

his destiny; and since the Revelation brought down from heaven by Christ, none but fools or knaves deny that the destiny of man is immortality! If the object of youthful education is to fit man for his destiny, it follows that the great object of the education of children is to prepare them for eternity! All this is precisely what the Catholic Church primarily intended when she devised schools for popular education at the first? What follows again from this?—Why, that every man, if consistent, must deny the doctrine of immortal life as taught by Christianity, or else must acknowledge that the religious dogmas that lead man safely to that immortality are the most valuable and important things that can be taught in schools; and that schools where religion is not taught and practised, do not accomplish the end of education—the fitting of men to fulfil their destiny.

I might leave it then to the advocates of our State schools to settle how schools, created by a State, and in the image of a State, that is incompetent in matters of the soul, can be themselves other than incompetent to instruct the soul rightly for immortality; or what value an education neutral, indifferent, or incompetent in the things of immortality, can be to men whose life on earth has no other value than as a preparation for an eternal life, whose conditions depend upon religion. In the presence and in the teeth of this incompetent State system it would be enough that I proceed to assert the unchangeable doctrines of Catholic truth, and of all men whose profession of Christianity has any sincerity.

All true learning, and all real science is good in its measure, and in subordination to the doctrine of God and of Religion, which is the basis of all truth.

But no science, and no learning is good, or safe, or worthy of acceptance by immortal man, which is not subordinate to the doctrines of God, and seasoned throughout with the salt of religious teaching and religious practice.

But it is no wish of ours to be impracticable, or to urge merely theoretical objections to the arrangements that others of our fellow-citizens may desire to enter into. Notwithstanding that we avow our conviction that the assumption of education as a function of our Civil Government is impolitic for the State, yet show us how it can be so adjusted as not to defeat the great end of immortality for which we live, and we will waive our objections, and give the plan at least a full and unembarrassed trial.

Do you say that our State can have nothing to do with religious doctrines in schools? But it has to do with them! It does decide upon them, when it excludes any of them from the schools of the people.—It thereby murders religion in the nursery; it strangles it in the very cradle. Do you say it can give no money to support doctrines not common to all the people? But it does give its support and all its support to maintaining the very worst of doctrines, and one far from common to all the people. The doctrine which teaches that religion need not be taught in schools! Do you say that no arrangement for separate schools where different religions may be taught is possible? and that the attempt would break down the system? This, then, would prove that the system is bad and ought to be broken down. But an arrangement is not so impossible as it is thought.—Let but a disposition be shown to do justice, and to deal fairly, so far as can be easily done, and the most grievous difficulties would vanish. When such a disposition is shown we will be found ready to propose a plan that should give satisfaction to all candid men, and for the points which cannot be reached, and which require consideration and compromise, I will guarantee that the objections will not be urged from Catholic quarters.

But, in truth, the real position of the supporters and advocates of the State school system, is this:—They do not want anything different in their arrangements! Whether it be that the system as at present organised affords plunder for jobbers upon the public treasury, or whether that it affords influence to the men who for the time being gain control of it; or whether it be that its promoters esteem it as injurious to interests that they desire to see ruined; or whether it be all of these together—the desire is to keep the present school system in operation at every cost, and at every hazard. I am sure it is too late in the day to argue that the system does no wrong, on the ground that any general religion can be taught, effective as religion, but not deeply offensive to any one creed. Excluding all reference to Catholics, the sects have found out by this time that the elimination from religious instruction of the doctrines on which they differ one from another, leaves mere infidelity. And when the tens of thousands of children of Catholics in this city and State are taken into the account, as they must be, we have told them and must repeat it, that the inculcation of whatever kind of religion they may consider as common to all of them, or devised by any wit of any of them for the special occasion, is as injurious to our feelings, and as repugnant to our consciences, as could be to theirs the public teaching in common schools of prayers to the Blessed Virgin, or professions of fealty to the Holy Roman Catholic Church! But the supporters of the State school system, commonly desert all consideration of religion. They contemptuously banish it, as having little right to meddle with the things of this world, which they seem to consider as being wholly given over to be managed by the devil—and themselves! They tell us that separate religious education promotes bigotry, and destroys good neighborhood. The firm belief in the truth of any religion must be accompanied by the conviction that every religion opposed to it is false. If this be bigotry, then the only liberality is scepticism. But if they say that in any other respect than that of possessing profound religious convictions, religious education injures good neighborhood, we challenge them to the proof. As to Catholics the appeal is triumph-

