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P. 49. Fn. 2. Omit 'attended the same school.' Mr. Gladstone was at school at Eton, Cardinal Manning at Harrow.

P. 82. Fn. 9. Line 2 should read, 'there were no board schools at the time...'

P. 107. Fn. 5. Line 2 should read, 'during most of its existence.'

T.P. O'Connor represented the constituency from 1885 until 1929. David Logan was the Member from 1929 until 1964. The constituency was merged with Liverpool (Exchange) constituency in 1974.

T. P. O'Connor represented the constituency from 1885 until 1929. David Logan was the Member from 1929 until 1964. The constituency was merged with Liverpool (Exchange) constituency in 1974.

P. 158, Fn. 4, and P. 287, Fn. 1. The Hon. Charles Russell (1863-1928) was the second son of Lord Russell of Killowen (1832 - 1900).

Lord Russell, who became Lord Chief Justice, had been Liberal M.P. for Dundalk (1880 - 1885) and for South Hackney (1885, 1886 - 1892).


P. 299. Line 15 should read, 'There would be no objection to a Clause...'

P. 423. Line 5 should read, 'Such Centres are listed on p. 425.'

SECTION 4.

POLITICAL IDEOLOGY AND THE ATTACKS ON THE

1902 SETTLEMENT.
After their years of financial struggling, during 1903 and 1904 the managers of the voluntary schools, and of the Catholic schools in particular, had every reason to feel that the worst was over. Teachers' salaries, supplies of books, apparatus and furniture were no longer the financial burdens they had been for so long. Although the cost of supplying the new buildings and modifying the existing ones was a problem, once the buildings were in existence, the cost of maintaining the fabric would be shared by the Local Authority. Above all, that feeling of resentment over the injustice of being excluded from a share in the rate fund had been removed. The Catholic schools which had been established and maintained as a gesture of defiance by the new Catholics and their descendants were now accepted as an integral part of the national education structure. The future looked good. The knowledge that the population of the Catholic elementary schools, alone of the denominational schools, was still on the increase, (1) made the Catholic community more determined than ever that their schools should thrive.

Then, in 1906 came the rude awakening. The results of the General Election, held in December, 1905, were confirmed in January, 1906. 'It was like an earthquake. There had been nothing like it since the destruction of the Tory Party in the first election after the Great Reform Bill, and that had been the consequence of an entirely new electoral system.'(2) The new House of Commons gave the Liberals 597 seats, an overall majority. There were 83 Irish Nationalists, 157 Conservative and Unionist Members and 50 Members from the Labour Party.(3) The Liberals were now in a position to carry out the programme of legislation which they had longed for. Although the Education Act had been a minor issue during the election campaign, there was no doubt that the new Government would have to do something to appease the strong feelings of the Nonconformist Members over the Act.

By early January, 1906, the cabinet were considering

(1) See Table 14, p.195.
(3) The new Parliament contained 180 Dissenters, 13 Scottish Presbyterians, 16 Jews, 80 Irish Roman Catholics, 10 English Roman Catholics, 300 Anglicans. 'If 40 more Conservative seats had been lost, the Anglicans would, for the first time, have been without a majority in the House of Commons.' (Halevy, 'The Rule of Democracy, 1905 - 1914', Bk. 1. pp.64 - 65.)
a simple One-Clause Bill, to regulate the composition of the managerial boards of the voluntary schools. By reversing the existing proportions, that is by having four out of the six managers appointed by the Local Authority, it seemed that the schools could be brought under popular control. But Morant was at pains to point out to the Cabinet the many dangers in attempting to get control of the voluntary schools in this way. (1) In his Memorandum, he made five points which effectively disposed of the whole idea. His third point was:

'The One-Clause bill, by itself, would continue the existence of the voluntary schools as such, would continue the giving of denominational instruction in school hours paid for out of the rates, would continue the selection of teachers on a denominational test... and would continue the expenditure from the rates in respect of denominational instruction, although it is true that all these things would be done by the Local Authority acting through its own majority of managers.'

In his fourth point, Morant suggested:

'It is certain that in the vast majority of cases, if not in all, the majority of four Local Authority managers would transfer the voluntary school to the Local Authority, so that it would become, in all respects, a provided school, subject to the Cowper-Temple Clause.'

Following on from this, Morant made his fifth point:

Hence, it is clear that the One-Clause Bill would simply confiscate all voluntary schools and turn them into provided schools, without any quid pro quo, whether in the shape of some sort of facilities for religious instruction, inside or outside school hours, or in the shape of rent or other recognition of the alienation of the Trust Property to wholly undenominational purposes... It is certain that vast numbers of schools would take the option of standing out, and a large expenditure of public money would be required to erect new schools to take their place... '(2)

Morant, possibly recalling the issue of the single-school areas which had come up in the debate on the 1902 Act, placed another Memorandum before the Cabinet, probably because he thought that an attempt might be made to legislate on schools in such areas. (3)

(2) Ibid.
(3) Ibid. 'The Single-School Area Grievance,' Revised 1st. January, 1906.
He set out the position thus:

'Of the 13,000 Parishes in Rural Districts, together with the parishes in the few Urban Districts which comprise one parish, there are 7,753 within the boundaries of which there is but one school. Of these, 5,834 are Church schools, 36 are Roman Catholic schools, 197 are undenominational voluntary schools, 15 are Wesleyan schools and 1,651 are Council schools. 550 such Parishes are in Wales, of which, 515 have only a Church school and 212 have only a Council school. Then there must be noted the 851 Parishes in Rural Districts which, although they possess more than one school, have only one type of school. Of these, 557 have none but Church schools and 298 have none but Council schools.'

Morant went on to explain that the figures as they stood were misleading, 'and misleading in two opposite directions.' The figures took no account of the number of Parishes where 'there is another school within easy reach in one or other of the contiguous Parishes, that other school being denominational.' The figures were also misleading in respect of 'the children in a Parish who may desire to go to some other kind of school than the denominational one in the Parish, but have no alternative one which they can reach.' He ended his memorandum, 'It is, in fact, a question of there being or not being an undenominational school within the reach of any child, anywhere, whose parents desire such a school rather than a denominational one. It must be remembered that there are very many towns where there are nothing but denominational schools and in Lancashire alone there are as many as 22.'

The Cabinet also realised that any attempt to settle the schools question would have to take account of the wishes of the Catholic community. Mr. G.B.M. Coore, an Assistant Secretary at the Board of Education submitted a long 21-page document to the Cabinet dealing with the particular problems presented by the Catholic schools. Starting from the premise that 'it must be laid down as axiomatic that undenominational teaching can never be accepted by the Catholic church or the Catholic people' Coore went on to stress the political aspect of the Catholic schools problem. In para. 7 he conceded that the Liberal Party could

(1) In the original document, the word 'denominational' is crossed out and 'voluntary' written in the margin.

(2) Preston, St. Helen's, Warrington and Bury were among the towns which had voluntary schools only.

(3) P.R.O. File Ed. 24/111, Document B8, dated 15th January, 1906. 'The Catholic Schools and the Coming Re-Settlement in Elementary Education.'
'obtain such a majority at the polls as would enable it to impose its will on the Catholic fraction for at least one Parliament.' But that would not be the end of the matter. 'The Catholic fraction will always be able to count on a solid phalanx of, at least, 50 Irish votes... A determined minority may have it in its power to overthrow a settlement it regards as outrageous to its inmost convictions... The question of the Catholic schools in England and Wales is, primarily, an Irish question... an integral part of the Irish question itself...'

Coore then condemned the Catholic claims about their rights in the matter of education:

'Catholics must disabuse their minds of loose and wild notions about the rights of minorities which are current at the present time... Exaggerated ideas on this head prevail a good deal as the result of the Home Rule controversy, and the insistence in that connection upon the rights of the Protestant minority in Ireland..... The Protestants of Ireland amount to about one-third of the Irish people. (1) They are exceptionally strong in social position, wealth and intelligence... To compare their position in any way with that of the weak Catholic fraction in England would be to show a singular lack of a sense of proportion.'

On the Catholic claim that they paid more in rates than their schools cost, Coore simply described it as 'anarchical doctrine which no State could admit.'

'The money contributed by Catholic rate-payers would not suffice to maintain Catholic schools... The most that Catholics can reasonably or practically claim is the provision, partly at the cost of the State and the Municipality, of schools in which facilities for denominational instruction are afforded.' (2)

The first issue of The Tablet to appear after the result of the election became known contained an article which surprised many Catholics. (3) After describing the position of the Catholic schools since the passing of the 1902 Act as marking 'our achievement, to secure to every English child, as part of the

---

(1) This statement was inaccurate. The figures from the Census of Ireland, 1901, (Cd. 1190, p. 50) show that out of a population of 4,485,000, there were 581,000 Anglicans and 443,000 Presbyterians, about 22% of the population.

(2) P.R.O. File Ed. 24/111, Document B8, 15th. January, 1906. 'The Catholic Schools and the Coming Re-Settlement in Elementary Education.'

inheritance to which he is born, his right to a free education, in a school maintained by the State, without risk to his religion,' the article went on:

'It becomes necessary to distinguish between our right to have Catholic teachers in Catholic schools, with liberty, between defined hours, to teach the Catholic religion to those children whose parents desire such instruction for them, and the particular machinery by which those rights are secured.'

The article went on to recall the accusation made against the voluntary schools since the passing of the Act, viz. 'because the Foundation Managers outnumber those appointed by the Local Authority, the schools, although maintained at public expense, were still under the previous Managers.'

'In fact, the Managers manage nothing. They select the teacher but they do not pay him. The Local Authority may dismiss him, fix his salary and arrange his hours of work...Every detail of the management of the school is under the direct control of the Local Authority. But the apparent injustice of allowing schools supported out of the public purse to remain under private management has fired the imagination of the people...the whole strength of the passive resistance movement has been drawn from this simple and foolish misunderstanding...'

According to the article, there was a simple solution, now that 'a powerful section of the Liberal Party demands that the majority of the Managers shall be appointed by the Local Authority.' All that was required to settle the question was that the Local Authority should agree to appoint Catholic teachers from a list of qualified teachers. The Trustees of the school would have the same right to dismiss a teacher on religious grounds as the Local Authority had to object to a teacher on educational grounds. No doubt relying on The Tablet's reputation as a mouthpiece for the Catholic Hierarchy, a few days later, The Morning Post printed the following(1)

'We understand that the present Government is negotiating with the Roman Catholic authorities in this country and in Ireland in the hope of arriving at a compromise, in that Amendment of the Education Act to which the Ministry is committed, that will satisfy the Roman Catholic community without giving to the English Church those concessions which would inevitably arouse Nonconformist opposition...The

'obvious intention is, if possible, to divide the Anglicans and the Roman Catholics on this issue, and thus to remove one of the obstacles to the complete union of the Irish and Liberal Parties.'

However, The Times was able to forestall The Tablet by printing a disclaimer on the part of the Catholic Hierarchy:

'We are authorised to state that so far as the Roman Catholic Authorities in this country are concerned, there is no foundation whatever for the following paragraph which appeared in the Morning Post on Tuesday...

The paragraph duly appeared in The Tablet and in the same issue there were many letters of protest against the proposal to allow the Local Authorities to have a majority control on the managerial bodies of the Catholic schools. One such letter stated:

'Were it not for the fact that The Tablet is regarded by many as the organ of Catholic opinion in England, and even by some as the mouthpiece of the ecclesiastical authorities, one might be disposed to treat the article with silence... The Local Authority cannot, as you state, dismiss a teacher. This power is in the hands of the managers, to be used, subject to the consent of the Local Authority, where there is a question of educational grounds, independently when the dismissal is made on grounds connected with the giving of religious instruction...

You suggest to the enemy, even give him to understand, that it will be accepted if not welcomed by the Catholics of England as a solution of the education problem...the most damaging you could possibly suggest - destruction of the very keystone of the position...'

Not all correspondents were opposed to the idea. One letter praised the proposal as 'so simple, so satisfactory, that the wonder is that no-one has suggested it before...Let the Local Authorities do in name what they already do in fact, let them appoint the teachers, under a statutory obligation to appoint Catholic teachers.'

(4) Ibid.
(5) Ibid.
The original article in The Tablet, suggesting that the Catholic authorities might be prepared to accept a change in the composition of the panels of managers of the elementary schools, was given a new significance in a remarkable passage from a Pastoral Letter issued by Archbishop Bourne on 25th. February, 1906. (1) Anticipating the introduction of an Education Bill, the Archbishop wrote:

'The late Government endeavoured to meet the position by enacting that four out of the six Managers of our schools should represent the Trustees, and these six Managers should appoint the teachers...the arrangement was not in every sense a satisfactory one...'

Immediately after the passing of the 1902 Act, the Board of Education had strongly disputed the powers claimed by the Catholic Bishops to appoint and to dismiss managers. (2) Bishop Thomas Whiteside of Liverpool insisted that a Catholic Bishop need give only fourteen days notice in writing to dismiss a foundation manager of a school in his diocese. (3) But Selby-Bigge refused to concede to Catholic Bishops the right which had been denied to the Anglican Bishops to dismiss foundation managers, unless it was on the grounds that the manager had ceased to be a Catholic. He told Bishop Whiteside that the solution was to exercise more care in appointing foundation managers and the need to dismiss them would not arise. (4) Selby-Bigge also refused to accept the phrase 'recognised as a Roman Catholic' as one of the qualifications of a foundation manager, having no doubt as to who would do the recognising. Hence, when Archbishop Bourne had described the existing arrangement as 'not in every sense a satisfactory one' it is not clear exactly what he meant. The right to appoint four out of six of the managers virtually ensured that Catholic teachers would be appointed to the schools, and the schools would be permeated with the Catholic atmosphere which was held to be so important. Could it have been sheer coincidence that the earlier article in The Tablet (5) had suggested a change in the composition of the panels of managers? Lord Ripon certainly knew that the Cabinet had discussed the possibility of introducing the One-Clause Bill. Could it have


(2) P.R.O. File Ed.11/24 contains a great deal of correspondence between Catholic Bishops and the officials of the Board on the question of the powers of Bishops to revoke such appointments.

(3) P.R.O. File Ed.11/24, Bishop Whiteside to Selby-Bigge, 2nd. January, 1903.

(4) Ibid. Selby-Bigge to Bishop Whiteside, 9th. May, 1903.

been that the Archbishop learned of the proposal from Lord Ripon? There is no evidence in the Westminster Archives that letters were ever exchanged on the subject, but it is highly unlikely that news of such confidential discussions would ever be written down.

After a series of meetings in January, the Cabinet Committee on the problem had made very little progress. The Cabinet felt reasonably certain that the Irish Members would support them in whatever line they took on the voluntary schools. Dillon had assured Sir James Bryce that the Party could count on him 'to do my best to promote a compromise and not afraid to oppose the views of the leaders of the Catholic Church in England... The spiritual guides of the Catholics in England are the blindest of the blind... You know how deeply I fear the consequence of the policy adopted by our people in England, under the inspiration of Cardinal Vaughan...'

But when Lloyd George, wearying of the lack of progress being made on the issue, proposed that since the Government had been given a mandate from the people to make all the schools popularly controlled, there should be no longer any denominational teaching funded by the rates, or, indeed, in the school curriculum at all, Lord Crewe opposed such a proposal on the grounds that it would lead to the resignation of Lord Ripon. Augustus Birrell, the President of the Board of Education, felt that a Bill with such a proposal was a possibility. He suggested that the Bill would get through the Commons, the Lords would insist on the clause banning denominational instruction being removed, and the Government would agree to this, providing that the remainder of the Bill was accepted. But the Committee as a whole felt that it would be a bad omen if they gave way to the Lords on the first issue which cropped up.

Finally, Richard Haldane suggested that the Committee should draw up a list of the points which comprised the absolute minimum which they could recommend to the full Cabinet. In all, there were seven points:

(a) When the Bill became law there would be no elementary school in the country receiving money from the rates which was not under full popular control. Possibly,

(1) Lord Ripon, now over eighty years old, declined to serve on the Cabinet Committee. He did attend the Meeting on 6th. Feb. 1906 and commented that the 'The Tablet has gone further in the way of concessions to the Liberal requirements than many Catholics would do.' (P.R.O. File ed.24/116)
(2) The Bryce Papers, Dillon to Bryce, 24th. Decemebr, 1903.
(4) Haldane later became famous for his Army reforms, 1906 - 14.
this would also apply to any school receiving the Government Grant.

(b) No elementary school maintained out of the rates would give any denominational religious instruction.

c) There would be only one kind of elementary school. In such schools, there would be 'rate-supported Cowper-Temple religious instruction.' However, all elementary schools including the former provided schools, must permit of facilities for denominational religious instruction at some time during the week.

d) The ordinary teachers would give the Cowper-Temple type instruction, and be paid for doing so out of the rates. Denominational religious instruction would be afforded 'facility time' but would have to be paid for privately. In no case would the ordinary teacher in the school be allowed to give the instruction, otherwise this might lead to the denominational selection of teachers.

e) It might be found possible for the denominational instruction to be given on two mornings in the week at the same time as the Cowper-Temple type of instruction was being given.

(f) In all elementary schools, denominational religious instruction must be permitted, but such a facility would be confined to two mornings per week.

(g) All teachers must be appointed by the Local Authority. Trust requirements to appoint Church of England or Roman Catholic teachers would be removed by the Bill. At the same time, there need be nothing specific in the Bill which would prevent an Authority from asking any questions of a teacher as to religious belief.'

Sir Henry Fowler (1) then expressed a wish to have an Anglican and a Roman Catholic on the Cabinet Committee 'to advise as to the wishes of the various sections of the population on these moves.' Lord Crewe read a letter which he had received from Lord Ripon who had expressed a wish not to be included as a member of the Committee. When Sydney Buxton, who had been a member of the Cross Commission, asked that Lord Ripon should receive an account of the Cabinet Committee's deliberations, Lord Crewe refused to accede to the request. He wrote to Buxton to explain why (2):

'Morant has shown me your letter to him of yesterday, as to sending the Education Committee's papers to Lord Ripon....As he is not a member, I am averse

(1) Lord Ripon and Sir Henry had been members of all the Gladstone Cabinets.

'from sending him these rough reports which may sometimes mislead anyone who was not at the discussions, especially as we reached no conclusion on the Catholic question.'

Obviously there was no question of any hostility on Lord Crewe's part, either towards Lord Ripon or the Catholic community. In the same letter, Lord Crewe had written, 'On the general question of getting (Lord Ripon's) views before the full Cabinet discussion, I am quite with you - I object only to the method.'(1)

It was at the same Cabinet Committee meeting on 30th. January, 1906, that Lord Crewe read from a letter he had received from Lord Ripon, setting out what Ripon described as 'the Catholic position.'(2) A brief summary of the points in the letter must raise the question as to how many of the points had actually been agreed upon by the Hierarchy.

(a) The Bill must secure that the teachers in the schools attended by Catholic children were Catholics.

(b) One way of overcoming this difficulty would be to have a Parents' Committee for every school. The views of this Committee would have to be taken into account by the Local Authority when appointing teachers.

(c) Although paid for by the denomination concerned, this denominational instruction must be allowed during the ordinary school hours.

(d) Roman Catholics could not be asked to rely upon the mere probability that any Local Authority would deal with them fairly as regards facilities for religious instruction.(3)

(e) Roman Catholics would be prepared to surrender all their schools in single-school areas.(4)

(f) Roman Catholics cannot agree that Cowper-Temple instruction be given in all schools, e.g. in schools attended mainly by Catholics...No Catholic man or woman would agree to give such instruction, and, as such would be debarred from teaching in schools in which the whole, or at least a very large proportion of the children were Catholics.(5)

It was at this point in the discussion that Haldane suggested the

---

(2) Lord Ripon was a member of the Catholic Education Council, but it seems unlikely that the Council had agreed to (e). Such a suggestion was bitterly disputed during the Debate.
(3) The West Riding Case was on at this time.
(4) Would they be so prepared? The only concession offered was that extended facilities would not be insisted on in such areas. See p.257.
(5) Birrell did not agree. He once quoted Monsignor (later Bishop) Brown as saying that there were 300 Catholic women teachers in L.C.C. schools, and, presumably, giving such instruction.
'four-fifths' clause as a means of helping Catholic schools to secure their denominational instruction every day:

'In any school in which four-fifths of the children do not desire Cowper-Temple teaching, it need not be given, even on the three mornings, and denominational instruction might be given on the three mornings, as well as on the other two, but only at the cost of the denominations.... But this must never be allowed in a parish in a rural district, as undue pressure is so easily exercised under such circumstances.'

During the remainder of the meeting, several points were raised by Members. Haldane asked if a voluntary school refusing to join the scheme should lose both Government Grant and rate-aid, but Lord Crewe felt this would be much too drastic a compulsion.(1) Birrell thought that as an additional incentive to schools to join the scheme, the Local Authorities should agree to continue to pay for the repairs, etc. to voluntary school premises.(2) Haldane suggested that there might be an arrangement to pay the Government Grant, and even the rate-grant for a period of five years, so that the voluntary schools would be able to see the advantages, even the necessity of joining the scheme.(3) Birrell stressed the value of all the denominations being allowed entry to the council schools to give their religious instruction.(4) But Sydney Buxton insisted that if facilities were to be given for all the denominations to give their instruction in all kinds of schools, it would have to be made compulsory for all the schools to come into the scheme. Otherwise, the price (i.e. the granting of the facilities) would have been paid without securing the return.(5)

However, at the end of the meeting, the Committee were of the opinion that the Cabinet could not be expected to decide anything in respect of the Education Bill until the Cabinet Committee could come up with some clear alternatives.

When the Committee met again on 6th. February, 1906, (6) Lord Ripon was present. He stressed that he was speaking on his

(2) In 1902, such repairs were costing Catholic schools 2s.2d. per annum, per child in average attendance. (P.R.O. Ed.24/5/12 d.)
(4) Ibid. Para. 19.
(5) Ibid. Para. 25.
own behalf. He referred to the article in The Tablet which had suggested that the Catholics might be prepared to accept a change in the proportions of the managerial bodies in their schools. (1) Lord Ripon suggested that the newspaper 'has gone further in the way of concessions than the hierarchy would go.' Although, as Lord Ripon reminded the Cabinet, the Prime minister had suggested earlier that he was in favour of some form of special treatment for the Catholic schools as distinct from the Anglican schools, Catholics did not want special treatment. All they wanted was to keep the treatment they were now enjoying.

He welcomed Mr. Cadman's proposal that if four-fifths of the parents of the children attending a school wanted denominational instruction for their children, it should be given, but he posed the question as to what would happen if four-fifths of the parents did not want Cowper-Temple instruction. Would this mean that Cowper-Temple instruction would not be given? Lord Ripon also suggested that the only way to ensure that teachers, appointed to a school in which four-fifths of the parents wanted their children to have specific denominational instruction, could give that instruction, was to allow the parents some say in the appointment of the teachers. But Lloyd George immediately spoke out against this suggestion, as it would introduce religious tests for teachers. 'Nonconformists will allow undenominational teaching; they will never allow religious tests for teachers in any Bill.' (2)

Mr. Birrell also challenged Lord Ripon's claim that Catholic teachers would never give Cowper-Temple type instruction. He stated that Monsignor Brown had told him that there were 300 Catholic women teachers employed in the schools of the London County Council and Birrell presumed that all of these were giving Cowper-Temple instruction. (3) On the matter of parents being allowed to have a voice in the selection of the teachers, Birrell raised a matter which Archbishop Bourne had questioned him on. If a teacher was found to be unsound on matters of Catholic doctrine, but otherwise very satisfactory as a teacher, would the parents have the right to ask for the dismissal of such a teacher, and, if so, would

---


(2) An editorial in The Tablet (19th December, 1905) had asked the Nonconformist M.P.'s now they reconciled their strong opposition to the religious tests for teachers with their acquiescence in the Royal Declaration which forbade the Sovereign to become a Roman Catholic, or in the disqualification of Catholics from the post of Lord Chancellor or even from that of Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland.

(3) Monsignor (later Bishop) Brown, was vicar-General of the Southwark Diocese. He had been a member of the London School Board, and, with A.J. Mundella, had been surcharged under the Cockerton Judgment. (The Times, 24th April, 1902.)
the Local Authority have to comply with such a demand? Lord Ripon was informed by Birrell that the Archbishop had already been informed that a Local Authority could not be required to dismiss a teacher merely because the teacher was considered unsound from the view of denominational teaching. Lord Ripon felt that such a decision was one which the Bishop should be allowed to make, but he would not press the matter any further. On the matter of consultation with the Parents' Committee, Sydney Buxton said that as it was the parents and not the Local Authority who would be responsible for the quasi-test, he felt it could be attempted. After a long discussion, the Committee agreed that a Local Authority should not be compelled to have regard to the wishes of a Parents' Committee when choosing the ordinary teacher of the school, Lord Ripon alone dissenting.

Anxious not to offend Lord Ripon, Haldane then suggested an alternative form of wording:

'A Local Authority shall not appoint anyone as an ordinary teacher to whom four-fifths of the parents object.' (1)

Ripon countered with the suggestion that if it was to be assumed that there would be a Parents' Committee, that Committee could make representations on any matter. The wording then could be:

'The Local Authority shall have regard to any such representations'

There need be no reference to any particular matter such as the appointment of teachers. (2) But Birrell insisted that everyone would see that the choice of teacher was involved, and there would be 'a risk, if not a certainty, of the re-introduction of religious tests for teachers in this way.' (3)

Lord Ripon asked the Committee not to forget that since 1902 many Catholic schools had mortgages secured on their buildings which the Local Authorities were now proposing to take over. Haldane, who was a lawyer, assured him that there would be legal provision for this in the Bill. (4) He also agreed with Ripon's suggestion that if denominational instruction had to be

(1) P.R.O. File Ed. 24/118, para. 37. 6th. February, 1906.
(2) Ibid. para. 38.
(3) Ibid. para. 39.
(4) Ibid. para. 42.
provided and paid for privately, Cowper-Temple teaching would also have to be provided and paid for privately. Secular instruction only would be paid for out of public money.

It was about this time that Sir Henry Fowler(1) had a lengthy interview with Morant to discuss the Education Bill. Morant prefaced the account of the interview with a note to say that 'they are rough notes of ideas floating in Sir Henry Fowler's mind.'(2) There are twelve points in the document. They leave no doubt about the attitude which Sir Henry felt the Cabinet should adopt towards the voluntary schools. They would simply be taken over. The only concession would be that on two mornings in each week, the denomination would be allowed entry to the school to give denominational instruction, at its own expense. For children whose parents did not desire the denominational instruction, Cowper-Temple instruction would be given by the ordinary teacher, 'as part of the duties for which he is paid a salary out of the rates.' All this, of course would be subject to the conscience clause. (3)

Sir Henry went on to suggest that 'a certain amount of money must be given to the Trustees, which might be called rent. They need not be tied to spending this money in giving denominational instruction or in any particular way.'(4) Although he anticipated great opposition to the idea, Sir Henry thought that the denominations should have a right of entry to the council or provided schools to give religious instructions if the parents of any of the children so desired, 'but under no circumstances will the ordinary teacher in the school be allowed to give the denominational instruction...He will be needed for giving the undenominational instruction on those mornings to those children who do not desire the facilities instruction.'(5) On the actual take-over of the voluntary schools, Sir Henry felt that the Local Authority should have complete freedom to 'rent or purchase the premises, as and how it pleases.' There could be no compulsion, either to make the denomination sell or the Authority purchase.

(1) Sir Henry Fowler was an elder statesman of the Liberal Party. He and Lord Ripon had served in all of the Gladstone Administrations.

(2) P.R.O. File Ed.24/118. 'Interview with Sir Henry Fowler, 7th. February, 1906, revised 10th. February, 1906.'

(3) Ibid. para. 3.

(4) Ibid. para. 4.

(5) Ibid. para. 6.
But there was one ominous paragraph:

'Reate aid and Government Grants will no longer be paid in respect of any school which does not come in, and since any school not coming in will get nothing, the great majority will come in.'

If, under the existing Trust, Trustees are required to have a school in the building and yet they will not come in so as to allow the Local Authority to conduct a public elementary school in the building, the Trustees will have to conduct a certified efficient elementary school in the building, without any Government Grant or rate-aid to fulfill their Trust... If they are unable to do this, the building will have to be compulsorily made available for use by the Local Authority to conduct a public elementary school in it. (1)

From the Catholic point of view, any legislation based on these suggestions would have been a disaster. To continue to run the schools without any grant whatsoever was out of the question. Yet, since most Catholic schools were subject to Trusts, the Local Authority would have the power to take over the buildings if the Catholics refused to continue to run the schools. (2) The major concession proposed by Sir Henry, that the denominations would have the right of entry to the council schools to give their religious instruction, was unlikely to have been of any great value to the Catholics since in any area where there was a sufficient number of Catholic children, it was more than likely that a Catholic school had already been established. The suggestion that although a community of nuns was established in a parish, with a number of them teaching in the parish school, the nuns would be forbidden to give Catholic instruction, but could give Cowper-Temple type instruction in the school was quite impossible.

It is doubtful if Sir Henry's proposals were ever seriously considered by his colleagues on the Cabinet Committee. Haldane had already asked what the Government would do if a very large number of the voluntary schools called the Government's bluff, so to speak, and refused to enter the scheme. (3) There were many large areas of the country where there were no council schools, and Lord Crewe had commented that the public in such areas might not

(1) P.R.O. File Ed.24/118. 'Interview with Sir Henry Fowler, 7th. February, 1906, revised 10th. February, 1906.' para. 9 and 10.

(2) 716 Catholic elementary schools were the subjects of Trust Deeds; 237 schools were privately owned; 114 had no Trust Deeds. (P.R.O. File Ed.24/118, document SB/6, dated 17th. January, 1906.) See Appendix 7, p. 410.

see the value of paying large sums of public money to purchase or to obtain the use of schools which the public already had free of charge. (1) The Cabinet had already received a Memorandum from Mr. Selby-Bigge setting out the stark financial facts of taking over the voluntary schools, even assuming that the managers were willing to give them up. (2) The detailed costing of such an exercise showed that, over a 30-year period, some £959,000 would be required annually. In addition, if the Government was to have regard for the debts incurred by Local Authorities who had spent large sums of borrowed money in providing schools, a further sum of £654,000 would be required annually, making a total of £1,613,000.

My 16th. February, 1906, Birrell had a Memorandum ready to present to the full Cabinet. (3) It began:

'In order to fulfil the two election pledges of public control of the schools and the abolition of religious tests for teachers, it would be necessary to remain in possession, during school hours, of a large majority of the old non-provided schools... This increases the delicacy of our task, and also, in my opinion, the necessity of generous treatment in the matter of religious facilities...'

Reluctantly, Birrell admitted the necessity for the take-over of the voluntary schools. If they stayed out of the scheme and tried to exist solely on the Government Grant, the Local Authority would have no control over them. The enormous expense of replacing the voluntary schools with council schools put that solution out of reach. But Birrell's Memorandum shows that he was particularly concerned about the reaction of the Catholic Hierarchy to his plans. He outlined certain concessions which would be of assistance to the Catholic schools without actually mentioning Catholic schools by name. For example, assuming that all Catholic schools would have a majority of four-fifths of the parents wanting denominational instruction for their children, he posed the question:

'Where four-fifths of the parents declare that they do not desire any Cowper-Temple type instruction, the Local Authority may (must?) permit the ordinary teacher of the school to give the denominational instruction on the two mornings of the week.'


(2) Ibid. Document 9G/SB4, 14th. January, 1906. A copy of Cd. 3054 in File Ed.24/120, lists 142 Boroughs and Urban Districts in England and one in Wales in which there were no council schools.

(3) P.R.O. File Ed.24/118. 'Notes on the 1906 Education Bill. Memorandum by A. Birrell for the use of the Cabinet, 16th. February, 1906.'
'(Query: Would it be possible to extend this concession to the whole of the five mornings in schools where there is four-fifths demand for it? This would go far to meet the Catholic difficulty without naming them, or giving them, as such, any special treatment.)

It is clear that Birrell was very conscious of the Catholic insistence that the teachers should be Catholics. 'It is felt that it may be desirable that every school shall have a statutory "Committee of Parents" and it is this Committee which should express desires of the kind above referred to.' (In the original document, these lines are crossed through and in the margin there is a hand-written note, 'Some mode of representation of parents."

'(Query: Is it possible to have a clause in the Bill to the effect that in choosing the teachers of a school, the Local Authority must have regard to any wishes which the Parents' Committee may express in regard to their need of denominational facilities on all five days and to their not needing the Cowper-Temple type instruction at all during the week, so that the ordinary teachers might then be chosen by the Local Authority with regard to their being qualified to give denominational instruction in facility time...The time spent by the teacher in giving the denominational instruction would be paid for by the denomination...This would meet the Catholic difficulty without naming it...')

Birrell went on to suggest that to attempt to give Cowper-Temple type instruction in a school when four-fifths of the parents had declined to allow their children to attend it would make a nonsense of the whole business. He seemed to be convinced that if the Catholics were allowed to appoint the teachers and to have their denominational instruction every morning in the week, they would accept the Bill. The question of the teachers was a serious one:

'For example, in Liverpool, the majority of the teachers are nuns who are highly qualified and are most efficient teachers...Some of them belong to the National Union of Teachers...They are the regular teachers of the schools...any attempt to deprive them of the teaching of religion in the schools would render the whole concession worthless...Whether the Roman Catholics would wreck the whole scheme on this point, I cannot say...'

(1) P.R.O. File Ed.24/118, 'Notes on the 1906 Education Bill. Memorandum by A. Birrell for the use of the Cabinet.' Para. 8.
(2) Ibid. Para. 9.
(3) Ibid. Para. 9.
'There is no reason to suppose that a Local Authority would ever appoint a Protestant teacher to a Roman Catholic school....From the conversations I have had with Roman Catholic prelates, I may say they do not anticipate much difficulty on that score...'(1)

The final paragraph of Birrell's Memorandum suggests that there was no doubt in his mind about the impossibility of settling the schools problem unless the Catholics agreed to the terms of the settlement:

'The practical consequences of leaving the Roman Catholic grievances untouched are obvious enough... The Roman Catholics cannot support all their existing elementary schools (2) (as certified efficient elementary schools) without grants, in Liverpool, Manchester, and other large towns......It is confidently asserted that they will not send their children to our schools... If they do not, what is to be done? In Liverpool alone, there are 60,000 Catholic children...'(3)

The undertakings given at the time of the election that the Education Act of 1902 would be amended demanded that an Education Bill should be introduced. No-one outside the Cabinet knew what such a Bill would contain, but it could be inferred that it would not be to the advantage of the voluntary schools if any effort was made to redress the grievances of the Nonconformists.

In his Lenten Pastoral(4) Archbishop Bourne referred to the impending legislation. He praised the Government for their avowed intention to reach 'a just, permanent and definite settlement of the difficulties which have hampered and retarded the educational progress of the country for so many years.' Although the Catholics 'have made more sacrifices than any other body to provide adequately for the education of our children,' the Archbishop said he was prepared to consider the Government's proposals 'with no thought of mere party politics, no heed to party advantage or disadvantage.' On the subject of the Cowper-Temple type teaching, which he referred to as 'simple Bible teaching' he said the Catholic community had 'no desire to interfere with the rights of parents to have such a system if it satisfies them ...We can have none of it...The Catholic claim was, as it always was, a Catholic education

(1) P.R.O. File Ed.24/118. 'Notes on the 1906 Education Bill. Memorandum by A. Birrell for the use of the Cabinet.'
(2) In 1906, the Catholic elementary schools had accommodation for 411,360 scholars and an average attendance of 286,452. (Cd. 6002 dated March, 1912)
(3) P.R.O. File Ed.24/118 as in Note (1) above.
in a Catholic school, given by Catholic teachers.' The Archbishop made no concessions, apart from a suggestion that it might be found possible to change the composition of the managerial bodies of the Catholic schools. Catholics wanted 'even-handed justice...If a quarrel comes, it will be because it has been forced upon us.'(1)

In a sermon on St. Patrick's Day, 1906, the Archbishop told the congregation at Bayswater that 'in the anxious days ahead' the Catholic people would make it known, 'quietly and courteously' that they still held the opinions on Catholic education for which they had made so many sacrifices in the past.(2)

The Bill was to have its First Reading on 9th. April, 1906, the day before the House adjourned for the Easter Recess. On 6th. April, E.H. Pelham at the Board of Education, sent 'a copy of the most important Clause in the Bill, which will affect such Roman Catholic schools as may be transferred to the Local Authority,' to Archbishop Bourne, 'in accordance with the promise made to you by the Prime Minister.'(3) The Clause, Clause 4, was concerned only with Catholic schools in areas of more than 5,000 persons. In such areas, the Local Authorities would grant 'extended facilities for denominational instruction' in any school in which four-fifths of the parents desired such facilities. In such schools, the Local Authorities MAY permit the teachers in the school to give the instruction, but not at the expense of the Local Authorities. The 'extended facilities' would only be given if there was accommodation in schools not affected by the permission for children whose parents did not want their children to receive instruction under the extended facilities clause.

The Clause posed some difficult questions for the Archbishop. No-one knew how many Catholic schools there were in which four-fifths of the parents would ask for the extended facilities, although it seemed that the vast majority of Catholic schools would ask for the extended facilities. But the 5,000 limit meant that there would certainly be many schools, built by Catholic money, in which Catholic instruction could be given only on two or possibly three mornings each week, with Cowper-Temple type instruction given on the other mornings.(4)

(4) The Tablet, 2nd. June, 1906, p.843, was wildly inaccurate in suggesting that over 200 Catholic schools would be affected. In single-school areas, less than 30 Catholic schools would be affected.
### Table 15.

**The 5000 Limit: Schools in Urban Areas, 1st. January, 1906**

(Source: Cd 3219, P.R.O. Ed 24/120)

**Numbers of Voluntary Schools in England and Wales on 1st. January, 1906 in:**

1. **Urban Areas with a Population of more than 5000 Persons**
2. **Urban Areas with a Population of less than 5000 Persons**
3. **Rural Areas**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGLAND AND WALES</th>
<th>URBAN AREAS, OVER 5000 PERS</th>
<th>URBAN AREAS, UNDER 5000 PERS</th>
<th>RURAL AREAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No. of Schools</strong></td>
<td><strong>Av. Attend.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Schools, Av. Att. % of Sch. % of Att.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Schools, Av. Att. % of Sch. % of Att.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,811</td>
<td>1,996,448</td>
<td>3,018 1,148,562 25.6 57.5</td>
<td>419 103,956 3.5 5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,062</td>
<td>284,746</td>
<td>819 263,233 77.1 92.5</td>
<td>53 5,925 5.0 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>444</td>
<td>114,209</td>
<td>233 91,296 52.0 80.0</td>
<td>36 7,974 8.0 6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>10,189</td>
<td>12 10,189 100.0 100.0</td>
<td>- - - -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>739</td>
<td>138,056</td>
<td>292 79,823 39.5 57.8</td>
<td>35 11,751 11.5 8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14072</td>
<td>2,543,648</td>
<td>4,374 1,593,103 33.1 62.6</td>
<td>593 129,606 4.2 5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cd. 3054. P.R.O. File Ed. 24/120 is the list of 142 boroughs and urban districts in England with populations of more than 5000 which had no council schools.

One Welsh Borough with a population of more than 5000 had no council school.
THE 1906 BILL IN PARLIAMENT.

In the weeks before the General Election, Archbishop Bourne had circulated to the dioceses a carefully-worded question which he suggested the Catholic electors should put to any candidates asking for their votes. The question was:

'Will you, if returned to Parliament, resist any interference with the rights of Catholic parents as at present secured by law, to have their children educated in the elementary schools of this country in conformity with their conscientious religious convictions? (1)

However, with the possibility of a Home Rule for Ireland Bill in mind, the Irish National League had campaigned for the Liberal candidates. When the result of the election showed that the Liberals had almost 400 seats in the Commons, and a clear overall majority, there were recriminations.

'The Irish Party have taken a terrible responsibility on themselves...If our Catholic schools are wrecked, if the Catholic Church in England gets the most ruinous blow inflicted upon it since the Reformation, great and terrible will be the responsibility of the Irishmen.' (2)

The Tablet was pessimistic about the future of the Catholic schools in single-school areas:

'Those who called upon the Catholic electors to put their faith in Mr. Redmond and vote for the Liberal ticket have grievously miscalculated...the Liberals will work their will upon the schools and Mr. Redmond, unhappily, is in no position to offer any resistance....It only remains to see what can be saved from the wreck...We understand the case of the single-school districts is hopeless...' (3)

The board's 44 page 'History of the Education Bill, 1906,' was compiled by Mr. Eaton. The bare facts are that the Bill was given its First Reading on 9th. April, 1906, the day before the House adjourned for the Easter Recess. The Debate on the Second Reading began on 7th. May, and lasted for four days. It was carried by a majority of 206, although the Irish Members voted against it. The Committee stage began on 21st. May and lasted for 21 days. The Third Reading was carried in the Commons on 30th. July. On this occasion, the majority was 192 votes, although the Irish

(1) Oldmeadow, E.: Francis, Cardinal Bourne, 2 vol. London. 1940. Vol. I, p. 275. In the two questions which Cardinal Manning had suggested should be put to candidates in 1885, the questions referred to 'voluntary' schools and not to Catholic schools.


(3) Ibid.
Members again opposed it.

In the House of Lords, the Second Reading was carried without a Division on 3rd. August, after a Debate lasting for three days. Before the Bill came up for the Third Reading on 6th. December, a series of important Amendments had been made in it. It was passed by a majority of 77, although all the Catholic Peers voted against it. The Catholics were not satisfied that there were sufficient safeguards for the Catholic schools. But the Commons refused to accept the Bill because it had been so heavily amended. It was rejected by a majority of 309, the Irish Members voting with the Government. The Bill was returned to the Lords who refused to withdraw any of their Amendments. So a stalemate was reached and the Bill was finally withdrawn on 20th. December, 1906. (1)

It will be remembered that the Government had already sent a copy of Clause 4 to Archbishop Bourne a few days before the Bill was introduced. The accompanying letter had described the Clause as 'the most important Clause in the Bill which will affect ...such Roman Catholic schools as may be transferred to the Local Authority for the purpose of conducting a public elementary school.' (2) Birrell went to great lengths to express his sympathy for the Catholics in the struggle they had made to provide their schools.

'The man must have a heart like the nether millstone who is not deeply touched by the sacrifices which the Catholics of this country have made to provide for the education and religious needs of their fellow-believers...
They have had cast upon them the obligation of looking after thousands and thousands of poor Irish folk .... I believe I am right when I say that it is a charge which ought not to be brought against the Liberal Party that it is without sympathy with those from whom, on many important points, they most radically differ.' (3)

Some of the Irish Members were cynical about Birrell's attitude. One compared him to Lewis Carroll's Walrus, who wept over the fate of the oysters he was about to enjoy. (4) In 1906, the Catholics, like the other voluntary school bodies were not demanding anything new; simply the right to keep what they had already enjoyed, under the law, for the last four years.

(1) P.R.O. File Ed.24/120. 'Mr. Eaton's History of the Education Bill, 1906.'
(3) Parliamentary Debates, 9th. April, 1906. c.1034.
Press reaction to the new Bill was predictable. The Manchester Guardian saw it as 'a large, thorough and tolerant measure, taking full account of the needs of the people and the legitimate appeal of the minorities...It has the merit of keeping close to the facts of the situation.'(1)

The Daily Telegraph, having first congratulated Birrell on 'a distinct success on his first appearance as a Minister,' regretted that 'unfortunately, we cannot extend any measure of praise to the Bill....It is an elaborate piece of tyranny and intolerance, which will never appear on the Statute Book...a provocative challenge to all friends of denominational education...The crux of the Bill is religion...On religion the issue will be joined.'(2)

The Times, having at first expressed the opinion that 'the Bill will not be accepted without radical alteration,' later suggested that, because of the four-fifths provisions, the Catholics would accept the Bill, 'as the best they can hope for under existing circumstances.' Obviously, The Times was uneasy about the provision made for Jews and Catholics to keep their schools truly denominational, but there was to be no such provision for the Anglicans.(3)

The Daily News saw the bill as marking the end of the long road. 'It is for the churches to make the choice...A fair offer is made to them in the interests of justice and peace...We hope it will be accepted, and that we may turn, once and for all, from these bitter conflicts to the true work of educating our children...This is certainly the last time that the blessed word 'compromise' can ever enter into the settlement of the education question.'(4)

To the Anglicans, it must have seemed ironic indeed, that having, over the years and at considerable expense, provided schools for all comers, they were now to be deprived of the schools because they were not Anglican schools. The votes of four-fifths of the parents would decide the future of the school.

(3) The Times, 11th. April, 1906, p. 10
Undoubtedly, it was the proposal to allow four-fifths of the parents with children attending a school to decide what the religious instruction in the school would be which was most resented by the Anglicans. It was obvious to them why it had been introduced, and equally obvious that in the vast majority of cases, it would not be of much value in preserving the Anglican nature of the schools.

Forty years after the debate, Monsignor Brown, the then Vicar-General of the Southwark Diocese, and later Bishop of Pella, wrote:

'Birrell understood the Catholic cause perfectly and sympathised with it. But it was not possible for him to differentiate between Catholic and Church of England schools openly in the Bill, so he was forced to the device of separate Clauses, under one of which, schools which were homogeneous would secure teachers of the same religion, while the others would have to throw open certain posts to teachers not of their Church. The Anglicans saw through this, and bitterly resented the proposal that Catholics would be able, under the Bill, to get Catholic teachers for all the posts in their schools whereas the Established Church would be less favourably treated.'(1)

When Archbishop Bourne spoke at a meeting of the Catholic Truth Society in London, on 26th, April, 1906, he stressed how important it was that the Bill should be studied carefully. It was for this reason that he had not spoken out earlier. But, when the Bill had been considered by the Bishops and the Catholic Education Council independently of each other, judgement had been made that the Bill was not acceptable. 'It is this united voice of the Catholic Church in England that we now make known to our countrymen and, above all, to the Members of the Ministry which has deemed it necessary to force a conflict upon us.'(2)

The Tablet, which had first called the Bill 'a new Penal Law...We are treated as pariahs, as a people apart,'(3) had taken up a more optimistic attitude at the beginning of May.

(1) Brown, Rev. W.F. : 'Through Windows of Memory' (1946) p.57. Brown is being over-kind to Birrell. On 11th, December, 1906, during the Debate, he refused to accept an Amendment that 'No teacher would be appointed without the concurrence of the parents' committee.' (Parliamentary Debates, 11th. December, 1906, c. 217.)


(3) The Tablet, 14th. April, 1906, p.561.
It quoted the leading article in the Dublin 'Freeman's Journal.'

'Dr. Bourne recognises the painful and possibly protracted struggle that lies before the Catholic body. But he is cheered by the knowledge that the Bishops of Ireland will give their heartiest co-operation in the struggle, and he may count on the unswerving support of the Irish representatives.... The position of the Irish representatives has never been in doubt.'(1)

Unfortunately, when faced with a choice between Home Rule for Ireland and support for Catholic schools in England, the position of the Irish representatives was very much in doubt. But the Catholic Bishop of Leeds had no inhibitions in his attack on the Liberal politicians. Bishop William Gordon claimed:

'The Bill outrages every law, human and divine ... It is an iniquitous Bill.... The Liberals won their majority under false, nay, base issues.... Some people say we should be courteous to these men. What! Courteous to blackguards? Courteous to thieves?'(2)

There was a great deal of irresponsible talk about the Bill, in spite of Archbishop Bourne's insistence that the Catholics did not wish 'to attack, still less to denounce those who, wittingly or unwittingly, are the cause of our present great anxiety.'(3) During the Debate on the Second Reading, Mr. T.P. O'Connor made the extraordinary claim that, under the Bill, the Catholics stood to lose 243 of their schools. (4) The Tablet went even further:

'Many of our schools have over 20% of Protestant children in attendance and so, ipso facto, are shut out from the operation of the extended facilities clause.... In the Diocese of Westminster there are 25 such schools, in Southwark 36, in Birmingham at least 49, Hexham 10, Leeds 27, Middlesborough 2, Nottingham 21, Plymouth 9, Shrewsbury 10, Portsmouth 15, Liverpool and Salford comparatively few.... But we know enough to be sure of this, that taking the Bill as it stands, and even assuming that Clause 4 is made mandatory, we stand to lose nearly half of our schools....'(5)

(3) Archbishop Bourne's speech at the Royal Albert Hall Rally on 5th. May, 1906.
So far as O'Connor's claim was concerned, he must have arrived at the figure of 243 schools by adding together the totals of 190 schools in rural areas and 53 schools in urban areas with a population of less than 5000, and assuming that in none of these 243 schools would there be a majority of four-fifths of the parents who would want Catholic religious instruction for their children. The claim made in The Tablet that 'nearly half' of the Catholic schools were at risk is too far-fetched to be taken seriously. There were 1062 Catholic elementary schools at the time, so 'nearly half' could be taken as meaning about 500 schools. But, as suggested above, it is highly unlikely that even 243 schools would be at risk.

John Dillon, another Irish Member, suggested that two concessions, and two concessions only, were required to make the Bill acceptable to the Irish Members and, he believed, to the Catholic community also. The first concession was that Clause 4 should be mandatory and not optional on all Local Authorities. This would mean that Catholic teachers only would be appointed to Catholic schools, i.e. to schools in which four-fifths of the parents had asked for the Catholic religious instruction for their children. Dillon probably had in mind the consequences of an Authority like the West Riding County Council being given the option of appointing teachers. (1) The second concession was that Catholics should have the right to establish new elementary schools in an area if it could be shown that the need had arisen. (2) This right to establish new schools was very important to the Catholic community. O'Connor had explained earlier in the Debate, 'Our population is a shifting population...that is one of the marks and tokens of its position as a poor population......it is shifting because it has to follow its work.' (3)

There seems to have been a feeling of regret on the part of the Liberals and on the part of the Irish Members that the Bill was a source of disagreement between them. Birrell was partly to blame for the disagreement because of an unfortunate remark he had made earlier in the Debate. He had referred to the difference in the treatment of the Catholic schools and the council schools and

(1) The verdict in the West Riding Case was given on 15th. December, 1906. O'Connor had spoken of 'pig-headed obstinacy, denominational bigotry and jealousy on the part of the Local Authorities of this country.' (Parliamentary Debates, 7th. May, 1906, c 1046)
(2) Parliamentary Debates, 9th. May, 1906, c.1326)
(3) Ibid. 7th. May, 1906, c.1046.
added, 'Minorities must suffer, it is the badge of their tribe. It is the duty of enlightened Liberalism to mitigate their sufferings as much as possible.'

