

ADDRESS
TO
THE CLERGY
OF THE
DIOCESES OF DUBLIN AND GLANDALAGH, AND KILDARE
ON THE
RECENT CHANGES IN THE SYSTEM
OF
IRISH NATIONAL EDUCATION.

BY
RICHARD WHATELY, D.D.

ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN.

Τὸ γὰρ βραχὺ τοῦτο πᾶσαν ὁμῶν ἔχει τὴν βεβαίωσιν καὶ πείραν τῆς γνώμης· οἷς εἰ ξυγχωρήσετε, καὶ ἄλλο τι μείζον εὐθύς ἐπιταχθήσεσθε.

THUCYD. Hist. I., c. 140.

“For this small matter contains the very thing that is to put your resolution to the test; and if you give way to these demands, a still heavier burthen will presently be laid upon you.”

LONDON:
JOHN W. PARKER AND SON, WEST STRAND.

DUBLIN:
HODGES AND SMITH, GRAFTON STREET.

M DCCCLIII.

LONDON:
SAVILL AND EDWARDS, PRINTERS, CHANDOS STREET,
COVENT GARDEN.

ADDRESS TO THE CLERGY,

ETC.

MY REVEREND BRETHERN,

Although I have briefly noticed, in the Appendix to the Charge of this year, the disputes that have lately taken place relative to some books published by the Education Board, I have thought it advisable to lay before you a somewhat fuller explanation of the transactions which led to my removal from that Board.

So numerous, and so varied, and so gross are the misstatements and misconceptions that are now afloat on the subject, that I think you may fairly expect of me such explanation. But I shall deem it sufficient to lay before you, briefly, what is the true state of the case, without thinking it necessary to particularize the several falsehoods and misrepresentations that have been circulated,—for the most part anonymously,—as they will have been incidentally refuted by the true statement of facts. I will only remind you, that the resort to falsehoods may be taken as a presumption of a thoroughly weak cause, and of a consciousness of this on the part of the originators of them. Many others, however, have probably received, and helped

to propagate, misstatements, merely through rash credulity. But both have been undesignedly bestowing praise where censure was designed, and censuring those they meant to commend, when they reprobated the one party and applauded the other for doing exactly the opposite to what really was done by each respectively.

They have censured, for aiming at unwarrantable innovations, the very persons who have steadily resisted such innovations; and have commended for adhering firmly to the Established System of National Education, those who have been labouring to subvert it.

I, for my part, am far from the design to bring charges against others. I wish merely to explain the real state of things. I would not be understood to censure the consent given by others to what I cannot approve, or the opposition made by others to what I consider both expedient and just, except so far as *incidentally* is unavoidable in vindicating my own conduct.

If others consider as fair, justifiable, and right, the proceedings to which I am about to advert, I have only to express my unfeigned wonder, and my utter dissent, and my deep regret.

I should be sorry to give *unnecessary offence*, but it was indispensable for me to state my views in *joining* and in *quitting* the Board,—what view I took, and on what grounds, of proceedings which forced me to the last important step—a step, for which I should

have been deeply culpable, if not unavoidable, and called for by a sense of duty to the public.

When the Education Board was originally established, it was at first a matter of doubt whether anything more could be accomplished than simply to provide a joint education, purely secular, leaving all instruction in any way connected with religion to the care of the pastors of the several Denominations. And it was judged that even teaching the children of the poor to read and write, only securing them from seditious and positively immoral books, would be a great advance beyond the existing hedge-schools, in which the few children who did obtain the first rudiments of learning, received them, too often, blended with much that was absolutely corrupting.

But some of the Commissioners suggested, and the suggestion was adopted by the rest, and sanctioned by Government, that it would be possible to introduce into the united education, such portions of sacred history and of christian instruction as might involve no matter of controversy among Christians. *Complete* religious instruction, indeed, it was plain, *could not* be imparted in common to those of different persuasions. But it was suggested that, as there are some points on which all Christians are agreed, it would be desirable that in these the children should be instructed together, leaving a fuller religious instruction to be supplied to them separately, in conformity with the will of their parents.

Accordingly, a brief summary of Sacred History

was introduced into the 'READING BOOKS' provided by the Board. And, in addition to this, the *Scripture Lessons*, comprising a large portion both of the Old Testament and of the New Testament, were drawn up. It was thought best that the portions of Scripture selected (containing the chief part of the early historical books of the Old Testament, the Gospel of Luke, and the Book of Acts) should not be taken exclusively either from the Authorized Version of our Church, or from the Douay Version, but partly from each, where the one or the other seemed preferable; and partly varying from both where a new translation was called for. And to each Lesson were appended Questions which the Teacher was to ask the Children, and to which he was to confine himself. This we considered as highly important; because, on the one hand, if children are not examined at all as to the sense of what they have been reading, the words will often fail to make any impression on the understanding; and, on the other hand, it would evidently be very rash to leave the questioning of the learners entirely to the discretion of an ordinary schoolmaster or mistress; who might often, without any ill design, ask very ill-judged and improper questions.

That the *Scripture Lessons* are the most correct translation extant in our language, I have always found acknowledged by every competent scholar who was exempt from prejudice. And I was the more confirmed in this conviction by the objections urged against the translation by some persons of undoubted

learning, but whose unfavourable bias was but too manifest. For those objections were so palpably frivolous, that it was perfectly wonderful how any man of sense could seriously bring them forward. But they were the only ones that could be found.

I am speaking now of such persons as had read, or, at least, looked into, the books in question. Among the greater number who had not, many very grave objections were afloat, resting entirely on fabrications, which were swallowed with implicit credulity by persons who would not take the trouble (small as it would have been) of ascertaining what was the fact.

To take one instance out of many: it was publicly announced, and that repeatedly, in crowded assemblies, that a dispute had existed among the Commissioners, whether 'repent' or 'do penance' should be the rendering in a passage in the early part of Luke's Gospel; and that the result had been, the total omission of the whole passage. And this statement was received, day after day, with shouts of indignation, by hundreds of auditors, no one of whom ever thought of looking into the book itself, (which was to be bought for sixpence,) where they would have seen the passage translated just as it is in our own authorized version.

And I could give many other instances of the same unenquiring credulity, in reference both to these books, and to many other matters concerning the National Education System.

Subsequently, however, these *Scripture Lessons*

were so far approved by many of those who had originally denounced them as corrupt and mischievous, that they recommended that the use of them should be made indispensable. This, however, I, in common with the other Commissioners, always resisted. We did not think it right to enforce on any patron of a school the use of any book he might not approve. And with respect to these *Scripture Lessons*, and also to a book of *Sacred Poetry*, and *Lessons on the Truth of Christianity*, we did not allow any child, whose parents had a conscientious objection, to be compelled to attend the reading of them.

To all the three books just mentioned the sanction of the Board was given, they being drawn up with a careful avoidance of matters of controversy among Christians, and adapted to the capacity of children.

You are doubtless aware that all the books, either published or in any way sanctioned by the Board, had, and were always required to have, the *unanimous* approval of *all* the Commissioners. Copies of each were sent round to each individual Commissioner, and nothing was admitted that was objected to even by any *one* of them.

As for the books employed in the separate religious instruction of the children of different communions, with these, of course, the Board itself can have nothing to do; though they were subjected, to a certain extent, to the control of those Commissioners respectively who were members of each communion.

