

*Sir J Young*

10

# EDUCATION

BEST PROMOTED

BY PERFECT FREEDOM,

NOT

BY STATE ENDOWMENTS.

WITH AN

APPENDIX,

CONTAINING

OFFICIAL RETURNS OF EDUCATION,

IN 1818, 1833, AND 1851.

---

BY

EDWARD BAINES,

AUTHOR OF THE "HISTORY OF THE COTTON MANUFACTURE."

---

LONDON :

JOHN SNOW, PATERNOSTER-ROW.

LEEDS: R. NEWSOME.

1854.

*Price Sixpence.*

EDWARD BAINES AND SONS, PRINTERS, LEEDS.



# CONTENTS.

---

## CHAPTER I.

	Page
Introduction—Gradual and Rapid Advance of Government Education— The Proposal to make Grants to Mechanics' Institutions—Would destroy the Independence of the Institutions, and of Men of Science—Analogy of the Periodical and Political Press—The Working Classes do not need Government Help or Compulsion ... ..	5

## CHAPTER II.

Fallacy in the Argument for Government Education—Its Advantages— Its Disadvantages ... ..	10
--	----

## CHAPTER III.

The Two Manchester Systems—Their constantly changing features—Re- markable opposition of opinion in Manchester among the advocates of State interference—Objections to the Local or Religious plan—Objections to the Secular plan—Manchester an epitome of England... ..	16
---	----

## CHAPTER IV.

The Government of Schools: The Central and the Local authorities : Objections to both—Unfitness of Committees popularly elected to conduct Schools—Parsimoniousness in Country Districts—No Security for the Piety of Teachers—The Plan of the Committee of Council on Education—Satis- factory to no Party—Objectionable Minute under Lord Derby's Administra- tion—The Minutes of Council of April 2nd, 1853, brought into operation without any Parliamentary sanction or discussion—Summary of Objections ...	21
---	----

## CHAPTER V.

The Voluntary System Defined—Its Advantages—Its Disadvantages— Replies to Objections—The Power of the Voluntary System is that of the whole People—Reflex Influence of its operation—Importance of cultivating Self-Reliance—Effect of the Voluntary System in knitting together the classes of Society—Free Scope given to Religious Instruction—Opposite evils of the Prussian and Dutch Schools ... ..	28
--	----

## CHAPTER VI.

The Voluntary System—Proofs of its Power—Progress of Education in England—Sunday Schools—Day Schools—Activity both of the Church and the Dissenters—Infant Schools—Ragged Schools—Institutions for the Train- ing of Teachers—Mechanics' Institutions—Bible Society—Tract Society— Foreign Missions—Benevolent Institutions of England—Explanation of Apparent Anomalies in Day-School Returns—Comparison of Manchester and Exeter—Evidence furnished by the Census of 1851 of the Number and Increase of Day-Schools—Proportion of Scholars to Population—Extraordinary Increase of the Unendowed Public Schools—Explanation respecting aid to the Children of Paupers and to Reformatory Schools—Conclusion ... ..	35
---	----

## APPENDIX.

Official Return of the Comparative Education of 1818, 1833, and 1851 ... ..	46
---	----

# CONTENTS

## CHAPTER I

The Government of the Republic of Liberia  
The Government of the Republic of Liberia  
The Government of the Republic of Liberia  
The Government of the Republic of Liberia  
The Government of the Republic of Liberia

## CHAPTER II

The Government of the Republic of Liberia  
The Government of the Republic of Liberia  
The Government of the Republic of Liberia  
The Government of the Republic of Liberia  
The Government of the Republic of Liberia

## CHAPTER III

The Government of the Republic of Liberia  
The Government of the Republic of Liberia  
The Government of the Republic of Liberia  
The Government of the Republic of Liberia  
The Government of the Republic of Liberia

## CHAPTER IV

The Government of the Republic of Liberia  
The Government of the Republic of Liberia  
The Government of the Republic of Liberia  
The Government of the Republic of Liberia  
The Government of the Republic of Liberia

## CHAPTER V

The Government of the Republic of Liberia  
The Government of the Republic of Liberia  
The Government of the Republic of Liberia  
The Government of the Republic of Liberia  
The Government of the Republic of Liberia

## CHAPTER VI

The Government of the Republic of Liberia  
The Government of the Republic of Liberia  
The Government of the Republic of Liberia  
The Government of the Republic of Liberia  
The Government of the Republic of Liberia

## APPENDIX

The Government of the Republic of Liberia  
The Government of the Republic of Liberia  
The Government of the Republic of Liberia  
The Government of the Republic of Liberia  
The Government of the Republic of Liberia



# EDUCATION

BEST PROMOTED BY PERFECT FREEDOM,  
NOT BY STATE ENDOWMENTS.

---

## CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION—GRADUAL AND RAPID ADVANCE OF GOVERNMENT EDUCATION—THE PROPOSAL TO MAKE GRANTS TO MECHANICS' INSTITUTIONS—WOULD DESTROY THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE INSTITUTIONS, AND OF MEN OF SCIENCE—ANALOGY OF THE PERIODICAL AND POLITICAL PRESS—THE WORKING CLASSES DO NOT NEED GOVERNMENT HELP OR COM-PULSION.

THE Educational question having last year assumed several new features, I venture to solicit a re-consideration of the inquiry whether we are moving in a right direction. The new features are—1st. The Municipal Boroughs Education Bill, and the Minutes of Council of April 2nd relative to small towns and rural districts, the former of which was postponed, but the latter of which are to take effect from the 1st of January, 1854; 2nd. The proposal made from several quarters to take the Mechanics' Institutions and all scientific and artistic instruction into Government pay; 3rd. The light thrown by the Census on the actual state of Education; and 4th. The improved condition of the labouring classes, rendering them more able than ever to pay for the education of their children.

The direction in which we are moving is apparently towards placing the whole education of the country, elementary, artistic, scientific, industrial, and collegiate, under the charge and control of the Government.

My object is to inquire, whether this direction, which is certainly new in England, is wise and safe;—whether it is called for by any necessity;—whether it will ultimately conduce to the most healthy character of education itself;—whether the great extension of Government patronage which must accompany it is politically expedient;—whether it will be unattended with injustice to numerous classes;—whether it is consistent with the rights of conscience;—and whether it may not impair the self-reliance and spontaneous action of the people.

The question is not in the least as to the desirableness of education itself. Lest any should suppose that my objections to putting the training



of the young into the hands of the Government arise from hostility or indifference to popular enlightenment, I may be pardoned for saying that education has been the favourite object of my life; that I have taken an active part in promoting day schools, infant schools, Sunday schools, mechanics' institutions, colleges, libraries, and societies for spreading education and religion at home and throughout the world. I would aim at nothing short of the universal education of mankind.

If it should be doubted whether we are moving towards a system which would virtually place the whole education of the country under the control of the Government, it may be well to consider the following facts, namely, that the first Parliamentary grant for popular education in England was as recent as 1833, was of the modest amount of £20,000, and was intended solely to aid in the erection of school buildings;—that the grants have continually been growing larger, till this year they reached the amount of £260,000;—that the Government proceeded from aiding in the erection of school-houses to aiding in the erection of normal schools;—that it next formed a Government Board, under the name of the Committee of Council on Education;—that then it devised a system of annual grants towards the salaries of teachers, the employment of pupil teachers, the training of students in normal schools, and the providing of books, maps, and apparatus;—that it placed all the schools assisted with public money under Government Inspectors;—that though it originally professed to rely much on voluntary effort, it has now resolved largely to increase the grants to schools and to training institutions, and last Session it introduced a Bill which would have made *five-eighths* of the annual expenses of schools payable out of *public funds*, leaving only *two-eighths* to be raised by subscriptions,\* and only *one-eighth* to be paid by the parent;—that Minutes in

\* To show how clearly it was announced as a *principle* of the Minutes of 1846, and as a safeguard against undue expenditure and the undue patronage involved, that the *proportion* observed in those Minutes between Government grants and voluntary contributions would be constantly maintained, I quote the remarks of Sir James Kay Shuttleworth, in his semi-official pamphlet entitled "*The School in its relations to the State, the Church, and the Congregation*:"—"It cannot have escaped Mr. Baines's penetration, that the period within which such an outlay could be incurred, must be almost indefinitely postponed by the vast amount of contribution required from private sources, as a *condition of the grants* under many of the heads of his estimate." "*Every fresh increment of expense* would have to be met with an *equal amount* derived from *private charity*." "The operation of the Minutes would very slowly bring upon the State that portion of this charge (*one-half*) which would have to be sustained from the public resources."—pp. 90, 93. Lord John Russell, in introducing the plan on the 19th of April, 1847, said—"This was not a system of State education, but a system which merely came *in aid* of voluntary efforts on behalf of education." Mr. Macaulay said—"If there were no voluntary subscriptions, this House would never be called upon to pay a farthing for education; and if ever, as had been stated, they would be obliged to expend £2,000,000 for that purpose, which he never expected to see, the reason would be that the voluntary subscriptions would have increased to an enormous and impossible amount." Yet in the plan explained by Lord John Russell and Sir Jas. K. Shuttleworth (in his volume on "Public



Council for applying this measure in substance to rural districts and small towns have been announced to take effect from the 1st of January, 1854, without any discussion in Parliament on the subject, or any vote of either House in favour of the measure ;—that no teacher can be employed in any school aided by public funds without a Government certificate ;—that though religious instruction is required to be given in all schools receiving grants, yet the religion may be of any kind, and all is alike paid for out of the public purse ;—that Government has established Schools of Design, and is proceeding further in the promotion of artistic and industrial education ;—that measures are pressed upon Parliament year after year for erecting a great system of State education, some proposing to make the instruction exclusively secular, others to make it imperatively religious ;—and that now from various quarters we have proposals issued for grants to Mechanics' Institutions, and even for a complete system of primary, secondary, and tertiary education, all supported by national money and placed under Government inspection.\*

Now if the education of the people is the proper work of the Government, all these measures may be highly commendable. But it were to be wished that the whole object were fully disclosed at once, so as to enable the country to judge of it, instead of advancing with such stealthy steps towards a concealed end. Each of those steps has naturally followed the preceding step ; and each will as naturally be followed by others, until a kind of necessity is created for taking the whole education of the country, in every department, under the charge and conduct of the Executive.

But what does this imply ? Does it not imply that an enormous number of persons shall be brought under the pay and influence of the Government ? We have in England and Wales alone 46,000 day-schools, with a much greater number of teachers and assistant teachers. We have

Education,") in 1853, it is proposed that the total cost of the primary schools shall be £2,938,499 ; of which no less than £1,836,562 to be raised by general and local taxation, and only £550,968 (between a *third* and a *fourth* of the preceding amount) is required to be raised by subscriptions.—p. 300. In the Municipal Boroughs Education Bill it is proposed, that 5d. per week shall be raised by taxation, 2d. by subscriptions, and 1d. by school fees,—total 8d. Here it is obvious, 1st. That the charge on the public which I anticipated, and which was so anxiously disclaimed, in 1847, would be exceeded ; and 2nd. That the principle then distinctly laid down to limit the public expenditure has been abandoned.

\* Such a measure has been proposed in full detail by the Rev. C. Richson, of Manchester, in a recent lecture at the Manchester Mechanics' Institution. This gentleman is the author of the "Manchester and Salford Education Bill," which is again to be brought forward as a private bill in Parliament. Several pamphlets have been published, containing the same recommendation as to Mechanics' Institutions, and most of them assume those institutions to be "failures." If the authors had seen the first English Mechanics' Institution (that of London), as I did, meeting in an old rented chapel, and had seen and heard as much as I have of the excellent effects of these Institutions whilst they were increasing from one to *six or seven hundred*, with more than 100,000 members and 700,000 volumes in their libraries, they would have a very different opinion.



in the United Kingdom upwards of 700 Mechanics' Institutions ; and as there are in Great Britain alone 815 towns, and more than 16,000 villages with defined boundaries, there might be an immense number of new institutions created at the public expense and under governmental direction. Let the extent of patronage involved in such a creation, and in the superintendence of all the educational and scientific establishments of the country, be seriously considered. Let the effect of placing all the science of the country under State pay be weighed. Let it be remembered that the patronage thus newly formed would very far exceed all that the Government has hitherto possessed ; and that it must have its effect at Parliamentary elections and on the character of the people.\* Would the tendency be to elevate the character of our men of science, our teachers, and our school managers ? Would it be to strengthen the safeguards of liberty ? Would it be to increase the manly independence of the people ?

An idea prevails that institutions may preserve their independence, if they receive only a part of their income from the Government. But it is worthy of remark, first, that the tendency already shown is towards a constant increase of Government grants ; and secondly, that even a small grant, if it becomes of importance to the institution, is a fetter nearly as strong as if the entire income were thus derived. Government cannot, if it would, dispense with the control of the institutions aided by public money. Money cannot be granted without conditions ; and inspectors must be appointed to see that the conditions are fulfilled. But those conditions and that inspection, however well-meant, are liable to abuse, and to operate at some future time as serious restrictions. No institution that is subject to them can have the conscious feeling of independence. At the Committee meetings, the question would constantly be—"Will the *Inspector* allow this ?" or "Shall we not lose the *Government grant*, if we do so and so ?" Suppose that a school or a Mechanics' Institution once became dependent on the Government for *one-third* of its income, and that that one-third were to be withdrawn, is it not certain that it would in most cases lead to the fall of the institution ? Yes, as surely as a three-legged stool would tumble if one of its legs should fail. Then let us not deceive ourselves. It is possible for Government to get the control of education at a comparatively cheap rate. Not only is it true that the paymaster is the real master all the world over ;

\* My former apprehensions on this subject were ridiculed in and out of Parliament. Lord John Russell said—"To regard the proposed scheme as one tending to the increase of Government patronage, was giving way to idle apprehensions." But it is undeniable that this influence already operates, and to no mean extent. On a recent visit to South Wales, a gentleman occupying a high position in one of the boroughs told me, that he himself knew no less than five voters, who had formerly always voted on the Liberal side, but who, having children employed as "pupil teachers," were induced, three of them to be neutral, and two to vote for the Tory candidate, at the General Election under Lord Derby's Administration, in consequence of intimations from the clergyman that if they voted against the Government their children would lose their situations.



but it is equally true that the party who advances any considerable portion of the funds has virtually and practically the control of the institution.

