See the magnitude of the injury of thus standing aloof; the largest body of pious working clergymen are denying themselves, and the influential laymen who act with them, all access to the Government on the greatest question affecting the country. If "Middle Schools" are to be recommended, if the question of "Endowed Schools" is to be discussed, the voice of the Church can only be felt through deputations of a few brethren who approach the Government alone, rather than leave the Church entirely silent. Not so the Roman Catholics, who meet in solemn synod, and boldly in a mass send forth an Ultramontane dictation, which shocks the feelings of many even of their own communion, and which must draw forth large additional concessions, if the Government are not promptly strengthened by the cordial adhesion of the Church's influence. Not so either the Presbyterians, whose General Assembly has long shown that union with the National Board involves no danger to giving Scriptural education to all children whose parents are willing they should receive it at their hands. Not so, still further, the Wesleyans, whose United Conference, after full discussions, has come to the resolution to connect their schools at once with the Board. Will the Church of Ireland allow this valuable opportunity to pass over for taking her right position of strength and usefulness beside the Government of the country in educating the people? Will she speak only with the voices of isolated members in this great question, in which all other denominations are taking each one its united and firm stand? If so, the wisest of her children cannot foresee or estimate the "heavy blow" and fatal discouragement which the course now taken may bring upon her, probably before ten years more shall have passed away.

But before closing these remarks, I desire to bring out another "plan for meeting the difficulty" which has been recently put forth, and which evidently has received considerable attention in circles of great influence. I have no doubt the idea that it might be adopted has for some years kept

many Churchmen from thinking seriously of joining the Board. It has appeared in a pamphlet by "FIAT JUSTITIA,"—Dublin: Hodges, Smith, and Co., 1859. On the same day which brought my Address to the Clergy of Ireland, a review of this pamphlet appeared in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette*, strongly approving of the recommendations it contains. The essential part of the plan suggested is contained in the following extracts:—

"First, then, let there be no change whatever made in the rules that affect the *model* or *training*, or what are called the *vested* schools of the National Board.

"Secondly, if the patrons, Protestant or Romanist, of the *non-vested* schools, or of others that may hereafter be similarly connected with the Board, should claim the right of unrestricted power with regard to Religious instruction, let them still be entitled to *inspection*, *books*, and *other requisites*, and *access* to the *training* and *model schools*; but, instead of *salaries*, as at present, let them receive only *small capitation allowances* for those children that may be recommended for such, by the Board's Inspector, as having shown at his examination a suitable amount of proficiency in *secular* knowledge.

"Thirdly, instead of the present cumbrous and fluctuating Board, let there be three permanent paid Commissioners; all to be laymen, and chosen for their intelligence, their acquaintance with the subject of education, and their fitness for the office in other essential points."

Here is, FIRST, an unqualified approbation of the rules which govern those schools where the *principle* and practice of the National Board is most distinctly exhibited. No public institution could obtain a stronger testimony to the value of its vital position than follows from the words, "let there be no change whatever made in the rules that affect the *model* or *training*, or what are called the *vested* schools, of the National Board." The very fountain of what the National System is doing in the country, and capable of doing on a much more extended scale, is witnessed in the

schools thus cordially approved of; and the essential *principle* of the system is sanctioned without reserve.

