





LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS

1917

1918

1919
1920
1921
1922
1923
1924
1925
1926
1927
1928
1929
1930
1931
1932
1933
1934
1935
1936
1937
1938
1939
1940
1941
1942
1943
1944
1945
1946
1947
1948
1949
1950
1951
1952
1953
1954
1955
1956
1957
1958
1959
1960
1961
1962
1963
1964
1965
1966
1967
1968
1969
1970
1971
1972
1973
1974
1975
1976
1977
1978
1979
1980
1981
1982
1983
1984
1985
1986
1987
1988
1989
1990
1991
1992
1993
1994
1995
1996
1997
1998
1999
2000
2001
2002
2003
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
2014
2015
2016
2017
2018
2019
2020
2021
2022
2023
2024
2025
2026
2027
2028
2029
2030
2031
2032
2033
2034
2035
2036
2037
2038
2039
2040
2041
2042
2043
2044
2045
2046
2047
2048
2049
2050
2051
2052
2053
2054
2055
2056
2057
2058
2059
2060
2061
2062
2063
2064
2065
2066
2067
2068
2069
2070
2071
2072
2073
2074
2075
2076
2077
2078
2079
2080
2081
2082
2083
2084
2085
2086
2087
2088
2089
2090
2091
2092
2093
2094
2095
2096
2097
2098
2099
2100

1917

U. W. J. C. Talbot 12
L.C.

(PRIVATE IMPRESSION.)

with Dr. Wordsworth's
Comments

REPORT OF THE SPEECH
OF
THE REV. DR. WORDSWORTH,
AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF
THE NATIONAL SOCIETY,
JUNE VI, MDCCCXLIX,
ON THE
PRESENT ENFORCEMENT
OF
THE "MANAGEMENT CLAUSES."

LONDON :
GILBERT AND RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

S P E E C H,

&c.

MY LORD ARCHBISHOP, AND GENTLEMEN,—

It is with very mixed feelings that I rise to second the present Resolution*. It was by an unexpected concurrence of circumstances that I was brought into connexion with this Resolution at the last annual meeting of this Society; and my friend Mr. DENISON will bear me witness that he has been strongly urged by me to commit it, on the present occasion, to abler hands. But he has represented to me, that if our names, which have been once coupled together in this Resolution, were now disjoined, it might, perhaps, be imagined by some that there was a want of unanimity among the supporters of this proposition, which, we trust, is far from being the case. Feeling also much admiration for Mr. Denison's untiring energy in the cause of education, I have not thought myself at liberty to shrink from the task, which was not sought by

* See below, p. 39. *ho*

me in the first instance, and from which, on many accounts, I should have been glad to be relieved.

It will be my earnest endeavour, my Lord, in the observations which will now be made, to abstain from all personal topics; and I trust that nothing may fall from me which may disturb the harmony of this meeting; and deeply, indeed, would it grieve me, if any thing should escape me which could, in any degree, be suspected of being inconsistent with the heartfelt reverence which is due to your Grace's exalted office and character, and to that of the Right Reverend Prelates by whom your Grace is surrounded.

I. In the first place, my Lord, let me premise a few words *in reply* to the *objections* which have been raised in certain quarters to the present Resolution.

1. It is alleged by some that this Resolution expresses the *feelings of a party*. This, my Lord, we cannot allow. If I may venture to speak of myself,—I never have belonged, and it is my hope that I never shall belong, to any party but that of the CHURCH OF ENGLAND; and the tolerant spirit of that Church will restrain me from retorting this charge, and from imputing motives to others who may happen to differ from me in opinion, and who may allege surmises instead of adducing proofs.

But the question is, my Lord, Does this Resolution speak the language of *a party*? Happily, we may here appeal for a reply to your Grace and to



the Right Reverend Prelates near you. We may appeal to the *Committee of this Society*, over which your Grace presides. Their last letters to the Committee of Council, announce that the spirit embodied in this Resolution is *no spirit of a party*, but pervades England. Allow me, my Lord, to read some paragraphs from one of these letters.

“When the clauses were originally framed, the Committee agreed to recommend them, upon a distinct understanding that the promoters of education throughout the country should be at liberty to select the clause best adapted to their own case; and they have expressed, on various occasions, their desire that applicants for aid should have the same liberty of choice, as to the constitution of their schools, which had previously been conceded to them both by the Committee of Council and the National Society. *To the withdrawal of that concession on the part of their Lordships, and to the enforcement of a particular clause as a condition of receiving public aid, must be attributed, in a great measure, that jealousy of a Central Control, and those apprehensions with respect to Government interference, which have been so decidedly expressed in various parts of the country during the last few months.* It would no doubt have been a great advantage (as the Committee of the National Society have acknowledged) if Management Clauses could have been so framed as to be adopted by general consent. But it has become more and more apparent, during the progress of this correspondence, that the clauses which have hitherto been proposed are not generally acceptable, and that *the attempt to enforce them has caused serious embarrassment*; and it may reasonably be doubted whether, in the present state of the question relating to National Education, it be expedient *to impose* upon the founders of schools any system of management

which shall not be open to modification by competent authority at some future time.

“In these and all their previous suggestions, the Committee have endeavoured to point out practical improvements, and they have given warning of difficulties likely to interfere with the attainment of the end which they have at heart in common with the Committee of Council. But they feel that they should not fully discharge their duty in this respect, if they did not advert to the very *widely-spread feeling of uneasiness arising from the uncertainty of the basis* on which all arrangements relative to the distribution of Parliamentary grants for the purposes of education at present rest.” (*Letter dated March 17, 1849.*)

“Jealousy of Central Control,” and “apprehensions which have been so decidedly expressed in various parts of the country;” “a wide-spread feeling of uneasiness”—such are the words of the Committee of this Society: and no one will charge them with a desire to exaggerate in this matter. And if any one now imputes this Resolution to a party, we refer him to the Committee for a reply.