It would therefore be folly to shut our eyes to the fact, that *Government help implies Government control*. It presents itself in the first instance in the guise of harmless and useful benevolence ; but it is like the money-lenders who inveigle the unwary into accepting loans ; it takes a bond which the borrower is never able to discharge, and puts the Government in the position of a Jew creditor. For a time the dupe may not discover his bondage ; but the chain is inextricably around him, and the result is the surrender of his estate. I, for one, solemnly protest against thus delivering over the schools and institutions of England bound hand and foot to the Government.

Nor does the mischief stop here. A principle has been acknowledged, and a precedent established, which may be applied to an indefinite extent. If the education and the science of the country are placed under the Government, why not also *the literature* ? Why not *the political and periodical press* ? Quite as strong reasons, nay, stronger, may be alleged for Government *help* (of course, mere kindly *help* !) to authors as to lecturers,—to men of letters as to men of science,—to all libraries as to all Mechanics' Institutions,—to all newspapers as to all seminaries. In each of these cases, inefficiency and defect may be alleged ; the public advantage, nay, safety, may be pleaded ; sad tales of necessity may be told ; brilliant pictures may be painted of the wonders to be done by public money ; tempting prospects of cheapness may be held out ; the great advantages of having none but *examined and certificated* authors and editors may be paraded : and with shallow though plausible reasons like these, the nation may be gulled into the surrender of its free literature and free press !

Let it not be said that these apprehensions are vain. I engage to make out a stronger case against the newspapers of England than can be made out against the schools or the Mechanics' Institutions, on the grounds of poverty, editorial incompetency and ignorance, want of literary and commercial helps, precarious position, and unworthy dependence on individuals or committees. Of course there can be no question that the public interest and safety are involved in having well-qualified guides of public opinion. So that, I repeat, there are actually stronger reasons in favour of placing the Press under Government management than the schools. Nor do I deny that, with certificated editors and authors, public grants to every journal, and a Government inspection and censorship, you might produce a more scholarly, accurate, and critic-proof periodical literature. All I allege is, that the press would be ENSLAVED ! It would be a polite, powdered, liveried, and silk-stockinged *flunkey*. It would be a dependent, soulless, nerveless, cringing, base, and good-for-nothing *parasite*, deserving to be scouted and kicked by every man of spirit or sense.

I entreat the reader not to do himself and his country the injustice to assume that these are vain imaginings. Only very lately, when I maintained that the principle of Government education would equally apply to



the Governmental superintendence of all science and literature, it was answered that the fear was chimerical, for that there was the broadest and clearest distinction between the training of children and the providing of information for grown men. But now we have it openly proposed, from several quarters, to take the art and science of the country under State support and direction, and to make the Mechanics' Institutions, which are even more for grown men than for youths, stipendiaries of Downing-street. Not only will the principle of State education legitimately apply to the aid and control of all science, art, and literature; but it will sanction the providing of books and newspapers to every family in the land. It will justify Government in taking under its management our libraries and newsrooms, our charities and benefit societies. In short, it rests on a *socialistic* principle, which may be as easily applied to industry and property as to education. Accordingly we find that Socialists are every where among the most ardent advocates of the principle and practice of State education. In so acting they are sagaciously consistent. But their activity ought to be a warning to others.

At no period in the history of the country was Government help, or rather compulsory taxation under the name of help, so entirely needless as at present, because never were the working classes enjoying so large an amount of comfort. The reduced price of food, the diminished taxation on the necessaries of life, and the rise of wages consequent on good trade and emigration, have combined very greatly to improve the condition of the operatives. No well-informed person can doubt that they have the ability to pay for the education of their children; and their disposition to do so is constantly increasing with the spread of knowledge. Nor can any reflecting person question, that the moral influence on parents of voluntarily paying for the education of their children, is of the highest value, and that a people thus educated occupies a far more honourable position than a people compelled by law to perform that natural duty.

---

## CHAPTER II.

### FALLACY IN THE ARGUMENT FOR GOVERNMENT EDUCATION—ITS ADVANTAGES—ITS DISADVANTAGES.

BELIEVING that State Endowments are not the right or the best way of promoting education, it is my duty to explain distinctly the grounds of that belief.

And first, it may be well to expose a fallacy which lies at the root of the arguments for State Education. It is argued, in various forms, that, inasmuch as the peace and welfare of the community are promoted by the education of its members, whilst disorder and crime are the frequent effects



of ignorance, it is one of the first duties of Government, which exists for the protection of society and the punishment of crime, to educate its subjects.

Cheerfully admitting the general tendency of education to promote the peace, welfare, and advancement of the community, I cannot on that account admit that education falls within the province of Government. Many things are in a high degree conducive to the public welfare, which it is not, and cannot be, the duty of Government to superintend. For example, nothing is more conducive to the peace and prosperity of nations than regular industry; but it is now admitted by enlightened statesmen that the attempts of legislatures, in this and other countries, to regulate, guide, organize, or even to encourage and stimulate, industry, were gross blunders;—that all the notions of the competency of a Government, from superior knowledge and the means at its command, to direct industry, were mere delusions;—that, though it had the power, and often exercised it, to lay down rules for manufacturing, marketing, trading, and cultivating, yet the self-interest of the people is infinitely better, both as a spring and regulator of industry, than the wisest of legislatures;—that, moreover, State industrial establishments were found to be nests of jobbing, and that laws to prescribe the course of industry always proved to be partial and unjust:—and thus, in the upshot, notwithstanding all speculative probabilities to the contrary, the MARQUIS OF LANSDOWNE only spoke the plain language of experience when he said—

“It is now universally admitted that Governments are the worst of cultivators, the worst of manufacturers, and the worst of traders.”

Then it is evident that industry, though a chief cause of the peace and welfare of nations, does not on that account come within the province of Government, and that when Governments have interfered with it, they have done harm instead of good. In regard to education, the argument for Government interference, drawn from the same premises, is equally unsound, and I believe the practice will be equally unsuccessful. The premises are true, namely, that Governments are interested in having an educated people; but the conclusion is false, that it is therefore the business of Governments to educate; and it may turn out, though perhaps many years hence, to be “universally admitted that Governments are the worst of *educators*.”

Many other illustrations might be given to show the fallacy of the argument on which State Education is based. The State is greatly interested in the prudent nursing of children and training of families, in a fair rate of wages, in the perfect sobriety of its subjects, in their provident habits, in their wholesome diet, in their well-assorted marriages, in the books and newspapers published for their information and guidance, and in the religious truths which lay the basis of their moral conduct. Speculative philosophers of ancient and modern times have made all these matters the province of the State. But the most judicious statesmen have discarded such views, which would imply that nations are as helpless as



children, whilst their rulers are as wise as sages : they have seen that such matters could not be controlled by Governments without the exercise of an intolerable despotism, nor without reducing subjects to a degrading pupillage. It is natural for the partizans of arbitrary Government to advocate the same kind of prerogative in the head of the state as in the head of the family : but the friends of liberty ought to know, that the notion of parental wisdom in rulers is ridiculous, and that they are much more frequently taught by their subjects than their subjects by them. I scarcely know any measure of reform or improvement in modern days which has not proceeded from the people, and after a long course of popular agitation been virtually forced upon reluctant Governments and Legislatures.

It may then at least be taken as proved, that the duty of Government to educate cannot be deduced from the interest it has in the people being educated. If that duty exist at all, it must be founded on the *superior fitness* of the Government to educate. Let us, then, examine that point, which resolves itself into two,—first, is Government well qualified to conduct the education of the people ? and second, are the people themselves ill qualified for the work ?

At present I confine myself to an examination of the advantages and disadvantages of a strictly Governmental education.

It possesses the following *advantages* :—

1st. Government has, with the consent of Parliament, possession of the purse-strings of the nation, and it can therefore command adequate funds for the most efficient support of education.

2nd. It can either, by its own authority, establish as many schools as are needed, or it can aid and supplement those which are already established ; so as to ensure an ample supply of schools for the whole country.

3rd. It can train and examine teachers, and can insist on all the schools having efficient teachers, and on the adoption of an efficient plan of education.

4th. It can place the schools under the visitation of able Inspectors, whose reports will enable Parliament and the public to judge of the state of education, and to correct what may be defective or wrong.

Such is a not unfavourable view of the advantages of a system of education conducted by the Government. But though apparently capable of effecting anything and everything, the system will be found to be attended with the following over-balancing *disadvantages* :—

1st. The duty of educating being assumed by the State, it is of course taken off from the parent, who thereby loses one of his most sacred responsibilities, and with it loses the influence which the performance of that duty would give him with his child, as well as a part of the moral discipline intended by Providence for the strengthening of his own virtues.

2nd. Just in proportion to the extent of the Government control, will be the indifference on the part of religious bodies and benevolent citizens to



the work of education ; and of course the happy social influence arising from those educational organizations which now engage numbers of the upper and middle classes in co-operation with the working classes will be destroyed.

3rd. The responsibility of education being thus removed both from parents and Christian philanthropists, it will rest wholly upon a set of political officers, who have no interest whatever in the work beyond that which is ordinarily taken in the discharge of official duties. The functionaries will be selected from political motives, and will be changed with the change of parties ; and the schools will then be managed just in the same spirit as the Custom-house or the Stamps and Taxes. Whilst the subject is new, there will be considerable activity : and when public vigilance is lulled to sleep, the Education Board will go to sleep also. There will be the same proportion of conscientious men, bent on improvement, in this as in other departments of the public service ; and, unfortunately, the same proportion who discharge the duties perfunctorily and heartlessly for the mere sake of the salary.\*

\* I might quote volumes of authorities to show the inefficiency of State functionaries for a work like that of education, which peculiarly requires to be conducted with the heart and soul of benevolence and piety. Suffice it, however, to adduce a few testimonies from the speakers at the recent Conference at Birmingham on the reformation of Juvenile Delinquents. The Earl of Shaftesbury, whilst maintaining that Government grants were needful, said that "Government aid, if alone given, would soon become *cold, formal, and ineffective*?" The Earl of Harrowby said—"If it were desired to have moral action brought to bear upon the individual—and this was indispensable to reformatory establishments of the class contemplated—it would be necessary to bring the heart of one man to bear on the heart of another ; and no act of Parliament could secure that amount of enthusiasm and zeal which was necessary for reforming the heart of a criminal, whether adult or child. It was not enough to appoint well-paid officers, or to have a number of persons *scrambling for Government appointments, and too happy to receive Government salaries*. They must, on the contrary, look for assistance to those who had already distinguished themselves by personal sacrifices and great exertions in the work. Measures of reform of this character were the work of such persons as Elizabeth Fry, Miss Carpenter, Mr. Ellis, and others, whose names he could mention, and great care should be taken lest, by any legislative interference, they extinguished the spark of voluntary efforts which had already been productive of so much good. They must not suffer themselves to be led away by the specious example of Governmental interference in other countries, but urge upon the Government at home to encourage, rather than to interfere, with the risk of crippling them, with the operations of a movement already attended with great success."—Mr. Commissioner M. D. Hill, Q.C., alluded to the success of reformatory attempts already made, and asked upon what principle all this had been done. "Was it by the order of Government, or under the hope of Government reward? No, it was gratifying to find that *all that yet had been done in this matter had been the result of the voluntary principle, and not by the paid agency of the State*. The voluntary principle was the popular one. They might have Government education in a despotic monarchy. The Emperor of Russia might, for ought he knew, have a governmental system of education in his country ; but he would not permit the voluntary system in his empire, because he well knew that no bounds could be set to its operation ; and if the voluntary



4th. It is purely impossible for any Government Board to give effective superintendence to all the primary schools of the country. In England the number of schools would be *twenty thousand*. The idea of any real supervision by the Central authority is out of the question. Therefore the effective authority, and with it a tremendous amount of power, must necessarily be confided to the Inspectors, who would go about the country as little despots, owning scarcely any real responsibility, and dictating to school committees (if such things remained) and to the schoolmasters.

5th. Educational Societies having ceased to exist, and all the schools being under Government control, it is natural to suppose that one uniform system of tuition would prevail, with one set of school-books and school apparatus; than which nothing can be conceived more adverse to future improvements in education. The stereotyped school-books would be an emblem of the whole system, which would be unwieldy and inflexible in the highest degree. The production of new school-books and the invention of new methods would cease, from the impossibility of introducing them to use, except through the Government Board, which, if better disposed towards innovations than it is likely to be, would find it a work of enormous labour and expense to change the apparatus of twenty or thirty thousand schools,—an expense not easily to be obtained from the great milch-cow, the Exchequer, at whose teats innumerable hands are always pulling.

6th. Liberal as is the disposition of the House of Commons now towards education, it is by no means certain that that liberality would continue, if the whole expenses of the schools came to rest on the State. Judging from the wretched salaries given in the Post Office and other public departments, and from the difficulty there often is in wringing money from the Treasury, it is quite possible that education might not only be bound, but starved, under official management.