But, **SECONDLY**, some assistance is asked for towards schools whose patrons "should claim the right of unrestricted power with regard to Religious instruction;" the assistance, so far as payment of teachers is concerned, to be limited to "*small capitation allowances*" on such a number of children as the Board's Inspector would from time to time report to have "shown a suitable amount of proficiency in *secular* knowledge." This amount of assistance might perhaps be of some small benefit in central cities, where wealthy congregations support good schools, but in the small towns, and all over the country districts, it would be valueless if granted. I will give a few instances:—there is before me a sermon in MS., kindly sent to me by a brother clergyman in the South, whose excellent spirit is well seen through the touching appeal he has made for contributions in support of Church Schools. His argument is founded on the practical difficulty of the rigid average attendance required by an existing rule of the Board, which has been noticed above. His manner of putting his appeal is earnest, and at the same time gentle. I can scarcely conceive a sermon better calculated to draw out sympathy and liberal support; but on the back are entered the following three collections, made in different churches:—No. 1, 2*l.*; No. 2, 15*s.* 6*d.*; No. 3, 3*l.* 10*s.* 2½*d.* Of what avail would it be to offer schools supported by such collections as these the prospect of "*small capitation allowances*," so soon as a Government Inspector should find in them some scholars "showing a suitable proficiency in *secular* knowledge?" Again, in a parish in the North, the master of the Church School is a man who gains part of his livelihood by small farming to assist a salary of less than 10*l.*; while the master of a Presbyterian School in his neighbourhood is a man who has gained his certificate, and enjoys a salary approaching 70*l.* per annum. How could a promise of "*small capitation allowances*" at some future period render such a school efficient? Or let a town

near the centre of Ireland be thought upon ; there are buildings, but literally nothing else deserving the name of school appliances : and one of the most active and devoted clergymen in Ireland is "heart-broken" to see all the children scattered from him, and falling under the education of a body of Nuns, who welcome the Inspector of the National Board, a Protestant gentleman who bears strong testimony to the excellence of their schools. The clergyman, if he was patron, would rejoice to have schools under the Board, but to offer him a distant prospect of "*small capitation allowances*," without salaries to strengthen him in engaging teachers able to prepare children for inspection, would be to him no better than a painful mockery. Such cases could be multiplied so as to startle the minds of those, who, in leading positions themselves, and without efficient means of information from the provinces, have no adequate appreciation of the imminent danger there is of incalculable injury resulting from a prolonged separation from Government aid. But it will sufficiently appear, from what I have stated, that the "safe plan" proposed by "*FIAT JUSTITIA*," after abandoning still further the *principle* contended for by the Church, and after fully recognizing the excellence of the working of the National System, would give the Church Schools a mere appearance of benefit utterly valueless where assistance is required.

But it is right to remark upon this proposal in another way. It may be considered probable, from the notes which are given, that some leading statesmen have at times been led to look favourably upon it. It cannot be doubted, when thinking of adopting such a plan, and engrafting upon the National System two offshoots to embrace both extremes, they had an impression that such "*small capitation allowances*" would effect some considerable benefit, and be claimed by a goodly number of efficient schools. Let it be supposed this boon was obtained, and an efficient and impartial Inspector was deputed by the authorities to examine

the schools whose patrons claimed "unrestricted power over Religious instruction," how would he find the case? On the one side, a host of "Christian Brother," "Redemptorist," "Convent," and every class of strict Roman Catholic Schools would appear before him in activity and life, supplied as they have been with funds from abroad, (for the spread of Roman Catholic agents, and the rise of their expensive buildings all over Ireland, has been amazing during the last fourteen years,) and he would report a large number of the youth, who were drinking in the most Ultramontane tenets in politics and Religion, as fit pupils to entitle their teachers to Government allowances; while on the other side, after he left a few of the schools connected with wealthy congregations, he would find such Church Schools as, in point of teachers and requisites, would call upon him for a report, that the expense of a second tour would be a useless outlay, as he could not expect to find pupils brought to a suitable state of proficiency; unless, indeed, at the same time of granting the alteration, the authorities would lower the standard of knowledge, required in such schools, to a scale quite below that which would prevail in all other schools throughout the United Kingdom, which have any connexion with Government aid. The practical end of such an arrangement would quickly be, to attach a new and large State endowment to the most bigoted classes of Roman Catholic Schools, and confer very little, if any, advantage on schools connected with the Church. No hesitation need be felt in stating a strong opinion, that to abstain from a hearty union with the Board, in vain expectation of an inefficient and heterogeneous scheme like this, is willingly to throw away a pressing opportunity for doing a vast benefit to the Church and people, under a manifest and painful delusion.