For this separate instruction no books—besides

the authorized Formularies of each church—were to be used without the consent of those Commissioners who belonged to that church. Between the books published by the Board itself, and others that are sanctioned by it, there is this, and only this, distinction—that the latter are merely *allowed* to be used by those who may prefer them, as being in the Commissioners' opinion unexceptionable, and suitable for united education; while the former are *recommended* as the *most* suitable. But the unanimous approval of the Board has always been required for both.

It was not deemed right to make the use of any book imperative. Each Manager of a school was allowed to use, and to obtain gratis, or at half-price, whatever books (sanctioned by the Board) he approved, and to omit the use of any of them he might not wish for.

In the central Model-school in Dublin, and in all the Model-schools, the Board itself being the Patron, *all* the Books published by the Board were, of course, used. For this was implied in the rule just above mentioned, that *every* Patron was to use as many of these books as he *approved*; and the Commissioners, of course, were understood to approve the books they themselves had published and recommended.

The system thus established has been going on for above twenty years, both in the Model-schools and in a considerable number of schools under Private Patrons. It was said, indeed, at first, and from time

to time, ever since, down to the present day, that the attempt to give any portion of religious instruction to Protestants or Roman-catholics jointly, must end in a total failure; that it is a thing quite impossible; that it was "one of the wildest schemes" (this is reported to have been said in Parliament during the present Session) "that ever entered into the mind of man;" that a "plan of united education must fail, and had notoriously failed," &c. And certainly there were not wanting most strenuous endeavours to prevent success. But notwithstanding all predictions, and all assertions, and all efforts, the impossibility was surmounted—the "wild scheme" was successfully realized—the system, whose failure was inevitable, was actually working; and though the opponents were unconvinced by facts, children were educated. And the system might have continued to exist now, and to make progress in its most beneficial form, had it been supported by a larger number of persons, such as would have firmly resisted any encroachments attempted by an ultra-montane party. As it was, the plan, though, in a majority of instances, rendered partially abortive through the efforts made to render it so, was completely successful in, I believe, *every* instance (and there were many hundred such) in which it was allowed a full and fair trial. In the central Model-school, in which there are usually about 1100 children (of whom about 80 per cent. are Roman-catholics)—children of all denominations received together such instruction as I have been describing. And it was

the same with the other Model-schools, and with hundreds of schools under Private Patrons, in which thousands of persons have been educated, and many of whom have since married, and had children, who are now attending the very schools in which their parents had been taught. These schools were as obstinate as those Planets which Galileo was compelled to acknowledge—"did not, and could not, possibly move;" and "yet"—as he whispered to a friend—"they do move."

The idea of having steam-carriages that should travel at the rate of as much as twelve miles an hour, was derided, when first suggested, as one of the wildest schemes that ever entered the mind of man. This is not, however, maintained still, now that we see them in motion every day. But, in the other case, political and theological party-feelings gave a stronger bias to men's minds.

I, for my part, can never repent having contributed to confer even an imperfect, but still an important benefit, on many thousands of my countrymen—even though, for inscrutable reasons, it should be decreed that the next generation is to be thrown back into darkness.

Unfortunately, in some of the lately-established District Model-schools, without any meeting of the Board, summoned specially to discuss and decide so important a matter,—without even the knowledge of many of the Commissioners,—some officers of the Board took upon them (at the first opening of these

schools) to exclude altogether some of the books published and recommended by the Board.* And to this manifestly irregular procedure may be traced, chiefly, if not entirely, the present deplorable state of things.

As soon as I discovered—which was in the autumn of last year—what an unwarrantable step had been taken, I applied to the Board for the redress of so manifest and gross a usurpation of our authority. But, unhappily, so great an encouragement had been afforded by the very occurrence of the irregularity, to the party secretly or openly adverse to the existing system, that, after so many delays and excuses, there seemed to be a disposition in the majority of the Commissioners, instead of rectifying the manifest wrong that had been done, rather to confirm and ratify it, and to follow it up by still further encroachments on the system.† And a suspicion was thus—not unreasonably—generated, that over and above any innovations that might be introduced by the Commissioners themselves, direct, other innovations also might, to an indefinite extent, be introduced *without* any authority from them, and might afterwards, instead of being checked, receive their sanction.

Resolutions were proposed, and some of them carried, of a character palpably at variance with the system hitherto in operation; as, for instance, that in

* See Appendix.

† See Appendix.

each District Model-school it should be a question to be decided by the Board which of the Books sanctioned by the Board should be used or excluded; (and yet each was to be called a MODEL-school!) that every teacher should use or refuse to use these books, according to his own choice, and in either case should still retain his situation; (which is as if every officer in the army should be allowed to refuse serving in a place he objected to, yet to insist on *retaining his commission*;) that one of the rules should be interpreted in a sense which the words will bear, but which is utterly at variance, not only with reason and with the known intention of the framers, but also with the sense in which it had always been explained, and always acted on;* and that thus the objection of any one child to a certain book should debar all the rest from the use of it;† and finally, it was proposed to *prohibit altogether* three of the books published by the

* See Appendix, Correspondence with Mr. Tottenham.

† The words "separate religious instruction," in the 8th Rule, may be understood (taking the words by themselves) either of the "separate instruction of *different persuasions*," or of "instruction separate from that secular instruction which *all* children are *obliged* to attend." This latter—which is the interpretation that had always been acted on—is indisputably the one designed; because the rule relates to books sanctioned by the whole Board, which never had, or could have, anything to do with books to be used in the separate instruction of children of the several religious persuasions. And the framers of the rule never had their minds crossed by the thought of anything so absurd as the exclusion of a number of children from the reading of what their parents approved by the objection of others.

Board, the *Scripture-Lessons*, the *Sacred Poetry* and the *Lessons on the Truth of Christianity*.

Subsequently, this prohibition was for the present limited to one of the books, and the one fixed on was the last of the three.* It was probably thought—and not erroneously—that, when once the *principle* was established, that the Commissioners might fairly and equitably prohibit any books sanctioned by them, no one could wonder or complain at its being afterwards applied to an indefinite extent. And perhaps it was thought that some people, in England at least, would be so simple as to think that the exclusion of *one* book could be no very formidable change; that this would satisfy all parties, and that nothing further would be attempted.†

I, however, (besides that I knew that much more was actually designed,) perceived—as I think any man of common sense must—that there could no longer be

* The reason for this selection we can only conjecture; certainly it could not have been the one which some have assigned, its being “an essentially Protestant book.” For though drawn up by Protestants—Dr. Carlile, the late Bishop Dickinson, and myself—it is, as far as regards the present question, not at all less the work of Archbishop Murray than ours. For he, as well as the rest of the Commissioners, deliberately recommended it. He perused it with scrupulous care; and he sent over a copy to the late Pope, who had it read to him in Italian, and found it unexceptionable. The other edition of the book—that not published but merely sanctioned by the Board—was translated into Italian by a Roman-catholic priest at Florence, during the present Pope’s reign.

† See Motto.

any *security* against any amount of innovations; that those who had broken faith with the public could never enjoy or deserve any further public confidence; and that I could not, consistently with principles of honour, consent to be a party to proceedings which amounted to an abandonment of all fixed principles, and to a consequent subversion of the existing system, and a misapplication of a parliamentary grant.

All those—so-called modifications—of the system, amounting, in my view, to a virtual abandonment of it, which were formerly called for by some Protestants, I always resisted, though perfectly aware of the obloquy I should incur by so doing. But I acted as I did, not from a desire to gain the favour of this or that party, but on principle,* and to that principle I shall ever adhere, though well knowing that even-handed justice is a virtue, for which it is, for a time, more difficult to obtain pardon, than for most faults. He who opposes the unreasonable demands of *both* parties, must expect to incur censure from each alternately.

