

THE
LETTERS OF JANUS
ON
IRISH NATIONAL EDUCATION,

ADDRESSED TO
THE RIGHT HON. SIR MICHAEL E. HICKS-BEACH, BART., MP.,
CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND;

AND EDITED BY
THOMAS ADAIR, A.B.,
Queen's University, Ireland.

DUBLIN:

BELFAST:

1875.

Price One Shilling and Two Pence.

Houses of the Oireachtas

THE
LETTERS OF JANUS
ON
IRISH NATIONAL EDUCATION,

THE BOARD, THE MIXED SYSTEM, & THE TEACHERS,

ADDRESSED TO
THE RIGHT HON. SIR MICHAEL E. HICKS-BEACH, BART., M.P.,
CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND;

AND DEDICATED TO
THE FRIENDS OF THE TEACHERS IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

EDITED BY
THOMAS ADAIR, A.B.,
Queen's University, Ireland.

DUBLIN:

BELFAST:

1875.

"The increasing multiplication of Schools leads to the unnecessary multiplication of Teachers, to a reduction of salaries, and these to the employment often of incompetent persons."—*Schools' Inquiry Commission, 1867; Rev. J. Fraser's Report, p. 32.*

"Sir, whatever the Educational System may be—be it mixed or be it denominational, it is impossible that it can be successful, if the teaching Staff be not thoroughly efficient and contented."—*John F. Maguire's Speech, House of Commons, 26th July, 1869.*

"Where every thing is left to be done by voluntary effort, Schools, where most needed, are not established at all. Where every thing again is done by the State, there is wasteful extravagance, and local apathy."—*Education Commission, 1861; Vol. IV., Matthew Arnold's Report, p. 94.*

"No doubt it was intended that the State should supplement local contributions, and not contribute almost the whole cost of National Education in Ireland."—*Marquis of Hartington's Speech, House of Commons, 3rd August, 1872.*

"These changes are demanded in the interest of a power hostile to the State, to civil liberty, and liberty of conscience."—*Royal Commission Reports, 1870; Vol. I., Protest of Sir Robert Kane.*

PREFACE.

THESE *Letters* were in great part written in reply to statements made in a letter addressed by Vere Foster, Esq., to the Editor of the *Belfast Daily Northern Whig*, in May, 1870; owing to various causes they were not published at the time. They have now been re-written, considerably enlarged, and illustrated by copious notes drawn from many sources. They are now presented to the public in the earnest hope that, though still very imperfect, they may, to some extent, assist in the solution of the great problem of the present day—that of Irish National Education. At the time these *Letters* were written the question was not then ripe for settlement, nor the public mind sufficiently prepared for the policy advocated by the author of the *Letters*. The Royal Commission on Primary Education was then sitting. From the well-known antecedents of some of the gentlemen composing that Commission of Inquiry, the writer was, it seems, not vain enough to suppose that any letters of his could possibly influence the decision of the Commission one way or the other. The determination of the majority of the Commission to recommend such changes in the old Irish System as would practically bring in the *Separatism* then prevalent in England was too well known; indeed most people who knew anything, regarded the Commission as met to ratify a foregone conclusion. This determination is, indeed, apparent throughout their *Historical Sketch*, and in their *General Report*, Vol. I., Pt. I., but is barefacedly prominent in the absurd volunteer Reports of two of the Royal Commissioners—the Rev. B. M. Cowie, and S. N. Stokes, Esq.—on the District and Minor Model Schools, and on the Training Institution and Model Schools, in Marlborough-street, Dublin. The former of these gentlemen was an Anglican High Church Clergyman, of tolerably pronounced sympathies, while Mr. Stokes was an inspector of Roman Catholic Denominational Schools in England, and both were bitterly hostile to the fundamental principle of Irish National Education. The laughable mistakes and egregious blunders made by these two Commissioners in their over hasty tour of the Irish Model Schools, were, at the time, sources of rare amusement to all sections of the Irish public—both Catholic and Protestant parties having alike agreed to reject their Reports as comparatively worthless, from the evident haste, animus, and exaggeration of the writers. Like Balaam, these men volunteered to curse the Model Schools, and lo, they have blessed them altogether.

The same unfortunate excess of zeal for Separatism, is more than observable in the Reports of some of the assistant Commissioners, and in none more than in the Report of W. S. Coward, Esq., which might be very appropriately described as a Jeremiad over the woes of Convent and Monastic Schools.

In the House of Commons during all the protracted debates attendant on the passing of the Irish Church Act of 1869, it is said that the Report of the Irish Church Commission was rarely, if ever, referred to as an authority. However this may have been, the labours of Government Commissions are ever fated in these days to become in great part antiquated and useless; and this owing to the lapse of time, the rapid progress of history, public opinion, and legislation.

I do not say that in the six volumes of Reports of the Royal Commission of 1867 there is not much that is valuable, but it must be confessed that, owing to recent legislative changes in the School systems of England and Scotland, and various most remarkable and ominous events, changes, and movements, working themselves out on the Continent since July, 1870, the minds of the statesmen and people of England must now regard some of the recommendations of the Royal Commission of 1867, as not only absurd, but positively mischievous, and fraught with imminent peril to the safety of the State.

Irish Education can now no longer be settled on a denominational basis. In Ireland the State cannot, even indirectly, endow religious teaching in the public Schools, except the policy of the Irish Church Act is now to be reversed in the interests of the majority. After passing the English and Scotch Education Acts, if the English and Scotch Members of Parliament do their duty to their constituents, it will be practically impossible, on financial grounds, for any statesman to propose any improvement of the present sad condition of the Irish

Teachers without raising the question of Systems and School Boards (*vide* note p. 21). It is for the public to judge whether it is not plain from these *Letters* that the welfare of the Teachers and sound instruction are bound up with Mixed Education, and that so far from any improvement in his position being compatible with the Separate system, it is plain that its formal and legal introduction into this country, or even its piecemeal, smuggled, secret, and covert introduction under the administration of the present Board, would only tend still further to impoverish and degrade him, lower his social status, and the general standard of Education. We see what his position is under the present *semi-denominational* system. The condition of the average Irish Teacher is, indeed, to-day miserable in the extreme. The present Board's system has been tried quite long enough. The only remaining system is the *secular*, permitting religious teaching however, in *all* Schools aided by the State, but transferring the burthen of imparting it from the shoulders of the State-paid secular Teacher, to those of the Clergymen of the various Churches. This arrangement will guarantee the soundness and efficiency of both secular and religious teaching, the very *suspicion of proselytism* will be for ever banished from the Schools, and we shall at once get rid of the endless annoyance about Religious Instruction, which, like an evil genius, has followed the present system from its very cradle. It will not be necessary to alter even the *name* of the present system, one of "Combined Secular and Separate Religious Instruction;" only let it be well understood that the separate religious teaching is to be given by the Pastors themselves.

This change will necessitate a closer relation between the Teacher and the State—such a relation as will guarantee a reasonable security of official tenure, a respectable fixed salary, rent free residences, and pensions for the Teachers. These things are at present altogether unattainable, they are only compatible with such a secular system as I have sketched; but, until these changes are effected, Irish Teachers can never be contented, nor Irish Schools efficient in the truer and higher sense of the word. These changes I advocate, not only in the interest of a sound secular, but also of a sound religious instruction. Besides they will be found in the end financially more economical, safer, and therefore more advantageous for the State and Civil Government, than the present Board's System, yearly growing more and more expensive, extravagant, and financially and educationally ruinous.

These changes imply Local Taxation and School-Boards, thus obliging the Clergy of all denominations to share with an educated and intelligent laity, their present virtual, but highly invidious monopoly of the direction of popular education. And this change is now as much needed in the interests of popular liberty, and the growth of a sound public opinion and civil life in Ireland, as it is absolutely necessary for fiscal and economic reasons, and for the extension of sound secular learning, and the Teachers' independence of the frequently mischievous control, interference, and dictation, of individual Managers.

Before rejecting this thoroughly sound, wise, and really patriotic mode of settling the Education Question, let us reflect what improvement some of these changes have already effected in English and Scottish education, not only in the teaching apparatus, and School Buildings, but also in the salaries and social status of the Teachers.

Under no other plan is a system of compulsory attendance so essential to the real progress of Education, at all fairly practicable. Its application is attended with endless and almost insuperable difficulty, under any denominational, or semi-denominational system. It may, perhaps, be necessary to state here, that in bringing prominently to the front the names of certain official and public persons, the writer has not the smallest personal feeling against these gentlemen, most of whom he has never seen, and many of whom are, no doubt, excellent men in private life. The author has no quarrel with them, but only with their policy and principles. They may, therefore, rest assured that to their official position alone is due any notoriety whatever, which he has, however reluctantly, been obliged to confer on them. He has been animated throughout by a strong sense of public duty, which spares neither friend nor foe.

THOMAS ADAIR.

CONTENTS OF THE LETTERS.

LETTER I.

	PAGE
Introduction—National Education League (1869), and Vere Foster, Esq.—Irish Education Board—Vere Foster's Letter—Undue Multiplication of Schools—Its Evil Effects—Farther Evil Effects—Conclusion,	1—6

LETTER II.

<i>Resumé</i> —Further Evil Economic Effects—Violation of Lord Stanley's Charter—Examination of Board's Early Reports—Reports for 1840 and 1842, compared with Reports for 1854 and 1863—Present Condition of Primary Teacher—Local Parties have done Nothing—Low Social <i>Status</i> of Secular Teacher in Ireland—Social, Moral, and Political Effects—Conclusion, ...	6—16
---	------

LETTER III.

<i>Resumé</i> —Amended Rules of 1854 and 1863—The "Sliding Scale" of Salaries—Its Evil Separative Effects—Recent Policy of the Board—Payment by Results and Separation—Remedy for their Evil Effects—Conclusion, ...	16—23
--	-------

LETTER IV.

<i>Resumé</i> —An Irish Education Act—Vere Foster's Letter—the Convent Schools—Capitation Grants—Another "Sliding Scale"—The Convent School System—A Contrast—"The same Equal Treatment"—Results—Conclusion,	23—29
---	-------

LETTER V.

<i>Resumé</i> —Convent Schools not "National"—Names—Professor Kavanagh's Statements—Ultramontane Ethics—Minorities—"Faith and Morals"—Conclusion,	29—34
--	-------

LETTER VI.

<i>Resumé</i> —"Exclusively Catholic" Schools—1869 v. 1875—The "Upas Tree" in 1869—Inconsistency of Irish Politicians—The Victorian Secular System—Well adapted to Ireland—Conclusion,	34—37
---	-------

CONTENTS.

PAGE

LETTER VII.

Vere Foster's Letter—Payment by Results—Intermediate Religious Instruction—The Educational Wedge—Further Evil Effects—Separation—Practical Policy of Irish Churches—Motives—Weakness—Defects of Separatism—Conclusion,	37—42
---	-------

LETTER VIII.

<i>Resumé</i> —Some Effects of Separatism—Why it is Desired—Present Religious Teaching very Inefficient—Dean Dawes—Practice of some Managers—Division of Labour—Conclusion,	42—45
--	-------

LETTER IX.

The Census—Old Teachers, Paupers—A Natural Effect of the Board's Policy—Anomalies—Desiderata at present Unattainable—Present Duty of British Statesmen—The Past—The Future—Three Irish Acts yet Wanted—A "National" System of Training for Scotland—Retrogression in Ireland—Conclusion,	45—50
---	-------

CONTENTS OF APPENDIX.

Reply of the Commissioners to the Letter of the Chief Secretary,	51—53
Resolutions of National Teachers' Congress (1874), and of Teachers' Central Executive Committee, (19th January, 1875).	53—54
Fixed Salaries—Opinions and Statements of Teachers,	54—55
Pensions—Opinions and Statements of Teachers,	55—57
Salary, Results, Training—Speech of Mr. Hubbert, of Kenmare,	57—60
Salaries, Pensions, Residences, Results' Payment—Speech of Mr. Meldon, M.P. for Kildare,	60—62
Vere Foster's Last Letter—"Payment by Results, and Woman's Rights,"	62—65

THE
LETTERS OF JANUS.

LETTER I.

TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE

SIR MICHAEL EDWARD HICKS-BEACH, BART., M.P.

CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND.

RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR,

In one of Vere Foster's letters in the *Belfast Northern Whig*, he protests against certain unfortunate passages of a sectarian complexion in a report of the Irish National Education League, of which he was then a member.*

The League seems to hold that the Board has been re-modelled on a sectarian basis, and they blame the Commissioners for endowing Convent and Christian Brothers' Schools in the immediate vicinity of their own Model Schools. These are the charges the League makes against the Board; these it is bound to maintain, and to prove that such proceedings were inconsistent with the terms of the Board's Charter—the celebrated letter of Lord Stanley to the Duke of Leinster, in 1831,—or if not, at least inconsistent with a sound state policy, and with the real efficiency of the Schools, as tending to lower the standard of education, to sacrifice the interests of the Teachers, by multiplying Schools to an unwarrantable extent. The natural effect of this would be to so reduce the attendance in those already in existence, as to lower the emoluments of the Teachers, and drive many of the best of them out of the service.†

Vere Foster's justification of the new constitution of the Board is admirable, and, I think unassailable, if the principle of religious representa-

* This letter of Vere Foster's may be found in the *Northern Whig* of May 3rd, 1870. The Royal Commission was then sitting. The League Report referred to, is that for 1869.—*Ed.*

† In the Irish National Schools, Class Salary and Results' Payments, depend *now* chiefly on attendance and proficiency of pupils.

tion at the Board be admitted;* the new Board of twenty is less sectarian than the old Boards of seven and thirteen members. But the question still remains, is it equally efficient? It was in 1839 that the Board was first increased to thirteen. The first Board, and I believe, by far the best and most efficient one, consisted of only seven members. Is not the division of responsibility among so many calculated to work badly? A few members, with the Resident Commissioner and officials, do all the real work, and only when some factious division is imminent do we ever find a full meeting of the Board.† In such a case the religious representation principle is powerfully operative, but often only for mischief. The interests of the Churches are, doubtless, looked after, but the interests of real education suffer. Abundant illustrations of this may be found in the history of the Board since 1861. Would not three paid Commissioners, directly responsible to Parliament, and acting on certain well-defined principles, or a responsible Minister of Education and three Commissioners as a Council, assisted by their official staff of Inspectors, be far more efficient than an unwieldy Board of twenty members? A plan something similar was suggested at the time of the establishment of the present system. Some account of it may be found in the evidence of A. R. Blake, Esq., in his examination before the Committee of the House of Commons, on the 11th of August, 1835.‡ This far more efficient and statesmanlike plan had been rejected by the Cabinet of 1831. The Churches clamoured for the representative principle, and the anxiety to satisfy them, and disarm their active opposition to the system, then in its infancy, led the Government to give way, and satisfy the denominations by adopting a principle in laying the foundation of their scheme—the constitution of the Board of

* This principle in the constitution of the Board has been acted on in the appointment of Inspectors, Model School Teachers, Assistants, and even Monitors.

† As in the O’Keeffe case, and the recent division on Mr. Keenan’s motion for non-vested Training Schools, and other occasions.

Those who know the history of the agitation for non-vested training Schools, will feel the full force of the late resolution of the Board on this question. So early as 1858, Mr. Keenan proposed this very change to the Board. It was then rejected, because, as they said, “the plan proposed by Mr. Keenan for the establishment of non-vested Model Schools, involves an organic change in the system.” Three years later, in 1861, the Board was re-constructed, and increased to twenty, on Mr. Cardwell’s half-and-half principle; and again, under more favourable circumstances in 1866, Mr. Keenan’s plan, slightly modified, was brought before the Board in a letter addressed to them from Dublin Castle, by the then Chief Secretary, Sir C. Fortescue, now Lord Carlingford.

The New Board beg leave to express their general approval of the proposals, contained in this letter, and their readiness to co-operate with the Government in carrying them into practical effect. A sum of £11,000 was actually put in the estimates for the proposed denominational Schools but fortunately for the mixed system it was struck out by the Treasury, and never passed,

as in the meantime there had been a change of Government.

Again the same scheme is brought forward by Mr. Keenan in reply to the Chief Secretary’s letter of October, 1874, all the personal influence of the Resident Commissioner in its favour. The Board of course, passes his motion, three Commissioners being conspicuously absent, and in so doing exemplifies the truth of the following passage from the pen of an Ultramontane Catholic writer, in 1859:—*The Resident Commissioner is the person who practically determines every decision that is registered as the Board’s.* The officers in favour are always able to anticipate with confidence what the decision of the Board is to be in any case of interest. *Catholic Case Stated, Note p. 141.* This Work is dedicated to the Catholic Archbishops and Bishops, and the Author says in the preface that it was submitted in portions as written for the approval of the four Archbishops; it is, therefore, *authoritative.* I wish this fact remembered for future use.

This scheme, waiting now over sixteen years, has not yet been carried, and I trust it never shall be, even under the hardly disguised form of an allowance for board and lodging to individual Teachers in training. This would soon prove practically, but a further endowment of some of the large Dublin Convent or Monastic Schools.

‡ Vide Report of the National Education Commissioners for 1836, page 000, Question 3395 to 3410.

1831—which has since vitiated the whole system, and subsequently led to the enlargement of the Board to its present number, at a time when the Catholic party found themselves sufficiently strong to exert a decided pressure on the Government. If this principle never had been admitted, or better, if the plan of Mr. Blake had been adopted at first, all occasion for Church clamour and political pressure would have been obviated; the growth of the system might not have been so rapid, but it would have been sounder and healthier, and decidedly it would not have been so terribly expensive as it has now become. The rotten stick in the building originally was this same principle of the representation of religious denominations at the Board.

In his letter, Vere Foster says:—"The Board could not do anything else but endow rival Schools to draw away the attendance from their own Model Schools, and those already in existence, as it was always their recognised practice so to do—to endow rival Schools on certain conditions, even if the Schools had a very small number of scholars. How then could they refuse to endow largely attended and efficient Convent Schools?" Sir, I disagree with this statement of Mr. Foster's, I deny that it was always their practice on certain conditions to endow rival Schools, even if attended by a very small number of scholars. It is true there were certain conditions of granting aid to all Schools, and one of the conditions was, a sufficient average attendance before being taken into connection in the first instance. I need only refer to all the earlier reports of the Commissioners up till a comparatively recent period. In 1861, the representative principle had full swing, and then began that rapid process of disintegration, which might have been expected from the first, and which has been at work up to the present. This process had been going on even before, but slowly; the seeds of constitutional disease were in the system from the first, but latent and dormant. In the vigour of its youth it seemed as if they should perish altogether, but advancing age has only revealed the fact that these seeds grew with its growth, and strengthened with its strength, and now, as some parasitic plant grasping a noble tree, and threatening to absorb its strength, or drag it by its weight to the earth, this National System seems destined to perish by the weight of the abnormal growths into which these seeds have developed.

If my memory serve me right, I think the necessary average attendance required by the first Board was 30.* With a less average than this no school could be permanently enrolled on the Board's list. And then there were other very stringent conditions to prevent the undue multiplication of Schools, with all its attendant evils. Some of these were imposed by

* *Vide* National Board's Report for 1847, page 48, paragraphs 12 and 16.

Vide also Report for 1848, page 205, where the *strict enforcement of the condition as to Local Aid* is insisted on.

Yet in the Report for 1849, at p. 9, and in paragraph 26, they say:—"Now it must be admitted that this condition (a permanent local fund in support of the School), has never been strictly enforced by us." They excuse themselves

by saying that Lord Stanley's plan was impossible. Their local payments were (1) School Fees; (2) Donations; (3) Subscriptions; (4) Permanent Funds. They say further—and on this confession I will hereafter convict them—"No salary grant is made except there is proof of a sufficient average attendance to augment, by the weekly pence, the salaries furnished by us to the Teachers."

the terms of their Charter,* and never very strictly carried out ; but all of them ceased practically to be any impediment to the mushroom growth of schools after this period. In passing, I may say also, that it was about this time they ceased supplying managers and public institutions with their Reports.† So the general public knew very little of what was being done. Carrying out this plan, in 1861 they partially suppressed the Report of John E. Sheridan, Esq., on Convent Schools. A full copy of this instructive document could not be obtained until printed by order of the House of Commons, in 1864. Latterly it has been sought altogether to suppress some of the Reports of their Inspectors ; why, they best know themselves.

But if they exceeded their powers in granting aid where Schools were not really required by the necessities of an increased population, and permitted the erection of Schools where those already in existence were not even well attended, and endowed rival Protestant Schools beside their Model Schools in Ballymena, Lurgan, Newry, and elsewhere, as Mr. Foster says, this will not make the endowment of Convent Schools right in itself. It is, however, a reason why some Protestant clergymen, members of the League, have no right to complain of the partiality of the Board. The endowment of rival Convent Schools and the endowment of rival Protestant Schools, in the immediate vicinity of their own Model Schools, are both alike wrong. Protestant Leaguers have no ground to complain as Protestants, but they may justly complain as citizens, because the standard of education is lowered in every district, and its cost to the nation increased by the undue increase of Schools, and I need not say, there are several reasons for this.‡

The Schools become more denominational, and in country districts smaller, and therefore more inefficient. For small schools mean low salaries, and the loss of the Teacher's independence, and, therefore, inferior teaching and laxer discipline. And, in the second place, in a mixed community, because the Teachers of denominational Schools possess a kind of monopoly of the teaching of pupils of their own denomination ; parents in most cases, and especially if ignorant, send their children to a School, not because the education imparted is better, but because the School is the "Church School," or the "Chapel School," or "the Meeting House School." Thus the wholesome stimulus of a healthy competition

* "They will invariably require, as a condition not to be departed from, that local funds shall be raised, upon which any aid from the public will be dependent."—Mr. Stanley's Letter, p. 3, Report 1834.

† On examining the shelves of the Queen's College Library in the year 1870, the writer found that the last Report that had found its way there was that for 1862.

‡ In 1859 the author of the "*Catholic Case Stated*"—no mean hand at statistics—thus wrote—"The numbers of Schools and of scholars have been steadily increasing, until at length they have arrived at a point, beyond which, all circumstances considered, no material advance can

be expected."—Page 345. Yet since that period over 1,500 Schools have been added, while the population has decreased over half a million. From 1852 till 1858, 462 Schools were added to the Board's list. During these six years the population had decreased 374,705, and the daily average attendance at the Schools had steadily fallen 11,608. This is only a specimen of what has been done to accommodate the Churches. Since 1859, in Ulster 0000 Schools have been added to the list ; it had 0000 in 1859. The Ulster Schools are, as might be expected, very small, especially in rural districts. Small schools are far more expensive than large ones.—*Vide* note page 17.

among different schools is taken away, and the business of the Teacher becomes more and more of a sinecure, so far as really good secular teaching is concerned—that teaching for which alone the State is supposed to aid Irish schools. And this among others is the great cause of the inefficiency and national expensiveness of every denominational and semi-denominational system. Their tendency is always to multiply Schools, to inferior teachers, to diminished local aid, to lavish expenditure of the public funds. In a country like Ireland, with a mixed population, several baneful results are apparent. If the population, as in the North, is nearly equally mixed, the schools of both denominations will be smaller than they might be, and if one denomination prevail, as in the South, the minority must either do without Schools altogether, or put up with very inferior ones.

And the support of these denominational or semi-denominational Schools is the endowment of Religious Establishments in a new and disguised form. There is ever-increasing expense, because local parties have no interest in keeping it down by limiting the number of Schools, and the time devoted to religious teaching in the schools is always increasing; secular teaching, is partially neglected, and the people's children are daily being divided in the Schools into two hostile camps. And this state of matters is wholly opposed to sound policy and good government. Nay, as shown, in the enormous expense of the transfer of troops and police to put down riots, in part traceable to the separation of the children in these Schools, in their young and tender years, the administration of justice is rendered more expensive.* On these grounds, I believe, Convent and Monastic

* It is only in towns that, under the present National System, the complete separation of the children of the different religions is possible. Here, as in Belfast, Lisburn, and Londonderry, and other northern towns, sectarian feelings are strongest, and among the lower orders especially bigotry is rampant. Some of these places have been the scenes of most disgraceful party riots. Those accustomed to the kindly and neighbourly feelings common in country districts where the population is mixed, and where children of all denominations sit on the same benches in the National Schools, are astonished and disgusted by the insane displays of party feeling and violence prevailing in these localities. Two causes are at work to intensify sectarian bitterness in these localities, (1) the influx of the population from purely Protestant or purely Catholic country districts. In these districts latent party feeling is always stronger, and this because the people have lived apart. (2) These meet together in the towns for the first time, and owing to the general prevalence of Congregational Schools, the children are educated strictly on these separate systems. The Belfast riots may be traced in part to this cause.

At page 209 the author of the *Catholic Case* quotes the great riots in Belfast "the modern Thebes," as apt illustrations of the naturally evil effects of the mixed system; but the illustration is by no means a good one, as, thanks to the zeal of the Churches, and an accommodating Board, since 1855, this system, as far as the mixing of

Protestants and Roman Catholics is concerned, can hardly be said to exist in Belfast and other large northern towns. As a matter of fact, however, among a population nearly equally mixed, it is only in the towns that the introduction of the separate system has been attended with any considerable success. The riots in Lisburn and some other towns are, in part, traceable to this very cause.

The following extract is from a letter by John Larmour of Carrickfergus, in the *Belfast Northern Whig* of the 7th (?) Dec., 1872:—"In the police reports of your issue of the 2nd inst., there is, under the head of "*Stoning Schoolboys*," one deserving the serious attention of all true patriots. It appears that in Conway St., Belfast, and under the Board, are two schools which are to all intents and purposes really denominational Schools, the one being exclusively Protestant, the other Roman Catholic. Two children, hitherto strangers, belonging to each, come into contact, and an assault is committed—no provocation having been given, save the iteration of an insulting epithet. This is truly a lamentable state of matters, and only faintly foreshadows what would be under Denominational Education." It used to be the regular practice for some time for the children coming from the Model Schools to be attacked by those attending congregational and other exclusively denominational Schools.

In an investigation arising out of the Belfast riots, and conducted before the magistrates of

Schools should be no longer aided, the present practice of the Board, in granting aid to all and every applicant almost indiscriminately, should be discontinued; or if not, the Board must be got rid of, and the System remodelled on an entirely new basis. If local parties were taxed for the support of the Schools, they would not be permitted to multiply to such an unwarrantable extent, and this would serve as a very important check on extravagant expenditure, and the efficiency of the School and the standard of education would be raised.

