

NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND).

FURTHER CORRESPONDENCE relative to NATIONAL EDUCATION in *Ireland*
(presented in continuation of Parliamentary Paper, No. 26, of the present Session).

To the Right Hon. *Edward Cardwell*, M.P., Chief Secretary for *Ireland*, &c. &c.

Sir,

Dublin, 18 March 1860.

YOUR letter of the 28th November ultimo, conveying the reply of Her Majesty's Government to a Memorial of the Roman Catholic Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland, presented in last August through you to his Excellency the Lord Lieutenant, has been for some time the subject of our most serious deliberations. Persuaded that the question which you examine is of vital importance to religion and society, and having considered your suggestions and your statements with the greatest care, we deem it necessary to submit to Government this reply to your letter, giving a further explanation of the course regarding national education marked out in our Memorial. Whilst writing with a due sense of our great responsibilities, and a full conviction of our right to freedom of education, we shall not depart from the courteous and conciliatory tone in which you have addressed us.

1. Three Principles regarding Education admitted by Government.

Examining your letter, we are happy to find that you lay down, and fully admit, on the part of Government, principles of great importance, in which we cheerfully concur. You distinctly admit, first, the paramount importance of religious education; secondly, the necessity of granting, in the circumstances of this country, separate religious training to the children of each religious denomination; and, thirdly, the right of the Heads of each Church in regard to the religious education of those of their communion.

2. First Principle—paramount Importance of Religious Training.

The first principle, namely, the paramount importance of the religious education of children, is universally recognised; and the experience of the past, in many countries, shows how the neglect of it has been, not only fatal to spiritual interests, but also detrimental to the peace, harmony, and good order of society.

Treating of this subject, Mr. Portalis, one of the ministers of Napoleon the First, says:—"There is no instruction without education; no proper education without morality and dogma. The professors, because it was unwisely proclaimed that we should never speak of religion in the schools, have taught in the desert. . . . We must take religion as the basis of education; and if we compare what the instruction of the present day is with what it ought to be, we cannot help deploring the lot which awaits and threatens the present and future generations."* In thus expressing his opinion, this experienced politician

* "Point d'instruction sans education, point d'education sans morale et sans religion. Les professeurs ont enseigné dans le desert, parce qu'on a proclamé imprudemment qu'il ne fallait jamais parler de religion dans les écoles. . . . Il faut prendre la religion pour base de l'éducation. Si l'on compare ce qu'est l'instruction avec ce qu'elle devrait être, on ne peut s'empêcher de gémir sur le sort qui menace les générations présentes et futures."—*Discours au Corps Legislatif*, 1802.

tician had in view undoubtedly the recent history of his country, and its fearful revolutions during the preceding 13 years,—revolutions produced by a spirit of infidelity, which had been widely propagated by withdrawing education from the saving influence of religion.

Another celebrated French statesman of the present day, Mons. Guizot, writes in the same sense: "The development of the intellectual faculty, unaccompanied by moral and religious development, becomes a principle of pride, of insubordination, of selfishness, and consequently of danger to society."* Indeed, as knowledge, kept within proper bounds, and moderated by religion, is the source of every blessing; so, left unbridled and unrestrained, not being the "wisdom descending from above," it becomes destructive and pernicious, and, as the Scripture describes it, "earthly, sensual, devilish."—James, iii. 15.

3. Opinions of British Statesmen on the Necessity and Character of Religious Training.

Several most eminent British statesmen have expressed their views on this subject with great force and authority. We make some few extracts from their speeches, not with the view of proving what is admitted, or that any doubt can be entertained as to their sentiments, but in order to show what they understood by religious education. We shall see whether they pretend that all secular knowledge, history, moral philosophy, the sciences, as far as they enter into an elementary course, should be taught independently of religion; and whether they would be satisfied with a system exempting children from religious control whilst attending to the lessons of secular knowledge, and interdicting the master all reference to dogmatic truths or religious practices, in his instructions. Their opinions on these matters are decided.

Lord Sandon, in 1847, referring to a speech of Lord John Russell, said that he "was glad to hear the admission that religion was an essential part of everything worthy of the name of education. . . . The State (through Lord John) admitted that education, in order to be effectual, must be religious. . . . He thought that religion ought to be interwoven with every part of their education: he meant that the man who taught should be a religious man, and that in his moral teaching he should always keep in view the principles of religion."—(Hansard Deb., April 19th, 1847, p. 1063.)

Lord Morpeth, now Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, explained the reason why separate grants were to be made in England to the schools of each religious society, says (same Debate, p. 1083), "We might have taken a *uniform* scheme, in which we might have prescribed the same course to all alike, without advert- ing to the existing methods, and without adopting any special method of religious teaching; but I believe in my conscience that such a plan would not have met with the consent either of Parliament or of the people."

Lord Mahon (same Debate, p. 1197–8) said, "The second question was, whether they would have a scheme of secular education solely, or of secular and religious education combined? For his own part, he considered that if the State should confine itself to secular education, without associating it with religion, it would be doing absolutely worse than nothing."

Lord John Russell (*ib.* p. 1221), refuting the project of Mr. Roebuck to separate religion from education, said, "I do not think that the future minister, contemplated by Mr. Roebuck, is likely to have a very long tenure of power, if 'vote for education without religion' should be placed on his banner, and that schools entirely secular should be established by the State."

Sir Robert Peel (*ib.* 1234) said, "I am for a religious as opposed to a secular education. I do not think that a secular education would be acceptable to the people of this country. I believe, as the noble Lord (John Russell) has said, that such an education is only half an education, but with the most important half neglected."

From these passages it clearly results that those distinguished statesmen understood by religious education a system of general instruction having religion for its basis, having religion interwoven with it, and imparted by a master who should

* "Le développement intellectuel tout seul, séparé du développement moral et religieux, devient un principe d'orgueil, d'insubordination, d'égoïsme, et par conséquent, de danger pour la société".

should instruct by word and example. This is what those statesmen understood by religious education, and not a system excluding the teaching of religion, or restricting it to one hour, prohibiting during the remainder of the day any reference to it and its practices. In accordance with such opinions, a denominational or separate system, blending religion with every sort of instruction, has been sanctioned in England.

4. Catholic Doctrine on the Importance of a Religious Education, and what it implies.

Our views on this subject are substantially the same as those now stated, and have been frequently laid before the public. Though anxious to promote every branch of science and literature, we repudiate any system in which education is restricted to temporal and material concerns, and to the acquirement of mere worldly knowledge, excluding the all-important interests of immortal souls, of religion, of eternity. Persuaded that the conduct of man in his riper years, and his fate in the world beyond the grave, depend on the religious training of youth,* we continually impress upon children the necessity of serving their Creator from their earliest days, and of directing all their studies and other occupations to the honour and glory of God: we teach them that their greatest and most important business on earth, the end for which they were created, is their own sanctification; we remind them frequently of the maxim "What doth it profit a man to gain the whole world, if he lose his own soul?" (Mat. xvi. 26), and of the words of the Apostle, "Do all things for the glory of God" (1 Cor. x. 31); "all, whatsoever you do in word or in work, do all in the name of the Lord" (Col. iii. 17).

According to our principles religious education requires, firstly, a knowledge of the doctrines, and of the practices of the Catholic Church, differing essentially from those of other communions; secondly, a proper training in the actual practice of the religious duties prescribed by our Church, such as prayer, making the sign of the cross, self-examination, confession of sins, and obedience and attachment to the Church and her precepts. External religious practices, together with the use of sacred symbols, experience has taught us, deeply impress the youthful mind, and therefore ought not to be excluded from schools.

Besides, religious teaching, to be advantageous, must be given by one having authority, religious himself, and exemplary in life. The teacher, even without intending it, infuses his own spirit and opinions into the minds of his pupils. Hence, as a Pagan or a Jew could not give a religious education to Christians, so a Socinian or a Unitarian or a Presbyterian would not be well suited to mould the tender mind to Catholic practices and doctrines.

5. The paramount Importance of Religious Education not admitted by the National Board.

Examining the national system as it actually exists, not as you suppose it to be, or as Lord Derby intended it to be—examining it by the test of your first principle, that is, the paramount importance of the religious element, we find it altogether deficient. Firstly, in certain schools, namely, in many belonging to Presbyterians in the North, and in others, Roman Catholic children are not allowed to receive any Catholic education, but are instructed in religious opinions which we condemn; secondly, in the schools vested in the Board all instruction in history, in philosophy, and even in morality, as far as such things are taught, is withdrawn from religious influences, and during the greater part of the day, Roman Catholic children are obliged to act as if they had no religion; thirdly, in all schools, not only the sign of the cross, and all external religious practices, but even, by an extraordinary stretch of authority, mental prayer, have been prohibited by the Board; fourthly, in all, even exclusively Catholic schools, during the hours of secular instruction, the images or pictures of our Blessed Lord, of his Virgin Mother, and of the saints are prohibited, whilst profane figures are freely admitted; fifthly, in all schools it is prohibited to set the symbol of Christianity on the building itself.

Is

* "A young man," says the Scripture, "according to his way, even when he is old, he will not depart from it."—Prov. xxii. 6.

Is this course calculated to make the rising Catholic generation religious? Is it the harmonious blending, so strongly insisted on by British statesmen, of religion with education? Is religion here made the *aroma scientiarum*, to use the words of Bacon, by which knowledge is sanctified and preserved from becoming pernicious to the best interests of mankind?

