

Durham E-Theses

The evolution of local administration in English elementary education during the period 1833 – 1930 with special consideration of the problems of finance, administrative areas and inspection

McHugh, G. P.

How to cite:

McHugh, G. P. (1932) *The evolution of local administration in English elementary education during the period 1833 – 1930 with special consideration of the problems of finance, administrative areas and inspection*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online:
<http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/10328/>

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

THE EVOLUTION OF LOCAL ADMINISTRATION IN ENGLISH
ELEMENTARY EDUCATION DURING THE PERIOD 1833 , 1930
WITH SPECIAL CONSIDERATION OF THE PROBLEMS OF
FINANCE, ADMINISTRATIVE AREAS AND INSPECTION.

by

G.P.McHugh, M.Sc., Ph.D., A.I.C.

Thesis submitted to the University of Durham in
part fulfilment of the requirements for the
Degree of Master of Education.

February 1932.

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.
No quotation from it should be published without
his prior written consent and information derived
from it should be acknowledged.

I wish to thank Miss E.L.Melville,M.A., of Armstrong College,Newcastle-on-Tyne, for the counsel she has freely given me during the preparation of this Thesis.

I owe her a great debt of gratitude for the constructive criticism she has invariably afforded me, and I gladly take this opportunity of acknowledging my warmest appreciation of her kindness.

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

MOVEMENTS IN ENGLISH ELEMENTARY EDUCATION
FROM 1800 to 1833.

pp. 1 - 13.

CHAPTER I.

THE ENCOURAGEMENT OF LOCAL EFFORT TO
PROVIDE SCHOOL ACCOMMODATION AS THE BASIS
OF ADMINISTRATIVE POLICY FROM 1833 to 1870.

pp. 14 - 56.

CHAPTER II.

THE ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1870 AND
ITS EFFECTS UPON THE ADMINISTRATIVE POLICY
OF THE CENTRAL AUTHORITY FROM 1870 to 1902.

pp. 57 - 90.

CHAPTER III.

STIMULATION AS THE BASIS OF EDUCATIONAL
POLICY FROM 1902 to 1918.

pp. 91 - 117.

CHAPTER IV.

THE EDUCATION ACT OF 1918 AND ITS
INFLUENCE UPON LOCAL ADMINISTRATION.

pp. 118 - 214.

Finance.
Administrative Areas.
Inspection.

CONCLUSION.

pp. 215 - 229.

APPENDIX OF STATISTICAL TABLES.

pp. 230 - 246.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

pp. 247 - 250.

Introduction.

Movements in English Elementary Education from 1800 to 1833.

INTRODUCTION.

Movements in English Elementary Education from 1800 to 1833.

To the twentieth century the early years of the nineteenth century are noticeable for the hesitancy with which the State approached the question of educating its people, but educational policy followed in the wake of political philosophy based upon the economic theory outlined by Adam Smith in his "Wealth of Nations". The gradual evolution of capitalistic industry was responsible for the feeling that it was undesirable for the State to interfere between employer and employee, or between parent and child. Schemes of education therefore originated from evangelical and philanthropic motives as witnessed by Sunday Schools, Schools of Industry, and the work of Lancaster and Bell. The impossibility of undiluted laissez-faire was slowly revealed in the industrial system, and the factory code arose out of legislation for the weak. It was through the Factory Acts that the State first approached popular education.

The striking feature of this legislation was the detached way in which the State touched upon the problem of education. Educational clauses were embodied in proposed Factory Bills, and yet it was these clauses which more often than not led to the destruction of measures that might otherwise have been put into operation. Through its Factory legislation the State was acting for classes of the population which previous systems of education had failed to recognise. The compulsory education clauses implied that the State was being asked to act as a responsible educating body. But the position was complicated by the fact that the State was unable to make a clean start. The Church, Philanthropy, and Private Enterprise were already in the field, a state of affairs attributable to the fact that the ~~Church~~ Church was originally the founder and controller of educational

institutions in the country, and from her own ranks provided the teachers. The growth of more secular education was not due to opposition to the Church, though the office of schoolmaster slowly ceased to be regarded as the exclusive function of the clergy.⁽¹⁾ Nevertheless, the Church clung to her ancient prerogative and regarded herself as the representative of the State in education. Pole's Constitutions of 1557, Elizabeth's Injunctions of 1559, and the Canons of 1571 enjoined that only persons possessing a Bishop's license would be allowed to teach, whilst the Canons of 1571 went so far as to stipulate the Latin Grammar to be used. The Recusancy Act of 1580 went still further, for a schoolmaster who taught without a Bishop's license and did not attend service at the parish church was liable to imprisonment for one year and disqualification as a teacher. This repressive legislation was extended to all branches of education by the Stuarts, for the Canons of 1604 definitely placed the control of education in the hands of the Church by banning unlicensed schoolmasters under penalties of imprisonment and fines, and by giving the clergy preference as schoolmasters over laymen, and by meticulously defining the duties of schoolmasters.

Apart from the religious aspect the Canons were important as showing that education was no longer synonymous with the Church, but had risen to an independent position and was legislated for as such. The Church and State were in close co-operation, however, and, following out the plan of enforcing uniformity, the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge were identified with the State, especially under the Statutes of Archbishop Laud. This policy persisted throughout the Commonwealth and Restoration periods, though, of course, it was interpreted as the political exigencies of the time determined. The Act of Uniformity of 1662 compelled every schoolmaster to give his "unfeigned assent and consent" to every statement contained in the
 (1) A.W.Parry. "Education in the Middle Ages." p.125.

Book of Common Prayer, and the Five Mile Act of 1665, forbade Nonconformists to teach publicly or privately, whilst the Test Act of 1673 added more repressive burdens to the Roman Catholics. This legislation was held by the Courts in 1700, in the case of *Rex v Cox*, to apply only to the teaching of grammar, and from that decision arose private enterprise in the shape of the Nonconformist Academies of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

That the State was identified with the Church militated against the movement for a definite State system of education. When foreign thought on the subject of education began to influence English opinion, Joseph Priestley put forward the objection of the Dissenters to a system of State education in his "Essay on the First Principles of Government, and on the nature of Political, Civil, and Religious Liberty", published in 1768.⁽¹⁾ He contended that education, as a branch of civil liberty, should not be subjected to State intervention. The official connexion between the State and the Church led some to fear that the State, in its supposed interest, would employ national education to suppress Dissent, whilst others, like Godwin, were apprehensive that the State would employ national education to suppress freedom of political thought. Yet the idea of State interference in the education of its people was not new, for the history of Western Civilisation from the earliest times showed that the State had taken an active part in such matters. The Greeks attacked the problem from the basis of working out a social order in which provision would be made for a consideration of the rights of all, and they sought to attain it, more especially in Sparta, by State domination of the organisation, character, and content of education. The same conception of State interference can be traced in Roman education and in the Aachen Capitularies of Charlemagne.⁽²⁾

"Let them (the clergy) admit to their company and associate with

(1) Adamson. "Short History of Education." p.216.

(2) Ibid. p. 9.

4.

themselves not only children of servile ~~company~~ ^{condition}, but sons of men of birth also. Let there be reading schools for children. In every monastery or bishop's seat let them learn psalms, notes, singing, the computus, grammar."

In England, too, the fundamental idea of State regulation was present in the mediaeval system ~~from~~ ⁽¹⁾ the time when its history as a unified State began. Parry quotes the "Preface to Gregory's Pastoral Care", and Asser's "Life of Alfred" to show that Alfred the Great wished every free English child to be taught the mother tongue, and also established a Court School similar to that founded by Charlemagne. These systems of education took little account of the mass of the population. They were designed either for training a professional class or for the governing classes, though it must be remembered that the professional class was not recruited on a social basis. The highest office in the land was open to the son of the humblest parents, and "Poor Scholars" and "Free Grammar Schools" were characteristic features of the mediaeval system.

In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries signs were not lacking that a change was inevitable and that education would become universal. Luther in Germany, Comenius in Bohemia, William Petty in England, and La Chalotais in France, had made public expression of faith in the right of the people to education, but the doctrines of continental liberalism, culminating in the French Revolution, made England cautious, a position succinctly stated by Mr. Davies Giddy during a debate in the House of Commons on Whitbread's Bill of 1807. ⁽²⁾

"However specious in theory the project might be, of giving education to the labouring classes of the poor, it would, in effect, be found to be injurious to their morals, and happiness; it would teach them to despise their lot in life, instead of making them good servants in agriculture and other laborious employments to which their rank in society had destined them."

In spite of the apprehension of the Dissenters and the unwillingness of sections of the governing classes, the State was being forced, slowly but surely, to take more than a passive interest in the education of the masses by reason of the changing economic structure

(1) A.W. Parry. Op.cit. p.32.

(2) Quoted by De Montmorency, "State Intervention in English Education." p.222.

5.
of the country. An "Agricultural Revolution" was in progress, together with the first phase of the Industrial Revolution. The disappearance of the commons, new ideas in farming, and the Enclosure Acts broke up the old self-contained villages, and gradually but inexorably deprived the agricultural labourer of his means of subsistence. From comparative independence the state of labourers and small farmers changed to one of dependence, for the growth of mechanical industry in the North of England destroyed the home industries which had previously kept the villagers from want. Poverty increased in the towns owing to the immigration of dispossessed workers from the country in search of employment, and the Poor Law system was strained by doles and allowances. The educational implications of this were far reaching, because the homes of the old villages ceased to exist as an educating force. New towns sprang up almost overnight, possessing no sense of local responsibility and no arrangements for local government, whereas the older towns and villages had a direct sense of responsibility and of government. The social order of agricultural times had divided the community into sharply defined divisions of society, but it was essentially a community with parallel interests, and the well-to-do classes had almost a vested interest in ~~the~~ the well-being of the lower classes.

With the end of the Napoleonic Wars in 1815 matters became worse. Migration to manufacturing towns and villages became general, and the localisation of trades and industries gave rise to a demand for child labour. Education was forced upon the attention of the Government as a means of ameliorating the lot of factory children who were workhouse apprentices.

The characteristic feature of English Poor Law since 1601 was the compulsory apprenticeship of the children of paupers so that they might learn a trade. Workhouses established schools, or made special arrangements for the same purpose, such as admittance to the Schools of Industry which flourished in the

6.

XVIIIth Century. By 1800 workhouse schools were firmly established as an integral part of Poor Law administration. They were under the control of local vestries or guardians and represented the first example of the use of public money for furthering the purpose of education. Financial support was afforded them through parish rates. Moreover, they represented local responsibility for the provision of educational facilities, and Cubberley⁽¹⁾ quotes a record of the workhouse school established in Bishopsgate Street, London, in 1701.

"(Poor children) being taken into the said workhouse are there taught to Read and Write, and kept to work until they are qualified to be put out to be Apprentices, and for the Sea Service or otherwise qualified.....The Habit of the Children is all the same, being made of Russit Cloth, and a round Badge worn upon their Breast, representing a poor Boy and a Sheep: the Motto; God's Providence is our Inheritance....In this workhouse children were"taught to spin wool and flax, to Sow and Knit; to make their own Cloathes, Shoes and Stockings, and the like Employments; to insure them betimes to labour. They are also taught to read, and such as are capable, to write and cast Accounts; and also the Catechism, to ground them in Principles of Religion and Honesty."

With the advent of the Factory system the lot of such children became pitiful, and one of the earliest Factory Acts was Peel's "Health and Morals of Apprentices Act" of 1802, which applied to cotton and woollen factories in which three or more parish apprentices were employed. Daily hours of labour were restricted to twelve, night work was prohibited, and the employer was obliged to provide instruction in reading, writing and arithmetic during the first four years of apprenticeship. At each Midsummer Quarter Sessions Inspectors were appointed - one a Justice of the Peace and the other a clergyman - to enforce compliance with Peel's measure. The Act was unpopular and evasion easy, for, with the repeal of the Compulsory Apprenticeship Act in 1813, all that was necessary was to avoid actually apprenticing the children. In spite of its shortcomings the Act marked a stepping stone in legislation, for it contained the first compulsory education
(1) Cubberley! "History of Education".p.453.

clauses of any English Act, and it showed that an influential section of public opinion was awakening to the fact that the changing order of society not only needed regulating but reforming. Whitbread's abortive Poor Law Reform Bill of 1807 followed on somewhat similar lines, and included a plan for the establishment of rate-aided parochial schools under the direction of the clergy. The Bill was a step, however small, in the right direction, for it contained the germ of the idea of local responsibility in return for local financial support upon which the modern system of education has been built.

These proposals only touched a small proportion of the child population, and, in 1816, Henry Brougham secured the appointment of a Select Committee of the House of Commons to inquire into the education of the "lower orders". For the first time since the Reformation the question of the position of the "lower orders" was the subject of Parliamentary discussions. The State had already admitted the principle of the regulation of social conditions, and it was but a step to extend that sphere so as to include education, though the theory of individualism here maintained its ascendancy for a longer period owing to sectarian influences. The Report of the Select Committee, published in 1818, recommended the award of Treasury Grants towards building schools in districts able to provide for future maintenance by voluntary effort, and the provision of rate-aided schools in poor areas. In no case was intervention to be attempted where private enterprise was meeting all the demands made upon it. Private enterprise in the elementary schools was the work of the National Society and the British and Foreign Schools Society, representing the Established Church and The Dissenters respectively, and the Select Committee failed to come to a decision on the question whether building grants should be distributed by these Societies or by specially appointed Commissioners. School accommodation was described as inadequate.

The Committee came to a much more momentous conclusion when they declared that the education of the people was a matter which vitally concerned the State.

The Report was not favoured on account of its suggested solution of the religious question. That was ingenuous, for the schoolmaster was to be placed entirely under the local clergy, the appointment being left to "the parish vestry subject to the approbation of the parson and the visitation of the diocesan." As might be expected, the demand that the schoolmaster should be a communicant of the Church of England evoked strong opposition from the Dissenters and the Roman Catholics. ⁽¹⁾ With regard to the religious question the core of the controversy was a relic of past suspicions; it was not whether children should be taught this or that creed, but which party should control education. Schemes which were politically, morally, and socially desirable in themselves were wrecked owing to the inability of their protagonists to think socially.

Brougham was not disheartened by this initial failure, and in 1818 and 1820 he introduced two Bills dealing with popular education. The Bill of 1820, based upon the Report of 1818, proposed the erection of new schools supported by local rates, by diverted endowments, and by the contributions of manufacturers, and it stipulated that necessitous children should be admitted without payment of school-fees. Once more the religious question brought disaster to a Bill, but in one of his speeches Brougham laid down ⁽²⁾ four conditions to be observed in framing any educational measure.

"The first thing naturally to be considered was how to place the school; the second how to procure a proper schoolmaster; the third what he was to teach when procured; and the fourth how to relieve the country of part of the expenses necessarily attendant upon the plan by making the old endowments in some measure available."

(1) J.G. Montmorency: "State Intervention in English Education".

(2) Hansard. Vol. II. Cols. 49 to 80. *Ibid.* p. 265.

The Commons were interested in Brougham's pronouncements as leader of the education party, but were strengthened in their belief in the efficiency of the Voluntary system. Yet this speech of Brougham was prophetic, for the four points he stressed were the very problems which had to be solved by the Central Authority after 1839.

The proposals of Brougham are note-worthy from another aspect. Each contained a demand for rate-aid, or, in other words, local responsibility. The idea of local responsibility was not a conception new to the XIXth Century any more than it is to the XXth Century. The system of workhouse schools already referred to is evidence of this, and Brougham, with his almost fanatical attachment to the question of the abuse of endowments, furnishes more evidence of a similar kind. That they were abused is not a matter of dispute, but the very existence of the endowments indicated previous local activity in education, though not necessarily elementary education.

Many of these endowments owed their origin to ancient guilds or associations of individuals banded together for some common purpose either of a spiritual nature or with a utilitarian object. Nevertheless all guilds had a spiritual side to their activities, and some of them maintained chantry priests for the purpose. It soon became the natural order of things for such priests to keep some sort of school as part of their duties. Many chantries were dissolved by Henry VIII and Edward VI on the ground that they were sources of superstition, and their incomes were to be devoted to the erection of Grammar Schools. This laudable intention was too often frustrated, however, owing to the need of the Court for money. Though most of the chantry and hospital schools were "grammar" schools, the chantry certificates show that elementary or vernacular instruction was undertaken, and that municipal activity

(1) 10.

in education was not unknown. According to Parry a number of chantries were founded by parishes in order to provide educational facilities for the children, and he quotes the work of A.F. Leach to show that arrangements were made for elementary teaching in the chantries of Glasney, Brecon, Chumleigh, Newland, and numerous other places. With regard to municipal activity, the certificates for Wisbech, Stratford-on-Avon, and the City of Worcester were indicative of such work, and it appears that the burgesses of Coventry, the municipality of Ipswich, the civic authorities at Bridgeorth, and the corporation of Plymouth either provided or maintained schools.

(2)

(3)

Leach gives a certificate relating to Launceston which brings out this point quite clearly -

"Stephen Gouge, incumbent and schoolmaster there...hath for his salary and living of thr Mayor and burgesses yearly £6 or over.. and 14s.4d. yearly distributed to an aged man chosen by the mayor to teach young children the A.B.C."

Though Brougham's work yielded no immediate result, events were taking place in the field of social legislation. In 1819 the deficiencies of earlier factory acts were theoretically remedied. No child under the age of nine years was thenceforth to be allowed to work in a cotton factory; from nine to twelve years of age the hours of daily labour were to be limited to twelve. The Act, though practically a dead letter, served its purpose by bringing into being a Select Committee, presided over by Michael Sadler, which essayed the first thorough investigation into the conditions of factory life. The main conclusions were that children suffered mentally, morally, and physically, and that, owing to the inoperation of the existing laws, a case for further legislation had been made out.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century religious and socialistic forces were actively at work for the amelioration of the conditions of the working classes, and their activities in education were the outward manifestation of the movements. The hitherto accepted tenet of education as a means of training the poor to be content with their

(1) A.W. Parry. Op. cit. pp. 165-168.

(2) Ibid. pp. 153-154.

(3) A.F. Leach. "English Schools at the Reformation". Pt. II. p. 34.

position in the social order was undergoing a slow, and at times,^{11.} almost imperceptible change, but that change was hastened by the passage of the first Reform Bill in 1832. The Reform Parliament, Whig in spirit and outlook, relegated popular education to the category of less important affairs, but the seed had been sown. J.A. Roebuck, M.P. for Bath, had taken the place of Brougham as leader of the education party in the Commons, and in 1833 he championed the cause of education when moving a resolution demanding the national education of the whole nation. His plea went unheeded, but it (1) contained the basic ideas of the Act of 1870.

"I would say that I would oblige every child in Great Britain and Ireland, from perhaps six to twelve, to be a regular attendant at school. If the parents are able to give, and actually do give, their children elsewhere sufficient education, then they should not be compelled to send them to the national school. If, however, they should be unable or unwilling to give them such instruction, then the State should step in and supply this want, by compelling the parent to send the child to the school of the State."

Roebuck was opposed by both Whigs and Tories and withdrew his motion, but in the same year a Return was ordered to be made to the House of Commons on the state of education in England and Wales. These Returns, commonly called the Kerry Returns after Lord Kerry who proposed their compilation, were the first Parliamentary investigation into the state of popular education. The results were given in the Parliamentary Papers by way of a summary, and though they were later attacked by the Manchester Statistical Society as inaccurate, they give a general indication of the position in 1833. An abstract of the Returns follows.

(2)

Abstract.

(3)		
<u>Infant Schools.</u>	<u>Schools.</u>	<u>Scholars.</u>
Children from 2 to 7 years.	2,985	89,005.
(4)		
<u>Daily Schools.</u>		
Children from 4 to 14 years.	35,986	1,187,942.
	<u>38,971</u>	<u>1,276,947.</u>

- (1) Hansard. Vol. XX. July, 1833. De Montmorency, "State Intervention in English Education." p. 338.
 (2) Sunday School Statistics omitted as they included adults.
 (3) The Returns classified as Infant Schools all schools where the children left before the age of 7 years.
 (4) Included schools of every description where scholars remained above the age of 7 years.

Maintenance of Schools.

	<u>Endowment.</u>		<u>Subscriptions.</u>	
	<u>Schools.</u>	<u>Scholars.</u>	<u>Schools .</u>	<u>Scholars.</u>
Infant.	30	1,450	197	13,081
Daily.	<u>4,076</u>	<u>152,314</u>	<u>2,632</u>	<u>165,436</u>
	<u>4,106</u>	<u>153,764</u>	<u>2,829</u>	<u>178,517</u>

	<u>Fees and Subscriptions.</u>		<u>School Fees.</u>	
	<u>Schools.</u>	<u>Scholars.</u>	<u>Schools.</u>	<u>Scholars.</u>
Infant.	408	33,753	2,350	40,721
Daily.	<u>2,487</u>	<u>178,464</u>	<u>26,791</u>	<u>691,728</u>
	<u>2,895</u>	<u>212,217</u>	<u>29,141</u>	<u>732,449</u>

In the Returns the following remarks occur in connexion with the number of scholars -

"In calculating the number of free scholars, those schools which are partly supported by subscriptions in aid of payment by the parents of children (such payment seldom exceeding 1d. or 2d. per week), may perhaps be considered as Free Schools; as well as those which are endowed or entirely maintained by subscription. Reference to the General Abstract will show that the majority of National and Lancasterian Schools are maintained in this manner; and that of 1,276,947, children under daily instruction, 544,498 are at free schools." (1)

Thus, in 1833, approximately 545,000 children of the "working classes" were receiving daily instruction of some degree of efficiency. The Returns do not show any information concerning the manner in which the attendances were distributed throughout the country, or how agricultural areas compared with manufacturing districts. From the records of the Manchester Statistical Society it is clear that the numbers varied considerably, and that the proportion of public "daily school scholars" to the whole number also showed wide variation. Thus, in Manchester the proportion was 24.7 per cent, in Bury 26.4 per cent, and in Liverpool 46.8 per cent.

In spite of the deficiencies shown by the Returns, the Government was not disposed to attempt any radical reform of the position, but in August, 1833, a vote in the Finance Bill allocated a sum of £20,000, for the purpose of aiding private subscriptions for the erection of school-houses in Great Britain. The motion was carried
 (1) Population of Great Britain in 1833. 14,400,000.

by 50 votes against 26. Although the grant was merely financial encouragement to the National Society and the British and Foreign Schools Society to continue their work in providing school accommodation and did not commit the Government to active participation in the educational field, its implications went further. Control of the factory system had been accepted in principle, and since factory and educational legislation were interwoven it was only a matter of time before the State would be forced to accept a similar responsibility for education. In this case, however, the position was complicated by religious controversy, and progress was necessarily slow and cautious. The award of the Treasury Grant paved the way for direct Government action, but, in so doing, it gave official sanction to the Voluntary system which dominated the educational machinery of the country until the close of the nineteenth century. In this way arose the State controlled and self-contained system of public elementary education, the administration of which up to the present time is the subject of this Thesis.

Chapter I.

The encouragement of Local Effort to Provide School Accommodation
as the basis of Administrative Policy from 1833 to 1870.

Chapter I.

The encouragement of Local Effort to Provide School Accommodation as the basis of Administrative Policy from 1833 to 1870.

(I)

Both the Church and the Dissenters welcomed the action of the Government in giving them grants in aid of their work, but they remained antagonistic to all forms of control and interference by the State. Their reasons for the distrust of State intervention were widely different. The Church was working for the foundation of schools in which the education given to children should be in absolute accordance with the religious principles of the Established Church. It refused to entertain the idea that any secular education would remove the social and moral evils which the schools were intended to eradicate. The foundation of the National Society, in 1811, for "promoting the education of the Poor in the Principles of the Established Church throughout England and Wales" had been a practical manifestation of the official position of the Church as a teaching body, and also of its intention to try to assume a national responsibility for elementary education, on the ground that it was the Church of the State.

The Dissenters, on the other hand, held so strongly to their theory of personal liberty that any indication of State activity made them suspicious, and the British and Foreign School Society was founded in 1814, with the object of promoting the "education of the Labouring and Manufacturing Classes of Society of every religious persuasion."

In the National Society and in The British and Foreign School Society denominationalism and religious principles in a broad sense were confronted, and in such an atmosphere a State system of education acceptable to all shades of religious opinion

was an impossible proposition. A Treasury Minute of the 23rd August, which formulated rules to be observed in the disposal of money granted for the provision of school accommodation "for the education of the children of the poorer classes in Great Britain", placed virtual control of the £20,000, in the hands of the National and British Societies, for all applications had to be countenanced by one or other of the societies, and for all practical purposes the State washed its hands of the whole affair. ⁽¹⁾ The method employed was not new, for the Kildare Place Society performed a similar function in Ireland from 1817 to 1831, when the Government assumed control owing to religious differences, and, on the motion of Mr. Wyse, appointed a Board of unpaid members to supervise the award. With this example to serve as a warning, it was somewhat surprising that the Government duplicated the scheme in England, ⁽²⁾ but any other arrangement meant some measure of State interference, and that was the last thing the Government was prepared to undertake.

This state of affairs was not allowed to remain unchallenged. The activities of the Manchester Statistical Society (1834) and the Central Society of Education (1836) with its publications advocating secular education, together with the growing economic depression in the North of England, directed attention to the question of education. During the period 1833-1839 three Select Committees were appointed to consider the best means of providing educational facilities. The Committee of 1834 was instructed to inquire into the working of the Treasury Grant, but they sought refuge from their unenviable task by declaring that they were unable to report any opinion to the House, and it was not until

(1) The Treasury Minute stipulated:-

- a. That building accounts should be liable to audit.
- b. That trustees and managers of schools should make such reports as might be called for by the Lords of the Treasury.
- c. That at least one-half of the estimated expenditure should be raised by private subscription, and that this amount should be received, expended, and accounted for before any issue of public money.
- d. That preference should be given to applications from large cities and towns.

(2) CORLETT: "A SURVEY OF THE FINANCIAL ASPECTS OF ELEMENTARY EDUCATION." p. 24

the Committee of 1837 reported that any valuable information was forthcoming on the conditions in the large towns in England and Wales. In the Report, published in 1838, the Committee paid tribute to the work of private benevolence and deplored the lack of necessary machinery for securing correct information regarding the state of education of the humbler classes. Incidentally, the returns made to queries sent out by the Committee of 1834 were described as incorrect as well as defective. The recommendations of the Select Committee may be summarised as follows:-

- a. That a dearth of education existed among the children of the working classes in the Metropolis and in the great towns.
- b. That suitable instruction should be provided for a proportion of not less than one-eighth of the population.
- c. That the manner of Government assistance should be regulated as before, but that relaxation of the requirements should be made in favour of districts where poverty could be proved.
- d. That the scheme of distribution through the National and the British Societies should be retained, but the amount of the award should be increased.

Evidence given before the Committee showed that good schools were few and far between, that school-houses were often squalid and the attendance of children irregular, and that the teachers were more often than not incompetent. A greater part of the education provided was given in Dame and Common Day Schools which were often (1) nothing but confined garrets and small cellars.

"In a garret up three pairs of dark, broken stairs, was a common day school, with forty children, in ~~the~~ the compass of ten feet by nine. On a perch, forming a triangle with the corner of the room sat a cock and two hens; under a stump bed, immediately beneath, was a dog kennel in the occupation of three black terriers, whose barking added to the noise of the children and the cackling of the fowls, on the approach of a stranger was almost deafening; there was only one small window."

In 1838, Mr. Wyse raised the question in the Commons by moving a resolution demanding the appointment of a Board of Commissioners for Education in England. Schools were built on no settled plan,

(1) Quoted by Sadler in a "Summary of Statistics of Elementary Education in England and Wales; 1833-1870." p.26.