7th. The patronage of the Government would be dangerously increased by the enormous establishments required to direct many thousands of schools. There would be one or more great Boards of Education, with numerous departments, and employing many classes of tradesmen; there would be forty or fifty Normal schools, with their staffs of professors; there would be a great number of School Inspectors, continually travelling about the country, on whose reports every teacher and pupil-teacher would be dependent for his livelihood. We have now 46,114 public and private schools in England and Wales, of which 15,584 are public schools. Whatever the number of schools might be under the new system, it would be sufficiently great to create a net-work of official influence over the whole country, resembling the bureaucracies of the Continent, and exercising a

system began by reforming thieves, it might probably end by reforming emperors.” —If voluntary zeal is so indispensable in the reformation of criminals, will it not form our best and only true agency for the education of the young? Will not Government agency in this all-important work be liable to become “cold, formal, and ineffective?”



similar effect on the holders and expectants of school-appointments. Such an extension of Government agency and patronage is scarcely consistent with free institutions.

8th. With the control of the schoolmasters and the school-books, Government would possess the power of moulding the religious and political opinions of the people,—not a very fit thing for a great and free nation, nor compatible with its intellectual independence.

9th. The difficult subject of religious teaching must be dealt with in one of three ways,—1st, it must be altogether excluded from the school; or 2nd, only *one* form of religion must be taught; or 3rd, *every* form of religion must be taught. To each of these methods insuperable objections would present themselves.

10th. If artistic and industrial education, if Mechanics' Institutions, Colleges, and all the establishments of secondary and tertiary education, are to be taken under Government management, the objections stated above would be greatly aggravated and multiplied.

I have endeavoured to state fairly the advantages and disadvantages of Governmental education. Let them be weighed together; and if I mistake not, the latter will be found enormously to preponderate.

Many will say, however, that they do not advocate Government education, but only Government help and inspection; and they will agree that the former would be an intolerable thing in England, and even mischievous to education itself, as well as to liberty and the spirit of self-reliance. I should be glad to have this acknowledgment made far more distinctly than I have seen it made by the friends of Government interference; for it is certain, in the first place, that we are continually hearing *the duty of Government to educate the people* plainly asserted; and if such a duty exists, it will not be easy to prove that Government should be fettered in its performance. Let the doctrine either be openly vindicated or openly abandoned. As it is, we are tending fast towards the practice of Government education; and, as I showed in the previous chapter, there is a clamorous demand for it in every shape, with an extraordinary blindness to its evils. Foreign Governments are commended in proportion to the completeness of their educational establishments. Further, if Government education in its full development is the wrong and dangerous thing which I have attempted to show, a presumption lies against the wisdom of any approach to it. If the principle is bad, the practice can only vary as to degrees of badness. Each interference on the part of the Government has only led to a demand for stronger interference; each grant of money, to calls for more money; and each step taken has led the Government itself to take another and a larger step in the same direction. The reports of the Inspectors are full of complaints, all pointing to more extensive measures. Wherever there is any want of success, the blame is laid on the insufficiency of the law. Nearly all agree to speak contemptuously of those voluntary efforts, which ought to be encouraged as our surest dependence, but which it is the natural tendency of Government interference to unnerve.



I conclude this part of my argument with a quotation from a philosophical criticism of MR. MACAULAY on "Southey's Colloquies on Society," a quotation, the profound truths of which are not invalidated by the author's subsequent inconsistency in supporting the Minutes of Council. MR. MACAULAY said—

"The maxim that Governments ought to train the people in the way in which they should go, sounds well. But is there any reason for believing that a Government is more likely to lead the people in the right way than the people to fall into the right way themselves? Have there not been Governments which were blind leaders of the blind? Are there not still such Governments? Can it be laid down as a general rule, that the movement of political and religious truth is rather downwards from the Government to the people, than upwards from the people to the Government?

"It is *not by the intermeddling of Mr. Southey's idol, the omniscient and omnipresent State, but by the prudence and energy of the People*, that England has hitherto been carried forward in civilization; and it is to the same prudence and the same energy that we now look with comfort and good hope. Our rulers will best promote the improvement of the nation *by strictly confining themselves to their own legitimate duties*,—by leaving capital to find its most lucrative course, commodities their fair price, *industry and intelligence their natural reward*, idleness and folly their natural punishment, by maintaining peace, by defending property, by diminishing the price of law, and by observing strict economy in every department of the State. *Let the Government do this; THE PEOPLE WILL ASSUREDLY DO THE REST.*"

---

## CHAPTER III.

THE TWO MANCHESTER SYSTEMS—THEIR CONSTANTLY CHANGING FEATURES—REMARKABLE OPPOSITION OF OPINION IN MANCHESTER AMONG THE ADVOCATES OF STATE INTERFERENCE—OBJECTIONS TO THE LOCAL OR RELIGIOUS PLAN—OBJECTIONS TO THE SECULAR PLAN—MANCHESTER AN EPITOME OF ENGLAND.

HAVING weighed the advantages and disadvantages of a purely Governmental Education, and found the latter greatly to preponderate, I come now to remark on some of those modifications of Government Education which have been proposed,—by the Committee of Council on Education, by the Manchester and Salford (Local) Education Committee,—and by the National (Secular) Public School Association.

A difficulty here presents itself to the examination, arising out of the ever-changing features of these several plans. The changes in the system adopted by the Committee of Council on Education have been those of *development* or *addition*, making the system to rest more and more on public help and control, and less and less on private exertion either on the part of parents or friends,—yet changes so affecting the balance of power as most materially to influence the judgment that must be formed concerning



the plan, even by those who are favourable to State interference.—The Manchester and Salford Local project was so changed in the course of its formation into a Bill, as to produce a secession of Roman Catholics on one side, and Quakers on the other, from the number of its friends. When it came before a Committee of the House of Commons, it appeared that portions of it were disapproved of both by the Bishop and the Dean, and other portions were acknowledged to be objectionable by MR. ENTWISTLE, the representative of the promoters; and now it is said to have undergone further changes preparatory to its third introduction into Parliament.—The system of the National Public School Association has for years been in course of constant alteration. At first it was so exclusively secular that the Bible was not to be permitted in the schools: this prohibition was abandoned on the remonstrance of a leading member: and in the last shape under which I have seen it, there is the *appearance* of a great concession on the point of religion, because existing schools are permitted to receive support; but there is to be no direct religious instruction within school hours, or given by the schoolmaster, or paid for out of the public money, or which the scholars are to be expected to attend as part of the school duties. Therefore I apprehend that the appearance is delusive, and that the schools would practically be secular schools. This Association has also entirely remodelled its original machinery, which provided County Boards, with an absolute authority to levy rates, to prescribe plans of tuition and school-books for a whole county, and to certificate schoolmasters.—Then one of the leading Seculars, MR. W. J. FOX, brought forward a Bill for Secular schools, which gave to the Committee of Council such enormous powers both of taxation and control, that LORD JOHN RUSSELL pronounced the Bill to be “evidently despotic,” and to be calculated to “destroy altogether the schools already existing:” and LORD ASHLEY estimated that the taxation which the Committee of Privy Council would be empowered to raise under the Bill would not fall short of £3,000,000 per annum. This extraordinary measure received an early *quietus*, and I only mention it as one of the many forms in which it has been proposed to force education on the country by legislation.

It would be as vain to criticize in detail any of these plans, as to define the hue of the chameleon or the shape of Proteus. But their incessant changes at least prove, that no plan of national education has been proposed that is not open to insuperable objections. Moreover, it will be observed that these several plans stand in irreconcilable hostility to each other, both on religious and civil grounds. Some of them absolutely require religious instruction to be given in the schools (though, indeed, it may be of any and every kind), and others strictly forbid all religious instruction (at least during school hours). One set of plans give the real and substantial authority over the education and the teachers to a central Governmental Board, namely, the Committee of the Privy Council, and another set give it to local elective committees. According to one class of educationists, it is essential that there should be no school fees;



according to another class, it is essential that the children should pay. Surely these opposing views, on the most important principles of National Education, afford a presumption against National Education itself; especially when it can be shown, that there is a system free from every one of the objections. And if it should appear that the chief variance is not merely one of speculative opinion, but of religious principle, and relative to the greatest of all questions in practical education, the presumption becomes infinitely stronger.

The following remarks apply to all the systems referred to, though in different degrees: They all require an Act of Parliament to carry them into effect, and therefore submit the education of the people to the legislature as the rightful authority to decide upon it,—a concession which is as great an infringement of just principles, as if the legislature were asked to regulate industry or the periodical press: They all destroy the free, independent, and voluntary character of education,—take it out of the hands of individuals and societies, to put it more or less under some public authority,—and render the pecuniary support of whatever form may be adopted compulsory on the whole community: They all weaken the responsibility of parents, in regard to the education of their children, by committing it to legislative care: They all lessen the moral responsibility, the activity, and the wholesome influence of the benevolent friends of education, who now aid the humbler classes in providing good schools: They all tend to destroy the self-reliance of the people—the noblest virtue of freemen: They all involve the necessity of taxing numerous classes for systems of which they conscientiously disapprove: They all encounter the religious difficulty in one form or another.

The recent experience of Manchester affords a most convincing proof of the insurmountable difficulties in the way of any satisfactory measure of legislation. There were in that city three parties, the Locals, the Seculars, and the Voluntaries. The two former were favourable to systems of free schools, supported by local rates, but they differed from each other in regard to the teaching of religion, which the Locals made an indispensable condition of receiving public money, whilst the Seculars expressly forbade such instruction to be given by the teachers or within school hours. The third party, the Voluntaries, was firmly opposed to both the other two. All the three objected to the existing plan of the Government!

When the Locals and the Seculars were preparing to bring their respective plans before Parliament, upwards of 40,000 ratepayers petitioned in favour of the Local Bill as against the Seculars, and upwards of 60,000 inhabitants petitioned in favour of the Secular plan as against the Locals! Against the Local or religious plan, the Town Council of Manchester petitioned, as both unnecessary and objectionable. It was also opposed by the High Church clergy,—by thirty-five ministers of Dissenting bodies, including the Independent, Baptist, Wesleyan Association, Primitive Methodist, Methodist New Connexion, and Calvinistic Methodist,—by several Dissenting congregations,—by all the Roman Catholic clergy,



—by the Society of Friends,—by public meetings of Congregationalists and Baptists,—and of course by all the Secular party. Against the Secular plan, on the other side, there stood arrayed, with very few exceptions, the ministers of religion belonging to the Establishment, the Wesleyans, the Catholics, and the other sects, except the Unitarians, with many of the laity; and of course all the friends of the Local plan, and all the Voluntaries.

The nature of the objections against the Local or religious plan may be judged of from a document published by the Executive Committee of the Secular or National Public School Association. That document disapproved of the fundamental principle of the Bill, declaring that it “will violate the conscientious convictions of a large body of the ratepayers, who object to be taxed for the support of religious teaching, and particularly for the teaching of opposite, and, in their view, erroneous religious opinions;”—that it “proposes to lay a tax on the whole community, whilst the conditions of union are such as will exclude many rate-payers from benefit, whose conscientious convictions are at variance with such conditions;”—that it “lays a tax for a local object, but gives the power of management almost entirely to a central authority, and renders the municipal Council subservient to the Committee of the Privy Council;”—that it is “a premium on sectarianism,” and would “place new schools in the hands of the richest sects.”

On the other side, the supporters of the Local Bill and the Voluntaries were outraged by the proposal of the Seculars absolutely to forbid, by Act of Parliament, the giving of religious instruction in the schools of the whole country. They felt this to be a monstrous interference with religious liberty and the liberty of teaching; and they knew it to be in opposition to the fundamental principles of all the educational societies that have been formed in England in modern times, as well as to the plan of the Government. The object of many, if not most, of the Seculars, in excluding religious teaching from the schools, was doubtless to avoid offence to conscience: but in avoiding one evil, they fell into a still greater, namely, the invoking of the authority of law to FORBID the teaching of religion in the schools which *all* were to be taxed to support. Such a law will never be tolerated in England. If enacted, it could not be enforced. So deep is the conviction of multitudes that religious instruction properly accompanies secular, that it is even of greater importance, and that it is specially needed for the children of the poor, owing to their inferior advantages at home,—that a law excluding it from schools would certainly be disobeyed, under a sense of duty to a higher Power.

Here, then, we see two great parties in Manchester in hostile array against each other on the most important question connected with education, and a third against both, and all three against Government. It is obvious that *no* legislative plan could be carried, without offending the conscientious convictions of a large part of the population of that city. No such plan, therefore, is compatible either with justice or with peace.



These are not my assertions, but are proved with overwhelming force by the witnesses before the Committees of 1852 and 1853 on Manchester and Salford Education, and laid at full length before the public in two folio volumes.\*

But Manchester may be regarded as an epitome of England, because the same diversities of religious belief and of opinion on education which exist in that city, prevail throughout the country. In this state of things, how can the legislature justly sanction any plan intended for general adoption and resting on compulsory taxation?

Let it be observed, that from these and every other difficulty on the score of religion, the Voluntary system is perfectly free. It does injustice to no one; it interferes with no one's liberty of action. Religious schools and secular, Protestant schools and Catholic, may exist side by side, without the shadow of complaint, each emulating the rest in a competition of excellence, and each patronized by the public in proportion to its merits.

