THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND THE ELEMENTARY EDUCATION CONFLICT IN ENGLAND AND WALES, 1870-1908

CENTRE FOR NEWFOUNDLAND STUDIES

TOTAL OF 10 PAGES ONLY
MAY BE XEROXED

(Without Author's Permission)

I.LOYD HILLYARD

c.1

100818

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND THE ELEMENTARY EDUCATION CONFLICT IN ENGLAND AND WALES, 1870-1908

by

Lloyd Hillyard

A thesis submitted to the Department of History, Memorial University of Newfoundland, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

August, 1974

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
ABSTRACT		i
PREFACE		iii
INTRODUCTION		1
CHAPTER		
I	THE EDUCATION POLICY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, 1870-1903	15
	The Church Schools and the Settlement of 1870	15
	The Free Education Act, 1891	26
	Churchmen and Board Schools	30
	More State Aid for Church Schools	34
	The Gestation of the Education Bill of 1902	49
	Conclusion	57
II	THE DEFENSE OF THE EDUCATION BILL OF 1902	59
	Reactions to the Education Bill	59
	An Attempt at a Compromise	71
	The Committee Stage of the Bill	74
	Concessions to the Nonconformists	84
	The Controversy over the Kenyon-Slaney Clause	91
	New Demands and Gains by the Church	94
	Conclusion	97

CHAPTER		PAGE
III	THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EDUCATION ACT, 1903-1906	99
	The London Education Bill	99
	Resistance to the Act	101
	The Welsh Revolt	109
	The Church Schools and the Working of the Education Act of 1902	112
	Towards the Amendment of the Education Act	117
	Conclusion	123
IV	THE EDUCATION BILLS OF 1906 AND 1908	124
	The General Election of 1906	124
	Anticipation of the Education Bill	127
	The Introduction of the Education Bill of 1906	131
	The Reaction to the Bill	133
	The Bill in the House of Commons	140
	The Bill in the House of Lords	147
	A Final Effort	154
	Conclusion	161
V	CONCLUSION	164
APPENDIX I		171
APPENDIX II		173
APPENDIX III		175
APPENDIX IV		176
BIBLIOGRAPHY		178

ABSTRACT

During the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the Church of England was, in its claim to dominate the educational system of the nation, confronted by the prevailing forces of liberalism and secularism. This thesis examines the efforts of the Church of England to maintain her control over national education in the face of these opposing trends in the period 1870 to 1908.

The state system of schools established by the Forster Act of 1870, because of superior financial resources, threatened to supersede the Church schools. The failure of voluntary contributions to increase in proportion to educational costs, and the advent of the Free Education Act of 1891 which deprived the urban schools of substantial support from school fees caused many Church schools to be abandoned while the rate-aided state schools system in which Anglican teaching was disallowed grew rapidly. The efforts of the Church to get a better deal for her schools resulted, in part, in the Education Act of 1902, which proposed to extend to the Church schools financial support identical to that enjoyed by the state schools and so perpetuate the Church schools system. But the Church was unable to placate the Nonconformists who objected to paying rates in support of Church schools, and only the Conservative-dominated House of Lords prevented the enactment of the Liberal Bill of 1906, which would have incorporated most of the Church schools into a system of state schools with undenominational religious

teaching. It was ironical that, in spite of the controversy over it, the Act of 1902 did not halt the decline of the Church schools, or provide new schools for the Anglican children who attended state schools and received no denominational teaching.

Consequently, efforts were made to arrange a settlement of the education question satisfactory to both Nonconformists and Anglicans, the most significant of which was the abortive agreement of 1908, through which the Church would have surrendered the majority of her schools to the state in exchange for doctrinal teaching supplementing Bible teaching in both the state and former Church schools. But this concordat was rejected mainly because of the influence of the High Church Party who wanted denominationally controlled schools for the effective teaching of religious doctrines. It was mostly because of the prominence of the Anglo-Catholics that the education conflict was not solved during the first decade of the twentieth century, to the detriment of secular as well as religious education.

PREFACE

This thesis examines the role of the Church of England in the education conflict in England and Wales in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Its purpose is to show how the Church of England attempted to maintain her influence in national education in the face of the prevailing forces of liberalism and secularism in the period 1870 to 1908.

The thesis begins with the Elementary Education Act of 1870 whose effect was increasingly to supplant the Church schools with state schools. As a result, a Conservative administration brought in legislation in 1902 which increased public aid to Church schools.

An examination of the controversy over the Education Act of 1902 and the Bill of 1906 reveals how the Church confronted the attacks made on her influence in national education by the secularists and Nonconformists, angered by the support given to the Church schools by the Act of 1902. Though many people in the Church of England had doubts about the constitutionality and fairness of the Church's educational policy, the Church achieved its objectives largely because it had the support of the pro-Anglican Conservative party.

Since the conflict over education continued after 1902 and the Church schools continued to decline, the Church attempted to make a compromise with the Nonconformists so as to guarantee religious teaching in the state schools. A final effort to settle the education conflict in 1908

failed because of the influence of the Anglo-Catholics who wanted Church controlled "atmosphere" schools for the effective teaching of religious doctrines. The intensity of public interest in the education conflict is demonstrated by the attention which great national papers like The Times, The Spectator and The Manchester Guardian gave to the problem. The point of view of the Church was given by The Times and The Spectator, but more pointedly by Church organs, namely The Church Times, The Guardian, The Pilot and The Church Quarterly Review.

The conclusion of the thesis is that the Church was unable to check the decline of her schools which was caused by the growing secularism of the age. The failure of the Church to make a settlement with the Nonconformists was detrimental to both religious education and education per se.

The writer would like to express his gratitude to the Newfoundland Government for financial assistance which enabled him to write this thesis, to the Reference Department of the M.U.N. Library for its valuable service in obtaining materials which would not otherwise have been available, and to Dr. W. H. Whiteley for his patient supervision and helpful criticisms of this work.

INTRODUCTION

The Church of England is an outcome of the religious and political conflicts of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. As the National or Established Church, it has fundamental connections with the state. The governorship of the Church is invested in the Crown; the Crown appoints the bishops of the Church; its doctrines and forms of worship are regulated by statute, and any change in them has to be sanctioned by an Act of Parliament.[1] As the National Church, it is theoretically co-extensive with the nation, and all those not professing to be members of it were, until the end of the first third of the nineteenth century, offically ostracized from national life.[2]

One of the duties assumed by the National Church was to provide for the secular and religious education of the people. Long before the Government got actively involved in the provision of education through the Elementary Education Act of 1870,[3] the Church of England had

---

1 Hubert Hensley Henson, Bishop of Durham. The Church of England (Cambridge University Press, 1939), p. 186.

2 Owen Chadwick, The Victorian Church (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1966), Vol. 1, p. 3.

3 Great Britain, Public General Acts, 33 & 34 Vic., cap. 75. An Act to provide for Public Elementary Education in England and Wales (Elementary Education Act, 1870), hereafter cited as the Forster Act. Sir William Forster, 1818-1886, introduced the Bill, Liberal M.P. for Bradford, 1861-86, Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education (also called the Education Department) 1870-74, during Gladstone's first Ministry, 1868-74; he was a Quaker.

Elementary Education was that given to children up to age 13, consisted mainly of reading, writing and arithmetic, and was mostly for the working class.

been involved in elementary education, and in higher education as well, through its control of the ancient grammar schools,[4] its influence in the Public schools,[5] and in the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge. In 1811 the National Society for the Promotion of the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church was founded and became the educational arm of the Church of England. By 1870, there were 6,382 Church of England or National elementary schools having an average attendance of 844,334 and comprising the largest educational establishment in England.[6]

During the nineteenth century, the Church's view of education was characterized by the fundamental position in which it placed religious teaching in the schools. "Religion was not merely one of the subjects of instruction, it was the cement by which all the constituent parts of education were built into a whole." "Education, at its full and proper sense" could only be carried on where "definite religious beliefs and religious principles pervade the whole teaching of a school".[7] Therefore, the teaching of general religious

---

4 Schools founded by the Church, some during the Middle Ages, which during the seventeenth century became exclusively middle class schools. They originally heavily emphasized Latin; hence, the name, Grammar schools. H. J. Burgess, Enterprise in Education (London: The National Society, 1958), pp. 1-8.

5 Great private schools like Eton and Harrow which catered to the aristocracy.

6 Parliamentary Papers 1871, Vol. XXII, C-406, "Report of the Committee of Council on Education, 1870-71", p. 600.

7 H. Kirk-Smith, William Thompson Archbishop of York, 1819-1890 (London: S.P.C.K., 1958), p. 134.

principles common to all Christian denominations was inadequate, as was the separation of religious from secular instruction by having the former given exclusively at the beginning or end of a session. In other words, a Church atmosphere should exist in the schools, and a Church atmosphere could only exist if the teachers were Churchmen, who would use every opportunity to instil in the children the beliefs of the Church. Only in an "atmosphere" school could the aim of a Church elementary school be effectively realized, which was to produce Christians who would stoically accept their often hard conditions of life.[8]

During the last quarter of the nineteenth century and the first decade of the twentieth century, it became increasingly difficult for the Church to maintain a major role in national education. In trying to maintain denominational schools and to further the interests of religious education, the Church was fighting against the trends of the times. Secularism was increasing, though the decline of the Church was only in the embryo stage at the turn of the century. Not only did the increase in church attendance fail to keep up with the increase in population, but church attendance actually declined in the towns.[9] Moreover, the number of Nonconformist (Protestant Dissenter) communicants was approximately equal to that of

---

[8] "The Education Ideals of the National Society", The National Society's Annual Report, 1847, as found in C. K. F. Brown, The Church's Part in Education, 1833-1941 with Special Reference to the Work of the National Society, Appendix III, pp. 153-156.

[9] Chadwick, op. cit., p. 232.

the Church of England.[10]

The Established Church was increasingly becoming less representative of England and Wales. Furthermore, new life styles were drawing people away from the Church. As early as 1893, the Convocation of Canterbury discussed the phenomenon of middle class people, the main body of Church goers, going to the country for picnics on Sundays instead of going to Church as they had done traditionally.[11] Churchmen were aware that secularism threatened to become a powerful force during the new century. During the education conflict of 1902, Lord Hugh Cecil, in a masterly speech, appealed to the Nonconformists to join Churchmen and "fight shoulder to shoulder" against the growing secularism of the age.[12] The Welsh religious revival of 1904 was welcomed as a means of combating the growing religious "indifferentism of the age".[13]

Moreover, the increased cost of education during the last quarter of the century necessitated that the Church depend upon the Government for aid for her schools. Indeed the Church had been receiving state aid

---

10 Chadwick, op. cit., p. 235. Howard Evans, "Religious Statistics of England and Wales", The Contemporary Review, Feb. 1897, Vol. LXXI, p. 276. "The Sects", ibid., Sept., 1897, Vol. LXXII, p. 417.

11 The Times, June 5, 1893, p. 8.

12 Hansard, 4th series, Vol. CVII, May 5, 1902, p. 848. Hugh Richard Heath-Cote Gascoyne-Cecil, Baron Quickswood (1869-1956), youngest son of the Third Marquis of Salisbury; ed. at Eton, and University College, Oxford; M.P. for Greenwich, 1895-1906. Best known as a spokesman for the High Church Party, and a champion of the Church schools.

The term "Churchmen" as used in this thesis refers to the Bishops, clergy and laymen of the Church of England; "Nonconformist" refers to the ministers and laymen of such Protestant Dissenting communions as the Methodists, Congregationalists and Baptists.

13 The Church Times, Feb., 1905, p. 215.

for her schools since 1833 when the Government gave a grant of £30,000 in aid of the educational efforts of religious societies. It will be seen later that as the century progressed the state came to pay a large proportion of the maintenance costs of the Church schools. However, the phenomenon of state-aided denominational schools conflicted with the doctrines of Liberalism. Belief in the separation of Church and state, and that the state had no right to support the teaching of religion was held by a number of people, mainly the Nonconformists, who were jealous of the privileged position of the Church of England. During the last half of the nineteenth century the Nonconformists became a powerful pressure group within the Liberal Party.[14] Consequently, Liberal administrations put through such measures as the University Test Act (1871) which allowed non-Anglicans to receive degrees from and to hold offices in the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, the disestablishment of the Church in Ireland (1869), and tried unsuccessfully to disestablish the Church in Wales (1892-95). A considerable movement for the disestablishment of the Church in England existed in the Parliaments of 1868-74 and 1880-85, but following the schism in the Liberal Party over Gladstone's Irish Home Rule Policy, the political power of Nonconformity was weakened, and the disestablishment movement lost its momentum.[15] Though the Liberationists Society, the pressure group advocating Church

---

[14] W. G. Addison, Religious Equality in Modern England, 1714-1914 (London: S.P.C.K., 1944) p. 151. "Of 374 Liberals elected in 1880, 100 owed allegiance to one or another of the Dissenting communions".

[15] Chadwick, op. cit., pp. 436-37.

disestablishment, was apparently re-invigorated after 1902, no further effort was made to disestablish the Church in England.

However, the fact that the Church was officially Established made difficulties for the Church's educational policy. Since the Non-conformists were determined that the Church should get no more advantages from the state, they consistently opposed the granting of state aid to Church schools.[16] Moreover, it was commonly accepted as a constitutional principle, even by Churchmen, that the spending of public money involved popular control. It was felt then, that the granting of state aid to denominationally controlled schools was inconsistent with this constitutional principle. Furthermore, the existence of denominational atmosphere schools also necessitated that teachers submit to a religious, or creed, test even if they were to teach only secular subjects. As the University Test Act of 1871 had abolished such tests in the Universities, the continuance of them in the elementary schools increasingly appeared to be an anachronism. The maintenance of denominational schools was running counter to the social and political ideas of the time. Moreover, the foundation of state elementary schools under the Forster Act, which resulted to a large extent from secular forces, provided heavy competition for the Church schools.

---

16 Henry Foreman, "Nonconformity and Education in England and Wales, 1870-1902". Unpublished M.A. thesis, London University, 1967, passim. The Archbishop of Canterbury reviewing the history of the schools' controversy. Hansard, 4th series, Vol. CLXI, Aug. 2, 1906, pp. 921-923.

Of great significance to the Church's educational role was the change which occurred in the Church of England itself. By the end of the century the Oxford, or Tractarian, movement of the 1840's, which had emphasized ritual and the importance of the episcopacy, had made prominent the High Church, or the Anglo-Catholic, section of the Church. Its growth was opposed by the Low Church Party, in particular by the Protestant Association which was dedicated to maintaining the Protestant character of the National Church. This conflict was particularly acute during the period 1890 to 1910, when the controversy was at its height over the Church's role in education.[17] The effect of the growth of the Anglo-Catholic movement on the Church's educational policy was paradoxical. Whereas its leaders lent resolution and initiative to the cause of denominational schools, yet it increased the Nonconformist suspicion of the proselytizing motives behind the Church schools and brought to their aid these Evangelical Church laymen represented by the Protestant Association. However, it seems that the increased vigor brought to the cause of denominational schools by the Anglo-Catholics more than compensated for the increased opposition to public support of the Church schools which the advent of Anglo-Catholicism precipitated.

Fortunately for the pursuit of its educational objectives, the Church was strong politically. Its traditional defender in national politics was the Tory Party, which, up to the mid-nineteenth century, was composed mainly of Anglican gentlemen, reflecting the alliance of squire

---

17 Chadwick, op. cit., pp. 353-58.

and parson in the countryside. It had opposed the enactment of measures decreasing the privileges of the National Church such as the University Test Act and the disestablishment of the Church in Ireland.[18] Though during the last half of the century the Tory Party was slowly infiltrated by representatives of the middle class, it remained basically Anglican and continued to defend the Established Church.

At the end of the nineteenth century, the Church of England still had definite political advantages. The Tory Party was securely in power again after the brief Liberal interlude of 1892-95. Most of the members of the House of Commons were at least nominally Anglican.[19] The majority of the members of the House of Lords were Tory and Anglican and twenty-four Anglican bishops represented the Church in the Upper House.[20]

Undoubtedly, many Tory members of Parliament were only nominal Anglicans who were not deeply committed to the Church. Never-

---

18 Chadwick, op. cit., p. 429. Also, Kenneth O. Morgan, Wales in British Politics, 1866-1922 (Cardiff: University of Wales, 1963), pp. 120-166.

19 Benjamin Sacks, The Religious Issue in the State Schools of England and Wales, 1902-1914 (Albuquerque: The University of New Mexico Press, 1861), p. 11.

20 According to J. L. Guttsman, The British Political Elite, (London: McGibbon & Kee, 1963), p. 85, there were only 61 Liberals in the House of Lords in 1904; the remaining 591 Peers were Conservative, although quite a few were backwoodsmen who seldom attended the House. There was not a single Nonconformist in the Lords, but there were a few Catholic Peers. See Dr. John Clifford, "Mr. Balfour's Defense of the Education Act of 1902 (Questions of Conscience)", The New Liberal Review, Feb., 1903, p. 26; and Lord Eversley, "The House of Lords and the Education Bill", The Nineteenth Century, Vol. 60, No. 2, 1906, p. 1018.

theless they supported the Church out of loyalty to the Conservative Party whose policy was to uphold the National Church. A large number of Tories, including J. C. Talbot (Oxford University) and Sir Francis Powell (Wigan), were members of the Church Parliamentary Committee, a pressure group which lobbied in the interest of the Church.[21] The Cecil family, a powerful force within the Tory Party, was peculiar in its resolute devotion to the Church of England. The head of the family, the Third Marquis of Salisbury,[22] the Prime Minister, was an ardent Anglican as were his two sons in the House of Commons, James Edward[23] and Hugh Cecil. All of them sympathised with the Anglo-Catholic Party, and Hugh Cecil was destined to be an eloquent spokesman for the High Church Party in the House of Commons. Another Cecil, William, was to become Bishop of Exeter. In the Cabinet of 1895-1902, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Michael Hicks Beach, was an Anglican and participated strongly in the debates on Welsh disestablishment, 1892-95.[24] Both of the

---

21. J. P. Cornford, "The Parliamentary Foundations of the Hotel Cecil", in Robertson Robson (ed.), Ideas and Institutions of Victorian Britain (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1967), p. 306.

22. Lady Gwendolen Cecil, Life of Robert, Marquis of Salisbury, (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1971), Vol. 1, pp. 49-102. Robert Arthur Talbot Gascoyne Cecil, Third Marquis of Salisbury (1830-1903); ed. at Eton and Christ Church, Oxford; Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary 1885, 1886-1892, 1895-1902 when he retired.

23. James Edward Hubert Gascoyne Cecil, Fourth Marquis of Salisbury (1861-1947); ed. at Eton and University College, Oxford; M.P. for Darwen Division, 1885-1892, for Rochester, 1893-1903; the elder son of the Third Marquis of Salisbury, he succeeded to the Peerage in 1903. From 1893-1900 he was chairman of the Church Parliamentary Committee.

24. Morgan, op. cit., p. 137.

ministers concerned with education were Anglicans - the eighth Duke of Devonshire, Lord President of the Privy Council with nominal powers over the Education Department, and Sir John Gorst,[25] Vice-President of the Education Department, who was later a member of the Church Schools' Emergency League, founded in 1903 to maintain the Church schools. Their successors in 1902 to comparable positions in the newly created board of Education, Lord Londonderry, President of the Board of Education, and Sir William Anson,[26] Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education, were Churchmen.

Moreover, Arthur James Balfour,[27] a nephew of Lord Salisbury, who was Leader of the House of Commons before he became Prime Minister in July, 1902, was both a member of the Presbyterian

---

25 Sir John Gorst, 1835-1916; ed. at St. John's College, Cambridge; M.P. for Chatham, 1866-68, 1875-92, Cambridge University, 1892-1906; Vice-President of the Education Department, 1895-1902. Best known for his working-class sympathies, and for setting up Conservative Party constituency associations, 1869-74.

26 Sir William Anson (1843-1914); ed. at Eton and Balliol College, Oxford; Warden of All Souls College, Oxford, 1881-1914; a distinguished lawyer and scholar; wrote The Principles of the English Law of Contract, and The Law and Custom of the Constitution. Conservative M.P. for Oxford University, 1894-1914; Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education, 1902-1905; a strong, but reasonable, supporter of Church schools.

27 Blanche E. C. Dugdale, Arthur James Balfour (London: Hutchinson, 1938), Vol. 1, pp. 40-41. Arthur James Balfour, first Earl of Balfour, 1848-1930; ed. at Eton and Trinity College, Cambridge; M.P. for Hertford, 1874-1885, East Manchester, 1885-1906; Member of the "Fourth Party"; Chief Secretary for Ireland, 1887-1891; Leader of the House of Commons, 1891-1892, 1895-1902; Prime Minister, 1902-1905; First Lord of the Admiralty, 1915-16; Foreign Secretary, 1916-1919.

Church of Scotland and a communicant of the Church of England. He appreciated the fundamental place of religion in education and, hence, the necessity of denominational schools. Indeed he was destined, as it will be seen, to do more than anyone else for the preservation of the Church schools.

The Irish Nationalists in Parliament, usually allies of the Liberal Party because of its support for Home Rule, were supporters of the Conservatives on the education issue. Though the Irish schools were not involved in the dispute, the Nationalists felt obliged to defend the interests of their Catholic brethren in England, many of them Irish immigrants. Since the Catholics, who comprised a tiny minority of the English population, were also interested in maintaining public aid for atmosphere schools, they were allies of the Anglicans in the education controversy.

A fact unfavourable to the Anglican Church was that Joseph Chamberlain,[28] Colonial Secretary, 1895-1903, probably the most popular man in the Unionist Government of that time, was a Unitarian, a leader of the Nonconformist Liberal Unionists, and formerly a champion of the Nonconformists' educational policy. Though he still believed in a national secular system of education, he had by now come to the conclusion

---

[28] Joseph Chamberlain, 1836-1914; Chairman of the National Education League, 1870; Mayor of Birmingham, 1873-78; M.P. for Birmingham, 1876-1906; President of the Board of Trade, 1880; resigned upon the introduction of the Home Rule Bill, 1885; Secretary of State for the Colonies in Salisbury's Third Ministry, 1895-1902, and resigned in 1903 to conduct his tariff reform agitation.

that its attainment was impossible. His presence in the Unionist Government did not prohibit it from favouring the educational interests of the Anglican Church.

More of a threat to the Church was the influence of the Nonconformists in the Liberal Party. The 1901 annual report of the National Education Association - an organization which advocated the Nonconformist policy of universal unsectarian schools - stated that 61 of its members, most of them presumably Liberals, successfully contested the Khaki election of 1900.[29] Several leaders of the Liberal Party who were ministers in the Gladstone-Rosebery Governments of 1892-95 were Nonconformists, including James Bryce, Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, 1892-94, and chairman of the Royal Commission on Secondary Education, 1894-95, who was a Presbyterian; Herbert Henry Asquith,[30] Home Secretary, who came from a Congregational family; Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman,[31] Secretary of War,

---

29 The Times, Feb. 26, 1901, p. 6.

30 The Earl of Oxford and Asquith, Memoirs and Reflections (London: Cassell, 1926), p. 3.

Herbert Henry Asquith, first Earl of Oxford and Asquith (1852-1928); ed. at City of London School, and Balliol College, Oxford; a lawyer and Liberal M.P. for East Fife, 1886-1918; a Liberal Imperialist during and after the Boer War; Home Secretary, 1892-1895; Chancellor of the Exchequer, 1905-1908; Prime Minister, 1908-1916; created Earl of Oxford and Asquith, 1925.

31 J. A. Spender, The Life of the Right Hon. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1923), p. 8.

Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman (1836-1908); ed. at Glasgow University and Trinity College, Cambridge; Liberal M.P. for Stirling Burghs, 1868 until his death; Financial Secretary to the War Office, 1871-74, 1880-82; Secretary to the Admiralty, 1882-1884; Chief Secretary for Ireland, 1884-1885; Secretary for War, 1886, 1892-1895; Leader of the Liberal Party in the House of Commons, 1899-1905; Prime Minister, 1905-1908.

1892-95, and Leader of the Liberal Party in the House of Commons after 1899, who was a Presbyterian. David Lloyd George,[32] a future leader of the Liberal Party was nominally a Baptist and was a militant champion of the Nonconformist cause. However, with the overwhelming majority acquired by the Unionists in the 1900 election[33] the advent of a Liberal Government seemed to be very remote.

The aim of this thesis is to examine the educational policy of the Church of England during the last quarter of the nineteenth and the first decade of the twentieth century, the means by which the Church attempted to realize its policy, and the efforts of the Conservative Party to meet and defend the educational interests of the Church. It will begin with the settlement of 1870 and show that the working of that settlement eventually culminated in the Act of 1902 which was designed, in part, to put the Church schools on a durable financial foundation. It proceeds to investigate the means through which the Church managed to defend its schools in the wake of the popular reaction which followed the Act of

---

32 Frank Owen, Tempestuous Journey (London: Hutchinson, 1958), pp. 18-19.

David Lloyd George, first Earl Lloyd-George of Dwyfor, 1863-1945; ed. at a Church school at Llanystatumdwy, Caernarvonshire; Liberal M.P. for Caernarvon Boroughs, 1890-1945; President of the Board of Trade, 1905-1908; Chancellor of the Exchequer, 1908-1915, and introduced the People's Budget; Minister of Munitions, 1915-1916; Secretary for War, 1916; Prime Minister, 1916-1922; represented Nonconformists' interests in the House of Commons, and opposed vigorously the Education Bill of 1902.

33 The Unionists had a majority of 144 over the Liberals and Irish Nationalists combined.

1902. Efforts to make a compromise of the schools' question in 1908 will also be examined. The Church of England was unsuccessful in checking the relative decline of its schools; an increasing number of Anglican children attended state schools in which they received no Church teaching at all.

CHAPTER I

THE EDUCATIONAL POLICY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, 1870-1902

The Church Schools and the Settlement of 1870

The Elementary Education Act of 1870 represented an effort of the British Government to make schools available for all the children of England and Wales up to the age of 13. In that year there existed 8,231 state-aided denominational schools providing accommodation for a million and a half children.[1] During the enactment of the Forster Act, the Church lobbied for the extension of the denominational system through which the various religious denominations would provide and control the schools with substantial financial assistance from the Government. The Church was helped by the National Education Union which had been formed in 1869 to fight for the denominational cause. But because of the spirited efforts of the Nonconformists through the medium of the National Education League, which pressed for a national, unsectarian, compulsory and free system of education and no state aid for denominational schools, the Church had to accept a compromise.[2] The Forster Act intended to "supplement, and not supplant" the denominational schools' systems.[3] The Act allowed

---

1 "Report of the Committee of Council on Education 1870-71", p. 600. In August, 1870 there were, besides the 6,382 Church of England schools, 1,549 British, Wesleyan and 'other' schools, and 350 Roman Catholic schools. The British Schools belonged to the British and Foreign School Society, founded in 1808, and supported by the Nonconformists.

2 These opposing societies were formed in 1869. Cf. John William Adamson, English Education, 1789-1902 (Cambridge at the University Press, 1930), pp. 348-353. Also, H. J. Burgess, Enterprise in Education (London: The National Society, 1958), pp. 192-196.

3 Hansard, 3rd series, Vol. CXCIX, Feb. 17, 1870, p. 444.

agencies six months in which to fill deficiencies of public school accommodation in any district with government assistance.[4] At the end of this period of grace, if the deficiencies were not met, the Education Department could cause an ad hoc body, a school board, to be set up in the district to provide the needed accommodation.[5] Thus, out of the conflict between the National Education Union and the National Education League there emerged a dual system of elementary schools - the denominational or voluntary schools, i.e., schools controlled by religious denominations; and board schools, schools controlled by the popularly elected school boards.

The denominational schools were recognized as public elementary schools, within the meaning of the Act, and thus eligible for state support, only if they accepted students regardless of their religious beliefs and provided in the timetable that religious lessons were to be given at the beginning or end of a session for the convenience of students who desired to withdraw from them.[6] This clause was designed to make any type of denominational school suitable to the children of other denominations. Because the Nonconformists and Anglicans inhabited generally the same areas, many Nonconformist children were to be found in the Church of England Schools, and the clause would make the Church

---

4 The Forster Act, C. 96.

5 Ibid., C. 6.

6 Ibid., C. 7, sub-sections 1 & 2.

schools safe for them. However, this so-called timetable-conscience clause detracted greatly from the realization of the Church's educational ideals because it separated religious from secular instruction.

The religious teaching in the board schools was also a matter of dispute. Initially, Forster intended that the individual school boards should decide on the kind of religious instruction to be given in schools under their jurisdiction. The Nonconformists, fearing that the superior resources of the Established Church would allow it to control the religious teaching in most of the board schools, and believing that the state had no right to support the teaching of religion, were opposed to doctrinal teaching in these schools. The Anglicans of course wanted denominational religious teaching in the board schools. A compromise was reached through the Cowper-Temple[7] clause which states "that no religious formulary or catechism which is distinctive of any particular denomination" could be taught in the board schools.[8] This compromise was based on the premise that the similarity of Anglicanism and Nonconformity made it possible to offer religious lessons which would be suitable to both Nonconformists and Anglicans. At that time the compromise appeared to be more satisfactory to the Anglicans than to the

---

[7] William F. Cowper-Temple, Baron Mount-Temple (1811-1888); A Whig, he was M.P. for Hertford, 1835-1868; South Hampshire, 1868-1880, when he was raised to the peerage; among offices held, he was Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education, 1857-1858, in Palmerston's first Cabinet; an Anglican, he was Chairman of the Education Union, 1869-1870.

[8] The Forster Act, C. 14, s.1.

Nonconformists, because statesmen in the House of Commons asserted that the Cowper-Temple clause would not preclude doctrinal teaching.[9] It will be seen that, ironically, it worked more for the benefit of the Nonconformists than for the Anglicans.

Since much of the subsequent agitation on the subject of elementary education had to do with the financing of education, it is necessary to examine the financial provisions of the Forster Act. The Act provided that funds for the maintenance of all public elementary schools should be derived from three sources: (1) school fees (sums paid by the parents to the managers of schools for the right of having their children taught in these schools); (2) voluntary contributions and endowments in the case of voluntary schools, the local rates (local taxes) in the case of board schools; (3) the Parliamentary grant.

The Parliamentary grant represented the government's contribution to elementary education. Voluntary schools were excluded from rate support, and to compensate for its loss the Parliamentary grant was increased to all schools so that it could amount to one-half instead of a third of the income of any school. However, no distinct

---

[9] R. W. Dale, "Cardinal Manning's Demand on the Rates", The Nineteenth Century, Vol. XIII, No. 2, 1882, pp. 64-65. Dale was a leader of the Education League. Sir William Harcourt and Mr. George Dixon, also leaders of the Education League, opposed the clause. Cowper-Temple, Forster, and Gladstone said Anglican Doctrines could still be taught. See "The Education Question from a Churchman's Point of View (Report on Elementary Education addressed to the Leeds Ruri-Decanal Chapter, 1899)", The Church Quarterly Review Vol. XLIX, 1899-1900, pp. 426-441.

advantage was given to the voluntary schools; since board schools also were eligible for the increased grant.[10] The Elementary Education Act[11] of 1876 allowed schools to receive an annual Parliamentary grant amounting to 17s 6d per child in average attendance, unmatched by local income.[12] This amendment to the Forster Act was designed to aid the poor village schools, most of them belonging to the Church of England.

A school receiving the Parliamentary grant had to be "conducted in accordance with the conditions required to be filled by an elementary school",[13] such conditions were to "be contained in the minutes of the Education Department"[14] as expressed in the annual Code. This stipulation gave the Department an immense power, for it could annually increase its demands in regard to teaching staff, curriculum and facilities, which schools with a small local income would find difficult to meet.