6. Continual Religious Training necessary for the class of Children attending National Schools.

And here an important fact is not to be forgotten, that the parents of the pupils of the National Schools are generally poor, and obliged to devote themselves to hard and incessant labour in order to provide scanty means of subsistence for themselves and their families; so that they have not time, nor are they otherwise well suited to give proper religious instruction to their children, who must consequently depend on the school for that portion of their early education so necessary to make them good Christians and useful members of society. The children themselves, in great part mere infants, generally under ten or twelve years of age, are destined to earn their bread by the sweat of their brow, and to lead a life of care and sorrow that can be soothed only by the influence of early religious training. Their hopes of success in literature or science, or in the race of wealth are generally but slender indeed, but there are noble prospects open to them beyond the grave, which will certainly be realised by the practice of religion. Is it not evident that with them religion should be made the great business of the day? Is it not necessary to give them a continued religious training, in order to supply the deficiencies of their domestic education, and to enable them to bear up against the temptations incident to a life of poverty, and to preserve them from becoming dangerous members of society? Now, what is the case? The pursuit of secular knowledge, in which few can succeed to any extent, is made by the national system their primary occupation; the study of religion, which holds out certain rewards to all, and is so necessary in every stage of life, is either omitted altogether, as happens in some schools, or made a matter of minor importance, as is the case in all. Thus time is preferred to eternity, and earthly interests to those of the immortal soul.

7. Religious Instruction rendered inefficacious in National Schools, by being made the mere task of an hour.

Another defect in the system is, that religion, in so far as the system provides for it, does not pervade the children's occupation at school, does not run through the school hours, but is made a thing of some brief moments, and therefore necessarily fails to season and imbue the mind with its wholesome influence, whereas, were it the presiding spirit of the school, hallowing secular knowledge by its practices, mixed up with all the varied lessons of the day, and gradually infused, the best results would be obtained. Besides, when a Catholic child is warned that during the greater part of the day it is not lawful in the National School to exercise any act of his religion, and when he perceives that the teachers are not allowed to make any reference to so sacred a subject in their common instructions, is it not to be feared that he will begin to suspect that there is something wrong or degrading in his religion requiring that it should be put under ban, and rendering it unfit to be mentioned or practised in a public school. Such impressions are easily made on the youthful mind, and produce most baneful effects in after life. A doubt or a suspicion excited in the observing mind of a child, may become the fruitful seed of future scepticism or infidelity. It was wisely said by a pagan, "*Maxima debetur puero reverentia.*"

8. Patrons allowed by the Board to exclude all Religious Instruction from National Schools.

Notwithstanding the admitted paramount importance of religious instruction, the Board has not hesitated to sanction, if such be the wish of the patron, its total exclusion from non-vested schools. In the words of the rule "It is for the patrons or managers to determine whether any, and if any, what religious instruction shall be given in the school-room." (Rules, sec. iv. 9.) Thus, in a Christian country, religion is left to the whim of the patron, whilst the acquirement of human knowledge is strictly enforced.

We

We are told, indeed, that in the cases referred to, parents may instruct their children in religion at home, or the pastors may do so in the church. But religious training, treated in this way, is not made paramount in the course of studies, and the system which leaves so important a branch of education to the casual or voluntary intervention of others, is worthy of censure, as calculated to sow in the youthful mind the baneful seeds of indifference to religion, or of contempt for its lessons, which, as even children will observe, are deemed of so little value, that the patron, if he think fit, may banish them altogether from the precincts of the school.

9. Second Principle admitted by Government—separate Religious Education.

The second principle referred to in your letter, namely, that of separate religious education for children of different persuasions, seemingly requires no comment. Whilst Unitarians and Socinians deny the Trinity of Persons and the Divinity of Christ, the atonement of the Redeemer, and the eternity of punishment; whilst Presbyterians and Calvinists deny free will, and the divine institution and authority of an Ecclesiastical Hierarchy; whilst the members of the Established Church deny the infallibility of the Church, the spiritual supremacy of the Successor of St. Peter, and the Seven Sacraments, doctrines admitted by Roman Catholics; it would be impossible to carry into operation any scheme of combined religious education; any such attempt would produce a complete chaos.

10. Secular Education requires to be associated with Religion.

But whilst it is clear that religious instruction should be given separately, we cannot admit that secular education can be properly imparted without the sanction of religion, and without blending with it the lessons and practices of religion, as we have already observed, and any attempt to separate them is manifestly a dangerous infringement of the first principle of your letter, contrary to the wise maxims of British statesmen, and condemned by the experience of the world.

11. The Principle of Separate Religious Instruction not adhered to by the Board.

In the second place, we cannot admit that the principle of separate religious education is practically adhered to by the Board. There is a numerous class of schools under Presbyterians, and others in which Catholic children receive united religious instruction with Protestant children, as we shall show hereafter, and this without violating the existing regulations of the Commissioners. This practice, as opening the way to proselytism, cannot be denounced in terms too strong.

12. Combined Religious Instruction attempted in the National School Books.

Besides, some books have been introduced into the National Schools purporting to teach, formally, what is called common Christianity, to the exclusion of the peculiar doctrines of each Christian denomination.* Is not this an attempt to establish a combined system of some sort of vague and undefined religion, excluding all mention of mysteries, of the Trinity, of the Incarnation, of the Divinity of Christ, and of other leading principles of Christianity, which ought to be continually before our minds and influence all our conduct? The evident tendency of this modern project is to promote indifference to all religion by preventing children from thoroughly knowing the doctrines and practices of the communion to which they belong, or of any other communion—an indifference than

* The Scripture Lessons, by a Presbyterian, Rev. Mr. Carlisle, and the "Evidences of Christianity," and other works, by the Most Rev. Dr. Whately, are of this character, and tend to impart to Catholic children sceptical or rationalistic views.

than which nothing more pernicious to sound faith, or more demoralising can well be conceived.*

13. National School Books regarding History, Morality, and Religion, compiled by Protestants for Catholic use.

As to the other books in general use in the National Schools, they contain much matter in the nature of combined religious instruction, at once exposing Catholics to danger, and opposed to the principle you lay down. Though destined principally for Catholic use, all those books, in as far as they treat of history, philosophy, morality, and devotional matters—(and all these subjects are introduced into the National School books)—have been compiled by Protestants,† who give an anti-Catholic colouring to their pages, omitting matters considered necessary by us, and insinuating or teaching dangerous errors. For example, where there is question of sin, the Catholic doctrine of contrition and confession is passed over, and something else suggested in its place. Private judgment is referred to, where we appeal to Ecclesiastical authority, and the Scriptures seem to be made the only rule of faith, to the exclusion of the decisions of the Church of God. In the historical chapters there is no mention whatever of the Holy See and its beneficent influence on religion, so that after going through the whole course, a child would not know that there was a Catholic Church in the world, or that the great majority of the people of Ireland, and of all Christians, were Catholics. Indeed, the history of our country and of its religion is altogether omitted; and the compilers of the National School books appear to have determined to leave the rising Catholic generations in Ireland without any knowledge of their forefathers in the faith, and without any traditions whatsoever of country or of family to console, to cheer, and to excite them to virtue.

It is said that the rules of the National Board do not require that those books should be adopted in every school. In reply we state that this may be true, and yet the books in reality are made obligatory, because, in the first place, no other books purporting to exclude all reference to religious doctrines, and compiled in accordance with the regulation of the Commissioners can be found; and, in the second place, the low price of books published with assistance from
the

* We here quote as an illustration of our subject a passage from a speech of Lord Stanley in 1839. "He was contending that education was not a thing against and separate from religion, but that religion should be interwoven with all systems of education, controlling and regulating the whole minds, and habits, and principles of the persons receiving instruction. This was a very serious subject, and he was aware that it was one which perhaps could hardly be properly treated and argued upon in a popular assembly; and yet the question so mainly depended upon it—he meant the question how far the Church was justified in the resistance she had given to the plan of Her Majesty's Government, for a combined system of education for all classes of persons in one common school, to receive one common course of instruction—that it was impossible not to ask the House and the country to consider whether or not those great points of doctrine and of faith, upon which the several sects of the Christian community conscientiously differed, and which were yet so interwoven with the great scheme of Christianity, and were so important in influencing Christian conduct and Christian motives, that they could not be overlooked by the Church or blinked by the people, or complimented away for the purpose of conciliating persons of various denominations and opinions—it was impossible (he said) not to ask the House and the country to consider this question in its connexion with points of faith and doctrine: for instance, the great scheme of redemption, the doctrine of justification, the efficacy of infant baptism, the solemn mystery of the holy eucharist—and yet one and all these must be frittered away; one and all of them they must consent to cede at once, and to put aside as matter not to be treated of in public education, if they insisted on adopting the Government scheme of instruction; for, according to that plan, Baptists, Unitarians, Socinians, Lutherans, and Roman Catholics, all those who differed upon any of those points, and differed conscientiously, were to be educated together. Now, if these, or any of these points, were mere points of abstract theory, if they were mere opinions, the solution of which the one way or the other was of no great importance, he should say, in the name of Christian charity, and for the purpose of combining as far as possible all good men, and of softening the animosities of conflicting sects, let us lay aside whatever is not important, let us lay aside whatever is not essential, let us give up all points of curious speculation, and let us be united. But when he saw that these were not such dogmas—when he saw that they were main points of Christian faith and doctrine, believing that by them mainly, motives must be produced in the hearts of our children, he could not, from any fancied scheme of conciliation, consent to put into the background, he could not consent to treat as matters of indifference, or to put aside those principles which he held to be among the fundamental doctrines of Christianity." . . .