I remain, Rt. Hon. Sir,

Very truly yours,

JANUS.

New Year's Day, 1875.

LETTER II.

TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE

SIR MICHAEL EDWARD HICKS-BEACH, BART., M.P.

CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND.

RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR,

IN my last letter, replying to a statement of Vere Foster's, I endeavoured to show that the original constitution of the Board, admitting as it did the principle of the representation of the various religious creeds—has vitiated the whole system. It has led to the enlargement of the Board itself, rendering it unnecessarily unwieldy, and only potent for mischief. It has led to the multiplication of Schools, and the establishment of opposition denominational Schools in the immediate vicinity of the Board's own Model Schools. It has tended more and more to denominationalise the Schools, to lower the character of the education, and render it more expensive to the country, and at the close of my last letter I suggested local taxation for School purposes as the best means of keeping this growing expense within due bounds.

But besides the other evils that over multiplication of small denominational Schools leads to, there is another affecting the efficiency of the School itself; I mean that the smallness of these Schools prevents a due division

that borough, it was sworn in evidence by the Teacher of the Conway St. R. C. National School that the Schoolhouse would not have been attacked during the riots had there been any Protestant children in attendance. As a contrast to this the following is from the Report of Head Inspector (now Resident Commissioner) Keenan on the working of the Belfast Model Schools in 1857:—"During the prevalence of the riots

which disgraced Belfast, and which were, I believe, entirely caused by religious and political rancours, there was not a single case of dissension between any of the 1,737 children in the Model Schools, although the scenes of tumult and wrecking were immediately about the School, and that some of the parents, relatives, or friends of the children, must have been sufferers, or actors in those unfortunate commotions."

of labour, and this, Adam Smith has shown, is one of the causes of increased expensiveness of any product whatever. In a small School it is impossible rightly to classify the pupils. There are always some boys in a class who might be promoted into a higher, if the School were larger, and others who are hardly able to keep up with the rest of the class. This cannot happen to the same extent in a larger School; there the children in any class are of more nearly equal attainment and ability, and their progress is much greater than in the corresponding class in a smaller School, where the imperfect classification causes one part of the class to keep back another—all the pupils being in three or four classes.* In the latter case the principle of emulation does not give individual pupils the same stimulus to exertion as in a larger and more perfectly classed School. In a large Model School there will often be perhaps three, four, or five divisions of each class, each division being nearly equal in ability to the one above it and the one below it, and all the pupils in any one division almost equally matched. The noble rivalry of such a School is missed in all small Schools. And again, besides the evils of an imperfect classification of pupils, there can be no division of labour among the Teachers, as in these small Schools there is generally only one Teacher, who must teach all things during the day—now the very highest class, now the alphabet. Thus there is a waste of teaching power in small Schools. There is no proper division of labour, and, as in manufactures, there is waste of materials, loss of time and little development of skill in the workman, so here there are similar disadvantages. The Irish Teacher is often a “Jack-of-all-Trades, and master of none.” Too much is expected from him, he ends by doing nothing right. The result is a want of progress in the pupils. Inspectors are always complaining that the per-centage of removals from class to class during the year is so very low. They are taking as a standard the removals in large Model Schools. They are simply expecting impossibilities in small Schools. There we rarely find rapid removals from class to class, unless the Teacher be an exceptionally good one, whose method, order, and extra diligence, overcome the obstacles that invariably beset the Teachers of small Schools.

I shall now pass to another point. To show more fully the nature of the conditions on which the Board at first granted aid to Schools, I shall refer to some passages in the earlier Reports, and first to Lord Stanley's Letter, the great Charter of the National Education Board.

There was to be a strict inquiry made into all the circumstances, of every case in which only *one* denomination applied for aid to a new School. The Board was to exercise great caution in granting aid in such cases. It was not absolutely prohibited from granting aid; but one cannot see for what this inquiry was intended, unless to prevent the factious establishment of Schools virtually denominational—in fact, to protect the interests of *bona fide* mixed Schools.†

* Dr. Joyce's Handbook, pages 102, 103.
Robinson's Manual of Method and Organization, p. 256-261.

† Vide Commissioners' Report for 1834, page 3, paragraph 4 of Mr. Stanley's Letter.

In the next place, a Local Fund in aid of the Teacher's salary, repairs of School, and the purchase of books and requisites, was to be forthcoming in every case. A certain number of pounds annually were to be paid the teacher from this Local Fund, as a permanent annual salary.* This was precisely the same condition under which the *Regium Donum* was granted to the Presbyterian Church in Ireland. Happy, had the condition been as strictly adhered to in the one case as in the other. But let Presbyterians just picture to themselves the condition of their Churches to-day, if the Government had not insisted on the £35 annual stipend before granting aid to a new congregation. As it was, the congregations were, in fact, sufficiently split up; in some cases we could now wish that they had not been divided so much. Now this, affording a premium on separation, was financially and politically a source of weakness; but just fancy the condition of the Church to-day, had the Government relaxed its condition of granting the *Regium Donum*. It would have been one of weakness, and utter prostration—a case for the wholesale amalgamation of congregations.

Lord Stanley was wise and far-seeing in imposing this condition on School Managers and School Committees, but the Board forgot all about it in a few years. It certainly entailed enormous expense, but the Consolidated Fund was,—Irishmen have always thought so—an exhaustless treasure. John Bull was willing to pay, and no questions were asked. The system was flourishing; the number of the Schools was ever increasing. English statesmen rejoice at their increase, even to the present day.† There is no doubt, however, there was a limit beyond which it was not safe to increase the number of Schools; the increased sums of the Treasury Grants did not always produce a corresponding increased good educational result. Education was declining; the article was not worth the purchase paid for it; the State was making a bad bargain.

The constantly increasing number of Schools is the more remarkable, as the population was declining in the famine years, and the Commissioners were always well aware that there was an increasing difficulty in obtaining properly qualified teachers to take charge of the new Schools. But Managers had always bright boys coming on; it was easy converting a cabin into a School—the Commissioners were not

* "They will refuse all applications in which the following objects are not provided for: 1st—A fund sufficient for the annual repairs of the Schoolhouse and furniture. 2nd—A permanent salary for the master, not less than — pounds. 3rd—A sum sufficient to purchase books and requisites at half-price."—Mr. Stanley's Letter, page 4, Report 1834.

† In their speeches in the House of Commons on the 27th of June, 1873, the Chief Secretary for Ireland, and Sir F. Heygate, unite in rejoicing over the increase in Irish Schools from year to year, although there had been a decrease in the population. There is no just reason why English statesmen should sing pæans over this fact, ex-

cept they regard the increase in the number of Irish Schools as indicating a growing confidence in the Irish National School System, because the multiplication of Schools in a country with a declining population is not necessarily the real advancement of education. Certainly this cause has, more than almost any other, tended to retard and injure Irish education. To it and to the employment of the supposed cheap monitorial system for recruiting the frightful loss on the Teaching Staff, is due the low average salary of the Irish Teachers (£56 per annum), when their English and Scotch brethren are in receipt of an average salary of over £100 a year.

latterly over nice—so Schools must be got up at all hazards to take the Grant, and accommodate the bright boys, and their parents. I once heard an Inspector say,—“Why the Grant is there, and you may as well have your share of it;” but at last the plague of boy-teachers became so great, that it threatened to be as bad as two or three of those of Egypt rolled into one. Thick darkness that might be felt, began to overspread the land, and Inspectors busied themselves in thinning out the boy-teachers. Better they had not allowed the growth of these small Schools at first.

The Teachers, in cases of new Schools, were to be from the Model Training Schools, when formed.* We should remember there were a great many Schools already in existence in 1831, some of them hedge Schools, others those of the Kildare Place Society. Many of these were at once enrolled on the Board's list. Aid was to be given only to those Managers and Founders of Schools who conformed to the necessary conditions, and positively refused if the Fund I have spoken of was not guaranteed. Had this one rule been strictly carried out, and aid withdrawn, if the local parties stopped payment of the annual salary, the check on the mushroom growth of Schools, would have been most effectual.

In the Report for 1835, we get some idea of the sum named as annual salary from the Local Fund.† The Board speaks of £25 as a certain salary to the Teacher of every primary School. This must mean a *minimum* salary. In the Report for 1840, at page 162, the Board's salary for third class is £12; this is the lowest class, and, therefore, we are to suppose that £13 or *over one-half of the whole annual salary was to be raised locally*. Simple-minded but honest Commissioners of 1835! How would you have been astonished in your boardroom, had the shade of Mr. Keenan stood up and said, “Ye know nothing at all of the genius of the system ye administer. In the year of grace 1870, when it will be my privilege to direct the system ye are now planting, the Treasury will be paying the Irish National Teacher, not less than one-half his annual salary, but 80 per cent. of the whole sum!” I can imagine the indignation of some, the incredulity of others, and the positive delight of many at the good news that England could be so liberal. I have no doubt some sanguine ecclesiastical spirits would have thought 1870 the beginning of the Millenium at least, and not the birthday of Home Rule, that latest child of chaos and old night, the airiest phantom of modern times.

At page 112 of the Report for 1837, are queries to be answered by those requiring aid in getting up Schools. Question No. 16 is this, “What Schools, especially National Schools, are within three miles of your proposed School?”

* The appointment of their own Teacher was allowed to individual managers applying for aid subject to the following restriction. 2nd. “He shall have received previous instruction in a Model School to be established in Dublin.” Masters and Mistresses in Schools already established were excepted, but unfortunately for

Irish Education, the exception became the rule. (Lord Stanley's letter).

† The Commissioners will require that a further income to the Teachers be secured either by local subscriptions or School Fees. This rule will be strictly enforced. Report, 1840, p. 163.

In the Report for 1840, the *strict enforcement* of the rule relating to Local Aid, is again referred to. The genius of the system had in ten years begun to manifest itself. The infant was now an active boy, impatient of restraint—not any longer to be kept in leading strings. The cramping conditions of Lord Stanley, and the first Board, were beginning to give trouble both to the Board and the Sects.

In the Report for 1842, we have the Queries as to Local Aid and existence of other Schools, again and again repeated.* It appears that these queries were, in 1842, answered by the Inspector or Superintendent.†

In the Commissioners' Report for 1854, are given *in extenso* the Board's amended Rules, divided into paragraphs and sections for reference. In Part III., sec. II., 2, it is stated that no aid is granted for building, in case the proposed School is within three statute miles of a Schoolhouse already aided in a similar way. The conditions under which aid is granted to ordinary National Schools are also given.‡ They are these, and vague enough,—“That it be deserving of assistance; that there is reason to expect that the School will be efficiently and permanently supported, and that some local provision will be made in aid of the Teacher's salary in addition to School-fees.” This last item shows that already School-fees had begun to want that element of permanency essential to warrant the granting of aid. But mark the peculiar, vague, general phraseology used in this paragraph, “deserving of assistance,” “reason to expect that the School will be efficiently and permanently supported,” “some local provision !” The system was now twenty-two years old ; it had attained its majority. No longer was it content to be guided by those who had nursed it in its infancy. The safe rules of Lord Stanley, and the first Board, were now being disregarded. The genius of the system scorned restraint. The Board, in 1839, had been increased to thirteen. The number of masters had been increased ; but there was no corresponding increase of authority or knowledge.§ The Commissioners were fast losing all power or will to control the system ; the representation of the Sects on the Board was doing its work. Vague and unmeaning generalities had now taken the place of the strict conditions of Lord Stanley. No mention of a Local Fund ; no hard and fast line. The day of decision and firmness was over ; the day of weakness and indecision, hesitancy, and easy accommodating good nature had begun.

“Oh, what a fall was there my countrymen.” Henceforth, easy con-

* Page 218, queries 3, 22, and 42.

† *Vide* page 254, questions 15, 17, 18, and 22, 30, 36, and 42. In this last question the permanency of the local salary is insisted on.

‡ Sect. III. 3, (Code 1855.)

§ Every member of the seven composing the first Board had then disappeared : three had died, three had retired for various reasons, and Archbishop Whately, because in 1853 the Board had removed his books from their list ; two of the new E. C. Commissioners retiring on principle at the same time. The first Board was thus composed—three were Established Church, two Roman Catholics, one a Presbyterian, and the

other a Unitarian. Fifteen members sat at the Board that drove out Archbishop Whately, the only remaining member of the first Board. They were six Established Church, two Presbyterians, six Roman Catholics, and one Unitarian. It was the death of the venerable and highly respected R. C. Archbishop Murray in Feb. 1852, that led to the attack on Dr. Whately's books. Cardinal Cullen succeeded Archbishop Murray in the see of Dublin in 1852. The Cardinal, though an Irishman, had lived many years at Rome. The real troubles of the mixed system date from that period.

cession was to take the place of prudent inquiry, prodigality of parsimony, and local beggarliness came to do the work of local benevolence and beneficence. Ireland's financial millenium was dawning; what might not be expected from John Bull and honest Sandy, in the future? The famine years may have led the Commissioners to relax their stringent conditions for a time; but sound wisdom and discretion should have taught them to re-erect their barriers, as Ireland began to recover from that fatal blow.— Let us continue the conditions:—

“That the Schoolhouse is in good repair, that there is sufficient furniture, a competent Teacher, and that the School is in operation.” In paragraph No. 5, it is stated, that for continuance of aid, the house and furniture must be kept in repair by local contribution. This rule was practically inoperative in four cases out of five; the duty of repairing the house and furniture, generally fell on the poor under-paid teacher, owing to the fact, that as local parties held over him the power of arbitrary and summary dismissal, he had no means of protecting himself. The average Irish Schoolmaster often does the work himself; he is carpenter, painter, glazier, mason, slater, all in one. I have seen him at work. He knows very little practically about division of labour except this, that an unusually large share of it is laid on his shoulders, poor fellow.* And in ad-

* There is to its surroundings an adaptative tendency in any system or organization, found to be the case in plants, especially flowers, as shown by Sir John Lubbock, in his *Address delivered before the British Association*, in August last, and also in Charles Darwin's *Origin of Species*. That this law holds not merely in the animal and plant world, but also in *social science* as well, is evident from the following rather amusing extract from Mr. Robinson's *Manual of Method and Organization*, p. 308. After quoting the opinion of another Inspector—a Mr. Irvin, who advises Teachers, if Managers refuse to effect repairs on the School, “to put to their own hands and manage those trifling matters themselves,” Mr. Robinson continues: “I know several Schools suffering much from this defect. The Teacher thinks the Manager should glaze the windows, the Manager thinks the landlord should do it, and as the landlord refuses, and looks upon giving the School at all, as a compliment, the houses are rarely fit to be seen. I have given invariably to these Teachers the advice that Mr. Irvin gives. The man who is always saying, ‘It is not my duty to do this or that,’ is very worthless as a public servant. He who merely does his duty may be paid for his services, but he can never expect to gain the friendship and esteem of his employers (in this case the *Do-nothing Managers*, whose sole apparent duties connected with the School, are to appoint and dismiss the Teacher lest faith and morals might suffer). A man should be always seeking for opportunities to exert himself. It is by works of *supererogation* we advance. Now Mr. Robinson is a Presbyterian; but probably John E. Sheridan, Esq., the now Chief of Inspection, who, he says (Preface, p. viii.), afforded him valuable assistance in the preparation of the work, had some hand in this. It seems Mr. Sheridan suggested a good deal of the ‘methods,’

recipes for black paint, and white paint, red paint and blue paint, *et hoc genus omne!* It strikes me that after preparing his pupils for the Results' Examination, Notes of Lessons for his next day's work, studying for the next Teachers Examination, and instructing the children before and after School hours, in Catechisms and the peculiar dogmas of his particular Church, in order to oblige the Manager, and so earn his Board's salary; the Irish National Teacher will have but little time left for such *works of supererogation*, as Sweeping and Dusting, Glazing, Putting Putty, Painting, Whitewashing, Slating, Paving, Carpenter Work, making a Playground, and Yard, etc., etc.

Mr. Robinson's idea of the dignity of the profession must be very high. I might ask him how he and Mr. Sheridan would like, after a hard day's work, examining a School, writing reports, or the more arduous, though perhaps pleasanter and better paid work, of conducting an investigation, for say a blessed fortnight in a Model School, to begin the work of Sweeping and Dusting, Painting and Glazing, Whitewashing, Paving and Slating, and in addition the not less necessary work of making and mending his own shoes, and outer apparel. I would very much like to see them at it. How would the Rev. Messrs. Green, Black, or Short, the Rev. Messrs. Pomp, and Pyass, or the Rev. Messrs. M'Snap, M'Snort, like to be set to such work? It would not do for the ecclesiastical or inspectorial cloth, but then a *mere Teacher* is a low fellow.

What Messrs. Keenan, Sheridan, and Robinson think of the social position of the Teacher, we find at page 316. He says—“A good School prevents crime, and thereby adds to the value and security of property, and forms beneficially the manners and character of the people. A Teacher has it in his power to plant sedition and discord, to sow treason and corruption, irreligion,

dition to the repairs of his Schoolhouse and premises, the Irish Schoolmaster has frequently to pay rent to a landlord for his School—often an old cabin or barn, overhauled by its owner, one of the class of small and needy tenant farmers; surely this is not as it should be. If local managers and others who have property, and claim the entire control and direction of the schools—the appointment and dismissal of the teacher—were doing their duty. Nay, more, rarely is a residence for the teacher and his family provided, and he has often to be content with a single room in the poor smoky cabin of some neighbouring farmer—a room doing duty as sitting-room, study, dining-room, and bed-room—a room frequently not more than seven feet by nine, so built and arranged that there is no proper window or fireplace, where study is impossible, and the sanitary arrangements seem designed to sow in his system the fell seeds of consumption and death. Or if he has to travel several miles for a better lodging, his case is not much improved. Travelling, in winter, through rain, sleet, and snow, over a rough mountain road, or clayey fields, where there is no road, he often arrives, his garments soaked through with wet, to find his school-children huddled in groups round the school door, where, perhaps, they have thus stood shivering for almost an hour in the wintry blast. A fire is then to be kindled somehow. The work of the school goes on, but it lacks both that earnestness, and hearty, cheerful spirit observable, where the physical comfort of the children and teacher is better attended to. The evening journey home fatigues and wearies the teacher, whose bodily energy has been weakened by exposure, damp, and cold garments; he is unfit for study; his relish for a meagre dinner is very slight, and, under such trying circumstances, it is not wonderful if many a young man, earnest, active, thoughtful, and aspiring, after struggling hard against adverse circumstances, ultimately succumbs, and becomes a prey to lingering disease, or a morbid melancholy worse than death itself; his work which might have been a pleasure, a—

“Delightful task to rear the tender thought”

becomes a slavish and heartless drudgery, pursued with a feeling of apathy and loathing, from which the natural results may be expected, till at last kind nature's lamp, long burning low, flickers, fades, and dies, and the

and immorality, and frequently to unite the people together for evil; or he may cultivate allegiance to the Sovereign, obedience to God, and respect for our fellow-man.” Very good. How are we to get these? Mr. Robinson then quotes with approval the following passage, from the Report of the Commissioners of Education. It is very instructive, as showing what they thought of this very thing:—“The occupation of an elementary Schoolmaster is not well fitted for a young man of an adventurous, stirring, or ambitious character; and it is rather a misfortune than otherwise, when persons of that temper of mind are led into it by the prospect which its earlier stages appear to afford of rising in the world socially and intellectually. It is a life which requires a quiet, even temper, pa-

tience, sympathy, fondness for children, and habitual cheerfulness. It wants rather good sense and quiet intelligence, than a very inquisitive mind or very brilliant talents, and the prospect which it affords (then an average salary in Ireland of some £35 a year), appear well calculated to attract the class of persons best fitted for it! A Schoolmaster is sure of a good income (in England), a great deal of leisure, and moderate labour as long as his health lasts.”—Report of Education Commissioners, 1861-2, vol. I, page 162.

Well done Robinson and Sheridan! This is just the thing for Mr. Keenan, and the present Board. It is besides just the style of thing for Cardinal Cullen, and Bishops Dorrian and Donnelly.—*Vide* Note, page 13.

unhappy sufferer sinks into an early grave.* And this is how local generosity provides for the Teacher; this, the hapless state of the primary Teacher, so long permitted by the baneful practice of giving large State Grants for Irish National Education, and aiding, almost indiscriminately, every poor, miserable cabin of a school, with no residence for the Teacher, no Local Fund for repairs, or purchase of books and requisites. All these things come out of the Teacher's pocket; thus the wholesome principle of Lord Stanley, having been almost entirely lost sight of, the natural consequences have followed. The growth of Schools to catch the Grant, has been amazing, but, little or no conditions having been insisted on, his condition has become, in many places, miserable in the extreme. Instead of being what the founders of the system intended he should be—respected, looked up to as occupying a position of honour, in receipt of such a salary as would enable him to become respected—he is frequently an object of pity, contempt, or insult.† This is not the way to advance education.

* This is no mere picture of the imagination; the writer has drawn it from life. He remembers with heartfelt regret that one of the Teachers of his youth was so cut off at the early age of 25. Mr. C. was trained, and held a first class certificate; he was, besides, an earnest and pious young man, respected and beloved by all who knew him.

† The first Commissioners said they proposed to give their Teachers such a position in society, that they might be respected, but "not greatly elevated above" the common people. How their successors have carried out this idea, may be judged of from the fact that at present the average salary from all sources is far below the earnings of a carpenter, mason, or ordinary artisan; it is not even equal to the average wages of a quay labourer, and is almost on a level with the pay of the common agricultural labourer or farm servant. This latter class now obtains £8 the half year, with board and lodging; setting down these latter at £25 a year, we get £41. Mr. Traynor says that £42 a year is about the correct average salary of the average Irish Teacher. This arises because so many of them are in the lowest class; Managers are quite satisfied with these. Dr. Donnelly, Bishop of Clogher, in his letter to the *Freeman's Journal* in 1872, said he did not want to see Teachers *made fine gentlemen*. In a letter to the *Irish Teachers' Journal* of the 14th of Nov., 1874, p. 560, Dr. Dorrian, R. C. Bishop of Down, desires only a *moderate settlement* of the claims of the Irish National Teachers. In his evidence before the Royal Commission, Cardinal Cullen said that too high an education is not good for the poor people. Such studies as Grammar, Geography, for the poorer classes are not at all required. What does a boy need to know of Marsupalia or Pachydermata? Too high an education unfits them for the business of life—for *ploughing, digging in the fields, hammering iron, and building walls*.—*Reports, Vol. IV, QQ. 27,142-27,153, (QQ. 27,048-27,050; 27,076; 27,106-27,110.*

Dr. Donnelly and Dr. Dorrian were only reflecting the light of their chief. The truth is, it is to be feared the R. C. Prelates do not desire a high class education for their people. The most convenient way of getting rid of inconvenient inquiry, reasoning, investigation, intellectual

pride, and independent judgment, is to keep the Irish Teachers, as they have long been kept, on *short commons*. (*Vide Notes pp., 12, and 17*). The comparatively recent administration of the present Board, has been happily and eminently adapted to enable this to be done—the multiplication of Schools, the unwise application of the Results' System, refusal by the present Board, to increase or recommend any increase to the fixed salaries, the increase in the salaries of the lower grades of Teachers, while the higher classes have had their fixed salaries reduced, the encouragement to the cheap monitorial system to avoid raising the salaries of the Teachers, the efforts at cooking the Nolan returns, the attempts of Chief of Inspection, Sheridan, to make the calculation of the average salary appear vastly exaggerated in the Glynn and Kerlin Pamphlets, the scornful rebuffs given the Teachers' humble petitions some ten years ago, the waste on Convent Schools and First-class Monitors, the proposal to endow a fresh lot of new training Schools, and thus increase the supply of candidate Teachers—these and many other points in the Board's administration, especially under Mr. Keenan's rule, suggest the inevitable conclusion that the Board will accommodate itself to high ecclesiastical functionaries' views, by keeping the Irish salaries low—the half of what they are in England.

Bishop Dorrian of Belfast, in his evidence before the Royal Commission on Primary Education in Ireland, confirms the views expressed in the above paragraph.—*Vide vol. iii., p. 342*. He prefers low-classed Teachers (QQ. 8,662-8,667); he objects to Model Schools because there the children of the richer classes associate with the poorer (Q. 8,712). The Model Schools are not fitted for poor children (QQ. 8,715-8,717); they make the children *stubborn, indocile, and conceited* (? self-reliant); the Teachers come under the influence of a spirit of disunion, unkindliness, *bickering*, and *criticism* (Q. 8,719); they get notions into their heads quite unsuited to their position in life (Q. 8,891). The female Teachers in the Model Schools dress too well for the Bishop's ideas (Q. 8,909). The whole evidence, Vol. iii., pp. 341-370, is worthy attentive perusal; it is a gem, brilliant with the light of the *Vat. Dec.* of 1870. See *Cullen's, Q. 27,415-27,439*.

The primary Teacher is robbed of the position and influence he should enjoy as a guide of youth; he cannot dress respectably, his surroundings being contemptible, as the common people judge chiefly by externals, the parish clergyman naturally receives all that respect, consideration, and reverence, which, under other and more favourable circumstances, he would share with the teacher. But, unhappily, all this is only the natural effect of our present mode of paying the Teacher, of our present system which interposes the Clergyman between him and the State, and makes him entirely dependent on his manager for his means of subsistence. Under our present system of National Education, the Teacher must ever remain a kind of ecclesiastical drudge, having little or no will of his own. He must look at everything from his patron's stand-point. Woe betide him if he should dare to think for himself, or gainsay the high behests of his respectable, well fed, well housed, and well clad clerical superior! The Board of Education, by limiting the number of Schools, might have raised the Teacher's salary and improved his social standing, but still he would have remained essentially a slave to his patron's will and caprice, a mere subordinate, a tool for effecting a special work, a thing to be made, on proper occasions, to feel its dependent and inferior position, to be got rid of as easily and summarily as possible, but never to be permitted to feel, know, or even suspect, that he is a link in the social chain, an element in civil society, as important in his own sphere, and, as such, deserving of freedom, pay, reward, and respect, as any clergyman, I care not how filled he may be, with a deep sense of his own innate dignity and importance.*

* I wish to be understood. It is far from my intention to assert that all Teachers are slaves, and that all managers, whether lay or clerical, are tyrants. This would not be a fact; there are many kind, indulgent, and considerate managers. Many are not prepared to resort to the use of extreme arbitrary power, with which the present system invests them. There is more humanity in most than to permit them to do this; but if a manager chose to be exacting, and unjust towards his Teacher, the law enables him to be so with almost entire impunity. The essential relation between Manager and Teacher, is one not favourable to the growth of a healthy public opinion, and civil liberty. The existence of School Boards would be some protection to the Teacher, as the power now vested in the individual, would be divided among a number whose prejudices, caprices, &c., would frequently neutralise one another. The Teacher would no longer be under arbitrary power, so often put forth to crush relentlessly the helpless and unprotected. The present movement among the Teachers has been the means of bringing to light many cases of managerial oppression, besides the famous Cawley case in Co. Sligo—a case tried at the Sligo Assizes before Baron Fitzgerald, himself a Commissioner of Education, and which led to the present compromise of a three months' notice on either side. This settlement of the "Managerial Question," is, however, nothing but a compromise, a mere temporary device, and is no more a final settlement of this question than the concessions made by various Governments to Irish tenant farmers,

were final settlements of the Irish Land question. Nothing less than School Boards will ever confer on the Irish Teacher that independence so essential to the real progress of education in Ireland. It is remarkable that the men who fought hard for fixity of tenure for the Irish farmers, were the men who opposed the Government in its recent anxious desire to give to Irish Teachers some slight degree of protection from arbitrary dismissal—some little security of tenure.