\* Take an example from each side; Mr. W. Entwisle, the chairman of the Manchester and Salford Education Bill Committee, quoted to the Committee of the House of Commons the following fundamental principle adopted by the clergy of the rural deanery of Leeds, "*That religious training shall be recognised as an essential element in any national system of education, for otherwise both Churchmen and Dissenters would alike give it the most determined opposition.*" on which Mr. Entwisle adds—"That is the principle to which we have given our adhesion;" (Q. 708); and he adds, that his association is "unanimous" in opposing schools from which religious instruction was excluded. (Q. 807). On the other side the Rev. W. Mc. Kerrow, D.D., says,—"*The Manchester and Salford Bill for the Promotion of Education is objectionable, first, because it violates the rights and aggrieves the sensibilities of conscience, by proposing to endow, at the public expense, various and contradictory creeds, by demanding the universal support of local and direct taxation on behalf of opinions and forms of worship called religious, which multitudes of those from whom support will be forcibly taken consider to be unscriptural and erroneous in their nature, and injurious to the interests of pure and true religion.*" (Q. 335.) Again, "To select and teach the creed of *one* religious party would be to inflict a wrong on all other parties which are equally entitled to determine for themselves what is truth; and to endow *all* religious opinions and modes of worship is, in my opinion, to place truth and the manifold forms of error and superstition on the same footing, and, indeed, to obstruct the former and encourage the latter, and thus to excite the resistance of the conscientious, who desire for the propagation of all religious opinions only a fair field and no favour." (Q. 343.) All Scotland is now agitated and divided by the respective plans of national education. The Established Church cling to the old parochial schools, with religious instruction and the Assembly's Catechism. At a meeting of the Free Church Presbytery of Glasgow, it was unanimously resolved on the motion of the Rev. Dr. Buchanan (a principal leader of the body), "That in the law instituting and regulating the national schools, it should be provided that in all these schools the religious instruction hitherto in use in the parish schools shall be continued." The United Presbyterian Church insist on religious education. But Lord Melgund, a prominent Parliamentary supporter of a secular plan, spoke thus of the present Government plan at a public meeting at Kelso on the 5th January, 1854—"I cannot go so far as the Lords of the Privy Council, and as the Government of the country, seem to have gone in regard to perfect liberty, for it seems to me that the toleration they propose is a sort of toleration carried to an



## CHAPTER IV.

THE GOVERNMENT OF SCHOOLS: THE CENTRAL AND THE LOCAL AUTHORITIES: OBJECTIONS TO BOTH—UNFITNESS OF COMMITTEES POPULARLY ELECTED TO CONDUCT SCHOOLS—PARSIMONIOUSNESS IN COUNTRY DISTRICTS—NO SECURITY FOR THE PIETY OF TEACHERS—THE PLAN OF THE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL ON EDUCATION—SATISFACTORY TO NO PARTY—OBJECTIONABLE MINUTE UNDER LORD DERBY'S ADMINISTRATION—THE MINUTES OF COUNCIL OF APRIL 2ND, 1853, BROUGHT INTO OPERATION WITHOUT ANY PARLIAMENTARY SANCTION OR DISCUSSION—SUMMARY OF OBJECTIONS.

IN any general Plan of Education supported and enforced by law, there must of course be a provision for the government of the schools and schoolmasters. Some projectors have proposed to give the power to a State authority, that is, to the Committee of Council on Education; whilst others propose to entrust it entirely to local committees, elected by the rate-payers. To both the *central* and the *local* plans there are most formidable objections.

The central is objectionable, on account of the undue influence it gives to the Executive, and its hampering of the freedom of education. The local is objectionable, owing to the strife of political and religious parties, which already exists, and which elections of school committees would be certain to aggravate; and also owing to the probable unfitness of persons so elected to manage the schools of a town or of a district.

Our educational projectors have been sorely perplexed to choose between these evils, and in no case has a plan been devised that is not open to serious objection. The Manchester and Salford Local Bill, we have just seen, was complained of by the Secular Association, on the ground that it "lays a tax for a local object, but gives the power of management almost entirely to a central authority, and renders the Municipal Council subservient to the Committee of the Privy Council." MR. FOX's plan was charged by LORD JOHN RUSSELL himself with giving to the Privy Council powers of control and taxation "evidently despotic." The Secular plan,

extreme excess. It is toleration run mad. It is not merely that every individual shall have a right to follow out his own opinions on religion according to the manner he thinks best, but that every opinion on religious subjects shall be paid by the State money. Why, under those Minutes of the Privy Council, you have the Free Church paid to oppose the Establishment, and the Establishment paid to oppose the Free Church. You have the Episcopal Church paid to oppose, I suppose, both the Free Church and the Establishment, and you have the Roman Catholic Church paid to oppose all the three. In short, you have a system of payment and encouragement of *every system of religion whatsoever*, however monstrous or absurd it may be. The opinion I hold is, that the State ought to have nothing whatever to do with questions of religion at all,—that the State is stepping beyond its proper sphere and function, and is doing injury both to itself and to the people, when it goes into these questions at all." Such are the hopeless diversities of principle on these subjects!



in its first shape, proposed a County Board, which would have given an absolute control over the system of tuition and the school-books, for the two million inhabitants of Lancashire, to a dozen persons, with a power of taxing the districts against their own consent. When the despotic nature of this constitution was exposed, the County Board was abandoned, and the whole power was given to district school committees, who were to be elected biennially by the rate-payers. It is now proposed that these committees should be authorized to tax the inhabitants, to build and establish new schools, to support old schools, to appoint, pay, and dismiss teachers, to appoint and pay visiters, to sanction all the school-books, and generally to control the instruction and management of the schools;—powers of enormous magnitude, and which in some cases would extend over hundreds of schools.

To any one who has practical experience of municipal and parochial elections, I appeal, whether such a committee would be calculated wisely to conduct the schools of a whole district. School management is a task of great difficulty and delicacy. It is no light matter for a committee of experienced persons to conduct a single school,—so great is the attention required to the selection, qualifications, and conduct of teachers, to systems of tuition, to the condition of the premises, to school-books and school materials, to examinations and prizes, to the visiting of parents, to inquiries after absentees, and numerous other details. But for a committee of unpaid members, consisting of men engaged in business, to have the charge of fifty, a hundred, or two hundred schools, is absolutely preposterous. The power and patronage of such a committee would be immense, but their duties would be bewildering. To compare the efficiency of such a plan with the efficiency of the existing committees of schools, which consist usually of the minister and a few of the most zealous and experienced friends of education, who themselves visit the schools, would be an absurdity.

And of whom would the district school committee, under the Bill of the National Public School Association, probably consist? Of the wisest, most impartial, and most-at-leisure educationists? Or would they not rather be elected, after strong contests, from among the most forward of political or sectarian partizans? The tendency to party organization and action is seen in elections of town councils, of churchwardens, of guardians of the poor, and of surveyors of highways, as well as of members of Parliament.\* In elections for school committees, there would be religious differences to aggravate the ordinary party heat to seven-fold violence. It would be a struggle between High Church and Low Church, or between Establishment and Dissent, or between men of religion and of no religion, or be-

\* At this time, and for several years back, the Surveyors of Highways in Leeds are all Chartists. For a considerable time the Churchwardens were Chartists: now they are Churchmen and Tories, with an understanding that there are to be no Church Rates. For some years the Poor Law Guardians were nearly all Tories; but a great effort was made, and the Tories were expelled at the last election, and replaced by Liberals. Nearly all the members of the Town Council are Liberals,—the party struggles of many years having led to this result. Leeds may be received as a specimen of the largest and purest constituencies in the country.



tween Tories and Chartists : and at one election one party might prevail, and at the next the opposite party, who would upset what had been done by their predecessors, and perhaps dismiss teachers to make way for their own friends.

Another point : with what degree of liberality would the farmers in rural districts vote money for the schools ? Is there not great reason to fear that in a large proportion of those districts the schools would be miserably starved ? If MR. CORDEN correctly described the ratepayers of the rural parishes, it is not only probable, but certain, that the school-committees chosen there would be utterly unqualified for the duty ; and experience shows that they would be extremely parsimonious. In towns we should have our hot and cold fits of economy and extravagance. It was avowedly the danger from these sources, which led the National Public School Association to propose a County Board, with a controlling authority over the district committees ; and the County Board was only abandoned when it appeared that so despotic a power would be a still greater evil, or at least so unpopular as to make the system intolerable.

To one other point of paramount importance I would invite attention. There is nothing so essential in education, with a view to the moral and religious character of the rising race, as that the schoolmasters and schoolmistresses should be persons of decided virtue and piety. This opinion is of course held by all who value a religious education ; but it is scarcely less distinctly admitted by many of the Seculars, who argue that the principles and life of the teacher, exhibiting themselves in a thousand ways to the children, afford a better guarantee for a good moral influence than any direct religious instruction. Agreeing in this view, at least to the extent that genuine piety is the first qualification of the teacher, I maintain that there can be no effectual security for it under any system which leaves the appointment of the teacher either with the central Government or with a parish board elected by the rate-payers. It must be superfluous to argue the unfitness of Downing-street to judge of religious qualifications. Then is there the slightest probability that a parish board, elected as such boards have been shown to be, would either have the means of judging of religious character, or would make that a leading element in its choice ? Is it not all but certain that party and personal favouritism would usually govern the elections ? If the Secular plan of education had been adopted, it is probable that religious character would not even be looked at. By common consent, and as a matter of propriety, it would be admitted that the qualifications for secular teaching were alone to be considered ; or at least that a fair moral character was all that could be required, in addition to scholastic attainments.

Whilst this would naturally be the case in the choice of teachers by a parish board, just the reverse would be found where the teacher was appointed by a committee, who represented either a religious body, or an educational society formed (as all our educational societies have been) with special regard to the religious training of the young. In such cases religious



character could be easily ascertained, and would be regarded as of the first importance. May it not, therefore, be considered as evident, that the Voluntary system affords the best guarantee for the religious character of the teachers; and that there could be no such guarantee where the teachers were either appointed by Government or by a parish board?

But it is thought that the plan actually adopted by the Government avoids the objections which exist to other plans of national education, whilst it secures all their advantages. It consists in *aid* and *superintendence*, not in the direct establishment and administration of schools. Existing schools are aided under certain conditions, and the funds granted by Parliament are distributed by the Committee of Council on Education, with the assistance of able School Inspectors. It is alleged that this plan stimulates voluntary zeal, instead of superseding it, inasmuch as money is only granted to meet voluntary contributions and payments; and that the special object of the system is to improve the quality of education, by supporting normal institutions, making grants to teachers and pupil teachers, subjecting them to examination before employing them, and thus raising their qualifications and their *status*. It is said that this plan has in point of fact already succeeded in elevating the character of schools and schoolmasters.

I am far from denying that good has been done, or that several of the methods adopted by the Committee of Council are judicious. So much money cannot have been wasted, nor so many accomplished scholars employed to inspect the schools in vain. It is no part of my case to deny that Governments can aid, superintend, or even directly conduct education, and with some considerable advantages: in the second chapter I pointed out those advantages. My argument is, that, looking at the whole case, and in the long run, with a view both to the interests of education and the other interests of a people, the Voluntary system is the best. It is highly probable that if Government were to take in hand the improvement of the periodical Press, it would effect as much as it has done in the schools. If it were to appoint a Board of Agriculture, to superintend the farming of the country, it might cause numberless negligences to be repaired and improvements to be carried out. So with manufactures. So with all our charities and institutions. Further, a department of State appointed to redress the inequalities of fortune might do prodigious good, by cutting down excessive properties and distributing them among the necessitous. But surely the man would be a simpleton, who should argue in favour of any of these methods of Government interference, because of the probability that partial good might be done by them, and even done more rapidly than in the ordinary course of events. Philosophy requires us to examine, not a few examples occurring within a short space, but all the examples we can find over an extended space, and thence to deduce our principles of political science. By such a process it was that men learnt to "admit universally," notwithstanding a few facts apparently to the contrary, "that Governments were the worst of cultivators, the worst of



manufacturers, and the worst of traders." The same process, with the aid of analogy, will show us, that it is unwise for Governments to do what their subjects are able to do for themselves, and what they have infinitely stronger motives than the State can have for doing well.

It happens unfortunately, however, for the Committee of Council on Education, that *no one is satisfied* with its operations under the Minutes of 1846 and subsequent years. Neither of the two Manchester parties nor any of their Parliamentary sympathisers, are satisfied; for they are proposing new and very different measures. The Dissenters are not satisfied; for they complain that the Minutes work them great injustice.\* The School Inspectors are not satisfied; for they are constantly complaining of the inadequacy of what is done, and suggesting larger interference. The Government itself is not satisfied; for it last Session introduced fresh measures both for towns and the rural districts. The principle of aiding every form of religious instruction is offensive to immense numbers, though many, having not had the manliness to refuse the bribe, are of course unable to enter their protest. The practice of proportioning grants to voluntary contributions is unjust to the poorer districts, and the whole system is unjust to the poorer sects, because the latter will not accept public money at all. That there must be great practical objections to the system is evident from the fact, that out of 15,584 public schools in England, only 3,474 received building grants, and only 2,310 are receiving annual grants for teachers and apprentices. The remedy for this, no doubt, is sought in larger grants under easier conditions; but in thus yielding to expediency, the original principle and boasted safeguard of the measure is likely to be sacrificed.

What can the people of England think of a system, which changes the Government Board of Education with every change of Administration,—which so lately placed at its head the EARL OF LONSDALE, a nobleman never before heard of in any connexion with education,—and

\* By the Congregational and Baptist bodies the Government plan in all its forms has been repeatedly condemned, both on civil and religious grounds, but especially as a plan for the teaching of religion under the authority of law and at the public expense, and, still further, as a plan for the teaching of *all* religions at the public expense. It is known that an absolute condition of receiving Government aid is that the instruction shall be religious, but it may be religion of any kind from the Roman Catholic to the Unitarian or the Jewish. This is a palpable step towards the open endowment of the ministers of all sects;—a violation of principle against which most of the Dissenters have consistently protested, and which many Churchmen and Wesleyans would loudly condemn, who yet are found supporting a measure which obviously involves the same confounding of truth and error. Most, if not all, the minor Methodist sects, and some of the Wesleyans themselves, are found among the opponents of the Government plan, both in its principles and details. Of course, the schools of the sects which refuse the public money are exposed to a most unfair competition from the schools aided by the Government; and those sects find themselves subject to the extreme injustice of being compelled to contribute towards schools where all the forms of religion of which they disapprove are taught.



which, under his *regime*, allowed a Minute to be passed (of the 13th June, 1852), thus described by SIR JAS. K. SHUTTLEWORTH ?—"By this Minute the schoolmaster may be *suspended* by the clergyman on account of *any objection to his teaching, discipline, or conduct*, not merely on religious, but on moral grounds. In schools where this constitution is adopted, he is therefore *at the mercy of the clergyman*." But for the retirement of LORD DERBY'S Administration, this Minute, which would have given the clergyman a virtually despotic power over the schoolmaster and the school, would at this moment have been in force. For every man of the least political experience knows, that it is the most difficult thing in the world to induce Parliament to interpose for the purpose of controlling a department of the Executive in its duty.\* Then what, I ask, is our security for the educational liberties of the country, when, by one subtle stroke of the pen, a Minister of State can erect the ecclesiastics into school-despots?

Nor is it in a constitutional view one whit less alarming to see LORD JOHN RUSSELL himself, and the Committee of Council of which he is the most influential member, bring into operation a Minute (of 2nd April, 1853) introducing a new system of grants to schools in small towns and rural districts, which may ultimately entail *an annual expense of several hundred thousand pounds* on the country, without one word of discussion in Parliament on the subject! Yes, LORD JOHN, in a few brief sentences, referred to the plan in a speech in the House of Commons, and then laid the Minute on the table, together with a Bill for Education in Municipal Boroughs. It was expected that both would be discussed together; but the latter was put off time after time, and was never discussed at all. Meanwhile, because the House passed the annual vote for education, which was done *among a heap of other miscellaneous estimates*, on an evening *when it was not expected to come on*, and *without a single word being said*, this immensely important measure, affecting the schools of *the greater part of England*, is taken as passed, and came into operation on the 1st of January, 1854!!! Such a proceeding, adopted in spite of the fullest explanation and repeated remonstrances, addressed personally and by letter to LORD JOHN RUSSELL, and personally to the EARL OF GRANVILLE (President of the Committee of Council), makes me feel that a Parliament which will submit to such *sharp practice* is extremely unfit to guard our educational liberties.†

\* This objection applies in principle to the very existence of the Committee of Council on Education, which, however theoretically responsible to Parliament, is practically irresponsible. All experience shows, that the idea of bringing the conduct of the Committee in its management of the schools under full and fair examination in Parliament, would be utterly hopeless.

† It is impossible in these letters to criticise the annual Reports of the School Inspectors; but for a very searching and valuable examination of those documents I refer to a pamphlet published by the Rev. Andrew Reed, B.A., of Norwich, entitled "Inspectors inspected—a Review of the Operations of the Educational Committee of the Privy Council from 1846 to 1852:" published by John Snow. The summary and recapitulation of Mr. Reed's argument is as



follows:—"I have shown that it (the Government measure) is *unjust and partial* in the *distribution* of the *grants*, the Church having eight parts to one for Dissent. It is also an absolute *waste of taxation*, there being a deficiency of only some £4 or £5 per annum on each school assisted—a sum which might easily be made up in other ways. With all this outlay, the really *needy spots and struggling schools* are cut off from help, which is lavished on those that could do as well or better without it. It encourages a base and *mercenary spirit* in children, teachers, and inspectors; and leads to a constant proposal of *new bribes and rewards*, which drain the public resources, and deprave, rather than elevate the schools. It leads subscribers to *reduce the salaries of teachers*, and lessen their subscriptions,—teachers to become *unsettled* and anxious for better places, and to evade the time required for training pupil teachers, and all parties to become *functionaries*,—that is, to get as much money as possible, and do for it as little work as they can. While it supplies the clearest evidence that *self-supporting schools* are *desirable and possible even in rural districts*, such as those of Wales, and proves that the *common people*, so far from being unable to pay school-fees, are *actually paying far larger fees in private schools through preference of them to charity-schools*, yet it leads inspectors to disparage the voluntary efforts of those who refuse State aid, and to speak too flatteringly of schools which receive it. It does not appear that *any material improvement* in an educational point of view has arisen from this system, for it has only made use of those appliances of normal schools, trained teachers and assistants, pupil-teachers, &c., which Voluntaryism had already brought into existence, and the natural progress of which, it should seem, by its stimulating money-grants, to have *rather overdone* than beneficially assisted. The *power of the inspectors* has been shown, even at the outset, to be *fearfully absolute and irresponsible*,—an evil which is certain to increase. While strongly urging the extreme importance of *religious teachers and teaching*, it makes *no adequate provision* to insure it. It supports *schools in which error as well as truth* is freely taught, and allows a *Romanist inspector* to publish, under its sanction, through the length and breadth of England, the *praises of Popish monks and nuns as superior to our Protestant teachers*, together with the most obnoxious religious principles. It exhibits a system of *common endowment* and sanction given to *all forms of religion*, and so encourages among the people a spirit of sceptical indifference. I firmly believe it is more calculated *gradually to undermine* what religion already exists in English schools, than to increase its influence. In tolerates in *Church schools a gross violation of religious liberty*, in failing to require, as a condition to all grants, the abolition of the rule, that all children, whatever their parents' principles, shall be treated as belonging to the Church. At the same time, it *concedes to all Romanist schools what it denies to those of the English Church*—the unrestricted supremacy of the priests and bishops of their own Church, notwithstanding that *Rome* is everywhere seeking a *monopoly of education* in the power of the Jesuits. Nay, a Minute was adopted by the late Government, the effect of which was to place the power of English Church Schools in the hands of the clergy; and though the present Government has rescinded it, a fresh change in the Cabinet might at any moment alter the vital principles of British education. The *Inspectors themselves* admit the system to have failed in the most serious respect, that of having *attracted the co-operation of parents, and lengthened the stay of children at school*. Many of them regard it as a mere transitional state; and they propose and advocate different plans in its place. Meantime, *we are justified in our objection to all Government education*, by the *ill success* which has distinguished this *first attempt in England*; and, we believe, every succeeding experiment (if the people will try more) will but confirm our position, that *education, to be effective, must be voluntary and religious.*"—pp. 63–68.



## CHAPTER V.

THE VOLUNTARY SYSTEM DEFINED—ITS ADVANTAGES—ITS DISADVANTAGES—REPLIES TO OBJECTIONS—THE POWER OF THE VOLUNTARY SYSTEM IS THAT OF THE WHOLE PEOPLE—REFLEX INFLUENCE OF ITS OPERATION—IMPORTANCE OF CULTIVATING SELF-RELIANCE—EFFECT OF THE VOLUNTARY SYSTEM IN KNITTING TOGETHER THE CLASSES OF SOCIETY—FREE SCOPE GIVEN TO RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION—OPPOSITE EVILS IN PRUSSIAN AND DUTCH SCHOOLS.

IN maintaining the sufficiency and superiority of the Voluntary system in education, I shall not insult the reader by supposing that he expects any where faultless perfection. In all things human there are defects; and he who should hope to find a perfect system must look for it with a lantern at noon-day. I apprehend that he would scarcely, in his quest, direct his steps either towards Downing-street or towards a parish board. For the Voluntary system I claim the praise, that it is noble in its principles, powerful in its working, consistent alike with perfect justice and perfect freedom, conducive to religious influence, and on the whole by far the best. I admit that it has the irregularities of freedom, together with its virtues.

And first let me define what is meant by the Voluntary system. It seems needful to inform some that it is not confined to charity; still less does it mean Dissent. The Voluntary system includes *all that is not Governmental or compulsory,—all that men do for themselves, their neighbours, or their posterity, of their own free will.* It comprehends the efforts of parents, on behalf of the education of their children,—of the private schoolmaster and tutor, for their individual interest,—of religious bodies, benevolent societies, wealthy benefactors, and co-operative associations, in the support of schools,—and of those numerous auxiliaries to education, the authors and editors of educational works, lecturers, artists, and whoever devotes his talents in any way to promote the instruction of the young, without the compulsion of law or the support of the public purse. He who has imagined that the Voluntary system implies anything less than this, has been under a strange delusion. He who understands its import sees, that it rests on the broad basis of parental duty and affection, and of the intelligence, patriotism, and religion of the people, aided by the competition of all the educators who press forward to supply a universal want.

Whilst the Voluntary system enlists in its aid these natural and noble agencies, its very essence is *liberty*. It offends no man's conscience, exacts from no man's purse, favours no sect or party, neither enforces nor forbids religion in the schools, is open to all improvement, denies to no person the right of teaching, and gives to none the slightest ground for complaint. It is as *just and impartial* as it is free. In all these important respects it differs from systems which require the support of law and taxation. The only preference that can exist under it must be that which zeal gains over



apathy, benevolence over niggardliness, talent and industry over incapacity and sloth.

Under this system we should have no contentions in Parliament, no annoyance to the Government, no quarrels with the Church, and no broils to disturb our Town Councils or parishes. With unrestrained competition there might be plenty of controversy ; but it would be the hopeful contest of truth and error, or of rival educational systems, stimulating the parties to perfect their respective plans for the public good. It would not so much be the battle as the race ; and in watching this peaceful competition we might contentedly say—“ *Palmarum qui meruit, ferat.*”

It is, however, said that the Voluntary system, though it may have done great things, is not equal to the occasion ; and it is charged with the following *disadvantages*, namely, 1st. that it is irregular and fitful in its action ; 2nd. that it is unequal in its pressure, taxing the benevolent, and letting the niggard go free ; 3rd. that it is too feeble for so great a work ; 4th. that men’s disposition to acquire knowledge for themselves and their children is small, just in proportion as their need of it is great ; 5th. that the system allows unqualified persons to thrust themselves into the office of teachers, and thereby to do harm rather than good.

To these objections I reply, briefly—to the 1st, that the Voluntary system has only the same irregularities that we see in Nature and in Freedom, as, for example, in the trees of a forest, or in the progress of a free country like England, and that its vigorous virtue more than atones for the want of uniformity :—2nd. That if benevolence is taxed, at least it is self-taxed,—that its sacrifices are its pleasures,—and that to force the benevolent and the niggardly to give alike would be to destroy the virtue of the former, and to extort from the latter a grudging and hated service :—3rd. That the imputation of feebleness can only arise from the error of supposing that the Voluntary system rests wholly upon charity, whereas it rests upon the duty and affection of all the parents in the land, and on the self-interest of all educators, as well as on benevolence and religion,—a combination of powers superior to any other that can be found, and far more salutary than any Governmental agency :—4th. That as the last objection arose from looking exclusively at one reliance of the Voluntary system, this objection arises from looking exclusively at another, or rather from looking exclusively at the condition of the lower portion of the operative classes ; but that benevolence and Christian principle come in specially for the assistance of this portion,—not to mention the natural spread among the working classes themselves (now to a large extent actually witnessed) of a sense of the value of education :—5th. That for the qualifications of the teachers we may safely trust to the sagacity of parents, and the competition and self-interest of the teachers,—just as safely as we trust to the sagacity of buyers and the self-interest of sellers in trade, and discard the antiquated laws for measuring and stamping cloth, and for regulating other branches of industry : but that, in addition to these natural grounds of reliance, we have the efforts of the enlightened friends



of education, who promote the training of teachers and the introduction of improved methods of tuition.

To my judgment, these answers to the objections urged against the Voluntary system are perfectly satisfactory. The apparent force of any of the objections arises from taking a partial view of the vast and varied agencies embraced in the Voluntary system. Look fairly at the whole, and they will be found equal to the requirements of our social want. To conclude otherwise seems to me a reflection on our MAKER himself, whom it would convict of leaving his creation and providence defective in one of the most essential points. He has endowed his creature, Man, with the instincts and the reason which qualify him for his own support and the care of his offspring as to their animal wants ; and can we believe that He has left out of that wondrous organization the springs which would move men to provide for the training of the higher and immortal nature of their children ? True, He has permitted sin to invade our world, with a horrid brood of evils, darkening and defiling our moral nature. But there still remains, among the least impaired of our right affections, parental love : and He has provided the grand restorative of human virtue, the Gospel of His Son, with principles so heavenly as in their natural working to repair the ruin of the fall. There exist, then, natural means in society for the moral training of the rising race. Even were it not so, the governments created by men would be at least as indifferent as the men themselves to that work. But those means will be the more powerful in proportion as they are more directly employed. *Civil government is no fit agency for the training of families or of souls.* It has neither the *motive* nor the *adaptation* for such a duty ; and in attempting its performance, it has committed every kind of error and injustice, and damaged the people whose duties it has usurped.

It seems by many to be most strangely overlooked, that whatever pecuniary means and whatever moral and intellectual power are at the command of any representative government, must be derived from the people whom they represent, and must bear only a small proportion to the entire means and power of that people ; and that Governments, therefore, have no funds or means of *their own*, from which they can bestow boons on the nation. I do not say that all the advocates of Government education commit this absurdity, but that it is extremely common, and that it seems to lurk in the arguments of almost all. Whether Government can with advantage use the civil arm to compel its subjects to employ a portion of their power and means for the purpose of education, is another question. I have before endeavoured to show that it cannot. The only point I wish now to make clear is, that *all the mind, the soul, and the money, belong to the people themselves* : there they are, and no Government can command more than a small portion of them. Therefore to charge the Voluntary system with wanting either *means* or *power* is absurd. The people can do *what they will* : and the only question is whether education shall be *by will* or *by force*.



Now it is evident that in the free and willing performance of all duty, there is both a moral virtue and a happy reflex influence upon the performers themselves ; and that neither this virtue nor this influence belongs to what is done under compulsion. The Voluntary system, then, is a noble school for the exercise of a people's virtues. The Governmental system, on the contrary, is a school for teaching the habit of dependence. Shameful and fatal lesson ! If there is a single virtue which philosophers and moralists agree to extol as of inestimable value, it is the virtue of SELF-RELIANCE. And statesmen have been driven, times innumerable, to preach the same doctrine. Who more distinctly than LORD JOHN RUSSELL proclaimed that the want of this virtue was the great moral and social want of Ireland ? Who more plainly than LORD LANSDOWNE inculcated self-reliance on the classes engaged in trade ? Who more practically than SIR ROBT. PEEL drove the agriculturists to its exercise ? Who more explicitly than MR. DISRAELI left the colonies to its unaided power ? Who more eloquently than MR. MACAULAY held it up as the agent of English civilization ? Who more indignantly than MR. COBDEN denounced the folly of dependence on Parliament for that which the people should do for themselves ? Who more clearly than M. GUIZOT pointed out the self-reliance of the English as the foundation of their liberties and their greatness ?

All the great reforms of modern times have been in the direction of increasing the popular action and diminishing the Governmental. In regard to industry, to commerce, to religion, to the press, to the representative system, to our municipalities, and to our colonies, every movement has been to take off both restriction and help, and to confide in the people. Education is the only exception, and in regard to it, under the influence of Continental example, our Government is violating a grand principle of English policy.

In the arguments for Government education there is a strange ignoring of one of the great excellencies of the Voluntary system, namely, its effect in knitting together the different classes of society. Every operation of that system brings those who take part in the support of schools into contact with parents or children of a class different to their own, and thus exercises the sympathies of each class towards the other. For example, in the Sunday schools of England alone we have three hundred thousand gratuitous teachers, who not only instruct the children in school, but often visit them in their homes, reclaim them from their wanderings, provide them with books, bring them into Temperance and other societies, counsel them, pray for and with them, and anxiously watch over their best interests. Can this be, without exercising a most important influence both over the teachers and the taught ; or without acting as a cement between the ranks of society to which they respectively belong ? Impossible. I speak from long observation when I say, that the blessings to both classes are beyond our power to estimate. In like manner, every educational committee in the kingdom, with its visiters of schools and



homes, is a centre of influence, from which is spun, so to speak, a beautiful web of social affections, which none but the utterly thoughtless can fail to admire and prize. Now Government education would destroy all this admirable organization.

It is sometimes argued that the self-relying principle in the Voluntary system is inconsistent with its benevolent principle. But surely this is a play of argument, in disregard of common sense. It is, indeed, possible for private charity to pauperize, though not so degradingly as public charity. But is it likely that benevolence will be put forth by individuals, to any great extent or for any long time, where there is no real need? My opponents on this question will hardly venture to maintain the affirmative. May I not fairly compare the two principles to the two auxiliary powers in a screw steamer—the screw and the sails? When the latter will serve, the former is at rest. Steam is not wasted under a fair wind. But in adverse winds or currents, the propeller becomes invaluable. Just so may the benevolence of the educated classes most usefully provide schools and well-trained teachers, and assist where assistance is most needed: but when it becomes evident that a good school may be self-supporting, and that the working classes do not require aid, common sense tells us that money will not be lavished in vain. Not so, however, with a Government system, which, if once established, creates such “vested interests,” and becomes so inflexible, that ages could not destroy or alter it.

But the strongest of all the reasons in favour of the Voluntary system is, that it naturally enlists religion in support of education, and introduces the religious element freely and fully, without offence to any person’s conscience, into the teaching of the day-school.

No conceivable support to education can be so powerful or effective as that of the Christian communities, sustaining schools under a sense of Christian duty. The liberality evoked by religious principle is larger, more enduring, and more accompanied by personal service, than that which springs from any other motive. All our experience in England,—I may add, in every other country, and in all ages,—proves that education has practically found its chief support from religious bodies. Whatever, then, tended to sever the connexion between Christian communities and schools, and to pronounce a legislative censure on the union, would be most mischievous to the cause of popular education. Such would be the effect of an Act of Parliament to make the schools exclusively secular: and, on the other hand, the practical and natural working of the Voluntary system is, to confirm the desirable connexion between schools and the Christian church.

But when schools are established and sustained by religious bodies, it is obvious that religious training will be united in the schools with secular instruction. Denying the right of any one to force religion upon another, and also denying the justice of taxation on behalf of schools where religious teaching is made indispensable, I have the strongest conviction that religion is the best element in education, and ought to lie at its very basis. I think



so,—because religion is the highest duty and interest of every man, as well in regard to the present life as to his immortal destiny;—because its principles and sanctions make it the most powerful instrument in moulding the characters of children, and conducting the education of the whole nature;—because the teaching of religion cannot be begun at too early an age, and the longer it is delayed the less effective is the instruction likely to be;—because God's own word, with its biographies, its narratives, its truths, and its precepts, is the most intelligible, impressive, and winning of all the means of moral training;—because, whatever the importance to society of its members having cultivated intellects, it is of far higher importance that their hearts, minds, and consciences should be under the influence of religious principle;—because religion is naturally connected with several branches of knowledge, for example, with history and the study of God's physical creation, and it would be most mischievous to sever the moral and religious lesson which any study is calculated to yield from its bare facts;—and because in too many instances the parents of the children are not qualified to give them the religious instruction they need, whilst the circumstances by which they are surrounded peculiarly call for religious principle to enable them to resist temptation.

These reasons seem to me all-important in favour of religious instruction in day-schools; and as to the notion that those who advocate such instruction do it merely to instil their own peculiar doctrinal views, and thus to strengthen their own sect or party, it is so idle and ignorant a prejudice that I cannot persuade myself to reply to it. At all events, I, for one, whilst glad to see any other person embracing whatever I myself honestly regard as the truth, hold in disdain and abhorrence the idea of putting sectarian interests in comparison with the true and immortal welfare of the rising generation.

Now under the Voluntary system the religious element, which I maintain to be the most important in education, may be naturally introduced, without offence to conscience. It is not made the subject of legislative requirement; it is not supported by compulsory taxation; it is not imposed on any one. Creeds and catechisms are not essential to the system, though they need not be prohibited: God's own book, in the hands of a pious teacher, is all-sufficient. The school may be opened with prayer and the reading of the Bible. Scripture history may be taught, with a free deduction of the religious lessons in which it abounds. Every branch of instruction may be conducted, and all discipline maintained, in a Christian spirit, and with a constant recollection of the highest interests of the children; and the teacher will never feel himself fettered. We may thus, under the Voluntary system, have the full benefits of *Religion* and *Freedom*: and under no State system can they be combined.

Compare with the Voluntary system the two opposing systems adopted where the education is conducted under State management. We see them illustrated respectively in Prussia and in Holland.



In Prussia, it is made an essential condition that religion shall be taught in the schools, and the Protestant and Roman Catholic religions are alike taught at the public expense ; whilst it is confessed that many of the schoolmasters, who are, of course, Government *employés*, are unbelievers in the doctrines which they profess to teach. MR. HORACE MANN, of Massachusetts, in his "Educational Tour in Germany," &c., shows how distressingly this system works for the schoolmaster;\* and any one may judge how it is likely to work for the interests of truth, and for the religious interests of the children subject to that kind of instruction.

In Holland, on the other hand, the teaching of religion in the schools is forbidden, but the children receive religious instruction from the minister for about an hour in the week. I visited a school near Amsterdam during the last summer, and was pleased with the order, the cleanliness, the singing, and the method of instruction. But when I asked the intelligent and courteous master if he gave any religious instruction, he replied, "It is strictly prohibited, as we have scholars of different creeds." It appeared that there was *one* Roman Catholic child in the school, and at least *a hundred and eighty* Protestants. I asked further if he did not even teach scripture history, and his reply was extremely significant: "Yes," said he, "We teach the history of the Jews, but *only in the same manner as we teach the history of the Greeks and Romans.*" Thus even sacred history is *secularized*, and *all the religion discharged out of it*, in order to comply with the monstrous system which forbids by law the use of religion in ordinary school education. Of course that master would not be likely, in the course of a twelvemonth, ever to allow the name of God to escape from his lips. He said that the children received religious instruction from the minister on one afternoon in the week ; but he was himself so little cognizant of the circumstances, that he was obliged to ask one of the children as to the length of the instruction : he could not, of course, be aware whether the children attended or were absent. If we suppose them all to attend, the hour of ministerial instruction would be a very poor substitute for the daily religious instructions and appeals of a pious teacher, and almost no compensation for the studied exclusion of religion from the branches of knowledge to which it naturally belongs.

It is certain that *either* the Prussian or the Dutch system must be wrong. In my judgment they are *both* wrong,—the former in compelling the teaching of religion in the schools, and the latter, in enforcing its exclusion. Under the Voluntary system, the education would naturally be religious, but there would be no element of coercion.

\* "No inconsiderable number of the teachers in the Prussian schools, gymnasias, and universities, are inwardly hostile to the doctrines they are required to teach. I asked one of these how he could teach what he disbelieved, and whether it did not involve the essence of falsehood? His reply was, '*It is a lie of necessity. The Government compels us to do this, or it takes away our bread.*'"—Educational Tour, p. 234. Mr. Mann adds, that "this is doubtless one of the principal reasons of the rapid spread of Infidelity in that country."



## CHAPTER VI.

THE VOLUNTARY SYSTEM—PROOFS OF ITS POWER—PROGRESS OF EDUCATION IN ENGLAND—SUNDAY SCHOOLS—DAY-SCHOOLS—ACTIVITY BOTH OF THE CHURCH AND THE DISSENTERS—INFANT SCHOOLS—RAGGED SCHOOLS—INSTITUTIONS FOR THE TRAINING OF TEACHERS—MECHANICS' INSTITUTIONS—BIBLE SOCIETY—TRACT SOCIETY—FOREIGN MISSIONS—BENEVOLENT INSTITUTIONS OF ENGLAND—EXPLANATION OF APPARENT ANOMALIES IN DAY-SCHOOL RETURNS—COMPARISON OF MANCHESTER AND EXETER—EVIDENCE FURNISHED BY THE CENSUS OF 1851 OF THE NUMBER AND INCREASE OF DAY-SCHOOLS—PROPORTION OF SCHOLARS TO POPULATION—EXTRAORDINARY INCREASE OF THE UNENDOWED PUBLIC SCHOOLS—EXPLANATION RESPECTING AID TO THE CHILDREN OF PAUPERS AND TO REFORMATORY SCHOOLS—CONCLUSION.

MY final and confident appeal is to the evidence of FACTS.

What I undertake to prove is, not that the education of England is all we could desire, but that within the nineteenth century the progress of education has been steady, rapid, I may even say immense,—that that progress has been owing to causes which belong to the Voluntary system, and but in a very small degree to any Government measures,—and that the rate of past progress, together with the point we have already reached, is such as to justify full reliance on the power of the people to educate themselves, without either provision or compulsion on the part of the legislature.

If the educational state of the country at the beginning of the century was deplorably low, that may indeed reflect upon the Voluntary system, but (on the principles of those whom I am opposing) it reflects much more on the Governmental. It is assumed to be the duty of Government to educate the people; yet here we find our own Government doing absolutely nothing for that great end till the year 1833, and nothing beyond aiding voluntary zeal in building schools till the year 1847. In the mean time Sunday schools and day schools had arisen, out of the benevolence and religion of the people themselves, together with the efforts of parents and of private teachers, and had nearly satisfied the educational requirements of the country. It was when agencies of every kind for that end were in full operation, that the Government stepped in, first with modest help, but at length to dictate and control, and with bribes so large that they amount almost to moral compulsion, and are obviously intended to outbid all independent agencies. These facts prove undeniably that the Voluntary system has done incomparably more for us than the Governmental.

The growth of England in education, as in her free institutions, and in every branch of civilization, has been gradual. Centuries back, monarchs and nobles were unable to read or write; the very clergy were



unlettered ; there were few books and almost no libraries. The invention of printing was our intellectual day-spring ; but as late as the time of SHAKSPEARE, whose father (an alderman of Stratford) was unable to write his name, a historian remarks, that “probably throughout the community, for one man that was scholar enough to subscribe his signature, there were a *dozen* who could only make their marks.”\* Little more than a century ago, namely, in 1744, it is computed by MR. CHAS. KNIGHT that not more than £100,000 a year was spent by the people of England in books, newspapers, and publications of every kind, whereas in 1844 the amount thus expended was £2,085,000,†—being an increase of more than twenty-fold, whilst the increase of population in that period was only two and a half fold. Within the public life of my own father, his newspaper was increased from a size containing 20,000 words (in 1801) to a size containing 180,000 words (in 1848), or nine-fold : the general dimensions of newspapers within that period increased six-fold, and their extent of circulation about the same. Whether we look at the newspapers, the magazines, the books, the maps, the schools, or the literary institutions of England—all of which may be regarded as *measures* of the intellectual cultivation of the people—I believe it to be a moderate estimate to say, that, taking into account the quality as well as the quantity, they were *tenfold higher in 1850 than in 1800*.

The first modern impulse to popular education was given by *Sunday Schools*, which originated in the private efforts of ROBERT RAIKES, a newspaper proprietor at Gloucester, in 1782. Without the aid of a sixpence or a smile from Government, Sunday schools have gradually increased, so as to become coextensive with places of worship ; and I know not a nobler feature in the history of our country. In 1818, the Sunday schools of England and Wales were returned to MR. BROUGHAM’S Parliamentary Committee on Education, (probably under-estimated), as 5,463, with 477,225 scholars. In 1833 they were returned to LORD KERRY’S Parliamentary Committee as 16,828 schools with 1,548,890 scholars. In 1851, they were found by the Government Census to number 23,498 schools, with 2,407,409 scholars. Compared with the population of the respective years, the Sunday scholars were as one in 24.40 in the first period, one in 9.28 in the second, and one in 7.45 in the third.‡ The number in actual attendance on the Census Sunday was about 2,280,000.§ Considering that the children of the upper and middle classes do not attend the Sunday schools, it may be said that nearly *the whole* of the children of the working classes attend them and remain there on an average *eight years*.|| What is scarcely less

\* Pictorial History of England, vol. ii. p. 823.

† Mr. Chas. Knight’s “Life of Caxton”—Appendix.

‡ Parliamentary Paper, No. 487, Session 1853.

§ Report on “Religious Worship,” Census, 1851. p. clii.

|| The population at the Census was 17,927,609 : and, assuming the ages to be in the same proportion as in 1841, the children between 5 and 15 years (generally called “the school age,”) would be 22.854 per cent. of the population, or



gratifying than the number of scholars, is the prodigious number of gratuitous teachers, who are stated in the Census Report on Religious Worship at 302,000,\* or *one in sixty of the whole population*,—representing an amount of religious principle and practical zeal for education infinitely beyond what most writers on education seem to have conceived. In the Principality of Wales, the Sunday scholars are in the proportion of 1 to 4 of the population.

In *Day Schools* the great modern impulse to the education of the working classes was given by JOSEPH LANCASTER, a humble schoolmaster of the Society of Friends, just at the beginning of the century. DR. BELL, who had before adopted the monitorial plan in India, and even tried it in England, emulated LANCASTER'S zeal, and realised larger success. The former established his schools on the principle of simple biblical instruction; the latter added the distinctive religious teaching of the Church of England. From LANCASTER'S efforts arose the "British and Foreign School Society;" and from BELL'S the "National Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor in the principles of the Established Church." Both of these great Societies have proceeded from strength to strength for more than forty years. One of their earliest objects was to promote the establishment of schools throughout the country, and even in the colonies and foreign countries; and with these views they trained teachers, prepared school-books, employed inspectors and travelling agents, made grants of money and school materials, furnished plans of school buildings, published yearly reports, and became the mediums of the benevolence of thousands. When the Census is published in detail, we shall know more exactly the fruits of their labours. It has been supposed that the British Schools contain 200,000 children; whilst the National and other Church Schools of primary instruction, according to a minutely detailed report of 1846-7, published in a folio volume,† contained 955,865 day-scholars. It is worthy of remark, that both the National and the British Societies tried for many years the plan of gratuitous instruction, and that, from an experience of its bad consequences, they both abandoned it, and adopted a moderate charge for the education given.

4,097,175. In some parts of the country the working classes may be taken at two-thirds of the whole population, and in others at three-fourths; and if we take the medium of these proportions, we shall find 2,902,165 children of the working classes between 5 and 15 years of age. If the whole of these attended school for ten full years, we should, of course, have 2,902,165 Sunday scholars; and as the number of Sunday scholars is 2,407,409, it gives an *average of eight years and four months* for *all* the working class children in the Sunday school; and though it is certain that all do not attend, yet such an average shows that an extremely large proportion of them do attend, and remain in the schools for many years. The proportion which the Sunday scholars bear to the *entire* working-class population, estimated as above, is about 1 in 5.

\* Report on "Religious Worship," p. clii.

† "Result of the Returns to the General Inquiry made by the National Society into the State and Progress of Schools for the Education of the Poor. 1846-47."



The Dissenters were from the first favourable to popular education ; and a greater number of Sunday scholars will be found under their care than under the care of the Church ; but they did not establish day-schools of their own, being content to join liberal Churchmen and other Dissenters in supporting British schools, until the acceptance of public money by the British and Foreign Society induced many Dissenters (subsequent to 1846) to withdraw from its connexion, and to originate independent schools. The superior wealth and position of Churchmen, however, together with their control of most of the ancient endowments and the church property, have enabled them to do far more for day-schools than Dissenters. Though they were later in the field, the prelates and clergy, the aristocracy and gentry, the High Church and the Low Church, have made great exertions on behalf of education ; and with the aid of general and diocesan societies, together with the produce of Queen's letters and Government grants, Church schools have been established in all except the smallest parishes of England and Wales.\* There seem to be no assignable limits to the power which the Church possesses of establishing and sustaining day-schools, especially when receiving, as they do and ought, the school-fees of the children.

The Dissenters, with all their disadvantages, and having to maintain their own ministers and places of worship, have shown a determination to take their part in the good work of day-school education. The Wesleyan Methodists, the Congregationalists, and the Roman Catholics have formed organizations for the purpose. Each of those bodies has an efficient Training Institution for teachers,† and each has raised large sums for the establishment of schools. The Congregationalists, who altogether reject Government aid, by an effort extending from 1843 to 1848, raised £130,000 ; and the Congregational Board of Education has since obtained Homerton College for a training institution, with model schools attached, at an expense of £12,000, subscribed by the body. The "Voluntary School Association," comprising Congregationalists, Baptists, members of the Society of Friends, and other Dissenters, has also established training institutions for male and female students, and assisted schools at home and in the colonies, of course without public money. A Normal College also exists at Swansea, (formerly at Brecon), for the supply of Wales.

*Infant Schools*, both public and private, now exist in very considerable numbers, sometimes in connexion with juvenile schools ; and for the training of teachers, the Home and Colonial Infant School Society was formed in 1834.

\* Of 12,962 parishes or ecclesiastical districts in England and Wales, only 1,172 were without a Church school. In 2,144, however, there was not a public school, but "only a Sunday school, or only a Dame school, or both." It is added in the Report—"A proportion of these parishes, however, have no doubt too small a population to require a National School building."—*Preface to Returns*, p. iii.

† The Wesleyans in Westminster, the Congregationalists at Homerton College, and the Roman Catholics at St. Mary's, Hammersmith.



For the purpose of drawing under instruction the very lowest class, living in mendicancy and even in crime, *Ragged Schools* have been established in many parts of England and Scotland; and the last report of the London Union returned about 20,000 scholars.

The training of teachers is one of the most important services that can be rendered to education, and it has been ignorantly supposed that for this object Government aid was indispensable. The fact is, that from the very establishment of the British and Foreign School Society and the National Society, this was one of their leading objects.\* Their training institutions in the Borough Road and in Westminster were in operation very many years before Government made any grant whatever towards schools or school-building. The operations of the Home and Colonial Infant School Society also commenced before public money was given. Most of the *Normal Schools* now in existence were originated without Government aid, though they afterwards accepted it when proffered. Those of the Congregational Board of Education, the Voluntary School Association, and Swansea (formerly Brecon) College, exist on purely independent principles. Some of the diocesan Normal Schools have not yet received grants. There are now in England and Wales more than thirty training institutions, with accommodation for more than two thousand students,—a greater number than would keep all the public schools constantly supplied with teachers.

Before stating the ascertained results of the great efforts on behalf of education continued for half a century, let me allude to a few of the important *auxiliaries* to popular instruction which have risen up contemporaneously and from the same cause, namely, the awakening of a general sense of the value of knowledge.

*Mechanics' Institutions* originated in Glasgow about the beginning of the century, but only two such institutions existed in Scotland, and not one in England, before the year 1823. In the year 1850, as we learn from DR. HUDSON'S "History of Adult Education," there were 622 Mechanics' Institutions in England and Wales, with 103,522 members; and the libraries they had accumulated, contained no less than 698,355 volumes, with 1,837,548 issues in the course of the year. These Institutions contain evening classes, in which the instruction acquired at school may be sustained, and its defects repaired. Lectures and papers are also delivered at them in such abundance, that in many places there has been a positive cloying of the public appetite. In addition to the Institutes enumerated, there are numerous "Mutual Improvement Societies," "Mental Improvement Societies," "Young Men's Christian Associations," Parochial Libraries, and other institutions of a similar nature.

\* One of the fundamental rules of the British and Foreign School Society was this—"III. The Institution shall support and train up young persons of both sexes for supplying properly instructed Teachers to the inhabitants of such places in the British dominions, at home and abroad, as shall be desirous of establishing schools on the British system. It shall instruct all persons, whether natives or foreigners, who may be sent from time to time, for the purpose of being qualified as Teachers in this or any other country."



Since 1804 the *British and Foreign Bible Society* has issued (independent of its foreign auxiliaries) 26,571,103 copies of the Holy Scriptures,—by far the larger proportion of them in this country; so that now there are comparatively few houses or cottages in the land where a copy is not to be found.\*

The *Religious Tract Society* has in about the same period issued the enormous number of *six hundred and eight million* of tracts and books, in one hundred and twelve languages; of which a large part have been circulated in England.

Numerous Societies of the nature of Christian Missions have been formed, some for conveying the gospel to heathen lands, and others for employing ministers and agents in the towns and rural districts of England, all of which agencies may be said to be of an educational character. The effects produced by these societies have been immense; and they evince a power in the Voluntary principle for the spread of religion and education which it would be difficult to over-estimate.

The benevolent and other public institutions of England, many of which are either directly or indirectly educational—such as orphan asylums, schools for the blind and for the deaf and dumb, idiot asylums, schools for the children of the clergy and ministers, industrial schools, penitentiary and reformatory institutions, temperance societies, societies for supplying Bibles and books to the army and navy, yeoman schools, colleges for the training of ministers, &c. &c.—are really numberless. Some idea may be formed of them from the fact, that in MR. SAMPSON LOW, JUN.'S “Charities of London,” published in 1850, four hundred and ninety-one separate charities are enumerated as belonging to the Metropolis, *of which 294 (or three-fifths) were established within the present century*, and that these societies had an aggregate annual income of £1,022,864 from voluntary contributions, and £741,869 from funded property or otherwise secured,—total £1,764,733. This includes most of the great national societies, such as the Bible and Missionary Societies, which have their head-quarters in London, but it “does not include local charities or the charities in the gift of the corporate companies,”—by “local charities” being meant congregational, trades’, and other charities of specific and limited application—nor amounts raised for the direct support of public worship and its ministers.

\* As an illustration, I may quote the last report of the Stamford Religious Tract Society, which states that a *colporteur* employed to visit the district for the sale of Bibles and tracts, called on 17,376 families, and found only *thirteen* without a copy of the Bible. This being in an agricultural district, I was desirous to ascertain how far the report was accurate, and I therefore wrote to the Secretary of the Society, requesting him to ask the *colporteur* this question—“Does he feel quite convinced that there were only thirteen families destitute of the word of God?” The Secretary replies (Nov. 29, 1853)—“I am happy to say that the *colporteur* feels quite satisfied that he is correct. In very many of the instances they showed him, or he saw, their bibles, and he has no doubt in making the statement.”



To return to the Day-schools. A brief explanation may remove a very general misconception. It will be found, when the details of the Census are published, that in the most flourishing and wealthy seats of manufactures and mining, there is the smallest proportion of day-scholars. Why? Not either from want of liberality in the upper classes or of means in the lower: but mainly from the fact, that in those places *the working classes bear a much larger proportion to the whole population than they do on the average in England*. As the working class do not and cannot keep their children at school more than about half as long as the middle and upper classes, it is obvious that only half as many (in proportion) of the children of the former would be found in school *at any one time*, as of the children of the latter, even though the whole of the latter received a reasonable length of schooling. *E.g.*, if 1,000 children remain at school on the average 8 years, and another 1,000 only 4 years, there will always be found *twice as many* of the former *actually attending* school as of the latter. Therefore to judge of the education of a district, without taking into account its social circumstances, would be inevitably to fall into the greatest blunders.

Thus in Manchester, the richest city of England, except London, the proportion of day-scholars to the population is only 1 to 11.60; whilst in Exeter, it is 1 to 6.77. The reason is, that Manchester has enormous manufactories, where many hundreds, and in some cases thousands, of workpeople are employed by one capitalist, and therefore the working-class population of Manchester is very much greater in proportion than that of Exeter, where the manufactures are of small importance, and the population belong chiefly to the upper and middle classes. The attendance at Sunday schools in the two cities, being nearly in the inverse ratio to that in day-schools, is another illustration of the contrast between the populations as to their social circumstances: in Manchester the Sunday scholars are 1 to 7.15 of the population, and in Exeter 1 to 15.53.

That the small proportion of day-scholars in Manchester is not owing to want of liberality on the part of the friends of education, appears from the facts proved by the REV. C. RICHSON before a Committee of the House of Commons, namely, that whilst the number of day scholars is 34,354, there is school accommodation for 74,887 children in public schools, exclusive of all private schools,—that of that amount, schools for no less than 43,146 children were provided between the years 1833 and 1851,—and that of 172 public schools, 19 only received building grants from the Government, to the small aggregate sum of £8,283. There is, therefore, in Manchester, as in most other towns, *a large excess of school accommodation* beyond the wants of the inhabitants—nearly all provided by voluntary means.

The sum and crown of the evidence in proof of the sufficiency of the Voluntary system to reach our educational wants is found in the Census of 1851, compared with the earlier (but certainly less complete) returns of



1818 and 1833. From the Parliamentary Paper, No. 487 of the last session, we learn the following most gratifying comparison :—

DAY SCHOOLS IN ENGLAND AND WALES.

