

by the School-Board for London, in effect as follows: That the Bible shall be read in the schools, with such explanations and instructions in the principles of morality and religion as are suited to the capacities of children; provided always that no attempt be made to attach the children to any particular denomination; and that in the case of any particular school the board would consider any application by managers, parents, or ratepayers of the district that the school should be excepted from the operation, in whole or in part, of the resolution. The board made provision for the use of prayers and hymns at the time allowed by the Act of 1870, leaving the arrangements for such religious observances to the discretion of the teacher and managers in each case. In the London metropolitan board schools "the observances" are concluded by 9.15 in the morning, Bible instruction being given either between 9.15 and 9.45, or between 11.30 and noon. Another regulation made by the London Board has also been widely adopted—namely, that which provides for the separate instruction in secular subjects during the time of the religious teaching or observances of any child who is withdrawn from the latter by his parent or guardian. General regard is expressed for a rigid adherence to the "conscience clause" and the "Cowper-Temple clause" of Mr. Forster's Act. The clause which Mr. Cowper-Temple introduced into the Bill stipulated that no religious catechism or religious formulary which is distinctive of any particular denomination shall be taught in a rate-aided school. But this does not appear to be universally acted upon, for while in some districts the Bible is merely read without note or comment, we find such boards as Cocker-mouth and Caistor-next-Yarmouth, in which the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments, and the Apostles' Creed are taught; while at Bowness, Cumberland, instruction is given in the Church of England catechism.

The reply from Birmingham is worthy of remark: "The school board make no provision either for religious instruction or any form of religious worship. In buildings erected by them opportunity is given to voluntary teachers to give religious instruction, and to conduct any form of religious service they please. The teachers, who must not be board teachers, pay rent to the board for the use of the buildings." For this purpose the schools are open three-quarters of an hour on two mornings in the week. The principle here laid down scarcely differs from that adopted in some other places, except in the provision that board teachers may not give religious instruction. The elaborate schemes adopted by Wolverhampton and Manchester are identical. Attaching great importance to the value of religious knowledge on the part of teachers and scholars alike, these boards prescribe a graduated course of oral teaching and the committing to memory of portions of the Bible, with suitable exercises in writing and reading.

Both Manchester and Wolverhampton are conspicuous in the short list of boards who, while maintaining schools of their own, pay fees on behalf of children at voluntary schools. In this way the former have annually expended an average sum exceeding £1,800. The Liverpool Board appears to be the only one which sanctions the Douai version of the Bible. This is done where Roman Catholic children are the majority, or are sufficiently numerous to be entitled to separate religious instruction. When a school is transferred under the powers of the principal Act, a clause is frequently inserted in the deed of transfer reserving the use of the school premises by others than the board, with a view to the holding of Bible classes within certain specified hours. On this principle we find that at Great and Little Abington, Cambridge, religious instruction according to the principles of the Church of England is given before each morning meeting of the school. Similar arrangements have been made at other places. Bowness, Cumberland, where the Church Catechism is taught, differs essentially from the cases just cited, in that there the Catechism is taught under the auspices of the board, whereas, in the other parishes the school premises are not in the hands of the board while Church lessons are being given. The districts where the board of instruction is stated to be purely secular number twenty-six. In one of the two board schools at Conwil Caio, Carmarthen, no instruction is given of any other nature than secular, while at Gelligaer, Glamorgan, a like system is adopted for three out of six board schools.—*New England Journal of Education.*