I mean the R. C. Clergy who wished one principle applied to Irish Landlords in 1870, and quite another to themselves, the Irish School Managers of 1872. Surely what was good for Irish farmers in 1870, should not now be bad for Irish National Teachers.

Vide The Petition of R. Catholic Managers to the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland, as published in the *Dublin Evening Mail* of Dec. 18, 1872. They say that—"the change is an aggravation of the educational grievances, gradually introduced against Catholics into our National system of education," it unnecessarily "*weakens and undermines our managerial authority in the appointment and dismissal of Teachers.*" Then again—"we respectfully deny the abuse of authority over our Teachers which your new rule most unwarrantably assumes to exist." This, in the face of the fact that for the five years, from 1867 to 1872, the Teachers had, at their annual Congresses in Dublin, continued to protest against the flagrant abuse of arbitrary managerial power; in the face of the fact that it was admitted to be a grievance in 1871, even by such papers as the *Catholic Weekly*

Until the State see fit to break the ecclesiastical shackles that a past age has imposed on the Nation's Teachers, education will fail to impart light, freedom, and vigorous national life to its people, and the wheels of civil government shall, at least in this country, move uneasily, clogged and impeded at every revolution by ever recurring outbursts of anarchy and sedition. The secular Teachers of a nation represent and foster its civil, moral, and political life. So long as they are hampered, fettered, and oppressed by poverty, and vexatious interference of those who hardly ever pay them a fraction, and have, therefore, no excuse for intermeddling in their work, the growth of national life, of freedom, of self-reliant independence, and unflagging industry, must ever be seriously interrupted and retarded, and Civil Government, apart from Ecclesiastical interference and dictation, rendered from day to day more impossible. And in a country which has popular election, the ballot, and free institutions, the evil is only aggravated. Free institutions are perverted to work the will of designing demagogues, and freedom, respect for law, and liberty can never flourish, because the people have no more been prepared for free institutions, than the negroes of Louisiana, whose blind subservience to the will of a dangerous faction, has involved the American Republic in the broils of ceaseless civil strife. No people who have not received a proper training for free institutions in a sound system of common State Schools are fit for freedom; they will only abuse it, and to admit them to the enjoyment of the electoral franchise is only to endanger the safety of the commonwealth. Hence the great importance of basing our educational system on a sound and secure foundation. The Ballot Act without a proper Education Act is the sure and certain road to anarchy, revolution, and national disaster. It leads to the disintegration of civil society, and the dissolution of empires. That our rulers may be wise in time, and prevent *now* what hereafter may be so difficult to remedy, is the earnest hope of,

Right Hon. Sir,

Very truly yours,

JANUS.

New Year's Day, 1875.

Register and the *Freemans' Journal*, and that the "three month's notice by mutual agreement" had been suggested as a practical remedy in a letter of Dr. Donnelly, the R. C. Bishop of Clogher, in a letter addressed to the *Freemans' Journal* in 1871.

For a full and satisfactory account of the famous case of the arbitrary dismissal of Farrel P. Cawley of the Kilfree N.S., Co. Sligo, the trial before Baron Fitzgerald, and the consequences, as far as the Teacher himself was concerned, it is necessary to turn to page 336, vol. V., of the *Irish Teachers' Journal* for Feb. 1872, where the trial is given, and to pp. 337 and 362 for Mr. Cawley's letters, explanatory of the case. In the second letter, after explaining the harsh treatment to which he was subjected, having found that restoration to the favour of his clerical patrons, and to his former position of Teacher of the Kilfree School, demanded from him the sacrifice of every principle of manhood, and violation

of the sacred principle of conscience, and having spurned the offer, though well knowing the act cut off all chance of his appointment to any other R. Catholic School in all Ireland, this poor, but strangely, and sternly—some would say insanely—heroic teacher of Kilfree, thus ends his letter:—"I have, accordingly, spurned the proposition with that unqualified contempt it richly merits, as being alike degrading to its authors, to my profession, to myself personally, and calculated, if complied with, to do most unpardonable violence to my conscience, which, according to the late illustrious Dr. Hanlon of Maynooth, would have been a great mortal sin. So, even by the dignitaries of the Church, man's vanity must be honoured, though it be by the commission of mortal sin. More of the strange ideas of the latter half of the nineteenth century." The case of Cawley is, just now, well worthy of examination. His statements in these letters have never yet been contradicted.

LETTER III.

TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE

SIR MICHAEL EDWARD HICKS-BEACH, BART., M.P.

CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND.

RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR,

In my last letter I tried to point out some of the evils of an over multiplication of small Schools as affecting the efficiency and cost of National Education in Ireland; how in such Schools there can be no proper grading of pupils, or division of labour. I also showed from the Board's own Reports that they were bound to look strictly after the Grants, so that they might not be foolishly and unnecessarily squandered on rival Schools set up purposely in opposition to one another; how in the course of time this came to be forgotten by the enlarged Board, no Local Fund for salary and repairs having been insisted on; how this led to an indiscriminate aiding of Schools, and regular scramble for the Grant among Local Managers. We saw how the Local Manager provided for his Teachers—no residences, no permanent local salary, no book fund, no repairs, nothing whatever for his comfort and convenience; how these accumulated inconveniences, added to his dependent position, enslaved and degraded him; and at the close I tried to explain the natural connection between the freedom, comfort, respectability, and independence of the Teacher, and peace, order, and good government in the State—the crying necessity in a country like Ireland, for a system of education which will be a guarantee that her people shall possess sufficient light, knowledge, and independence for the intelligent exercise of the electoral franchise under the Ballot Act.*

* "Give the Teachers free residences according to the recommendation of the Royal Commissioners, and the rules of the National Board can be attended to with scrupulous exactness; the cultivation of the youthful intellect of the country will reach a higher degree of development than it has hitherto done; and the Teachers themselves will entertain towards the Government, sentiments that will hereafter be reflected in the dutiful and loyal conduct of their pupils towards the reigning dynasty of these realms. The success of the Prussian armies over those of France has not been attributed alone to the superior generalship of the commanders, the valour of the Crown Prince, or the administrative ability of Bismarck; the Prussian Schoolmaster has justly come in for his meed of praise. Raise the status of the National Teacher to a par with that of the Prussian, and I warrant the Government, such will be the result, that whether it be in up-

holding the honour of the Imperial Flag in a foreign land, or in repelling hostile armies, should their martial tramp be heard upon our shores, the manhood of the rising generation of this country will assert itself with a valour, a courage, and a patriotism not to be surpassed by any nation of the world. If the Government fail to redress these grievances, the teaching body will be yearly emasculated of its young, and most talented members, and will soon be left a ruin, bleeding at every pore, racked in every fibre of its frame, and groaning beneath the weight of these intolerable grievances" (loud applause).—Extract from a speech of David Shine of the Co. Cork Teachers' Association, delivered at the *Public Meeting*, during the ANNUAL CONGRESS in Dublin, on the 31st December, 1874.

For an account of the exact position of the Teachers of the people who lost at Woerth,

I now proceed to a further examination of the amended Rules of the Board as contained in the Reports for 1854 and 1863, examining more especially those bearing on the granting of aid to new Schools, because, as you are already aware, I hold, and have good reason for holding, that the new Board of 1839, but more especially that of 1861, in their anxiety to extend the system in Ireland, or at least to *seem* to extend it, and at the same time to accommodate the natural desire of each sect to establish a School of its own, violated, by the undue multiplication of small and inefficient Schools, the Charter of Lord Stanley, and have pursued a policy directly at variance with it, with sound education, and in conflict with the integrity of a system, mixed, national, and unsectarian. In so doing, they have developed a system, semi-denominational, "neither fish, flesh, nor good red herring," so attended with ever increasing expense to the National Treasury that it is impossible for the British Parliament to do anything else now but re-model it on a new basis.* (*Appendix*, n. p. 51, and n. p. 21.)

Sedan, and Gravelotte, I shall refer Mr. Shine and his brother-Teachers to the *Daily News* of the 20th Dec., 1871. In a letter from Paris, giving an account of M. Jules Simon's new bill to improve French primary education, the writer laments that nothing has been attempted to improve the degraded position of the French Teacher. He is described as "bellringer, sweeper of the chapel, and general servant of the *Curé*."

* During the ten years from 1847 to 1857, the Parliamentary Grant was almost doubled, being £120,000 in the former year, and £223,002 in the latter. During those ten years the population had fallen from 8,025,274 to 5,919,454—almost two millions of souls. In those ten years the number of Schools had increased 1,512, they had apparently increased the number on Rolls 111,813—I say apparently, for, as Head Inspector Kavanagh showed in 1859, a good number of these were enrolments of old pupils in neighbouring Schools—but what shows most clearly the fact of the undue increase in the number of Schools is this, that during the five years from 1852 to 1857, the average daily attendance had actually fallen 11,608. *Vide* Note, page 4. From 1857 to 1873, the population declined *over half a million*, the number on rolls has increased from 564,445 to 974,606, the number of Schools on the Rolls has been swelled to 7,160, showing an increase of 1,823. During these 16 years the Grant has again been more than doubled, the sum voted for 1873-4 having been £542,222, it was £223,002 in 1857; thus the Treasury Grant has increased in the ratio of 4 to 10, the number of Schools in 1857 to the number in 1873 as 5,337 : 7,160, or as 4 : 5.4; the average daily attendance in 1857 is to that in 1873, as 268,400 : 373,371, or as 4 : 5.6. Thus it may be seen at a glance that while the actual number of children taught has not increased more than $1\frac{1}{2}$ in every 4, the cost had in 1873 become $2\frac{1}{2}$ times what it was in 1857, at a time when it was admitted that no further increase in the Schools was to be expected, or was at all advisable. But, I have not yet done. The Board has just asked for £140,000 of an increase for Results Payments in 1875-6; this added to £542,222, swells the Grant to £682,222. The 1857 Grant is to that for 1875 as —

223 : 682, or as 4 : 12.2, so that in 18 years the Treasury Grant has been *more than trebled*. But has the position of the Teachers been improved in an equal degree? Is the salary over three times what it was in 1857? Let them speak for themselves. The Nolan Returns make the average salary of the Irish National Teacher £56 10s.; the Teachers justly challenge this average, as it has been purposely made to appear at least £10 more than what it actually is. At the recent Deputation to the Chief Secretary, Mr. Traynor, the President of the Organization, set the average down as £42. In 1857 the average salary was £30. Thus the position of the teaching staff has not been improved in a degree at all proportionate to the increased Treasury Grants. The truth is that it is not in this direction that the money has gone. A very large portion of it supports the Official Establishment in Marlborough-street, another portion to increase the salaries of sixty Inspectors, and six Head Inspectors, an ever increasing sum is squandered on Mr. Keenan's *Cheap Jack* system of paid Monitors, and on First Class Monitors for Convent Schools. But the most favoured quarters are the Convent Schools themselves; Mr. Keenan, and a few others of his official staff are very fond of Convents—great admirers of Nun-Schools. I will give a specimen or two of recent practice, and so conclude.

In April, 1864, the Board crippled the efficiency of its own Model Schools, by reducing their staff by five assistant Teachers, sixty-one Monitors, and twenty-four pupil Teachers, in all 90 Teachers available for training in the Normal School. The Commissioners presented an estimate for the Model Schools less by £2,011 than that for the previous year, and they asked for a sum of £2000 for the payment of First Class Monitors in rival Schools. Two years earlier (Aug. 1862), they had begun by appointing these Monitors in the King's Inn St. Convent School, and for a length of time had continued to do so *without ever consulting Parliament on the subject*. In 1843, when Monitors were first appointed to ordinary Schools, they had the decency to ask the House of Commons for leave to do so; they do these things better now. The £2,000 for these Monitors were thus allocated:—

In section VI. paragraph 1 is given a list of the average attendance required to draw salary for the several classes. Thus for first class salary, 35 of an average attendance ; for second class, 30 ; for third, 25 ; for Probationers', 20 ; but as if this lowering of the standard were not sufficient for the complete disintegration of the system, a note is appended stating that an attendance of 15 and under 20 will draw half of a Probationer's salary, and that under 15 no salary is paid, but books and apparatus are granted, and the School has the benefit of inspection, and the Teacher of training ! This is veritably the sliding scale down which the mixed system gradually slid into its present absurd condition of semi-denominationalism. This sliding scale is most unjust both to the Teacher and the people ; the former may work as hard, and indeed harder in a small School than the Teacher of a larger one, and the people are entitled to good and efficient Schools, no matter where they live, or what creed they profess. Of what possible use, except for purposes of separation, and division, Schools of 20 and 15 average attendance, and under, could be, or for whose especial advantage and delectation, they were to be provided by Commissioners anxious for the spread of education, it would be difficult to determine, unless we knew the spirit that has all along more or less animated a representative Board, and dictated a policy, ruinous alike to real instruction, the good of their Teachers, and most embarrassing to sound statesmanship.

Observe the natural effect of this most disastrous sliding scale. If the Commissioners had not overdone the business of School extension, attendances could never have fallen so low ; all their Teachers might, so far as average attendance is concerned, have been eligible for first class. But no ; they now put on the screw of torture to make Teachers and neighbourhoods suffer for their own misdeeds.* These Schools, miserably attended,

138 Convent Schools got 75 pupil Teachers, at a cost of £1,208, and 5,959 ordinary Schools got 49 of these pupil Teachers ; each of these cost £20 per annum. Now the reasons assigned by the Board for this remarkable proceeding are very strange ; 700 new Teachers were needed every year, the Model Schools could furnish but 130. The Board addresses itself to the task of remedying this defect by striking 90 candidate Teachers from the staff of their Model Schools. — *Vide* note to P. J. Keenan's evidence before the last Royal Commission, for the distribution of 143 First-class Monitors in 1866 (Vol. iii., page 55.)

The growth of the portion of the Grant absorbed by these Convent Schools has, especially during recent years, been something enormous, as may be seen in the following table :—

Year.	No. of Schools.	Amount of Grant.
1860	124	£8,000 6 9
1861	128	9,031 18 3
1862	129	10,143 13 2
1868	145	16,129 6 11
1873	1??	??,?? ? ?
1875	1??	??,?? ? ?

Thus it is plain that in eight years the Grant to these Schools has been doubled, and in fifteen

years almost 00000 led. They are still naturally increasing in numbers, as every considerable town and village is to have one or two of them, and bye and bye we are to have the *Monastic Schools* on the list. The line that separates the two classes of Schools is very narrow. "*Quousque tandem abutere, Catilina, patientiâ nostrâ?*" *Vide* page 48, notes pp. 25, 26.

* Quite recently we have had another example of this sort of practice. The Board has just returned to its original rule, requiring an average attendance of 30 pupils, as an indispensable condition for receiving aid ; they thus tacitly admit the fact of undue multiplication. This hasty withdrawal of the Grants will, no doubt, sacrifice many vested interests, and inflict much suffering on the Teachers. But the proceedings of the Board have never been characterized by a fine sense of justice.—Rule 30, page 7, *Rules and Regulations*. Very strangely, however, the rule is relaxed in No. 31, as if, indeed, No. 30 was a kind of joke, never seriously intended to be carried out. No. 31 runs thus :—"In certain cases, however, namely—where the means of religious teaching are not attainable by children of a particular denomination, within reasonable distance from their homes, in any existing National School, the Commissioners are prepared to make modified grants to Schools in which the average daily attendance is less than 30. But

and still more miserably taught and equipped, were intended for religious minorities. Ireland is, after all, an English and Scottish colony ; it is not a nation, inhabited by a purely Celtic race ; the researches of Anthropologists have recently established the fact. Scattered here and there among the primitive, but still mixed populations of the South and West, in Limerick, Westmeath, and even Mayo, are many Scotch and English settlers, occupying, some of them large grazing farms, and others engaged in the improved modes of modern tillage. These afford a most useful example of peaceable industry, of neatness, thriftiness, and untiring perseverance, well fitted to produce a wholesome effect on the surrounding population. These are loyal people too ; they are neither Fenians nor Ribbonmen. They are a law loving, and law abiding people—the advanced guard of English and Scottish industry, and civilization. One would think it might be worth while for the English Government to protect them, and their conscientious convictions, by enabling their children to obtain as good an education in the Schools of their country, as all other creeds and classes in the community. But what says this Board—the infallible twenty—representing in Ireland the interests of the Crown and Parliament of England ? This :—“ All reasonable facilities must be afforded the various creeds, sects, and parties of Ireland, for educating their children apart, so that if they desire, or their clergy desire it for them, they shall ultimately be compelled to do so. In the interests of the Crown and of good Government, of peace and harmony between all classes of Her Majesty’s subjects in this island, notorious for political bitterness, sectarian animosity, religious strife and division, it is desirable that, as far as we can possibly manipulate it by means of our sliding scale, the children of the people,—of neighbours, those who are to live in peace and friendship, useful and honourable citizens of the same State,—should, from their earliest years, be educated in separate Schools. It is not the interest of the State, it is not desired by Queen Victoria, that

they reserve to themselves the power in all cases of preventing the unnecessary multiplication of Schools in any district, and require, as a condition of this modified aid, that the managers of such Schools shall be *either clergymen or other persons of good position in society.*” On reading this, one is almost tempted to ask if this be a Board for looking after the advancement of education, or one for attending to the religious wants of the community ? The “power” referred to, is, I need not say, rarely exercised. The desire to show good Reports and addition to the number of Schools is too strong. Rule 31 is a trap for unwary clergymen. It is a temptation to foist on their people an inferior education, by establishing small denominational Schools. It is a temptation made still stronger since the introduction of the Results’ System. We need not dread Rule 30 ; it is but *brutum fulmen*. Schools of this class are to be encouraged in future. Rule 177 (Modification of Aid) says—“ Schools with an average daily attendance under 15 pupils may be allowed inspection books and apparatus, under existing regulations. The Teachers can receive no salary, but are eligible for Results’ Fees and for training. If the attendance be over 15 and under 30, in addition to

the above a *capitation allowance* on the average daily attendance will be allowed by the Commissioners, viz. :—16s. to masters, and 13s. 4d. to mistresses.”

This is fresh encouragement for these schools. It is as well to observe, in passing, that this is the first extension of the plan of Capitation Grants ; hitherto they have been confined to Convent Schools. No doubt this precedent will hereafter be quoted by Mr. Keenan and his friends, as a reason for extending this precious principle to all Schools, as soon as they are sufficiently denominational. The attempt is sure to be made ; I am aware it is contemplated, and I now warn the public. Under Capitation Grants it does not much matter what is the character of the instruction ; they afford a strong premium to sectarian separation into denominational Schools. They will feed bigotry and intolerance of the most rampant kind. Results’ Payments in Ireland will afford a sop to the same devouring spirits ; Capitation Grants would intensify the separative feeling. No doubt they will be plausibly recommended on the score of getting there by a better attendance. Results are already quite a sufficient stimulus to Teachers in this respect.

these children should sit on the same benches, should stand in the same classes, and, receiving the same lessons from the same Teachers, early learn to know one another, and form friendships most lasting and durable, resulting in after years in mutual respect, forbearance, and social peace, union, and harmony. This, Queen Victoria, this the British Parliament does not desire, and we, as her liegemen, right trusty and well beloved Commissioners shall, as far as in us lies, carry out their intentions in this respect. We will multiply Schools, even at the risk of exhausting the resources of the Imperial Treasury, only let this truly wise, loyal, eminently beneficent, and National Policy be well and faithfully carried out." It is true, however, that these Schools, thus temptingly placed within the reach of these minorities, can never afford them an adequate education, but as their clergy desire it, lest they might perchance lose their hearers through intercourse with the majorities, it is well to oblige them. The end justifies the means. That people should never change their religious belief, is thus by our wise rulers regarded as of far more importance than the stability, peace, and good Government of the country ! Clergymen who have charge of these minorities will establish these Schools where they can ; who can blame them ? But what I do blame is this, that Commissioners appointed ostensibly to administer a mixed system, will thus, to oblige a few clergymen, endanger the safety of the mixed system. It is also inflicting, or at least permitting to be inflicted on minorities a very serious evil—viz., an inferior teaching in their small Schools. Thus they, though equally taxed with all others, receive from the State a very inferior education in their miserably small Schools. It is true they have their clergy to thank for it ; they wish separation for ecclesiastical and congregational purposes, but no Board of Education should so far forget its primary functions as to put it in the power of any silly clergyman, to oblige his people to receive an inferior education. On the contrary, sound policy would dictate the advantage of throwing every possible obstacle in his way. This silly sliding scale of salaries according to attendance, I characterise as an attempt to foist on minorities an inferior education, because it encourages clergymen to set about establishing small Schools.

It is highly unjust, impolitic, expensive, anti-national, and ruinous to education, and should at once be discontinued. Better far to limit the number of Schools by insisting on the compliance with such strict conditions as shall secure for every teacher a respectable maintenance. See to it, that he is trained for his work, that his teaching is likely to be efficient, and then he will have an attendance sufficient to draw him a good fixed salary. Payment by results is, in Ireland, highly unjust to minorities for a similar reason. I wonder that any sound educationist, looking to the present condition of Irish Schools—multiplied as they have been beyond all precedent—could recommend such a system. The teachers of the majorities will carry off the lion's share of these payments. In the interest, then, alike of the small Protestant minorities in the South and West, and of the larger Catholic minorities in the North and North East, I think we should demand the complete withdrawal of sliding scales of salary, and also of payment by results. They are both necessarily the offspring of our

present semi-denominational system, and grow as naturally out of the representative constitution of the Board, as thistles and docks from their respective seeds. These educational thistles and docks should be rooted out, and provision made that no such seeds should in future sink into the soil of Irish National Education. The only sound remedy is School Boards, Local Taxation with a stringent Irish Education Act, guaranteeing Board Schools free from the taint of Sectarianism, open to all, well equipped, well paid, and, therefore, well taught. For reasons of a fiscal kind, the School Boards would soon diminish the number of the Schools—the waste of having so many Schools and schoolmasters to support, for doing what a less number could do equally well, being at once apparent. The efficiency of the teaching would be increased, and the cost of National Education in Ireland very much reduced at the same time. And besides the arrangement would be attended with this advantage, that the Irish people would themselves pay the cost of Irish Education, as the people of England and Scotland pay for theirs, out of their own pockets. At present, besides paying for their own schools, the people of England and Scotland are paying largely for the support of Irish Schools, and this is hardly fair. I say this, though an Irishman, and one, I hope not unpatriotic, nor yet ashamed of my country or its people, but simply because I respect it, and them, and would not have my native land under any obligation to either England or Scotland for the education of its people.*

But, when Ireland paid for her own Schools, there would be far more effective and active supervision of them; a stricter watch kept on the expenditure, and this would most certainly thin out small Schools. Those remaining would be well supported, and, therefore, better taught, and the people's education, long languishing, would very soon make rapid progress in every department. But, of course, if the present Board and its high officials were retained, even the new *regime* might be worse than the present one. The last state of our Schools might be worse than the first. It

* One point in which the system of National Education in Ireland has not been satisfactory, is the extremely small proportion borne in Ireland by local contributions, to those of the State. No doubt it was intended the State should supplement local contributions and not contribute almost the whole cost of National Education in Ireland.—Speech of the Irish Chief Secretary in the House of Commons, August 3rd, 1872.

"It is impossible but that next Session payments on account of education in Ireland, shall be placed on the same footing as those of England and Scotland, because now that the voluntary system has been done away with, and payments by rate introduced, there is no reason why one country should have so much larger a proportion of its charges for education paid out of the National Funds than the other."—Speech of Mr. Henly, M.P., in the House of Commons, Aug. 3rd, 1872.

"The increased grant for the benefit of the Teachers has been voted for a term of three years, and the Government have expressed a hope that at the expiration of that time, a large contribution from local sources will be forthcoming in aid of National Education."—Speech

of the Marquis of Hartington, Irish Chief Secretary, in the House of Commons, Friday, 27th June, 1873.

"The noble Marquis had spoken of seventeen per cent of the cost of the Schools being derived from local sources, but that included the subscriptions of the landed proprietors, and the poor children's pence. Omitting the latter, the whole local contributions did not exceed three per cent, whereas in Scotland the local aid amounted to one-half the whole cost."—Speech of Mr. M'Laren, M.P., in the House of Commons, August 3rd, 1872.

"If we, as in England, supply a much larger amount than at present, we will require to have some share in controlling the system, and ask for free elective Boards, as in England."—Speech of Mr. Synan, M.P., in the House of Commons, Aug. 3rd, 1872.