17.

the distribution of the grants was not effectively supervised, and no safeguards for the efficiency of the instruction of the maintenance of the school premises were introduced. The reason for this was not far to seek, for in 1833 the Treasury made no provision for the inspection of schools, the right to audit school accounts does not appear to have been exercised, and individual schools were without any connection with the State. Even schools which had been erected by the National Society were not of a uniform degree of excellence, as the Charter of the Society stated that it was not to interfere in the internal management of schools. Once a school was erected the work of the Society in respect to that school ceased, and no further superintendence was undertaken. Any supervision was undertaken by the local clergy, who could, if they so desired, invite the assistance of the Diocesan Inspector who was an official attached to the staff of the Bishop and without any connection with the Treasury. (1) Wyse's motion was lost, however, by four votes owing to a combination of Church hostility and Government indifference.

The Church was doubly watchful of any attempts to impose a so-called secularist bias on the schools, and the attitude of the House to any measure dealing with education was uncertain. Under the circumstances Lord John Russell deemed it inadvisable to submit a proposal for a Committee of the Privy Council on Education to Parliamentary discussion, and attained his object by means of an Order in Council, dated 10th April, 1839.

"It is this day ordered by Her Majesty in Council that the Most Honourable Henry, Marquis of Lansdowne, Lord President of the Council; The Right Honourable John William, Viscount Buncannon, Lord Privy Seal; The Right Honourable Lord John Russell, one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State; and The Right Honourable Thomas Spring-Rice, Chancellor of Her Majesty's Exchequer, be and they are hereby appointed, a Committee to superintend the application of any sums voted by Parliament for the purpose of promoting Public Education."

(1) Evidence of the Rev. J. G. Lonsdale, Secretary of the National Society, before a Select Committee on Education, 1865. Minutes of Evidence, p. 83.

This Committee did not issue a Report.

This procedure evoked strong opposition, but the Government remained firm, and the Committee was set up. Dr. James Kay (afterwards Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth) was appointed Assistant Secretary to the Committee, and two Inspectors, the Rev. Mr. Allen and Mr. S. Tremenheere, were appointed to office.

The work of Kay-Shuttleworth in this first venture of the State in Educational Administration is of such importance, that it is desirable at the ~~at the~~ outset to sketch his previous activities, since they shaped his policy and educational ideals.

(II)

James Kay was born in Manchester in 1804. He ultimately qualified as a physician, but later became interested in social questions, and this interest which aroused political differences was not favourable to his success as a medical man. In 1835, after unsuccessful applications for appointment as physician on the staff of the Manchester Infirmary, he wrote -

"I did not hesitate. I resolved to exchange my career as a physician for public administration."

and in 1835 he accepted a post as Assistant Commissioner under the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834. Previous experience with the Manchester Statistical Society served him in good stead, and in his new position he became intimately acquainted with the condition of workhouse children. He saw that the premium system should be abolished, and its place taken by an education which should be useful and moral.

"The education of the poor must be substantial. The mere elementary rudiments of knowledge are useful chiefly as a means to an end. The poor man will not be made a much better member of society by being only taught to read and write. His education should comprise such branches of general knowledge as would prove rational sources of amusement, and would thus elevate his tastes above a companionship in licentious pleasures."

In this he was supported by the Poor Law Commission of 1834,

though Dr. Kay gave a wider interpretation to the meaning of "moral"

(1) Frank Smith: "Life and Work of Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth" p. 31.

(2) Frank Smith: Ibid. p. 25.

(3) Report. Appendix C., p. 1. Rev. Peyton Blakiston.

and religious" than his contemporaries:

"The result of my inquiries and observations respecting the moral and religious education of the children in the workhouse is, that it is generally neglected....At this moment the generality of parochial workhouses in Hampshire do not supply an effective religious and moral instruction."

(1)

"We are perfectly aware that for the general diffusion of right principles and habits we are to look, not so much to any economic arrangements and regulations as to the influence of a moral and religious education....As soon as a good administration of the Poor Law shall have rendered further improvement possible, the most important duty of the Legislature is to take measures to promote the religious and moral education of the labouring poor."

By religious and moral education Dr. Kay meant more than memorising religious catechism and formulae. To him a religious and moral training could be achieved best through personal
(2)

experience and practice -

"....and he agreed that the pauper child needed, above all else, a training in industry; not, however, to make a profit of their labour, but to accustom them to patient application to such appropriate labour as will be most likely to fit them for the discharge of the duties of that station which they will probably fill in after life."

For the same reason he was unhappy about the omission of gardening from the curriculum followed in the Norwood establishment of Mr. Aubin ~~at Norwood~~, since he had the -
(3)

" strong conviction that physically, mentally and morally it might be made an efficient means of training."

The narrower view was exemplified by the Bedford Union which requested, in 1836, that the schoolmaster should teach reading only, so that pauper children should not be placed in a more advantageous position than children outside.
(4)

In 1837 Dr. Kay went on an educational tour in Scotland with E. Carleton Tufnell, a fellow Assistant Commissioner. Amongst other places they visited Stow's School and Seminary at Glasgow. On his return Dr. Kay improved some of the workhouse schools and appointed a Mr. Horne, an organising master from Wood's Edinburgh Sessional

(1) Final Report of the Poor Law Commission. 1834. p. 362.

(2) Frank Smith: "A History of English Elementary Education." p. 166.

(3) Frank Smith; Ibid.

p. 167.

(4) Poor Law Commission; Second Annual Report. p. 529.

School, to reconstruct workhouse schools in the Eastern Counties.

Horne visited and resided in the several workhouses for a month

(1)

or two -

"Wherever the schoolmaster was capable he placed him, with an improved knowledge of method, a better organised and disciplined school, new desks, books, and apparatus, in charge of the training of the children, in humble learning, religion and industry.....Some of the scholars caught his spirit. Among these was a lad, named William Rush who rapidly rose to the head of the little school. The master fell seriously ill; William Rush, unbidden, though ~~only~~ a boy of only 13 years of age, took charge of the scholars. The master of the workhouse found the school in its usual order... I visited the workhouse, and at my suggestion William Rush was thenceforth regarded as the apprenticed assistant of the schoolmaster....This incident afforded me a valuable hint of which I availed myself in organising other workhouse schools. Generally we sought out the most promising boys, with a view to retain their services for a series of years as Assistant Teachers."

The object of Kay's reforms was to separate the workhouse child from its corrupting environment, and the method deemed to lie in the creation of District Schools. After being transferred to the Metropolitan District, in 1838, Kay put his plan into operation at Mr. Aubin's Children's Establishment at Norwood. The curriculum included writing, ciphering, composition, drawing, reading, geography, workshops for boys, and domestic science for girls. The most important development was that other workhouse schools sent boys to be trained as schoolmasters. The experiment at East Anglia became part of the normal routine of the Norwood establishment. Plans for the formation of District Schools were discussed with the Government, and, foreseeing the need for a supply of trained schoolmasters, Kay suggested the creation of a Government Training School. In 1839, however, the Government consulted him over the proposed Committee of Council on Education to which he ultimately became Assistant Secretary.

These earlier activities of Dr. Kay influenced him to a considerable extent. He became convinced that a scheme of popular

(1) Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth: "Four Periods of Public Education". p.287ff.

(2) Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth: Ibid.

p.288.

(3) Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth: Ibid.

p.290.

(4) Frank Smith: "Life of Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth."

See whole of Chapter II., pp.35-72.

21.

education should be practical as well as theoretical, that an adequate supply of trained schoolmasters was a necessity, and that the monitorial system had outlived its usefulness. Stow in Glasgow and Wood in Edinburgh, influenced him with regard to methods of instruction; the Dutch and Swiss normal schools shaped his ideas on the question of training teachers, and out of them arose the typically English system of professional training. Unhappily for Dr. Kay in his new career he had to contend with a factor which was absent from his work under the Poor Law - the factor of religious controversy.

With the establishment of the Committee of Council and the appointment of Kay as Assistant Secretary, the State took a direct interest in national education.

(III)

In 1839 the unit of local self-government in England was the parish, and this authority was responsible for the administration of the Poor Law, Highways, and Charitable endowments. With the creation of the Committee of Council on Education in 1839 it was open to the Government to utilise this organisation in framing a system of national education, or, alternatively, to assume control by means of a central office. The Committee of Council found it expedient to adopt a compromise, and determined to follow out a policy of aiding the erection of school accommodation. A subsidy from the Central Authority might be awarded either in proportion to local wealth or to local need. Under the first condition, Parliamentary aid would bear a direct relationship to the amount raised by a particular locality or organisation. Under the second condition aid would be given in inverse ratio to local wealth - the poorer the locality or organisation the more assistance it would receive from central funds.

The Committee of Council adopted the interpretation of aid

22.

formulated by the terms of the Treasury Grant of 1833, and based its grants upon the amount of money raised locally, either by subscriptions or donations, to assist in the erection of school buildings; "locally" being interpreted as the parish in which the proposed school was situated, or within a radius of four miles from such school.

The first Minute issued by the Committee, on 13th April-1839, indicated that the National and British Societies would no longer supervise the administration of the building grants, thus establishing the power of the State purse, but so many requests for aid, which was increased to £30,000, were received, that a further Minute was published on 24th September, "To govern the appropriation of the sum intrusted to the superintendence of the Committee for the present year." Applications exceeded the allocated amount by £18,590, primarily owing to the fact that a large number of school-houses had been erected in expectation of receiving pecuniary assistance upon conditions similar to those required by the Treasury during the years 1833-1839. To regulate future applications it was determined that-

1. The right of inspection would be required in all cases.
2. The Committee would require to be satisfied, by reference either to the Inspectors or to the National or British Societies, that the case was deserving of assistance.
3. The building accounts should be liable to audit.
4. For every 10s. granted by the Committee the means of educating at least one child should be provided.
5. The amount of private subscriptions should be expended before the grant was paid.
6. The school should be associated with the National Society or with the British and Foreign Schools Society.

Furthermore, plans of model school-houses were circulated, and details of situation, construction, and salaries were to be furnished with any application. The provision of schools was the need of the moment, but the Minute showed that the Committee also realised the urgency of efficient school buildings.

On December 3rd a Minute was issued explaining the conditions upon which aid would be granted to schools not associated with either of the two Societies, provided that the Scriptures were read daily in the schools. Applications for aid were to be transmitted by the School Committees either through the Inspectors or through a religious organisation. The same Minute imposed a "Conscience Clause" because the Committee of Council decided
(1)
to give preference to schools -

"....which did not enforce any rule by which the children will be compelled to learn a catechism, or attend a place of Divine Worship, to which their parents, on religious grounds object."

Contemporarily with these Minutes the Committee issued "Instructions to Inspectors of Schools" in 1840, and these Instructions were the beginning of a stimulating force in the improvement of school
(2)
conditions.

"In superintending the application of the Parliamentary Grant for public education in Great Britain, my Lords have in view the encouragement of local efforts and for the improvement and extension of elementary education whether made by voluntary associations or by private individuals. The employment of Inspectors is therefore intended to advance this object, by affording to the promoters of schools an opportunity of ascertaining at the periodical visits of inspection, what improvements in the apparatus and internal arrangements of the schools, in school management and discipline, and in the methods of teaching, have been sanctioned by the most extensive experience.

"The inspection of schools aided by public grants is, in this respect, a means of co-operation....You will explain to them that one main object of your visit is to afford them your assistance in all efforts for improvement.....the Inspector HAVING NO POWER TO INTERFERE, and not being instructed to offer any advice or information excepting where it is invited....You should bear in mind that this Inspection is NOT INTENDED AS A MEANS OF EXERCISING CONTROL, BUT OF AFFORDING ASSISTANCE."

When compared with the system of inspection in operation at the present time, these Instructions show that the Committee possessed little power to enforcement should the promoters of the schools be averse to considering the recommendations of the Inspectors.

(1) Minutes of the Committee of Council. 1839-40.p.14.

(2) Minutes of the Committee of Council, 1839-40.pp.22ff.,
Sections 3.,4.,5. Italics mine.

Kay, however, had no intention of limiting Inspectors to mechanical routine, for he realised the benefits which would accrue from sympathetic inspection. In the Instructions there were no less than 174 questions and supplementary questions which were to be answered for every school visited. These questions covered every phase of school activity - the site and tenure of the buildings, situation, methods of instruction, organisation and discipline, number and qualifications of the staffs, attendance and registration, and play-ground provision. In addition, attention was directed towards social activities, e.g. mutual assurance societies, clothing clubs, libraries, intercourse with parents and connection maintained with scholars who had left school. This accumulation of information was useful as a basis for later development, as it showed the main lines upon which advance should be made, and Dr. Kay deliberately (1) used the knowledge so gained for that purpose.

"The Reports of the Inspectors of Schools disclosed that in a great number of instances, even the primary arrangements for enclosing the school site, providing proper offices, completing the drainage and ventilation of the building, furnishing it with proper means of warmth in winter, and with desks and benches for the scholars, were either executed in a meager and insufficient manner, or were, in some cases entirely neglected. The schools were generally found ill-supplied with the apparatus of instruction.

"The Reports of the Inspectors disclosed a relation between the imperfection of the school and the condition of the schoolmaster of the most painful character....He has, therefore, a scanty knowledge even of the humblest rudiments of learning, meager ideas of the duties of his office, and even less skill in their performance."

The Committee of Council, however, had moved too rapidly. The Church had never conceded the right of the State to inspect her schools, holding that such supervision was part of the duty of the Ordinary of the diocese or his delegate, and in spite of the carefully worded Instructions friction arose when one of the Inspectors, the Rev. John Allen, declined to present his report through the Secretary, or even to address it to the Committee of Council. Mr. Allen took up the position that Inspectors who were

(1) Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth: Op.cit. pp.473ff.

clergymen were outside the jurisdiction of the Secretary and responsible only to the ecclesiastical authorities. The crisis was serious because it struck at the very foundation of the authority of the Committee of Council. If the view held by Mr. Allen were correct, then the Committee was purely a Government agency for the distribution of public money, without any controlling power or function, and the real directing authority was the Church. The matter went before Lord Lansdowne, and Dr. Kay intimated his intention to resign unless his authority, and, incidentally, that of the Committee were upheld. Lord Lansdowne replied that Mr. Allen and the other Inspectors would follow the recognised routine of Government Departments and submit their reports to the Secretary, who would open them, acknowledge them, and lay them before the Lords of the Committee of Council. (1)

Insistence by the Committee of Council on its right to inspect schools aided by public money gave the State the power to fix standards of secular instruction, but, after this incident, the Concordat of 1840 was effected, by which the Archbishops were empowered to nominate the Inspectors for Church Schools and the Committee of Council to make the actual appointment. Religious instruction was thenceforth in the hands of the Church, or religious denomination to which the school belonged, and this arrangement continued until 1870.

On the whole the Inspectors interpreted their instructions somewhat liberally, and their reports frequently throw light on the social conditions of the time, showing as no statistics could ever make clear, the poverty and misery of the classes for which Dr. Kay had to make educational provision. Thus Seymour Tremenheere, one of the first Inspectors of Schools, made a "Report on the State of Elementary Education in the Mining Districts of South Wales" which gives an indication of the attitude of the people towards

(1) Frank Smith: "Life of Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth" p. 99.

(1)

education.

" It is perceived by them (the parents) that their children are sure of being able to gain an ample livelihood at an early age without the aid of learning. The parents are therefore apt to believe that their superiors are actuated by some selfish motive in endeavouring to induce them to send their children to school.....The boys are taken into the coal or iron mine at eight or nine years old, often earlier....A mother stated that her husband wanted to take one of her boys, then only seven years old, into the mine. She said that her others had gone there young enough at eight, and after they once went there "they turned stupid and blind-like and would not learn anything, and did not know what was right; and now like the rest, they went to the publichouses like the men."

"It cannot be said that poverty is in this district the cause of the deficiency of education."

(2)

Rev. F. Watkins, Report on the Northern District.

"I cannot leave this subject without mentioning one of the many miseries of the manufacturing life, which not only affects our schools but is the source of incalculable evil to the whole community. I mean, the circumstances long in operation, and yet increasing with every improvement of machinery, that the labour of the child tends to supersede the labour of the parent. Hence arises a state of social, I will not call it family, life which is more easy to imagine than describe... What the child wills, that the parent must do, and in fact does.....Does the parent wish the child to be punctual at its half-school time? to attend the Sunday School? not to remain in the streets after dark?.....He may command all this, but the truth is, that the child will not obey him; and, moreover, glories in his disobedience. He knows that his parents are, in great measure, dependent on him for their daily bread, and he makes them eat the bread of bitterness. It is almost impossible to say to what extent this monstrous evil persists."

Rev. John Allen, Report on the Mining Districts of Durham and Northumberland. (3)

" In nine-tenths of the common day schools visited I found no profession made of giving any religious instruction. The masters appeared in most cases to be very ill educated, and the schools being matters of private speculation...they are subject to no inspection, and are consequently in a great measure beyond the reach of those beneficial influences which could not fail to be produced by intercourse with persons of superior intelligence....Of education in that sense of the work which includes the training and the endeavour to perfect the faculties of the entire man, there is none."

(1) Minutes of the Committee of Council, 1839-40.

Appendix 11., p.182.

(2) Ibid. p.283.

(3) Minutes of the Committee of Council, 1840-41., p.127.

Seymour Tremenheere, Report on the New Pic Street School,
Westminster. (1)

" It was originally opened as a Sunday School...A few persons hired a stable...this was rudely fitted up as a school room, when, to their surprise, no less than to their gratification, they had in a few weeks 120 children...The~~ir~~ appearance of the children sufficiently denoted the class to which they belonged. Many were without shoes or stockings; almost all were of English parents; some were so ill clad that their naked skin appeared through many parts of their tattered clothing; all were equally dirty, the effect of extreme poverty or domestic depravity."

With such a picture before him as that revealed by the reports of the Inspectors, Dr. Kay had no intention of limiting the activities of the State to the provision of non-recurrent capital building grants. He had a vision of a Central Authority which would really participate in education and not merely confine its operations to distributing money. He saw that the local bodies building schools need^{ed}~~ing~~ instruction in how to build and how to use them. But above all Kay perceived the pressing need for teachers who knew their work and how to impart their knowledge. A project nearest his heart was the erection of a State Normal College, and on the 13th April, 1839, the Committee of Council approved a Minute which sought to appropriate a sum~~s~~ of £10,000, granted in 1834 for the purpose of building a Training College but never expended. According to the Minute of 1839 the Committee of Council decided to "found a school in which candidates for the office of teacher in schools for the poorer classes" could be educated and trained, together with a model or practising school. The scholars in this model school~~s~~ were to be taught on the "Simultaneous Method" in separate class-rooms and in classes of fifty, though provision was made for "Gallery Lessons" in "subjects not so technical as to require division into classes" In these proposals the influence of Stow is apparent. The sections of the Minute relating to religious education proved to be the stumbling block.

(1) Minutes of the Committee of Council, 1842-43., p.485.

It was proposed to allow both "general" and "special" religious instruction - reading of the Scriptures and denominational instruction- and controversy became fierce. The Government withdrew the proposal and divided the money equally between the National and British Societies to assist them in building schools. The failure of this scheme did not daunt the Assistant Secretary, for in 1841 the Committee issued its first Minute dealing with teaching methods entitled, "Minute on Constructive Methods of Teaching Reading, Writing, and Vocal Music."

Obliged by the religious controversies to abandon the idea of a State Normal College, Kay-Shuttleworth⁽¹⁾ pressed for annual grants to training colleges belonging to the religious bodies, but the Committee declined to accede to his request, though they did consent to refund a proportion of the original expense of building in the case of approved applications, conditional upon the right to inspect these colleges,⁽²⁾ and in 1844 the modest sum of £2,500 was awarded.

Efforts to remedy some of the more obvious deficiencies were carried further by a Minute of 22nd September, 1843, in which the Committee agreed to bear two-thirds of the expenditure on school-rooms, but refused to make any grant towards books.⁽³⁾ The principle of proportioning central aid directly to local wealth was retained, for the grant was double the amount of private subscriptions, with a sliding scale according to the number on the roll.

Meanwhile, some of the schools which had been erected under the conditions of 1833 and 1839 did not find it easy to secure funds for satisfactory maintenance. The state of affairs may be gathered from the following extract from a letter written to the Committee of Council by a Henry S. Bright of Hull.⁽⁴⁾

(1) Dr. Kay changed his name to Kay-Shuttleworth on his marriage in 1842.

(2) Minutes of the Committee of Council, 22nd November, 1843.

(3) Letter to the Inspectors. 7th August, 1844.

(4) Minutes of the Committee of Council, 1845-46. Vol.1., p.xviii. Italics as in original.

Jan.10th, 1846.

Dear Sir,

I have not troubled you about the St.James' National School at this place for a long time, and I would not do so now but that I feel COMPELLED to do so from a sense of the responsibility I have taken upon myself by being so mainly instrumental in the erection of these schools.

They are answering the most sanguine expectations which I ever indulged in when pleading for a grant from the Privy Council and the National Society, but as regards the Boys' Schools, a period has arrived when, without further aid is afforded from the Council or National Society, our usefulness will be most seriously impeded. We have an average attendance of 200 to 240 boys and only ONE MASTER. Our funds will not admit of our engaging further assistance.... I urge the case strongly from a deep and growing conviction that the great work of National Education is only half done by the new building of school rooms. To make them efficient, I am quite sure yearly support must sooner be afforded.

Similar Memorials praying for further aid came into the Central Office from all parts of the country, but the Government was too occupied with political troubles to give attention to the question. (1)

Kay-Shuttleworth was impatient at the delay, but within the course of a few months the Government was defeated on the "Irish Coercion Bill". Lord John Russell returned to office in June, 1846, and on August 25th., the Committee of Council issued a Minute which put the schools and their governing bodies in direct and close contact with the Central Authority.

The main provisions of the Minute were:-

- a. An increase in the Inspectorate.
- b. The framing of regulations fixing the qualifications of schoolmasters.
- c. The institution of "Apprentices."
- d. Payment of annual grants to schoolmasters and mistresses who trained apprentices.
- e. The provision of retiring pensions.
- f. The provision of gratuities for teachers of especial merit.

The institution of Apprentices by this Minute was an attempt to provide a body of skilled and efficient teachers. The most

deserving and proficient scholars between 13 and 14 years of age
(1) Frank Smith: "Life of Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth" p.170.,

quoting a private communication from Kay-Shuttleworth to Lord Francis Egerton in March, 1846.

were to be apprenticed to a suitable master or mistress for a period of five years, and to receive from the Government a stipend rising from £10 to £20. At the end of the fifth year, providing attainments and conduct were satisfactory, a certificate would be granted and the pupil teachers permitted to compete for an exhibition entitling them to be sent, as Queen's Scholars, to any Normal School under inspection.

The Minute gave a decided impetus towards providing more capable teaching staffs, and the increased financial aid was utilised as a means for securing greater central control over the general conditions in aided schools. Inspectorial visits were made more frequent, and attention was paid to the quality and strength of staffs. Moreover, Inspectors were obliged to report on candidates who wished to be apprenticed, to conduct the requisite examinations, and investigate the ability of schools to give the necessary training. The operation of the Minute led to the neglect of the backward child owing to the financial returned to be gained by apprenticing as many as possible of the brighter children, and it was criticised in that light by the Newcastle Commission of 1858-1861. In spite of that it was a big advance, for, in the first place, there was partial acceptance of the maintenance of schools and recognition of the properly qualified teacher, and secondly, the Central Authority exercised definite control over the attainment of staffs besides obtaining a useful estimate of the cost of efficient education. In financial policy the Minute departed from the rule correlating central aid and private subscriptions, though the break was not complete. The grants paid towards the salaries of pupil teachers and the master or mistress instructing them were independent of any fresh specific contribution on the part of voluntary subscribers, but the trustees of the school were obliged to provide the teacher with a house rent free and a salary equal at least to twice the amount of the grant, and a minimum stipend of £70 was stipulated by

the Committee of Council. In some districts this imposed no additional burden, but in others the conditions were difficult, if not impossible to meet. In effect, therefore, the very poor districts derived no benefit from the Minute and the desired improvement was not attained - a result which characterised many of the enactments of the Committee of Council. A complementary Minute - "Books and Apparatus Minute" - helped all schools to obtain necessary apparatus by supplying it at very much reduced prices.

The Minutes of 1846 and 1847, however, had a deeper significance than the purely educational advance they inaugurated, for they reflected a change in the relationship between the Central Authority and the local bodies administering ^{on} behalf of the State. They were an extension of the principle, enunciated in the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834, of compelling local autonomy to yield to central control. The Municipal Corporations Act of 1835 and the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834 were examples of two tendencies at work in Local Government. In the first case complete, or almost complete, autonomy was granted in the management of local affairs, and in the second case complete central control was enacted. ⁽¹⁾

As the Poor Law system developed it became clear that the fulfilment of conditions laid down by the Central Authority implied sufficient local resources, and where these were inadequate some form of assistance was essential. Therefore, the first suggestion of grants-in-aid concerned the Poor Law Administration when Sir Robert Peel, in 1846, introduced his proposals for the reduction of the duties on foreign corn. The position was as follows. The agriculturalists were about to lose the benefits of protection, and, owing to the altered situation of the agricultural rate-payer, the Corn Law proposals were accompanied by an understanding that provision would be made to transfer part of the local burdens from the rates to the Exchequer. The State was in future to pay the cost of

(1) Watson Grice: "National and Local Finance." p. 11ff.

32.

criminal prosecutions, to undertake the whole cost of the salaries of Poor Law Medical Officers, and to pay the salaries of teachers in Poor Law Schools. (1). Peel's advocacy was made on the propositions that the change would give relief to landowners, increase central control, and lead to more efficient and economical administration, but he also insisted that grants-in-aid should be earmarked for special purposes and be made to depend on the efficiency of the services performed. It was impossible to apply the theory behind the grants-in-aid in its entirety to education, because the position was complicated by the religious question, but the relationship between it and the terms of the Minute of 1846 is clear. The Government agreed to give extra aid to education on conditions which increased the degree of centralisation of the service as far as was practicable at the moment, and which made for greater efficiency on the part of the majority of the teachers. These changes were put into operation without legislation, but not without opposition from the Nonconformist and High Church Parties who represented that the operation of the Minute would tend to discourage, if not paralyse, voluntary exertion owing to the closer connection which would thenceforth exist between the schools and the State.

Associated with these Minutes were the controversies over the Management Clauses. The policy of the Committee of Council gave a direct interest in education to the subscribers, to the religious body connected with the schools, and to the Committee of Council as the administrator of public funds. The clauses were put forward so that each would function in its own sphere. To suit different conditions four sets of clauses were issued, but in each case moral and religious instruction was entrusted to the clergy of the Church of England. Religious controversy broke out afresh; the Church was assailed as a privileged party, (2) with the result that

(1) Hansard. Third Series. Vol. 83., p. 264. Sir. R. Peel.
(2) See an Explanatory Minute of 28th June, 1847.

(1)

State aid was extended to other denominations.

The system of administration had already become complex for it was based on no unifying principle. The aid given consisted of a number of piecemeal additions to local contributions, and the labour involved was enormous. In 1849 Kay-Shuttleworth resigned on grounds of ill-health, and was succeeded by Mr. R. R. Ling. ¹

In 1851, the Census Year, a Report on Education was published by Mr. Horace Mann, and as these figures were generally accepted as reliable it is possible to give some indication of the progress made from 1833 on the policy of Aid.

(IV)

(2)

It has been calculated ⁽³⁾ that the population of England in 1833 was 14,400,000, and that approximately 545,000 children of the working classes received some form of daily instruction, or the equivalent of 3.8 per cent. ⁽³⁾ The result of the Factory Acts of 1833 and 1834 was to increase the potential school population between the ages of eight and fourteen years, and this helps to explain why the Committee of Council placed most stress on the provision of school accommodation during the period under review.