On the whole the educational settlement of the 1870's from the point of view of the Church of England was not favourable. In return for increased grants from the government, the Church schools had to accept a timetable-conscience clause, and had, as before, to submit to the

---

10 The Forster Act, C. 97, s. 1. This meant that the Government would grant a pound for every pound the school received in local income.

11 Great Britain, Public General Acts, 39 & 40 Vic., cap. 79: An Act to make further provision for Elementary Education (Elementary Education Act, 1876), hereafter cited as the Lord Sandon Act.

12 Ibid., C. 19, s. 1.

13 The Forster Act, C. 7, s. 4.

14 Ibid., C. 97.

inspections and demands of the Education Department. More important was the fact that a new system of board schools supported out of the local rates was set up in competition with the voluntary schools supported out of the less dependable voluntary contributions. In the board schools the religious formularies and catechism of the Church could not be taught. Yet, with the Nonconformists in the Liberal Government demanding universal state schools, the Church had to accept the compromise or have all public support withheld from her schools. In 1870 the Church could not have known that the Forster Act would work, not to supplement the denominational schools as Forster had stated, but inevitably to supplant them.

The Church's response to the educational settlement of 1870 was to try to cover all of England and Wales with elementary schools before the school boards could be established. In this effort, the National Society in the first year alone after 1870 made 1,419 grants totalling £63,000 to assist Churchmen in building new schools which represented a total expenditure of £848,000.[15] In the ten-year period from 1870-1880 the Church of England built 5,034 schools and increased the average attendance in her schools by 642,275. As a comparison, the school boards during the same period provided 3,433 schools for an average attendance of 769,252.[16] But after this initial spurt the rate of growth

---

15 "The Annual Report of the National Society, 1871", pp. 9, 8, 11, as quoted in Brown, op. cit., p. 71.

16 Calculated from the "Report of the Committee of Council on Education, 1870-71", p. 600, and (P.P.) 1881, Vol. XXII, C-2948-1, "Report of the Committee of Council on Education, 1880-81", p. 535.

of Church schools was slower in comparison to that of the board schools. From 1880 to 1894 the number of Church schools increased by 436 and their average attendance by 378,070; the board schools increased by 1,648 and their average attendance by 1,036,854. In 1894 there were 11,906 Church schools having an average attendance of 1,777,797.[17] Thus the Church of England still had the largest educational establishment in the country, but the decreased growth rate of Church schools suggests that the Church was encountering increasing difficulties in trying to expand her school system. One difficulty was that in school board districts, school boards had the first chance of providing additional schools,[18] and with the expansion of school board districts the number of areas where voluntary agencies had complete freedom to build new public schools was correspondingly reduced. Another difficulty was that the Church was finding the maintenance of her existing schools so burdensome that she could spare little effort to build schools.

As explained above, voluntary schools and board schools were to acquire their maintenance funds from school fees and parliamentary grants, but in place of the money which board schools acquired from the local rates, the voluntary schools had to depend on the voluntary contributions of their supporters. Voluntary contributions increased from £329,826 in 1870 to £587,211 in 1880, but to only £622,034 fourteen years later.

---

17 (P.P.) 1895, Vol. XXVII, C-776-1, "Report of the Committee of Council on Education, 1894-95, p. 742. See Appendix I, p. 171 below.

18 The Forster Act, C. 6.

From 1894 to 1899 annual contributions fluctuated from a high of £632,241 in 1897 to a low of £585,945 in 1898. Not only did the increase in contributions slow down and level off, but contributions failed to increase in proportion to the increase in the average attendance of Church schools. The average contributions per child in average attendance decreased from 7s 9 3/4d in 1880 to 6s 8½d in 1894.[19] This was happening at a time when educational demands were increasing.

The contributions paid by Churchmen to the managers of voluntary schools represented only a part of the Church's expenditure on education. The total expenditure included expenditures on teachers' training colleges, diocesan inspection, grants from the National Society, and subscriptions to buildings. The total expenditure reveals a pattern similar to that of the voluntary contributions to school managers. The total increased from £470,000 in 1870 to £1,000,000 in 1895, and had declined to £940,873 by 1901.[20]

Churchmen's financial contributions to education reached a plateau in the 1890's. This was due to several factors. Among them was the agricultural depression of the 1890's which prevented landlords, strong supporters of the rural schools, from increasing their

---

19 (P.P.) 1881, Vol. XXII, C-2948-I, "Report of the Committee of Council on Education, 1880-81", p. 152, and (P.P.) 1900, Vol. LXV, C-109, "Report of the Committee of Council on Education, 1899", p. 152. See Appendix II, p. 173 below.

20 The Archbishop of Canterbury at a public meeting at Dover Town Hall, 1896, as quoted in The Times, March 14, 1896, p. 12.

"The Annual Report of the National Society, 1901", p. 28, as quoted in Brown, op. cit., p. 173.

contributions. The expansion of school board districts meant that denominationalists had to pay both the school board rates and make their contributions to their own schools. Many could not afford to pay both and chose to pay only the mandatory school board rates. Moreover, according to the report of the National Society of an inquiry conducted into the condition of Church schools, many Churchmen were satisfied with the religious education given in the board schools and saw no need of maintaining Church schools.[21] The failure of contributions to increase in the 1890's was also related to the growing secularism of the age.

However, the greatest threat to the Church schools was the enormous increase in the income the board schools acquired from the local rates. This increased from £726,000 in 1880 to £1,724,296 in 1894, and to an impressive £2,704,504 in 1899.[22] These figures make abundantly clear the problems of the Church schools. In 1894, for example, they had to accomplish with a local income of 6s 8½d per child in average attendance what the board schools achieved with 18s 4 3/4d!

The discrepancy between the local income that the board schools received from the local rates and what the Church schools acquired from voluntary contributions was reflected in the amount of money each type of school spent on the education of its pupils per capita, the amounts for 1894 being £2 8s 9 3/4d for the board schools, and £1 18s ½d for the

---

21 Quoted by Lloyd-George, Hansard, 4th series, Vol. CVII, May 8, 1902, p. 1097.

22 "Report of the Committee of Council on Education, 1899", p. 227. This page contains figures for the period 1870-1899. See Appendix II, p. 173 below.

Church schools.[23] Teachers' salaries comprised a considerable proportion of the maintenance costs of the schools, and board salaries were much higher than those of the voluntary schools. So in 1884 the average salary for a headmaster in Church schools was £120 18s 3d; in board schools it was £148 3s 9d.[24] Ten years later the figures were £120 and £161, respectively.[25] The significance of these sums for education was that the teachers of board schools were generally more qualified than those of the voluntary schools. In 1894 there was one teacher with two years of training in a teachers' training college to every 124 children in board schools, and one to every 175 children in Church schools.[26] Moreover, the pupil teacher system whereby the older pupils taught the younger ones was more extensively used in the voluntary schools than in the rival board schools.[27]

---

23 "Report of the Committee of Council on Education, 1894", p. 770. See Appendix I, p. 171 below.

24 (P.P.) 1887, Vol. XXX, C-5158, "Report III, Minutes of the Cross Commission", p. 294. This commission was set up in 1886 "to make an inquiry into the working of the Elementary Education Acts" by Lord Salisbury's first administration of 1885-86, in response to demands by Catholics and Anglicans for such an inquiry. R. A. Cross (Chairman of the Commission), first Viscount Cross, 1823-1914; ed. at Rugby and Trinity College, Cambridge; M.P. Preston, 1857-62; and for South-West Lancashire, 1868; Home Secretary in Disraeli's Ministry, 1874-80, and in Salisbury's First Ministry, 1885-1886; a staunch Anglican.

25 "Report of the Committee of Council on Education, 1894-95", p. 749.

26 Ibid., p. 747.

27 Letter by Mr. T. W. Sharpe (a Department of Education Inspector, ca. 1899) to The Times, April 15, 1899, p. 8. He said the Department's Committee on Pupil Teachers, 1899, told the National Society that the chief points on which voluntary schools fell behind board schools were those mentioned above.

Some of the disparity between board schools and Church schools was due to the fact that many Church of England schools were small village schools, while most of the board schools were large, located in towns and cities.[28] In the villages, Church schools were no worse off than board schools. Since property values were low the parish school boards received insufficient funds from the local rates even when they were high. The board schools suffered from the lack of interest in and enthusiasm for education which was prevalent in these areas.[29] It was in the wealthy urban areas where the income from the local rates was adequate, and where there was considerable public interest in education that the difference between the rival schools was quite pronounced. Obviously, having fewer facilities and less qualified teachers, all rural schools were less expensive to operate than the more sophisticated urban schools.

The policies of the Education Department at Whitehall aggravated the difficulties and disadvantages of the Church schools. The payment by results system instituted in the Code of 1862 by which schools were paid according to the number of passes in various subjects meant that the more efficient schools would get the most grants. From 1870 to 1894, the Education Department continually increased the number of subjects for which grants were paid, and schools with better equipped staffs could offer a more varied curriculum than the less fortunate schools.[30] Board schools earned

---

28 (P.P.) 1888, Vol. XXV, C-5484, "Report IV, Final Report of the Cross Commission", p. 159.

29 Dr. T. J. Macnamara, "The Education Bill", The Nineteenth Century, Vol. II, No. 1, 1904, p. 999.

30 For an account of improvements in curriculum and educational standards demanded by the Department through the Education Code, see J. W. Adamson, op. cit., pp. 367-376.

a greater annual grant per pupil than the Church schools; in 1894 the former received 19s 1 3/4d while the latter received 18s 2¼d.[31] This was only a slight difference in comparison to the discrepancy between the sums the Church schools acquired from voluntary contributions and what the board schools received from the rates. But the tendency of the Education Department to raise the standards of educational facilities, coupled with the deficiency of voluntary contributions, meant that the Church schools would ultimately be replaced by the better financed board schools.

The Free Education Act, 1891

As the increase in the amount of voluntary contributions slowed down while education costs at the same time increased, voluntary schools began to depend increasingly on the children's pence or school fees.[32] From 1870 to 1891 the average annual school fee per child in average attendance in Church schools increased from 7s 9d to 11s 2d,[33] while from 1873 to 1891 that of the board schools increased from 7s 5½d to 9s 1¼d.[34] The dependence of Church schools upon school fees was heavy especially in the North where high annual school fees of 13 - 20s largely replaced voluntary subscriptions.

---

31 "Report of the Committee of Council on Education, 1894-95, p. 742. See Appendix I for total grants, p. 171 below.

32 "The Annual Report of the National Society, 1881", p. 10, as quoted in Brown, op. cit., p. 76.

33 "Report of the Committee of Council on Education, 1870", p. 161, and (P.P.) 1892, Vol. XXVII, C-6746-I, "Report of the Committee of Council on Education, 1891-92", p. 315.

34 "Report of the Committee of Council on Education, 1899", p. 266; Table of school fees from 1870 to 1899.

The small village schools of the South depended mainly upon the subscriptions of landlords and clergymen, and school fees were usually low. This difference between northern and southern schools reflected the fact that workers in the towns and mining districts where most of the northern schools were located could afford to pay high fees, whereas the poorer agricultural labourers of the southern villages could not.[35]

However, by 1890 it was apparent that the charging of school fees was incongruous with compulsory elementary education initiated by the Lord Sandon Act of 1876. Influenced by Joseph Chamberlain and his liberal Unionists,[36] who demanded free education, the Conservative Government enacted a Free Education Act[37] in 1891. Through this Act the Government undertook to pay school fees for children in elementary schools to the extent of 10s per child,[38] in addition to the previous Parliamentary grants. Schools which charged a higher fee could continue to charge the amount by which these fees exceeded 10s; however, if parents demanded free education for their children, their request had to be complied with.[39]

---

35 Letters by Messrs. Egerton of Tatton and H. H. Howorth to The Times, November 5, 1896. Cf. "A correspondent on the Archbishop's Committee's Report on the Voluntary Schools", found in The Times, January 10, 1895, p. 12. The traditional fee in the South was 2d per week. See E. A. Knox (Bishop of Manchester), Reminiscences of an Octogenarian, 1837-1934, (London: Hutchinson, 1934), p. 240. Bishop Knox, ed. at Corpus Christi College, Oxford; Tutor of Merton College, Oxford, 1875-1894; Suffragan Bishop of Coventry, 1894-1903; Bishop of Manchester, 1903-1921; an evangelical and a great protagonist of the voluntary schools.

36 Knox, op. cit., p. 184 & p. 240.

37 Great Britain, Public General Acts, 54 and 55 Vic., cap. 56: An Act to make further provision for assisting Education in PUblic Elementary Schools in England and Wales (Elementary Education Act, 1891).

38 Ibid., C. 1.

39 Ibid., C. 2 & C. 3.

The result of the Act was that school fees dropped rapidly, and in 1894 the average school fee per child in average attendance in Church schools was only 1s 8 3/4d, and 5½d in the board schools.[40] Unlike the schools with lower fees, the northern voluntary schools lost considerable income as the Act was enforced, for when parents insisted on free education, the schools had to abolish their fees or lose children to the board schools. The Act did much to undermine the hitherto stable system of Church of England schools in the North.[41]

The education system established in 1870 gave the Department of Education the prerogative of setting educational standards that a school had to achieve in order to receive a Parliamentary grant, and such standards could change from year to year. During the Liberal interlude, 1892-1895, Arthur Acland,[42] a keen supporter of the Nonconformist educational policy, was Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education and he used vigorously the powers of the Education Department.

The Code of 1890 contained a new clause, Article 86, which declared that "a school must be efficient" and such a school was one

---

40 "Report of the Committee of Council on Education, 1894", p. 24, and "Report of the Committee of Council on Education, 1899", p. 266.

41 "A Correspondent on the Archbishops' Committee's Report on the Voluntary Schools", The Times, January 10, 1895, p. 12. Also, E. A. Knox, op. cit., p. 184.

42 Arthur H. D. Acland, 1874-1926; ed. at Rugby and Christ Church, Oxford; Liberal M.P. for Rotherham division, 1885-1889; Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education, 1892-1895; played a prominent role in the Nonconformist Conference, Exeter Hall, November, 1888, which condemned the pro-denominational resolutions of the majority report of the Cross Commission.

from which the inspectors did not "recommend the withdrawal of the grant on account of insufficiency of staff, instruction, or discipline".[43] Under Acland's administration the vigorous employment of this article harassed the voluntary schools. For example, in 1894, of 355 schools "warned" that the grant would be withheld unless improvements were made, 270 or 75% belonged to the Church of England.[44]

A circular to inspectors in 1893 required them to inquire into the sites and sizes of school buildings, playgrounds and apparatus, and many voluntary schools were found to be substandard.[45] A measure less frightening, but more detrimental to the interests of the voluntary schools, was the memorandum published by the Department in 1893 stressing the right of parents under the Free Education Act, 1891, to demand free education for their children and explaining how they could exercise that right.[46] The requirements of teaching staff, curriculum, and building standards were stiffened.[47] To some Anglicans these measures were aimed, deliberately, at increasing the pressure on their schools. Bishop Knox, then Suffragan Bishop of Coventry, a champion of the denominational schools, observed that "all devices at the disposal

---

43 (P.P.) 1890, Vol. XXVIII, C-6079-I, p. 155, "The New Code, 1890".

44 (P.P.) 1894, Vol. LXVI, Cd-7320, "Return of Schools Warned, etc.", pp. 459-499. The number warned in 1892 was 274.

45 The Times, February 11, 1893, p. 8.

46 Ibid., June 5, 1893, p. 8.

47 (P.P.) 1895, Vol. LXXVI, C-7653, "The Code of 1895", Arts. 73, 85, and schedule VII.

of the Department to depress or extinguish the voluntary schools had been relentlessly used"[48] by Acland.

The vigilance of the Department under Acland had underlined the weaknesses of the voluntary schools. The Church schools were hard pressed to meet the increased educational requirements demanded by the Education Department[49] and their maintenance expenditure per scholar had increased by about 13s from 1870 to 1894.[50] The most difficult matter was the problem of teachers' salaries which were being continually raised because of the competition from the board schools, which were spending, in 1894, 20s more per child on maintenance than were the voluntary schools, and were amply supported from the local rates to the tune of one and three-quarters of a million pounds per year. With the failure of subscriptions to increase appreciably in the 1890's, and the loss of income by many Church schools because of the working of the Free Education Act, the future of the voluntary schools looked quite dim.

Churchmen and Board Schools

As the school board system threatened to supplant the denomin-

---

48 Bishop Knox, op. cit., p. 185.

49 The provision of cookery centres was a peculiar problem for the Church schools. See Bishop Knox, op. cit., p. 201.

50 "Report of the Committee of Council on Education, 1880", Abstract of Expenditures, etc., 1870-1880, p. 192.

"Report of the Committee of Council on Education, 1894-95", p. 770.

ational schools, Churchmen became, on the whole, antagonistic toward board schools, though few would agree with Canon Gregory, Dean of St. Paul's and Chairman of the National Society, "that they had lowered the tone of morality and increased the amount of crime."[51] Their chief complaint was that they had to support their own schools by voluntary contributions, as well as pay the local rates to support the board schools[52] - a fact which they claimed accounted for the poverty of the voluntary schools in the towns.[53] They also accused the board schools of extravagance, of increasing teachers' salaries, and so making life difficult for the voluntary schools in competition with them.[54] Most of all they were dissatisfied with the religious teaching in the board schools which served as a reason for maintaining their own schools.

However, Churchmen, as was their right as rate payers, had considerable involvement in the school board system. Since Nonconformists and Anglicans were intermingled within the same localities, Nonconformist and Anglican children were found in the same schools. At the turn of the century approximately a million Nonconformists in rural areas,

---

51 The Times, April 20, 1902, p. 5.

52 Cardinal Manning, and Canon Gregory, "Religion and the Rates", The Nineteenth Century, Vol. XIII, No. 1, 1883, pp. 314-337.

53 Bishop Knox, op. cit., p. 184.

54 Opinions of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Benson; the Third Marquis of Salisbury, the Bishop of Manchester, as quoted in Sir James Marchant, Dr. John Clifford C.H., Life Letters and Reminiscences (London: Cassell, 1924), p. 118.

where the only school was often a Church school, attended Anglican schools.[55] On the other hand, in the cities like London and Birmingham where the voluntary schools were weak, about a million Anglicans, many of them probably children of nominal Anglicans who did not take religion seriously, attended the board schools.[56] In London, alone, according to Athelstan Riley, a High Churchman and a former member of the London School Board, 300,000 of the 750,000 children in the board schools in 1903 were Church children. At the same time there were only 150,000 Anglican children in the London Church schools.[57] Moreover, since the Church owned about two-thirds of the teachers' training colleges, many board school teachers were Anglicans, probably attracted to the board schools by their higher salaries. Churchmen elected their own representatives to the boards, who often worked in the interest of the voluntary schools, which included opposing the building of board schools in areas where they would compete with voluntary schools.[58] Many Anglican clergymen had prominent positions on school boards, and in many rural areas, as well as in cities, clergymen were chairmen of school boards and

---

55 Hansard, 4th series, Vol. CVII, May 8, 1902, pp. 1102-3. (Lloyd-George quoting a report by the Methodists Connexion); also, R. W. Dale, op. cit., p. 61, states that in 1882 "An half or a third of the parishioners are Nonconformists" in rural areas. The figures in both statements are possibly exaggerated.

56 Augustine Birrell, "Elementary Education: A Retrospect and an Outlook", The Independent Review, Vol. 1, Oct. 1903, p. 89.

57 Letter to The Church Times, May 8, 1903, p. 558.

58 Lyluph Stanley, "Religion at the London School Board", The Nineteenth Century, Vol. XXIV, No. 1, 1894, p. 759. Stanley was a member of the London School Board and a leading protagonist of the school board cause.

managed the board schools just as they had formerly managed their own schools.[59] Whether they disliked board schools or not, Churchmen participated considerably in the school board system.

The main objection Churchmen had to board schools was that they were prohibited by the Cowper-Temple clause from teaching the distinctive formularies and catechism of the Church. Though, as stated above, it was believed in 1870 that the clause did not preclude the teaching of Church doctrines, it came to be implemented so as to exclude all doctrinal teaching and institute only plain Bible teaching in the majority of the board schools. Some clergymen, like Archbishop Benson, and the Bishop of Durham, thought highly of the Bible teaching in the board schools, and little was said about the way the clause was being interpreted until High Churchmen began to complain in the 1890's.[60] The Anglo-Catholics particularly disdained Bible teaching, because they wished to have more doctrinal teaching for the Anglican children attending the board schools. For this reason Athelstan Riley, in the years 1893 and 1894, attempted to impose a more doctrinal religious syllabus on the London Board Schools. But because of the opposition of the London School Board teachers, who feared an inquiry into their religious beliefs, and the indignation of the Nonconformists, who were quite satisfied with Bible

---

59 (P.P.) 1877, Vol. XXIX, C-1780-1, "Report of the Committee of Council on Education, 1867-77", p. 435.

60 "The Education Question from a Churchman's Point of View", op. cit., pp. 429-30.

teaching and feared proselytism by the Church, this effort to make the religious teaching in the board schools more satisfactory to Churchmen failed.[61] But the significance of the controversy which accompanied this effort was that it aroused the interest of the Church in the religious teaching given to Anglican children in the board schools, and hereafter the repeal of the Cowper-Temple clause to allow dogmatic religious instruction in the board schools was a cardinal point in the educational policy of the Church of England.

More State Aid for Church Schools

As the financial problems of the Church schools became increasingly pressing, it became obvious that more state aid was necessary for the survival of the Church schools. In less than ten years after the enactment of the Education Act of 1870, as it became evident that the Act was working to the detriment of the voluntary schools, denominationalists began to make protestations to the Education Department about the effect of the Act on the denominational schools.[62] In 1886 they were successful in having the Conservative administration of Lord Salisbury set up a Royal Commission to study the working of the

---

61 For a full account of this controversy see, "Article X", The Edinburgh Review, Vol. CCCLXIX, 1894, p. 475.

62 W. H. C. Armytage, "A. J. Mundella, Vice-President of the Council and the Schools' Question, 1880-85", The English Historical Review, Vol. 63, 1948, pp. 57-60. Cardinal Manning & Canon Gregory, "Religion and the Rates", op. cit., pp. 327-37. "The Annual Report of the National Society, 1883", p. 11, as quoted in Brown, op. cit., pp. 76-77.

education acts. Furthermore, after it was discovered that the operation of the Free Education Act (1891) had undermined the financial security of the northern urban schools, Churchmen began to make schemes to save their schools from eventual extinction. In 1894 the Archbishops of Canterbury and York appointed a committee on the Church schools. This committee had no difficulty in establishing the necessity for the Church to maintain the voluntary schools. It declared that these "schools are the hope of the future, and the religious condition of England thirty years hence will largely depend on the action of Churchmen now".[63]

But the Committee had great difficulty in deciding how the schools could be maintained. They agreed with the Cross Commission, 1888, that the solution to the financial problems of the voluntary schools lay in granting them aid from the local rates.[64] Nevertheless the committee fell short of recommending rate aid for the Church schools for the same reason which a conference of Churchmen had in 1888 rejected the Cross Commission's resolution to this effect.[65] They feared that in return for rate aid the rate payers would demand some control over the Church schools in accordance with the constitutional principle that public control

---

63 "Report of the Archbishops' Committee", par. 26 & 28, as quoted in Alan Rogers, "Churches and Children", British Journal of Educational Studies, Vol. VIII, No. 1, November, 1959, p. 47.

64 (P.P.) 1888, Vol. XXV, C-5458, "Report IV, Recommendations of the Cross Commission", p. 223. "Report of the Archbishops' Committee", par. 17; Cf. Archbishop Benson at the National Society, The Times, June 8, 1895, p. 8.

65 Report of the Conference, The Times, November 7, 1888, p. 5.

was a corollary to the spending of public money. In particular the committee feared that such control would extend "sooner or later to the appointment of teachers" and so jeopardize the religious teaching in the schools. Had they found some satisfactory way of preventing this from happening, they would have probably proposed rate aid for their schools.[66] Instead they proposed that Parliament should substitute for the present various grants, a grant which should defray all the costs of teaching staff in all schools and give 5s a head in addition. The salaries and numbers of the staff would be settled by the Education Department, but, naturally, the control of the teachers would remain with the school managers. This was the most important of the committee's proposals which were incorporated into a set of resolutions and accepted by the Convocation of Canterbury, May 17, 1895.[67]

In November, 1895 the Archbishops of Canterbury and York presented a memorial to Lord Salisbury, who had become Prime Minister in June, 1895, and in July had won a great majority in the general election. This memorial, based on the recommendations of the Archbishops' committee, requested, though in guarded terms, the Exchequer aid envisaged by the Archbishops' committee's report. The memorial also requested that the progress of the school boards be curbed by having their "precepts" (demands for rate aid served on the local rating authorities) revised by some "superior authority" and by allowing denominational

---

66 "Report of the Archbishops' Committee", par. 16. Cf. Statement of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, quoted in The Times, June 8, 1895, p. 8.

67 The Times, May 18, 1895, p. 12.

schools to be built in school board areas. Finally, it dealt with the disability Churchmen suffered in regard to religious teaching in the board schools, and asked that "all reasonable facilities should be afforded for the separate religious instruction of children in board and voluntary schools when parents desire it".[68] The last was a demand which had grown out of the London School Board controversy of 1893-94.

There seemed to be a good chance that the new Conservative Government would receive the Archbishops' memorial sympathetically. For some time now, the Conservative leaders had been expressing considerable interest in the plight of the voluntary schools. They had been aware of difficulties that Acland's administration of the Education Department had been creating for those schools. Lord Salisbury, speaking at Preston, Lancashire, a stronghold of voluntary schools, in 1893, accused Acland of being "driven by his hatred of the voluntary schools" and of using "the exceptional and anomalous powers which the Department gave him to force his own particular predilictions on the English people".[69] Arthur James Balfour, speaking at Manchester, in January, 1895, spoke of the "intolerable burden" borne by the supporters of the voluntary schools, which were in a state of "peril", and advised that the Minister of Education should treat the voluntary schools "tenderly, lovingly . . . rather than just increase the standards of education and make life difficult for them".[70]

---

68 The Times, November 16, 1895, p. 9.

69 Ibid., October 18, 1893, p. 7.

70 Ibid., January 19, 1895, p. 8.

On June 12, 1895, Lord Salisbury spoke at a meeting of the National Society[71] where he gave Churchmen a vague promise of rate aid for their schools by advising them "not to throw aside the board-school money as a sum hopelessly lost". He observed that the Cowper-Temple clause of the board schools had "unexpectedly" worked against the teaching of Church doctrines which could only be taught to others "through the employment of formularies". Urging them to "capture the school boards under the present law", he promised a "new law which would repeal the Cowper-Temple clause". This was as generous a promise of help as the denominationalists dared ask for.

During the period 1892-95, (the Ministeries of Gladstone and Rosebery) sectarian matters became important political issues. The Conservatives had strongly opposed the unsuccessful efforts of the Liberal Government to disestablish the Church in Wales, and the Parish Councils' Act,[72] which took certain powers of local government away from the Church, was passed only after a long debate and with numerous amendments. The Conservatives' support of the Church schools, thus, was in keeping with their general policy of defending the interest of the Established Church. Because the questions of the disestablishment of the Church and the position of the voluntary schools had played a prominent part in the general election of 1895, Churchmen had reason to expect

---

71 The Times, June 13, 1895, p. 12.

72 Great Britain, Public General Acts, 56 & 57, Vic. cap. 73: An act to amend the laws relating to local Government in England and Wales, and for other purposes connected therewith (Local Government Act, 1894), also known as the Parish Councils' Act.

substantial aid for their schools from the new Conservative Government.

As expected, in April, 1896, John Gorst, the new Vice-President of the Committee of Council on Education, introduced into the House of Commons a bill to help the denominational schools and to provide for a radical re-organization of the machinery of educational administration. The bill proposed to make such units of local government as the county and county borough councils (created by the Local Government Act, 1888),[73] the single authorities for secondary education with supervisory powers over elementary education as well.[74] The bill attempted to do much to meet the demands contained in the Archbishops' memorial to Salisbury during the previous November. First of all it provided for a grant of 4s per child to voluntary schools, and to necessitous board schools under section 97 of the Forster Act of 1870. This aid would amount to £618,500 annually to the voluntary schools, and £154,500 to the board schools. Federations of school managers would distribute the money to voluntary schools according to need. A limit was to be placed on the amount of money school boards could acquire from the rates in order to

---

73 Great Britain, Public General Acts, 51 & 52 Vic, cap. 41. An act to make further provisions for Local Government in England and Wales (Local Government Act, 1888), also called the County Councils Act.

74 The story of the growing demand for state involvement in secondary education - that is, education between that given by the elementary schools and the universities - is outside the scope of this paper. Sufficient it is to say that there were now two local authorities, the school boards and the municipal councils, involved in secondary education, both having quasi-legal authority to do so. See P.H.J.H. Gosden, The Development of Educational Administration in England and Wales, (Oxford: Basil Blackwood, 1966).

curb the competition of the school boards. Another favour to the Church was clause xxvii which required that where a reasonable number of parents desired, the local authority should grant permission for separate religious instruction for their children in all public elementary schools - a measure which practically repealed the Cowper-Temple clause.

A bill so radical in its administrative intentions and favourable to the Church was bound to encounter much opposition from supporters of the school boards and the Nonconformists, who objected to the 4s grant as a further endowment of the Church which would perpetuate the difficulty of the Nonconformists in the single school areas, and to clause xxvii which they suspected would lead to undue interference in the board schools by the ecclesiastical authorities.[75] However, what most likely killed the bill was the political power of the municipalities. When Balfour accepted Albert Rollit's amendment making boroughs of not less than 20,000 in population local authorities for education, the urban districts demanded the same status, and the county councils objected to it.[76] The Conservative Party was divided over the issue and it was probably

---

75 Opposition expressed by the Association of School Boards, The Times, May 21, 1896, p. 24; the Congregational Union of England and Wales, ibid., May 15, p. 12. At Leeds the Education League was formed, and Rev. Hirst Hollowell founded the Northern Counties Education League.

76 Meeting of the Northern Boroughts Association, ibid., April 25, p. 7. Meeting of the Municipal Corporations' Association of which Albert Rollit, Liberal Unionist M.P., was chairman, ibid., April 17, p. 10. Meeting of the Executive Council of the County Councils' Association, June 19, ibid., June 20, 1896, p. 12. Hansard, 4th series, Vol. XII, June 11, 1896, p. 907.

because of this that Balfour withdrew the Bill on June 22, before the first clause had passed the committee stage.[77] His disastrous interference in Sir John Gorst's conduct of it probably motivated him to attempt, himself, to re-organize the educational system. Anyway, when announcing the withdrawal of the Gorst Bill, he made known his intentions to introduce a new bill, granting aid to the voluntary schools, in the following January.

Churchmen realized that much more substantial aid was necessary for the survival of the voluntary schools than was offered by the ill-fated Gorst Bill. The opinion was growing that the only way to put the voluntary schools on a firm financial basis was to acquire rate aid for them.[78] Grants made from the national Exchequer like that proposed in the Gorst Bill could, in the face of increasing educational costs, only provide temporary relief for the schools. In June, 1896, the Convocation of York passed a resolution in favour of rate aid for the voluntary schools,[79] and in July the Convocation of Canterbury considered the matter of Government aid for the Church schools and decided that "the Convocations of York and Canterbury resolve themselves into a

---

77 Hansard, op. cit., June 22, 1896, p. 6.

78 Canon Nunn, quoted in The Times, April 7, p. 9. (He was chairman of the Manchester School Board ca 1895). The National Society, ibid., April 16, p. 7. The Bishop of Manchester, ibid., April 17, p. 10.