ant. The Catholics who are now your neighbors have for the most part been all brought up under a religious separate education, and very many of them in entire segregation from people of other religions. Can you say that the people, thus brought up, who frequent the Sacraments and services of the Church, are not good neighbors? Why it is proverbial, even in the mouths of their opponents that these are, in all things human, the very best of neighbors? Can you point me, in the Catholic Catechism, or in any of the Religious observances that we inculcate in our schools to one doctrine or commandment, that, either in itself or in the tendency of its influence, goes to making man or woman a bad neighbor? For the catechisms and doctrines of religions other than the Catholic I have little love. And yet I know most of them and I must say that, although many of the pulpit declamations of Protestants go directly to making bad neighbors, yet I know of no doctrine inculcated in any one of their catechisms that tends to make a man a worse neighbor than he would be without learning that catechism! But I will tell you whence is the danger of bad neighborhood and of an intolerable population! It is from the total abrogation in the education of the young, of that Divine religion which teaches man to fear God and to reverence His laws; to love God, for Himself, and to love ones neighbor for the sake of God! Hence come upon our afflicted society the selfishness, the oppression, and the unscrupulous extortions and frauds of the rich and powerful! Hence come the robberies, the thefts, the forgeries, the recklessness, and the self-abandonment of those who are poor and wish to be rich! Hence come the overflows of licentiousness, that have polluted our society till men are no longer secure of the honor of their wives, the peace of their families, or the security of their estates. And yet, from the gilded and bedazzled charnal house of this modern society, men are not ashamed to raise their care-worn, spectre-like faces, to exclaim against the danger of bigotry and bad neighborhood from the too positive inculcation of the doctrines and duties of religion!

Abandoning, perhaps, such a ground, the fosterers of godless schools turn to a plea more consonant with the sentiments of the god of New York; and urge the motive of economy. But from the fact that the men of our times so well know how to calculate the uses and economy of money, this is a plea the more certain to refute itself. Let me only remark, that the Board of Education of this city, in answer to the charge of extravagance urged against them two years ago by Mayor Kingsland in his Message showed, satisfactorily so far as I know, that the schools under their management were more cheaply conducted than the schools of other cities under the same kind of State management. Well, by consulting the last year's Report of the State Superintendent I find that more than half a million of money was demanded of this city for schools, for one year. And, by the same Report I find that the average attendance was but a little over 40,000. So that the expenses of this economical system, for just what they do for the children of the city amounted to from twelve to thirteen dollars per scholar.

I will dismiss this plea of the economy of State control of schools with two remarks. The one is, that every man who has examined the subject knows it is true of all work done by the State, that it costs more than work done under private supervision. I say farther that men could be found, as a mere business matter, to contract for doing all the State and city do in education, for one-third of the half million they called for. However, the plea of economy is but a sordid plea, at best; and their undoubted extravagance of expenditure is one of the lightest objections we have to urge against the managers of the State schools.

The last plea to which the champions of godless education are driven in its defence, and the only one that even in theory has the shadow of reason or law on its side is, that the State must take education into its hands to secure its own interests; as a preventive of ignorance, and the crime that is supposed to flow from ignorance.

But if my feeble powers will permit me to rise in any degree to the true heights of the question here in debate, I will tear away this mask of reason and of law. I will show that the assumption of education as a State function has defeated its own ends; that in the hands of the State, education has done little towards dispelling ignorance, and instead of preventing, has actually promoted and been the cause of crime.

Have I gone too far? Now listen, and see if I prove not my assertion. Within the memory of men who are still young, the city of New York departed from what was the practice throughout this State, and instead of leaving parents and neighborhoods to choose their own schools and teachers, and sometimes granting money for their encouragement; in this city the plan was proposed of the State taking charge of education. From step to step they went on till the law of 1842 was carried, after warnings given of its results, by one whose name will forever shine in the history of the struggles of religion against godless State schools in New York. Well, you have had ten years of experiment. To what result has it brought you? One result is that now, with an annual tax upon the people of more than half a million of dollars, these schools thrown open by the State, with all their allotments of gratuities, have within their precincts but little more than an average of forty thousand children—far less than one-third of the children of the city. Is it thus that this lavish outlay of money is to dispel ignorance? The people distrust these schools, they will not send their children to them. The system has been imposed on the community, under the pretence of being a benefit, from the very fact of the traditional feelings in favor of an education that had its source elsewhere than in the