By 1851 the population rose to 17,927,609, the number of scholars to 2,144,378, and the total number of schools to 46,042. The number of children of the working classes attending these schools was placed at 29,718 schools with 1,579,982 scholars, or an equivalent percentage of 8.9. Therefore in 18 years the proportion of working class children receiving instruction rose from 3.8 to 8.9, a result worthy of unstinted praise.

(1) Letter to the United Committee of Privileges and Education of the Wesleyan Conference, April, 1847.

(2) The Kerry Returns.

(3) Sadler in his "Summary of Statistics, Regulations, Etc., of Elementary Education in England and Wales, 1833-1870", p. 14., calculates that 795,000 children of the working classes attended some form of daily instruction in 1833, or an equivalent percentage of 5.5.

This result entailed an expenditure of £379,996, by the Committee of Council between the years 1833 and 1849, a detailed summary of which, extracted from the Minutes of the Committee of Council, 1849-50 is given in Table I.

Table I.

Grants awarded to schools for erection, enlargements, etc.	£339,358
Average daily attendance.	246,979.
<u>ANNUAL INCOME.</u>	
a. From endowments.	£ 12,769.
b. Voluntary subscriptions.	£101,088.
c. School-pence.	£ 78,217.
d. Other sources.	£ 16,911.
	<u>£208,985.</u>
<u>EXPENDITURE.</u>	
a. Salaries of teachers.	£170,789.
b. Books and apparatus.	£ 14,749.
c. Other expenditure.	£ 41,432.
	<u>£226,970.</u>
<u>ANNUAL GRANTS FROM THE COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL.</u>	
a. Augmentation of salaries.	£ 5,447.
b. Gratuities for instruction of apprentices.	£ 28,757.
c. Grants for Books, Maps, etc.	£ 6,434.
	<u>£ 40,638.</u>

Tables II compares the distribution of the Grant according to Counties, from 1833 to 1849, with the average daily attendance, and the proportion of day-school scholars to the population. The grant awarded and the average daily attendance have been personally calculated from "Detailed Statement, No.XV.," published by the Education Department, in which the information is given for individual towns and districts only. The proportion^{of} Day Scholars is taken from Horace Mann's Report, p.34, and refers to the year 1851.

Table 11.

<u>County.</u>	<u>Grant.</u>	<u>Average daily attendance.</u>	<u>Proportion of day scholars to the populations.</u>
Lancashire.	£56,949	29,015	1 in 10.6
Yorkshire.	£56,899	36,428	13.7
Middlesex.	£29,398	21,368	10.6
Stafford.	£19,539	8,325	10.9
Cheshire.	£18,210	7,456	12.1
Surrey.	£15,641	8,483	12.5
Kent.	£13,757	7,554	13.9
Warwick.	£11,762	5,551	10.8
Gloucester.	£10,356	8,892	12.2
Devonshire.	£ 9,077	7,493	11.3
Somerset.	£ 8,675	7,114	12.1
Hampshire.	£ 8,655	9,038	14.3
Worcester.	£ 8,593	3,701	11.0
Durham.	£ 8,521	6,493	12.6
Essex.	£ 8,355	5,531	12.6
Sussex	£ 7,667	6,470	13.7
Wiltshire.	£ 7,509	5,548	13.7
Derby.	£ 7,072	4,653	12.6
Cornwall.	£ 6,955	4,951	10.9
Norfolk.	£ 6,935	5,078	12.1
Suffolk.	£ 6,769	5,269	12.3
Nottingham.	£ 6,255	3,439	11.5
Lincolnshire.	£ 5,884	4,117	12.8.
Leicester.	£ 5,297	3,147	12.3
Hertfordshire.	£ 4,883	2,544	14.0
Cambridge	£ 4,820	2,965	13.1
Shropshire.	£ 4,371	3,112	11.0
Northampton.	£ 4,316	2,345	12.5
Buckingham.	£ 4,011	2,026	11.6
Dorset.	£ 3,830	2,708	13.6
Bedford.	£ 3,720	2,441	10.4
Cumberland.	£ 3,484	2,465	13.0
Northumberland.	£ 3,469	2,340	12.3
Berkshire.	£ 2,788	2,536	13.3
Oxford.	£ 2,701	1,971	13.8
Monmouth.	£ 2,336	1,626	9.0
Hereford.	£ 2,310	866	9.9
Huntingdon.	£ 1,773	1,004	14.0
Westmorland.	£ 549	704	15.4
Rutland.	£ 268	212	14.8.

The statistics in Tables given in Horace Mann's Report do not give any information as to the success of the policy of Aid followed by the Committee, because the term "Day Scholars " included pupils in attendance at private schools, endowed schools, schools aided by general or local taxation (military, workhouse and prison schools) and "other" schools (ragged, blind and orphan schools).

A more detailed estimate of the situation for the purposes of this investigation may be obtained by considering the public day schools connected with religious bodies receiving aid from the Committee of Council, and the ratio of such schools to the population. It was to these schools that the aid of the Committee went, for they catered for the mass of the children of the working classes. The figures are given in Horace Mann's Report, and Table 111 has been calculated from his statistics.

Table 111.

<u>County.</u>	<u>Population.</u>	<u>Number of Public Schools.</u>	<u>Number of scholars in Schools.</u>	<u>Proportion of Schools to population.</u>
Bedford.	124,476	81	6,424	1 to 1,537
Berkshire.	170,065	156	12,534	1,090
Bucks.	163,723	150	10,639	1,091
Cambridge.	185,405	127	11,500	1,460
Chester.	455,725	253	28,576	1,801
Cornwall.	355,558	191	16,232	1,862
Cumberland.	195,492	102	8,780	1,917
Derby.	296,084	205	18,209	1,444
Devonshire.	567,008	359	28,346	1,579
Dorsetshire.	184,207	221	14,785	834
Durham.	390,997	187	21,049	2,091
Essex.	369,318	329	26,302	1,123
Gloucester.	458,805	327	29,264	1,403
Hampshire.	405,370	386	33,606	1,050
Hereford.	115,489	88	5,402	1,312
Hertford.	167,298	183	13,468	914
Huntingdon.	64,183	63	4,792	1,019
Kent.	615,766	353	39,599	1,744
Lancashire.	2,031,236	687	113,287	2,958
Leicester.	230,308	196	13,287	1,175
Lincolnshire.	407,222	290	20,131	1,404
Middlesex.	1,886,576	542	101,009	3,481
Monmouth.	157,418	74	6,288	2,127
Norfolk.	442,714	409	29,429	1,082
Northampton.	212,380	169	13,060	1,257
Northumberland.	303,568	158	13,475	1,921
Nottingham.	270,427	153	13,791	1,767
Oxford.	170,439	181	12,582	942
Rutland.	22,983	22	1,441	1,045
Shropshire.	229,341	171	14,558	1,341
Somerset.	443,916	382	30,092	1,162
Stafford.	608,716	328	37,505	1,856
Suffolk.	337,215	304	21,897	1,109
Surrey.	683,082	304	41,226	2,247
Sussex.	336,844	287	25,182	1,174
Warwick.	475,013	210	23,966	2,262
Westmoreland.	58,287	43	2,782	1,356
Wiltshire.	254,221	291	21,953	874
Worcester.	276,926	130	14,219	2,130
Yorkshire.	1,797,995	951	100,155	1,891.

It will be seen that the proportion of schools to population showed considerable fluctuation, but in general the trend was towards a deficiency in industrial areas. The population was more concentrated in these districts than in agricultural areas, whilst the inhabitants were poorer on the whole and dependent for educational facilities upon the efforts of the subsidised voluntary societies. That the Committee failed to give sufficient aid to areas which required it most seems a fair conclusion to draw, but hardly any other result could be expected from a policy which made local resources the determining factor.

The number of schools erected between 1831 and 1841 was 7,407, but between 1841 and 1851 the number rose to 22,214. The advance (1) is shown even more clearly in Table IV.

Table IV.

<u>Period.</u>	<u>Population.</u>	<u>Total number of Day Scholars.</u>
1818	11,642,683	674,883.
1833	14,386,415	1,276,947.
1851	17,927,609	2,144,378.

Whilst the population increased by 54 per cent, the increase in the number of day scholars between 1818 and 1851 was 218 per cent, but the comparative age of scholars in Inspected Schools in 1851 showed that 63 per cent of those in attendance (2) were under ten years of age. The total number of schools visited by H.M. Inspectors, in England and Wales, in 1851, (3) was 2,093.

(V)

As a result of the chaotic position which had arisen out of the attempt to set up a Central Authority on the basis of a policy of Aid, the general position of education attracted a fair amount

(1) Horace Mann: "Report on Education, 1851." pp. 15-18.

(2) Appendix to Thesis. Table A.

(3) Appendix. ~~Table A.~~

Sadler. Summary of Statistics. 1833-1870. p. 106.

38.

of attention during the years 1850 to 1860, and the efficiency of denominational control and centralised administration came under review.

In April, 1850, Mr. W.J.Fox, introduced a Bill in which it was proposed that the Inspectors should make a report to the Committee of Council on the means of secular education existing within every parish of their districts. Where a deficiency of education was found to exist the overseers of the parish were to be obliged to convene a meeting of the rate-payers and inhabitants for the purpose of electing a Committee of Education consisting of not less than five and not more than fifteen members. The Committee of Education was to be charged with the preparation of a scheme for remedying the deficiency of secular education, subject to the approval of the Committee of Council. It was proposed that in approved cases the Committee of Education should establish schools and that all the children of the parish should be free to attend without cost. The schoolmaster or mistress was to be appointed by the Committee and to receive a salary of £100 per annum for every 50 children attending the school. In addition, the Committee of Education were to have powers to erect Infant Schools for children under the age of seven years, and adult evening schools for persons above the age of thirteen years of age.

The expense was to be met by a school rate levied in the same manner as the Poor Rate. The Committees of Education were to be established in perpetual succession. Every year they were to submit report to the Committee of Council embodying an account of their proceedings, a statement of receipts, and details of expenditure, from which the Committee of Council would compile an annual report on the state of secular education in England and Wales.

In parishes where a Committee of Education was not elected or

where the Committee of Council^{39.} were unable to approve of the suggested scheme, it was provided that the Committee of Council should undertake direct supervision of the means of secular education. The Bill was rejected.

The Manchester and Salford Committee on Education formulated a programme based on a system of local rating combined with the existing organisation, and embodied it in a Bill of 1851 which was referred to a Select Committee of the House in 1853. A rate of not more than 6d. in the pound was proposed, the money to be distributed amongst managers of schools in the town, and where voluntary subscriptions failed to meet any deficiency the Town Council was to assume responsibility for the schools concerned. On the other hand, the National Public Schools Association wished to break completely with the denominational ideal and to erect secular schools assisted by Government grants but managed by local bodies with power to draw upon the rates if necessary. Denominational schools were to be allowed to participate in the scheme, provided that they gave free secular instruction and allowed scholars to withdraw from religious instruction. A Bill embodying these proposals was introduced in 1851, but it was referred to another Select Committee of the House of Commons in 1853. Both Bills were ultimately defeated.

By 1853 education was under the direction of the Committee of Council with one important reservation. This direction had been obtained without the aid of legislation, and its strength lay in the power of the purse and in the system of inspection which had grown up. But the Committee lacked the power to initiate schemes for providing additional educational accommodation. Local organisations and the Voluntary Societies were in a position to thwart the intentions of the Committee either by refusing to build schools or by taking no heed of the conditions upon which grants were awarded. The general position was not satisfactory

40.

when such a state of affairs could not be prevented, and in 1853, Lord John Russell introduced a Borough Bill which would, it was hoped, remove some of the anomalies.

This Bill deserves consideration, because it inaugurated a series of Bills which had one feature in common - proposals to decentralise educational administration. No sooner had a real Central Authority come into being than ^{the} creation of Local Authorities was proposed, though the suggestions of the Bills for Local Authorities were for an organised system of decentralisation far different from the disjointed local bodies of the earlier period. Lord John Russell's measure was permissive, and the Councils of Boroughs might adopt it provided that a majority of two-thirds of the members present at a specially convened meeting were in favour of so doing. The terms of the Bill provided that the Council of a Borough should be empowered to elect a School Committee and make bye-laws subject to the approbation of the Committee of Council. In schools admitted to the benefit of the Bill parents were to have the right to withdraw children from religious instruction, and the schools were to be inspected annually by one of Her Majesty's Inspectors. Expenditure under the Bill was to be met by means of a rate which was limited to 6d. in the pound. The Bill was part of a comprehensive scheme which never matured, and dealt with elementary education, charitable trusts and the constitution of the Science and Art Department. Lord Russell declared that it was the intention of the Government to strengthen and improve the system of education which had grown up by voluntary effort, but the Bill was coldly received in Parliament. According to Kay-Shuttleworth, ⁽¹⁾ the Government was not of the opinion that agricultural districts were ripe for rate-aid, and proposed to provide for them by means of a capitation grant. The Bill, however, obtained little support from the Boroughs as the idea was new, and the Borough Councils who

(1) Report of the Newcastle Commission. Vol. 1., pp. 368ff.

41.

did adopt it were given no powers over the schools they were expected to finance. In practice, the schools would have remained under the control of the committees appointed by the religious denominations with which they were connected.

The Bill was dropped in August, 1853, but the part of the original scheme relating to agricultural areas had been put into operation somewhat prematurely by a Minute of 2nd April-1853, applying to "Agricultural Districts and Unincorporated Towns containing not ~~less~~ ^{more} than 5,000 inhabitants.", since these were intended to remain a charge upon central funds. Like most decapitated measures the working of the Minute soon gave rise to misunderstanding and uncertainty over the question of defining towns which should, or should not, be admitted to benefit.

The struggle for a decentralised administration was not abandoned. In 1855 another Bill incorporating the plan of the Manchester and Salford Committee was introduced by Sir John Pakington; Mr. Milner Gibson, and Mr. Cobden sponsored a Bill expressing the views of the National Public Schools Association, and Lord John Russell introduced another Education Bill. Thus in one session there was the unusual spectacle of three education Bills fighting for Parliamentary approval, and perhaps the plethora of riches was responsible for the downfall of all the proposals.

Russell's Bill followed closely along the lines of his rejected measure of 1853, but it was extended so as to include parishes and gave control to Local Committees. According to clause 20⁽¹⁾ -

"The council of any borough and the vestry of any parish acting under this Act shall have, by themselves or by such school committee as they may appoint, the entire management, direction and superintendence of the schools to be established or aided under this Act by such council or vestry, subject to the rights of any trustees or special visitors of such schools, but all schools established or aided under this Act shall be subject to the inspection of any inspectors appointed by the said Education Committee." (the Committee of Council.)

The Bill was unfortunately worded, and it was argued that this
⁽¹⁾ Sadler. "Summary of Statistics. 1833-1870". p. 51.

particular clause conflicted with the rights of the denominations.

Sir John Pakington's Bill was permissive in character. It extended to towns and areas of Poor Law Administration, and proposed the election of school committees of which the resident borough magistrates, or the county magistrates resident in the union or parish, were to be ex-officio members. The financial clauses imposed a maximum **rate** of 6d. in the pound, and, in brief, the Bill aimed at bringing educational administration upon the same basis as contemporary Poor Law. Denominational schools were to benefit on condition that religious instruction was not compulsory, but in new schools established by the committee which were to be free, the religious teaching was to be in accordance with the views of the majority of the inhabitants in the district where the school would be erected.

The Free Schools Bill of Gibson and Cobden proposed the establishment of a Board of Public Instruction to replace the Committee of Council. The Board was to divide the country into "districts" composed of a parish, poor law union, city or borough, and the rate-payers in each district were to elect a school committee. All schools established by such committees were to be free, denominational instruction was not to be given, and the teachers were to be under the control of the locally elected body. The Bill broke with the purely secular standpoint of the National Public Schools Association by allowing distinctive religious teaching during a period not exceeding one-quarter of the total hours of general education, but such instruction was not to be given on school premises. In the case of existing schools which desired to benefit under the Bill it was proposed that no doctrinal teaching should be given between the hours of 9am. and 11 am., and 2pm. and 4pm., so that scholars could be exempted if their parents so wished. Finally, the Bill empowered the levy of a school rate and the erection of undenominational training colleges.

43.

All three Bills were abandoned, and further Bills, introduced by Lord John Russell and Sir John Pakington in 1856 and 1857, suffered the same fate. In spite of the differences between the promoters of the Bills as to the means of improving education, all were united on the fact that the system was in need of reform. The proposals for decentralisation showed a uniformity which clearly indicated that all parties were conscious of the direction in which future development lay.

The policy of aiding local effort in direct proportion to local wealth had proved an unsound principle on which to found an administrative policy. According to the evidence of Mr. Bellairs, one of H.M. Inspectors, before the Select Committee of 1866, (1) schools had ceased to receive annual grants because the burden of finding resources locally to meet the demands of the Minutes of 1846, 1847, and 1853 and 1856, proved too great, and a centralised office was in no position to differentiate between cases of relative hardship. In 1858 the number of children of the poorer classes (2) receiving some form of education has been placed at 2,213,694, and of this number approximately 917,000 were in attendance at schools receiving annual grants, leaving 1,306,694, children deriving no benefit from public funds. The grant spent upon (3) teaching power, books, maps, and capitation grants in 1858, was only £354,955, and the Government was therefore aiding schools to the extent of 7s.9d. per child. If, at a conservative estimate, £1 per pupil be taken as the cost of education, voluntary agencies were left to find no less than 12s.3d. for each scholar. The absolute necessity of allowing local support from the rates, coupled with some degree of local responsibility, was apparent (4) during the discussion of the Bills already noted-

"By the voluntary principle alone we cannot educate the people of this country as they ought to be educated; you can no more do it than you can carry on a great war or defray all the

(1) Minutes of Evidence. Vol. 2., p. 30.

(2) Sadler. "Summary of Statistics etc. 1833-1870". p. 33.

(3) Appendix. Table G.

(4) Hansard. Vol. 137. pp. 658ff. Sir John Pakington. 1855.

44.

annual expenses of the Government....The voluntary system has broken down...and the only legitimate mode in which you can provide education for the people is by calling upon people to contribute a rate for it."

The policy of aid pursued by the Committee of Council and the centralisation of the administration were correlative, and if one disappeared the other would not be long in following. This point was seen in its full application by Lord John Russell and the other education leaders whose Bills had been rejected, but it was not accepted by Parliament. Nevertheless, all parties joined in demanding a commission of inquiry into the state of popular education. Sir John Pakington's proposal was carried by a majority of 61, and in 1858 the Newcastle Commission was appointed. During the debate the opposition contended that such a Commission could result only in compulsory education- an utterance which was truly prophetic.

(VI)

The Commission was directed to -

"Inquire into the present state of popular education in England and Wales, and to consider what measures, if any, are required for the extension of sound and cheap elementary instruction to all classes of the people."

There were deep seated differences of opinion between the Commissioners as to the extent to which the State should make itself responsible for the provision of educational facilities, and the full implication of the terms of reference "to all classes of the people" was not recognised. The Majority favoured a system of State education to cover the independent poor only, whilst the Minority was disposed to deal with the destitute, the vagrant, and the criminal classes. The Commission did not escape from the idea of education as a charitable gift, and viewed with alarm any suggestion that the community had a right to free education - (1)

"It appears to them (the Commissioners) that if the State proceeds further in its present course, and adopts as definitive the system which has hitherto been provisional, it will be difficult hereafter to induce parental and social

(1) Report of the Newcastle Commission. Vol.1.p.299.

duty to undertake the burden which it ought to bear, or to escape from the position neither just in itself nor socially expedient, that large and ill-defined masses of the people are entitled, without reference to individual needs, or to the natural claims which many of them may possess on the assistance of masters and employers, to have their education paid for, in part at least, out of the public taxes."

The Commission, in its anxiety to refute the claims for free education, failed to recognise that the right to free education was a different matter from the right of the nation to education. The appeal to the "natural claims on the assistance of masters and employers" implied some form of State action, as the State represented employers and employed in the mass, and "social" duty demanded that the State should regard education as a national affair and afford protection to the section of the community which was incapable of looking after itself. The "large and ill-defined masses of the people" had been dependent on "natural claims" for years, and the result was tragic -

(1)

"None are too old, too poor, too ignorant, too feeble, too sickly, too unqualified in one or every way, to regard themselves, and to be regarded by others, as unfit for school keeping. Nay, there are few, if any, occupations regarded as incompatible with school keeping, if not as simultaneous, at least as preparatory employments. Domestic servants out of a place, discharged barmaids, vendors of toys or lollipops, keepers of small eating houses, of mangles, or of small lodging houses, needlewomen, who also take in plain or slop work; milliners; consumptive patients in an advanced stage; cripples almost bed-ridden; persons of at least doubtful temperance; out-door paupers; men and women of seventy and even eighty years of age; persons who spell badly (mostly women, I grieve to say), who can scarcely write, and who cannot cipher at all."

Yet, it would be unjust to blame the Newcastle Commission for all the results which followed its deliberations. Education was, and is, dependent upon the interest and the resources supplied by the community, and these in turn were closely allied to the economic conditions and political thought. England of 1860 subscribed to the doctrines of the Manchester School, and their influence can be traced in the Report itself.

(1) Report of the Newcastle Commission. Vol. 1., p. 93. Quoted by Frank Smith: "History of English Elementary Education." p. 247.

(1)

46.

" In the first place independence is of more importance than education; and if the wages of the child's labour are necessary to keep the parents from the poor rates, or to relieve the pressure of severe and bitter poverty, it is far better that it should go to work at the earliest age at which it can bear the physical exertion than it should remain at school."

and

(2)

".....the main object of the promoters of education must be to teach the people to value it as a source of morality, enjoyment and comfort in the station of life in which the great mass of them are necessarily destined to remain."

whilst

(3)

".....the general principle upon which popular education was promoted was that a large portion of the poorer classes of the population were in a condition injurious to their own interests, and dangerous and discreditable to the ~~rest~~ rest of the community."

These quotations furnish the problem as the Commission saw it - to improve the system without making any fundamental change in the idea of voluntary responsibility. The method suggested was to alter the administration so that emphasis should be moved from the school to the child. Under the old regime grants were paid primarily on the school as a whole, on the buildings and on the proportion of expenditure contributed by voluntary subscribers; and the Commission noted the defect in this interpretation of the policy of aid.

(4)

"The principal obstacle which has prevented the Committee of Council from assisting schools in places which prima facie would appear most to stand in need of aid, arises from the fact that any extension of assistance to meet exceptional cases is sure to pass rapidly into an universal rule involving much waste of public money....We have therefore been led to look for some principle on which assistance can be afforded to poorer schools, whether in town or country, without violating the rule, which has hitherto directed all Government grants to education, that no public assistance shall be given to schools except in proportion to their own exertions to meet it."

They declined to follow out the logical sequence to this statement and increase the grant, because an outlay of nearly £2,100,00 which was calculated as being the amount necessary to do this,

(1) Report of the Newcastle Commission. Vol.1. p.188.

(2) Ibid. p.224.

(3) Ibid. p. 33.

(4) Ibid. p.338.

See also the evidence of R.R.Lingen.Vol.VI.,Q.87 and 88.

was "too large a sum to throw upon the general revenue for an object, the benefits of which are in a great measure local." (1)
 Instead, the Commissioners recommended that a grant should be paid primarily on the child - on the average attendance and on the attainment of the individual scholar. (2)

" A premium (be placed) upon every scholar, upon proof given of a definite amount of knowledge, no condition being required from the school except it being clean and healthy."

This principle was not new, for W.J.Fox, M.P. for Oldham, had previously suggested it in 1853 during a debate on Russell's Education Bill, (3) and it was already in operation as one of the conditions of award of the Capitation Grant of 1853. Moreover, the connexion between these conditions and the recommendations of the Newcastle Commission was significant, for, in discussing the question of examination according to age, the Committee of Council were of the opinion, in 1853, that - (4)

" It is therefore of the greatest importance to bring increased attention to bear upon these children in each school who are approaching the age at which their labour becomes valuable and to make the measure of public assistance depend in some degree upon the connection between age and efficiency."

A utilitarian conception of education had crept into the Central Office since the departure of Kay-Shuttleworth, and the personal contact of the earlier administration disappeared. After the appointment of a paid Vice-President in 1856 the Committee had become a fiction, (5) and all the business relating to the inspection of schools and the making of subsidiary grants and decisions regarding particular cases were made by the Secretary and the Vice-President. Interpretations of rules and regulations were given by the office staff, even if the decision involved tightening up conditions and concerned finance, whilst the Secretary rejected applications for grants on his own responsibility. The

dictatorial attitude of the office was keenly resented and their

(1) Report of the Newcastle Commission. Vol.1. p.314.

(2) Ibid. p.338.

(3) Sadler."Special Reports of Educational Subjects." Vol.1.p.447.

(4) Explanatory letter to H.M.Inspectors. 29th August, 1853.

(5) Select Committee on Education. 1865.Vol. 1.pp.1-33. R.R.Lingen.

seemingly arbitrary actions aroused hostility in many managers of schools. (1) Education had gradually degenerated into a commodity which could be computed in precise terms of shillings and pence, and Kay-Shuttleworth protested strongly against that attitude in his evidence before the Newcastle Commission. (2) To him, education meant much more than the mere inculcation of facts, and the spirit of his administration was the recognition of the child as a social being.

The recommendations of the Commission were drawn up in the form of a "General Plan", and are given below, the original wording being retained wherever possible.

1. The grants paid for the annual maintenance of schools to be reduced to two kinds:
 - a. A grant provided out of the general taxation of the country and distributed on the basis of average attendance.
 - b. A grant paid out of the County rate, in consideration of a certain amount of knowledge by the children in the school during the year preceding payment.
2. The existence of this knowledge to be ascertained by examiners appointed by the County or Borough Boards of Education.
3. The total of both grants should not exceed the amount of subscriptions and fees, or 15s. per head based on the average attendance.
4. In every County or division of a County having a separate county rate there shall be a County Board of Education.
5. In corporate towns of more than 40,000 inhabitants the Town Council may appoint a Borough Board of Education, and the grants shall be paid out of the Borough Rate or other municipal fund.
6. Further recommendations included the continuance of grants to training colleges, the organisation of evening schools with a special grant, and the prevention of evasion of the educational clauses of the Factory Acts.

The recommendations regarding County and Borough Boards of Education were an attempt to protect central funds from further demands, and to foster local interest in education, but the reception accorded to previous proposals which advocated decentralisation made the Commissioners cautious. A full policy of rate-~~and~~ was regarded as an impossibility, for they were of the opinion that the independence

(1) Select Committee on Education. 1865. Vol. 1., p. 167. Rev. W. Kennedy.
 (2) Report of the Newcastle Commission. Minutes of Evidence.

of religious teaching could not be secured where the management was mainly committed to the rate-payers. (1) It was plain that municipalities were not willing to shoulder a financial burden unless they had a considerable share in the management of the schools, and the Commission was evidently not prepared to accept this corollary of rate-aid. In fine, the suggestions of the Commission for decentralisation were of little value, as the proposed Boards of Education were to be nothing more than examining bodies distributing local money on a very uncertain basis.

On 29th July, 1861, a Minute was issued revising the Code in the light of the Report of the Commission, (2) The proposals went far beyond the recommendations, for they included the abolition of grants for school books and apparatus, of augmentation grants and pupil teachers' stipends, of capitation grants, of teachers' pensions, and of certain grants to training colleges. To replace these, a grant of one penny for every attendance over 100 in day schools, and over 12 in evening schools, was offered. But these grants were to be conditional upon the scholars passing an examination in the 3 Rs., with deduction of one-third of the sum if failure occurred in any one of these subjects. For the purpose of the examination the children were to be divided into four age groups:-

- Group I. 3 to 7 years of age.
- Group II. 7 to 9 years of age
- Group III. 9 to 11 years of age.
- Group IV. 11 years of age and over.