"Until there is a local vote, however, and local Boards, we cannot have an effective system of education in Ireland. We cannot have the one without the other, and I hope we may now look forward to the time when we will have both."—Speech of Mr. Pim, M.P., in the House of Commons, August, 3rd, 1872.

would be avoidin Scylla and falling into Charybdis—*Anglice* “Out of the frying-pan into the fire.” That anti-national anachronism—a practically irresponsible Government Board invested with legislative powers, should at once be got rid of, and its place filled by an Irish Minister of Education, or even better, as in the case of Scotland, the Education of Ireland like the other two countries, administered by a Common Council in London. The Board would act on certain well defined and fixed principles; its locality and position would make it less subject to external pressure than the present Dublin “Court of High Commission.” It would, doubtless, breathe a cooler and a purer atmosphere; and, more directly under the control of the Government of the day, it would be more responsible to Parliament. Besides, provision would thus be made, that ultimately a system of schools would be formed which would be homogeneous, based on a common principle, and administered by a common head. Next to the representative principle in the constitution of the Board, the greatest mistake was conferring on it legislative functions. Legislative powers belong to Parliament. It abnegates its functions, if it leaves its legislation to be vicariously performed by any Board, whether of Education, or any other. To permit any body in the State to possess legislative power superseding the action of Parliament is highly dangerous to the safety and liberty of the State. If England did not permit even her Kings to legislate for her, it certainly should not any longer commit this privilege to a Board of Decemvirs in Dublin. It is, therefore, high time to relegate this anachronism—this infallible Board of Twenty, to utter oblivion. It has played its part, it has served its purpose; its acts are now matter of history; let it be consigned to utter forgetfulness, along with medieval feudalism, the ecclesiastical upas tree, the law of distraint, or any other institution whose existence we desire gratefully to forget. Let us say “Go; the State hath no longer any need of you.” Praying ever for this consummation devoutly to be wished,

I remain, Right Hon. Sir,

Ever sincerely yours,

JANUS.

New Year's Day, 1875.

* An examination of the various accommodating changes made by the Irish Education Commissioners in the administration of the Mixed System, some of which are referred to in these Letters, may be more advantageously made in the complete collection of their *Thirteen Codes*, given in Vol. I., Part II., of the *Reports of the Royal Commission on Primary Education in Ireland* (1870), from p. 607-693. These Reports are, or should be, in the hands of most members of the House of Commons, and it is more convenient referring to this *one* volume, than the *forty*

volumes of the Board's Reports. The worst features of the changes made from time to time, especially since 1861, have not been exaggerated by Janus, but rather underdrawn. The *Codes* of 1863 (p. 648-670), of 1866 (670-675), and of 1869 (675-693), but especially of 1863, are eminently deserving of careful scrutiny and searching examination. At p. 659 will be found, among a mass of *new rules*, the notorious “*sliding scale*” referred to in the text. The *omissions* are often quite as instructive as the new rules.

LETTER IV.

TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE
SIR MICHAEL EDWARD HICKS-BEACH, BART., M.P.
CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND.

RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR,

We have seen the injustice to religious minorities of the celebrated sliding scale of salaries, how it plays into the hands of ecclesiastics, enabling them to set up small and useless Schools, greatly to the injury of those already in existence, thus foisting upon religious minorities an inferior educational article. This sliding scale has been the natural effect of an over multiplication of Schools, for which it might be supposed a remedy—but it is one really worse than the disorder. The Commissioners have made the minorities and their Teachers suffer for their own misdeeds in accommodating the various sects and parties. They have extended education with a vengeance, enabling these miserable mushroom excuses for Schools to be established all over Ireland, thus creating an immense number of vested interests, and making it impossible for really good, large, respectable Schools to be erected. All this has been financially ruinous in the extreme. And this separative process has been actually encouraged by the Rules of the Queen's Commissioners, though a flagrant violation of their Charter, both in the letter and the spirit. They have pursued a policy decidedly anti-national, and dangerous to the best interests of civil government in Ireland. We have seen also how Payment by Results bears exceedingly hard on minorities, as Schools of an average of 20 can expect to reap very little Results' Payments, while Convent Schools and other large Schools of the religious majorities, will draw fine sums. No doubt all this was expected by the Board and its officials, some of whom were extremely anxious that this mode of paying the Teachers should be introduced from England, as, indeed, they are now very anxious to have the English Training System imported into Ireland. England, however, has a State Church, Ireland none, and this makes a very considerable difference. If the present semi-denominational system is to be maintained in Ireland, it can only be done at a constantly increasing cost, and the bestowal of large Grants from the Treasury. School-boards and a local tax for School purposes would be fairer, and soon put an end to financial extravagance, while at the same time education would be much improved, and the incomes of the Teachers, because many Schools

would be suppressed.* The Education Act in England led to the establishment of new Schools, and a demand for Teachers. In Ireland this state of things would be reversed. Many Teachers would receive notice to quit, but then the position of those left would be better. They would have more pupils, and more pay. I have suggested that the National Education Board, having proved so unfaithful to the Mixed System, should at once be superseded by new machinery, or else matters might only become worse. The new governing body should possess executive powers, not legislative, and the Act should be very stringent, leaving very little discretionary power in the hands of the School Boards, or they might become the favourite arenas of party conflicts as in England. The limits of their powers should be exactly defined, and if they are to suppress certain Schools by withdrawing the Grant, they should spare those that are larger and better taught. The mode of choosing in such cases should be laid down in the Act, at least certain leading principles should be affirmed in language precise, and exact, not in the vague, empty phraseology of some recent Acts of Parliament, such that neither magistrates, people, or lawyers can understand them.†

“But,” continues our friend Vere Foster, in his letter of May 3rd, 1870, “Were I a Commissioner, I would not only consent to give endowments on the present unjustifiably insignificant scale to numerous attended Convent Schools, if conducted strictly in accordance with the fundamental principles of the National System; but I would endeavour to remove the injustice of apportioning smaller Grants to large and efficient Schools connected with Convents and Monasteries, than to other little, and comparatively unimportant Schools not so connected. All should be entitled to equality of treatment.” How like our benevolent friend Foster; I know he is partial to large and efficient Schools; I know he would never multiply Schools to such an extent that their Teachers would be compelled to starve, and that the Schools themselves, like Pharaoh’s lean kine, would eat one another up. Yet I must say these are rash unguarded statements. “Were I a Commissioner.” Rash man, you could not any longer make those splendid Copy Books for the Board, and the Messrs. Ward would lose their commission, which may the Fates avert. Still Foster would be logical at least; he would treat all alike. If he aided Convent Schools at all, it would be like all other Schools. Our friend Foster does nothing by halves; as our American cousins say, he “goes the whole hog or none.” “Were I a Commissioner.” Aye, Foster, I wish you were, not a Commissioner, but Minister of Public Instruction in Ireland. The Schools,

* Still I think it would be very harsh to suppress even these small Schools all at once. It is not desirable either in the interest of education or of the Teachers; the latter have now vested interests sacred as those of the clergymen provided for by the Irish Church Act. It is amazing to see the present Board, by a recent regulation, relentlessly riding roughshod over these vested interests, and crushing in the dust those Teachers, whose offices their own past policy had created. *Vide Rules and Regulations*, Oct. 1st, 1874, page 25, Rule 169. It displays a very

slight regard for the wants and feelings of our fellow-men. It is positively unjust and cruel, and will, doubtless, bring with it a righteous retribution. It would be both merciful and politic, either to recognise these vested interests, or suppress the Schools on their becoming vacant. If a public Government Board evinces so very slight a regard for natural justice in its treatment of Irish Teachers, it can hardly be expected that these latter should impress on the Irish people a very deep respect for the rights of property.

† I do not know to what Acts JANUS refers,

the Teachers, the people, the sects would be perfectly safe in your hands, because you are an honest man, and one who knows the real wants of Ireland, of Irish Teachers, and Irish Schools better than any living Irishman. Long ago you proved your zeal in the good cause, by expending a large portion of a princely fortune on Irish Schools,* but then, I must say, you really do not seem fully to understand the true position of these Convent Schools. The real truth is, these Schools are the incubus of the mixed system. They are parasites *on* the system, not *of* it. With it they have never had anything in common. Admitted almost from the first, in a moment of weakness, through dread of the failure of the mixed system, Lord Stanley left them to us—a perilous legacy—and they have become the bane of Irish Education. In a properly reconstructed system they should find no place, or, at least, provision should be made for their final extinction, else they will most assuredly drag down any system admitting them, to their own level of pure denominationalism. What says Mr. Foster? “If conducted strictly in accordance with the fundamental principles of the National System.” I thank him for this condition. They can never be, and more, they never have been so conducted. Again, “All should be entitled to equality of treatment.” I say the same. The Board could not treat them so, and it has never treated them so. They were exceptional, abnormal from the first, and so the Board has always treated them. Mr. Foster is not so far astray. (*Appendix*, pp. 53, 64, n. 66.)

Now, the facts are these. In the Board's Rules,† Part II., Sec. 9, Paragraph 1, it is stated that aid is granted to these Schools, and also to Monastic Schools, as to the ordinary National Schools, and that they are subject to the same rules. This is not just the fact. “The Nuns with their lay assistants do the teaching, but the salaries of the assistants must be defrayed by the community.”‡ The endowment paid to Convent Schools is regulated by the average attendance, according to a scale laid down by the Commissioners.§ Thus in the Report for 1862 we see that an average attendance of from 30 to 50 draws £10 a year; 51 to 75, £15; from 76 to 100, £20; and £5 for each added 25 of average attendance, or fraction of 25 over 100 up to 300, when the Convent loses 15s. of the £5, and receives only £4 5s. for each additional 25, or fraction of 25 up to 600, when the increase is at the rate of 15 per cent. for each addi-

most probably to the Licensing Act, 187?, in the clause referring to “*a populous place*,” and to clause I. of the Landlord and Tenant Act, 1870, word “*usages*” v. *custom*.”

* From 1851 to 1864, Vere Foster, younger son of the late Right Honorable Sir Augustus J. Foster, Bart., expended £1,200 of his own money in aiding and assisting 1000 poor Irish emigrants to emigrate to America, where nearly all did well, and many became independent. Through Mr. Foster's personal influence, other large sums for this purpose were subscribed by Viscount Palmerston (then Prime Minister), Lady Palmerston, the Earl of Derby, Earl of Carlisle, Earl Granville, Lord Carlingford, Earl of Shaftesbury, and Lady Shaftesbury, Earl and Countess of Ripon, Marquis of Ripon, and Lady Ripon, Duke

of Devonshire, Viscount and Lady Canning, Marchioness of Waterford, etc. Besides Mr. Foster expended the munificent sum of £13,000 in building, repairing, flooring, and furnishing Irish National Schools; most of these were Roman Catholic Schools, but Mr. Foster made no distinction. It is but simple justice to Mr. Foster that these facts should be known.

† Report for 1854.

‡ Until the day of *First Class Monitors*.

§ Recently they have been placed in a much better pecuniary position, as they now receive Results' Payments in addition to these Capitalization Grants. Being very largely attended, they draw immense sums for Results' Payments.—*Vide* note, page 17 and 47.

tional 25 or fraction of 25 over 600. This is an educational sliding scale of another kind from that named in my last letter; and surely it affords a great premium on average attendance and is eminently calculated to slide every available pupil out of the lay Schools into these Convent Schools. Let us remember these Schools, have all the influence of the priesthood at their backs.

Are the ordinary National Schools paid and aided as these are? Is average attendance the only element entering into a Teacher's salary? It is not easy seeing how this is treating Convent Schools on the same equal grounds. The Convent Schools are paid according to average attendance, but the proficiency of his pupils and the general efficiency of the School are elements entering into a lay Teacher's classification. He is paid according to class. Have Convent School Teachers been classed? Not at all. They require no class; they are not paid class salary. They would never submit to examination and classification like other Teachers. What need they? They are paid according to average attendance.* And the rule is imperative; no matter what may be the proficiency of the scholars, and, as might be expected, we hear very little about this in the reports of Inspectors, at least up till 1862. But sometimes we hear a stray notice in their favour, coming from the pen of a special pleader, on the score of "neatness, cleanliness, gentleness of manners, and good needlework."† Mr. O'Carroll agrees with Mr. Foster that they should be more liberally supported, and approves of the Board's recent liberality in creating a new teaching power for the especial benefit of these Schools, viz., First Class Monitors,‡ and this in order that Managers may be able to get properly qualified Teachers from these *quasi* Model Schools. I thought the State had already gone to great expense in providing Training Schools, and their subsidiary Model Schools, for this very purpose. And here it has to pay for the whole thing over again.

But, perhaps, Mr. Foster will turn with me to the Report of Inspector Sheridan on the Wexford Convent Schools, not to be found in full in any of the Board's Reports. However, it is to be had separately. I believe it was published in 1864, by an order of the House of Commons. Mr. Sheridan tells quite a different tale. He says, the Convent Schools are very inefficient, and the proficiency far below that of pupils in the most ordinary lay National School in the same district.§ And why? The

* On examining the *Rules and Regulations* recently issued (Oct. 1874,) I find that still greater advantages are conferred on these Convent Schools. In addition to the Capitation Grant, they receive Results' Fees; they have, besides, the option of Examination and Class Salary. No such choice is permitted the Teachers of ordinary National Schools. This alone is a decided advantage to the Convent School. If the staff be good, it can go in for fixed Salary and Results; if bad, for Capitation Grant and Results.

† Vide Report of Mr. O'Carroll on the Convent Schools in the North Dublin District.—Commissioners' Report for 1862, page 240.

‡ Really Pupil-Teachers who receive, if males, —the first year £14, the second £17, the third £20. Those of the third year take rank in the second, or lowest division of second class.—Vide

Nos. 191-195 of *Rules and Regulations*, pp. 27 and 28, and note, page 17.

§ But, vide Royal Commission Reports, vol. iii, pp. 219-253, comparing QQ. 5,057-5,068, and 4,866-4,884; 5,417-5,451, and 5,175-5,179; 5,866-5,867, and 5,824, *et seq.* statement. Among the "great changes" that had taken place in the meantime (1860-64), one was the *enlargement of the Board, and the inauguration of a new policy*. Mr. S.—'s Report for 1860 seems to have been written with the view of pointing out defects in the Convent Schools, in order that they might be converted into Training Schools for the R. C. Teachers; this step was actually taken in August, 1862 (*vide* note, page 17). It is remarkable that Mr. S.—'s change of opinion was contemporaneous with the "great changes" aforesaid. QQ. 4,872, 4,873, and 4,880-4,882.

Teachers never have had any special training, the Inspectors never examined them. The whole course of teaching was very bad. In the Report for 1862, it is stated that the progress made by the Christian Brothers' Schools is greatly due to the National Schools in their vicinity; the National Schools have compelled zeal and bigotry to do the work of education, if not, they will occupy the vacant places. It is here shown that the natural tendency of every strictly denominational system of education is downward. And this is borne out by the state of education in all countries. In the States of the Church, in Italy, and in Spain up till a recent period, notwithstanding the abundant supply of ecclesiastical teaching power, they do not seem to have set themselves to the work with a *bona fide* intention of educating the people, for only a very small percentage of the common people could either read or write. And this is not confined to the Continent of Europe; the same may be said of the Conventual and Monastic Schools of Lower Canada. The education of the people, when wholly in the hands of the religious orders has utterly failed, and the ignorance is lamentable.

Contrast the education in these countries with that of countries where it is in the hands of lay Teachers, paid, encouraged, and directed by the State—Saxony, Prussia, Holland, Scotland, the United States, and the picture is complete, the dark side of the one bringing into strong relief the bright features of the other.*

† *Vide* Johnson's Physical Atlas; Religion and Education Maps.

Also "Freedom of Education," a pamphlet by J. Lowry Whittle, a R. C. barrister, and published by Hodges, Smith, and Co. of Grafton-st., Dublin. This is just now one of the most readable and instructive pamphlets ever issued on the question of Irish Education. At page 22, Mr. Whittle says:—"The truth is, the clerical party is, and always has been, afraid of educating the masses. Human reason this party regards as the *ignis fatuus* of man. That, education tends to develope; when nobody thought of educating, all went well. Now that education must be given, the only chance of preventing man going astray is, for the clergy to undertake the task; and they profanely interpret the text, 'Go, and in my name teach all nations,' by adding the words, 'reading, writing, arithmetic, and the use of the globes.'

The richest endowments held by the Church in this century were in what constituted the kingdom of Naples. And it appeared in the Census of 1864, that there the per-centage of those who could neither read nor write, reached the figure 80." In a telling note Mr. Whittle adds very pointedly:—"In Ireland the per-centage is 49." In 1859 the Ultramontane writer of the *Catholic Case Stated*, in chapter XV., page 344 to 354, graphically describes the sad condition of the Irish National Schools in his day. A great many of his facts and all his figures are correct. The conclusion he arrives at is remarkable. In an intensely emphatic italicised sentence he exclaims—"the mixed system has done this!" He ascribes the great defects of Irish education to the small number of exclusively Catholic Schools, the presence, in most, of very

small Protestant minorities, the restrictions on the *Angelus*, the prohibition, during School hours, of the habit of "making the sign of the Cross," the Model Schools, the immoralities of their Pupil-Teachers and Masters, the presence in Catholic Schools of rude and ungentlemanly Protestant Inspectors, and "liberal" Catholic ones, worse than the Protestants. He sighs for the palmy days of Naples, Italy, Spain, and other countries of that type, to bring light, national life, and intellectual vigour into Ireland.

In Holland, according to the testimony of two Frenchmen of great ability, MM. Cuvier and Cousin—the latter prejudiced in favour of the French denominational system—nothing can exceed the efficiency of the instruction. Both these eminent and able men were surprised at the fine, large, well managed, well kept, and well taught Schools. There was a very sound instruction in religious knowledge, too, *given by the pastors*. The natural results might be anticipated. There was an entire absence of bigotry, sectarianism, superstition, and intolerance. How were these grand effects produced? The system was virtually almost secular, and mixed. The R. C. Clergy attacked it, and put the Bible out of the Schools, making it *still more secular*. The religious and secular elements were divorced; yet the teaching in the Dutch Schools is, to this day, characterized by all the attributes ascribed to it by MM. Cousin and Cuvier. How is the secular instruction so good? The Dutch have hit on the secret we in England and Ireland are after; they have (1) the proper system; (2) they pay their Teachers. "In that country, far inferior to this in wealth and importance, there is scarcely to be found a Schoolmaster with a salary less than £100 a year, and in the towns they

So much for the efficiency of these Schools and the equality of the treatment. Surely they got less for educating an equal number of pupils, but if so, they did less work.* If there be any injustice it is the Teachers of lay Schools who have more cause to complain, as the proficiency of the pupils is not taken into account in the examination of Convent Schools,† and we cannot see how this is, except to give them an undue advantage over the lay Schools. By all means apply the same rules to all, and not profess to do so, and really apply far different rules. If Payment by Results should come to be applied to Ireland, as attendance is one of the conditions of payment, then would the Convent and Monastic Schools occupy a still more favourable position, because every pupil from a lay National School will be a gain to them in a pecuniary sense, and a loss most severely felt in the annual receipts of the neighbouring lay National Teachers. It is confidently expected that the present Royal Commission‡ will recommend the adoption of this part of the English system, and if so, the flight of Teachers will be nothing abated, and the doom of the present system will be sealed.§ This, no doubt, is why the Teachers are so much opposed to this plan of payment. In the *Teachers' Journal* we constantly find protests against it, among the resolutions passed at Meetings of the Associated Teachers. It will be, indeed, the heaviest blow ever received by the mixed system in Ireland. It is a premium offered to bigotry and religious intolerance to put forth every effort to separate the sects, and educate them each in its own School. The State will have given up the idea of classification, and training of Teachers.|| Why should these be any longer necessary, when this principle is applied to a system professedly undenominational? It matters not who is the Teacher of a pupil, or where he has been taught if he pass the examination. The Model Schools therefore, are, rendered unnecessary. They have cost

have from £160 to £200 a year, all having besides a house and garden. Mr. Arnold, one of the Assistant-Commissioners, sent to inquire into the working of popular education in foreign countries, speaking of the Dutch Teachers, says:—"The fruits of this comfort and consideration are to be seen in the good manners, the self-respect, without presumption, of the Dutch Teachers; they are never servile, never offensive. Again, look at our Australian Colonies, the salaries range from £100 to £500 per annum."—*Speech of Mr. Considine, of Ennis, at the annual Congress in Dublin, on the 31st of Dec., 1874.* Mr. Considine might have said, if allowable, that in most of the Australian Colonies the system is mixed, in several, if not all, purely secular.

* We have seen if the Teachers in Convent Schools do not receive Salaries, they have themselves to blame. They will not submit to examination for classification.

† At least for the Capitation Grants.

‡ The reader shall remember that parts of these letters were written in 1870, during the sitting of the Royal Commission.

§ In 1870, 000 Teachers were trained, and 000 left the service; in 1871, 000 were trained, and 000 left the service; in 1872, 189 were trained,

and 440 left the service; in 1873, 257 were trained, and 412 left the service; thus, in the four years since the change, 000 Teachers have been trained, and 0000 have ceased to serve the Board—a total loss of 0000 Teachers! Of these 000 were trained. Let us remember this loss is not due by any means to a want of Training Schools, as is frequently represented to the Government by high education officials. It is chiefly due to a miserably low salary.

The money loss—the cost of training the 000 Teachers—the smallest item of loss in the account—at £40 a head, cannot have been less, during the last four years alone, than £27777. It might reasonably be asked what advantage could *Non-vested* Training Schools afford, except to treble or quadruple this waste of the public Funds. These sums, added to that granted every year for retiring allowances, would go far to pension the 111 Teachers now in the Irish workhouses. This done, the sums at present squandered on paid monitors, and gratuities for training Teachers (*Rules and Regulations*, 219, 220, 230, 231) would in time become, to a great extent, unnecessary.

|| indeed Resident Commissioner Keenan says "he does not see how these are any longer necessary under a Results' system."

immense sums, but, doubtless, they will be handed over to the Religious Orders. So this is the pass to which we have come. The vessel has got upon the rocks. The Board's administration of the system has been attended all along with enormous expense; these Model Schools were only one item. Oh, that we had been wise in time and considered the latter end. Then might we have saved money. To reconstruct a new vessel, or turn the old one adrift, and let her founder, will be an effort for a future Government, fully equal in magnitude, and of no less importance to the State than the cutting down of the "upas tree." What Statesman will have the honour—Disraeli or Gladstone? Whoever does it, and does it well, will deserve well of his country.

Ever, Right Honourable Sir,

Most sincerely yours,

JANUS.

New Year's Day, 1875.

LETTER V.

TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE

SIR MICHAEL EDWARD HICKS-BEACH, BART., M.P.

CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND.

RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR,

It is now apparent that Convent and Monastic Schools never formed an integral part of the present Irish National System. They are abnormal and exceptional, and as such they have even been treated by the Board. The Board could not do otherwise. The Nuns and Brothers refused to be classified, and so they could not be paid fixed class salary like other Teachers. If taken into connection at all, some new mode of payment must be devised; so the Board lowered its standard, and adopted the rough plan of Capitation Grants to these Schools. They never looked very minutely into the quality of the teaching. It might not be convenient on all occasions. They never received the same treatment as the ordinary National Schools; in fact, the lay Teachers have had just cause to complain of the partiality of the Board for these Schools, in opening a wicket-gate into the system, specially for their accommodation.

But these Schools should never have been recognised by the Commissioners, because they were utterly opposed to the genius of the system they were to administer—a system non-denominational and non-sectarian. According to the express statement of Lord Stanley's letter, this system was defined as one "from which the very suspicion of proselytism should be

banished, whose Schools should be practically open to all creeds—to every denomination of Christian pupils." No religious emblems, crosses, or other decorations were to be permitted in the case of State Schools, either inside or outside. They were not even to be used for any religious purpose which should practically denominationalise them, or lead parents to have conscientious objections to sending their children to them. Everything there, likely to prejudice any class or creed against any particular School, was, to be most carefully avoided. In an early Report we find that an altar was removed from one of them in consequence of the objections of the Board; but the Synod of Ulster claimed the right of using its Schools for religious purposes—for worshipping in*—and this right was acknowledged by the Board, and a most important concession made to them on their repeated demands, though it is not easy to see how the concession of this privilege was consistent with the removal of the altar, and it is, really, an open question whether this concession to the demands of the Synod of Ulster, was not really an infringement of the Board's own rules—a violation of its fundamental principles.

Then the Schools were not to be internally connected with any place of worship, and most minute, and exact rules, were drawn up for religious instruction, in order that conscientious rights should be protected, and no one might have any scruples in sending his child to a National School. The name "National School," was to be put up in a conspicuous place outside the Schoolhouse, and no other title permitted except one descriptive of the locality, street &c. In fact, in accordance with the spirit of the system, no National School should ever have been associated with any name which should even seem to have the effect of limiting it any one denomination. This principle seems, however, in the course of time to have been lost sight of in a great measure. We find such names in the Board's own Reports, as "St. Bridget's National School," "St. Peter and St. Paul's National School," "St. Francis Xavier's Female National School," "Queens-town Convent National School," "St. Laurence O'Toole's National School," "Holy Cross National School,"† in place of simply "National School," and the name of the street, townland, or founder, associated. And we may be sure names of this kind, which no Board faithful to a mixed system, should ever have permitted, did as much, if not more, practically to shut the doors of these Schools against all save pupils of one denomination, as almost any of the abuses—altars, crosses, internal connections with churches or chapels—so strictly guarded against by the Board's Rules. So much is in a name; the name is ever present with any parent proposing to send his child to one of these Schools, even more than the crosses and emblems, and acts as a deterrent to most Protestant parents with equal effect. These cunningly-devised names were just as admissible in a mixed system, as the National School of the congregation of such and such and such a place, or the National School belonging to such and such a church or chapel. The appropriation of such names to these Schools involved

* 26th of August, 1833.

† Vide Report for 1855, *et seq.*

most essentially the exclusive and separate system, and their general adoption most pointedly marked the degradation and disintegration of the mixed system. For the reasons given, I need not say that such names for Irish National Schools should never have been tolerated,* and I am confident they most certainly would not, had not the religious representative principle in the constitution of the Board vitiated it as a Council for the faithful administration of a mixed system.

But Convent and Monastic Schools should never have been admitted into a mixed system, and this for another reason, that they are not, and can never be conducted in strict accordance with the fundamental principles of the Board. For what saith Professor J. W. Kavanagh, of the Catholic University—the famous ex-Head Inspector of National Schools,—in certain letters of his, addressed to the Ulster Plantation in particular, and to the British public in general? We read from his letter, as we find it in the *Freeman's Journal* of December the 6th, 1869,† and these demi-official statements of this champion of Ultramontarism in Ireland, have never yet been officially contradicted by any archbishop, bishop, priest, or section of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland, so that we must regard this witness as true—the ominous silence of the Catholic Church during the sitting of a Royal Commission, from which such great things were expected, must be construed into cordial consent. Mr. J. W. Kavanagh says,—“In the *exclusively* Catholic Schools, the Patrons and Teachers feel released from any obligation to observe any restrictive rules intended for mixed schools, which they can evade without detection, or without forfeiture of the Grant. They make, therefore, what religious references, &c., they think fit during the ordinary school hours. These cannot be detected, as they are suspended during the visits of the Board's Officers. This is the same principle as that applied by the Roman Catholic Clergy, fifty years ago to the Schools of the Kildare Place Society. The law is one intended to protect the consciences of religious minorities. As there is none, there is no need to observe the law The spirit of the law is kept, though the letter is broken, and good faith is kept with the Government. It is clandestine, but not dishonourable, for no child is thereby in effect, directly or indirectly excluded from the other advantages which the School affords!” ‡ The man who writes this, is, I need not say, not writing a

* The name *National School* implies one not sectional or private, but open to all—“*To every denomination of Christian pupils.*” The use of such exclusive, congregational names in connection with the name *National* is an abuse of language—in fact a fair example of an Irish bull.