Writing many years later, Monsignor Brown, who knew Birrell well, explained that when Birrell used the words 'Minorities must suffer,' he was stating a truism, but 'the words, taken apart from the context, were used as a Party cry, and given the meaning that he meant the Catholic minority in the country to suffer.'(1)

John Dillon rejected any Liberal claims that the General Election result had given them a mandate to destroy the voluntary schools. He told them:

'Go to the Liberal Members for Liverpool, Manchester and Bolton, and ask them about the pledges they gave to the Catholic electors who voted for them..... Pledges were given by the Liberal candidates that they would see that no injustice was done to Catholic schools.'(2)

When John Redmond, another Irish Member who spoke in the Debate, was taunted that English affairs were no concern of Irishmen, he replied that, if the Irish people were allowed to control their own affairs, they would be 'only too glad to give up all possible interference in English, Welsh or Scotch(sic) affairs.' He added, 'The Catholic minority in England is an Irish minority. The Catholics of England who will be hit by this Bill, whose children go to these schools, are all Irish.' Redmond ended with an appeal to the Liberals to remember their own 'proud history associated with heroic struggle in defence of civil and religious liberty.... These men for whom we speak have similar traditions, traditions of even greater persecution for conscience sake.'(3)

The Second Reading was carried by 206 votes, although the Irish Members voted against the Bill. Redmond expressed his regret that their strong feelings on voluntary schools forced the Irishmen to vote 'against our Home Rule friends and with the traditional enemies of Irish popular rights.'(4) The Tablet assured the Irish Members that 'English Catholics owe a debt of gratitude to their Irish comrades which shall surely not be easily forgotten.'(5)

(3) Ibid. 10th. May, 1906. cc. 1509 - 1515.
(4) Ibid. 10th. May, 1906. c. 1336.
DIVISIONS AMONG THE CATHOLICS IN 1906.

The easing of the strain on the Catholic schools as a result of the implementation of the 1902 Act brought great financial relief to the Catholic community. Now, after three years of equality with the council schools, the result of the 1906 election threatened to destroy this hard-won equality. English Catholics saw the blame for the situation as lying with the Irish Catholics living in England who had followed the advice of the League and voted Liberal. The bait, of course, was the promise of a Home Rule for Ireland Bill. But amongst the other promises which the Liberals had made to their supporters was one to amend the 1902 Education Act which had done so much to favour the voluntary schools. There was a strong body of Nonconformist Members determined to see that the Party kept this promise. Thus, Catholics living in England were again divided on the issue of Home Rule for Ireland or Catholic schools in England.

On Saturday, 5th May, 1906, a massive Catholic rally had been arranged. It was to be held in the Royal Albert Hall, and was certainly not a rally for the poor. For some weeks before the rally, The Tablet carried advertisements for seats in the private boxes. Prices ranged from £1 5s. for a box for five persons to £5 for a box to seat twenty persons, prices well beyond the reach of the average Catholic worker. Over 50,000 applications were received for the 12,000 seats available. Although the rally had the appearance of a demonstration of Catholic solidarity, it was far from being that. At first, the Irish Members refused to have anything to do with the rally because it had been arranged by the Catholic Education Council and the Duke of Norfolk, along with other Catholic peers would attend. (1) Only when the Archbishop gave an undertaking that there would be no political speeches or resolutions did the Irishmen agree to attend.

In its report on the proceedings, The Tablet indulged in some fanciful rhetoric. The rally was described as:

'...the opening battle of a conflict which will shape the destinies of the country for years to come...

(1) The Duke of Norfolk was Chairman of the Catholic Education Council. His brother, Lord Edmund Talbot, M.P. for Chichester, was also a member. The Irish Members would have nothing to do with the Council because 'it was a Tory-dominated body.' Lord Ripon and the Hon. Charles Russell, two prominent Liberals, were also members of the Education Council.
'Every man present felt that he was going into battle in a life and death struggle... The spirit of Langton, de Montfort and O'Connell, which had wrung liberty from the tyrants of old still ranged abroad in defence of the eternal right...' (1)

Although the Daily Telegraph was more restrained in its comments, it had noticed the lack of political feeling at the rally.

'It was an assembly drawn from all classes, from the duke to the dustman... The intention of the promoters was to make the meeting a ratepayers' meeting, without any political complexion...(2)

The Times commented on the size of the demonstration, and the lesson to be learned:

'The Bill must be largely amended if the religious difficulty is not to be made infinitely worse than it is now... The Government are faced with serious and justifiable opposition, coming from many quarters... they cannot be under an illusion any longer as to the extent and strength of the antagonism called out by the Bill.' (3)

The Standard issued a warning:

'The speeches at the great meeting of Roman Catholics on Saturday give no idea of the enthusiasm which animated the audience........ If this Bill, or anything like it, ever became law, the Roman Catholics would kill the Act by passive resistance on a scale which the Nonconformist objectors to the legislation of 1902 have never dreamed of... '(4)

But, when the rally was over, and the banners and the brass bands had gone, the division was still there. The Irish Members refused to have any contact with the Catholic Education Council. The Council, formerly the Catholic School Committee, and originally the Catholic Poor School Committee, had two representatives, one clerical and one lay, from each Diocese in the country. It was the official Catholic body for carrying on negotiations with the Board of Education and generally putting forward the Catholic point of view on education matters. No doubt, the Irish Members felt that as supporters of the Liberal Government, they should avoid contact with what they described as a 'Tory-dominated' body. But their attitude caused severe difficulty in the Catholic ranks as the debate continued.

(1) The Tablet, 12th. May, 1906. p 750
(2) The Daily Telegraph 7th. May, 1906.
(3) The Times. 7th. May, 1906.
Archbishop Bourne's position was one of extreme difficulty. He was anxious to retain the confidence of both groups, but with the feeling existing between the Irishmen and the Education Council, this was no easy task.(1) During the debate on the 1902 Act, he had been Bishop of Southwark(2) and must have known that the Irish Members were not the loyal supporters of the Catholic schools which the Hierarchy would have liked them to be. But the truth of the situation was that the Liberals in the House of Commons had a sufficient majority to pass the Bill with or without the support of the Irish Members. The only concessions the Irish Members could gain for the schools would be on account of the support which they had gained for the Liberals in the English constituencies, a support which the Liberals might require in the next election. But that was four years away, and the Liberals knew that the danger to their Bill came from the House of Lords. Anticipating such danger, it seems difficult to understand why the Government went ahead with the Education Bill instead of the Parliament Bill which had to wait until 1911 before it became law. Had the Parliament Act been in force in 1906 or 1907, it seems almost certain that the schools issue would have been settled on the lines of the 1906 Bill.

LORD RIPON'S ROLE IN THE DEBATE.

On the day of the mass rally at the Royal Albert Hall, The Tablet had made an outspoken attack on Lord Ripon. The veteran Liberal Cabinet Minister was a Catholic and a member of the Catholic Education Council.(3)

'In spite of all that happened last week, the Marquess of Ripon is still a member of the Cabinet... It is impossible not to know that the position of Lord Ripon is a source of no little perplexity to the great majority of his fellow-Catholics...... At the 80-Club last week, Mr. Morley boasted that there was a Catholic as well as an agnostic in the Cabinet....Mr. Herbert Paul goes out of his way to remind us that Lord Ripon, as a Cabinet Minister, 'is responsible for every line of the Bill, and there is no stauncher Catholic than he.'

(1) It is difficult to understand the assertion that it was the refusal of the Catholic Peers, and by implication, the Catholic Education Council, to have any dealings with the Irish Members which caused the difficulties. (Gwynn, D.R.: 'The Life of John Redmond' London. 1932, pp. 115-116.) The assertion is also made in Williamson, C., 'Great Catholics' London. 1939 p. 484.

(2) Catholic churches south of the river in London are in the Diocese (now Archdiocese) of Southwark.

The writer of the article then went on to surmise why Ripon was acting as he was.

'He attaches great importance to the 'extended facilities' clause....he feels that whatever power for good he possesses, it will be more effectually used within the Cabinet than from outside it...We are all one in our belief that, whatever chances, Lord Ripon will do what, in his opinion, is best for the cause of the Catholic schools. (1)

Ripon was indeed doing his best for the Catholic schools. On 14th. June, 1906, he had written to 'My Dear Birrell' to describe an interview he had on that same day with Archbishop Bourne. (2) Apparently, Redmond and Dillon, the Irish leaders, had called to tell the Archbishop of an interview they had had with Birrell!

'I do not know exactly what you said to Redmond, but the Archbishop seems to have understood that your proposition was that all Catholic schools should be put under pre-1902 conditions, Government Grant, no rates...He thought this would throw a very heavy burden on the Catholic body....I suggested that your real idea, not as coming from you, of course, but as a device of my own for meeting this difficulty, that any return to the pre-1902 state would be resorted to only when local authorities refuse to act fairly...This he much preferred....The Archbishop is greatly alarmed as to the effect of the 5000 limit...He gathered from Redmond that you might make some concession on that point.'

Next day, 15th. June, Ripon again wrote to Birrell, apparently having failed to see him in person in the meantime.

'If I had been able to see you, I would have added one or two more points....I thought that Dillon had more weight with the Archbishop than Redmond had, although he spoke highly of the latter...he thought he would be bound to call a meeting of his fellow-Bishops for next week, which I regret, as many of them are less reasonable than he is...' (3)

On 19th. June, Ripon again wrote to Birrell:

'I earnestly hope that you will adhere to your intention to delete the 5000 limit from clause 4. It would exclude from the benefit of the clause a far larger number of Catholic schools than that mentioned at the Cabinet when it was first talked about.' (4)

But apparently, Birrell did not act. Ripon wrote again:

'Is it impossible to get rid of that horrid 5000 limit in the House of Commons? I would be very grateful if this were done...' (5)

(3) Ibid. 15th. June, 1906.
The Third Reading of the Bill was carried on 30th July, 1906. The Government majority was 192, so the fact that the Irish Members again voted against the Bill had little effect one way or another. The Catholics may have been resigned to the loss of the schools by now because Lord Ripon was in communication with Birrell on the question of mortgages which were still outstanding on Catholic schools which were to be taken over. (1) Birrell could only assure him that the matter was one which was being considered by the Board of Education, and he would hear from the Board in due course. (2) Ripon replied:

'I am obliged to you for your letter...I have not yet received any Memorandum from the Board of Education on the question of the mortgages, but I daresay I shall before I go back to London. All that I want is to be able to discuss the matter with the Archbishop if he should speak to me about it when I see him.' (3)

During the last days of the Bill, Ripon was again doing all he could to save it. He was unable to see the Archbishop as he was in Paris. (4) He wrote to Birrell:

'I wrote to the Archbishop of Westminster on Friday to ask him to see me, mainly for the purpose of begging him to be guided by Redmond rather than by Norfolk. He was in Paris, but I received the enclosed reply from him this morning. He has, as you will see, anticipated my recommendation, and, what is important, the Roman Catholic Bishops generally have agreed with him. I think you ought to know this at once. It would be a great pity to lose this chance of a settlement with the Roman Catholics. We do not wish to lose their votes at elections if it can be avoided... I send you the Archbishop's letter. Please return it to me.' (5)

The Archbishop's letter showed that whilst the Catholic Bishops 'heartily disliked the Bill,' they would prefer that it should pass 'on account of the delicacy of the future situation.' But, this all depended on the Amendments being granted 'which Mr. Redmond hoped to obtain.' There were four such Amendments:

1. Extended facilities to be granted everywhere except in single-school areas.

(1) P.R.O. File Ed.24/111. 'Correspondence as to the Safe-guarding of the Catholic schools,' dated 20th September, 1906.
(2) Ibid. dated 24th. September, 1906.
(3) Ibid. 30th. September, 1906.
(4) The Archbishop was also out of the country during the final stages of the Runciman Bill in 1908.
(5) Ibid. dated 10th. December, 1906. Obviously, the letter was not returned as it is still in the File at the P.R.O.
2. The proportion of parents to be not higher than three-quarters, in a ballot where only those parents actually voting would be considered.

3. Alternative schooling to be required only if a reasonable number of children need it.

4. Teachers to be appointed with, at least, the concurrence of the parents' committee.

The Bishops are also very anxious that some consideration should be extended to the future provision of Catholic schools. 'Failing the above Amendments, the Bishops hoped the Bill would be withdrawn' (1)

The letter is of interest in that in shows quite a difference of opinion between what the Archbishop was prepared to accept and what the Catholic Education Council held to be the absolute minimum of Amendments to be made before the Bill became acceptable to Catholics. (2) Of the four Amendments asked for by the Archbishop, the third would have seemed meaningless to the Cabinet, in that the use of the phrase 'a reasonable number' implied that some authority would have to decide what 'reasonable' meant. The question must arise as to who this authority should be. So far as the fourth Amendment was concerned, Mr. Lough 'shook his head' when asked in the Commons if he would accept an Amendment giving the parents a voice in the selection of teachers. (3) It is difficult to understand why the Archbishop subsequently backed Redmond's claim that when he spoke in support of the Bill, he did so 'in consultation with' and 'with the concurrence of the responsible heads of the Catholic Church in England.' (4) There are some interesting comments on the people taking part in the 1906 Debate in Monsignor Brown's book, but oddly enough, there is only one brief mention of Lord Ripon. This is simply to record his resignation as Chairman of the Catholic Education Council, in which post he was succeeded by the Duke of Norfolk. (5)

(1) P.R.O. File Ed.24/111. 'Correspondence as to the Safeguarding of the Catholic Schools,' dated 8th December, 1906.

(2) See Appendix 6, p. 408, for a summary of the various conditions set out by the Archbishop, the Irish Nationalist Members, and the Catholic peers, speaking on behalf of the Catholic Education Council, for the acceptance of the Bill.

(3) Parliamentary Debates, 11th December, 1906, c. 217. See also p. 249 infra.


THE END OF THE 1906 EDUCATION BILL.

As the summer passed, it became more and more obvious that, far from solving the education problem, the Bill would please neither side. When he addressed a meeting on Wimbledon Common, Dr. John Clifford, the minister of the Westbourne Park Baptist Church, asserted that the passing of Clause Four would cause passive resistance to continue, 'but with this difference: the passive resisters would now be sent to prison by the men they had sent to Parliament.' (1) During the same week, The Tablet carried an article also attacking Clause Four. The writer claimed that if the Clause was implemented, the result would be a disaster for the Catholic schools. On the subject of the four-fifths of the parents rule, The Tablet stated:

'In the Diocese of Westminster there are 25 such schools; in Southwark, 36; in Birmingham, at least 49; Hexham, 10; Leeds, 27; Middlesborough, 2; Nottingham, 21; Plymouth, 9; Shrewsbury, 10; Portsmouth, 15; Liverpool and Salford, comparatively few. But we know enough to be sure of this, that taking the Bill as it stands, and even assuming that Clause Four is made mandatory, we stand to lose nearly half of our schools.' (2)

In the same month of June, 1906, the Court of appeal had decided in favour of the County Council in the West Riding case. Understandably, the Catholic community was now very worried about the future of the schools. (3) In October, The Times reported that in some areas, Local Authorities were giving notice to the teachers in voluntary schools, but immediately re-engaging them on a lower salary to take account of the time spent in giving religious instruction. (4) When the annual audit of the accounts of the London County Council was announced, a deputation of Nonconformists led by Rev. Sylvester Horne, attended to lodge an objection against the County Council's practice of paying the teachers in voluntary schools during the time they were giving denominational religious instruction. Rev. Mr. Horne insisted:

'There is no escape from the decision of the court in the West Riding case....It has been held that the rate-payments for religious teaching in the non-provided schools are not authorised by law,'

(2) The Tablet, 2nd. June, 1906. p. 843. Since there were 1,064 Catholic schools in 1906, the claim that 'nearly half' the Catholic schools were at risk was an exaggeration.
(3) The Catholic school at Hemsworth was one of the schools in the West Riding test case.
and, if made, should be disallowed at the audit.' (1)

But the Catholic deputation which also attended at the audit, and was headed by the Hon. Charles Russell and Mr. Snead-Cox, the editor of The Tablet, put the opposite view. Rev. Fr. Bannin, who spoke as 'London rate-payer, objected to any deductions being made because of the denominational instruction being given in the London schools. He pointed out that the matter was still 'sub judice' as the Government had decided to take the matter to the House of Lords. If the ruling was upheld there, Fr. Bannin contended that all religious instruction would come under the ban, including the Cowper-Temple teaching in the provided schools. The solicitor for the County Council, who was present at the hearing, agreed that there were serious legal issues involved. He asked that the meeting be adjourned so that the legal issues should be considered at greater length. The Auditor, Mr. T.B. Cockerton, agreed, and the two deputations were invited to return on 27th. November, 1906. (2)

Not everyone was pleased when it was announced that the Government intended to take the West Riding issue to the House of Lords. Feeling was still particularly high in parts of Wales. The Times quoted from an article in the Welsh language newspaper, Baner ac Amserau Cymru in which a bitter attack was made on the President of the Board of Education, Mr. Birrell:

'Why appeal against a judgement which, we should imagine, ought to be quite satisfactory to the Government..... Is it possible that the man in whom we have joyfully placed our trust...is about to follow in the staggering footsteps of the late Mr. W.E. Forster? We know to our sorrow...that he preferred the praise of the Bishops and the Church to the approval of the country.... If he proceeds, he will merit the title of Forster the Second, and he will land himself and the Government in trouble.' (3)

Catholics in the West Riding were also loud in protest at the prospect of further dangers to their schools. The Leeds Diocesan School Managers' Association had addressed an 'Appeal for Justice' to every Member of the House of Lords, asking them to either reject the Education Bill altogether, or to introduce such Amendments as would 'safeguard the consciences and liberties of His Majesty's Catholic subjects, of whom there were 756,000 in Lancashire and 90,000 in Birmingham.' (4).

(1) The Times, 17th. October, 1906. p.10
(2) ibid.
When the Catholic Bishop of Leeds spoke at a protest meeting in Leeds Town Hall on 19th. November, 1906, The Times reported that there were three overflow meetings in Victoria Square, so great was the number of people who wished to show their opposition to the Education Bill. The Bishop, Dr. Gordon, thanked the Members of the House of Lords for their stand on the Bill. He also said that he approved of the recent utterances of Mr. Dillon who had advised the Catholics to show the Government that they were quite prepared for active as well as passive resistance to the Bill. The Bishop read a letter of apology from the Catholic Bishop of Limerick, who was unable to be present at the meeting. In his letter, that Bishop, Dr. O'Dwyer, remarked that it was strange indeed that the Catholics had to look to the Unionist House of Lords to protect their rights. (1)

When the Bishop of Salford spoke at a meeting at Radcliffe he challenged the Liberal claim that the results of the election had given them a mandate to deal with the problem of the voluntary schools. The Bishop said:

"What the election vindicated was the question of Free Trade and nothing else....If the Catholics had supposed that the Party in power would have exercised that power in this tyrannical way, Mr. Birrell and his Party would not have got a single Catholic vote." (2)

But the staunch Nonconformist, Dr. Clifford, urged the House of Commons to stand firm. He said that in every area he visited, the actions of the Anglican Bishops in the House of Lords were regarded 'with mingled contempt and anger.' He advised the Liberal Government to send the Bill back to the Lords, having first removed all the Amendments that House had made. The Bill should contain 'no foot-holds for sectarian privilege.' Instead, the watchword should be, 'No surrender to the Bishops! No, not one inch!' (3)

On 29th. November, 1906, two very important events took place. Each of them involved one of the Catholic factions in the Debate, the Irish Members and the Catholic Education Council. On that day, John Dillon, one of the Irish leaders, wrote to Birrell, and sent him the final terms on which the Irish Members could be expected to support the Bill, recognising that, within a few days

the Amended Bill would be coming back from the House of Lords for the final decision to be made in the Commons. (1) Dillon's letter dealt with alterations in Clause Four to overcome 'the great difficulty, the question of the appointment of teachers.' Urging Birrell to 'take a strong line' with his colleagues in the Government, Dillon ended:

'We shall have a very tough task with our crowd to bring them to reason, and this can only be done if it is possible for Redmond and myself to to take the field vigorously in support of the Bill... Unless this point is made clear, that the Catholic schools will be safeguarded absolutely against any attempt on the part of Local Authorities like the West Riding to nullify Clause Four by appointing Protestant or anti-clerical Catholic teachers to the schools, it will be quite impossible for us to support the Bill, with the result that the Bishops, with their Tory priests, will thwart the votes of our people and the break between the Irish and the Government will be rapidly widened.' (2)

The second important event which took place on 29th. November, 1906, was a deputation, organised by the Catholic Education Council, to Lord Lansdowne, the Conservative leader in the House of Lords. The original intention had been for each Diocese to organise a separate deputation to Lord Lansdowne, to ask him to urge the Lords to stand firm on their Amendments to the Bill. However, because of the numbers involved, Lord Lansdowne asked that one representative deputation should attend and put the case to him. Both The Times and The Tablet listed the names of the members of the deputation which was led by the Duke of Norfolk. They came from all parts of the country and included priests, aldermen, councillors, and ordinary Catholic citizens. It is difficult to understand why John Redmond's biographer, writing in 1932, when all the details were available, should describe the deputation as being 'far from representative, for it consisted almost entirely of Tory Catholics from London.' In fact, only two of the 44 members of the deputation came from London. (3) Individual speakers impressed upon Lord Lansdowne the consequences of trying to enforce the provisions of the Bill upon Catholic schools, in particular, that of allowing Local Authorities to appoint non-Catholic teachers to Catholic schools. In his reply, Lord Lansdowne said he could be under no illusions

(1) Redmond's biographer described the Lords' Amendments as 'hacking the Education Bill into a truncated condition.' Gwynn, D. : 'The Life of John Redmond,' (1932) pp.139-40
(3) Gwynn, op.cit. p.139.
'about the representative character of this great and important delegation.' He realised 'how great was the weight which must be attached ...to anything which comes to us with such a backing of authority.' He went on to say that as the Education Bill was a bad Bill, it was impossible to turn it into a good Bill. It was just possible that it might be turned into ' a passable Bill which would put an end to the controversy for the time being.' He ended by saying that although the controversy over the education of the nation's children was most regrettable, and he was anxious to see it terminated, 'the termination of the controversy could be bought too dear...You need not fear that the House of Lords ...will pay an excessive price to bring that controversy to an end.'

The Irish Members were extremely angry when they heard that the Catholic Education Council had sent the delegation to see Lord Lansdowne. Their anger was directed towards Archbishop Bourne who had failed to tell them about it. When they complained to him, he replied that he himself had known nothing of the delegation until the meeting had taken place.(2) This, of course, seems quite incredible. Each Diocese in the country had two representatives on the Catholic Education Council, a priest and a layman. Monsignor Brown, a close friend of the Archbishop, was a member of the Education Council. In spite of it all, the Archbishop insisted that he knew nothing of the meeting until it had taken place.

Redmond did his best to see that there would be no more delegations. He immediately wrote to Birrell:

'I have just heard that it is proposed to ask the Prime Minister to receive a deputation consisting of the Duke of Norfolk and the other gentlemen who, in the name of the Catholics of England, recently waited on Lord Lansdowne for the purpose of urging the Lords to stand by their Amendments....I am convinced that such a deputation, which could speak only for a small minority of the Catholics in this country, would be most mischievous. Can it be avoided? I hope the Prime Minister will not receive it.'

There is no evidence that the Prime Minister did receive the deputation although whether this was because of Redmond's letter or of pressure on the Prime Minister's time is not known. One thing was obvious, that as the Bill came to its final stages, there were serious divisions in the Catholic ranks.(1)

In the Lords, the Bill had been dealt with by 6th. December, 1906. Lord Lansdowne summed up the position of the Lords by saying:

'We have admitted to the full the principle of popular control. We have admitted that there shall be no religious tests for teachers. We have admitted that the denominations must pay for the religious education they require. We now look to the Noble Earl opposite (Lord Crewe, Leader of the Liberal Peers) and his colleagues, to assist us in quelling the flood of misrepresentation by which our action has been obscured.' (2)

The Amended Bill was passed by the Lords on 6th. December, 1906, by 105 votes to 28, the Catholic Peers voting solidly against it. The Duke of Norfolk defended their action:

'It appeared to us that the earnest self-sacrifice of years was to be swept away...There is only Clause Four to look at as a harbour of refuge, the passage to which is impeded by quicksands, and the shelter of which, when obtained, will be of doubtful character....
The Bill passed through the House of Commons its severity tempered with kindly phrases and promises, but when we turned to the Clauses of the Bill, we found that these promises had not been turned into legal enactments.'

The Duke agreed that the Catholic Peers had not divided the House when the Bill came up for the Second Reading. 'We determined to take a risk and do the best we could with the Bill...' But the Amendments were not enough. 'The underlying principle of the Bill and the provisions it contains still remain in a form which the Catholic body are totally unable to accept.'(3) It seemed that the Duke did speak for the Catholic body. The Catholic Education Council passed a resolution at its meeting on 5th. December, 1906, 'gratefully appreciating the stand made by the House of Lords' but 'in the absence of any effective security for the appointment of acceptable Catholic teachers to Catholic schools, the Bill cannot be accepted by the Catholic body.'(4)

(1) The correspondence between the Archbishop and the Duke of Norfolk on the subject of the deputation is dealt with in the next chapter
(3) Ibid. c. 1105 - 1107.
No-one viewed the prospect of a clash between the two Houses over the Education Bill with more anxiety than King Edward. On 25th. November, 1906, in a personal letter to the Prime Minister, he expressed his concern about 'the serious state of affairs which would arise were a conflict to take place between the House of Lords and the House of Commons on the Amendments passed by the former House on the Education Bill.' (1) The King suggested that a meeting between the Prime Minister and the Archbishop of Canterbury might result in 'some modus vivendi on the line of mutual concessions' and an avoidance of the conflict. (2) In his reply, the Prime Minister was not too enthusiastic. 'It may be that the time has not yet arrived for a mutual accommodation,' he wrote, but agreed to seek a meeting with the Archbishop. (3)

The meeting took place on 26th. November, 1906. In his account of the meeting, the Prime Minister told the King that the Archbishop could not accept the condition that although a teacher in a denominational school was willing and able to give the denominational instruction, he could not be allowed to do so. 'Your Majesty's Government thinks this would be inadmissible,... it would leave the voluntary schools with all their powers and privileges.' (4) In thanking his Prime Minister for the letter, the King could only hope 'that an arrangement may yet be made which would prevent a collision between the two Houses.' (5)

On 8th. December, 1906, the Prime Minister wrote to the King, then staying at Sandringham, and told him of the Cabinet decision to reject the Lords' Amendments en bloc. The King was not impressed. He could not quite see 'where the spirit of compromise comes in,' and expressed his doubts as to whether the Lords would regard such a move as 'a desire on the part of the House of Commons to arrive at an amicable conclusion.' (6) In his reply, the Prime Minister reminded the King that the Opposition had 'denounced the Bill in unmeasured language... not a single Bishop voted for it.' (7) But he assured His Majesty that the Government could not 'give away themselves and their friends in vain.'

(2) Ibid. p. 302.
(3) Ibid. p. 303.
(4) Ibid. p. 304.
(5) Ibid. p. 304.
(6) Ibid. p. 306.
(7) This is not strictly correct. The Bishop of Hereford supported the Government. (Spender, op. cit. p. 311.)
However, the Prime Minister stressed that the Government still wished to save the Bill, 'and thus settle the conflict, at least for a time.' (1)

Campbell-Bannerman's biographer may not be entirely accurate in his listing of the concessions which the Government were prepared to make in order to save the Bill. (2) He wrote:

'The Government offered to substitute three-fourths for four-fifths as the majority of parents required for an extended facility school...

They also consented to include future as well as present voluntary schools under the extended facilities clause, thus giving the denominations a chance of establishing such schools and making them a charge on the estate...

They agreed that, in such schools, the Local Authority should consult with parents' committees and appoint teachers acceptable to them'

Not surprisingly, Spender quotes the Nonconformists who complained that the Bill was no longer worth passing, 'with these large encroachments on their principle of the test-free teacher.' Spender goes on to state:

'It was rumoured that the only question now outstanding was the head-teacher's option to give the denominational instruction in the transferred schools, and a compromise was possible, even on that. (3)

Spender gives no information on the source of the rumour. He is equally vague on the final efforts made to save the Bill:

'The story goes that a draft compromise was submitted to Mr. Balfour, who was laid up with influenza. Whatever happened to it in the sickroom, it never saw the light of day... '(4)

Birrell's account of the last fight to save the 1906 Education Bill is the more credible of the two. He describes the two meetings between the leaders of the various interests which


(2) Ibid. p. 309.

(3) Ibid. p. 310.

(4) Ibid. p. 310.
'The first meeting was at the home of Lord Crewe in Curzon Street. At this meeting, Lord Lansdowne and Mr. Davidson met Lord Crewe, Mr. Asquith and Mr. Birrell. Later, on the same evening, the same parties met Mr. Balfour at Mr. Balfour's room at the House of Commons. But two issues remained unresolved, viz.

1. Extended facilities in schools in rural areas

2. The liberty of a teacher in a school to give religious instruction when ordinary facilities have been agreed.' (3)

If these two issues were all that separated the opposing sides, then agreement was almost reached. But Birrell's account of the meeting was written over thirty years after the events. It is difficult to understand that offers of such concessions were made on the evening of Tuesday, 18th December, yet no mention of them was made during the discussion in the Lords on the following day(4) or in the private letter which the Prime Minister wrote to the King on 20th. December, 1906, the day on which the Bill was withdrawn. (5) nevertheless, the Birrell account of the attempt to save the Bill is interesting if only because of the light it throws on the remarks made by Archbishop Bourne at Leeds in February, 1908. On that occasion, the Archbishop spoke of the Catholics going 'to the very limit of concessions to arrive at an agreement...I do not regret our action....nor will anyone who knows the full details of those concluding moments.' (6) But here again, the question must arise as to whether any of the persons named as attending the two meetings on 18th. December would have had the will or the opportunity to consult the Archbishop on his views on the concessions. If the concessions had been offered openly to the Catholics, it seems likely that having been given the right to appoint the teachers and to claim extended facilities when three out of four parents voting asked for them, the Catholics would have accepted. The question remains as to whether they were offered.

(2) Spender,op.cit. p.310, claims that the Archbishop was 'Laid up with influenza.'
(3) Lord Lansdowne described the refusal to allow a teacher who wished to give denominational instruction the right to do so as 'an insuperable obstacle to peace.'
(4) See p. 251
(5) See p. 251
(6) See p. 270, and The Tablet 29th. February, 1908, pp.339-341
And so the Bill, heavily amended, went back to the Commons. A statement by the Catholic Bishop of Liverpool had an ominous threat. Bishop Thomas Whiteside said:

'If our opponents think to take over the Catholic schools, they will find the Catholics ready to fight....
I do not hesitate to say that the first time a non-Catholic teacher is appointed to a Catholic school in Liverpool, all the Catholic children in the city will go on strike.' (1)

The Executive of the National Union of Teachers issued their rooted objection to 'parents' committees in connection with the management of public elementary schools.' They also lodged their objection to three other concessions being made in the Bill. These were 'creed tests for teachers in public elementary schools;' 'teachers being allowed to volunteer their services to give denominational instruction during school hours;' 'schools being allowed to receive public moneys while they contract out of public control.' (2)

When the Commons met on Monday, 10th. December, 1906, Mr. Birrell made it clear that there was no question of the Government accepting the Lords' Amendments en masse. He did express his willingness to look again at Clause Four. If the Lords would accept a three-fourths majority of parents, it might be possible for the Government to look again at the question of the urban areas. He saw no hard and fast objection to parents' committees having a voice in the selection of teachers. But he was in no mood to make the concessions the Lords asked for:

'If either they (i.e. the Opposition) or anyone else, either Church or chapel, think they can for very long, put themselves athwart the will of the municipalities or county councils in their mode of providing education, primary or secondary, they are awfully mistaken.' (3)

Redmond made a last plea to the Government. If they would abolish the whole idea of 'urban areas' and settle on the rule of 'three-quarters of the parents voting' as the measure for denominational instruction, he believed the Catholics would accept the Bill. He felt the issue of Catholic parents being allowed a voice in the selection of the teachers had already been conceded. Although

(1) Speech reported in The Tablet, 8th. December, 1906, p. 912.
The Liverpool City Council had sent a petition to the House of Commons asking the House to accept the Lords' Amendments.(P.D., 11th. December, 1906. c.218.)
the Catholics were likely to lose about 30 of their schools by accepting such conditions, the Catholics well understood the feelings of the Nonconformists on the subject of single-school areas, and had no wish to perpetuate their grievance. (1)

Clearly, the Catholic Education Council's spokesman in the Commons, Lord Edmund Talbot, was taken aback by the speech made by Redmond and also by an Amendment on the Order Paper in the name of John Dillon. Although the Amendment could not be moved because of the Government's curb on the Debate, it would have proposed that, under Clause Four, 'No teacher should be appointed without the concurrence of the parents' committee.' Lord Edmund asked the Secretary to the Board of Education, Mr. Lough, if that was an Amendment which the Government were prepared to accept. But the Secretary would go no further than to say that the President of the Board had said that 'he would consider certain Amendments.' Lord Edmund then pressed for an answer, as this was a particular Amendment, standing in the name of the Member for East Mayo, (John Dillon) calling for a 'Yes' or 'No.' Were the Government prepared to accept the Amendment? Apparently the Secretary did not answer, but simply shook his head. Lord Edmund interpreted this as a sign that he was not prepared to give an answer. 'Then we know where we are. While there are Amendments suggested, we are unable to get from the Government any definite announcement as to whether they will accept them or not.'(2)

Lord Edmund then stated that the Bill was not acceptable to Catholics in the country.

'A resolution has been passed by the Catholic Education Council, which was representative of every Catholic Diocese in this country, that the Bill, as amended by the House of Lords, still remained unsatisfactory to Catholics. That resolution was unanimously approved by the Catholic Bishops of England and Wales.'(3)

He also questioned Redmond's suggestion that 30 Catholic schools would be refused 'extended facilities' for religious instruction under his Amendments. Lord Edmund said the number would be nearer 170 schools. (4)

The Commons voted, by 416 votes to 107, to return the Bill to the Lords without accepting any of the Amendments. With only

(1) Parliamentary Debates, 10th. December, 1906, c.1611-16.
(2) Ibid. 11th. December, 1906. cc. 215 - 218
(3) Ibid. c.218
(4) Ibid. 216.
two exceptions (1), the Irish Members voted with the Government in favour of rejecting the Lords' Amendments.

On the following Monday, 17th. December, 1906, the Lords met to consider the rejection of their Amendments by the Commons. Lord Crewe, in a conciliatory speech, suggested that the four-fifths majority of parents asking for the extended facilities for religious instruction could be altered, although he would not concede the point that it should be the actual number of parents voting rather than the number entitled to vote which counted. He also suggested that in any case where a Local Authority refused a denomination the permission to establish a new school, the denomination would have the right to appeal to the Board of Education. On the appointment of teachers, Lord Crewe was prepared to accept an Amendment that the Local Authorities would only be allowed to appoint teachers who were acceptable to the parents. 'If I am asked how to reconcile the words of this Clause with the general rule of 'No religious tests for teachers,' ...I am bound to admit that it must be, owing to the very special circumstances, an exception to that excellent rule.' (2)

Lord Crewe warned the Lords that it was the last time the Liberal Party would go to such lengths to obtain agreement on an Education Bill. He blamed the Conservative Peers for the failure of the Bill:

'They have chosen to open the sluice gates and let free the flow of sectarian unrest and religious passion. What that flood may destroy and sweep away in its course, I am not going to attempt to predict.' (3)

The Duke of Norfolk, speaking for the Catholic community, thanked Lord Crewe for his attempts to find a solution to the difficulty. Reminding the Lords that since 1870, the Catholics had not handed over a single school to the school boards, he went on, 'We are not likely to accept any Bill which foredooms many of our schools to extinction.' (4) Referring to the implied threat in the last part of Lord Crewe's speech, the Duke said, 'If he meant that we are to have a hard time of it, I can only say that we have had a hard time for the last sixty years... We base our claim merely on justice.' (5)

(1) The two Members were Timothy Healy and William O'Brien.
(3) Ibid.
(4) The Duke had suggested that one-fifth of the Catholic schools were at risk, the number given in The Tablet (2nd. June, 1906, p843.
Lord Ripon, the Catholic Peer also spoke on behalf of the Liberal Lords. He warned the Duke of Norfolk:

'If you are going to reject this Bill in the hope that you are going to get something better, may I be forgiven for saying that is pure gambling.... I do not believe you will get anything more; on the contrary, although I should deeply regret it, I fear you are likely to get not more but less.'

Lord Lansdowne's motion that 'This House do insist on its Amendments to which the Commons has disagreed,' was carried by 132 votes to 52, and the Bill was returned to the Commons. (2) The Archbishop of Canterbury and seven other Bishops voted for Lord Lansdowne's motion. The Bishop of Hereford voted with the Government. On the following day, 20th. December, 1906, the Bill was withdrawn from the Order Book. The Prime Minister denounced the action of the Lords in preventing 'a settlement of this great question.' But he expressed the conviction that a way would be found by which 'the will of the people will be made to prevail.'

On the same day, the Prime Minister wrote to the King, explaining why the Government could not agree to the Lords' Amendments. The Opposition demand that head teachers and assistant teachers, with or without the consent of the Local Authority, should be allowed to teach 'dogmas' could not be granted. It would simply mean the continuance of 'all the present denominational schools with the addition of a rent being paid for them...The purpose for which the Bill was introduced was the exact opposite of this....the Cabinet cannot save the Bill.'

Back in the Commons, the Labour Party leader, Keir Hardie, expressed the regret of his Party that such 'a futile termination should be the result of the long and weary labours in which the House had been engaged.... Even if the Bill were passed, it would still leave what was known as the religious difficulty unsettled.' His Party asked the House 'to accept what they more than ever believed to be the only possible settlement of the question, the elimination of religious instruction from the public

(2) Ibid.
(4) Ibid. p. 311.
schools of the country." (1)

The Irish leader, John Redmond, praised Birrell's 'good humour, wit and patience...his kindliness, his conciliatory tone towards his opponents.' Redmond went on:

'The concessions that had been made completely fulfilled the promises that had been made by the President of the Board of Education. Whoever might consider that what had happened was a defeat, the Rt. Hon. Gentleman ought not...

He then quoted from 'an interesting interview published in one of the evening papers today from a distinguished dignitary of the Catholic church, the Rt. Rev. Monsignor Brown, Vicar-General of the Diocese of Southwark (2) in which, speaking of the Bill, he said:

'As amended by the Government, the Education Bill would have been a working measure....Unless administered in a hostile spirit by the local authorities, the Catholic schools would have remained Catholic in every sense of the word.'

Under these circumstances, Redmond explained 'the very grave question' facing his colleagues and himself. Should they facilitate the passage of the Bill, or should they join with the Opposition and the House of Lords in wrecking the Measure, so 'facing all the perils and the uncertainties of the future with a light heart?' He went on:

'It was not without consultation with those who were best entitled to speak on behalf on the Catholic body in the country that they had come to the conclusion that, in the interests of the Catholic schools, it would be unwise ...to make themselves in any degree responsible for the wrecking of this Measure...In taking this course, they were acting not only in consultation with, but with the concurrence of the responsible heads of the Catholic church in England.' (3)

Not everyone believed Redmond. The Times commented that 'in their anxiety to promote Home Rule, the Irish Members have left the business of defending their Church to the House of Lords.' (4)

---

(2) A summary of Monsignor Brown's Memorandum, 'Considerations arising out of the Education Debate, 1906,' in the Westminster Diocesan Archives, is given in Appendix 8, p. 411.
(4) The Times, 13th. December, 1906. p.9. But, as the vote to reject the Lords' Amendments was carried by 416 votes to 107, the Irish vote made no difference to the result of the proposal.
Mr. Redmond is apparently content to sacrifice all the single-school areas and to accept the suggested majority of three-fourths...... We would be in danger of losing 180 schools, built by Catholics solely in order that Catholic children should be taught by Catholic teachers... To these must be added the 35 single-school area schools and probably 40 other schools...... A total of 255 Catholic schools would stand under sentence of death... (1)

Lord Edmund Talbot wrote to The Times explaining why he had spoken against the Bill.

'A resolution had been passed by the Catholic Education Council... which was representative of every Catholic Diocese in this country, that the Bill as amended by the House of Lords still remained unsatisfactory to Catholics...... The Bill, even with such concessions, would wholly fail to secure justice for Catholic schools.'

Lord Edmund went on to outline Mr. Birrell's 'vague promises of concessions,' but added, 'His refusal to give us any form of words leaves us in the dark as to how such concessions would be of any real value.' He ended, 'Nothing is gained, even as a matter of expediency, by understating a just demand.' (2)

In his reply to Lord Edmund, Dillon defended the action of the Irish Members in voting with the Government to reject the Lords' Amendments. He stressed that a series of Amendments had been agreed upon, in consultation with the Catholic Bishops, which would make the Bill tolerable. (3)

'On Wednesday night, we had succeeded in obtaining four-fifths - I think I might even say nine-tenths - of the Amendments originally demanded... What would be the consequence in the future to our schools if we threw back the concessions of the Government in their face... and joined the Peers in wrecking the Bill? Could Lord Edmund Talbot give us the Lords' Amendments? He was not in a position to offer anything of the kind. The Duke of Norfolk and Lord Edmund Talbot have themselves declared that the Bill as amended by the House of Lords could not be accepted by the Catholics...' (4)

Lord Edmund did not allow the Dillon letter to go unchallenged. He once again reminded him of the two critical issues. The first was that the Catholic Education Council had decided that in

(3) Many of the Catholic Bishops later disputed this claim.
spite of the Lords' Amendments, the Bill was not acceptable to the Council, because it failed to safeguard the future of the Catholic schools. The second was that, because the Government had failed to give any public pledge that the minimum demands of the Catholics would be granted, Dillon's tactics were 'illusory.' (1)

It had not escaped the notice of many Anglicans that, in its final stages, the debate centred around what was acceptable to the Catholics and no mention was made of the Anglican schools. The Bishop of Manchester sent a long telegram to the editor of The Times calling attention to the fact that the Anglicans had been left out of the discussions:

'The House of Lords is asked to amend the Bill so as to make it palatable to the Roman Catholics without any sort of concession to the Church of England.... The House of Lords is asked to save the Catholic schools and to abandon the Church schools. Is this the object for which the Second Chamber exists? Will the Bishops of our Church accept a compromise on these terms?' (2)

It is difficult not to feel some sympathy for the Anglicans in the situation in which they found themselves. When the four-fifths majority of parents was first proposed (3) the object was to draw a distinction between schools which were strictly denominational and schools which were denominational in name only. Many such Anglican schools were now 'neighbourhood schools' in the sense that children attended the school because it was the nearest school to their homes. Although parents did not withdraw their children from the denominational instruction in the school, they would not insist that the denominational instruction was given. On the other hand, Catholic schools had come into being comparatively late in the day. (In 1867, there were 296 Catholic elementary schools inspected, compared with 5,522 elementary schools of the Church of England and the National Society. (4) ) The Catholic schools were established in localities where there were sufficient Catholic children to fill them, so that almost all the children attending the Catholic schools were, nominally, Catholics. In 1870, the existence of an Anglican school in an area meant that, under Forster's plan, there was no gap to be filled, and no board school was established. The Anglican schools admitted all comers, whether Anglican or not. Now, after so

(2) Ibid.
many years of providing education in a neighbourhood, the Anglican schools seemed set to lose their identity. Ironically, it was the service which the Anglican schools had given over the years, in opening their doors to all comers, whether Anglican or not, which weakened their position under the Bill. There could well have been many Anglican schools in which less than four-fifths of the parents were prepared to demand specific Anglican instruction for their children. In the Catholic schools, with their large Irish populations, under the influence of a priest who almost certainly was Irish, there would be very little difficulty in persuading four-fifths of the parents that it was their duty to ask for the extended facilities on offer under the terms of the Bill.

The action of the Irish Members in voting with the Government to reject the Lords' Amendments to the Bill did not pass without comment. The Dublin correspondent of The Times reported that there was amazement in Ireland 'at the Party's vote on the Lords' Amendments to the Education Bill.... an open conflict between the politicians and the Hierarchy appears inevitable.' Dr. O'Dwyer, the Catholic Bishop of Limerick, wrote a 'bitter and vehement letter' which was published in the Freeman's Journal, complaining about the action of the Irish Members. (1) The Bishop's letter appeared in The Tablet. He wrote:

'I could not believe it within the bounds of possibility that they would do what they have done... I thought that we were safe and that the honour of Ireland would come out of the struggle without a stain... Let those who have taken their choice between the Catholic Bishops of England and Mr. Birrell justify, if they can, before the Irish race throughout the world, their discreditable vote... Their votes are wanted. Their Liberal masters are in difficulty. Their iniquitous Bill is in danger, and so the screw is put on.... The Irish Party, by a vote which will never be forgiven, rat upon themselves, and forswear their own profession.' (2)

Redmond was quite unrepentant. In an interview with The Tablet he stoutly defended the action which the Irish Members had taken. He had read the article by the Bishop of Limerick ' with very great regret.' and he added, 'His Lordship is quite misinformed of the facts...No negotiations have taken place between the Irish Party and the Government on the Education Bill except after consultation with the English Bishops...'(1)

Not surprisingly, The Tablet praised all who had 'fought so hard to impress upon the Government the strength of Catholic feeling over the Bill. On Redmond's claim to have done everything 'not only in consultation with, but with the concurrence of the heads of the Catholic Church in England,' comment was restrained. The writer merely assumed that 'the Bishops actively advised the course of action which was finally taken....one which was legitimately within the discretion of men anxious to do their utmost to save the Catholic schools.'(2) But no mention is made of the resolution of the representative Catholic Education Council, a resolution which had decided the Catholic Peers to reject the Bill.

The official historian of the Bill concluded that 'Redmond was quite satisfied with Birrell's final concessions... the rock on which the Bill finally split was the teacher and the right to give religious instruction.'(3) The Manchester Guardian insisted that the struggle was not over.

'They have not saved the denominational schools... It will not require more than a slight turn of the departmental screw to squeeze large numbers of them out of existence...their buildings are hopelessly behind the obvious requirements of the present day. .... The Church has taken sides with the forces of reaction and must take the consequences.'(4)

But those weeks in December, 1906, saw the opposition to the voluntary schools reach its peak. On 15th. December, the decision in favour of the voluntary schools was given in the West Riding County case. Then, on 20th. December, the Education Bill was withdrawn. Although the Runciman Bill of 1908 was still to come, that Bill never posed the threat which the 1906 Bill had posed. Meanwhile, the smooth working of the 1902 Act made it seem more and more desirable that the settlement should not be disturbed.

(1) The Tablet, 22nd. December, 1906. p.991. The interview is described as having taken place 'last Sunday' presumably on 16th. December, 1906.

(2) Ibid. p. 961.

(3) P.R.O. File Ed.24/120. 'Mr. Eaton's History of the Education Bill, 1906.'

When the 1906 Education Bill was withdrawn, possibly the last serious threat to the voluntary schools was averted. But, so far as the Catholic community was concerned, the controversy over that Bill was to have serious repercussions in its ranks. The leader of the Irish Nationalist Members, John Redmond, said in the Commons that 'no particle of responsibility for wrecking the Bill rested upon the Irish Members.' He went on to say that whatever action they had taken during the debate on the Bill, they were acting 'not only in consultation with, but with the concurrence of the responsible heads of the Catholic Church in England.' (1) Not surprisingly, the Duke of Norfolk and his colleagues on the Catholic Education Council were extremely angry at Redmond's claim. They had opposed the Bill throughout, on the grounds that it quite failed to give the Catholic community the guarantees they required for the future existence of their schools. Their anger was increased by the knowledge that, far from contradicting Redmond's claim, Archbishop Bourne had written to Redmond to thank him and his colleagues for their efforts on behalf of the Catholic schools. (2)

On 2nd. January, 1907, the Duke of Norfolk took the unprecedented step of writing to each Catholic Bishop in England and Wales, including the Archbishop of Westminster, Archbishop Bourne, asking for some clarification of the claim made by the Irish leader. Referring to the letter of thanks which the Archbishop had sent to Redmond, the Duke wrote:

'No-one joins more heartily than I do in such an expression of thanks for the efforts of the Irish Members....I cannot but be painfully impressed by the fact that the Bishops could not combine with gratitude some expression of regret or disavowal in regard to the course adopted...The situation thus created appears to me to be so full of perplexity, and so likely to put the cause of the schools in serious jeopardy, that I hope I may be forgiven if I venture to ask that it receive the earnest consideration of our Bishops....Until the Debate in which these speeches were delivered, the Catholic body was regarded as representing a firm and unbroken front in the defence of great

(2) The Tablet, 9th. February, 1907. p.30
principles, showing an example which called forth the admiration of other bodies not sufficiently united to follow it. Then, at the eleventh hour, what happens? ...(The Irish Members) fall back from the position they have been defending and take up a lower one, justifying their acceptance of the Bill by their obtaining, or hoping to obtain certain concessions which neither negative the principles of the Bill, nor procure any disavowal of its admitted object.