In addition, the grant earned was to be reduced by any excess over:

- a. The amount of the school-fees and subscriptions: or
- b. The rate of 15s. per scholar in average attendance.

(1) Report of the Newcastle Commission. Vol. I. pp. 301 ff.

(2) In 1858 the initial step in the codification of the Minutes was taken, when a Parliamentary Paper (No. 192) was published giving a precis of the Minutes of the Committee. This was followed, in 1860, by the first Code in which regulations were arranged in sections according to subject. The Code developed into an annual publication, which, like the Minutes, did not require the assent of Parliament before becoming operative. It was not until 1870 that the provision requiring the Code to lie for one month on the table of the House came into force.

There appears to be a certain amount of evidence that the Education Department attempted to put into operation, under the cloak of adopting the suggestions of the Commission, a preconceived scheme, which, it was hoped, would simplify administration by reducing the number of individual items upon which grant was payable. ⁽¹⁾ The plan was not entirely successful, for opposition

became so pronounced that the introduction of the Minute was suspended by a Supplementary Minute dated 23rd. September, 1861, "much to the regret of the Education Department." ⁽²⁾ The Parliamentary struggle reached its height in 1862, and on May 9th the "Revised Code as Altered" was published, to become effective after 30th June of the same year. The State grant was divided into two parts, both based on the number of scholars:

- a. The sum of 4s. per scholar in day schools, and 2s.6d. in evening schools based on average attendance.
- b. A grant equivalent to 8s. per scholar in day schools, and 5s. in evening schools, subject to passing an examination in the 3 Rs. The penalties for failure were 2s.8d. and 1.8d. per subject respectively.

The objects of the Code were stated to be the extension of the system to poorer districts, the encouragement of local activity, to control expenditure, and to secure a greater degree of attainment of elementary knowledge. Yet, the principle of previous grant payments in which no special aid was given to poorer areas was deliberately left untouched. The educational results were unhappy. Kay-Shuttleworth and Matthew Arnold had little difficulty in showing that education would thenceforth be limited to the 3 Rs., or that instruction would be stereotyped, and that the moral and social sides of education would be neglected, but these effects were equally an outcome of the general financial policy which animated the Central Authority from 1839. The original basis of a percentage contribution from local sources was retained. This was the same for the whole country, and grants

(1) Frank Smith. "Life of Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth." p.265.
 (2) Report of the Committee of Council. 1861-62., p.332.

were given for certain well-defined, in inelastically interpreted, purposes upon fulfilment of specified conditions. They were "Specific" grants, each with an unmistakable label, and from their nature it was impracticable to modify conditions of award in favour of special cases. Insistence upon local effort obscured the equally important but less obvious factors of available wealth and needs, and the Education Department failed to grasp the fact that it was not an increase in the number of grants which was required, but a reduction coupled with a re-organised method of distribution based on the poverty of areas and not on their wealth. To make grants harder to obtain and to identify education with the 3 Rs. was an inexplicable method of encouraging local activity or of extending the system to poorer districts. The extent to which local activity was stimulated may be judged from the fact that the central expenditure for 1862 showed a decrease of £38,698.13.8 when compared with 1861, whilst voluntary contributions increased by only £25,204.

Unsatisfactory features of the earlier period remained unchecked. Change of school was frequent amongst scholars, and the only practical effect of the Code was to increase the proportion of children under six years of age, or those exempt from the examination provisions and paid a grant on average attendance only. Older and brighter children were neglected because the success of a school depended on the number of children passing an examination framed to test the capabilities of a child under ten years of age, and each success had a monetary value. The Code also failed to stop frequent change of school by the children. Table V.

(1)

Table V.

Year.	Percentage at same school for less than two years.	Percentage under six years old.	Percentage over eleven years old.	Grant for children under six years old.
1862	58.60	22.51	23.18	£12,281
1864	60.33	23.29	19.26	£38,770
1866	56.51	24.47	18.19	£50,326
1868	63.46	25.47	17.81	£62,584
1870	63.61	25.30	17.99	£75,212

(1) Appendix. Tables B. and H.

However, the percentage cost of elementary education borne by the Central Authority decreased considerably, as Table VI shows.

(1)
Table VI.

<u>Year.</u>	<u>Percentage of income obtained from Parliamentary Grant.</u>
1861.	46.1
1863.	39.4
1865.	33.8
1867.	34.2
1869.	37.6

Attempts were soon made to give special help to poorer districts without sufficient resources to meet their needs, by the provisions for the amalgamation of parishes in rural areas, in 1865. Further action was taken in 1867 when a Minute was published with the objects of -

- a. Relieving the smaller schools of their proportionately higher expenditure.
- b. Encouraging the extension of the subjects of instruction.
- c. Ensuring an adequate supply of male teachers.
- d. Improving teaching methods.

Every school or department was to be paid at the rate of £8 for 120 passes in the 3 Rs., and in the small schools no additional staff was required unless the average roll exceeded 65. A further provision allowed a scholar who had passed the Standard VI examination to earn one more grant for his school by passing a satisfactory examination in any higher subject. To encourage schools to employ pupil teachers instead of Assistant Teachers, grants of £10 or £5 were to be paid for every male pupil teacher placed in the first or second class respectively at the examination for admission to a Normal School under inspection. If the pupil teacher were successful in obtaining a pass in the first or second division at the end of the first year of residence a further grant of £8 or £5 was paid to the school from whence he came.

It was clear by 1869 that the change of 1862 had failed to bring the majority of the schools into the State system, or to improve the attendance or the duration of school life. Yet these were two of the main objectives. The evidence may be found in the reports of the Inspectors from which the following extracts are taken:

(1)

"The dark side of the picture is that outside of the present State system still remain nearly two-thirds of the parishes with schools in my district....Thirty seven unaided schools have been inspected by me.....and if these schools are to be accepted as fair specimens of schools not under inspection, they present a deplorable picture of education outside the Government system."

(2)

"There are still a number of populous places, and in the rural districts whole tracts of country, urgently in need of good schools; and even in the towns where some of the best schools are to be found there is always a large substratum of the poorer class of children whom the existing schools have failed to reach."

The unaided schools referred to above were a product of the administrative policy of the Central Authority. Generally they were Church schools in charge of clergymen who were not in a position to employ certificated teachers owing to lack of the necessary financial support and therefore unable to apply for annual grants, or who were unwilling to dismiss an old and valued master or mistress simply to obtain public assistance. Most of these schools were situated in poor rural parishes and came under the category of "Simple Inspection" Schools, which meant that a right of inspection had been acquired from the trust deed, the school having been erected with the aid of a building grant. In some of the more prosperous areas the survival of these schools was due either to ignorance of the advantages to be gained from public funds, or to sheer indifference. A considerable number were inspected by Diocesan Inspectors appointed by the Bishop of the diocese but having no recognition from the Education Department, but in all cases the right of entry of such visitors was subject

(1) General Report. Mr. Binns" 1869-70.p.89.

(2)"General Report. Mr. Barry" 1869-70.p.60.

to the approval of the managers. These Inspectors were usually clergymen who received no remuneration for their duties, and occasionally they visited assisted schools in their official capacity. On the whole, the Government Inspectors devoted little time to the "simple inspection schools" or other unaided schools unless an application were received for a certificate to be granted to the teacher in charge. To be college trained was not necessary for the award of the teacher's certificate, provided that the candidate was able to pass the appropriate examination, but no teacher could sit for the examination until his school was twice inspected, and the certificate was not awarded until two inspections of his school had taken place after his success in the examination.

These unaided schools find little mention in official reports or in histories of English Education, but a description of a school of this type which was later admitted to annual grants was given by the Rev. W.H. Bellairs to the Select Committee on Education of 1866.⁽¹⁾ Whilst making his final inspection for approval of the school he copied the following letter from the logbook.

"Made an examination of the school to-day, and found that the attainments of the children were very low indeed. In the first class there was only one boy who could do simple long division, whilst most of them were unable to do anything more difficult than simple multiplication with one figure....In reading, the children generally throughout the school do not find much difficulty with the hard words, but that is nearly all that can be said in their favour, for they keep no stops; and I found, upon questioning them, that they had no idea what the stops were for. The second class are most of them unable to do a simple subtraction sum- their dictation is on a par with the first class. In the third class only three children could do a simple addition sum of three lines and three figures in each line....Having called out the first class for mental arithmetic I was much surprised to find that not a single child knew the multiplication table."

Visiting another school which was the only school in the district receiving grants from the Education Department, Mr. Bellairs

(1) Minutes of Evidence, pp.30ff. This Committee did not issue a report, and the account of unaided schools has been extracted from the evidence of Rev. W. Kennedy, H.M.I., Rev. James Frazer, and the Rev. F. Temple before the Select Committee of 1865.

copied from the log book:

"During the past five years, above thirty neglected children have been admitted into this school from other parishes of ages varying from 13 to 6. Only one of them, a lad of thirteen, would have done for Standard IV " (that is, three years below his age) "and he would scarcely have passed the examination. About seven, whose average age would be at least ten, might have done for Standard II" (that is again two years behind each of them) "provided they had six months behind each of them to prepare for the examination; twenty would have been dull ones in Standard I., several of them scarcely knowing their letters, though their average age amounted to $9\frac{1}{2}$ years."

Statistically, the position was as follows. The estimated population of England and Wales in 1869 was 21,869,607, and Dr. Farr, in calculations made for the Schools Inquiry Commission, estimated that 1 in 7.8 of the population belonged to the upper and middle classes. Accepting these figures, approximately 18,745,378 fell within the range of the Parliamentary grant. On this basis, that children between the ages of 6 and 12 years were covered by the Revised Code and that 135 out of every 1,000 of the population were between these limits, it follows that 2,530,610 children should have been at school. The actual number on the registers of State aided schools was 995,036, and out of these only 696,440 were presented for examination as having attended for the prescribed minimum of 200 attendances. The Inspectors were of the opinion that only compulsory attendance could remedy the conditions.

(1)

"For my part I well nigh despair of seeing these places properly supplied with schools, until the Legislature either takes the matter into its own hands, or else affords more liberal aid and encouragement to those who do."

(2)

"There is indeed one difficulty of which I have heard much in my last year's work, a real difficulty which must be surmounted, though it be called "compulsory education". Such education in some shape or other is absolutely necessary. Whether you look into the schools and see ~~how~~ many vacant places there; or into the registers, and see how short a space is the school time of these little ones; or examine fairly into their knowledge, and mark how mechanical it is for the most part, and how little likely to fit them for their place and work in life...you will feel not only that compulsion must be used for better educating these poor children, but that it must be speedy and positive."

(1) General Report by Mr. Binns., 1869-70.p.89.

(2) General Report by Mr. Watkins., 1869-70.p. 265.

The Education Department was also of the opinion that the system
 (1)
 required considerable modification :

"(These results) show that out of every 1,000 children in our schools qualified by age and attendance only 98 were presented in the two higher standards in place of the 318 who ought to have been prepared to pass such an examination at the close of what must be to them the brief period of their school life....The accommodation in our schools continues to be largely in excess of the number of children who avail themselves of it, whilst the attendance of inspected schools falls grievously short of the supply of scholars who ought to be forthcoming from the population."

Between the years 1839 and 1870 the State acquired the rights of audit, inspection and criticism through the conditions attached to the grants. A sum of £12,546,559, was spent by the Central Authority during the same period in subsidising voluntary effort, but the voluntary system was no longer capable of meeting the demands made upon it. The proposition that the education of the "poorer classes" was a matter of philanthropy, even with State encouragement, was no longer tenable, and the idea that the nation had a right to be educated gained ground more rapidly after the Reform Act of 1867 gave the franchise to sections of the community which could only be described as half-literate. The concern of the moment was to give the people some interest in the educational position, but the sole and direct control exercised by the Education Department deprived the community of important and responsible powers, and conferred none which were not trivial in extent. The case for rate-aid had been made out to the satisfaction of a responsible section of the nation, but local support would only be given in return for a share in administrative responsibility, and some degree of decentralisation became necessary. Determination of the exact extent to which localities could be entrusted with management and control of the education service was not easy, as the question of religion could not be ignored, and Parliamentary opinion was by no means agreed on the measures to be taken.

(1) Reports of the Committee of Council. 1869-70 and 1870-71.

CHAPTER II.

The Elementary Education Act of 1870 and its effects upon the Administrative Policy of the Central Authority from 1870 to 1902.

Chapter 11.

The Elementary Education Act of 1870 and its effects upon the Administrative Policy of the Central Authority, 1870 to 1902.

By 1870 the weakness of the system of awarding grants in direct proportion to the amount raised locally stood revealed. The policy had failed to provide adequately distributed schools, it had failed equally to fill the schools which had been erected, and numbers of schools remained outside the Government system. Unfortunately for the progress of education, the speeches on the Education Bill of 1870 showed little appreciation of the real state of affairs, for the emphasis was laid on the deficiencies of the system and not on the causes of these deficiencies, with the result that education was regarded as little more than the provision of school accommodation, and the determination to legislate as cheaply as possible was as pronounced as in the days of the Newcastle Commission. It would be unjust to men like Forster, Fawcett, and Mundella, to deny that they strove to effect a real reorganisation of the administrative and financial systems, but the Bill as eventually passed was only an attempt to remedy the more obvious results of previous mistakes without removing the causes. The scheme embodied in the Act of 1870 was devised for the children of the working classes, deriving its inspiration from the exigencies of the situation and leading nowhere. Sectarian agitation wrecked the original Bill of 1870 on the second reading, and the importance of the Act as passed is derived as much from its faults as from its virtues, for, whilst preserving the fundamental principle of aiding local effort, the artificial division of elementary schools into Board and Voluntary set into operation a financial policy more disastrous than that of the earlier period and brought administrative chaos in its wake.

For these reasons the Act must be treated in some detail, and to do this it is desirable to consider the situation just prior to 1870.

A revival of interest in educational legislation was a feature of the years 1867-1870, and the driving power behind this re-awakened activity lay in societies which were closely connected with radicalism in the large towns. In 1867 Disraeli extended the franchise to include about one million additional voters, most of whom were artisans in the towns, and the educational position underwent an almost revolutionary change. This was shown in a succession of Bills, the most important of which was the "Education of the Poor" Bill of 1867. Its object was to enable any borough or district to levy a rate for the purpose of erecting or maintaining schools, and the fund was to be administered by a Committee appointed by the Borough Council, or, in the case of a Rural District, by a Committee elected by the rate-payers. The Bill was permissive, and to conciliate religious sentiment the proposed schools were to be denominational if desired. The Government declined to accept the Bill, raising particular objection to the rating clauses.

In December of the same year, Earl Russell moved resolutions asserting the right of every child to education, and maintaining that it was the duty of the State to provide the means. He stressed the need for local rates, and insisted upon the provision of an effective conscience clause. The need for action was pressing, for as late as 1863 there were approximately 11,000 parishes in Great Britain, with a population of six millions, which received no aid from the ~~State~~ State for their schools, owing to inability to meet the conditions imposed by Lowe's Code. On February 14th, 1869, Mr. Disraeli announced the intention of the Government to bring in a Bill dealing with elementary education. It was duly introduced, in the House of Lords, on March, 24th., but the hopes of the education leaders were doomed to disappointment.

The Government did not adopt a rating provision, all it proposed to do was to perpetuate the existing system and improve it by a scheme of financial patching. After prolonged debate the Bill was withdrawn on the 18th of May.

Meanwhile, events were moving rapidly outside Parliament. The various municipal associations formed themselves into larger associations, and the Manchester League and the National Education League were formed. Though denominationalism and undenominationalism were here in separate camps, a speech by Mr. Dixon, M.P. for Birmingham, serves to demonstrate the cause for which both were fighting:⁽¹⁾

"The work we have set our hand to is to arouse the whole country to a sense of the extent and dangers of our present educational destitution, to create a wide and strong public opinion and to make possible a bold comprehensive measure.

Local Authorities shall be compelled by Law to see that sufficient school accommodation is provided for every child in their districts, and the cost of founding such schools as may be required shall be provided out of local rates, supplemented by Government Grants. Rate aided schools shall be under local management."

Despite opposition Mr. Dixon drafted a Bill in 1869 embodying the programme of the National Education League, with the support of John Sandford, Archdeacon of Coventry, Joseph Chamberlain, Robert William Dale, and Henry Fawcett, M.P. for Brighton, but on the 17th February the expected happened when Mr. Forster, Vice-President of the Council, introduced an Education Bill on behalf of the Government.

Forster's first sentence in his speech on the motion for leave to bring in the Bill revealed the spirit in which the measure had been framed. The Bill was not a recognition of the right of the people to education, but it would do good⁽²⁾ by

".....removing that ignorance which we are all aware is pregnant with crime and misery, with misfortune to individuals and danger to the community."

The Bill was not intended to be a real attempt to place on a safe foundation and new basis the whole question of providing

(1) Adams. "The Elementary School Contest." p. 194.

(2) Speech in the House of Commons. 17th February, 1870.

adequate school accommodation and maintaining it when provided; its objects were to fill in the gaps in the voluntary system and with the least possible expenditure of money. The subordination of education to political, social and economic considerations was continued. This was inevitable, however, as these considerations still provided, and will provide, the method of approach to the education question.

The Bill proposed to divide the country ~~the country~~ into school districts comprising boroughs and civil parishes, and the deficiency in school accommodation would then be examined. School boards would be elected in the boroughs by the town councils and outside the boroughs by the vestries, with power to levy rates and, if they chose, to impose compulsory attendance. The Government desired to retain the Voluntary system, and these Societies were to be given one year to make good any deficiency in accommodation. The Bill did not remit school fees, but provision for remission in necessitous cases was included. The question of religious instruction was left to local settlement. The parents, the Government, and the rate-payers would, it was claimed, bear the burden of expense in about equal parts.

There was little opposition until the second reading, but then the storm broke. Forster was accused of betraying his principles, of imposing denominational instruction at the expense of the rate-payers, and of sacrificing the Dissenter. It appeared as though the position had become hopeless until the Government promised that amendments would be made in Committee. On this assurance the second reading was agreed to without division. On June 16th Mr. Gladstone explained the Government proposals to a full and somewhat suspicious House. On July 22nd the Bill was given a third reading and on 9th August, 1870, the Royal Assent was received.

The Act may be analysed as follows:

1. The Country was divided into School Districts of three types:-
 - a. The Metropolis with its own rating scheme.
 - b. The Boroughs, in which the rating authority was the Borough Council.
 - c. Civil parishes or unions of parishes, in which the rate was the Poor Rate levied by the Overseers.
2. Where public elementary school accommodation was insufficient a School Board might be set up, at once if the inhabitants desired, or after a period of grace, six months, during which time the accommodation might be brought up to the requirements of the Education Department, by voluntary effort.
3. School Boards were empowered to issue a demand or precept upon the rating authority which it was bound to honour.
4. Penalties were to be imposed for breach of bye-laws enacted by School Boards.
5. Building grants were to be abolished after 31st December, 1870. (1)
6. The Education Department was empowered to take proceedings on the default of a School Board, and the Department was the sole judge of default.
7. The obligation to give religious instruction as a condition of the award of grant was withdrawn, leaving such instruction unfettered except by the provisions of the "Cowper-Temple" and the "Conscience" clauses.
8. Parliamentary grants were no longer payable in respect of religious instruction.
9. Grants would not be paid to schools which, in the opinion of the Education Department, were unnecessary.
10. The grant paid to schools would not exceed the income of the school derived from voluntary contributions, school-fees, and from any other sources than the Parliamentary Grant.
11. The schools should be open at all times to the inspection of any of Her Majesty's Inspectors, but the latter would not inquire into the instruction in religious subjects.
12. School-fees should not exceed nine-pence per head per week when spread over the whole of the average attendance.
13. The school must not be carried on with a view to private profit.

The problem facing educational legislators was not solved by the Act. On the contrary, it was made more complex than ever, and Fawcett stigmatised the measure as a timid, feeble compromise,

(1) Between 9th August and 31st December, 1870, no fewer than 3,342 applications for building grants were received, and the item did not disappear from the accounts until 1882.

(1)
implying a semi-paralysis of Government.

The Act failed to achieve its declared objects, because it was but a half-hearted attempt to meet the situation. It was a piece of permissive legislation and exhibited all the hesitancy of such measures. Though the function of the Act was to provide an adequate distribution of school accommodation it did not do so in actual fact. Neither did the Act compel steps to be taken to fill such schools as existed. There was permissive compulsion in the School Board areas, as Fawcett aptly described it in the Committee stage of the Bill, "...there was to be permissive (2) compulsion, permissive school aid and permissive time", but outside there was none except that implied in the Factory Acts and the Industrial Schools Act of 1866. The result was a patchwork of compulsory and non-compulsory areas, the differences between which were intensified by the fact that the compulsion of the Factory Acts were most effective in the manufacturing towns, that is in the very districts where School Boards were most commonly found. The Act encouraged the Voluntary societies to supply any deficiencies which might have arisen, but when that very desirable state of affairs had been achieved the areas would have no need of a School Board and therefore were unable to apply compulsion even though they should wish it.

Two new principles in educational administration were, however, introduced by the Act, a rating provision and local management, and the Government hoped that their inclusion would stimulate the provision of schools and ensure satisfactory attendance, but once again these principles were not thoroughly applied. Administration was rendered more difficult by the division of elementary schools into Voluntary and Board Schools. The Voluntary schools were continued on the fixed lines laid down in 1839,

(1) Times. 8th July, 1870.

(2) Quoted by Adamson "English Education, 1789-1902." p.357.

whilst the new Board Schools were given a different orientation.

Before the Act of 1870 there were only Voluntary schools, and their income was derived from Government grants, school-fees, and subscriptions. After the Act there were Voluntary schools receiving their income from Government grants, school-fees, and subscriptions, and Board schools receiving their income from Government ~~grants~~, school-fees, and rates. Subscriptions and rates were the respective sources of "local wealth" from which these types of schools derived partial support, and the rating provision in the Elementary Education Act gave the School Boards power to make a levy upon local wealth, in the form of property, by means of a rate. Voluntary Societies, on the other hand, remained entirely dependent on the generosity of subscribers. This difference in the financial ability of the Voluntary and Board schools to meet the demands made upon them was vital, as the School Boards alone were in a position to raise money by statute to meet any deficiency in accommodation and to provide for the future maintenance of their schools. The Education Department appeared to lose sight of this difference between the financial positions of the Voluntary and Board schools, and subsequent central grants became directed to securing other ends desired by the Central Authority rather than to supplying the monetary backing required by the education service as a whole. The grants became "Dynamic" and, like the "Specific" grants of the pre-1870 period, bore less and less relation to the ability of the schools or localities to meet the demands which were made upon them.

By 1875 the financial disparity between the Voluntary and the Board schools was noticeable, and the passage of time only served to accentuate the difference. Table VII indicates the relative position in 1875.

(1)

Table VII.

	<u>Board.</u>	<u>Voluntary.</u>
Number of schools.	1,136	12,081.
Average attendance.	227,285	1,609,895.
Rates raised.	£230,682	-
Subscriptions.	-	£ 673,203.
Local income per scholar.	29s. 9d.	18.11d.
Expenditure per scholar.	36s.11d.	31s. 1d.

Apart from the Government grant, the income of the Board schools exceeded that of the Voluntary schools by 10s.13d per scholar, and they expended 5s.10d. per scholar more than the Voluntary schools. The total rates of income, that is including Government grants, were 37s.3d. and 30s.6d. respectively - the Board schools alone showing an excess of income over expenditure. A comparison of the amounts received from Government grants, rates and subscriptions from 1872 to 1875 is given in Table VIII.

(2)

Table VIII.

<u>Year.</u>	<u>Board Schools.</u>		<u>Voluntary Schools.</u>	
	<u>Grants.</u>	<u>Rates.</u>	<u>Grants.</u>	<u>Subscriptions.</u>
1872	£ 2,876	£ 3,254	£657,606	£492,851
1873	£12,869	£ 57,052	£759,203	£535,908
1874	£37,886	£129,735	£861,667	£601,173
1875	£79,254	£230,682	£941,286	£675,203

Mr. Forster, in introducing the Bill of 1870, estimated that a rate of 3d. in the pound would yield sufficient to defray the expenses of the School Boards, but the following analysis for the year 1875 shows that many boroughs and parishes found it necessary to levy rates far in excess of that amount. Table IX.

(1) Appendix. Tables C.D.E.F.

(2) Appendix. Table C.

Table IX.

<u>Education Rate.</u>	<u>England.</u>		<u>Wales.</u>	
	<u>Boroughs.</u>	<u>Parishes.</u>	<u>Boroughs.</u>	<u>Parishes.</u>
9d. and over.	2	30	-	8
6d. to 9d.	6	59	1	16
3d. to 6d.	21	160	5	44
1d. to 3d.	50	139	3	37
Below 1d.	8	20	1	5

In England the highest rates, per pound, were 10d. in the Borough of Chesterfield, and 16d. in the Parishes of Queenborough and Staplehurst, Kent.

These Tables show that the School Boards began to rely on the rates to furnish the major portion of the money to finance their activities, whilst the Voluntary Societies looked to Government grants as their main support. As there was no statutory limit to which School Boards could utilise the rates, whereas the Government grants were definitely circumscribed by a maximum of 15s. per head, the financial strain on the Voluntary schools increased as time went on. To help the Voluntary schools the Code of 1876 raised the maximum limit of grant from 15s. to 17s.6d., but any relief was only temporary. The competition between the Voluntary and Board schools was not so much the outcome of direct rivalry as a consequence of the rising standards of efficiency with regard to buildings, equipment and salaries. The serious nature of the position was recognised by the Cross Commission which sat from 1886 to 1888, but before proceeding to detail the recommendations of the Commission it is advisable to describe the operation of the successive editions of the Code.

Under the Code of 1871 an extra grant of 3s. per subject became payable for every pupil who passed a satisfactory examination in not more than two "specific" subjects, provided that the scholar was presented in Standards IV to VI. The Code defined the subjects as geography, history, grammar, algebra,

(1) Report of the Committee of Council, 1874-75. Vol.1., p.XXV.

geometry, the natural sciences, political economy, physical geography, languages, or any definite subject of instruction extending over the classes examined. The grant was raised to 4s. a subject by the Code of 1875, and children who had passed Standard VI were permitted to take three specific subjects, but geography, history, and grammar were relegated to a new category of "class" subjects. For class subjects a grant of 4s. or 2s. per pupil was awarded according as the instruction proved to be "good" or "fair". This grant covered children above the age of seven years, in Standards II to VI who passed a creditable examination in any two of the following subjects: grammar, history, elementary geography, and plain needlework. In 1875, therefore, the curriculum was divided into three parts, the standard subjects of instruction, the 3 Rs., class subjects, and the specific subjects.⁽¹⁾ Each division had its own system of grant payment, and, in addition, a separate portion of the grant was made to depend on the report of the Inspector on the discipline and organisation of the school.

In 1882 the Code was entirely re-modelled. The portion of the grant depending on the standard subjects of instruction was assessed on a percentage basis - one penny per unit percentage passes in elementary subjects, the percentage of passes being calculated as the ratio between the number of passes actually obtained and the number of passes that could have been obtained. Furthermore, the requirement of 250 attendances before sitting for the examination was replaced by that of 22 weeks enrolment previous to the examination. A Seventh Standard was added owing to the children remaining at school for a longer period. This was due to the operation of Mundella's Act of 1880 by which School Boards and School Attendance Committees, instituted by Lord Sandon's Act of 1876 and set up in places which were without School Boards, were compelled to frame bye-laws regulating the attendance of

(1) Cross Commission. Final Report., p.37.

children in the area under their jurisdiction. The Code also modified the items of class and specific subjects. Twelve specific subjects were recognised, but the lowest qualifying Standard was raised to Standard V~~X~~, and the grant earned was not paid unless the percentage of passes in the standard subjects at the previous examination exceeded seventy. Under the Code of 1882 the following Table X shows the maximum grants which could be earned by Boys, Girls, and Infants.

