



AND

Conception Bay Journal.

VOL. V.

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 18, 1839.

No. 285.

Printed and Published by JOHN THOMAS BURTON, at his Office, opposite Mr. W. Dixon's

From the Liverpool Standard.

The correspondence which has recently taken place between the Bishop of Exeter and Lord John Russell is satisfactory in one respect, as adding, if possible, a clearer proof than hitherto existed of the falsity of the charge which represents the Church of England as insisting upon retaining within the limits of her own pale a monopoly of Education. We might be disposed to say, that it is satisfactory also in another, namely, as exhibiting the courteous tone and temper with which the Colonial Secretary professes to speak of the Establishment, had we not pretty strong proof that such language is extorted from the fears of his Lordship, and in no degree flows from any feeling of attachment on his part towards the interests of the Church.

The fact is, that Ministers, in their late attempt to force this scheme of National education upon the people, had wholly miscalculated the force of the resistance which would be offered to their plan. They fancied that the alarm, if sounded at all, would be confined to the voices of some few isolated individuals, whose zeal would be considered greater than their knowledge; and that the specious boon of Government school-masters overspreading the country, and converting every hamlet into an oasis of enlightened wisdom, would be hailed with noisy gratitude, and bear down any opposition which could proceed from a few vigilant champions of the Church. They now feel that they have made a false step, and that, in effectually awakening the fears of the establishment, they have done more to endanger their political existence than by any other act during their long period of misgovernment. Their chief anxiety, therefore, is to avert the consequences of this grand error; and hence the hypocritical affectation of respect for the interests of the Church, and earnest desire, if possible, to conciliate the Clergy. If the last Treasury minute which issued from the Educational Board was so carefully worded as almost to disarm criticism, and lull to sleep any jealous suspicions of lurking hostility towards a system of Scriptural instruction, who for a moment doubts to what cause to attribute this contrast between the former and present policy of Ministers? They have provoked a dangerous foe, and seek to appease it by every art of rascality and cunning. To believe that such language proceeds from such men as the genuine expression of their real sentiments, is to exercise a degree of charity of which we confess ourselves incapable. No

the true motive is fear; and to attribute the altered tone of Lord John Russell on this subject to a higher principle, is to act as absurdly as those "who hang grapes on thorns, and then gather them as the natural fruit of the branches."

But to the point with which we set out. The recklessness with which our opponents avail themselves of the aid of "enormous lying," when other weapons of attack are not forthcoming, imposes upon us the necessity of wearying our readers with reiterated exposures of the calumnies with which the Conservative party is assailed. It must be said, sung, and repeated, until the poisoned arrow from the quiver of faction has lost its power, that on no occasion, at no time, and by no authoritative voice proceeding from herself, has the Church of England wished to restrict the blessings of education to the members of her communion. She has never asserted that the State should expend the public money solely upon her, and that the only schools assisted by Government should be those in which she could train up the minds of the young, and exercise a superintending care. But she did insist, and her voice has prevailed, that in the conduct of her own schools she should be left free and unfettered; and that, whatever might be the system of instruction which would please the somewhat coarse palate of Dissenters, and unite Unitarians, Deists, Muggletonians, Huntingdonians, Anabaptists, and Papists in harmonious co-operation, she at least should be called upon to make no compromise of her principles, or admit as intermeddlers with her discipline and rules a Committee of laymen in whose religious principles she could place no confidence, and appointed by a Government which might be hostile to her existence.

Indeed, the best proof of the falsehood of the charge so emphatically denied by the Bishop of Exeter, is that fact, that no objection whatever has been raised by Churchmen to the mode in which the Education Grant has been disposed of since the period when Lord Althorp made the first proposal in Parliament. The National School Society has been a portion of the annual grant of £20,000 bestowed upon the British and Foreign School Society without a murmur or complaint. The Church of England received her share of the public money appropriated to purposes of instruction, and the Dissenters received theirs; and neither Bishop, Priest, nor Layman made the slightest opposition to this just and equitable arrangement. It is false, therefore, to assert that the Clergy have ever

called upon the State to lavish all its expenditure and care upon that portion of the community only which submitted to their guidance and control. It is false to assert that they have called upon the Government "to withhold all public aid for the instruction of those children of the poor whose parents conscientiously object to allow their children to be taught the Church Catechism, or to be compelled, as the price of their instruction, to attend to divine service in other than their own places of worship." We quote the words of the Bishop of Exeter, and we cordially concur in his emphatic disavowal of any such wish or design on the part of that Church of which he is one of the most distinguished members. *Sic utere suo ut alienum non laedas* is a maxim of the common law, and we only ask for an equally fair principle to be applied in this controversy between us and the Liberals. Let the Government adhere to the old principle of distribution, and grant money to the two Societies in proportions adapted to the efforts made respectively by each. We well know that the Church will obtain the lion's share, but it will be an honourable competition, a noble rivalry, and however much we may lament that her sound system of education is rejected by so many of our fellow-countrymen, we will not begrudge them pecuniary assistance in their attempts to amend their intellectual condition according to their own fashion. The former plan worked well, why was it departed from? To bring the schools more directly under the care of the establishment within the influence of the executive, and thus afford an opportunity of tampering with the minds of the young by a process which was intended hereafter to tell with powerful effect in favour of the Liberals.

Indeed the *Edinburgh Review* makes this very acquiescence on the part of Churchmen, in the former principle of distribution, a ground of attack against the Conservatives now. The writer of the article headed "Ministerial Plan of Education, Church and Tory Misrepresentations" argues that we are inconsistent in repudiating the offer of a boon which we previously accepted with thankfulness; and the language of Lord Stanley, in which he declared that the previous plan "had the unanimous assent of the House of Commons, the almost unanimous assent of the people of this country, and the entire approbation of the people of the community," is cited as a proof that factions motives are the cause of the present opposition. But what gross "misrepresentation" is it to at-

tempt to identify the proposition of Lord Althorp in 1832 with the scheme originally brought forward by Lord John Russell in 1839? In the former there was no model school for adult Teachers, in which were to be admitted the holders of the most opposite opinions on the most momentous of all subjects—whom it would be impossible to qualify for the task of imparting religious instruction, however learned they might have become in various departments of secular knowledge—and who, consequently, would soon look upon the former as useless or altogether subordinate to the latter;—there was no Treasury Committee of Laymen who, like the Board of Poor Law Guardians in Somerset House, were to set in motion and regulate the whole machinery of national schools;—there was no system of Government inspection and interference with the kind of instruction which the Church might think it most useful to impart. There was all the difference between the acceptance of a free gift and one clogged with an odious condition. The great body of Churchmen thankfully received the former, and turned it to the best advantage. They rejected and denounced the latter; and for this they are exposed to the charge of inconsistency and bigotry, and whatever else the Liberals think will make our cause more unpopular with the nation. But these epithets are receding on themselves. The people have unequivocally declared themselves in this matter upon the side of the Church; and the Whig-Radicals now find to their confusion, that her "name is a tower of strength, which they upon the adverse faction want." Hence these reiterated attempts to distort the real facts of the case, and blacken the motives of her strenuous and partially successful opposition to the scheme of Ministers.

The private letters received from Alexandria, which are dated on the 7th instant, are important in a commercial point of view, since they refer to the stoppage of the communications with India through Egypt as a probably event, should the allied powers proceed to a blockade of the port of Alexandria. In fact, Mr. Waghorn, who had recently returned to Egypt from a visit to Constantinople, which he had made at the instance of some of the English merchants resident in Egypt, has issued circularly to the merchants both of England and of India, to give them warning that such a turn of affairs was likely to take place, and to enable them to guard against the consequences. According to the private letters, the policy of the Pacha of Egypt continued to be of the same wavering character. He was apparently firm in his declarations that he would neither abandon any of his territorial acquisitions nor surrender the Turkish fleet, but it was believed at the same time that he relied mainly on the want of sufficient union among the allied powers to take any decisive measures against him; and that, were he once persuaded of the contrary, a different tone would be adopted. A change having been made in the day of departure from Bombay of the steamer with the Indian mail, from the 12th to the 13th of September, the news it conveyed could not reach Alexandria before the 12th instant. The cause of this change is not explained, and therefore cannot be absolutely condemned; but it is certain that such alterations are much to be deprecated, and that they cause much disappointment and inconvenience to the mercantile interest.

Espartero called upon the bystanders to "huzz for the Holy Virgin who had given victory to the Christians." "If there then a *Noire Dame* of treachery in Spain.—*Charivari*.