79 "The Education Question from a Churchman's Point of View", op. cit., p. 433.

committee to consider the question of elementary education in November or late October.[80]

It is now worthwhile to examine the position of the Archbishop of Canterbury on the question of public aid to Church schools. Archbishop Benson was a vigorous opponent of rate aid and in 1896 said that he "would prefer to give up the whole of England to board schools with a strong clause 27 (a reference to the Gorst Bill), withdraw the subscriptions of the Church and convert them to religious education pure and simple rather than expose the Church to such a miserable series of defeats" as would be attendant upon the acceptance of rate aid.[81] To him rate aid was synonymous with the control of the voluntary schools by the local authorities.

Archbishop Benson died October 11, 1896, and the New Primate, Dr. Fredrick Temple,[82] shared the views of his predecessor as to the dangers of accepting rate aid for the Church schools. In June, 1895, he had told the ten northern Bishops requesting rate aid that they should surrender some of their schools to the school boards, rather than "put the body of Church schools on the slippery slope of support from the

---

80 The Times, July 8, 1896, p. 13.

81 J. A. Carr, Life of Archbishop Benson (London: Elliot Stock, 1898), p. 220. Statement made at a meeting on the National Society, June 10, 1896. Edward White Benson, 1829-1896; Headmaster of Wellington College, 1859-72; Bishop of Truro, 1877; Archbishop of Canterbury, 1882, until his death in 1896.

82 Fredrick Temple, 1821-1901; Headmaster of Rugby, 1857-69; Bishop of Exeter, 1869; Bishop of London, 1885-96; Archbishop of Canterbury, 1886-1901.

rates."[83] But during the summer of 1896 the demand for rate aid by Churchmen was so strong that he announced that he would "abide by the policy of the convocation in the interest of the Unity of the Church" should convocation accept the principle of rate aid.[84] Only reluctantly, and as a matter of expediency, did he accept the idea of rate aid for the Church schools. But his acceptance of rate aid tipped the balance in favour of those Churchmen who wanted rate aid and influenced the Church to accept it.

On October 30, a meeting of the Standing Committee of the National Society and of delegates representing the convocations and houses of laymen of the southern and northern provinces, diocesan conferences, and boards of education throughout the country considered the report of the Education Committee of the National Society on the question of public aid for the voluntary schools. The Conference agreed to ask for aid from the Exchequer at a rate not less than 6s per child to all public elementary schools alike. It also requested aid from the local rates, but limited the request to voluntary schools in school-board districts in which the rates were already raised. The meeting decided that in return for rate aid "it is reasonable that the rating authority shall be satisfied that the secular part of the teaching is efficient and the money economically spent, but it is essential that the appointment of the teachers and the control of the religious teaching in denominational schools shall remain under the control of the denominations".[85]

---

83 E. G. Sandford, ed., The Life of Fredrick Temple (London: Macmillan, 1966), p. 648.

84 At the Shrewsbury Conference, July, 1896, ibid.

85 The Times, October 31, 1896, p. 8.

The decision of the meeting caused considerable soul-searching and controversy among Churchmen. Certain points in the controversy show the dilemma of the Church at the time in regard to her schools. The first is that the demand for rate aid came mainly from the North which had more voluntary schools than the South and which had suffered more from the working of the Free Education Act, 1891.[86] Voluntary schools in the towns were hard-pressed by competition with the board schools and most northern voluntary schools were located in the towns.[87] Unlike the small Church schools in the single-school areas, they could not survive on subscriptions and Exchequer grants, so they needed rate aid. The South, excluding London, would be content with an increased Exchequer grant, and there was a feeling that the North should pay more subscriptions.[88] Moreover, several observers, including W. A. Spooner, an Anglican clergyman and educationalist, and Major Rash, Conservative M.P. for S.E. Essex and a firm supporter of agricultural interests, stated that the rural areas were opposed to the extension of the school rates to their areas (areas with no school boards paid no school rates), or to the increase of such rates if they were already subjected to them.[89] There was also debate among Churchmen as to whether or not

---

86 "The Prospects of Educational Legislation" by a Correspondent, The Times, November 5, 1896, p. 4.

87 Sir Joshua Fitch (an Inspector with the Education Department), "The Education Problem", The Nineteenth Century, Vol. 51, No. 1, 1902, p. 30.

88 Letter by W. A. Spooner (Dean of New College, Oxford) to The Times, November 5, 1896, p. 12, gives an analysis of the controversy. Cf. recommendations accepted by the Convocation of Canterbury, found in The Times, May 18, 1895, p. 12.

89 Letters by Spooner and Major Rash to The Times, November 5, 1896, p. 12.

they should reject rate aid and maintain the absolute independence of their schools, or accept rate aid and grant rate payers control over secular education and the expenditure of money as they would probably demand.

The Conference of the Convocation of Canterbury and York met on November 5, and the proposals of the National Society's meeting were discussed. The resolution requesting a state grant of 6s per child for all elementary schools alike was accepted, and a motion for rate aid was passed by a large majority. The Archbishop of Canterbury explained that "rate aid was restricted to school board areas alone, for to ask for a fresh rate where none now existed, would be to provoke a new 'church-rate war'" - an allusion to the struggle of the Nonconformists in the 1860's to get the Church rate abolished. A new condition included in the motion - that the amount collected from the rates must not exceed the total amount of voluntary contributions and endowments - was necessary, for "unless voluntary contributions were maintained Churchmen would not be able to retain the appointment of the teachers and the truly religious character of their schools".[90] So it was with reluctance and uneasiness that the Church accepted the idea of putting her schools on the rates.

Unfortunately, the mood of the country in 1897, as Balfour admitted in the House of Commons, March 25, was not conducive to supporting the voluntary schools out of the rates.[91] After all, the Agricultural

---

90 Report of the Conference, The Times, Nov. 5, 1896, p. 12

91 Hansard, 4th series, Vol. XLVII, March 25, 1897, p. 1418.

Rates Act[92] had just given the economically depressed agricultural areas a measure of relief from taxation, so it would be inconsistent to impose new taxes right away. Consequently, Balfour's Voluntary Schools Act[93] of 1897 did not grant rate aid to the voluntary schools. But it gave a grant of 5s per pupil to the voluntary schools to be distributed by associations of school managers set up under the Act.[94] Both Archbishops regarded the Act as a temporary relief measure to last until such time as the government introduced a comprehensive measure to place the voluntary schools on a secure financial basis.[95] Balfour regarded it as an "experimental and modest measure" and not as a final solution to the voluntary schools' question.[96]

The measure aroused the usual opposition from the Liberals and Nonconformists who dubbed it an endowment of the Church. A motion by Lloyd George, requiring adequate representation of local authorities on the management committees of schools in receipt of the

---

92 Great Britain, Public General Acts, 59 & 60, Vic. cap. 17: An Act to amend the law with respect to the Rating of occupiers of Agricultural land in England, and for other purposes connected therewith. (Agricultural Rates Act, 1896).

93 Great Britain, Public General Acts, 60 & 61, Vic. cap. 5: An Act to provide for a Grant out of the Exchequer in aid of voluntary Elementary schools, etc. (The Voluntary Schools Act, 1897).

94 Ibid., Clauses 1 & 3.

95 The Archbishop of York to the clergy of Sheffield on Feb. 8, 1897, as quoted in The Times, May 13, 1897, p. 9. The Archbishop of Canterbury at Convocation, May 11, ibid., May 12, 1897, p. 7.

96 Hansard, op. cit., p. 1418.

grants was supported by a number of Unionists, but was opposed by Balfour on the grounds that it might impair the denominational character of the voluntary schools, supposing Nonconformists got elected to the management committees.[97] The interest in the Bill expressed in the country and in the House of Commons where it was debated for fifteen days demonstrated how the religious factor made education controversial in the late Victorian era. However, the Bill passed in its original form without substantial change.

At first the Act served to give the voluntary schools a new lease on life, and the Report of the National Society, 1898, and the Archbishop of Canterbury, speaking at the annual meeting of the National Society in 1898, expressed enthusiasm with the working of it. The efficiency of the schools was improving and the expenditure on maintenance per child had increased by 2s 3d from 1897 to 1898.[98] The National Society accelerated its efforts to extend the Church schools all over the country and in the three years from 1897 to 1899 provided additional accommodation for 32,753 children.[99]

But the new prosperity of the voluntary schools proved ephemeral. The National Society noticed with alarm the decrease in subscriptions from £632,241 in 1897 to £585,945 in 1898, and a minor

---

97 Hansard, op. cit., February 25, p. 1200.

98 The Times, June 16, 1898, p. 8.

99 Meeting of the National Society as reported in The Times, June 14, 1900, p. 13.

increase to £603,241 in 1899 after strenuous efforts to elicit subscriptions.[100] The increased aid from the Exchequer had precipitated a decrease in voluntary subscriptions as some people had feared. By 1900 increased salaries had consumed £544,000 of the approximately £600,000 aid grant to the voluntary schools.[101] The combined debt of 11,000 Church schools was £450,000 in August, 1900.[102] From 1870 to 1899, 960 Church schools had been transferred to the school boards[103] - a process which had increased since 1895.[104] At the end of 1900, John Gorst judged that the voluntary schools were in the same difficulty as they had been in 1895: "All expediencies for saving the schools must fail, unless they result in providing them with a secure income, something like that of the board schools with which they have to compete."[105] It was obvious that the voluntary schools system financed through government grants and voluntary contributions had proved inadequate for the provision of a satisfactory standard of education.

---

100 Meeting of the National Society as reported in The Times, June 14, 1900, p. 13.

101 P.R.O. Ed. 24/20; 2/3/02. Note on Voluntary Schools Aid Grant, as cited in Gosden, op. cit., p. 170.

102 P.R.O. Ed. 24/18; 14/2/02, Kingsford to Morant, as quoted in ibid.

103 "Report of the Committee of Council on Education, 1898-99", p. xv.

104 "The Annual Report of the National Society, 1898", as printed in The Times, January 15, 1898, p. 12.

105 P.R.O. Ed. 24/29; 13/12/00, Gorst to Devonshire, as quoted in Gosden, op. cit., p. 170.

The Gestation of the Education Bill of 1902

The introduction of the Board of Education Bill in 1899, uniting the Education Department and the Science and Art Department[106] into a single department under a board of education, occasioned renewed interest in a re-organization of the local administration of education. The possibility of such legislation prompted Churchmen to ponder schemes for including the voluntary schools in it.

Churchmen knew that it was unlikely that the government would propose a bill, the sole objective of which would be the maintenance of the voluntary schools substantially out of public funds, for the probable opposition to such a measure by the Nonconformists and the public, generally, would make it politically inexpedient. For this reason the scheme proposed by the Archbishops' committee, 1895, had included all elementary schools, board as well as voluntary; the Gorst Bill proposed to give aid to board schools as well as to voluntary schools, and Balfour's Voluntary Schools' Act was followed by the Necessitous School Boards' Act[107] in aid of the rural school boards. The way to get Parliament to solve the financial problems of the voluntary schools was to include them, as the Gross Commission had suggested, in a bill to establish "some more

---

106 The Science and Art Department was a branch of the Committee of Council on Education which sponsored scientific and vocational training.

107 Great Britain, Public General Acts, 60 & 61, Vic. cap. 16: An Act to amend section ninety-seven of the Elementary Education Act, 1870, (Elementary Education Act, 1897), also called the Necessitous School Boards' Act.

comprehensive system of administration which would remove as far as possible the grave and inequitable inequalities of the two systems of voluntary and board schools now existing".[108] In respect to such a scheme the denominationalists had a problem: How could the voluntary schools be included in a public system of administration without losing their denominational character? without losing control over the teachers and the religious teaching?

Three schemes for the solution of this dilemma were published in The Guardian, December 23, 1899. All three - the Manchester, Birmingham, and Leeds schemes - provided for one local educational authority which would support and control, to some extent, the voluntary schools, but were not really acceptable to most Churchmen. On November 19, 1900 the Salisbury conference of religious and educational leaders of the Church of England decided that the local authority would have to be a large one embracing one or more counties and would maintain all schools out of funds acquired from the local rates and from the Exchequer. In return for this aid the local authorities would have representatives on the management committees of the schools.[109] In February, 1901, the Standing Committee of the National Society accepted a similar scheme, but stipulated that the "appointment and dismissal of the teachers and regulations respecting religious instruction should be as provided in the

---

[108] The Cross Commission's Final Report, p. 222.

[109] Reported in The Times, November 20, p. 7.

trust deeds" of the schools.[110] Both schemes affirmed that parents would have the right of having denominational religious instruction in all schools at their own expense. Churchmen were groping towards reaching a consensus as to what would comprise a suitable scheme.

Moreover, the opportunity for a re-organization of the whole education system was now developing. Robert Morant,[111] an assistant director in the office of special inquiries and reports of the Education Department, who was obsessed with the idea of streamlining the educational system, and a High Church committee headed by Athelstan Riley and Hugh Cecil, who wanted a re-organization of the educational system for the benefit of the voluntary schools, instigated the case which led to the Cockerton Judgement. Upon a representation by Mr. Francis Black (Headmaster of the Camden School of Art, London), who was acting on behalf of the High Church Committee, Mr. T. B. Cockerton, an auditor with the Local Government Board, decided in July, 1899, to surcharge the London School Board for money spent on secondary education on the grounds that such expenditures were illegal. The upholding of the Judgement by a High Court in April, 1901, made it mandatory for the

---

[110] Reported in The Times, May 18, 1901, p. 14.

[111] Sir Robert Morant, 1863-1920; ed. at New College, Oxford; Assistant director of Special Inquiries and Reports, Education Department, 1895-1902; Assistant Private Secretary of Board of Education, 1902-1913; Permanent Secretary of Board of Education, 1903-1911. For an account of Morant's part in the Cockerton Case, see Bernard Allen, Sir Robert Morant (London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd., 1934).

government to propose a bill for the creation of an authority for secondary education which would administer the secondary educational institutions hitherto supervised by the school boards.

In July, 1901, a one-clause bill, the Cockerton Act,[112] was passed allowing municipal authorities to sanction the illegal work of the school boards for one year. The inevitability that the government would soon produce a new bill providing for the re-organization of the local authorities for education caused a joint conference of the Convocation of Canterbury and York to convene, in July, 1901, to decide how the voluntary schools could be included in it.[113]

The Conference formulated a definite policy which it expressed in a series of resolutions.[114] It took it for granted that there would be a new educational authority, having responsibility for all elementary schools. Like the Salisbury conference and the Standing Committee of the National Society, the Conference suggested that the local authority pay for the maintenance of the voluntary schools out of the local rates, including the teachers' salaries, but in return for this liability the local authority would have representation on the management committees of the schools. The denominational character of the schools was to be secured by leaving the

---

112 Great Britain, Public General Acts, 64 & 1 Edw. VII, cap. 91: An act for enabling local authorities to empower School Boards temporarily to carry on certain schools, etc. (Education Act, 1901).

113 Reported in The Times, July 4, 1901, p. 4.

114 For the Resolutions, see Appendix IV, p. 176 below.

appointment and dismissal of the teachers in the hands of the school managers, two-thirds of which were to be private members appointed by the denominations owning the schools. In consideration of the Anglican children in the board schools, it was determined that Church teaching should be allowed in the board schools when requested by the parents.

While formulating this policy, the Conference was confronted with the question of what financial responsibility the Church should assume in the new system. It could either pay for the upkeep of the buildings or the denominational teaching, but not both. The Conference, probably believing that the maintenance of the buildings would provide greater security for the preservation of the Church's role in education, decided to maintain the buildings.

The Conference also resolved that Churchmen "make a united effort to urge upon His Majesty's Government the necessity of introducing and pressing, during the coming session, legislation on the lines indicated" by the Conference in its resolutions. Under the aegis of the Church Committee for Church Defense and Instruction, beginning in October, 1901, some ten thousand petitions were sent to the government urging that elementary education be included in a comprehensive educational measure.[115] As will be seen the Church's lobby was successful.

Meanwhile during the summer of 1901, A. J. Balfour and Robert Morant had formed an alliance to work out a comprehensive scheme for

---

[115] "Circular of the Committee for Church Defense and Instruction", April, 1902, as cited in The Liberal Magazine, July, 1902, p. 338.

the new bill. Both of them wanted elementary education included in the bill, but for different reasons. Morant, though probably a sympathizer with the Church of England on the subject of the schools' question since he had once planned to take "orders" in the Church, was primarily an educationalist and wanted it included in order to harness the support of the denominationalists so as to overcome the opposition of the school boards. Balfour wanted it included basically for political and religious reasons; and to him it was not the "hostility of the regular opposition" to its inclusion that mattered, but that of Churchmen towards its omission.[116]

The first draft of the bill proposed that the new local authorities for education be the councils of the county and county boroughs and urban districts, which were to govern secondary education and maintain the elementary schools, including the voluntary schools, out of the local rates. The Cowper-Temple Clause was to be repealed so as to allow denominational religious teaching in the board schools.[117]

The Cabinet meetings of November 5 and December 13 rejected the scheme. Chamberlain, the Colonial Secretary and leader of the Liberal Unionists, was a powerful figure in the Unionist Cabinet. He opposed the granting of rate aid to voluntary schools on political grounds, fearing the loss of the support of his Nonconformist Liberal Unionists. Lord

---

[116] Allen, op. cit., p. 155 & 160.

[117] Ibid., pp: 156-57.

Salisbury, too, opposed it on the same grounds. They demanded that the bill be confined to secondary education alone.[118]

But at this moment the Church's lobby and her connection with the Conservative Party came into play. The great bulk of Anglican Tories in the Party were demanding the incorporation of the demands of the Church, as expressed in the resolutions of the Joint Convocation of Canterbury and York in July, 1901, into the bill. A bill rejecting these demands could possibly not pass through Parliament. The Whips' Office reported: "It would be hazardous to ignore the feelings of the great bulk of the Party, in favour of rate aid to the voluntary schools, for the sake of removing the scruples of a few radical Unionists in the Midlands."[119]

Under these circumstances the Cabinet finally accepted the scheme of Morant and Balfour. Chamberlain's consent was reluctantly given after the inclusion of a clause making it optional for the local authority to grant rate aid to the voluntary schools.[120] He hoped this concession would satisfy his Nonconformist supporters.

In March, 1902, Balfour introduced his education bill[121] to the

---

[118] Julian Amery, The Life of Joseph Chamberlain (London: Macmillan, 1951) Vol. IV, p. 486.

[119] Memoirs of Sir Almeric Fitzroy, as quoted in ibid., p. 488. Sir Almeric Fitzroy, 1851-1935; ed. at Balliol College, Oxford; Private Secretary to the Lord President of the Council, 1895-1898; Clerk of the Council, 1895-1923.

[120] Ibid., p. 488.

[121] A Bill to make further provision for Education in England and Wales. The Education (England and Wales) Bill, published in The Times, March 26, 1902, p. 10. For Balfour's introduction, see Hansard, 4th series, Vol. CV, March 24, 1902, pp. 846-68.

House of Commons, the essence of which was that the local educational authorities were to be such units of local government as the councils of the counties, county boroughs, non-county boroughs with a population of over 10,000, and urban districts with a population of over 20,000, acting through a committee in all matters "except the raising of rates or the borrowing of money". It stipulated that the authorities might aid the supply of secondary education, and they were given an optional power to take control of elementary education provided by the board and voluntary schools. Owing to the uniqueness of the London system of municipal government - there being borough councils and the London County Council - that metropolis was temporarily excluded from the Bill.

The great favour which the Bill offered to the Church was that the voluntary schools were to be included in the re-organization of education on the terms outlined by the Joint Convocation of Canterbury and York, July, 1901. The local authorities (if they optioned to take control of elementary schools) were given control of secular education in the voluntary schools and had to maintain out of the local rates and keep efficient these schools, while the managers of the individual schools were responsible for the upkeep of the buildings. The denominational character of the schools was not to be violated as the local authorities could appoint no more than a third of the managers of these schools, and the appointment of the teachers was entrusted to the managers subject to the consent, on educational grounds only, of the local authorities. Denominationalists were given the opportunity of establishing denominational

schools in areas where the parents of no fewer than thirty children so-desired, something which had for long been a perennial demand of the Church. However, the repeal of the Cowper-Temple clause was omitted from the bill for fear of the possible Nonconformist opposition to it.[122] Except for this short-coming and the inclusion of the optional clause, the Bill met the demands of the Joint Convocation of Canterbury and York. The survival of the Church schools was to be assured and provision was made for the extension of the Church schools system.

Conclusion

Under the Education Act of 1870 a state system of elementary schools developed which threatened to supersede the Church of England schools supported in part out of voluntary contributions in lieu of rate aid. Voluntary contributions proved to be not so lucrative a source of income as rate aid and in time many Church schools had to be abandoned because of increasing educational costs while the more adequately financed school board system continued to expand. Nor could the Church afford to build new schools and an increasing proportion of Anglican children had to attend board schools in which they received no Church teaching.

The obvious solution to this problem was the acquisition of rate aid for the voluntary schools, but Churchmen feared that this could result in losing control of their schools to the local authorities. Nevertheless, following the implementation of the Free Education Act of 1891, which deprived the northern schools of their hitherto substantial support

---

122 Allen, op. cit., p. 171.

from school fees, the Church cautiously formulated a policy which combined rate aid with a degree of local control over their schools. This policy was accepted by the Conservative Government after it became clear that the aid granted to voluntary schools by the Voluntary Schools Act of 1897 was insufficient to maintain these schools, and was incorporated into Balfour's Bill of 1902.

The Education Bill of 1902 marked the successful conclusion of the Church's lobby for substantial aid for her schools which had been increasing in intensity since 1895. How to get this measure of unprecedented aid accepted by Parliament and the country was the problem of the future.

CHAPTER II

THE DEFENSE OF THE EDUCATION BILL OF 1902

Reactions to the Education Bill

Since the need for one local authority for all levels of education was generally felt in England at the turn of the century, the immediate public reaction to the Bill was quite favourable. The Times praised it as a charter for educational progress,[1] while The Manchester Guardian, which later became a distinct opponent of it, described Balfour's speech introducing the Bill as "temperate and conciliatory" and "as an effort to deal with education in a comprehensive manner, and not for sectarian or party interests".[2]

In the House of Commons the Bill was welcomed by both Liberal and Conservative educationalists, although they expressed disapproval of the optional clause. A Conservative, Sir Richard Jebb (Cambridge University), a Greek scholar, and the Liberals, R. B. Haldane[3] (East Lothian), and Dr. T. J. Macnamara[4] (North Camberwell) spoke of the need for such a reform

---

1 The Times, Leader, March 25, 1902, p. 4.

2 The Manchester Guardian, Leader, March 25, 1902, p. 7.

3 R. B. Haldane, 1856-1928; ed. at Edinburgh Academy and the Universities of Gottengen and Edinburgh; a lawyer, he handled many cases before the Privy Council; Liberal M.P. for East Lothian, 1888-1911; Secretary of State for War, 1905-1912 and was responsible for important army reforms; Lord Chancellor, 1912-1915, in the Liberal Government, and 1924 in the Labour Government.

4 Dr. T. J. Macnamara, 1861-1931; ed. at St. Thomas' School, Exeter, and the Borough Road Training College for Teachers; a teacher, editor of the School Master, organ of the N.U.T., of which he became president in 1896; Liberal M.P. for North Camberwell, 1900-1924; Parliamentary Secretary to the Local Government Board, 1907; Financial Secretary to the Admiralty, 1908; Minister of Labour, 1920.

of education as the Bill offered to bring about, although the latter had some reservations about the abolition of the borough school boards, and about the continuation of denominational religious teaching in schools supported out of public funds.[5] The most critical speaker on the Opposition side was James Bryce, author of the Royal Commission's Report on Secondary Education (1895), who questioned the adequacy of the popular control of education to be provided by the new local educational authorities.[6] Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, the Liberal leader, reserved his judgement until later, but ominously expressed the wish that the local authorities' control of the rate-aided voluntary schools would be real and that the principle of popular control in educational matters would be strengthened by the Bill.[7] In general, the speakers concentrated on the educational aspects of the Bill and spoke sparingly, and in a conciliatory tone, on the religious factor. The Bill passed the first reading by a vote of 176-23, the 23 opposing it consisted mainly of the hard core of Nonconformist Liberals in the House. Parliament, as well as the general public, seemed to be in an amiable mood to settle the educational problems of England.

As would be expected, the Church of England approved of the Bill, which, inasmuch as it concerned the voluntary schools was fashioned

---

5 Hansard, 4th series, Vol. CV. March 24, 1902, pp. 881-889.

6 Ibid., pp. 929-943.

7 Ibid., pp. 868-871

along lines suggested by the Church. On March 20, the Standing Committee of the National Society announced its support for the Bill, as did the Bishop of Manchester, who for a decade had been a spokesman for those demanding rate aid for the voluntary schools.[8] A special meeting of the Convocations of York and Canterbury gave it enthusiastic support.[9] Anglicans saw great merit in the creation of one local authority for education and, not surprisingly, in giving rate aid to the voluntary schools. Without exception they condemned the optional clause, for its operation could mean that in many counties elementary voluntary schools would not come under the new authorities and would not receive rate aid.

Some uneasiness had been previously expressed by the framers of the Bill that some Churchmen would object to the degree of local control the scheme demanded over their schools.[10] It was feared that the presence of two representatives of the local authority on the management committee of the schools would result in the watering down of the religious teaching so as to make it acceptable to the Nonconformists who attended them.[11] At the Convocation of Canterbury on April 24, A. F. Vulliamy opposed having to place the prosperous schools under the control of the

---

8 The Manchester Guardian, April 4, 1902, p. 6.

9 The Times, April 30, 1902, p. 12.

10 Bishop Knox, op. cit., p. 212.

11 The Pilot, Leader, March 29, 1902, p. 335.

local authorities and expressed fear that the upkeep of the buildings would be too great a burden for the managers of some schools to bear. Although these reservations were not shared by the Convocation as a whole, it passed a resolution making it clear that Churchmen would accept no modification of the Bill which would endanger the denominational character of their schools.[12]

Some dismay was expressed over the failure of the Bill to repeal the Cowper-Temple clause and allow Churchmen to provide doctrinal religious teaching for the approximately one million Church children in the provided schools, as the former board schools were to be called under the new system. The Convocation of Canterbury accepted a motion by Athelstan Riley which regretted that "reasonable facilities to parents who may wish to obtain religious teaching for their children different from that given by the ordinary curriculum of the school" were not provided by the Bill. The Church Times condemned the Bill for this failure,[13] and The Spectator thought it "paradoxical" that Churchmen, while so concerned about the children who attended Church schools, expressed little concern about those Anglican children in the board schools.[14]

The truth of the matter was that the demand for "facilities" came mostly from the High Church Party. This could have been because

---

12 The Times, April 12, 1902, p. 12.

13 The Church Times, Leader, March 27, 1902, p. 385.

14 The Spectator, Leader, April 12, 1902, p. 543.

the Anglo-Catholics were probably stronger in the more sophisticated urban congregations than in the rural areas, and it was in the cities, where the voluntary school systems were weak, that most Anglican children attended the board schools. Presumably, many of them were the children of Anglo-Catholic parents. According to Rev. D. C. Lathbury, editor of the High Church Pilot, the majority of Churchmen had not been adamant in support of "facilities" which probably accounts, in part, for its omission from the Bill.[15] Probably the majority of Churchmen did not want to open their schools to Nonconformist religious teachers, for that would interfere with the peculiar Church atmosphere of their schools.[16] Moreover, Churchmen feared that owing to the opposition of the secularists and Nonconformists, such a provision "could not be carried through Parliament unless the Church was prepared to give the representatives of the ratepayers a majority of places on the boards of management" of the voluntary schools, and this the Church would not do.[17] When Lord Hugh Cecil moved his amendment offering "facilities" during the report stage of the Bill, it received only fifty-seven votes. Besides the Nonconformists, the majority of the Anglicans and Conservatives voted against it. In fact, through the Education Bill of 1902, the Church had decided "to teach its own religion to its children

---

15 Rev. D. C. Lathbury, "The Clergy and the Education Act", The Nineteenth Century, Vol. 53, No. 1, 1903, pp. 4-5.

16 Rev. T. A. Lacey, The Pilot, Dec. 7, 1901, p. 665; Rev. W. J. Wood, ibid., Feb. 1, 1902; Archdeacon Fletcher, The Spectator, April 26, 1902, p. 647.

17 Lathbury, op. cit., pp. 4-5.

by its own teachers in its own schools".[18] Clauses 9 and 10 allowed the Church to build new schools for Anglican children where needed, and this would, in time, alleviate the problem of the religious education of Anglican children in the board schools.

Not surprisingly, the Bill was soon denounced by organizations whose educational ideals were seriously affronted by it. The National Education Association, the Northern Counties Education League, the Executive Committee of the Association of School Boards, a national conference of trade unionists at Exeter Hall, London, the National Liberal Federation - all condemned the Bill for the abolition of the school boards and for giving support to sectarian education. The Liberal Magazine, epitomized their reaction to the scheme by declaring that "it was not so much an Education Bill as another voluntary schools Relief Bill".[19]

Since Nonconformists were prominent in these organizations, these reactions were typical of the Nonconformist attitude towards the Bill. In letters to The Times on the fifth and eighth of April, respectively, Dr. Joseph Parker, President of the National Council of the Evangelical Free Churches, and Rev. Hugh Price Hughes, the great Methodist divine, stated the deeply felt Nonconformists' objections. One objection was based on principle. The Bill violated an "established principle of British Education that if sectarian education be maintained, the sects that demand

---

[18] Archdeacon Fletcher, "The Renewed Struggle for the Schools", The Nineteenth Century, Vol. 51, No. 1, 1902, p. 540.

[19] The Liberal Magazine, May, 1902, p. 274.

it must at least bear a considerable portion of the cost and that in no case should the rate-payers be compelled to support sectarian education".[20] But the crux of their opposition to the scheme was that it aggravated the problem of the Nonconformists in the single-school areas where the only school was a Church school. The Nonconformists could not afford to establish their own schools in these areas, and they hoped that board schools would eventually be established in all areas. Now in 8,000 districts the Nonconformists were to be "forced to support schools in which their children are taught to despise the convictions and church of their parents".[21] Moreover, in these areas Nonconformist children were barred from becoming teachers. This situation had existed before 1902, but then the Nonconformists did not have to pay rates in support of the schools. Dr. Parker warned that the Nonconformists would "resist the education rates ... rather than submit to a new Church rate and a new variety of sectarian degradation".[22]

On April 15, a National Conference of 1100 duly appointed representatives of the Free Churches from all over England and Wales met at the Temple Hall, London.[23] From the enthusiasm and excitement of the meeting it was clear that Nonconformity had been thoroughly aroused.

---

20 Rev. H. P. Hughes, The Times, April 8, 1902, p. 8.

21 Ibid.

22 Ibid., April 5, 1902, p. 8.

23 Ibid., April 16, 1902, p. 4.

The conference unanimously passed resolutions condemning the Bill for compelling "Nonconformists to pay rates and taxes to schools whose teaching is repugnant to their consciences" and for "abolishing the school boards", and urged Nonconformists to resist the Bill by all legitimate means". On the same day they sent a deputation to Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, who promised that in the House of Commons the Liberal Party would "strenuously" oppose the Bill. Later, on June 12, they presented their case to Balfour, but he offered no concessions to them.[24]

During the first week in May the second reading of the Bill occurred, and the views of both the supporters and the opponents of the scheme were thoroughly articulated by their representatives in Parliament. Although the majority of the speakers on both sides said little about the religious problem, it was brought into prominence by Lord Hugh Cecil and David Lloyd George. Lord Hugh Cecil, the representative of the High Church Party in the House, said that the Bill proposed to give the local authorities complete control of all but religious education in the voluntary schools. He said the purpose of denominational schools was to indoctrinate children into the religious beliefs of their parents: "A Church school, a Wesleyan, or a Roman Catholic school are schools with two doors, and the other leads into the Church or chapel and brings the child into contact with this or that denomination".[25] He explained that Bible teaching in the board schools was more favourable to the Nonconformists than to the

---

[24] Rev. H. P. Hughes, The Times, June 13, 1902, p. 12.