(1)
Table X.

<u>Item.</u>	<u>Boys.</u>	<u>Girls.</u>	<u>Infants.</u>
Fixed Grant paid on the Average Attendance.	4/6	4/6	9/-
Merit Grant.	3/-	3/-	6/-
Singing.	1/-	1/-	1/-
Needlework.	-	1/-	1/-
Examination in 3 Rs.	8/4	8/4	-
Two Class Subjects.	4/-	4/-	-
Two Specific Subjects.	4/-	-	-
Specific Subject for Girls who took			
Cookery.	-	2/-	-
Cookery.	-	4/-	-
	<u>24/10.</u>	<u>27/10.</u>	<u>17/-</u>
Average Grant earned.	17/9 ³ / ₄ .		-

The result of these changes in the Code, with their new demands for efficiency of the instruction and their effort to remove the limitations of Lowe's Code, was that the Voluntary schools found increasing difficulty in meeting the local expenditure entailed. In 1883 the National Society ~~sent~~ sent a Memorial to Mr. Gladstone praying for special consideration. Both Lord Lingen and Mr. Patrick Cumin, the Secretary to the Education Department were of the opinion, in evidence before the Cross Commission, that the only solution lay in abolishing the distinction between the Voluntary and Board Schools in their title

(1) Cross Commission. Final Report, p.184.

An analysis of the grants paid to Elementary Schools, compiled from the Annual Reports of the Committee of Council is given in Tables H and J of the Appendix.

to public assistance. They suggested the formation of County Boards of Education with comprehensive powers of administration and supported by a County Rate. The Commission failed to reach unanimous conclusions over the relative positions of the two types of schools, but they were in favour of rate-aid to Voluntary schools, though the majority wished to see the Voluntary system maintained, and were not in favour of any considerable change⁽¹⁾ in the manner of administration.

"It does not seem either just or expedient to allow the voluntary system to be destroyed by the competition of board schools possessing unlimited resources at their command. We therefore recommend that the local educational authority be empowered to supplement from local rates the voluntary subscriptions given to the support of every public State-aided elementary school in their district, to an amount equal to these subscriptions, provided it does not exceed the amount of ten shillings for each child in average attendance."

The Minority of the Commissioners disagreed with the proposal on the ground that it was "unsound in principle, destructive of the settlement of 1870, and certain, if it became law, to embitter educational politics and intensify sectarian rivalries."⁽²⁾

The Minority Report was on more sure ground than the Majority, even though the arguments advanced therein might not meet with approval. The crucial difference between the Voluntary and the Board Schools lay in the denominational teaching of the former⁽³⁾ and the undenominational teaching of the latter. When the Board schools were set up in 1870 provision was made for local management through the School Boards, and there was no doubt that districts would have declined to give rate-aid to Voluntary schools without some representation on the management of those schools. The proposal of rate-aid to Voluntary schools was not practical until a scheme of local administration had been created

{1} Cross Commission. Final Report., p.195.

{2} Ibid. p.246.

{3} Section 14(2) of the Act of 1870, commonly known as the "Cowper-Temple" clause, stated that, "No religious catechism or religious formulary which is distinctive of any particular denomination shall be taught in the school." This referred only to Board Schools.

which would unite the Voluntary and the Board schools in a national system, and reconcile, as far as possible, their different religious outlook. Only one of the Commissioners, Sir Francis Sandford, saw this point clearly, and he drew up a plan for bringing elementary education within the scope of the Local Government Bill which was under discussion in Parliament.

(1)

Sandford's plan was not worked out in any detail, but it was the first suggestion for decentralising educational administration through the agency of comprehensive local authorities, a method which was utilised later, in 1902.

He suggested that School Boards and School Attendance Committees should be abolished and replaced by new Committees composed of members of the new County Councils, and by "District Councils" comprising Boroughs and Urban Districts of over 10,000 inhabitants. The County Councils were to be given the duties of the Education Department in respect of determining the adequacy of school supply, the enforcement of attendance, and the examination of schools. The District Councils were to be under the direct supervision of the County Councils and to exercise the powers formerly held by the School Boards and School Attendance Committees. Rate-aid was to be extended to Voluntary schools provided that the public interest was given representation on the management of the schools. The Education Department was to contribute a fixed grant of 10s. per pupil on average attendance and a maximum of 10s. per scholar for Specific Subjects, the Department grant to apply to all schools.

The Commission expressed no opinion on the desirability or feasibility of Sandford's proposal as they thought it highly improbable that the Local Government Bill would deal with education, and in this they were correct. The possibilities of the scheme

(1) Cross Commission. Final Report., p.205.

were not explored because the Government declined to accept the recommendation to extend rate-aid to the Voluntary schools.

Both the Majority and the Minority Reports of the Commission were critical of the system of "Payment by Results" of Lowe's
(1)
Code.

"we are unanimously of opinion that the present system of "payment by results" is carried too far and is too rigidly applied, and that it ought to be modified and relaxed in the interests equally of the scholars, of the teachers and of education itself."

Nothing remained but for the Education Department to pursue its policy of seeking greater efficiency by revising the Code and varying the methods of award of grants, whilst trying to avoid inflicting greater hardship on the Voluntary system. Until a scheme of local administration was evolved with the power to give rate-aid to all schools the inequality between the Voluntary and the Board schools could not be entirely removed.

Following the Report of the Cross Commission, the Code was revised in 1890. Grants were no longer paid on the results of individual examination in elementary subjects, but were awarded, on a higher or lower scale, according to the reports of the Inspectors. Thus passed Lowe's Code, and neither the Central Authority nor the Local Authorities have revived, or attempted to revive, a system which worked incalculable damage to the progress of education in this country. The new Code introduced examination by sample, and a fixed grant was to be paid on average attendance. The new grant consolidated the Merit Grant and the examination grant into a payment of from 12s.6d. to 14s. per child in average attendance. The lower grant of 12s.6d. was only to be reduced in cases where there was a failure to carry out the general conditions attached to the award of Annual Grants, and, generally speaking, it therefore became a fixed block grant. Further assistance was also given to schools in areas with small populations. The upper limit

(1) Cross Commission. Final Report., p.183.

of 17s.6d. was retained, and thus the revision of the Code did little to ease the burden on the Voluntary schools. Despite agitations, the Government delayed taking action over the plight of the Voluntary schools, and a Committee appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York reported in 1895 upon the condition of the Church schools.⁽¹⁾ Financial pressure was attributed to the increasing demands made by the Education Department for extensions and alterations to school-buildings,⁽²⁾ the operation of the Fee Grant, and the raising of the standard of instruction. The Fee Grant was introduced by the Elementary Education Act of 1891. The Act was permissive, and in schools which availed themselves of its provisions a sum of 10s. per annum per head was contributed by the Central Authority, subject to two conditions:

- a. If the school-fees were less than 10s. per annum they were to be abolished.
- b. If they exceeded 10s. then only the difference between 10s. and the fee formerly paid could be charged to the scholars.

In the latter case, the fee of 9d. per head per week per scholar, when spread over the whole average attendance, was the maximum, as a higher fee would have taken the school out of the range of Public Elementary Schools, under the Act of 1870. This grant was independent of those made by the Education Department, and its aim was to extinguish or greatly reduce school-fees, thus bringing about the practical establishment of free and compulsory education.

Some of the Board schools were suffering from distress caused by heavy rates - in Walthamstow the education rate was 18d., in West Ham, 28d., and in the Forest of Dean, 29d.

The Government, however, was still averse to any relaxation of central control of education, and a further period of hesitation followed. In 1896, Sir John Gorst, introduced a Bill on behalf of the Conservative Government which provided for a special aid grant

(1) The Schoolmaster. 12th January, 1895.

(2) Especially by Circular 321 of 1892. Known as the "Fabric Circular."

for necessitous areas and schools to be administered by County Education Authorities existing in conjunction with the School Boards. The Bill was withdrawn, but on February 1st, 1897, the Government stated its intentions with regard to the financial question. These included the abolition of the 17s.6d. limit. In order to appreciate the importance of this step a brief history of the rise of the limit follows.

The first State grant towards education, in 1833, was administered on the principle "that no application be entertained unless a sum be raised by private contribution equal to at least one-half of the total estimated expenditure." By 1876 the cost per child had risen to 35s., and the State, preserving the basic 50 per cent ~~ration~~, fixed its contribution at 17s.6d., but ~~with~~ this departure from the old rule. Up to 17s.6d. per child the Government would contribute towards the cost without reference to local income, but beyond this amount the principle that it should be met in equal amount by private subscription or rate-aid was retained, so that schools earning over 17s.6d. per scholar were "fined" the difference in some cases. For example, a school earning 17s.6d. per scholar received 17s.6d. even though local income were less than 17s.6d. per scholar, whereas if a school earned 17s.7d. per scholar this had to be met by 17s.7d. per head local ⁽¹⁾ subscriptions, or be reduced to 17s.6d. The financial effect of this unbalanced policy is difficult to ascertain, but for the year ending August 31st, 1895, the fine amounted to approximately £40,300, in Voluntary schools, and £12,500 in Board schools; equivalent to 4d. and 1½d. per head respectively.

The only solution of the problem was that previously advocated by the Majority Report of the Cross Commission, namely, to place Voluntary schools and Board schools on an equality with regard to

(1) Compare articles in "The Schoolmaster" during the years 1895-1897.

rate-aid, but the religious difficulty once more deferred the establishment of such a comprehensive scheme. Meanwhile, two alleviating measures for both types of school were put into operation. The first, The Elementary Education Act, 1897, amended Section 97 of the Act of 1870 which provided that if the sum raised by a 3d. rate for any school district produced less than £20, or less than 7s.6d. per child in average attendance, the School Board would be entitled, in addition to the annual grant, to such further aid as would make up the sum of £20, or the sum of 7s.6d. per child. The amendment was such that the sum of 7s.6d. should be increased by 4d. for every complete penny by which the School Board rate for the year exceeded 3d. A limit of 6s.6d. per child was imposed.

The Voluntary schools received separate treatment under the Voluntary Schools Act of the same year. The 17.6d. limit was withdrawn and an Aid Grant was to be paid out of central funds amounting to 5s. per head for the whole number of children in such schools. The grant was for the purpose of helping necessitous schools and increasing their efficiency. To achieve this object arrangements were made for schools to unite in "Associations" and pay the accumulated grant to the poorer members. Finally, the Act released Voluntary schools from the obligation to pay rates.

Table XI, showing the relative position of the Board and Voluntary schools over a period of 15 years, brings out the fact that the Board schools were obtaining more than twice the amount per scholar from rates than the Voluntary schools were obtaining from subscriptions, in 1896. The Table is selected from Tables C.D.E. and F. of the Appendix to the Thesis.

Table XI.

<u>Voluntary Schools.</u>	<u>1881.</u>	<u>1889.</u>	<u>1896.</u>
a. Number of Schools.	14,370	14,686	14,430
b. Average Attendance.	2,007,184	2,257,790	2,465,919
c. Voluntary Contributions.	£ 726,136	749,821	850,968
d. Total income per scholar less Government grant.	19s. 1d.	19s. 4d.	10s. 4d.**
e. Government grant per scholar.	15s. 3d.	17s. 1d.	28s. 8d.***
f. Expenditure per scholar.	34s. 4d.	36s. 4d.	39s. 7d.

<u>Board Schools.</u>			
a. Number of Schools.	.3,692	4,624	5,432
b. Average Attendance.	856,351	1,424,835	1,956,992.
c. Rates.	£ 738,737	1,229,037	2,182,372
d. Total income per scholar less Government grant.	26s. 11d.	26s. 11d.	22s. **
e. Government grant per scholar.	14s. 8d.	17s. 8d.	30s. ***
f. Expenditure per scholar.	41s. 6d.	44s. 6d.	52s.

The Aid Grants of 1897 afforded some relief for a time by reducing the excess of expenditure over income. In the year preceding the first distribution, the total expenditure in Voluntary schools exceeded the income by £188,545, but in the year ending 31st December, 1899, this excess was reduced to £90,421. The chief purposes for which the grant was given in 1899 were, the improvement of teaching power, £370,166, and the improvement of equipment, £182,144. The expenditure upon salaries was greater by £404,882, or 10 per cent, than in 1897, whilst that upon books increased by £172,479, or 54 per cent. (1)

The gradual decline in the number of Voluntary schools was checked for the time being, but the improvement was not maintained and the number of schools once more decreased, whilst Voluntary subscriptions showed only a slight increase. In addition, the

** Reduction due to the operation of the Fee Grant.
 *** Increase due to the operation of the Fee Grant.
 (1) Report of the Board of Education. 1899-1900. Vol.1.p.13.

percentage of the cost of education borne by the Central Authority rose considerably, and it became more and more evident that a financial policy which placed the Voluntary schools on a different footing from the Board schools had become unworkable.

Tables XII, XIII, and XIV, which are built up from Tables in the Appendix exemplify these positions.

Table XII.

The decline in the number of Voluntary Schools.

<u>Year.</u>	<u>Board Schools.</u>	<u>Average Attendance.</u>	<u>Voluntary Schools.</u>	<u>Average Attendance.</u>
1894.	5,081	1,777,787	14,626	2,448,037
1896.	5,432	1,956,992	14,430	2,465,919
1898	5,555	2,072,911	14,427	2,481,254.
1899	5,632	2,137,805	14,444	2,499,133
1900	5,691	2,177,253	14,409	2,488,877

Table XIII.

Comparison of Rate raised per scholar and Voluntary subscriptions per scholar.

	<u>1899.</u>	<u>1900.</u>	<u>1901.</u>
Rate raised per scholar.	23s.7d.	26s. 5d.	26s.9d.
Voluntary subscriptions per scholar.	9s.3d.	9s. 5d.	9s.9d.

Table XIV.

Cost of Elementary Education borne by the Central Authority.

<u>Year.</u>	<u>Government Grant.</u>	<u>Total Income.</u>	<u>Percentage Grant.</u>
1892	£3,963,083	£8,057,989	49.2
1895	£6,155,997	£9,658,748	63.7
1898	£7,268,789	£11,068,509	65.7
1899	£7,831,244	£11,868,227	65.9

The division of elementary schools into Voluntary and Board Schools by the Act of 1870, and the different methods of financial support afforded to them, ultimately resulted in the partial collapse of the Voluntary system, but, apart, from questions of finance, the Act was also ushered in ⁱⁿ ~~responsible for~~ an era of general administrative confusion, the consequences of which are still felt. To trace the growth of this it is necessary to return to

In the first place it can be definitely stated that the Act of 1870 did not enforce compulsory education and that it did not give the country a complete and efficient system of schools. (1) The Act, which is nearly always regarded as the foundation of the elementary school system, was a permissive measure, and the inadequacy of its provisions was noticeable as early as 1876. In that year the population of the country was 24,244,010, and the number of children between the ages of six and twelve was 2,874,336, but only 1,982,263, were on the school registers, whilst school accommodation for 3,426,318 day scholars had been provided. Again, the number of towns in England and Wales with a population exceeding 20,000 was 103, but of these only 78 had elected (2) School Boards. The total figures were as follows:-

England.

108 Boards in 202 Boroughs.
1,424 Boards in 1,965 Parishes.
Special provision made for London.

Total population under School Boards. 12,076,536.

Wales.

15 Boards in 21 Boroughs.
243 Boards in 361 Parishes.

Total population under School Boards. 753,292.

Admittedly, School Boards were not necessary if the work of the Voluntary Societies proved adequate, but only School Boards were empowered to enact bye-laws enforcing compulsory attendance. Of all the Boards in England and Wales, only London, 109 Borough Boards and 612 Parish Boards had availed themselves of this power. The first step towards enforcing attendance was the passage of Lord Sandon's Act in 1876. This laid down that it was the duty of parents to provide their children with efficient instruction in the 3 Rs., and indirect compulsion was initiated by means of penalties against those who employed children under the age of ten years, or above ten years and under fourteen, unless they had

(1) Frank Smith. "A History of English Elementary Education". p.299.
(2) Report of the Committee of Council, 1876-77., p.xiii.

reached Standard IV or made 250 attendances each year for the last five years. Unfortunately, many means of evading the Act were permitted under the title of exemptions; children who resided at a greater distance than two miles from a school were allowed to work, and six weeks could be devoted to agricultural labour in rural districts if the School Board gave consent. The Act did set up special machinery for dealing with evasion of the educational clauses of the Factory Acts, and School Boards were made responsible for framing the necessary bye-laws. School Attendance Committees were set up in places which were without School Boards. Like the Act of 1870 the measures provided by the Act of 1876 were inadequate. Orders and penalties applied only to breaches of the bye-laws of School Boards, but the enactment of bye-laws was not compulsory, and the Act took no steps to make it obligatory for reactionary Boards to make the necessary bye-laws. School Attendance Committees were not empowered to raise rates, nor were they charged with the duty of providing school accommodation. Procedure in the case of a School Attendance Committee was extremely complicated. If such a Committee decided that the school supply was inadequate, representations were made to the Education Department, and an Inspector was sent down to hold an inquiry. Should he report a deficiency, the parish or district was called upon to remedy it by voluntary effort, or failing that to elect a School Board for the purpose.

After four years working of the Act the situation was still disquieting. (1)

".....our tables show (1) that for every 100 seats provided there is an average attendance of not more than 71.05 children in board, and 62.75 in voluntary schools; (2) that for every 100 scholars on the registers there is an average attendance of only 70.84 in board and of 70.52 in voluntary schools; (3) that only 76.56 per cent of the scholars on the registers over seven years of age were qualified by attendance for examination; and (4) that while 93.9 per cent of those scholars were present to the inspectors, not more than 48.32 per cent of those above ten were presented in standards appropriate to their age."

(1) Report of the Committee of Council. 1880-81., p. xv.

Compulsory attendance was enforced in 1880 through Mr. Mundella's Act, by which School Boards and School Attendance Committees were compelled to pass bye-laws regulating the attendance of children in their districts. This Act depended on local sympathy for its enforcement, and evidence given before the Cross Commission showed that it was practically inoperative in the country areas as magistrates were unwilling to convict,⁽¹⁾ variation in the standards of exemption was too great,⁽²⁾ and the improvement in attendance, if any, was infinitesimal.⁽³⁾ The Secretary to the Education Department, Mr. Patrick Cumin, and the Inspectors stated that small rural schools varied greatly in efficiency, that village School Boards were unsatisfactory, and that a more uniform system of fixing standards of exemption and enforcing attendance⁽⁴⁾ was necessary. From 1871 the general scheme of administration was relatively simple. The education machinery of the country was composed of the Education Department, the School Boards, and the Voluntary Societies. The Voluntary Societies and the School Boards were entirely separate units and preserved their individual identity in their relations with the Education Department, whilst the sole means of connexion between the Central Authority and the schools lay in the system of inspection which had grown up.

The Inspectors were given special instructions in Circular 17 of 29th March, 1871, to ascertain the supply of public school accommodation in their districts, and in the course of the next few years they were engaged as follows:-

- a. Examining scholars under the Code.
- b. Reporting on the efficiency of schools and scholars and teachers.
- c. Examining pupil teachers and candidates for the certificate.
- d. Assisting Inspectors of Training Colleges in examining students.
- e. Reporting on acting teachers who wished to sit for the Certificate examination.

(1) Rev. J.J.Blandford. Report. 1882-83. p.249.

(2) Mr.H.W.Claughton. Report 1882-83., noted 45 sets of bye-laws in Norfolk, Suffolk, and Essex.

(3) Rev. J.R.Byrne. Report. 1882-83.p.275.

- (4) See in particular the evidence of Rev.R.Bruce, E.N.Buxton, and A.P.Graves, before the Cross Commission.
-

- f. Advising Managers and School Boards upon points of law, interpretation of the Acts and procedure.
- g. Reporting to the Education Department on questions of policy and administration.

By 1886 the system had been in operation sufficiently long to enable an inquiry into the ~~working~~ of the Elementary Education Acts to be made with profit, and in 1888 the Cross Commission made its report. The system of inspection came under review. Since the Act of 1870 declined to recognise religious instruction as part of the responsibility of the Education Department the arrangements governing Inspection had been revised. It was no longer undertaken on a denominational basis, but the country was reorganised into divisions for the purposes of Inspection which practically corresponded to the areas of Local Education Authorities established by the Act of 1902, whilst the Concordat with the various religious bodies was withdrawn. This redistribution was facilitated by the fact that the need for State Inspections of subsidised services had been conceded by 1870, and the Factories, Workshops, Poor Law Schools, and the Police were all supervised by centrally appointed Inspectors. The Cross Commission was emphatic that Inspection had wandered away from its true function of stimulating and enriching the educational experience of staffs of schools. Instead, it had degenerated into a mechanical routine, bound by the chains of the Revised Code.

"The inspection day is the day towards which the eyes of all connected with an elementary school are continually looking forward. The arrangements for the whole year are devised to meet the requirements of the inspector's visit. The course of teaching, the classification of the scholars, the daily progress of the children, the working staff, the time-table, even the seasons of the year and the idiosyncrasy of the inspector, are one and all to be taken into account in their bearing upon this great event of the ~~year~~ school year."

(1)

Matthew Arnold, in his General Report for 1863, had pictured Inspection as it had become under the Revised Code.

" The new examination is in itself a less exhausting business than the old inspection to the person conducting it; it does not make a call as that did upon his spirit and inventiveness; but it takes up much more time, it throws upon him a mass of minute detail, and severely tasks hand and eye to avoid mistakes. Few can know till they have tried what a business it is to enter into a close-ruled schedule, as an examination goes on, three marks for three different things against the names of 200 children whom one does not know one from the other, without putting the wrong child's mark in the wrong place. Few can know how much delay and fatigue is unavoidably caused before one can get one's 600 communications fairly accomplished, by difficulty of access to children's places, difficulty in seeing clearly into the obscurer parts of the ~~exam~~ schoolroom, difficulty of resisting, without feeling oneself inhuman, the appealing looks of master or scholars for a more prolonged trial of a doubtful scholar. Then there are inquiries and returns to be made by the Inspector about log-books, portfolios, accounts, pupil teachers' engagement and stipends, which had not to be made formerly."

Sir Lovelace Stamer, one of Her Majesty's Inspectors, in evidence before the Cross Commission indicated that the passage of years
(2)
had made but little difference.

" I do not think that there is sufficient time given, to begin with; and there is a general state of haste in all the proceedings which, of course, upsets the discipline of the school. My own belief is that the old days of inspection gave the inspectors a far better opportunity of getting at the character of the school than they can possibly have now when ordinary work and discipline of the school is upset in order to facilitate the inspection."

The Commissioners were not prepared to advocate the repeal of "Payment by Results", but they were agreed in thinking that
(3)
the system had been too rigidly applied and carried too far, whilst they also recommended that more freedom should be granted to schools in classifying pupils than had been allowed since the introduction of Lowe's Code of 1862.

The looseness of the relationship between the Central Authority and the Local Bodies responsible for elementary education was an illusive simplicity which ultimately helped to bring about the

(1) Reports on Elementary Schools. 1852-1882. Edited by F.S. Marvin. pp. 95-96.

(2) Minutes of Evidence. Question 24, 120.

(3) Final Report. p. 183.

chaos of the latter part of the century. Even with the help of the Inspectors there was uncertainty about the exact interpretation of the Education Acts. The sections dealing with the powers and duties of School Boards and School Attendance Committees were somewhat loosely worded, and some of the more progressive Boards took a wider view of their functions than was intended. Furthermore, friction arose between the Voluntary Societies and the School Boards as to the prior right to supply deficiency of accommodation. Having sought the opinion of Counsel, the Education Department decided that School Boards were not only compelled by the Act to supply the original deficiency, but they were entitled, if they so desired, to supply further deficiency even against the offer of the Voluntary Societies. If the Societies persisted in building, then any schools erected by them would come under the category of "unnecessary schools", which implied non-recognition of the purposes of annual grants. In one outstanding example which created feeling at the time, the School Board for Swansea was allowed to ban the admission of a Roman Catholic School to the annual grant list on the ground that the School Board had already provided ample accommodation to meet the needs of the district. As Lord Lingen pointed out in evidence before the Cross Commission, ⁽¹⁾ the Board Schools were under no similar disability because they were in a position to fall back on the rates to an unlimited extent, and could therefore be maintained without any education grant whatsoever.

By the time of the Cross Commission, 1886-1888, the lack of co-ordination between Voluntary and Board schools had become pronounced. Expense had made it almost impossible for the Voluntary schools to maintain the same standards of instruction as the Board schools, and the Education Department found it difficult to provide

(1) Minutes of Evidence. Question 56,360.

for anything but a minimum of efficiency. This reacted against any uniformity in educational provision in areas under the charge of School Boards, and the majority of the Cross Commission viewed with alarm the wide interpretation of the term "elementary education" adopted by some of the progressive Boards. The Commissioners were of the opinion that the unwarranted extension was an attempt to defray a portion of the cost of the education of the children of the wealthier classes out of the rates, but, in reality, it was the confusion which had been growing since the Act of 1870 coming to a head.

To understand the position clearly it is necessary to turn to the activities of the Department of Science and Art, formed in 1853 to encourage education in technical subjects. Though placed under nominal control of the Education Department in 1856, the Science and Art Department retained its distinctive title and administration; it was financially independent, drew up its own scheme of instruction, and devised its own system of grant payment. Up to 1872 the work of The Science and Art Department and the Education Department did not overlap to any considerable extent as far as elementary schools were concerned, for the Science and Art Department only awarded grants to schools for proficiency in drawing. After 1872 the position changed, as the Science and Art Department created a special order of classes, known as "Organised Science Schools", and offered payments for attendance in the case of schools or classes complying with their regulations for organising a three years' course of scientific instruction which could be given either in day or evening classes. This instruction was intended to follow and supplement the ordinary elementary education provided by the Education Department.

This was when the confusion really commenced, for the Act of 1870 gave no definition of "elementary education," and

as early as 1876 some of the more active School Boards were giving instruction outside the limits of the Code, and, more especially outside the limits of the schedule of specific subjects. The Education Department sought to make the practice cease by introducing a provision into the Code by which, at 14 years of age, no child should be longer chargeable to the Parliamentary grant.⁽¹⁾ But it was not so much a question of ^{the} age of scholars as ^{of} the subjects taught which was causing the apprehension of the Education Department. In 1876, Sheffield School Board, for example,⁽²⁾ suggested the establishment of a -

"....central school, to which advanced scholars from the elementary schools of the town are to be promoted, and where not only ALL the subjects mentioned in the fourth schedule are to be taught, but other subjects said to bear upon the industries of the district, e.g. mineralogy, geology, chemistry, principles of mining, machine construction, etc."

The funds for the support of a school of this type~~s~~ would have been furnished by the Education Department, the Science and Art Department and the rates. Movements with similar objectives⁽³⁾ were on foot elsewhere -

"The Burton-on-Trent School Board proposed to introduce a technical course connected with its main industry into one of the boys' schools. The curriculum of the Albion Schools at Ashton-under-Lyne was said to be as extensive as that of any middle class school, and of their scholars three had matriculated at the London University....."

By 1886 the movement for the extension of elementary education had grown to considerable proportions. The Report of the Cross Commission indicated that some School Boards had instituted special schools, and these were giving technical instruction, earning grants from the Science and Art Department. Manchester, for example, established a Central School which admitted scholars from elementary schools who had passed the Education Department Code for Standard V; when the children completed Standard VII under the Code they remained as pupils of an Organised Science

(1) Report of the Committee of Council. 1879-1880. p. viii - x.

(2) Quoted by Frank Smith, "A History of Elementary Education" p. 310.

(3) Ibid. p. 311.

School, under the South Kensington Directory, and earned grants (1) by passing the examinations of the Science and Art Department.