The Duke then came to the main point of his letter:

'On what does Mr. Redmond base his statement that he was acting with the concurrence of the Bishops? Certainly not to the Catholic Education Council .... nor to the Catholic Peers did any word come that our Irish allies had received any sanction from the Bishops to fall back....Nor even did our leading Catholic Member in the House of Commons, (1) receive the slightest intimation that he was being left to defend alone the position we had all......been struggling to maintain...The position of the Catholic body which had been raised so high by the way in which the fight had carried on, has received a wound which is ....painfully evident.'

The Duke enclosed a hand-written note with the copy of the letter which he sent to Archbishop Bourne:

'I was quite unprepared for the extraordinary action taken by the Irish Members in deciding to vote against the Amendments we had carried in the Lords... I am most deeply disturbed at the high position we had taken up having tumbled down***************(2)
I felt it impossible to keep silent ...I was in doubt what to do as Redmond's statement has received no episcopal denial...'(3)

The Archbishop replied by return, and sent a copy of his reply to all the other Bishops. He promised that the letter from the Duke would have his 'earliest consideration....there is evidently a misconception somewhere...I regret extremely ...that you should have thought it necessary to write to the Bishops on the matter without a previous communication with me...'(4)

When Bourne replied in full a few days later, he rejected all the charges made by the Duke. At no time had there been 'any change or falling back in the attitude of the bishops or in that of the Members of the House of Commons who were endeavouring to realise the bishops' wishes.' Although the bishops disliked the bill, they

(1) Presumably a reference to the Duke's brother, Lord Edmund Talbot, Conservative Member for Chichester.
(2) The handwriting in the note is illegible
'determined to abstain from anything in the nature of obstruction or aimless wrecking.' They worked steadily for specific Amendments which were communicated to Redmond and the Committee of the Catholic Education Council.

'Mr. Redmond was more than justified in saying, on December 20th., that he had acted 'not only in consultation with, but with the concurrence of the responsible heads of the Catholic Church in England... In face of the ill-informed attack of the bishop of Limerick I would indeed have played a mean and cowardly part had I not publicly assured Mr. Redmond that I was satisfied that he had done his best to deal with a very delicate and critical situation.'

The Archbishop went on to complain bitterly about the way in which other Catholic representatives had treated him, in comparison with Redmond, 'who was loyally consulting me at every critical moment.' On the Catholic Education Council's deputation to Lord Lansdowne he wrote:

'I was not informed of it until all the arrangements had been made... I had to undo the mischief which had been wrought as best I could... This deputation was the first evidence of want of unity among Catholics.'

He complained about the speech which Lord Edmund Talbot had made in the Commons on 11th. December, 1906. 'My advice was not sought before Lord Edmund's speech... Either Monsignor Brown or Mr. Redmond could have given a useful opinion at such a moment... It was not asked.' (It is difficult to see what there was to object to in Lord Edmund's speech. He had simply asked the Secretary to the Board of Education, Mr. Lough, if the Government were prepared to accept the Amendment standing in the name of Mr. Dillon, that no teacher would be appointed to a voluntary school which had qualified for extended facilities 'without the concurrence of the parents' committee.' When Mr. Lough 'shook his head' by way of reply, Lord Edmund replied that the Catholics 'knew where they were.' He then reminded the House that a resolution of the

(1) The Duke later denied that any specific Amendments had ever been communicated to the Catholic Education Council. (See p. 262)
(2) Supra, p.255.
(4) Supra, pp.242 - 243.
(5) Gwynn's account is different. See p. 242 supra.
(6) But it will be remembered that the Irish Members had refused to recognise the Catholic Education Council's Committee in 1902 and in 1906.
Catholic Education Council, 'a body representative of every Catholic Diocese in the country,' had found the Bill, even as amended by the House of Lords, unsatisfactory to Catholics. He added that the Education Council's resolution on the Bill 'was unanimously approved by the Catholic bishops of England and Wales.' (1) Possibly, it was this statement to which the Archbishop took exception, since it flatly contradicted Redmond's claim to 'act with the concurrence of the responsible Heads of the Catholic Church in England.')

The Archbishop ended his letter with the accusation that there were forces among the Catholic Peers who were hostile to him. Although he excluded the Duke and his brother from his accusation, he wrote:

'There are others who politically sympathise with you who have never acted fairly towards me....To gain their ends they will split the Catholics of England in twain...The bishops would have led their people to disaster if they had followed the advice tendered from that quarter at the time of the General Election.' (2)

In a letter to the Catholic Bishops, Archbishop Bourne defended Redmond's claim that he was speaking for the bishops:

'By 20th. December, he was entitled to say he had acted with my concurrence...Consulting me at every stage, he had, with no ordinary skill, definitely won practically all we had asked him to work for last Spring.... The Bill was wrecked by Balfour as a political move, and by the Anglicans, because they were getting too little and the Romanists, in their judgement, too much. I have good authority for what I say.' (3)

Meanwhile, the letter which the Duke wrote in defending his action in writing to the Bishops on 2nd. January, 1907, crossed with the letter which the Archbishop had written to the Duke accusing the Catholic Peers of not acting fairly towards him. (4) The Duke's reasoning was that he was concerned with the Bishops' collective responsibility in defending Redmond's claim, and for

that reason, he wanted them to understand the serious effect which their action would have on the Catholic body.

'If I had written in the first instance to the papers, or made any public statement, it would have been different... They were in a position to put me right if I had stated anything wrong... What I did think I was justified in begging them to consider, and what it appeared to me they did not seem to appreciate, was the effect on others, and the result to the Catholic body of the course they thought it well to adopt.'(1)

The Archbishop would not accept the Duke's reasoning. In a letter written by return,(2) he pointed out to the Duke that the letter of thanks he had written to Redmond, to which the Duke objected, had been written on 20th. December, 1906, the same day as Redmond had made his remarks in the House. Moreover, that letter 'was written in my own name with no reference to the Hierarchy.' Since the Bishops had last met on 4th. December, they could not have been aware of 'of what was agreed after that date.'(3) He told the Duke:

'You have not shown me your usual consideration in writing to my suffragans... upon a matter for which I am, from my position, primarily, and they only secondarily responsible... Your action has all the appearances of an appeal against me to them, and as such, has no precedent in the history of the Hierarchy.'

When the Duke received the Archbishop's previous letter, in which Bourne had accused the Catholic representatives of ignoring him, he told the Archbishop that the whole thing was 'absurd.' But he admitted that when 'a course had been decided upon without any communication to us'(4) things had changed. Nevertheless, the Archbishop's accusation 'has caused me deepest pain.'(5) Possibly with his brother in mind, the Duke added, 'Your letter is marked, 'Confidential;' may I show it to anyone or not?' The Archbishop's reply was conciliatory. He had 'no thought of associating you personally with any conscious disregard of my opinion, still less with any want of consideration towards me.' But, after speaking to Monsignor Brown, he found that the Monsignor shared his view of the situation.(6) The Duke's reply, in a letter of some fourteen pages, defended the action of the Catholic

(3) Exactly what was agreed to after that date is not clear.
(5) Ibid.
Peers and the Catholic Education Council. Some of the more important points made in the letter are as follows:

The idea that to make the Bill acceptable to Catholics, all that was required was to make some Amendments in Clause Four 'appears to me to be a theory which .......calls for emphatic denial.' But the Duke added, 'I cannot remember that any specific amendments were ever communicated to our Committee, nor, so far as I was aware, to anyone else.' He reminded the Archbishop that the Committee had submitted Amendments to him. If he approved of them, they were to be submitted to the Irish Members 'with the request that, so far as they accorded with their own views, they should be moved and supported in the House...I know this seems a complicated machinery, but it arose from the fact that the Irish Members declined, in every way, to come into touch with our Committee.'......'That anything like specific Amendments were ever submitted to us from any quarter is so completely new to my mind that I cannot but wonder if you are not under some misapprehension on the point.'

On the Archbishop's allegation that he had been ignored, the Duke asserted 'most emphatically' that 'there is no foundation whatsoever for such an impression....I came to you from time to time. Never once did you express the wish that I should come oftener, nor the least dissatisfaction at the way in which the affairs were being conducted, nor as to the amount of information you received.'

So far as the deputation to Lord Lansdowne was concerned, the Duke wrote:

'I am very sorry that you should regard this as having done mischief, and as having given evidence of a want of unity among catholics...'

He explained that since Lord Lansdowne was unable to receive the many diocesan deputations which the committee had originally planned, because of the pressure upon his time, it was agreed that one representative deputation would call upon him. The Duke expressed his conviction that it was because of this deputation and the strong opposition to the Bill in the House of Lords that the Government changed its attitude on the concessions. The decision of the Catholic Peers to vote against the Bill in the House of Lords was calculated to assist the Irish Members in their opposition to the Bill in the Commons. If the Peers had not acted as they did, it could have been said, 'The Catholic body does not care about the Bill; local representations have ceased; the Peers have not even voted against

the Third Reading.' The Duke concluded that if the Archbishop felt there was anything ill-timed about the deputation to Lord Lansdowne, 'I can only feel there was something going on of which we were not told.'

The Duke then turned to the claim which the Archbishop had made that the Duke had been kept fully informed about the Irish Members' attempts to negotiate concessions with the Government. He admitted that on one occasion the Archbishop had told him that Redmond and Dillon had suggested that a compromise on the Bill might be possible. This was why they had asked the Archbishop for details of 'what would be the minimum acceptable to the Catholics as an inducement to assessing any compromise.' But the Duke insisted, 'Nothing you said gave me the least suggestion of what eventually took place.'... 'That there was any notion of the Irish Members breaking away from our forces and actually opposing the Amendments which, in defence of religious education, had been inserted by the Lords, never for one moment crossed my mind.'

On 10th. December, 1906, (1) Redmond had asked the Commons to accept two Amendments to Clause Four to make the Bill amenable to Catholics. The Amendments were the abolition of the 'urban areas' described in the Bill, and the acceptance of a three-quarters majority of parents instead of a four-fifths majority for the granting of extended facilities. Redmond felt that Birrell had already conceded the Catholic claim to have Catholic teachers in their schools by allowing representatives of the parents to associate with the Local Authorities in the selection of teachers. (2) Of this development, the Duke wrote:

'Directly I saw this speech in the papers, I felt the position to be serious... I telegraphed to Monsignor Brown, begging him to meet me at my brother's house.... You say that either Monsignor Brown or Mr. Redmond could have given a useful opinion at that moment. As a matter of fact we did discuss the question with Monsignor Brown, and he fully assented to it. (3) ...It was on the following day that Monsignor Brown mentioned at our meeting that the Bishops had assented to the Irish Members adopting the course they had proposed to the Bishops. It would certainly appear that Monsignor Brown did not know until Dec. 12th. what had occurred, or that it was not until

(2) But on the following day, Mr. Lough, Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Education, 'shook his head' when Lord Edmund Talbot asked if the concession was granted. (P.D. 11th. Dec. 1906, c.216.
(3) Assented to what? Redmond's speech or the Duke's fears about it?
'that date that he felt himself at liberty to mention it.'

The Duke stressed that when Monsignor Brown mentioned the Bishops' decision, he was speaking in conversation and it was in no sense a message or an official communication. Much alarmed by the course of events, the Duke had gone to see the Archbishop on his return from Paris on the evening of 12th. December.

'I told you of the painful impression produced upon me by what Monsignor Brown had told us....I gathered that the Bishops had agreed upon a compromise; that the action of the Irish Members was governed by such a decision; and that no communication of facts of this extreme importance had been made to us. You informed me at once that this was not the case.(1) It appeared to me most extraordinary that a decision of such importance, and which entailed such consequences should not have been at once communicated to us....It was not until after Christmas, when I first saw a report of Mr. Redmond's speech, that I was astounded to see that he stated that he and his Party had been acting with the concurrence of the Heads of the Catholic Church in England....On the same day, I saw the letter Your Grace wrote, thanking the Irish Members...My bewilderment was complete when I saw that you did not, in any way, correct the statement in Mr.Redmond's speech...It was because that statement held the field, without contradiction from any Bishop, and was doing incalculable injury....that I ventured to write to each of the Bishops.'

Finally, the Duke dealt with the accusation which the Archbishop had made against unnamed Catholic Peers who, he claimed, were trying to prejudice the Duke against him.(2)

'This is a terrible charge to make against anyone. I can be but tempted to hope you are under some complete illusion....I have been cudgelling my brains to conceive who these men can be...I am utterly at a loss, even to make a guess...I most earnestly hope that what I have said may tend to disabuse your mind of what I think is an absolutely mistaken impression..' (3)

---

(1) The Archbishop's explanation had been that the Irish Members wanted the Bishops to decide if it would be sinful for the Members to drop their opposition to the Bill if certain concessions were obtained. The Bishops had decided that it would not be sinful.


The Archbishop's reply to the Duke suggests that he was becoming rather tired of the whole business. (1)

'I would gladly leave this very painful subject... I fear that we can hardly come to an understanding as your remembrance of our conversations is not in complete accord with mine... by December 20th., Mr. Redmond was entitled to say that he had acted with my concurrence, for, step by step, and consulting me at every stage, he had definitely won practically all the bishops had asked him to work for last spring......I have never regarded it as any part of the duty of Catholics to intervene in the disputes of the Protestant sects. These disputes had a large place in the discussion of the Education Bill.'

The Archbishop insisted that with the deputation to Lord Lansdowne, 'matters passed out of my control, except so far as Mr. Redmond was concerned.'

'I am greatly relieved to know that no attempt has been made to influence you adversely towards me, but being aware that such influences have been at work elsewhere, I could not but attribute them to the unprecedented course which you adopted in appealing to my suffragans without a previous communication with me. Such action would, I believe, never have been taken towards my predecessors.....I have, however, the consolation of knowing that in many quarters my action is understood and appreciated.'

The letter ended with the Archbishop's assurance that he alluded to 'these painful matters' simply because 'your letter of the 3rd. left me absolutely no choice.'

The Duke prepared one final document (2) and sent a copy to each bishop. With the copy which he sent to the Archbishop, he enclosed a short handwritten note to the effect that he was going away, and no letters would be forwarded. The document covers all the old ground of the dispute, and need not be repeated here. But the Duke reminded the bishops that:

'It was denied by no-one that the Bill was an attack on the whole theory that definite religious teaching should be upheld in those public elementary schools which had been provided expressly to ensure such teaching being given.'

On Redmond's claim to have the approval of the bishops for his actions, the Duke wrote:

'That statement, so far as I am aware, has elicited no contradiction....While others are still fighting the guns, is it for the Catholic body to abandon the position, and make compacts with the enemy? Is it not our place to lead the army, not to desert it?

Of the Irish Members he wrote:

'They declined all communication with our Committee and would not meet its members, stating that they would strive to carry out the wishes of the Episcopate, but would hold no communication with us....it certainly never entered my mind that the policy of the Catholic body was to be decided by the Bishops in consultation with the Irish Members and that the clergy and the laity were to be ignored.'

The Duke went on to pose two questions:

'How far is it right or wise that in defending Catholic schools, Catholics should regard only their own special needs, and desert the general cause of denominational education, even to the extent of joining its avowed foes?'(1)

'What certainty had the Irish Members of winning their hoped-for concession by this breaking away from the forces of religious education?'

The Duke loyally defended the part played by his brother, Lord Edmund Talbot, in the Debate:

'A member of our Committee, who is also a Member of Parliament, makes a speech in the House of Commons stating the demands of the Bishops and the Catholic body against the retreating attitude of Mr. Redmond. He learns afterwards that Mr. Redmond had the concurrence of the Bishops, and that our Committee had been left in ignorance of the fact.'

He also defended the deputation to Lord Lansdowne, which the Archbishop had condemned. (2)

'I am now told that this deputation showed a want of unity among Catholics, and that in some mysterious way, it did mischief. I think it will be seen that nothing could have been more in accordance with the attitude assumed by the Bishops towards the House of Lords, or more called for to sustain the Peers in

(1) The Archbishop had written to the Duke, 'I have never regarded it as any part of the duty of Catholics to intervene in the disputes of Protestant sects.' (Letter 18, 20th. January, 1907.)

(2) The Duke enclosed a special memorandum on the subject:

'Memorandum re. Deputation to Lord Lansdowne, 30th. January, 1907
the course which the Bishops had called upon them
to adopt.'

The Archbishop's complaint that he had not been consulted by
Lord Edmund Talbot before the latter's speech in the Commons on
11th. December, 1906, was resented by Lord Edmund.(1) In a letter
to Archbishop Bourne (2) he explained that he wished to 'refrain
from making comment on the general question.'

'For the moment, I am concerned only with Your Grace's
views regarding my own action as expressed in your
letter to my brother of 6th. January....
On the night previous to my speech, Mr. Redmond had
made a definite statement of policy weaker than that
of the Catholic Education Council. I knew the latter
(policy) had been accepted and approved by Your Grace
and the Bishops.....
In re-stating the Catholic case, I was doing only
what, in the absence of any communication from Your
Grace and the Bishops, I knew was in accordance with
your view...It is true that, as it has turned out,
I did not know what the real situation was......
Your Grace and the Bishops had conveyed to the Irish
Members information withheld from the Council and
myself.....I respectfully submit that the information
it was in Your Grace's power to give might have been
vouchsafed to me.'

The Archbishop's reply was conciliatory to some degree, but he
would not accept that he was in any way responsible for the
misunderstanding:

'I had not the smallest idea that you intended to
speak when or as you did. If I had known of your
intention, I would have asked to see you.....There
was no thought of withholding information from you.
Nothing reached me implying that information was
desired or needed'(In the copy of the letter in the
File, the following words are crossed out: 'The
Bishops had not accepted or approved the later policy
of the Catholic Education Council.' Presumably, they
were not included in the letter to Lord Edmund.J.C.)
.... As my letters to the Duke will have shown you,
I felt the whole incident very keenly, and I feel
it still.'(3)

(1) Westminster Archives, Archbishop Bourne to the Duke of
See supra, p.259.

(2) Ibid. Letter 23, Lord Edmund Talbot to Archbishop Bourne,
9th. March, 1907.

(3) Ibid. Letter 24, Archbishop Bourne to Lord Edmund Talbot,
12th. March, 1907. The crossed-out phrase is difficult to
understand. Presumably, Lord Edmund would have known if the
Hierarchy had informed the Catholic Education Council that
they did not approve of the Council's policy towards the
Education Bill.
It must remain a matter of opinion as to how far the Catholic Bishops agreed with their Archbishop in his support for the policy adopted by the Irish Members. Almost as soon as he had received the Duke of Norfolk's letter, the Bishop of Salford, Bishop Louis Casartelli, wrote to Archbishop Bourne:

'I am deeply pained at the misunderstanding which seems to have arisen in our ranks...Our excellent friends and allies have been making far too wide a use of the approval we gave to a certain line of policy to be attempted by them in the Commons, as though implying blame of the action of the Catholic Peers in the House of Lords....The Government never yielded a single concession to us during the first stage of the Bill in the House of Commons, and would not have thought of any at the later stage but for the action of the Lords.... I think it most urgent to endeavour to unite our ranks on some basis of honourable and friendly agreement.'

The Bishop of Clifton, Bishop George Ambrose Burton, also had some reservations:

'The Bishops cannot accurately be described as having concurred with Redmond's action. All they had been asked was whether certain concessions offered seemed sufficient in their eyes to justify the Irish Party in abstaining from an attempt to wreck the Bill....The concessions fell short of the Catholic demands, and this was pointed out in the Bishops' reply. The Bishops carefully abstained from bestowing explicit sanction on their action... Therefore, I cannot join in any expression of regret or disavowal of what I did....Although the Catholic Education Council is the official advisory committee to the Bishops, the Irish Party has not been wont to communicate with the Catholic Education Council...The Irish Party cannot be cut off from communication with the Bishops, and their confidential communications must be respected...' 

In a rather curt reply to the Bishop of Clifton, the Duke explained that the purpose of his letter to the Bishops was not to seek expressions of regret. What was needed was a public disavowal of Redmond's claim that in abstaining from any attempt to hinder the passage of the Bill, he was acting 'not only in consultation with, but with the concurrence of the responsible heads of the Catholic Church in England.'


(2) Ibid. Letter 8, dated 3rd January, 1907. If the Bishops could not inform their 'official advisory committee' of the intentions of the Irish Party because such intentions were confidential, it was inevitable that there would be no unified policy on the Catholic side.

In April, 1907, the Bishop of Nottingham, Bishop Robert Brindle, wrote to Archbishop Bourne on the matter. (1) He described the concessions which the Irish Members claimed they had been promised as 'small in importance and improbable of attainment.' He went on:

"When I read in the public press Mr. Redmond's statement in the House that he and his Party had acted 'after communication and in consultation with the Heads of the Catholic Church in England' the subject assumes a different aspect... Speaking for myself, it is not correct to say that the Bishops were either in consultation or communication with the Irish Party... I desire to enter my protest against Mr. Redmond's statement, and I think it ought to be contradicted..."

Since there is nothing in the File to suggest that any Bishop wrote to the Archbishop to assure him of support on the issue, it is quite inexplicable why the Archbishop relied on the Irish Party rather than on the representative Catholic Education Council.

It is equally difficult to accept the Archbishop's plea that he knew nothing about the Council's deputation to Lord Lansdowne until after it had taken place. Since every Bishop had a representative on the Council, and Monsignor Brown, in daily contact with the Archbishop, knew of the deputation, it is very difficult to understand how the Archbishop remained in ignorance of it. One possible explanation is that, if the Archbishop had learned officially of the deputation, he would have been asked by the Irish Members to ban it, and this he did not wish to do. When Redmond heard that the Council was trying to arrange a deputation to see the Prime Minister, Redmond wrote to Birrell to ask him if he could prevent the deputation from seeing the Prime Minister, as it was 'most mischievous and unrepresentative.' (2) Although the Archbishop, when speaking in Manchester in September, 1909, spoke of last-minute discussions between the Prime Minister and Birrell on one side and the Irish leaders on the other, in an attempt to save the Bill, there appears to be no record of the meeting. Birrell's account of the attempt to save the Bill makes no mention of the Irish leaders being present. (3) Neither does Campbell-Bannerman's biographer. (4)

(1) Westminster Archives, File Bo.1/178, dated 8th. April, 1907.
The Archbishop's biographer, Oldmeadow (1), dismisses the whole incident thus:

'Carelessly reading a statement made at the time by Mr. John Redmond, some people have imagined that the Archbishop and his brother-Bishops gave way on some essential point. The utmost Mr. Redmond said was, 'No negotiations have taken place between the Irish Party and the Government on the Education Bill except after consultation with the English Bishops, and this consultation continued up to the last moment.'

The remark was made by Redmond in an interview, reported in The Tablet, when he was asked for his comments on the scathing attack which the Bishop of Limerick had made on the Irish Members.(2)

Oldmeadow makes no reference whatever to the claim, which Redmond made in the Commons, to be acting, 'not only in consultation with, but with the concurrence of the responsible heads of the Catholic Church in England.'(3) It was to this claim that the Duke of Norfolk took exception. Oldmeadow makes no reference to the correspondence between the Duke and the Archbishop, but he does refer to a speech which the Archbishop made at a meeting of the Catholic Federation in 1907. In it, the Archbishop spoke of the Duke of Norfolk and Redmond 'bringing the Catholic Peers and the Irish Nationalist Members of the House of Commons into a determined phalanx against the Birrell Bill.'(4) He also quotes the Bishop of Kerry as praising the Archbishop for his 'noble letter to John Redmond, thanking the Irish leader for services rendered to the cause of Catholic education in England by the Irish Party.'(5)

On two later occasions, the Archbishop referred to the last stages of the 1906 Bill. At Leeds, in 1908, he spoke of 'going to the very limit of concessions to arrive at an agreement.'(6) In September, 1909, at Manchester(7) he described as 'so inaccurate as to be positively misleading,' any suggestion that the Bishops had been prepared to accept an arrangement which the Irish Members had obtained from the Government.

'...Just before the final withdrawal of the Bill, negotiations were entered into between the late Prime Minister and Mr. Birrell on one hand and Mr. John Redmond and Mr. Dillon on the other...The Bishops had cognisance of these negotiations...The Prime Minister gave certain assurances....

(1) Oldmeadow, E.:'Francis, Cardinal Bourne.' London. 1940. Vol.1, p.308
(2) See p. 255 supra.
'which justified the Nationalist Party in voting for the Government... The assurances of the Prime Minister were never submitted to the Cabinet owing to the prompt failure of the Bill. It is certainly not true that anyone, of any Party, had ever succeeded in obtaining an arrangement which the Bishops would have accepted as a settlement of the question.'

The statement does little to clarify the position. Much depends on the meaning of 'just before the final withdrawal of the Bill.' The Bill was withdrawn on 20th. December, 1906. If the Bishops 'had cognisance of these negotiations,' the negotiations must have taken place before 4th. December, 1906, because the Archbishop had told the Duke of Norfolk that the Bishops had not met since that date. The whole tone of the statement by the Archbishop is at odds with his letter to the Duke of Norfolk, in which he claimed that Redmond 'was more than justified in saying on 20th. December that he had acted 'not only in consultation with, but with the concurrence of the Heads of the Catholic Church in England.'

The Board of Education's official historian of the Bill, Mr. C. Eaton, summed up the reason for the failure of the Bill thus:

'Redmond was quite satisfied with Birrell's final concessions. They ensured that the majority of Roman Catholic schools would remain Roman Catholic... The rock on which the Bill finally split was the question of the teachers and the right to give religious instruction in schools.'

If the historian's assessment is correct, then whatever Redmond was prepared to accept, the fact remains that the Catholic Education Council would accept no settlement which failed to give the Catholic managers the right to appoint the teachers and to give those teachers the right to give the religious instruction in the Catholic schools. Any qualification of these conditions was absolutely out of the question.

At a meeting in Waterford, in February, 1907, Redmond again insisted:

'From the beginning to the end, the Irish Party and I, myself, acted in consultation with the English Bishops and with their concurrence... The letter which His Grace the

(2) See p.261 supra.
(4) P.R.O. File Ed. 24/120. 'Mr. Eaton's History of the Education Bill, 1906.
'Archbishop of Westminster was kind enough to write to me at the end of the session is proof enough that the view of those most concerned...... was that the Irish Party acted, in the difficult position in which they found themselves, with wisdom, absolute loyalty and success.' (1)

A few weeks later, at a St. Patrick's Day meeting in Liverpool, Redmond blamed 'the Duke of Norfolk and his friends' who had 'thought it best to wreck the Bill.' Redmond added, 'I feel certain that, were it not for their actions, with the concessions, the Bill would have been passed.' (2)

Not all of the Bishops would have agreed with Redmond in blaming the Duke of Norfolk and his friends for the part they had played. In his Lenten Pastoral, the Bishop of Hexham and Newcastle, Bishop Thomas Wilkinson, praised:

'the noble opposition made to the unjust and unchristian measure in the House of Lords which freed us from the danger threatening us...It is a cause of special joy to us to note the prominent and active part in that opposition which was taken by the Catholic Peers, headed by their noble leader, His Grace the Duke of Norfolk...' (3)

Rev. Canon Tynan, on behalf of the Salford Diocesan Voluntary Schools Association, also wrote to Redmond and the Members of the Irish Party. On behalf of the 280,000 Catholics in the Diocese, the Canon thanked the Irishmen 'for your magnificent services all through this trouble.' He added,

'As a member of the Catholic Education Council, Holding its sessions at Archbishop's House and at the Westminster Palace hotel, I am in a position to state the feeling of the Council as to the incomparable value of the Irish Party.' (4)

The letter is of interest because apart from the apparent conflict of view between the Canon and the Committee of the Catholic Education Council on the behaviour of the Irish Members, the Bishop of the Salford Diocese wrote to the Archbishop of Westminster condemning the use which the Irish Members made of 'the limited approval'

(2) Ibid. 23rd. March, 1907. p. 471.
which the hierarchy had given to their policies. (1) Of course, it may have been that the controversy between the Archbishop, the bishops and the Duke of Norfolk had been kept secret, and the Canon knew nothing of it. Certainly, outwardly the relationship between the Duke and the Archbishop must have seemed to be as cordial as ever. For example, the Duke was Chairman of a committee of the Diocesan Voluntary Schools Association which had been appointed to assess the cost of complying with the building requirements of the London County Council before the Catholic schools in London would be accepted as suitable by the Council. The Committee reported to the Archbishop early in February that at the time of reporting, the sum of £87,429 would be required for improvements to the schools already surveyed. The Report concluded:

'We should be quite within the mark if we state that £100,000 are required at once to prevent the closing of several of our schools, and to build new ones to replace those that have been, or are about to be closed.' (2)

In spite of the strained relationship between the Archbishop and the Duke, the Duke took an active part on the Committee which was established to raise the 'Diocesan Emergency Fund' to pay the cost of the building improvements.

Further recriminations, whether public or private would have served no useful purpose. Before the month of February, 1907, was out, the attack on the voluntary schools was resumed in Parliament in the form of the McKenna 'Little Bill.' (3) To the credit of the Duke and his brother, Lord Edmund Talbot, they remained at the forefront of the renewed struggle to secure justice for the voluntary schools as a whole, knowing that any

(2) The Tablet, 19th. January, 1907, p. 114. The policy of the London County Council towards the voluntary school buildings has already been mentioned. (p. 189 supra.) By 1905, over one hundred voluntary school buildings in the area of the London County Council had been condemned as unsuitable for use as public elementary schools, and seventeen of these were in use as Catholic schools. During the Debate on the McKenna-Runciman Bill in November, 1908, Lord Edmund Talbot, in a speech condemning the injustice of the contracting-out proposals, claimed that the Catholic community had spent over £200,000 on their schools in London since the passing of the 1902 Act.
suggestion that the Catholic schools would be able to 'go it alone' was out of the question so far as the drafting of legislation was concerned.

**McKENNA'S 'LITTLE BILL'**

Writing on the causes of the failure of the 1906 Bill, an education historian (1) has suggested that the Liberals made the mistake of trying to force all the elementary schools into the same mould. Then, realising that this was impossible, they began granting exceptions to their general rule. It was this which angered their own supporters, yet, at the same time, failed to satisfy their opponents. Reginald McKenna, Birrell's successor, (2) had no intention of making that error when he submitted his Bill under the Ten Minute Rule, on 26th. February, 1907. (3) Explaining that no legislative settlement could be obtained 'until the relations between this House and another place have been re-adjusted,' he sought, 'by this small Measure, to remove one particular evil which is offensive to the consciences of a large number of our fellow-citizens.' (4) The Bill provided that the only religious instruction which would be paid for out of the public funds was Cowper-Temple type instruction. Teachers who gave denominational instruction in the voluntary schools would have one-fifteenth of their salaries deducted, to allow for the amount of school time spent in giving such instruction. To avoid any trouble from the teachers' union, McKenna proposed that the teachers would receive full salaries, but the managers would be responsible for refunding the one-fifteenth of the salaries to the Local Authorities. 'If any Managers refuse to pay, the non-provided school in question will no longer be maintained as a public elementary school.' (5) In fact, the Bill sought to impose the ruling of the Court of Appeal in the West Riding case before that case went to the House of Lords. Anticipating the objection that the Nonconformist religious instruction, the Cowper-Temple type instruction, was to be allowed on the rates, McKenna commented that if the Cowper-Temple type instruction was Nonconformist religion, 'it is surely strange that Nonconformists should not insist, as Churchmen do, upon the teachers who give the instruction being appointed by themselves.' (6)

---

(2) Birrell had been appointed Chief Secretary for Ireland in January.
(3) The title of the Bill was Education(Special Religious Instruction) Bill, 1907. (P.D. 26th. February, 1907. c.1454.)
(4) Parliamentary Debates, 26th. February, 1907. c. 1455.
(5) Ibid. c. 1456.
(6) Ibid. 1455.
Although the Bill looked simple enough, Morant had doubts about it. On 25th. February, 1907, he had sent a memorandum to Mr. Thring, the official responsible for drafting legislation.

'Mr. McKenna tells me that, after consulting with I dont know whom, he has decided to bring in his Religious Instruction Bill tomorrow (Tuesday). I urged him against the difficulties ... he wants to give the Board of Education the duty of determining, so as to exclude appeal to the courts, any questions that arise...' (1)

When the Bill had been introduced, A.J. Balfour immediately corrected McKenna's suggestion that the voluntary school supporters regarded Cowper-Temple type instruction as Nonconformist religion. But it was 'the religious teaching of the Nonconformist in the shape that he likes' and it was paid for out of the rates. Yet, although the denominations gave the public the buildings in which they carried on the elementary education, at a cost which paid 'over and over again for the cost of denominational teaching,' further deductions from teachers' salaries were proposed. Balfour confessed he could see no religious peace coming from such proposals. (2)

The press gave the Bill a lukewarm reception. The Times saw its chance of survival as slim. It was 'not liked by the Nonconformists, voted against by the Roman Catholics, and disliked by the High Churchmen.' (3) Even the Manchester Guardian regarded the Bill as 'merely a measure, perhaps provisional, for abating the evil of passive resistance ... and for sparing the consciences of the vast numbers who objected to the Balfour Act.' (4) The Tablet saw the Bill as 'the new Penal Law' striking one more blow at the Catholic schools.' (5)

McKenna was soon pressed in the House to give details of the number of teachers who were employed in giving denominational religious instruction in voluntary schools, and the length of time spent in such instruction each day. (6) Lord Edmund Talbot asked for an estimate of the amount of money Roman Catholic school managers would have to pay to Local Authorities in respect of the proposed Bill. McKenna's reply was that it was impossible to give any

(2) Parliamentary Debates, 26th. February, 1907. c.1457.
estimate of the 'total liabilities which will be forced on managers under the bill' and suggested that the managers who 'arrange the methods under which the instruction is given, can themselves establish the effects of those arrangements in respect of finance.' In reply to a further question from Lord Robert Cecil, McKenna said he had no information as to the amount of money which the non-provided schools had spent on their premises since the 1902 Act had come into operation.\(^{(1)}\)

It seems likely that McKenna, in his haste to bring in the bill, had neglected Morant's advice, and the bill was not properly prepared. He was proposing to deduct a fixed proportion of the salaries paid to teachers in the non-provided schools for the time spent in giving denominational religious instruction. At the same time, he was forced to admit that he did not know how much time the teachers spent in giving such instruction. Morant came up with some figures on teachers' salaries although the figures were based on the salaries paid in 1902 and corrected for the increases paid since that date. So far as the Catholic schools were concerned, the salary account was for £600,000 and one-fifteenth of this would mean that the managers would have to return £40,000.\(^{(2)}\) A more accurate set of figures, issued in April, 1907, gave the figures for the Catholic schools as £539,110 in salaries, which meant that £35,940 would have to be repaid.\(^{(3)}\)

A report in *The Tablet* \(^{(4)}\) gave some idea of what the new proposals would mean to the Catholic schools in Preston. In that town, there were six Catholic elementary schools. By the provision of the buildings, it was calculated that the Catholics in Preston were saving the ratepayers four-fifteenths of the cost of their children's education. The payment of one-fifteenth of the teachers' salaries would mean that the Catholics were being compelled to pay one-third of the cost of their children's education. *The Tablet* concluded that the Bill 'will have a short and stormy career' and promised that, if the bill ever became law, the Catholics would 'extend the area of passive resistance very considerably, and ... make the law as unworkable as it is unjust.'

---

\(^{(1)}\) Parliamentary Debates, 4th. March, 1907. cc.479 -482.  
\(^{(2)}\) P.R.O. File Ed.31/52. Document 5. 27th. February, 1907.  
\(^{(3)}\) Ibid. Cd.3416. April, 1907.  
Although the Irish Members also condemned the Bill, John Redmond insisted that if the 'Duke of Norfolk and his friends' had not interfered with the passing of the 1906 Bill, the Catholic schools would have been already safe. John Dillon, addressing a St. Patrick's Day meeting in Wolverhampton, condemned the Bill, but he expressed the opinion that the ruin of the Catholic schools was inevitable so long as their future was bound up with 'the cause of reaction and Toryism.'(1) The Catholic Hierarchy, assembled in London for the Low Week meeting, claimed that the Bill was unjust because it deprived Catholics of all public aid in giving their children the religious teaching which their consciences claimed, yet compelled them to pay for religious teaching which their consciences opposed.(2) The Catholic Education Council opposed the Bill because it failed to meet the demands which the Council had put forward during the Debate on the Birrell Bill, viz. Catholic schools, Catholic teachers, Catholic managers, and facilities for improving the education of the Catholic pupil-teachers and teachers.(3) On a more practical level, Henry Miles, a Liverpool city councillor, said that if the Bill ever became law, the Liverpool Authority would have to find £250,000 to provide school accommodation for the 100,000 Catholic children in Liverpool. Under the circumstances, he thought it likely that the Liverpool ratepayers would support the Catholics in their opposition to the Bill. (4)

A few weeks later, at a public meeting in Westminster Cathedral Hall, the Duke of Norfolk stressed that the matter was in no sense a political matter. Catholics were pledged to the principle that Catholic children should be taught the Catholic Faith in Catholic schools by Catholic teachers. The meeting approved a proposal by Hon. Charles Russell that it should resist the Education Bill to 'the utmost of its power.' (5) However, on 3rd. June, 1907, the Prime Minister told the Commons that the Bill would be withdrawn. He promised the House that 'we should undertake, next session, the great task of putting the education system of the country in order.'(6)

(3) Ibid. 12th. April, 1907. p. 7.
(4) Ibid.
CATHOLIC SCHOOLS OR HOME RULE? THE BY-ELECTIONS AT MANCHESTER N.W. AND WOLVERHAMPTON.

The claims of the Irish Members to be the defenders of the cause of the Catholic schools received setbacks in April and May, 1908, as a result of the by-elections in Manchester and Wolverhampton. In Manchester, the Conservative-Unionist candidate was Mr. Joynson-Hicks, the Liberal candidate was Winston (later Sir Winston) Churchill. In Wolverhampton, Mr. L.S. Amery stood as the Conservative-Unionist, Alderman G.R. Thorne was the Liberal candidate.

During the Manchester campaign, a conference of Catholic priests met at Bishop's House, Salford, on 14th. and 16th. April, 1908, and adopted a resolution calling upon

'...the Catholic electorate of N.W. Manchester to offer Mr. Churchill their most unflinching opposition by their influence and votes ...Mr. Joynson-Hicks has given guarantees which we trust, and which are in full harmony with his Party, who have declared and worked on the principle of oppressing no man on account of his religion....We call upon all voters not to be betrayed by Mr. Churchill, but to vote solid for Mr. Joynson-Hicks.'

The resolution was signed by Rev. Canon Richardson and 15 other priests from the Catholic churches in the constituency.

The Times(1) in an article by its special correspondent in Manchester, dated Sunday, 19th. April, 1908, was able to 'throw light on what was going on behind the scenes in regard to the Irish vote in N.W. Manchester.' The correspondent stated that there was 'a serious split in the Irish ranks.' The Thomas Davis branch of the United Irish League in Manchester had sat in committee on Friday and Saturday, 17th. and 18th. April, and had decided upon an announcement, but postponed the publication of the announcement over the weekend 'so that no counter-blast might be delivered from the Roman Catholic pulpits in Manchester on the Sunday.' When the announcement was eventually made on behalf of the officers and committee of the Branch, the committee asked 'very earnestly' that all the Irish electors should withhold promises of support from any of the candidates, pending the decision of the standing committee of the League. 'When that decision has been given, faithfully carry it into effect.' (2)

(2) The Manchester Guardian. 18th. April, 1908. Presumably, the news was 'leaked' to the paper.
The correspondent of The Times estimated that there were about 900 Irish electors in the constituency, but they were split into two groups. The larger group, estimated at about 500, were 'devoted children of the Roman Catholic Church and would be guided by their priests.' The remaining 400 would cast their votes 'according to the orders of their political leaders.' (1) The correspondent expressed the opinion that Churchill had certainly lost the votes of the group of 500, and exactly how many of the remaining 400 votes would be cast for him could only be a matter of surmise. The Socialist candidate was known to be an ardent Home Rule supporter, and might easily command 100 of the 400 votes. (2)

Next day, the correspondent was able to confirm that 'the announcement of a split in the Irish ranks is absolutely correct.' The English Catholics in the constituency were dismissed as 'a negligible quantity.' (3) Apparently, in reply to the questions which the priests put to him on the schools issue, Mr. Churchill would go no further than to say that their requirements with regard to education must be dealt with, if at all, administratively. When the clergy received 'no further satisfaction' from him, they told him they must openly oppose his election. The correspondent added that since Churchill believed that any Home Rule Bill should be subject to the Imperial veto, the League would 'leave the electorate whom they speak for to vote as they choose.' (4)

On 20th. April, a telegram from Sir William Butler, an Irish landowner, urged the Irish voters in Manchester to support Winston Churchill 'whose work in reconstructing ruined South Africa is the surest guarantee that he will render a similar service for ruined Ireland.' (5) But the Catholic Bishop of Salford, in a letter to priests in the constituency, agreed that 'the election does not concern Catholics as Catholics in its political, social or commercial aspects, but it does concern Catholics as Catholics in its religious aspect - the future of the religious education of our children.' On the claims of the two main candidates, the Bishop

(1) The Times, 20th. April, 1908, p. 6.
(2) Ibid.
(3) The Times, 21st. April, 1908, p. 6.
(4) Ibid. The suggestion was remarkably accurate. John Redmond had told a meeting of the League in Dublin, 'I cannot conceive how it is possible for us, in the existing circumstances, to ask that the Irish vote be given to Churchill.' (The Tablet, 25th. April, 1908, p. 671.)
'The questions concerning Catholic education have been satisfactorily answered by Mr. Joynson-Hicks. The Catholic Federation, therefore, in the supreme interest of Catholic education, are fully justified in casting their votes in his favour....

From the same standpoint, the Right Honourable Winston Churchill is a member(1) of a Government which for three years has persistently endeavoured to penalise Catholic education by legislative and administrative action....

The Catholic Committee have decided they could have no confidence in such a Party. Therefore, His Lordship and the Committee do not feel justified in advising the electors to vote for Mr. Churchill....(2)

On the eve of the poll, the local priests issued a Manifesto to their people. They reminded them that the Education Bill (3) then before Parliament would mean a fine of £3,247 on the Catholic schools in the constituency if it ever became law. The Manifesto went on:

'Catholics, will you take this from Mr. Churchill lying down? If not, vote for Mr. Joynson-Hicks....

Remember, this is not a Home Rule election. Next time, Home Rule, and you will know where to find us....

Remember, this is not a Free Trade or a Free Breakfast election. If Mr. Churchill gets in, you will have no breakfast by the time you have paid £3,247 in fines....

Catholics and Irishmen! Stand by your children this time. We shall all pull together for Home Rule next time.'(4)

When the result of the election was announced, Joynson-Hicks was elected. He polled 5,417 votes to Churchill's 4,988. The Socialist trailed a long way behind with only 276 votes.

Churchill was in no doubt as to the cause of his defeat. He told a meeting after the result had been announced:

'This exiguous majority was achieved only through the sudden, and organised transference of between four and five hundred Catholic votes, always, hitherto, an integral part of the Liberal strength in Manchester, to the Protectionist side, but on grounds quite unconnected with the main issues...' (5)

(1) Churchill, of course, was a member of the Liberal Party, but not, at the time, a member of the Government.

(2) The Tablet, 25th. April, 1908. p. 673.

(3) The McKenna - Runciman Bill, with the controversial 47s. payment for contracting-out, had been introduced on 24th. Feb.

(4) The Tablet, 2nd. May, 1908. p. 713.

(5) Ibid. p. 713.
The Tablet congratulated the Catholics of N.W. Manchester 'on the decisive part they have played in the most fiercely contest of recent times....they have struck a decisive blow at the Government of Persecution...' (1)

As the excitement died down in Manchester, it was reaching its peak in Wolverhampton. This must have seemed like a safe Liberal seat, since, in the 1906 election, the Liberal had a majority of 2,865 votes in a poll of some 9,000 votes. Again, it seemed as if the Catholic vote would be split into two parts. The 'English Catholics...who consist of the more well - to - do people.....will, it is expected, support Mr. L.S. Amery, the Unionist candidate, on the question of the teaching of the Catholic Faith in their schools.' (2) At Willenhall, where there were about 300 Catholic voters(3) 'there is strong evidence that they will support Mr. Amery, but it is not proposed to make a public declaration for either candidate....This course is to avoid a collision between the English Catholics and the Irish Home Rule section....Those of chief influence urge their friends to support the candidate in favour of maintaining the Faith in the schools, and to leave Home Rule out of consideration for the time being.' (4) Neither candidate issued any literature dealing with the schools question, but the local correspondent of The Times considered that the education question was likely to 'operate in Mr. Amery's favour.' (5)

A few days before the polling, T.P. O'Connor, President of the Irish League, who was also the Member of Parliament for the Liverpool Scotland constituency, sent a message to the Liberal candidate, Alderman Thorne, urging that all the Catholic voters in the constituency should support him 'on the grounds that he is a Home Ruler.' (6) The Times, however, was of the opinion that 'the bulk of the Irish vote may be regarded as religious rather than political.' (7)

(1) The Tablet, 2nd. May, 1908, p. 683.
(2) The Times, 25th. April, 1908, p. 8.
(3) There were about 1,100 Catholic electors in the constituency. (The Tablet, 9th. May, 1908, p. 753.)
(4) The Times, 27th. April, 1908. p.11.
(5) Ibid. 1st. May, 1908. p. 16.
(6) Ibid.
(7) Ibid.
Shortly after the publication of the O'Connor message, the Catholic Bishop of Birmingham, Edward Ilsley, and the Catholic priests in the constituency issued a declaration concerning 'the misleading reports in circulation.' The declaration concluded by asking the Catholic electors to 'note well...Mr. Amery is perfectly fair and just to Catholics and quite satisfactory to the Bishop, the clergy and the Catholic body in general.... Mr. Thorne's attitude is ambiguous and he refuses to define it clearly... Having seen the written and signed statements of both candidates, I am convinced it is the plain duty of all Catholic electors of the district to support Mr. Amery with their votes.'

A meeting of members of the local branch of the Irish League who were supporters of Alderman Thorne heard a message from the candidate in which he expressed his regret that 'the Catholic priests had not called on me before publicly declaring against me.' He professed himself to be 'a sincere friend of Ireland' who favoured 'an honourable concordat' to settle the education question. He was quite unable to understand why 'any section of Catholics should be against me.'

Another misleading report which was in circulation in the constituency was that Archbishop Bourne and the Hierarchy had urged Catholics to support the Irish League and the Liberal candidate to secure the Home Rule Bill. Archbishop Bourne sent a telegram to the Archbishop of Birmingham denying that anyone had authority to quote him on the issue. 'I invariably leave such matters to the local clergy.'

From the Catholic Federation branch in Manchester, a telegram advised the Catholic voters:

'Churchill's position on education was absolutely untenable. It cost him the election in Manchester. The Prime minister's declaration in the Commons precludes any Catholic voting for his Party.
Canor Richardson. (4).

---

(2) The Times, 4th. May, 1908. p. 11.
(3) The Times. 5th. May, 1908. p. 10.
(4) The Tablet, 9th. May, 1908, p. 753.
The result of the election was declared on 6th. May, 1908. On the first count, it seemed that the Liberal candidate, Alderman Thorne, had won by eight votes, but, after a recount, the majority was reduced to six votes. As in the case of the defeated candidate at Manchester, Mr. Amery blamed his defeat on the Catholic votes:

'At the last moment, one of the leading priests took it upon himself, in spite of the advice given by the Roman Catholic Bishop of Birmingham, to post a notice on his church railings urging his flock to rally round Mr. Thorne, and to place the cause of the Fatherland before the schools. This, no doubt, turned a great many Irish Roman Catholics.'

Meanwhile, angered at the events in Manchester N.W., the Executive of the local branch of the League had written to the National Executive, complaining bitterly about the manner in which the Catholic clergy had interfered in the election. The main complaint was that, although the Irish Party were fighting the cause of the Catholic schools in Parliament, 'the Party's advice is openly flouted by the Catholic leaders, mostly clerical, in this constituency.' The letter went on to describe how a Liberal Cabinet Minister had 'raised the Home Rule standard to the top of the mast and nailed it there' and was still driven from his seat, 'largely by the efforts of clergymen.' If the League continued to tolerate this attitude on the part of the clergy, the Executive of the Manchester branch felt that 'the League might as well disband. Certainly, no politician would negotiate with it because, while professing to speak for the Irish electors in Great Britain, its efforts are being paralysed.'

The National Executive of the League met in London on 9th. May, 1908, to discuss the complaint made by the Manchester branch and by other branches throughout the country. Twelve of the Irish Members of Parliament and a representative of every branch in the country attended the meeting. A lengthy statement was issued at the close of the proceedings:

'Largely numbers of communications have been received from branches throughout the country protesting against the action taken by Catholic Federations, by some of the English clergy, and by the bishops

'in some Dioceses in advising the Catholics, nine-tenths of whom are Irish or of Irish descent, and Nationalist in politics, to vote for Unionist candidates against the Liberal-Home Rule candidates.'

The statement went on to complain that 'another organisation' had employed every means to persuade 'our people' to support the Tory candidate. 'The issue, so far as Ireland was concerned, could not have been clearer....The support of Home Rule for Ireland was the policy of the League; the support of coercion was the policy of the hostile organisation.'

'This policy of forgetting and betraying Ireland is justified by what are supposed to be the interests of the Catholic schools....The Irish Party will continue their defence of the Catholic schools but their power of fighting for the Catholic schools will be ultimately destroyed if these attacks are continued on the very organisation which holds our people together...'

The statement, which was signed by T.P. O'Connor and the twelve Irish Members illustrates the potentially deep rift in the Catholic cause. The 'hostile organisation' which the statement mentions was the Catholic Federation, which had been established by the Hierarchy to put the Catholic point of view to the public when the schools issue was being discussed. The President of the Federation was the Hon. Charles Russell.

In a letter to the Manchester Guardian, Canon Richardson, the President of the Manchester branch of the Catholic Federation, defended the Federation against the accusations of the League. The Canon stated that 'the meeting at St. Augustine's House was private and had no authoritative value...My desire was to bring about mutual understanding between the various sections of the Catholic body...I repudiate entirely the right of anyone to make garbled accusations concerning the Archbishop of Westminster or myself...'