I was therefore compelled to consider myself dismissed, the office I had held being virtually abolished.

* A writer in some periodical which I saw lately, brings forward the vehement and successful efforts of the most bigoted Roman-catholics against the system, as a proof that it had been originally framed so as to give—and on purpose to give—an undue predominance to Roman-catholics! One would think that any one answering to the usual definition of man, as a “rational animal,” would have drawn the opposite conclusion.

But is there no conceivable case, it may be asked, which would justify the Commissioners in expunging from their list any book once sanctioned by them? Certainly, I can imagine such a case. If it had so happened (which is next to a moral impossibility) that the Commissioners had published some book of *Science* or *History*, which was afterwards found to contain much that was erroneous, and much that was obscure, they would be authorized to withdraw it, and to *substitute another* that should better fulfil the design of the former one. For instance, I have seen a book of geography, designed for the use of schools, in which the writer speaks of the Province of Ulster as the only portion of Ireland in which the English language is in common use. A book that should abound in such errors, or that should teach some exploded doctrines of Astronomy, for instance, or Chemistry, or any other science, ought certainly to be suppressed, and *superseded by a correct one on the same subject*. But this is manifestly quite a different thing from excluding altogether one *whole branch of study*, on which books had been carefully provided and unanimously recommended by the Commissioners.

But some Roman-catholics (it has been urged) have a conscientious objection to certain books. This is a sufficient reason why these persons should not be compelled to use them; nor is any so compelled, nor had I ever such a wish: but this is no reason why the use of them should be prohibited to others who do *not* feel the objection. And that there *are* such

others, is implied by the very prohibition; which would be quite *superfluous* if the objection were universal.

But you should remember that this objection is nothing *new*, and therefore cannot, with any fairness, be brought forward to justify any new procedure.

There were (besides many Protestants) Roman-catholics of as high dignity as Archbishop Murray, who decried the books in question from the very first. What, in such a case, was Government to do? To conform to all the various opinions of the different members of the same Church would have been impossible. To have allowed the most unreasonable and intolerant to dictate to the rest, would have been as unwise as unmanly. The then Government, therefore, selected persons who might be considered fair representatives of each communion, and left them to frame a system of education that should be *offered* to all, but *forced* on none.

By the "complete control over the books" to be used that was given to the Commissioners, every one always understood that no books were to be used (in united education) that were *not* sanctioned by them; but certainly not that the books they did sanction were liable at any time to be withdrawn and prohibited. It is vain to urge that the Commissioners, when first appointed, were not bound to sanction such and such particular books. The question that came before Parliament, when each successive grant was moved for, was, not what the system *might* con-

ceivably have been, but what it actually was. This is plainly proved by all the debates—and they have been numerous—that have ever taken place on the subject.

In the debate, lately, on a motion of Lord Clancarty, and in every debate on the motion for a grant for the schools, and on many other occasions, reference has been made (both by advocates and opponents) to the *list of books* sanctioned by the Board. Never did any opponent come forward to say, "This is all delusion: we are wasting time in discussing the merits of these books, since some of them may probably be struck off the list next week, and some more the week after. The list of books is merely a *bait* to allure the over-trustful into placing schools under the Board; and as soon as the deception has succeeded, the books which had chiefly aided in it will be prohibited."

A man of honour, I need not, I trust, explain to you, considers himself bound to fulfil the expectations which he has knowingly and designedly raised and kept up, no less than if he were compelled under legal penalties. And an understood promise there certainly was, that the books sanctioned by the Board would be permanently permitted to be used; else, it is manifest, all the invitations given—and often accepted—to patrons to place schools under the Board, on that understanding, would have been a mere deception: and all the appeals to the books as characterizing the system, by every successive ministry

(including the present), and by the members of every successive parliament, in the debates on the subject, including some in this very session—all this would have been utterly nugatory and absurd.

The books, therefore, published as sanctioned by the Board, were always, it is evident, considered both by advocates and opponents as a part of the system.

That system no one was compelled to favour and support. If, however, any one on being offered the appointment of Commissioner, found that any of the books, or of the other parts of the system, were what he could not approve, he had only to decline the appointment; or at least to announce to Government *at once* that he could not accept it except on condition of such and such alterations.

No one was obliged to be a Commissioner. We all accepted the office with our eyes open; and I must ever maintain that we were appointed for the purpose of carrying on the existing system, and not of subverting it.

I was convinced, therefore, that to make myself at all a party to such proceedings, would be to forfeit all hope of public confidence, and all just claim to it. And I was obliged, therefore, to decline remaining a Commissioner even for a time, and waiting till Ministers should have had time to deliberate, and come to a final *decision*, because, during the interval, the evil was in actual operation; faith with the public was violated, and a parliamentary grant misapplied.

It is not unlikely that I shall be represented by

some persons of each of the two most opposite parties as having changed my mind respecting the system of the National Schools,—as no longer approving it, and as having thereupon abandoned it. This is not only untrue, but is the very reverse of the truth. I not only approve the system as decidedly as ever, and am as ready as ever to carry it on, but it is precisely *because* I will *not* be a party to its subversion that I have ceased to be a Commissioner. But there is nothing so notoriously false or absurd that may not gain credence if maintained, in common, by persons the most adverse to each other.

And both parties will, perhaps, rejoice at the overthrow — for the present at least — of a system which has flourished for so many years, in spite of such powerful opposition. Which of the two has the better *cause* for rejoicing,—which will have (according to the French proverb) “the last laugh,”*—remains to be proved.

The grounds on which I have acted I have thought it right, my reverend brethren, to lay before you. And I have subjoined, in an Appendix, such documents as may be needed for further explanation.

But I declined going over to England (as some had suggested) and volunteering a vindication of myself in Parliament, where no charges had been brought against me. If any other member of either House thinks that faith has been broken with Par-

* *Rit bien qui rit le dernier.*

liament, and with the country, he can most suitably bring the matter forward for discussion. And if, on the contrary, no one of them is of this opinion, my coming forward might naturally be imputed to factious motives, or to feelings of personal resentment.

It is my earnest wish and prayer that the final decision of the Ministry, and of the Legislature, may be in accordance with the principles of honour, and such as will conduce to the permanent benefit of the nation. Should such be the event, I shall rejoice, not for my own sake, but for my country's. And should the result be unhappily the reverse, it is for my country, and not for myself, I should grieve. But it will, at any rate, be a consolation to me to reflect that I shall have had no share in bringing about such a result. The few remaining years which, at the very utmost, are all that I can expect in this world, will not have been embittered by self-reproach, for having at the last sacrificed the principles I have acted on all my life to views of temporary and falsely-called expediency.

and with the country he can most suitably
 be put forward for discussion. And if on
 the one hand no one of them is of this opinion, my
 coming and might naturally be imputed to fac-
 tions and to feelings of personal resentment.
 It is in such a case and I pray that the final
 decision of the Ministry, and of the Legislature, may
 be in accordance with the principles of honour, and
 such as will contribute to the permanent benefit of the
 nation. Should the event, I shall rejoice
 not for my own sake, but for my country's. And
 should the result be otherwise, the reverse it is for
 my country, and not for myself I should grieve.
 For it will be my duty, in consultation to me to
 reflect that I shall have no share in bringing
 about such a result. The few remaining years which
 at the very utmost are all that I expect in this
 world will not have been employed by the reproach
 of having at the last sacrificed the principles I have
 acted on all my life to views of temporary and false-

Houses of the Oireachtas

APPENDIX.