Years.	Number of Schools.	Number of Scholars.	Proportion of Scholars to Population.
1818	19,230	674,883	1 in 17.25
1833	38,971	1,276,947	1 in 11.27
1851	46,114	2,144,377	1 in 8.36

Since 1818 the increase of the population has been 54 per cent. (from 11,642,683 to 17,927,609), but the increase of day-scholars has been 218 per cent. or *four* times as great as the increase of population; and the increase of Sunday scholars has been nearly *eight* times as great.

When it is remembered that SIR JAS. K. SHUTTLEWORTH admits the proportion of 1 day-scholar to 8 inhabitants as that agreed upon as desirable by “most writers on the statistics of education,”\* and that the Committee of the House of Commons on Education in 1838 recommended that proportion of school-room for towns,—when it is seen that in 1851 we had reached the proportion of 1 to 8.36,—and when it is observed by what a splendid amount of voluntary agency our great educational improvements have been originated and carried on, I know not how it is possible to resist the conclusion, that the Voluntary system is amply sufficient, as well as in its moral nature and influence incomparably superior to any Governmental agency.

A fact deserving special notice, as showing the power of the Voluntary system, is the extraordinary increase in the number of *unendowed public schools*, since the year 1818. In the *Appendix* will be found in full the Parliamentary Paper, No. 487, which gives the returns for 1818, 1833, and 1851. If the reader will turn to it, he will see, on comparing the first and second tables, that the number of “endowed” schools had diminished from 4,376 in 1818 to 4,106 in 1833; and it may be assumed that the number will not have increased from 1833 to 1851. But, on looking at the “unendowed” schools for 1818, it will be seen that only 861 are classed as “New,” which implies that they belonged to the class of National, Lancastrian, or British schools (it being one of MR. BROUGHAM’S express objects, in forming the schedule, to ascertain the number of that class of schools). In 1833, however, it will be seen, there were 2,829 schools supported by “subscriptions” only, and 2,895 schools supported by “subscriptions and payments,”—total 5,724, all of which must have been *unendowed public schools*. But in 1851 the number must have been immensely greater. The details of the educational Census are not yet published; but we learn from the Return made to the House of Commons on the 23rd May, 1853,

\* In his volume published in March, 1853, entitled “Public Education,” he says—“I take the rate of *one scholar to eight inhabitants* as that supported by most writers on the statistics of education.”



No. 514, that the number of "*public schools*" in England and Wales was 15,584 schools with 1,417,300 scholars, and of "*private schools*" 30,530 schools with 727,077 scholars,—total 46,114 schools and 2,144,377 scholars. Now if the "*endowed*" schools had not (as I have argued) increased since 1833, it would follow that the "*unendowed public schools*" must have increased very greatly; because, deducting the 4,106 "*endowed*" schools existing in 1833 from the 15,584 "*public schools*" in 1851, there would remain 11,478 *unendowed public schools* in 1851. Taking the schools with the number of scholars attached to them in 1818 and 1833, and estimating the schools and scholars for 1851 from the Parliamentary Return as just explained, I draw out the following remarkable results concerning the class of schools which has been specially created by the benevolent operation of the Voluntary system:—

UNENDOWED PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN ENGLAND AND WALES, IN 1818, 1833,  
AND 1851.

Year.	Schools.	Scholars.
1818 .....	861 .....	110,062
1833 .....	5,724 .....	390,734
1851 .....	11,478 .....	1,263,536

  

INCREASE.		
	Schools. per cent.	Scholars. per cent.
From 1818 to 1833 .....	665 .....	255
From 1833 to 1851 .....	201 .....	323

Thus in the 15 years between 1818 and 1833, that is, before any State aid whatever was given either to school support or school-building, the class of schools created by voluntary benevolence increased 665 per cent., and the scholars 255 per cent.; and in the 18 years between 1833 and 1851, that class of schools increased 201 per cent., and the scholars 323 per cent. In the latter period grants of public money were made in aid of the building of 3,474 schools (up to the 31st Dec., 1851),—the grants being about *one-third* of the cost; but the number of schools built in that period was 5,754, and therefore 2,280 must have been built wholly without aid. Voluntary benevolence, then, provided the whole of the schools built from 1818 to 1833, and did vastly more than the Government from 1833 to 1851. The schools in the building of which Government assisted are returned as containing about 400,000 scholars; and as there are altogether (in public and private schools) 2,144,000 scholars, Government has contributed *one-third* of the cost of providing less than *one-fifth* of the school accommodation in use,—representing less than ONE-FIFTEENTH of the whole cost of that accommodation, whilst the Voluntary system has provided the other FOURTEEN-FIFTEENTHS. And until the year 1847 the Voluntary system raised the entire annual cost of supporting the schools; since which grants have been made to schools which have increased to the number of 2,310.

Having thus completed my argument, which I have put into the shortest compass in my power, rejecting many tempting points of contro-



versy or illustration, I merely add a needful explanation. There is no objection, I conceive, on principle, to the Guardians of the Poor paying for the education of the children of out-door paupers; and still less is there an objection to Reformatory or Penitentiary schools for young criminals, aided by public funds, and with the inspection of the magistrates. In the former case, there is 1st, absolute proof of the inability of the parents to pay for their children's education; 2nd, a public reason for drawing the children out of the streets, where they would be subject to many temptations to mendicancy, vice, and crime; and 3rd, the same check to abuse, and the same natural termination to the expense, as in the case of the pauperism of the parents. In regard to Reformatory or Penitentiary schools, they seem to be recommended alike by reason and humanity, and to have the strong argument of experience in their favour. Here the children have come under the notice of the law and under the care of the magistrate; it is a question of the best mode of treatment, with a view to the reformation of the delinquents and the future protection of society. But it must be added, as the result of all the evidence received by the Committee of the House of Commons on the subject, that it is a serious and difficult question, whether it is expedient that the Reformatory schools should be directly under the management of the public authorities. The most experienced philanthropists who gave evidence were of opinion that the institutions should be *voluntary* in their origin and management, owing to the incomparable superiority of voluntary benevolence over the cold, formal, and heartless discharge of mere official duty. It was admitted that there must be a certain amount of public aid and inspection, but the danger of checking benevolence by this public aid was strongly felt.

Having declared my opinion that there is no objection, on principle, to these two modes of aiding the education of classes which have already come under the notice of public authorities, I merely add, that the doubts felt as to the effect of official management are a very strong tribute to the superior efficacy of voluntary zeal in the work of education.

---

To conclude: It is not denied that there are strong *primâ facie* reasons in favour of Government Education, arising out of the power of Parliament to command the public resources, and to organize and sustain schools over the entire country. But when we look further into the case, it appears, in the first place, that so much has been done, and is now doing, by the people themselves for education, as to afford ground for confident reliance that they will be able and disposed to complete the work;—next, that there are moral and social advantages in the system of self help and mutual help, which could not be destroyed without the most serious loss, but which must be sacrificed if education is taken out of the hands of the people themselves;—further, that there are disadvantages in every form of State aid to education, affecting public liberty, the freedom of teaching, the influence on parents, the government of schools, the stimulus of competing systems



on education itself, the treatment of dissident sects, the communication of religious instruction, and the interests of truth,—disadvantages so great and cumulative as far to outweigh any advantages arising from public money and authority;—and lastly, that a system of education resting on the Government, or on compulsory taxation, is at variance with the genius of our institutions and national character, and, if carried out as the principle would require, and applied to the press and the pulpit, to literature and science, would degrade the English nation into a resemblance of Continental nations, in which the bureaucratic system has annihilated the noble spirit of self-reliance, and with it the best safeguard of public liberty.

My conviction is, that the course of wisdom would be, not to pass any law of education, secular or religious, and not to extend the operations of the Committee of Council on Education, but, now that the sufficiency of the people for their own education is so amply proved by official evidence, to discontinue all interference with the general education of the country, and to confine the action of Government in this respect to institutions which properly belong to public authority, namely, to those connected with the dependent poor and those designed for reformatory training.

To the Government and Parliament I would humbly say—Throw the people on their own resources in Education, as you did in Industry; and be assured, that, in a nation so full of intelligence and spirit, Freedom and Competition will give the same stimulus to improvement in our schools, as they have done in our manufactures, our husbandry, our shipping, and our commerce.



## RETURN OF THE NUMBER OF DAY SCHOOLS AND SUNDAY SCHOOLS, 1818.

I.—Returns of the Number of DAY SCHOOLS and SUNDAY SCHOOLS, and of the Number of DAY SCHOLARS, to the Select Committee appointed to inquire into the Education of the Poor, Session 1818, "New Schools, Dames' Schools, and Ordinary Schools," with the Numbers and those who paid for their Instruction."

### DAY SCHOOLS.

NUMBER OF SCHOOLS.									NUMBER OF SCHOLARS.								
ALL SCHOOLS.			ENDOWED.			UNENDOWED.			IN ALL SCHOOLS.			IN ENDOWED.			IN UNENDOWED SCHOOLS.		
New.	Dame.	Ordinary.	New.	Ordinary.	New.	Dame.	Ordinary.		In New Schools.	In Dame Schls.	In ordinary Schls.	In New Schls.	In ordinary Schls.	In New Schls.	In Dame Schls.	In ordinary Schls.	
1,173	3,175	14,882	312	4,064	861	3,175	10,818		150,642	55,247	468,994	40,580	132,478	110,062	55,247	330,685	
Total 19,230			Total 4,376			Total 14,854			Total 674,883			Total 173,058			Total 501,825		

\* The numbers under this head will not agree with the Summaries in the Returns of 1818, in consequence of the alterations made in the Returns of 1818, which appear to be correct are here inserted. An Appendix to the Returns of 1818 contains a "Supplement" to the details of Schools previously mentioned in general. It has not been found practicable to make

1833.

II.—Returns of the Number of DAY SCHOOLS and SUNDAY SCHOOLS, and of the Number of DAY SCHOLARS, made pursuant to an Address of the House of Commons, dated the 24th day of May, 1833, "with the Numbers of their Scholars respectively, and the Sources of "Maintenance" of the Infant and "Maintenance" is specified.

### DAY SCHOOLS.

NUMBER OF SCHOOLS.						NUMBER OF SCHOLARS.					
		Number of the foregoing which were maintained by						Number of the foregoing who were maintained by			
Daily Schools.	Infant Schools.	Endowments.	Subscriptions.	Payments by Scholars	Subscriptions and Payments.	In Daily Schools.	In Infant Schools.	Endowments.	Subscriptions.	Payments by Scholars	Subscriptions and Payments.
35,986	2,985	4,106	2,829	29,141	2,895	1,187,942	89,005	153,764	178,517	732,449	21,947
Total 38,971						Total 1,276,947					

### COMPARISON BETWEEN

III.—Comparative View of the Number of DAY SCHOOLS and SUNDAY SCHOOLS, and of the Number of SCHOLARS, in the Years 1818, 1833, and 1851, and the Proportions which the Day Scholars and SUNDAY SCHOLARS bore to the Total Number of SCHOLARS.

DAY SCHOOLS.						SUNDAY SCHOOLS.					
NUMBER OF SCHOOLS.			NUMBER OF SCHOLARS.			NUMBER OF SCHOOLS.			NUMBER OF SCHOLARS.		
1818.	1833.	1851.	1818.	1833.	1851.	1818.	1833.	1851.	1818.	1833.	1851.
19,230	38,971	46,114	674,883	1,276,947	2,144,377	5,463	16,828	23,498	477,225	1,548,890	2,400,000

NOTE.—In the number of Schools here given for 1851 are included 1,206 Day Schools and 377 Sunday Schools respectively include an estimate for these defective returns; and the proportions for the years, it should be borne in mind that the returns obtained in 1818 and in 1833 (especially those of 1833) are not complete. Census Office, 13th May, 1853.



N 1818, 1833, AND 1851.

1818.

Number of the foregoing Scholars who were in FREE SCHOOLS and PAY SCHOOLS respectively.*				SUNDAY SCHOOLS.				Estimated Population in May, 1818.
IN FREE SCHOOLS.		IN PAY SCHOOLS.		Number of SCHOOLS.		Number of SCHOLARS.		
Endowed.	Unendowed.	Endowed.	Unendowed.	In New Schools.	In ordinary Schools.	In New Schools.	In ordinary Schools.	
152,756	174,578	20,302	327,247	412	5,051	51,692	425,533	11,642,683
Total 327,334		Total 347,549		Total 5,463		Total 477,225		

1833.

SUNDAY SCHOOLS.

NUMBER OF SCHOOLS.				NUMBER OF SCHOLARS.				Estimated Population in May, 1833.
Number which were maintained by				Number who were in Schools maintained by				
Endow- ments.	Subscrip- tions.	Payments by Scholars.	Subscrip- tions and Payments.	Endow- ments.	Subscrip- tions.	Payments by Scholars.	Subscrip- tions and Payments.	
571	15,244	101	912	39,533	1,423,377	5,718	80,262	14,386,415
Total 16,828				Total 1,548,890				

1818, 1833, AND 1851.

POPULATION.

### PROPORTION OF SCHOLARS TO POPULATION.

POPULATION.			DAY SCHOLARS.			SUNDAY SCHOLARS.		
1818.	1833.	1851.	1818.	1833.	1851.	1818.	1833.	1851.
Estimated 11,642,683	Estimated 14,386,415	17,927,609	One in 17.25	One in 11.27	One in 8.36	One in 24.40	One in 9.28	One in 7.45

GEORGE GRAHAM, Registrar-General.