2. Next, it is alleged by some, that this Resolution is founded on a desire to *exclude the laity* of the Church from the management of Church Schools. My Lord, let us here make a distinction. *If* by *laity* of the Church are meant any, who, professing themselves Churchmen, would undermine the doctrine and discipline of the Church: *if* by *laity* are meant any who would banish the Church Catechism from Church Schools, in defiance of the Charter of this Society, and of the solemn

exhortation given by every Pastor, at every baptism, in every church in this country; then I for one *plead guilty to the charge*. I do, indeed, regard it as a solemn duty to endeavour, to the best of my power, to resist the intrusion of *such* a laity as that into the management of Church Schools.

But, my Lord, *if* by *laity* are meant (as all language and history teach us *ought* to be meant) the λαός, the chosen *people*, the *faithful* members, and communicants of the Church, then, we boldly affirm, it is the cause of *such a laity* as that, which we are now pleading—it is their cause, and it is the cause of their children; and it is *on their aid that we rely*; and if we now betray our Church Schools into the hands of a *pseudo-laity*, then we should be sacrificing the highest interests of the *true laity*, and of the Church herself.

3. Next, it is said by some, that in proposing this Resolution we are bringing the *Church* into *collision* with the *State*, and are acting in a manner inconsistent with our duty to our civil rulers.

My Lord, it has long been my deliberate conviction, that, whenever the State of this realm is severed from the Church, then the sun of England sets. The example of continental nations shows, what *our own* fate will be, if we proceed further than we have already done in the unhappy work of dissolution. But, if a Church and State are to remain united, two things are necessary. It is not enough

that the Church be loyal; the *State must be religious*. It must refrain from profanely meddling with what does not belong to it. The State must not attempt to do the work of the Church. It must enable and encourage the Church to do the work of the Church, in the way of the Church; otherwise the Church cannot aid it. By becoming its slave, the Church will be useless to it. The State, by crippling the Church, will be *felo de se*—it will destroy itself.

Therefore, my Lord, in contending that the Church should be left free to act as a Church in the great work of education, we are contending for the maintenance of that efficiency by which the Church most benefits the State.

Besides, let us ask, what is it, my Lord, which has preserved *England*, when so many other nations have been convulsed by revolution? Our education. And *by whom* has that education been administered? Mainly, by *the Church*. Why then should we revolutionize *that*, which has saved us from revolution? Why substitute in its place a system of instruction, which has involved other countries in anarchy and ruin?

Who then are the *true* friends of the State? Which of the two parties are the *most loyal* to our civil rulers? they who would maintain that sound ancient system of education by which England *is what she is?* or, they who would send us to France

or to Prussia for a new system of instruction, which has made socialists in politics, and sceptics in religion, and has banished Monarchs and Ministers of State, and overthrown all government and law?

4. Another objection to this Resolution is urged by some; or, rather, it is an objection to the *proposal* of it in *this place*. It is inexpedient (it is said) for the Church, and for this Society, that serious questions should be debated at large meetings like the present, in which the passions may be inflamed, and the members may be involved in controversial discussions, unfavourable to the peace and prosperity of this Society and the Church.

I readily confess, my Lord, that, abstractedly speaking, I feel much sympathy with this objection. Few of us, probably, who are here present, would not wish, *if the choice were granted us*, to be now employed in the peaceful discharge of our daily duties, rather than to be engaged in the discussions of this day. But, my Lord, “is there not a cause?” *Is the choice allowed us? Is it allowed us as citizens? as Christians? above all, as clergymen?*

I answer, No!

There is now a crisis—a pressing emergency, a stringent necessity—which requires us, yes, which compels even those among us who most love peace, to quit our homes, and to assemble here. The present question, all allow, is a most important one. It ought to be discussed some where; and where? and by whom? By the Church in her synods? be

it so. But *where are* her synods? Where are her diocesan synods? Where are her provincial? Where is her Convocation? I do not venture to say any thing of the expediency of reviving that assembly; but Church questions ought to be deliberated by the Church some where; and it is surely very unjust first to close the doors of our synods, and then to complain that we do not close our own lips in all other places.

And next,—To-day we are met “in a lawful assembly.” The Charter of this Society provides, that general meetings for considering the affairs of the Society should be held annually, and that advertisements of such meetings should be inserted, a fortnight beforehand, in the public newspapers. It courts publicity. We have been summoned to attend here. We are now acting according to our Charter; and if there ever was an occasion for the application of that law of our Charter, it is the present.

Perhaps, too, my Lord, it may be added, that the meeting of *last* year has not been without its beneficial results. It announced to the Committee of this Society, it announced to the Committee of Council, it announced to the Country at large, that a very large and most respectable body of the members of this Society feel an *invincible repugnance* to the *compulsory enforcement* of the Management Clauses; and so it strengthened the hands of the Committee of this Society in their communications

with the Committee of Council: and it may be hoped, my Lord, that the *meeting of this day* will produce more than the same effect; especially, too, if this present Resolution should be honoured with your Grace's approval, and with that of the Committee of this Society, and of this meeting at large.

Such, my Lord, is a brief reply to the allegations urged by some against the present Resolution. Let me sum up this part of my observations, by referring to a very striking document in my hands.