The THIRD recommendation, as to three Lay Commissioners superseding the existing Board, is a point purely practical. To my mind it could not well be adopted without extraordinary confusion; and I am unable to comprehend

how the appointment of three Commissioners could be securely arranged, so as to guarantee their impartiality in appointing Inspectors, and conducting all the other parts of so large a power of administration. Surely Laymen have their Religious predilections as well as Ministers. From what denominations should the charter lay down a rule for their selection? High Churchmen, Low Churchmen, Wesleyan Methodists, Primitive Methodists, Presbyterians, Independents, Baptists, and other Protestants, together with Liberal Roman Catholics, Jesuit Roman Catholics, and other numerous orders of Ultramontane Roman Catholics, would each and all have their faithful laymen willing and anxious to fill an office with so considerable an amount of influence. How should it be fixed to make selections of three individuals to administer a great national institution, embracing a large power in spending hundreds of thousands of pounds? No doubt, to ensure impartiality, laymen should be sought for who had no heart or earnestness in any form of Religion whatever. Could a supply of *such* men be found sufficiently educated in the present day, when the minds of all men are daily stretching more and more into religious subjects? And if they could be found, is it a wholesome proposal to make, that the heads of a great source of education must be men whose souls are asleep as to Religious matters? From any point of view in which it can be considered, the plan suggested by "FIAT JUSTITIA" appears to my mind fraught with danger and confusion.

Such being the state of the question, what is the really safe course? With the admitted efficiency and great practical value of the system established and approved of by the Government; with a *principle* at work which is fair and equal to all Religious ministers, essentially founded on the freedom and protection of a sacred parental right; with arrogant demands put forward by a priesthood whose foreign and un-English sympathies are boldly proclaimed; with a grievous want of better education for the poor people of the

Church; and with so great a desire for information and independence at large amongst those hitherto led by superstition; what should be done? It is a solemn question. The answer is plain; its sound should be distinct all over the land, from every pious Christian and every loyal subject—*The time is come which calls on every man of sound principle and true wisdom, immediately and thankfully to* “JOIN THE NATIONAL BOARD.”

APPENDIX II.

SINCE I laid my thoughts upon the subject of education in Ireland before the public, the discussion of the question has passed through another stage, the importance of which cannot be overrated. The Committee of the "CHURCH EDUCATION SOCIETY" have re-issued the statements which fifteen years ago expressed the reasons then preventing union between the Society and the Government in the work of education; and it has been announced that neither the modification in some rules, admitted value and soundness of model and vested schools, acknowledged freedom and privileges of patrons, nor the existing position of several parties with reference to the Government, can move the Committee from their old position of separation. The traditions of past years bind them to the same demands—their stand is taken irrevocably.

From Cork and Belfast the same sound has been heard. A willingness to consider how an arrangement of union can be effected has been expressed by some speakers, but they have joined in passing resolutions, utterly unyielding in their spirit and expressions, on that one point which no Administration could grant them, namely, *refusing to give admission, or any advantages in their schools, to children whose parents or guardians might object to have them receive Religious instruction.*

On the other hand, the Government have declared their

resolution firmly to maintain the existing system in that vital point of its principle; and no practical man can have the least serious expectation that pecuniary assistance will be given by the State to schools which refuse the right of objection to the parent. So every one may now rest satisfied that those who speak forth for the Church Education Society, have definitely resolved to act with no Government assistance in educating the people of the country; since they have made their *sine quâ non* condition such as the Rulers of the Nation cannot and will not adopt.

This is a situation of the matter which must be contemplated, by any witness unfettered by local associations and prejudices, with the deepest and most painful regret. It plainly rivets a considerable number of those in whose hands Government aid would do vast benefit to the country, in a state of antagonism to the authorities, which is running them fast into the list of persons whom the nation at large must consider "*pious but impracticable*" men. The speakers, who have fixed the Society in this dangerous position, have used expressions most unfair towards the system which is established and ready for their use, and statements are pervading their speeches painfully misrepresenting the true state of the matter. I do not believe this is intentional; it is the result of a foregone conclusion to speak against the system, and it exhibits a mind which refuses to investigate or understand with candour what is really the case. Thus the noble chairman in Cork says, "But, supposing we were even willing to adopt the rules of the National Board as they stand, what practical absurdity would take place! Let me, for instance, take a case of my own. I found, on a property of mine, which had been for many years out on lease, and over which none of my family had consequently any control—I found in the mean time a school had been established in the chapel-yard, under the management of the priest. I found the parochial school under the management of the excellent Protestant clergyman in the neighbourhood. Which of these schools are to give

