

nominationists. Once again, nothing could be farther from the facts of the case. The Lords do not for a moment object to having those who pay the money see that every penny of it is well spent. They welcome any popular control which means that the education authorities are to have charge of the expenditures, are to see that the teachers are qualified, and are to have inspectors see that the work is done well. But they maintain that no education can satisfy our needs, in which a matter of such vital consequence to man as religion, is not given an important consideration. Mr. Birrell's idea of education seems to be so much knowledge of letters, and of arithmetic. But the conception of the Lords is far different. Their view is that beyond all this, there should be the formation of character and the development of conscience from the knowledge of man's duty, to God and to his neighbor. This is the kind of education for which they were endeavoring to provide by their amendments. This is the kind of education for which hundreds of England's best citizens, assembled at meetings throughout the length and breadth of the land, were clamoring. Yet in the face of the necessity of religion in education, and of such widespread dissatisfaction with the Bill, it is argued that the action of the Lords in amending it in accordance with the expressed wish of several millions of England's population, was not justifiable. To say the least, it is extremely difficult to see on what grounds the argument is based.

Again it is objected that the action of the Lords in providing for denominational schools is hindering the establishment, by Mr. Birrell, of one grand national system of education. The answer is that far from establishing a national system, Mr. Birrell was establishing and endowing one particular kind of teaching in the state schools, to the exclusion and at the expense of every other—the kind called "Undenominationalism". His Bill violated the very principles of religious equality and established a system of teaching of so unreasonable and unsatisfactory a nature, that it could only result in bringing religion into disrepute. Napoleon wished to see the whole of Europe one grand French unity. To attain his end he was ready to march through fire and blood. Who can imagine the ruin and misery through which we might have had to pass in the pursuit of Mr. Birrell's policy of unification. Surely no one has forgotten how M. Combes undertook to force on France, one uniform and rigid system of state education with so little religion in it that even our Nonconformist friends could not com-