State. But it has not taken hold of the children of the people. It pretends to have but from a fourth to a third of them. And yet for this it taxes this city more than half a million of money. Evidence of this failure of the system is to be found in the official reports themselves. I suppose Mayor Kingsland, whose term of office has just expired, will not be considered to be in the pay of the Catholics, when he uses this language:—"I trust that the amount demanded for school purposes, (which was over half a million of money,) will have the effect of directing to this subject the attention of those who contributed this sum, and unless action is had with regard to placing in the municipal authorities some control over the expenses of this institution, they will increase from year to year, until, in the end, there may be a revulsion of feeling against an organization so enormously expensive, which may result in serious injury to the cause of universal education." Within a few years past designing or misguided men have leagued together to spread this same system throughout the State. After three years of experiment the promoters of it, last summer, called a Convention; and listen to the terms of the call:

"The interest felt for common schools by the community is manifestly less at the present moment (1852) than at any time for many years past," and that "the mischief wrought among our schools, and the distrust engendered in the public mind are now prevailing to an extent which may well alarm the friends of education;" and, they add, they "feel that immediate steps should be taken to stay the downward progress of our schools."

Dr. Potter, formerly of Union College in this State, now Protestant Bishop of Pennsylvania, in a letter to this Convention regretting his inability to be present, speaks of "what, to a 'looker on in Venice,' seems much like a backward movement in the great State of New York." Dr. Potter was one of the hottest advocates for the State school despotism inaugurated in 1849-1850.

Do I need to go farther in order to show that the assumption of education by the State has defeated its own ends, by imposing great expenses on the community, and showing results that produce in return only disgust? But I was to show something farther. I was to make it clear that the kind of education offered us by the State is actually productive of crime; instead of a preventive. The education here offered is an education without religion. It is the teaching of letters, and of the elements of science, without the correlative inculcation of moral principles resting for their sanction and obligation on the revealed will of God—which is religion. Now, if reasoning a priori—or if the experience of man—or if the results of statistics, go for anything, they prove that all such education, quickening the wits, and deadening the conscience; training the intellect, and neglecting the heart, and the supernatural faith that alone rightly directs the heart—only creates a power of havoc and destruction in the moral universe. I would give you some startling statistics to this purpose, but statistics are made in our day to talk any language that is desired; but instead of unreliable statistics, I will give you one most unsuspected testimony to my assertion.

What I have said is, that teaching the rudiments of letters and science, without positive religious doctrines, is productive, not preventive, of crime. The cant of modern times has supposed that any instruction of the intellect tends of itself towards the practice of virtue. Under this notion a system of "Sabbath Schools," as they called them, was started many years ago in London and other parts of England. That is, Sabbath Schools for the purpose of teaching children to read, but not sectarian; that is not training them in the doctrines and practices of any particular sect or church. Now let me read a paragraph from a Protestant religious paper of London, copied into the Methodist organ of this city two or three weeks ago:—

"In 1845, it was calculated that from London alone, there was a yearly circulation of stamped and unstamped newspapers and serials, of a decidedly pernicious character, to the extent of 28,862,000. . . . the beginning of 1851, above 100 new penny periodicals were started; and again in January, 1852, at least an equal number, the greater part of these being calculated to do harm rather than good. A correspondent of the Morning Chronicle says; 'Since the year 1844, when Eugene Sue's Mystery of Paris appeared in London, a great number of penny papers of a vitiating character have been published in London, Manchester, Liverpool, and other large towns. . . . The mischief already done is considerable. The young people of both sexes, in the families of the mechanic and the shop-keeper, are now habituated to a course of reading in which felony, murder, violation, forgery, adultery, and all other crimes, are treated as the common occurrences of life. The consequences is, that the minds of thousands are depraved by that very exercise which ought to improve it.' . . . With regard to infidel publications, we were ourselves informed by a clergyman, that in one large manufacturing town alone—that in which he labors—the weekly circulation of an infidel and blasphemous penny periodical there published, is 23,000; the proprietor and editor of which both deny the existence of a God. The Edinburgh Review, July 1850, made the following appalling statement: 'the total (annual) issue of immoral publications has been stated at 29,000,000.'