It contains the recorded judgment of the Deputation appointed by the ESTABLISHED CHURCH OF SCOTLAND in its GENERAL ASSEMBLY, to consider the subject now before us, which this document calls "The GOVERNMENT SCHEME of EDUCATION."

After commenting on that SCHEME, it closes with the following memorable words, which deserve the serious attention of this meeting, and which form a sufficient reply to all the allegations urged against the present Resolution:—

"There is ground for awakened attention to the way in which ultimately the plan of School *superintendence and inspection* by the Committee of Council, may operate on the great objects which the Church of Scotland has ever had in view by her schools. She has her own modes of a plain Bible instruction for the godly upbringing of youth: and it does require serious consideration how far there is the risk, upon the terms of the pecuniary grant as now pro-

posed, that *inspection* may advance to interference, and interference, under the guidance of the hand that aids, may proceed to a control which shall at last shape both the *matter of instruction and its form*.

“It is the subject of grave concern, what prospectively is to be the result of a system, the tendency of which is to centralize the whole affairs of a nation’s instruction—to place the support of teachers, the patronage of pupil apprentices, and the *framing of education* through the medium of inspectors,—all in the hands of a *board which partakes much of the character of an irresponsible board*. The tendency in such a case is to have every thing at last centred in *one person by whose views* the whole course is *formed and directed*.

“If the best system and most acceptable details were adopted, something essential to the completeness of any plan would be still wanting, so long as, unbased on the legal security of the *constitution of the country*, it is liable, any one year, to be subverted by the same voice that, in the previous year, had voted the pecuniary supply which gave it being.

“Signed in the name of the Deputation by

“WILLIAM MUIR, D.D.

Convener.

“*London, 4th July, 1848.*”

Such, my Lord, is the language of the Church of Scotland on the question now before us.

Now, let me ask, will any one venture to say that this is the language of a *party*? Are these the words of agitation? do they proceed from a desire to exclude the laity from National Schools? do they arise from disaffection to the Government? or from a wish to make a schism between the spiritual

and civil powers? No one will dare to bring these charges against the CHURCH of SCOTLAND. Let not, then, these charges be brought against *us*. Doubtless many who are here present will admire the vigour and clearness with which the dangerous tendencies of the New SCHEME of INSTRUCTION are characterized in this document, and will feel an earnest desire that we of the CHURCH of ENGLAND may now imitate the Church of Scotland, and speak on the same subject in language equally explicit and equally true.

II. I proceed now to the positive part of the argument.

Why do we protest against the present compulsory imposition of the "MANAGEMENT CLAUSES?"

A distinction must be drawn here.

The Management Clauses are one thing: their *compulsory imposition* is another.

For argument's sake, let the Management Clauses be not objectionable in themselves; still this does not in the least degree affect the question now in debate, which is,

Ought we to submit to the enforcement of these clauses by the Committee of Council?

(1.) My first reply to this question concerns the nature of the *authority from which they emanate*—the "COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL FOR EDUCATION."

However well qualified the Committee of Council may be to serve the original fiscal purposes of

its institution, it is scarcely possible to imagine any body of persons *less* competent to *legislate* (and practically they *do* legislate) in the great matter of education. This is not attributable to the eminent individuals who now compose, or may have formerly composed, that Board, but it arises from the constitution of the Board itself.

First of all, they are only a *very small body*. We may imagine some august conclave, when we hear their sounding title. But this is a mistake. They are *four* councillors and a secretary*. What should we say, if a dean and his four canons were to legislate for England, on education?

Next, the Committee is not a permanent Board, but consists of four persons, whose official existence depends on the ebb and flow of parliamentary majorities.

And what is the consequence?

The Committee of Council is tempted to treat education as a question of party interest; and so the great cause of education, instead of being fixed upon a solid basis, is turned adrift on an Euripus of politics.

Or else another result takes place, equally disastrous.

Ours, my Lord, is an age of Commissions; and government by *moveable Commissioners* is govern-

* Originally five; but the fifth, the Master of the Mint, does not usually act.

ment by *immoveable Secretaries*. The four members of the Committee of Council are *ephemeral*: but they have a *perpetual* Secretary. The tenure of *their* places is precarious; *he* “*sedet æternumque sedebit.*” They, as Ministers of State, have many *other* engrossing cares; *he* has but *one* care; the Council is his all in all; and he is all in all to the Council. *He is* the Committee of Council. And so, while we fondly imagine that we enjoy the freedom of a *representative* Government, we are held in the grasp of an invisible dictator.

Can we have any confidence in a Board, so constituted as this, legislating on Education? No, surely, we cannot.

(2.) Secondly, we protest against the exercise of the power claimed by the Committee of Council in the imposition of the Management Clauses as *unconstitutional*. It is subversive of our national rights and liberties, and especially chargeable with injury to one branch of the Legislature,—the HOUSE OF LORDS.

The Committee of Council dates its origin from the spring of 1839. It was instituted on the 10th of April in that year, for the purpose of dispensing the funds voted by the nation in parliament for education. We are informed by the present Secretary*, writing in 1839, that its functions “are

* See his “Recent Measures,” p. 50.

precisely similar to those which were exercised *by the Treasury* in the years 1835, 6, 7, 8.”

Had it confined itself to this, its legitimate province, no one would have complained. Had it provided for the due enrolment of trust deeds, and the legal tenure of the sites of schools, and other similar matters, every one would have been very grateful to it.

But it soon began to overstep its bounds, and to usurp the office of Educational Legislation.