[25] Hansard, 4th series, Vol. CVII, May 5, 1902, p. 845.

Anglicans, because formularies and catechisms were more important in Anglicanism than they were in Nonconformity. In his conclusion he appealed for an alliance with the Nonconformists against the growing forces of secularism.[26]

Lloyd George in a virulent speech made it obvious that the fight about the Bill was going to be mainly about its sectarian aspects. He said the main point of contention was not "the question of the local authority... but that of rate aid for the teaching of religion".[27] He accused the Anglican schools of proselytizing Nonconformist children, and quoted an article to this effect by Canon Pennington, a diocesan inspector, which was published in The Guardian, May, 1899, and alluded to the Romanist movement within the Church of England. While stressing the disadvantages of the Nonconformists in the single school areas which were particularly acute in Wales, he denied that the Anglicans had grievances in the board schools, since only the Bible, and not the doctrines of the Nonconformists, was taught in these schools. In conclusion, he charged that: "It is a Bill for riveting the clerical yoke on thousands of parishes in England".[28]

Lloyd George's assault on the Church's position in education was immediately countered by Sir Arthur Griffith-Boscawen[29] (Conservative M.P. for Kent, South West Division), a stalwart defender of the Established Church,

---

26 Hansard, 4th series, Vol. CVII, May 5, 1902, pp. 840-848.

27 Ibid., May 8, p. 1100.

28 Ibid., p. 1110.

29 Sir Arthur Griffith-Boscawen, 1865-1946; ed. at Rugby and Queens College, Oxford; Conservative M.P. for Tonbridge, Kent, 1892-1906; Dudley, 1910-1921; Taunton, 1921-1922; Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries, 1921-22; of Health, 1922-23; Secretary (ca. 1892-1906), Church Parliamentary Committee which lobbied for the Church; author of Fourteen Years in Parliament, and Memories.

who reminded the House that the conscience clause guarded against proselytism in the Church schools. He admitted that it was a grievance that in "9,000" schools only the religion of the Church of England could be taught, but suggested that this could be offset by having facilities for separate religious instruction outside school hours.[30] To the charge that the Nonconformists were to pay for the religious teaching in the voluntary schools, he asserted that the value of the Church's school buildings more than paid for the religious teaching given in them. He referred to the grievance of Churchmen with the board schools, insisting that the religious teaching in them, while suitable to the Nonconformists, was "in many cases positively injurious" to Churchmen. Moreover, for 30 years Churchmen had been paying for the support of their own schools while at the same time they had to pay rates in support of the school boards.[31]

Balfour wound up the debate and declared that he had never found any evidence of proselytism in the Church of England schools. If it did exist, it would be "immensely mitigated by the Bill" which brings to an end "the one-man management" which was responsible for such "clerical tyranny" of which Lloyd George had complained. The other members of the school-management committee would be a check on the "zeal" of the clergymen.[32] He accused the Nonconformists of wanting to "starve the

---

30 Hansard, 4th series, Vol. CVII, May 8, 1902, pp. 1113.

31 Ibid., pp. 1113-1117.

32 Ibid., p. 1212.

voluntary schools" and equated their grievance in regard to the voluntary schools with those of Churchmen in regard to the religious teaching in the board schools. Anyway, he declared, the Bill, through clauses 9 and 10, allowed Nonconformists to build their own schools in the single-school areas; and he could not understand why they objected to paying the local rates in support of the voluntary schools when they did not object to paying taxes to the Exchequer in their support.[33] This statement Balfour was to make repeatedly during the controversy. It insinuated that the Nonconformist objection to paying the rates was insincere, and this was congruous with his contention that the opposition to the Bill was essentially political, being stirred up by Nonconformist supporters of the Liberal Party for political motives.

In spite of the criticisms of the Bill, it passed the second reading by a favourable vote of 402-165, the Irish Nationalists supporting the Government. The Church had done very well in the first round of the contest over the Education Bill.

By the time the second reading of the Bill had ended, the objections to it had been made crystal clear. The first was that it compelled citizens to pay for sectarian teaching in the voluntary schools. By so doing, it aggravated the Nonconformists' sense of grievance in the single-school areas where their children had to attend Anglican schools. The second was that it allowed the local authorities to give rate aid to the voluntary

---

33 Hansard, 4th series, Vol. CVII, May 8, 1902, p. 1216.

schools without giving the local authorities a corresponding degree of control over them. Another salient criticism was that the Bill, since it stipulated that the appointment of the teachers was to be the prerogative of the managers of the denominational schools, imposed a religious test on the teachers. This was also a violation of the constitutional principle that no religious tests should be imposed on civil servants. The teachers, being now paid by the local authorities, were de facto civil servants and should be accorded the same treatment as other civil servants. Briefly, in the eyes of the Liberal-Labour-Nonconformist opposition to the Bill, it was merely a scheme to aid the voluntary schools out of the local rates while maintaining their denominational character. That they were able to represent their criticisms of the Bill as violations of constitutional principles, was a strong point in the opposition's case against the Bill, for it raised their case above the claims of religious sects and pressure groups and enabled them to appeal to the whole community.

The Church and its supporters did not challenge these constitutional principles, but insisted that the Bill did not violate them. They claimed that the Bill gave the local authorities control over the secular instruction in the denominational schools. The Bill safeguarded the appointment of teachers in regard to educational efficiency by giving a veto to the local authority and a power of dismissal under clause 8 (which was not actually stated in the Bill), as well as the power to fix the curriculum and inspect the schools. The power of the purse was invested in the local authority, and the one-third representation of the local authority on the school management committee brought in the element of publicity and criticism

All that was left to the management committee was the appointment of the teachers and control of the religious teaching, which, it was commonly agreed, should belong to the denominations.

This defense of the Bill was plausible to the more sophisticated, but it was easier for the general public to believe that the two-thirds denominational majority of the management committees would really control the schools. That the denominational managers were given the majority, seemed to confirm the suspicion that the Government was giving priority to supporting denominational education.

An Attempt at a Compromise

Undoubtedly, many Churchmen realized that a sectarian conflict was a heavy price to pay for securing rate aid for their schools. The Nonconformists were resentful because they had not been consulted during the formation of the Bill, although they represented one-half of the religious communicants in England. That the Government consulted the Anglican and Roman Catholic leaders and ignored the Nonconformists, who had grievances in connection with many Anglican schools, was unfortunate.[34] Robert W. Perks[35] (Louth, Lincolnshire) the Liberal Methodist spokesman in the House of Commons, and Mr. William Younger,[36]

---

34 Allen, op. cit., p. 155 and p. 159. Consultations were held with Cardinal Vaughan, and the Bishops of Rochester and London.

35 Hansard, 4th series, Vol. CXV, Dec. 3, 1902, pp. 1008-1009. (Perks, in the third reading).

36 Letter quoted in The Liberal Magazine, Oct. 1902, p. 575.

Conservative member for Stamford, reflected that a compromise of some sort could have been formed if a meeting of the various religious denominations had been convened during the planning stage of the Bill.

On July 12, however, a belated effort at a compromise was made. At the instigation of the Bishop of London a conference of Church and Nonconformist leaders was held at Fulham Palace, London. Attending for the Nonconformists were Dr. John Brown Paton, Rev. Hirst Hollowell, Rev. F. B. Meyer; among the Anglicans were the Bishops of Ripon, Carlisle, and Fulham, and Lord Hugh Cecil. It seems that no concordat was arrived at, but certain suggestions were made which could mitigate the conflict, though they were not totally accepted by either party.[37]

These suggestions were made public in letters between Dr. Paton and the Bishop of Hereford which were published in The Times and came to be known as the Bishop of Hereford's compromise.[38] The suggestions had to do with the problems of the Nonconformists in the single-school areas and did not involve the board schools or the Church schools in board school areas. The most important suggestion had to do with the management committees. It was proposed that the Church appoint one-third of the managers instead of two-thirds, as proposed by the Bill, the local authority appoint one third, as proposed by the Bill, but the

---

37 Rev. F. B. Meyer, quoted in The Church Times, Sept. 5, 1902, p. 246; William Evans and William Claridge, James Hirst Hollowell, and the Movement for Civic Control in Education, (Manchester: The Northern Counties Education League, 1911), p. 86.

38 The Times, July 22, 1902, p. 5.

remaining third should be elected either by the Parish Council or by a Parish meeting. This arrangement would give the Nonconformists some voice in the operation of the schools and still preserve the Anglican interest in them. The denominational character of the schools would be maintained by reserving the post of Headmaster for members of the Church of England, but all other positions could be open to all denominations.

These proposals, being a concession to the Nonconformists, were apparently accepted by the majority of them, although rejected by the extremists, Dr. Clifford and Rev. Hirst Hollowell.[39] A minority of Churchmen accepted the proposals.[40] They realized that a fair and equitable settlement of the Nonconformists' grievances would make it easier for the Church to pursue its policy of denominational education. Yet the proposals were unacceptable to the Church as a whole; for on

---

39 The Times, Aug. 4, 1902, p. 6. They wanted to "kill the Bill".

Dr. John Clifford, 1836-1923; ed. at University of London; a Baptist, was pastor of Westbourne Park Chapel, London; President of the National Council of Evangelical Free Churches (1898-99); published "The Fight Against the Education Bill of 1902".

Rev. James Hirst Hollowell, 1851-1909; a Congregationalist minister at London, Nottingham and Rochdale, founded the Northern Counties Education League (1896) and led the fight against the Education Bill of 1902 in the North.

40 For instance, Rev. Prebendary Baker, Rector of St. Marlebone, letter to The Times, Aug. 24, 1902, p. 6; Rev. Charles Stubbs, Dean of Ely, ibid., Aug. 4, p. 7; Rev. F. D. Cremer, Vicar of Eccles, ibid., Aug. 28, p. 6; William Banks, Archdeacon of Richmond, ibid., Aug. 27, p. 6; The Pilot, Leader, Aug. 2, 1902, pp. 108-109.

July 10, a joint meeting of the Houses of Laymen of Canterbury and York had declared against any change in the management committees of the schools, and on July 21, a letter signed by 23 clergymen and Church educational authorities, condemning the Hereford compromise, appeared in The Times.[41] Presumably, they feared that the compromise would only encourage the Nonconformists to acquire public control of all voluntary schools. It will be seen that the clergy were opposed to even Anglican laymen having control of the religious teaching in the Church schools. The Bishop of Hereford made his proposals again on July 30, during the Church Congress on October 10, and again during the Committee stage in the House of Lords, but to no avail.

The Committee Stage of the Bill

The essence of the controversy about the Education Bill of 1902 had to do with the religious problem in elementary education. Since clause 1, which defined the new local educational authorities, involved the elementary schools, it is necessary to examine its progress through the committee stage. As to which local authority was best for education per se - the ad hoc school boards, or the county or county borough councils - it is sufficient to state that the major argument in favour of the school boards was that they were more democratic and generated more public interest in education than did the municipal or

---

41 The Times, July 11, 1902, p. 5; ibid., July 21, 1902, p. 10.

county governments acting through committees.[42] But the main argument in favour of the "municipalization" of education was that it would enhance the efficiency of local government by "giving one single body representing the rate payers ... sole control of local finance".[43]

The Church of England was in favour of replacing the school boards with some other authority sympathetic towards the Church schools. For years Churchmen had been complaining of the extravagance of school boards and of the lack of local support for them. It was often pointed out that few people participated in the school board elections.[44] But the main reason Churchmen opposed school boards was that the religious teaching offered by them was inadequate for Anglicans, and the competition of the board schools was too severe for the Church schools.[45] Clergymen were not bothered by the fact that they were not eligible for election to the councils, whereas they had been elected to school boards and had played a major role on them. They expected to be nominated to the education committees which were to manage education for the councils. Actually the Church supported the abolition of the school board system,

---

42 Sir Joshua Fitch, "The Education Problem", The Nineteenth Century, Vol. LI, No. 1, 1902, p. 24; "Some Possible Amendments to the Education Bill", op. cit., p. 952; The Manchester Guardian, Leader, April 4, 1902, p. 5.

43 Sir John Gorst, "The Education Bill", The Nineteenth Century, Vol. LII, No. 2, 1902, p. 581; The Times, Leader, April 29, 1902, p. 9.

44 Lord Hugh Cecil (Second Reading Speech), Hansard, op. cit., p. 838.

45 Bishop Knox, at the Convocation of Canterbury, April 29, as quoted in The Times, April 30, 1902, p. 5.

because by so doing the government was given the opportunity to set up a new scheme of administration which would be more favourable to the voluntary schools. Because the new local authorities were empowered to grant rate aid to the voluntary schools, the Church supported them regardless of other considerations.

The committee stage on clause 1, which established the new local authorities for education, began on June 2. The Liberals expounded upon the democratic features of the school board system, and, conversely, explained the anti-democratic features of the municipal system. George Lambert (South Molton) moved that the Bill apply only to secondary education. This was designed, not primarily to preserve the school boards, but to avert the problem of elementary education and the sectarian issues involved in it.[46] This motion was defeated by a vote of 299-114. Clause 1 was eventually passed by a vote of 305-102, and no Liberals voted for it.

The end of the school boards was not decreed by clause 1, for clause v made it optional for the local authorities to assume control of elementary education. Only if they did so would the school boards be abolished and the voluntary schools "quartered on the rates". The end of the school boards came on July 10 when Henry Hobhouse, Conservative member for Somerset East, moved an amendment providing that Part III

---

46 Hansard, 4th series, Vol. CVIII, June 2, 1902, p. 1151. The Manchester Guardian, supported this in Leader, April 26, 1902, p. 7.

of the Bill - elementary education - shall apply to every local authority established by the Bill.[47] Balfour avowedly supported the amendment because it would preclude the sectarian battles which would accompany the decision of a local authority to implement the optional clause.[48] But, undoubtedly, his real reason for supporting the amendment was that it fulfilled his aims of establishing new local authorities for education and of giving rate aid to the voluntary schools. The opposition attacked the amendment both for abolishing the school boards and for giving rate aid to the voluntary schools. Sir William Harcourt and Lloyd George emphasized the sectarian problem, and the latter angrily threatened that the Nonconformists would refuse to pay the education rates.[49] The amendment was passed by a vote of 271-102, and its acceptance by the committee really marked the end of any serious debate on the school boards. So much of the discussion about the local authority for education after the passing of Hobhouse's amendment was merely rhetoric.

The deletion of the optional clause from the Bill was a triumph for the Church, for it meant that all voluntary schools would be supported by the local rates. On this clause the Church had the support of the educationalists, for it was obvious that the working of the optional

---

47 Hansard, 4th series, Vol. CX, July 9, 1902, p. 1233.

48 Ibid., p. 1240.

49 Ibid., p. 1280.

clause would result in an irregular system of education, with some local authorities supporting all levels of education, while others supported only secondary education. The Liberals - Macnamara, Bryce, Asquith and Grey supported the abolition of the clause in the interests of creating a logical system of education, but those same Liberals were determined to amend the Bill so that it would satisfy the Nonconformists.[50] That it was not obligatory for the local authority to assume responsibility for elementary education, enhanced the Nonconformist opposition to the Bill. The abolition of the optional clause greatly simplified the controversy by reducing it to the matter of public aid to voluntary schools.

On July 21, the committee began consideration of clause vii of the Bill which defined the management committees of the elementary schools. This clause was the keystone of the government's scheme for aiding the denominational elementary schools. The denominational character of these schools was to be maintained by allowing the denominations owning the schools to appoint two-thirds of the management committees according to the trust deeds of the schools. The two-thirds majority would insure that the teachers appointed would belong to denominations owning the schools, and in this way the religious teaching in the schools would be preserved. The Church was adamant that the denominational majority be maintained and its determination was expressed by a joint meeting of the Houses of Laymen of Canterbury and York on July 10.[51]

---

50 Hansard, op. cit., pp. 1246-1250.

51 The Times, July 11, p. 5.

The Nonconformists were determined that the clause should be amended so that the local authorities would nominate a majority on the management committees of the voluntary schools. Such an amendment would place these schools under popular control and so nullify a vital Nonconformist objection to the Bill. They were particularly determined that the Anglican schools in the single school areas would be placed under popular control. Therefore Reginald Mckenna (Liberal for North Monmouthshire) moved an amendment, the aim of which was to turn the voluntary elementary schools in the single-school areas into "provided" schools.[52] In supporting the amendment, opposition spokesmen stressed the peculiar difficulties of the Nonconformists in these areas. Lloyd-George, in particular, pointed out the situation in rural Wales where the Anglicans owning the schools were in a minority. He gave the example of Bangor where 80 of the 110 children attending the school were Nonconformists; yet, the school was controlled by the Church of England, the teacher always an Anglican, and a Nonconformist had to become an Anglican in order to become a teacher in that school.[53] H. J. Wilson (Liberal for West-Riding, Yorkshire, Holmfirth Div.), gave examples of proselytizing

---

52 Hansard, 4th series, Vol. CXI, July 22, 1902, p. 923.

Reginald Mckenna (1863-1943); ed. at King's College (Anglican), London; Trinity Hall, Cambridge; lawyer; Liberal M.P., North Monmouthshire, 1895-1918; President of the Board of Education, 1907-1908; First Lord of the Admiralty, 1908-1911; Home Secretary, 1911-1915; Chancellor of the Exchequer, 1915-1916; he was probably an Anglican.

53 Ibid., pp. 927-928.

by the clergy and of discrimination against children who had been removed from the religious lessons under the conscience clause.[54] Henry Broadhurst (Liberal for Leicester City) explained how the consciance clause was ineffective in guarding against such outrages because of the social and economic hegemony of Anglicans who were usually the landlords and mine proprietors in these areas.[55]

On this issue the Nonconformists were joined by a few evangelical Churchmen in the House of Commons. Charles E. Tritton (Conservative for Lambeth, Norwood Div.), treasurer of the Church of England Temperance Society, said he would vote against the Government if the Nonconformists' grievances were not met.[56] W. S. Caine (Liberal for Camborne) warned the Government of the motion recently passed at the meeting of the Church Association at Exeter which condemned the Bill as the work of Romanists within the Church of England.[57] Robert Wallace, the Liberal M.P. for Perth, said that evangelical Churchmen "objected as strongly as Nonconformists to doctrines which were taught in some Church schools."[58] He was alluding to the teachings of Anglo-Catholics.

---

54 Hansard, 4th series, Vol. CXI, July 22, 1902, pp. 955-956.

55 Ibid., p. 940.

56 Ibid., p. 941.

57 Ibid., p. 933.

58 Ibid., p. 944.

Balfour recognized the grievance complained of, but objected to the amendment because it would undenominationalize a large number of denominational schools. He again argued that the Bill would alleviate the problem by allowing Nonconformists to build their own schools. Both he and Lord Hugh Cecil offered the "facilities proposal" as a solution to the religious problems in English education.[59] He charged that the Nonconformists were not interested in the religious teaching in these schools, but in taking them away from the denominations which owned them.[60] The amendment was defeated by a vote of 243-124.

The climax of the struggle about the schools in the single-school areas was probably precipitated by the Bishop of Hereford's second letter to The Times outlining his compromise and in which he condemned the Education Bill as an "inequitable proposal" and the Churchmen's support of it as "shortsighted". This letter appeared in The Times on August 30. In the evening, John Dillon,[61] who had been looking for a compromise on the Education Bill so as to free him from the embarrassing position of having to oppose his Liberal allies, moved an amendment which embodied the Hereford compromise as it affected the management of the schools. He proposed that in the single-school areas the management committees would be appointed, one-third by the local educational authority, one-third by

---

59 See above, p.

60 Hansard, 4th series, Vol. CXI, July 22, 1902, p. 925 and p. 945.

61 John Dillon (1851-1920), M.P. for East Mayo, 1885-1918; a leader in the struggle for Irish Home Rule, 1885-1918.

the denominations owning the schools, and the other third by the parents of children attending the schools. In so doing he warned that unless the grievances in question were met the denominational schools "would be submerged in a wave of reaction" which would inevitably follow the passing of the Bill. He declared that "it was only fair that when the majority of the parents were Nonconformists, they should have a voice in the management of the schools".[62] It was a dramatic appeal for justice and fairness towards the Nonconformists.

But, as already stated, the Hereford compromise had not been accepted by the Church at large, and the Government stood by the Church. Balfour rejected the proposal for the reason which had become characteristic of his rejections of amendments to the Bill. It would undenominationalize a large number of Church schools. He predicted that if the motion were passed the result would be resistance on the part of those who supported the schools and an intensification of the controversy. He also feared that the amendment would be later applied to all denominational schools.[63] Both Sir William Anson and Sir Arthur Griffith-Boscawen explained that the reason a majority of denominational managers was needed was to guarantee the appointment of denominational teachers and so protect the religious teaching in the schools.[64] Closure brought

---

62 Hansard, 4th series, Vol. CXII, July 30, 1902, pp. 141-145.

63 Ibid., pp. 145-150.

64 Ibid., pp. 163-166, (Anson), pp. 168-171, (Griffith-Boscawen).

the debate to an end, and the Conservative majority fell to its lowest point in all the divisions on the Bill. Opposed by the Irish Nationalists and by eight Liberal Unionists, the Government's majority fell to only 41 as the amendment was defeated by a vote of 230-189.

The Government's rejection of the Dillon amendment was unfortunate. Lloyd George acknowledged that it would have removed "the most crying part of the Nonconformists' grievances, and in time the Nonconformists might have come to accept the Bill as a whole".[65] A considerable minority of the clergy favoured the Hereford compromise,[66] and about one hundred Conservatives were demanding an increase in the popular representatives on the management committees.[67] In view of the support for a compromise in the Church, Parliament, and the Conservative Party, the Government could have carried the amendment probably with opposition from only the hard core of denominationalists in the House. As it was, an opportunity for settling the controversy was allowed to slip away. The Government's refusal to accept the Dillon amendment greatly angered the Opposition and intensified the Nonconformist opposition to the Bill.

The Church's objections to the Dillon amendment as expressed by its supports in Parliament were not completely valid. The amendment

---

65 Hansard, 4th series, Vol. CXII, July 30, 1902, p. 155.

66 See above, p.

67 I. E. B. Cox, Conservative M.P. for Middlesex-Harrow, in a letter to his constituents, quoted in The Liberal Magazine, Nov., 1902, p. 575; also, a correspondent to The Manchester Guardian, Aug. 4, 1902, p. 7.

was not as destructive to the Church's interests as Balfour claimed, for in areas where the Anglican and Nonconformist populations were about equal, the Anglicans would still have a majority on the management committees. The Times, a steadfast supporter of the Education Bill, admitted a week later that "popularly elected representatives (would not) necessarily be hostile to the Church".[68] Churchmen could hardly, with justice, demand a majority where they were in a minority as in rural Wales. But, on the other hand, the majority of Churchmen probably did not realize the profundity of the Nonconformist sense of grievance concerning the Anglican schools in the single school areas. Nor were they aware of the considerable degree of public sympathy for the Nonconformists which soon became manifest and was later to threaten the existence of the Church schools. However, after the defeat of the Dillon amendment, all efforts to alter the management committees were purely formalities. On August 8, clause vii was accepted by a vote of 220-89. The Church had maintained its two-thirds majority on the management committees of her schools.

Concessions to the Nonconformists

Parliament adjourned on August 8, the day before the Coronation of King Edward VII, and from that day until Parliament met again on October

---

68- The Times, Leader, Aug. 9, 1902, p. 9.

16 to continue the committee stage of the Bill, a tremendous Liberal-Labour-Nonconformist campaign was carried on against it. Dr. Clifford's letters, written to The Daily News during July stating the classic Nonconformist case against the Bill, were published in pamphlet form and had a "phenomenal" sale of several hundred thousand copies.[69] Liberal and Nonconformist leaders, like Lloyd George, James Bryce, Dr. Clifford and Rev. Hirst Hollowell, stumped the country. Mammoth demonstrations were held at Alexander Park, Manchester, on Woodhouse Moor, outside Leeds, and at St. James Hall, London.[70] Finally, on October 15, a special meeting of the General Committee of the National Liberal Federation condemned the Bill in speeches which rang with optimism and determination. The essence of the Opposition's policy towards the Bill was expressed emphatically by James Bryce: "There shall be no compromise on the principles of public control of public money and no religious tests for teachers".[71]

Great as were these demonstrations of opposition to the Bill, the Government could still dismiss them as being trumped up by their traditional opponents for political reasons. But opposition came from supporters of the Government. A September meeting of Liberal Unionists at Birmingham condemned the Bill for denying public control of rate-aided sectarian schools.

---

69 Marchant, op. cit., p. 125.

70 Evans and Claridge, op. cit., pp. 84-85.

71 The Times, Oct. 16, 1902, p. 8.

and for imposing religious tests on teachers.[72] However, Chamberlain publicly supported the Bill and in a special meeting of officials of the Liberal Unionist Party convened at Birmingham in October, he laid his immense personal prestige on the line and quelled the Liberal Unionist revolt against his policy towards the Bill.[73] But he was really deeply troubled by it as he saw many of his supporters leaving him. He secretly urged Balfour to make concessions so that local authorities would have a majority on the management committees of the voluntary schools.[74] But Balfour refused, probably because of political considerations, as he intimated in a letter to Chamberlain;[75] however, it could also be that he really thought, as he stated at a meeting of delegates to the annual meeting of the National Union of Conservative Associations in Manchester on October 14, that his Bill separated religious and secular education and that the opposition to it was a result of "misunderstanding" and "misrepresentation".[76] But he had by then decided to mitigate the opposition to the Bill by making changes concerning the appointment of Nonconformist teachers and control of the religious teaching in the voluntary schools.

A number of prominent Conservatives also expressed a desire for concessions to the Nonconformists. In July, Sir William Walrond, the Conservative chief whip, urged that Balfour settle the Nonconformists;

---

72 The Manchester Guardian, Oct. 1, 1902, p. 5.

73 Ibid., Oct. 11, p. 4; also, Amery, op. cit., pp. 478-509.

74 Letter to Sandars (Balfour's private secretary), ibid., p. 497.

75 Balfour to Chamberlain, Sept. 3, 1902, as printed in Amery, op. cit., p. 437.

76 The Times, Oct. 15, 1902, p. 5.

grievances.[77] Later, in September, Sir Charles Welby, a former Conservative whip, in a letter to The Times, appealed for public control of the voluntary schools.[78] Moreover, the body of Ulster Unionists, extreme Protestants, were, according to a letter by the Marquis of Hamilton to the Government's chief whip, having serious misgivings about the Government's education policy.[79] The Liberal victory in the Leeds' bye-election, followed by the serious reduction of the Tory majority in the Sevenoaks' election, encouraged the opposition to the Bill and fanned Conservative fears that it might have drastic political consequences.

In the face of this opposition to the Bill, Churchmen stood firm in defense of its main provisions, but expressed a willingness to alleviate the grievances of the Nonconformists in the single-school areas. Bishop Knox, and the Bishop of Rochester, at the October Church Congress, suggested that Nonconformist pupil teachers could be allowed to teach secular subjects in Church schools and that Nonconformists could have "facilities" to teach their religion to their children in the Church schools without having to make a reciprocal concession to Anglicans in the board schools, "except in single-school areas". They were also willing that the Bill should be amended so that it would be clear that the local authorities had control over the expenditure of money and secular education in the

---

77 The Times, July 23, 1902, p. 4.

78 Ibid., Oct. 2, p. 8.

79 The Liberal Magazine, Oct., 1902, p. 578.

voluntary schools.[80]

On October 16th, Parliament reconvened and clause viii of the Education Bill was considered in committee. Now this clause prescribed the powers of the managers of the voluntary schools, and Balfour was determined that the local authorities' control of secular education would be made perfectly clear. He therefore accepted an amendment introduced by the Liberal Unionist, Charles McArthur (Liverpool, Exchange Div.) which stipulated that the local authorities could determine "the numbers and qualifications of the teachers to be employed for such instruction and could order the dismissal of any teacher on educational grounds".[81] To give teeth to these powers, Balfour moved an amendment of his own to the effect that when confronted by disobedient managers, the local educational authorities could intervene themselves and carry out their instructions.[82]

In spite of these amendments the opposition was not satisfied that the local authorities had control of the secular teaching in the voluntary schools, because the appointment of the teachers was vested in the hands of the managers and this would constitute a barrier to the increasing number of Nonconformists who wanted to enter the teaching profession.[83] In the debate on J. A. Pease's motion that the appointment and dismissal of the teachers lie with the local authorities instead of with the managers, as the clause proposed, Asquith, Macnamara,

---

80 The Times, Oct. 11, 1902, p. 7.

81 Hansard, 4th series, Vol. CXIII, Oct. 23, 1902, p. 650.

82 Ibid., p. 673.

83 Ibid., Oct. 27, p. 831 (James Bryce). Also, The Manchester Guardian, Leader, Oct. 28, 1902, p. 6.

Lloyd-George, and Bryce clearly stated the Liberal position. But probably the case against the appointment of the teachers by the managers was most effectively articulated by the radical Liberal Unionist, J. T. Middlemore, an Anglican. He argued that it was impractical and unconstitutional to have the local authorities pay the teachers' salaries but not appoint the teachers. He pointed out, as did James Bryce, that their appointment by the managers inflicted a "religious test", a "disability" on the teachers, and lowered the status of the teaching profession. "What moral right", he asked, "had the state to inflict this great disability on half the teachers in the country?". He intimated that the blame for this situation lay with the High Church Party "who wanted public money but distrusted" the people who would provide it.[84]

Balfour defended the imposition of religious tests for teachers with the rationale that "since religious teaching is to be carried on in these schools someone had to determine that the teacher is qualified to teach it".[85] Later, Lord Hugh Cecil declared that the religious welfare of the children should have precedence over the rights of the teachers.[86] With the defeat of Pease's amendment the last threat, in the committee stage of the Bill, to the denominational character of the voluntary schools was averted.

Meanwhile, the Government introduced concessions which had

---

84 Hansard, op. cit., Oct. 27, pp. 843-845.

85 Ibid., p. 847.

86 Ibid., Oct. 30, p. 1298.

been previously promised by representatives of the Church to alleviate the grievances of the Nonconformists. An amendment introduced by Henry Hobhouse allowed the managers of voluntary schools to appoint pupil and assistant teachers regardless of their "religious creed or denomination".[87] Another by Sir William Anson provided that when there were more than one application for a position as pupil teacher, the local authority, itself, should "determine the qualifications of the candidates".[88] But these concessions were grudgingly received by the Opposition who wanted all positions opened to all denominations.

Balfour believed that much of the opposition to his Bill stemmed from popular suspicion of the proselytizing motives of ritualistic clergymen.[89] To dissipate the fear that the Bill would further such activities, the Government had Colonel Kenyon-Slaney introduce the amendment which bears his name:

> The religious instruction should be given in a school not provided by the local educational authority, in accordance with the tenour of the provisions of the trust deeds (if any) and shall be under the control of the managers.[90]

The clause made it clear that the religious teaching was under the control

---

87 Hansard, op. cit., Oct. 27, p. 979.

88 Ibid., Oct. 30; p. 1277.

89 Hansard, 4th series, Vol. CXIII, Oct. 31, 1902, p. 1329. Also, the Bishop of Winchester to Balfour, Sept. 17, 1902, and to J. S. Sandars, Oct. 29, 1902, as printed in G. K. A. Bell, Randall Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury (London: Oxford University Press, 3rd ed., 1952), p. 379.