The matter came up again when the League held its National Congress at Leeds in June, 1908. The 400 delegates at the Congress

(1) The Tablet, (13th. June, 1908, p. 921) reminded the Irishmen that the House of Commons had passed the 1906 Bill. It had been rejected by the House of Lords.
(3) See Appendix 10, p.419 for some examples of the Federation's pamphlets.
heard bitter denunciations of the conduct of the Catholic clergy from many speakers. Church interference in political matters was condemned, and members were urged to reject any future clerical manifestoes. One delegate described the Catholic clergy as 'very good priests, very poor politicians.' Others denounced the use of the pulpit to make political speeches, calling it 'the coward's platform.'

The Tablet commented on the speeches at the Congress:

'These orators of the United Irish League complain that the Liberal candidates, although hostile to the cause of Catholic education, were in favour of Home Rule... There was a simple clear issue before the Catholic electors. They had to choose between religion and politics, between the schools and Home Rule.'

The bitter feeling in the Catholic ranks which erupted during the two elections caused much anxiety among Catholics. The Irish Member, William O'Brien, commenting on the Leeds Congress, said:

'It is now only too evident that a disastrous cleavage has taken place in a political force always noted for its fidelity to Catholicism and to Nationalist interests....The Irish organisation in Great Britain has been rent in two...On one side stand the priests and one-half or two-thirds of the Catholic population; on the other, the office-holders of an association controlled by Mr. O'Connor, and now converted to a safe Liberal asset.'

A notable convert to the Catholic Faith, Rev. Robert Hugh Benson, wrote to The Tablet on the subject.

'If it is true that a considerable number of Irishmen have sacrificed English schools to Irish politics, I cannot help thinking that many English Catholics like myself who would have been ready up to now to throw themselves, in future elections, on the Home Rule side, believing that Home Rule would mean the furtherance of the Faith, will now hesitate.'

---

(2) The Tablet, 13th. June, 1908. p. 920
(4) He was the son of Archbishop E.W. Benson, Archbishop of Canterbury, 1883 - 1896.
Even Bishop Edward Bagshawe saw fit to remind the Irish Catholics living in England that 'they owe their first duty to England, and should fulfil that duty by promoting the policy best calculated to maintain the Catholic Faith in the schools of England.' In a reference to the resolutions passed at the Leeds conference, the Bishop condemned 'the representatives of Ireland who arrogate to themselves the right to dictate to Irish voters resident in England how they should vote....to tell them they must further the cause of Home Rule....and who will not tolerate any advice given to the contrary.'(1)

Oddly enough, the Catholic Hierarchy as a body appears to have made no attempt to condemn publicly the activities of the League, or even to reply to the accusations levelled against them at the Conference. The assumption must be that, with the debate on the new Education Bill looming ahead, the Bishops felt that it would not be wise to say or do anything which might prejudice the support of the Irish Members during the Debate. But the rift in the Catholic ranks was there for all to see. It became increasingly obvious during the next few months that Asquith and Runciman paid far less heed to the Catholic case than Campbell-Bannerman and Birrell had paid in 1906.

(1) The Tablet, 20th. June, 1908. p. 975. Bishop Bagshawe had advocated the setting-up of a Catholic Party at the time of the 1885 election. (See pp. 54 - 56 supra.) He had retired from his Diocese of Nottingham in 1901.
THE McKENNA - RUNCIMAN BILL, 1907 - 1908.

In spite of the Government's majority in the House of Commons, by June, 1907, three attempts to legislate on the schools question had ended in failure. For this reason, it was to be expected that the Government would be extremely careful over the drafting of another Bill on the subject.

Early in October, 1907, McKenna invited Charles Russell(1) a Catholic Member of Parliament, to comment upon the ideas which might form the basis of the next Bill. At their meeting, McKenna explained that he would propose a 'contracting-out' solution for the Catholic schools. The Managers of each Catholic school would receive a Government Grant based on the number of children in the school. This Grant would be the same as that paid to the Local Authority for children attending the council schools. But the Catholic schools would receive no grant from the rates. The Catholic community would be expected to provide the money to match the grant which the council schools received from the rates. It was, basically, a return to the pre-1902 conditions.

Russell duly reported the proposals to the Archbishop of Westminster:

'I had a few words with Mr. McKenna today...He stated that he did not think it possible to incorporate in the Act any provision to pool the Grant. This would have to be done entirely by voluntary arrangement with the Managers of the different schools...' (2)

McKenna outlined his proposals in a letter to A.T. Thring, whose task it would be to draft the proposals into a workable Bill. His instructions were clear and simple:

'No aid out of rates unless certain conditions are satisfied.
No aid out of taxes unless certain other, but less stringent conditions are observed.
Subject to these main conditions, which are chiefly negative, the Parliamentary Grant is to be distributed in accordance with the rules and conditions embodied in the Minutes of the Board, i.e. the Code....
The shorter the Bill, the better. (3)

(1) He was the son of Lord John Russell, the former Liberal Prime Minister.
(3) P.R.O. File Ed.24/153. McKenna to Thring, 21st. October, 1907.
Presumably, some figures were discussed at the meeting between Russell and McKenna on 7th. October, 1907, because by the end of November, Russell was able to write to McKenna:

'With reference to our conversation some time ago concerning education, I was appointed by the Archbishop on the 12th. inst. to a small committee to try to ascertain exactly what Catholic education was costing, apart from the fabric and the upkeep of such fabric....This information has been difficult to obtain, but I now have particulars which I think are reliable, from eighteen schools in different parts of the country.(1) The average cost of educating a child works out at £2 18s. 9d. Any grant which would make the sums already given up to £2 or a little over, would not, therefore, be of any use whatever.'

Russell felt that the suggestion that the grants should be pooled in order that the money could be shared out according to the needs of the various parish schools would be 'impossible without statutory power.'

'No doubt the authority of the Catholic Church is great, but not great enough to effect such a voluntary pooling....I have also made enquiries as to whether the right to charge fees would be of much benefit. The answer given to me is that, practically, it would be useless, the people have now been so long accustomed to free education.'(2)

McKenna was not impressed with Russell's figures for the cost of education in the Catholic schools. The information was 'too meagre to admit of analysis.'

'There is, however, a return prepared by Liverpool, giving in detail the cost per child in each school. From this I gather that the cost to the rates for the Catholic schools is, on the average, 14s. 7½d. in considering this figure, it must be remembered that Liverpool is somewhat lavish, and the nett cost of education here is probably higher than in most other towns, except London.'

McKenna added that he hoped to get another £1 million to be expended in grants, which would mean an additional 4s. per child, making the deficiency in Liverpool 10s. 7½d. per child. He had no doubts that with economy of management, the Catholic schools could be maintained with 'voluntary contributions of a very few shillings per child. That would be a small price to pay for the privilege of appointing the teachers and preserving a denominational atmosphere.'(3)

(1) Details in Table 16, p.289.
(3) Ibid. dated 16th. December, 1907.

(The figures were submitted to Mr. McKenna on 29th. November, 1907, by the Hon. Charles Russell. **SOURCE**: Westminster Diocesan Archives, File Bo.1/181, dated 29th. November, 1907.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>COST (per scholar in av. attendance)</th>
<th>COST TO RATES.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middlesborough</td>
<td>£2 16s.</td>
<td>£ 14s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£2 9s. 8d.</td>
<td>10s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>£2 15s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devonport</td>
<td>£3 7s. 6d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>£2 19s.</td>
<td>£1 0s. 0d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashton-u-Lyne</td>
<td>£2 13s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>£2 12s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Helens</td>
<td>£2 7s.</td>
<td>3s. 7d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrewsbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale</td>
<td>£2 19s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph's</td>
<td>£3 4s. 1d.</td>
<td>5s. 6d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crewe</td>
<td>£2 6s. 1d.</td>
<td>13s. 6d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staleybridge</td>
<td>£2 13s. 8d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birkenhead</td>
<td>£3 0s. 5d.</td>
<td>19s. 0d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td></td>
<td>14s. 7d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widnes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£3 4s. 3d.</td>
<td>£1 3s. 5d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£2 15s. 7d.</td>
<td>15s. 2d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£3 5s. 0d.</td>
<td>£1 4s. 6d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>£3 11s. 0d.</td>
<td>£2 0s. 0d.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(McKenna considered the information to be 'too meagre to admit of analysis.' McKenna to Russell, 16th. December, 1907. Westminster Diocesan Archives, File Bo.1/181.)
McKenna had also been in contact with the Nonconformists and had outlined to them three options which he was considering. He asked the nonconformist Members of Parliament Committee to let him know 'if any one of them be adopted in the Education Bill by the Government, which would be the least objectionable to Free Churchmen.' The three options were:

1. Provision for 'contracting-out.'
2. A clause similar to Clause 4 of the 1906 Bill which would involve consulting parents.
3. Giving each Local Education Authority the freedom to settle the nature of the religious instruction to be given in its schools. (1)

In its reply, written from the Liberal Club in London, the committee felt that Option 3 was completely out of the question as it would involve the repeal of the Cowper-Temple Clause, and would only transfer the controversy from the national to the local level, where it would be more bitter than ever. The choice would lie between Options 1 and 2. But the experience of the 1906 Bill suggested that the Clause 4 idea would never be accepted by the Commons. The first option, that of allowing 'contracting-out' seemed to be the only alternative. However, so far as the single-school areas were concerned, contracting-out would not be allowed. (2) The letter signed by Rev. Scott Lidgett, Sir George White, Robert Whyte, and Silvester Horne, must have convinced McKenna that contracting-out was the solution. But he knew that the issue of the truly denominational school, efficiently run, which was being put out of the national system of education on grounds which had nothing to do with the school's educational performance was likely to prove a serious obstacle to the Bill in the Commons.

Michael Sadler wrote to the Board suggesting that the contracting-out schools might take more kindly to the idea if they were given a guarantee that they would never have to find more than one-sixth of the cost of keeping their schools on equal financial terms with the council schools. But nothing came of the suggestion. (3)

McKenna was not left in doubt for long as to what the Catholic community thought of his proposals. Charles Russell,

(3) Ibid. Document 72, undated. Sadler was now Professor of Education at Manchester University.
addressing a meeting of Catholics at Battersea Town Hall on 20th. January, 1908, said that with a total of 284,000 children attending Catholic schools in 1907, there would have been a loss of £200,000 for the Catholic community to make up if the contracting-out proposal became law. Russell ended:

'With all the knowledge of the solemnity of what I am saying, I declare that, by God Almighty, the Catholics will have none of it....McKenna's name will go down to posterity not as Minister of Education, but as Minister of persecution.'(1)

But such oratory did nothing to prevent the Bill coming up for its First Reading on 24th. February, 1908.

Progress of the Bill through Parliament falls into two stages. McKenna introduced the Bill on 24th. February, 1908, but before the Bill had its Second Reading, the Prime minister, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, resigned, and was succeeded by Herbert Asquith. McKenna was moved to the Admiralty and Walter (later Sir Walter) Runciman, succeeded him at the Board of Education. McKenna's last duty at the Board of Education was to introduce the Second Reading of the Bill on 18th. May, 1908. When the Bill came up for Third Reading on 25th. November, 1908, it was virtually a new Bill because of the lengthy discussions which had taken place between Runciman and the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Randall Davidson, during the summer and Autumn.(2)

Clearly, Thring had followed McKenna's instructions to make the Bill as short as possible. In the single-school areas, defined as areas in which there was only one school and that a denominational one, all such schools would be transferred to the Local Authority, compulsorily or otherwise. In the remaining areas of the country, all voluntary schools would have the option of 'contracting-out' or becoming Local Authority schools. The contracted-out schools would return to the pre-1902 arrangement. The school would receive a Government Grant based on the number of children in average attendance, but no contribution from the local rates. This difference would have to be made up by voluntary contributions. In return, the denominations would be able to appoint

(2) Campbell-Bannerman resigned on 5th. April, 1908 and died on 22nd. April, 1908.
teachers, fix the hours of religious instruction and the
managers would be appointed by the denomination. However,
the contracted-out schools would have to match the council
schools in academic attainment and in standards of accommodation.
Voluntary schools which were taken over by the Local Authority
would be known as 'transferred schools.' The denominations would
be relieved of all expense connected with the fabric of such
buildings, and would be paid a rent for the use of the buildings.
No denominational instruction would be allowed in school hours,
and the teachers would be expected to give Cowper-Temple type
instruction. The buildings would be at the disposal of the
denomination for giving denominational instruction for five
days in the week out of school hours and for Saturday and Sunday.
In explaining his Bill, McKenna said that the denominational
instruction out of school hours would be given, 'of course, by
some teachers other than the regular teachers in the school.'(1)
Obviously, a serious issue would be raised if a teacher in a
transferred voluntary school was barred from teaching in a
Sunday School held in the building simply because the teacher was
employed in the school during the week.

The Government Grant would be paid at the rate of 47s. for
each child in average attendance, irrespective of age. In addition,
managers would be allowed to charge fees of up to 9d. per week
to make up the cost of the maintenance. Children attending the
contracted-out schools would be allowed to retain the advantages
of such civic services as medical inspection, admission to cookery
and handicraft centres, and to be fed under the provisions of the
Feeding of Children Act.(2) 47s. was the same amount as that paid
to the Local Authority for each child in average attendance in its
council schools, but, as in school board days, there were some
very wide differences in the amounts which the Local Authorities
added out of the rates. (3) Thus, the burdens on the contracted-
out schools would vary greatly from place to place, according to
the generosity or otherwise of the Local Authority to its own
schools.

(2) The Education (Provision of Meals) Act was passed in 1906;
The Education (Administration Provision) Act, of 1907, gave
Local Authorities power to attend to the health and physical
well-being of children in elementary schools.
(3) See Table 17, p.293. Maintenance expenditure varied from
less than £2 10s. to over £5 per child in average attendance.
TABLE 17. EXPENDITURE ON MAINTENANCE, PER CHILD IN AVERAGE ATTENDANCE, BY LOCAL EDUCATION AUTHORITIES NATIONALLY.
SOURCE: Cd. 4406, March, 1907.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Under 60s</th>
<th>60s-70s</th>
<th>70s-80s</th>
<th>80s-90s</th>
<th>90s-100s</th>
<th>Over 100s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COUNTIES.</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONDON (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO. BOROUGHS.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOROUGHS.</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN DISTRICTS</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS.</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A.J. Balfour, who had introduced the 1902 Bill, immediately asked McKenna to clarify a point on the single-school area question:

'How far would a child have to go and yet have it in his power to say he has not an alternative school at his disposal? ... There is a large thoroughfare between two schools, one voluntary, one provided... They are separated, it may be, by only one hundred yards. Are these in the same area or in different areas?'

McKenna fell right into the trap which Balfour had set. He explained that 'the Local Authority does not build a school next door to each child... The distance (a child may have to travel) may be from half a mile to two or even three miles in rural districts. Whatever is the law now will be the law under this Bill.' (1)

Balfour was able to conclude:

'Then the Local Authority will decide whether the school is near enough for the child to go to?... It depends entirely on the Local Authority to decide whether a Church of England school or a Roman Catholic school can contract out of the Act... Let the House consider what the injury is that the Right Hon. Gentleman is doing to the cause of education... You sacrifice education to religious prejudice, and to the desire to injure a Church to which you do not belong.' (2)

From the moment the Bill was introduced, it was clear that there was to be no compromise. The gap between the two sides was as

(2) Ibid. c. 1397.
wide as ever. The Times thought that the situation was impossible to resolve, considering "the unfriendly attitude displayed towards the new Bill on the Opposition benches," "the lukewarm reception extended towards it by the more militant Nonconformists," and the "studious non-committal attitude of the Irish Party."(1)

On the treatment proposed for the denominational schools in the single-school areas, particularly in the matter of the setting aside of the Trust Deeds by the State, The Times suggested that "there is a certain English sense of justice which will resent this part of the Bill as an attempt to cripple the Church of England in respect of work for which England is, and long has been her debtor."(2) Lord Hugh Cecil commented ruefully on the distinction which the Bill made between denominations living in the towns and living in the country:

"In towns, supporters of denominational schools have consciences of an inferior sort of dignity...The rural denominationalist is not supposed to have a conscience at all."(3)

The Tablet took a gloomy view of the situation which the Catholic community would face if the Bill ever became law. Apart from the loss of the Catholic schools in the single-school areas, other small Catholic schools would be at risk because of the difficulty of maintaining them on a small grant. The only thing that could be said in favour of contracting out was that the schools which did survive would be truly Catholic. There would be no question of public control, no ban on religious tests for teachers. The Tablet concluded "It is satisfying to know that these sacred Nonconformist principles are up for auction, but the price is excessive."(4)

An accurate estimate of what that price might prove to be appeared in The Morning Post.(5) Noting that the cost of maintenance had risen from £2 12s. 9d in 1902 to £3 6s. 8d. in 1907, and a reasonable estimate would be that by 1909 the cost would be £3 16s. for each child in average attendance, the article went on:

"(In London) the cost for the 27,450 Roman Catholic children will be £104,500, of which, £64,500 will

(2) Ibid.
come from the Treasury. The Managers must find £40,000 for the Catholic teaching...It is almost inconceivable that the Roman Catholics can subscribe the balance necessary.'(1)

John Redmond, the Irish leader, opposed the whole idea of contracting out. He told a meeting at the Free Trade Hall in Manchester that the inevitable result would be that there would be two classes of schools. He argued that there was no difference in principle in asking Catholics to pay for Protestant schools through the rates and in asking Protestants to pay for Catholic schools. He also repeated his claim that the rates paid by the Catholic community for education would be more than sufficient to support every Catholic school in the country.(2)

At a meeting of the Free Church Council in Southport, in March, 1908, there were mixed feelings on the contracting-out issue. The Rev. Sylvester Horne challenged the Anglican schools to contract out:

'The day when the national Church contracts out of the national system of education would be the day when the Church abdicates her claim to be the national Church.'

However, Mr. Perks, the Member for Louth, Lincs., speaking at the same meeting, suggested that there might well be a quite different danger in allowing schools to contract out. The scheme might 'lay the foundations of a vast and wealthyly endowed system of sectarian education that could prove a far more formidable difficulty than the existing one.'(3)

The National Union of Teachers also condemned any system of contracting out. The Union saw it as 'fatal to the efficiency of the schools, and injurious to the health, comfort and education of the children.'(4)

Monsignor Brown, writing in The Tablet condemned the Bill as 'a tinkering measure.' He thought it would be impossible for the contracting-out schools to maintain any kind of parity with

(2) The Times, 16th. March, 1908. Redmond's claim had been denied by Coore in 1906. (P.R.O. File Ed.24/111. See also p.209 supra. )
the council schools. He also expressed the opinion that there were many Local Authorities who would not welcome the existence of a rival group of elementary schools in their areas. (1)

It seemed to be generally accepted that nothing could be done to save the few Catholic schools in the single-school areas. But, as The Tablet pointed out, there was little justice in the proposal:

'There are districts in England in which the only people who have enough care for the education of the children are the Catholics.... We built these schools when no-one else would build them. For that reason, they are to be destroyed. We pay the education rate, but have no share in it. Instead of a share of the rates, we are invited to have jumble sales among ourselves.... It is explained to us that, as a gracious concession, we may save such of our schools as are not scheduled for instant execution, by providing the equivalent of the rates out of our own pockets... We must either sacrifice our schools or pay an annual tribute of something like £180,000. (2)

Canon Glancey, a member of the Catholic Education Council, and a former member of the Birmingham School Board, suggested that the idea of contracting - out was not wrong in itself. It satisfied the original Catholic demands of Catholic teaching by Catholic teachers in Catholic schools under Catholic control. The critical issue was the amount of grant which was to be offered. To suggest that the Catholic schools should charge fees was 'to mock our poverty.' In his city of Birmingham, there were eleven Catholic schools and in all but three of them, the annual cost per scholar was over £3. In one school, the cost was £4 1s. In Wolverhampton, the cost was £2 19s. 10d; in Walsall, the three Catholic schools spent £2 11s., £2 9s., and £2 5s.. In Hanley the amount was £2 15s. The Canon suggested that the Canadian system might be adopted, in which Catholics could allocate their share of the education rate to the Catholic schools. 'To those who say the yield would be insufficient, I reply 'So much the worse for us. We do not want the rates of the Nonconformists.' (3)

(1) The Tablet, 29th February, 1908. p.338.
(2) Ibid. pp. 339 - 341.
(3) The Tablet, 14th March, 1908. P.404.
A letter in the same edition of The Tablet, in an attempt to show the utter impossibility of the position of the Catholic schools if the proposals were implemented, quoted the case of the Catholic school in Hatton Garden, which had an average attendance of 758. The cost of the teachers' salaries was £2,291 annually. The 47s. grant would leave a deficit on the salaries account of £510 annually. With an annual cost of £450 for the upkeep of the school, the parish would be faced with a bill of £960 annually.(1)

Archbishop Bourne, whilst not condemning the proposals outright, expressed grave doubts about them as they stood. He raised the question as to whether the proposals were a genuine attempt to meet the difficulties of the Catholic schools or 'a covert attempt to starve them out of existence.' He said he would reserve his final judgement until he knew the exact amount of the grant which would eventually be paid. With the proposed 47s. grant, 'compared with what we know is the annual cost for each child in the elementary school, I cannot believe that the scheme as now set forth can possibly work....It is quite impossible for us to find more than a certain amount of money every year. But, in order to arrive at an arrangement, having made sacrifices in the past, I know that our people are prepared to continue to make sacrifices in the future.'(2)

The School Guardian, the organ of the National Society, saw in the Archbishop's remarks all the signs of a compromise:

'Dr. Bourne went on to give Mr. McKenna credit for having endeavoured to introduce a genuine basis for a settlement, and he stated that the Bishops will see if any arrangement can be arrived at. All this reads uncommonly like a compromise or a secret understanding.(3)

The Archbishop was quick to assure the Catholics that there was no question of any compromise on the proposals. He stressed that Catholics wanted equality for their schools, and would accept nothing less. But whatever attitude the Catholics were forced to adopt, it would be one of 'reasoned argument and not one of sentimental considerations.' As for the suggestion that the Catholics were seeking a compromise for themselves and disregarding the rights of the other denominations, the Archbishop

(1) The Tablet, 14th. March, 1908, p.401.
(3) Quoted in 'The Tablet, 14th. March, 1908. p. 404.'
reminded his audience 'of what I said on this subject three years ago ....that what we ask for ourselves, we ask for all others who claim it on the same grounds.'(1)

But the Archbishop went on to express his doubts about the solidarity of the Church of England on the issue of the denominational schools when compromise was mentioned:

'Have not many members, and even some Bishops of the Established Church proclaimed their whole-hearted acceptance of Cowper-Temple teaching, and are they not, therefore, presumably in sympathy with Mr. McKenna's proposals with reference to schools in the single-school areas? ...Is it not a fact that many Anglicans and many Bishops are prepared to accept Cowper-Temple teaching, provided they have the facilities and the right to enter the provided schools, and that they would settle the education question on that basis, although in doing so it would involve the destruction of the Catholic schools?'(2)

The Manchester Guardian praised the Archbishop's attitude in refusing to condemn the Bill out of hand. The paper considered that the Archbishop looked on the Government's proposals as 'not fundamentally objectionable......rather an interesting bargain, to be imposed as far as possible by judicious haggling.'(3) The Salford Diocesan Association also sent a telegram to the Archbishop congratulating him on his 'elevated and statesmanlike speech on the education question.'(4)

Early in March, 1908, Dr. Davidson, the Archbishop of Canterbury, wrote to McKenna. He explained that he thought it desirable that there should be some contact between them 'on public grounds' but he made no attempt to explain what these public grounds were. The Archbishop stressed that the opinions he was expressing on the Bill were his own, but in forming such opinions he had used 'every opportunity open to me....taking counsel with those who are best qualified to give me information and advice.'(5) He went on to tell McKenna that 'in its present form, the Bill would accentuate rather than relieve our difficulties... The objections to the Bill as it stands are, so far as I can at

(1) When the Duke of Norfolk complained about the efforts of the Irish Members to arrange a settlement purely for the Catholic schools, the Archbishop told him that he had never regarded it 'as any part of the duty of Catholics to intervene in the disputes of the Protestant sects.' See p.266 supra.

(2) The Tablet, 14th. March, 1908. p. 431.


(4) In Westminster Diocesan Archives, dated 9th. March, 1908.

present judge, insuperable.' The Archbishop considered that the proposal to allow contracting-out simply meant a return to the pre-1902 conditions. (1)

Meanwhile, another problem for the Catholic schools arose. John Gilbert wrote to the Archbishop of Westminster to call his attention to the fact that, if schools contracted-out, they would lose the furniture and equipment which was on loan from the London County Council. 'At Brent Court, it would take £300 to replace the London County Council's furniture, books and apparatus... If contracting-out is carried, even on favourable terms, I am sure it will be the first step in the destruction of our schools.' (2)

The Archbishop must have raised the point with Charles Russell, who was in communication with McKenna, because a few days later, Russell wrote to the Archbishop to reassure him that 'there would be objection to a clause securing that all the present equipment and furniture of the school should not be taken away.' Russell's letter also suggested that, because the figures for the schools in the London area were 'hopeless,' McKenna would be driven to embody a clause which would exempt London. There would also be no objection to the formation of a Catholic School board, which would receive all the grants for the Catholic schools and distribute them.(3)

The letter from McKenna to Russell is significant in that it shows how anxious the minister was to reach an agreement with the Catholic authorities. The figures for the schools in the London area were set out in a memorandum which the Southwark Diocesan Association had sent to Russell in February, 1908. To avoid any disagreement over the accuracy of the figures, the amounts had been broken down to show the costs of salaries, fuel, books, etc.(4) When faced with these figures, McKenna must have realised the utter impossibility of the schools continuing to exist on a 47s. grant. Questions on the removal of furniture which had already been provided for schools which were to contract out

(3) Ibid. 13th. March, 1908. The L.C.C. had made it clear from the outset that anything provided for the voluntary schools by the Council was provided conditionally, and remained the property of the Council. See p. 189.
(4) See Table 18, p.300.
TABLE 18
COST OF MAINTAINING CATHOLIC SCHOOLS IN LONDON. MEMORANDUM FROM THE ARCHBISHOP OF SOUTHWARK TO LORD (SIC)
CHARLES RUSSELL, 22ND. FEBRUARY, 1908. (SOURCE: WESTMINSTER DIOCESAN ARCHIVES, FILE 80/1/181. V)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>ROLL</th>
<th>AV. ATT.</th>
<th>RATE GRANT</th>
<th>SALARIES/PER HEAD</th>
<th>FUEL</th>
<th>BOOKS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. George, Lambeth.</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>£1581</td>
<td>£1756</td>
<td>£2 18s 1d</td>
<td>4s 3d.</td>
<td>£3 5s 5d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Patrick.</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>£4 66s</td>
<td>£752</td>
<td>£2 13s 6d</td>
<td>6s 2d.</td>
<td>£3 2s 9d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph, Wandsworth.</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>£7 82s</td>
<td>£985</td>
<td>£3 6s 0d</td>
<td>5s 6d.</td>
<td>£3 14s 7d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roehampton.</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>£6 19s</td>
<td>£355</td>
<td>£4 16s 1d</td>
<td>9s 6d.</td>
<td>£3 14s 8d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Kensington Practising</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>£4 27s</td>
<td>£641</td>
<td>£3 10s 9d</td>
<td>13s 0d.</td>
<td>£4 6s 5d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacred Heart.</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>£8 06s</td>
<td>£787</td>
<td>£2 5s 11d</td>
<td>6s 6d.</td>
<td>£2 16s 5d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brent's Court</td>
<td></td>
<td>537</td>
<td>£1260</td>
<td>£1831</td>
<td>£3 8s 2d</td>
<td>5s 4d.</td>
<td>£3 16s 7d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
were asked in the House of Commons on 12th. March, 1908, the day before Russell had written the letter to Archbishop Bourne. In reply to questions from Lord Edmund Talbot and John Redmond, McKenna had said that the provisions of the Education Bill 'would not affect the ownership of the furniture or equipment of the schools not transferred to the Local Authority.' Lord Edmund persisted and asked if 'it would be within the power of the Local Education Authorities to remove the furniture from such schools.' McKenna's answer was that 'if the furniture was the property of the Local Authority' they would be able to remove it. After a further exchange of questions, McKenna was asked if he would 'insert provisions in the Bill to allow the schools to keep the furniture,' but his reply was, 'No, sir. I cannot undertake to do that.'(1)

A month after the exchange of letters between Archbishop Davidson and McKenna (2) the two men met again to discuss the Bill. The Archbishop was not happy at the outcome of the meeting. He wrote to McKenna:

'I have been thinking over what passed in our interview of yesterday...I hope I made it clear how gravely apprehensive I feel as to the possibility of a harmonious settlement...

With regard to your suggested conference procedure, I feel puzzled... If I understood you aright, what you suggest is that there should be these successive stages:

1. A resolve on your part what to recommend.

2. An endeavour on your part to obtain the individual concurrence of certain leaders in educational matters.

3. A conference under the Prime Minister's Chairmanship, at which those who had already committed themselves to you in private, should commit themselves in the presence of one another with such results that the conference might be quoted as having agreed to particular arrangements....

I would not be honest if I told you that I thought it probable that the successful concurrences and acceptances would be procurable in the conflicting quarters concerned.... You will realise that the bottom is knocked out of what I said in the House of Lords if we are to secure neither the universal access for facilities in the council schools nor the use of the head teacher in the rural schools.'(3)

Archbishop Davidson's reference to what he had said in the House of Lords concerned the re-introduction of a Bill which had originally been introduced in May, 1904. (1) The Bishop of St. Asaph, in introducing the Bill stressed that it was in no sense a proposal from the Anglican body, but a personal attempt to ease some of the tensions which the implementation of the 1902 Act had brought about in Wales. The Bishop suggested the drawing up of an 'Agreed Syllabus' of religious instruction in the same way as the London School Board had drawn up its syllabus after 1870. This syllabus would be taught in all schools, for three mornings in the week in the denominational schools, for four mornings in the week in the council schools. On the other two mornings in the denominational schools, denominational instruction would be given, and by the ordinary teachers in the school if they were willing to give it. On the fifth morning in the council schools, the denominations were to have the right of entry to give their denominational instruction to such children whose parents wished them to have it. Again, if the ordinary teachers in the council schools were willing to give the denominational instruction, they would be allowed to do so. The Bishop had stressed that his reason for making the proposals was the fear that 'while religious men are wrangling about the form of the religious instruction to be given, the secularist will steal the key of the school.' (2) When the Bill was re-introduced in 1908, the Archbishop of Canterbury had not condemned the proposals outright. Certainly, the prospect of entry to the council schools to give denominational instruction, possibly given by the ordinary teachers in the schools, while, at the same time there would be no question of the transfer of schools, made the proposals a marked improvement on the 1908 proposals in the Bill. However, so far as the Catholic schools were concerned, there was no question whatever of the proposals being accepted. Similarly, in the mood of 1908, there was no question of the Liberal Government allowing access to the council schools for denominational instruction, and allowing the ordinary teachers to give the denominational instruction during normal school hours at the rate-payers' expense. Hence, the proposal came to nothing when re-introduced in March, 1908.

But there were rumours of compromise in the air. Lord Ripon wrote to Archbishop Bourne about the St. Asaph proposals:

(1) Parliamentary Debates, 9th. May, 1904. c.704. 'Education (Transferred Schools) Bill.'
(2) Ibid. c.710.
'I think it is my duty to let you know that the air is full of rumours of compromise about the Education Bill, but they relate to compromise with the Established Church and not with the Catholics...
The Bishop of St. Asaph's Bill seems to ignore the existence of Catholics... I venture to submit to Your Grace that your presence in London at as early a date as may be convenient to you is very desirable...(1)

There was great danger to the Catholic schools in any such proposal as the St. Asaph Bill because it could cause a split in the ranks of the supporters of the voluntary schools. The Archbishop of Canterbury himself admitted this when he spoke of 'the schools in England...which cannot come within such a provision as this.....Roman Catholic schools, Jewish schools, some of the Anglican schools, practising schools attached to the denominational training colleges, Wesleyan schools.' 'The awkward expedient of contracting - out' was the only solution for such schools. The Earl of Crewe did not have much hope of the success of the St. Asaph proposals. He foresaw 'passive resistance from every Roman Catholic, from the Noble Duke (of Norfolk) opposite, down to the poorest Irish labourer who carries a hod up a ladder.'

Even Lord Ripon had to admit that there was one aspect of the bill to which he could not think of being a party, 'and that is that it makes no provision for Roman Catholics and Jews.'(2)

High Anglicans viewed the St. Asaph proposals with some anxiety also. Lord Halifax wrote to The Times, quoting an editorial from The Tablet:

'If this Bill truly represents the mind of the Church of England, we have come to the parting of the ways...Here is the great divide...From this hour forward, the Catholics of England will have to fight the battle of the schools alone...At any rate, we stand where we did...the charge of desertion in the face of the enemy does not lie at our door...We have to see how far the action of the Bishop of St. Asaph is endorsed by the rest of the Anglican Episcopate...Unless it is promptly disowned, the whole situation with regard to the Education Bill must at once become profoundly modified.(3)

Although the St. Asaph Bill never reached the House of Commons, McKenna saw that the Bill, or something like it, would have the advantage of removing the vast majority of the denominational

(2) Parliamentary Debates, 30th. March, 1908. cc. 15 - 47.
(3) The Times, 1st. April, 1908. p.6. quoting from The Tablet 21st. March, 1908.
schools from the area of controversy.

'Up to the present, it was not open to the Government to deal with various religious denominations otherwise than on a basis of perfect equality... But when a Bill was introduced by the Bishop of St. Asaph, the Government feel more at liberty to act with regard to certain denominations, for whom alone the alternative of contracting out would have to be retained.'(1)

When the House adjourned for the Easter Recess, the Bill which McKenna had hoped to pilot through Parliament had all the signs of being in serious trouble. The difficulties which were arising over contracting-out seemed insuperable.(2) The Non-conformists regarded contracting-out as a privilege for which the denominations should expect to pay. The Catholics regarded it as a penalty. During the Debate on the Second Reading, Dillon reminded the House that the Catholic schools did not want to contract out.

'But, if we are going to be put out, we must be put out on a footing of equality....the poor children of the Roman Catholics of this country must not be condemned to an inferior system of education...'(3)

There appears to have been some slight difference in the Catholic opinion on the question of contracting-out. There were those who were in favour of contracting-out, provided that the financial arrangements were satisfactory. There were others who felt that the whole idea should be rejected, whatever financial terms were on offer. Thus, a Memorandum issued from Archbishop's House, Westminster condemned the Bill 'in its present form' on three counts:

1. The financial arrangements are manifestly inadequate...

2. The denominational system is placed in a position of evident inferiority...outside the Public Elementary School System of the country, and regarded as an anomaly...

3. It perpetuates the manifestly unjust proceeding of taking rates from Catholic rate-payers and giving them to the teaching of essentially Protestant doctrine...... Bible teaching left to

(1) Parliamentary Debates, 19th. May, 1908. c. 120.
(2) Telegrams of protest had come to Archbishop's House from the Liverpool Catholic Teachers' Association and Tyneside Catholic Teachers' Association. When the Catholic Education Council passed a resolution condemning the Bill(30th. March, 1908) the Hexham Diocesan representatives voted in favour of contracting-out.
(3) Parliamentary Debates, 19th. May, 1908. c.121.
'the individual interpretation of the teacher.'(1) But the memorandum was not an outright rejection of the Bill, but a rejection 'in its present form,' of a bill which would put the Catholics at a financial disadvantage.

The Duke of Norfolk and the Catholic Education Council opposed the Bill outright. The Duke sent his own Memorandum to the Archbishop of Westminster, setting out in detail his objections to the McKenna proposals.(2) He also sent a copy of the memorandum to Monsignor Bidwell,(3) to forward to Cardinal Merry del Val, the Cardinal Secretary of State at the Vatican. The Duke explained that, in his view, the Bill 'removes anything in the way of denominational management from the schools, including all chance of selecting teachers.' The alternative was to 'contract-out' and this would oblige the schools to accept 'inadequate funds.' Once the schools were 'outside the national system of education and with inadequate financial support,' the result would be 'second-rate schools, under teachers who, for lack of proper salaries, will tend to become second-rate also.'(4)

The Duke then referred to the clergy of the Diocese of Hexham 'who are inclined to look kindly on contracting-out.' 'They appear to be able to run their schools at less expense than clergy in other parts of the country.' The Duke ended his Memorandum with a warning against accepting any form of contracting-out of the national system:

'I have always had a strong doubt of the possibility of Catholics being put on a special footing in the country, and of such position being left to them year after year, through all the changes of political opinion...... At present, the special venom of the Nonconformists is directed at the Established Church, but the class who find spokesmen in such men as Dr. Clifford are not likely to allow Catholics to remain in any exceptional position for long.'(5)

---

(1) Westminster Archives, File Bo.1/181 V. undated.
(2) Ibid. Dated 8th. April, 1908.
(3) Monsignor (later Bishop) Bidwell, the former Chancellor of the Archdiocese of Westminster, was appointed to the Secretariat of State at the Vatican in 1907. He returned to London in 1908 as a member of the Papal Delegation under Cardinal Vannutelli for the Eucharistic Congress. The Liberal Government banned the procession at the Congress, an action which many Catholics considered to be an insult to the Pope.
(4) Westminster Archives, File Bo.1/181, dated 8th. April, 1908.
(5) Ibid.
Three days before the Duke had sent his Memorandum to the 
Archbishop, the Prime Minister, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, 
had resigned because of ill-health. (1) His successor was Herbert 
Asquith. In the consequent re-shuffle of the Cabinet, Mr. McKenna 
became First Lord of the Admiralty and his successor at the Board 
of Education was Walter Runciman.

When McKenna replied to Archbishop Davidson's letter of 
11th. April, (2) he appeared to be of opinion that some form of 
agreement might be reached:

'...Nobody appreciates your difficulties more than 
I do, and I fully understand that the possible basis 
of settlement which I discussed with you differs from 
the position you took up in the House of Lords.... 
The basis to which I refer is now being put into 
writing and I shall submit it to you after Easter.' (3)

The Bill duly received its Second Reading on 18th - 19th. May, 
1908. The trend of the Debate was predictable. The Opposition 
produced figures to show how inadequate the contracting-out 
grant of 47s. would be. Mr. F.E. Smith, (later Lord Birkenhead) 
a Liverpool Member, urged the Liberals to remember the pledge they 
had given to their Catholic constituents to uphold the rights of 
the voluntary schools. He quoted Charles Russell's figures for 
the Catholic schools in London, which showed that the Catholic 
community in London would have to find £52,392 if their schools 
were obliged to contract-out. In Liverpool, Mr. Smith said, the 
figure would be about £12,000. He also expressed the hope that 
'the Minister for Education' (4) would find time to look into the 
case of the church school at Mickleham in Surrey. The local people 
had just had the school built at a cost of £2,390 'with the 
specific object of avoiding Cowper-Temple teaching.' This school 
was now to be taken over without any compensatory privilege 
except that they could now have Cowper-Temple teaching. (5)

The Irish Member, Mr. Dillon, denied that contracting-out 
was a privilege which Catholics sought for themselves. The truth

(1) Campbell-Bannerman died a few weeks later.
(2) See p. 301 supra.
(3) P.R.O. File Ed.24/153, Doc. 113, dated 13th. April, 1908 
Presumably, the basis for a settlement to which McKenna 
refers was the conference under the Chairmanship of Mr. Asquith.
(4) There was no Minister for Education at the time. Presumably he 
meant the President of the Board.
was the Catholics were being forced out of the national system. 'If we are to be put out, it must be on a footing of equality.' But Mr. Dillon could not refrain from the assertion that the present situation need not have arisen if the 1906 Bill had been sent back to the Lords for the second time. (1) Generally, there was a great deal of sympathy with the Catholic case. Sir George Scott Robertson, the Member for Bradford, claimed that the word 'poverty' took on a new meaning when one looked at the Catholic poor in that city. Yet these people were contributing £12 each week to meet the cost of the new school they had built. 'And this sum will now be increased by an additional £20 per week - an intolerable burden.' (2)

The Second Reading was carried on 19th. May, 1908, by 370 votes to 205. The unenviable task of trying to make something of the Bill now rested with the new President of the Board, Walter Runciman. Feeling was high on both sides. The Nonconformists were angry that the voluntary schools were still to continue to receive state funds without any popular representation on the managerial boards. The voluntary school supporters felt that the relief they had gained under the 1902 Act was now to be taken away from them, not because they had failed to make good use of it but because of the dogma of a political party. But Lord Stanley of Alderley reminded the Catholics that when they protested so loudly over the 47s. grant, they were being very unreasonable. They were being offered more than the Catholics received in France, Italy, Germany, Switzerland, the United States of America or the British colonies. As for the suggestion that Catholic parents would not send their children to the council schools on conscientious grounds, Lord Stanley said that Catholics had always adopted their position to the prevailing circumstances. He quoted the case of the United States where there were two million Catholic school-children, and one million of them attended the common schools. In Lord Stanley's opinion, the Catholics were simply striving 'to get all they could get.' (3)

(1) Parliamentary Debates, 19th. May, 1908. cc. 119 - 122.
(2) Ibid. cc. 100 - 102.
It has already been explained that the resignation of the Prime Minister, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, on 5th. April, 1908, resulted in a re-shuffle of Cabinet posts. Herbert Asquith became Prime Minister, Reginald McKenna moved from the Board of Education to the Admiralty and Walter (later Sir Walter) Runciman was appointed President of the Board of Education. Thus, when conversations on the Education Bill were resumed after the Bill received its Second Reading on 19th. May, 1908, the conversations were between the Archbishop of Canterbury and Runciman.

On 1st. June, 1908, Runciman wrote to Archbishop Davidson enclosing a document containing a list of points on which agreement had been reached. He wrote:

'If they are put forward by you and your friends as conditions you could, for the sake of peace, accept, I am practically certain that I could induce my friends and supporters to agree to them being incorporated in the Government Bill.'

However, when conversations were eventually resumed in October, 1908, it soon became evident, as the copy of the document on the next page shows, there were serious differences of opinion as to exactly what had been agreed.

(1) P. 306 supra.
The document in the File (1) is typewritten, but the notes and lines crossed out are in manuscript.

'CONFIDENTIAL

16th. October, 1908.

'Memorandum of the possible terms of an education Concordat first put on paper as a result of conversations between the Archbishop of Canterbury and Mr. Runciman in May, 1908, although not agreed to at that time. It was the basis of conversations again on 15th. October, 1908. The marginal notes are the Archbishop's comments on the latter occasion and were read over and agreed to by him.'

After reading them in this paper, the Archbishop states that they represent what he himself would be prepared to accept if a settlement were thereby produced. But, of course, he does not put them forward as proposals. Both the conversations and these notes are absolutely confidential.

W.R.

1. All schools in the State system to be under the control and management of the Local Education Authority, but where a reasonable number of parents ask for denominational instruction, facilities in the case of council schools MAY, and in the case of voluntary schools, MUST be accorded by the Local Education Authority on three mornings per week, the denominational instruction then given being paid for by the denomination and only given on the demand of the parents.

2. The facilities instruction may be given by any one of the staff who volunteers to give it, except the head-teacher.

3. Head-teachers should not be allowed to give the denominational instruction in order to avoid the suggestion that the State school is mainly pervaded by one denomination.

4. Schools which through the unwillingness of parents to have their children taught any subject by teachers not belonging to their own denomination, cannot come under the system above described, will have to be content with State aid only.

5. Some definition must be found which will enable such schools, but only such schools, to be eligible for a State Grant, though not coming under the State system.

After these conversations between the Archbishop of Canterbury and Runciman, the Archbishop appeared to be reasonably optimistic that a settlement might yet be reached. He drew up a further Memorandum on 19th. October, 1908. (1) In this, he described Runciman's attitude as 'a more reasonable and practical approach to the settlement than we have yet seen.' Although the existing House of Commons 'could easily pass a Bill which would be intolerable to Churchmen, and which the House of Lords could not reasonably be expected to agree to... my hope of a settlement lies in the belief that Mr. Runciman's Memorandum embodies a scheme which does not have that character.'

Unfortunately, the biggest problem envisaged by the Bill had not been resolved. This was the position of the voluntary schools which would be forced to contract out, and the Catholic schools were among them. Selby-Bigge, an assistant secretary at the Board of Education, and Runciman met in Runciman's office on 22nd. October, 1908, to attempt to clear up the position of the contracting-out schools. (2) Runciman's first point was significant.

'No attempt should be made to draft a formula of decisions by parents which, while admitting Roman Catholic schools, would tend to exclude Church of England schools...

The only tests for contracting-out were that the minimum number of parents, possibly 30, should ask for it; the school should have the power to provide sufficient money to carry on in an efficient manner; the school must belong to an association formed for the purpose of pooling the Grant....It will be quite immaterial if, in a Roman Catholic school of, say, 200 children, there are 150 or even 170 Protestants, the 30 Roman Catholics will be a sufficient justification for the denomination's demand for contracting out.'

The document then lists some of the 'positive characteristics of contracting out.' These would include equality in scholarship privileges, medical inspections, feeding necessitous children, and the right of admission to cookery and handicraft centres. Contracted-out schools would have the right to exclude any child and any child would have the right to refuse to attend a contracted-out school. The Government Grant would not be paid direct to any

(1) P.R.O. File Ed.24/153, Document 118, dated 19th. October, 1908. There is no indication as to whom the document was sent but the fact that it is preserved in the File suggests it was sent to the Board.

(2) Ibid. Document 50. 'Points provisionally settled with Mr. Runciman, 22nd. October, 1908.'
individual school but to the relevant association. So far as transferred schools were concerned, Selby-Bigge envisaged three forms of agreement to cover the take-over of the premises. These were:

1. Outright purchase, leaving no rights to the denomination selling the school.

2. Acquisition. The Local Authority would pay a rent, maintain the fabric of the school premises, but the denomination would have the use of the building at week-ends, and would pay for the light and heat used at week-ends.

3. Renting. The premises would be retained by the Trustees, who would continue to maintain the fabric. The Local Authority would pay a rent for the use of the premises on five days each week.

There was an additional clause which was possibly included in case any Catholic schools were transferred:

'It will be open to the Trustees of a school to be transferred, whether compulsorily or voluntarily, to stipulate that facilities shall attach to a school. The facilities shall be of whatever kind the parents demand, and will bear no relation to the Trust under which the school was originally held.'

Thus, it would seem that if there was no Catholic school in an area, and thirty Catholic families attended a transferred school, the Catholic parents could ask for facilities for their religious instruction to be given in the school. Similarly, if thirty non-Catholic families attended a Catholic school in a single-school area, such families could ask for denominational instruction in the school. It seems highly unlikely that the consequences of such a clause were ever seriously thought through.

On the day after the meeting between Selby-Bigge and Runciman outlined above, Runciman met the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Southwark at the office of the Board. Claude Schuster, the Board's legal adviser was also present. The Archbishop explained that he had been consulting with other Anglicans on the proposals made so far. Schuster noted:

'Apparently those attending had been small in numbers comprising a few Bishops and laymen, including the Bishop of Manchester and Sir Henry Hobhouse.'

(1) P.R.O. File Ed. 24/153. Document 50. 'Points provisionally settled with Mr. Runciman, Thursday, 22nd. October, 1908.
As a result of these consultations, the Archbishop now raised two very serious objections to the proposals. The first was the serious financial burden which would be placed on the Anglican community in having to pay a triple rate, that is, the education rate, the cost of contracting-out, and the cost of giving the denominational instruction in the transferred schools. The Anglicans felt the injustice of the financial burden very much. When the Archbishop raised the question of the amount of fees which would have to be charged in the contracting-out schools, Schuster reminded him that if the fees charged amounted to more than 10s. per annum per scholar in average attendance, the Board would have the right to reduce the 47s. grant. (1)

The Archbishop's second objection concerned the clause which forbade the head-teacher in a school from giving the denominational instruction, even if the head-teacher was anxious to do so. (2)

Runciman refused to make any concessions to the Archbishop on the question of new denominational schools being built and contracting-out. All new schools would be council schools, unless the denomination was prepared to run the schools as efficient elementary schools without any grant. Schuster noted:

'They asked if the grant for the contracting-out schools was fixed for ever by Statute, or was it to be the ordinary grant for the council schools, to rise with any rise in the latter.'

Runciman refused to give any undertaking on this point, but agreed to consider it. He also insisted that it would be impossible to compel Local Authorities to choose teachers from contracted-out schools for teaching posts in the council schools. Schuster commented:

'The Archbishop was greatly perturbed at the notion that persons taking service in contracted-out schools would very seriously prejudice their chances for life as regards ever getting employment in council schools.' (3)

At the end of the meeting, it was clear that there were very serious obstacles to a settlement. The next important event was a meeting between Morant and Schuster to discuss the issues.

(1) It is not clear how this condition relates to the clause that allowed contracted-out schools to charge up to 30s. per annum in fees. (See p. 288 supra.)
(3) Ibid.
raised in the meeting with the Archbishop at which Schuster had been present. Morant's Memorandum to the Cabinet (1) sets out the position as it was at the end of October, 1908. There were three modifications to the proposals discussed by Runciman and the Archbishop. They were:

2. No new contracted-out schools would be allowed but 'query the Roman Catholic case.'

7. (Arising out of the Caerphilly case. (2) ) A Local Authority not wishing to afford facilities in a transferred school must cease to use the school premises...But directly a school ceases to be used as a public elementary school, either as certified efficient or as contracted-out, the Local Authority revives its rights.

Addendum, Every Local Authority would establish a 'Religious Instruction Committee.' Matters concerning religious instruction could then be referred to such a committee....An Amendment to the Bill is to be prepared, making the giving of religious instruction according to the London Syllabus (3) compulsory.