Very soon after its creation—almost on the morrow of its birth*—it promulgated a new plan of education, in the proposed establishment of a NORMAL SCHOOL, on that most dangerous of all dangerous principles—the principle of *general religion*. This was its *beau-ideal* of National Education.

The Christianity of our schools was to be filtered away from its distinctive dogmas,—so that nothing was to remain but a tasteless and colourless residuum. This was for the sake of peace! The most felicitous results were augured from this process! The golden age would revive! All our sects would be reconciled! And, doubtless, my Lord, *if this* system had been realized, this might have been the case; all religious denominations might have sunk into one another’s arms in a fraternal embrace,—of universal *negation*.

My Lord, *if* this system, then promulgated, had

* April 13th, 1839. See “Recent Measures,” p. 51.

been carried into effect, *England*, I verily believe, would, at this moment, be in the condition of *France*. But happily the Committee of Council was *then* checked in its legislative career; as, it is devoutly to be hoped, it will be checked *now*. The destructive tendencies of this measure were exposed. Your Grace will remember the seasonable and serviceable Letter of Archdeacon Wilberforce on that subject; and none of us will ever forget the part—the wise, the courageous, the truly Apostolical part—which was taken by your Grace's venerated predecessor, our late beloved Primate, the then President of this Society, on that critical occasion. That has been justly regarded as one of the brightest pages in His Grace's history*.

On the 5th of July, 1839, in his place in the House of Lords, His Grace moved a series of Resolutions on this subject, and carried them by an overwhelming majority (229 to 111). The language of these Resolutions is familiar to many of us; but it cannot be too forcibly inculcated, or too frequently repeated, at this time. Let me, therefore, read an extract from them:—

It appears, "That on the 13th of April last it was proposed by the Committee of Council, to establish a Model School, which might serve as an example to other schools, and also a Normal School, in which a body of school-masters might be formed competent to assume the management of similar

* See a valuable article in the "English Review," No. XXI. p. 111, for March, 1849.

institutions in all parts of the country. That it appears to this House that the powers thus entrusted to the *Committee of Council* are so important in their bearing upon the moral and religious education of the people of this country, and upon the proper functions of the Established Church; and at the same time, so *capable of progressive and indefinite extension*, that they ought not to be committed to any public authority without the consent of Parliament.”

“ That this House considers itself bound by obligations of public duty to present an humble address to Her Majesty, conveying to Her Majesty the Resolutions into which it has entered, and humbly praying ‘ that Her Majesty will be graciously pleased to give directions that no steps shall be taken with regard to the establishment or foundation of any plan for the general education of the people of this country, without giving to this House, as one branch of the Legislature, an opportunity of fully considering a measure of such deep importance to the highest interests of the country.’ ”

Now, my Lord, one would have imagined that after this solemn legislative Protest, from the highest tribunal in the realm, against the unconstitutional usurpations and arbitrary aggressions of the Committee of Council,—a Board, let us remember, consisting of four individuals and a secretary,—the Committee of Council would have been quiescent, and have confined itself within its proper sphere. And so it did for a time. This appears from the important statements made in the recent Charge of the venerable Treasurer of this Society (pp. 14—18). But, alas! it could not long resist its cravings for *legislation*. It must needs make a *new Educational code*.

On the 28th of June, 1847, came forth the famous MANAGEMENT CLAUSES, for Church Schools. The *Twenty-eighth of June*.—This is a black day in the annals of modern Educational Legislation. On the *Twenty-eighth of June* (1833) came forth the celebrated Law on Primary Instruction in *France*, which is the avowed model of the framers of the Management Clauses*. And on the *Twenty-eighth of June*, 1848—*fifteen years after* the passing of that law—the Monarch and Minister of Instruction who affixed their signatures to that law, had been driven from France, and were exiles in England, and Paris was in a state of siege. *Absit omen!*

To return to the Management Clauses promulgated on the *Twenty-eighth of June*, 1847. They contain, either in germ, or fully developed, a new *charte* of education. What more could an Act of Parliament do, than is done in these Clauses, issued by the Committee of Council? The election and removal of masters; the choice of Committees; the superintendence of school instruction;—all these things are determined in these Clauses, with the magisterial authority of an imperial statute! And, observe, there is *no finality* in them. They involve a *principle of boundless expansion*. If the Committee of Council may enact *four* Management Clauses, why not *forty*?

And, let us next observe, these Management

* See below, pp. 35, 36.

Clauses, having been at first only “recommended” and “suggested,” are now *enforced*. The *Congé d'élire* has been screwed up to a *Præmunire*. And all this in defiance of the vote of the House of Peers! And thus, my Lord, in the great work of National Education, the Committee of Council has erected itself into a Star Chamber, and has degraded the House of Lords into a club. And if *this* is not an *unconstitutional* proceeding, it is hard to say what is.

(3.) Some persons, it is true, my Lord, would congratulate us on certain *concessions* which they say we have recently gained from the Committee of Council; and by which, *as they think*, the Management Clauses are made innocuous. These concessions, they allege, are very liberal. Be it so. But this very allegation shows the dangerous character of the Committee of Council. Who *gave* them the *power to concede*? They have seized it for themselves. And *if* they can *concede to-day*, they can *revoke to-morrow*. “*Qui dedit hoc hodiè, cras, si volet, auferet.*” If their concessions are large, the largeness of their concessions on *their own arbitrary authority* would only be another proof of our subjection. The same hand that can let out a loose rein, can draw in a tight one, and ride us with a sharp curb.