90 Hansard, Oct. 31, p. 1316.

of the whole body of managers, and, therefore, prohibited the clergymen from instituting "any form of religious teaching or any practice or observance in connection with the religious teaching which might not have the consent and approval of the majority of the managers of the school".[91] Though the amendment was bitterly opposed by Lord Hugh Cecil, who interpreted it as an "insult" to all clergy,[92] it was accepted by the House with only 41 dissentients, the Irish Nationalists being absent from the House. The vote was an indication of the Protestant sentiments of the great majority of the Church of England members of Parliament and demonstrated the suspicion of the High Church minority of the Established Church which was prevalent in the country. Clause viii was then passed by a vote of 165-69. The amended version was much longer than the original and did much to conciliate the opponents of the Bill, and yet maintained the denominational character of the voluntary schools.

The Controversy over the Kenyon-Slaney Clause

The acceptance of the Kenyon-Slaney clause, giving the managers control of the religious teaching in the voluntary schools, brought opposition to the Bill from a different quarter. The great majority of the clergy were deeply affronted by the Kenyon-Slaney clause. They believed that by conferring the supervision of religious teaching on laymen, the clause encroached upon the clergy's duty to interpret religion for their

---

91 Hansard, Oct. 31, p. 1312.

92 Ibid., p. 1330.

people, and violated the trust deeds of the National Society which made the clergy the custodians of the religious teaching in Anglican schools.[93] The clergy had always feared that the acceptance of rate aid for their schools would result in the loss of their control over the religious teaching in them, and now their worst fears were realized. Unlike Balfour, the Church, according to Lawrence Hardy (Conservative for Kent, Ashford), had not understood that the powers of the managers "involved the definition of the dogmatic teaching...of the schools".[94] Had they been aware of this the clergy would never have supported the Bill. The High Church Party was most indignant. The Church Times urged the closing of the Church schools rather than submit to the clause, and in the North, Canon Cleworth organized the Church Schools Emergency League, which later spread all over the country.[95] It was ironic that those who were once the most avid supporters of the Bill were now its most virulent opponents.

Many Anglicans, among them the Bishops of Winchester, Coventry, and St. Asaph, and even Lord Hugh Cecil, wanted a clause which would guard against wrongful teaching and yet preserve the authority of the Church. Whereas Lord Hugh Cecil favoured ecclesiastical authority

---

93 For instance, the Bishop of Winchester to J. S. Sandars, Oct. 29, 1908, in Bell, op. cit., p. 379; The Church Times, Nov. 7, p. 535; Nov. 14, p. 568 (Numerous petitions from Diocesan Conferences); The Guardian, Nov. 12, 1902; The Pilot, Nov. 1 and 8, 1902.

94 Hansard, op. cit., p. 1327. Balfour quoted his speeches of May 8 and July 22, 1902. Ibid., Oct. 31, p. 1338 (Lawrence Hardy).

95 The Church Times, Nov. 7, 1902, p. 535.

to investigate periodically the teaching of the clergy, others wanted the managers to have direction of the religious teaching with the right of appeal to the Bishop in matters of dispute between the managers and clergy. Indeed, provision for appeal to the Bishop was contained in the trust deeds of the National Society. As opposition to the clause grew, many demands were made for the right of appeal to the Bishops, and this suggested a plausible compromise. Eventually, at the great meeting at the Albert Hall,[96] London, November 16, which had been originally planned by the Bishops of London and Rochester as a demonstration in support of the Bill, the Bishop of London introduced an "authoritative interpretation of the clause". It was that although the religious teaching was to be under the control of the managers, the clergy could do the actual teaching and there was a right of appeal to the Bishops. This statement calmed the feelings of the meeting. Yet, a motion by Lord Hugh Cecil, supported by the Bishop of London, that "greater security was needed for to safeguard the religious teaching in the schools" was unanimously accepted. From the sombre tone of the meeting it was obvious that the clergy had lost much of their enthusiasm for the Education Bill for which they, to a large extent, had been responsible.

However, the Bishop of London's "authoritative interpretation" prevailed. In the debate on Sir Charles Alfred Cripps' (Conservative for Lancashire, S.E. Stretford Div.) amendment in the report stage of the Bill to delete the Kenyon-Slaney clause, Sir William Anson,

---

[96] The Times, Nov. 15, 1902, p. 8.

Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education, gave an interpretation of the clause which was the same as that made by the Bishop of London.[97] The "authoritative interpretation" was later embodied in an amendment moved in the Upper Chamber by the Lord Chancellor, Halsbury, which was later accepted by the House of Commons.[98] Though the Government had been forced to amend the Kenyon-Slaney clause, the Anglo-Catholics remained unplacated.

New Demands and Gains by the Church

During the autumn the financial problem of the voluntary schools again became prominent. The Bill required that the denominations maintain the fabric of the schools and make such alterations and repairs as the local education authorities ordered. The Bishop of London at the Albert Hall meeting expressed fear that the Church would not be able to meet such demands, especially if subscriptions were to drop in the wake of the enactment of the Bill, and schools would have to be closed. Pressure, he said, had been applied to members of Parliament to have this burden alleviated, and he noted that the Bishops, themselves, would try to take action on the matter in the House of Lords, that bastion of Tory-Anglican privilege.[99] That such doubts were being expressed about the financial provisions of the Bill, brings into question its ultimate value as a means of relieving the financial

---

[97] Hansard, Vol. CXV, Nov. 27, 1902, pp. 659-665.

[98] Ibid., Vol. CXVI, Dec. 10, 1902, p. 617.

[99] The Times, Nov. 13, 1902, p. 8.

strain on those supporting the voluntary schools. Was the Bill really a success, if, after placing the Church schools on the rates, the Church could not keep up the buildings?

The Government soon began to respond to the Church's demands for further financial aid for her schools. In October, Sir William Anson's motion that the denominations be paid rent for the teachers' houses was accepted by the Government.[100] On November 10, the Government, encouraged by gaining recently the Devonport seat from the Liberals, introduced closure by compartment and under the cover of this weapon succeeded in getting "endowments" used for the making of repairs, though they had been intended to pay for the teaching in the schools.[101] The Church was also granted a proportion of the fees where they were still charged.

The most important gain was made by the denominationalists in the House of Lords. There, the Bishop of Manchester moved that repairs due to "wear and tear" be the responsibility of the local education authorities, and this motion was accepted by the House against the wish of Government.[102] Later, the Duke of Norfolk succeeded in adding a contradictory rider to the amendment to the effect that it would not involve further financial liabilities on the local authorities.[103] This gimmick

---

100 Hansard, Vol CXIII, Oct. 28, 1902, p. 1021.

101 Ibid., Vol. CXIV, Nov. 12, 1902, p. 795.

102 Ibid., Vol. CXVI, Dec. 10, 1902, p. 562.

103 Ibid. Dec. 15, p. 1139.

allowed the amendment to be accepted by the House of Commons, for it was generally recognized that matters of finance were its prerogative.

When the amendment was debated in the House of Commons, Balfour allowed a free vote on it, though Unionists such as Colonel Richard Pilkington (Lancashire, Newton Div.), Gibson Bowles (Lyme Regis), and Mr. Henry Chaplin (Lincolnshire, Sleaford Div.) denounced it as a breach of the privilege of the House. The measure was passed by a vote of 197-159, 50 Unionists voting against, and the Irish Nationalists for it. The Duke of Norfolk's rider was deleted, so that the amendment imposed further financial liabilities on the local education authorities. Probably the Government was giving in to the demands of the Church in order to mellow the latter's resentment over the Kenyon-Slaney clause. Out of all these measures the Church gained a sum of £500,000 a year in excess of what was granted to it in the original Bill.[104]

The Opposition denounced these additional gifts as a "breaking of the bargain the Church had made with the state" as represented in the original Bill. Even The Spectator, a strong supporter of the Bill, termed the Church's actions in regard to the "wear and tear" amendment as a piece of "sharp practice".[105] The net result of these additional financial concessions was that they undid whatever good had been done by the

---

104 Hansard, Vol. CXV, Dec. 1, p. 1076. (Macnamara in the third reading said £150,000 was gained from rent on teachers' houses, endowments, and school fees); ibid., Vol. CXVI, Dec. 16, p. 1139. (Campbell-Bannerman quoted the Bishop of Manchester to the effect that £350,000 was gained from "wear and tear"). The total was £500,000.

105 The Spectator, Leader, Dec. 13, 1902, p. 926; also, The Manchester Guardian, Leader, Nov. 20, 1902, p. 6; Nov. 21, p. 6.

opposition in clause viii. People who once saw the Church's bargain with the state as embodied in the Bill as a quid pro quo now thought that the Church was getting too much.

Conclusion

On December 19, the Education Bill received the royal assent after having, according to the Duke of Devonshire, consumed more time in the committee stage in the Commons (46 of 58 days in the Commons were spent in committee) than any other Bill before its time.[106] But the passing of the Bill was not an unqualified triumph for the Church. It was true that Churchmen had gained rate aid for their schools while preserving their denominational character, and, with clauses 9 and 10 intact, the right to extend their school systems. But a grievance had been inflicted on the Nonconformists in the single-school areas located in the rural districts of England and Wales where their children had to attend Church schools, and during the enactment of the Bill the Church and the Government failed to reach a compromise with the Nonconformists. The Government's Kenyon-Slaney clause, designed to assure that the religious teaching in the Church schools was suitable to Anglican laymen and least objectionable to the Nonconformists, did not satisfy anyone, and by giving the laymen control of the religious teaching in the schools, disenchanted the High Church Party with the Bill. A new problem emerged for the Church as the Free Churches moved to implement passive resistance to the Act, while the Liberals, refusing to accept the Act, vowed to undo it when they gained power.

---

106 Hansard, Vol. CXV, Dec. 4, p. 1191.

Their recent successes at the polls made this appear likely.[107] As Dr. Macnamara declared, the passing of the Bill of 1902 "was not the last word on the Education System of England".[108]

---

107 The Manchester Guardian, Dec. 19, 1902, p. 9. In the municipal elections, 670 of the candidates against the Bill were successful as compared with 490 who were for it. The Liberals had recently won Cleveland in a bye-election with an increased majority.

108 Hansard, op. cit., Dec. 2, p. 1078.

CHAPTER III

THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EDUCATION ACT, 1903-1906

The enactment of the Education Bill in December, 1902, did not end the education conflict. During the following three years the attention of the public was drawn to the issue by a number of developments, including the enactment of the Education Bill for London, the passive resistance movement, the struggle against the Act in Wales, municipal elections in which the Education Act figured prominently, and the various attempts to arrive at educational concordats between the Church and the Nonconformists. A discussion of each of these phenomena and the Anglican relationship to them will make clear the extent to which the Education Act worked to the advantage of the Church of England and will also suggest possible solutions to the education question.

The London Education Bill

The London Education Bill, introduced into the House of Commons by Sir William Anson, Parliamentary Secretary of the Board of Education, on April 7, 1903, extended the Education Act of 1902 to the metropolis of London. The contest over it was in many ways a miniature of the great struggle over the 1902 Bill, with the various Nonconformist educational and religious associations appealing for the continuation of the London School Board and other groups connected with the Church and the Conservative Party agitating for the County Council scheme. The abolition of the London School Board was a controversial undertaking, because it was a prestigious institution which was responsible for an area containing six and a half

million people. Many distinguished people had served on it and it had done a remarkable job of providing education for the working class children of London. Even The Times, which maintained that its end was inevitable, regretted its passing.[1] In Parliament, Macnamara feared that because of the size of London, the educational duties of the County Council would devolve almost entirely upon committees, and popular control over education would be virtually lost.[2] Nevertheless, the Bill was soon put through Parliament and received the Royal assent on August 14. The London County Council was given a role in education similar to that of the other county councils of England and Wales.

The enactment of the Bill for London was an important gain for the Church. It meant that in the Dioceses of Winchester, Rochester and London, the Bishops of which had played a weighty part in the development of the Government's educational policy, the hard pressed voluntary schools would be placed under the London Educational Authority and receive rate aid as did the voluntary schools in the other areas of England and Wales. The legislative educational program of the Church and the Conservative Government was now consummated.

---

1 The Times, Leader, April 8, p. 9.

2 Hansard, 4th series, Vol. CXXI, April 28, 1903, pp. 667-690.

Resistance to the Act

The Church's success, however, was marred by the determination of the Nonconformists not to submit to the Education Act. They carried out the threats which they had first made after the Bill of 1902 was introduced into the House of Commons, and in January, 1903, they formed the National Passive Resisters League under the chairmanship of Dr. Clifford. The aim of this movement was to generate so much resistance to the Education Act that the Government would have to rescind it, or amend it so that rate aid for the voluntary schools would be abolished, just as the passive resistance movement of the 1860's had inspired Gladstone to abolish the compulsory Church rates.[3] As the Act went into operation in most of the English boroughs and counties, the passive resistance movement became widespread. Formerly law-abiding citizens, including Nonconformist ministers, magistrates, mayors, and labourers, refused to pay the education rates and suffered distraint of goods or imprisonment. By March, 1904, according to Mr. James Everett, secretary of the National Passive Resistance Committee, some 45,593 summonses had been issued and 1,636 sales of goods

---

3 Rev. G. Silvester Horne, "Passive Resistance", The New Liberal Review, Vol. IV, Nov., 1903, pp. 428-435; Dr. Robertson Nicoll, "The Education Bill and the Free Churches", The Contemporary Review, Vol. LXXXII, Nov. 1, 1902, pp. 632-647; Dr. John Clifford, letter in reply to Balfour's letter on passive resistance, published in The Times, July 1, 1903, p. 11.

and 106 cases of imprisonment had occurred.[4] Instead of dying out, as the skeptics expected, the movement continued to flourish and by April, 1906, the numbers of summonses, sales of goods, and imprisonments had nearly doubled.[5]

Church leaders attempted to discredit the passive resistance movement. The new Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Davidson, and the Bishop of Rochester attacked the doctrine of passive resistance, claiming that chaos would result if every citizen were to claim for himself the right to decide whether or not he should obey an act of Parliament.[6] They also repeated Balfour's contention that it was inconsistent of the Nonconformists to oppose rate aid for the voluntary schools when they had consented to pay taxes in support of them for thirty years. But the Bishop of St. Asaph acknowledged that there was a difference between taxes and rates in that

---

4 The Times, March 11, 1903, p. 14.

5 The Liberator, April, 1906, as quoted in Sacks, op. cit., p. 51.

6 The Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Davidson, at the annual meeting of the Canterbury Diocesan Society, quoted in The Times, Jan. 25, 1904, p. 9.

Dr. Randall Davidson (1848-1930); ed. at Harrow and Trinity College, Oxford; Dean of Windsor, and Queen Victoria's domestic chaplain, 1883; Bishop of Rochester, 1891-5; Bishop of Winchester, 1895-1903; Archbishop of Canterbury, 1903-1928; worked to maintain the unity of the Church, and was a member of the Royal Commission on Discipline, 1904.

The Bishop of Rochester, in a charge to the clergy, ibid., Jan. 30, 1903, p. 8. Balfour had most recently made this statement in his letter on passive resistance, published in ibid., June 26, 1903, p. 12.

the former were paid for services in general, while rates were paid for specific services and, consequently, it was easy to determine the amount of the rates payable for education.[7] Moreover, Churchmen could hardly fail to know that the Nonconformists had opposed the granting of rate aid to the voluntary schools in 1870, had always opposed Exchequer grants to the voluntary schools, and had only acquiesed in them for the sake of the compromise of 1870.

Nevertheless the phenomenon of otherwise law-abiding citizens being compelled by their consciences to disobey a law which the Church of England was largely responsible for, deeply troubled many Churchmen. Consequently, Church leaders, such as the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Rochester, attempted to combat passive resistance by mitigating the Nonconformist grievances under the Act. They urged school managers to appoint Nonconformist assistant teachers in the Church schools in the single-school areas, and the National Society produced a form for their employment. It was also proposed that the time for catechetical and Bible instruction be separated in the timetable so as to facilitate the withdrawal of Nonconformist children from the former.[8]

Late in 1903 the Archbishop tried to arrange a conference with

---

[7] The Bishop of St. Asaph, "Educational Concordats", The Nineteenth Century, Vol. LVI, No. 2, 1904, p. 42; also, The Pilot, Leader, June 6, 1903, p. 940.

[8] The Primate to Lord Aschombe (Chairman of the Church Parliamentary Committee), Dec. 12, 1903, as quoted in The Church Times, Dec. 18, 1903, p. 781; the Bishop of Rochester, loc. cit.; The Annual Report of the National Society, 1904, p. 12, as quoted in Sacks, op. cit., p. 110.

the Nonconformist leaders in order to work out a common creed suitable to both Anglicans and Nonconformists which could be taught in the schools. He proposed that once the religious syllabus had been agreed to, the question of popular control of rate-aided voluntary schools and sectarian tests for teachers could be discussed.[9] The offer was rejected by the Nonconformists on the grounds that it was now too late for such a conference as the Education Bill had become law, and the government seemed to have no intention of amending the Act.[10] The effect of the passive resistance movement was that it demonstrated that the Education Act had not been accepted by a great section of the English population.

Moreover, Churchmen had to contend with another form of Nonconformist strategy. This was to influence the local authorities to work the Education Acts, as far as possible, in conformity with the Nonconformist educational policy. The Nonconformists had made known their educational aims in a manifesto issued by the Education Committee of the Evangelical Free Churches at Newcastle, October, 1903.[11] Its essential points were that all schools aided with public funds should be under the complete control of popularly elected authorities; that there should be no sectarian tests for teachers; that the Cowper-Temple clause should be maintained in all public schools, but provision could be made for the teaching of denominational

---

[9] The Archbishop to Dr. Horton, published in The Manchester Guardian, Nov. 12, and Nov. 30, 1903, p. 5.

[10] Rev. F. B. Meyer to the Archbishop of Canterbury, Ibid., Nov. 4, 1903, p. 10.

[11] Ibid., Oct. 27, 1903, p. 5.

religion in the schools after school hours. The first two of these points had the approval of the National Liberal Federation and the leaders of the Liberal Party.[12] The National Union of Teachers also supported them and was particularly adamant on the point about no religious tests for teachers.[13]

The Nonconformists tried to implement their educational policy by working through the councils. This strategy - the Cardiff policy - was enunciated by Lloyd George at the Cardiff Conference of Welsh Progressives in January, 1903.[14] His plan was to resist the Education Act within the letter of the law and work it against the Church schools. It was decided that the local authorities would require that the voluntary school buildings be in good repair before having anything to do with them, and would exercise their maximum powers under the Education Act in regard to the operation of these schools. It was hoped that the enforcement of this policy would make matters so difficult for the Church-school managers that they would be glad to accept the Nonconformists' educational policy and grant complete public control of their rate-aided schools. This plan was later accepted by a conference of "Progressive Representatives on the Local Educational Authorities of England" which was held at Westminister in

---

[12] Special meeting of the National Liberal Federation, Nov. 18, 1903, as reported in The Times, Nov. 19, 1903, p. 12.

[13] The Annual Conference of the National Union of Teachers, ibid., April, 1903, p. 4. Subsequent conferences passed the same resolution.

[14] Ibid., Jan. 21, 1903, p. 4.

February, 1903.[15]

The success of this strategy depended upon the Nonconformists' getting control of the municipal and county councils. The fight about the Education Act now entered municipal politics. In the country-wide borough elections of November, 1903, the Nonconformists tested candidates and supported those who agreed to espouse the Nonconformist educational policy. By so doing they compelled the Church to get involved in municipal politics in defense of her schools by supporting candidates usually moderates or Conservatives, who were sympathetic to the cause of the Church schools. For the March, 1904, county council elections, the Bishop of London urged Churchmen to imitate the Nonconformists' methods,[16] and the Church Educational Electoral Committee was set up to campaign for candidates who indicated their support of Church schools.[17] The Liberals or Progressives made considerable gains,[18] but the Anglicans were successful in having a majority on most of the Education Committees. For example, Buckingham and Cumberland, with a committee of 35, had 28 Anglicans; Devonshire, with a committee

---

15 The Annual Conference of the National Union of Teachers, as reported in The Times, Feb. 7, 1903; also, Education Campaign Urgent (pamphlet by the Free Church Council), published in The Times, Jan. 18, 1903, p. 9; Circular Guiding Administration of the Education Act, as reported in ibid., Jan. 30, 1903, p. 5.

16 The Bishop's New Year's Address to his Diocese, ibid., Jan. 1, 1904, p. 4.

17 The Church Times, Jan. 22, 1904, p. 1120. A list of questions given to the London County Council candidates by the Electoral Committee is found in ibid., Oct. 2, 1903, p. 43.

18 In 1903, the Liberals made a net gain of 14 seats, The Annual Register, Part II, 1903, p. 31; in 1904 they gained 50, ibid., 1904, p. 29; in the London County Council Election the Progressives lost one seat, ibid., p. 6.

of 49 had 32 Anglicans; Gloucester, with a committee of 60 had 48 Anglicans.[19] Even in places where the Nonconformists had a majority on the councils, as in the case of Liverpool, and the Isle of Wight, the Anglicans had ascendancy on the Education Committees.[20] However, the London County Council, which had a Progressive majority, at first refused to co-opt members of associations connected with voluntary schools to its educational committee. Generally, as far as giving the Church influence in the council or provided school systems was concerned, the new Act worked quite well. The clergy had an influence in the council system at least as great as they had had in the school board system.

Consequently, during the implementation of the Education Act, few hostile actions were committed against the voluntary schools by the education authorities. The London Education Committee conducted an investigation into the conditions of voluntary schools and found that out of some 408 schools, 92 were deemed to be wholly unsuitable, because of glaring structural defects and inadequate facilities for ventilation and sanitation.[21] Some schools were in old churches and others in church basements, but the National Society claimed that the standards set for the schools were too high.[22] Yet these schools were not closed, and in 1906, the County Council claimed

---

19 Evans and Claridge, op. cit., p. 89.

20 Statement by Rev. Thomas Law, Secretary of the Free Church Council, as quoted in The Manchester Guardian, July 3, 1906, p. 4.

21 The Tablet, Jan. 30, 1904, p. 168.

22 The Church Times, April 20, 1905, p. 519.

that about one hundred condemned voluntary schools were still in use.[23] It seems that they were not abandoned because the replacement of them would have cost half a million pounds. Financial considerations prevailed over educational ideals. But in the Isle of Wight the Church was obliged to hand over her schools to the local authority and accept provisions for denominational religious teaching within school hours, because the managers were unable to make repairs required by the local authority.[24] The West Riding County Council offered the managers of the voluntary schools a concordat similar to that agreed to by the Isle of Wight Council and the Church, but it was rejected by the Church school managers.[25] Later the Council refused to pay teachers for the time spent in giving religious instruction[26] - a decision which was in 1906 declared legal by a court of appeal, and later declared illegal by the House of Lords. Of all the English local authorities only that of Cambridgeshire refused to grant rate aid to the voluntary schools.[27] With these exceptions the local authorities implemented the Act quite fairly towards the Church, for her political power and traditional social influences were great enough to foil the hostile efforts of the Nonconformists.

---

23 The Church Times, Sept. 21, 1906, p. 377.

24 D. C. Lathbury, "Educational Conciliation, an Appeal to the Clergy". The Nineteenth Century, Vol. 56, No. 2, 1904, p. 70.

25 The Times, Feb. 4, 1904, p. 12.

26 Ibid., May 10, 1904, p. 12.

27 The Tablet, Jan. 30, 1904, p. 310.

The Welsh Revolt

In Wales, the Nonconformists had better prospects of carrying out the "Cardiff policy" because they had control of the councils.[28] But before putting their policy into operation they agreed, under the leadership of Lloyd George, who now demonstrated his initiative for solving problems, to attempt to reach a concordat with the Church concerning her schools. Although only one of the Welsh Bishops - the Bishop of St. Asaph - agreed to a conference, representatives of the Diocese of St. Asaph and the Borough and County councils of Wales met at the Westminster Palace Hotel on March 23, 1903. A tentative concordat was agreed to, which pointed a way towards a settlement of the education question.[29] It was agreed that all voluntary schools would be transferred to the local authorities and become provided schools, and that all teachers would be appointed irrespective of religious affiliations. Undenominational religious teaching, or Bible teaching, similar to that of the London school board syllabus would be given in council schools on four days per week and in the transferred (voluntary) schools on three days per week. In council schools on one day per week and in transferred schools on two days per week denominational religious teaching could be carried on. Regular staff teachers could give the denominational as well as the undenominational teaching in both types of schools. The Nonconformists' objection to denominational teaching

---

28 The Manchester Guardian, March 7, 1904, p. 4.

29 For a report of the Concordat see The Times, April 29, 1903, p. 7; the Bishop of St. Asaph, op. cit., p. 38.

within school hours was circumvented by having the school day begin at 9:00 A.M. instead of 9:45, all religious teaching to be given from 9:00-9:45. The experiment was to last for three years.

In view of later Nonconformists' demands it will be seen that the Welsh Concordat was not wholly unfavourable to the Church, although the Church would have lost control of the appointment of the teachers. It allowed denominational teaching to be given by regular teachers in all schools within school hours. But it was rejected by the St. Asaph Diocesan Board of Education and Association of Church schools. The most plausible explanation is that the Church school managers wanted to maintain some of the "distinctive Church atmosphere" in the schools. They rejected the concordat, because the councils would not accept their request that the clergy participate in the religious teaching in all schools, and that the Church have a part in selecting the head teachers.[30] It was the Church's insistence on "atmosphere" which doomed the concordat, not the adequacy or otherwise of the facilities for religious teaching offered in the concordat.

Later, in 1904, as the struggle over the Church schools worsened, the Bishop of St. Asaph recommended the concordat as a settlement of the religious problem in education in both England and Wales.[31] He also introduced into the House of Lords a Bill to grant legal security to such an arrangement.[32] But no further efforts at a compromise were made in Wales.

---

30 The Church Times, April 29, 1903, p. 526; Lloyd-George, "Educational Compromises", The Pilot, May 30, 1903, p. 521.

31 The Bishop of St. Asaph, op. cit., pp. 38-45.

32 The Times, May 10, 1904, p. 6.

After the failure of the attempted concordat, the Nonconformists put into operation the "Cardiff policy". Before assuming responsibility for the maintenance of the voluntary schools, the local authorities insisted that the school buildings be in good condition; they fulfilled their responsibilities towards the Church schools without granting them rate aid, maintaining the schools with Exchequer grants alone. The Government took no action against the councils, but when Carmarthenshire refused absolutely to have anything to do with the voluntary schools whether or not the buildings were in a satisfactory condition, the Government declared the council in default.[33] Then, in 1904, the Government instituted the Local Authorities Default Act, which circumvented the resistance of the councils. It provided that in any case where a council had been declared in default for not maintaining the voluntary schools, the Government would pay grants directly to the voluntary school managers and deduct the amount of these grants from other grants due to the council. Its passing caused a disorderly scene in the House of Commons, when the Welsh representatives followed by the Liberals walked out of the House. Welsh nationalism was involved in the revolt. Moreover, a religious revival inspired by Evan Roberts, a young Welsh evangelist, was sweeping through Wales, giving new strength to the Welsh Nonconformists and new hope to their brethren in England.[34] The issue of Welsh Disestablishment became prominent during the conflict, and Liberals promised to pursue it when they again formed the government. Later Merionethshire and Montgromeryshire refused to recognize the voluntary

---

33 The Times, April 30, 1904, p. 7.

34 The Manchester Guardian, Feb. 1, 1905, p. 12.

schools and the Default Act was employed against them. When this occurred the Nonconformists withdrew their children from some of the Church schools in these counties and set up schools in the chapels in an effort to defeat the Default Act.[35] The revolt continued until the Liberals gained power in November of 1905.

Faced with this Nonconformist and Nationalist movement, the Church kept a low profile in Wales. While some clergymen protested that the Act was being misrepresented in Wales, that the religious teaching in the Church schools was not paid for out of the local rates, and that the Cardiff policy inflicted an injustice on the Church children in the Church schools,[36] most of the clergy remained passive; for, since the revolt was a Nationalist as well as a Nonconformist reaction, many Church laymen supported the councils. In both England and Wales efforts were made to raise funds for the Welsh voluntary schools, but the prevalent attitude of the clergy was to stay put and hope that the storm would soon subside.[37]

The Church Schools and the Working of the Education Act of 1902

The operation of the Act did very little to alter the denominational character of the Church schools contrary to what some denominationalists

---

35 The Church Times, Nov. 3, 1905, p. 556.

36 For example, resolutions by the Rev. P. Lewis (Conway) at the Conference of the Church Schools Emergency League, reported in The Manchester Guardian, Jan. 19, 1905, p. 7.

37 The Times, Sept. 15, 1905, p. 4; also, "An Appeal by the National Society", The Pilot, Dec. 19, 1903, p. 602.

had feared. Though, as previously stated, efforts were made to utilize the provisions in the Act for the employment of Nonconformist assistant and pupil teachers in the Church schools, it seems that few Nonconformist teachers were actually hired to teach in these schools. Nonconformists continued to complain of religious tests for teachers. Advertisements continued to demand of applicants a willingness to teach on Sundays, or "to sing in the choir".[38] As the head teacherships were reserved exclusively for Anglicans, the Church schools remained essentially the same as they were before 1902, just as objectionable to the Nonconformists, and just as suitable to the Anglicans.

On the other hand, the Kenyon-Slaney clause, which placed the religious teaching in the voluntary schools under the control of the managers, did not work as adversely for the Church as the pessimists had earlier forecasted. Even R. C. Lathbury, a foremost critic, acknowledged that only in a few cases did the managers interfere with the parson's religious teaching in the schools or attempt to water down the Church teaching in order to make it more acceptable to the Nonconformists.[39] Frequently, the clergy managed the schools as they did prior to 1902, because the managers left the duties of managing the schools and appointing the teachers to them.[40]

---

[38] Silvester Horne, loc. cit.; The Daily News, Nov. 29, 1905; W. R. Perks in his second reading speech on the Education Bill of 1906, Hansard, 4th series, Vol. CLVI, May 7, 1906, p. 1054.

[39] D. C. Lathbury, "Educational Conciliation", loc. cit.; also, the Bishop of Rochester, The Times, Jan. 30, 1903, p. 8.

[40] The Yorkshire Post, Sept. 27, 1904, as quoted in The Liberal Magazine, Oct., 1904, p. 539.

The management committee often consisted only of Anglicans, as few Nonconformists were appointed as the representatives of the local educational authorities. According to Robert W. Perks, Liberal M.P. for Louth, in Lincolnshire "hardly a single Nonconformist" was to be found on these management committees.[41] Therefore it is not surprising that under the new Act the parson's relationship to the Church schools was, in practice, basically unaltered.

The policy of the Board of Education during this period, by attempting to mitigate the grievances of the Nonconformists, inadvertently appeared to be inimical to the Church's educational objectives. In April, 1903, the Board issued what came to be known as Sir William Anson's model bye-law which excluded the time devoted to religious teaching from the compulsory school time in cases where parents notified the school of their intention to withdraw their children from the religious lessons.[42] It allowed the Nonconformist children to be taken to the chapel, or for Anglican children in Council schools to be taken to the Church, for religious instruction. The model bye-law had the support of The Church Times which hailed it as a step towards the institution of "universal facilities" for religious teaching.[43] Others condemned it for diminishing the efficiency of Church teaching by allowing children to stay home during

---

41 Hansard, op. cit. p. 1052; also, Rev. Thomas Law, as quoted in The Manchester Guardian, July 3, 1903, p. 4.

42 The bye-law was published in ibid., June 27, 1903, p. 7.

43 The Church Times, July 3, 1903, p. 91.

the religious lessons.[44] Actually the bye-law did not have much effect on the religious lessons in the majority of the elementary schools, for it was implemented by less than a third of the local educational authorities.[45] However, another publication by the Board of Education - circular 312 - caused more controversy, because it prohibited Church school managers from taking children to Church during regular school hours to receive religious instruction.[46] The circular was intended to avert incidents complained of by Nonconformists of their children being penalized for not taking part in particular Church services. Both the model bye-law and circular 312 tended to weaken the Church schools as instruments for indoctrinating the children in the teachings of the Church.