Administrative confusion was rendered still worse by the Technical Instruction Act of 1889 which empowered County Councils, formed under the Local Government Act of 1888, and the Council of any Urban Sanitary Authority within the meaning of the Public Health Acts, to aid technical or manual instruction by means of a rate not exceeding one penny ~~xx~~ in the pound, and certain excise money, "whiskey money", was placed at their disposal for the same purpose. The Science and Department was not slow in taking advantage of the new situation. The scheme of instruction of the Department was reorganised to include compulsory literary subjects, and the length of the course was no longer specified as three years. The compulsory subjects were definitely non-technical and soon afterwards South Kensington sanctioned almost every subject except the classics. Moreover, even in the subjects which might be legitimately called technical, the Department no longer insisted on treatment from a technical point of view, and hence nearly all the money went in furthering higher education of a general type. The School Boards also managed to obtain grants from the County and Urban Authorities by instituting "science courses" in elementary schools receiving annual grants from the Education Department, as the Councils followed the lead given by the Department of Science and Art and interpreted "technical" in a much wider sense than the original technical education.

The practical effect of this was to make the Science and Art Department a Central Authority for aiding in the supply of technical education with a standing almost equal to that of the Education Department. Apart altogether from the question of administrative confusion, the introduction of the County Councils

(1) Frank Smith. "A History of Elementary Education". p.327.

as local bodies furthering higher education, and indirectly touching the elementary system by grants to School Boards, was of great significance as pointing to a possible solution of the complication of local administration which had arisen.

The general position soon reached a state of chaos. There were two Departments, the Education Department and the Science and Art Department, which had different functions, giving grants to elementary schools. County and Urban Councils also awarded grants to the same schools, and the result of such overlapping was an inconsistent and expensive policy. None of the Acts which had been passed since 1870 gave any definition of elementary, secondary, or technical education, and even the Education Department was in doubt and difficulty. Mr. G.W. Kekewich, the Secretary to the Education Department, in his evidence before the Bryce Commission on Secondary Education of 1894 to 1895, stated that his Department had a double connection with "secondary" education through the Higher Grade Elementary Schools and the Training Departments at Universities and University Colleges. In deciding what was elementary education or secondary education nothing was refused recognition as elementary education provided it came within the schedules of the Code.

"I think it would be exceedingly difficult to take anything out of the schedules of the Code and put it into the domain of Secondary Education, so as to prevent the elementary schools that are at present teaching these subjects from continuing to teach them. When I spoke of Secondary Education depending on the subjects and not upon the age or standard, I meant that in my opinion you cannot say that when a child is out of the standards in a day school he then enters upon a Secondary Education, because a child in Standards V., VI., VIIa, of the Code, if he is being instructed in specific subjects, may be receiving instruction in specific subjects as a child who is out of the seventh standard - what we call the "ex-seventh."

(1) The term "secondary" is here used to include all forms of education outside the provisions of the Code for Elementary Schools.

(2) Report of the Bryce Commission. Vol. 11., Question 975.

(3) Ibid. Questions 983 and 986.

(1)

The Rev. T. W. Sharpe, H. M. Senior Chief Inspector of Schools, stated:

"I think many of these higher grade schools are really taking Secondary Education which would be better left to some different authority than the school boards."

Mr. Kekewich further intimated that it was impossible to indicate the difference between the grades of education by means of reference to specific subjects of instruction. (2)

Children in elementary schools were receiving what might be regarded as secondary education in so far as organised science classes were concerned, and similarly in the case of certain literary subjects, (3) such as Latin, it was not possible to draw a distinction because:

"....the elementary instruction dovetails into the secondary instruction."

(4)

He gave a concrete illustration which shows the confusion clearly.

"In the Bridge Street School at Birmingham, the school for many years was worked as a public elementary school having science classes attached to it....It was practically a science school.....The public elementary school was merely kept up in order to enable the school board, therefore, to spend the rates upon the maintenance of science classes....We could not tell whether there were children in the science class who were not in the public elementary school."

(5)

The Commission concluded that:

"Some of the higher grade elementary schools which receive grants from the (Education) Department under the name of public elementary schools, are in fact secondary schools as regards the higher part of their curriculum. The only limits to such grants are;

1. that the scholar earning the grant must be under 14; or
2. if over 14, must not have passed in the three elementary subjects enjoined in the Seventh Standard."

The factors causing this undoubted confusion were the lack of a Central Authority which could make for a right ordering of education from the elementary to the higher stages without overlapping and antagonism, and the need for local authorities to be organised on a similar basis, so that elementary and higher education could be harmoniously provided without any overlapping of the activities

(1) Report of the Bryce Commission. Vol. 11., Question 1, 430.

(11) Ibid. Question 987. (111) Ibid. Question 986.

(4) Ibid. Question 981.

(5) Final Report. Vol. 1. p. 30.

of the School Boards and of the County and Urban Councils. The growth of elementary education since 1880 showed that some form of local authority was highly desirable, for districts possessing active School Boards had made remarkable advancement, and such Boards possessed a knowledge of local needs which a central Education Department could never acquire. The problem was of special interest to the Bryce Commission from the point of view of a better organisation of Secondary Education, and the question of organising secondary education on an "area basis" was discussed (1) by the Commission. Four suggestions were considered.

- a. The Parliamentary Division.
- b. A Geographical Division.
- c. A population Division.
- d. The existing Municipal and County Divisions.

These proposals were concerned only with secondary education and were not discussed from an administrative point of view to any extent, though there appears no reason why they should not have applied equally well to a consideration of the whole educational system. The conclusion reached was that the existing Municipal and County Divisions offered the most satisfactory solution (2) in spite of its inconveniences, as these could be -

"...obviated by a less burdensome and revolutionary measure than the special creation of educational areas or provinces, with all the electoral, fiscal and administrative readjustments it would involve."

Nevertheless a suggestion by Sir George Young deserves special consideration as it has been continually revived since that date. He suggested that educational districts could be arranged upon a larger basis than the small counties, and instanced Westmorland, Cumberland, and Barrow-in-Furness as one district, whilst the North Riding of Yorkshire with the southern part of Durham formed another. (3)

(1) Final Report. Vol.1.p.114.

(2) Ibid. Vol.1.p.116.

(3) Report. Minutes of Evidence. Questions 16-18.

This suggestion was developed, and it was advocated that all the boroughs be merged into the counties in which they stood so as to form provincial areas governed by provincial authorities.

A scheme was outlined for five such provincial areas for England, excluding Monmouthshire. ⁽¹⁾ Some ^{of} the Commissioners were in favour of having the same Central and Local Authorities for elementary and secondary education, though it was recognised that the management of elementary education in a large area might ⁽²⁾ prove difficult.

The Education Bill of 1896 proposed to make county and county borough councils the sole local education authorities, but it was withdrawn owing to an amendment being accepted which would have made smaller authorities autonomous for all forms of education. In the end the solution to these financial and administrative problems came from an entirely unexpected quarter. In 1898 Mr. Cockerton, the Local Government Board Auditor, surcharged the London School Board with respect to payments made to an art master who taught drawing classes in Board schools, and to a science master who taught his subject to evening classes in Board schools, both in connection with the South Kensington Directory. The Courts decided that the School Board was not entitled to devote money from the rates to such teaching, or for the teaching of adults in any case. To ease the situation the illegal expenditure was condoned by special Acts of Parliament, but legislation and reorganisation could no longer be delayed.

The reform of the Central Authority took first place, and as a preliminary step the Board of Education was established by an Act passed in 1899. The Board was to take the place of the Education Department, and incorporated the Department of Science and Art and the educational work of the Charity Commission and the

(1) Bryce Commission. Minutes of Evidence. Questions 80-84.

(2) Bryce Commission. Report, Vol.V., p.33. Memorandum by J.H.

Board of Agriculture. It was charged with the superintendence of all matters relating to education in England and Wales, and was the first real Central Authority entrusted with the duty of correlating all types of educational activities. The judgment of the Law Officers gave the Board the opportunity to make a clean sweep of the whole administrative and financial policies, but they were not in a position to do this. The crux of the matter lay in the Voluntary schools. These schools had been fostered by the old Central Authority itself, partly with the idea of avoiding the religious difficulty, and partly with the idea of cutting down expense. The Act of 1870 split elementary education into two branches existing side by side, one under private management, the Voluntary schools, and the other under public management, the Board schools. The results of this policy have been traced out in this Chapter; the Voluntary schools were in a state of virtual collapse owing to the policy of aid pursued by the Central Authority, whilst the Board schools were in a welter of financial and administrative illegality owing to the lack of definition of elementary education.

The remedy suggested by a Minority of the Cross Commission, that Voluntary schools should be compulsorily transferred to School Boards, was historically and practicably impossible. Encouraged by the Government for seventy years, the Voluntary schools provided the largest proportion of elementary education in the country, and they would certainly exist to meet the wishes of parents who demanded a denominational instruction for their children, whilst the alternative proposal, to replace Voluntary schools by Board schools, was too expensive for any Government to contemplate. The Voluntary schools had to continue, and one

of the problems was to devise some means of bringing them into a national system, whilst at the same time affording them protection against schools aided from local funds. The other problem was to reorganise national and local administrations in such a manner that the events of the "nineties" would not be repeated.

The solution to the first problem was that recommended by the Cross Commission, to extend rate-aid to Voluntary schools. The solution to the second problem was the creation of the Board of Education to deal with national administration, and the setting up of new Local Authorities to manage local administration.

CHAPTER III.

Stimulation as the Basis of Educational Policy from 1902 to 1918.

Chapter 111.

Stimulation as the Basis of Educational Policy from 1902-1918.

The period of ~~seventy~~ years dealt with in the preceding chapter witnessed far reaching changes in the attitude of the nation towards education. Until 1833 it was largely founded on philanthropy, but by 1902 it was realised that one of the most important duties of the State was to educate all its members. The reorganisation of 1899 had given proof of this. During the period of transition, the forces giving rise to the development of education derived their motive power from widely different bases, leading to the inevitable confusion in administration which had arisen.

The Board of Education Act of 1899 and the Education Act of 1902 provided the foundation for the erection of a new system of administration. With the establishment of the Board, departments previously working independently were co-ordinated and unified as we have seen, and the Education Act of 1902 broke down the financial barrier which had practically isolated the Voluntary schools for over thirty years. The concession of rate-aid to the Voluntary schools was accompanied by obligatory representation of the public interest in their management, and the lightening of the intolerable financial burden on these schools together with the systematisation of elementary, secondary and technical education enabled the Central Authority to give its administrative policy a new direction. It became directed towards stimulating the activities of the new Local Education Authorities which the Balfour Act^{of 1902} brought into being.

By the Act of 1902, School Boards, School Attendance Committees

and the Technical Instruction Committees of the County Councils and Urban Authorities were dissolved and their powers transferred in differing degrees to the County, County Borough, and Borough Councils. County and County Borough Councils were given control and management over such elementary, secondary and technical education as they provided and were known as Part II Authorities. Non-County Boroughs of over 10,000 inhabitants and Urban Districts of over 20,000 inhabitants were given control and management over elementary education only, and were known as Part III Authorities. The Part III Authorities could, if they so desired, relegate their powers and duties to the County Council. The Act also provided that County Education Authorities, County Borough Education Authorities and Authorities for Elementary Education which were alone responsible for the control of elementary education in their respective areas, could delegate some of their powers to the managers of elementary schools and to Minor Local Education Authorities such as Parish Councils. In cases where the areas of County Education Authorities included those of Authorities for Elementary Education only, the County Education Authorities statutorily exercised ~~its~~ powers with respect to Higher Education in the areas of the autonomous Elementary Education Authorities situated in the administrative Counties. There was no system of conjoint administration, though, by Section 5 of the Act, it was admissible to constitute a joint committee for any area formed by a combination of counties, boroughs, or urban districts.

The Council of every County, County Borough, Borough and Urban District coming within the scope of the Education Act was compelled to elect a statutory Education Committee to which all powers, except those involving the raising of a rate or the borrowing of money, were to be delegated. In Boroughs the majority

of the members of such Education Committees were to be members of the Council, but in Counties and Urban Districts this was not compulsory. The Local Education Authorities, both Part II and Part III, were made responsible for the efficiency of all the public elementary schools in their areas, but in the case of the Voluntary schools, officially described as Non-Provided Schools in order to distinguish them from the Council Schools or Provided Schools, this responsibility was limited to the subjects of secular instruction. The "Cowper-Temple" Clause of the Act of 1870 was retained in the Act of 1902 with respect to religious instruction in Provided Schools, and the "Conscience" Clause which enabled parents to withdraw their children from religious instruction if they wished to do so, was made operative in all schools. Though the obligation was placed upon Local Education Authorities of maintaining and keeping efficient any Non-Provided Schools recognised as necessary by the Board of Education, the managers of such schools still had to provide school sites and buildings, and to keep these in structural repair at their own expense. The power of managers to act as treasurers of the schools was taken away, as all grants previously paid to them were paid to the Local Education Authority and disbursed by them. One third of the board of managers of Non-Provided Schools were to be nominated by the Local Education Authorities, but restricted powers were given to the Authorities in respect to the appointment of teachers in these schools. The managers of the Non-Provided Schools were obliged to carry out the direction of Local Education Authorities as to the secular instruction, including any directions as to the number and educational qualifications of the teachers employed for such instruction, but Local Authorities were not in a position to withhold consent to the appointment of teachers except on educational ground. In a similar manner the consent of Local E

Education Authorities was required to the dismissal of a teacher unless such dismissal was connected with the giving of religious instruction in the school.

The cardinal difference between the old system and the new system lay in the fact that the Central Authority was able, for the first time, to regard elementary education as an organic whole. The former idea of administrative convenience gave way to a conception of co-operation, and the Board no longer had dealings with individual schools, for 2,568 School Boards and 14,238 bodies of Voluntary school managers were replaced by 318 Local Education Authorities.

The change in financial policy enunciated by the Act was accompanied by a change in administrative policy. The Board of Education gave a greater share of responsibility to the Local Education Authorities than that which the old School^{Boards} possessed, and the Act made provision for a still greater measure of decentralisation. Under the Act the Local Education Authorities were empowered to devolve some of their powers and duties to district or other local bodies, and two ways were open.

- a. Under section 17 the County Council was obliged to form an Education Committee, and under Schedule 1.A.(6) the Committee was allowed to form sub-committees whose duties were confined to specified local areas, provided that at least one member of each sub-committee was a member of the Education Committee.
- b. Under Schedule 1.B.(4) Part II and Part III Authorities had power to give direction to managers of schools which would enable them to exercise considerable powers of management, or, alternatively, schools could be grouped under one body of managers.

In 1908 a Departmental Committee reported on "Devolution of powers

and duties by County Authorities". The extent to which the powers and duties were devolved differed considerably in different areas, and some Authorities combined both ways, but, generally speaking, the following scheme held good. It should be noted that the Departmental Committee did not proceed by means of the examination of witnesses, the information required being supplied in response to a questionnaire sent out to all Part II (County) Education Authorities.

a. Counties devolving powers and duties under Schedule I.A.(6)

Cheshire, Cornwall, Derbyshire, Durham, Essex, Hampshire, Hertfordshire, Kent, Lancashire, Northampton, Oxfordshire, Staffordshire, Surrey, Westmorland, Worcester, Yorkshire (West Riding).

b. Counties devolving powers and duties under Schedule I.B.(4).

i. To grouped Managers.

Sussex (East), West Riding of Yorkshire, Monmouth.

ii. To ordinary Managers.

Bedford, Buckingham, Cambridge, Cumberland, Hereford, Leicester, Lincolnshire, Middlesex, Norfolk, Nottingham, East and West Suffolk, West Sussex, Wiltshire, East and North Ridings of Yorkshire.

Though there was no uniform scheme, some idea of the different procedures adopted may be gained by ²consideration of the methods of "devolution" followed by certain counties. (1)

1. LANCASHIRE. Devolution to Sub-Committees.

Number of Council Schools.	772
Number of Voluntary Schools.	627.
Total average attendance.	138,501.

A Local Area Sub-Committee was appointed for each of the specified 35 areas into which the administrative county had been divided for the purpose.

Constitution of the Local Area Sub-Committees.

Minor Local Education Authorities were given the right to nominate one or more representatives according to the size of the school. The other members consisted of the resident members of the County Council and of the Education Committee, as a member of the County Council need not necessarily have been a member

of the Education Committee, and the Education Committee also included co-opted members who were not County Councillors. In addition, each Sub-Committee co-opted two women members. Most area Sub-Committees appointed a paid clerk, subject to the approval of the appointment by the County Authority.

The duties of each Sub-Committee were numerous and were arranged under headings in the Report as follows:-

- School Attendance. All matters relating thereto.
- School Management.
 - Grouping of schools and determination of the number of managers.
 - Selection of future Minor Local Education Authorities.
 - Hours of opening and closing schools.
 - Changes in school organisation and curricula.
 - Consideration of reports of H.M. Inspectors.
 - Visits to schools for general oversight.
- Teaching Staff.
 - Number and status of teachers.
 - Objections to appointments or dismissals.
 - Appointment of temporary teachers.
 - Fixing general holiday arrangements.
 - Recommendation of special salaries.
- Supplies.
 - Recommendations for apparatus and furniture.
 - Acceptance of tenders for works.
 - Approving and ordering school requisites.
- School Provision.
 - Necessity for schools.
 - Transfers.
 - Selection and purchase of sites.
 - Plans of schools.
 - Renting and letting of Council Schools.
 - Improvements to the buildings of Council and Voluntary Schools.

The Sub-Committees delegated the following duties to Managers and Minor Local Education Authorities:-

- Upkeep of buildings, warming, lighting, and cleaning.
- Appointment of teachers, their punctuality and efficiency.
- School discipline, time-tables, transfers and holidays.
- Checking of registers.
- Libraries, banks, etc.
- Recommendations as to curricula.
- Supervision and requisition of supplies.
- Supervision of religious instruction in Council Schools and to ensure that the conditions of the "Cowper-Temple" and "Conscience" Clauses were observed.

2. STAFFORDSHIRE. Devolution to two distinct classes of Sub-Committees and also to Managers.

Number of Council Schools.	86
Number of Voluntary Schools.	288.
Total Average Attendance.	77,499.

The County Education Committee was divided into three Geographical Sub-Committees to correspond with the three areas, North, Mid, and South, into which the administrative County was divided. The personnel of each Geographical Sub-Committee was composed of the resident members of the County Education Committee, no additional members being included. Each Sub-Committee dealt with all questions affecting education, both high~~er~~ and elementary, in its area, with the exception of "matters of principle" which were reserved for the consideration of the County Education Authority. These were not specified in the Report of the Departmental Committee. In addition, the Sub-Committees were not empowered to deal with questions concerning school attendance, staff salaries, the provision of school materials, and the provision of school buildings. Consideration of these was reserved to three Central Sub-Committees, the members of which were appointed by the three Geographical Sub-Committees. The necessary administrative staff was provided from the County Officials.

In addition to the Geographical Sub-Committees there were 37 local School Attendance Sub-Committees which dealt only with matters relating to school attendance. In urban areas not autonomous for elementary education the Council Schools were grouped, and the managers of each group acted as the Attendance Sub-Committee for all elementary schools, that is for Council and Voluntary schools, in their district. In rural areas, where most of the schools were Voluntary schools, the Attendance Sub-Committee consisted of one member from each body of

managers with the addition of one or two members of the Education Committee as ex-officio members. These committees possessed all the powers and duties with regard to school attendance, except those of making bye-laws and some unspecified duties reserved to the County Education Committee. The County Education also reserved the power of over-riding the decisions of the Attendance Sub-Committees, a power frequently exercised owing to the reluctance of some Sub-Committees to enforce proceedings for school attendance. This significant statement was an example of a truth which had to be recognised, namely, that a local body was still a local body whether it be called a School Board or the local instrument of a County Council, but it demonstrated the optimism of the policy behind the devolution of powers and duties by the County Council and by the Central Authority. That optimism has since been justified, for local bodies now regard themselves as active co-operators in a work which must be carried on in spite of any local prejudice or feeling.

The County Education Authority also gave considerable powers to the managers of schools. In the case of Voluntary schools they were given all the powers under the 1902 Act; in the case of Council schools the managers were entrusted with the appointment of assistant teachers, and the selection of three candidates for each vacancy as Head Teacher. The actual appointment of the Head Master or Mistress was made by the appropriate Geographical Sub-Committee subject to formal confirmation by the County Education Authority. With regard to supplies the managers were to consider and endorse requisitions of school materials, notify the need for alterations and repairs, consider architects reports and plans, and obtain tenders for

work to be done, at the same time signifying which tender they considered should be accepted. Finally, all necessary arrangements for heating, lighting, and cleaning were left in their hands.

Thus the County Education Committee had little to do, except to formulate general lines of policy, determine capital expenditure, and to act as a check on local expenditure.

3. MONMOUTH. Devolution to Grouped Managers.

Number of Council Schools.	97.
Number of Voluntary Schools.	78.
Total Average Attendance.	35,715.

The County was divided into ten districts, for each of which a separate body of managers was elected. The managers did not act as a Sub-Committee of the County Education Committee except for the purposes of School Attendance. Each body of managers consisted of representatives of the County Education Authority and of the Minor Education Authorities in the area, together with co-opted members appointed by the County Education Authority. In general the representatives of the County Authority were resident in the district. Each body of managers was given all the powers of the County Education Committee with the exception of fixing a rate, the final decision respecting the appointment of Head Teachers, and actual expenditure beyond petty disbursements not exceeding £5 on any one item. Except in connection with attendance and the provision of fuel the grouped managers had no jurisdiction over Voluntary schools. Each district had a paid clerk appointed by the County Education Committee.

4. MIDDLESEX. No devolution (except School Attendance) to Local Bodies, but wider powers conferred on Managers. (1)

Number of Council Schools.	41
Number of Voluntary Schools.	68.
Total Average attendance.	30,950.

The County was divided into six districts, a divisional clerk being appointed for each area who also acted as clerk to the

(1) The headings describing the method of devolution followed by the different Counties are taken from the Report of the Departmental Committee.

groups of managers. The Council schools were grouped wherever possible under one body of managers, and then local committees, not technically Sub-Committees, were constituted from the members of the different bodies of managers, to carry out the duties in connection with school attendance. The duties of the bodies of managers were described in the Report as follows:-

School Attendance.

Appointment of representative to sit on the local School Attendance Committee.

Management.

All the ordinary duties of managers and the determination of holidays.

Teaching staff.

Appointment of assistant teachers and the recommendation of three candidates for each vacancy as Head Teacher.

School Provision.

Advice as to the necessity for, and the purchase of, sites. Consideration and submission of architects plans.

Repairs.

Execution of all repairs not exceeding £5 in amount.

Lincolnshire adopted very much the same plan as Middlesex, except that the County was divided into three districts and a special School Attendance Sub-Committee was constituted for each district, composed solely of resident members of the Education Committee. The reason for this departure from usual practice was not stated, but it was probably due to the supposed reluctance of local bodies to institute proceedings for non-compliance with the regulations for enforcing school attendance.

The arrangements described above referred only to elementary education, and the arrangements with respect to higher education followed different lines. These will be dealt with later, and it is sufficient for the present to indicate that the general tendency was to appoint separate local Higher Education Sub-Committees in conjunction with non-county boroughs, urban districts, and other committees in the more rural areas. A few County Councils, such as Lancashire, Staffordshire, and the West Riding of Yorkshire,

acted conjointly with the non-county boroughs and urban districts which were autonomous for elementary education, (Part III Authorities), and delegated some of their powers and duties to a Higher Education Committee constituted of members of the County Education Authority and of the Part III Authority. Such Committees then became a Sub-Committee of the Part III Authority, administered grants received from the County Education Authority, and reported through the Education Committee of the Part III Authority to the County Education Committee. In other administrative areas this procedure was slightly modified so that the joint committee became a Sub-Committee of the County Education Authority and not of the Part III Authority. The power of a County Authority to elect separate and distinct education committees for different parts of the administrative county does not appear to have been exercised.

In this connection the relationship of the Higher Education Sub-Committee in County Boroughs and Municipal Boroughs ~~xxxxx~~ to the Education Committee is not the same, as Borough Education Committees have really no legal standing with regard to higher education. Any arrangements made for the participation of Borough Education Committees in higher education are made solely on the initiative of the Authority for Higher Education. With regard to County Boroughs the usual procedure is for the Education Committee to appoint a Sub-Committee for Higher Education and another Sub-Committee for Elementary Education. The Sub-Committees decide questions within their "preference" and submit reports and recommendations to the Education Committee on important matters. The Education Committee then submits to the County Borough Council proposals affecting the larger issues of policy as distinct from current administration.

The Report of the Departmental Committee on "Devolution of Powers and Duties" showed up clearly the extent of the changes brought about by the Act of 1902. The old School Boards, with their "ad hoc" method of election, had an entirely different outlook from the post-1902 Local Education Authorities. The conception of education was enlarged, and new Local Education Authorities realised that the provision of educational facilities, though an important part of their work, was not the sole object of their duties. Education had its social and political implications, and out of those implications arose measures for the feeding of children, for medical examination and treatment, and for securing equal opportunity for all.

The Local Education Authorities, however, had administrative problems of their own to be solved, for they were charged to "consider the educational needs of their areas.....to supply or aid the supply of education other than elementary and to promote the general co-ordination of all forms of education." Not only had new schools to be erected to take the place of the old Higher Grade Schools, but the whole system which the chaos of the previous century had left had to be reorganised. Arrangements had to be made for the training of teachers and a scheme of scholarships and free places had to be devised if the aim of providing opportunities for all was to become a reality. More than this remained to be done. The Act of 1902 entrusted the care of the Voluntary schools to the Local Authorities, and to bring them up to the level of the Council Schools involved additional expense on staffing and equipment.

In spite of this and the attendant difficulties there was a premature tendency on the part of the Central Authority to regard to financial question as being more or less settled. Actually much was to turn upon it.

In 1904, the Local Education Authorities for Elementary Education received the following grants from public funds:

- a. The Annual Grant based on average attendance.
- b. The Fee Grant under the Act of 1891.
- c. Special grants.
- d. The Aid Grant under Section 10 of the 1902 ACT.

The grants on average attendance were 17s. per unit of attendance in the Infant Departments unless the average attendance were under 20, in which case it was increased to 22s., and 22s. for each unit of attendance in the other Departments.

The Fee Grant differed from all other grants in that it was instituted with the object of transferring the greater part of the charge borne by the parents of the scholars to the State, and did not relieve the burden on local funds. It was a corollary of the introduction of compulsory education. The grant amounted to 10s. per scholar between the ages of 3 and 15 years, provided that the managers of schools charged no school-fees, or reduced the fees in force before 1891 by at least 10s. per scholar. Although adoption of the Act was permissive only few schools declined to take advantage of its provision. At first the grant appeared to have increased the income of the schools accepting the award, but after 1902 the number of fee-paying scholars diminished rapidly ⁽¹⁾ e.g. from 633,226 in 1902 to 184,958 in 1906, so that it was probable that the sum received under the fee grant was no longer sufficient to counterbalance the loss in school fees. Definite proof of this assumption is not available as the Board of Education gave no information of the average receipts per scholar from fees and fee grant after 1902.

The special grants were made to schools in areas with small populations and for instruction in special subjects. In the first case a lump sum was paid on the following schedule:

(1) Appendix. Table K.

£25 if the population did not exceed 200.

£20 if the population were between 200 and 300.

£10 if the population were between 300 and 500.

The special grants for instruction varied from 2s. to 7s. per scholar according to the subject and provided that the requisite number of attendances were made.