They have not conceded *the one great thing*, which is, their claim to *impose* the Management Clauses upon us against our will. At this moment they *are*

enforcing those clauses. They have, therefore, conceded *nothing*.

And here let me refer to a remarkable instance of this grasping dominion, shown in concession.

We have to thank one of our most venerated prelates for bringing out this fact. The Bishop of Ripon writes to the Secretary of the Committee of Council to learn whether he (the bishop) would have power to exclude an irreligious book from a Church School in his diocese. The Secretary replies (Nov. 7th, 1847): "That the Committee of Council would not *hesitate to determine* that the correct interpretation of the power *given to the Bishop*" (*i. e.* given by the Committee of Council) "to decide upon appeals respecting questions relating to religious instruction in the schools, *gives* the diocesan the authority to exclude any book, against the use of which an appeal should be made on religious grounds."

To what a state, my Lord, are we reduced! A Bishop of the Church obliged to ask the Committee of Council whether he may banish an irreligious book (Paine's "Age of Reason," suppose) from a Church School, and the Committee graciously permitting him to do so! Truly Popery is a tremendous evil; but it is no small evil also to have a Lay Pope, an "Episcopus Episcoporum" in Downing Street. And these are liberal concessions, and we are to be grateful for them!

In my mind, my Lord, the main thing now to be *avoided*, is the RECOGNITION of a LEGISLATIVE POWER in the Committee of Council. We are *aggrieved* by that power, and we ought to *protest* against it. This is the aim of the present Resolution. Our very negotiations with them are pregnant with danger. They may, perhaps, now flatter us with fair terms, and so beguile us to *recognise their authority*; and then *all is lost, utterly, irrecoverably lost*.

(4.) My next objection is—

The Committee of Council, in its corporate character, has *no religion*, and therefore *cannot educate*.

It regards *all creeds as equally true*. Anglicans, Wesleyans, Romanists—it patronizes all alike; or if it has any partiality, it treats the sects as if they were the Church, and it treats the Church as if it were a sect.

It teaches a farrago of contradictions.

With it, the decrees of Trent are as orthodox as the Thirty-nine Articles; The Roman Breviary is as good as the English Liturgy; the Creed of Pope Pius IV. is equal to that of the Apostles. In one hand it holds out the Apocryphal Books *as uninspired*, in the English authorized Bible; and in the other hand, it holds out these same Apocryphal Books *as inspired*, in the version of Douay!

By thus endowing various and *conflicting* opinions, it confounds all notions of religion; it teaches religious indifference; it *propagates infidelity*.

How, my Lord, *can* such a Body as this pretend to EDUCATE the NATION?

How can it expect the Divine blessing upon it in the performance of this solemn work? how can it expect the blessing of Him Who reveals Himself as “a jealous God?” And is it quite clear, my Lord—with great submission to your Grace—that as long as it *is* what it is, and claims what it claims now, we can co-operate with it, and be guiltless?

III. But, my Lord, I should not be dealing candidly with this question, or with this meeting, if I omitted to notice the *pleas* which are urged in *favour* of the Management Clauses, and of their compulsory enforcement by the Committee of Council; and this will lead me to notice some *details* of these clauses.

In so doing, I shall not draw from any private sources, but solely from official documents.

(1.) Having carefully examined the defences made of these clauses, I find it urged in their behalf, that they are *no new thing*; that “My Lords have imposed *no new conditions**,” and that, *though promulgated* in 1847, the Management Clauses *have been in operation ever since* 1844. To cite the words of the Secretary of the Committee of Council in his

* Secretary’s Letter to the Dean of Lichfield, dated Council Office, Nov. 24, 1847.

official reply to Mr. Barrow* (p. 15): "Those who describe as unauthorized the interference of the Committee of Council, . . . appear not to know that this interference *has been unostentatiously in operation* since 1844."

Such is the defence set up for these clauses. They were published and enforced in 1847; but they "*had been unostentatiously in operation since 1844.*"—Such, let us observe, is their *defence!*

This surely, my Lord, is a very serious matter. *If* four clauses, A, B, C, D, "were unostentatiously in operation in 1844," and were not developed till 1847, the probability is that *at this very moment* some *other* Management Clauses, E, F, G, H, are now mining their way, softly and stealthily flowing, Alphæus-like, underground, to emerge in the Arethusa of some future minute of the Committee of Council in the year 1853.

Can your Grace—can the Church—can the Nation—have any confidence in a Board which acts and writes thus? Ought we to resign the most sacred interests of the country into their hands? Assuredly not.

(2.) Next, it is said by the Committee of Council, that (with the exception of a better provision for

* Dated Oct. 7, 1847. See also his Letter to the Dean of Lichfield, Nov. 24, 1847. These documents will be found in "Official Letters in explanation of the Minute of Council of Education, dated June 28, 1847. *Published by authority, 1847.*"

Trust Deeds of Schools, to which no one raises any objection) the Management Clauses are founded on the "Terms of Union" prescribed by the NATIONAL SOCIETY to the Schools in connexion with itself, and are in accordance with those "terms of union;" and that the Committee of Council have "embodied" this Society's "terms of union in certain Management Clauses;" and that "practical effect has been given by them to the provisions of those terms of union," and that they have been sanctioned by our late revered President, and by the Committee of this Society.

This is affirmed by the Committee of Council in the Secretary's Letter to the Dean of Lichfield and to Mr. Barrow.

It is most deeply to be regretted, that the venerable name of our late Primate has been mixed up with this discussion, in a manner which is hardly reconcilable with private delicacy or public respect. Such a use could not have been made of it, if it had been remembered that these clauses made their appearance at the close of his Grace's life, and that he is not among us to declare his judgment upon them.