The ruling on the Caerphilly case would have had a serious effect on any Catholic schools in single-school areas. If such a school was owned and staffed by an Order of nuns, it would be reasonable to assume that, as the nuns would no longer be allowed to teach in the school, the Order would wish to convert the school to a private fee-paying school, staffed by the Order. But under the ruling, as soon as the school ceased to be used as a public elementary school, the Local Authority would have the right to take over the school premises for such use if they were needed.

After his meeting with Schuster, Morant must have been convinced that there was little possibility of the Archbishop of Canterbury accepting the Government's proposals. Instead, it seemed likely that, as in the past, the Anglicans would make public the terms they were prepared to accept. Morant wrote to Runciman:

'It becomes extremely important that we prevent the Church from getting in the first word to the ear of the public...We must endeavour to show that the

---

(1) P.R.O. File Ed.24/153, Document 153, dated 30th. October, 1908. 'Taking over the voluntary schools: Points settled by the end of October.'

(2) The Authority refused to allow any denominational instruction to be given in its schools.

(3) The Bishop of St. Asaph had suggested the use of the old London School Board Syllabus of Religious Instruction on four days in the week in council schools and on three days in the week in voluntary schools. (P.D. 9th. May, 1904, cc. 705 - 706.)
Government was strenuously endeavouring, from May and June onwards, to take every possible step to find on what controversial points 'give and take' might be secured.'(1)

ARCHBISHOP BOURNE AND THE 1908 PROPOSALS.

An unfortunate incident had taken place in the summer of 1908 which tended to sour relations between the Liberal Government and the Catholic community. Westminster Cathedral had recently been completed, and to mark the occasion, a Eucharistic Congress was held in London on 10th. - 15th. September, 1908. The police had given permission for a procession to be held through some of the streets around the new Cathedral, but at the last moment, the Government had banned the procession under the Act of 1892 as a threat to public order. As a Papal Legate and several Cardinals from all parts of the world had come for the Congress, feeling among the Catholic community was very bitter. Archbishop Bourne managed to avert serious trouble on the morning of the procession by arranging a route which kept to private grounds around the new Cathedral and its precincts. But when Runciman wrote to Bourne a fortnight later on the question of the Education Bill, the Archbishop's reply was not particularly encouraging:

"In my judgement, it would be unwise to look for any satisfactory arrangement at the present time... The Government has judged well to remind English Catholics that they do not enjoy the same liberties as other Englishmen, and to invoke against them disabilities which they thought were obsolete...."

After a reference to the banning of the procession, and the action of the Cathedral authorities 'which averted a serious danger and saved the Government from a terrible responsibility,' the Archbishop ended his letter:

"You can easily understand that time must elapse before Catholics...can be brought to consider calmly any education proposals emanating from the present Ministry....I strongly urge upon you a postponement of this question....I do not propose to publish this letter, but you are, of course, at liberty to communicate it to the Prime Minister.'(2)

Runciman's reply was merely to thank the Archbishop for writing, and to tell him that he had passed the letter to the Prime Minister.(3) Soon after this exchange of letters, Archbishop Bourne

(1) P.R.O. File Ed.24/152, Document 7, undated.
(3) Ibid. 30th. September, 1908.
left for a visit to the English College in Rome.

Meanwhile, there was a great deal of conjecture as to what would happen to the Education Bill, which, it will be remembered, had its First Reading in February and its Second Reading in May, 1908. On 22nd. October, 1908, Lord Edmund Talbot wrote to Monsignor Butt, the vicar-General at Westminster Cathedral, since 'I promised the Archbishop I would let you know, to forward to him, any information regarding the Education Bill....' Lord Edmund was of the opinion that the Bill would come up for Third Reading 'after the Licensing Bill has been disposed of.' After indicating that he would be attending a meeting of the Executive of the Catholic Education Council 'which is called for Tuesday next,' he wrote:

'Although I can hear nothing definite, I believe the Archbishop of Canterbury is still in negotiation with Mr. Runciman, although I am quite unaware on what lines....If he succeeds in coming to any arrangement, it is not likely to be advantageous to us....'(1)

Two days later, on 24th. October, 1908, Runciman again wrote to Archbishop Bourne on the possibility of holding a formal conference on the education problem.

'Progress made during the last few months(2) leads me to hope that a formal conference might now be possible and useful....The Archbishop of Canterbury has expressed a strong wish that the conference, if held, should include Roman Catholic representatives. He earnestly begged me to ask you whether you would accept an invitation to it....In spite of your intimation that you and your friends consider any negotiations with the Government to be impossible, I write to ask whether you would be willing to attend or be represented at a formal conference....'(3)

The Archbishop replied from the English College in Rome:

'The average Catholic thinks that this Government, which has wearied us in education matters ever since it came to power, has now gone out of its way to wound us in our most cherished religious convictions...if the Prime minister can find an opportunity of publicly assuring Catholics that he will consider how he can place them on an equality with their fellow-subjects, it will be easier for me to answer your letter as I would desire to do.'(4)

(1) Westminster diocesan Archives, File Bo.1/181, 22nd. October, 1908.
(2) See pp.309-12 supra. At the meeting on the previous day, very little progress had been made.
(4) Westminster Diocesan Archives, File Bo.1/181, 27th. October, 1908. The Archbishop was in Rome to attend the Golden Jubilee of Pope Pius X's ordination to the priesthood.
At the end of October, the Archbishop received an up-to-date account of the position from the Duke of Norfolk:

'I have had a private talk with Lord Salisbury... I asked him if anything was going on, and, if so, what? He said that something was going on, but what he knew, he knew in trust and confidence, and could not, therefore, tell me all about it... He said he had urged most strongly on the Archbishop of Canterbury that no decision should be acted upon without our being fully consulted... I gathered that the Archbishop was ready to do a deal with Asquith, but he did not know if the National Society had been consulted.'(1)

Before the Archbishop of Westminster had time to reply to the Duke, the Duke had written a second letter to him. Apparently the Duke had met the Archbishop of Canterbury and he had told the Duke that he would not attend any conference at which the Catholics were not represented. But the Duke expressed the opinion that if the Catholics took part in any talks, they would most certainly be blamed for the failure of the talks. On the other hand, if the Catholics refused to take part in talks, the Archbishop of Canterbury could say, 'We did our best to consult the Roman Catholics, but they declined to have anything to say to the discussion... You had your chance; you remained dumb.'(2)

On the day after he had written the letter to the Archbishop, who was still abroad, the Duke of Norfolk was obliged to write to him again. The Duke had again spoken to the Archbishop of Canterbury who was able to tell him that Runciman had invited the archbishop of Westminster to attend, or to be represented at a meeting, and the Archbishop had refused to attend.(3)

'If it is the case that the Government asked you to a conference, and you refused to attend, there is the further danger that if we are left out in the cold, and go to the Government, they will say, 'We invited you to a conference and you did not come. We could not wait for ever. It is too late to re-open the question.'(4)

As Runciman's letter of 24th. October shows(5) Bourne had been invited to attend a conference on the education problem and had

(2) Ibid. 6th. November, 1908.
(3) Apparently the Catholic Education Council had not been told of the invitation to attend the meeting.
(4) Ibid. 7th. November, 1908.
(5) See p.315 supra.
refused to attend or to send a representative. It is difficult to understand why the Archbishop kept the invitation, and his reply to it, a secret. Certainly, it would have done no harm if a representative from the Catholic Education Council had attended if only to learn of the latest offers made by the Government. The Duke of Norfolk, with the 1906 Bill and its aftermath still fresh in his memory, must have been disheartened and not a little angry to receive the news from the Archbishop of Canterbury. On 10th. November, with the Third Reading fixed for 25th. November, the Duke sent a telegram to Archbishop Bourne in Rome simply telling him it was 'Most important you return without delay.' (1)

By 18th. November, Bourne was back in London. Lord Ripon wrote to him:

'I venture to urge Your Grace to go to see Mr. Runciman if possible. I am sure it would be useful, and if you did not go, it might be misunderstood.' (2)

The meeting between the Archbishop and Runciman must have taken place almost immediately. On the following day, 19th. November, in an exchange of questions in the Commons, the Prime Minister said there had been discussions with all the parties concerned in the education question. Redmond immediately challenged the statement saying, 'I have in my possession, received today, a document from the highest authority representing Catholics in England, saying that no such communications have taken place up to to-day. Asquith assured Redmond that 'the President of the Board of Education, as late as yesterday, was in communication with the Roman Catholic authorities.' But when Lord Robert Cecil asked the Prime Minister if there had been an actual agreement with the Roman Catholics, Asquith replied that he would require notice of that question. (3) Whoever 'the highest authority representing Catholics in England ' was, he had not given Redmond very accurate information.

On the same day, 19th. November, the questions were asked in the Commons, Archbishop Bourne wrote to Runciman, 'in reference to our conversation of last evening.' Bourne wanted to be re-

(2) Ibid. 18th. November, 1908.
assured on four points, viz. that newly-built Catholic schools would be allowed to contract out; that children attending contracted-out schools would be permitted to take scholarship examinations on equal terms with children from the council schools; that teachers employed in the contracted-out schools would have the same pension rights as teachers in council schools; that the statistics on the cost of maintaining the contracted-out schools, on which there had been some disagreement at the meeting, would be re-considered. (1)

Runciman replied by return, he assured the Archbishop that, with the exception of newly-built schools in the single-school areas, all newly-built schools would be allowed to contract out. All children would have equal treatment so far as scholarship opportunities, cookery and manual training classes were open to all children in contracted-out schools, and, since contracted-out schools were still public elementary schools, the teachers would have exactly the same pension rights as teachers in council schools. On the question of the statistics, Runciman suggested that the Archbishop might care to send his representatives, with their statistics to meet the Board's representatives. The matter could then be discussed at greater length. Runciman ended his letter with the hope that he would be able to offer an increase in the amount of the contracting-out grant. (2) But his briefing to the Board's representatives was in quite a different tone. The instruction given to Mr. G.E. Murray was:

'I would like you and Morant, with whomever he thinks necessary, to see these Roman Catholic experts... Make mincemeat of their figures.' (3)

The Archbishop, too, was worried about the figures. He told the Catholic representatives to 'be quite sure of your figures. They must be substantiated.' (4)

Meanwhile, the Nonconformists were uneasy at the way in which, it seemed to them, the Anglicans were again being granted too many concessions. A group of leading Nonconformists, including Dr. Clifford, Sylvester Horne, Sir George White and Rev. Scott Lidgett, wrote to the Prime minister expressing concern at

the proposals which the Archbishop of Canterbury had made public. They felt that no further negotiations would be of any value unless three firm guarantees were given by the Government. These were that all Anglican schools would be transferred to the Local Authorities; that any attempt to coerce Local Authorities into allowing schools to contract out would be abandoned; that a guarantee that teachers would be protected from denominational tests would be given. (1) Runciman agreed to meet the Nonconformist leaders on 9th. November, 1908, to discuss their grievances over the proposals.

Morant wrote to Runciman to brief him for the meeting with the Nonconformists. The tone of Morant's letter is interesting. Apparently he had asked one of the secretaries at the Board to attend a meeting of Nonconformists at which the Bill was discussed, and he was able to tell Runciman something of the mood of the meeting.

'I have now had an opportunity of drawing Maurice as to what happened at the meeting...He had the impression that the orators felt it necessary to fan into flicker of flame what were obviously dying embers.... There was a desperate attempt on the part of the organisers of the meeting to bring about some outspoken expression of determination.... Of course, I write this for your eyes only. It might be desirable that you burn this letter when you have read it.'(2)

Armed with this information, Runciman faced the meeting of the Nonconformist leaders on 9th. November, 1908. It was a long meeting, and Runciman asked that a record be taken of what was said. The record occupies 45 pages.(3) Why Runciman asked for the record to be taken, and had brought along a shorthand writer to take it, is a matter of speculation. It can only be assumed that he wanted no recriminations as to who had said what when the Bill was at such a critical stage.

After a historical review of the education problem, he went on to speak of the Bill before the House. He insisted that 'contracting-out was inevitable...there was no way out of it.... it was the only way you could provide for the Roman Catholics, the Jews, and those English Church schools which are very similar to the Roman Catholic schools.'(4)

(3) Ibid. Document 54.
(4) Ibid.
Clearly, Runciman had the case of the Catholic schools, as distinct from that of the other denominations, very much in mind. He went on:

'You cannot define the Roman Catholics by name in a Statute...I do not believe that you would ever get through the House of Commons any Clause which provided a special exemption for the Roman Catholics by name.....The only differentiation you can make is by money...If they are prepared to pay to remain outside, then let them pay and remain outside...' (1)

When asked how many schools would be contracting out, Runciman had to admit that he did not know. When it was suggested to him that the number would be between six and seven thousand, Runciman expressed the opinion that, if this was the case, it would be a disaster for teachers and children. But he insisted that there was no alternative to contracting-out:

'You cannot force the Roman Catholics to come in... The Roman Catholic position is different from any position we have taken up...They want, not only Roman Catholic teaching, but they want Roman Catholic atmosphere with Roman Catholic emblems....You cannot have that in a council school...But if you are going to put the Roman Catholics outside, you must leave outside also those Church schools which are very little different from them, and which have been paid for out of Church money.'

As an example of such schools, Runciman quoted the case of the clergyman in Kennington, Canon Brooks, who had spent £38,000 in building schools in that area during the previous five years. He described this as 'an example of the Anglican spirit in education, a spirit which cannot be ignored.' (2)

THE END OF THE 1908 EDUCATION BILL.

As outlined above (3) after the meeting between the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Southwark and Runciman and Schuster on 23rd. October, the differences between the two sides were still considerable. When the Archbishop wrote to Asquith on 29th. October, his letter made it clear that there were to be no further concessions on the part of the Anglicans. (4) He told the Prime Minister he was 'putting on record the conditions on which

(2) Ibid.
(3) See pp. 311 - 312 supra.
our co-operation might be given in effecting a settlement.... The sacrifice which is asked on the part of the Church is immense...To make it can only be justifiable if we believe that it will result in a real settlement of the religious controversy.'(1)

The Archbishop then set out seven conditions which he considered to be essential for a settlement. Briefly, they were:

1. So far as possible, there should be a non-denominational school under the public authority, within the reach of every child in the country.

2. To secure this, where necessary, denominational schools in single-school areas should be transferred to the Local Authority.

3. Wherever parents wish, non-denominational instruction should be given in all schools at public cost.

4. 'Full and effective opportunity' should be afforded in all schools, in school hours, for denominational instruction, where so requested by the parents. Such instruction is not to be paid for out of public funds.

5. Teachers, including head-teachers, to be allowed to volunteer to give religious instruction, subject always to such reasonable conditions necessary for the management of the school.

6. Ownership of school premises to remain with the owners or Trustees. Rent to be paid for transferred voluntary schools.

7. Denominational schools in other areas to be maintained 'without placing an impossible strain on voluntary subscribers' or to be maintained at public expense, the buildings being supplied by the denomination.(2)

The Archbishop went on to say that, even if these points were made the basis of a settlement, and many of his fellow-Churchmen felt they were not, the settlement would still be unfair to the Church of England. He quoted the second point, the transfer of the Church of England schools in the single-school areas as an example of this unfairness. On the contracting-out issue, the Archbishop noted that education experts condemned the whole idea, particularly if a large number of schools was involved. But, 'if reasonable fairness is to be shown, the number of denominational schools in areas where parents have freedom of choice must be considerable.' He felt that 'it is not for me to

(2) Ibid.
discuss what the Roman Catholics will consent to after their years of work and sacrifice.' He ended:

'...If a real settlement is to be reached, such Church of England schools as are good and vigorous cannot possibly be left in the position of a sickly and somewhat awkward excrescence, grudgingly tolerated on the outside of our national education system... Preferential treatment of non-denominational teaching is inconsistent with the broad principles of justice and equality.'(1)

In his reply, Asquith pointed out very firmly that the seventh point in the Archbishop's list could not, under any circumstances whatever, be included in a settlement. Although such a point might have been conceded in 1906, 'both Lord Crewe and the then Prime Minister stated that what had been conceded then would never again be conceded by a Liberal Government.'(2)

One Anglican minister, Rev. Russell Wakefield, the rector of St. Mary's Church in Gloucester Place, London, wrote to Morant in the strictest confidence:

'The Archbishop is honestly desirous of a settlement...he has always, unnecessarily, dreaded the power of the Church extremists...One man after another to whom I speak agrees that it is not fair to ask for head-teacher in the single-school areas to give the denominational instruction, because in such schools the head-teacher is the atmosphere...Why cannot the parson in the country village do this work?'(3)

There is no way of knowing if the Prime Minister or Runciman were ever shown this letter, but when Asquith wrote to the Archbishop again, on 10th. November, his offer was:

'If you will give way on one point, we will concede the other...If you will meet us over the head-teacher, we will acquiesce in a statutory right of entry to all council schools....The Government feel...it would be a serious reflection on our national common sense if agreement cannot be reached on these two points.'(4)

But the Archbishop was adamant:

'Those who have entered the teaching profession on the understanding that they would, in denominational schools, be allowed to teach the Faith that they hold, must not now be deprived of a privilege which they so intensely value.'(5)

The Bill was due to come up in the Commons on 25th. November, 1908. Runciman sent a copy of the Bill to the Archbishop on 17th. November, but the Archbishop's letter of thanks contained some ominous comments:

'The places for the figures are left blank.... Until these blanks are filled up, there must be uncertainty in my answer.... The terms for contracting out and the conditions of transfer are also missing....

I have, throughout, and you have, I believe, meant also, that besides the facilities in the council schools, some place must be found in the education system of our country for denominational schools of a particular character...

On the importance of allowing newly-built denominational schools to contract out he stressed:

'It may not be inopportune to remind you that this is a point which acquires special strength for the circumstances of the Roman Catholic population of this country...'

So far as the question of the head-teacher in the single-school area being allowed to give denominational instruction was concerned, the Archbishop was 'prepared to acquiesce in something less than the full requirement we have made in this matter.' He ended his letter by again stressing that the conditions to which he was prepared to agree expressed 'not the claim which the Church of England is reasonably entitled to make, but the sacrifice in which I can recommend my fellow-Churchmen to acquiesce in the interests of religious and educational peace.' (1)

The Prime Minister wrote by return, asking the Archbishop for clarification of his phrase 'something less than the full requirement' in the question of the head-teacher being allowed to give the denominational instruction in the transferred schools in the single-school areas. The Archbishop was unable to reply, as he had suffered a bad fall and injured his leg. But, in a reply dictated to the Bishop of Southwark, he told Asquith that 'if you are able to allow the following points;

1. The power of building new contracting-out schools.
2. The right of the existing head-teacher in a transferred voluntary school to give denominational instruction during the full tenure, however long, of his existing headmastership; and further, to give it for a period of five years from now in

'any transferred voluntary school to which he may be moved.

3. If you will give a clause permitting Local Education Authorities to form Committees of Advice in the way that has been suggested for matters connected with the religious teaching,

'he himself will not press for the right of the future head-teacher to give denominational instruction, although, on this point, he cannot answer for others.'(1)

Runciman replied to the Archbishop's letter. He accepted the three conditions set out in the letter, but with one qualification.

'It must be clearly understood that we could not concur in any arrangement which might lead to the employment of direct or indirect tests on the teachers.... I hope to present the bill, embodying the agreement, when the House meets tomorrow...' (2)

It seems difficult to understand how Runciman could have believed that the Bill had any chance of success when the Catholic representatives had not been consulted. But Asquith announced in the Commons that the McKenna Bill had been withdrawn and a new Bill, based on an agreement with the Archbishop of Canterbury, would be introduced. He described the proposals as:

'the outcome of prolonged communications in various quarters...I have strong grounds for believing that those with whom, on behalf of our Nonconformist friends, we have been conferring, and on the other hand, the Archbishop of Canterbury, are prepared to support the proposals.' (3)

It was at this point that Redmond asked the Prime Minister if any communications of a similar nature had taken place between the Government and the representatives of the two million Catholics in the country. Asquith was able to state that such a meeting had taken place 'as late as yesterday' but he would not say if there had been any agreement with the Catholic authorities. (4)

(Runciman and Archbishop Bourne had met on 18th. November, 1908. See p.317 supra.) A copy of the revised Bill was sent to the Archbishop of Canterbury for his approval. This time, the figures

(4) Ibid.
had been inserted in the blank spaces to which the Archbishop had referred in his letter of 17th November, 1908. (1) The Archbishop immediately wrote to Runciman:

'You scarcely realise how vehement has been the criticism of my action in having abstained from seeing the proposed figures before allowing my assent to the settlement plan to be quoted......I had your assurance that we need not worry about the financial part of it, provided the rest was satisfactorily settled......you saw your way to devising a plan which would be generous, although you could not then tell me what it was......I have been laughed at by more than one friend for my confidence in you......'a Simple Simon negotiating with people who were not Simple Simons.' (2)

In a long telegram to the Archbishop, Runciman assured him that the Government were prepared to accept a sliding-scale to provide for any general rise in the cost of education in the future. He went on, 'Although anxious to do so, (we) have been unable to construct reliable sliding scale for lack of good enough criteria. We will sympathetically consider any feasible suggestion......so that future Parliaments need not re-open the question.' (3) So it was that the Bill came up in the Commons with virtually no agreement between the Government and the supporters of the voluntary schools.

In introducing the Bill, Runciman declared that the 'culpability of a navigator is not in foundering on rocks which he cannot see, but in going to sea without a chart......I endeavoured to find out where most of these rocks lay.' He found himself 'easily in contact with the Archbishop of Canterbury and, for a short time, with the Archbishop of Westminster......the leading men of both sides are prepared to acquiesce in the agreement.' (4) He then explained that 'there was no possibility of arriving at an agreement with the Trustees of the Roman Catholic schools and with some of the extreme Church of England schools, except by contracting out.' He next tried to convince the House of the generosity of the contracting-out terms offered by the Government, such as through the pooling of the grant and the right to charge fees of up to 30s. per annum. (5)

(1) See p. 323 supra.
(4) This was an amazing statement for Runciman to make when he knew that neither Archbishop had agreed to his proposals.
(5) But Schuster had reminded the Archbishop of Canterbury that the Board would have the right to reduce the Grant if fees of more than 10s. per annum were charged. See p. 312 supra.
'Where advantage is taken of the right to charge fees, an income of 30s. per annum, per child, can be raised, which, together with the grant of £2 10s., will give an income of £4 per child per year.'(1)

T.P. O'Connor rose to put the Catholic point of view. He could not help asserting that 'if the Noble Lord on the front Opposition bench and his friends could have induced themselves to support the Bill of the Chief Secretary (2), they would not now be face to face with an inferior settlement.' Nevertheless, O'Connor condemned the whole idea of contracting out. It was 'diametrically opposed to our fundamental proposition that every child of the State has a claim to the provision by the State of equal opportunity for secular education.'(3)

When 'the Noble Lord' (Lord Edmund Talbot) spoke, he also attacked the contracting-out idea. Describing the 'treatment we get from the Party of freedom, of equality and toleration,' he suggested that the low grants which would put them outside the national system of education also meant lower standards. Then, when the standards had fallen below those of the other schools in the country, the contracted-out schools would be deprived of their grants. Lord Edmund gave some figures on contracting out as they would affect a Catholic school in Clerkenwell. With an average attendance of 787 scholars, the school would receive £1,869 in grant under the terms of the Bill. The cost of maintenance was £495 per annum and teachers' salaries amounted to £2,407. Thus, that one school would have to find an annual balance of £1,033. Runciman interrupted to say that the figures were not accurate because the sliding scale he was introducing would favour small schools, and he anticipated that the non-Catholic children would leave the Catholic schools when they contracted out. But Lord Edmund pointed out that as there were exactly five non-Catholic children in the school at Clerkenwell, the sliding-scale would not make a great deal of difference. The Catholic estimate was that £35,000 would have to be found annually by the Catholics in London to meet the cost of contracting out. He challenged Runciman to prove his figures were inaccurate. The Catholics did not know

(2) Ibid. c.460. Birrell was now Chief Secretary for Ireland.
(3) Ibid. c.463.
(4) Ibid. c.496.
(5) Ibid. c.497.
how many non-Catholic children would be leaving their schools, and Runciman did not know either.

'Taking the country as a whole, I understand that the Catholic body as a whole will have to find no less than about £214,500...And let me tell the House that in London alone, since the 1902 Act, in order to comply with its legitimate demands, we have had to spend no less than £200,000...Now we are to be fined by an annual sum of £35,000...'

As for the 'concession' of pooling the grant to help the poorer schools, since 'our schools are practically all on the same level of poverty, it is quite useless to think that pooling will be of any advantage whatever.' (1) The Bill had been condemned not only by the Catholics. The teachers' associations had condemned it; the education Committee of the London County Council had condemned it; throughout the country, County Councils had condemned it. (2)

When Lord Edmund sat down, Runciman returned to the defence of the Bill. He reminded the House:

'Teacherships cannot be treated as a preserve for any one Church...Catholics wish to have preserved 5,000 teacherships to members of the Roman Catholic Church. That is a very large piece of private patronage...so long as they retained it, they could not have the same terms as given to those who were prepared to allow their teacherships to be filled by men of all denominations' (3)

Runciman described the figures which the Catholic authorities were putting forward as the cost of contracting out as 'most grotesque exaggerations.' He considered it absurd to quote a sum of £5 18s. as the cost of educating a child in a Catholic school in London when this sum included loan charges and sinking-fund charges. Only that morning, Runciman went on, they were presented with figures at the Board of Education as to the cost of the Catholic schools. He did not believe the figures were accurate, although the Government were trying to find out what the true figures were. If the Roman Catholics could prove their case that they would have to find £300,000 per year to keep their schools in existence, the Government would be prepared to reconsider the financial provisions. But he was certain that the figure was

(2) Ibid. c. 498.
(3) Ibid. c. 1163.
'vastly exaggerated.' (1)

Two days later, John Redmond took up the question of the amounts of money which Runciman had claimed that the Catholics were putting forward as the cost of contracting out. Redmond's figures showed that the cost to the Catholic community would be about £120,000 per annum, assuming the grant was 50s. per child. No responsible person had ever stated that the cost to the Catholic community would be £300,000, as Runciman had claimed. He challenged Runciman to name the person who said the cost would be £300,000. (2) Runciman denied that he had said the figure was given by a Member of the House. It had been given by a dignitary of the Roman Catholic church. Later on, on the evening of the same day, Runciman explained that 'I was quoting from a paper which I believe is a Catholic paper, called The Tablet........ I quoted it as an example of the sort of exaggeration which many Members attempt in this House... '(3)

Next morning, 3rd. December, the sub-editor of The Tablet, J.B. Milburn, sent a messenger to the office of the Board of Education asking 'if you could kindly furnish, by bearer, the reference to our columns for this statement.' (4) Morant's reply was guarded. He had been 'endeavouring to trace the history of the statement.' He then quoted from The Tablet of 28th. November, 1908, in which the figure of £300,000 was given as the cost to the Catholic community of the contracting out proposals. In a handwritten postscript, Morant wrote

'The reference to a dignitary of the Church was obviously a slip of memory. Monsignor Brown will remember that Mr. Runciman especially drew the attention of his deputation to these extraordinary exaggerated figures in The Tablet.' (5)

On the same day, 3rd. December, the editor of The Tablet, Mr. Snead-Cox, sent the cutting from The Times in which The Tablet was quoted, to Runciman, with a request that he 'be so kind as

(2) Ibid. 2nd. December, 1908. c. 1551.
(3) Ibid. c.1568.
(5) Ibid. See Appendix 10 , p.414, 'Different Versions of the Cost of Maintenance in the Catholic Elementary schools.'
to furnish me with a reference to the passage.' Runciman's reply was, 'A letter has already been sent to your office in reply to your emissary of this morning.'(1)

Opposition to the Bill was very strong among the Anglican parish clergy, who, like their Catholic counterparts, would have had to face up to the financial implications of accepting the proposals.(2) The School Guardian, the mouthpiece of the National Society, said that to accept the Bill would be 'a colossal surrender.'(3) A group of Anglican laymen, led by Athelstan Riley, petitioned the Archbishop of Canterbury to call a special meeting of the Church of England Representative Church Council to consider the Bill. When the Council met on 3rd. December, 1908, the members heard a plea from the Archbishop to take the opportunity 'to secure, by law, the right to give denominational teaching in every elementary school in the country.'(4) The plea was to no avail. Although the Bishops were in favour of accepting, by 18 votes to 3, the clergy were against by 73 votes to 35, and the laity against by 113 votes to 46.(5)

The Government, too, must have been in difficulties. Writing some 40 years after the event, Monsignor Brown recalled:

'(Morant) became rather difficult and impatient ... There were several sharp passages between us when I was able to produce some figures which upset his estimates...He was guilty of sharp practice when Mr. Runciman's Bill was before the House. There had been a meeting at which I challenged some of his figures, and he had promised to take my proofs to the Minister in time for the Debate...I arrive punctually and got a Member to take a message to Sir Robert that I was there, but no-one came out to see me...'(6)


(2) Contrary to popular belief, all Anglican livings were not very lucrative. In 1900, there were 6,000 benefices of under £200 p.a. which would leave very little to spend on the parish school. Anglican candidates for ordination numbered 1,428 in 1894, but had fallen to 1,276 by 1898. 814 persons were admitted to the Diaconate in 1886. By 1898, the number had fallen to 658. (Source: Deane, Rev. Anthony: 'The Falling-off in the Quantity of the Clergy' The Nineteenth Century, xlc, pp. 1023 et seq.)


(4) Ibid.

(5) Ibid.

On the afternoon of Friday, 4th. December, 1908, Mr. Asquith gave notice that he would move the withdrawal of the Bill on the following Monday. (1) The Tablet commented:

'We have no wish to dance on its coffin...it is enough to know that the thing is dead,...Mr. Asquith had never a single word to say in reference to the Catholic schools... He negotiated with the Anglicans and with the chiefs of dissent...with anybody except the Archbishop of Westminster' (2)

But the writer of the article in The Tablet must have known of the Archbishop's attitude towards both Runciman and the Prime Minister when they tried to persuade him to take part in the negotiations. Monsignor Brown, in his analysis of the failure of the Bill attributed it to the false assumption that almost all the voluntary schools would become council schools, leaving only a small residue of schools to contract-out. 'To leave such a vital point as this unsettled ...was to court failure at the most trying moment.' (3)

On the day the Bill was withdrawn, Archbishop Bourne praised the Archbishop of Canterbury for refusing to be a party to any settlement 'in which the special circumstances of the Catholics were left out of account.' He laid the blame for the failure of the Bill on the Government:

'There had been nothing in the way of negotiations between the Government and the Catholic Church on the matter....the negotiations were between the Government and the Anglicans...' (4)

But, of course, Archbishop Bourne had been invited to join in the negotiations and had refused the invitation. (5) If the contracting-out grant had been attractive enough, and a majority of the voluntary schools had contracted out, the country would have had to accept two quite separate systems of education. So far as the Nonconformists were concerned, this cure was worse than the disease. Even Dr. John Clifford seemed to be resigned to the inevitable. If the Bill meant that the nation's schools were to be separated into council schools and contracted-out schools, 'the Government had better fling the Bill to the winds, and allow the people to go on suffering the injustice of the legislation of 1902.' (6)

(1) Parliamentary Debates, 4th. December, 1908. c. 1766.
(3) Ibid. p. 938.
(4) Ibid. p. 951.
(5) See p. 315 supra.
1908 also saw the retirement of Lord Ripon, the Liberal Cabinet Minister, who, since his conversion to the Catholic Church in 1874, had played a prominent and often controversial part in attempts to settle the education problem. The circumstances of Ripon's retirement are all the more poignant because, at the end, he was compelled to choose between his duty towards his Party and his duty towards his Church.

It will be remembered that in September, 1908, a Eucharistic Congress had been held in London. (1) It was Archbishop Bourne's original intention to close the Congress with a great procession of witness, in which the Blessed Sacrament was to have been carried through some of the streets around the new Westminster Cathedral. Asquith, presumably under pressure from Protestant extremists, decided that the procession should not take place. He was on holiday in Scotland at the time, and sent a telegram to Ripon urging him to use his influence 'to secure the abandonment of the proposed procession, which is contrary to the letter of the law and provocative to Protestant sentiment.'

Ripon refused to act in the matter unless he was allowed to show Archbishop Bourne the Prime Minister's telegram. When Asquith agreed, Ripon sent the telegram to the Archbishop and, in an accompanying letter, advised him that, 'on the grounds of public duty' he should defer 'to such an expression of opinion from the Head of the King's Government.' (3) As stated above, the Archbishop altered the arrangements for the procession, but in such a way as to avoid any hint of conflict with the Government. Ripon must have felt the insult to his Church and to himself very much. A committee of Catholics had received the permission of the police to hold the procession, and there seemed little likelihood of any threat to public order. Indeed, with thousands of Catholics arriving in London on the Sunday morning for the procession, banning the procession would have posed a much greater threat. Ripon, who held the post of Lord Privy Seal in the Cabinet, wrote to Asquith, saying he had no choice 'but to lay before the King his resignation as Lord Privy Seal,' because he 'could not support or defend the course taken by the Government with regard to the procession.'

(1) See p. 314 supra.
(3) Ibid.
(4) P.314 supra.
CONCLUSION.

The political impasse on the schools question reached its climax in the long debate on the 1906 Bill. It has to be said that the votes of the Irish Members could not have influenced the progress of the Bill one way or the other. It was only on the vote to reject the Lords' Amendments to the Bill, Amendments to which the Catholic Peers had not agreed, that the Irish Members voted with the Government. The Parliament Act had not yet been drafted, and this vote decided the fate of the Bill. Redmond, knowing that there was no possibility of the Bill becoming law, felt confident in asserting that, if the Bill had gone through, it would have provided a working solution to the problems of the Catholic schools. It was this assertion, which Redmond claimed was backed by the Catholic Hierarchy, which brought about the bitter exchanges between the Archbishop of Westminster and the Duke of Norfolk.

So far as the Anglicans were concerned, there was a more sinister side to the 1906 proposals. They sought to differentiate between the Anglican schools and the Catholic schools by introducing the politically-acceptable excuse of following the wishes of a majority of three-quarters of the parents in the matter of the denominational instruction to be given in a school. The Anglicans saw through the proposal, and resented it deeply. When it became clear that the wishes of the parents might go too far, and insist on religious tests for the teachers in their schools, the Liberals were forced to decide against the idea.

1908 saw the final attempt made by the Liberals to revise the 1902 settlement. By then Liberal attitudes had hardened and they seemed desperate for a settlement acceptable to their supporters. The 'contracting-out' proposals had all the appearances of an ultimatum, a once-and-for-all settlement. Anglicans and Catholics were again united in adversity. The Archbishop of Canterbury was upset at the Government's ambiguous statement over the exact amount of the grant payable to the contracted-out schools. The Archbishop of Westminster was still angry at the Government's banning of the Catholic procession in London in September, 1908. Indeed, it seems difficult to understand why the Government went ahead with the amended Runciman Bill in November, 1908. Agreement had not been reached with either Anglican or Catholic Archbishops. The Liberal Peer, Lord Ripon, a veteran of all of the Gladstone administrations, had resigned over the banning of
the procession in September. In the country as a whole, there must have been a great deal of anxiety when it became obvious that the national education system was again to be disorganised, although the 1902 settlement was working well. Two entirely separate systems for Council schools and voluntary schools which had nothing to do with education efficiency, did not commend the Liberal plan to the majority in the land.

Although most Catholics were against the contracting-out idea, there were many who did not oppose the principle, so long as the financial arrangements were generous enough. There were Nonconformists who feared the rise of a number of superior schools among those contracted-out. They felt it would be wiser to go on enduring the 'injustice' of the 1902 settlement rather than to have the two systems. So it was, that after three years of intensive effort, backed by a large majority in Parliament, the Liberal Party had failed utterly to impose its will on the nation's education system.
SECTION 5.

THE FINAL PHASE - THE SINGLE-SCHOOL AREA GRIEVANCE.
THE FINAL PHASE—THE SINGLE-SCHOOL AREA GRIEVANCE.

In December, 1909, a year after the withdrawal of the Runciman Bill, an 'Educational Settlement Committee' presented a petition to the Cabinet. The 738 signatories included fourteen Anglican Bishops and four Earls. The petition stressed the desire of the signatories that 'religion and moral training should be retained as an essential part of school life.'(1) Indeed, with the 1902 settlement working so well, there seemed to be no sound reason for throwing the system into the melting pot again. When the General Election was pending in 1910, Archbishop Bourne wrote to his Bishops suggesting that the Catholic community need take no corporate action on the question of the schools. One Bishop, Joseph Cowgill of Leeds Diocese, disagreed. He expressed his personal opinion that 'we should fight the enemy as vigorously as ever.'(2) Although Asquith's Liberal Government remained in power, the votes of 120 Irish Nationalists and Labour Party Members were necessary to preserve a majority in the House of Commons.

In March, 1912, the Liberal Member, Thomas Harvey, introduced a Private Member's Bill dealing with schools in areas where no council schools existed. The Bill proposed that, in such areas, and in return for the right to enter all council schools to give denominational instruction, the voluntary schools should be transferred to the Local Authority on terms mutually agreed. Mr. W.R. Barker, the Senior Examiner at the Board of Education, was not too impressed with the Bill. He considered it 'so obscurely expressed that on almost every important point there is a doubt as to what is actually intended.'(3) Not surprisingly, nothing further was heard of the Bill.

When Walter Runciman was replaced by J.A. Pease as the President of the Board of Education in January, 1912, he was not sorry to go. He told a Liberal gathering at Newcastle upon Tyne that 'having regard to the composition of the House of Commons, no extreme view on education can be rammed down its throat.'(4) The Nonconformist Radicals were not sorry to see Runciman go, either, considering that 'the less he says on the future of education matters, the better.'(5) Even so, the Yorkshire Post referred to 'strenuous efforts being made to persuade the Government to undertake an Education Bill.'

(1) P.R.O. File Ed.24/124, Document 104.
(3) P.R.O. File Ed.24/624, 'Mr. Harvey's Bill,' 8th. July, 1912.
... 'a short measure dealing with denominational schools in single-school districts.... it might be possible to obtain the support of the Irish Nationalist Members... Mr. Redmond was reported to have expressed his sympathy and that of his colleagues with Non-conformists in single-school rural areas...' (1)

Dr. John Clifford also wrote to Mr. Pease asking if 'I could have a line from you on our prospects... Our friends feel that they cannot work enthusiastically for Home Rule in Ireland unless they can be free from Home rule in England.' (2) Pease thanked Clifford for his letter and assured him that he would do his best, as his views on the Nonconformists' grievances had not changed. Hay Morgan, a Liberal Member, also asked Pease to receive a deputation of Nonconformist members 'to lay before you the desires and aspirations of this Committee in matters educational.' (3) A copy of the Committee's resolution was also sent to the Prime Minister with an accompanying letter revealing their fears that 'once the Irish Members are sure of Home Rule, they will feel free to vote against or abstain from voting on a measure removing nonconformist grievances.... If a measure dealing with the single-school areas were run side by side with the Home Rule Bill, it would keep the Government forces together until both measures became law... A solution of the whole question is asked for only that the Government may be in a strong position in getting...

(1) The Yorkshire Post, 25th. January, 1912. Quoted in The Tablet 3rd. February, 1912, p.174. The article suggested that the Irishmen would support such a Bill because only about thirty Catholic schools would be affected. Both Dillon (P.D. 30th. July, 1902, c.145) and Redmond (P.D. 10th. May, 1906, c.1509) appeared to be sympathetic to such a measure.

(2) P.R.O. File ed.24/624, Clifford to Pease, 24th. October, 1911. In his letter, Clifford insisted 'it was the Irish vote which carried the mill of 1902,' although, in fact, the Irishmen had not voted.

(3) P.R.O. File ed.24/624, Hay-Morgan to Pease, 14th. November, 1911. The committee were convinced that the Government were considering 'the possibility that the education question might be relegated to some future date which would make it impossible to get a bill through the House before the next General Election.'
the Irish Party to support a Bill dealing with the Single-School areas.(1) Pease, accompanied by Mr. Trevelyan and Sir Godfrey Baring received the deputation on 21st. November, 1911. Pease assured the deputation that he would 'do his very best to induce his colleagues to introduce a measure in the 1913 Session,'... but there is little advantage in introducing a Bill only to be criticised if it is not passed into law.'(2)

But there was expectation in the country that a new education bill would be introduced, and that it would again attempt to restrict the advantages which the voluntary schools had gained in 1902. The annual conference of the National Federation of the Catholic Teachers' Associations in January, 1912, expressed its 'unalterable conviction' that the only way to secure educational peace and progress was 'by a full and frank recognition of the denominational principle....If undenominational teaching was recognised, denominational teaching must also be recognised.'(3) But the King's Speech at the opening of Parliament on 14th. Feb. 1912 made no mention of any education legislation, and the supporters of voluntary schools breathed easily again. Pease was aware that there had been a rapid falling-off in the rate of expansion in Catholic elementary education.(4) A 'wait and see' attitude may have been adopted on any large issue, so long as there was a measure introduced to regulate the position in the single-school areas. But the problem was that this attitude would not placate the more militant Nonconformists. The Prime Minister's letter to Rev. F.B. Meyer, which was read at a meeting of the National Free Church Council at Cheltenham on 5th. March, 1912, assured him that it was the intention of the Government 'to proceed next Session with an Education Bill which I trust may prove satisfactory to you.'(5) The Meeting accepted Asquith's excuse that the delay was caused by 'the necessity of passing the Parliament Act and other urgent

(2) Ibid. Memorandum of an interview with Nonconformist Members of Parliament, 21st. November, 1911. See also Appendix 12, p.421.
(4) In the nine years from 1902 - 1911, 20 new Catholic elementary schools had been opened and average attendances had increased by 26,611. For the previous nine years, 1893 - 1902, the figures had been 91 new schools and an increase in average attendance of 52,680. (Source: Cd.6002 quoted in The Tablet, 23rd. December, 1911 and Cd. 7776, Annual Report of the Committee of Council, 1894 - 95, pp. 776 - 7.)
legislative and social reforms.' But Dr. Clifford felt compelled to 'express the deep concern that an Education Bill had not been introduced during the present session of Parliament.' He asked for 'a definite assurance that an Education Bill on civic and undenominational lines shall be the first measure introduced in the session of 1913.'(1)

The letter which the Prime Minister wrote to Mr. Meyer was to crop up again towards the end of the year. In October, Pease wrote to Dr. Clifford complaining about a poster which was being printed in Tunbridge Wells and in which the Prime Minister's letter was quoted. At the bottom of the poster appeared the words, 'Wake up, Nonconformists! Don't let the priests and the Irish Nationalists fool you again.' In his letter to Clifford, Pease wrote, 'I am most anxious that we should introduce a measure next session which will be supported by the Irish Nationalists, otherwise, there is little prospect of the measure becoming law.... This is not the moment to raise the Catholic opposition.'(2) In his reply, Clifford wrote, 'This is the first I have heard of this poster.... I expect it is being circulated by those who oppose Home Rule on the alleged ground that it is Rome Rule.'(3)

THE CROYDON MARKS BILL, 1912.

Although the Bill was a Private Member's Bill,(4) the Board of Education took a great deal of interest in it. Introduced in February, 1912, it obviously owed much to the 1908 Runciman Bill. Clause I stated, 'The only school in the Single-School Area shall be the one provided by the Local Education Authority.' The Bill proposed that where the only school in an area was a voluntary school, the Local Authority would have the power to take over the school and it would become a 'Council' or 'provided' school. Compensation for the schools taken over would be paid at different rates, according to the type of agreement which the managers or trustees preferred.

(2) P.R.O. File Ed.24/624. Pease to Clifford, 7th. October, 1912.
(3) Ibid. Clifford to Pease, 7th. October, 1912.
(4) The official title was 'Education Act (Single-School Areas) Amendment Act, 1912.
Croydon Marks did not know that the Board of Education had looked very carefully at the possibility of introducing an Education Bill which would have removed this particular grievance of the Non-conformist Members. But two Memoranda prepared by Robert Morant (1) had made it clear that there was very little that could be done in the matter. Nevertheless, when the Bill appeared, the Board went to the trouble of costing the proposals. (2) But again, the vagueness of the Bill made any accurate costing impossible. Mr. W.R. Barker, the Board's Senior Examiner, later Assistant Secretary, prepared a Memorandum for Pease on the implications of the Bill. (3) He wrote, 'The Bill assumes that in every Parish, non-autonomous Borough or Urban District, every child who wants a place in a council school must have one... It is possible, therefore, that every voluntary school in the whole of the country areas is affected, that is to say, the Bill potentially affects some 10,000 voluntary schools with an average attendance of 1,100,000.... The Bill cannot possibly be made into a working measure unless its scope is restricted to rural parishes where there is no council school and only one voluntary school.' Barker then went on to say that any attempt to introduce parents' wishes into the Bill would make the task of licking the Bill into shape 'a very long and difficult one.' He concluded, 'It may be noted that the Bill as at present drawn, would involve the transfer or closure not only of 24 Roman Catholic schools in rural parishes which have only one school, but also of 144 Roman Catholic schools in areas which have more than one voluntary school but no council school.... If the scope of the Bill is restricted to rural parishes in which there is literally only one voluntary school, it would affect 5,704 schools, including 24 Roman Catholic schools, having an average attendance of 428,947.'

Mr. Selby-Bigge dismissed the Bill as 'obviously nonsense' in his Memorandum to the President. (4) 'The Bill is a futility for it does not cure the grievance it sets out to cure...

(1) The Memoranda are summarised in Appendix 12, p. 421.
(2) P.R.O. File Ed. 24/617. See Table 19, p. 340.
(3) Ibid. 'Memorandum to the President of the Board on Sir Croydon Marks's Education Bill.'
(4) Ibid. dated 26th. February, 1912.
because it does a great deal more than is necessary to cure the grievance. ... The fact that it involves the transfer of some 26 (sic) Roman Catholic schools is, perhaps, sufficient to damn it politically. The fact that it proposes that the State should compulsorily acquire and use private property for the purposes of Council Schools .... offends all sorts of principles and characterises the Bill as predatory. Selby-Bigge expressed the opinion that the Bill 'makes almost as many grievances as it removes.' He believed that the question of the single-school areas was a parents' grievance, and quite different 'from the grievance which gave rise to passive resistance, namely, the use of public money in support of denominational instruction. ... The phrase 'choice of schools' is dangerous, and cuts both ways .... it suggests an equal grievance where nothing but Council Schools are available for Roman Catholic and Anglican parents.' (1)

On 23rd. February, 1912, Pease wrote to Croydon Marks. His letter left no doubt about the Board's view. 'Dont print your Bill as drafted. Clause I suggests giving the power to denominational school-owners to contract-out, to become grant-aided but not rate-aided ... It suggests that schools are maintained by Minor Education Authorities. (2) There are no such Authorities which maintain schools ... There are several other drafting points ... I do not propose to become responsible for the drafting of your Bill, but simply to put you on your guard against inserting unworkable clauses.' (3)

But Croydon Marks was not to be put off. On 27th. February, 1912, he sent a revised draft of his Bill to Pease. 'I enclose another draft of the Bill .... It is not for your approval, but for your kindly suggestions and criticism.' (4) But it appears that by now the Board had decided that the Bill was unworkable. Presumably at the request of Pease, Barker had prepared a list of urban single-school areas, i.e. of boroughs with populations of less than 10,000, and urban districts with populations of less than 20,000, in which there was only one school, and that a non-provided school.

(1) P.R.O. File Ed.24/617, Selby-Bigge to Pease, 26th. February, 1912.
(2) 'Part III' Authorities were responsible for elementary education in boroughs with a population of over 10,000, and urban districts with a population of over 20,000. Otherwise, 'Part II' authorities were responsible for the schools.
(3) P.R.O. File Ed.24/617, Pease to Marks, 23rd. February, 1912.
(4) Ibid. Marks to Pease, 27th. February, 1912.
TABLE 19.

ESTIMATED COST OF IMPLEMENTING THE CROYDON-MARKS PROPOSALS.

SOURCE: P.R.O. File Ed.24/617, February, 1912.

ALTERNATIVE A.

'This statement shows the cost per annum if the Bill applies to Rural Parishes with only one voluntary school and no council school.'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transfer Type</th>
<th>Cost per Annum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absolute Transfer</td>
<td>£64,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional Transfer</td>
<td>£16,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited Transfer</td>
<td>£32,171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this case, the Bill would apply to 5,704 voluntary schools with an average attendance of 428,947.

ALTERNATIVE B.

'This statement shows the cost per annum if the Bill applies to areas where there are one or more voluntary schools but no council schools.'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transfer Type</th>
<th>Cost per Annum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Absolute Transfer</td>
<td>£104,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional Transfer</td>
<td>£26,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited Transfer</td>
<td>£52,084</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this case, the Bill would apply to 7,808 voluntary schools with an average attendance of 694,459.