† Ten years earlier—in 1859—Mr. Kavanagh had uttered these oracular words, which may be found at page 401, in the last paragraph of the last note to the text of his “*Catholic Case Stated.*”—“The mixed system is no more; it departed this life in its 28th year, the victim of constitutional disease; prolonged to that age by unusual stimulants and large bribes to a host of Ulster nurses, who were his chief attendants; its remains will be removed for interment to Belfast in the course of the summer, ‘unwept, unhonoured, and unsung.’” It is strange, however, to find it still alive in 1869, and Mr. Kavanagh

travelling northward for evidence to condemn it before the Royal Commission. Mr. K.'s facetious announcement was premature; he had overrated the effect of the *Catholic Case Stated*. The system is still alive, and lives in the affections of many good men and true, both in the North and South. It owes, however, little to the doctors—at least those who have had charge of the patient's constitution of late days. That it is not now defunct is not their fault. In passing I may say that “a constitutional disease, prolonged to that age by stimulants,” hardly expresses Mr. K.'s meaning.

‡ In addition to the £100,000 granted in 1871 for Results' Payments, the Board has just recommended that Parliament should, this year grant, £140,000 more for this purpose.—*Freeman's Journal*, 29th December, 1874.

As managers rarely, if ever, pay the Teachers

joke ; he is really in earnest. He is (1870) Professor of Mathematics in the Catholic University, a mighty hand at statistics, especially relating to Irish National Education, and the chosen mouthpiece of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy in this very matter. (N. †, p. 2.) The letters are highly instructive. I need not speak of the grammatical propriety of the relative clause in the opening sentence, though I may remark, in passing, such a slipshod style of writing may be worthy of the dignity of an ex-Head Inspector, and Professor in the Catholic University. Neither need I speak at length of the peculiar ethical system taught there, if the moral teaching of this letter is to be regarded as a specimen. "*It is clandestine, but not dishonourable.*" If not dishonourable, I might say, why clandestine ? And why suspend the religious exercises during the visits of the Board's Officers ? Mr. Kavanagh will reply it is to catch the Grant. To be honest might cause the School to lose the Grant. The end justifies the means. Faith is not kept with the Government, either in the letter or the spirit. It seems, the violation of good faith with the Government—the receiving of money on false pretences, a positively immoral act, is but a small matter in Mr. Kavanagh's ethics, if only the loss of the Grant to the School be not incurred. British gold has, if we are to believe Mr. Froude, at all times had a most wonderful effect on Irish morals. This is a case in point. To encourage the spread of ethical teaching of this exalted type, larger and ever increasing Grants from the Imperial Treasury of Great Britain, for the support of religious teaching in Irish National Schools, are year after year demanded.

And observe, the practice here commended is not peculiar to the Convent and Monastic Schools. We are informed authoritatively, that is common to all the exclusively Catholic Schools, *i.e.*, to all the Schools attended by Roman Catholic pupils only. We know how ardently of late years, Rome has desired to increase the number of these Schools, and how backstairs manoeuvres in Marlborough-street, in the modification of the conditions of giving the Grant, and when these were not fully successful, the ban of the Church—altar denunciations, and deprivation of sacraments were resorted to in order to draw away Roman Catholic pupils from mixed State Schools.* That so very little success has hitherto attended this kind of practice, even with the collusion of the Education Board, is a proof that the mixed system is the only sound National system. But, it is to be feared that Mr. Kavanagh, in order to bring in his peculiar system of ethics, wilfully misunderstands the spirit of the Board's Rules regarding Religious Instruction. In an ordinary man ignorance is pardonable, but in an ex-Head Inspector, who in his time devoted so much attention to these very rules, and wrote a book of 447 octavo pages on the subject, it is wholly inexcusable. He most dexterously substitutes cause for effect. The careful and strict observance of the rules as to religious instruction is desired in *all* cases, not merely in those cases in which a few pupils of another denomination may

anything, and as a very considerable number of hours every week is devoted to religious teaching, it must be paid for from these Grants. How much is paid for it is another question.

* On one Monday morning the Monaghan Model School was thus emptied of all the R. C. pupils, save one or two children of the official staff of Teachers.

be present, and this in order that every National School *may be open to all pupils* for the purposes of secular instruction. This is the aim of the Board's Rules, this the spirit of them, and it is clear, the practice commended by Mr. Kavanagh is a direct violation of the Board's Rules. The beneficent intention of the founder of the system, is frustrated, the minorities are not protected; because if these practices are allowed, the Schools are not open to Protestant pupils, and none will attend them. Mr. K. says because none attend them, we don't observe the rules; but I say, because you don't observe the rules, none will attend. Fancy an isolated Protestant family in one of those scattered settlements in the South and West, trying to avail itself of the secular education imparted in one of these Schools. Then picture to yourself the pious horror experienced by the Manager and Patron, the Teachers and the pupils, that the admission of one Protestant boy or girl, must curtail these religious exercises—must limit them to a certain hour of the day, must oblige them to forego these pious practices, for the sake of which the Manager and his Teachers have violated both faith and morals. I would not choose to be one of these Protestant pupils. I think I should be regarded as an interloper, whose presence would be dangerous to faith and morals. Is it at all probable, however, that these exercises would be discontinued? They might for a time, but if the pupil were very young, and not likely to discover at home to his parents, he would, in the end, most probably be perverted;* if of sufficient age to know the difference, and that he told his parents at home, he would be withdrawn, or if they insisted on having the Board's Rules faithfully carried out, the School could, in a very short time be made too hot for him.

As these Schools must, from their very nature, be essentially Roman Catholic, and taking the Professor at his word, it remains a question whether they should any longer receive aid from the Board.

So much for the mode of conducting these Schools "in accordance with the fundamental principles of the National system."

I must now pause, however, and reserve further strictures on these Conventual and Monastic Schools for a future letter. Meantime,

I remain, Right Hon. Sir,

Faithfully yours, &c.,

JANUS.

New Year's day, 1875.

* Evidence of the V. Rev. Mons. L. Forde, PP., and Vicar-General of the Diocese of Dublin, in *Royal Commission Reports* (1870), Vol. IV., p. 999, QQ. 23,196, 23,197; 23,266-23,268; 23,282-23,286; 23,249-23,252. *Sheridan*, 5,275-5,283; 5,235-5,243; 5,617-5,620. *Bishop of Down and*

Connor, 19,646-19,649. *Bishop of Ossory*, 20,617. *Dean Byrne*, 21,670-21,674. For how the Board has met the case of minorities, and its fidelity to the Mixed System, *vide Keenan's Evidence*, 1,559-1,562; *Sheridan's*, 5,617-5,620 *O'Reilly's*, 14,933; *Warren's*, 15,267-15,271.

LETTER VI.

TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE

SIR MICHAEL EDWARD HICKS-BEACH, BART. M.P.

CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND.

RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR,

IN my last letter I showed how Convent and Monastic Schools never really formed part of the National School system. The Board always treated them exceptionally, applying to them a mode of examination and payment very different from that applied to the ordinary National Schools. These Schools, from their very name and nature, as ostensibly and exclusively Roman Catholic Schools, are not really open to Protestant pupils. Protestant children could not conscientiously attend them, and as a matter of fact they rarely attend them.* They are in no sense mixed Schools, as the lay Schools in Ulster are mixed. They are, therefore, entirely opposed to the national genius and spirit of the system, and in order to save it from final ruin, should at once be severed from it.

I have quoted an extract from the letter of a Catholic University professor, in which he says that in these exclusively Catholic Schools there is not even a decent attempt made to carry out the Board's rules as to Religious Instruction; that the Managers and Teachers of these Schools openly break faith with the Government, in order to practice at all times those pious religious exercises so dear to all good Catholics—a show of observing these rules being made on the occasion of the visits of Her Majesty's Inspector, lest the Government Grant might be endangered. Mr. Kavanagh, being a Professor in the Catholic University, and long an Inspector of Schools, is an excellent authority, and his statements in the *Freeman's Journal* have never been disowned or contradicted. This being the case, it is admitted that these Schools are decidedly *not* National Schools; they are, no doubt, paid by the Government as a means of teaching the tenets and practices of the Roman Catholic religion, but they are wholly opposed to the fundamental principles of the mixed system.

* The peculiar garb worn by the Nuns and Christian Brothers affixes to these Schools a denominational character, quite as effectively, if not more so, than the name of the School; crosses inside or outside the building, internal

communications with places of religious worship, or any of the hundred and one things against which the Board's rules profess to guard, however ineffectually. *Royal Commission Reports*, (1870) *Dorrian*, 9,057-9,062.

This flagrant breach of good faith on the part of Catholic Managers is admittedly the practice not merely in Convent Schools but in all "exclusively Catholic" Schools. Under these circumstances the present system may be *called* mixed, non-denominational, unsectarian, but it is essentially denominational, as far as these Schools are concerned. This admission of Professor Kavanagh, intended no doubt to produce this impression on the minds of the Royal Commission, and of British Statesman, that the denominational system was virtually, in Ireland, *un fait accompli*, is really most damaging and deadly in its influence on that system. Things are changed since 1869. Mr. Kavanagh would now doubtless, willingly forget this confession—the result of a pious zeal for his system and his party. No doubt, this admission was intended to be used as a sword to cut to pieces the mixed system of Lord Stanley. And it might have been so used then, but the Irish Church Act of 1869, has put a second edge upon it, and it can now be used with most deadly effect against the system Mr. Kavanagh so much desiderates, and the system practically recommended by the Royal Commission. Things are changed educationally in England, and Scotland too. The existence of a system in England almost purely denominational, can no longer be put forward as a precedent for Ireland. The English and Scotch Education Acts bespeak a system much more nearly approaching the old Irish system, and therefore, less denominational. Irish education has always been in advance of English in this respect. Not to speak however, of the absurdity of England and Scotland supporting their own Schools almost entirely by a local tax, and having in addition to pay a large annual Treasury Grant for the support of the "exclusively Catholic Schools" of Professor Kavanagh, and their superlatively celestial morality—their exalted ethical teaching, as confessed by the Professor himself,—it seems wholly opposed to public policy in Ireland that after the disestablishment of the State Church, and the disendowment of the Presbyterians, a Treasury Grant of over half a million of money should be annually disbursed by the Commissioners of Irish National Education, in Schools confessedly separate, and whose main object is the inculcation of the peculiar dogmas of the modern Catholic faith, and their chief work to train the youth of Ireland in the practices of the Catholic religion. This is, essentially, a thing for which Irish Roman Catholics are justly entitled to pay themselves. A Grant from the Treasury should not be necessary, particularly as Irish Catholic votes disestablished the State Church in Ireland, affirming, with a unanimous voice, the propriety of "levelling down" all Churches in this land, that the State should no longer pay anything in Ireland for religious teaching. Ireland's State Church was then the "upas tree." They aided Mr. Gladstone with a right good will in laying the axe to the root of that tree. When that tree fell, the present National School system virtually fell with it. We must ask Irish Roman Catholics to be consistent; we must now address ourselves to the brambles and brushwood that grew around the base of that noble, but now fallen tree; we must have a complete clearing of the soil, lest some of these brambles, now the shade of the upas tree is removed, might grow into a

tree ten times more deadly and noxious. Statesman have now a splendid opportunity in Ireland. They can give us, with complete logical and political consistency, a school system purely secular.* This, to be consistent, they are, indeed, bound to do; and they can do so without endangering the present English system, or interfering in the least with the present liberty of religious teaching across the Channel. If they are really wise they will do so. It is the only really practicable permanent solution of the difficulties, which during the last decade or more, have been growing up around the Irish system of Schools. We will then have in these countries the advantage of a trial of several educational plans—the English, liberal, the Scotch, very liberal, the Irish, most liberal of all—being indeed based on the great principle affirmed by Irishmen of almost every creed in 1869—a system to which Irishmen cannot reasonably object, as it is based on Irish ideas. But, no doubt, even already English Statesman have become familiar with this system. It is that of Victoria, New South Wales, and several other British Colonies. It has been found to work there exceedingly well. It is just the system for Ireland—indeed eminently applicable to a land distracted by religious bigotry, and sectarian animosity. It is, indeed, now the only healing balm Statesmen can apply to the wounds of Erin. The jealousies, and religious and political passions of her people have left her without a State Church. When the Churches, both Catholic and Presbyterian, could not agree to remain as they were, and enjoy the system of Lord Stanley, they must have another. It is well this system has already been so successfully tried in Victoria. We must borrow a leaf from colonial legislative wisdom, as, indeed, we have often done before. The School system that Irish Statesmen helped to found in the land of the Southern Cross, is just the system for Ireland.† But, there is another reason why this colonial plan is so very *apropos* at present. Noisy Irish patriots never will admit that it is an integral part of the British Empire. They advance pretensions, however absurd, to be called a separate nationality—the Irish nation. It is essentially an English Colony, according to its modern patriots, and most popular politicians. We will take them at their word; it shall be treated as a colony, but as in the past it was found incapable of self-government—the scandals of the period before the Union having been popular themes for the display of fiery Irish eloquence, and occasions for the outpouring of virtuous Irish indignation—it cannot be entrusted with a parliament of its own.‡ The Union is a *fait accompli*, and Mr. Kavanagh and his school cannot reasonably object to that. Besides, her

* Let me be understood. I do not mean by "purely secular," prohibiting all religious teaching, I mean a system under which the Teacher would not be obliged, by his relation to a Local Manager, to act as a Teacher of religion. Religious teaching might be permitted, but then, to carry out the principle of the Irish Church Act, the ministers of religion, or those paid by them out of congregational funds, are the men to do the work. So long as the present peculiar relation subsists between Manager and Teacher, the

State is most unquestionably endowing the religious teaching in the Schools.

† If I mistake not, it was during the ministry of an Irishman, Charles Gavan Duffy, that the Victorian Legislature passed this law.

‡ Froude says it is now conclusively proved by State Papers, that the only one of the Irish patriots who could not be bought during the period before the Union, was Henry Grattan. *English in Ireland*, Vol. II.

position makes united government both possible, more practicable, and by far the best for her. But seeing her people desire to be treated rather as a colony of England and Scotland, they should be, as far as possible, gratified in this whim or caprice. We have heard that Ireland should now be governed by Irish ideas, and this colonial plan is just the thing for the Schools of Ireland. By all means let us have it, if we cannot have Home Rule. If Ireland must be saved from its patriots in 1874, as was done in 1800, let us at least gratify to the full, the passion for those Irish ideas that played a part so very conspicuous in the legislation of five years ago.

As this letter is already long enough, perhaps too long for Irish ideas, I had better conclude by saying that in my next letter I shall resume my observations on the Convent Schools, and the administration of the Board. Meantime, goodbye, and believe me,

Right Honourable Sir,

Very truly yours,

JANUS.

New Year's Day, 1875.

LETTER VII.

TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE

SIR MICHAEL EDWARD HICKS-BEACH, BART, M.P.

CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND.

RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR,

ATTENDING to the wants of Professor Kavanagh and his friends, has almost led me to overlook our friend, Vere Foster. I beg that gentleman's pardon; I now return to him and his opinions regarding the Convent Schools. He believes they should be more largely endowed than ever; Capitation Grants affords but a poor mode of rewarding the merits of these hitherto badly used Schools. The Board has never done them full justice in the past. It has been reserved for the age rejoicing in the light shed on Irish educational topics by Mr. Foster, Mr. Keenan, and Professor Kavanagh to do so. It is not enough, as I have shown, that hitherto the Board has been even more partial to them than to the Lay Schools—paying them so much a head for each pupil, without looking minutely into the character of the teaching. Some new system must be now devised whereby those dear ladies may be enabled to put their hands something deeper into the pockets of the British taxpayer; oh yes, now we have it; Mr. Lowe's English plan of payment by results is just the thing for Ireland. It is true Mr. Lowe says this plan is one applicable to a denominational system only,

and decency obliges us to call the Irish system undenominational, else the Presbyterians would not keep quiet; but then Professor Kavanagh has proved in his letters and evidence before the Royal Commission that really mixed Schools are *rare æ aves*—that even in Ireland the separate system is an accomplished fact, to which statesmen must bow; what prevents us applying the Results' plan? So, doubtless, it will be adopted in Ireland, as it is likely to be recommended by the Royal Commission with its English sympathies, and its strongly anti-Irish prejudices. The Convent Schools will then be in a much better position. They can have payment either by Results or by Capitation Grants,* classification and training must go by the board; they will become entirely unnecessary. (*Appendix*, n., p. 53.)

If Mr. Foster will examine the Board's early Reports, its professions and practice, and compare them with their present practice, taking special note of the changes introduced after the period of the Board's reconstruction—particularly those after 1861—he will, no doubt, find many other anomalies besides that referred to in his letter, where he says that the principal anomaly is the giving of religious instruction at an intermediate time between the beginning and close of the ordinary secular instruction. This is indeed an anomaly, and I quite agree with him, it should be discontinued. It is a wedge to split the mixed system. Formerly religious instruction had to be given either before or after the close of the secular teaching. It was not inconveniently intrusive on pupils who might not desire it, and it would seem as if twice during the school day might satisfy any reasonable mortal, but the desire for the pious exercises, referred to by Professor Kavanagh, led to a clamour for still further indulgence. These interlopers—this mere handful of Protestant children—must not interfere with that godly training of the Roman Catholic youth of Ireland, for which the British taxpayer pays so smartly; no, this mere handful must be turned out once every day—must be made to feel that this is a specially Roman Catholic School, that they are here rather out of place, and had better take their departure if they have any desire for their own comfort. It was not enough in Schools professedly national that twice every day the pupils should be divided into separate and hostile camps; this was not enough for the pious fervour of ecclesiastics; they must be divided a third time in the middle of the day; the Roman Catholic portion of the School must be separated thrice daily from their Protestant playmates and schoolfellows. Thus early must the external distinctions of creeds be forced on the young mind, the evil of dissent be ever kept before the mind of Catholic children, that when they become men and women they may be better citizens, and liegemen and women of Her Majesty Queen Victoria. This separation of pupils in the Schools of the State for religious teaching, though one of those things contemplated to a certain extent by Lord Stanley, has here reached its culminating

* The fact is these Schools are now paid both *Capitation Grants and Results*. From their large attendance they draw larger sums for Results than most of the lay Schools. If Parlia-

ment should now grant the £140,000 asked by the Board, their Results' Fees would be doubled. *Wilson's Evidence*, QQ. 16,063-1,6080. *Vide* n. p. 18, and nn. pp. 53 and 66.

point, the climax of absurdity. It was never intended that any use so anti-national, should be made of this privilege, that the religious teaching should in time come to so overshadow the secular instruction in our National Schools, as to make it occupy the subordinate position, so perverting the mixed and unsectarian system of Lord Stanley as to make it a means of alienating in youth, as far as possible, the affections of one section of the Queen's subjects from the other—a result probably more injurious viewed in the light of peace, order, and good civil government in Ireland, than the absence of such a System as the present one is under the management of the Irish National Education Board, year after year becoming—a system thrice daily dividing Irish children into rival camps, a system heavily subsidized by the Treasury of Great Britain—a system under which British citizens are trained to regard one another from early infancy as separate in religion, separate in race, hostile in politics—two nations living together, governed by the same laws, and speaking the same language—but eternally separate in all things, and never designed to act together for the common weal, but ever to live in a state of constant, and chronic religious and political hostility, and isolation. I say the School system, which is specially contrived, adapted, and paid by the British Parliament for doing work of this kind, is an anomaly and an anachronism in this enlightened and progressive age, and the statesmen who maintain it have not rightly gauged the spirit of the age—have not estimated the dangers to which so much political and social weakness exposes our country, and if they be wise in time they will hasten to bring to a conclusion a state of matters in regard to Irish Primary Schools dangerous in the extreme, and one for which, had the Board been even ordinarily faithful to the national trust confided to it, they had never been called on to find a remedy.*

If religious instruction be given at all in the National Schools of Ireland, it should be given either at the beginning or close of the School day, so that this separation of pupils of the different creeds might be as little marked as possible; especially is this necessary in all cases in which there is but one apartment or School-room; but if Irish Schools were, as they ought to be, large, well equipped and well sustained—what they might now have been, if a truly national and wise policy had, during forty years, been pursued by the Education Board—then there might have

* What JANUS here says applies only to the mixed system, as administered at present by the Board.

What he means by the "spirit of the age" I cannot tell. Perhaps he means an ancient mediæval spirit—the spirit whose more recent developments are so well analysed in a late pamphlet by the Rt. Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P., and entitled "*The Vatican Decrees*,"—or, indeed, it may be the foreign, over-bearing, and domineering spirit that intrudes itself in the most intermeddling fashion into the social, political, and civil affairs of England, Germany, France, Spain, and Ireland, instead of remaining at home and minding its own business, if it happen to have any of its own; the spirit whose practical

operations in the National Church of the Irish people, in the parish Schools, at the Board of Education, and the Poor Law Board, have been so ably and forcibly described in a recent work by the Rev. Robert O'Keeffe, Parish Priest of Callan, in Co. Kilkenny. The book is called "*Ultramontaniam versus Civil and Religious Liberty*." As a practical commentary on the *Vatican Decrees* nothing can surpass this recent work; it should be read by every one desiring to comprehend the mysteries of modern Irish Ecclesiastical History, Irish Politics, and Modern Irish National Education. The publishers are Hodges, Foster, and Co., of Grafton Street, Dublin.

been in every School two or three apartments, and the Clergymen of the various creeds might have been permitted to attend on certain days either before or after the usual school hours, and impart such religious and moral teaching as they might deem desirable. And had they been truly anxious for the interests of the Christian Religion, they would at once have fallen in with this sensible and reasonable plan.* But, I candidly confess, it is to be feared, that here, as elsewhere, the outcry raised about constantly mingling secular with religious teaching, has often been a mere pretext for intermeddling in the public schools. What have been the real motives directing the policy of the Irish Churches, are the total separation of the children for ecclesiastical and congregational purposes; and, as a matter no less important, the employment of the State-paid Teacher, as a convenient, useful drudge for imparting those elements of religious knowledge which were better imparted by clergymen themselves. In addition to these motives have been no less active, the desire of controlling the quality and quantity of the Education, by retaining in the hands of clergymen the important power of appointing and dismissing the Teacher, thus rendering him, in every respect, the merest tool and creature of the Church. These are the real reasons of the constant interference of Clergymen in National Education in Ireland. I will not say, indeed, of individual clergymen; but these are the chief reasons which influence those who direct our ecclesiastical machinery. Whether worthy aims or reasons, it is not for me to determine. To me it seems to betray a certain amount of weakness in the Churches, a lack of belief in the innate power of truth, a dread of knowledge, and intellectual liberty, that should never enter the minds of men thoroughly imbued with a belief in the intrinsic power of those eternal

* It is stated in the Rev. J. Fraser's Report to the Schools' Inquiry Commission (1867), p. 247, that in one town in Upper Canada—the town of Hamilton—the various clergy do attend to the religious teaching in the Schools. There is an entire absence of religious bigotry and sectarian animosity.

In Holland for many years this plan was carried out. No where could there be found a people better taught and imbued with a more truly religious (Christian) spirit, according to the testimony of M. Cuyler and M. Cousin, made in 1811 and 1836.—*Mr. Arnold's Report* (pp. 134-159, Vol. IV.) to *Education Commission*, 1861.

In Prussia the clergyman (Pfarrer) is by law obliged to attend personally, and teach religion so many hours a week, with what Results have been seen during the last decade. The Prussians wisely carry the great principle of division of labour into their educational economy.—*Vide* Rev. M. Pattison's Report, *Education Commission*, Vol. IV., p. 178. In both Prussia and Holland the secular teaching is confessedly far superior to what prevails where the same Teacher is responsible for both religions and secular teaching.

The recent remarkable speech of the Bishop of Manchester, Dr. Fraser (Liverpool, Jan. 1875), seems to point to something of this kind. The present system in England, he said, "gives us neither good Christians nor good citizens," both the

religious and secular elements of the teaching are defective. Sooner than retain a Church School in a languishing condition, it should be handed over to the School Board. He would not despair of religion if the School Boards had all the Schools in England; Clergymen might be better employed in advancing education than in carping at School Boards, in letters to the newspapers. This is the only proper mode of combating Tyndallism, modern infidelity, and superstition; let the secular and religious instruction be the best of their kind. To effect this, let each Teacher,—the Schoolmaster, and Clergyman,—attend to his own department. If there be deficiency anywhere, we can then fix the responsibility. Bishop Fraser, in common with the Rev. Adam Montgomery, of Belfast, is quite right. Mr. Montgomery, a plain, blunt man, who calls a spade a spade, a veteran of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, in a debate on this question in the Presbytery on the 2nd of February, 1872, said—"Government is for the benefit of all parties in the country: I see no other mode of settling this question, than by adopting a purely secular system of State Education. Indeed the present system of instruction in morals and religion in the Schools, is after all, *more or less a sham. These subjects would be far more efficiently taught by the Churches themselves.*" It is plain that the dawn is visible, the day of common sense is at hand. In this direction

and immutable verities of their religious systems. The truth has nothing to fear from intellectual freedom, from the free play of youthful emotion, and the formation of early friendships and attachments. Nay, if anything, it might naturally be expected to have the advantage over error in the end, if the ministers of religion did their duty. "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."* When Clergymen are found so anxious for a separate, and exclusive system of education, the mind is naturally led to believe—if it inquire at all—that the system which requires it, must be a weak one, faulty either in doctrine, or in the ability of the men who administer it. Very active minds may be led at a certain critical period of life, strongly to the conviction, that the former is erroneous, and the latter humbugs. This is not at all uncommon in either Protestant or Roman Catholic Churches. The results are not favourable even to Christianity itself. The separate system is *per se* anti-social, and radically opposed to a sound, vigorous and effective civil policy. In the interest even of the Church itself, I advocate the secular system; as it will give us a people with a much better secular education, it will oblige Clergymen to improve their own education, and fit them better for their special work. The separate system only half educates. It renders the mind capable of perceiving only half truths. The mind may be healthy enough; but the specialized education acts, between it and the whole truth, much as hammered glass does between the eye and a beautiful landscape. The irregular refractions distort the real object of vision, nothing is seen in its true place, or relation; or after the lapse of time, even when the truth is perceived, it is but dimly; the eye long accustomed to its film perceives only "men as trees, walking." Until men and churches, are inspired with a greater love of the truth for its own sake, than of their own party, school, or sect, we cannot expect them to act in that fair, honest, humble, and tolerant spirit which a sincere pursuit of truth and attachment to it, always produce.