"Is it possible for such a foul deep stream of iniquity as this to pour forth through the country, and penetrate into every street and alley, of every large and small town and even village in the land, without annually engulfing thousands of our youth in hopeless ruin? How many of the flower of our congregations, and families, and the hope of our Churches, are by these means cankered with the principles of atheism, infidelity, and ungodliness? These principles corrupt first the mind and then the manners of the rising ge-

neration, and it is distressing to see to what an extent this has been done. The tares have been sown while men slept, and now they appear rank and luxuriant. It is true that the advocates of unbelief in our day weave with thin cobwebs; yet, according as they deal with the depravity of their nature, they are strong enough to hold many of their insects, I mean our young people, and when once they have entangled them, they never cease to instil their venom until they have totally poisoned and ruined them. It is lamentable to see how soon some of these novices set up as doctors in the devil's school, and seating themselves in the chair of the scorner, can deride all revealed religion, arraign and condemn Christ as an impostor, and besmear him again with their spittle, burlesque the Holy Scriptures, and laugh at immaterial substances and everlasting flames.

"I suppose that it will not be denied that our Sabbath have created the market for the abundance of cheap periodicals in this city. Before the masses of our population could read, there was no demand for these things, but as that vast power has been bestowed upon the working classes, the press is teeming with its cheap literature in every direction. Who are they who devour with the greatest eagerness the frothy and demoralising works which teem from the press of this day? They are young people, who have lately been in the Sabbath school, and others who were there a few years ago. But is it not inflicting a curse, and not a blessing, upon young people to give them the power of letters and then leave them to the victims of cheap writings which are corrupting the youth of our age?"

The Methodist paper of this city accompanies this citation with the regret that the evil complained of has equal applicability to this country—although Methodists in their hate of the Catholic Church are almost foremost in joining hands with those who promote godless education in this country, and thus weave their cobweb for catching the children of the people.

I cite this testimony, but I do not need it. All who have eyes to see, or ears to hear, in this city, where State godless free schools have been longest in operation, see and feel what is becoming of the youth of the city. The frightfully swelling lists of youth whose names figure on the return and books of the police tell the story! The repeated presentments of our Grand Juries as to the increase of juvenile delinquency tell the story! The charges of our Judges, and the language of the prosecuting officers in our criminal courts; all these unite in testifying what is happening to the children of this city submitted to an education without the strenuous inculcation of the practices and doctrines of revealed religion. All these testify in tones that should make this city start from its long torpor, as to the purpose and effect to which have been applied the millions of money here lavished under the name of education, after being wrung by the tax-gatherer from the owners of property; who in their turn collect it from the people in increased rents on every man or woman who occupies a shop, or a house, or so much as a poor room in this city.

If this be education—and if the results of teaching the children of the people to read are to continue thus—if they are to be taught in schools no fear of God, no principles of religious restraint, no horror of using their newly acquired power of reading, upon the piles of flagrant licentiousness and blasphemy, and immorality, which is the most plentiful, the cheapest, the easiest of access to them; if they are to go on reading what the supply of the popular shops of cheap literature shows to be their principal reading at this time; then, for my own part, I would invoke the ridicule of this age that thinks itself so wise and so free, because it knows how to read George Sand and Eugene Sue; and I would not be afraid of the paradox of declaring a new Beatitude, and saying—*Blessed are the Ignorant!* If popular knowledge is to consist in knowing how to read, and then in reading chiefly all that is shameful and criminal and obscene in the records of life in New York and other cities, and all that is hideous and foul in the diseased imaginations and corrupted hearts of the writers of licentious fiction—then *blessed are the ignorant!*

The speaker here referred to Ireland as a nation which its oppressors had for ages robbed of scientific as they had of material wealth, and which, therefore, men of a certain class were pleased to call ignorant, but he showed how, by preserving solely the knowledge of religion, not only had the people been able to accomplish their real destiny—the salvation of their souls—but that the nation itself, instead of perishing, or sinking into brutishness, had, at the moment when it seemed annihilated, risen and showed itself in the face of the world in an attitude that claimed the astonishment and veneration of the whole Catholic world. The conclusion he would draw was this:—that religion without secular education might well suffice the real ends of man, but that an intellectual training, from which the doctrine of God was excluded, was worse than useless.

CATHOLIC INTELLIGENCE.

RE-OPENING OF THE CHURCH OF ST. GENEVIEVE.—The 3rd of January, 1853, will be a memorable day in the annals of our Holy Church in Paris; a day of solemn expiation and pious joy, on which a public scandal ceased, and the august patroness of the great city again took possession of the temple raised in her honor. On that morning, the church, so long profaned by the name of the Pantheon, was restored to God, under the invocation of St. Genevieve.

A CATHOLIC HIERARCHY FOR HOLLAND.—We read in a Dutch journal, the *Woordbrabanter*: "It is announced that Mgr. Zurin, Bishop of Lura in partibus, V. A. of Ribourg, will be named Archbishop of Holland—that is to say, to the first charge