(A.)

Copy of Letter from N. L. Tottenham, Esq., relative to the right of Patrons of National Schools to enforce the reading of the Scripture Extracts and Book of Sacred Poetry.

Glenfarn Hall, Enniskillen, 27th August, 1840.

GENTLEMEN,—

In the two National Schools of Loughries and Kiltyclogher, established on my estate, the Roman-catholic priest has desired the teachers not to allow your *Scripture Extracts* or *Sacred Poetry* to be read. This has not met my approval, as I wish to insist on both being read. I wish, therefore, to know from you how I am to act, as I would wish to enforce the reading of both, and to exclude any children from the School who will not read the books authorized by your Board, as you are as well aware as me that a mere secular education, without attending to the moral one also, is worse than none at all. Requesting your answer,

I have the honour to remain,

Your obedient servant,

(Signed) N. L. TOTTENHAM.

To the Secretary, Board of Education.

Copy of Reply from the Secretaries to the Board of National Education, to the foregoing Letter from Mr. Tottenham.

Education Office, 7th September, 1840.

SIR,—

We have laid before the Commissioners of Education your letter of the 27th ultimo, respecting the use of the *Scripture Extracts* and *Sacred Poetry* in the National Schools on your estate.

In reply, we are directed to state, that the Commissioners do not insist on having the *Scripture Extracts* or *Sacred Poetry* read by any children whose parents or guardians object to them; nor can they sanction any compulsion for the purpose. But the patrons of any School, who think proper, may have them read on the opening, or immediately before the closing of the School, provided no children shall be required then to attend against the will of their parents or guardians.

We have the honour to be, Sir,

Your very obedient servants,

(Signed)

M. CROSS,

H. DOWDALL,

Joint Secretaries.

N. L. Tottenham, Esq., Glenfarn Hall, Enniskillen.

(B.)

MEMORANDUM, No. 1.

1st July, 1852.

Visited Clonmel Model-school. * * * * * I find that *all* the books published by the Board are not used—the *Scripture Extracts* and the *Lessons on the Truth of Christianity* being excluded. It appears to me *most important* that, in *all* the Schools of which *we* are the Patrons—viz., the Model-schools, *all* our books should be read. The inference naturally to be drawn from this not being done is, either that we are *insincere* in *recommending* books which we prove, by our conduct, we do *not* think well of, or else that we suffer this or that person to usurp our power and dictate to us. I have no doubt we shall hear of this, and very unpleasantly. *We never compel* any Patron to use a book he does not like, or to abstain from the use of any, sanctioned by us, which he does like; and we should exercise the same right where *we* are Patrons.

(Signed)

RD. DUBLIN.

MEMORANDUM, No. 2.

As the Archbishop will be prevented attending the next Board, he has thought it best to send a Memorandum of all he would have to say as to the question of books to be used at the Model-schools.

Memorandum.

It occurred to me, that, if questioned, as we are likely to be before long, as to the books used in the Model-schools, we should not be able to give satisfactory answers on some points.

No one has ever shown himself more ready than I have to brave *undeserved* censure. But I doubt whether, in this case, we could show that it *is* undeserved.

I would premise,—in order to avoid being led into irrelevant discussions as to the merits of this or that particular book,—that the objection I am looking to, is to the omission of *any* of our books at *any* Model-school. If, therefore, there should be some Model-school which uses the books omitted at Clonmel, but omits *some others*, the objection would be the same.

We may be asked whether we are *insincere* in *recommending* certain of our books which we ourselves exclude from schools of which we are the Patrons?

Or, whether we suffer persons to *assume authority* over us to which they have no right?

And, moreover, we may be asked to show the *Minutes* of the *Board* at which it was resolved to exclude certain books. And we may be asked whether we deemed the question quite *unimportant*; since it was never submitted to the *Board* at all? And why, on the contrary, it was not discussed at a *special* and *full* meeting?

[My own impression is, that those who settled this matter,—in the way, doubtless, which they fully believed to be best,—quite *overlooked* the circumstance that there were important questions involved, and looked on the matter as quite one of detail; just as if it had been any ordinary school.]

(1.) If we should allege that the employment of all our books in our Model-schools might raise a suspicion that the same rule might be extended to *all* schools under the Board, the answer might be:

Such a suspicion, if ever it did arise (which is most improbable), might easily be shown to be utterly groundless and unreasonable, the two cases being not only unlike, but perfectly *contrasted*. For, it is well known that there are hundreds of schools connected with the Board, whose patrons, for various reasons, dislike certain of our books; and yet (without any inconsistency) they place their schools under it, precisely **BECAUSE** they are left a free choice, and because among the other books—those which they *do* approve—they find enough to meet their wants.

Now it would be monstrous to turn round on these persons, and say, “You shall be deprived of the liberty hitherto enjoyed, because *we* choose to enjoy the like! Because *we* use such books as we *approve*, in the schools of which we are patrons, *therefore* you shall be compelled to use what you do *not* approve!”

(2.) If we should observe that some Patrons abstain from introducing into their schools books which they do themselves approve, because these schools are situated in places where all the inhabitants are under the control of some persons,—a squire, or a priest, &c.,—who have set them against certain books, and because it would be vain to appoint, for instance, a certain hour for the reading of the *Scripture Extracts* by all who *did not object*, when it was known that *all would object*.

Answer.—The Model-schools were purposely fixed in localities where there was a prospect of exhibiting a specimen of united education.

(3.) If we should say that a *majority* of the parents, at Clonmel for instance, disapprove of such and such books.

Answer.—A good reason why *their* children should not be compelled to use them; but none, why they should act the dog in the manger, and seek to *preclude* others whose parents

might be even desirous of having these books read by their children. For by that rule they might seek to prevent others from doing anything at all which they did not choose to do themselves.

We might perhaps be asked, under this head, whether all those who object to these books have had it *explained* to them that they are books deliberately sanctioned and recommended by the *unanimous* voice of *high authorities* in *all the several religious communions*?

If we could answer in the affirmative, and show that they nevertheless do not approve these books, the reply would be, "Then let them enjoy their own liberty, only let them not deprive others of theirs."

(4.) "But some of the *Teachers* may perhaps dislike these books."

Answer.—Are the Teachers your servants? or, are you theirs?

If they are to have a *veto* on the books to be used, (and by parity of reasoning, on every part of the system,) you are, in fact, making *them* the Commissioners. And how can you presume to delegate to persons not at all *responsible* except to *yourselves*, a most important office, entrusted to *you*, and for which you are responsible to the Lord Lieutenant.

If you are Commissioners in reality, and not merely in name, it is for you to determine what course shall be pursued in the schools of which you are the patrons, and to find fit persons to carry out your plans, and dismiss any who may be unable or unwilling to do so.

Every other patron of a National School does so. He does not first appoint teachers, and then suffer them to dictate to him how the school shall be conducted; but he lays down the plan (conformable to the requisitions of the Board) which he thinks best, and then appoints teachers to execute his directions; even as a farmer does not allow his labourers to prescribe to him what fields shall be ploughed, and what crops cultivated, but hires men to do the work which he has marked out for them.

I don't recollect having heard of anything else that could be urged in opposition to my views. And I would wish it to be considered calmly, whether the objections, which I have stated as fairly as possible, are such as would be likely to be thought satisfactory by those who may have to examine us.

MEMORANDUM, No. 3.

Relative to the Reports of the Inspectors respecting the Books excluded from certain Model-schools.