I remain, Right Hon. Sir,

Very truly yours,

JANUS.

New Year's Day, 1875.

also pointed the evidence of many of the more independent witnesses examined before the Royal Commission. *Vide* evidence of the *Bishop of Down and Connor*, Q. 19,585-19,590; 19,602; 19,650; 19,714-19,727; 19,719-19,726; 19,732-19,737. *Dean Warburton's*, QQ. 20,889-20,891; 20,881-20,883. *J. S. Porter's*, QQ. 18,187-18,193; 18,196-18,199; 18,200. *C. Matthews'*, 18,489; 18,521; 18,531. *Gordon's*, 18,772-18,785; 18,950-18,954; 18,965-18,967; 19,054-19,059; and 18,886-18,893; 18,949; 18,899-18,902; 18,904-18,907 (for the Results in Canada read QQ. 18,908-18,912). *Dean Byrne's*, Q. 21,684-21,687; 21,754-21,758. *M'Menamin's*, 22,113-22,136; 22,142-

22,146. *Tobias'*, 22,798-22,802; 22,760-22,767; 22,857-22,860. *Petticrew's*, QQ. 16,592-16,595; 16,758-16,763. Compare too the evidence of *Bishop Dorrian*, QQ. 8,669-8,673; and *Bishop Keane*, Q. 15,629; *O'Hara's*, 26,834-26,838; *Whittle's*, QQ. 24,138-24,146; 24,147-24,151. To all these weighty opinions may be added the fact that the Resolutions of the Committee of the House of Commons (19th May, 1828) contemplated relieving the Secular Teacher from the task of giving Religious Instruction (*vide R. C. Reports* (1870), Vol. I., part II., page 605, par. 3 and 4.

* John viii., 32.

LETTER VIII.

TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE

SIR MICHAEL EDWARD HICKS-BEACH, BART., M.P.

CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND.

RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR,

WE have seen the great mistake made by the Commissioners in permitting the secular instruction to be interfered with in certain Schools, by permitting religious teaching and other pious exercises to be admitted at least once between the beginning and the end of the School day. I will not say, that this concession never was sought for any other purpose than to affix to such Schools a more denominational character, and as far as possible, limit the attendance to pupils of only one denomination, but it has actually had this effect, and we may safely say, the Commissioners might have foreseen the necessary result—that it would be used as a wedge to split up the mixed system—yet in the face of the too manifest aim of the application, and abundant public warnings at the time, this foolish and dangerous concession was made. It is still a regulation of the Board. Ready hands have availed themselves of this wedge; they lost no time in driving it in, and it is still being driven into the system, and ably performing its part in that splitting up process, which is daily going on, and which so many minor regulations of the Board seem specially adapted to encourage. We have seen how such a frequent separation of the pupils for religious instruction, into, as it were, two hostile camps, runs counter to every principle of peace, order, and the best interests of Civil Government in Ireland—that the constant interference of the Churches in Irish Education has been dictated mainly by ecclesiastical and congregational motives, not the advancement of education; and I have pointed out that the demand for a separate and exclusive system, is, on the part of any Church, at best, but a symptom of weakness, and I may now add, more especially so, if that Church be the Church of the majority.

There is no doubt, the frequent separation of pupils of different religions in the National Schools, even at *any* period of the day, is not, to say the least of it, calculated to obliterate those unhappy sectarian feelings, hitherto, alas, too prevalent in this country, and on the whole, perhaps, it would be better since the Irish Church Act has become law, to get rid of the last remnants of the State Endowment of religion in Ireland—not to permit the Teachers in the National Schools to become a kind of inferior

clergy—as many of them are at present—ecclesiastical hewers of wood and drawers of water to the curates, priests, and ministers of the several Churches of England, Rome, and Scotland. To effect this, it would be necessary to give the Teachers such an independent position as would make it impossible for Managers—often better called Mis-managers—to force work of this kind on their Teachers. This work of religious teaching many of them already feel to be the merest drudgery, a work for which their other duties leave them really little or no time, for which they have never received any training, and for which, as State Teachers, their position should wholly disqualify them. This work could, indeed, be much better done by the clergy themselves in the Sunday Schools, or at the Schools, by attending during the week at special hours appointed for the purpose. In accordance with economic laws, there is every reason to believe that, some arrangement of this kind, by relieving the Teachers of the burden of religious teaching, would improve not only the secular, but also, the religious instruction.*

It may be asked why the clergy do not fall in with this plan, and appoint catechetical examinations at the Schools, weekly, fortnightly, or monthly, as might be convenient. The plan seems sensible, and recommends itself to the plain, common sense of most people, at least laymen. The answer is simple. The clergy do not want this labour thrust on them by the State, so long as it is willing to pay the National Teachers for doing it. So long as they can get it done *gratis*, by those whom the State pays for doing far other work, why should they undertake it? It is true our Lord said to Peter: Feed my lambs and my sheep;† but this is just one of those commands addressed to Peter and his apostolical successors, which most Irish Churches find it very convenient to forget. It would have agreed better with present practice if our Lord had said, “Peter, feed thou the sheep, and get the National Teachers to feed the lambs; it is the cheapest, easiest and most convenient way for thee.” But this is not what was addressed to Peter at all, but Feed my lambs and my sheep.‡ Why are the clergy in modern times so unwilling to obey the command of our Lord? It enables them to put forward a convenient claim, that of controlling the education imparted in the State Schools, and this they can most effectually do, by retaining the power of appointing and dismissing the Teacher at pleasure. Thus the quantity and quality of the secular instruction is controlled, and at the same time a valuable ecclesiastical drudge is secured in the interest of dogmatic religious teaching—a useful drudge, upon whom any amount of extra work of this kind may be laid, without paying him a farthing—one whose diligence, and due submission are secured by the ever impending dread of daily dis-

* As in Canada, Victoria, Holland, and Germany. *Vide n. p. 40, Gordon's Evidence.*

† John xxi., 15, 16.

‡ Not even the most ardent denominationalist will dare affirm that this command addressed to the Apostles, included such secular learning as arithmetic, geography, grammar, writing, the use of the globes, and navigation, else the

clergy would be our only Teachers of these subjects. They themselves will reject this idea as absurd; they desire to confine themselves to their own sphere of religious teaching. Why, for equally valid reasons, should not the Teacher of secular subjects desire to confine himself to his own sphere?

missal. This condition of the nation's Teachers is pitiable in the extreme. It is, I say it from strong conviction, most unfavourable to manly independence, the growth of civil freedom, popular liberty, and a healthy public opinion—so much needed in Ireland. It is inconsistent with sound public policy, with good government, and, indeed, with the spirit, and genius of our laws; and to put an end to this abuse of our educational system would have done more to build up the fabric of Irish society on a sound and enduring basis than any number of Land Acts, Church Acts, and Coercion Bills.

Religious instruction cannot be much longer imposed on the overwrought and underpaid National Teacher. Except as an excuse for the frequently mischievous interference I have mentioned it is really useless. It is, indeed, most inefficient. Coming for the most part at the close of the day's work, when both Teacher and pupils are wearied out, it is got through in the most hurried and perfunctory manner, generally indeed with a very bad grace.*

† "From the report which has lately been published on the state of education in England and Wales, there is one thing that appears very remarkable, independent of the lamentable state of ignorance which seems generally to prevail, which is this—that in those districts where the people seem to have a very considerable knowledge of Scripture, the state of their morals is of the very lowest and most degrading—in this the evidence of the clergy of all denominations, seems to agree. Something of the same kind I have myself observed in the South of England, and it is by no means an uncommon thing to find some, nay, I should say in many of that class, an aversion to their children being taught anything of a secular kind—as if secular instruction partook in some measure of the nature of a sin; this is no doubt, a state of gross ignorance greatly to be pitied, and which will in the end be corrected by the influence of a better educated class which is rising up among them. But the most singular and unaccountable part of it is, that this apparent knowledge of Scripture should have so little influence on their moral conduct, that it should never enter into their minds, or if it does, they do not regard it, that Scripture truths are intended as rules of life. Whether the sort of familiarity which they have with Scripture phrases, and the constant habit of interweaving them in their conversation can have led to this, I do not know, but such is the fact. A man who gravely tells you "I do the best I can to get an honest living," and perhaps quotes some text of Scripture in support of his views, at the same time knowing that the very principle upon which he acts towards those he employs, makes it almost impossible for them to do so cannot be said to make the proper application of his religious knowledge." *Dean Dawes in the Introduction to Suggestive Hints*, p. xxi.

From a very considerable experience of the religious instruction in National Schools in Ireland, I must affirm that it is my decided conviction that if the Scripture be used promiscuously in the School, as an ordinary School-book, it receives no more respect than Sullivan's Spelling Book, and it is likely to have a not much greater moral effect on the lives of the pupils. It has

often pained me very much to see the light and almost disrespectful manner in which, from excessive familiarity, the children seem disposed in these Schools to treat the Word of God. I have often observed that the children were in the greatest possible hurry to get done with the lesson, and they and the Teacher seemed to experience a considerable relief when the books were somehow got together, and perhaps hastily flung into the place provided for them.

This passage from *Dawes' Suggestive Hints* has frequently, on these occasions, occurred to my mind, and the question suggested itself whether the strange and unaccountable fact observed by the acute Dean did not arise from this circumstance, that in the Schools that existed before his day, the Bible was almost the only class book in the hands of the pupils. From the want of training for the work of imparting religious knowledge, so apparent in the case of most Irish National Teachers, and the great press of business at all times, especially in a large School, I must say that I believe the religious knowledge to be had in one of these Schools, does not go much farther than the Dean's *familiarity with Scripture phrases*. The moral perversity observed by the Dean in the English peasantry is just what may be expected from teaching of this kind. Some of it remains in the head, it rarely touches the heart, or influences the conduct. Nay, knowledge of this kind has a hardening effect on the conscience. Knowing this, and feeling its truth, I have often wished that in our public Schools the secular and religious elements were finally divorced, and that the religious teaching were done in the Sabbath School, or in the daily School by the clergymen themselves; They could give these lessons with a power and effect far beyond what any National Teacher could do. Theirs would be real lessons.

I know some clergymen who adopt this plan much to the relief of their hard-wrought Teachers, and I know their services are gratefully appreciated both by the parents and Teachers. An hour on some one day in the week is so set apart, and the clergyman's weekly visit is looked forward to with pleasure by the pupils. Among others, this plan is followed by the Rev. Mr.

There are two questions to be answered by every one examining this subject. First, is the secular Teacher the proper person to give religious instruction? And second, if given by him, is it likely to be efficient? The best educators answer *no* to both these questions. As I have said, there is not a proper division of labour in imposing this kind of work on the secular Teacher, when there is another Teacher specially trained, and fitted for doing it most effectively. From none does religious and moral teaching come with more effect than from the parent or clergymen. It is their duty to feed the lambs—to give to each his portion of spiritual food in due season. To delegate this work to any hireling, is not faithfully obeying the command of the Great Teacher. They should look to it that this work is theirs especially. They cannot thrust it from them without incurring a fearful responsibility.

Hoping in the interests of sound secular and religious teaching that the Churches may be able to see their duty in this respect,

I remain, Right Hon. Sir,

Ever truly yours,

JANUS.

New Year's Day, 1875.

LETTER IX.

TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE

SIR MICHAEL EDWARD HICKS-BEACH, BART., M.P.

CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND.

RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR,

I AM entirely agreed with Vere Foster, as to the necessity for raising the social status of the National Teacher, and with this, his influence and efficiency as an educator. I approve of the several modes in which he proposes to do this. A longer course of training is necessary, and a higher salary to keep him in the service when trained.* Pensions

Young, Rector of Ballibay, Co. Monaghan, in the School taught there by Mr. David Ranson; Mrs. French is the patron of the School. The same practice prevails in the Castleblaney (No. 2) National School, taught by Mr. Edward Gardiner. The School is managed by Mrs. Hope's agent, and she, as patron, takes a lively interest in the School. The Rev. Mr. Bradley attends on every Monday to give religious instruction. Mrs. M'Mahon, the patron and manager of the Crieve N. School, near Ballibay, does the same.

I would say to all Managers of National Schools, *Go thou, and do likewise.*

* If the Commissioners of Education had been wise in time, and raised the salaries when the Teachers were flying from the service in thousands, they would have had more trained Teachers to-day. As it is, without a large increase as fixed salary, to talk of increased facilities for training Teachers, in order to improve the education of the country, is very childish. When trained they would not remain in the service, with wages at

too, are required for a similar reason, and as some consolation for spending the best years of his life, in an irksome and unwholesome occupation. They would serve as a very strong inducement to remaining in the service, affording, as they would, some guarantee that the Teacher should not, after having served his country, end his days in the almshouse, or become the recipient of the cold charity of the world. That recent statistics have revealed the astounding fact that there are at present numbers of superannuated Teachers immured in the Irish Workhouses, is most disgraceful to our boasted nineteenth century civilization, and especially disgraceful to any system of *National Education*.* It supplies, indeed, a fitting comment on the administration of a system now verging on an existence of half a century. It is a fact to make the Education Board blush, if anything could. To think that this is the sorry result, as far as the Teacher is concerned, of a system that has cost so much—a system founded in the confident hope of regenerating Ireland, and inaugurating a new era in Irish history. This single fact, tells a miserable tale of what has been the destiny of the system—multiplied schools, extravagance and waste, decline of local aid, the sacrifice of the interests of the Teacher, the sacrifice of his freedom and independence, at the shrine of a sorry sectarianism. In time past we have heard the Board put forward the miserable excuse for not raising the salaries of the Teachers:—We can get as many of the sort of Teachers we want, as we require; nay, more. By every law of political economy, we are bound to keep the salaries as they are, or even lower them. We have a beautiful contrivance for training monitors, and converting them into Teachers. It is cheap, it is economical, it is admirable; so long as there are so many of these on hand, we cannot raise your salaries.† It would be sheer

home so high, even in menial occupations, and salaries twice as large in England and Scotland, and five times as large in the Colonies. Besides an increase in Training Schools means an increased supply of Teachers, and this, according to a well-known economic law, a diminished salary. This cause has kept salaries in England below what they should be. The English Teachers know and confess this. That State Grants for training Teachers would lead to an increased supply, there is no doubt. Lavish Grants to denominational Reformatory Schools have had the effect of multiplying to a wonderful extent the inmates of such Schools in Ireland. I need only refer to the article from the *Times* of Tuesday December 29th, 1874.

Those who, like Baron Emly, advocate the adoption of the English Normal School System in Ireland, are not the real friends of the Irish Teachers. If this plan has kept salaries low in England, what would it not do in Ireland, where already the return of the Commissioners to an old rule (an average attendance of 30 required for the continuance of the Grant) will throw 1,300 Teachers out of employment? These in the labour market, with those to be trained in the non-vested Training Schools of Mr. Keenan, will keep the Irish salaries low enough. The present Board, at least a few years ago, acted on the principle of not paying a higher salary so long as they could get the low-classed Teachers—such as it seemed they required—for less. The present Training School

and the Model Schools are quite equal to training all the Teachers required. If managers will not let the Teachers be trained, the Board should be firm, and immediately cause the Grants to be withdrawn. The erection of a good Board School immediately after, in the same locality, would produce a good effect.—*Appendix*, p. 58.

* Hear it, ye statesmen of the richest empire in the world: *one hundred and eleven* Irish National Teachers were inmates—paupers, in the Irish workhouses on the day the last Census was taken!—*Vide Census Reports for 1871*.

The system cannot surely be in a healthy state which thus turns off its superannuated Teachers to die within the cold walls of the Union Workhouse. From every county in Ireland almost four Teachers wearing the pauper's garb! What a moral lesson to the pupils of the National Schools to avoid the profession of Teacher. How it must tell on the future character of the Teachers in these Schools. No one will permanently become a Teacher who can do anything else. Thus the Schools will be taught by men who are making teaching a stepping-stone to something better, and by such incapables as cannot better themselves. What an encouraging prospect for the future of primary education in Ireland.

† *Vide Evidence of Mr. Charles Matthews, of Strabane, in his Examination before the Royal Commission. (1870) — Evidence, vol. iv., Q. 18,275-18,277.*

folly, and economic madness. But this reply was madness. It stung the poor Teachers to the quick. "Hope deferred maketh the heart sick." The heart of the Teachers had long been both sick and sore, waiting for British justice, patiently waiting to see a paternal Government honestly recognising the duty of paying a fair day's wages for a fair day's work, and so keeping up the status of its Teachers and the standard of Irish Education; but it was not to be. Official red-tapeism had other schemes to subserve—a shallow, hard, unfeeling political economy, reigned supreme. It suited the views of some who did not desire a high standard of education for the youth of Ireland. The die was cast. The last shred of hope fluttered to the winds. The hearts of many Teachers were broken. Thousands fled the service, for other occupations, and for foreign lands.—In one year, almost a thousand resigned. I was told by a well informed Inspector that at one period the per-centage of loss to the teaching staff, was greater than that of an army in the field. The Board at length saw its mistake; but the damage was already done. The Educational Proteus, who had recommended the cheap monitorial system, as by far the best for supplying the drain on the teaching staff—a system still pursued with unflagging zeal, under the auspices of Mr. Keenan, Resident Commissioner, and Mr. Sheridan, his Chief of Inspection—now began to point out the nakedness of the land. Model Schools and Training Schools together, it was shown, could not keep up the supply. Lest they might be able to do so, they had been dismantled of a part of their staff, and great opposition offered them by the Roman Catholic Hierarchy. The educational mountebanks directed attention to the training capabilities of the Convent and Monastic Schools. Here all was greenness—a very promised land—an unfailing source of supply for the future Schools of Ireland! This policy is still being vigorously pursued by the almost irresponsible officials under the Board—a Board professing unflinching fidelity in all its acts and utterances, to the mixed system.*

It is not very difficult to see that the policy I have portrayed, was one most cunningly conceived, and most plausibly, persistently and unscrupulously carried out, with the view of damaging the credit of Model Schools, and with them the mixed system, they were intended to strengthen, and illustrate. More recently, however, a change has been apparent. After the sitting of the Royal Commission, there was an evident eagerness to recommend an increase, and indeed a large increase for Results' Payments. The motive too, was apparent at the time. It would place the Convent Schools in a far more favourable pecuniary position; they could draw immensely larger Grants, and this has actually occurred.† At the same time, it was astutely foreseen, that the principle of classification and fixed class salaries

* The late resolution passed by the majority of the Board, and proposed by the Resident Commissioner, Mr. Keenan, is an apt illustration of how faithful the Board has latterly been to the mixed system. It begins with these words:—"While maintaining our own Training Schools at the highest possible degree of efficiency," &c.

Mr. Keenan must have well known that the plan he proposed of subsidising non-vested Training Schools, would be the death knell of the mixed system, and of the Marlborough Street Training Schools.

† Vide pp. 25, 26; notes, pp. 17 and 18.

would be endangered—might possibly in the end be given up. Then would come the grand opportunity of the Monastic Schools, rejected since 1855—though why the Government and the Board are able to see any difference in these two classes of virtually denominational Schools, except the distinction of the sexes of their Teachers, I never could understand. To all intents and purposes Nuns' Schools are just as denominational as Monks' Schools, and if the one class be admitted to the advantages of State support under a mixed system, I do not see why the other should be rejected. The distinction of the sex of the Teachers is, indeed, in this case, a very small distinction on which to base a great educational policy. The anomalies of the present system are really something wonderful.

Free residences, suitable Schoolhouses, and School gardens, local School Boards, and compulsory attendance, would, along with pensions, be very useful in raising the social position of the Teacher, improving his physical comfort, and scholastic efficiency, and binding him to the State by the strong ties of good will, and self interest—securing in fact, his entire loyalty to the Crown and Constitution—a thing so desirable in Ireland. But I need not say, very few, if any, of these desiderata are at all compatible with a denominational system, or its necessary corollary, the undue multiplication of Schools, which has been carried out in this country, by the present Board to an extent unprecedented in the annals of education, and ruinous to any sound system of education, ruinous to the Schools, ruinous to the Teachers, whose material interests are thereby injured and sacrificed—salary, fees, and results being diminished by the constantly diminishing attendance at the Schools.* The several causes already named, have contributed a share in disintegrating a system, which, had it been possible to carry out as its founder had intended, would have proved a great blessing to the country; and it must be confessed, that even as it has been administered, it has proved a blessing, but not because of the secret aims of these who have latterly directed and controlled it, but in spite of all their efforts to upset it, and bring in a purely denominational system in its stead.

That in as far as it has been honestly and faithfully carried out, it has done so much good in diminishing crime, diffusing the blessings of intelligence, peace, order, and prosperity over a country formerly distracted by ceaseless broils, even worse than now—that pauperism is on the decrease, that the people are better fed, housed, and clothed, more civilized, kind, and forbearing in all the relations of life, are reasons for rejoicing, and reasons why British Statesmen should stand fast by the principle of the mixed system. There can be no doubt, however, that the system has been hampered by the manner in which it has been administered,

* I had intended making some rather difficult statistical calculations in proof of the undue multiplication of Schools. A recent order of the Board has rendered this quite unnecessary. They now insist on an average attendance of 30 pupils in every School, or it will not be retained in connexion. This is an old rule long disused. The fact of undue multiplication is thus admitted. The increased attendance was not at all proportioned to the increase in the number

of Schools. An examination of the reports will prove this. Take the average increase in the attendance for three years, beginning with 1850; and divide by the average increase in the number of Schools for the same period; continue this down to the present, and the result will reveal numbers forming an irregular, descending arithmetical series. These numbers will give the proper average attendance to each newly established School.

the constant changes, generally for the worse, the increase in the number of the Board—the consequent diminished responsibility of its members; all these causes have tended to diminish the efficiency of the system. It has done well, but it might have done far better. Looking to the evil constitution of the Board, that, until recently, it had not done greater harm is cause for devout thankfulness.

But recent legislative changes in Ireland have made it necessary to alter this system, and place it on a sounder basis. The Irish Church Act has made the old system of Lord Derby an anomaly in Ireland. The only possible system is the secular. The Churches must take charge of the religious teaching of the young. It will be perfectly just, and amply sufficient, that abundant facilities should be afforded the clergymen of the several Churches for attending at the State Schools, and teaching religion and morality to the junior portion of their flocks. This is, indeed, all the State can fairly be expected to do now. It can, in Ireland, no longer permit its own Teachers to be employed in teaching religion. This alone would affix to the Schools a sectarian stigma—denominationalise them in fact.* Only in this way can the Government carry out to the full the principle already affirmed, that in Ireland religious teaching cannot be paid for by the State.

And, it is well that already there exists an example of this system in Ireland—the Queen's Colleges. There, Deans of Residence have charge of the religious teaching of the young men. The system works well. We have quite recently been told that this system of higher education must be maintained, extended, and strengthened. These are noble, manly words, having in them a genuine ring, and that impress of firmness and decision so much required in the government of Ireland. The words are pregnant with a glorious hope for the future of Irish education, portending, as they do, the dawn of a brighter and better day for our common country.

Mr. Gladstone's Government brought what was called in the political parlance of the time, three messages of peace to Ireland and Irishmen—the Ballot Act, the Irish Church Act, and the Irish Land Act. There yet remain in reserve three other messages of peace for Ireland, viz., an Act for regulating Irish Primary Education; another for extending and developing the system of Higher Education in the Queen's Colleges, and a third for establishing Intermediate Education, so as to connect and strengthen the two former. It will then be the glory of the present Administration to have settled at once and, I trust, for years, the great and vexed question of Irish Education in all its departments.† The whole work should be homogeneous throughout. The principles of the

* JANUS goes perhaps too far here. *Vide* note page 36. The Teachers might be permitted to assist the clergymen in hearing catechism, &c., but their relation to the latter should not be such that they could be compelled to undertake the work, on pain of dismissal. Thus the Churches, if they employed the National Teachers for teaching religion, would be obliged to pay them, which is but fair.—*Vide* also note, p. 40.

† Mr. Disraeli's Government seems, indeed, specially and providentially in power for this purpose. If it fail to address itself to this task it will lose prestige, and one of the grandest opportunities ever presented to any Government, for settling an important question, and carrying out Mr. Gladstone's policy of ruling Ireland according to Irish ideas.

higher education should be extended to the lower, and a strong and enduring union effected between the two. The higher posts in the Model Schools should, with a view to training up an efficient staff of classical Teachers, be opened up to graduates of the Queen's University. And, indeed, it might be desirable that, as in America, there should be a class formed in each of the Intermediate Schools or Colleges for the study of the art and theory of School-keeping. The formation of this Normal School for Teachers of a higher grade would, doubtless, necessitate the establishment of an additional Chair in each of the Colleges. Something of this kind it is necessary to have done in order to give to Ireland a sound system of Intermediate Schools.* Hoping that I have not extended this letter to too great length already, asking your kind forgiveness for having detained you so long, and wishing you a happy New Year,

I remain, Right Hon. Sir,

Most truly yours,

New Year's Day, 1875.

JANUS.

P.S.—I hope, as a sincere friend, and because you have promised to befriend the Teachers, that you may have a prosperous session, and, that to settle this whole question as I desire, your Government may remain long, and strong in office. I shall now, however, say, as was once said to another great man, "*Beware the Ides of March*," when you will likely hear from me again.

JANUS.

* "The Secretary of the Board of Education in Massachusetts, expresses (in his 28th Report, at page 63) a wish that the New York arrangement for forming classes in the science of teaching in certain selected Academies, were imitated in his own State. 'Such an arrangement with those Academies which are within convenient distances of those portions of the Commonwealth least favoured with public Schools of the higher grades, would do much towards meeting the constantly increasing and deeply felt want of Teachers of higher qualifications for the Common Schools, and towards elevating their character and condition.'" (*Schools' Inquiry Commissions*, 1866; Rev. J. Fraser's Report, p. 105.)

If the plan suggested in the text were adopted, I have no doubt many others besides candidate Teachers would avail themselves of these classes, e.g. Theological Students, many of whom may become Managers of Schools, and many Students in law, arts, medicine, some of whom may in time look forward to places on our School Boards. The association of these latter in the same class with those in training for the higher grades of elementary Schools, could not fail to be productive of some most important and beneficial results in the after life of all, not the least of which would be a deeper interest taken by all classes in Primary Education, and in the men actually engaged in the work of teaching.

In the course of his address in opening (Nov., 1874) the University of Edinburgh, Principal Sir Alexander Grant spoke on the subject of a Chair of Education. He observed—"The prospect of a new means of usefulness has lately been opened to us by the liberality of Dr. Bell's trustees, who

from the funds at their disposal have offered us the sum of £6,000 towards the endowment of a Chair of the Theory and Practice of Education. Such a chair will be a novelty in this country, though courses of lectures on what they call *Pedagogik* have long been given in the Universities of Germany. It will doubtless be a very useful thing to have all the views and theories of Education, from Plato to Pestalozzi, from the laws of Lycurgus to the last New Revised Code, brought together, and, as much as may be, reduced to scientific form by a professor of ability. Future schoolmasters, having had the advantage of going through such a course, and of being practically trained in the art of school-teaching by one who has made the subject his especial study, will commence their duties in a less empirical spirit than would otherwise be the case, they will know more clearly what they have to aim at, and will avoid many errors at the outset. Another point to be gained by the erection of Chairs of Education in the Universities of Scotland, will be the institution of a national instead of a denominational system of training for schoolmasters, which will correspond with the national system of elementary Schools lately adopted throughout the country. Proposals are now under consideration between the four Scottish Universities and the Education Department for the entire training of Queen's Scholars—that is, of the *élite* of the pupil Teachers—at the Universities instead of in the Normal Colleges. If this measure can be carried out, it will have the good effect of ensuring a broader and more liberal cultivation in science as well as in literature, for the Teachers of the public Schools of Scotland."

APPENDIX

TO THE

LETTERS OF JANUS.

REPLY OF THE COMMISSIONERS TO THE LETTER OF THE CHIEF SECRETARY.

From the Freeman's Journal of December 29th, 1874.

As we stated recently, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach communicated with the Commissioners of National Education, requesting to be informed with reference to their views upon each of the six following questions, viz.:—(1) The inadequacy of the remuneration of the National School Teachers; (2) the great disproportion which exists between the contribution of the State and of the localities towards the support of schools; (3) the want of a scheme of pensions for old and disabled teachers; (4) the want of suitable residences for teachers; (5) the irregularity in the attendance of pupils at Irish National Schools; (6) the vast numbers of untrained teachers employed in the National Schools.

In reply to the first question the Commissioners state that they have reviewed the salaries awarded by the Board to the National Teachers at the different periods of a change in the scale of payment since the institution of the National System, and drawn up an abstract of the salaries granted at each of these successful periods.* Excluding private tuitions, science and art payments, and other emoluments earned out of schoolhours, the Commissioners set out the incomes from all sources, at present derived by the principal National Teachers, thus:—† 92 first of first class teachers (male), receive class and good service salary, £61 6s. 1d.; results' fees, gratuities, &c., from the Board, £26 8s. 10d.; local contributions, £29 2s. 11d.; total, £116 17s. 10d. The second of first class teachers, 336 in number, receive under the different heads specified above, £44 5s. 8d., £20 14s. 11d., and £18 7s.; total income, £83 7s. 7d.. 1,263 second-class teachers receive £32 8s. 1d., £17 6s. 10d., and £12 7s. 5d.; making

* *Vide* Royal Commission Report (1870), Vol. I., part II., page 613, sec. III., par. 4; for 1838, page 617, sec. V., par. 6 and 7; for 1843, page 620; No. 7, paragraphs 6, 7, 8; for 1848, also 21. For 1850, p. 623, sec. 2, par. 1; also scale of payment to Convent Schools. For 1853, p. 632, sec. 2, par. 1. For 1855, p. 644, sec. VI., 1 par. 1, and for Convent Schools, p. 645, VI., 8 par. 1—5. For 1863, p. 653, sec. IV., par. 1—7, and for the famous *Sliding Scale*, par. 7, 8. For Convents and Monasteries, sec. VI., F. For gratuities and good service, page 662, sec. VII., A, 1—5, and B, 1—6; also C, D, E, F, G, and H, for various other gratuities, intended artificially to increase the staff of candidate Teachers, and keep the salaries low. For 1869, page 635, IV., par. 1, and for Convent Schools, p. 686, sec. VI., F.

N.B.—The various codes may be found in the *Board's Reports* for these years; and by comparing them it may be seen what *changes were made from time to time* (*vide* note, p. 22).

† These are the same figures as in the Nolan Returns, except that the Science and Art Class Fees are omitted, as well they might.—*Vide Rules and Regulations* of the Board, page 81, sec. XIV. It may be safely said this regulation has destroyed Science and Art Teaching in Ireland. These classes have in common with Dr. Tyndall, been denounced in recent pastorals. It is well to keep out heresy. *Vide* p. 54 for statement of Mr. Traynor, President of the N. T. Organization.

£62 2s. 4d. per annum. Third-class teachers, of whom there are 1,918, receive £24 15s. 6d., £11 11s. 8d., £7 6s. 3d.; total income, £43 13s. 5d. The average income of all classes of male teachers from all sources enumerated, is put at £55 14s. 5d.

Using the same items, the Commissioners set out the income of 59 first of first class (female), at £48 14s. 2d.; class and good service salary, £25 10s. 6d.; results' fees, gratuities, &c., from Board, £18 17s. 9d.; local contributions, &c., making a yearly total of £93 2s. 5d. Second of first, numbering 226 female teachers, receive under the three heads £35 7s. 5d., £19 15s. 8d., and £14 2s. 2d., making £69 5s. 3d. 829 second-class teachers receive £24 18s. 2d., £14 18s. 5d., and £8 4s. 3d.; total, £48 0s. 10d. 823 third-class, receive £21 2s. 5d., £10 19s., and £5 10s. 3d., making a yearly total of £37 11s. 8d. The general average income is fixed at £45 13s. 9d. *The Commissioners regard with satisfaction the result of their inquiry, so far as it exhibits the condition of the first-class teachers, who, however, they observe, are but a very small proportion of the whole body of teachers. They consider that the pay of this class ought "as a matter of justice and policy," be still further increased "to a moderate degree."** They are also of opinion that the remuneration of the second and third class is inadequate. To meet the case, the Commissioners recommend the renewal as a permanent arrangement of the provisional grant for results—viz., for 1875-76, £120,000; and they recommend in addition that a further grant of £120,000 should also be made to be applied to the same purpose, making the total of payments for results in 1875-76, £240,000.†

The average incomes of the different classes of principal teachers would then, it is estimated, be as follows:—93 first of first-class (male), £140 17s. 3d.; 336 second of first, £102 13s. 9d.; 1,263 second-class, £78 9s. 9d.; 1,918 third-class, £54 15s. 10d. Average income of all classes, £69 15s. 5d. The average income of the different female classes are set forth thus;—59 first of first, £116 12s. 8d.; 226 second of first, £87 7s. 3d.; 829 second-class, £62 2s. 10d.; 823 third-class, £48 2s. 7d. Average yearly income of all classes, £59 0s. 8d.

With respect to the great disproportion between the contributions of the State and of the localities towards the support of schools, the Commissioners say—"They see no mode of substantially increasing the amount of local contributions except by the levy of a rate." But upon the expediency of that course the Board do not think it their place to tender advice.

They are of opinion that a pension scheme might be advantageously established on some such basis as that of the Post Office system of annuities, and that the State should contribute some portion of the premium annually payable by the teachers.

The Commissioners renew their suggestions with reference to the provision of suitable residences for the teachers.

As to the question of irregular attendance, they observe the average daily attendance indicates a decided improvement in 1873 as compared with 1872, being 17,552 more in the former than in the latter year.

In reference to the query relating to the vast number of untrained teachers employed in the National Schools, the Commissioners express their opinion that the system at present in force in the Marlborough Training School might be advantageously modified, by permitting those admitted to the school to reside in

* In recent blue books it is recommended to reduce the salary of this class. The Commissioners' new scale reduces the salary of I² £6. The class I¹ is hedged about by impossible conditions. In the recent rise to the lower classes the class I² received no addition.—Vide pages 25 and 51, *Rules, &c.*, Oct. 1874. The Board has

now altered its mind; it will permit the salary of the 1st class to be raised "to a moderate degree" Bishop Dorrian of Belfast also desires "a moderate settlement" of the Teachers' claims. Vide note †, p. 13.

† Vide note, p. 17.

*private boarding-houses approved by the Board, and to receive a grant sufficient to defray the cost of living of the pupils so resident.** Of the different denominations of teachers under the Board, there are trained 2,640 Catholic teachers, 426 Established Church, 720 Presbyterians, and 56 "others," making a total of trained teachers of 3,842. Of untrained teachers there are 5,907 Catholics, 380 Established Church, 650 Presbyterians, 81 "others," making a total of untrained teachers of 6,118.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE NATIONAL TEACHERS' CONGRESS, (1874).

The following Resolutions were passed unanimously at the late Congress of Irish National Teachers, held on the 31st December, 1874:—

1—"That in view of an early settlement of the Irish National Teachers' claims, this meeting feels bound to declare that no arrangement can be regarded as satisfactory that does not secure a very substantial addition to the present fixed or class salaries, and that the lowest class salary should be £1 per week for third class, £1 10s. per week, for second class and £2 for first class Teachers."

2—"That no settlement of the Education Question can be considered satisfactory by the Teachers, which fails to make provision for them by pensions when obliged to resign through age or infirmity."

3—"That it is essential to the success of the National System of Education in Ireland that free residences or an equivalent should, in all cases, be provided for the Teachers."

RESOLUTIONS OF THE TEACHERS' CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE PASSED AT THEIR MEETING ON THE 19TH OF JANUARY, 1875.

Resolved—1. That this Committee believing it to be the intention of Government to improve the financial position of the National Teachers of Ireland during the ensuing session of Parliament, most respectfully urge, that in the distribution of the proposed Grant, the Class Salaries of the Teachers shall be first considered with a view to a substantial increase in those Salaries.

2—That no settlement of the Teachers' claims will be considered satisfactory which does not recommend a substantial augmentation of the Class Salaries.

3—That, taking into consideration the large proportion of National Schools examined for Results, which earned under £5, viz., 1,097 (see last Blue Book, 1872), and the still larger proportion, viz., 2,626 Schools, which earned over £5 and under £10; further, that these 3,723 Schools constitute more than one-half the number of Schools examined, viz., 6,724; this Committee is of opinion that the distribution of the new Grant on the results' principle, pure and simple, will effect no sensible improvement in the position of the Teachers in those 3,723 Schools, who are invariably the worst paid in other respects, and who, as a general rule, are in receipt of the smallest class salary, viz., £24 and £20 per annum.†

4—That the further development of the Results' System, whilst failing to improve the position of the great majority of the Teachers, will benefit in an undue proportion large town and city Schools, as, from the regular attendance of the pupils in these Schools, they will be certain to earn double results fees, and thus the intention of Parliament and Government in their desire to improve the position of the humbler class of Teachers will be completely frustrated.‡

* This is a retrograde step. It is simply the temporary practice of 1834. It was not this, Mr. Keenan carried at first; it was a motion for Non-Vested Training Schools.—*Vide* Notes, pp. 2, 45, 47, and 50.

† *Vide* pp. 19, 20, 21, and 23, and note, p. 17, 18, and 19.

‡ Among the other "large town and city Schools" the Convent Schools, from their enormously large attendance, will, especially with

5—That as an all-important reason why any new grant should be added to our class salaries instead of results, we beg to submit that the results system would surround the formation of a pension scheme with insuperable difficulties.

This, in the interests of education, would be a great misfortune, as no increase of salary or attempted settlement of the Teachers' claims can allay their discontent, while they are left unprovided for in old age.—*Irish Teachers' Journal*, 30th January, 1875.

FIXED SALARIES.

At the Deputation that waited on Sir Michael H. Beach, Chief Secretary for Ireland, at Dublin Castle, on Saturday the 16th of January, 1875, the President of the Teachers' Organization, Mr. Traynor, said—"From the Return called for by Captain Nolan last June, it appears our average salary is £56 10s., the average salary of our English brethren being £103, and of the Scotch £110. As £56 10s. is in excess of the average previously returned by us, I beg to direct your attention to some of the exceptions the Teachers take to this return—(1) It excludes the salaries of between 2000 and 3000 assistant classified Teachers, with an average salary of £30 each. (2) It includes fees earned under the Science and Art Department, which ought not be looked on as salary, as they are earned outside of School hours, and are very fluctuating and unfixed. For example, I earned in one year £52, in the succeeding year only £14, and in this year I shall earn nothing, consequent on a new regulation of the Department, which restricts the Science teaching to the highest class.* (3)—The results returned for '73 included in many instances the results for '72 and '73. The examinations for '72 being held late, some Teachers entered in their returns the amount for both years. But whether our average salary be £56 10s. or £42 1s. is immaterial, for it cannot be denied, that, considering the important and responsible duties we have to perform, we are as compared with other branches of the Civil Service, shamefully and miserably paid."†

Mr. Morrin, the Central Secretary, said—"With regard to the figures given in the *Freeman's Journal*, as the average salaries of the male and female principal Teachers, they are the same as those in Captain Nolan's return—except that the Science and Art fees are omitted, which is only just. The Teachers, however, make the average salary £42 per annum, by including the salaries of 2691 assistant Teachers who are all classed, 409 of these Teachers ranking as first and second class Teachers. But, taking Captain Nolan's return as it stands, the average salaries of the English and Scottish Teachers are double those of the Irish Teachers. A large proportion of the former must be in receipt of £200 and £300 per annum; indeed, one English Teacher has told me that he cleared over £400 per annum. The highest class salary of the Irish Teacher is £52, the lowest £24 and £20. Of the 9800 National Teachers in Ireland, but 121 are in receipt of £52, whilst no less than 5,890 are in receipt of smaller sums. It is these salaries the Teachers require to be increased and not the Results' Fees.

From the Commissioner's Report for 1872, the total number of Schools examined for Results' payments was 6,724 of which 1,097 earned under £5 of Results' Fees, and 2,626 more over £5, and under £10. An increase in the Results' Fees would benefit the larger Schools, but not in anything like the same degree the smaller ones."

Capitation Grants, draw heavy sums; and every penny drawn by these Schools will be just so much out of the pockets of the neighbouring lay Teachers. Mr. Sheridan, in his Evidence before the Royal Commission, confirmed the truth of a statement made in his Report of 1860, that

these Schools are very "impatient of competition."—*Vide* pp. 25, 26, 28, and notes, pp. 17 and 18.

* *Vide* note *, p. 51.

† *Vide* note *, page 17.

At the public Meeting in Dublin on the 31st of December, 1874, Mr. Ferguson said—"In the Third Report of the Commissioners of National Education, the state of Ireland is shown when the Board was instituted, and its staff of Teachers organized. They (the Commissioners) say—'We accepted our commission, that it might enable us to pour oil on the troubled waters of Ireland, and to allay those dreadful dissensions which divide and distract her people—to give a new stamp to the rising generation of the country, to bring children of all denominations together in feelings of charity and good will, to make them regard each other as subjects of the same king, not as belonging to rival sects, but as fellows in the same redemption.' Now this was the work the National Teachers had to do, and I had the honour to hear one of your Right Honourable predecessors state in this room, that they had done their work well. In their Second Report, the Commissioners state that 'competent persons must be induced to become Teachers by a fair prospect of remuneration and advancement. It is only through such persons that we can hope to render the National Schools successful in improving the general condition of the people. It is not, however, merely through the Schools committed to their charge, that the beneficial effects of their influence would be felt. Living in friendly habits with the people, not greatly elevated above them; but so provided for as to be able to maintain a respectable station, trained to good habits, identified in interest with the State, and therefore anxious to promote a spirit of obedience to lawful authority, we are confident that they would prove a body of the utmost value and importance in promoting civilization and peace.* We see here the position the Teacher was intended to occupy, and while it is acknowledged that he has performed *his* part, he complains that the State has not done *its* part to him in return. He was led to expect that he would be 'not greatly elevated above the people,' but in reality the vast majority of the Teachers are at the very bottom of the social scale. Payment by Results does not meet their case, for to those who need it most, least will be given. It will be seen from these reports that instruction of their classes is but a part of their work, yet everything else is completely ignored by the system of results.† To conclude that in those large Schools which receive the lion's share of the Results' Fees, the Teacher has done more work than is performed by the Teachers of smaller Schools, and hence deserves more, would be a fallacy drawn from false premises, for the Teacher of a School of less than 50 average attendance, has to do all himself; but when the average rises above that, assistants are allowed, so that the School, no matter how large it is, is in reality divided into a number of small Schools, or what is equivalent to it (Mr. Erskine supported this view very strongly). Nothing but a respectable increase to their fixed salaries would give satisfaction to the Teachers of Ireland. Then they had to complain that as regards those who had made teaching their life work, it did not make for them a life provision. The National Teachers of Ireland have successfully engaged in the work of National regeneration, and they find themselves after forty years as poor as when they first engaged in it. The complaint which they made to the House of Commons nearly 20 years ago, that, 'having spent their energies and their youth in the service of their country, there remained for them but the workhouse or starvation; is still urged, and they bitterly complain that their only alternative after a life of poverty, should be a speedy death, or a pauper's grave. If a respectable addition be made to their class salaries, they would not object to a deduction from them being made towards a superannuation fund, but otherwise they would object, for they could not afford it."

* *Vide notes* *, †, pp. 11 and 13.

† *Vide notes* pp 28 and 53. Results, though

good for Convent and Monastic Schools
wont satisfy the Teachers. That is plain

PENSIONS.

At the late Deputation Mr. Traynor, the President said,—“The only objection I have ever heard against pensions is that we are not the direct servants of the State, the managers having power to appoint and dismiss us. This argument, if used by the State, would be simply this, which I would look on as rather extraordinary. ‘We, the State, originally gave the managers power to appoint and dismiss you, and now because they have this power we cannot give you pensions.’ Again, the manager’s appointment is in reality the State’s, for we cannot be appointed without the State’s inspector certifying as to our fitness, and, again, when a manager dismisses us, it is merely from his own service, but not from the Board’s.”—*I. T. Journal*, 23rd Jan., 1875.

At the public meeting on the 31st of December, Mr. Ross of Mohill, Co. Leitrim, said,—“I have been a Teacher in the service of the Board now 19 years. I have taught in Ulster, Leinster, and Connaught. During all these years, and in all these provinces I have known very many Teachers. But you will scarcely think it strange when I tell you, I never knew a wealthy National Schoolmaster, but I have known and met many, who had the pinched looks of respectable poverty as clearly marked on their persons and countenances as if printed there; I have known about 14 who were reported unfitted for further work—all these, with one exception, received the Board’s retiring gratuity, and all afterwards, as this gratuity is spent, go down step by step till they are compelled to shelter themselves within the bleak walls of the union workhouse, if not supported by children or friends in their old age. Out of these 14 I’ll tell you of three—their history is the history of all the others when left unhelped. The first I’ll mention was a Teacher of a neighbouring School in Co. Leitrim, who, after about 20 years’ service in 1861, received the munificent sum of £17 as a retiring allowance from the Board. Compare that with the present pensions of the Royal Irish Constabulary—£50 per annum allowed a sub-constable. This poor man lived, or rather I should say starved, for two whole years on this miserable sum. At length his last shilling was spent, and he became an inmate of the Mohill Workhouse and died there, and now fills a pauper’s grave. The second case was a Teacher of superior qualifications, one of the old second of first-class men. But age and infirmity unfitted him for work. He was compelled to retire in 1863, and received £110. He had a wife and one child. He tried to eke out this sum by teaching, and for a time was Master of a School under the Church Education Society; but age again unfitted him for further active duties, and now he is saved from the workhouse only by receiving the alms of the congregation of which he was once an active and respectable member. One more case and I am done, it is one of a late date—1867 or ’68—a third class Teacher, but a respectable and upright man, was compelled to retire; he received £42. It is all long since gone. He is now trying to keep body and soul together by teaching a hedge School.* How he is living you can gather from this fact—that about two months ago, to prevent him from starving, some of his neighbours, nearly as poor as himself, applied for *out-door relief* for him from the relieving officer. This officer himself told me he was sorry he could not grant it, as the case was a bad one; but the Teacher would rather starve than personally ask or sign a paper asking for this relief. He is still living—still struggling on, assisted occasionally by former pupils and old friends; a picture of what we may all yet be if the Board and the Government turn a deaf ear to our humble petition.”

* Thus lowering the salaries of the neighbouring National Teachers, by withdrawing pupils

from their Schools, and so lowering attendance, School fees, Salary, and Results’ payments.

Mr. Ferguson, of County Kildare, said : “ Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen, it has been already referred to that 111 worn-out members of our body were inmates of the Workhouse. This hideous fact, which like a warning spectre fills the prospective of our future has been unveiled by the Census returns of '71, and with its skeleton finger grimly points to the consummation of the reward which a grateful country bestows on ‘the moulders of the Empire’s mind.’ But it may be said ‘that is some years ago, surely a reformed Parliament, the representatives of the people, will ere now have dealt more generously with the people’s instructors, and besides are not our own Board daily awarding gratuities to superannuated Teachers? This scandal must ere now have been removed.’ Such an expectation would be as natural, as it is unwarranted by facts. For Parliament has done nothing to remove it, and the Board’s gratuity is not always certain to be given, but when granted is woefully insufficient. It is only given when energy is gone, and death is thought to be immediate,—‘only when there is a total break down.’ It has been truly said that ‘it is only given to buy a coffin with.’ A Teacher who taught not far from where we stand, for 50 years, above 20 of these in the service of the Board, was forced to retire and received his retiring gratuity, but instead of dying when it was spent, as perhaps it may be expected he should have done, he lived on, and is now begging. This poor old man taught, and now lives in the courtly which is so worthily represented by our honoured chairman, who may consider him as one of his constituents, as he certainly is one of his clients. Another Teacher of my acquaintance was forced to retire, and received his gratuity, but neither did he seem to know when to die, and must have gone to the workhouse, but that he has a son in the service of the Board, who, in the spirit of manly independence and filial pity, acts up to the resolution, that his honoured parent shall share whatever he has, and thus, out of his son’s penury he has been kept from increasing the pauper roll of the 111. A third, having got through his gratuity, and not dying when he ought, is kept out of the workhouse by the generosity of his son-in-law, at the expense of sacrifice he can ill bear, that his wife may not be heart-broken, by the consciousness that she is the child of a pauper sire. A fourth who had tasted of his country’s generosity like the others, and who, like them, did not know when to die, although above 80 years of age, makes shift to support himself by working a day’s work in the fields. Let us look facts in the face ; as these men are, we must expect to be, and, as to those whom God has given us, their future may well fill us with despair. For, alas, our enforced poverty renders our making provision for the future impossible, ‘and yet we are expected to be humble-minded,’ ‘devoted and contented.’ ”

Mr. McGoey, of the County Longford, gave the details of two other most pitiable cases that came under his own observation :—“ The first retired after 23 years’ service, in ill health. He got the usual compensation, which lasted a few years ; his family scattered, his eldest son died. He then sought relief from his friends. His next step is into the Workhouse. The other, the case of a husband and wife who taught school not twenty miles from Longford. They both took ill at the same time, from cold received by living in a damp dwelling. After a few years, when the retiring allowance dwindled away, the poor wife, more sensitive than the husband, seeing no means left for the support of their helpless family, died of a broken heart. The husband and little family live, as best they may, upon eleemosynary aid ; but, of course, his next step is into the dreary walls of the Workhouse.”—*I. T. Journal*, 23rd Jan. 1875.

SALARY, RESULTS, TRAINING.

The following is an extract from the speech of Mr. Michael Hubbert of Kenmare, Co. Kerry :—“ A great deal has been said of late, even in high quarters, on the subject of training the teachers ; one says the teachers are not long

enough in training, another says the number trained is not sufficient for the wants of the country. A noble lord (Emly),* has said it would require 700 trained teachers annually, to supply the wants of the nation. Now I say out at once, that too much attention is wasted on the subject of training teachers for the profession, and too little bestowed on the best means to keep those teachers in it. Did it ever occur to Lord Emly, and those who think with him, to ask why is it necessary to increase the number of trained teachers to such an extent? Has he inquired what has become of the masters trained from year to year? Have they died out? If not where are they? I will tell him what has become of them, from the information given us by the Board's Reports, for the last two years, preceding the year just passed. According to the Report 440 Teachers left the profession in the year 1872, of whom 189 were trained. What became of these 189 trained masters? Did they die? Now it is admitted that the cost of training each master is £40 at least, which multiplied by 189, gives a loss to the public of £7,560 in that year alone. In the year 1873, 412 teachers left, a corresponding number of whom were trained.† The Report for this year is not yet issued, but taking the drain in the teachers to be the same as in each of the two previous years (though it will be found to be much more, as the inducements to leave are daily becoming more numerous), we have a loss to the public in those three years just passed, of £22,680. It certainly is a loss from the purpose for which it was originally intended. Now there is no use in mincing matters, I ask what has taken these men away? Simply to get adequate pay for their labour. What can be done to keep those trained men in the service of the public? Give them sufficient salary to enable them to remain. Why talk so much about training them, and so little about keeping them in it? It reminds me of a certain French doctor, who was consulted as to the best mode of recruiting a favourite horse, that had got broken down from over-work and over-training. Well, this sagacious man prescribed for the animal almost every restorative, but forgot the oats.‡ What is the salary then of the Irish teacher, that salary which drives the promising young men away, and on which the man must live who has trusted much too long to the generosity of his rulers. Well, the average salary of the Irish teacher is just £42 1s. 2d., as shown by Mr Meldon, in the debate of the 9th of June last. When the Irish teacher contrasts that with the average salary in England, which is £103, and in Scotland, £110, he naturally says to himself, the sooner he leaves the better. I will give one instance to show how trained teachers leave. I have the honour to represent one of the largest associations in the south of Ireland, and it is none the less active from being in Kerry. One of the teachers of this association (Kenmare), was called up to training: his name is Mr O'Connor; after his course he was respectably classed; I met him a short time after he arrived home; of course, I dare say, he was expected to carry out the instructions that were imparted to him at such expense to the public. He told of his success, 'and now,' said he, 'I will soon show how I can teach;' and so he did, for at the next Excise examination he took a high place, and left the Board's salary of £32, to get £60, with 2s. a day. Without increasing teachers' salaries, training them is only setting a premium on their leaving. Then, I believe, it is expected that from the monitors the ranks of the teachers will be recruited, but will they remain? Will the teachers conscientiously advise them to remain? They cannot. It is not two months since a monitor of mine left his salary of £17 a year, to get £60 a year, with 2s. a day. The times are gone by when a smart lad will be content to labour in a schoolroom for 5d. per day. I shall give one case to show this. Not long since, a young lad was monitor in the Kenmare National School,

* *Vide note, p. 45.*

† 159.