If the rates were raised to 5s., 1s. 6d., and 3s. as proposed by Mr. Runciman in the last stages of his Bill, the costs would be increased to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative A.</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£107,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£32,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£64,342</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative B.</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£173,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£52,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£104,169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There were 74 such areas named on the list. There were also 43 areas in which the only school was a council school. (1) Thus, even in its most restricted form, the bill was likely to call for considerable expenditure. (See Table 19, p. 340)

The Board had already noted that the Anglicans might not welcome a wholesale takeover of their schools in the single-school areas. In Lichfield, where there were no council schools, but there were six Church of England schools and one Catholic school, 'school accommodation is very unsatisfactory.' (2) But when, in 1908, the Local Authority gave notice that a new council school was to be provided, 'strong protests against the proposal were raised by the supporters of the Church of England schools.' The Board had concluded that 'it must be obvious to any impartial person that Lichfield is a place where there ought to be a choice of school...If the representatives of the Church of England in Lichfield had been in earnest that the Nonconformist grievances should be removed, they would not have opposed the building of a council school, but would rather have welcomed and warmly supported it.' (3)

The Croydon Marks Bill was due to have its Second Reading on Friday, 8th. March, 1912. Apparently, (4) on the previous day, Cardinal Bourne had met Talbot Baines, the Secretary of the National Society. In a letter to the Cardinal, dated 7th. March, 1912, he wrote of the Bill:

'In the conversation with Your Eminence this morning, it was assumed that the Nationalist Roman Catholic Members of Parliament would probably be correct in holding that Sir George Mark's Bill would only affect a small number of Roman Catholic schools, and those in rural districts in which no Irish children would be likely to be affected.....I think it by no means fanciful to suggest that if the Nationalist Roman Catholic Members think that the children in whom they are especially interested are safe under the sweep of the Croydon Marks Bill, under, for example, such an Authority as the West Riding, from which Roman Catholics have often suffered, they are dwelling in a fool's paradise.' (5)

There were widely-differing estimates among the Catholics as to the

(1) P.R.O. File Ed.24/617. 'List of Urban Single-School Areas.'
(2) Ibid. 'The Single-School Area Grievance- Lichfield.'
(3) Ibid.
(4) There is no record of the meeting in the Westminster Archives. Archbishop Bourne had been named Cardinal in 1911.
actual number of their schools which would be affected by the Bill. Monsignor Brown listed the names of 26 Catholic schools which he believed would be taken over if the Bill became law. (1) The secretary of the Catholic education Council was not quite so sure of the number likely to be affected. He wrote to Mr. Fass at the board of Education:

'Could I be informed, unofficially, for the Catholic Education Council, what is the number of Roman Catholic schools which the Board consider will be affected by the Single-School Areas bill which was read a second time last Friday? .... I cannot make the meaning of the interpretative clause clear to myself... One reading thereof would bring over 500 Catholic schools within the Section, although I admit the authors of the Bill do not intend this result... '(2)

In his reply, Fass tried to reassure Anderton, the secretary of the Catholic Education Council:

'The answer to your letter of yesterday is that there are 24 Roman Catholic schools in areas where there is only one school and that a non-provided school... There appear to be 138 areas where there are more than one non-provided school but no provided school. The total number of Roman Catholic schools in such areas we make to be 145... It is somewhat difficult to discover from the Bill precisely what is to be the fate of the non-provided schools where there are more than one non-provided school but no provided school... I should be interested to know how you could bring the figure up to 500.' (3)

Anderton's reply was:

'As the Bill is drafted, any area in which a single child, on lst. January, 1912, could not find accommodation suitable to its age and sex in a Provided School is a single-school area... The result is probably not what is intended, but the Bill would allow it.... The total number of Catholic schools in such areas is 524, i.e. 91 in Metropolitan Boroughs and 433 in County Areas of England and Wales.' (4)

So, once again, Catholic feeling throughout the country was roused by what seemed a totally unnecessary attack on the schools. The Preston School Managers' Association found the Bill 'objectionable' because 'it seeks to deprive our children, in certain districts very vaguely defined, of the distinctive education we have provided

(2) P.R.O. File Ed.24/617, Anderton to Fass, 11th. March, 1912.
(3) Ibid. Fass to Anderton, 12th. March, 1912.
(4) Ibid. Anderton to Fass, undated.
for them' (1) A resolution from the Leeds Diocesan School
Managers' Association claimed that the provisions of the Bill
were 'fundamentally unjust, inasmuch as they would destroy the
Catholic character of over 160 schools and would endanger an indef-
finite number more.'(2) The resolution which the Westminster Catholic
Federation sent to Pease called the provisions of the Bill 'fundament-
ally unjust' and claimed that they would put the Cowper-Temple type
of instruction 'in a privileged position.'(3) The Paddington Catholic
Federation also called the Bill 'fundamentally unjust,' claiming
that it would either starve out the Catholic schools in the areas,'or transform them into schools in which Catholic teachers will be
prohibited from giving Catholic religious instruction.'(4) The
Executive Committee of the Catholic Education Council, meeting at
Archbishop's House, passed a resolution condemning the Bill which would
'destroy the Catholic character of over 160 schools.'(5)

THE CROYDON MARKS BILL IN PARLIAMENT.

The Bill came up for Second Reading on 8th. March, 1912.
The leader of the Irish Nationalists, John Dillon, assured the
House of his Party's support for the Bill. If the country was
going to carry on 'the cause of denominational education with
disability and persecution against the Nonconformists, the cause
of denominational education is finished' (6) Dillon was immediately
challenged by the two Cecil brothers, whose father, Lord Salisbury,
had championed the cause of the denominational schools in the last
decade of the 19th century. Lord Hugh Cecil asked Dillon if he was
speaking on behalf of the Catholics of England. When Dillon insisted
that he was so speaking, Lord Robert Cecil shouted, 'No.' But Dillon
persisted that he spoke for 'nine-tenths or even nineteen twentieths
of the Catholics of England.' Lord Hugh Cecil laughed at Dillon's
claim to have always been a champion of denominational education.

'I do not remember the Hon. Member except as a
false friend of religious education...he stands
up to betray our cause...The truth is, of course,
that the Hon. Member is, as he is quite entitled
to be, an Irish Nationalist and a Radical first,
caring a great deal more about the cause of Nation-
alism and Radicalism than he does about the cause of

(1) P.R.O. File Ed.24/617. Canning to Pease, 2nd. April, 1912.
(2) Leeds Diocesan Association to Pease, 10th. April, 1912.
(3) Westminster Catholic Federation to Pease, 12th. April, 1912.
(4) Paddington Catholic Federation to Pease, 16th. April, 1912.
'religious education... He is always prepared to sacrifice the interests of the denominational schools to the interests of Home Rule..... If there are any Roman Catholics who believe in him, theirs is a form of belief which leads to over-credulity.'

Lord Hugh ended by saying that Mr. Dillon's enthusiasm for the Bill was very like the 'enthusiasm and loyalty of a dog when it expects its dinner.'(1)

Sir Philip Magnus, who had served on Lord Samuelson's Commission on Technical Education, 1882 - 84, also condemned Dillon's speech.

'I do not believe for one moment that it represents the feelings of the Catholic Party.....I am informed that there are not more than 18 or 19 Roman Catholic schools in the Single-School areas.....The Hon. Member for East Mayo is willing to throw them to the Non-conformists to obtain their assistance in the passing of the Home Rule Bill...I believe that is the worst form of bargaining.'(2)

The Debate made it clear that the Bill was not to be considered on its merits. The Irish Nationalists were prepared to concede the loss of a small number of Catholic schools as an acceptable price to pay for the long-awaited Home Rule Bill. But to the Anglicans, the loss of 5,800 schools, a reasonable estimate of the number of their schools involved, seemed a quite preposterous price to pay to settle an issue which had nothing whatever to do with religious education. Lord Hugh Cecil summed up the position thus:

'The Nonconformists are going to vote for Home Rule to get a satisfactory solution to the education question; the Irish Nationalists are going to vote for whatever Education Bill is brought forward in the hope of getting Home Rule. That is the Radical concept of democratic self-government.'(3)

But, by a majority of 81 votes, the Bill went on to the Committee stage.

The Government now found itself in a very difficult position over the Bill. There was every possibility that the Bill could become law, yet the Government's legal advisers were convinced that the Bill, as it stood, was quite unworkable.

(1) Parliamentary Debates, 8th. March, 1912. c. 747 - 748.
(2) Ibid. c. 767.
(3) Ibid. c. 750.
In Committee, an Amendment proposed by the Liverpool (Scotland) Member, T.P. O'Conor, that the Bill would apply only in areas where there was one school and that a voluntary school, was accepted by Mr. Croydon Marks, as was an Amendment that the area controlled by the London County Council should be excluded from the provisions of the Bill. Sir William Anson, who had taken a prominent part in the debate on the 1902 Bill, refused to vote on the O'Connor Amendment. O'Connor had said that his Amendment would remove all the Catholic schools from the scope of the Bill except for 24. Sir William claimed that this would make the Amendment 'a transaction discreditable to all the parties concerned.' (1)

Mr. Pease, the President of the Board of Education, addressed a Memorandum in the form of a list of questions to the Prime Minister. (2) The fifth question was, 'Am I to narrow the scope of the Bill, limiting it to an area where there is only one school, and that a voluntary school?' Pease went on to explain, 'The Bill as drawn at present ... includes the areas where there is more than one Non-Provided school, but no Provided school.... In this extension about 150 Roman Catholic schools would be included in addition to the 24 Roman Catholic schools in the Single-School Areas proper, and this would be resisted by the Irish Nationalists.' The Prime Minister wrote, 'Yes' in the margin. Pease was clearly worried about the Bill. With the possibility that he would be introducing a Government Education Bill went the danger that any provisions agreed to in the Croydon Marks Bill might be 'taken as determining the lines of a subsequent general settlement of education by a Government Bill next year.' (3)

On 12th. March, 1912, Pease wrote to Croydon Marks and asked him to postpone any further discussion on the Bill until after the Easter Recess:

'I think to postpone the Bill until after Easter would certainly not prejudice the interests of the Bill, but quite the reverse.' (4)

Marks agreed, and so, for the time being, the crisis was averted.

(1) The Tablet, 27th. April, 1912, p. 656.
(2) P.R.O. File Ed. 24/617, Pease to Asquith, 11th. March, 1912.
(3) Ibid.
(4) Ibid. Pease to Croydon Marks, 12th. March, 1912.
Understandably, the Anglican community were very angry at the prospect of the Bill going through with the support of the Irish Nationalists. The Church Times commented on Mr. Dillon's claim that he was speaking on behalf of the Catholics of England:

'We must leave him to settle that point with his fellow-Romanists...Mr. Dillon places his Nationalist principles before his religious principles...His support of Sir George Marks was a flagrant admission of a compact between Nationalists and Radical Dissenters, by virtue of which, votes are assured in favour of Home Rule for Ireland...The whole transaction is perfectly shameless and without disguise.' (1)

Cardinal Bourne also rejected Mr. Dillon's claim. He issued a statement:

'The action of the Nationalist Party in supporting the Second Reading of the Education Acts (Single-School Areas) Amendment Bill was taken in direct opposition to the clearly-expressed opinion of the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, who regards the Bill as full of menace to the interests of religious education....Mr. Dillon had no authority for stating that he spoke on behalf of the Catholics of England.' (2)

Talbot Baines, the secretary of the National Society wrote to the Cardinal thanking him for the copy of the Cardinal's statement, 'in particular, your repudiation of Mr. Dillon's claim to speak on behalf of the English Roman Catholics....I shall be very happy to publish that communication in the School Guardian of this week, which will go to press today.' (3) In publishing the Cardinal's statement, the School Guardian praised the Cardinal for his outspoken repudiation of Mr. Dillon's claim. 'It will be read with cordial satisfaction, not only by the friends of definite religious education, but by all opposed to a particularly unpleasant form of political log-rolling.' (4)

In Ireland, Mr. Dillon's rebuke by the Cardinal was noticed.

'Mr. Dillon is now enrolled in the ranks of the English Radicals...Lord Hugh Cecil's description of him as 'a Radical first of all' has been corroborated by the following official announcement, 'The Radical Foreign Policy Committee met yesterday...among those present were Mr. Dillon, Mr. Ponsonby, &c... Mr. Dillon, who has long been one of the bores of the House of Commons, is qualifying rapidly as one of its funny men.' (5)

(1) Quoted in The Tablet, 23rd. March, 1912, p. 454.
(2) The Tablet, 16th. March, 1912, p.403.
(3) Westminster Archives, Bo.181/V, Baines to Bourne, 14th. March, 1912
(4) Quoted in The Tablet, 23rd. March, 1912, p. 454.
In an article entitled 'The Lie to Mr Dillon,' the same paper comments:

'In his time, Mr. Dillon has tried to play many parts, but when he soared to the giddy heights of the representative of the Catholics of England in the matter of educational policy, he hardly reckoned on being so quickly pulled off the pedestal as has been the case...

Of the Cardinal's disclaimer, the article went on:

'In one sense, the disclaimer was unnecessary as with Mr. Dillon's record on the subject, few would have taken his presumptuous declaration with any degree of seriousness....At the same time, it is as well that those who do represent Catholic opinion in the country should make it clear and beyond doubt, that the impertinence of the Member for South Mayo, above all others, should be officially resented.' (1)

On 17th. March, 1912, Dillon addressed a St. Patrick's Day banquet in Liverpool. He insisted that he spoke the truth when he made his claim to speak for nine-tenths of the Catholics of England.

'I know there is a section of the Catholics of England - I estimate them at one-tenth - who have been distinguished from generation to generation by their hatred of the Irish people and of everything that is Irish. But did I not speak for the nine-tenths of the Catholics of England? Was I not justified in saying that I spoke for the faithful Irish who built up the Church in the country, and but for whom the Catholic church in England would make a sorry show today....It will be a sad day for the Catholics of England, and a sad day for Ireland, when the Catholics of this country lose confidence in the Irish Party.' (2)

The Bill was withdrawn on 25th. April, 1912. There was a great deal of bitterness on both sides. Croydon Marks warned the Government that 'any conciliation in regard to religious education is now impossible....I hope the Government will take notice of what has happened when they introduce their Education Bill next year.' T.P. O'Connor said the Opposition would live to repent their attitude to the Bill. 'The voluntary system is crumbling away through the obstinacy and bigotry of the supporters of the Church schools.' Lord Hugh Cecil taunted the Irishmen. As Catholics, he

reminded them that they hated the Cowper-Temple instruction. In spite of this, they were not ashamed to support the Nonconformists in their efforts to force that same instruction on the Anglicans. He warned them that their tactics would destroy not only the Church of England schools, but eventually the Catholic schools also. (1)

THE PEASE PROPOSALS, 1912 - 1914.

The cost of implementing the comparatively modest Croydon-Marks proposals must have convinced the Government, if they were not already convinced, of the impossibility of any large-scale acquisition of the premises of the voluntary schools. (2) But since agreement on the Bill had proved to be impossible, the question of any large-scale acquisition of the voluntary schools was unlikely to arise. There were signs, too, that the country was tired of the constant bickering of the politicians over the education issue, especially since the 1902 settlement seemed to be working well. At the TradesUnion Conference at Newport, on 4th. September, 1912, a motion was carried on a card vote which eliminated from the agenda of future Conferences, the issue of secular education. (3)

In July, 1912, Sir Thomas Dyke Acland, one of the leaders of the Education Settlement Committee, wrote to the President of the Board of Education, asking for 'a few moments' conversation' with him. Apparently, Sir Thomas was to preside at a meeting of the Settlement Committee, and wanted to have Pease's opinion on some proposals which the Committee were putting forward. Pease agreed, but asked Selby-Bigge to meet Sir Thomas as 'I shall be a few minutes late.' (4) From the discussion, it seemed that the Settlement Committee had become alarmed over the way in which the whole question of national education was becoming a pawn in the bargaining with the Irish Members on the Home Rule issue. Pease asked Sir Thomas to draw the attention of the Committee to the notes which Morant had drawn up concerning the proposals made earlier by the Settlement Committee. (5) It seems clear that the intention was to prove to the Committee that what seemed a simple

(2) P.R.O. File Ed. 24/617, 'The Cost of the Croydon-Marks Bill' (Details in Table 19, p. 340)
(3) The Times, 5th. September, 1912, p. 8. The voting was 952,000 to 909,000.
(4) P.R.O. File, Ed. 24/624. Pease's note to Selby-Bigge explained, 'I want to see the start of the Oxford and Cambridge cricket match.'
(5) P.R.O. File Ed. 24/624. November, 1911. (See Appendix 12, pp. 421 - 422.)
The public meeting to which Dyke Acland had referred took place on 11th July, 1912, at the premises of the Bible Society in London. As well as Acland, A.J. Mundella, Michael Sadler (who was at this time Vice-Chancellor of the University of Leeds), and Thomas Harvey who, earlier in the year had sponsored the Private Member's Bill, were present. Acland spoke of the hopeless nature of the education problem. 'The country clergy are waiting for a change in Government to get something better.' Michael Sadler thought the Anglicans would prefer to see a complete secularization of the schools rather than a 'triumphant undenominationalism.' He believed that the Catholics, too, would agree to this, so long as they were allowed to keep their schools and to build new schools wherever there was a need. All the speakers agreed that there was now no chance for the Government to reach 'a friendly and impartial settlement of the religious difficulty in education.' (1)

Alarmed by the reports of the Education Settlement Committee meeting, a group of Nonconformist Members of Parliament wrote to Pease and asked him to receive a deputation to hear their views on the education question. Pease agreed, and met the deputation on 1st August, 1912. The deputation asked that there should be no concessions whatever given to the voluntary schools. They asked that public money should be given only to those schools which were publicly controlled; that teachers should be appointed without any reference to their religious beliefs; that three-quarters of the cost of building any new council schools required should be found by the Government, and that there should be no right of entry to council schools for the purpose of giving denominational instruction. (2) Pease passed the proposals he had received from the deputation to W.R. Barker, the Board of Education's Chief Examiner, for his comments. His memorandum on the proposals which he sent to Pease listed 23 serious objections. He pointed out that the proposal that every child who wished to attend a council school should be able to do so was simply a demand for the duplication of all the existing voluntary school accommodation. To begin with, it would involve the provision of 54,000 extra council school places in London. Apart entirely from the question of cost, it would be

(1) The Times, 12th July, 1912, p. 4.
(2) P.R.O. File Ed. 24/264. 'Deputation of Nonconformist Members.' It is dated 1st August, 1912.
quite impossible to find sites for the schools in London.

Para. 13 of the Memorandum suggested that many Local Authorities would find it more convenient to pay the fine imposed rather than go to the expense of building a council school. Para. 14 asked what the position would be if the Board of Education tried to exact a fine from a Local Authority for not providing a council school when another Government Department had refused to sanction the compulsory purchase order to obtain the site for the school. Barker's final point was, 'It is easy to find one child who cannot attend a council school, but to find fifty or a hundred, and then to find a site which can be obtained and which all that fifty or one hundred can attend, would be impossible.' (1) It certainly appeared as if there was a serious rift developing between the hard-line Nonconformist Members and the Government on the education question.

Meanwhile, there were other ways in which pressure could be exerted on the voluntary schools. In May, 1913, the Board's Inspectors presented to the London County Council a list of names of the voluntary schools in the Council's area which failed to satisfy the Board's building requirements. The named schools were arranged according to three schedules. The Managers of schools in the first schedule had 'already been notified that recognition will cease on 30th. April, 1915.' There was only one Catholic school in this category, that being St. Peter's at Woolwich. (2) The Managers of St. Peter's had already replied to the Board, explaining that they were endeavouring to provide accommodation 'that will satisfy the Board's requirements and, at the same time, maintain the present number of scholars.' (3) The second schedule listed schools on which 'expenditure would be thrown away,' but there were no Catholic schools in this list. The third schedule listed the names of nine schools in which 'substantial improvements are required as a condition of recognition.' Two of the nine schools were Catholic schools, St. Joseph's at East Greenwich, and St. Philip's at Lewisham. The priest at St. Philip's had written to the Board to say, 'The Managers are prepared to do all in their power to render the school satisfactory.' (4)

(1) P.R.O. File Ed.24/264, 16th. August, 1912. '23 Objections to the proposals.'
(2) P.R.O. File Ed.14/57 dated 13th. May, 1913.
Thus, of the eleven schools mentioned in the Schedules, three were Catholic schools.

In the following year, 1914, the Board again raised the question of the voluntary schools in its area with the London County Council. It was pointed out that in 112 of the 365 voluntary schools in the Council's area, 'the playgrounds are either non-existent or are of insufficient area for the performance of physical exercises by children in classes of 40.' The Board reminded the Council that 'two playgrounds, one for boys, and one for girls and infants, of a convenient shape and of 1,300 square feet in area, may be considered just sufficient.'(1) 28 of the 112 voluntary schools listed were Catholic schools. Clearly, this was a matter of urgency for the parishes concerned. Catholic schools were usually situated in built-up areas, often adjacent to the church, and areas of land for extending playgrounds were simply not available. But they seem to have made the effort. The vicar of All Saints Anglican church, Mile End, wrote to the editor of The Standard, complaining about the expense being forced upon the voluntary schools through the playground regulations. He was of the opinion that 'these requirements appear to apply only to church schools...recently, a new Roman Catholic non-provided school has been sanctioned with only a playground on the roof, which is utterly inadequate.'(2)

There was considerable resentment at the Board's insistence on the playground requirements. The 15 constituent members of the Confederation of metropolitan borough Councils each sent an identical letter to the Board of Education. They argued that 'where additional playground accommodation is necessitated by the requirements of the Board of Education in connection with schools which were considered satisfactory by the London County Council as recently as 1904, the cost of such playgrounds should be met out of state funds.'(3)


(2) P.R.O. File Ed.14/57. Undated.

(3) Apparently there was some difficulty over the legal position of a Local Authority so far as school playgrounds were concerned. The Town Clerk of Liverpool had given a ruling that where a playground existed in a voluntary school, the cost of maintaining it lay with the Managers. However, if no playground existed, the Local Authority had no power to insist that one be provided. (Minutes of the Meeting of the Liverpool Education Committee, 14th. September, 1903.)
In March, 1914, the Board issued another 'Black List' of voluntary schools in the London County Council area. (1) Catholic schools did not fare too well in the list. 29 out of the 124 schools listed were Catholic schools. Four Catholic schools were classed as 'not justifying any considerable expense.' Two other Catholic schools had insufficient playground accommodation. In the case of twelve schools, 'The Board insists on the execution of substantial improvements at an early date as a condition of prolonged recognition.' From the eleven other Catholic schools on the list, 'the Board will expect to receive proposals for remedying defects at an early date.'

The Government appears to have been concerned about the overall condition of the buildings used as elementary schools. In July, 1913, Pease introduced a One-Clause Bill 'to amend the Law with respect to Grants in aid of building, enlarging, improving or fitting-up elementary schools.' (2) He explained that the Bill was merely an introduction to 'a very comprehensive Measure which we hope to introduce in the next session.' The total amount of money involved was about £150,000. Pease assured the House that he was not proposing to give building grants, merely 'a grant in aid of charges incurred for building.' (3) In his speech introducing the Bill, Pease referred to 'our so-called national system of education' and its two defects, viz, it was not national and it was not a system. But he looked forward to the next session when, 'We shall be bound to redress that balance between the Parties, which was, in our judgement, so heavily weighted on one side by the Act of 1902... The grievance felt in the single-school areas cannot wait for indefinite settlement... we propose to deal with it in our measure next year.' (4)

These were brave words, intended, no doubt, to reassure the hard-line Nonconformists that the Government intended to live up to its promises on the settlement of the education question. On 17th. December, 1913, a Nonconformist deputation, consisting of Rev. Dr. John Clifford, Rev. F. B. Meyer and Sir John Compton-Rickett, called on the Prime Minister and the President of the Board at 10, Downing Street. (5) There is no record of this meeting in the File at the Public Record Office, but The Times stated that 'the deputation was entirely private. No statement was issued to the Press, beyond the

(2) 'Education (No.2) Bill, 1913,' Introduced 22nd. July, 1913.
(3) Section 96 of the Act of 1870 had abolished building grants.
fact that the meeting was concerned with the educational policy of the Government. But already the National League had protested at the provisions of the One-Clause Bill which, they claimed, gave building grants to the voluntary schools for the first time since 1870.

Meanwhile, Pease showed little enthusiasm for the presentation of his Education Bill. In February, the King's Speech made reference to

'Measures will be presented to give effect to the proposal announced in the last Session for the development of a national system of education.'(1)

A few days later, Mr. Bathurst asked the President of the Board a question about the measures:

'...Whether the Bill providing for the national system of education will be introduced before Easter and whether such Bill will be a purely educational measure or whether it will also deal with matters of religious controversy.'

The President's reply was non-committal:

'I am unable to make any statement as to the date when the Bill will be introduced, or as to its scope. I may refer the Hon. Member to the statement I made on 22nd. July last year in this House(2) and remind him that the King's Speech contained an announcement that the proposals there outlined would be the subject of a Bill this session.'

Mr. Bathurst then asked:

'Is the Right Hon. Gentleman aware that Local Education Authorities throughout the Kingdom are desirous of having a real Education Bill and not a religious squabbles bill.'

But the Speaker intervened to remind Mr Bathurst that this was not a question designed to elicit information but merely an argument.(3)

The draft of the Bill, 'Mr. Hulton's Scheme'(4) was in no sense the 'very comprehensive Measure' which had been promised in July, 1913. It dealt with the problem of the single school areas, 'however such areas are defined.' In such areas, all voluntary schools would either have to close or be transferred to the local council. For such transferred schools,

(1) Parliamentary Debates, 10th. February, 1914. cc.52 - 53.
(2) See p.
(3) Parliamentary Debates, 18th. February, 1914. c.995.
(4) P.R.O. File Ed.24/643 'Mr. Hulton's Scheme.'
the Local Authority would pay 'a substantial, but less than a full rent.' The denomination would be allowed to give denom- inational instruction in the school, 'out of school hours, by persons other than the teachers, at the expense of the denom- ination.' ...'If the Managers refuse reasonable terms of transfer, the school will be closed and the Local Authority will build a new Council School....The State will contribute to the cost by bearing a share of the loan charges involved.' The Scheme then refers to Morant's Memorandum on the Single-School areas. (1)

Clearly, Pease was concerned about the effect the Bill would have on the Catholic schools. According to which definition of a single-school area was adopted, the number of Catholic schools affected by the proposal would vary between 24 and 144. There were also other points which Pease had left open. Would the Local Authorities have to accept all the schools offered to them by the voluntary school authorities? If the State was willing to help to defray the cost of building any new replacement schools which were required, would it be expected to pay a part of the rent of transferred schools? Where a voluntary school built under a Trust Deed was transferred, would the Local Authority be required to pay a rent to the denomination for the use of such a school?

(1) P.R.O. File Ed.24/118. 'The Single-School Area Grievance' revised 1st January, 1906. (See summary, pp. 421 - 422.)
In his Memorandum to the Cabinet on the implications of the Bill, Pease estimated that the cost of the proposals would be some £18,000,000, of which the Government would have to find £13,500,000 and the Local Authorities £4,500,000. He was adamant that the Bill should contain two Clauses, 'Power to appoint and dismiss teachers in a school not provided by a Local Authority in a single-school area .... shall be vested in the Local Authority,' and 'Teachers in those schools shall not be allowed to give any religious instruction except the undenominational religious instruction as defined in the Act.' The only concession he proposed was that, 'Managers of such a school may themselves provide religious instruction of any character in the school .... any religious instruction provided by the Managers shall be provided at their own expense.' (1)

Pease, of course, knew that the Catholics would not accept such a settlement. But there were three aspects of the situation in 1914 which may have persuaded him that it would be possible to get the Bill made law. First, the number of Catholic schools involved was small, probably 24. The remainder of the Catholic elementary schools, over 1000, would continue to enjoy the benefits of the 1902 settlement. The maintenance of the 24 schools affected, by transferring them to Diocesan or even national care, would have been well within the means of the Catholic community. Second, the Irish Home Rule Bill was also before Parliament at the time. The Irish Nationalists were unlikely to upset the Liberal Government by voting against the Education Bill, especially if this meant that the Home Rule Bill was again dropped. (2) Third, the Parliament Act, which had been passed in 1911, meant that the Lords could not throw out the Bill as they had treated the Birrell Bill in 1906.

By June, 1914, Pease had his Bill in some form of readiness. Apparently, no conversations had taken place between the President and any representatives of the Anglican or Catholic communities, although the Bill had certainly been discussed with the Nonconformists. There were three drafts of the Bill. (3) Draft B, marked 'Probably acceptable to the Nonconformists,' named two dates, 1st. January, 1915, and 1st. January, 1916. By the first date, all

(1) P.R.O. File Ed, 24/643. 'Memorandum to the Cabinet on the 1913 Education Bill. (Undated)
(2) Asquith was having doubts about the Home Rule Bill because of the problem of Ulster.
(3) P.R.O. File Ed. 24/624. The full title was 'Education (Single-School Areas) Bill, 1914.'
owners and Trustees of voluntary schools in Single-School Areas would have to inform the Local Authority if they were prepared to hand their schools over to the Authority as Council schools or close them. After the second date, 1st. January, 1916, all schools in the Single-School Areas would be Council schools. If the owners decided to sell, and the Local Authority was prepared to accept the school, the amount of money to be paid would be settled by mutual agreement. But the Authority would then have complete control of the school, even on Saturday and Sunday. If the former owners wished to hire the school on a Saturday or Sunday, they would not be in a more favourable position than any other person wishing to hire the building. (1) The Draft also contained some technical proposals on compulsory purchase of land where new schools would have to be provided, and on building requirements, as it was presumed that some schools would have to be provided quickly. To help with the costs which would be incurred by Local Authorities, it was proposed that a grant of 7s. per scholar in average attendance in the schools which were to be replaced would be paid by the Government for three years.

The Draft marked, 'Less Favourable to the Nonconformist Wishes,' proposed that the Managers should retain control of their schools, subject to the Local Authority being given the right to appoint the teachers. If a sufficient number of parents made the request in writing, the Managers would be allowed to provide the denominational instruction at their own expense, but the undenominational instruction was to be given, either by the teachers in the school, or, if they were unwilling to give it, by teachers employed for the purpose by the Authority. In return for this, the Local Authority would be responsible for keeping the buildings in good repair and for the maintenance of the school. (2)

Pease's third Draft was prepared with the Catholics in mind. Although the school would become a council school in name, there would be no automatic entry for a teacher to give the undenominational instruction unless the parents specifically asked for it. Denominational instruction would be allowed in school hours but at the Managers' expense. The Authority would have to pay the cost of the maintenance of the school but the upkeep of the buildings would remain the responsibility of the denomination. Although the Catholics were unlikely to accept such a proposal, in almost every case, it would have meant that only Catholic instruction was given in the

(2) Ibid. 'Alternative Draft of the Education Bill,' dated July, 1914.
Almost a year had passed since Pease's promise to introduce a 'comprehensive Measure.' It seemed unlikely that anything would come of his current proposals. On one hand, Selby-Bigge complained that the Measure was 'too long.' (1) On the other, a high-powered deputation of Nonconformists, including Dr. Clifford, Scott Lidgett, Mr. Shepherd, the Vice-Chairman of the Congregational Union of England and Wales and several Nonconformist Members of Parliament, met Mr. Pease who was accompanied by the Attorney-General and the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Apparently none of the proposals in the Bill were acceptable to them. They were particularly opposed to any of the denominations having access to the schools after they had been taken over. Their proposal was for 'a clean sweep' carried out by buying the existing schools and turning them into Council schools. If the owners would not sell, new schools would have to be built. (2)

Selby-Bigge wrote to Mr. Thring, the Parliamentary draftsman:

'Yesterday, Pease, accompanied by the Chancellor of the Exchequer had a conference with the leading Nonconformists...In the result of this, Pease thinks it will be necessary to confine the Single-School Areas to provide on the following lines:
After a certain date, voluntary schools in the Single School Areas shall come to an end altogether.... Managers who wish to transfer their schools to the Local Education Authority, may do so for full (?) valuable consideration....In any school transferred under the Bill, there are to be no facilities whatsoever for denominational religious instruction.' (3)

As things turned out, the Bill never received a First Reading. On the day before the meeting between the Nonconformist delegation and the President of the Board, 28th. June, 1914, the assassination of the Archduke at Sarajevo set in motion the train of events which united, for a few months, all the sides in the dispute.

There were a few final items of controversy. For example, on 6th. July, 1914, Mr. King, a Liberal Member, alleged that the Managers of the voluntary schools in London had collected £14,065 in school pence and were using this money 'for their own purposes' instead of using it to keep their schools up to standard. He wanted to know if the Board would abolish the collection of school pence.

(1) P.R.O. File Ed. 24/643. Memo. from Selby-Bigge to Pease. 'Draft of the Single-School Areas Bill.'
(2) Ibid. Memorandum of Meeting with Nonconformist Deputation, 29th. June, 1914.
(3) Ibid. L.A. Selby-Bigge to Thring, 30th. June, 1914.
in voluntary schools. (1) On the following day, he raised the matter of the alleged deficiencies in the voluntary schools again. He asked if 'the President of the Board of Education is aware that there are 13 voluntary schools under the London Education Authority which have no playgrounds and in which no adequate provision can be made for physical exercises and recreation, and what steps will he take to secure to the children in these schools physical exercise and recreation?' Mr. Trevelyan, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board, explained that the matter was the subject of official correspondence with the London County Council. (2)

Mr. King next turned his attention to the Catholic school at Westminster Cathedral.

'Is the President of the Board aware that Westminster Cathedral school has been condemned by the Board of Education as so defective in the premises that no reasonable expenditure on the existing school building would be justified; whether it is his intention to cease to recognise the school after a certain date and whether the Local Education Authority will be called upon to provide the necessary accommodation for the children?'

Mr. Trevelyan assured him that they were well aware of the defects of the school, and were prepared to listen to any suggestion which the Managers may desire to offer. (3)

The condition of the voluntary schools in London was the subject of Parliamentary questions on several occasions during the war. It was suggested that the work should be carried out to reduce the amount of unemployment in the building trade. (4) In April, 1917, Mr King again raised the question as to what the Board of Education proposed to do about the 124 schools in London which 'were condemned as unsuitable and insanitary by the Board.' (5) On 16th. October, 1918 he raised the matter with Mr. Fisher, who replied that he assumed Mr. King was referring to a letter which the Board had written to the London County Council in April, 1914. Owing to the restrictions on building, the matter had not been cleared up, but it had not been overlooked. (6)

(2) Ibid. 7th. July, 1914. c. 878.
(6) Ibid. 16th. October, 1918. c. 100.
When G.B.M. Coore presented his Memorandum to the Cabinet before the introduction of the 1906 Education Bill, he wrote:

'This question of Catholic schools in England and Wales is primarily an Irish question...The Catholic fraction will always be able to count on a solid phalanx of at least fifty Irish votes...A determined minority will always have it within its power to overthrow a settlement which it regards as outrageous...'(1)

By 1914, the education policy of the Liberal Government had been reduced to attempts to legislate for schools in the single-school areas. It seemed likely that, with the Home Rule Bill in the offing, the Irish Members could have been relied upon to support such legislation. At worst, about 24(2) Catholic schools would have been affected by such legislation, over 1,000 would have continued to enjoy the benefits of the 1902 settlement. The small number of Catholic schools affected would have been withdrawn from the national system and financed, on a diocesan and fee-paying basis, as certified efficient elementary schools.

If the Government had arranged its parliamentary business so that the Bill which became the Parliamentary Act of 1911 had been introduced in January, 1906, the 1906 Education Bill might well have become the Education Act after a delay of two years caused by the Lords' veto. Well might Birrell complain that 'after winning great electoral victories, the foes you routed in the open field could mutilate all your work...' (3) But this must remain one of the 'ifs' of history. The Liberal Government decided not to appeal to the country on the Lords' veto of the Bill, presumably because Campbell-Bannerman did not wish to risk the fate of his Administration on a comparatively unimportant issue. (4) The settlement survived the attempt made in 1908 to amend it, and was not seriously threatened again.

---


(2) This was the Board's official figure. (See p. 342) In 1912, there were 1,074 Catholic elementary schools with an average attendance of 295,802. (Cd.6002. March, 1912.)

(3) Birrell's speech at Bristol, 13th. November, 1906. (Birrell was Member of Parliament for Bristol East.)

(4) A.J. Balfour said, 'They will not dissolve - they know better' (Speech at the Junior Constitutional Club, 28th. November, 1906.) Balfour, Asquith, Birrell, Lord Crewe, Lord Lansdowne and the Archbishop of Canterbury had a private meeting to try to save the Bill on the evening of 18th. December, 1906. See p. 247.
'Three successive Presidents of the Board of Education had now spent themselves in vain endeavours to abolish the dual system, and the Liberals, who had entered office with high hopes were in despair... It was, indeed, a sad retrospect to look back over three years of Liberal Government and to acknowledge complete failure...' (1)

By 1912, all that seemed possible was a modest Bill to deal with the single-school areas. The principle was that no child should be compelled by law to attend a denominational school to which his parents objected. In areas where there was one school only, and that a denominational school, the County Council would have the power to take over the school and establish it as a council school. Even this plan, which seemed to be both reasonable and simple, proved to be impossible to implement. There were many areas in which there were voluntary schools, both Anglican and Catholic, but no council schools. If the intention was that every child in such areas was to have the option of a place in a council school, all the voluntary schools would have to become council schools, and this was out of the question. Financial and physical considerations made the provision of new council schools an impossibility. The question would also arise as to why the wishes of parents who wanted their children to attend council schools should take priority over the wishes of parents who, because they wanted denominational education for their children had already provided the necessary school buildings at their own expense. (2)

The fate of the Croydon Marks Bill, and the reluctance of the Government to show any enthusiasm in introducing promised legislation, suggests that the Government had decided there were more profitable ways of using parliamentary time than debating the education question. There was increasing satisfaction in the country on the way in which the settlement was working. The open acknowledgement that the attempts made to revise the settlement were based on ideological rather than on educational issues, did little to stir the Government into taking action. The soundest policy seemed to be to leave well alone.


(2) The Board of Education (p. 342 supra) suggested there were 143 Catholic schools in such areas, in addition to the 24 in areas where the Catholic school was the only school. The Single-School Area Memorandum (P.R.O. File Ed. 24/624, dated February, 1912,) gives the number as 144, with an average attendance of 13,600.
It was in August, 1917, when the education issue again came up in the Commons. H.A.L. Fisher, (1) in introducing his Education Bill, spoke of the 'increased feeling of social solidarity which had been created by the war.' He went on:

'When you get conscription, when you get a state of affairs in which the poor are to be asked to pour out their blood, and be mulcted in the high cost of living for large international policies, every just mind begins to realise that the boundaries of citizenship are not decided by wealth....It is especially desirable that the old religious controversy should not be fanned into flame....the question of education should be decided in the light of educational needs, and in the light of those alone.' (2)

In the face of such sentiments, it would hardly have been appropriate to suggest that although educational needs were not to be decided by wealth, they might still be decided by religious beliefs.

(1) Fisher was President of the Board of Education in Lloyd George's Coalition Government.

SECTION 6.

PUPIL-TEACHERS AND TEACHERS IN THE CATHOLIC

ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS, 1880 - 1914.
It was in 1846 that the Secretary of the Committee of Council for Education, James (later Sir James) Kay-Shuttleworth established the system of apprenticeships for teachers. Boys and girls who were of good moral character and at least thirteen years old could be indentured for five years as apprentices to certificated teachers. At the end of the five years, the 'pupil-teachers' as they were called, were admitted to a competitive examination for the Queen's Scholarship. (1) The names of the successful candidates were listed in order of merit, so that the training college to which the would-be teacher applied for a place could have some idea of the ability of the applicant. Training college courses lasted for one, two or three years duration, according to the financial resources of the student and the decision of the college authorities. The 'trained certificated teacher' received an annual payment of £15 - £25 from the Education Department in addition to the salary paid by the school managers or the school board. A teacher who was 'certificated' as distinct from a teacher who was 'trained certificated' would have completed a five-year apprenticeship, but, instead of going to a training college, would have taught until the age of twenty-one as an uncertificated teacher, and then taken the examination for the much-coveted 'parchment' or teacher's certificate. Certificated teachers received an annual payment of £10 direct from the Education Department.

The absence of any recognised secondary schools on a national scale meant that the pupil-teacher received instruction from the master or mistress at the end of the school day. One hour on each school day was the minimum time allowed for this purpose, and the teacher responsible for the instruction was required to be a certificated teacher. Obviously, the standard of the instruction given would depend on the education and the enthusiasm of the teacher and the pupil-teacher. Such standards must have varied very much, and the opportunities for studying at home, which would depend on the pupil-teacher's home background, were a crucial factor in the pupil-teacher's progress.

In this respect, female pupil-teachers in the Catholic schools

(1) There are some autobiographical accounts of the ways in which pupil-teachers taught and were taught in Burnell, J. ed.: Destiny Obscure, London. 1982. pp. 172 - 6.
### TABLE 20. PUPIL - TEACHERS IN THE CATHOLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Nationally</th>
<th>R.C.</th>
<th>Nationally</th>
<th>R.C.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>3,395,558</td>
<td>174,069</td>
<td>5.12%</td>
<td>23,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>3,717,917</td>
<td>193,285</td>
<td>5.19%</td>
<td>29,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>4,225,834</td>
<td>223,057</td>
<td>5.28%</td>
<td>28,465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>4,636,938</td>
<td>248,293</td>
<td>5.35%</td>
<td>30,783</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the Catholic elementary schools, in 1885, 13% of the pupil-teachers were male; nationally, the figure was 27%.

By 1900, in the Catholic elementary schools the figure had fallen to 10%; nationally, the figure was 20%.

**SOURCE:** Relevant Annual Reports of the Committee of Council.

### TABLE 21. MEN AND WOMEN TEACHERS IN THE CATHOLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Nationally</th>
<th>R.C. Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEN</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>15,863 (40.6%)</td>
<td>23,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>18,250 (40.1%)</td>
<td>27,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>20,486 (40.4%)</td>
<td>30,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>24,253 (39.0%)</td>
<td>37,832</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** Relevant Annual Reports of the Committee of Council.

### TABLE 22. CATHOLIC PUPIL-TEACHER CENTRES, 1904 - 1914.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Nationally</th>
<th>Catholic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>314 centres</td>
<td>29 centres (9.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>482 &quot;</td>
<td>39 &quot; (8.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>586 &quot;</td>
<td>38 &quot; (6.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>617 &quot;</td>
<td>34 &quot; (5.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>619 &quot;</td>
<td>32 &quot; (5.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>486 &quot;</td>
<td>26 &quot; (5.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>435 &quot;</td>
<td>23 &quot; (5.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOURCE:** Relevant 'Statistics of Public Education in England and Wales.'

See also Appendix 13, pp. 423 - 425.
had an advantage over the male pupil-teachers. The Orders of nuns who taught in the Catholic schools often provided study facilities for the female pupil-teachers, in many cases, residential facilities. The proportion of pupil-teachers employed in the Catholic schools was below that of the pupil-teachers employed nationally. (1) Similarly, although there were more female than male pupil-teachers employed, the percentage of female pupil-teachers employed in Catholic schools was higher than the national average. 

In 1880, A.J. Mundella, then Vice-President of the Council, introduced the Act which allowed school boards to establish centres for pupil-teachers. The idea was that by withdrawing the young people from the schools for half of each day, it would be possible to raise their standards of education. Whilst the scheme was excellent in itself, the conditions in the voluntary schools were such that it was quite impossible to release the pupil-teachers for half days because they were an essential part of the teaching force. (3) Ironically, Mundella once admitted that his plan for 'a central system of teaching for pupil-teachers' was a result of 'the great success which had attended the Catholic centre at Mount Pleasant... the London School Board has imitated what was begun by the Catholics of this town.' (4)

The Catholic Poor School Committee were becoming increasingly anxious about the position of the male pupil-teachers in the Catholic schools. It is surprising that the organisation responsible for the training of Catholic teachers had so little idea of the position. In 1894, the Secretary, Mr. Honeybun, was instructed to write to every Catholic elementary school known to have pupil-teachers on its staff and to find out what facilities existed for their education.

The Poor School Committee had earlier made two attempts to establish residential homes for male pupil-teachers on the same lines as the hostels for the girls which had been established by the Sisters of Notre Dame in Liverpool. The home established in

(1) See Table 20, p. 363.
(2) Ibid.
(3) The Archbishop of Canterbury had written a personal letter to Mundella complaining of the undue strain which the withdrawal of the pupil-teachers would place on the teachers in small country schools. (The Mundella Papers, 13th. May, 1882.) The centres were not a great success. By 1885, 1,636 out of 23,414 pupil-teachers were attending the eleven centres open.
Glasgow in 1887 had not sent a single student to the Men's college at Hammersmith by 1885, although the Committee had given the home grants amounting to £455. The home closed in 1885 when the Committee refused to pay any further grants. (1) In 1878, the 'Male Pupil-Teachers' Home' was opened at Shaw Street in Liverpool. The 18 boys admitted to the Home, from 'poor homes and surroundings little calculated to fit them for the office of teachers' were all successful in the Scholarship examination of 1882. Their success was attributed to their 'being placed in a home where there is every incitement to piety and learning.' (2) When the return was made to the Secretary's inquiry in 1894, the Centre appears to have been a day centre only.

When the Secretary presented his report to the Poor School Committee in 1895, it showed that forms of inquiry had been sent to 987 Catholic schools and replies had been received from 420 schools. These showed there were 20 areas in England and Wales in which centres were provided for the pupil-teachers from Catholic schools. (3) The majority of the centres were for girls only and were under the care of the Sisters of Notre Dame. The only centres for boys, apart from the Shaw Street Centre, were at Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Bradford, Birmingham, and at Southwark and Regent Square in London. Only the Regent Square Centre was a residential establishment. There seems to have been some confusion over the question of Catholic pupil-teachers attending school board centres and, after 1902, Local Authority centres. For example, the Sheffield Education Committee refused to give a grant to the Notre Dame Pupil-Teacher Centre in that city because the male pupil-teachers from the Catholic schools attended the centre provided by the Education Committee and that Committee could see no reason why the female pupil-teachers could not attend also. (4)

The lot of the pupil-teacher in the Catholic school appears to have been a very hard one. The accepted amount of teaching time was about 25 hours a week. In many schools, the pupil-teachers also supervised children who remained at the schools during the

(3) Report of the Catholic Poor School Committee's sub-committee on Pupil-Teacher Education, 1895.
(4) From the Minutes of the Meeting of the Sheffield Education Committee, 23rd. November, 1903. The Birmingham Education Committee were given a 4:2 proportion of Managers on the Board of the Centre for Catholic Pupil-Teachers. (Minutes of the Meeting of the Birmingham Education Committee, 26th. Feb. 1904)
mid-day break. The report concluded that the school managers who said their pupil-teachers worked for about 32 - 35 hours each week were making an accurate return. The replies showed that amounts of time allowed for private study during the school week ranged from none to 27½ hours. (1)

Even in the residential centres, the time allocated for private study was out of school hours. Pupil-teachers appear to have worked almost a full day at teaching, thus confirming the opinion that in voluntary schools they were teachers rather than pupils, whilst in board schools they were pupils rather than teachers.

It is possible that the residential pupil-teacher centres in some convents were, in fact, some kind of junior novitiate for the Order. In 1906 - 7, there were 14 pupil-teachers at the St. Mary's Centre in Leeds, but only two of them were from Leeds. The remainder were from Ireland. (2) Since training college facilities in Ireland were at least as plentiful as they were in England, (3) it seems unlikely that so many young girls would leave their homes in Ireland and travel to England unless there was some other purpose behind their action. At the Notre Dame Centre, in 1906, there were 39 pupil-teachers. Of these, 19 resided in Leeds. Of the other 20, 16 lived at the Notre Dame convent, 4 lived elsewhere in the west Riding. (4)

All the managers who replied to the Poor School Committee survey felt that pupil-teachers should have less responsibility in the schools. Even if there was no possibility of the pupil-teachers attending a centre, it was felt that there should be time allowed during school hours for private study, even if this meant that additional teachers would have to be appointed. The managers felt that, ideally, all large towns should have a pupil-teacher centre, and that grants to establish such centres should be made by the Poor School Committee. H.M. Inspector, Mr. Scott-Coward told the Committee that he was of opinion that it would be very difficult to establish pupil-teacher centres for male pupil-teachers where they already existed for females. The duplication of the facilities would be very expensive. He recommended that in areas where school boards had established

(1) As 27½ hours was the amount of teaching time in a week, this reply should not be taken too seriously.
centres, pupil-teachers from Catholic schools should be allowed to attend. Religious instruction could be given at the pupil-teacher's own school. Mr. Scott-Coward quoted the case of the Manchester School Board which had given an undertaking that nothing said or done in the Board's pupil-teacher centre would give offence to any Catholics attending. Finally, Mr. Scott-Coward said that if centres for male pupil-teachers were established, the principals would be men. He regretted that so many of the Catholic schools were staffed entirely by women. But nothing could conceal the fact that the poverty of the Catholic schools and the inability to pay a sufficient teaching force meant that the pupil-teachers were required to spend almost all their time in the class-rooms. In one school in Bristol, with an average attendance of 90, the teaching staff consisted of the mistress and two pupil-teachers. When the mistress became ill, the two pupil-teachers carried on the work of the school, with the assistance of a monitress. (1)

Where centres did exist, the Sub-Committee's report gives some interesting facts about the way in which the centres functioned. The Reverend Mother of the Convent in Clarendon Square in London, told the Committee that 55 girls attended the pupil-teacher centre in the convent. Twelve of these were resident in the convent; the others attended for 9½ hours each week. (2) The resident pupil-teachers taught for about half-time. The 'externs' paid 10s. 6d. per term for the first three years and £1 per term in the scholarship year. The residents paid £25 per annum.

Canon Dubberly, from the Liverpool Centre, told the Sub-Committee that many school managers refused to allow the pupil-teachers to attend the centre in Shaw Street. This deprived the centre of the £7 grant which the centre received each year for every student who attended regularly. But after the passing of the 1902 Act, the Liverpool Education Committee decided that 'Roman Catholic candidates shall receive travelling expenses to attend the Mount Pleasant Centre.' (3) No mention is made of the Shaw Street Centre. In the following year, 1904, the Liverpool Education Committee agreed that 'the Mount Pleasant Pupil-Teacher Centre be authorised to arrange for admission to prep-

---

(1) Log Book of the Holy Cross School, Victoria Street, Bristol. Entries for December, 1897, March, 1898.
(2) Presumably, the 9½ hours would be out of school hours.
(3) Minutes of the Meeting of the Liverpool Education Committee, 14th. September, 1903.
ary classes as full-timers, of some 35 young people approved as candidates by managers of voluntary schools.'