How far the objections alleged to be felt by many parents to the reading of certain books may have been produced or fostered by any of the Inspectors themselves must be matter of conjecture. But this, at least, is certain; that such objections only show that the reading of those books should not be made *imperative* on *all* the children. It would be most unjust for any one to require that because *he* does wish his own children to read this or that book, therefore, his neighbour's children should not be allowed to read it when the parents do approve of it.

I have no doubt that, to make such a CONCESSION as this, would lead to objections being raised to some of our *Reading-books*; and if we were to alter or withdraw *these*, fresh objections would be started against *others*; and so on, till we had quite spoilt books which have been so justly valued wherever the English language is spoken, and so widely circulated. And, after all, we should probably have fresh and fresh encroachments attempted, and double complaints made, if we did not give way to them.

The simple, straightforward, consistent, and firm course, is the one which saves trouble in the long run.

I observe that the "Priest of the Parish" is often spoken of, or alluded to, as issuing orders to the Schoolmasters, negotiating with the Inspectors, &c.

All our Masters and Inspectors should be reminded, when there is occasion, that no clergyman of any denomination is

recognised by the Board as *authorized* to *give directions* as to what any child shall read, &c. It is only the *parents or guardians* that can be so recognised. And the Minister may say (and so, indeed, may any one else) to those parents who place themselves under his guidance, whatever he sees fit; but must not claim any direct control over the Schools.

R. D.

MEMORANDUM, No. 4.

11th November, 1852.

As a Special Board has been summoned, and a full attendance is expected, I think it right to apprise the Commissioners that my absence is to be attributed not to neglect, but to feelings of delicacy.

The Memorandum which I sent in last summer may be regarded as something of the nature of a *complaint*. Not that I attributed any culpable negligence to the Board, or any intentional misconduct to any one. But I alleged that something had gone wrong, and required to be remedied. Now, it is against all reason, that a complainant should be one of the judges; that a prosecutor should sit on the jury.

I pointed out that a decision had been made on a most important matter, and a course adopted in conformity therewith (doubtless with good intentions) *in behalf of, and under the authority of, the Board*, and for which the Board will, of course, be *held responsible*, though the matter was never distinctly and formally brought before the Board at all.

The decision made was, in my judgment, most unwise; but, at any rate, the question ought to have been determined, on mature deliberation, by a Special Board, fully attended, and summoned for the purpose.

My attendance in person would be quite superfluous now. The Commissioners have before them my opinion, and my reasons for it, and my answers to what has been urged against it. I have said all that I have to say on the subject. And I therefore leave the question to the decision of the other Commissioners.

R. D.

MEMORANDUM, No. 5.

A copy of the Minute of the Board, of the 3rd instant, has been forwarded to me.

It would be unreasonable to expect that every decision of the Commissioners should be exactly what I should most *approve*. But it is not too much to require, that every decision should be expressed clearly and without *ambiguity*. And, I most solemnly declare, that I am quite unable to feel any confidence as to the meaning of the above Minute: which therefore, I earnestly entreat the Commissioners, so far to modify as to leave no doubt as to its meaning; doubts being likely to lead to perplexity, alarm, and dissatisfaction.

The passage of the Rules referred to (paragraph 8, § 2, which says, that the Commissioners "do not insist on such and such books being used in any National School") evidently has reference to schools *under private Patrons*. It decides that the *Patron* shall not be *required* to use in his school any book that he may not approve of. But neither that, nor any other rule, *precludes* the Patron from using in his school any book (not objected to by the Commissioners) which he *does* approve of.

Now since every Patron is, and always has been, left to decide (subject to the above restriction) what books shall and shall not be used in his school, and since, accordingly, any book which *does not appear* in the *list* he adopts is *excluded* from his school, (during the general school-hours,) it seems naturally to follow, that if the words "do not insist," &c., be applied by the Commissioners to schools of which **THEY** are the *Patrons*, the meaning of this must be, that the books in question are to be **EXCLUDED** from **ALL** the *Model-schools*; as they *now are* from that at Clonmel.

Any book which the *Patron of the school* does not "insist" on employing in it, he "insists" on *excluding* from it; unless, indeed, it is to be understood that the master, or the children, or the inspectors, are to be left to their own choice in such a matter, and are to adopt a book, or reject it, or reintroduce it, at their own pleasure, without reference to the Patron.

Whatever it is that is really meant by the above Minute, I trust the Commissioners will see the importance of letting that meaning be fully understood.

(Signed) RICHARD DUBLIN.

MEMORANDUM, No. 6.

Palace, 21st December, 1852.

I had not designed to trouble the Commissioners with anything further relative to the Model-schools before their decision of the questions concerning them.

But on looking over the Report and Appendix a fresh difficulty has struck me. There is no mention of the exclusion of certain of the Board-books from some of those schools. Now, let the Report and Appendix be put into the hands of any one not previously acquainted with all the details of our proceedings, and let him read all that is said about the books and about the Model-schools, and then ask him whether he does not infer, as a matter of course, that a similar course of instruction is pursued in all,—that in all the schools of which the Board is Patron, all the books published by the Board are used by some at least of the children; and whether it is not a surprise to him to find that out of eleven Model-schools five use books which are excluded from the other six.

Suppose him to *approve* of the course actually taken, as allowable, and wise, and beneficial, still I cannot doubt that he would wonder why that course was not announced to the public, and some reasons for it assigned, or at least a statement that some reasons did exist; instead of the reader's being left—and indeed led—to infer an opposite state of things from what really exists.

Considering the strong opposition to the Board which has always existed, it is doubly important that no room should be left for even any plausible insinuation that the Commissioners are withholding from the public the knowledge of any part of their proceedings, or wishing to leave an erroneous impression on men's minds.

(Signed) RD. DUBLIN.

MEMORANDUM, No. 7.

Having been summoned to a special meeting, for the purpose of deliberating as to the books to be used in one of the schools of which the Board is Patron, and feeling it to be my duty to *absent myself* from that meeting, I feel also bound to lay before the other Commissioners my reason.

It is, that I know not, nor can conceive, any possible *grounds* on which we can deliberate and decide on such a question, except such as (in my judgment) *we ought not to recognise* or consider at all. I have been told that we are to consult the *Inspector*, and direct him to consult the *neighbouring clergy and people*, and learn whether the majority of them approve of such and such books, or not; and that we are to be guided in our decision by theirs. And indeed, if we are to debate the question at all, I cannot conceive that we can possibly have any other grounds for our deliberation. But I conceive that in thus proceeding, we shall be *handing over to others*, who ought to have *no voice* in the matter, a most important trust which has been committed *to us*. The parents of the children likely to attend the school ought to have no control, except as to their *own* respective children. And the teachers, inspectors, and other servants of the Board ought to be made to understand that *they* are to follow *our* directions, not we theirs.

I might add, that it would not be difficult for an inspector, in conjunction with a few influential persons in the neighbourhood, whom he might wish to stand well with, to *get up* an opposition to some of the Board's books.

But waiving this, and supposing the proposed investigation to be fairly conducted, I cannot think that we should be justified in thus putting such a question to a *popular vote*.

I have been told, indeed, that after this investigation shall have been made, the *ultimate decision* will still rest with the Board. But all that this amounts to must be, I conceive, that if we doubt whether the *votes have been fairly computed*,

we may order a fresh scrutiny; and we may decide *how large* the *majority* must be that is to influence us.

But the decision, after all, will have been, virtually, left to those who, I must think, have no right to make *any*.