way? Are the children of my Religion to attend the school in the chapel-yard, or is the priest prepared to unite in my Scriptural school? Well, then, we are told to unite them in one new school!" This pointed expression of a difficulty was received with "laughter" and "applause," and a meeting was carried away by it and similar statements to a conclusion which must give intense satisfaction to the enemies of the Church. What could be more erroneous? It is entirely the fault of Lord Bandon, and other similar patrons, that their "Scriptural schools" are not enjoying Government aid as well as those in the chapel-yard. No such setting up of a new school is either required or suggested; indeed the Training School of the Society in Dublin, and all their schools throughout the country might remain as they are, only the Government would require as a uniform rule, the admission to secular advantages of children whose parents might object to their receiving Religious instruction from the Committee. Then, the repeated assertions that the Society's schools alone are "Scriptural," after all the explanations and testimony to the contrary, have been made at the meetings which have taken place to an extent sadly devoid of candour. I have no doubt as good, if not better Scriptural scholars would be found in National Schools as in the schools of the Society; and tenfold more Scriptural knowledge would be given if the advantages of Government aid were extended to the pupils in the schools of the Society. But, so far as the Committee in Dublin, and the speakers in Cork and Belfast are concerned, it is henceforth hopeless; they have resolved to use their position to withhold advantages from the mass of the children under their care, because the Government will not grant public money to their schools, so long as their doors would be shut against children afflicted with misguided parents who might object to their being instructed in Scripture.

Great and serious are the injuries which must spring from this inflexible attitude on the part of the leaders of the Society who have thus publicly come forward; and many

an anxious heart I know will be saddened by it, amongst the brethren throughout the country, who, in the midst of pressing difficulties, have been looking to a means of reconciliation being put forth by the Committee, which both the Government and the Church could adopt. They will look in vain for any relief to the eloquent, but impracticable declamations, by which they have been committed to the alternative of either acting individually for the true benefit of the Church and Nation, or adhering to an unwise and erroneous opposition to the State, until the mischief of such a course cannot be undone.

It has been anxiously hoped by many that the Society would address the Government, expressing a willingness to yield the point of right of objection being granted to the parent, and asking the removal of the necessity for a notice to be sent to the parent, in the first instance of a child of different communion from the teacher attending Religious instruction. For my own part, I could not enter strongly into the difficulty resulting from the requirement of this notice; because, after once allowing the right to the parent to make objection, I could only see in the notice a fair regulation to give the parent the benefit of the right. Still there could be no injustice, when the special character of the school, as to patron and teacher, would be publicly known, to place the *responsibility*, as well as the *privilege*, on the parent, and leave him, if he chose to make objection, to do so when placing the child at school. And thus I did join in an earnest hope that the men now acting as the Church Education Society, would lead the way in asking the Government to withdraw the requirement of the notice in question; at the same time, an appeal might have been made to have the rule relaxed which fixes an average attendance of *twenty* scholars as the lowest entitling any school to Government aid. But now the point of the notice will be impossible. Look at the position of the Government,—the Roman Catholics press warmly to have it made imperative on the teachers to exclude the child from Religious instruc-

tion, without waiting for any objection on the part of the parent, and assert that the notice in question is not a sufficient safeguard against what the priest would withhold from the child ; if therefore the Government were to throw the matter open, by withdrawing the necessity for the notice, very large and serious questions would be raised ; this might perhaps have been done, if the Society, and the Church as a body, had represented it as desirable ; but, from the language used by the representatives of the Society, it is evident the question of the notice cannot now be opened. In fact the aspect of the Society, as now manifested, is as impracticable towards the Government on the one side, as that of Dr. Cullen, and the ultra "Christian Brother," "Redemptorist," and extreme orders of Roman Catholics on the other side. Moreover, the voice of such clergy and Protestant patrons as already work with the Government would be against rescinding the rule about the notice, because in their opinion it would remove a protection for the Protestant child in an isolated position which they consider valuable. The Presbyterians, who have found no injury resulting from it, would also oppose its being withdrawn. And a large body of people, who look upon the opposition of some members of the Society, as arising from political and other reasons much lower than the high demands of a clear conscience, would cry out against such a concession being made to what they call a factious party spirit ; so it would of necessity require a very strong and united demonstration of opinion to lead the Government to entertain a proposal to abandon the notice. I fully believe, with the deepest regret, the speeches and resolutions in Cork and Belfast, together with the sounds of *Kentish fire* so rashly mixed up with the Northern meeting, have destroyed all hopes of an application being made in such a manner, as could obtain so serious a change as rescinding the necessity for the notice would introduce.

What is now then to be done ? Is the nation to be told, through the voice of Parliament, and other channels, that

the Church of Ireland is represented by the meetings in Cork and Belfast? Is it true that those meetings represent the Church? Is it the opinion of the Church that the schools represented by those meetings are alone "Scriptural," and that the Government do not honour the Scriptures, because in granting public money they require secular instruction not to be refused to a little child whose parent may raise the objection referred to? I have the fullest confidence in stating my conviction that those speeches, meetings, and resolutions do not represent the Church. Nay, more, I have grounds for believing that they painfully misrepresent the real feelings and wishes of the Church at large. But, alas! the chain of their influence is hard to be broken; I greatly fear it cannot be done so as to obtain any united action in approaching the Government, and the only remedy which now seems open is an *individual* application for aid, where patrons are sufficiently independent to act as they think and know to be right. Has the Church any knowledge of the last proposals made to the Government in her name? Have the proposals, which the Government felt bound to decline accepting, been made known even to the members of the Society throughout the country? I have reason to believe, if those proposals were subjected to a discussion, similar to that which the Roman Catholic manifesto is now receiving, they would be decidedly repudiated not only by the Church, but also by the Society at large.

In commenting on the Cork meeting, a Dublin newspaper exulted in the belief that, amidst all descriptions of "trials and difficulty," the banner of "NO SURRENDER!" had been finally hoisted, and the leaders had "nailed the colours to the mast." The sentiment is worthy, and in accordance with our national feeling. If Nelson found his fleet engaged with a deadly enemy, he would rightly judge that his country would honour him for fighting to the last. His country, however, could quickly bring such a course to *court-martial*, whose decree would soon rectify any officer's mistake. But, in the

case before us, where is the enemy assailing the Society with deadly energy ? and how is the court-martial to be arranged ? A few prominent men may effect incalculable mischief by fighting against images of their own erection ; they may " nail colours to the mast," and conduct a violent conflict to such a length, that the Church which has reared them may sink beneath the popular billows which pronounce them impracticable and unwise ; but the great Court-Martial must be deferred until *THAT DAY*, in which noisy prejudices shall be hushed ; and solemn will be the account which must then be rendered of the opportunities abandoned and lost by this terrible withholding of co-operation from the rulers of our land.

J. G.

3, Waterloo Place, London, S.W.

1st February, 1860.

THE END.

the end of the century, and the Society of Friends
 and how is the count-maintained to be arranged?
 A large amount of time may be effectually misapplied by
 the Society of Friends in their own creation; they may
 "tail count the mass," and conduct a violent conflict to
 such a length that the Church which has reared them may
 and become a popular belief which pronounce them im-
 practicable and useless; but the great Court-Martial must be
 deleted from the history in which noisy prejudices shall be
 hushed; and shall be the account which must then
 be rendered of the opportunities abandoned and lost by
 this terrible withholding of co-operation from the rulers of
 our land.

J. G.

2, Waterloo Place, London, W.
 14th February, 1830.

THE END.