Father Buckley told the Sub-Committee that the Southwark Pupil-Teacher Centre in Melior Street had been in existence for eight years in 1895. Every year, some 27 - 28 boys attended the Centre. The average cost was about £4 4s. per annum. (2) The timetable was so arranged that all the lessons were given out of school time, although on Mondays, when the lessons began at 4pm., the pupil-teachers were expected to leave their schools early so as to be at the Centre by 4pm. The first lesson lasted until 5pm., when tea was provided. Lessons resumed at 6pm. and continued until 8pm. On two other evenings in the week, there were lessons from 6pm. to 8.30pm. On Saturday mornings, there were lessons from 9.45am. until 1pm. Overall, the instruction lasted for 11½ hours each week. Fr. Buckley asked if the Poor School Committee could make a grant to the Centre based on the actual number of pupil-teachers who attended, rather than on the number of pupil-teachers who obtained a first or second class pass in the Queen's Scholarship examination. He also asked if the Committee would consider the possibility of paying the cost of correspondence courses undertaken by pupil-teachers on subjects outside the scope of the Centre.

Canon Puissant of the Leeds Pupil-Teacher Centre told the Sub-Committee that the Leeds Centre had been open for three years and both boys and girls attended. (3) There were lessons on two evenings a week, and two certificated masters were employed to give instruction.

As might have been expected, the return submitted by Sister Mary of St. Philip from the Notre Dame Centre in Liverpool was in favour of all pupil-teacher centres being residential if they were to be really successful, 'since many of the homes of the pupil-teachers are unsuitable for the purposes of private study.' Sister Mary was not in favour of Catholic pupil-teachers attending the centres established by the local school boards, except in very special circumstances. Sister Mary also raised the question of

---

(1) Minutes of the Meeting of the Liverpool Education Committee, 3rd. October, 1904. 'Young people' suggests a mixed class.

(2) Presumably this is in addition to the £7 per student grant paid by the Education Department.

(3) A return made to the Leeds Education Committee in 1903 showed that at that date there was a centre at St. Mary's Catholic school in Leeds, £90 being the salary of the headmistress and £110 the salary of assistant teachers.
the provision of correspondence courses for pupil-teachers likely to benefit from them. But even at the Notre Dame Centre, the amount of school time which was allowed for private study did not amount to more than three hours per week. Thus, it would seem that, in their preparation for the Queen's Scholarship examination, the pupil-teachers in the Catholic schools were at a great disadvantage when compared with their counterparts in the school board centres, who were allowed to attend their centres for half of the school week.

The relationships between the pupil-teachers and the adult teachers in the schools were not always cordial. At St. Joseph's Boys' School in Manchester, where an average attendance of 120 - 130 boys was taught by the master and three or four pupil-teachers or 'monitors'(1) the master recorded that 'the pupil-teachers conduct themselves in a most unsatisfactory way... they are more nuisance and annoyance than the boys in the school.'(2) At St. Joseph's Girls' School, there are numerous entries in the log-book complaining about the frequent absences of the pupil-teachers. After 1885, there is no mention of the pupil-teachers, the assumption being that Article 68 teachers were employed in place of the pupil-teachers. At St. Peter's School, Cardiff, the mistress recorded, 'The pupil-teachers do less work than ever... they study for more than half the day in school and teach only a few hours in the week...they are of very little use.'(3) In the school year 1899 - 1900, there were nine-entries made in the log-book complaining about the conduct of the pupil-teachers.(4)

When all the reports from the schools had been considered, the Poor School Committee received certain recommendations from the Sub-Committee.(5) These suggested that the Poor School Committee should support the non-residential pupil-teacher centres by giving a grant at the rate of 1d. for each hour which a pupil-teacher spent at the classes in the centres. Approved 'candidates' would also qualify for this grant, as would any boy or girl over the age of twelve years who was allowed to attend the classes. It was felt that, by allowing suitable scholars to attend the classes, a wider choice of pupil-teachers for the Catholic schools would be

---

(1) Monitors or 'candidates' were considered suitable for employment as pupil-teachers and were waiting for a vacancy to occur.
(5) Annual Report, Catholic Poor School Committee, 1895.
available. So far as the payments for correspondence courses were concerned, the Sub-Committee recommended that when pupil-teachers were in the third or fourth year of the apprenticeship, the cost of the course should be met by the Poor School Committee. If the pupil-teacher lived in an area in which no centre was available, the Committee might consider meeting the cost of such courses during the whole of the period of apprenticeship. If pupil-teachers were to receive education at the centres, the grants being paid to masters whose pupil-teachers did well in the Queen's Scholarship examinations could be abolished. To provide more time for private study in school hours, the Sub-Committee considered that additional pupil-teachers should be allowed in schools to cover the teaching requirements, and recommended that the Education Department should be asked to alter the existing Regulations on the subject. (1) In February, 1896, the recommendations of the Sub-Committee were adopted.

In 1899, the Queen's Scholarship Regulations were amended. Results obtained in the Senior Local Examinations of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and the London University Matriculation Examination qualified students for scholarships and for admission to the training colleges. In spite of this, the pupil-teacher centres continued to function. The provision of secondary schools as a result of the implementation of the 1902 Act did not affect the centres for some years, as many recognised secondary schools had pupil-teacher centres attached to them. (2) But the 'bursary' system (3) which was introduced in 1907, was adopted by many Local Authorities as an alternative to the pupil-teacher system, and pupil-teacher centres which were not attached to secondary schools decreased in number. (4) As will be seen later, there were very few recognised Catholic secondary schools in 1914, and so the number of prospective teachers seeking admission to the men's training college at Hammersmith was small.

(1) Pupil-teachers were paid by the Education Department. Under the terms of the Code of 1890, a certificated head-teacher could be responsible for two pupil-teachers. In assessing the staffing provision in a school, a pupil-teacher could be responsible for 30 pupils.

(2) For a list of such Catholic schools see Appendix 13, pp. 423-424.

(3) Any scholar who had gained a scholarship to a recognised secondary school, and who had completed satisfactorily the first three years of the course, could apply for a 'bursary' (usually £8 per annum) for the remainder of the course, and would serve for a year as a 'student-teacher' before going to a training college. The scheme ended in 1921, although in 1938 there were still 545 student-teachers recognised by the Board. (Details: Curtis, S. J. History of Education in Great Britain London, 1968 ed. p. 329.)

(4) See Table 22, p. 363.
CATHOLIC TEACHERS AND THEIR TRAINING COLLEGES, 1880 - 1914.

Before the Queen's Scholarship Regulations were amended in 1899, admission to a training college could be gained only by serving an apprenticeship as a pupil-teacher and then passing the scholarship examination sufficiently well as to be placed high on the list. From 1899 onwards, the position changed to some extent, and there were two ways in which admission could be gained.

In the first way, a student could opt to become a 'candidate' at the end of the elementary school course, usually at the age of 13. After serving as a candidate until reaching the age of 16, the student then became a pupil-teacher. (1) During the two years spent as a pupil-teacher, the student would prepare for the Queen's Scholarship Examination, and if successful, would proceed to the training college for two or three years. This scheme was favoured by students whose parents were poor and unable to support the student. As a candidate, the student would receive £5 per annum. During the first year as a pupil-teacher, the salary would vary from £15 - £21 for men, £12 - £15 for women. During the second year, these amounts would be increased to £18 - £25 for men, £15 - £18 for women. Students who did not wish to go to the training college could work as an uncertificated teacher until taking the examination for the teacher's certificate at the age of 21.

The second way to gain admission to a training college was to secure a place in a secondary school at the age of 11 - 12 years, usually by passing one of the 'scholarship' examinations held by Local Authorities after 1902. Winners of such scholarships could receive a small maintenance grant, subject to a means test. Such grants varied in amount from place to place. In Bristol, for example, the grant was £3 in the second year of the course and £7 in the third and fourth years. (2) In Liverpool, the grant rose from £6 at the start of the course to £15 during the fourth and fifth years. (3) In addition, many Local Authorities offered 'bursaries'

---

(1) In some country districts, where there were many small schools, pupil-teachers were admitted at 15 years.


(3) Minutes of the meeting of the Liverpool Education Committee, 14th. September, 1903. The Liverpool Authority seems to have been very generous with grants. Candidates received an addition of £10 to the £5 salary for passing the Junior Oxford Certificate. Pupil-teachers received the maximum salary of £25 (men) and £18 (women). The corresponding salaries in Leeds were £18 and £15. (Leeds Education Committee, 18th. February, 1904)
of £8 per annum for the fourth year of the course to suitable students who were willing to become teachers. The results of the public examinations taken at the end of the course would decide if the candidate was offered a place in a training college. (1) But since recognised Catholic secondary schools were few and far between, most Catholic students admitted to training colleges were likely to be former pupil-teachers who might have received some education at a pupil-teacher centre. The academic superiority of the students at the Notre Dame Training College at Liverpool could well have been the result of the painstaking preparation of the girl pupil-teachers in the Notre Dame Centres. (2) It was the replacement of the old pupil-teacher system by the secondary school/bursary system which the deputation from the Catholic Education Council complained about on its visit to the Board of Education in June, 1908. Monsignor Brown claimed that poor Catholic families could no longer afford to educate their children to become teachers. (3)

There was only one college for Catholic men who wished to train as teachers. This was St. Mary's College at Hammersmith, in West London. (4) Women students had a choice between the Catholic colleges at Liverpool and at Wandsworth in South London. (5) Between 1856 and 1863, there had been a Catholic training college at St. Leonard's, near Hastings, in Sussex. Administrative and financial problems brought about the closing of the college which had been established by the Sisters of the Holy Child. During its existence, about one hundred women teachers had qualified there. (6)

(1) In the recognised Catholic secondary schools, the examination was almost invariable the Oxford Senior Local Examination. In 1910 - 1911, 59 (15.6%) of boys leaving such schools passed the examination; 239 (21.8%) of girls leaving such schools passed. (Source: Statistics of Public Education in England and Wales, 1910 - 1911. Cd. 6338)

(2) In the scholarship examination of 1891, 81% of the pupil-teachers from the Notre Dame Centres achieved First Class passes. Pupil-teachers from the school-board centres achieved 59% First Class passes. (Source: Diamond, M.G.: 'The Work of the Catholic Poor School Committee' Unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Liverpool, 1963. p. 159.)


(4) St. Mary's College moved from Hammersmith to its present site at Strawberry Hill in 1925.

(5) The College moved from Wandsworth to Bayswater in 1904 and eventually became the Digby-Stuart College at Roehampton.

St. Mary's College at Hammersmith had originally been established as a novitiate of the Brothers of the Christian Instruction, a French Order, similar in its aims to those of the Irish Christian brothers. The only lay students admitted to the College were those who had expressed a desire to become members of the Order. Meanwhile, there were 424 male pupil-teachers in Catholic schools with no possibility of entering a Catholic training college. (1) The Poor School Committee persuaded the Principal, Rev. Dr. Glenie, to accept as students at St. Mary's five Catholic pupil-teachers who had passed the Queen's Scholarship examination. The Principal agreed, hoping that life in a religious community would be such as to persuade the students to join the Order, and in 1856, five years after the College had been established, the lay students began their studies. By 1860, the novitiate was empty, and from then onwards, only lay students were admitted. (Irish Christian Brothers and Brothers of the Christian Instruction have, of course, been trained as teachers at the College, but have attended as lay students.) The Poor School Committee became responsible for the finances of the College.

During the remainder of the nineteenth century, the problems of the College were serious and varied. It has already been suggested that male pupil-teachers were at a great disadvantage compared to their female colleagues inasmuch as the academic and pastoral care which the Orders such as the sisters of Notre Dame devoted to the young female pupil-teachers was almost entirely lacking. Again, the financial straits of the Catholic schools before 1902 meant that many such schools were staffed entirely by women teachers, a great many of whom were members of religious Orders. This greatly restricted the opportunities for men teachers in the Catholic schools. (2) It was, almost certainly, the cause of the small number of admissions to St. Mary's between 1880 and 1900. (3) Nationally, places in the men's training colleges were at a premium, but at St. Mary's the available accommodation was never taken up. One unfortunate consequence of the empty places

(1) From the Annual Report of the Catholic Poor School Committee, 1854.
(2) See Table 21, p. 363. In 1900, 14.7% of the certificated teachers in the Catholic schools were men. Nationally, the figure was 39%. The proportion of male pupil-teachers in Catholic schools was below the national figure. (See Table 20, p. 363.)
(3) Diagram 10, p. 374. In 1886, the worst year, only 12 out of the 35 places available were occupied.
DIAGRAM 16 ADMISSIONS TO THE MEN'S COLLEGE AT HAMMERSMITH AND TO THE WOMEN'S COLLEGES AT LIVERPOOL AND WANDSWORTH, 1878-1900. (SOURCE: ANNUAL REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL)

(AVAILABLE ACCOMMODATION SHADED IN RED) NATIONALLY, 96%-97% OF PLACES WERE OCCUPIED.
in the college was the high cost of training such students as were admitted. But in spite of this high cost, H.M. Inspector agreed that 'the College is very economically administered... the salaries of the staff are low, compared with those of other colleges.'(1)

It is difficult to explain the irregular pattern of admissions to the College in the years 1880 - 1900. A general dissatisfaction with the prospects for men teachers in the Catholic schools would have kept the admissions at a constant low level. However, the irregularity of the pattern of admissions would seem to rule out any factor remaining constant over the years. It was the practice at St. Mary's of admitting pupil-teachers who had completed their apprenticeship to a class which prepared them for the Queen's Scholarship Examination,(2) and the vacant places in the College would not be wasted, so far as the accommodation and teaching resources were concerned. But there is no evidence that this practice had any real effect on the numbers admitted to the teacher training course proper.

There is some evidence to suggest that Catholic teachers were not averse to working in the board schools. In 1888, Dr. Graham, the Principal of St. Mary's knew of sixteen or seventeen men who had been trained at St. Mary's and who were in the service of the London School Board.(3) By 1899, the number of men from the College who were known to be working in board schools was 42. In 1906, Augustus Irrell, the President of the Board of Education, told the Cabinet that the information he had received from monsignor Brown suggested that there were 300 Catholic teachers in the service of the London County Council.(4) The Catholic Hierarchy had always felt very strongly about Catholic teachers who, having gained their certificates in the Catholic colleges, accepted posts in board schools where salaries and conditions were better. Apart from the cost to the Catholic community of training a teacher there was always the risk that the presence of a Catholic teacher in a board school would encourage Catholic parents to send their children to the school.


(2) The numbers in the preparatory class varied between five and fifteen. In 1886, there were only 29 students resident in the college on the teacher-training course, and another 12 students in the preparatory class and resident in the College. (Centenary Record, p. 14)

(3) Annual Report of the Poor School Committee, 1888.

Cardinal Manning was very concerned about the numbers of Catholic teachers who were teaching in the board schools. He had compiled a list of teachers, presumably from information supplied by parish priests, who had been trained in Catholic colleges and were employed by the London School Board. (1) The list is a very detailed one, containing not only the names of the teachers, but also the names of the schools in which they were teaching and the salaries they received. For the year ending Lady Day, 1889, there were 81 names on the list. 23 were of men who had been trained at St. Mary's, 37 of women who had been trained at the Notre Dame College in Liverpool, 16 of women who had been trained at Wandsworth, and 5 of women who had been trained at the Holy Child College at St. Leonards. (2)

So far as the men teachers were concerned, if there was little hope of obtaining a post in a Catholic school, it would not be unreasonable to work in a board school. As early as 1879, Lord Ripon had called the attention of the Catholic Hierarchy to the practice of employing mistresses rather than masters in the Catholic elementary schools. (3) The Bishops discussed the matter at the Low Week meeting in 1881, when a deputation from the Poor School Committee met the Bishops. (4) Later in the same year (1881) the Liverpool Male Catholic Teachers' Association sent a letter to the Duke of Norfolk, Deputy-Chairman of the Poor School Committee, asking him to call the attention of the Committee to the practice in Catholic schools of replacing men teachers with women teachers. The Association warned the Committee that 'while impractical men, although well-meaning, are indulging in experimental whims, many will be ruined by their reckless actions.' The letter quoted as an example the case of the St. Alexander's Catholic school in Bootle, a very large school which had been placed entirely under the care of women teachers, and similar encroachments had taken place elsewhere. The reason which had been given for the employment of women rather than men was that they were cheaper and more efficient. Naturally, the Association denied that such was

(1) The Cardinal realised the cost to the Catholic community of training a teacher at a Catholic college. Apart from providing and maintaining the premises, the Poor School Committee had to provide 25% of the cost of the day-to-day running of the colleges. At the Low Week meeting in 1875, the Hierarchy agreed that, as a last resort, Catholic teachers who taught in board schools should be banned from receiving the Sacrament.

(2) From the document in the Manning Papers.


(4) Catholic Poor School Committee Annual Report, 1881.
the case and invited comparisons in the standards of work in schools taught by men and in schools taught by women. The Association also claimed that, because of the employment of so many mistresses, masters were reduced to 'an unparalleled state of insecurity.' The number of male Catholic teachers unemployed was so great that salaries were reduced to a minimum. The Poor School Committee was urged to take some action to discourage male pupil-teachers from entering the profession. Intending pupil-teachers, who would probably be a success in some other walk of life, should not be induced to enter 'a barren and blighted profession.'

In his reply, the Duke of Norfolk assured the Association that the developments they complained of were receiving 'his most earnest attention.' (2) But little seems to have been done in the matter and the situation, so far as the men teachers were concerned, did not improve. At the Low Week Meeting in 1886, the matter was again discussed. The Bishops concluded:

'The displacing of schoolmasters by the substitution of women teachers tends to discourage our schoolmasters and to depress their efficiency.....and to dispose parents to send their boys to non-Catholic schools to be taught by masters.' (3)

Undoubtedly, lack of money was at the root of the problem. Where a religious Order moved into a parish to staff the parish school, it would be necessary for as many of the community as possible to be employed in the school, in order to enable the community to be supported on the low salaries paid. In addition, by 1900, 10% of the teachers recognised under Article 68 of the Code were employed in the Catholic schools. (4) Although more and more teachers were required to cope with the increasing numbers in the Catholic schools, the requirement must have been met by employing an ever-increasing proportion of unqualified women teachers, either assistant teachers or teachers recognised under Article 68 of the Code. (5)

---

(1) Letter from J. Healey and L. Conway to the Duke of Norfolk, 3rd. June, 1881. St. Mary's College Archives. The Chairman of the Poor School Committee was serving as Viceroy of India at the time.

(2) Annual Report of the Poor School Committee, 1881.


(4) Teachers recognised under Article 68 had no formal academic qualifications, and were employed if they satisfied H.M. Inspector on his annual inspection.

(5) See Diagram 11, p. 378 and Diagram 12, p. 379.
Diagram II

Percentage Increases in the Number of Unqualified Women Teachers in Catholic Elementary Schools, 1886 - 1900.

A. % Increase in School Population in Red.
B. % Increase in Number of Assistant Teachers.
C. % Increase in Number of Teachers Recognized Under Article 68 of the Code. (1886 numbers taken as 100)

(The number of male assistant teachers had decreased from 122 in 1886 to 93 in 1900)

Source: Annual Reports of Committee of Council, 1886-1898
Annual Report of Board of Education, 1900.
DIAGRAM 12.

DECREASE IN THE NUMBER OF MEN TEACHERS IN CATHOLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS, 1888 - 1900

SOURCE: ANNUAL REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL AND OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION.

A - NUMBER OF 4TH-YEAR MALE PUPIL-TEACHERS IN CATHOLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS.
B - NUMBER OF STUDENTS ADMITTED TO THE MEN'S TRAINING COLLEGE. (35 PLACES)
C - NUMBER OF MALE ASSISTANT TEACHERS IN CATHOLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS.
As has already been suggested, the vacant places in the college had very serious effect on the college finances. (1) The increasing proportion of women teachers in the elementary schools was not peculiar to the Catholic schools, although the increase was much greater in the Catholic schools than elsewhere. (2)

The two training colleges for women teachers fared rather better than the men's college. It will be remembered that one of the two original colleges, that of the Sisters of the Holy Child, at St. Leonards, closed in 1869, seven years after it had opened. The Liverpool college struggled on alone until 1874. Diamond (3) suggests that the College was able to survive thanks largely to the generosity of a member of the Order who gave £250 per annum to the College for as long as the College required it. In 1874, the Order of the Society of the Sacred Heart opened their College at Wandsworth in South London. (4) At first, the Wandsworth College had a difficult time. The prestige which the Liverpool College had earned for itself meant that Catholic pupil-teachers made that College their first choice when seeking admission to a college. Wandsworth had to make do with the pupil-teachers who had passed the examination well down on the list. Again, vacant places in the College (5) meant higher annual costs per student. But, by 1900, the College was full, and looking for more suitable accommodation. (6) By that time, the Order had already spent £22,000 on the site and the buildings at Wandsworth. (7)

(1) The average cost of maintaining a student in the colleges, based on the official figures for the years 1880 - 1900 was: Hammersmith £65 18s. (Nationally, £57 18s.) Liverpool, £44 18s. Wandsworth, £55 12s. (Nationally, £43.)

(2) See Table 21, p. 363.

(3) Diamond, op. cit. p. 145. The donor, Sister Mary of St. Francis, was the hon. Mrs. Edward Petrel who entered the Order on the death of her husband.

(4) Diamond suggests that Cardinal Manning did not want the new College in the Westminster Archdiocese, so it was established in Wandsworth, which being south of the river, is in the Southwark Diocese. (Op. cit. p. 166.) Ironically, the College eventually moved to the premises in Bayswater which had been built for the school on which the Cardinal had placed such high hopes, but which had eventually been closed.

(5) See Diagram 10, p. 374, and Note (1) above.

(6) The College eventually settled at Roehampton as the Digby-Stuart College.

The effect of the 1902 Act upon the Catholic training colleges illustrates very vividly how important the financial assistance was to the Catholic community. By September, 1904, there were four colleges for women teachers and they offered accommodation for 353 students. All four colleges had been established by religious Orders. By 1906, the number had increased to six colleges and the accommodation for 437 students was available. Although there was still only one college for men (1) by 1906 there was accommodation at Hammersmith for 106 students. 63 of the 70 available places were occupied in 1901, and by 1904 the decision was taken to extend the College to give the extra accommodation. In 1906, 105 of the 106 places were occupied, a pattern which was followed up to 1914. Incredibly, a survey showed that only one of the 105 students came from London. (2)

The Board of Education appears to have been puzzled by the fact that the body responsible for the Catholic education in the country owned only one of the training colleges, the men's college at Hammersmith. All the colleges for women were owned by religious Orders. G.B.M. Coore, an assistant-secretary at the Board, instructed one of his staff, Mr. Barker, to find out as much as he could about the finances of the Catholic Education Council. Mr. Barker reported, in confidence, that the income of the Council amounted to 'less than £3,000 per annum, but an effort is to be made to increase this income...which is less than the expenditure...With the exception of certain funds, the capital of which amounts to about £7,000, the whole of the income is derived from voluntary subscriptions and donations...mostly from collections in Catholic churches.' (3)

Obviously, the most likely cause of the improvement in the fortunes of the Catholic training colleges was the increased demand for qualified Catholic teachers, both men and women. There was no longer any need for the managers of the Catholic schools

(1) St. Mary's College was the only Catholic training college for men teachers until the end of the 1939 - 1945 war.

(2) The same survey showed that of the 631 students in the Catholic training colleges, only 36 came from London.

(3) P.R.O. File Ed.40/72, Coore to Barker, doc. 13972, dated 30th. May, 1905; Barker to Coore, doc. 05/4898, dated 4th. July, 1905.
to shop around, looking for the least expensive teaching force available, because all salaries were paid by the Local Authorities. (1) In many cases, such Authorities insisted that teachers appointed to schools in their areas would have to be qualified teachers. Although many unqualified teachers remained on in the Catholic schools after 1902, one possible explanation is that the managers felt an obligation to the teachers who had served the schools during the difficult years. Local Authorities, in general, were anxious about the standards of the teaching staffs whose salaries they were paying. In Sheffield, for example, the Education Committee would consent to the appointment of teachers qualified under Article 68 'only in very special circumstances... It must be distinctly understood that any such teachers appointed must raise their qualifications within two years.' (2) The Sheffield Committee also agreed that consent to the appointment of any teacher would not be given unless the Staffing Sub-Committee were satisfied that the teacher possessed satisfactory qualifications.

When the managers of the Guardian Angels' Catholic school in the Mile End Road asked permission of the London County Council to appoint a supplementary teacher at a salary of £30 per annum, to assist in the lower standards of the school, the Committee gave permission only on the understanding that another supplementary teacher employed in the same school would be released to attend, half-time, the Council's classes for teachers studying for the certificate. (3) The London County Council could make exceptions to its rules. For many years, an unqualified teacher had given her services free at the school of Our Lady of the Sacred Heart at Islington, 'because of the very great poverty of the voluntary subscribers.' In 1904, the school managers asked the Authority for permission to employ the teacher at a salary of £50 per annum, and permission was granted. (4) In September, 1903, the Leeds Authority confirmed the appointments of two teachers in Catholic schools who were qualified under Article 68. At the same meeting, the appointments of two former pupil-teachers as uncertificated teachers in a Catholic school were confirmed. (5)

(1) The salaries of teachers in the Catholic schools increased considerably after 1902. See Diagram 9, p. 199.

(2) Minutes of the Meeting of the Sheffield Education Committee, 6th. May, 1903. In 1900, of 5,999 adult teachers in the Catholic elementary schools, 3,267 were unqualified. There were 1,555 recognised under Art. 68, and 1,714 assistant teachers.

(3) Minutes of the meeting of the Education Committee of the L.C.C. 26th. October, 1904.


(5) Minutes of the meeting of the Leeds Education Committee, 30th. September, 1903.
In spite of the efforts of the training colleges, there were not always enough qualified teachers. For example, at St. Peter's Catholic school in Cardiff, although the Local Authority had advertised in the papers for a teacher for the school, there were no applicants. An official of the Local Authority called at the school to say he could do nothing further in the matter. (1) Yet, at St. Michael's Girls' School, Ancoats, Manchester, the staff consisted of a certificated mistress, three certificated assistants, two uncertificated assistants and a supplementary teacher to cope with an average attendance of 200 - 220. (2)

The Catholic training colleges set an example in the low level of fees which their students were asked to pay. (3) In 1904, for example, the fees at Homerton were £28 per annum, at Bangor, £25 per annum, and at Edgehill, £25. (4) That fees in the Catholic colleges were so low is a tribute to the generous support given to the colleges by the Catholic community. Academic standards continued to rise, so that by 1910, students from Malta, Tasmania and New Zealand were receiving their training at the colleges in England.

Only on one occasion was there a possibility that the progress being made by the voluntary training colleges might be checked. This was in 1906, when the Liberal Government was looking at the whole question of public funds being given to denominational schools which were not subject to popular control. Under the provisions of the 1902 Act, Local Authorities were encouraged to build training colleges in their areas by generous building grants. (5) Similar grants were made available to the denominations. When the 1906 Education Bill was before Parliament, the President of the Board of Education, Augustus Birrell, wrote to Robert Morant and asked him for his suggestions as to how the denominational training colleges could be brought under popular control. (6) Morant replied after a delay of some days, and apologised to Birrell, explaining that he had been suffering from severe toothache. He explained to Birrell that the case of the training

---

(3) See Table 23 p. 387.
(5) Local Authorities showed no great enthusiasm for the opportunity. By 1938, 21 municipal training colleges had been established.
colleges 'raises more precise issues than do secondary schools and other forms of higher education.' Morant reminded Birrell why the training colleges had come into being in the first place. (1) Their primary purpose had been 'the better education of students intending to be teachers in public elementary schools..... rather than for giving them actual paedological training.'

There was no provision for the education of the intending teacher between his elementary school course and his training college course. The system selected the young boy of 14 in the Church elementary school, made him help to teach from 14 to 18 in that same school, and pick up extra knowledge and practice from the Church head-teacher of that same school, thus keeping him for 12 years in the same surroundings. It then sent him on, if he went to college at all, to a Church training college. Exactly the same was done in the Roman Catholic schools and colleges.

Morant was at pains to explain that in the terms of the 1902 Act, the Government had put 'no premium or special facilities for denominational colleges...but merely offered building grants and maintenance grants impartially to anyone who had founded and would support a training college. The offer was taken up widely by persons interested in denominational education but not by the Nonconformists.' After half a century, the Nonconformists realised that practically all the training provision in the country was conditioned by denominational considerations. 'Then arose their demand that they should be allowed entrance to the existing colleges, long ago founded by the denominations for denominational purposes.....The response of the late Government to this demand was to give Local Authorities the power to provide, out of the rates, new training colleges sufficient for the needs of the nation as a whole....The late Government imposed the Cowper-Temple Clause on any new college so provided out of the rates... thus doing, in 1902, in the sphere of training what the Act of 1870 had done in the sphere of elementary schools....It is to be regretted that the Local Authorities are still hopelessly unwilling, in most cases, to go to the expense of providing training colleges.'

(1) P.R.O. File Ed.24/111, Document B6, dated 12th. May, 1906. 'An Analysis of the Denominational and Public Control Difficulty in regard to Training Colleges.'
In his Analysis(1), Morant then posed two questions for Birrell's consideration:

(a) Can the existing denominational colleges be forced to admit students without any tests?

(b) If the existing residential denominational colleges could be allowed to continue as at present, with the existing grants, would this be a serious inconsistency in government policy?

Morant expressed the opinion that if the denominational training colleges were forced to admit any suitably qualified student to the day facilities in the colleges, this would entail a restriction on the number of residential students admitted, unless the Government was prepared to offer a grant to extend the classroom facilities. Further, any suggestion of the immediate cessation of the grants to training colleges would mean that the colleges would close, and the supply of virtually all the elementary school teachers would be withdrawn. Morant could offer only one solution to the Government's problem. It was that 'the denominationally-staffed colleges were residential institutions, and could, conceivably, be considered on different lines from the elementary schools.'

Presumably, Morant had in mind such 'residential institutions' as the denominational reformatories and industrial schools. There was no question of any changes being made in the administration of these institutions, and in Morant's mind, there seemed to be little difference in principle between the control of such places and the control of the training colleges. (1) However, when Birrell first raised the question with Morant in May, 1906, he had little idea of the fate which was to end the Government's attempts to legislate on the education question. Not surprisingly, nothing further was heard of the attempts to bring the denominational training colleges under representative control. But it is of interest that when the Southampton Training College applied for recognition, the Board refused it, unless there was an attached day training college to which students could be admitted subject to the conscience clause. The Order of nuns establishing the College(2) were forced to use the premises as a hostel for students attending the University College at Southampton, in order to avoid the complete financial loss on

(1) The next document in File Ed. 24/111, B7, dated 2nd. November, 1906, lists the denominational reformatories and industrial schools for boys and girls. 3,910/11,318 or 34% were in Catholic institutions.

(2) The Religious of La Sainte Union des Sacres Coeurs.
the undertaking. Most of the students admitted to the hostel were non-Catholics. Eventually, the Board agreed to the establishment of the residential college without insisting on the attached day college. (1)

Before the implementation of the 1902 Act, the young teacher who had successfully completed the college course was then faced with the problem of finding a teaching post. There were no national salary scales for teachers before 1921 (2) and the salary a teacher could command was largely a matter of luck. The salaries paid to teachers in Board schools were usually better than those paid to teachers in voluntary schools, but here again there were exceptions. In Portsmouth, for example, board schools allowed £1 8s. 9d. per scholar, annually, for teachers' salaries. In the voluntary schools, the corresponding figure was £1 10s. per scholar. (3) But far more typical was the London figure of £2 15s. 9d. in the board schools and £1 13s. 8d. in the voluntary schools. (4) In 1896, the average amount spent on teachers' salaries, per child in average attendance, was £1 10s. 1d. in the voluntary schools and £2 0s. 4d. in the board schools. (5) In the voluntary schools, salaries paid in the Catholic schools were lower than those paid in the schools of the other denominations. (6) It was not that the managers of the Catholic schools were reluctant to pay the higher salaries. The truth was that the money to pay the salaries was simply not available. Although the position improved slightly after the passing of the Voluntary Schools Act of 1897, (7) the resources available to the school boards through the rate fund, were of far more value than the collection in the Church on Sunday. The financial advantages in the matter of the teachers' salaries which were gained as a result of the 1902 Act were very great. The possibility that such advantages might be removed by the proposed legislation of 1906 - 1908 explains much of the bitterness which erupted over the proposals of the legislation contemplated at the time.

(1) The case is discussed in Diamond, op. cit. pp. 179 et seq.
(2) The 'Burnham Scales' were introduced in 1921. Teachers' Certificates were issued by the Board and not by the Colleges up to 1930.
(3) Annual Report of the Committee of Council, 1896 - 97. Table J.
(4) Ibid.
(5) Ibid.
(6) See Table 24, p. 388.
(7) It will be remembered that the Act gave a grant of 5s. per scholar in average attendance to voluntary schools.
### TABLE 23. THE CATHOLIC TEACHER TRAINING COLLEGES, 1902 - 1906.

#### ST. MARY'S, HAMMERSMITH.
FEES. £5 per annum for board, lodging, tuition and washing. The £5 fee was reduced for students who did well in the entrance examination. Students were required to pay one-half of the cost of the books used on the course.

#### NOTRE DAME, LIVERPOOL.
FEES. £7 10s. per annum for board, lodging, tuition, washing. £5 10s. for the books required on the course. 5s. Doctor's fee. 2s. 6d. laboratory breakages. 1s. Library fee. (The board and lodging fee was raised to £10 in 1904.)

#### ST. CHARLES'S, NORTH KENSINGTON. (formerly the Wandsworth College)
FEES. £5 per annum for board, lodging, tuition and washing. 5s. Library fee. 5s. Piano practice.

#### SALFORD.
1904: 20/38 places occupied. 1906: 72/72 places occupied.
FEES. £7 10s. per annum for board, lodging, tuition and washing. £3 10s. Books and stationery. 1s. Library fee. 17s. Drill costume.

#### SOUTHAMPTON.
1904: 29/60 places occupied. 1906: 104/102 places occupied.
FEES. £7 10s. (excluding washing.) 5s. Laboratory fee. 2s. Library and games. Students to provide their own books and stationery.

#### ENDSLEIGH, HULL.
FEES. £10 per annum for board, lodging, tuition and washing. 10s. per annum for laboratory, games and library.

#### ST. MARY'S COLLEGE, NEWCASTLE UPON TYNE.
FEES. £10 per annum for board, lodging, tuition and washing. 7s. 6d. Library fee, 2s. 6d. laboratory fee. Students to provide their own books and stationery.

**SOURCE**  
'Statistics of Public Education in England and Wales' for the relevant years.
### Table 24. Teachers' Salaries, 1896 - 97.

#### Certificated Headmasters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nat. Soc. / C. of E.</th>
<th>£121 19s. 0d.</th>
<th>Rent-free houses 61%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan.</td>
<td>172 19s. 1ld.</td>
<td>&quot; 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.C.</td>
<td>117 15s. 7d.</td>
<td>&quot; 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Society.</td>
<td>143 9s. 1d.</td>
<td>&quot; 30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Schools.</td>
<td>166 3s. 8d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATIONAL AVERAGE</td>
<td>139 16s. 0d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Certificated Assistant Masters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nat. Soc. / C. of E.</th>
<th>£75 16s. 3d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan.</td>
<td>84 15s. 6d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.C.</td>
<td>78 1s. 5d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Society.</td>
<td>92 11s. 5d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Schools.</td>
<td>102 14s. 1d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATIONAL AVERAGE</td>
<td>97 7s. 6d.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, the headmaster in a Catholic school would receive about 70% of the salary which the headmaster in a board school would receive. The corresponding percentage for the assistant master in the Catholic school would be 76%.

#### Certificated Headmistresses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nat. Soc. / C. of E.</th>
<th>£76 4s. 6d.</th>
<th>Rent-free houses 40%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan.</td>
<td>88 6s. 2d.</td>
<td>&quot; 1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.C.</td>
<td>68 0s. 6d.</td>
<td>&quot; 21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Society.</td>
<td>82 16s. 8d.</td>
<td>&quot; 19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Schools.</td>
<td>115 14s. 9d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATIONAL AVERAGE</td>
<td>88 17s. 7d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Certificated Assistant Mistresses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nat. Soc. / C. of E.</th>
<th>£53 0s. 8d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan.</td>
<td>54 13s. 7d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.C.</td>
<td>52 12s. 7d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Society.</td>
<td>57 10s. 11d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Schools.</td>
<td>79 9s. 4d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATIONAL AVERAGE</td>
<td>71 19s. 3d.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, the headmistress in a Catholic school would receive about 58% of the salary which the headmistress in a board school would receive. The corresponding percentage for the assistant mistress in the Catholic school would be 66%.

Nationally, 99% of headmasters in Catholic schools received less than £200 per annum. The corresponding percentage for headmasters in board schools was 70%.

Nationally, 97% of headmistresses in Catholic schools received less than £150 per annum. The corresponding percentage for headmistresses in board schools was 78%.

**Source:** Annual Report of the Committee of the Privy Council, 1896 - 97.
CATHOLIC TEACHER-TRAINING, 1914.

The stark facts of the poverty which haunted the Catholic elementary schools before 1902 are as obvious in the area of teacher-training as in every other area of Catholic elementary education. In fact, had it not been for the efforts of the religious Orders in pouring money into the training colleges, it is difficult to see where the supply of qualified Catholic teachers would have come from.

After 1880, the difference between the educational standards of the pupil-teachers in the board schools and in the voluntary schools became inevitable. In that year, the school boards, empowered to use the school rate to establish pupil-teacher centres, began to educate their pupil-teachers away from their schools. Since pupil-teachers in the Catholic schools were an integral part of the staff, it was quite impossible for them to be released from the schools to study for half of each day. A pupil-teacher in a Catholic school would be lucky to get any time off from teaching duties to study. Thus, the pupil-teacher from the Catholic school would go to the training college with little education beyond that gained in the 'standards' as a pupil or in after-school instruction from the master. This state of affairs was reflected in the narrow curriculum taught in many Catholic schools. Basic subjects were taught extremely well; subjects calling for specialised teaching or apparatus were far too often lacking.

The sad state of the admissions to the men's college at Hammersmith reflects the pattern of the staffing in the Catholic schools before 1902. Such schools had about half of the average percentage of male pupil-teachers, about 90% of the teachers were women, many of whom were without qualifications, and the majority of the teaching staffs were members of religious Orders. Poverty was at the root of this imbalance. Trained men teachers were not in demand since it was cheaper to employ unqualified women teachers.

The change came when the 1902 Act made teachers' salaries the responsibility of the Local Authorities. The demand for trained teachers soared. It reflects great credit on the religious Orders and on the efforts of the Catholic Education Council that the Catholic training colleges were able to provide training facilities for the increased numbers of Catholic students seeking them, and at a much lower cost than in any of the other training colleges.
The new-found security which the Catholic training colleges had enjoyed for the few brief years since 1902 was again threatened by the election of the Liberal Government in 1905. Fortunately, the threat came to nothing and the expansion was able to continue. But by now, a new difficulty was at hand, viz. the lower academic standards of the students seeking admission to the Catholic colleges. The poverty of many Catholic parents meant that their children entering the teaching profession did so via an apprenticeship in an elementary school as a pupil-teacher rather than by way of qualifying in a public examination after education in a secondary school. Tropp (1) suggests that the Board of Education wanted prospective teachers to be educated in secondary schools where they would come under the influence of secondary school teachers rather than under the influence of the elementary school teachers in the pupil-teacher centres, and so be given an education of a quite different quality. But since places for Catholic children, especially boys, in Catholic secondary schools were few and far between, and even then, concentrated in certain areas, it was only by becoming pupil-teachers that Catholics could qualify for admission to the training colleges. Yet the colleges not only survived; by 1914, places were at a premium in every one of them.

CONCLUSION.

The thesis set out to show how the Catholic community in England and Wales, for the most part composed of poor, immigrant Irish people and their descendants, struggled to establish and to protect their elementary schools during the last critical decades of the 19th. century. It has been suggested that, up to 1902 at least, the schools had been established in a spirit of defiance, in a desire to express resentment at the conditions of social and economic deprivation in which the majority of the Catholic community were compelled to live. Since the only alternative to the provision of a Catholic school might well have been attendance at an Anglican school, the Catholic clergy regarded such provision as a necessity if the Catholic children were to be shielded from the supposed dangers to the Faith by attending non-Catholic schools. By 1902, because of the sacrifices of the Catholic community, their elementary schools were firmly established as a part of the national system of education.

After 1902, it was no longer a question of survival. At first it was a question of defending the position gained by the 1902 legislation. But after 1908, it was a matter of seeking equality with the provided schools. Although it was possible to obtain generous grants for the recognised Catholic secondary schools after 1902, somehow the urge to provide recognised Catholic schools never emerged. The spirit of defiance, which prompted thousands of Catholic families to put aside the weekly 'school money' for the parish elementary school, was lacking so far as the secondary schools were concerned. There are several possible reasons for this. Most Irish families lived in large cities, and the municipal secondary schools established in such places were clearly not denominational, and there seemed little risk to a child's Faith from attending such schools. As parents themselves became more educated, their relationship with their neighbours became more cordial, and there seemed little need to make any

(1) By 1914, there were 45 recognised Catholic secondary schools in England but none in Wales. Of the 45, 12 were for boys, 33 for girls. 7 of the boys' schools were in Lancashire and the West Riding, 2 in London, and one each in Bristol, Birmingham and Newcastle upon Tyne. Although 5.7% of the elementary school population attended Catholic schools, 2.6% of the boys attending secondary schools attended recognised Catholic secondary schools. Girls fared much better, 7.2% of the girls attending secondary schools attended Catholic secondary schools. Many of these had been pupil-teacher centres which were recognised as secondary schools. (See Appendix 15, p. 425.)
effort to provide a special Catholic secondary school.(1)

The huge mass of Irish immigrants who came to England in the 19th. century was in no sense a cross section of the population of Ireland. The immigrant body was made up almost entirely of peasants driven from their native land by a simple desire to stay alive.(2) Apart from the Catholic priests who came with them, or followed to minister to them, there was no group of educated Irish immigrants who might have helped their less-fortunate compatriots.(3) As it was, the unskilled Irish labourers were objects of suspicion to their English neighbours. They were despised because of the degrading poverty in which they were compelled to live. All too often, they were hated because of the threat they posed in times when employment was scarce and wages pitifully low.(4) Not surprisingly, the provision of education for its own sake would not rank highly in the priorities of the immigrants. Even as late as 1901, statistics(5) show that although Ireland had enjoyed a national system of education, backed by generous Government Grants since 1831, 14% of the population over the age of five years could neither read nor write. The figures varied in each of the four provinces, from 21% in Connaught to 12% in Ulster. 13.2% of men marrying in Ireland in 1901 were unable to write their names in the register. (The corresponding figure for men in England was 2.8%.) Attendance at the National Schools in Ireland(6) averaged 62% whereas the corresponding figure for English schools was 83%. It is not really surprising that half-time education was more common in the Catholic schools in England and Wales than it was in the board schools or in the Anglican schools.(7) When considered against this background, the continued growth of the Catholic elementary schools in England and Wales is even more remarkable.

(1) It has to be remembered that building grants for voluntary schools had ceased in 1870.

(2) Census figures show that although the population of Ireland fell by 31% between 1851 and 1901, the decline was not spread evenly across the country. In Ulster it was 21%, in Leinster 31%, in Connaught 36%, and in Munster a staggering 42%.

(3) The M.P., T.P. O'Connor claimed that Irish people came to this country only because they did not have the three or four pounds to take them to America; all they had were the three or four shillings to take them to Liverpool on the deck of a cattle boat. (Parliamentary Debates, 7th. May, 1906, c. 1048.)

(4) Booth (op. cit. Vol. 1, p. 36) quoted the wages of 23.6% of the labouring class in 1900 as less than £1 per week.


(6) Schools of the 'National Board' not National Society schools.

(7) See Table 3, p. 114.
It seems doubtful if the Liberal Party hierarchy ever really trusted their Irish allies when the Catholic schools were at risk. When G.B.M. Coore presented a memorandum to the Cabinet in January, 1906, he warned:

'This question of Catholic schools in England and Wales is primarily an Irish question...the Catholic fraction will always be able to count upon a solid phalanx of at least fifty Irish votes....a determined minority will always have it within its power to overthrow a settlement which it regards as outrageous to its inmost convictions.'(1)

Although the behaviour of the Irish members did much to foster an 'us and them' situation between the Irish and their English neighbours, with the benefit of hindsight it seems that the Irish Members really did very little either for or against the cause of the Catholic schools. But the possibility that they just might do something in the matter was always there. It was this which caused both the Liberal Government and the Catholic Hierarchy to treat them with such respect. By absenting themselves from the Commons at critical times, both in 1902 and 1906, the Irishmen managed to steer a careful course between offending the Liberals and doing any real harm to the Catholic cause. All the indications suggest that the clergy did not trust them, and, when such occasions arose, the Catholic electors voted for the candidate named by the local parish priest. Indeed, after the Liberal 'landslide' in 1905, the Catholic press was outspoken in its condemnation of the Irish Members for their part in the return of the Liberal Government.(2)

In spite of the insinuations of the Irish Members, the old English Catholic Peers proved to be the most reliable allies of the Hierarchy in the defence of the schools. It was Archbishop Bourne's reluctance to recognise this fact which almost brought about disaster for the Catholic schools in 1906. With the West Riding case apparently going in the Council's favour, and the Archbishop's naive trust in the ability of the Irish Members to negotiate with the Liberals for a special treatment for the Catholic schools, the Catholic ranks were split, for the first and


(2) E.g. The Tablet, 20th. January, 1906. p. 81. The Editorial spoke of 'the terrible responsibility' which the Irish Members had taken upon themselves for 'the most ruinous blow inflicted on (the Catholic Church in England) since the Reformation.' 'Those who called upon the Catholic electors to put their faith in Mr. Redmond have grievously miscalculated.'
only time. Probably it was the insistence by Asquith that the religious procession, which the Catholic Hierarchy had planned to hold in London in September 1908, should be called off which caused the Archbishop to doubt the value of the expressions of sympathy which the Liberals had made for the Catholic schools. When the Croydon Marks Bill was debated in the House in 1912, the Cardinal was outspoken in his condemnation of the Irish Members' support for the Bill. (1)

The 'ifs' of history may be innumerable, but one 'if' is worthy of consideration so far as the fate of the Catholic schools was concerned. If Campbell-Bannerman's Government had arranged the legislative programme so that the Parliament Act, which became law in 1911, had become law in 1906, before the introduction of the Education Bill of that year, would the Lords have been able to block the passage of the Education Bill? The possibility is that the Bill would have become law, with dire consequences for the Catholic schools. Fortunately, that situation did not arise. The 1902 settlement held firm, and it was not until 1917 that H.A.L. Fisher introduced another major Education Bill which passed into law. (2) When Fisher spoke of 'the increased feeling of social solidarity created by the war' he was describing the process which had done much to destroy the barrier of hate which had once existed between the Irish communities and their English neighbours. It would have been difficult indeed to look down on communities whose menfolk had died in their thousands doing battle in the common cause. Fisher insisted that 'the old religious controversy must not be fanned into flame...education must be considered in the light of educational needs, and in the light of those alone...' (3)

Not all Catholics, not even all Irish Catholics, were concerned with the fate of the Catholic elementary schools. The socially-mobile Catholics who aspired to a higher social status might well have their children educated in one of the numerous Catholic private schools which had been established during the 19th. century. (4) The wide variations in the fees charged in such

(1) See p. 346 supra. Archbishop Bourne was named Cardinal in 1911.

(2) The Education Act, 1918, was introduced on 10th. August, 1917. Fisher was President of the board of education in the Coalition Government headed by David Lloyd George.

(3) Parliamentary Debates, 10th. August, 1917.

(4) 43% of the pupils attending private schools known to the board in 1901 were attending Catholic schools. (239,369 out of 544,755.) Source: P.R.O. File Ed. 24/14, Memorandum 20, dated 1st. October, 1901.
schools suggest that they catered for a wide range of social groups. It would be reasonable to assume that Catholic parents whose children attended such schools in preference to the parish elementary school would have more in common with non-Catholic parents whose children attended the same school than with Catholic parents whose children attended the parish elementary school. (1) Booth's observations in London suggest that many of the converts to the Catholic church came from what Booth described as middle-class circles, and if in such circles there were 'mixed' marriages, there were safeguards for the religious education of the children of such marriages. (2)

Archbishop Bourne, unlike his two predecessors, was in a different social position from the old Catholic peers, and he seemed to be very conscious of the fact. It will be remembered that in the controversy over the 1906 Bill, he complained to the Duke of Norfolk about the way in which the old Catholic peers had opposed his appointment. (3) But it was the Archbishop's misfortune that he could not see the schools issue as a purely moral one, which was how the old Catholic peers regarded it, rather than as a political issue, which the Irish Members had made it. The idea that two dozen Catholic schools in the single-school areas could be sacrificed for some political gain was one which the old Catholics would never entertain.

When one considers the high proportion of half-timers and the poor attendance figures in the Catholic elementary schools, it is not surprising that the Catholic parents who had supported the elementary schools so loyally showed little enthusiasm for the Catholic secondary schools. (4) Such parents were not anxious to prolong the school careers of their children any more than was necessary to keep within the law. Had secondary education been compulsory in 1902, and organised on a parochial basis, no doubt there would have been a much greater response from the parents. But state-aided secondary education was for the few (5)

---

(1) Kohn, M.L. 'Social Class and Parent-Child Relationships' in American Journal of Sociology 1969, pp. 471 - 480. In an analysis of differences in social class behaviour, Kohn stresses that by enjoying or suffering different conditions of life, members of different social classes develop quite different ideas of social reality. Thus, it seems quite likely that the outlook of the socially-mobile Catholics would change.


(3) See p. 260 supra. The Archbishop would not give any details.

(4) Attendance figures in Catholic schools were affected by the distances which many pupils had to travel to reach the school.