I understand that if it shall appear that there is in any district a large majority of Roman-catholics, the *Scripture Lessons* are to be excluded from the school of that district—that is, if most of the people are of the same religious communion with Archbishop Murray, who, along with the other Commissioners, *deliberately sanctioned* these books for *united education*. And the same with seven-eighths of the pupils in the Marlborough-street School, who have always used these books—in that case we are to decide that their wish, and their right, is to debar from the use of those books, not only their own children, but those of their neighbours!

I am well aware that Archbishop M'Hale and several others objected to several of our books, but I never felt myself authorized to enter into any of the controversies that might arise in another religious communion. All I had to look to was, not which party judged the more wisely, but that Archbishop M'Hale was *not a Commissioner*, and that *Archbishop Murray was*. The system originally established—be it the best or the second best—is that which has been defended in Parliament by successive Ministers, and to which *Parliamentary grants* have been made, and which men of *various persuasions* have been even *invited to support*; and I do not, therefore, feel myself at liberty to depart from it. If it were such as I could not conscientiously maintain, I should feel bound to resign my commissionership.

I am myself convinced that the concession of any principle will not even have the effect of conciliation; it is more likely to lead to fresh and fresh encroachments, and to increased resentment at any refusal of compliance.

But be this as it may, I do not feel authorized, at least without the express sanction of Government, to depart at all from the system originally adopted, and so long carried on.

In any case where a question comes before the Board, on

which it is proper for us to deliberate and decide, I shall always be ready to discuss the matter fully, and to acquiesce in the decision of the majority. But when, as in the present case, there is a question which admits of no deliberation, except on grounds which I cannot but consider as quite inadmissible, I feel bound to absent myself, and to protest against the proceeding altogether.

I wish it to be understood, therefore, that in *every* case of a school of which the Board is Patron, my vote is to be considered as given in favour of the introduction of *all* the books published by the Board; and that I solemnly and earnestly protest against consulting an inspector on the subject, or sending round to collect the votes of the neighbours, and conforming to their advice, or request, or orders. But if the majority of the Commissioners should be of opinion that this latter course is allowable and advisable, I would entreat them at least to forbear acting on that decision till the arrival of the Lord Lieutenant. When a step is proposed to be taken which appears to the oldest of the Commissioners to be an *unwarranted transfer* to others of a trust reposed in *us*, it is surely not unreasonable to ask that at least the matter should be submitted to his Excellency.

(C.)

*Extract from Minutes of the Proceedings of the Board of
National Education, 17th June, 1853.*

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:—The Right Rev. Dr. Denvir
Very Rev. Dean Meyler; Rev. Dr. Henry, President, Queen's
College, Belfast; Right Hon. M. Brady, Lord Chancellor;
Right Hon. Francis Blackburne; Sir T. N. Redington,
K.C.B.; J. J. Murphy, E.C.; James O'Ferrall, Esq.; James
Gibson, Esq.; Robert Andrews, Esq.; The Right Hon.
Alexander Macdonnell, Resident Commissioner.

The secretary reads a letter (3754) addressed by the Lord Lieutenant to the Resident Commissioner, dated 13th May, intimating the wish of his Excellency to be made acquainted with the decision of the Board on the resolution proposed by Baron Greene.

The secretary reads a letter dated 11th June (4552) from Baron Greene, stating that he cannot attend the meeting of the Board; but that after mature consideration of the amendments proposed to the resolution submitted by him, he cannot concur in either of them; and that he continues of opinion that the Minute suggested by him would be a proper one.

The secretary also reads a letter (4656) from the Marquis of Kildare, dated 15th June, in which he states, "I approve of Baron Greene's resolution, and will also consent to adopt Master Murphy's first amendment, if it is thought necessary by the majority of the Commissioners."

The secretary then reads Baron Greene's resolution, and the amendments proposed by Master Murphy, as follow:—

Baron Greene's Resolution.

The Commissioners do not insist on the *Scripture Extracts*, *Lessons on the Truth of Christianity*, or *Book of Sacred Poetry*, being read in any of the National schools; nor do they allow them to be read as part of the ordinary school business—during which all children, of whatever denomination they may be, are required to attend. In any school attended by children whose parents or guardians object to their being so read by their children, in such case the Commissioners prohibit the use of these books, except at times set apart for the purpose, either before or after the ordinary school business, and under the following conditions:—

— 1st. That no child whose parent or guardian objects shall be required, directly or indirectly, to be present at such reading.

2nd. That in order that no child whose parent or guardian objects may be present at the reading of the books above specified, public notification of the time set apart for such

reading shall be inserted in large letters in the time-table of the school; that there shall be a sufficient interval between the conclusion of the ordinary school business and the commencement of such reading; and that the teacher shall immediately before its commencement announce distinctly to the pupils, that any child whose parent or guardian so desires, may then retire.

3rd. That in every such case there shall be, exclusive of the time set apart for such reading, sufficient time devoted each day to the ordinary school business, in order that those children who do not join in the reading of the books may enjoy ample means of literary instruction in the school-room.

Master Murphy's Amendments.

1st. That the *Lessons on the Truth of Christianity* be omitted from the foregoing resolution.

2nd. That the *Lessons on Christian Evidences* be omitted from the list of "Books not published but sanctioned by the Commissioners of National Education."

After some discussion, Master Murphy withdraws his first amendment, and substitutes the following:—

That the *Lessons on the Truth of Christianity* be omitted from the list of books published by the Board.

The Commissioners proceed to consider Master Murphy's two amendments in connexion with Baron Greene's resolution.

The Commissioners determine not to come to a final decision on the whole question, but to ascertain and to record the opinion of each member present, with regard to Baron Greene's resolution, and the two amendments thereto, as proposed by Master Murphy.

Each Commissioner then states his opinion, as follows:—

1. In favour of both amendments should Baron Greene's resolution be passed—

1. Right Rev. Bishop Denvir.
2. Right Hon. M. Brady, Lord Chancellor.

3. Sir T. N. Redington, K.C.B.
4. Very Rev. Dean Meyler.
5. Right Hon. A. Macdonnell.
6. J. J. Murphy, Esq.
7. James O'Ferrall, Esq.

2. Against both amendments—

Right Hon. F. Blackburne.

3. Against the first amendment—i.e., against the proposition that the *Lessons on the Truth of Christianity* be omitted from the list of books published by the Board—

1. Dr. Henry.
2. James Gibson, Esq.
3. Robert Andrews, Esq.

4. In favour of Amendment No. 2—i.e., for the withdrawal of the *Easy Lessons on Christian Evidences* from the list of books sanctioned but not published by the Board—

All the Commissioners present, with the exception of the Right Hon. F. Blackburne.

5. In favour of Baron Greene's resolution—

1. Right Hon. M. Brady, Lord Chancellor.
2. Right Hon. F. Blackburne.
3. Rev. Dr. Henry.
4. Right Hon. A. Macdonnell.
5. James Gibson, Esq.
6. James O'Ferrall, Esq.
7. Robert Andrews, Esq.

Note.—Of the above seven, one alone, Mr. Blackburne, supported the resolution unconditionally; of the remainder, some supported it on condition that one of the books on Christian Evidences—others that both of the books—should be removed from the list of books published or sanctioned by the Board.

6. Against Baron Greene's resolution—

1. Right Rev. Dr. Denvir.
2. Very Rev. Dean Meyler.
3. Sir T. N. Redington.
4. J. J. Murphy, Esq.

Note.—These four opposed the resolution whether either or both of the books were withdrawn from the list or not.