‡ *Vide notes, p. 23.*

when Summer vacation came on, what did the poor monitor do? He asked for work in unloading a ship, got 2s. 6d. per day for three weeks, and thus earned £2 5s. in the same time that his work as monitor would bring him 7s. 6d. Did that young man remain to accept the brilliant future held out to him? Will you believe it, Mr Chairman and gentlemen, that I know a young man now in the Excise, who was actually unable to get himself classed as a teacher at the annual examinations in Killarney (I could give his name, but, for obvious reasons I shall not do so). When young men of such acquirements can win a position, what will the smart man do? Will he remain a teacher until age, and a young family come on, and be actually processed for a debt of 8s. 6d.; which recently happened to a poor teacher in my locality, and to my own knowledge? A great deal has been said, from time to time, on this subject by very able advocates, but where is the really earnest effort made, after all, to improve our position? With your permission I shall read a short extract bearing intimately on this subject, from a speech of that great man, the late John Francis Maguire, in a debate in the House of Commons, on the 26th July, 1869. Mr Maguire said—‘The evil fruit of this miserable payment to the most important of your public servants—the teachers of the youth of a nation; those who are powerful for good, and could be potent for mischief, is manifold desertion, loss, inferior teaching, and deep-seated discontent. As a body, the National Teachers of Ireland, men and women, are entitled to the greatest admiration, for, notwithstanding their temptations—the temptations of poverty and discontent, they are the advocates of law and order, and the promoters of ideas of industry, progress, and public morality.’ What was the answer to that powerful appeal? The Government of the day spoke in the person of the Hon. C. Fortescue, now Lord Carlingford. Mr. Fortescue said—‘I am quite ready to admit that the Irish National School Teachers are unduly paid, considering the vast influence they have in their respective districts, and that they are generally men of considerable education, and literary attainments; considering too, the amount of good they can, and are doing, and have done, and also the amount of evil they could do, and, I am afraid in some instances they have done; considering, also, the enormous importance of the House taking every care that those men are contented with their position, and are ranked upon the side of what is best for the interests of the country, I most cordially admit with my hon. friend near me, and the hon. baronet opposite (Sir F. Heygate), that those National School Teachers are not placed in a position which they ought to occupy.’ Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, after such testimony, uttered five years ago, by such distinguished men, and notwithstanding that our Organization for the last seven years has, and must still continue to proclaim our grievances until they be redressed; and bearing in mind the generous advocacy of our cause during the last sessions by our distinguished friend Mr. Meldon, and those hon. gentlemen who assisted him, yet, I repeat, where is the earnest effort made to place us in that position where all honourable men would wish to see us? There has been an unnecessary anxiety of late, as regards what source the expected increase to the Teachers’ salary is to come from. But I can speak in the name of my Association, and I believe, in the name of the Teachers of Ireland, with, perhaps, a few remarkable exceptions, that we shall hail with satisfaction such an increase to our salaries, no matter from what source, as shall place us in such a position as the public opinion of Ireland feels we ought to occupy. It has been said:—‘Give me the making of the ballads of a country, and I care not who make its laws.’ This is a great truth, but ballads are no longer omnipotent. The Press and the School have driven them from the field, and of those two agencies that now act on society, the School is not inferior to the Press. I think, then, the foregoing may be thus rendered:—‘Give me the moulding of the minds of a country’s teachers,

and I care not who make its laws.' It is high time then, that those in power should turn their attention to this great truth ; and I fondly hope the day is not far distant, when we shall all assemble here, or elsewhere, not to proclaim as we are here to-day, our wretchedness and discontent ; but that the Teachers of Ireland will meet in their numbers, and bring their admitted talents and acquirements to further the cause of education among the Irish people (loud applause)."
I. T. Journal.

SALARIES, PENSIONS, RESIDENCES—SPEECH OF THE MEMBER FOR KILDARE.

Mr. Meldon, who, on rising, was received with cheers, expressed his thanks for the warm recognition that had been shown him, and mentioned the gratification it gave him to preside to-day. Referring to the present condition of the affairs of the teachers of Ireland, Mr. Meldon said, that when the motion in their favour was last session brought forward in the House of Commons, the Chief Secretary for Ireland expressed his regret at his then want of knowledge and experience of Irish questions. He could not plead want of knowledge now, because, since he came to this country he had shown himself active in finding out what were the true facts, and what was the true state of Irish affairs.—As regarded the teachers the whole facts of their case would be in the possession of the Chief Secretary, in the coming session of Parliament, and he must admit that their position was one which imperatively demanded remedying (hear). The Chief Secretary had, indeed, he understood, admitted the unsatisfactory state of the teachers' position, and the fact that their grievances required a remedy. In the coming session all the facts would be doubtless in the possession of the Government, and all the facts would be admitted from the outside (hear, hear). The Chief Secretary had been making inquiries on every side, and could not but observe that the grievances of which the National teachers complain, call aloud for redress (applause). These grievances were admitted because the Chief Secretary had gone to head-quarters—to the Commissioners themselves. He held in his hand what was the statement received from the Commissioners, and their suggestions for the amelioration of the condition of the teachers. It was admitted in that report that they were grossly underpaid, that there was an urgent demand for residences, and that they were entitled to pensions. Now, the report set out by stating what were the salaries of the teachers, which they could not take as being accurate, and he would in his place in Parliament show that their salaries, as set out in the report, had been—he would not say grossly—but very much overstated. The salaries as set out in the report, included large sums for results' fees, which should not have come within them. It included good service salaries, gratuities, &c., which were in existence before the system of results' fees, and were not now in existence, at least so far as the salaries were to be now calculated. These two items, of course, would make a very great difference. He took issue with the Commissioners, and stated that the salaries they named in their Report were not the salaries received by the teachers—those salaries so set out were for respective classes—£83 7s. 7d., £62 odd, and £43 odd. The remedy suggested was one which he said, should not be received by them. That was his own private opinion.—Payment by results had been put forward as a substitute for fixed salaries. He did not think the plan proposed was a fair way of meeting the question. The system he would suggest would be first and foremost to fix moderate and fair salaries, and then there might be payment for results (hear). The system of

* I think this able speech a fair reply to Baron Emly, Mr. Keenan, the Board, and the last query in the Chief Secretary's Letter to the Board.

Nothing could be better. It has been reprinted in several of the English Journals.

results was so hampered that a man was left in the hands of the parents of children, in respect of his remuneration. He would just go back and repeat what he had said that the Teachers' case was not properly stated in the official returns. He was now reading from the figures, by which it appeared that the Report of the Commissioners stated that 93 first class male Teachers received, including gratuities, &c., £116 7s. 10d. That was, he thought, an erroneous statement, because, in the first place, that statement took as its basis the return furnished last session to Parliament. That return included a large amount for Results' Fees, which did not properly come within the year at all. In the next place, that figure included good service salaries and other gratuities, which were in existence before the system of Results' Fees came into operation, and which did not now exist—at least as far as salaries were to be calculated. It was, therefore, an erroneous statement with regard to salary. The Report also stated that first class Teachers received as salaries £83 7s. 7d., that the second class Teachers received £62 2s. 4d., and that the third class Teachers received £43 13s. 5d.; and elements of error also equally applied to the statement of these sums as applied to the case he had first mentioned. Those were not the salaries which the Teachers were now receiving, but were much below them. The Commissioners had reported to the Chief Secretary that the salaries were insufficient, and they proposed a remedy, but that remedy was one which he thought, ought to be resisted by them in every legitimate and possible way (hear, hear, and cheers). That, at least, was his private opinion (cheers). The arguments which were put forward by the Commissioners in support of payment by results instead of fixed salaries, was not, in his opinion, a fair way of dealing with the Teachers, for many reasons. The Commissioners admitted that the salaries of the Teachers were too small, and approved payment by results. The system that he (Mr. Meldon) would suggest would be, first, to fix moderate salaries—such as they would be satisfied with—and then, in order to induce them to extra exertion he would give them by way of gratuity—payment by results. One of the consequences of sole payment by results was, that in the event of an epidemic by which a master's pupils would be lost either by death; or by being scattered over neighbouring Schools, the Teachers was left utterly unprovided for, as he would have no pupils to present for examination when the day arrived. Another result of the system was, that Teachers would try and kidnap children from other Schools, and bring them to their own.* It was clear then that the sole payment by results was most unsatisfactory. Exertion should, therefore, be made to show the Chief Secretary that payment altogether by results did not give them satisfaction, and that what they wanted was fair and moderate payment for their services. Even if the Government increased the remuneration to a double allowance by Results, it was an offer that they ought not to be satisfied with. What the Teachers really wanted was simply the means of subsistence—nothing more (cheers, and hear, hear). How were they to contribute towards the provision of annuities, unless they were well paid. If they were well paid the proposed system of annuities would work well. Therefore he thought the way in which the pensions were to be granted was perfectly impracticable (hear, hear). He would repeat what he had before stated—that they should not trouble themselves where the funds were to come from (loud cheers and hear, hear). He told them that in his opinion it was not serviceable for them to bother themselves with the consideration; and he would even go further and say that any person concerned in the present movement for removing the present grievances, under which the Teachers now laboured, would do positive harm to bring up this question and discuss it

* Thus diminishing *School Fees* almost the only form of *Local Aid* in Ireland.

(loud cheers). By so doing politics were at once introduced into the question. Many persons would gladly avail themselves of the grievances of the Teachers to put forward their own views on the subject. As far as he could he would keep the two questions perfectly distinct. This was a State system—they were servants of the State,* and the State was bound to see that they were paid (hear, and cheers). Once they introduced the question of who was to pay them, they made it a political question—they made it a question upon which their friends were divided; they made it a question upon which the entire House of Commons would be divided, and they would themselves throw the greatest difficulty possible in the way of obtaining a settlement of their claims (cheers). He thought they ought not to cease their Organization, but they ought to apply themselves to showing the Government that the system of Pensions, which they appeared now to entertain, was not a correct system, and that payment by Results would not be satisfactory. When the evils of which they now complained were remedied, then the system would require all the attention they could bestow upon it. He thought the amount of red-tapeism about the discharge of their duties was simply monstrous. Nothing but returns—returns—returns (loud cheers, and hear, hear). It did not exclusively apply to the Teachers, but to the entire department (hear, hear)—Convent Schools, Workhouse Schools, and their own Schools. If their Organization was kept up they would find, next session, members of Parliament, who formerly took no interest in their agitation, coming to their aid, rendering valuable assistance (cheers). Let them keep up their Organization and show a bright example of what they could do, how they could agitate, and how peacefully they could do it (applause). Their Organization had been an example to the entire country, and he had no doubt that when the matter came before Parliament during the next session, many members, who had hitherto known nothing about them, would be ready and willing to assist in removing the grievances under which the National Teachers laboured. In conclusion, Mr. Meldon said he believed that everything that had been done up to the present had been done by the Teachers themselves; they had themselves alone to thank, and he only hoped and trusted that they would ultimately succeed in obtaining what they wanted. He was strengthened in his expectation that justice would be done them, when he remembered the fact that in the House of Commons there had not been a dissentient voice on the question that grievances existed, and that they called for remedy" (cheers).†

VERE FOSTER'S LAST CIRCULAR LETTER.

From the Daily "Northern Whig" of February 12, 1875.

PAYMENT BY RESULTS AND WOMAN'S RIGHTS.

SIR,—In the agitation which is being carried on so vigorously by National Teachers against any further extension of the system of payment by Results, there is one important aspect of the question which appears to have been overlooked, namely, that *under no other system are female teachers likely to obtain their just rights of equality of treatment with male Teachers, when doing equally good work.* For instance, taking as examples the female Schools in the county with which I am specially connected, Louth, out of the twelve best Schools in the county, attended by boys only or girls only (assuming as best those Schools which earned the highest Results), ten are taught by female Teachers, and earned in 1873, according to the Board's 40th Report, just published, 6s. 6d.

* A proposition whose truth will, I doubt not, be made ere long another burning political question in Ireland.

† I absolve Home Rulers of this kind.

per pupil, the average number of pupils examined in each of those Schools being 45. If the National Board's proposal of increasing the Parliamentary Grant from £100,000 to £240,000 should be carried into effect, the payments to these Teachers, should they maintain their places in comparison with other Schools, would be £14 12s. on an average to each, but it is well known that, when it is a question of payment of salaries or wages to male and female *employes* of any description, the female *employes* usually come off second best, though frequently, as in the case of the Teachers above referred to, *producing far superior Results*.

I would therefore earnestly urge all *female teachers*, not only to hold on to the present system of payment by Results, but to petition manfully, and independently, if necessary, for its extension *in preference to any other mode of increase*.

I quite agree with the agitation of the male Teachers for increase of fixed salary over any other mode of increasing *their incomes* which may be in the province of the Government, and would favour a similar mode of increase for female Teachers, if assured that they would get their due share of increase; but I think, as I have often said, *that for the sake of the efficiency of the Schools, and therefore in the interests of the public, any increase of the Parliamentary Grant should be conditional on an increase of Local Contributions, in order not only to improve the condition of the at present ill-paid Teachers, but to secure also more lively local interest, supervision, and control.*

Having often on previous occasions stated in detail *the many serious objections which I entertain to the principles of the system of payment by Results, especially on account of its precariousness, from causes over which the Teacher can have no possible control, I am anxious to observe that I think the Teachers, by their strenuous objection and opposition to any form of increase except that which is most agreeable to themselves, are putting an unnecessary difficulty in the way of the National Board and the Government.* What I greatly fear is that Her Majesty's Government, seeing the almost universal opposition of the Teachers to the proposed extension of payment by Results—knowing the disinclination of Parliament to give any increased grant from the Imperial Treasury, except as a *quid pro quo*, either in the shape of *Results of Teaching* or in the shape of *increased Local Contributions*, such as are insisted on in England and Scotland, and foreseeing the hornet's nest which they would bring about their ears by any proposal of *Local Taxation*, which might be the occasion of an exasperated and interminable controversy between the respective advocates of national and denominational education—will adopt the middle course of proposing to Parliament an increased grant conditional on a corresponding increase of voluntary local contributions. As it is likely that in most cases such voluntary contributions will not be forthcoming, there may be no increased grant, and the question of increase may be shelved for two or three years more.

I wish very much that the Government would, in preference to any such course, at once firmly adopt the decision of proposing a comprehensive scheme of *Local Taxation*, for to this conclusion they must come at last; but inasmuch as the annual grant of £120,000, already distributed, has resulted in an average increase of £14 10s. to each School, and inasmuch as if the National Board's proposal of increasing the grant to £240,000 should be sanctioned by Parliament, there is not, I believe, any Teacher of a fairly efficient School, whether in town or country, throughout Ireland, with an average attendance of at least forty pupils, who would not, under ordinary circumstances, earn at least £30 from Results' Fees alone. I desire earnestly to suggest that it might be prudent for the Teachers (especially the female Teachers), even at this eleventh hour, to forward a united representation to Parliament to the effect that, however great may be their preference for an increase of fixed salary over any other form of increase, they will thankfully welcome a substantial increase in any other form which may be considered by Her Majesty's Government to be more proper or

more practicable. If an increase shall be obtained even in this less-preferred shape, *vested rights will have been secured, and a new point of departure for the Teacher's agitation.*—Yours, &c.,

Belfast, February 11, 1875.

VERE FOSTER.

VERE FOSTER'S LAST CIRCULAR LETTER.

While going to Press, the above letter from the pen of the Teachers' friend, Vere Foster, Esq., of Belfast, has just been received. It is here inserted for several reasons, and firstly, as an evidence of our impartiality; JANUS having opposed his views on the question of Convent Schools, as Editor of the Letters, I am anxious to let Mr. Foster say what he has to say for himself on the general question. Secondly, apart from the intrinsic merits of any opinion of his on this question, the letter is interesting, viewed in the light of his opinions formerly expressed in 1870, when he displayed a decided partiality for Convent Schools, and also as viewed in the light of the strictures made on those views in the Letters of JANUS. Thirdly, Mr. Foster being remarkably well-informed as to what is going on between the Board and the Government, his *pastorals* have very frequently accurately indicated their future policy. But whether this is due to his natural acuteness and logical ability, or to his reflecting the views of high officials, I have never yet been able to determine; I incline to the latter hypothesis for this reason, Mr. Foster is *not always logical*, indeed few men who desire to settle the Education Question on a basis satisfactory to Churches and Cabinets, can afford to be so. I need only refer to the statement of Mr. Forster, M.P., made during a debate on this very question in the House of Commons, we have seen that Mr. Foster, as a former member of the Education League, once professed himself favourable to the mixed system, but, he advocated at the same time *larger grants* to exclusively Catholic (denominational) Convent Schools, a policy which, as we have seen, is utterly destructive of the present mixed system. In the present case Payment by Results is denounced by him, but he is, for an extension of that principle, as good at least for female Teachers in the Co. Louth. Mr. Foster does not tell us how many of these super-excellent Schools are Convent Schools. One thing is certain, they are *purely unmixed* Schools, in this sense, that they are either purely male Schools, or purely female Schools. It is a great pity Mr. Foster had not told us how Schools attended by both boys and girls stood. I may tell Mr. Foster, I am not in favour of unmixed Schools, even of this kind. The sexes should, as in the American Common Schools, be educated together; neither do I believe in the efficiency of Schools conducted solely by female Teachers. If Vere Foster be right we should have none but female Teachers in all our Schools. Education is on the decline in all countries, whose primary Schools can command the services of female Teachers only. A tendency to this has been apparent in the Schools of the Irish *Do-nothing* Managers, and Mr. Foster's Co. Louth fact notwithstanding, I do not believe it possible for women-Teachers, as at present educated, to develop in our primary Schools, to their fullest extent the intellect, the heart, the manly independent spirit of the Irish people, however conducive their rule may be to dwarfing these, and other essential characteristics of people so ardently desiring Home Rule as the Irish—a people, however blindly, groping after self-government, and national independence. Women-Teachers may do very well for those who are to “knock under,” but never for a nation of manly men; they will not do for Ireland. Neither do I believe in the extension of any mode of payment so opposed to the life of the mixed system, and to the civil life, peace, and good government of Ireland, as Payment by Results has been proved to be, nor in common with the National Teachers of Ireland, have I the smallest shred of sympathy with the spirit of the women, who, on such very narrow grounds as those pointed out by Mr. Foster,

would "petition manfully, and, if need be, independently," against the mature and deliberately expressed views of their husbands, fathers, sons, and brothers, who are Teachers, and this, while they themselves, through their associations, were represented by the very men who came to this decision at the last *Annual Congress* in Dublin. I characterise this as an attempt, however unconscious, at sowing a-fresh discord and rebellion of the very worst type in the ranks of the Irish Teachers' Organization, and, I may say, I cannot sympathize with the views of the man who would urge on the female Teachers of Ireland the present imperative necessity of a proceeding so very questionable, and indeed so very unconstitutional. I have a greater belief in the honour, fidelity, and true [wo-] manliness of the daughters of Erin, than to believe them capable of doing anything of the kind. No doubt such a petition might, with perfect propriety, emanate from the Nun-Teachers in the Convent Schools, and who, from their peculiar position cannot be members of the Teachers' Organization; but it could never properly come from those male or female Teachers who are in the Organization, and if such a petition were got up, we must conclude that it emanates from those Teachers who are outside the associations—a thing altogether factitious, foreign to the profession, and of no weight whatever with statesmen.

It is too plainly evident from Mr. Foster's letter, that the honest, manly resolution of the associated Teachers to stand by "fixed salaries," and the "mixed system," has given dire offence to the minor gods of Tyrone House, in their attempt to urge on the greater gods of Downing Street, their peculiar views as to how the Irish Education Question may be settled, at least for the present. It is too bad that the gods of Tyrone House cannot any longer lead blindfold the men whose humble prayers they so scornfully rejected a few years ago; and again firmly, but blandly, in 1874,* the prayer for some reasonable addition to their fixed salaries. The Teachers, thanks to their *Journal*, their *Organization*, and their *English Deputations*, have won the ear of the House of Commons—of those who make and unmake the gods of Tyrone House. Having successfully addressed the higher powers, let them not go back to propitiate the favour of small, official red-tapeists, who, when they had it in their power to befriend them, scornfully refused to do so, and to whom are due all the petty vexatious annoyances to which, as a class, they have been for several years past incessantly subjected.

To fall back on the Local Contributions would not be a thing so very terrible after all; especially as Mr. Foster confesses that a few more years, at least, are certain to bring the Local Taxation he speaks of, and School-boards, as a necessary consequence. He overlooks the fact, that, the locality doing its duty—as, no doubt, when put to it, it would be compelled, in its own interest, to do—the Teacher would probably receive not merely double Results, but double School-fees. In a few exceptional cases, certain small, inefficient Schools would suffer, but the other Schools would be benefited in a corresponding degree. It would be really a righteous retribution that should compel Managers to do their duty to their Schools and Teachers by being obliged to increase the Local Aid. From this, really good Teachers have nothing to fear. Vere Foster's terrible alternative is not so terrible, after all. To sink principle for the sake of a little more money at present, might prove a short-sighted policy for the Teachers in the long run. The National Board has been pursuing this policy for many years. We see to what a pass their wisdom has brought us to day.

The argument from "vested interests," however useful in addressing Teachers, is none for statesmen. Nay, it is calculated to lead them to reject Results' Pay-

* As on the occasion of the recent Teachers' Deputation to the Resident Commissioner (30th December, 1874), when the bare mention of an

increase to fixed salaries was pooh-poohed by Mr. Keenan as preposterous.

ments, as a really very expensive mode of meeting the demands of Irish Educationists, except these "vested interests" should be treated as some other Teachers' vested interests have latterly been treated—by ignoring them altogether. (*Vide* Notes, pp. 18 and 24).

I do not at all sympathize with Mr. Foster in his desire to save either the Board or Her Majesty's Government from the "hornet's nest," by suggesting any half measures. On the contrary, Her Majesty's Government, having, through the present Education Board, encouraged the hornet to breed in the land; and the Board, having led it so far as the "hornet's nest" in its onward progress, I say there is nothing for it now but dismiss the Board, their treacherous guides, with many stripes, and demolish the hornets and their nest, regardless of any little unpleasant consequences at present. If they do not at once take this prudent and patriotic advice, I will venture on a prophecy, that, ere many years, these same ungrateful hornets will take them unawares, and demolish them, and all who shall attempt to travel in the same road of endless concession.*

* I need not say that during the last few years it has been strongly impressed on us by a certain section of the Irish National Press, that it is highly important to the political and social good of Ireland that Irish politicians, and more especially Irish Members of Parliament, should repudiate the doctrine of political allegiance and political gratitude to any section of English statesmen—in fact the present and future typical Irish patriot is to become a kind of political Ishmaelite, "a wild man whose hand is against every man, and every man's hand against him." It will be impossible, nay dangerous, for any English Cabinet or party to ally itself, even temporarily, with any party so void of all sound patriotic wisdom, and so destitute of faithful political allegiance. The old insane idea of "*Independent Opposition*," the dream of men like Lucas and Charles Gavan Duffy, the grisly phantom that led the Tenant Righters of those days to sure and certain defeat—the defeat of Sharman Crawford's Tenant Right Bill of 184? has again made its appearance, beckoning with bony fingers and luring on the Home Rule party to disgraceful and disastrous defeat. Irish History repeats itself, especially its follies. To mend matters, the High Priest or *sacred seer* of this insane party has had formally inscribed on its flag "*Denominational Education*," known by an abuse of language among the ecclesiastical euphemists of the party as "Freedom of Education" or "Free Education!" It is, it seems, desired by Mr. Butt—I suppose a sincerely religious man—in the interests of religion and morality. We are, among other Utopian schemes, to have a new University maintained at *immense cost*, whose buildings are to be erected either inside the railings of old Trinity, or, at least, somewhere near it! Expensive scheme, no doubt; financially ruinous, but eminently typical of what has been the past policy of the National Board—maintaining *two bad Schools* in every village and

town in Ireland, to do the work of *one good one*. What does *Separatism*, with all its fine schemes and theories, care for real Education? give it the *money*, give it power over the national purse, over the Teacher to appoint, create, control, and dismiss him; over the people to compel them to receive its special, one-sided, paltry pretext for an education; give the Church power to control the Civil Magistrate, and it is satisfied. Let it build up its Denominational Reformatory Schools, its enormous juvenile Bastilles in every corner of the land, and tax British citizens without giving them any control over the funds of these establishments, and all is well. It matters not about finance, social peace, civil allegiance, and good government. The future is far off. All is well.—*Vide Reformatory Schools* in note p. 45.

Note to Vere Foster's Letter.—That Vere Foster's Results average of £14 10s. is quite too high, is evident from this extract from the *Irish Teachers' Journal* of February 20th, 1875:—"Turning our attention to the County Louth we find the total amount earned in Results to be £1,141 4s. 2d; omitting £196 14s. 6d. paid to five Convent Schools, and dividing the remainder by 88, the total number of ordinary National Schools in operation during the year, we get £10 14s. 10d. as the average Results per School, and allowing the odd shillings and pence to go for paying sixteen assistants, each principal Teacher may be set down as getting £40 for his share." In the same way the writer in the *Journal*, by omitting Model and Convent Schools makes the average results to each School for Leinster, £11 5s 1d. Even that the estimate were correct, it would not do, as, supposing each School to earn for 1875-6, £30 Results, it would leave more than half a Third Class Teacher's salary *contingent*. It is now too plainly evident that, in making the calculation, the larger earnings of the five Convent Schools have been included.