(5) Before 1914, about 5% of elementary school children gained free places.
and, for the Catholic parent able to pay the fees, there was the wide choice of private schools. Otherwise, for the gifted boy or girl attending a Catholic elementary school, a place as a pupil-teacher was always a possibility. Apart from that, it was as well not to have ideas 'above one's station in life,' even in Catholic circles.

The spirited defence of the Catholic elementary schools by Cardinal Manning and by his successor, Cardinal Vaughan, earned the admiration of politicians of both major political Parties. But, after 1902, when the schools issue became involved with the Irish Home Rule issue, it was seen more as a political issue. The Cabinet Ministers of both major Parties appear to have tried very hard to be fair to the Catholic schools and were always willing to see the particular difficulties which they experienced. Probably, the politicians deserved more credit than they have received from Catholic sources. But the Liberal politicians were always annoyed by the way in which their Conservative opponents cited the example of the difficulties of the Catholic schools when it was necessary to make a point in the debate.

The claims made by the Catholics about the superiority of their schools probably have little basis in fact. The annual Government Grants earned by the Catholic schools during the last decade of the 19th. century fell well short of those earned by the board schools. (1) Only as 'value for money' schools did the Catholic schools stand out. When the amounts of money earned in Government Grants are stated as a percentage of the amounts spent in maintenance, the Catholic school stood out above the others. (2)

But the greatest achievement of the Catholic schools in the years before 1902 is that they survived at all. Although some Catholic schools were closed, through falling numbers, no Catholic school with its scholars was ever handed over to a school board. After thirty years of unequal and unfair competition between the voluntary schools and the board schools, competition which bore

(1) See Diagram 4, p. 30. Between 1876 and 1899, the amount of the annual Government Grant earned by the board schools increased by 101%, that earned by Catholic schools increased by only 52%.

(2) The actual percentage figures were: Catholic schools earned 48.9% of the money spent in maintenance; board schools earned 37.5%. (Source: Annual Report of the Committee of Council, 1896-1897, p. lxxi.)
most heavily on the Catholic schools because of the poverty of the Catholic community, by 1902, of all the voluntary schools, the Catholic schools were the only ones in which attendances were still increasing. (1) Much to the surprise of so many of the Liberals, the voluntary schools still educated more children each year than the board schools. Those who had set such high hopes on the future of the school boards must have realised after listening to the debates on the Technical Instruction Bills of 1888 and 1889, that any future national education legislation would have to be based on the 318 Local Authorities covering the whole country, rather than on 2,568 school boards covering about half of it. Although it was not realised at the time, the County Council Act of 1888 - 9 (2) had sealed the fate of the school boards. The attempts made to amend the settlement of 1902 were inspired, not by the need for further education reform, but rather for ideological and political reasons. That settlement worked well, and the longer it was in force, the less need there seemed to be to interfere with it. Even the attempts which the Liberal Government made to change the system in the single-school areas came to nothing. 'Three successive Presidents of the Board of Education had spent themselves in vain endeavours to abolish the dual system...the Liberals who had entered office with high hopes were in despair...it was indeed a sad retrospect to look back and acknowledge complete failure.' (3) Not only had their attempts failed. The failures seem to have deterred the Government from making any serious effort to interfere with the dual system during the rest of the Government's period in office. Forty years later, when the 1944 Act was enacted, the generous treatment offered to the voluntary schools was some indication of the respect which the denominations, not least the Catholics, had earned by their struggle to preserve religious education in their schools. The sacrifices made in the 19th. century by the Catholic poor who, out of the poverty and squalor of their lives, somehow found the money to build their Catholic schools, were the foundation on which such respect was built.

(1) Between 1902 and 1911, average attendances in Catholic elementary schools increased from 269,191 to 295,802 (9.8%). The number of schools increased from 1,056 to 1,074 (1.7%). Actual accommodation fell by 6.6% during the period, from 403,064 to 376,426. Source: Cd. 6002, Roman Catholic Schools, 1902 - 1911.

(2) The Local Government Act passed in August, 1888, came into effect on 1st. January, 1889.
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APPENDIX 1. THE ERRINGTON LETTER. (1)

House of Commons, May 15th, 1885.

Dear Lord Granville,

The Dublin Archbishopric being still undecided, I must continue to keep the Vatican in good humour about you, and keep up the communication with them as much as possible. I am almost ashamed to trouble you again when you are so busy, but perhaps on Monday you would allow me to show you the letter I propose to write.

This premature report about Dr. Moran(2) will cause increasing pressure to be put on the Pope and create many fresh difficulties. The matter, therefore, must be most carefully watched so that the strong pressure I can still command may be used at the right moment, and not too soon or unnecessarily. (Far too much pressure is quite as dangerous as too little.) To effect this, constant communication with Rome is necessary.

I am, dear Lord Granville,
Faithfully Yours,
G. Errington.

At first, Errington denied ever having written the letter, but when the newspaper offered to produce the copy, he admitted writing the letter but insisted that the letter must have been stolen. The Irish Nationalist Member, William O'Brien, raised the matter in the House of Commons, but Errington refused to answer any questions on the matter because he said O'Brien was quoting from a document which he knew must have been stolen.(3)

(1) This is the version of the letter which appeared in The Weekly Register on 1st. August, 1885, p. 157. Earlier, in the issue of 4th. July, 1885, p.19, an editorial had commented on 'the folly of a Minister in permitting himself to be persuaded to write a letter, accrediting a discredited politician to make representations which benefit nobody and offend everybody.....Mr. Errington was not able to persuade anyone that a veto on episcopal appointments - now denied even to Catholic rulers - should be allowed to Protestant statesmen with no care for the well-being of the Church....We hope Mr. Errington had the political piety to exclaim, 'Thank Granville!' when he knew he was rewarded with a title for accomplishing far less than nothing...'

(2) The Archbishop of Sydney, suggested by Granville as a suitable cleric for the Archbishopric.

(3) Parliamentary Debates, 5th. August, 1885.
Although Cardinal Manning had known of the Errington Mission for some weeks, it was not until the end of April, 1885, that knowledge of the Mission became general. A French newspaper carried an article explaining that

...the candidate presented in the first instance by the Irish clergy(1) Dr. Walsh, has been absolutely rejected by the English Government....The Queen has not forgotten that when she sent her expression of sympathy with the Chapter of Dublin on the occasion of the death of Cardinal McCabe, it was Dr. Walsh who opposed energetically the return of an address of thanks.'(2)

On the same day, an Irish Member, Thomas Sexton, asked the Prime Minister to explain Errington's presence in Rome, and if he had been in communication with the Pope. Gladstone would only say that 'so far as I am aware, the Cabinet have never had any cognizance of any communication between Mr. Errington and the Pope.' On the following day, Tuesday, 28th. April, Mr. Leamy asked the Foreign Secretary, 'to be good enough to explain what Mr. Errington is doing in Rome.' Fitzmaurice replied that Mr. Errington had not been given any instructions on what to do in Rome.(3)

Rumours continued to circulate. The Rome correspondent of The Times had

'the highest authority for explicitly stating that neither the Pope nor the Propaganda has sent, either through Mr. Errington or anyone else, a new list of three names to be submitted to the English Government for the selection of one of the three named for the Archbishopric of Dublin.'(4)

On Friday, 31st. July, 1885, the day before the Weekly Register published the Errington letter, T. P. O'Connor asked the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Bourke, if he 'knew anything about a letter published in an Irish newspaper, purporting to be addressed by Sir George Errington to Earl Granville.' The Under-Secretary replied that he had not seen the letter and he was 'not acquainted with any correspondence between

---

(1) 46 out of the 63 parish priests in the Archdiocese had voted for Dr. Walsh. (The Universe, 18th. April, 1885, p. 1.)

(2) Le Temps, 27th. April, 1885. Dr. Walsh had argued that the Queen's message had been sent to Lord Spencer, who conveyed it to the Chapter, and there was no need for the Chapter to thank the Queen.

(3) Parliamentary Debates, 27th. April and 28th. April, 1885.

(4) The Times, 18th. May, 1885. The Universe (15th. August, 1885, p. 2) quoted a statement from the Bishop of Ferns that he had learned 'from the lips of the Holy Father himself, that Sir George Errington had never approached His Holiness in relation to the appointment of the Archbishop of Dublin.'
Errington was the villain of the piece when the full facts of the Mission became known. What rankled most with the Irish Bishops was the fact that Errington was an Irishman and a Catholic, and a member of an illustrious Catholic family. The general opinion was that he should have known better than to be associated with such an adventure. The Universe saw him as 'the illustrious Errington, one of those Irish M.P.'s whose reputations have long been unsavoury in the nostrils of their countrymen.' Bishop Croke of Cashel described Errington as being 'held in utter abhorrence by every genuine Irishman on earth.' The Weekly Register was a little kinder. An editorial suggested that 'the best thing that can be done now is to forget as speedily as possible a series of incidents which, so long as they are remembered, must be remembered by all concerned in them with a very deep regret.'

(1) Errington was created Baron Errington in June, 1885.
(3) Errington was born in Dublin in 1839 and educated at the Catholic seminary-school at Ushaw, and at the Catholic University in Dublin. He was Member for Longford, 1874 - 1885. There are five Catholic priests named Errington listed in English and Welsh Priests, 1558 - 1800 (Dom. Aidan Bellenger, Downside Abbey, 1984, p. 57.)
(5) Ibid. 27th. June, 1885, p. 3.
In spite of the name of the Manifesto, it was, in fact, not written by Parnell. However, such was the influence of the very name of Parnell that the Manifesto was widely publicised in the national press when it was issued on 23rd, November, 1885, the day on which the polling began. Parnell's name did not appear on the Manifesto, which was signed by Justin McCarthy, Thomas Sexton, T.P. O’Connor and other members of the executive of the Irish National League. Michael Davitt suggested that Parnell did not approve of the Manifesto (1), but this seems unlikely.

O’Connor described how Parnell reacted to the Manifesto:

'The conversation between Parnell and myself with regard to the Manifesto took place at our small office in Palace Chambers....Parnell proposed no change in it, except to add after the word 'Liberals' 'and Radicals.'...Somehow or other, I felt that his reception of my (sic) Manifesto was somewhat tepid....I know now that at that very moment he was in consultation with Lord Richard Grosvenor, the Chief Liberal Whip, as to some deal by which, in the general ruck of denounced Liberals, there might be room in the arrangements to include O'Shea as the Liberal candidate for the Exchange Division.'(2)

What O’Connor did not know, or so it would appear from his Memoirs, was that O’Shea's wife, Katherine, had also approached Lord Grosvenor about finding a constituency which her husband could contest as a Liberal. Her suggestion was that if her husband was adopted as Liberal candidate for Mid Armagh, Parnell would get the whole of the Catholic vote in Armagh behind the Liberals as well as in four other Ulster constituencies.(3)

Although Parnell worked hard to get O’Shea returned in the Exchange Division of Liverpool, and although Gladstone himself approved of him as a Liberal candidate, O’Shea was defeated by 55 votes.(4) As things turned out, that 55 vote defeat was to

(4) The Conservative polled 2,964 votes, O’Shea, 2,909 votes, and the Liberal polled just 36 votes. A letter from Lord Richard Grosvenor to O’Shea (The Universe 28th. November, 1885, p.3) said, 'Mr. Gladstone authorises me to say he wishes you to obtain the seat.'
have far-reaching consequences for Parnell. O'Connor was of the opinion that 'if the miserable majority of 55 votes had been the other way, all the subsequent history of Parnell and Ireland would have been different.'

After the defeat at Liverpool, Parnell and O'Shea looked for another constituency which would return O'Shea to Parliament. The opportunity came in February, 1886, when there was a by-election in Galway. Parnell nominated O'Shea as his candidate and O'Shea was returned by 942 votes to his opponent's 54. But some outspoken remarks by the defeated candidate and his supporters after the election served to make public the nature of the relationship between Parnell and Katherine O'Shea, Captain O'Shea's wife. In 1889, the divorce suit was filed, and, because of the scandal, Parnell was voted out of office as the leader of the Irish Party, his place being taken by Justin McCarthy. Angry at the treatment he had received, Parnell returned to Ireland, determined to show his opponents that the people of Ireland were still behind him. He nominated his candidates in three by-elections, at Kilkenny (1890), North Sligo (March, 1891) and Carlow (May, 1891). All three were heavily defeated. Parnell returned to England where his marriage to the former Mrs. O'Shea took place in June, 1891. He died five months later at the age of 45. His widow survived him for another thirty years, and died at Littlehampton in 1921. Captain O'Shea died at Hove in 1906.


(2) There are several biographies of Charles Parnell. Possibly the most accurate account is in: Lyons, F.S.L. The Fall of Parnell, 1890 - 1891. London. 1960.
APPENDIX 3.

THE APPOINTMENT OF BERNARD MOLLOY AS A MEMBER OF THE CROSS COMMISSION.

The obvious choice for the second Catholic representative on the Cross Commission was Thomas Allies, the secretary of the Catholic Poor School Committee. But relations between the Hierarchy and Allies were strained and, to Allies's annoyance, the Irish Nationalist Member of Parliament for Birr, Co. Offaly, Bernard Molloy, was chosen instead. Molloy was a barrister who lived and practised in London. He was a friend of the Cardinal and had been educated at St. Edmund's College, Ware. A supporter of Parnell, he had first been elected to Parliament as Member for King's County in the 1880 election, and for Birr in 1885. He took little interest in the affairs of the Commission and resigned in 1887, his place being taken by the Duke of Norfolk.

In March, 1888, Allies wrote to the Duke, giving his views on Molloy's appointment:

'You will remember that Mr. Young raised the question of the appointment of Mr. Molloy as the second representative of the Catholics on the Education Commission. His motion was put off until the next meeting....In the interval, he received a letter of six pages from Cardinal Manning, taking upon himself the appointment of Mr. Bernard Molloy, and begging him not to proceed with his motion. ...In consequence, he withdrew it. One of the Bishops at the time explained it to me as the appointment of the parish clerk to say 'Amen' to the parson.(1).... The effect was that the (Poor School) Committee was evicted from the very place and office it was intended to occupy, and one person posed as the representative of clergy and laity in the most important occasion we have seen....'(2)

At the hearings of the Cross Commission, Allies gave evidence to the effect that he believed that rate-aid would be detrimental to the future of the Catholic schools, a point of view he shared with Lord Ripon and the Liberals, in opposition to the views of the Cardinal. The Minority Report of the Commission made much of his evidence.

(1) The remark has been attributed to Allies himself, but it would seem that he was quoting a remark made by one of the Bishops. Unfortunately, he does not say which Bishop. The reference to 'the parson' recalls that the Cardinal had been a member of the Church of England clergy, as indeed, had Allies.

(2) Arundel Castle Archives, Thomas Allies to the Duke of Norfolk, 14th. March, 1888.
Dr. Dale was a Nonconformist Minister who lived and worked in Birmingham. He was well known in that city as a member of the Birmingham School Board and an opponent of the voluntary school system. He had first clashed with the Cardinal in a series of articles published in The Nineteenth Century. It was during the exchange of articles in that periodical that Cardinal Manning wrote to Canon O'Sullivan, a Catholic priest serving in Birmingham, and asked him for some information about Dr. Dale. In his reply, the Canon described Dr. Dale as

'A rampant politician...one of the lights of the Liberal Party here...a strong religionist and a leading Nonconformist. During the six years we were together on the School Board, he was a follower of Chamberlain...he seemed to cling to the notion of forcing on the board schools the simple reading of the Bible. This, however, he soon gave up, and advocated the utter absence of any religious teaching...In his heart, I am sure he feels the strength, consistency and logic of Catholic doctrine.'

References are not given either for Leslie's quotation that the Cardinal considered Dr. Dale to be 'a Birmingham rough, like his master,' or for Dark's quotation that the Cardinal 'detested' Dr. Dale. Both quotations seem quite out of keeping with the Cardinal's character. In 1888, before the publication of the Cross Commission Report, the Cardinal had sent Dr. Dale a copy of his pamphlet, 'The Discourse of the Holy Spirit.' Dr. Dale replied with a courteous letter of thanks for the pamphlet 'which Your Eminence was good enough to send me.' By June, 1891, Dr. Dale was convinced that 'the denominational schools are now too strong for it to be possible to transfer the powers of their managers to the school boards.'

(6) Parliamentary Debates, 29th. June, 1891. c. 1764. During a speech on the Elementary Education Bill, Joseph Chamberlain quoted from an article which Dr. Dale had written for The Nonconformist. Chamberlain added, 'I cordially adopt Dr. Dale's views and reasoning on the subject.'
The Clauses which caused the anxiety among the Managers of the voluntary schools were as follows:

**GRANTS.**

The Merit Grant and the percentage Grant, based on the tests in the Standards were to cease. They would be replaced by one 'General Grant.' This would be paid at 12s., 14s., or 15s. 6d. per scholar, according to the Inspector's Report. A school would not be allowed to present any scholars for examination in the high-earning 'Specific' subjects (two subjects, 4s. per subject) unless the school as a whole has earned the General Grant at 14s. or 15s. 6d. per scholar.

On the awarding of the General Grant, the Code stated:

'Whether the school should receive any of these sums is determined by the Department, after considering the report and the recommendation of the Inspector.'

'If any General Grant has once been made, it may be reduced to 12s., but shall not be wholly withdrawn on the ground of inefficiency until after warning that it may be withdrawn at the next annual inspection if the report then made is not satisfactory.'

**STAFFING.**

The principal teacher in an elementary school must be certificated, and could be responsible for 60 scholars. Each additional certificated teacher on the staff could be responsible for 70 scholars (instead of 80 as formerly); each adult uncertificated teacher could be responsible for 50 scholars (60 formerly). Each pupil-teacher in a school could be responsible for 30 scholars, (40 formerly.)

**BUILDINGS.**

The school premises shall be constructed in general conformity with the rules for planning and fitting-up public elementary schools issued by the Department. This shall be the general rule, unless there are special circumstances. In every case, the Department will endeavour to secure at least 100 cubic feet of internal space and 10 square feet of internal area for each unit of average attendance.

**DAY TRAINING COLLEGES.**

'A training college is an institution either for boarding, lodging, and instructing or merely instructing students who are preparing to become certificated teachers in elementary schools. The former are called 'residential', the latter 'day training colleges.' The same college may be both a residential and a day college.' 'Local Committees' would be allowed to set up day training colleges for Queen's Scholars.
The three levels of payment of the General Grant were dropped. Instead, the grant would be paid at either 12s. 6d. or 14s. per scholar and there would be an additional grant, paid at 1s. or 1s. 6d. for 'discipline and organisation.' Payments for class subjects, at one of two levels, were unchanged.

STAFFING.

The staffing regulations were slightly eased. Trained certificated teachers could be responsible for 70 scholars. Teachers who were certificated but untrained could be responsible for 60 scholars. Uncertificated teachers could be responsible for 50 scholars. There would be a new category of teacher, 'additional teacher approved by the Department' who could be responsible for 30 scholars in the same manner as pupil-teachers. Where a teacher left the school during a term, managers would be allowed to employ older scholars as 'monitors' but only for the remainder of the term. Such 'monitors' could be responsible for 30 scholars.

BUILDINGS.

The 10 sq. ft./100 cu. ft. regulation would apply to all new schools but not to existing schools or to schools being built. All existing school buildings would continue to be recognised for the same number of scholars as before. (It is of interest to note that when the Liberal Government was in power, 1892 - 95, the 10sq. ft./100 cu. ft. regulation came into force for all school buildings.)

FINANCE.

Managers and not headteachers were responsible for the finances of the school. Headteachers were not to be allowed to organise the affairs of the school for their own financial advantage. All payments were to be made by the managers, and not by the headteacher. This meant that assistant teachers and school 'officials,' caretakers, cleaners, &c. were to be paid by the managers. A cash book containing details of all the finances of the school was to be kept. A balance sheet was to be available for H.M. Inspector on his annual inspection. This balance sheet was to be published after the inspection.
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MINIMUM CONCESSIONS REQUIRED FOR THE ACCEPTANCE OF THE 1906 EDUCATION BILL AS STATED BY:

THE ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER.

THE IRISH NATIONALISTS.

THE CATHOLIC PEERS. (The Catholic Peers actually voted against the Lords' Amendments because they felt that they did not offer sufficient safeguards for the future of the Catholic schools. The Irish Nationalist Members joined with the Liberals in voting to reject the Lords' Amendments on the grounds that they made too many concessions to the denominations.)

THE ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER. (The concessions were set out in a confidential letter to Lord Ripon, written from Paris, 8th. Dec. 1906. Ripon sent the letter to Birrell. See P.R.O. File Ed. 24/111, B.11, 'Correspondence as to the safe-guarding of the Catholic schools.')

1. Extended facilities to be granted everywhere, except in the single-school areas.

2. In Clause 4, the proportion of parents to be no higher than three-quarters, where only the parents actually voting would be considered.

3. Alternative schools to be required as a condition of the granting of extended facilities only if a reasonable number of children need them.

4. Teachers to be appointed with, at very least, the concurrence of the Parents' Committee.

5. Consideration must be given to the future provision of Catholic schools.

THE IRISH NATIONALISTS.

1. Clause 4 to be mandatory, not optional, for Local Authorities.

2. Three-quarters of the number of parents actually voting to be sufficient for the granting of extended facilities.

3. The 'urban areas' limit to be abolished.

4. Some mitigation of the requirement for the provision of alternative accommodation in the areas of extended facilities schools.

5. There should be some guarantee that the teachers appointed to Catholic schools would be acceptable to Catholic sentiment.
APPENDIX 6. continued.

6. Clause 6 to be omitted. (This was the Clause which proposed that all religious instruction, other than the Cowper-Temple type of instruction, should be given out of school hours.)

7. Catholic schools built in the future must be eligible for recognition under the scheme.

(These conditions were set out by John Dillon in a letter to The Times, 15th December, 1906, p. 13. He claimed that he had already gained nine-tenths of these conditions when the Lords' Amendments caused the Bill to be withdrawn.)

THE CATHOLIC PEERS.

(The Amendments listed are those which the House of Lords made in the Bill, and which the Government refused to accept. The Catholic Peers voted against the Lords' Amendments on the grounds that they did not offer sufficient safeguards for the future of the Catholic schools.)

1. Local Authorities to take over ALL voluntary schools, without any option.

2. There should be daily religious instruction in all public elementary schools.

3. In single-school areas, there should be ordinary facilities if enough parents requested them.

4. Clause 4 should be modified. The 5,000 limit for urban areas should be abolished, and the obligation to provide alternative accommodation should only be enforced if a substantial number of parents requested such accommodation. Extended facilities should be granted if two-thirds of the parents actually voting asked for them.

5. If there was a shortage of places in a school giving denominational instruction under the extended facilities clause, preference should be given to children of the denomination.

6. The Committee which would be established to control the religious instruction in the school would consist of six members, four parents, the 'owner' of the school and one representative of the Local Authority.

7. In any dispute over the take-over of school premises, the Board of Education would have the right to overrule the Local Authority.

8. In appointing a teacher to a school enjoying extended facilities, the Local Authority would consult with the Parents' Committee on the question of the teacher's suitability. In the other types of school, the Local Authority would decide the teacher's suitability for giving Cowper-Temple type instruction.

(The Catholic Peers and the Catholic Education Council considered that the term 'consult with' was too vague, and lacked any firm guarantee that only suitable Catholic teachers would be appointed to Catholic schools.)
APPENDIX 7. TENURES AND TRUSTS OF ROMAN CATHOLIC SCHOOLS.


The 1906 Bill envisaged the taking-over of all the voluntary elementary schools in the country, and the legal implications of such an action were likely to be considerable. The officials of the Board of Education had ascertained the position with regard to the Catholic elementary school premises in the country and had assessed the position as follows:

CLASS A. OLD TRUST DEEDS. 157 schools; 7 parts of schools.

Selby-Bigge was of the opinion that these would present no legal problem. 'The principle that the Local Authority should be regarded as executing one side of the Trust can probably be applied.'

CLASS B. MODERN TRUST DEEDS. 558 schools; 1 part of a school.

These 558 schools were not being used solely for the purposes of education, but possibly as churches on Sundays. The State would not, therefore, be entitled to regard them as being held solely on the terms of educational Trusts.

CLASS C. PRIVATELY OWNED SCHOOLS. 237 schools. 3 parts of schools.

These 237 schools, the private property of individuals, or, more likely, of religious Orders, presented a serious problem. The legal question seemed to be whether the premises had ever been used for any purpose other than that of education, before the Local Authorities had accepted responsibility for them in 1902.

CLASS D. NO TRUST DEEDS. (Premises simply used as schools.) 114 schools. 1 part of a school.

These 114 schools would be treated like the schools in Class B, and the Board had already made Orders for the appointment of Foundation Managers for the schools.

Selby-Bigge's recommendation was that the schools should be separated into two groups. The 829 schools in Classes A, B, and D could be expected to come into the hands of the State without too much trouble. If it could be shown that the 237 privately-owned schools in Class C had usage confined to education before 1902, he felt that these schools also could be acquired without any great difficulty.
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'CONSIDERATIONS ARISING OUT OF THE EDUCATION DEBATE, 1906.'

(Monsignor Brown's Memorandum, dated 13th. February, 1907.
SOURCE: Westminster Diocesan Archives, File Bo.1/178, Document 22.)

'One of the great inducements to the Catholic body to accept the Act of 1902 was that the Act would put the whole cost of maintenance of the schools, apart from the upkeep of the building, upon the public purse, while admitting Catholic children to many educational opportunities of which they had hitherto been deprived.

But this was not obtained without some sacrifices on the part of the Catholic body.

1. The loss of the cumulative vote(1) with no effectual means of securing representation on the new Education Authorities.

2. Teachers became officers of the Local Authority. Their dismissal, even on religious grounds, was practically impossible.

3. After 1902, any Catholic school whose attendance might fall below 30, could be closed by the Local Authority without any redress or compensation. The case of the Catholic school at Slindon in Sussex was an example.

4. Every difficulty was put in the way of opening new Catholic schools unless the Local Authority was friendly, or the number of children for whom the school was demanded was high, and certainly not less than 100.

5. The Act of 1902 compelled Catholic schools to receive non-Catholic pupil-teachers, and made it possible, in spite of the terms of Trust Deeds, for the Local Authority to require a Protestant assistant teacher to be appointed if no Catholic teacher could be found to fill the vacancy.

The Bill of 1906 recognised that England is a Protestant country. The Government, from first to last, made no secret of the fact that they were legislating in the main for Protestant children. They always admitted that into such a scheme as they proposed, neither Catholics, nor Jews, nor High Churchmen could be expected to enter. But, at the same time, they also admitted that no legislation could specify, and, by name, give place and privilege to Catholics, Jews and High Churchmen which was not offered to

(1) The Act of 1870 had given the school board electors one vote for each vacancy on the school board. Thus, if there were six vacancies, each elector would have six votes. The votes could be cast in any way, either all for one candidate, which favoured the minority groups, or shared among more than one of the candidates. J.C.
Undoubtedly, the Bill had its drawbacks, and perhaps, even outside the single-school districts some Catholic schools with many Protestant children might have been lost, but is it likely that any opportunity as good will ever be offered again to the Catholic schools of finding a place within the national system...?
APPENDIX 9.

THE ELEMENTARY EDUCATION (ENGLAND AND WALES) BILL, 1908.
The Bill was introduced on 25th. November, 1908, by Mr. Runciman,
President of the Board of Education. (Parliamentary Debates, cc.
420 - 423)

All rate-aided schools will be under the control of the Local
Education Authority.

Denominational teaching in such schools will be allowed only at the
expense of the denomination.

There will be no denominational tests for teachers in such schools.

There will be 'universal facilities' for children whose parents
wish them to have denominational teaching on two mornings each
week.

In single-school parishes, the school must come under the national
system, and the Local Education Authority must provide accommodation
in such schools for every child who desires it. No child shall be
forced to attend a denominational school.

TRANSFER OF VOLUNTARY SCHOOLS.

Schools may be either transferred absolutely or, in the case of
schools subject to a charitable trust deed, transferred but with the
user remaining with the trustees, or passed, with the user, to
the Local Education Authority. The amount of money paid for the
transfer would vary with the nature of the transfer.

CONTRACTING-OUT SCHOOLS.

Contracting-out will not be allowed in single-school parishes.

There must be at least thirty children in average attendance in
any school wishing to contract out.

Contracted-out schools must attain equal efficiency with the Council
schools in staff, premises and secular instruction.

Contracted-out schools must belong to an association of a denom-
ination for England and Wales, and there will be only one assoc-
iation for each denomination. The grants will be paid to the
association which will distribute them according to need. All the
grants will be spent on maintenance.

Contracted-out schools will continue to be public elementary schools.

Children attending contracted-out schools will retain the advantages
of such civic services as medical inspection, admission to cookery and
handicraft centres, and the right to be fed under the terms of the
Feeding of Children Act.

Contracted-out schools will be allowed to charge fees up to a limit
of 30s. per child per annum.
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THE 1908 EDUCATION BILL - DIFFERENT VERSIONS OF THE COST OF MAINTENANCE IN THE CATHOLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS.

The President of the Board of Education, Mr. Runciman, invited Archbishop Bourne to send his representatives to the Board's offices to meet the officials for a discussion of the figures which were being quoted as being the cost of maintenance in the Catholic schools. (1) The invitation was accepted. Runciman told his officials to 'make mincemeat of their figures.' (2) The Catholic party consisted of Rev. monsignor Brown, F.R. Anderton, (Secretary to the Catholic Education Council) and Council members Cash, O'Dea, Pinnington, Price, Villiers and Watts. The Board's representatives were R.L. Morant (Secretary) and W.F. Sheppard, G.E. Murray, and J.B. Poore.

Morant was insistent on knowing the basis of the figures submitted. Monsignor Brown explained that the difficulty was to relate their figures, which were a year or more out of date, with the current figures. For example, in the Monsignor's own parish at Vauxhall, the figures used by the Delegation with him had been compiled earlier that year, in March, 1908. The bill for the teachers' salaries then had been £1,586 per annum. Now, (i.e. in November, 1908) the bill had risen to £1,758 per annum. When Mr. Murray raised the question of the effect on the figures of the movement of non-Catholic children from the Catholic schools, Monsignor Brown said there was no way in which such figures could be estimated.

The figures which the Catholic Delegation left at the Board were later tabulated. (3) They were as follows:

| EXPENDITURE: £835,287, equivalent to 58s. 8d. per scholar. | Of this, £710,706, equivalent to 49s. 1ld. per scholar, was accounted for by the expenditure on teachers' salaries. £124,581, or 8s. 9d. per scholar was attributable to 'other items.' |

| GRANTS. These would amount to £704,473, leaving a deficiency of £130,814, or 9s. per scholar. |

After examining the figures submitted, the Board concluded that the estimates were 'wild' e.g. there were variations in the cost

(1) Westminster Diocesan Archives, File Bo.l/181, dated 19th. November, 1908. (See also p. 318 supra.)

(2) P.R.O. File Ed.24/153, Document 93, dated 27th. November, 1908. (See also p. 318 supra.)

of cleaning, warming and lighting the schools. St. Thomas at Wandsworth gave this cost as 20s. 3d. per scholar; St. Ignatius at Ossett as 15s. 7d. per scholar; St. Mary's, Nottingham, as 14s. per scholar; Holy Family, Saffron Hill, as 11s. per scholar; St. Mary's, Ilkley, as 10s. 6d. per scholar.

Similarly, the Board found that expenditure on books ranged from 15s. 3d. per scholar at St. Ann's, Leeds, to 11s. 4d. per scholar at St. James, Marylebone. 'Other expenses' ranged from 9s. 7d. in one school to 9s. 4d. in another. The Board also considered that 'many items have been included which are inadmissible as maintenance... No doubt, if other expenses could be dissected, many other items could be discovered.' The following examples were quoted:

St. Vincent's, Knutsford included the cost of the teachers' superannuation.

St. Ann's, Nantwich included the interest charge on £3,300 at 4%.

Holy Family, Saffron Hill, included 'Interest charges and necessary treats.'

St. Agnes, Bow, included the cost of the annual religious inspection.

St. Ann's, Underwood, included a charge of 12s. per scholar for 'necessary alterations to the school buildings.'

The Board concluded:

'If over-estimated and inadmissible items could be excluded from the returns, the probabilities are that the average cost of maintenance in the Roman Catholic schools would be but little more than 55s. per scholar, and that the Roman Catholic Associations would have to find somewhere about 5s. 6d. per scholar, or £77,000. In 1901, they found as voluntary contributions, 6s. 5½d. per scholar, or £85,490.'

The figures which the Board's officials drew up for the information of the Cabinet(1) compared the expenditure on Catholic schools and on other schools in the same localities for various parts of the country, and came to the conclusion that 'R.C. expenditure appears to be about 22% less than in other schools.'

---

(1) P.R.O. File Ed. 24/151, Document 151, 'Expenditure on Elementary Schools, England and Wales, 1906 - 1907.'
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The actual comparisons were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCALITY</th>
<th>NO. OF R.C. SCH.</th>
<th>EXPENDITURE IN R.C. SCH.</th>
<th>EXPENDITURE IN OTHER SCH.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRISTOL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>54s. 6d.</td>
<td>56s. 11d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIVERPOOL</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>54s. 6d.</td>
<td>81s. 6d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORWICH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56s. 2d.</td>
<td>63s. 0d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLDHAM</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>62s. 7d.</td>
<td>69s. 5d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEST HAM</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>74s. 0d.</td>
<td>79s. 5d.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Report concluded, 'The average cost of maintenance in Catholic schools in 1906-7 was about 50s. The Grant promised under the Bill averages 49s. 8d.'

RUNCIMAN AND THE ESTIMATE OF £500,000 WHICH THE CATHOLICS CLAIMED WAS THE COST OF CONTRACTING - OUT.

On 30th. November, 1908, Runciman referred during the Debate in the Commons to a figure of £300,000 which he claimed the Catholics were putting forward as the cost of contracting out. (1) When his figures were challenged, Runciman explained that he had taken the figures from The Tablet, although he had earlier said that the figures were given by 'a dignitary of the Roman Catholic Church.' (2)

The issue of The Tablet for 28th. November, 1908, p. 875, carried a report of a letter which Monsignor Brown, the Vicar-General of the Southwark Diocese, and parish priest of St. Ann's, Vauxhall, had written to the Westminster Gazette on the subject of the financial implications of the Education Bill for the Catholic schools. Monsignor Brown's figures were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGLAND</th>
<th>AV. ATT.</th>
<th>GRANT.</th>
<th>COST PER SCH.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LONDON</td>
<td>29,000</td>
<td>£72,636</td>
<td>£2 9s. 0d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTIES</td>
<td>51,994</td>
<td>£135,422</td>
<td>£2 12s. 1d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY BOROUGHS.140,084</td>
<td>£339,122</td>
<td>£2 8s. 5d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMALLER BOROUGHS 37,224</td>
<td>£93,362</td>
<td>£2 10s. 1d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN DISTRICTS. 15,014</td>
<td>£37,705</td>
<td>£2 10s. 2d.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALES</td>
<td>11,615</td>
<td>£29,151</td>
<td>£2 10s. 2d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>285,131</td>
<td>£707,400</td>
<td>£2 9s. 7d.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*** It was this figure of £5 18s. which Runciman described as absurd)

(2) Ibid. 2nd. December, 1908, c. 1551.
Excluding the cost in the counties, where, apparently, there would have been a gain, the total cost to the Catholic community would have been £332,468. Subtracting the gain of £21,317, which the counties would make, the total to be found by the Catholic community would have been £311,151. Runciman, therefore, was correct in his reference to the claim that £500,000 would have to be found by the Catholic community. Whether Monsignor Brown was 'a dignitary of the Catholic Church' is a matter of opinion. At the time, he was the Vicar-General of the Southwark Diocese and parish priest of St. Ann's Church in Vauxhall.

There is further evidence that the Government took an interest in articles which appeared in The Tablet. (1) On 4th. January, 1908, an article called, 'The Starving-out of Catholic Schools' appeared in the magazine. The article referred to a meeting of the Association of Catholic Teachers at Holy Name Catholic School, Manchester, on 28th. December, 1907. At that meeting, Mr. O'Dea, the local representative of the Association, claimed that in Manchester, the cost of maintenance in Catholic schools was £4 4s. per child in average attendance. The money was made up by a grant of £1 19s. 7½d. from the Government, and £2 4s. 4½d. from the local rates. The cost to the Catholic community in Salford if the Bill became law would be £3,650, in Oldham, £2,703, and in Bolton, £2,765. On such figures as these, The Tablet described the effect of the Bill would be to 'starve out' the Catholic schools.

The Board of Education checked the accuracy of the figures quoted in the article with the Borough Treasurers. These officials provided the following figures:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COUNCIL SCH.</th>
<th>R.C. SCH.</th>
<th>'TEACHERS' SALARIES.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OLDHAM</td>
<td>67s. 2d.</td>
<td>62s. 7d.</td>
<td>53s. 10d. / 54s. 8d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SALFORD</td>
<td>64s. 1d.</td>
<td>55s. 5d.</td>
<td>51s. 6d. / 47s. 5d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOOTLE</td>
<td>71s. 5d.</td>
<td>59s. 7d.</td>
<td>59s. 4d. / 52s. 0d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIVERPOOL</td>
<td>71s. 0d.</td>
<td>54s. 7d.</td>
<td>56s. 2d. / 46s. 2d.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The Liverpool figures were for the year ending 31st. March, 1906. The other figures were for the year ending 31st. March, 1907.)

APPENDIX 10-continued.

The memorandum continued:

'The figures given in The Tablet under the heading of 'Starving out' have been obtained from the Borough Treasurers' Accounts. I have been able to verify only those for Salford and Oldham. These agree with the Treasurers' statements....'

The Command Paper(1) giving a summary of the expenditure nationally by Local Education Authorities, per scholar in average attendance, gave the following details:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Under 60s.</th>
<th>60s. - 70s.</th>
<th>70s. - 80s.</th>
<th>80s. - 90s.</th>
<th>Over 90s.</th>
<th>100s.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COUNTIES (62)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LONDON (1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cty. BOROUGHS (74)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOROUGHS (137)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URBAN DISTRICTS (53)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS (327)</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From these figures, Morant concluded his Memorandum to Runciman on the Catholic figures:

'The Roman Catholics are saying that, taking the average cost of maintenance in all areas as 64s. 10d., and that their contracting-out grant will be 49s. 8d., as we have said, the Roman Catholic Church will have to find 285,835 x 15s. 2d., that is £216,759.

This is a complete misrepresentation. As a matter of fact, of the 1,019 Roman Catholic schools in areas other than single-school rural parishes, 446 schools, that is nearly half, are in areas in which the average cost of maintenance of all public elementary schools, Council and Voluntary, in those areas, is less than 60s; of these, 35 are in areas where the figure is under 50s., and there are only 317 Catholic schools where the figure is over 65s.

Thus, the figure of £216,759 which they have named, is very far beyond what can be needed.'(2)

(1) Cd. 4406. There is a copy in File Ed. 24/153.
(2) P.R.O. File Ed. 24/153, Document 158.
In 1908, the Catholic Federation issued pamphlets dealing with the cost to the Catholic community of the contracting-out proposals and the 'Rome on the Rates' accusation. Figures from two of the pamphlets (1) were as follows:

**PAMPHLET I. 'WHAT CATHOLICS WANT AND WHY THEY WANT IT.'**

The pamphlet stresses the inadequacy of the proposed contracting-out grant and quotes the following figures for the London Catholic schools:

- The average attendance is 27,503.
- The annual cost is £103,048.
- The 47s. grant will provide £64,602.
- The Catholics will have to provide £38,446 in London alone.

**PAMPHLET IV. 'IS ROME ON THE RATES?'.**

The pamphlet points out the difference in the cost of educating a child at a London County Council school and at a Catholic school in London.

- The cost of educating a child at a London County Council school is £6 10s. per annum.
- The cost of educating a child at a Catholic school in London is £3 15s.
- The saving on each child is £2 15s.
- The average attendance in the London Catholic schools is 30,000. Thus, the Catholic schools save the rates the sum of £82,500 each year.

(1) There are copies of the pamphlets at the Public Record Office, File Ed.24/153.
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**THE 1908 EDUCATION BILL: PROPOSALS FOR A SLIDING-SCALE OF GRANTS FOR CONTRACTING-OUT SCHOOLS. (1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AV. ATTENDANCE</th>
<th>PROPOSED GRANT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 - 50</td>
<td>55s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201 - 250</td>
<td>51s. 6d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301 - 350</td>
<td>50s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401 - 450</td>
<td>49s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>701 - 950</td>
<td>47s. 6d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 1300</td>
<td>46s. 6d.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXISTING GRANTS BEING PAID.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOLS</th>
<th>AV. ATTEND.</th>
<th>GRANT PD.</th>
<th>AV./SCHOLAR.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHURCH OF ENGLAND.</td>
<td>5,349</td>
<td>1,415,375</td>
<td>£3,529,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROMAN CATHOLIC.</td>
<td>1,019</td>
<td>285,836</td>
<td>570,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JEWISH.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9,800</td>
<td>523,259</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Of the 317 Roman Catholic schools where the maintenance cost is more than 65s. per scholar in average attendance, 90 are in London, 35 are in Liverpool, and 24 are in Manchester.)

**EXPENDITURE ON MAINTENANCE, 1906 - 07.**

**TEACHERS' SALARIES.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LONDON</th>
<th>CTY. HOR.</th>
<th>LONDON &amp; CTY. HOR.</th>
<th>ENG. &amp; WALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COUNCIL SCHOOLS</td>
<td>72s. 4d.</td>
<td>52s. 11d.</td>
<td>59s. 8d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOLUNTARY SCHOOLS</td>
<td>53s. 10d.</td>
<td>49s. 7d.</td>
<td>50s. 6d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL EXPENDITURE</td>
<td>93s. 0d.</td>
<td>64s. 11d.</td>
<td>73s. 2d.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AVERAGE COST OF MAINTENANCE, PER SCHOLAR IN AVERAGE ATTENDANCE, YEAR ENDING 31st. MARCH, 1902. (2).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R.C. SCHOOLS.</th>
<th>ALL VOL. SCH.</th>
<th>BOARD SCHOOLS</th>
<th>ALL SCHOOLS.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42s. 5½d.</td>
<td>46s. 3¾d.</td>
<td>60s. 9½d.</td>
<td>53s. 1¾d.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1902, Catholic school income was made up as follows:

- Government Grants, 34s. 11¾d.
- Voluntary contributions, 6s. 6¾d.
- Endowments, 2¾d. School Pence, 6d.
- Other sources, 2d. TOTAL 42s. 4¾d.

(1) P.R.O. File Ed.24/153, Document 08/151.
(2) Ibid. Document 156.
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FROM THE MEMORANDUM BY R.L. MORANT. 'BRIEF NOTES ON THE EDUCATION SETTLEMENT COMMITTEE'S PROPOSALS.'
(SOURCE: P.R.O. File Ed.24/6249 dated November, 1911.)

SINGLE-SCHOOL AREAS.

'The Committee have unwittingly fallen a victim to the long-standing fallacy that the problem is solved by a phrase, namely, the 'single-school areas.' The Committee seem to fancy that this need of alternative school accommodation, and of having a Council school within the reach of any child who wants it, arises only in villages and does not arise in towns. This, unfortunately, is a complete fallacy. For example, Bury has 7,900 children attending elementary schools. There is one Provided School which has 900 places. Therefore, 7,000 children have no alternative accommodation. The town of Bury would have to provide accommodation for these 7,000 children, insofar as individual parents would not accept denominational accommodation.'

(Morant then quoted two further examples, St Helens, with accommodation in Provided Schools for only 5,000 of its 18,000 children, and Worcester, with accommodation in Provided Schools for 900 of its 8,000 children.)

'The problem is not at all a rural problem predominantly. Even in London, there are hundreds of instances in which particular children have no Council School within reach, and have to attend a denominational school...
The issue as stated by the Settlement Committee is that there must be a Council School within reach of anyone desiring it.... This can only mean that Council School accommodation must be provided for the 1½ million children for whom, at present, there is no room in the Council Schools.... The Committee suggests that each Local Education Authority should submit a scheme to this effect, including a map of the districts concerned, showing where it would be necessary to have Council Schools in order 'to bring an elementary school under public management within the reach of every child.' If this means 'within the reach of every child whose parents say they prefer a Council School to a denominational school,' this means that every Authority must provide enough new schools to supply a place for every one of the children for whom there is now not a place in existing Council School accommodation,
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...that is to say, in Bury, the Local Education Authority must provide 7,000 places, or ten new schools; over the country as a whole, there would have to be expenditure for new Council Schools giving 1½ million places....Thus, it it is not simply a question of drawing a map.'

(Morant went on to quote the latest statistics on the question, showing the number of new Council School places which would be required if the Settlement Committee's proposals were implemented.)

ACCOMMODATION IN ENGLAND AND WALES ON 31ST. JULY, 1910.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(c)</th>
<th>(d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Attendance</td>
<td>Accom. in Co. Schools</td>
<td>Accom. in Vol. Schools</td>
<td>Total Accommodation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire</td>
<td>5,363,974</td>
<td>3,935,044</td>
<td>3,100,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampshire</td>
<td>90,805.</td>
<td>23,957.</td>
<td>37,269.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Statistics of Public Education in England and Wales, 1906 - 08, Cd.4288, p. 212 et seq.

(** denotes the existence of a separate pupil-teacher centre in the area served by the school. Such centres are listed on p. )

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF SCHOOL</th>
<th>NO. ON ROLL</th>
<th>P - T CENTRE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birkenhead, F.C.J. Convent High School.</td>
<td>68g. 8g.</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plymouth. Notre Dame Girls' High School.</td>
<td>121g. 3g.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlington. Immaculate Conception High School.</td>
<td>61g. 19g.</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham. St. Thomas Girls' High School.</td>
<td>76g. 28g.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunderland. St. Anthony's Girls' High School.</td>
<td>147g. 18g.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Hartlepool. St. Joseph's Convent School.</td>
<td>83g. 14g.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Ham Catholic Grammar School.</td>
<td>101g. 155g.</td>
<td>95g. 32b. in a Preparatory Class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Ham. St. Angela's Convent Sch. Forest Gate.</td>
<td>175g. None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ursuline Convent Boarding School, Forest Gate.</td>
<td>48g. None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol. Christian Brothers' College.</td>
<td>60b. None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southampton. La Sainte Union Girls' School.</td>
<td>77g. 6g.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seaforth, Lancashire. Sacred Heart Convent School.</td>
<td>176g. 29g.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notre Dame Collegiate Sch. Everton Valley.</td>
<td>329g. None.</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notre Dame High School for Girls, Mount Pleasant, Liverpool.</td>
<td>336g. None.</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Francis Xavier Boys' School, Liverpool.</td>
<td>369b. None.</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester. Notre Dame Girls' High School.</td>
<td>90g. None.</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME OF SCHOOL</td>
<td>NO. ON ROLL</td>
<td>P-T CENTRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salford. Adelphi High School for Girls.</td>
<td>106g. 4b.</td>
<td>39g. **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wigan. Convent High School for Girls.</td>
<td>236g. 10b.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battersea. Notre Dame High School for Girls.</td>
<td>77g. 12b.</td>
<td>10g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammersmith. Sacred Heart Convent School.</td>
<td>99g.</td>
<td>17g. **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poplar. Howrah House Convent School.</td>
<td>111g. 18b.</td>
<td>15g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Pancras, Highgate Rd. Convent School.</td>
<td>108g.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Pancras. St. Aloysius, Convent School, Clarendon Sq.</td>
<td>130g.</td>
<td>29g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwark. Notre Dame High School, St. George's Rd.</td>
<td>150g. 20b.</td>
<td>65g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wandsworth. Ave Maria Convent School.</td>
<td>110g. 4b.</td>
<td>15g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tottenham. St. Ignatius College.</td>
<td>178b.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne. St. Cuthbert's Boys' School.</td>
<td>145b.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcastle upon Tyne. St. Mary's Convent High School.</td>
<td>53g.</td>
<td>19g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Dominic's Convent Sch. Stoke on Trent.</td>
<td>130g. 27b.</td>
<td>26g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolverhampton. Sacred Heart Girls' Secondary School.</td>
<td>53g.</td>
<td>17g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croydon. Ladies of Mary Coloma Convent School.</td>
<td>173g. 26b.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham. St. Philip's Boys' Grammar School.</td>
<td>147b.</td>
<td>6b. **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hull. St. Mary's Convent High School.</td>
<td>98g. 10b.</td>
<td>21g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarborough. Ladies of Mary Convent School.</td>
<td>76g. 18b.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesbrough. St. Mary's Convent School.</td>
<td>115g. 15b.</td>
<td>37g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesbrough. St. Mary's College.</td>
<td>49b.</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF SCHOOL</th>
<th>NO. ON ROLL</th>
<th>P-T CENTRE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bradford. St. Bede’s Boys’ Grammar School.</td>
<td>91b</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford. St. Joseph’s Convent School.</td>
<td>88g, 6b</td>
<td>12g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds Catholic College.</td>
<td>123b</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SEPARATE PUPIL-TEACHER CENTRES.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birkenhead</td>
<td>Holt Hill</td>
<td>13 girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlington</td>
<td></td>
<td>11 girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>Everton Valley</td>
<td>61 girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mount Pleasant</td>
<td>88 girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hope Street</td>
<td>41 boys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>Bignor Street</td>
<td>24 girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loretto Convent</td>
<td>20 girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. Helen’s</td>
<td>38 girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hammersmith</td>
<td>16 girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>40 girls</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nationally, 4,016 girls were receiving instruction in pupil-teacher centres in England and Wales. Of these, 311 (7.7%) were in Catholic pupil-teacher centres.

Nationally, 687 boys were receiving instruction in pupil-teacher centres in England and Wales. Of these, 41 (6.0%) were in the Catholic pupil-teacher centre at Hope Street, in Liverpool.

A little over 5% of the elementary school population attended Catholic elementary schools.
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