7. In case both the books referred to in the amendments be retained on the list of books which may be used in a National School, all the Commissioners present, with the exception of Mr. Blackburne, are of opinion that no alteration should be made in Rule 8, with regard to the use of the *Scripture Lessons*, as at present worded.

The following Members are absent:—His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin, Right Hon. Baron Greene, the Marquis of Kildare, and the Right Hon. Lord Bellew. Lord Bellew did not communicate his opinion.

Ordered,—That Mr. Cross, Secretary, forward to the Lord Lieutenant, and also to the Archbishop of Dublin, a statement of this day's proceedings.

(D.)

Return to an Order of the House of Lords, dated the 18th July, 1853, for copy of a Resolution lately adopted by the Board of National Education in Ireland, excluding the use of certain Books for the Schools under their Management.

Extract from the Minutes of the Proceedings of the Meeting of the Board of National Education, held 8th July, 1853.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:—The Right Hon. the Lord Chancellor; The Right Hon. F. Blackburne; the Rev. Dr. Henry, President, Queen's College, Belfast; J. J. Murphy, Esq., Master in Chancery; James O'Ferrall, Esq.; Robert

Andrews, Esq., LL.D., Q.C.; Right Hon. Alexander Macdonnell, Resident Commissioner.

The Commissioners refer to and take into consideration the proceedings of the special meeting held on the 17th of June, 1853, with reference to rule 8, section II., as to the use of the *Scripture Lessons*, *Lessons on the Truth of Christianity*, and the *Book of Sacred Poetry*.

Ordered,—1st. That in accordance with the opinion expressed on that occasion by seven members out of eleven present, the *Lessons on the Truth of Christianity* be withdrawn from the list of books published by direction of the Commissioners.

2ndly. That, in accordance with the opinion expressed by ten members, the *Introductory Lessons on Christian Evidences* be also withdrawn from the list of books not published, but sanctioned by the Commissioners.

3rdly. That, in accordance with the opinion expressed by seven members, the rule 8, section II., (which is as follows) be rescinded:—

“The Commissioners do not insist on the *Scripture Lessons*, *Lessons on the Truth of Christianity*, or *Book of Sacred Poetry* being read in any of the National Schools, nor do they allow them to be read during the time of secular or literary instruction in any school attended by children whose parents or guardians object to their being so read: In such case the Commissioners prohibit the use of them, except at the times of religious instruction, when the persons giving it may use these books, or not, as they think proper.”

And that the following resolution, proposed by the Right Hon. Baron Greene, omitting the words, *Lessons on the Truth of Christianity*, be substituted:—

“The Commissioners do not insist on the *Scripture Extracts*, *Lessons on the Truth of Christianity*, or *Book of Sacred Poetry* being read in any of the National Schools, nor do they allow them to be read as part of the ordinary school business (during which all children, of whatever denomination they may be, are required to attend) in any school

attended by children whose parents or guardians object to their being so read by their children. In such case the Commissioners prohibit the use of these books, except at times set apart for the purpose, either before or after the ordinary school business, and under the following conditions:—

“ 1st. That no child whose parent or guardian objects shall be required directly or indirectly to be present at such reading.

“ 2nd. That in order that no child whose parent or guardian objects may be present at the reading of the books above specified, public notification of the time set apart for such reading shall be inserted in large letters in the ‘time-table’ of the school, that there shall be a sufficient interval between the conclusion of the ordinary school business and the commencement of such reading, and that the teachers shall, immediately before its commencement, announce distinctly to the pupils that any child whose parent or guardian so desires may then retire.

“ 3rd. That in every such case there shall be, exclusive of the time set apart for such reading, sufficient time devoted each day to the ordinary school business, in order that those children who do not join in the reading of the books may enjoy ample means of literary instruction in the school-room.”

Ordered,—That the foregoing resolutions take effect from the present date.

Ordered,—That the forthcoming Report (nineteenth) of the Commissioners be prepared and submitted for their consideration at the earliest practicable period, and that there be embodied therein a statement of the course now adopted with reference to rule 8, and to the *Lessons on the Truth of Christianity*, and the *Lessons on Christian Evidences*.

Ordered,—That copies of the foregoing proceedings be transmitted to the Lord Lieutenant, also to the Archbishop of Dublin, and to the members of the Board not present at this meeting.

James O’Ferrall, Esq., withdraws his amendments to the resolution proposed by the Right Hon. Baron Greene.

Master Murphy reiterates the statement made by him at the meeting on the 17th June, that if rule 8 underwent no alteration, he was satisfied that the *Lessons on the Truth of Christianity* and the *Lessons on Christian Evidences* should remain on the list of books published or sanctioned by the Board.

MAURICE CROSS, }
JAMES KELLY, } Secretaries.

Education Office, Dublin, 25th July, 1853.

(E.)

Copy of Letter from the Archbishop of Dublin to the Lord Lieutenant, notifying that he has ceased to be a Member of the National Education Board.

Palace, July 26, 1853.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY,—

Pursuant to the communication made a short time ago, I have now to announce to Government, through your Excellency, and to the Commissioners, that I am no longer a member of the Education Board.

When I found myself under the painful necessity of appealing to your Excellency against the recent proceedings of the Board, which I regard as a departure from the existing system, such as we were not justified in making, I added, that, if I obtained no redress from Government, I should consider myself as *dismissed*.

I have purposely avoided using the word “resignation,” lest I should be understood to have altered my views of the National System, or to withdraw from it as no longer approving it. The reverse is the fact. I am as much attached to the system as ever, and as ready as ever to carry it on. And it is precisely because I do retain these views that I am driven to

the present step. Feeling that the system which has flourished for above twenty-one years is virtually abandoned, and consequently that the office I have hitherto held is in reality suppressed, it would not be fair for me to deceive Parliament and the public by pretending to go on, carrying out the system, which in truth is fundamentally changed.

If I were to wait for the final determination of Government on the matters in debate, the decision of the Board *in the meantime taking effect*, I should be placed altogether in a false position. By withholding *my* decision, to withdraw, while the Commissioners do *not* withhold *theirs*, but carry it out in practice, I should be held responsible—and justly—for proceedings which I not only believe, but am *known* to believe, to be unjustifiable.

When I spoke of the Commissioners having exceeded their “powers,” and of their having no “right” to prohibit books that have received the unanimous sanction of the Board, of course I was speaking of *fair and equitable* rights. As for legal rights, or obligations enforced by legal penalties, these were not in my mind. I am considering what a man of honour would hold himself bound to do, or debarred from doing, in the faithful discharge of a public trust solemnly confided to him. I am well aware that a man may sometimes find himself so circumstanced as to have the “power,” with *legal impunity*, to break faith with his neighbour—to disappoint reasonable expectations which he knows to exist, and has himself contributed to raise; to “keep the word of promise to the ear, and break it to the hope.”

But to any one judging fairly it must be evident that the “full control over the books to be used” given to the Commissioners, was *always understood to mean* that no books were to be used *without* their unanimous sanction; and that any book thus sanctioned was to be supplied to any school in connexion with the Board, and might be used therein if the Patron approved it. That a book so sanctioned should be liable to be afterwards *prohibited*, is what never was at all contemplated by any of the *Ministries* who have supported

the system, or by any *Parliament* that has voted grants to it, or by any *members* of Parliament *favourable* or *hostile* to the schools. This is plainly proved by all the debates—and they have been very numerous—that have ever taken place on the subject. In the debate, lately, on a motion of Lord Clancarty's, and in every debate on the motion for a Grant for the Schools, and on many other occasions, reference has been made (both by advocates and opponents) to the *list of the books* sanctioned by the Board. Never did any opponent come forward and say, "This is all a delusion; we are wasting time in discussing the merits of these books; since some of them may probably be struck off the list next week, and some more the week after. The list of books is merely a *bait* to allure the over-trustful into placing schools under the Board; and as soon as the deception has succeeded, the books which had chiefly aided in it will be prohibited."