This, however, is almost unnecessary. *His Grace* never *approved the compulsory enforcement of these clauses* by the Committee of Council: and those memorable RESOLUTIONS which he moved and carried in the House of Lords, and which have been already

noticed, are the best protest against it that ever has been or ever can be made.

Concerning the Committee of this Society, it would be presumptuous in me to speak. But let me be allowed to offer them my humble thanks for the patient attention they have given to this subject, with an earnest hope that they may be able to *retrieve the ground we have lost*, and to secure the freedom of the Church.

But, my Lord, *are* these clauses in accordance with the “Terms of Union” of this Society? If they are, and if the Committee of Council *believe* that they are, why is it so desirous that this Society should recommend these clauses? and why is it so unwilling to allow us to remain content with *our own* Management Clauses—I mean the “Terms of Union” of this Society,—or to improve them by ourselves?

But, my Lord, it is obvious to any one who will compare the two, that the Management Clauses are *irreconcilable* with the terms of union of this Society; and that *if* our “Terms of Union” are equitable, the “Management Clauses” ought to be rejected.

To show this in one or two particulars.

What, my Lord, is the one great thing of paramount moment in the conduct of a school?

Doubtless the *choice of the master*.

The parochial minister cannot teach with any

good effect in the parish church, unless he has the full control over the parish school. The appointment of the *school-master* is quite as important to him as the appointment of his *curate*. He cannot exercise his functions as minister of the parish, unless the choice of the Church school-master is mainly in his hands: at least he ought to have a veto on the nomination.

Now, my Lord, in the "terms of union" of this Society there is nothing to prevent this being the case. The election and the removal of the master may be in the minister of the parish. But, according to the Management Clauses, however zealous and indefatigable the pastor of the parish may be in establishing the School, the choice of the master *never can be* in his hands, but must be *in all cases* in those of a *Committee of Management*.

And what—let us now be permitted to inquire—is this "Committee of Management?" They may be Wesleyans, or what not? In April, 1848, the National Society desired to stipulate that the Committee of Management should be Churchmen, and "not be joined members or frequenters of the worship of any other religious denomination." There are many persons, professing themselves Churchmen, who yet communicate with sectarians. John Wesley professed himself a Churchman, and charged all his followers to do so. What, now, in 1848, did the Committee of Council do? They

(June 3, 1848) allowed that the Committee of Management should be Churchmen, but would *not* allow that they should “not be joined members or frequenters of dissenting places of worship.” And they thus intimated their opinion, that a person may be a Dissenter, and yet profess himself a Churchman, and be qualified to choose a master for Church schools!

Thus, the measures of the Committee of Council tend to create parochial *opposition*, where parochial *union* is most desirable, I mean, between the clergyman and the school-master, and between the Church and the school.

Another point.

By the constitution of the Church, the Bishop is overseer of the schools in his diocese. His very *name* indicates this. He is charged to “feed the *lambs*” as well as “feed the sheep” of Christ’s flock. Now, by the “Terms of Union” of this Society, the promoters of a school are at liberty to take care that an appeal may lie to the Bishop on all matters of School management.

A similar freedom has been asked of the Committee of Council;—but, *asked in vain*!

Again. By the “Terms of Union” of this Society, “the children are to be instructed in the Liturgy and *Catechism* of the Established Church;” and

* See more on this point in the first of the able Letters by “C.” in the “Guardian.”

with respect to religious instruction, “the schools are to be subject to the superintendence of the parochial clergyman.”

By this condition the Catechism is declared essential, and nothing in the “Terms of Union” prevents the Clergyman from having full control and superintendence, *general* as well as *religious*, over the school.

Turn now to the Management Clauses.

Not a word is there said concerning the Liturgy and Catechism, and the framers of those clauses have not disguised their opinion with regard to the teaching of *the Catechism**; and we have too good

* “On Thursday, January 20th, 1848, a deputation of teachers belonging to the Sunday School Union waited on the Marquis of Lansdowne (who was also attended by *Mr. Kaye Shuttleworth, secretary to the Committee of Council on Education*), to urge on his lordship that a condition be annexed to *all grants* made under the authority of the Council, that in schools receiving such aid, the learning of *religious catechisms* and formularies, and attendance on Sundays at schools or public worship, be not rendered compulsory. His lordship is stated by the *Globe* to have replied that :—

“*His own feelings*, and he believed *the feelings of every member of the Committee of Council*, were in harmony with the object sought for by the Committee of the Sunday School Union ; that *every effort had been made, short of direct interference, to procure a rescinding of the rule of the National Society, by which the scholars were required to learn the Church Catechism*, and to attend on Sundays ; that *those efforts had been almost successful*, but some circumstances occurred which caused them to fail, and the rule still continued ; but that in *his lordship's own neighbourhood*, and in other parts, it was not enforced where

reason to fear that a *fifth* Management Clause may even now be “*unostentatiously in operation*” for superseding the Catechism in our schools.

Next: In the Management Clauses the superintendence of moral and religious instruction is allowed to the Minister of the parish, not as the rule, but as the exception: and *no other* superintendence *may be* exercised by him, but is confided to a Committee of Management, who, as we have seen, professing themselves Churchmen, may be frequenters of (or even teachers in) Dissenting Meeting-houses in his parish.

And yet we are assured by the Committee of Council that they have imposed “*no new conditions,*” and that the Management Clauses are “based on the Terms of Union of this Society.”