The Aid Grant was a development of the grant paid to School Boards under the Elementary Education Act of 1897¹ (the Necessitous School Boards Act), which was, in turn, a development of the special grant paid to School Boards under Section 97 of the Act of 1870. Under this Section if a 3d. rate failed to produce £20 or 7s.6d. per child in average attendance the Parliamentary grant was supplemented to make up the deficiency. The Act of 1897 provided that the minimum 7s.6d. of the Act of 1870 might be increased to a maximum of 16s.6d. under certain conditions which depended on the produce of a rate. The principle of the change was that the 7s.6d. should be increased by 4d. for every complete penny by which the School Board rate exceeded 3d., e.g. where an area raised a 5d. rate the Parliamentary grant would be 7s.6d. plus 8d., that is 8s.2d. per scholar.

The Aid Grant superseded the additional grants to School Boards and Voluntary Schools and consisted of two parts. The first, a grant of 4s. per scholar in average attendance, applied uniformly throughout the country on account of the heavy commitments incurred by all Local Education Authorities in respect of the Voluntary schools^{for} which they were compelled^e to accept responsibility. The second part of the grant was differentiated for various areas according to school population and rateable value. This provided for the payment of an additional sum equivalent to 1½d. per scholar for every complete 2d. by which the amount produced by a 1d. rate on the area of the authority fell short of 10s. per scholar. Thus, if the produce of a 1d. rate produced 6s. per

scholar, the deficit was 4s. or twenty-four "tuppences", and, therefore, the Parliamentary Grant would be increased by 3s. per scholar.

In estimating the produce of a penny rate in the area of a local education authority not being a county borough, the rate was calculated upon the basis of the county rate, and in cases where only part of a parish was situated in the area of a local education authority the rate was apportioned in such a manner as the Board of Education decided upon.⁽¹⁾ Moreover, if ~~any~~ⁱⁿ any one year the amount of Parliamentary grant payable to an Authority made the amount payable out of local sources less than the produce of a 3d. rate, the Parliamentary grant was reduced so that the amount payable out of local sources was increased by a sum⁽²⁾ equal to one-half the difference.

The principle underlying the formula was to give additional aid where the area was poor, as expressed by a low rateable value, but it failed to prevent the education rate from rising to a high level in certain districts, because the utilisation of a high rateable value as a reason for reducing the grant failed to take into account the higher cost of providing educational facilities in such areas.⁽³⁾ The higher cost was due to increased salaries, the cost of building, and to the exploitation of Authorities by landowners and speculators when they were approached to sell land for school sites.

By 1906 the charge on the rates for elementary education had risen to an almost impossible figure in some areas. Thus

West Ham was rated at 31d. in the pound, Tottenham at 30.3d.

(1) Owen. "The Education Acts Manual, 20th Edition." p.63.

(2) Ibid. p.64.

(3) In 1908 the London County Council prepared a Memorandum for a conference of Local Education Authorities on Education Grants, and in the Memorandum great stress was laid on the way in which the method of calculating the Aid Grant reacted unfavourably for London, as the higher cost of providing educational facilities was completely ignored.

Edmonton at 37.1d., Felling (Durham) at 24.6d., Burslem at 24.2d.,
 and Reading at 22.2d.⁽¹⁾ As a temporary measure of assistance additional sums were granted from 1906-07, under the title of the "Necessitous Areas Grant". This was calculated as three-fourths of the sum by which the net expenditure from the rates on elementary education exceeded the produce of a rate of 18d. in the pound. The amount expended in 1906-07 was £170,873, and this was distributed amongst 39 Authorities. This grant re-introduced the principle of the Elementary Education Act of 1897 - a grant graduated in accordance with the burden thrown on the rates - but the sum available was limited to a maximum of £350,000 until 1914-1915. Furthermore, the Board set aside a sum of £100,000, in 1907, for the purpose of building new public elementary schools in districts where the only available school was of a denominational character. In these measures the Central Authority was following out its policy of stimulating Local Authorities by removing financial burdens which pressed unfairly on the less wealthy areas.

Coupled with the financial embarrassment of some^{of} the Local Education Authorities a Parliamentary storm was brewing over the position of the Non-Provided Schools. The Liberals, who had never really accepted the compromise of 1902, were returned to power in 1906, and Mr. Birrell introduced a Bill which sought to deprive the Voluntary schools of the favoured position they had enjoyed, in the eyes of the Liberals and Nonconformists, since 1902. Under the Act the Voluntary schools were independent of the Local Education Authorities in all matters except the provision of efficient secular instruction, and the Bill was the first of a number which aimed at bringing both Voluntary and Council schools under one control, that of the Local Education

(1) L.C.C. Memorandum to the Conference of Education Committees.

Authorities, but, unlike the other Bills, it also contained proposals for altering the scheme of elementary administration. According to Section ²⁵ of Birrell's measure, the Council of a Borough (other than a Metropolitan Borough) or of an Urban District with a population, in each case, of 50,000 and upwards, might be made a Part III Authority, that is, an Authority for Elementary Education only, if the Board of Education considered such a course desirable. Section 26 also provided that the Council of a Borough, Urban District, Rural District, or of any Parish within a County might require the County Council to delegate to them any powers or duties of the County Council as to the management of public elementary schools other than the powers and duties in connection with the engagement, dismissal and salaries of teachers. The cost incurred in the exercise of such delegated powers and duties was to be borne by the area concerned. In the event of a refusal by the County Council to delegate such powers and duties the Borough, District or Parish was to have the right to appeal to the Board of Education whose decision should be final. Finally, the Bill proposed to allot £1,000,000 for the relief of rates in respect of elementary education, but it gave no indication of the way in which the distribution of the money should be effected.

With regard to Voluntary schools the Bill was drastic in its proposals, for after January 1st., 1908, no elementary school was to receive a penny of public money, either from the rates or taxes, unless it became a Provided school within the meaning of the Act of 1902, and therefore taught no distinctive religious creed. The terms of the transfer of Voluntary schools to the Local Authorities were to be settled by agreement between the Local Authorities and the trustees of the schools, and failing

agreement, the case was to be submitted to the arbitration of three specially appointed Commissioners whose judgment should be binding on both parties to the dispute. The Bill was dropped on amendment by the House of ~~xxxx~~ Lords, though it passed the Commons by a large majority.

The contention of the Liberals that the Voluntary schools were for all intents and purposes independent of the Local Education Authorities has received some support in recent years from events in London. A few years ^{ago} ~~back~~ the London County Council ruled that all married women teachers were ineligible for permanent appointments in the London service, unless they were appointed prior to 1923 or could plead special circumstances. The Managers of certain Non-Provided schools decided to dismiss such teachers even if their appointments were prior ~~to~~ 1923, and the National Union of Teachers obtained legal advice on the matter. Counsels' opinion was that the Managers of Non-Provided Schools were not bound by such decisions, and were in a position to act independently should they so desire. The Managers of some schools went even further in 1922 when, for the purposes of economy, the London County Council ordered a reduction of staff. Many Non-Provided Managers declined to comply with the order and the Council were compelled to exempt Non-Provided Schools from its operation.

Defeated in their general proposals in 1906, the Liberals turned their attention to the Training Colleges, which had always been predominantly denominational. Part II Authorities were given the power in the Act of 1902 to build Training Colleges as well as schools, but the question of cost was a bar to utilising the power, as such colleges would necessarily be used by areas paying nothing towards their upkeep. The Liberals were desirous that Local

Education Authorities should exercise their powers in this direction, more especially since all the existing colleges imposed some form of religious test upon candidates for admission.. It was decided that the Government would pay 75 per cent of the cost of building and furnishing new Training Colleges under Local Education Authorities. Many Authorities took advantage of the offer, Leeds, Sheffield, Dudley and Crewe building ~~building~~ non-denominational Training Colleges. In 1908 it was further stipulated that at least one-half of the places in all colleges should be open to all comers, irrespective of creed.

In 1908 the Liberals returned again to power, and the Parliamentary struggle for the abolition of dual control was once more resumed. Mr. McKenna put forward a Bill which proposed ^{that} three kinds of elementary schools should be recognised, Provided schools, called Public Elementary Schools, Elementary schools, and Private or Certified Efficient schools. Provided schools were to be built and supported by the rates and taxes and to have the benefit of publicly aided administrative machinery. Elementary schools, under which category would come all the Voluntary schools, were to receive ^{State} aid not exceeding 47s. per child, but to compensate for the loss of rate-aid they were to be allowed to charge school fees not exceeding 9d. per child per week. These Elementary schools were to be allowed only where there were alternative schools and where the average attendance was not less than 30. In the case of single school parishes, the Local Education Authority was given the power to take over Voluntary schools and to sell or dispose of them "as they think appropriate under the circumstances." The Bill was withdrawn, but it was succeeded by another, introduced by Mr. Runciman, which followed precedent and proposed to extend rate-aid only to Council schools.

Denominational teaching was to be permitted in the schools at the request of the parents, but the time allotted was not to exceed two mornings per week. Arrangements were made to recognise State aided schools not under Local Education Authorities provided these schools united in approved associations, and the State grants were to range from 55s. per scholar in schools with an average attendance less than 50, ~~45~~ to 46s.6d. per pupil in schools with an average attendance exceeding 1,300.

Runciman's Bill was also withdrawn, and the religious question passed out of the range of practical politics for a few years, but the same year saw a remarkable Bill, The Education (Local Authorities) Bill, introduced as a private members Bill by Mr. Walker, which suggested a scheme of devolution of the powers and duties of county councils in respect to elementary education. It provided that the councils of counties in England and Wales, other than those having a population of less than 65,000 should, after public inquiry, prepare schemes for the delegation of "some" of their powers and duties in respect to elementary education to local education committees. The delegation area was to be a local government area or a combination of local government areas, and the areas need not be contiguous. The Bill was thoroughly unintelligible, and a better description could not be found than that of Mr. Wedgewood, in opposing the measure. (1)

"In the first place, had such a vague Bill ever been put before the House? The Bill provided that the Council of every County should prepare a scheme for delegating to local education committees some of their powers and duties with respect to elementary education. Could anything be vaguer than that? The County Council shall devise some scheme to give some people unspecified some powers unspecified to spend some money again unspecified, for some purposes unspecified. A vaguer Bill could not be imagined."

The concession of a State grant to Voluntary schools in the Education Bills introduced by Mr. McKenna and Mr. Runciman on behalf

(1) "Education Debates. Session 1908. Col. 293.

of the Liberal Party was to permit those schools to "Contract Out" of the system inaugurated by the Act of 1902. The Liberal position was that the 1902 ~~was that the 1902~~ Act gave public money to Voluntary schools without effective public control and would encourage a dual system which was disastrous educationally (1) in the rural districts.

"In these parishes (single school parishes) there must always be a public elementary school, as I have already said, and if in addition to a school of that kind we were to have a multiplication of small rural schools the only object we would be certain to secure would be the complete destruction of the efficiency of education. Public money ought not to be spent, whether through rates or through grants, in fostering schools which must be educationally inefficient, and it is, therefore, unnecessary to go beyond the educational argument to justify the proposal in the Bill, that in any single school parishes the State will recognise no other than the public elementary school."

Unfortunately, the protagonists did not hesitate to utilise religious excitement with a disregard of the general interest. The flood of articles which emanated from the partisan press from the first introduction of the 1902 Bill stressed the religious aspect to the exclusion of everything else, and it is difficult to believe that the full educational implication of the 1906-08 proposals were realised.

Before the Act of 1902 there were two kinds of elementary schools recognised by the State, the Board schools and the Voluntary schools. Schools of the former type were under the control of the School Boards and were irregularly distributed. In towns like London and Birmingham the Boards administered elementary education efficiently, but, according to the witnesses before the Cross Commission, the Boards in country districts controlled only small areas and were generally inefficient. The situation of the Voluntary schools was serious. No effective public control was insisted on, and the only method of public supervision was found (1) Mr. McKenna. Educational Debates. Session 1908. Col. 157.

in the visits of the Government Inspectors. Though about two-thirds of the money spent on supporting them came out of the Parliamentary grant, the remaining third had to be raised by private subscriptions and school fees. As a natural result, these schools, which were the only schools available for a large proportion of the child population, were in a state of hopeless embarrassment. The practical effect of the 1906-08 Bills, had they been passed, would have been to increase the competition between Voluntary and Board schools, for it was part of the Liberal policy to build more Council schools on the plea of the unsatisfactory character of the Voluntary schools. The whole question of elementary education would have been in the melting pot once more, and the settlement of 1902 would have been upset. The Liberals underestimated the desire of a considerable section of the community for the denominational instruction of their children, and ^{also} their own financial limitations if the denominationalists had abandoned their educational work.

Whilst the politicians were thus engaged in a campaign which threatened to disturb their status, the Local Authorities themselves were pursuing courses which were the natural outcome of the new importance attached to the interpretation of the term "Education" under the Act of 1902. As already suggested in the discussion concerning the devolution of the administration of education from the Central Authority to the Local Education Authorities and to lesser local authorities, by 1905 it was apparent that education could not be divorced from the more general interests of the community. In 1905 the London County Council decided to seek Parliamentary powers to provide food for necessitous children attending public elementary schools. As far back as 1889 the School Board for London instituted an inquiry into the matter and

started a voluntary scheme. In 1904 an Inter-Departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration was set up, and it recommended the establishment of a system of medical inspection for the detection of ailing and ill-nourished children, and the provision of arrangements for feeding necessitous children. In 1906 the Education (Provision of Meals) Act¹ was passed, authorising the expenditure of a sum not exceeding the produce of a $\frac{1}{2}$ d. rate for the provision of meals for school children. Adoption of the Act was optional, but most Local Education Authorities found it necessary to set the Act into immediate operation. Tests on the effects of the Act were made in certain areas, especially in some of the poorer parts of London, and in 1907 another measure was passed directed towards the improvement of the general welfare of all children attending public elementary schools. The Education (Administrative Provisions) Act of that year imposed the duty of providing for the medical inspection of school children, ~~and also~~ gave Local Education Authorities the power to provide remedial treatment, and, in addition, the Central Authority stated that it was prepared to recognise expenditure incurred on vacation schools, vacation classes, play centres, and scholarships. Unfortunately there were areas which were not inclined to shoulder the financial burden incurred, as the cost of these additional facilities was to be borne entirely by the rates, and in 1908 the Central Authority laid down that any defect in the provision of an efficient medical service would entail deduction of grant. The Government declined to make the provision of meals compulsory in spite of continued Parliamentary pressure.

In the past the Central Authority generally recognised the principle that, where an additional requirement involved additional

expense, a special grant should be made in order to assist in meeting the cost, but the Act of 1907 departed from this principle. The need for central support became clear, and in 1912 the Government introduced a grant for the school medical services, the cost of which had risen to £50,374. The Board of Education had encouraged Local Education Authorities to extend their activities, but, in doing so, it had neglected to provide for adequate financial support, and the percentage of the total cost of elementary education borne by the State had gradually fallen from 64.9 per cent in 1900 to 50.1 per cent in 1908, and to 45.3 per cent in 1914.⁽¹⁾

It was realised that the extent to which the State should contribute towards the cost of the education service should be determined by reference to the extent of the existing inequalities,⁽²⁾ and in 1911 a Departmental Committee, generally known as the Kempe Committee, was set up to investigate the general question of Local Taxation and its relations to Exchequer Grant. This Committee and the issues involved will be considered in greater detail in Chapter IV where the financial implications of the Fisher Act of 1918 and the succeeding situation are discussed, so that the measures actually taken to relieve the situation are here only briefly described.

The Government did not wait for the Report of the Committee, published in 1914, and in June, 1913, Mr. Pease explained the Government proposals for "the development and maintenance of a complete and progressive system of education." The financial clauses were developed in Mr. Lloyd George's Finance Bill of 1914, but the structure of the Bill proved unsatisfactory and the scheme⁽²⁾ In 1913-14 London found 73 per cent of the cost of elementary education from the rates, and in 1916-17 the percentage was still as high as 68.

(1) Appendix. Table L.

of grants failed to materialise. The outbreak of war in 1914 stopped consideration of all such problems.

The grants for elementary education, in 1914, were therefore:

- a. The grant on Average Attendance.
- b. The Fee Grant under the Act of 1891.
- c. The Aid Grant under Section 10 of the Act of 1902.
- d. Special Grants to places with small populations, and for special subjects of instruction.
- e. The necessitous areas Grant.
- f. Grant for the School Medical Services.

In spite of abnormal conditions the position of the Education Service was sufficiently serious to warrant attention. In 1916 the Fee Grant was withdrawn, and in early 1917 a real attempt to adjust the situation was made. The Government issued instructions for a Supplementary Grant to be paid to Local Education Authorities on a formula which closely resembled the suggestions of the Kempe Committee of 1911-1914,⁽¹⁾ but modified in such a way as to encourage the payment of better salaries to the teachers. The financial relationship between the Central and Local Authorities was determined by four factors:

- a. School population.
- b. The wealth or poverty of an area as measured by the produce of a rate.
- c. The expenditure of the Local Authority on elementary education.
- d. The needs of the Area.

This formula made the grant expansive, and an Authority considering schemes involving additional expenditure would be able to rely on national funds to bear part of the burden. This additional grant was paid on the following basis:-

- a. 36s. per child in average attendance.
 - b. Three-fifths of the expenditure on the salaries of teachers.
 - c. One-fifth of the remaining net expenditure.
- The whole less the produce of a 7d. rate.

The rate of 7d. in the pound was the standard rate for education fixed by the Kempe Committee, and it was based on a consideration of the average rate for elementary education levied throughout

(1) Minute by the Board of Education. 18th April, 1917. (Cd. 8515)

the country. To prevent inequalities a maximum and minimum limit was imposed so that the State contribution should not exceed 66 per cent of the total cost of education in any area, and the whole of the Supplementary Grant should not become payable unless the education rate was in excess of 12d. in the pound.

The regulations for the grant were continued for the year 1918-19, but an extra grant was added to aid areas with a rate higher than 24d. in the pound. The Government agreed to bear two-thirds of the difference between the cost actually incurred and the produce of a rate of 24d. in the pound. The Supplementary Grant worked well on the whole, but in January, 1919, Circular 1087 was issued with the object of "Winding up the present system of grants for Elementary Schools." A "Substantive Grant", or percentage block grant, to be paid in the April of each year was henceforth to take the place of all the individual grants previously payable. The merits and demerits of this new change are considered in Chapter IV, for it had an intimate connection with the great Education Act of 1918.

In 1902 the Local Education Authorities were given power to develop all forms of educational activities in their areas. The Board of Education endeavoured to stimulate them to use these powers, but it had no authority to compel a reactionary Local Authority to take its place in the general march forward. Admonition and suggestion were the only weapons that the Central Authority could use, except in cases of serious default in statutory obligations. The Education Act of 1918 made the provision of a properly co-ordinated scheme of educational development compulsory, and it was a logical outcome of the Act of 1902.

In the Act of 1918 the idea of partnership was developed further, and, in addition, the necessity of co-operation between

the Local Education Authorities was emphasised.

"It is no exaggeration to say that the Act of 1918 embodies not only a greatly enlarged conception of the service of education, but also a new conception of the relation of the Central and Local Authorities. The local service is to be systematic, comprehensive, progressive....The Act reflects in its structure, more clearly perhaps than any other enactment, the idea of an active and constructive partnership between the Central and Local Authority, in a joint enterprise with reciprocal duties and responsibilities for the national interest. Though the idea of partnership cannot be defined - it stands in the Act as something much more than a sentimental aspiration."

Section 1 of the Act of 1918 stated that the intention was -

"The establishment of a national system of public education available for all persons capable of profiting thereby.",

and these words were re-stated in Section 11 of the Consolidation Act of 1921. The interpretation of these words was given by

(2)
Mr. Fisher during the debate on the Bill of 1918, when he informed the House that they were intended to give administrative direction of the policy to be carried out by the public bodies administering the education laws.

The period from 1902 to 1918 was one of great expansion of the social services directly connected with education, and the Act of 1918 carried the idea of similar expansion into the whole field of educational activity. There was little need for the Central Authority to persist in its policy of stimulating Local Education Authorities, for all of them had developed a deep sense of responsibility. But the idea of partnership and co-operation was completely new in the realm of educational legislation, and the change in attitude brought its own special problems. Efforts to equalise opportunities and burdens had to be made, and adjustments in finance and administration had to be, and still have to be, ~~xxx~~ worked out.

(1) Sir L.A. Selby-Bigge. "The Board of Education." p.187.

(2) Parliamentary Debates. Vol.105., Col.1990. Mr.Fisher.

CHAPTER IV.

The Education Act of 1918 and its influence upon Local Administration.

Chapter IV.The Education Act of 1918 and its influence upon Local Administration

(1)

The administrative arrangements of the Act of 1902 were preserved in the Act of 1918. Part II and Part III Authorities remained on the same footing as before, but the extension of their powers and duties implied an almost revolutionary change in the conception of education. Such extension of powers and duties was not essentially new, for similar provisions had been incorporated into the 1902 Act, but then they were permissive, whereas under the 1918 Act they became compulsory.

Generally speaking, the Act of 1918 gave a new direction to education by enunciating a policy of co-operation between the State and the Local Education Authorities, and also between the Local Education Authorities themselves, by providing that Part II Local Education Authorities should prepare schemes for the correlation of all forms of education in their areas, and that autonomous Part III Authorities in the area should advise in the preparation of such schemes. This policy placed responsibility first and foremost on the Local Authority, and the procedure compelled Local Education Authorities which were previously content to perform the minimum of their obligations to join in the general advance.

It was in the content of such schemes that the great changes which the Act brought about were most clearly shown. By means of Central Schools or by classes of a similar educational standard, Local Education Authorities were obliged to secure that adequate and suitable provision should be made for children who might stay at elementary schools beyond the age of 14 years. Moreover, the

duty was placed upon all Authorities with control over elementary education, either separately or in conjunction with other Local Education Authorities, to establish and maintain a sufficient supply of Day Continuation Schools for children who left school at 14 years of age. Attendance at these schools was to be compulsory for boys and girls between the ages of 14 and 18 years for a minimum of 320 hours per year, taken out of the time of the employers. To cover the transition period modifications of age and time were introduced in the Act, but the principle remained the same.

Finally, the Act stipulated that no child should be debarred from taking advantage of its provisions by reason of poverty, and it also brought private schools into the national scheme by making registration compulsory and requiring that such schools should be open to inspection, either by the Board of Education or by the Local Education Authority.

These were substantial achievements, but the most important mark of progress was the abolition of the artificial and watertight division of education into elementary and secondary which had persisted after the Act of 1902. The elementary school was to be re-modelled so as to provide a foundation upon which more advanced education could be built; it was no longer to be an isolated unit without any organic connection with higher education. In other words, the education of the adolescent was the keynote of Fisher's Act. But the education given was to be on a wider basis than before, for the hitherto neglected child with a practical, industrial or commercial bent was in future to take his place alongside the academically minded child who alone had received encouragement in the past.

Such schemes brought their own problems. At what age should

primary education cease and its place be taken by some form of higher instruction; how could the necessary practical and administrative changes be brought about; what types of curriculum would be best suited to the needs of the new schools, whether full-time day schools or Day Continuation Schools? Experience and experiment alone could supply the answers to some of these questions, but the problem as a whole was bound up with the ever recurring question of cost.

To bring such a policy to fruition demanded adequate financial resources on the part of Local Education Authorities, and consequently the position of the poorer bodies became a matter of vital importance. The financial clauses of the Act sought to surmount the difficulty by providing a method of calculating the Parliamentary Grant which would bring increased aid to necessitous Authorities, and therefore equalise the incidence of the administration of the Local Education Authorities as regards cost.

(11)

From 1833 the factor of finance had been of primary importance in deciding the relationship which should exist between the Central Authority and the local agencies working in conjunction with it. The State was no longer concerned only with the relationship between itself and the Local Authorities after 1918, but it also sought to equalise the conditions between the Local Authorities themselves by instituting grants which automatically expanded as expenditure and rate-cost increased. The change in financial policy outlined in the Act of 1918 has been criticised repeatedly on the grounds of extravagance and unsuitability, but a much wider question than that of financing the education service was involved in this arrangement, for it

touched the complex problem of the principles which should govern the distribution of Exchequer Grants to all classes of Local Authorities. Determination of these principles had engaged the attention of a Royal Commission which sat from 1897 to 1901, a Departmental Committee which sat from 1911 to 1914, and a Committee appointed in 1922, under the Chairmanship of Lord Meston, which has yet to issue a report.

A brief review of the history of the intervention of the Exchequer to relieve local financial burdens by means of grants is interesting as throwing light on the conditions prevailing before the Royal Commission on Local Taxation of 1897-1901. Before the Industrial Revolution the system of local government consisted of a simple division of the country into counties and parishes which were autonomous and financed almost independently by means of rates. The County rate was first levied during the reign of Henry VIII,⁽¹⁾ and large and small additions were periodically made until, in 1739, there were seven distinct rates for county bridges, building and maintenance of houses of correction for vagrants, relief of prisoners, relief of debtors, and the relief of the poor prisoners of King's Bench and Marshalsea prisons. All these items were consolidated in 1739, and the expenses incurred were to be met either by the Poor Rate or by a rate levied in a similar manner. The Poor Rate dated from the times of Elizabeth (1601) and laid down that an annual rate should be levied of all property owners and householders within the particular parish. It was quite separate from the County rate. After the consolidation of the County rate in 1739 history repeated itself, and the consolidated rate became the centre of a further series of additions. The Reform Parliament of 1832 determined to impose order on the system and commenced by passing

(1) Watson Grice. "National and Local Finance." Chapter 1.

the Poor Law Amendment Act of 1834. No grants were awarded out of public funds but parishes were compelled to combine into unions for more efficient and economical administration. In 1834 a Committee of the House of Commons was set up to consider whether some of the financial burdens borne by the agriculturalists could not be distributed amongst other classes of the community. Before the Industrial Revolution, ability to pay was indicated by the occupation of real property, and the correspondence was correct whilst property was connected with land and there was relatively little wealth in the nature of personal effects. Especially after the Industrial Revolution the term "property" assumed a new significance, and mere occupation of land ceased to be a true index of ability to pay. Agriculturalists objected to assessments being made on the same basis for industrial and arable land, because the assessment was based on the nett annual value of the land and took no account of the use or profits derived from such land.⁽¹⁾ The Committee of 1834 considered the possibility of including personal property in assessment, but came to the conclusion that it was too difficult to devise a satisfactory system, and suggested that the Central Authority ought to relieve the burden of the agriculturalists out of general taxation because the County rate was levied only on the occupiers of lands, houses, and rateable property. The Government agreed to accept the recommendation of the Committee, and undertook to pay one-half of the cost of prosecutions at assizes and quarter sessions, and a proportion of the expense of removing convicts from local prisons to the convict depots. This was the first example of the Government employing Exchequer Grants to give relief to local rates.

By 1888 Local Authorities received grants from Parliament in
 (1) Watson Grice. Op.cit., p.17.

add of the following services: Police, Poor Relief, Main Roads, Sanitary Officers, and Elementary Education, but the cost rose steadily. Under the Local Government Act of 1888 the Exchequer Grants were withdrawn for all these services except education, and were replaced by a system of "Assigned Revenues" whereby the produce of certain taxes was given to the newly created County and County Borough Councils. This system of assigned revenues was elaborated by Mr. (afterwards Viscount) Goschen, with the intention of simplifying the relation between national and local finance, and it was assumed that the Treasury would be freed from the burden of an uncertain and steadily rising charge which inconvenienced the framers of the National Budget. There would, it was thought, be less need for re-adjustment because the automatic increase of the assigned revenues would meet the growing requirements of Local Authorities, and thus obviate the necessity for further drafts on the Exchequer. The assumed automatic expansion of the assigned revenues was not always realised in practice. The exclusion of elementary education from the services so assisted was due to the fact that the County and County Borough Councils had as yet been given no powers over elementary education, though they had a connection with technical education through the Technical Instruction Act.