And if any one *had* brought forward such a surmise, it cannot be doubted that it would have been repelled with indignation and disgust. This being the case, it is plain that to depart from the system in this point, and to introduce an innovation never *contemplated* by any one *when the grants were moved for* and voted, would be to divert the public money from the purpose for which it was granted. And it is also a gross injustice towards the many hundred Patrons of schools who were invited and induced to place them under the Board on the strength of an implied promise fully understood by all parties, and acted on for twenty-one years, but which it is now proposed to violate.

When, on various occasions formerly, attempts were made by some parties among Protestants to introduce, for their purposes, such a "modification" of the system as would have amounted to a subversion of it, I always strenuously opposed any such unwarrantable changes. I never would, nor ever will, consent to break faith either with Roman-catholics or with Protestants.

And that the recent proceedings of the Board (even if not followed up—and I cannot doubt they will be by further

steps in the same direction) do amount to a breach of faith with the public, and involve a *misapplication of the public money*, is a conclusion which appears perfectly evident both to myself and to all those confidential advisers (including some of the ablest and most upright characters in existence) with whom I have discussed the subject.

I will take the liberty of suggesting, in conclusion,—not as a Commissioner, but as a Patron of a National School,—that measures should be taken to secure at least the schools (amounting to several hundreds) which are *actually using* the books proposed to be discarded, from being deprived of the advantage they have hitherto enjoyed. The Patrons of those schools, if thus grievously wronged, will be likely to bring forward their complaints in a manner which may lead to such contests as are much to be deprecated.

(Signed)

RD. DUBLIN.

(F.)

List of District Model-schools, showing in which of them the Scripture Lessons, Lessons on the Truth of Christianity, and Sacred Poetry, are read or not, and which of them.

DISTRICT MODEL-SCHOOLS.	BOOKS USED.
Ballymena	{ Scripture Lessons. Lessons on the Truth of Chris- tianity. Sacred Poetry.
Coleraine	
Trim	{ Scripture Lessons. Sacred Poetry.
Dunmanway	Scripture Lessons.

DISTRICT MODEL-SCHOOLS.

BOOKS USED.

Athy	} Sacred Poetry.
Bailieboro'	
Clonmel	
Newry	
Galway	None of the above books.

Central Model-schools . . .	{ Scripture Lessons. Sacred Poetry.
West Dublin Model-schools	Sacred Poetry.
Glasnevin Industrial . . .	Scripture Lessons.

*Letter from the Right Hon. Baron Greene to the Archbishop
of Dublin.*

Stephen's Green, August 8, 1853.

MY DEAR LORD,

Your Grace, I understand, proposes to make a statement of the transactions, which resulted in our retirement from the Board of National Education. There is one portion of them to which I wish to direct your Grace's attention. I need scarcely say, that the Resolutions which I originally proposed were not intended to introduce, or in any manner sanction, any innovation in the then existing system of education. On the contrary, it must be obvious, I think, from the reading of them, that they were based upon the assumption that no important change was to be made. The object of them was merely to guard against the possibility, that any child, with respect to whom an objection should be made, should be compelled to read, or even exposed to solicitation to read, any of the three books to which they related. The Resolutions were unnecessary and unmeaning, except upon the supposition, that the three books were to

continue, as theretofore, to constitute a part of ordinary instruction. Upon my signifying my intention to propose these Resolutions, notices were given of two Amendments, the adoption of either of which would have the effect of negating the original Motion. The proposed Resolutions and the Amendments were taken into consideration on the 17th of June last. I was on that day in London, and, of course, have no personal knowledge of what occurred. Having afterwards learned that my Resolutions were negated, and the Amendments carried, one by a majority of ten to one, and the other by a majority of seven to four, I at once determined to resign, and awaited only a formal communication of the proceedings of the 17th of June. Not having received it, I attended at a meeting of the Board, after my return to Dublin, and then suggested the propriety of having a regular entry or minute made of the opinions of the respective majorities at the discussion of the 17th of June, and of some formal resolutions or orders in conformity with them. This was considered right, and was, as I was informed, to be done on the next Board-day, the 8th of July. On that day I was absent on the circuit, and it was not until the 18th of July, that a copy was furnished to me of the minutes of the proceedings of the 8th. Immediately upon the receipt of it, I wrote a letter to the Lord-Lieutenant, tendering my resignation. Entertaining no doubt that what had taken place on the 8th of July was the mere formal record of the transactions of the 17th of June, I did not read the copy furnished to me with as much care as perhaps I ought. I put it aside, after I had forwarded my resignation, and in consequence of the pressure of business, did not recur to it, until I learned, to my great surprise, that my conduct had been animadverted upon, and that I had been accused of being instrumental to opening the door to a serious alteration in the system of National Education. I then looked more attentively at the copy of the orders of the 8th of July, and found, that instead of simply carrying out and formally recording the proceedings of the 17th of June, they varied from the latter in some

important respects. My Resolutions, which applied to the three books, are stated to have been,—not rejected, as in fact they were,—but *adopted* with regard to two of the books, omitting the third. Of this *modification* of the Resolutions, I never received any notice, and, it is unnecessary to say, I never sanctioned it. When I originally announced my intention to bring them forward, no intimation was given of any amendment, to the effect that they should be adopted, as to one or two of the books, and that the other or others should be omitted from their operation. Had I been apprized of the possibility of such a result, I should have felt myself bound to consider the propriety of altogether withdrawing them. The consequence of my not having been allowed this opportunity, has been, it appears, to expose me to the suspicion of having been conducive to an act which I do not approve, and with respect to which I had no possibility of exercising any judgment. Nor is this the only point in which the acts of the 8th of July differ from the proceedings of which they were to have been the only formal expression. By one of them, the Eighth Rule is rescinded. I have never had any notice or intimation of any Motion for that purpose. No such Amendment was alluded to at the meeting at which notice was given of the original Resolutions. I do not wish to be understood as offering any opinion as to the necessity or expediency of annulling or altering the Eighth Rule. I mean only to say, that nothing which took place on the 17th of June, so far as I know, warranted the act as a part of the proceedings of that day. Under what circumstances those proceedings were recorded in the form adopted on the 8th of July, I am altogether ignorant. But, without notice to me, an use has been made of the original Resolutions, which I could not anticipate, and never authorized. This, I take for granted, has led to the misconception of my motives to which I have adverted. I was willing to consent to certain regulations of the practice in the Schools, for the purpose of preventing differences, and meeting conscientious scruples, but necessarily upon the understanding that my proposition should

apply to all the books used. In the order as framed, however, advantage has been taken of the concessions offered by me as to two of the books, whilst the third has been wholly excluded. My object has thus been disappointed, and at the same time the consideration which I was ready to accord as the price of it has been, partially at least, accepted. It is but right, therefore, that I should disclaim any participation in the order, as recorded, and all responsibility connected with it. Your Grace has probably already seen the matter in its true light, but I am anxious that your Grace should distinctly understand how far there is any just ground for the supposition that the Resolutions which I proposed have laid a foundation for the recent order.

Believe me,

My dear Lord,

Your Grace's most obedient,

RICHARD W. GREENE.

His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin.