

more devoted, more blessed. Here there is no scope for casuistry or ostentation. The essentials are not covered; but "the light" shines and "the salt" preserves. *In Christo*—working for Christ, we shall be in Christ, united in Him, living in Him; in Him beloved, in Him redeemed; having in Him our grand hope, our great ideal, the only fountain-head of union and reform, of knowledge and character. *Ad Christum*—working for Christ and living in Christ, we shall grow after His likeness—the likeness of the perfect man—and we shall have in Him the realization of our ideals, the consummation of our hopes, and the crowning goal of the journey of our life. Living in the light and acting in the spirit of these three immortal principles—working for Christ, existing in Christ, and advancing to Christ—we shall be better Churchmen because truer Christians, and we shall not love our Church less, but Christ more.

F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK.



ART. VIII.—THE MONTH.

THE long controversy of the Education Bill was closed in Parliament just a week before Christmas Day, and it only remains to hope that, in spite of threats from the extreme parties on both sides, the general good sense of the country will secure its being brought into operation in a peaceable and practical spirit. The debate in the House of Lords will always be memorable for what we fear must prove the last public words of the venerable Archbishop of Canterbury. As these lines are being written he lies at Lambeth in a condition of extreme weakness, from which it is too much to hope that he can really recover. It is a striking and touching fact that his last words should have been a weighty contribution to the discussion of a subject to which he has devoted so large a portion of his life, and to which, perhaps, especially in his work on Royal Commissions, he has rendered more services than any man of his generation. It is a matter of great regret that his strength should have failed him before the opportunity arose of applying his unique abilities, experience, and authority to the settlement of the most important measure on education ever passed by Parliament; but his message to the Church and the country was none the less of a singularly impressive character. As became the head of the English Church, he did justice to the generous exertions and self-denying sacrifices which the clergy have made in the discharge of their duty to the

children of their flocks, and he justly observed that the extent of those sacrifices had received inadequate appreciation in the controversies which had raged around the Bill. Perhaps it was in some measure due to this representation that handsome acknowledgments of the services of the clergy in this great cause were expressed by subsequent speakers, such as the Lord Chancellor and Lord Goschen. But it was not less becoming in the head of the English Church that the Archbishop should recognise emphatically the great value of the Bill in establishing for the first time a comprehensive scheme for organizing the whole system of education in the country. He would himself have liked to go further in providing for secondary education, but he acknowledged that there were advantages in advancing gradually in that matter; and, at all events, he cordially welcomed the great step forward taken by the Bill in the promotion and organization of education. When he was seized with the weakness which closed his speech, he was on the point, as the Bishop of Winchester subsequently stated, of making an appeal to the Church to consult as far as possible the views of Nonconformists, and to remove any grievances they might feel. Alike in the charitable and kindly spirit thus displayed, and in rising above the controversies of the hour to the main purpose of the Bill, the Archbishop touched the considerations which should be predominant with all who are chiefly concerned with the broad interests of the country, and he has left an influence which should have a beneficent effect on all sides in carrying the Act into effect.

The Bill left the House of Lords practically unchanged; but one alteration was introduced on the motion and with the able advocacy of the Bishop of Manchester, which ought to be of considerable value to the Voluntary Schools. Under the Bill as it left the House of Commons, the managers of such schools would have been liable, not only for structural repairs, but for repairs due to ordinary wear and tear, and it was shown that the charge for the two sets of repairs combined would often come to considerably more than the amount of existing subscriptions. In spite, accordingly, of the resistance of the Government, the cost of the "wear-and-tear" repairs were thrown on the local authority. This change has been accepted in the Commons, with the qualification that the local authority is to be the judge of the amount it should pay for such repairs. It may seem somewhat unusual to make an authority the judge of the extent of its own liability, but the responsibility for the repairs in question remains imposed on the local authority, and confidence may be felt in the general fairness with which the extent of the

liability will be estimated. Another valuable improvement was carried at the instance of Lord Goschen, by which the local authority is required to allow denominations to give, at their own cost, religious instruction in the secondary schools and colleges, so that in these cases the rigidity of the Cowper-Temple Clause will be relaxed. It is felt in many quarters that some similar permission might well have been granted in respect to elementary schools, and it may be that it is in this direction that such religious difficulties as may arise under the Bill will ultimately have to be met.