## 2. FEMININE EDUCATION IN ENGLAND.

A Bill has just been introduced to the Imperial House of Commons, having for its object the permission for ladies to graduate at Scotch Universities. The Bill nominally was simply to give power to the Crown to authorize the University Courts to admit female students. But strong objection was made to this, on the ground that the Court did not fully represent the feeling of the members of the University, as the governing body does at the University of Oxford. The courts of Scotland having recently declared that it is contrary to law for

women to graduate, the proposed Bill was, in effect, to remedy this. As the application came from the Courts of the University, the objection was well taken, that, as they were constituted, a great impropriety would be committed by the House in acceding to a request from a body which need not necessarily know anything of the feeling of the University on the subject. As pointed out by Dr. LYON PLAYFAIR, the issue, though nominally in allusion to the medical profession and to Scotch Universities, was in reality much larger, and touched the entire question as to whether the "strong-minded" women of England generally should be admitted to all Universities, and be able to graduate in every art and science. He also pointed out that the Bill would entail great cost upon the country, as the present University staff of professors in Scotland could not undertake double work. In Edinburgh, for example, there were 800 medical men under training, and it could not be expected that the professors could undertake the teaching of so many more women. Nor was the Bill as constituted, "practically applicable, as it stood, for the purpose of admitting young ladies to practise as 'medical men'—or rather as she-doctors." But Mr. BERESFORD HOPE opened the whole question, and showed the fallacy of supposing that the seemingly narrow point of the Bill was the beginning and end of the argument. He remarked:—

It was a grievance, it seemed, that ladies were not able to practise as doctors or surgeons. It was equally a grievance that they were not allowed to be barristers or attorneys-at-law. He supposed his right hon. friend would say it was a grievance that these fair ladies should not be allowed to deliver an occasional sermon in Westminster Abbey. What were the arguments employed by the supporters of this Bill? A certain number of women had been disappointed in their hopes of obtaining a medical degree in Edinburgh, and now it was proposed that the Universities in Scotland should not be allowed to make their own terms with these women, but that these women should make their own terms with the Universities, and come in on the basis of an alleged claim. It was said that as to all professions, all means of livelihood, women should be put on an absolute equality with men. The medical profession naturally came first, but that profession, already exercised by men, was ramified in a singular way into various professions. In old times there was simply the healing man, who was both surgeon and physician. But now one man might be consulted on one branch of disease, and another man on another branch of disease. What was it but misguided ambition that prevented these women from desiring to do good to their fellow creatures in a way of which Florence Nightingale and Mary Stanley had given them glorious examples? Why should the faculty of nursing, for which women were so admirably adapted, be developed in colleges for nurses in London, Edinburgh, or anywhere else? This attempt to make women an antagonist of man in the battle of life, on the plea of opening an independent career to women, was based on a fallacy. It ignored the eternal difference between man and woman. Were the promoters of this Bill prepared to say that women should be allowed to plead in Courts of Law, to draw conveyances, and what not? If they were not prepared to say so, their whole argument broke down. He stood out for opening to women professions which they could follow, but he was utterly opposed to this episcene policy which would break down the distinction between man and woman.

The training of women is defective and bad, and the root of half the social evils of the period. Had women an education in general, that would give them something to do and develop these particular faculties, half the sorrows that come upon young women might be avoided; half the dangers and temptations that beset them, and the weaknesses that the cowardly and selfish at times take advantage of, avoided. But women, though truly man's equal, move on a different parallel, as it were, and the training required and the education needed, must be framed and chosen accordingly.—*Leader.*

## 3. EDUCATION IN THE BRITISH ARMY.

In a recent statement of the present condition of education in the English army, compared with that existing in 1858, General Sir John Adye shows that in that year twenty per cent. of the soldiers then serving could neither read nor write, and nineteen per cent. were able to read but not write, making 39 out of every 100 with scarcely any education. In 1873 there were only six per cent. who could neither read nor write, and five per cent. who could read but not write, making eleven per cent. who had received little or no education. "This," as Sir John observed, "showed a decrease of twenty-eight per cent. of ignorance in fifteen years." The *Pall Mall Gazette* believes that so rapid an advance of education among the class of Her Majesty's subjects that finds its way into the ranks of the army will, no doubt, "afford intense satisfaction to those who believe that education, and education alone, is capable of doing everything for us."—*New England Journal of Education.*