† The books referred to have been compiled by Rev. Mr. Carlisle, Most Rev. Dr. Whately and his family, Mr. Cross, Dr. Sullivan, Mr. Young, Mr. Rintoul, &c., all Protestants, and generally not Irish. No encouragement was given to native Catholic industry and talent. The hymns are by Watts and Taylor, Methodistical in sentiment and language. The extracts are from Taylor Blair, Porteus, and other Protestant divines.

the State, and the fact of a free stock being presented to each school, put the use of any other books out of question.

14. Published Analysis of National School Books admits that they contain combined Religious Instruction.

The religious character of the books is admitted by the agents of the Board, in an Analysis, of which we give an abstract:—"One of the main objects, in compiling and publishing this series, was to supply, not merely the national schools, but the public generally, with works moral and religious in their character, without being sectarian. Lessons on *the subject of religion*, drawn chiefly from the narratives of the Holy Scripture, are interspersed through *all* the reading books, and constitute an interesting epitome of sacred history. The lessons in the first book are of a moral kind, with one *decidedly religious*; several in the second book communicate important *religious* truths, and are well fitted to create *devout feelings*. The religious sentiments inculcated in the sequel to the second book are of the purest and most elevated kind; and the next work following affords a striking example of the successful manner in which some of the *most important truths of Revelation* are blended with secular instruction in the Irish National School books. The admirable abridgment of parts of the Old Testament, in the third book, is not intended as a substitute for the Bible, but to prepare the pupils for a more extended course of *religious instruction*, and a more beneficial study of the inspired volume. Apart from the Scriptural lessons continued in the fourth book, it contains several poetical pieces of a *devotional* character. The supplement to the fourth book contains a summary of the Old Testament, including a detailed account of the prophets, and the substance of their prophecies; besides several *essays on religious subjects by Archbishop Whately and other eminent divines*. The excellent lessons in the Girls' Reading Book form a complete manual of moral and domestic duties, whether in single or married life; and the selections from the British poets are pervaded by a *spirit of genuine piety*, and are well adapted for family reading."* It might have been added, that where so many religious questions were treated, special care was taken to exclude extracts from Catholic writers.

Thus, it is most distinctly admitted that a system of combined religious instruction has been introduced, offering innumerable opportunities of inculcating special doctrinal opinions, in violation of your second principle. Now, can it be held that a Catholic child is safe when patrons of schools noted for their violent declamations against everything Catholic (and there are many of this class) or teachers of their choice, are authorised to explain to him a large portion of the Scripture, and many extracts from Protestant divines, and to form his moral and religious feelings? Would we not be wanting to our duty if we failed to raise our voice against such a danger to Catholic children?

15. Extracts from Parliamentary Reports, showing the Dangers arising from combined Religious Instruction in the National School Books.

We give here some extracts from Parliamentary Reports, which fully confirm our apprehensions in regard to the use of the National School books. The Rev. Mr. Campbell, of Trinity Church, Belfast, stated, "The Presbyterian mistress of Murphy-street National School informed me that none of the children *refuse* to receive the instruction which she gives, which consists of *reading the Bible*. If explanation of the Bible were given, she said there would be refusals; but during the *lessons* from the *ordinary books* of the Board, opportunities do occur, which can be, and are taken advantage of to *instil* religious instruction, *without suspicion*. She added, '*Who is to take notice of this?*'" The same Rev. Mr. Campbell, adds, "The ordinary books contain *religious* instruction of a certain character, and to a certain amount, sufficient to give a teacher an opportunity of branching off from it, and giving peculiar *religious* instruction if so disposed."†
 † Dean Kennedy, a dignitary of the Protestant church, says: "The Roman Catholics, in my National School, receive *combined* religious instruction, in the Scripture

* The Analysis has been published by Thom, printer to the Board, and is circulated with the National School books, under the eyes of the Commissioners.

† Parliamentary Report on National Education, 1854. Qu. 8337-39.
 206.

Scripture Lessons, and are examined with the Protestants, who read the same portions of the authorised version, and I may mention that an opponent of the Board, and a friend of the Church Education Society, at the half-yearly examination of the children of my school, examined the classes, and himself awarded prizes, for the best Scripture answering, to Roman Catholic children. In my schools, there are Roman Catholics receiving a greater amount of Scriptural education, through the medium of the *secular* books of the National Board and the Scripture Lessons, than in any church education school that I know. This is my deliberate conviction." And, the Dean adds, *I think the principles of the National Board are the principles of the Reformation.*"*

With such evidence and with such facts before us, may it not be asked what confidence can be placed in, and what security is afforded by, the principle of separate religious education, so flagrantly violated under the sanction of the Board.

16. Third Principle of Government—the Right of the Heads of each Church in regard to Religious Instruction.

The third principle which we accept from you is that in which the Government, as you inform us, *cheerfully recognise the right which belongs, and the duty which attaches to the heads of the respective churches in regard to religious instruction.* In these words you not only recognise our rights, but you state our duties; we have a recognised right to give religious instruction to the children of our flock wherever they may be; we are bound to do so in virtue of the office which we hold, as bishops placed by the Holy Ghost to feed the flock committed to our care.

17. Explanation of Catholic Doctrine on the Right of giving Religious Instruction.

Though our right to give religious instruction is thus fully admitted by Government, it may not be out of place or useless to explain our doctrine on this head in very few words. It is, therefore, to be observed, that the truths of the Roman Catholic Church have not been given to the world after the manner of a philosophical system, with leave and liberty to every one to select any opinions he may think fit to adopt. We believe those truths to be the unchangeable revelations of Heaven, committed to the Roman Catholic Church as a sacred deposit—so sacred, that no truth can be wilfully impugned or rejected without incurring the greatest guilt.

The right of teaching, interpreting, and propagating these doctrines we believe was given by our Divine Redeemer to the bishops in the persons of the Apostles whose successors they are, when He said: "Go ye and teach all nations, baptizing them, . . . teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you" (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20). In virtue of this commission, bishops not only teach the doctrines of the Gospel themselves, but depute other ministers to assist in teaching them; and to carry religious instruction into the bosom of every family, they continually call on parents to provide, from the earliest infancy, for the religious education of their offspring. According to the doctrine of the Catholic church, even an ordained minister of religion is not allowed to teach or preach without authority from the bishop; and if he do so, his teaching loses what is sacred in it, and assumes a mere worldly character.

18. Right of Catholic Bishops to exclude anti-Catholic Books and Teachers from Schools.

Now the principle being admitted that the heads of the Roman Catholic Church have the right to give a religious education to the children of their flock, it is a violation of that right to prevent them from doing so, and if any obstacle debar them from exercising that right, they can justly require its removal. Hence their right to prevent the use in schools of books containing anything opposed to their doctrines; hence also their right to require that the teachers
and

* Parliamentary Report on National Education, 1854. Q. 8010. Q. 8034.

and all other connected with schools be such as shall not produce an anti-religious impression on the minds of Roman Catholic children, but rather aid in promoting their religious principles and practices, or as Lord Sandon, already quoted, expresses it, "that religion being interwoven with every part of the education of children, the man who teaches them shall be a religious man,—in his moral teaching always keeping in view the principles of religion." Indeed, if the care of children be committed to masters and mistresses of anti-Catholic tendencies—if, by word or example, they impress anti-Catholic doctrines on their minds—children being swayed by the words and example of those placed over and in continual contact with them, it will be vain to expect that the vigilance of the pastor, generally absent and occupied with various other important duties, can protect their faith from injury.

19. Catholic Doctrine not contrary to the Independence of the Laity.

We do not know whether an observation in the eighth paragraph of your letter, where you speak of "*sustaining the just independence of the laity, whether Roman Catholic or Protestant*," refers to the Catholic maxims just laid down, as if they were subversive of the liberty of others. If it be intended to refer to them, we shall merely say, that every Catholic layman, believing the pastors of the Church to have a divinely constituted authority, not derived either from the congregation or the state, cheerfully allows their right to teach all revealed doctrines, and to prevent the propagation of error; whilst, on the other side, the pastors, if religious truth be secured from false teaching, leave their flocks full liberty to expatiate as they will in the paths of mere secular knowledge, and to do as they please in all temporal matters, provided conscience be respected. This doctrine is fully understood by Catholics, among whom the most perfect harmony prevails regarding it. The clergy have made great exertions to establish schools both for the rich and the poor, which are filled (and many more if they could be erected would be filled) with the children of the laity of every class. It is not an indication of jealousy that those whose lot is cast in the humbler walks of life seek with great anxiety to be admitted into the schools of the Christian Brothers, exclusively religious; and that the wealthier classes cheerfully pay high pensions to have their sons and daughters educated in schools placed altogether under Roman Catholic ecclesiastical authority. Where both parties act so harmoniously, and are fully agreed upon their respective relations, we do not see what necessity there is of sustaining an independence that is not assailed; nor can we conceive how the history of past times could suggest to the Catholics of Ireland an appeal to the state for the maintenance of their educational or religious rights against supposed episcopal encroachments.

20. Rights of Catholic Bishops recognised in England.

But to return to our subject, we have sufficiently explained in what has been said, the Roman Catholic view of the rights of bishops and clergy in regard to education. The admission of those rights has been productive of great advantages to society in every country, and to the zeal and energy of the Catholic clergy in exercising them, we must attribute the foundation of innumerable universities, colleges, and schools, and the spread of education among the people. Feelings of gratitude and justice have secured the recognition of such rights, in all the principal kingdoms of the continent of Europe. They are admitted also in England and the British colonies. To say nothing of other countries, in England there are separate Roman Catholic elementary as well as training and model schools receiving aid from Government. The selection of books, the appointment of teachers, and the regulations for giving instruction, are under the direction of the Roman Catholic bishops. The schools are visited by inspectors selected by the same prelates, and supported by the Government. In case of a dispute regarding teaching, the bishops decide it on appeal. In fine, the right of the Roman Catholic Church to teach is practically recognised.

21. The Rights of the Heads of the Catholic Church in Ireland ignored by the Board.

What is our condition in Ireland? You assure us that our rights are "cheerfully recognised by Government," or by the Board acting in their name. But

we are forced to declare that we have in vain sought for any recognition of those rights in the present rules and actual administration of the National Commissioners. In the rules published in their 21st report, the functions of parents and patrons of schools are explained, but we cannot find in them any admission or even mention of ecclesiastical authority, though this authority was originally recognised by Lord Derby.

22. Catholic Pastors told to treat with the Board through their Flocks—
this Proposal examined.

We have, indeed, been told that we can act on the schools through the parents of Roman Catholic children, and that their protest against any books, or any form of religious instruction, will be attended to. If this be the recognition of our rights referred to in your letter, we owe it to the faith and docility of our people, not to any act of Government. We must add that this course of action is an inversion of the order of things. According to our doctrines the pastor is divinely commissioned to feed his flock, and to preserve it from danger; and the Government, through you, professes to acknowledge at least the right, if not the divine commission, to do so as appertaining to the Heads of the Catholic Church. But the Board will not allow us to exercise this function; we cannot treat with you, they say, but we will listen to your flock. The Board condescend to treat with those who know little of the requirements of a religious education, and are incapable of resisting their power, or penetrating their designs; but they will hold no direct and recognised dealings with the Heads of the Catholic Church. We have seen within the last few days a letter, written in this spirit, to a Roman Catholic bishop, Right Rev. Dr. Furlong, regarding the establishment of a model school in his own parish of Enniscorthy, pointedly refusing to discuss the question of its necessity with him. From the experience of the past we are obliged to conclude that parental authority is put forward so prominently in the rules of the Board, merely with the view of ignoring and evading all direct ecclesiastical interference, and Archdeacon Stopford, who was engaged in long negotiations with the Commissioners, insinuates that some changes were made in Lord Derby's original rules with the view of securing this result.* In reality the parental authority is set up against pastoral authority, whereas they ought to be concurrent.

23. No single case can be alleged in which Catholic Episcopal authority is
recognised by the National Board.

So far for the theoretical recognition of episcopal authority. Descending to details, may we not ask in what instance are our rights practically admitted? Have the Heads of the Catholic Church been consulted about the appointment of Catholic Commissioners and Inspectors who are supposed to be charged with Catholic interests? or on the selection of the books? Though they have repeatedly condemned the Scripture Lessons, and other books, have these been removed from model schools? Have they any control whatever over training and model schools where the masters and mistresses are formed, on whose good conduct and religious principles the faith of future generations must so much depend? Have their wishes and their reasons been attended to in regard to the establishment of such schools? Have their remonstrances against the exclusion of

* Archdeacon Stopford, in a report mentioned hereafter, at p. 24, speaking of pastoral authority says:—"It appears to have been felt that this part of their charter (*recognition of pastoral authority*) was ill-adapted to effect united education. The Board have never professed to found their rules on such a principle. They have, in fact, skillfully set it aside, and substituted a different principle in its place. About the year 1833 they applied for and obtained official explanations of Lord Stanley's letter. One object of these explanations was to substitute *parental* for *priestly* authority as the principle to which concession was to be made." How easily *parental* authority, when it clashes with Protestant views, can be set aside, the Archdeacon explains in the same report:—"A parent may prohibit his child learning those commandments of God which, at his baptism, he promised to keep. Such a prohibition, even from a parent, we hold to be of no moral obligation whatsoever." Again, in a pamphlet of 1847, he says:—"Were that child persuaded in his own mind, and capable of understanding that he was bound to hear the word of God, although prohibited by his earthly parents, and were he to present himself in my Scripture class, I would admit him. That would not be an interference with the child's religious persuasions, nor would it involve any violation of my obligation to the parent as defined in my application to the Board."

of religious practices been respected? Have they any right to instruct Catholic children in schools under anti-Catholic patrons? Are they, in a word, simply as bishops, practically admitted by Government or the Board to do any one thing in the control or administration of the national system? As a negative answer must be given to all those questions, it is evident that the national system is practically opposed to the rights of the Roman Catholic Church, virtually ignoring or destroying a leading principle laid down in your letter. If we are wrong in these views, we should wish to know in what particular cases and by what rules of the Board our rights have been recognised, or in what our rights are considered to consist.

24. Principles laid down by Lord Derby for the Management of the National System.

Having examined how far the general principles admitted in your letter are respected by the Commissioners, we shall now proceed to matters more specially connected with the National System, and referred to by you.

In the eighth paragraph of your letter, you allude to the principles laid down by the Earl of Derby in the well-known letter addressed to the Duke of Leinster in the year 1831, which principles, you add, "constitute the recognised conditions on which education in Ireland receives assistance from the State." If that document had been acted on, and its instructions carried into effect, we should not have had so many grounds of complaint against the national system. But we regret to say that both the spirit and the letter of it have been departed from by the Commissioners, and always in a way detrimental to Roman Catholic interests, as we shall have frequent opportunities of observing as we proceed.

25. Right assumed by National Board to change the essential Principles of the System.

Nor can this be a matter of surprise: for the rules of the Board as they now stand afford no protection against innovations and essential changes in the system, but on the contrary sanction them. The fourth leading principle of the Board is, "The Commissioners will not change any fundamental rule without the express permission of his Excellency the Lord Lieutenant."* With that consent, changes in the nature of the system most displeasing to the Catholics of Ireland, and injurious to their religious interests, may be made without ever consulting them, and even before any information regarding such changes can reach them, as the proceedings of the Board are carried on with great secrecy. Indeed, several changes seriously affecting us were made and carried into operation, before anything was known of them by the Catholic body in general.

26. According to Lord Derby's Letter the National System should afford separate Religious Education, and exclude all danger of Proselytism.

Without entering into minute details, let us see what was the essence of the system as laid down by Lord Derby. His letter provides for separate religious education for each religious denomination, and prescribes "that the most scrupulous care should be taken not to interfere with the peculiar tenets of any description of Christian pupils." In conformity with this instruction, the Board, in the first years of their existence, rigorously required that the children of one denomination should not be *allowed* to attend at the religious instructions of those of a different creed. In July 1833, we find a letter addressed to a Presbyterian, the Rev. Mr. Love, in which the Commissioners state, "That the Holy Scriptures might be read in his school, provided such children only as are *DIRECTED* by their parents to attend, be then *ALLOWED* to continue in the school, and that all others do then retire; for it is the *essence* of the rules that children, whose parents do not *direct* them to be present, should previously retire." Here it is required distinctly, that before children could be *allowed* to attend religious instruction in a creed different from their own, they should be positively directed to do so by their parents.

These same conditions were inculcated in the "Resolutions and directions" of the

* Rules published in 1856. Sec. 1, No. 4.

the Commissioners in 1833. "Any arrangement for religious instruction that may be made, is to be publicly notified in the schools, in order that those children, and *those only*, may be present at the religious instruction, whose parents or guardians APPROVE of their being so."

We give the commentary upon this rule of a Commissioner, Mr. Blake, in his evidence before Parliament, in 1837. "Our rule," says he, "is perfectly clear upon the subject. . . . The rule is that such children may attend as are authorised by their parents in doing so: and I consider it particularly necessary that the rules should require the APPROBATION of the parent, for otherwise tricks might be played, perhaps on both sides: Protestant children might be *induced* to remain in the school whilst Roman Catholic catechism is being taught; so the child is not left to remain, or not, at his discretion; and I should not consider the *absence of dissent* on the parent's part, as a sufficient justification. Our object is, in short, both with respect to Protestants and Catholics, to prevent tricking the children of one communion into attendance, when religious instruction is being given to the other." This passage clearly shows that, according to the original rules of the Board, Roman Catholic children were not to be allowed to attend Protestant religious instruction unless their parents gave positive orders for their attendance, and *vice versa* for Protestant children, for whom the same security was provided.

27. Essential change in the Original Constitution of the Board regarding Religious Instruction.

Have the principle of Lord Stanley and the original rule of the Board been maintained? Certainly not. The Presbyterians of the North, unwilling to lose the opportunity of imbuing Catholic children with their opinions, would not consent to exclude them from Presbyterian religious instruction, and, by giving a strong opposition to the rule, practically defeated its object. Besides, Protestant ministers of the Established Church, though anxious to put their schools in connexion with the Board, refused to do so until after repeated efforts and lengthened negotiations, described in a pamphlet written by Archdeacon Stopford,* of Meath, they succeeded in obtaining an essential change in the system. The rule as it now stands is, that "no child be COMPELLED to receive or to be present at any religious instruction of which his parents or guardians disapprove." Originally, no child was to be present or allowed to attend without the consent or direction of his parent; now, children are allowed, but not compelled to attend, and the consent of their parents is not required. What a door for proselytism has been thus opened? Poor Catholic children, not as yet acquainted with the value of their faith, may be induced, by the promise of food or clothing, or by the influence of a landlord or employer, to attend Protestant religious instruction, and may be infected with error before they themselves understand the danger, or their parents become aware of it. Now, sir, if you consider how violent is the spirit of bigotry in the land, and what exertions are made to injure or destroy catholicity, you cannot be surprised that this facility afforded to proselytism† should have filled our minds with apprehension.

28. Evil Results and Dangers arising from the change in the original Constitution of the System.

Facts show that our fears were well founded. Passing over other testimonies, we shall quote some words from the report of a head inspector of the Board, Mr. Keenan, words mysteriously omitted in the copy of that report presented to Parliament, and only produced on a special motion by Mr. Monsell:—"In all the schools which I visited in Belfast that were taught by Presbyterian teachers, the practice prevailed

* The Archdeacon's report to the Bishop of Meath, &c., printed in 1844, contains most interesting details regarding the manner in which changes were brought about in the national system to meet the wishes of the Protestant clergy, and to enable them to *induce* Catholic children to receive their religious instructions. The Archdeacon, in his evidence before a Parliamentary committee in 1854, says, "The rule was altered to meet my views."

† When we speak of proselytism, we do not mean that those who are exposed to it always openly change their religion. We speak of the dangers of faith, and of the lessening of faith by attending at anti-catholic instruction. A person may be inspired with feelings of deep hostility to his church without wishing to abandon it.

prevailed of giving common religious instruction to all, none of them retiring. Indeed it is pretty general throughout the counties of Antrim and Londonderry, but I never observed it to prevail in any other part of the country. By this practice religious instruction is *separate* as to time, but not as to the distinction of the denominations whilst religious instruction is going on. I have brought these different practices already under the notice of the Board in my ordinary reports." This testimony proves that Roman Catholic children, in great numbers (it is stated that they amount to thousands), are receiving religious education from non-catholic masters, and the Board, informed of the practice by an inspector, not only do not protect them from so great a danger, but endeavour to conceal the fact by suppressing the part of the report calling attention to it. We could here accumulate other facts, but the statement of Mr. Keenan is quite sufficient to show how completely Lord Derby's letter is set at nought.

29. Plan adopted by the Board to prevent these evil Results, a Mockery and a Delusion.

We are aware, indeed, that since our memorial was presented to the Lord Lieutenant an order has been issued by the Board* that newly appointed masters shall be obliged to give notice to the parent when a child attends religious instruction different from his own, even though notice should have been given by the preceding master. This rule supposes the existence of the grievance of which we complain, but the remedy applied is only a mockery and a delusion. No protection is afforded against proselytising patrons, who can address the children as often as they wish. Then the burden of deciding whether the instruction be fit for Catholics or not is thrown on persons generally poor and uninstructed, perhaps unable to read the notice sent to them. The interference of the pastor, who is acquainted with the duties and requirements of Catholic instruction, is not admitted, unless, indeed, he constitute the poor parent as his representative, and explain his objections through such a medium, to the patron, an expedient fraught with danger to the poor man, whom it may place in a situation of antagonism with his master or landlord, if patron of a school, whilst it ignores the right of the pastor to feed his flock.

30. The Character of National School Books in opposition to the original Constitution of National System.

Having treated thus far of a most important change made in the original constitution of the National System, we shall now merely add that the character of the school books prepared by the Board, which we have already noticed, and the facilities presented by them of tampering with the faith of Catholic children, afford a further proof that the principle of separate religious education, and the necessity of avoiding even the suspicion of proselytism, declared essential to the success of the combined system by Lord Derby, have not been attended to by the Commissioners.

31. Model and Training Schools contrary to the original Constitution of the National System, calculated to throw the Education of the People into hands of Government.

A further departure from the views and intentions of that nobleman is to be found in the gradual establishment of training and model schools in Dublin, and many other towns of Ireland, whilst originally only one training school was contemplated. We have the most decided objection to the principle on which such schools are established, inasmuch as they tend to throw into the hands of the State, acting through a body of Commissioners, the education of the country and the formation of the masters and mistresses of the rising generation. When Napoleon I. established the monopolising university system in France, he did not conceal the despotic design he entertained of forming, by education, the people according to his own heart, and communicating his own ideas to them. In England such an assumption was vigorously and successfully opposed by some of the present Ministry, and other members of Parliament, on the ground that education

* Dated 30th November 1859.

education so closely connected with religion does not belong to the functions of the State, and that it would be giving an unconstitutional power to any government were it allowed to form masters and pupils according to its own views.

In Ireland we have special reasons for opposing Government interference in the education of Catholic children, for we cannot forget that it has been the traditionary policy of the State to undermine our religion by its systems of public instruction. The Charter schools, the Kildare-street schools, and others, were introduced with this view, and vast sums of money were expended in promoting such a project. Can we now be satisfied to see a Government Board take into their hands powers so long directed against us? That great statesman, Edmund Burke, admonishes us in the strongest terms against agreeing to such a course: "If you consent," says he, "to . . . put any part of your education under their (the Government) direction or control, then you will have sold your religion for their money. There will be an end, not only to the Catholic religion, but to all religion, all morality, all law, and all order in that unhappy kingdom" (Ireland).*

32. Training and other Schools objectionable, as assuming Character of mixed Boarding Schools.

The training, agricultural, and district model schools are worthy of special condemnation, inasmuch as they assume the character of boarding schools, in which pupils of various religious denominations are permitted to live together without any special provision for religious instruction or practices. The female training schools of this kind are most objectionable, and present a sad contrast to the training institutions in England, in which, under the care of religious ladies, the future mistresses receive an excellent education, and are brought up in the practice of all the virtues that are necessary for their state. The mixed boarding system must produce deplorable results: its dangers appeared so evident to the Commissioners of the Endowed Schools that, whilst differing upon the character of mixed day schools, they were unanimous in condemning any attempt to establish mixed boarding schools. This sort of system has, for the same reason, been exploded by Parliament, in the establishment of juvenile reformatories. It is to be regretted that a short-sighted policy should endeavour to force upon the Catholics of Ireland, as if to remind them that the spirit of the penal laws is not yet defunct, a system not tolerated in England, and condemned by the wisest statesmen.

33. Model Schools not managed with a due regard to Catholic Interests.

But it is said that the model schools have been managed with the greatest impartiality, and in such a way as to preclude all ground for complaint. We cannot concur in those praises, for is it not the case that in the infant model schools the teachers are frequently persons who cannot fail to give an anti-Catholic bias to their little pupils, even without instructing them in religion; and does not the general aspect of the place, and the variety of religious denominations that are collected together, tend to bewilder poor children, and to render them sceptical or indifferent in doctrinal matters; whilst the prohibition of all reference to the Catholic religion during the time of common instruction must tend to impress on their tender minds the idea that there is something in that religion of which they have reason to be ashamed, an idea which in time will produce dangerous effects, and tend to encourage indifferentism or infidelity.

Then if we examine the case of the great model and training institution in Marlborough-street, placed immediately under the eyes of the Board, where above all other places it was to be expected that the liberality, the justice, and the impartiality of the Commissioners should be displayed, inasmuch as the spirit of the central institution was to be diffused through the whole system, and its administration to serve as a model to be imitated, what do we find? In this establishment the Catholic children are about seven times as numerous as the Protestants.† The masters and mistresses under training are, on an average, about

* Correspondence of Right Hon. E. Burke, by Lord Fitzwilliam, vol. iv. p. 299.

† The return given in the Report of 1852 is 1,311 Catholic children to 168 Protestants of every class, nearly eight to one; and 240 Catholic teachers trained to 62 Protestants of every class, or nearly four to one.—Rep. p. xvi.

about 80 Catholics to 21 Protestants of every class. Now what is the teaching body, where the Catholic majority is so great? It consists, in a great part, of Protestants of every religious denomination,* Unitarian, Presbyterian, and Anglican, giving to this element in teaching a proportion which it certainly does not enjoy in regard to pupils and masters under training. We see in the list of teachers and others employed in the establishment, persons of every religious persuasion, and even one who is merely designated a *Christian*, as not belonging to any church. Thus the school principally destined to train the future master is not at all calculated to strengthen religious convictions, and the future fate of the Catholic religion in Ireland, as regards the pupils of the Model school and the teachers, is left, in a great part, at the mercy of men who perhaps swear that it is idolatrous, or are ignorant of its tenets. Would any Protestant fellow-subject, if the case were reversed, tolerate this system for a day?

We have been obliged to protest both against the principle on which such schools are established and the manner of their administration; yet we find that at the very present moment the Board is erecting new model schools in Sligo and Enniscorthy, in despite of the reclamations of Catholic Bishops and their flocks, and endeavouring to extend their grasp on education to every part of the country.

34. Various other changes in the National System detrimental to Catholics.

Nor is it of model schools alone and books that we have to complain; were it necessary, we could easily show that in other matters also the administration of the Board, laying aside the character of impartiality prescribed by Lord Derby, has gradually developed anti-Catholic tendencies.

At first grants were made towards the erection of schools, of which the property lay in parish priests or others. This security has been abolished, and no grant is now to be made unless the lease of the school be surrendered to the Board.

For some time, if there was only one Catholic child in a school, the rules of the Board required that the Catholic pastor should have liberty to visit that school to give religious instruction in it to that one child. When, however, the Presbyterians objected to allow priests to enter their schools, the rule regarding religious education was changed, so that at present no priest can enter a non-vested school to instruct the children of his flock, however numerous they may be, without the previous permission of the patron. Pastoral rights allowed by Lord Derby are not recognised in the actual rules, but parental authority is substituted for them.

For years all convent schools were allowed to participate in the public grant; latterly nuns, if they have several schools in connexion with their convent, can receive aid only for the school where they reside. In the beginning Christian brothers and monks were permitted to have their schools in connexion with the Board; of late years this is not allowed (Rule vii. 2).

For a long period children were not prohibited to say short prayers occasionally, and in accordance with the custom of their parents, and of pious families, to make the sign of the cross at certain times; latterly all this is declared unlawful, and an unholy crusade has been commenced against all religious emblems and practices, in defiance of the traditional usage not only of our own country, but of the whole Christian world, and in opposition to the words of the Apostle: "God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ" (Phil. iii. 2).

Without entering into further details, we trust that the statements we have submitted will convince you that we have been compelled by the most cogent reasons, to withdraw our confidence from the national system. The principles upon which it was founded have been ignored or violated, and many changes and innovations gradually introduced dangerous and detrimental to Catholic interests and rights; and thus have been blasted the hopes with which we were inspired after the passing of Catholic Emancipation, and when the system of national education

* We give a list of some of the teachers:—Mr. and Mrs. Young, English Protestants; Mrs. W. Campbell, Miss Campbell, Mrs. Dixon, Miss Croll, Miss Gilmore, Mr. Martin, Mr. Brown, Dr. Sullivan, Mr. Rintoul, &c., all Protestants of the Church of England or Presbyterians. In the list of clerks and inspectors who attend at the central establishment, the variety of religions is equally maintained with a similar undue proportion of Protestantism.

education was first proposed, that the era of intolerance and exclusiveness had passed, and that Catholics were to be treated with justice and a fair regard to their claims.

35. Objections against the Separate System.

Having stated our views in regard to the gradual development of the national system, you will now allow us to examine the arguments urged against separate education, and in favour of a mixed system, which are glanced at in your letter. It is objected against the separate system of education, that it encourages dissensions among the various classes of society, checks the progress of knowledge, and interferes with the proper distribution of the public funds.

36. The Separate System does not promote discord or bad feelings; such feelings among Pupils, or indifferentism to Religion, the result of the Mixed System.

In the ninth paragraph of your letter you adopt the first assertion, stating that "sectarian (or separate) education is calculated to revive social divisions in Ireland, and to stimulate feelings which it is the object of every just and liberal government to allay." The natural tendency and the practical operation of the separate and mixed systems do not sustain your views, for we think there is less danger of exciting bad feelings in the country by denominational than by mixed schools. Discordant elements will not coalesce: when Catholic, Protestant, Presbyterian, Unitarian, and Socinian children are placed together, they cannot be prevented from entering into controversial discussions, and excited religious animosities. Protestant children are often fond of deriding fasting, the sign of the cross, devotion to the B. Virgin, and many practices which we consider most sacred. Only a few weeks ago the Presbyterian boys in a model school in the North thought fit to caricature the Catholic doctrines on confession, and to cast ridicule on their companions, who approached the tribunal of penance. This is only a natural development of the mixed system, except in cases where religious feeling is merged in indifferentism, and all special religious doctrines are regarded as of no importance.

37. Mixed System excites jealousy among the Pastors of various Religious Denominations. Violence of Protestant Press and Pulpit.

Besides, mixed schools are calculated to excite jealousy among the pastors of the various denominations. We learn from published placards, from advertisements in newspapers, and from other sources, that many Anglican and Dissenting ministers entertain their flocks on Sundays with denunciations of Catholics, calling us idolators and followers of Antichrist. In the public religious meetings held every year, the same language is adopted. The tone of the Protestant press is too well known to require notice. To propagate the opinions put forward in pulpit and press, proselytising schools are established, and every effort made to attract Catholic children to them. Such things should not surprise us, when we recollect that in oaths administered by the authority of the State, our doctrines are declared damnable and idolatrous. Now, when ministers such as those we have mentioned assume the management of national mixed schools, as is frequently the case, must not the Catholic priest be filled with alarm, lest by means of the interpretation of the lessons of religion contained in the school books and otherwise, the children of his flock may be imbued with error and with prejudices against their own Church. Establish separate schools, and this source of jealousy shall be dried up.

We have referred with sincere regret to the violence of the anti-Catholic pulpit and press, but it is a matter of public notoriety that cannot be concealed. This violence was never carried to a greater extent than within the last few months, during which period writers in the press, and ministers of various sects, whilst eulogising the national system of education, have not ceased to insult and revile the Heads of the Catholic church. Indeed, had we been guilty of treason, we could not have been more violently denounced than we were by Presbyterian patrons of national schools, and others, merely because proclaiming principles laid down by great English statesmen, and adopted by Parliament, we demanded Catholic education for Catholic children, leaving it to Protestants to impart a Protestant education to their children.

38. Catholic

38. Catholic Teaching tends to promote Charity and Good Will.

God forbid that imitating, or allowing our clergy to imitate, such conduct, we should engage in so unworthy a strife. Our teaching being of quite a different character, does not consist in assailing any one. Whether in the school or in the church, we employ ourselves wholly in inculcating the truth and the morality of the Gospel, explaining the sacrifice, the sacraments, the practical duties of the Christian religion, developing and enforcing the whole dispensation of the new law. In our catechisms no attacks are made on those who differ from us in religion, nor is any mention of them made except to inculcate the necessity of charity towards them and all mankind. We teach nothing to check the growth of mutual good-will, so desirable for all men, but especially for those of the same country. Our schools have never been conducted in an aggressive spirit, and no one has attempted to fix the charge of proselytism on them.* The children who have been trained in exclusively Catholic schools are good citizens, charitable men, and practical Christians. No argument against separate schools can be deduced from our teaching or our practices, but the contrary.

39. Results of Mixed Education in various parts of Ireland, and in our Times. Separate System introduced into England.

It may further be observed that the theory of mixed education, as lessening religious prejudices, and promoting social harmony, derives no confirmation from a reference to the history of those districts where that system most generally prevails. In these, as in Belfast and the northern counties, unhappily violent displays of party spirit and deadly religious feuds are of more frequent occurrence than in any other part of the kingdom.

It is to be added that bigotry and fanaticism and hatred of every thing Catholic were never so violent as at present, though the supposed conciliatory influence of mixed education has been acting on the country for nearly 30 years. Where, then, are the boasted effects of mixed education to be seen in Ireland?

Finally, were the separate system so destructive of charity, Her Majesty's Government would not have given so fatal a boon to England, reserving the blessings of mixed schools for Ireland.

40. The Separate System does not prevent the growth of Knowledge.

The other assertion, that mixed schools, by stimulating to greater intellectual exertion, have produced more satisfactory results, is completely at variance with facts and conclusions which the late Parliamentary Commission on the subject of Endowed Schools has placed on record. The Commissioners unanimously award, after the most searching investigation, a decided superiority in knowledge and discipline to denominational schools, such as those of the Society of Friends, the Incorporated Protestant Society, and the Christian Brothers.

The testimony of the Commission, in regard to this last class of schools, is entitled, in an eminent degree, to the attention of Her Majesty's Government. We shall make a few extracts. Assistant Commissioner, Mr. Crawford, says, p. 132. *Endowed Schools Report*:—"The *most efficient* schools, in my opinion, are those managed by the community of the Christian Brothers, and I attribute this efficiency to the excellence of their system, the training of teachers, and their zeal in the cause of education." Dr. M'Blain says:—"I was much impressed with the general aspect presented by these schools, and particularly with *their discipline and order*, combined with the cheerfulness and docility of the pupils. The boys educated in the Christian Brothers schools have, in general, attained an *unusual degree* of proficiency in the different branches of learning in which they are instructed."

"The

* "It is a remarkable fact, that since the formation of the Board, notwithstanding that in so many schools *never visited by the Protestant clergyman* taught by Roman Catholic masters, and placed under the superintendence of the Roman Catholic priests, a few Protestant children are to be found in the midst of a great number of Roman Catholics, only one case has been alleged of an attempt at proselytism on the part of Roman Catholics, and in this solitary instance the charge was proved to have been unfounded." Such is the testimony of a dignitary of the Protestant Church, Dean Hoare, in a pamphlet on National Education, Dublin, 1842, p. 21.

"The *superiority of those schools* is, doubtless, in a great measure to be ascribed to the extraordinary personal influence exerted by the teachers over the pupils. In addition to this cause, the Christian Brothers, who teach in these schools, appear to have been remarkably well trained for the business of instruction, not merely that they are themselves good scholars, but that they have acquired a great aptitude in the art of teaching, and no ordinary skill in devising the most efficient method for the organization and discipline of these schools.