For it is too probable that under the now famous Kenyon-Slaney Clause some such difficulties may still arise. That clause was in substance sustained in the House of Lords by a large majority, and by a conspicuous strength of opinion. An amendment of the Lord Chancellor's was introduced, by which the purport of the clause is better defined, and which secures the right of appeal to the Bishop which is prescribed by existing trust deeds. But that appeal will simply give the Bishop the right of deciding whether the religious instruction which a clergyman is giving in a school is in accordance with the doctrine of the Church of England; and if that decision proves unsatisfactory to the managers, it will be in their power to take the religious instruction out of the clergyman's hands. Practically the effect of the clause remains, as it was intended to be, that the religious instruction in Voluntary Schools is placed under the control of the managers. The most important result of the debates in the House of Lords on this provision of the Bill has been to render perfectly plain the reasons which have rendered the great majority of both Houses so firm upon the point. The Peers, in their position of greater independence, have not scrupled to tell the Bishops some very plain truths. The Lord Chancellor, in defending the clause, spoke in the highest terms of the work of the clergy in general, but observed that many regulations which were equally unnecessary and unwelcome to people in general had to be adopted in order to restrain a small minority of wrongdoers. In the same way, he said, it had become necessary to guard against the practices of some members of the clergy who, abused the opportunities of their position to inculcate doctrines and practices inconsistent with those principles of the Reformation to which the Church of England was pledged, and who, it had been shown by experience, were incapable of being adequately controlled by Episcopal authority. The Duke of Devonshire still more plainly, in answer to appeals from the Bishops, said he could not regard the declaration which had been made from the Episcopal Bench as sufficiently explicit to enable him to give way. If the

Bishops possessed this power, why, he said, had it not been exercised before? Had any of their Lordships ever heard of the proceedings of an indiscreet clergyman being restrained by the Episcopal authorities? That is the simple state of the case. The laity are deeply offended by the Romanizing practices of some of the clergy, and have come to the settled conclusion that the Bishops lack either the power or the will to restrain them, and they have consequently adopted a clause which places religious instruction in the elementary schools of the country under lay control. We believe that such a regulation need not, and in most cases will not, practically affect the clergyman's influence or position. If his teaching and his practice is true to the cardinal principles of the Reformed Church of England, and if he exhibits the discretion and good-feeling usual among the clergy, the laity will cordially trust him, and will be only too glad to leave the religious instruction of the parish school in his hands. But henceforth, if he teaches and acts as too many of the Ritualistic clergy have done, his influence in the school will be reduced, and he may even be excluded from it. No doubt this is a grave restriction to impose upon a man who is solemnly charged with the cure of all souls, young and old, in his parish, and the necessity for its introduction is much to be regretted; but the excesses of the Ritualistic clergy, combined with the indifference of some Bishops and the connivance of others, have rendered it unavoidable. The important question now is how it will be treated in practice. Lord Hugh Cecil, in the concluding debate, declared that no considerations of peace or tranquillity would prevent the clergy for whom he spoke from resisting the application of such a law. Mr. Balfour warned him that if that course were taken he would simply "be driving deeper the wedge which, unhappily, is separating certain classes of ecclesiastical opinion from the great body of religious lay opinion in this country, and in which I, at all events, see the greatest danger looming in the future to the cause of religion as a whole, and more especially to the cause, the welfare, and the prosperity of the Church of England." We can only trust that these firm and friendly words of the Prime Minister will be duly weighed, and that Lord Hugh Cecil, Lord Halifax, and their followers, will be warned in time by this Education Bill that the course they have been pursuing for many years past must, if continued, be fatal to the position of the Church of England.