My Lord, I cannot find words to express my astonishment when I see the large demands made on our credulity, and the contempt for the intel-

found objectionable. That the Committee of Council, having acted for some years with the National Society, on the understanding that its regulations should be maintained, did not feel themselves at liberty to *require the* rescinding of the rule, and that any such interference may cause it to be enforced still more rigidly; but that if, in any place, it appeared that any parties were deprived of the means of education through the operation of such a regulation, *the Committee would be ready to give assistance beyond their usual limit,* in order to enable a school to be established and carried on for the benefit of such parties, *being anxious to encourage the formation of schools to be conducted on liberal principles.*”

lectual faculties of the members of this Society, displayed in these assertions.

One specimen more may suffice.

This Society desired to stipulate (May 12, 1846) that “the parochial Minister should have the moral and religious superintendence of the parish school.”

To this the Committee of Council replied, Sept. 29, 1846, “that they do not hesitate, *as suggested by the Committee of the National Society*, to extend the superintendence of the Minister to the moral as well as to the religious instruction of the school.”

“*As suggested by the Committee of the National Society.*” As if the National Society were not able to distinguish between “moral superintendence” and “superintendence of moral instruction!” And this is cited as a concession!

(3.) The next plea urged in defence of the imposition of the Management Clauses is, that this is *no unconstitutional* measure, because “Annual Reports of the proceedings of the Committee are laid before Parliament.”

But, my Lord Archbishop, and Gentlemen, is there not here a great fallacy? The true question is, Was the *enforcement* of these clauses *previously* approved by the Legislature?—No. Has it ever been sanctioned by Parliament?—No. Has the judgment of Parliament ever been asked upon it?—No. It is nothing to say that funds from the public taxes have been allowed by *one branch of the Legis-*

lature, which funds have been dispensed by the Committee of Council *according to laws framed by itself*. We affirm that great organic changes *ought not* to be made in National Education, and that these organic changes ought not, at a favourable juncture, carefully watched and eagerly seized, to be hurried through the House of Commons, muffled up in the cloak, and disguised *under the mask, of a money vote*, perhaps with only *a majority of two*, as was the case in 1839, when the Committee of Council rose into being. We seek *prevention*, and not cure which is no cure. We seek the *previous* sanction of the nation, given after free deliberation, in a constitutional manner, by the Sovereign and three Estates of the realm, for the laws which are to regulate the distribution of the public funds supplied for National Education. Murder is no less murder because a man may be hanged for committing it; and so it will be no consolation to find, when our National System of Education is ruined, that we may impeach the Secretary of the Committee of Council.

(4.) The last plea to which I shall advert in favour of the Management Clauses is one of *necessity*. The finances of this Society, it is said, are in an embarrassed state, and it cannot answer the demands upon it without the public aid. And since that aid is intercepted by the Committee of Council from all who will not submit to the Management Clauses,

therefore, it is said, *in those Management clauses we must acquiesce.*

Every one must regret very deeply that the funds of this Society should be at a low ebb. Whence does this arise? One cause, perhaps the principal, may be found in the prevalent opinion, that this Society is disposed to concede the question of the Management Clauses, and so to sacrifice principle for money. There is a notion now abroad that, instead of remembering that a "gift blindeth the wise, and perverteth the words of the righteous," we now say, Do without the Management Clauses if convenient, but if not, submit. In building your School "Rem facias,—Rem,

Si possis, rectè, si non,—quocunque modo Rem."

This *quocunque modo Rem* is our bane. It has done us much harm already, and if we do not get rid of it, will plunge us in deeper distress. The Committee of Council will speculate further on our necessities, and will impose harder terms. But if we avow our determination to maintain principle *at any sacrifice*, as I trust we shall, by the vote of this day, then confidence will be restored, and our funds will revive also.

Surely too, my Lord, we may rely on the honesty of the English nation. Let us show our faith in our cause and in the public. Let us speak out; and we cannot doubt that the English people will aid us in breaking down the dykes and dams of these

Management Clauses, and will open the sluices, and will let the national bounty flow freely—bounty *mainly contributed by Churchmen*—for the good of the Country and the Church.

But I have trespassed too long on your patience, and will now draw these remarks to a close. It has been my endeavour to show that the objections raised by some against the present Resolution are groundless. I have appealed to the language of the CHURCH OF SCOTLAND concerning the “GOVERNMENT SCHEME OF EDUCATION.” We have seen that the compulsory imposition of the Management Clauses of the Committee of Council is *unconstitutional*, that the power claimed by that Committee is arbitrary and despotic, capable of indefinite extension, subject to perpetual change, and fraught with great peril to the country, and to the cause of Christianity in England. It has been proved that the pleas alleged in its defence are fallacious and illusory, and of such a nature as to preclude confidence in its administration.