Since under the Education Act of 1902 the local authorities were responsible for the maintenance of the voluntary schools, a marked improvement occurred in the salaries and qualifications of the teachers and in the general efficiency of the Church schools. But as for the financial soundness of the Church schools system, the working of the Act tended to verify the gloomy predictions of the pessimists. The managers of the voluntary schools were required to keep the school buildings in good repair and to make such structural alterations and improvements as required

---

44 For example, letter signed, "Parish Priest", The Church Times, July 3, 1903, p. 91.

45 Augustine Birrell, President of the Board of Education (1906), in the debate on the Education Bill of 1906, Hansard, 4th series, Vol. CLIX, July 2, 1906, p. 1441.

46 Letter by Canon Cleworth, The Times, May 23, 1904, p. 8; Report of the Deputation to the Board of Education by the Church Schools Emergency League, ibid., Feb. 25, 1905, p. 8.

by the local authorities. To meet this liability the managers needed subscriptions. Now, it had always been feared that placing the Church schools on the rates would result in the decline of voluntary subscriptions. In many instances subscriptions had been paid to the voluntary schools to keep out the board schools, which would have demanded a high educational rate. This motive was lost once the Education Act made the payment of school rates universal. Since subscribers had to pay the school rates, they could not afford to make subscriptions to the voluntary schools as well. Subsequent to 1902, subscriptions all but disappeared, and even the amounts earned from school fees and endowments fell from £566,968 in 1902 to £298,948 in 1905.[47] Because of the difficulty in acquiring funds for the repair and upkeep of the school buildings, notwithstanding the "wear and tear" concession, some 670 Church schools were transferred to the local educational authorities from 1903 to 1909.[48] In 1911 there were 769 fewer Church schools than there were in 1902, and the average attendance in Church schools had declined by 177,529.[49] Furthermore, the hopes of the Anglicans that many new voluntary schools would be built under the new Act did not materialize. By 1905, 21 new Church schools had been established as compared with 427 new council schools.[50]

---

47 "The Financial Effect of the Act of 1902", The Liberal Magazine, June 1906, quoting figures presented by Birrell in the House of Commons, May 16, 1906.

48 The Bishop of St. Asaph as quoted in The Tablet, Nov. 26, 1910, p. 873.

49 "Return of the Education Department (1911)", Cd-6002, as published in The Times, Dec. 18, 1911, p. 10. See Appendix III, p. 175 below.

50 "Report of the Board of Education (1905)", as quoted in The Church Times, Dec. 22, 1905, p. 986. See Appendix III, p. 175 below.

It was evident that the Education Act of 1902 would not fulfill the financial expectations of the denominationalists, and the Church schools, as prior to the Education Act of 1902, appeared to be doomed to inevitable extinction. Would Churchmen be content to bide their time and wait for this to happen?

Towards the Amendment of the Education Act

During the period 1903 to 1906, it became obvious to many people that the Education Act would have to be amended to terminate the obstructionism of the Nonconformists and placate the dissatisfied Anglo-Catholics. The failure of the Act to prevent the decline of the Church schools or to extend the Church schools system so as to care for Anglican children who would otherwise attend the council schools, also motivated some denominationalists to seek an alternative to the system established by the Act.[51] Moreover, in the wake of the dissension in the Unionist Party following Chamberlain's enunciation of his tariff reform proposals in May, 1903, a general election appeared imminent. The prospects for a Liberal victory in a general election were favourable in view of the Liberal success in bye-elections. The trend established in 1902 was continued in the following three years as the Liberals won 20 bye-elections in Great Britain while the Conservatives made no gains at all.[52]

---

51 D. C. Lathbury, "How Long Will the Education Act Last?", loc. cit.; "Educational Conciliation", loc. cit.; the Bishop of St. Asaph, "Educational Concordats", loc. cit.; The Pilot, Leader, April 4, 1903, p. 324.

52 M. Stenton, and J. Vincent (eds.), McCalmont's Parliamentary Poll Book of All Elections, 1831-1918 (Brighton: Harvester Press, 8th ed., 1971), p. 75.

Since the Liberal Party was pledged to amend the Act so as to have complete popular control of all schools aided out of public funds and to abolish sectarian tests for teachers, it seemed likely that a Liberal Government would lose no time in introducing a new Education Bill.

Churchmen, looking for a compromise, were faced with the question: Supposing a Liberal Government were to establish popular control over all voluntary schools in receipt of public money, how could the Church's religious teaching be carried on? A minority of Liberal clergymen, among them the Bishops of St. Asaph, Hereford, and Durham, Canons C. L. Hicks, H. Henson and J. J. Scott, believed that Bible teaching, i.e., the undenominational or Cowper-Temple teaching permitted in the council or provided schools, supplemented by instruction in the catechism or Church formularies on one or two days per week, at the expense of those requiring it, would be satisfactory for the majority of Anglicans,[53] for Anglicanism possessed the basic tenets of Protestantism in common with the various Nonconformist sects. This being so, there was no need for the Church to maintain her own schools system, and the Church schools could be sold or rented to the local authorities. Undenominational religious teaching, supplemented by lessons in the catechism and in the

---

53 The Bishop of St. Asaph, op. cit. p. 46; the Bishop of Durham, The Church Times, Dec. 24, 1903, p. 815; Canon H. Henson, ibid., May 19, 1905, p. 639; Canon Scott Holland and Dean Stubbs, ibid., Feb. 19, 1904, p. 247.

exclusive doctrines of the Church, would be taught in all schools. This solution had been embodied in the Durham, Yorkshire, and Welsh, or Lloyd George, Concordats.[54] The Nonconformists' official objection to denominational religious teaching within school hours did not appear to be an insuperable problem, since a number of Nonconformist leaders were not adamant upon this point and those taking part in the various concordats mentioned above had consented to it. In short, undenominational supplemented by denominational teaching appeared to be a satisfactory solution to many moderate men. It was consistent with the Liberal principle of popular control of schools supported out of public funds, and it offered facilities for religious teaching to those who wanted it.

A number of High Churchmen also recognized the possibility that a new Liberal Government would attempt to establish popular control over the rate-aided voluntary schools. Spokesmen for them were Athelstan Riley, D. C. Lathbury and such High Church journals as The Church Times, The Pilot, The Commonwealth, and The Church Quarterly Review.[55] In 1902 their scheme for the solution to the religious problem in education provided for Anglicans to teach the exclusive doctrines and the catechism of the Church of England to the Anglican children in the provided schools, and

---

[54] The Durham Concordat, The Times, Dec. 12, 1903, p. 6; Yorkshire Concordat, Ibid., Feb. 4, 1904, p. 12.

[55] D. C. Lathbury, loc. cit.; Athelstan Riley, letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, published in The Church Times, Dec. 9, 1904, p. 797. The Church Times, Leader, Oct. 9, 1903; Jan. 2, 1904; March 18, 1904; The Pilot, Dec., 1902; Jan., April, Dec., 1903; March, 1904. The Commonwealth, Jan, 1903; The Church Quarterly, "Education and Religious Liberty", Oct., 1902; "The Education Act and After", Jan., 1904.

for Nonconformists to teach the form of religion they preferred to the Nonconformist children in the Church of England schools, at the expense of the parents. But following the advent of the Kenyon-Slaney clause they advocated a more radical settlement. They proposed that all Church schools would be handed over to the local authorities which would either rent or buy them. No longer would the Church maintain schools or have anything to do with secular teaching. Facilities would be granted in the schools for all denominations to give their children, within school hours and at their own expense, the form of religious teaching they preferred. This included the specific and exclusive doctrines of the denominations, i.e., denominational religious teaching. The religious instruction could be given by the clergy themselves or by members of the regular school staff selected for that purpose by representatives of the parents.

This scheme differed in one great essential from those put forward by the undenominationalists. To High Churchmen undenominationalism was not an amalgam of several denominations but a separate religion itself. Therefore, they argued, it should be placed on the same footing as denominational religion. Like denominational religion, it should not be paid for by the local authorities and should not be given more frequently than denominational instruction. All religions should be given equality in the school system. This view of religious teaching was based on the assumption that Anglo-Catholicism was unique from Protestant Nonconformity.[56]

---

56 The English Church Union (High Church), reported in The Church Times, June 23, 1905, p. 826; The Church Times comment upon the Durham Concordat, Dec. 24, 1903, p. 814; D. C. Lathbury, loc. cit.

This proposal had the advantage of being logical. The denominational ideal of separate schools was impracticable because of the mixed religious composition of the school populations, and because of the numerous religious denominations. The secular system was unacceptable to most Anglicans and Nonconformists alike.[57] But universal facilities within a public school system would grant all denominations the religious teaching they preferred and would be compatible with the principles of popular control of schools supported out of public funds and no sectarian tests in the appointment of teachers. A bill proposing such a scheme was agreed to by a number of Nonconformists and Anglicans in 1904, and was supported by the Nonconformist journal The Westminster Gazette, and by the Anglican Guardian, Church Times, Christian World, and The Spectator.[58] This solution of the religious problem in education was to be offered to the country during the debate on the Education Bill of 1906.

Unfortunately, the compromisers included only a few of the clergy as the majority were determined, like Canon Cleworth of the Church Schools Emergency League, and Bishop Knox of Manchester, to maintain the Act of 1902.[59] They insisted that maintaining the denominational schools was the best way of effecting the religious teaching of the Church; that the

---

57 Rev. Thomas Law, reported in The Church Times, Nov. 17, 1905, p. 603.

58 The Spectator, "Prolegamena to Compromise", March 26, 1904, pp. 484-485; The Guardian, March 26, 1904, as quoted in The Tablet, April 2, 1904, pp. 665-666; The Church Times, March 18, 1904, p. 365.

59 Canon Cleworth's letter in The Church Times, Jan. 3, 1904, p. 10; Bishop Knox, ibid., June 30, 1905, p. 343.

denominational managers would have to be maintained, and that the appointment of the teachers should remain in the hands of the denominational managers. After all, such a system had the advantage of subjecting the children to the prevading Church atmosphere during the entire school day. Consequently, the various concordats arrived at by Nonconformists and Anglicans such as those of Wales, Yorkshire, Durham and Manchester were rejected by associations of the clergy and Church school managers. The National Society disapproved of any compromises outside the Act, and appealed for funds with which to establish more schools.[60] These people were determined to maintain the Church school system no matter what difficulties lay ahead.

The position of the Archbishop of Canterbury was probably representative of that of less extreme denominationalists. After the failure of his efforts to have a conference with the Nonconformist leaders in 1903, he fell back to defending the settlement of 1902,[61] and to believing that no "English Government would deprive the Church of her schools, or of the right to teach the Church religion in them".[62] The denominationalists might have been willing to make some reluctant concession to the demand for popular control over their schools, but they adamantly insisted on maintaining the denominational character of them.[63]

---

60 The Church Times, Dec. 18, 1903, p. 782; June 10, 1904, p. 750; June 15, 1905, p. 28.

61 Letter to Lord Aschombe, as quoted in The Church Times, Dec. 18, 1903, p. 781.

62 Letter to Athelstan Riley, quoted in ibid., Feb. 19, 1904, p. 248.

63 Declarations of principle by the National Society and resolutions by the Standing Committee of the National Society, The Times, Jan. 8, 1906, p. 4.

Conclusion

During the period 1903 to 1906, the Anglicans had to contend with the efforts of the Nonconformists to obstruct the working of the Education Act so that it would not benefit the Church schools system. Even though the Church of England was more or less successful in foiling the Nonconformists, the Education Act did not prove to be a panacea for the Church schools system, as the rate of transfer of voluntary schools to the local educational authorities increased, and the establishment of Church schools did not keep pace with the establishment of council schools. Partly because of the failure of the Act in this respect and the Nonconformist objections to it, efforts were made to work out a common solution to the religious problem in education. Though some Churchmen supported the scheme of a public system of education with undenominational supplemented by denominational teaching, or that of "equal facilities" for all forms of religious teaching, no solution to the problem was agreed to by the end of 1905. The majority of the clergy seemed determined to hold onto their schools and keep intact their distinctive Church atmosphere. Since a new Liberal Government was now in office, pledged to amend the Education Act, a new round was imminent in the prolonged controversy about religion in the elementary schools of England and Wales.

CHAPTER IV

THE EDUCATION BILLS OF 1906 AND 1908

The General Election of 1906

The Balfour Government finally came to an end in December, 1905, and Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman formed the first Liberal administration in more than ten years. On the 8th of January of the new year, Parliament was dissolved and a general election was held. Though the primary issue in the election campaign was tariff reform, or free trade, the education question shared the spotlight with other issues such as the employment of Chinese workers in South Africa and the Trades Disputes Bill.

The first results of the long-awaited election came on January 14 from Manchester and Salford. In this area of previous Tory strength the Liberals won all eleven seats whereas in the previous Parliament they had held only two.[1] Even the late Prime Minister himself was defeated in his old seat, Manchester East. As the Liberals made extensive gains in London and the Home Counties, the extent of the disaster suffered by the Conservative Party became apparent. The Liberals won the greatest electoral triumph since 1832, winning a total of 377 seats, and being independent of the Irish and Labour members of Parliament.[2] The Unionists, both liberal and conservative, were reduced to only 157 seats in the new Parliament. Very significant for the religious conflict was the fact that approximately 180 Nonconformists were to be found in the ranks of the victorious Liberal

---

1. The Manchester Guardian, Jan. 15, 1906, p. 6.

2. The Annual Register, 1906, Part 1, p. 12. The Irish Nationalists won 83 seats; Labour, 53.

candidates.[3] With this strong representation in Parliament and the presence of such non-Anglicans as Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, Asquith, Haldane, Bryce, Birrell,[4] and Lloyd George in the Cabinet, the future of the Church schools appeared to be dim. On the other hand, even now at the peak of Nonconformist strength, Anglicans formed a majority in the Liberal Caucus and Cabinet. So it was unlikely that the Government's policy towards the Church would be wholly unreasonable.

To what extent did the schools' question contribute towards the Nonconformist victory? Undoubtedly, the involvement of Nonconformist ministers in politics on the side of the Liberal Party greatly strengthened that Party's electoral machinery.[5] The Free Church Council had aimed to raise £29,000 to assist Liberal candidates, procured candidates for the party, and organized speaking tours in support of Liberal candidates.[6] While the Anglican and Roman clergy played a strong role in the Conservative campaign,[7] though the Archbishop of Canterbury and the majority of the

---

3 The Manchester Guardian, Feb. 28, 1906, p. 7.

4 Augustine Birrell (1850-1933); ed. at Amersham Hall School, Caversham, and Trinity Hall, Cambridge; lawyer and a noted writer; Liberal M.P., West Fife (1889-1900); North Bristol (1906-1918); President of the Board of Education, 1905-1907; Chief Secretary for Ireland, 1907-1916; of Nonconformist background and an agnostic.

5 According to Campbell-Bannerman this was not traditional. See The Times, Jan. 3, 1903, p. 11.

6 The Manchester Guardian, Dec. 14, 1903, p. 11; The Annual Register, 1906, p. 6.

7 Canon Cleworth, The Times, Jan. 19, 1906, p. 7; letter by Dr. Clifford, ibid., Feb. 7, p. 12. Letter by the Roman Catholic Archbishop Bourne supporting candidates favouring Catholic schools, ibid., Jan. 1, 1906, p. 6.

Bishops apparently remained neutral,[8] their involvement in politics in support of their schools was traditional and added no new strength to the Conservative Party. The education issue complemented other issues in the campaign. The trade unionists - and the Nonconformists had traditional connections with Labour - could vote for the Liberal or Labour Parties because of their position on education, the Trades Disputes Bill, and free trade; the Nonconformist businessmen could vote Liberal because of the Liberal Party's education policy and its stand on free trade; Anglicans and Roman Catholics who wanted to vote Liberal on other issues were not prevented from so doing because of the Liberal Party's educational policy, since Augustine Birrell, the Minister of Education, and others had pledged themselves to respect the wishes of the parents in the matter of religious education.[9] Several contemporaries, including such stout defenders of the Church schools as Sir Arthur Griffith-Boscawen and Sir John Kennaway (Conservative M.P. for East Devon), and clergymen like the Vicar of Bray and the Bishop of St. Asaph, believed that the Education Act of 1902 had contributed greatly to the Liberal landslide of 1906 by causing the entire Nonconformist vote to be cast for the Liberal Party.[10] Anyway, as will be seen later, no matter to what extent the results of the election were decided on the

---

8 The Times, Leader, Feb. 2, 1906, p. 7.

9 Birrell's election Manifesto, The Manchester Guardian, Jan. 3, 1906, p. 4; Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, Lord Rosebery, Sir Edward Grey, as quoted in The Church Times, Dec. 23, 1904, p. 847.

10 Sir Arthur Griffith-Boscawen, Fourteen Years in Parliament (London: John Murray, 1907), p. 351; Hansard, 4th series, Vol. CLV, April 9, 1906, p. 1084 (Sir John Kennaway); the Vicar of Bray, "Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman's Opportunity", The Fortnightly Review, Vol. LXXXV, 1906, p. 230; Alfred G. Edwards (Bishop of St. Asaph), Memories (London: John Murray, 1927), p. 214.

Education issue, the Church of England, the Conservative Party, and the country generally, acknowledged that the Liberal Government had received a mandate to amend the Education Act so as to institute popular control of schools supported out of public funds and to abolish religious tests for teachers employed in them. This was a very significant admission and it threatened to have the greatest consequences for the Church schools.

Anticipation of the Education Bill

As generally expected, the Speech from the Throne on February 19, 1906, announced that a Bill to amend the Education Act of 1902 would be introduced in the new session of Parliament, and Birrell, the Education Minister, predicted that it would be the Bill of the session.[11] Faced with this prospect, Churchmen were apprehensive as to what the bill would do to the voluntary schools. They began to make declarations as to what form of a Bill would be acceptable to them and made efforts to make their demands known to the Government.

Now both Liberal Evangelical and High Churchmen continued to propose that the local authorities assume complete control of rate-aided voluntary schools. Evangelical Churchmen continued to advocate undenominational religious teaching supplemented by denominational religious teaching,[12] and High Churchmen advocated that the teaching of all forms

---

[11] The Manchester Guardian, Feb. 1, 1906, p. 7.

[12] For example, Rev. Russell Wakefield, as quoted in The Church Times, Jan. 26, 1906, p. 95; Canon Wilson, ibid., Feb. 9, 1906, p. 189; Canon Henson, ibid., March 16, 1906, p. 340; the Bishop of Ripon, ibid., April 6, 1906, p. 455; the Bishop of Carlisle, The Times, Feb. 17, 1906, p. 11.

of religion, denominational as well as undenominational, have complete equality in the schools system.[13] However, extremists represented by the High Churchmen of the English Church Union, the Church Schools Emergency League, headed by Canon Cleworth, and Bishop Knox of Manchester wanted to preserve the Church schools' system.[14] Both the High Churchmen and Evangelicals of this group were united in their determination that the Church schools should be maintained as provided for in the Act of 1902 and that undenominational religious teaching should not be given preference over the distinct teaching of the Church catechism. But they probably differed in the importance they attached to each of these demands. High Churchmen were primarily interested in the procuring of denominational religious teaching by especially approved teachers within school hours.[15] But evangelicals were interested mainly in the survival of the Church schools system per se. Bishop Knox of Manchester claims in his autobiography that he was principally concerned with the preservation of the Church schools system, because of the intricate connections between the Church schools and the Church in Lancashire, the stronghold of denominational schools.[16] It is likely that he was representative of the

---

13 D. C. Lathbury, The Times, Jan. 25, 1906, p. 11; the Bishop of Birmingham, ibid., Feb. 2, 1906, p. 6; The Church Times, Leader, Jan. 26, 1906, p. 100.

14 Resolutions of the English Church Union, ibid., Feb. 10, 1906, p. 163; The Church Schools Emergency League, ibid., Feb. 9, 1906, p. 161.

15 Athelstan Riley, ibid, Feb. 2, 1906, p. 128; Lord Halifax's Memorial, ibid., April 6, 1906, p. 455; L. H. Cecil, The Times, Feb. 2, 1906, p. 6.

16 Bishop Knox, op. cit., p. 239.

majority of the clergy of the Church of England who wanted to maintain the Church schools system, and his resolutions advocating "the right to give religious instruction to Church children in Church schools at public cost" was accepted by the Convocation of York in February of 1906.[17]

The extremists made their views known to the Government through memorials and deputations. Lord Halifax, the Bishop of Manchester, and the Church Schools Emergency League all drew up petitions which were signed by thousands of people in support of denominational schools. Moreover, the Church Schools Emergency League passed a resolution which threatened passive resistance should the Government's Bill confiscate the Church Schools and endow undenominational religious teaching.[18]

The Archbishop of Canterbury would have nothing to do with this agitation. He appeared to have accepted the verdict of the country that some alteration would have to be made in the management of the voluntary schools, and he expected the Government to deal fairly with the Church.[19] Apparently, most of the leaders of the Southern Church agreed with him. The resolutions passed at the Convocation of Canterbury in February did not assume the extreme position of those of York. Though the former expressed a preference that the Church should retain her own schools, it reluctantly accepted the necessity of surrendering control of her schools

---

17 The Church Times, Feb. 23, 1906, p. 239.

18 Ibid., Feb. 13, 1906, p. 6.

19 Letter to The Times, Feb. 15, 1906, p. 8, and letter to J. D. Talbot, M.P., condemning passive resistance, in Ibid., Feb. 5, 1906, p. 8.

providing "that full recognition be given to the right of the parents to obtain for their children instruction in their own faith within school hours by teachers who believe in it". No protestation was made against undenominational teaching, and the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury requested that this form of religious teaching be provided in the curriculum of the schools. Both houses warned against the establishment of a purely secular system of education. These quite reasonable and most authoritative resolutions were also submitted to the Government.[20]

There appeared to be a good chance that in the formation of the new Bill the Government would be considerate of the interests of the Church of England. Birrell on several previous occasions had stated that the Cowper-Temple clause would have to be abandoned and denominational teaching allowed in all schools.[21] This would be the price exacted by the Anglicans in return for giving up their schools to the local authorities, and was included in an earlier draft of the Bill which was disclosed to the Archbishop of Canterbury in a meeting with Birrell on March 20.[22] But now the influence of the extreme Nonconformists was greater within the Government than that of the Church of England. They demanded, as their reward for their part in effecting the Liberal revival, not only public control of all rate-aided schools and the abolition of sectarian tests for teachers,

---

20 The Times, Feb. 22, 1906, p. 11.

21 Augustine Birrell, "Elementary Education: A Retrospect and an Outlook", The Independent Review, Vol. II, 1902, pp. 74-91; also, his statement in The Manchester Guardian, Jan. 8, 1906, p. 10.

22 Bell, op. cit., pp. 516-517.

but "no sectarian foot-hold in the public schools".[23] They were joined in these demands by the National Union of Teachers whose influence with the Government on educational matters was considerable. Indeed, Birrell later said that "if he was the Moses of the 1906 Bill", Macnamara, a Liberal M.P. and a former president of the N.U.T., "was its Aaron".[24] Consequently, the Bill paid slight attention to the special interests of the Church of England, and the provision to allow denominational teaching in all schools was omitted from it.

The Introduction of the Education Bill of 1906

The Education Bill of 1906 was introduced into the House of Commons by Birrell on April 9 in a highly successful speech. The first clause promptly obliterated the dual system of elementary schools. It boldly proclaimed that as of January 1, 1908, no elementary school would be recognized as a public elementary school and receive public support unless it became a "provided school" under the local education authority. Arrangements were to be made with the owners of the voluntary schools for the transfer of them to the local authorities for the duration of school hours. In exchange for the use of the schools during school hours the local authorities would maintain the fabric of the schools and would pay rent to the owners - a million pounds being allocated by the Government for this purpose. The Bill said nothing about secondary schools or the training colleges, and the local educational authorities were to remain as established by the 1902 Act.

---

23 Bell, op. cit., pp. 516-517.

24 The Manchester Guardian, Jan. 19, 1907, p. 10.

The Bill established another great principle. Clause vii declared that no teacher would be required to give religious teaching against his will, or, as a condition or his employment, to submit to any sectarian test or creed. In the words of Dr. T. J. Macnamara, this clause was "the teachers' charter of liberty".[25]

The proposals for religious teaching were, of course, the most important to the Church. The Government acted under the premise that the great majority of the English people, both Anglicans and Nonconformists, were protestant. It, therefore, proposed that Cowper-Temple teaching (Bible-teaching) was suitable for the majority of the children and that the local authorities could have it taught in all public schools by the regular teachers at public expense. For the special needs of the Anglicans, clause iii stipulated that the local authorities could allow "ordinary facilities" for denominational teaching in only the "transferred schools" on no more than two mornings per week. Such teaching was not to be given by a member of the teaching staff, nor paid for by the local authorities. Neither the denominational nor undenominational teaching was to be given within compulsory school hours - an extension of the Anson bye-law so as to make the conscience clause effective. In short the Church of England was to be all but squeezed out of the former church schools and was given no influence in the "provided schools".

Nevertheless the Bill included a compromise in clause iv which was designed to satisfy the needs of that minority of Englishmen - Roman

---

25 Hansard, 4th series, Vol. CLVI, May 7, 1906, p. 1092.

Catholics, Jews, Anglo-Catholics - who were not protestant; but it could be exploited to the benefit of Anglicans. This exceptional clause allowed the local authorities to grant "extended facilities" for religious instruction in schools homogeneous in religious composition. In such schools denominational religious teaching would be given, to the exclusion of Cowper-Temple teaching, by regular staff teachers, but at the expense of the denominations requiring it. These "extended facilities" schools would really be denominational schools possessing the distinctive atmosphere of the denomination to which they belonged, but controlled and totally financed by the local authorities. Such facilities could only be offered in urban areas with a minimum population of 5000, where 4/5 of the parents demanded them, and where there was alternative accommodation available for the minority who dissented from denominational teaching. Clause iv was really a generous offer to the minorities, but the stipulations hedging it invited all sorts of problems for the Government. Why 4/5? Why 5000? Why an urban area, only? How could the religious qualifications of the teachers be ascertained without the imposition of religious tests? This clause accounted for much of the ensuing controversy about the Bill.

The Reaction to the Bill.

The Bill when introduced into the House of Commons was greeted with a scene of jubilation by the Government members, but the Opposition appeared to be bewildered by it. Significantly, of those Conservatives who spoke in the first reading - George Wyndham (Dover), Sir William Anson (Oxford University), Sir John Kenneway (East Devon), and Lord Robert

Cecil (Marylebone) - none contested the main principles of the Bill, the abolition of the dual system and the abolition of sectarian tests for teachers. Sir William Anson and Sir John Kenneway expressed relief that the Government did not propose to establish a purely secular system of education, but argued that undenominational religious teaching was unsuitable for Anglicans. Lord Robert Cecil described the establishment of undenominationalism with the exclusion of other forms of religious teaching from the schools as "profound intolerance" and argued that the Cowper-Temple system would eventually lead to secularism.[26] The most significant reaction, though, was that of J. T. Middlemore (North Birmingham) who had led the Liberal Unionist revolt against the Bill of 1902. He charged that the Bill was more unfair to the Anglicans than that of 1902 was to the Dissenters, that it favoured all other denominations but discriminated against Anglicans.[27] Although all Opposition speakers protested against the injustice of the Bill, it was not challenged on the first reading.

In the country the Bill was greeted by Churchmen with shock and dismay. On the following day in a public letter to the Secretary of the National Society, Archbishop Davidson expressed his extreme disappointment with the Government's measure.[28] For he had hoped to "co-operate with the Government in attaining a really fair solution and a permanent

---

26 Hansard, 4th series, Vol. CLV, April 9, 1906, pp. 1089-94.

27 Ibid., p. 1074.

28 The Times, April 11, 1906, p. 11.

settlement of the education question". To him the death blow of the denominational system was embedded in clause vii which prohibited the former Church teachers from "giving the definite religious instruction", even outside compulsory school hours, which they had hitherto been accustomed to teach. He described the advent of the Bill as a "grave" and "far reaching" emergency. The next day a meeting of thirty-two Anglican Bishops expressed their conviction that "the Bill, as it at present stands, must be met with unhesitating opposition".[29] A number of Church organs condemned it as a violation of religious liberty, or, in the words of The Church Times, as "an act smarting of Cromwellian tyranny".[30] Later the Bishop of Manchester issued a manifesto describing the Bill as one "of pure robbery and confiscation" and called upon Churchmen of his diocese to actively resist it.[31]

The declarations of the April Convocations of York and Canterbury embody the official case of the Church against the Bill.[32] The most authoritative of these bodies was the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury, whose condemnatory resolutions were expressed in a document which was presented to the Government. This document lamented that the Bill threatened the security of the religious instruction then given in the voluntary schools by declaring that such instruction should not form part of

---

29 The Times, April 12, 1906, p. 7.

30 The Church Times, Leader, April 12, 1906, p. 492.

31 The Manchester Guardian, April 19, 1906, p. 8.

32 The Church Times, May 14, 1906, pp. 641-646.

the regular daily teaching as required by the trust deeds. The provisions for religious teaching contained in the Bill were "inadequate and precarious". Staff teachers were prohibited from giving the denominational teaching in the "ordinary facilities" schools and no security was given that undenominational teaching would be given by those who could give it "with genuine belief". In short the Bill did not "adequately" provide for the "right of the parents to obtain for their children .... instruction in their own faith" and nearly excluded the "denominational principle" from the educational system of the country.

A national campaign was now launched against the Bill. Between April and August some 1400 meetings were held denouncing the measure and petitions containing three-quarters of a million signatures were presented to Parliament.[33] The highlight of the campaign was the Bishop of Manchester's huge demonstration of Lancashiremen which occurred in London on June 8. It is remarkable that during this campaign few overt attacks were made on clause 1. Even The Times, a foremost supporter of the Bill of 1902, acknowledged that the maintenance of schools out of public funds necessitated complete popular control as provided by clause 1 of the 1906 Bill.[34] The main argument against the Bill was that it violated the principles of religious liberty by taking over the Church schools and endowing in them the undenominational religious teaching which the Nonconformists preferred.

---

33 Chronicle of the Campaign, issued by the National Society, Oct. 1906; as reported in The Times, Oct. 2, 1906, p. 4.

34 The Times, Leader, April 12, 1906, p. 9.

while almost excluding the religious teaching favoured by Anglicans.[35]

In trying to demonstrate the unsuitability of Bible teaching to Anglicans, Evangelicals were forced into assuming the High Church attitude towards undenominational teaching, that it was a distinct religion rather than the foundation of all Protestant denominations. Attacks on Bible teaching were so severe as to indicate that the Bible was inimical to the Anglican Church instead of being the fundamental authority on which the doctrines and teachings of the Church were founded.[36] Churchmen demonstrated remarkable unity in this crisis, in view of the fact that the discovery by the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline, that Romanist practices were prevalent in the approximately 500 Churches investigated by the Commission, had given cause for an intensification of the Anglo-Catholic-Evangelical conflict within the Church.[37] But now Evangelical or orthodox Churchmen like Bishops Knox of Manchester, Ingram of London and Edwards of St. Asaph, joined Anglo-Catholics, like Lord Halifax, Lord Hugh Cecil, and Dr. Gore, Bishop of Birmingham, in leading a crusade against the Bill. The leaders of the campaign had the support of the great majority of the clergy. The Representative Church

---

35 Lord Hugh Cecil, letter in The Times, April 21, 1906, p. 12; the Bishop of London at the Albert Hall meeting May 11, reported in ibid., May 12, 1906, p. 8; The Times, Leaders of April 11, 12, 17, 1906; The Church Times, Leader, April 20, 1906, p. 524.