"With respect to the schools (the Commissioners observe) under the care of the Christian Brothers, we received no complaints. Our Assistant Commissioners have expressed most favourable opinions as to these schools, in which we *entirely concur*."

With this evidence before us, the fullest which the Government have supplied on the subject, it is vain to tell us of the supposed advantages of mixed education. The contrary is established by testimony to which neither the country nor the Government can honestly refuse their assent; yet with a full knowledge of the excellence of the schools referred to, they are excluded by an express rule of the Board from any participation in the public grants.

As a further illustration of the advantages of the separate system, we give an extract from the evidence of an English Protestant gentleman, one of the principal officers of the National Board, Mr. Cross, before the Lords' Committee, in 1854, regarding schools taught by religious ladies: "I am persuaded," said he, "that in conventual schools the literary instruction is conducted with even greater advantage and success than in many of the ordinary schools. That is caused by the fact that the convent schools are conducted by a number of ladies of superior acquirements, whose vow and duty it is, according to their religious order, to attend particularly to the education of the poor, and who take the greatest pains in promoting their literary, moral, and religious instruction. Their schools are models with regard to discipline, neatness, and cleanliness; in fact, the *conventual schools present generally the best specimens of education that Ireland can produce*." Yet, notwithstanding these praises, such excellent schools are in many cases denied any aid by the Board; and where aid is given, a smaller allowance is awarded to convent schools than to others, and they are treated as if they were of an inferior character.

41. The Separate System not opposed to the proper Management of the Public Funds.

We now come to the third assertion, that we are anxious for the separate system, with the view of securing to ourselves the management of the funds allocated to educational purposes. The Protestant Primate of Ireland, Lord G. Beresford, in a published letter, says, that the Catholic bishops have been asking "for separate grants of money from the State, for the purpose of maintaining schools under the exclusive control of the prelates of the two churches," and the Presbyterians in their General Assembly deprecate "the proposal made by the Roman Catholic hierarchy of a separate grant, under their **OWN IRRESPONSIBLE CONTROL**." These charges do not require to be refuted, as our memorial expressly states, that "*we do not entertain any desire to interfere in the remotest degree with the proper management of the public funds, over which the Civil Government should exercise control*." But it is necessary to refer to an observation in your letter, which seems to bear upon this subject.

In the fourth paragraph you say, "Parliament assigns a considerable sum to the purpose of national education; and as this sum is drawn from taxes contributed by all, so it is devoted to an object in which all are equally concerned." If these words mean that no funds derived from the public taxes can be applied to schools in which any particular religious tenets are interwoven with education, we cannot admit their accuracy. The maxim contained in them in this sense, is at variance with the example of England and the Colonies, where not only Protestant, but also exclusively Catholic schools, receive aid from the common taxes, without exposing the State to the charge of partiality or injustice. But if the meaning of the passage be, that all those who contribute to the taxes have a right to share in the advantages derived from them, we cordially agree in so fair a principle, admitting that not only Catholics but all other religious denominations may advance a claim to participate in the educational grants of the State, the several classes receiving assistance according to their respective wants and

and their numbers, not for the purpose of establishing proselytizing schools, but to enable them to educate their children in their own religion. No aid ought to be granted to aggressive or proselytizing schools.

42. Government Interference in Education ought to be merely Financial and Inspectional.

And here let us ask, would it not be wise of Government to restrict its interference in regard to education, to the granting of pecuniary assistance and to financial arrangements, and to inspection as far as it serves to secure the proper expenditure of the public money. A Government consisting of persons professing different and contradictory opinions, and a legislative body to which Jews, Unitarians, Socinians, Baptists, Presbyterians, Anglicans, and Roman Catholics are equally admitted, cannot safely interfere in forming the mind of youth, a task not to be accomplished without inculcating special religious doctrines. Wherever the State has taken into its hands public education, and especially in mixed countries, its failure has been complete. The example of Prussia is instructive, which, obliged to abandon its schemes of State education, has begun to restore its legitimate functions to the church. The State ought to encourage the progress of every branch of knowledge, and can do so effectually by rewarding and promoting merit, by exciting emulation by competitive examinations, and by watching over the legitimate application of the funds allotted to education, without going farther. It ought not to educate, or, assuming the functions of the schoolmaster, to walk in the footsteps of the first French Republic, that declared all children to be the property of the State. The functions of the Government, or of any Government Board, ought to be merely financial and inspectional. If any public Board, especially a mixed one, undertake to give religious and moral lessons to the country, as the National Commissioners have done, it intrudes into the domain of religion, outstepping the boundaries of its own legitimate sphere of action in opposition to the maxim, "Render to Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's" (Mat. xxii. 21).

43. Statements favourable to the National System. Grants made to Catholics.

After having explained your objections against denominational schools, you dilate on the advantages of the national system, stating that it was established for the poor, who are generally Catholic, and you refer to the large portion of the grant obtained by schools under Roman Catholic patronage, and to the inestimable advantages enjoyed by Roman Catholics in those schools. There are, you state, 3,683 schools under Roman Catholic patrons, with 481,000 pupils professing the same faith, so that of every 100 children, 84 are Catholic, only 16 Protestant; and of the teachers, 80 in every 100 are Catholic, only 20 Protestant.

We are not indifferent to any good effects produced by national schools, and, without forgetting our rights to participate in the public grant for education, we are sincerely grateful for any benefits conferred by the State on our flocks. But as, in a question so closely connected with faith and morals, as education confessedly is, pecuniary and literary considerations alone are not to engross all our attention, you will allow us to make some observations, suggested by your statistics.

44. Grants made to Proselytizing Schools not mentioned by Government.

In the first place, we must remark that in your enumeration, there is a most serious omission of a large class of schools under Protestant and Presbyterian patrons, in which, in opposition to the original constitution of the system, and to our rights, Catholics receive a combined religious education with children of other persuasions. This class of schools, which is particularly dangerous, is never referred to in your letter.

45. Many Schools called *National* are *Catholic Parochial* Schools.

In the next place, the National Commissioners or the Government cannot claim credit for the erection of the large number of Catholic Schools in connexion

nexion with the Board. The non-vested schools under Catholic patrons were generally built without any assistance whatever from the public funds, owing their origin to the charity of the faithful, and the zeal of the Roman Catholic clergy. They are in reality *Catholic parochial schools*, though the Commissioners require the words *National schools* to be placed on them, an inscription contrary to truth, if it implies that they are the property of the nation, or that the State had the care or expense of their erection. Many also of the vested schools have been built, at the expense in a great part, and by the exertions of the Catholic clergy and laity, though by giving some contribution towards erecting or repairing them, the Board have acquired a legal claim to them.

46. Reason why Catholic Schools and Masters receive a large amount of Public Grant.

In the third place, if Catholic masters receive so large a proportion of the public grant, whilst we appreciate the advantage, we cannot consider it as a special boon conferred on the Catholic body. It is a consequence of the past and present state of the country, superinduced by former misgovernment and ill-treatment. If Catholic masters receive so large a proportion of the public grant, it is because Catholics constitute the great bulk of those who have need to be educated at the public expense, having been in past times reduced to poverty by confiscation, persecution, and the destructive operation of penal laws. As a matter of necessity the national schools in three provinces, and in a part of Ulster, are almost exclusively Catholic, and except in schools under Protestant or Presbyterian patrons, and in model schools, the mixture of pupils is not very considerable. And it is this exclusive character of the national schools that has prevented them from producing the dangerous results which so generally mark the progress of the mixed system.

47. Disadvantages of Catholic Schools under National Board.

Now, with such statistics before us, with such an immensely preponderating majority of schools, pupils, and masters on the Catholic side, was it not to be expected that special attention should have been paid to Roman Catholic interests in the administration of a system destined for the education of their children? We regret to state that so clear a principle of equity and sound policy seems to have been overlooked in a matter of so much importance. By a legal fiction innumerable schools built by Catholics under Catholic patronage, that have never been attended by a Protestant, and in districts where no poor Protestant resides, have been declared to be *mixed* schools, and are treated as if it were necessary to protect imaginary Protestants against Catholic instruction. During the greater part of the day every book containing special doctrines of our Church, every mention of our faith, every allusion to the Holy See, and every practice of Catholic piety is strictly prohibited. If the prohibition be violated, the grant is withdrawn, so that in order to participate in the public funds we are obliged to forego the advantages to be derived from pious practices and from sanctifying knowledge by religion. We have been also obliged to commit, to a great extent, the training of our teachers not only to Irish, but also to English and Scotch Protestants and Presbyterians.

The general constitution of the Board charged with the administration of the system is just as little conformable to your statistics. The resident Commissioner and a large majority of the other Commissioners are Protestant; and as the Catholic Commissioners either live at a distance, or are engaged in professional duties, the power of the whole body may be said to be placed in Protestant hands.

The majority of the principal officers employed in the central institution at Marlborough-street, for regulating the details of business through the country, is Protestant.

The proportion of Catholic to Protestant inspectors does not at all correspond to the number of Catholic schools and children, and it seems that latterly in selecting Catholics a regard is had to those who, having graduated in the Queen's colleges, may be suspected of not entertaining views favourable to the clergy, or the Church of the great majority of the people.