The Committee of Council has now been ten years in existence. One of its first acts, as we have seen, was to endeavour to organize a system of education on the basis of *general* religion. It proposed to found a Normal School on that principle. It was compelled to withdraw that scheme,—but *it has never renounced it.*

I have in my hand a remarkable pamphlet,

published at that time, and disseminated by thousands of copies, under the auspices of the Committee of Council. It is entitled "RECENT MEASURES for the Promotion of Education in England*." In this pamphlet we see the seeds of all the mischief, which has already sprung up, and of much more which will spring up, if it is not checked. In it, at the very commencement (I quote from the fourth edition, p. iv.), the Committee of Council declare their conviction that "the most useful application of any sums voted by Parliament would consist in the employment of those moneys in the establishment of a NORMAL SCHOOL, *under the direction of the State*, and not placed under the management of a voluntary society." In p. 54, we are informed that the Committee of Council have "postponed the establishment of a Normal school *to another year*." In p. 43, we read that the "*sole* effectual means of preventing the tremendous evils with which the anarchical spirit of the manufacturing population threatens the country, is by giving the working population a good *secular education*." In p. 79, we find the following sentiments quoted with applause: "Do you not suppose that a sufficient religious education could be conveyed, *without the conveyance* at the same time of any *peculiar religious doctrine*?" "I am disposed to think so, as regards children. . . . I think it most of all desirable to

* London, 1839.

have a system of religious instruction for schools, founded upon the Scriptures, but *directed only to those parts of the Sacred Volume* which have a *moral* tendency." What an insult, my Lord, on the Bible! . . . "I am fortified in that opinion by the example of the *German* States, where the school instruction is founded on this principle, as well as of *France*, where the law on that head is very nearly a transcript *of the German*." In the same page we read: "So, the business of a teacher of the people, considering the matter of National Education, would be to form religious habits, and those might be formed in a National School which *did not impose any dogmata* on the minds of the pupils?" The answer is, "I should say so, certainly." "Do you not think a true Christian feeling would be created by such a system of National Education?" "I do."

So farewell, my Lord, to our Creeds and our Catechisms, and to what St. Paul calls the *first principles* of the doctrine of Christ."

What can be more clear, my Lord, than that if we now concede the question of the Management Clauses, we shall have to fight over again the great battle of 1839, with tremendous odds against us, and that we may find, perhaps, our most formidable enemies in our own schools.

Here is one warning; there is another.

In this semi-official pamphlet we find the follow-

ing description of National Education in this country, twenty-eight years after the foundation of the National Society: "In *England*, primary education is *in utter ruin*," p. 41. "Our Educational Endowments are either misapplied or are used for the support of *such feeble* and inefficient methods of instruction as to render little service to the community." "In *England* we have no Normal Schools," (p. 33.)

Pass we now to *France*.

In p. 34, we find, "There are seventy-six Normal Schools in France; no Department wants an establishment for the training of teachers. It has above 30,000 Communal Boys' Schools."

Happy France!

Similar eulogistic accounts are given in other pages (pp. 23, 24, 26) of primary education in Prussia*, Baden, and Switzerland (p. 26). "Throughout Germany the greatest attention is paid, not merely to the acquirements of the teachers, but also to their capacity for teaching." In fact, my Lord, comparatively speaking, *other* countries enjoy educational light, but England is immersed in Cimmerian gloom.

* See also vol. ii. p. 547, "Minutes of Committee of Council on Education," 1847-8.

1. "Prussia has done most towards PERFECTING, on a large scale, the system of popular instruction which most closely suits itself to the wants and abilities of a large nation."

But where now are the Educational Utopias of the Committee of Council?

They have been swept away by the storm of revolution. Where are its Normal Schools, Model Schools, and Ministers of instruction, which were to have ushered in a millennium of peace? They have profited nothing. Rather, we may say, they have let loose the armies of destruction. Those Educational Utopias, to quote the words of Lord Brougham to Lord Lansdowne (Letter, p. 93), have produced the "*Abomination*"—yes, my Lord, the abomination—"of boys and *children from school* taking a forward part in civil broils."

Look now to the other side of the picture. England, unhappy England, "with no *Normal School*," and with her "primary instruction in utter ruin," alone survives the storm.

Therefore, my Lord, if this question were to be argued on *temporal* grounds alone, we should be guilty of great infatuation, if we trusted ourselves to the guidance of the Committee of Council, and recognized its right and competency to legislate for England in the work of education.

What we see around us may well inspire alarm. The recent elections in France show that we must now look for a reign of terror, or the rule of the sword, in that country, and perhaps in other parts of Europe. Let then England look well to her National Education.

But, my Lord, in fine, a still weightier consideration remains.

On the one side let us place the "Management Clauses," with all their false principles and fatal influences, and particularly, with the false and fatal principle and influence of *compulsory imposition* by the Committee of Council.

On the other side let us put the solemn words addressed to all pastors of the Church, "Feed My sheep," "Feed My lambs," "Go, teach" (*μαθητεύσατε, make disciples of*) "all nations." "Take heed to yourselves and to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost has made you overseers to feed the Church of God." "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." "Contend earnestly for the faith." "Hold fast that which thou hast received, that no man take thy crown."

These, my Lord, are no "Management Clauses," dictated by a changeable, earthly tribunal, but they are the words of Him Who is "Yea and Amen," and we shall be judged by them.

A Christian pastor may not submit to the imposition of conditions incompatible with these Divine injunctions; and every faithful layman would mourn over him if he did.

Since, then, the Management Clauses themselves, and since the compulsory imposition of them by the Committee of Council, are, in my deliberate opi-

nion, contrary to these commands, therefore, My Lord Archbishop and Gentlemen, in a deep sense of a solemn responsibility, both in the eye of man, and in the sight of the Great Head of the Church, I conclude with seconding the present Resolution, as a PROTEST against the power *now claimed and exercised* by the Committee of Council, and with a view of *recovering the ground* which we are in imminent danger of losing:

“That it is the opinion of this meeting, that no arrangement which shall involve the compulsory imposition of any Management Clause whatsoever as a condition of State assistance, or of any condition whatsoever except the legal tenure of the site and the right of inspection, as defined and ascertained in 1840, can be satisfactory to, or ought to be accepted by, the Church.”

THE END.