36 For these attacks Church leaders were criticized by The Manchester Guardian, April 20, 1906, p. 6; May 8, p. 8; The Spectator, April 28, 1906, pp. 657-58.

37 The Church Times, July 6, 1906, pp. 22-25.

Council,[38] on July 7, passed Lord Hugh Cecil's resolution condemning "undenominational teaching as unjust and oppressive to Churchmen and injurious to the religious welfare of the people".[39] However, supporters of the Government's measure claimed that the agitation had little support from the laymen and that the majority of them were satisfied with undenominational teaching.[40]

A minority of Churchmen dissented from the attacks on the Bill and on Cowper-Temple teaching. Among them were the Bishops of Carlisle, Ripon and Hereford, Canon Henson, and William Temple, son of the late Archbishop Temple.[41] They expounded a view, consistently advocated by The Spectator during the controversy over the 1906 Bill, that the Church of England, as the National Church, should have in mind the religious education of the whole nation rather than only that of Anglicans.[42] They claimed that by vociferously advocating the cause of denominational schools and the teaching of the catechism, the Church was behaving like a

---

38 Formed in 1903 to recommend legislation to the Government.

39 The Manchester Guardian, July 7, 1906, p. 14.

40 Canon H. Henson, to The Spectator, April 28, 1906, p. 666; Hubert Paul, "The Education Bill", The Nineteenth Century, Vol. LIX, No. 1, 1906, p. 713.

41 The Times, May 21, 1906, p. 7 (Bishop of Carlisle); The Manchester Guardian, April 11, 1906, p. 6 (Bishop of Ripon); ibid., May 19, 1906, p. 9 (the Bishop of Hereford); The Spectator, April 28, 1906, p. 666 (Canon Henson); The Times, Oct. 3, 1906, p. 4 (William Temple at the Church Congress).

42 The Spectator first expressed this opinion on Dec. 30, 1905, pp. 1109-1110; again on April 4, 1906, pp. 568-69; Aug. 28, pp. 567-68.

sect rather than a National Church. Instead, the Church should espouse the cause of "fundamental Christianity", of undenominational teaching, as the foundation for the more particular doctrines of the various sects. By so doing, it would work for the benefit of the whole nation.

A fundamental question facing the opponents of the Bill was whether or not to reject the Bill absolutely or to work for its amendment so as to acquire better facilities for denominational teaching. The former course was favoured by the extremists like the Bishop of Manchester and Lord Hugh Cecil,[43] and by the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury, but the Upper House of Canterbury and the Convocation of York declared to reject the Bill only if substantial amendments were not made.[44] The Convocation of York was not so averse to popular control of the Church schools as it was in February, probably because the majority of the Northern Church schools were located in urban areas and would become denominational clause iv schools under the Bill, totally supported out of public funds. The Archbishop of York, who moved the April resolutions of the Convocation of York, wanted the Bill amended.[45] However, the Archbishop of Canterbury seemed to be undecided, and in the April Convocation he did not declare what his position was.[46] He appeared to be waiting to ascertain what course the Bill would take in the House of Commons.

---

43 Bell, op. cit., pp. 518-519.

44 The Church Times, May 14, 1906, pp. 641-646.

45 The Manchester Guardian, June 16, 1906, p. 6.

46 Bell, op. cit., p. 519.

The Bill in the House of Commons

The various arguments against the Bill which were expressed in the country were reiterated in the House of Commons during the second reading of the Bill which occurred from the 7th to the 10th of May. The Church's position in the House of Commons was weak. Not only had the Conservative Party in the Commons been decimated as a result of the election, but forceful Anglican spokesmen such as Lord Hugh Cecil, Sir Arthur Griffith-Boscawen, and Sir John Gorst were now absent. In their place the Church's cause was championed by Lord Robert Cecil,[47] George Wyndham, Joseph Chamberlain and by the former Prime Minister, A. J. Balfour, who had recently won the City of London in a bye-election; and they reiterated the charges made against the Bill in the country. As in the country at large, no one denied that the Government had a mandate to introduce a Bill to remedy the grievances of the Nonconformists under the Education Act of 1902, or to establish popular control over rate-aided voluntary schools. But all condemned the Bill for "confiscating" the Church schools, for prohibiting Church teachers from giving the denominational religious teaching permitted by the trust deeds while allowing them to teach at public expense the undenominational, or Cowper-Temple, teaching approved by Nonconformists, but unsatisfactory for

---

47 Edgar Algernon Robert Gascoyne Cecil, Viscount Cecil of Chelwood, (1864-1958) third son of the third Marquis of Salisbury; ed at Eton, and University College, Oxford; Conservative M.P. for Marleybone, 1906-1910; Cambridgeshire, 1910; Herefordshire, 1911-1923; Under-secretary for Foreign Affairs, 1915-18; known as the founder of the League of Nations; a strong Anglican, he resigned from the Government over Welsh Disestablishment.

Anglicans. They claimed that the Bill was a deliberate attack upon the Church of England. George Wyndham, in moving the rejection of the Bill, declared that it violated the "principle of religious equality" and denied the "right of the parent to have his child brought up in the religion which the parent prefers, and to have his child taught by those who believe in that instruction".[48] He contended that the facilities offered for religious teaching in clause iii were a "mockery", and those in clause iv, "inadequate".[49] Joseph Chamberlain offered as a solution a public system of education with universal facilities within compulsory school hours for all forms of religious teaching. He, like the Conservatives, Sir John Kenneway, Sir Francis Powell (Wigan), and Sir William Anson, hoped that the Bill would be amended, but, significantly, Lord Robert Cecil and A. J. Balfour believed that it was beyond amendment.

The Government speakers answered the charges against the Bill quite effectively. They undermined the claim for a denominational system by declaring that the parent had no right to demand that the state pay for the religious instruction of his children. They argued that undenominationalism was not the religion of Nonconformity, and that Nonconformist doctrines were no more taught under the Cowper-Temple clause than were Anglican doctrines. All the Government was doing was establishing in the public schools a form of religious teaching common to all Protestant denominations, because the great variety of denominations made the teaching of the peculiar

---

48 Hansard, 4th series, Vol. CLVI, May 7, 1906, p. 1016.

49 Ibid., pp. 1022-23.

doctrines of all sects impossible. Many clergy had acknowledged that such teaching was suitable to Anglicans, and that they were satisfied with it. Meanwhile, the needs of the non-Protestant groups in the country would be met by clause iv. Chamberlain's solution was contemptuously rejected by Asquith because it would divide children into "pens" and would aggravate the differences among the sects.[50] The Bill passed the second reading by a vote of 410-204; the Labour members supported the Government, while the Irish Nationalists voted with the Opposition against the Bill.

The Committee stage of the Bill began on May 21. Some amendments proposed by the Opposition indicate how they proposed to reconcile the denominational principle - that the children should be educated in their parents' faith by teachers who believed in it - with the principles, which many of them professed to accept, of popular control over schools supported out of public funds and no sectarian tests in the employment of teachers. The most interesting solution was offered by Joseph Chamberlain who proposed to amend clause i so as to allow universal facilities for denominational religious teaching within compulsory school hours as he had outlined in his second reading speech.[51] The religious teaching could be given by members of the regular staff, but the religious beliefs of the teachers would not be a factor in their appointment to a teaching position in any school. For giving the religious instruction, the teachers

---

[50] Hansard, 4th series, Vol. CLVI, May 10, 1906, p. 1516.

[51] Ibid., Vol. CLVII, May 22, 1906, p. 1219.

would be paid by the denominations or parents requiring it. It should be noted that the system which he had implemented in Birmingham in the 1870's had provided facilities outside school hours for religious teaching, which had to be given by teachers other than those of the school staff.[52] The system which he now advocated had been frequently proposed by D. C. Lathbury, Dr. Gore, Bishop of Birmingham, and by a considerable body of educational opinion. Even Birrell said that many people in the Liberal Party and in the country thought Chamberlain's scheme to be a settlement of the religious issue.[53]

Chamberlain's amendment was rejected by the Liberals who threw against it the argument that its implementation involved insuperable practical difficulties, that the facilities would later be discarded and, secularism would take its place.[54] Yet the fact was that Chamberlain's system had worked in the Reformatory and Industrial Schools. If Nonconformists were to remain satisfied with the Cowper-Temple teaching in the Council schools, it would have involved only two types of religious teaching in most schools - undenominational and Anglican. In a few schools having a Catholic minority, Catholicism would also have had to be taught. Immense practical difficulties would have only occurred when the Nonconformists insisted that the distinctive doctrines of all Noncon-

---

52 Foreman, op. cit., pp. 132-34.

53 Hansard, 4th series, Vol. CLVIII, May 27, 1906, pp. 127-35.

54 Ibid., Vol. CLVII, May 23, pp. 1321-27 (George White); pp. 1348-51 (Dr. Macnamara); Vol. CLVIII, May 27, pp. 127-35 (Birrell).

formist sects be taught, something they had hitherto not insisted upon. Even the Nonconformist-supported British and Foreign School Society had required only Bible teaching. The real cause of the Nonconformist opposition to the scheme of universal facilities was that its inclusion in the Bill along with clause iv, which would still have been necessary because of the Catholic insistence upon having atmosphere schools, would have involved too much clerical influence in the schools. They probably feared that the Established Church would make more use of the facilities than the poorer Nonconformist sects. All the leading Conservatives spoke in favour of Chamberlain's amendment, and the Conservatives and some Irish Nationalists voted for it. The amendment, however, was defeated by a vote of 367-172. Probably many Conservatives supported it as an alternative to something worse - the Bill in its original form - as did the Irish Nationalists. As it was, Chamberlain's amendment, which could have been a solution to the religious problem in education, was never offered again. Eventually, clause i, establishing public control of the rate-aided elementary schools, was passed unamended by a majority of 365-162, the Irish Nationalists voting with the Conservatives against it.

On June 18, the Government introduced closure by compartments and the committee stage subsequently proceeded more rapidly. The most important work occurred in the consideration of clause iv, which, as explained above, allowed the local authorities to permit the regular staff teachers in a minority of transferred voluntary schools to give denominational teaching. The Opposition attempted to reduce the restrictions on this clause

in order to make it applicable to as many denominational schools as possible. Consequently, Evelyn Cecil (Conservative for Aston Manor) moved an amendment to make the granting of these facilities obligatory.[55] Both Anglicans and Catholics were afraid that because of the hostility of the local authorities the facilities would not be granted. The Government, hard pressed by the Nonconformists not to make any further concessions on clause iv,[56] refused to accept the amendment, but later introduced an amendment allowing some voluntary schools, in cases where agreement could not be reached with the local authorities, to contract out of the public schools system. Such schools would remain under private management and would receive the Parliamentary grant, but no rate aid. Though the amendment was opposed by a number of Conservative and Liberal educationalists as a retrograde measure, it was accepted by the committee.

The Conservatives introduced other amendments to extend the operation of the clause to rural as well as urban areas, and to grant facilities for denominational teaching in all schools, even to those in the single-school areas. Both amendments were rejected by the Government, and clause iv passed the committee stage by a vote of 415-138, the Irish Nationalists supporting the Government because of the contracting-out amendment. Conservatives also attempted to amend clause vi so that religious teaching could be given within compulsory school hours. Since

---

55 Hansard, 4th series, Vol. CLIX, June 23, 1906, p. 672.

56 Deputation of Nonconformist M.P.'s, as reported in The Manchester Guardian, May 16, 1906, p. 12; deputation of religious leaders, ibid., June 19, p. 7.

many Nonconformists, believing that many parents would keep their children out of school to work during the hour of religious instruction and children would be deprived of the only religious instruction they could get,[57] supported the Conservatives in opposing this clause. Birrell allowed a free vote on the clause, and it was passed by a narrow margin of 267-238. Clause vii was also very contentious since it contained a sub-section which prohibited teachers from volunteering to give denominational teaching in the "ordinary facilities" schools. The Conservative, Michael Hicks-Beach (Gloucestershire, Tewkesbury) moved the omission of this sub-section, explaining that it rendered useless the granting of "ordinary facilities" because the clergy, who would have to give the religious teaching in place of the teachers, could not teach as well as the regular school teachers.[58] But the motion was defeated, and clause vii was passed by a vote of 364-183, the Irish Nationalists supporting the Conservatives.

The standard Government reason for opposing these amendments was that they would destroy the protection which the Bill provided for the Nonconformists. Government members argued that if teachers were permitted to give religious teaching in the numerous clause iii ("ordinary facilities") schools, a teacher's religious beliefs, owing to the influence of the Church of England on the Education Committees, would inevitably

---

57 Hansard, 4th series, Vol. CLIX, July 2, p. 1437 (Mr. John T. Walters, Sheffield, Brightside); pp. 1452-54 (Herbert Paul, Northampton); p. 1466 (Francis Channing).

58 Ibid., pp. 1642-1646.

become a factor in his appointment to a position. Above all they feared that the single-area schools would remain the same as they were under the Act of 1902. If clause iv was extended as the Conservatives desired, the majority of the denominational schools would be untouched by the Bill, and the Nonconformists' grievances perpetuated.[59]

Following the consideration of clause vii, considerable changes were made in the parts of the Bill which did not involve the religious problem in education. The Bill passed the committee stage on July 21, and was read for the third time on July 30 by a large majority of 369-177, the Irish Nationalists voting against the Government. Although the Government had made few concessions on the religious aspects of the Bill, it might well be more conciliatory towards amendments made in the House of Lords. Some observers felt that the Government had refused to make various concessions in the Commons so as to have more grounds on which to make compromises with the House of Lords.

The Bill in the House of Lords

Everyone knew that the fate of the Education Bill depended upon the will of the House of Lords - a chamber in which the Conservatives and Anglicans were supreme. The second reading of the Bill began in the House of Lords on August 1, and Lord Crewe, the Government's Leader in the Lords, explained its intentions. He was immediately followed by the

---

59 Hansard, 4th series, Vol. CLIX, p. 1447 (Perks); p. 1652 (Birrell); pp. 1658-61 (W. Robson, the Solicitor General); p. 1674 (George White).

Archbishop of Canterbury who firmly condemned the Bill for expropriating the voluntary schools from the denominational purposes stipulated in the trust deeds, but, very significantly, he expressed his desire to amend the Bill rather than reject it. He mentioned several amendments of "a far reaching nature" which were needed in order to make the Bill acceptable to the Church. Among them were (1) the making of religious teaching mandatory in all schools; (2) denominational religious teaching for the children of parents who want it in all schools within school hours; (3) that regular teachers be allowed to give such instruction if qualified; (4) the widening of clause iv so as to apply to rural as well as urban areas.[60] As the Bill was not challenged on the second reading, the principle of clause 1 which established popular control over all schools supported out of public funds was accepted by the Lords. The prospects for a settlement of the education question appeared to be quite sanguine.

Shortly after the second reading of the Bill in the Lords, Parliament was prorogued for the autumn recess, and the committee stage of the Bill did not begin before October 25. The Archbishop of Canterbury noted that a thousand petitions against the Bill had been presented to the Lords, but he once again, in a very conciliatory tone, indicated his desire that the Bill be amended rather than rejected. The Marquis of Lansdowne, the Opposition Leader in the Lords, Lord Londonderry, and Lord Ashbourne indicated their desire to accept the Bill providing it was amended so as to grant adequate facilities for denominational teaching. However, during the

---

60 Hansard, 4th series, Vol. CLXII, Aug. 2, 1906, pp. 921-943.

ensuing weeks the Conservative Peers made amendments to the Bill which went somewhat beyond those suggested by the Primate in his second reading speech. The most inimical to the purposes of the Bill had to do with clause iv. Amendments made the granting of "extended facilities" mandatory, extended the operation of this clause to rural areas; reduced the majority demanding such facilities from 4/5 to a bare majority; and permitted schools in the single-school areas to become clause iv schools. The effect of the Lords' amendments was to allow all denominational schools to become "extended facilities" (clause iv) schools and to extend denominational teaching to the council schools. Since the teachers were to be permitted to give denominational teaching in all schools, the single-area schools would, as far as the Nonconformists were concerned, maintain their Anglican character. The Bill had been transformed from an undenominational to a denominational Bill.

The work of the Lords was bitterly criticized by the Nonconformists, the Liberal Press, and by Government spokesmen. The National Free Church Council condemned the Lords' amendments and urged the Government to make no more concessions.[61] It was noted how the action of the Lords regarding the 1906 Bill contrasted with their treatment of the Bill of 1902. Whereas in 1902 they had made a pro-Anglican Bill even more favourable to the Anglicans and more objectionable to the Nonconformists, they now altered a pro-Nonconformist Bill so as to make it

---

61 The Manchester Guardian, Nov. 16, 1906, p. 8.

unacceptable to them and favourable to the Anglicans.[62] Consequently a number of Liberal M.P.'s demanded that the Government reject the amendments en bloc.[63] A conflict was shaping up between the Commons and the House of Lords.

The transformed Bill passed the third reading in the House of Lords on December 6, and on December 10 the Lords' amendments were considered in the House of Commons. Birrell strongly condemned the Lords for altering the whole fabric of the Bill and announced that he would ask the Commons to reject the amendments en bloc. However, he said the door was still open to compromises and suggested that he was willing to make concessions on clause iv and on the issue of the teachers' right to teach religion.[64] Balfour, however, was unconciliatory and rejected these overtures. As an agreement had been recently arranged between the Catholics and the Government[65] on the Education Bill, the Irish Nationalists now supported the Government, and the Lords' amendments were rejected en bloc by a vote of 416 to 107.

Meanwhile, as the course of the Education Bill worked towards a climax, those Churchmen represented by Lord Hugh Cecil, the Bishop of Manchester and the National Society, continued to campaign for the death

---

62 The Manchester Guardian, Leader, Oct. 26, 1906, p. 6.

63 A memorial signed by 130 Nonconformist M.P.'s to the Prime Minister on Nov. 29, reported in ibid., Nov. 30, 1906, p. 9.

64 Hansard, 4th series, Vol. CLXVI, Dec. 10, 1906, pp. 1580-1599.

65 The Manchester Guardian, Nov. 30, 1906, p. 9; The Tablet, Jan. 1, 1910, p. 33.

of the Bill. In November demonstrations were held in Lancashire and London urging the Lords to reject the Bill, and on November 26, a deputation of Churchmen from all over England exhorted the Primate not to back down on the Lords' amendments.[66] However, others worked for a solution to the difficulty. On November 23, a delegation of distinguished laymen of the Church of England, including educational leaders, the former Conservative M.P. Henry Hobhouse, Sir John Kenneway, Conservative M.P. for East Devon, John St. Loe Strachey, editor of The Spectator, G. W. Prothero, editor of The Quarterly Review, urged upon the Archbishop of Canterbury the necessity of making a compromise on the education Bill "in the interest of arriving at a national settlement of the education question".[67] To both delegations the Primate indicated that the stumbling block in the dispute was the question of the right of the teachers to give denominational instruction in the "ordinary facilities" schools, and he was determined not to give way on this point. Moreover, the King, alarmed by the religious strife, and the prospects of a conflict between the Lords and the Commons, urged the Prime Minister and the Archbishop of Canterbury to reach a compromise on the issue.[68]

On December 17 in the House of Lords, Lord Crewe stated the Government's concessions. They demonstrate the extent to which the

---

66 The Times, Nov. 27, 1906, p. 12.

67 Ibid., Nov. 23, 1906, p. 15.

68 Found in Bell, op. cit., pp. 524-25; and in J. A. Spender, The Life of the Right Hon. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1923) Vol. II, p. 302. Bishop Knox op. cit., p. 238, says the King was interested in a compromise as early as 1904.

Liberal Government was willing to strain the loyalty of its supporters in order to save the Education Bill, the principal measure of the session. The Government was willing to allow assistant teachers, but not head teachers, to give denominational teaching in all except the single-area schools; to allow religious teaching to be given within compulsory school hours; and to allow for the establishment of parents' committees for the selection of teachers for the clause iv schools, and to make provision for the establishment of clause iv schools in the future.[69] Even The Times, an opponent of the Bill, suggested that these concessions were the "basis for a truce on the education question".[70]

Following the disclosure of the Government's concessions, the Opposition and Government leaders, and the Archbishop of Canterbury met, in deference to the advice of the King, at Crewe House on December 18. The Conservative leaders refused to accept the Government's concessions on the subject of the teachers' being permitted to teach the Church catechism. They insisted upon the assistant and head teachers giving such instruction, even in the single-school areas! But the Government could not accede to this demand, for it would have made the single-area schools practically the same as they were under the Act of 1902.[71] On the next day, Lord Lansdowne moved, successfully, that the Lords insist on their amendments. The following day an indignant House of Commons passed the Government's

---

69 Hansard, 4th series, Vol. CLXVII, Dec. 17, 1906, pp. 932-36.

70 The Times, Leader, Dec. 19, 1906, p. 9.

71 Bell, op. cit., p. 515; Spender, op. cit., p. 310.

motion not to proceed any further with the Bill.

The question arises as to who was primarily responsible for the failure of the Bill. The Government, considering the attitude of its Nonconformist supporters, made every possible concession in order to save the Bill. The leading journals of the country, including the Unionist papers like The Times[72] and The Spectator,[73] wanted a compromise as did the Archbishops of Canterbury and York. But, who, besides the extremists in the Church of England, did not want to save the Bill? Considerable evidence supports the contention of Asquith and Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman that A. J. Balfour did not want a compromise and the primary responsibility for the failure of the Bill lay with him.[74] At a meeting of the Junior Constitutional Club on November 28, he challenged the Government to oppose the Lords on the Bill.[75] His speeches during the Commons' consideration of the Lords' amendments were unconciliatory. The Archbishop of Canterbury, who had meetings with the Conservative leaders about the Bill, thought that Balfour did not want a settlement.[76] Probably he was still confident of the virtue of his Act of 1902 and wanted it to remain unamended. But it seems that his real motive was political. He

---

72 The Times, Leaders of Dec. 11, 19, 20.

73 The Spectator, Leader of Dec. 15.

74 Hansard, op. cit., Dec. 12, p. 468 (Asquith); ibid., Dec. 20, pp. 1735-36 (Campbell-Bannerman).

75 The Times, Nov. 29, 1906, p. 4.

76 Bell, op. cit., p. 524 and p. 528.

wanted to inflict a demoralizing defeat on the new Liberal Government. He had previously arranged with Lord Lansdowne for the cooperation of the Unionists in the Lords with the Unionist Party in the Commons so that the House of Lords was really commanded by him.[77] It, therefore, accepted the Trades Disputes Bill which the opposition had once vociferously condemned, because Balfour did not wish to offend the Labour movement; it destroyed the Education Bill, because he wished to humiliate the Liberal Government.[78] It was because of political motives, rather than religious opposition, that the Bill of 1906 failed.

Extreme denominationalists like the Bishop of Manchester, Lord Hugh Cecil, and members of the National Society were, of course, pleased that the Bill had been defeated. But in the House of Lords the Bishop of Hereford voted against Lord Lansdowne's motion that the Lords insist on their amendments to the Bill while several other bishops abstained. The Archbishop of Canterbury regretted that a compromise had not been reached.[79] There still persisted a desire among some Churchmen for a compromise on the education question.

A Final Effort

The Liberal Government was greatly frustrated by the failure of

---

77 Correspondence between Lansdowne and Balfour, in Lord Newton, Lord Lansdowne, a Biography (London: Macmillan, 1929), pp. 353-54.

78 The Spectator, Dec. 23, 1906, pp. 1825-26; The Morning Post (Unionist), Nov. 21, 1906, p. 7.

79 Hansard, op. cit., Dec. 19, p. 1405.

the Education Bill, and though Lloyd George and Earl Grey wanted to appeal to the country on the issue, no such decision was taken.[80] It appears that the Liberals were afraid of losing their preponderant majority so soon after acquiring it.[81] Birrell resigned as Education Minister, but both his immediate successors -- Reginald Mckenna, and Walter Runciman[82] made efforts to solve the education problem in 1908.

The Mckenna Bill would have confiscated all Church of England schools in the single-school districts, but would have allowed the urban schools to contract out and receive no rate aid. Deprived of rate aid the urban schools would have been just as impoverished as they had been before the implementation of the Education Act of 1902. Fortunately, the Mckenna Bill was discarded in April when the resignation of the Prime Minister, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, led to a reorganization of the cabinet, and Runciman became President of the Board of Education. The new Minister of Education was to come very close to settling the education conflict.

Corresponding to the efforts of the Liberal Government to legislate an educational settlement, was a growing national desire for the Noncon-

---

80 Peter Rowland, The Last Liberal Government (London: Barrie & Rockliff, 1968), p. 86.

81 Spender, op. cit., p. 312.

82 Walter Runciman, first Viscount Runciman of Doxford (1870-1949); ed. at Trinity College, Cambridge; Liberal M.P., Oldham (1899-1900); Dewsbury (1902-18); Swansea West (1924-9); St. Ives (1929-37); Parliamentary Secretary, Local Government Board, 1905-7; President, Board of Education, 1908-11; of Board of Agriculture, 1911-14; of the Board of Trade, 1914-16; 1931-37; Lord President of the Council, 1937-39; a loyal Methodist and supporter of the temperance movement.

formists and the Church to reach a compromise on the ever contentious education problem. This desire influenced the Nonconformists who, knowing that the only kind of Bill that could be enacted as long as the House of Lords stood in the way was one to which the Anglicans agreed, were more amenable to making concessions than they had been in 1906.[83] More significantly, as Church schools continued to decline and the number of Anglican children attending the rapidly growing council schools system continued to increase, the realization that a compromise was desirable gained ground within the Church of England, though more pervasively among the bishops than among the lower clergy and laity. This was probably so because the bishops, having broad jurisdictions, were more enlightened as to the future needs of the Church and more responsive to public opinion on national issues than the majority of the clergy and laymen who, preoccupied with local matters, were not inclined to subordinate present needs to those of the future, or parochial interests to those of the nation. At a meeting of the Representative Church Council in May, 1908, it became evident that the hierarchy of the Church had changed its policy on religious education in a direction which would make a compromise easier to attain. All but five bishops voted for a motion, supported by the Archbishop of Canterbury, which replaced the Church's traditional policy of denominational religious teaching by one of undenominational teaching supplemented by sectarian instruction, the policy so long advocated by the Bishop of Hereford and Canon Henson, among

---

83 Claridge and Evans, op. cit., p. 140. The Bishop of St. Asaph and Lloyd George were working on a Bill, ibid., p. 144.

others. Only a slight majority of the clergy and laity voted against the motion.[84]

That the resolution supporting undenominational teaching found wide support at the Representative Church Council, indicates that there was in the Church considerable support for undenominational teaching, for the Representative Church Council was, as its name suggests, a representative convention of Churchmen, consisting of the bishops and representatives of the clergy and laity of each diocese of England and Wales.[85] The Council, founded in 1903, was elected periodically to discuss Church matters and to recommend to the Government legislation concerning the Church. The increased support for undenominational religious teaching, as indicated by the Church Representative Council, meant that many Anglicans had moved close to accepting the Nonconformist position on religious education, and this greatly facilitated a compromise on the education question.

Meanwhile, after becoming Minister of Education in 1908, Runciman did what his predecessors had neglected to do, and worked with the leaders of the Anglicans and Nonconformists to reach an "agreed settlement".[86] The final agreement was similar to the Birrell Bill in that it allowed for basically a uniform system of elementary schools, with

---

84 D. C. Lathbury, "An Educational Surrender", The Nineteenth Century, Vol. LXIV, No. 2, 1908, p. 937.

85 Cyril Garbett, Archbishop of York, The Claims of the Church of England (Hodder and Stoughton: London, 1947), p. 159.

86 Bell, op. cit., pp. 533-537.

contracting-out schools forming a minority. The basic religious instruction in all but the contracting-out schools was to be undenominationalism or Bible teaching as allowed under the Cowper-Temple clause. This was to be taught by the staff teachers and paid for by the local authorities. However, concessions were made to the Anglicans which the Government and the Nonconformists would not grant in 1906: denominational teaching was to be given in council schools on three days per week at the expense of the denominations; and head teachers presently giving religious teaching, as well as staff teachers, could give denominational lessons in all schools, both council and former Church schools. The Church would be guaranteed a foothold in the growing system of public education.

But not all Churchmen were enthusiastic towards the compromise. These included denominationalists, of which the Bishop of Manchester and the National Society were typical, who wanted primarily to maintain the Church schools system because it enhanced the power and influence of the Church; and High Churchmen like Lord Hugh Cecil and the English Church Union who wanted to maintain the Church schools because of their distinctive Church atmosphere. The opponents of the Bill wanted most of the voluntary schools to become contracted-out schools with a distinct Church atmosphere, supported out of public funds. According to the Runciman Bill, the contracting-out schools were to exist, as did the pre-1902 voluntary schools, on Parliamentary grants, voluntary contributions, and school fees. Unfortunately, the precise financial arrangements were not included in the concordat announced by Prime Minister Asquith on November 19. When the Bill embodying the concordat was published, even the Archbishop of

Canterbury claimed that the proposed Government grants were inadequate for the contracted-out schools.[87] Dissatisfaction with these grants accounted for much of the opposition to the Bill, and the Bishop of Manchester, in a "plea" to the clergy, declared that the contracted-out schools would starve on the proposed grants.[88]

As in 1906, the Church Schools Emergency League, the National Society and Lord Hugh Cecil condemned the Bill because it favoured Bible teaching in the majority of the schools while making instruction in the catechism an "extra" in them.[89] Dr. Gore, the High Church Bishop of Birmingham, issued a memorandum in which he condemned undenominational teaching as the "weakest and the worst" kind of religious teaching for Anglicans.[90] The indignant High Church Party succeeded in having the Representative Church Council convened on December 3 to consider the Bill.

At the Council the Primate pleaded with Churchmen to accept the concordat. He pointed out how Church schools were steadily declining as the council schools increased - that in the past three years 550 Church schools having accommodation for 160,000 children had closed while 1,056

---

87 Correspondence between the Primate and Runciman, The Times, Dec. 3, 1908, p. 3. Also, The Times, Leader, Dec. 3, 1908.

88 Ibid., p. 7.

89 Ibid., Nov. 26, 1908, p. 10 (The Church Schools Emergency League and the National Society); ibid., Nov. 24, 1908, p. 10 (Hugh Cecil).

90 Edwards, op. cit., p. 218.

new council schools had been established with accommodation for 478,000. Some arrangement, he stressed, was needed to secure Church teaching for Anglican children attending council schools. The Runciman Bill offered facilities for the teaching of the catechism, not only in the Church schools which were to be transferred to the local authorities, but in the present and future council schools as well. However, the Bill was rejected by the Representative Church Council. Though all but three bishops voted for it, the majority of the clergy and laity voted against it.[91] According to The Times, the influence of the High Church Party, which was stronger among the clergy and laity than among the bishops, was mostly responsible for the rejection of the concordat. Aroused by the vigorous campaign of the High Church leaders against the Bill, High Churchmen had bent every effort to have delegates who were opposed to the concordat elected to the Representative Church Council while other Churchmen remained somewhat apathetic. Consequently, Churchmen wanting denominational teaching in atmosphere schools were predominant in the Council, and it was because of them that the concordat was rejected.[92] Knowing that the Conservative leaders in the Commons and the House of Lords would support the decision of the Council, the Government withdrew the Bill which had passed the second reading by a large majority.

The failure of the "agreed settlement" points out the difficulties

---

91 The Times, Dec. 4, 1908, p. 10. For the Bill, 18 bishops, 35 clergy, 46 laymen; against it, 3 bishops, 73 clergy, 113 laymen.