It appears, therefore, that the statistics referred to by you as a proof of the advantages of the national system, supply us with unanswerable arguments to show

show that the administration of the system has been carried on in a narrow and illiberal spirit, and without a due regard to the immense preponderance of the Catholic population, especially in the humbler walks of life.

48. Government Statistics of National Schools show the facility of introducing Separate System in Ireland.

Those statistics are also very valuable in another point of view, showing as they do the facility with which the separate system can be established. The 3,683 schools under Catholic patrons, and with Catholic masters, and in which the religious instruction is Roman Catholic, require but very slight modifications to make them denominational schools. Introduce the symbols of religion, and allow the use of Catholic books, such as those prepared by the Christian Brothers, which, both in literary and religious merit, are far superior to the national school books, and without many further changes more than three-fifths of all the schools of Ireland will assume a separate character. Very many vested schools could be converted into Catholic schools with the same facility, whilst others could as readily assume a Protestant or Presbyterian character.

49. Separate System established in England, though rendered difficult by the varieties of Sects.

In England, where the poorer population is split up into innumerable sects, the introduction of the separate system must have been a work of considerable difficulty. In Ireland the case is very different; in three provinces the poorer classes, and those who frequent national schools, are nearly all Catholic; and in Ulster, though there is a greater mixture of different denominations, many districts have only one prevailing religion. Hence the peculiar circumstances of this country seem well adapted for the introduction of the separate system, which, notwithstanding the difficulties arising from the variety of sects, has been established in England in accordance with the wishes of the people and the wise maxims of great statesmen, who would approve of no system unless it were blended with religion, and hallowed by its benign influence.

50. The Rejection of the claims of Protestants to Special Grants for Education, no reason why Catholic claims should be rejected. Privileges of Protestant Clergy in past times.

In the ninth paragraph of your letter you inform us that claims in regard to the national system bearing resemblance to ours had not been listened to by Government; whence you would seem to prepare us for a similar refusal. Presuming you refer to the claims of the clergy of the Established Church, we cannot but feel surprised that our demands should be confounded or compared with theirs. We are not called on to enter into the merits of their demands, but we must state that our position and our claims are altogether different. They are in the possession of large funds, formerly the property of the Roman Catholic Church, originally intended not only for the support of the clergy, but also for the education and relief of the poor—funds, much more than sufficient for all the religious, educational, and charitable requirements of a small minority of the population. Besides, in past times large grants were made by Parliament in favour of Protestants; and Royal schools, Erasmus Smith's schools, Charter schools,* and Kildare-street Society schools, were endowed for the purpose of propagating

* In the first Report on Education in Ireland, ordered 3d June 1825, we find a long account of the Charter Schools. "The expenditure," says the Report, p. 30, "of the Society (incorporated for promoting Protestant Schools in Ireland) during the ninety years it has been in operation, has been no less than 1,612,138*l*." The Report gives a detailed account of the frightful abuses of the Charter Schools. Page 7, extracts are given from the benevolent Mr. Howard: "The children in general," he stated, "were sickly, pale, and such miserable objects, that they were a disgrace to all society."

The Report adds, p. 30: "From these statements it results that 7,905 children apprenticed cost just a million sterling."—*Ib.* The Report then states that by a return made in 1814, it resulted that from 1803 to 1814 there had been apprenticed 1,583 boys and 934 girls—"of the former (the boys) 982 were doing well, and 603 had either eloped, or enlisted, or been discharged for bad conduct. The return speaks more favourably of the girls, 205 of whom, however, had eloped or turned out ill. But there is reason to apprehend," continues the Report, "that this return must be considered as far too favourable."

propagating their opinions. How far their success or fidelity in managing the funds committed to them in past times gives them a right to ask for a continuation or an increase of past privileges, is shown by many Parliamentary papers, and especially by the Report and evidence lately published by the Commissioners of the Endowed Schools.

51. Advantages of Protestant Clergy under present System.

But even under the national system, Protestant interests have not been forgotten. Is it not the case that a large majority of the Commissioners is Protestant, that the principal Professors of the head training school are of the same religion, that the books relating to history, religion and morality have been compiled by Protestants, contain innumerable extracts from Protestant writers, and totally exclude everything Catholic?

52. Protestant Clergy desire to establish a right to give Protestant Instruction to Catholic Children.

But not satisfied with all these advantages, the Protestant clergy insist on obtaining a recognised right to give Protestant instruction to Catholic children at the expense of the public funds to which Catholics largely contribute. Their object has not been concealed. "I could," says the Right Rev. Dr. Daly, of Cashel and Waterford, in a speech delivered in the presence of the Protestant primate and a large assembly of noblemen, on the 20th April, 1843, "I could," said he, "when I was minister of a large populous parish, have educated the Protestants of the parish effectually, scripturally, according to the forms of the Established Church under the system of the National Board; I could have taken care of the Protestants under that system." One would think that this ought to have been enough; but nothing less than the attendance of the Catholic children at his instructions would satisfy his zeal. Explaining his sentiments he adds, "but I do trust that nothing, whether favours conferred, or threats held out, will ever induce the Protestant clergy of Ireland to take part in a system which makes it a fundamental principle that notice is to be given to the Roman Catholic children to go away from the word of the living God." The Church Education Society in their various Reports have re-echoed the sentiments of Dr. Daly. Many Presbyterian ministers have bitterly spoken in the same sense, and it would be easy to show by other quotations that the great end of their aspirations is to seize on the religious education of Catholic children.

53. Catholic demands for Separate Education just and reasonable.

We need not say that our case is quite different. We speak for a population reduced to poverty by confiscation and penal laws. We speak in the name of a Church that has been persecuted and despoiled of all its property, and that has made great sacrifices in promoting public education. Though past injustices ought to be repaired, we ask for neither favours nor privileges; we seek for no monopoly, but for freedom of Catholic education,—a freedom which implies a fair participation in the benefits of the State. The principles we act on have been supported by the wisdom and authority of the greatest statesmen, and sanctioned by Parliament for England.

In the name of the same church we complain that solemn promises have not been maintained, and that our rights, which you, in the name of Government, profess to recognise, have been ignored. We complain that the administration of a system principally designed for a Catholic population is placed in the hands of a body in great part Protestant, and that in the appointment of inspectors and other officers due regard has not been had to the number of Catholic schools and pupils. We complain that the rules of the Board of National Education have

An account of the administration of the Diocesan and other similar schools is found in the same Report of 1825, and in that of the Commissioners of the endowed schools.

A Protestant writer, speaking of the Charter Schools says: "The Charter Schools have filled Ireland with vice and dissension. They have been the fruitful source of enmities, prejudices and immoralities."—*Views of Ireland*, by J. O'Driscoll, Esq. London, 1823. T. ii. p. 335.

The Report of the Endowed Schools Commission states that the Charter Schools have been successful since the project of converting Catholics through them was abandoned. Rep. p. 97.

have gradually undergone changes adverse to Catholics and favourable to Protestants. We complain of the dangers to which our children are exposed in schools where they are *induced* to receive Protestant religious instruction, or can receive no religious instruction at all. We complain that the books, such as we have described them, are unfit for the education of Catholics. We complain that the whole national system has been developed in a narrow-minded, illiberal, and anti-Catholic spirit, and that the Catholics of Ireland, as if to remind them of the degradation of past times, are deprived of many advantages freely granted to all classes in England. In fine, we complain of grievances affecting ourselves and the children of our flocks. But far from seeking to usurp the education of Protestants, we restrict our care to those of our own household, leaving all who differ from us in religion to provide for the instruction of their own children in whatever way they consider most beneficial.

Having now laid before you at considerable length some of our principal objections to the system of National Education, and stated the injustice and grievances of which we have to complain, we trust that when you shall have explained our views to Government, the demands which we have made and now make in the name of the vast Catholic population of Ireland, will be granted in a wise and liberal spirit, and the justice and necessity of our claims to a separate system of Catholic education for Catholic children fully recognised.

We have, &c.

+ PAUL CULLEN.	+ WILLIAM KEANE.
+ JOSEPH DIXON.	+ PATRICK DURCAN.
+ PATRICK LEAHY.	+ PATRICK FALLON.
+ PATRICK M'GETTIGAN.	+ JOHN KILDUFF.
+ JAMES BROWNE.	+ DAVID MORIARTY.
+ JOHN RYAN.	+ J. P. LEAHY.
+ JOHN CANTWELL.	+ DOMINICK O'BRIEN.
+ CORNELIUS DENVIR.	+ JAMES WALSH.
+ WILLIAM DELANY.	+ LAURENCE GILLOOLY.
+ JOHN DERRY.	+ DANIEL M'GETTIGAN.
+ THOMAS FEENY.	+ THOMAS FURLONG.
+ CHARLES MACNALLY.	+ JOHN MACEVILY.
+ EDWARD WALSH.	+ MICHAEL O'HEA.
+ FRANCIS KELLY.	+ MICHAEL FLANNERY.

NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND).

FURTHER CORRESPONDENCE relative to
NATIONAL EDUCATION in *Ireland* (presented
in continuation of Parliamentary Paper,
No. 26, of the present Session.

(Presented to Parliament by Her Majesty's Command.)

*Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,
3 April 1860.*

206.

Under 4 oz.