92 Ibid., Leader, Dec. 5, 1908, p. 11.

which confronted those who wished to solve the education question. The denominational system of education controlled by the denominations, but mostly maintained out of public funds, was unsatisfactory to many people, because it violated the constitutional principles that public control should accompany the spending of public money and that there should be no sectarian tests for civil servants, which teachers in practice were under the Act of 1902. But the denominationalists, as illustrated by the history of the voluntary schools and by the opposition of Churchmen to the Runciman Bill, could not as much as provide for a proportion of the cost of maintaining their educational systems at an efficient level. Moreover, the fate of the Runciman concordat demonstrated that denominational teaching within a public school system was inadequate for High Churchmen, though some of them had often requested this. A particular Church atmosphere was needed in order to teach efficiently the unique doctrines of Anglo-Catholicism. Only denominational schools could satisfy them. It was the growing strength of Anglo-Catholicism, widening the gulf between Anglicanism and Protestant Nonconformity, which precluded a settlement of the education question based on the similarity of the religious beliefs of the great majority of the people of England and Wales.

Conclusion

Through the Education Bill of 1906, the Liberal Government, influenced by the Nonconformists, attempted to impose the extreme Nonconformist educational policy on the country. It proposed that all rate-aided denominational schools become state schools and that undenominational

teaching be the regular form of religious teaching in the majority of them, while all but excluding distinctive Anglican teaching from the majority of the former Anglican schools as well as from the council schools. Churchmen, therefore, vociferously condemned the Bill and launched a national campaign against it.

However, it was not religious opposition but political factors which destroyed the Bill. Many Churchmen, including the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, and Conservative politicians indicated a desire to make a compromise on the Bill which would have provided more facilities for denominational teaching. But the Conservative leaders, Balfour and Lansdowne, hoping to humiliate the Liberal Government, frustrated last-minute efforts at reaching a compromise after an indignant Liberal-dominated House of Commons had rejected en bloc the Lords' devastating amendments to the Bill. In its final stages the Bill merged into the constitutional conflict between the Lords and Commons.

Finally, in 1908, an important development occurred as the Church hierarchy changed its religious educational policy from purely denominational teaching to undenominational supplemented by denominational teaching, thus drawing close to the position of the Nonconformists. This made it possible for Liberal Prime Minister Asquith and Education Minister Runciman to arrange a concordat, based on the Bill of 1906, between the leaders of the Nonconformists and the Anglican Church which allowed the teaching of Anglican doctrines in both the council schools and in Church schools which were to be transferred to the state. However, it was rejected by the Representative Church Council, the majority of the clergy

and laymen of which wanted to maintain the Church schools as prescribed by the Act of 1902, both to uphold the prestige of the Church and to secure "atmosphere" schools for the teaching of Anglo-Catholicism. This was the last serious effort the Liberal Government made to solve the education question.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

The basic problem of the Church schools throughout the late nineteenth century was financial. The failure of voluntary contributions to increase during the 1890's and the partial abolition of school fees meant that the Church could not maintain her elementary schools at a level of efficiency which was continually being raised by the state and that the Church schools were declining. Moreover, the rate-aided state system of education established through the Forster Act tended inevitably to dislodge the Church from its predominant position in national education. Although it was obvious that rate aid was necessary to ensure the survival of the Church schools, Churchmen feared that it would result in the local authorities acquiring control of the Church schools, and it was not until 1896, after it became evident that the Free Education Act had undermined the financial security of the urban schools, that the Church accepted in principle rate aid for her schools. But the granting of rate aid to the Church schools by the Education Act of 1902 did not, as it was hoped, arrest the decline of the Church schools and in the ten years following the advent of the Act the rate of decline exceeded that of the previous decade. This was so because in many areas the Church School managers could not maintain the fabric of the schools as required by the Act of 1902. It seemed that the principle of denominational schools was contrary to the prevailing liberal and growing secular spirit of the times.

Another perennial problem confronting the Church was how to secure Church teaching for the approximately one million Anglican

children who by 1902 were to be found in the flourishing board schools system in which the particular doctrines of the Church of England were not taught. During the 1890's many Churchmen (mostly Anglo-Catholics) advocated facilities for Anglicans to teach the catechism to Anglican children in the board schools, which would have involved the repeal of the Cowper-Temple clause forbidding denominational instruction, and this proposal was formally accepted by the Church as early as 1895. Other Churchmen dissented from this proposal because it would have necessitated the granting of facilities to the Nonconformists to teach Nonconformity to their children in the Church schools and would have diluted the Anglican atmosphere of the schools. Furthermore, it was believed that owing to the opposition of the secularists and Nonconformists the abolition of the Cowper-Temple clause could not be realized without the Church having to surrender control of her schools to the local authorities as a quid pro quo. Therefore the Church did not press for facilities during the formation of the Bill of 1902 and facilities were not granted by the Bill. Nor did the granting of rate aid to her schools enable the Church to establish new denominational schools for the education of Anglican children who would otherwise attend the board schools as Anglicans believed it would prior to 1902. The Act of 1902 did not cause a substantial number of new Church schools to be built. Year by year more Anglican children were attending council schools (as the board schools were called subsequent to the Act of 1902) in which Anglican doctrines could not be taught.

In trying to acquire public money for her schools the Church

had to contend with the argument that rate-aided denominational schools conflicted with what was generally held to be a constitutional principle that public control should accompany the spending of public money. It was in deference to this principle that the Church and the Conservative Government in the Act of 1902 gave the local educational authorities considerable control over the voluntary schools in exchange for rate aid. But this control was not sufficient to satisfy the Liberals and Nonconformists who claimed that the appointment of the teachers by a majority of denominational school managers inflicted a sectarian test on teachers. The slogans on sectarian tests for teachers and popular control over rate-aided schools figured in the general election of 1906 which resulted in a great Liberal-Nonconformist triumph. In a sense the elementary schools conflict was not settled because no way was found to reconcile denominational education with the principles of popular control of rate-aided schools and no sectarian tests in the appointment of teachers. Even in the temporary concordat of 1908 a minority of Catholic and High Church schools were allowed to contract-out of the proposed state schools system, and it was the dispute over the amount of Exchequer aid to these schools which wrecked the concordat.

The Church in the pursuit of its educational policies was hampered by the fact that, because Nonconformists and Anglicans inhabited the same localities, a million Nonconformists attended the Church schools. The Nonconformists carried on a tremendous agitation against the Bill of 1902, because it aggravated their sense of grievance with regard to the Anglican schools in the single-school areas of rural England and Wales by requiring

them to pay rates to have their children taught the Anglican catechism, it being contended that the conscience clause of the 1870 Act was ineffective. Unfortunately the Church failed to reach a compromise with the Nonconformists regarding these schools and following the implementation of the Act of 1902, the passive resistance movement became a reality and in the following years thousands of Nonconformists went to jail or paid fines rather than pay the educational rate in support of Church schools, and in Wales national resistance was offered to the Act by the Nonconformist-controlled county and borough councils. It became evident that the Church was largely responsible for inflicting an injustice on a great number of people.

Consequently, following the advent of the Act of 1902, a growing minority of Anglican religious and educational leaders advocated that the way to solve the Church's problems concerning elementary education was to make a compromise with the Nonconformists by which the Church would surrender her schools to the local authorities in exchange for Church teaching in all schools. High Churchmen demanded equality of facilities for Anglican and other forms of teaching in the schools; evangelicals wanted undenominational or Bible teaching for all children reinforced by denominational teaching for Anglican children. The latter was accepted by the Church bishops in 1908 and was contained in the abortive concordat of that year. Yet the majority of the clergy and laity in the Church Representative Council insisted on maintaining the Church schools both for the prestige of having a Church schools system and, especially in the case of High Churchmen, in having atmosphere schools for the effective indoctrination of children in particular

beliefs and doctrines; so the Church Representative Council rejected the concordat.

It was mainly the influence of the High Church Party which prevented a settlement of the education conflict in 1908. Their conspicuous role in advocating the cause of the Church schools accounted considerably for the suspicion with which the Nonconformists, the Church Association (Evangelical) and the general public regarded the Church's motives in supporting the Bill of 1902, which suspicion the Kenyon-Slaney clause was designed to allay. But the initiative, leadership and determination of the Anglo-Catholics strengthened the Church in the struggle for maintaining denominational education. Paradoxically they emphasized the need for atmosphere schools, while offering facilities for the teaching of Anglican doctrines in the board schools and for Nonconformist teaching in the Church schools as a settlement of the grievances of both Anglicans and Nonconformists. However, they rejected the Education Bill of 1908, which offered facilities for Anglican teaching in all schools, ostensibly because it did not allow denominational teaching equality with undenominational or Bible teaching. But the real reason was that they wanted "atmosphere schools", because they needed more extensive denominational teaching than could be offered by regulated hours of religious teaching within a state system. They wanted a bonafide denominational system supported totally out of public funds. Anglo-Catholicism was so different from Protestant Nonconformity that Bible teaching supplemented by denominational teaching was inadequate for them. The influence of the

High Church Party precluded a settlement of the education question based on the similarity of Anglicanism and Nonconformity in which Bible teaching satisfactory to both Anglicans and Nonconformists would be part of the curriculum of the schools, while the Anglicans would receive supplementary lessons in the catechism.

The education conflict was aggravated by politics. The Conservative Party, a traditional supporter of the Church of England, was largely responsible for the survival of the Church schools, especially during the period 1906 to 1910 when the Conservative House of Lords prevented the Liberal majority government from establishing complete state control of the rate-aided Church schools. But the attitudes of the politicians tended to increase the differences between the religious groups rather than conciliate them. The Conservative Government affronted Nonconformists' feelings by neglecting to consult them about the formation of the Education Bill of 1902 and failed to reach a compromise with them while enacting the Bill. The Liberal Party supported the Nonconformists' educational policy and intensified the conflict by proposing the Nonconformist Bill of 1906, though Runciman in 1908 worked with both Anglican and Nonconformist leaders and achieved a temporary concordat on the education question. The Conservative and Anglican House of Lords made the Bill of 1902 more objectionable to the Nonconformists and destroyed the Bill of 1906, causing the education conflict to merge into the constitutional conflict between the Lords and Commons. Undoubtedly had the politicians worked to restrain their religious constituencies rather than acceding to their most extreme demands, or encouraging them to make such demands, a settlement of the education

conflict would have been easier to attain.

As it was, the education question was not settled during the first decade of the twentieth century. As a result children who attended the Church schools had to accept facilities and buildings inferior to those enjoyed by the children attending council schools, because the Church could not afford the expense of repairing the buildings and so forth. Moreover, as the council schools increased and Church schools declined, fewer Anglican children received instruction in the Anglican faith within school hours. This paralleled the decline of the Church and the growth of secularism, making it more difficult for the Church to maintain an important role in national education. Thus both education, per se, and religious education suffered because no settlement was made of the problem of the Church schools which would have guaranteed religious teaching in all schools and solved the perpetual financial difficulties of the Church schools.

APPENDIX I

Comparison of Church with Board Schools in Number of Schools, Average Attendance, Parliamentary Grant and Expenditure per Pupil

Sources are given on the following page.

Type	No. of Schools	Average Attendance	Total Annual Parliamentary Grants	Average Parliamentary Grants per Pupil	Average Expenditure Per Pupil
1870					
Church of England Schools	6,382	844,344	£476,284	8s 9d	£1 5s 7½d
Board Schools	NO BOARD SCHOOLS IN 1870				
1880					
Church of England Schools	11,416	1,471,615	£1,235,103	15s 3 3/4d	£1 14s 10½d
Board Schools	3,433	769,252	£627,081	15s 7 3/4d	£2 1s 11 3/4d
1894					
Church of England Schools	11,906	1,847,668	£2,753,436 +	18s 2½d x	£1 18s ½d
Board Schools	5,801	1,777,787	£2,653,656 +	19s 1 3/4d x	£2 8s 9 3/4d
1899					
Church of England Schools	11,872	1,893,824	£3,647,417 o	20s 5d x	£2 4s 11d
Board Schools	5,758	2,137,805	£3,400,627 o	21s 1d x	£2 15s 7d

+ Includes fee grant o Includes fee grant and aid grant
x Does not include fee grant and/or aid grant

Sources for Figures in Appendix I

Parliamentary Papers 1871, Vol. XXII, C-406, "Report of the Committee of Council on Education, 1870-71", p. 161 (Total Annual Parliamentary Grants and Average Parliamentary Grants per Pupil), p. 600 (No. of Schools and Average Attendance).

(P.P.) 1881, Vol. XXII, C-2948-1, "Report of the Committee of Council on Education, 1880-81", p. 152 (Total Annual Parliamentary Grants and Average Parliamentary Grants per Pupil), p. 192 (Average Expenditure per Pupil, 1870-1880), p. 535 (No. of Schools and Average Attendance).

(P.P.) 1895, Vol. XXVII, C-776-1, "Report of the Committee of Council on Education, 1894-95", p. 742 (Total Annual Parliamentary Grants and Average Parliamentary Grants per Pupil, No. of Schools and Average Attendance), p. 770 (Average Expenditure per Pupil).

(P.P.) 1900, Vol. LXV, C-109, "Report of the Committee of Council on Education, 1899", p. 98 (Total Annual Parliamentary Grants and Average Parliamentary Grants per Pupil), p. 102 (No. of Schools and Average Attendance), p. 152 (Average Expenditure per Pupil in Church of England Schools), p. 224 (Average Expenditure per Pupil in Board Schools).

APPENDIX II

Comparison of Church of England with Board Schools in Local Income received from School Fees, Voluntary Contributions and Local Rates

Sources are given on the following page.

Type	Annual School Fee Per Pupil	Total Voluntary Contributions	Average Per Pupil of Voluntary Contributions	Total From School Board Rates (Local Rates)	Average Per Pupil From Local Rates
1870					
Church of England Schools	7s 9d	£329,826	7s 5 3/4d		
Board Schools		NO BOARD SCHOOLS IN 1870			
1880					
Church of England Schools	10s 9½d	£587,211	7s 9 3/4d		
Board Schools	9s 0d			£726,000	18s 7d
1894					
Church of England Schools	1s 8 3/4d	£622,034	6s 8½d		
Board Schools	0s 5½d			£1,724,286	18s 4 3/4d
1899					
Church of England Schools	1s 4d	£603,241	6s 4d		
Board Schools	0s 5d			£2,704,504	£1 3s 9½d

Sources for Figures in Appendix II

Parliamentary Papers 1871, Vol. XXII, C-406, "Report of the Committee of Council on Education, 1870-71", p. 161 (Annual School Fee per Pupil in Church Schools and Average per Pupil of Voluntary Contributions).

(P.P.) 1881, Vol. XXII, C-2948-I, "Report of the Committee of Council on Education, 1880-81", p. 152 (Annual School Fee per Pupil and Average per Pupil of Voluntary Contributions).

(P.P.) 1895, Vol. XXVII, C-776-I, "Report of the Committee of Council on Education, 1894-95, p. 24 (Annual School Fee per Pupil and Average per Pupil of Voluntary Contributions).

(P.P.) 1900, Vol. LXV, C-109, "Report of the Committee of Council on Education, 1899", p. 152 (Annual School Fee in Church Schools and Average per Pupil of Voluntary Contributions), p. 226 (Annual School Fee per Pupil in Board Schools and Average per Pupil from Local Rates, 1870-1899), p. 227 (Total Voluntary Contributions and Total from Local Rates, 1870-1899).

APPENDIX III

No. of Schools and Average Attendance (1902-1911)

Taken from the "Return of the Education Department (1911)", Cd-6002, as published in The Times, December 18, 1911, p. 10.

YEARS:	1902	1911
Church Schools, No. of:	11,711	10,952
Attendance	1,927,623	1,750,094
Catholic Schools, No. of:	1,056	1,074
Attendance	269,191	295,802
Council Schools, No. of: (Former Board Schools)	5,878	8,006
Attendance	2,369,980	3,164,391

APPENDIX IV

Resolutions of the Conference of the Convocations of York and Canterbury, July, 1901

1. "That all schools be financed, as far as the cost of maintenance exclusive of repairs in the structure of voluntary schools is concerned, out of public funds whether Imperial or local, and that it be no condition of participation in these funds by voluntary schools, whether any form of religious instruction be or be not taught in the schools.

2. That funds needed for capital expenditure on the school buildings, as well as for necessary extensions, be provided by the denomination to which the schools belong, but that the managers be not liable for any other expenditures.

3. That the government of every school, and especially the appointment and dismissal of the teachers, be left in the hands of the present committee managers, with the addition of certain members, appointed by, or under rules made by the local authority, such additional members not to exceed 1/3 of the whole number.

4. That whenever a reasonable number of parents desire that religious instruction, in accordance with their own beliefs, should be given to their children, opportunity for such instruction shall be secured, provided that this can be done without expense to the managers.

5. That in view of the grave issues involved in the conclusions arrived at in the foregoing resolutions a united effort be made by Churchmen to urge upon His Majesty's Government the necessity of introducing and pressing, during the coming session, legislation on the lines therein indicated."

Resolutions are found in Allen, op. cit., pp. 151-152.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

A. Government Documents

Parliamentary Papers 1871, Vol. XXII, C-406, "Report of the Committee of Council on Education, 1870-71".

(P.P.) 1877, Vol. XXIX, C-1780-1, "Report of the Committee of Council on Education, 1876-77".

(P.P.) 1881, Vol. XXII, C-2948-1, "Report of the Committee of Council on Education, 1880-81".

(P.P.) 1886, Vol. XXV, C-1863, "Report I of the Cross Commission on the Working of the Elementary Education Acts for England and Wales".

(P.P.) 1887, Vol. XXIX, C-50656, "Report II of the Cross Commission".

(P.P.) 1887, Vol. XXX, C-5158, "Report III of the Cross Commission".

(P.P.) 1888, Vol. XXXV, C-5485, "Report IV of the Cross Commission".

(P.P.) 1890, Vol. XXVIII, C-609-I, "The New Code, 1890, of the Minutes of the Education Department".

(P.P.) 1894, Vol. LXVI, C-6741-I, "Report of the Committee of Council on Education, 1891-92".

(P.P.) 1894, Vol. LXVI, C-7320, "Report of Schools Warned, etc., 1893-94".

(P.P.) 1895, Vol. XXVII, C-7776-I, "Report of the Committee of Council on Education, 1894-95".

(P.P.) 1895, Vol. LXXVI, C-7653, "The Code, 1895, of the Minutes of the Education Department".

(P.P.) 1900, Vol. LXV, C-109, "Report of the Committee of Council on Education, 1899".

Hansard, 3rd series, Vol. CXCIX, 1870; 4th series, Vols. XI, XII, 1896; Vols. CV, CVII, CVIII, CX, CXI, CXII, CXIII, CXIV, CXVI, CXVII, 1902; Vols. CXXI, CXXII, 1903; Vols. CLII, CLV, CLVI, CLVII, CLVIII, CLIX, CLXII, CLXVI, CLXVII, 1906.

B. Newspapers and Periodicals: (All London publications unless otherwise indicated)

The Annual Register, 1870-1908.

The Commonwealth Review, 1897-1908.

The Contemporary Review, 1870-1908.

The Church Quarterly Review, 1900-1908.

The Church Times, 1895-1908.

The Edinburgh Review (Edinburgh), 1890-1902.

The Liberal Magazine, 1900-1908.

The Manchester Guardian (Manchester), 1890-1908.

The Morning Post (Birmingham), 1906.

The New Liberal Review, 1903.

The Nineteenth Century, 1880-1908.

The Pilot, 1901-1907.

The Spectator, 1870-1908.

The Tablet, 1902, 1904, 1911.

The Times (London), 1870-1908.

C. Articles:

St. Asaph, Bishop of, "Educational Concordats", The Nineteenth Century, Vol. LV, No. 1, 1904, pp. 40-46.

Alderly, Lord Stanley of, "Education and the New Government", The Nineteenth Century, Vol. LIX, No. 1, 1906, pp. 377-386.

———, "The Education Crises: Points for Elucidation in the Bill", The Nineteenth Century, Vol. LXIII, 1908, pp. 534-49.

Bray, the Vicar of, "Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman's Opportunity", The Fortnightly Review, Vol. LXXXV, 1906, pp. 228-37.

Bompas, A.M., and Smith, J.C. "The Education Controversy", The Fortnightly Review, Vol. LXXXIII, 1903, pp. 448-52.

Birrell, Augustine "Elementary Education: A Retrospect and an Outlook", The Independent Review, Vol. II, 1902, pp. 74-91.

Bryce, James "A Few Words on the Education Bill", The Nineteenth Century, Vol. LI, No. 1, 1902, pp. 849-72.

Brereton, C. "An Educational Bill of Settlement", The Fortnightly Review, Vol. LXXVII, 1902, pp. 821-29.

Clifford, Dr. John "Mr. Balfour's Defense of the Education Act of 1902: Questions of Conscience", The New Liberal Review, Vol. III, 1903, pp. 13-35.

Dale, R. W. "Cardinal Manning's Demand on the Rates", The Nineteenth Century, Vol. XIII, No. 1, 1883, pp. 58-75.

Evans, Howard "Religious Statistics of England and Wales", The Contemporary Review, Vol. LXXI, 1897, pp. 266-79.

"The Sects", The Contemporary Review Vol. LXXI, 1897, pp. 418-23.

Eversley, Lord "The House of Lords and the Education Bill", The Nineteenth Century, Vol. LX, No. 2, 1906, pp. 1017-1026.

Fitch, Sir J.G. "Religion in Primary Schools", The Nineteenth Century, Vol. XXVI, No. 1, 1894, pp. 52-59.

"The Education Problem", The Nineteenth Century, Vol. LI, No. 1, 1902, pp. 24-38.

"Some Possible Amendments to the Education Bill", The Nineteenth Century, Vol. LI, No. 1, 1902, pp. 952-65.

Fletcher, Archdeacon "The Renewed Struggle for the Schools", The Nineteenth Century, Vol. LI, 1902, pp. 540-49.

Gorst, Sir John.

"The Education Bill", The Nineteenth Century, Vol. LII, No. 2, 1902, pp. 576-90.

Henson, Canon Hensley.

"The Education Crisis: A Cross-Bench View", The Nineteenth Century, Vol. LXIII, No. 1, 1908, pp. 550-67.

Hereford, Bishop of.

"A Plea for Mutual Concessions", The Nineteenth Century, Vol. LII, No. 2, 1902, pp. 591-601.

Horne, Rev. C. Silvestor.

"Passive Resistance", The New Liberal Review, Vol. IV., 1903, pp. 428-35.

Hughes, Rev. John.

"The Proposed Education Concordat: A Nonconformist Reply", The Nineteenth Century, Vol. LV, No. 1, 1904, pp. 387-401.

Kekewich, Sir George.

"The Church and the Education Bill", The Contemporary Review, Vol. LXXXIII, 1903, pp. 779-86.

"The Amendment of the Education Acts", The Contemporary Review, Vol. LXXXIV, 1903, pp. 457-68.

Lathbury, D.C.

"The Clergy and the Education Act", The Nineteenth Century, Vol. LIII, No. I, 1903, pp. 1-13.

"How Long Will the Education Act Last?" The Nineteenth Century, Vol. LV, No. 1, 1904, pp. 47-59.

"Educational Conciliation: An Appeal To the Clergy", The Nineteenth Century, Vol. LVI, No. 2, 1904, pp. 67-74.

Lloyd-George, David.

"The New Education Schemes", The Contemporary Review, Vol. LXXXIII, 1903, pp. 569-77.

Macnamara, Dr. T.J.

"The Next Session's Education Bill", The Fortnightly Review, Vol. LXX, 1901, pp. 986-94.

Macnamara, Dr. T.J. "The New Education Act at Work", The Fortnightly Review, Vol. LXXIX, 1903, pp. 88-89.

"The Education Act in the New Parliament", The Fortnightly Review, Vol. LXXX, 1903, pp. 800-809.

Manchester, Bishop of. "The Lords and the Education Bill", The Nineteenth Century, Vol. LX, No. 2, 1906, pp. 478-84.

"An Extremist's View of Educational Compromises", The Nineteenth Century, Vol. LXIII, No. 1, 1908, pp. 697-706.

Manning, Cardinal. "Is the Education Act of 1870 a Just Law?", The Nineteenth Century, Vol. XII, No. 2, 1882, pp. 958-968.

Manning, Cardinal, & Gregory, Canon. "Religion and the Rates", The Nineteenth Century, Vol. XIII, No. 1, 1883, pp. 314-337.

Nicoll, Dr. Robertson. "The Education Bill and the Free Churches", The Contemporary Review, Vol. LXXXII, 1902, pp. 632-47.

Paul, Herbert. "The Government and the Opposition", The Nineteenth Century, Vol. LIX, No. 1, 1906, pp. 1054-1060.

"What Will the Lords Do?", The Nineteenth Century, Vol. LX, 1906, pp. 1027-1034.

Riach, M.T. "Lessons from North Leeds", The New Liberal Review, Vol. II, 1903, pp. 167-71.

Ripon, Bishop of. "The Education Bill", The Fortnightly Review, Vol. LXXXV, 1906, pp. 1001-1015.

Rogers, Rev. Guiness. "The Nonconformists and the Education Act", The Nineteenth Century, Vol. LIII, No. 1, 1903, pp. 14-25.

"Educational Concordat Not Compromise: A Reply", The Fortnightly Review, Vol. LXXXV, 1906, pp. 332-46.

Spender, J.A. "This Far on the Education Bill", The Contemporary Review, Vol. LXXXII, 1902, pp. 808-821.

Stanley, Lyluph "Religion at the London School Board", The Nineteenth Century, Vol. XXXIV, No. 2, 1894, pp. 739-752.

Westminster, Archbishop of "The Peers and the Education Bill", The Nineteenth Century, Vol. LX, No. 2, 1906, pp. 835-40.

A Symposium. Articles by R. B. Haldane, Sidney Webb, et al., The Nineteenth Century, Vol. LII, No. 2, 1902, pp. 602-624.

For and Against the Education Bill. Articles by Dr. T. J. Macnamara, Viscount Halifax, et al., The Nineteenth Century, Vol. LIX, No. 1, 1906, pp. 705-762.

The Report on Ecclesiastical Discipline. Articles by Lady Wimborne, Canon Henson, and Herbert Paul, The Nineteenth Century, Vol. LX, No. 2, 1906, pp. 196-201.

The Education Act at Work: A Handbook for Free Church Workers. London: National Council of Evangelical Free Churches, 1903.

The Education Question from a Churchman's Point of View. Report on Elementary Education addressed to the Leeds' Rural Decanal Chapter, 1899. The Church Quarterly Review, Vol. XLIX, 1899-1900, pp. 427-41.

D. Contemporary Biography:

Carr, J.A. The Life of Archbishop Benson. London: The National Society, 1958.

Griffith-Boscawen, Sir Arthur Fourteen Years in Parliament. London: John Murray, 1907.

Sandford, E.C. The Life of Fredrick Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury. London: Macmillan, 1906.

Hughes, D.P. The Life of Rev. Hugh Price Hughes. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1905.

Secondary Sources

A. Articles:

Armytage, W.H.C. "A. J. Mundella, Vice-President of the Council and the Schools' Question, 1880-85", The English Historical Review, Vol. LXIII, 1948, pp. 52-82.

Howard, C.H.D. "The Parnell Manifesto of 21 November, 1885, and the Schools' Question", The English Historical Review, Vol. LXII, 1947, pp. 42-51.

Pugh, D.R. "The Education Act: The Search for Compromise", The British Journal of Educational Studies, Vol. XVI, 1968, pp. 164-178.

Rogers, Alan "Churches and Children - A Study of the Controversy over the 1902 Education Act", The British Journal of Educational Studies, Vol. VIII, No. 1, 1959, pp. 29-51.

B. Books:

Adams, W. S. Edwardian Heritage: A Study in British History, 1901-1906. London: Frederick Muller, 1949.

Adamson, J. W. English Education, 1789-1967. Cambridge at the University Press, 1930.

Addison, W. B. Religious Equality in Modern England, 1714-1914. London: Macmillan, 1944.

Allen, B. M. Sir Robert Morant. London: Macmillan, 1934.

Bell, G. K. A. Randell Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury. London: Oxford University Press, 3rd ed. 1952.

Birrell, Augustine Things Past Redress, London: Faber and Faber, 1937.

Blake, Robert The Conservative Party from Peel to Churchill. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1970.

Brown, C. F. K. The Church's Part in Education, 1833-1941, with Special Reference to the Work of the National Society. London: S.P.C.K., 1942.

Burgess, H. J. Enterprise in Education. London: The National Society, 1958.

Cecil, Lady Gwendolen — Life of Robert Marquis of Salisbury London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1971.

Chadwick, Owen — The Victorian Church. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1966.

Cornford, J.P. — "The Parliamentary Foundations of Hotel Cecil", in Robertson Robson, ed. Ideas and Institutions of Victorian Britain. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1967.

Cruickshank, Marjorie — Church and State in English Education, 1870 to the Present Day. London: Macmillan, 1964.

Dent, H.C. — A Century of Growth in English Education. London: Macmillan, 1964.

Edwards, A.G. — Memories. London: John Murray, 1927.

Evans, William and Claridge, William — James Hirst Hollowell and the Movement for Civic Control in Education. Manchester: The Northern Counties Education League, 1911.

Dugdale, Blanche E.C. — Arthur James Balfour. London: Hutchinson, 1934.

Fisher, H.A.L. — James Bryce. New York: Macmillan, 1927.

Garbett, Cyril — The Claims of the Church of England. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1947.

Gosden, P.H.J.H. — The Development of Educational Administration in England and Wales. Oxford: Basil Blackwood, 1966.

Griffith-Boscawen, Sir Arthur — Memories. London: John Murray, 1925.

Guttsman, W.L. — The British Political Elite. London: MacGibbon and Kee, 1963.

Hearnshaw, F.J.C. — Conservatism in England. New York: Howard. Fertig, 1967.

_____ ed. — Edwardian England, 1901-1910. New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1st ed. 1933.

Halevy Elie — A History of the English People in the Nineteenth Century, Vol. V: Imperialism and the Rise of Labour, 1895-1908. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1961 ed.

Henson, H.H. — The Church of England. Cambridge at the University Press, 1939.

Kirk-Smith, H. — William Thompson Archbishop of York, 1819-1890. London: S.P.C.K., 1958.

Knox, E.A. — Reminiscences of an Octogenarian, 1847-1934 London: Hutchinson, 1934.

Marchant, Sir John — Dr. John Clifford C.H., Life Letters and Reminiscences. London: Cassell, 1924.

Morgan, K.O. — Wales in British Politics, 1868-1914. Cardiff: University of Wales, 1963.

_____ — The Age of Lloyd George. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1971.

Newton, Lord — Lord Lansdowne, A Biography. London: Macmillan, 1929.

Oxford and Asquith, Earl of — Memoirs and Reflections. London: Cassell, 1926.

Owen, Frank — Tempestuous Journey: The Life of the Rt. Hon. David Lloyd George. London: Hutchinson, 1958.

Rowland, Peter — The Last Liberal Government. London: Barrie and Rockliff, 1968.

Russell, A.K. — The Liberal Landslide: The General Election of 1906. London: David and Charles, 1973.

Sacks, Benjamin — The Religious Issue in the State Schools of England and Wales, 1902-1914. Alburquerque: The University of New Mexico Press, 1961.

Simon, Brian — Education and the Labour Movement. London: Lawrence and Winhart, 1965.

Spender, J.A. — The Life of the Rt. Hon. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1923.

Stenton, M. and Vincent, J. eds. McCalmont's Parliamentary Poll Book of all Elections, 1831-1918. Brighton: Harvester Press, 8th ed. 1971.

C. Unpublished Sources:

Clarke, P.L.P. "The Education Act of 1902: A Study of its Background, Scope and Legislative Problems" Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1964.

Foreman, Henry "Nonconformity and Education in England and Wales, 1870-1902". Unpublished M.A. thesis London University, 1967.