The question of financing local services came up for discussion with the appointment of the Royal Commission on Local Taxation of 1897-1901. The Commission was of the opinion that the implicit distinction which had hitherto governed the method of financing the different services was capable of explicit definition, and proceeded to divide the services into two categories, "National^a and Onerous" and "Local and Beneficial"⁽¹⁾

"....the distinction between services which are preponderantly
(1) Royal Commission on Local Taxation. Final Report .p.12.

National in character and generally onerous to the ratepayers, and services which are preponderantly Local in character and confer upon the ratepayers a direct and peculiar benefit more or less commensurate with the burden.....cannot, it is true, be drawn with absolute logical precision.....But a service may be called properly local when a preponderant share of the benefit can be distinctly traced to persons interested in the locality. On the other hand, universality and uniformity of administration is generally a mark of a national service, because such administration does not confer special benefit on special places. Again, the presumption is that a service is national when the State insists on it being carried out, and on a certain standard of efficiency being reached."

".....Education is also national in a high degree. It confers great benefit, no doubt, upon the classes which participate in it, but does little to increase the rateable property in a particular locality. Under education we include technical and secondary as well as elementary education."

Education was grouped with Poor Relief, Police, Main Roads , the Navy and the Army under "National" Services. The Majority Report supported the Goschen scheme, but declared that the amount of the assigned revenues was insufficient for the efficient working of all the services, and to remedy this deficiency it was suggested that some part of the national income tax should be made available. (1) A Memorandum by Mr. C.N. Dalton, C.B., on the subject suggested a tax of one penny in the pound on Schedule C of the Income Tax comprising Government securities both English and Foreign; on Foreign and Colonial Railways, on Public Companies and Securities in Schedule D; and also on British Railways, Quarries and Mines. Such a tax was estimated to produce a sum of £770,000 per annum which was deemed to be ample for the purpose of the Commission. The scheme of assigned revenues would have been preserved even if a tax of this nature had been introduced, for the grant would have been paid to Local Authorities for all services en bloc. The Majority reported in favour of direct payments by the Central Authority to the Local Authority on a system of "Unit Grants" by which money is paid for each particular item of expenditure.

The Minority Report adopted a suggestion of Lord Balfour of Burleigh that each of the so-called "National" services should be

(1) Proceedings of the Royal Commission on Local Taxation.

awarded a Block Grant - that is to say a grant given without specification of the items of expenditure aided - and also recommended a return to the general financial system of grants-in-aid in operation before 1888. The reasons advanced in favour of a Block grant were:

- a. That it would have regard to the ability to pay of the Local Authorities.
- b. That the necessity for the services must be estimated and the distribution would be worked out so that the poorer areas would get larger grants.

The question of measurement of necessity was the crux of the problem, and the Minority Report concluded that there were three tests which must be taken together:-

- a. Expenditure.
- b. Density of population.
- c. Ability to pay, as measured by assessable value. Accordingly

a scheme was proposed in the Minority Report by which the total grant would consist of a primary and a secondary grant. The primary grant consisted of the difference between a standard cost and a standard rate. The standard cost was calculated as the smallest sum per head for which the service was administered, and the standard rate was taken as the average rate required to produce a sum equal to the standard cost. The secondary grant was fixed at one-third of the difference between the product obtained by multiplying the standard cost by the population and the expenditure actually incurred. ⁽¹⁾ An example makes the method of calculation clear.

The population of Helston Union	22,157.
The Standard Cost for administering the Poor Law.	3s.6d. per head.
The Standard Rate.	4d.
The sum payable to Helston Guardians at 3s.6d. per head of the population.	£3,877.
Product of a 4d. rate in Helston.	£1,073.
PRIMARY GRANT.	£2,804.
Actual expenditure of Helston Guardians.	£6,155.
Sum payable at the rate of 3s.6d. per head.	£3,877.
Excess expenditure.	£2,278.
One-third of excess expenditure.	£ 759.
Secondary grant.	£759.
TOTAL GRANT = £2,804 plus £759, or	£3,563.

(1) Final Report of the Royal Commission on Local Taxation. pp.77 and 134.

The system of assigned revenues recommended by the Majority Report of the Royal Commission is open to many objections and these were emphasised by witnesses before the later Departmental Committee on Local Taxation of 1911-1914. Local Authorities may tend to look upon funds so placed at their disposal as private property to be expended at will, and no check is provided against parsimony or extravagance. There is the further danger of Authorities neglecting the adequate development of essential services in order to lessen the amount of the assigned revenues actually spent, and so being in a position to apply the residue to secure a general rate reduction. The basic idea of assigned revenues is opposed to any system of Government check. A sum of money is turned over to the Local Authorities as the Central contribution to the cost of their services. As far as the Government is concerned no further help is given and any deficiency is to be met out of the rates. Thus, the more economically Local Authorities manage their services the smaller the demand on the rates, and as long as Local Authorities fulfil the minimum conditions of their statutory obligations the Central Authority is powerless to interfere.

Again, variation of the produce of assigned revenues and variation in necessary expenditure bear no relationship to one another, and a decrease in the amount of assigned revenues cannot easily be met by a reduction in the expenditure on the services which assigned revenues are designed to assist. The produce of assigned revenues is liable to fluctuation in two ways, either by failure of the taxes to yield the estimated revenues or by Parliamentary action in increasing or decreasing the rate of taxation. This difficulty has actually occurred when, owing to the operation of the Finance Act of 1910, the Local Authorities were suddenly faced with a considerable deficiency in their

(ii) resources. Local Authorities desire to levy an equitable rate, the

(1) Report of the Departmental Committee on Local Taxation.

Minutes of Evidence. 1912. Questions 6, 577-6, 578. H.E. Haward.

amount of which can be calculated with a reasonable amount of certainty from year to year, but this may be defeated by central action which is beyond the control of local administration.

According to the Minority Report of the Royal Commission on Local Taxation the system of assigned revenues had never been a success. No separation of Local and Imperial finance had been achieved,⁽¹⁾ and neither the total amount of the assigned revenues,⁽²⁾ nor the principle upon which the allocation of the assigned revenues was determined, was compatible with the needs of national services or the requirements of localities. The system was not sufficiently elastic to provide for adjustment between income and expenditure, and no incidence between income and expenditure⁽³⁾ was possible.

This reacted upon the financial condition of the County Councils, and in response to their demands for an official inquiry the Government set up a Departmental Committee in 1911 to review once more the field of local taxation. Witnesses called before the Committee complained of the financial burdens which County Councils were compelled to shoulder,⁽⁴⁾ and were practically unanimous in favour of a return to the system of grants-in-aid existing before 1888.⁽⁵⁾ Beyond the application of "Whiskey Money" for the purposes of technical education, education had

never been financed by a system of assigned revenues, but the
 (1) Minority Report of the Royal Commission on Local Taxation. Final Report. 1901. pp. 70 ff.

(2) Assigned revenues were paid to County and County Borough Councils, which, in turn, paid out certain sums to smaller authorities in their areas. The County and County Borough Councils were paid in the same proportions as they received in 1887, plus the sums paid to the smaller authorities. Any excess was divided amongst the larger authorities in direct ratio to their rateable value. Thus areas with high rateable values received more money than areas with low rateable values which required additional financial support more urgently.

(3) Departmental Committee on Local Taxation. Minutes of Evidence, 1912. R. Barrow, City Treasurer of Liverpool. Question. 58.

(4) Ibid. F. H. Owers, Accountant of Essex County Council. Q. 3, 925. H. E. Clare, Clerk to the Lancashire County Council. Q. 6, 924-26.

(5) Final Report of the Departmental Committee, 1914., p. 12.

scheme of fixed "item" or "unit" grants followed by the Board of Education was no better suited to provide for an adequate development of the service, and the Education Authorities joined with the rest in seeking more aid and a different type of grant.

Before discussing the various possible types of grants it should be noted that the Report of the Departmental Committee on Local Taxation, published in 1914, reflected the progress which had been made in the conception of Local Government since the Royal Commission of 1901, but economic changes also made a reconsideration of the question necessary. Since the issue of the Report of the Royal Commission on Local Taxation in 1901, the population had been increasingly mobile with the result that the former estimates of assessable values were no longer accurate, and the problem of necessitous areas became aggravated. The Departmental Committee disagreed with the Royal Commission on definitions, for they said that services labelled "National" were not really national, except in the case of the Navy and Army, but were more correctly described as "Semi-national", and should be financed on a basis which would demand that central and local funds contributed (1) equitably:

"The character of this intermediate class of "semi-national services", as they may be called, is that while they are administered by local authorities, the State has at the same time so marked an interest in their efficiency as to justify a claim to the supervision of their administration."

The Departmental Committee recommended the abolition of Exchequer (2)

Contribution Accounts and the Local Taxation system, which implied

(1) Final Report of the Departmental Committee on Local Taxation. p.15.

(2) The Local Taxation Account was an account kept at the Bank of England into which assigned revenues were paid. In this way they did not go into the Exchequer nor appear in the national accounts. The Account was operated by the Local Government Board for controlling the outflow to counties and county boroughs which were required to constitute for themselves Exchequer Contribution Accounts into which their respective shares of the assigned revenues were paid.

(Compare Watson Grice. "National and Local Finance".)

that the system of assigned revenues was no longer a suitable machine for the purposes of aiding Local Authorities. In 1908 the amount of assigned revenues had been limited, and thus the system lost any connection between income and expenditure which it may hitherto have possessed.

Attention was therefore focussed on the most effective system of grants. Most of the semi-national services began as local services, and it was only with the development of Local Government, which, in turn, included a sense of national responsibility, that such services came to be looked on as affecting the welfare of the whole community. This process was especially marked in the case of education after the Act of 1902, and that service was necessarily included in any suggested revision of the principles of grant payment by the Central to Local Authorities.

There are two ^{basic} kinds of grant, namely the Unit Grant and the Block Grant. Each kind might be paid either as a fixed sum or as a percentage of the expenditure actually incurred. Thus we have to deal at one time or another with fixed or percentage unit grants, and with fixed or percentage block grants. The succeeding discussion will always follow this initial classification of the grants, though in actual fact the terms have not always been so clearly defined. ⁽¹⁾

During the period 1909-1917 the main grants in operation for elementary education were :-

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| a. The Annual Grant. | A sum based upon each unit of average attendance. |
| b. The Fee Grant. | 10s. per scholar in attendance under the age of 15 years. |
| c. The Aid Grant. | Paid under Section 10 of the Act of 1902. |
| d. The Necessitous Areas Grant. | Paid after 1906-07. |
| d. Grant for School Medical Services. | Paid after 1912. |

All these grants were fixed unit grants paid under conditions which were constant for all Local Education Authorities whether they

(1) Compare Corlett. "Financial Aspects of Elementary Education". pp.147-149.

were rich or poor. Such payment was mechanical, and its chief attraction was simplicity of calculation. In effect it failed to do justice to the special circumstances of particular localities, or to secure any approach to an equalisation of local burdens. For instance, in the year 1913-14 the average rate for education for County Councils was 13.2d., and for County Boroughs the rate was 17.7d., whilst the average total cost of educating one child, that is the cost borne both by the rates and by the Government, amounted to 93s.2d. But if the cases of particular areas are examined, as shown in Table XV, the wide variations in costs borne by the rates become apparent.

(1)

Table XV.

<u>Areas.</u>	<u>Elementary Education Rate.</u>	<u>Rate cost per child.</u>	<u>Percentage of total cost of Elementary Education on rates.</u>	<u>Elementary Education Rate over area.</u>	<u>Aid Grant.</u>
	£				£
Cambridge (County)	15,212	26s.	36	10.9d.	-
Durham (County)	270,588	42s.	49	20.5d.	-
Hereford (County)	17,523	48s. 5d.	53	7.5d.	-
Yorks.W.R. (County)	379,505	42s. 5d.	50	15.7d.	-
London (County)	3,767,947	116s.9d.	73	21.3d.	-
Bournemouth.	22,491	59s. 4d.	59	7.5d.	-
Bradford.	127,644	70s.8d.	56	21.2d.	15,332
Walsall	22,794	29s.10d.	37	25.0d.	5,126
West Ham.	149,817	54s. 7d.	45	29.4d.	55,972
Bury.	12,599	34s. 3d.	44	10.7d.	-
East Ham.	58,095	50s. 9d.	45	28.5d.	16,911

The Act of 1918 embodied the findings of the Departmental Committee and introduced a "Substantive Grant" payable in respect of elementary education as a whole. This was essentially a percentage block grant, though certain items in the elementary education service were specifically aided, e.g. salaries of teachers and the Special Services, whilst a fixed grant of 36s. was paid in respect of each child in average attendance. In 1922-23, the

(2)

(1) Statistics of Local Education Authorities. 1913-14. (Cd. 7764)

(2) Corlett: "Financial Aspects of Elementary Education." p.105.

average rate for elementary education for County Councils was 24.2d., and for County Boroughs 29.0d., whilst the total average cost of educating one child, that is from the rates and the Government grant, was 227s.6d. But if the same areas are compared as in the previous Table it is clear that variations in the percentage cost of elementary education borne by the rates are not so pronounced as in 1913-14. Table XVI.

Table XVII illustrates the same fact for the year 1929-1930. The figures for this Table have been supplied by the Ministry of Health, as they have not yet been published.

(1)

Table XVI.

<u>Areas.</u>	<u>Elementary Education Rate.</u>	<u>Rate cost per child</u>	<u>Percentage of total cost of Elementary Education on rates.</u>	<u>Elementary Education Rate over area.</u>
	£			
Cambridge (County)	38,389	80s.6d.	39	24.3d.
Durham (County)	532,845	82s.4d.	39	36s.0d.
Hereford (County)	43,450	66s.11d.	40	18.0d.
Yorks.W.R. (County)	682,291	81s.3d.	40	25.9d.
London (County)	5,112,071	207s.10d.	49.5	25.2d.
Bournemouth.	36,351	100s. 8d.	46	10.6d.
Bradford.	233,816	148s. 5d.	49	24.6d.
Walsall.	56,218	70s. 2d.	36	43.2d.
West Ham.	295,475	116s. 6d.	38	53.7d.
Bury.	31,635	95s. 8d.	45	20.4d.
East Ham.	115,998	105s. 4d.	39	48.3d.

Table XVII.

Cambridge (County)	37,185	35.9	30.3d.
Durham (County)	601,683	41.7	47.1d.
Hereford (County)	42,685	37.4	21.4d.
Yorks.W.R. (County)	879,086	43.6	31.3d.
London (County)	4,978,850	50.1	20.8d.
Bournemouth.	44,717	48.5	7.9d.
Bradford.	245,341	51.4	23.8d.
Walsall.	66,801	38.2	39.0d.
West Ham.	308,169	39.9	46.0d.
Bury.	30,678	45.9	21.1d.
East Ham.	129,351	41.7	43.3d.

(1) Ministry of Health, Annual Local Taxation Returns: 1922-23. Part II., pp.70-71. Part III., pp.10-11.

By arriving at some estimation of the probable state of affairs which would have existed in the years 1922-23, and 1929-30, under the old system of fixed unit grants paid in an aggregate sum, and comparing with the actual position, further confirmation is gained of the beneficial influence of the new method upon the rate burden. By the new method is meant the introduction of a percentage relationship between the grant paid and the expenditure of Local Authorities.

The total cost of educating a child with respect to elementary education, that is the cost borne by rates and central grants, rose from 93s.2d. in 1913-14⁽¹⁾ to 227s.6d. in 1922-23,⁽²⁾ and to 255s.6d. in 1929-30,⁽³⁾ so that in 1922-23 it was approximately 2.4 times the cost in 1913-14, and in 1929-30 approximately 2.7 times the cost. The increase in total cost allows for the changes in circumstances between the years mentioned, so assuming that the financial conditions of 1913-14 applied to the later years, the elementary education rates raised over the various areas may be compared as in Table XVIII.

Table XVIII.

<u>Areas.</u>	<u>Elementary Education Rate raised over Area.</u>				
	<u>1913-14</u>	<u>1922-1923.</u>		<u>1929-1930.</u>	
	<u>Actual.</u>	<u>Actual.</u>	<u>Calculated.</u>	<u>Actual.</u>	<u>Calculated.</u>
Cambridge (County)	10.9d.	24.3d.	26.2d.	30.3d.	29.4d.
Hereford (County)	7.5d.	18.0d.	18.0d.	21.4d.	20.2d.
Durham (County)	20.5d.	36.0d.	49.2d.	47.1d.	55.3d.
Yorks W.R. (County)	15.7d.	25.9d.	37.7d.	31.3d.	42.4d.
London (County)	21.3d.	25.2d.	51.1d.	20.8d.	57.5d.
Bournemouth.	7.5d.	10.6d.	18.0d.	7.9d.	20.3d.
Bradford.	21.2d.	24.6d.	51.0d.	23.8d.	57.2d.
Walsall.	25.0d.	43.2d.	60.0d.	39.0d.	67.5d.
West Ham.	29.4d.	53.7d.	70.6d.	46.0d.	79.4d.
Bury.	10.7d.	20.7d.	25.7d.	21.1d.	28.9d.
East Ham.	28.5d.	48.3d.	68.4d.	43.3d.	77.0d.

(1) Statistics of Local Education Authorities, 1913-14.

(2) Cost per Child. 1924.

(3) Cost per child. 1931.

With regard to the equalisation of local burdens, the system of fixed unit grants produced some striking anomalies in the percentage cost of elementary education borne by the Local Authorities, as Table XIX shows.

Table XIX.

<u>Area.</u>	<u>Percentage cost of elementary education borne by the rates.</u>	
	<u>1913-1914.</u>	<u>1929-30.</u> (1)
Dudley.	35	32
Hornsey.	70	48.6
Ilkeston.	39	37.7
Chesterfield	40	41.6
Lewes.	41	47.8
Hove	63	49.1.

The position reached in 1930 under the percentage system shows a decided improvement with respect to those Authorities which were heavily rated during the era of fixed unit grant.

The payment of grants on the basis of fulfilment of set conditions without taking into account the ability of different Local Education Authorities to comply with the conditions was too inelastic to suit a rapidly growing service like education. Moreover, the Central Authority periodically imposed additional duties without increasing the grants payable. Reference has already been made to the School Medical Service in this connection, and a further example of the same procedure can be found in Circular 709, of March, 1909, relating to the staffing of schools. Evidence given before the Departmental Committee on Local Taxation showed that the increased demands made by the Board of Education involved Leicester in extra expense amounting to £5,000, which had to be met by an additional rate. (2) Progressive Authorities received little

encouragement to extend their activities, and no allowance was made for the differences in the cost of administration. Variation in

(1) Advance figures supplied by the Ministry of Health.

The towns given in this Table were referred to in the Report of the Departmental Committee on Local Taxation, First Report, Brackenbury and Groves, Questions, 637 and 648.

(2) Ibid. Question, 431.

this item of expenditure was ascribed to salaries paid to officials to compensate for the difference in cost of living between rural and urban areas, to liberality in staffing, and the varying necessities of capital expenditure.⁽¹⁾

As the collating functions of the Local Education Authorities were widened owing to the natural extension of the service, a similar state of affairs to that existing in the last decades of the nineteenth century came about. The financial system developed into a series of isolated grants, so that prior to 1917 to 1918, the grants for elementary education consisted of the main grants already referred to⁽²⁾ together with the following:

- a. Grants for Higher Elementary Schools.
- b. Grants to special schools for Defective Children.
- c. Grants for special subjects of instruction.
- d. The Supplementary Grant of 1917.

The Final Report of the Departmental Committee on Local Taxation expressed the opinion that no reform of the system of grants could attain any degree of permanence unless it provided for an automatic expansion of central aid with an increase in local expenditure. Witnesses favoured a percentage system as being easily calculated and more easily checked, and represented that the danger of extravagant expenditure on the part of Local Authorities could be provided against by stipulating that the larger proportion of the expenditure should be borne locally. The Departmental Committee recommended adoption of the percentage system for Education, Poor Relief, Main Roads, and Mental Defectives, but in respect to Public Health a unit system on a per capita basis, with a census revision, was suggested. Grants for the other services were to be percentage block grants.

As far as Education was concerned the Committee adopted the principle expressed in the Minority Report of the Royal Commission

(1) Departmental Committee on Local Taxation. First Report.

H.E.Haward. Questions 7,176-7,178.

(2) Page 129 .

on Local Taxation that State aid should be related to the necessity of an area and its ability to pay, and framed a formula providing 36s. per unit of average attendance together with two-fifths of the total net expenditure, the whole less the produce of a 7d. rate. The Government adopted the formula in all its essentials for the Supplementary Grant of 1917-18, and it was retained in the Act of 1918, subject to modification.

On the financial side, the Act of 1918 provided that all school-fees at public elementary schools should be abolished, that the Aid Grant, Supplementary Grant, Special Grants, and Small Population Grant should be withdrawn in favour of a Substantive Grant awarded on conditions imposed by the Board of Education, and that failure of a Local Education Authority in respect of its duties should incur liability to a deduction of grant, and, if necessary, a report should be made to Parliament. The conditions attached to the Substantive Grant were set out in "Statutory Rules and Orders, 1919, No. 554., Grant Regulations No. 1." Grants were to be paid on a formula based upon Average Attendance, the expenditure of the year, and the produce of a rate. The actual sum to be awarded to each Authority was to be calculated (1) as follows:

- a. 36s. per head on the average attendance in public elementary schools maintained by the Authority, (not including special schools for blind, deaf, defective and epileptic children.)
- b. Three-fifths of the expenditure on Teachers' salaries. (2)
- c. One-half the net expenditure on Special Services.
- d. One-fifth of the remaining net expenditure.
- e. The whole less the produce of a 7d. rate.

(1) In the Report of the Departmental Committee on Local Taxation, a., c., and d., were combined as two-fifths of the total net expenditure.

(2) Under the head of Special Services were grouped the School Medical Service, Provision of Meals, Schools for Blind, Deaf, Defective and Epileptic Children, Organisation and supervision of Physical Training, Evening Play Centres, and Nursery Schools.

To guard against excessive demands made by Local Authorities, provision was made that the grant should not exceed, except as provided below, the greater of the following amounts:

- a. Two-thirds of the net expenditure.
- b. The excess of the net expenditure over a sum comprising the produce of a 12d. rate upon the assessable value of the area, together with the grant under the Agricultural Rates Act.

In highly rated areas in which the grant when calculated as above would fall short of the net expenditure, even when added to the grant under the Agricultural Rates Act, ⁽¹⁾ additional grants were to be awarded upon conditions subject to periodical revision. In 1919-20, if the total grant fell short of the net expenditure by a sum exceeding the equivalent of a rate of 27d., the grant was to be increased by one-half of the deficit. In 1920-21 the rate was increased to one of 48d.

Finally, the Act provided that no Local Authority for Elementary Education should receive less than 50 percent of its approved net expenditure.

The result of this method of calculation was to ease the burden on the rates, as Table XX shows, for the State has borne an increased proportion of the total cost of elementary education from 1919.

(1)

Table XX.

<u>Year.</u>	<u>Percentage of the cost of elementary education borne by the State.</u>
1916-17.	45.2
1917-18.	49.3
1918-19.	45.1.
1919-20.	55.2
1922-23.	55.9
1924-25.	55.2.

1916-17.	45.2
1917-18.	49.3
1918-19.	45.1.
1919-20.	55.2
1922-23.	55.9
1924-25.	55.2.

(1) Under the Agricultural Rates Act of 1896 a grant was made from the yield of estate duty on personal property to provide concessions to occupiers of agricultural land. Relief took the form of an annual payment from the Exchequer equivalent to one-half the total rates levied in respect of the occupation of such land in the years, 1895-96. This became an annual grant. (Watson Grice. "National and Local Finance.")

The method is so closely bound up with the produce of a rate that until the system of local taxation is radically altered along the lines of the Rating and Valuation Act of 1925 the problem of the necessitous area, that is an area with a low assessable value and a high expenditure, will continue to present difficulty. A Memorandum submitted by the Board of Education to the Departmental Committee on Exchequer Grants, known as the Meston Committee, refers to the difficulty.⁽¹⁾

The problem of finance raised by the Act of 1918 soon came under discussion, for the Report of the Select Committee on National Expenditure of 1922, also known as the Geddes Report, again raised the question of the incidence of the cost of education upon Exchequer Grants and Rates respectively. The Report decided against percentage grants, and recommended the substitution of fixed grants, or grants based on some definite units. The Committee put forward as their first reason for such substitution the statement that -

"The development of the percentage system has materially affected the cost to the taxpayer."

So far as the total grant was concerned this was correct, but a mere statement that grants had increased was no argument against the system. Growth of expenditure has always taken place, and it is not entirely dependent on the scheme of grants in operation. Any diminution, even that following the Revised Code of 1862, has been of a temporary nature. Up to 1917 when grants were paid on a fixed unit basis expenditure increased, but the system worked unfairly in so far as it failed to establish a balance between different localities, and between the Central Authority and the Local Authorities. Between 1905 and 1912, the growth of expenditure on elementary education increased by approximately 21 per cent, whereas grants increased by only 9 per cent, and the proportion of

(1) Submitted in 1922 and published in 1926. (Cd. 2571). The Meston Committee has yet to issue a Report.

the cost borne by the Exchequer fell from 54.2 per cent to 46.9 per cent. The true cause of the rapid increase in expenditure after 1918 was the general movement for adjusting salaries and wages to the fall in the value of money, and the education service was particularly susceptible to those influences by reason of the low salaries which prevailed before the War. The postponement until after the War of any general revision of salaries, and the optimistic spirit of the 1918-1919 period with its inspiration of a "country fit for heroes to live in", together with the arrears of work to be undertaken on school buildings, were the underlying reasons for the increase. A criticism of rising expenditure is only valuable provided it shows that the economic ability of a community to find the necessary money is being exceeded, or that the return for the increased cost is out of all proportion to the amount. The Geddes's Report did not deal with this aspect of the question, and based the criticism more upon general grounds of economy, that is on a principle which tends towards saving, rather than on the economic inability of the country to find the necessary funds. Education expenditure cannot be regarded as something^h apart; it must be projected against a background of public expenditure in general. Table XXI shows the increase per cent on the principal services in England and Wales, between 1913-14 and 1919-20, calculated on the total expenditure of Local Authorities.⁽¹⁾ The figures have been calculated from statistics in the Report of the Royal Commission on Local Government, and are rather suggestive that the cost of elementary education has been too much stressed.

Table XXI.

Service.	Increase in cost per cent.
Education.	180.2
Public Health.	213.6
Highways.	159.4
Poor Relief.	156.1
Police.	226.0
Lunacy.	149.0
Trading.	198.0.

(1) Part 1. Minutes of Evidence. p.210.

Expenditure on Public Health, Police and Trading showed a greater increase than that on Education, though the education service was financed by percentage grants in 1919-20. Therefore it could not be said that the introduction of the new system strained the resources of the tax-payer unduly when compared with other services.

The second great objection of the Geddes Committee was that the percentage system was -

".....a money spending device.....Under it the Local Authority loses much of its incentive to reduce expenditure...The system should be abandoned in the interests of economy."

Economy as applied to the expenditure of a Local Authority may be defined as prudence in the use of public money, but prudence means wise spending and not necessarily a reduction in total expenditure. Incentive to reduce expenditure may, and often does, lead to parsimony, which is the ^{ti} antithesis of spending wisely. The conclusion of the Geddes Report that incentive to reduce expenditure and economy are correlative for all intents and purposes is not justified. If Exchequer grants were revised, so that the contribution of the Central Authority bore only an arbitrary relationship to the cost of the service, then an increased share of the burden would fall on the ratepayer, who might be unable, if not unwilling, to bear it. The effect would be to reduce expenditure, but whether the result would be real economy is open to doubt, for the rich and poor areas would be wider apart than ever. Educational facilities and opportunities would vary enormously from one area to another, and it is necessary to guard against falling into the same error as that of the Newcastle Commission; the mistake of regarding education as a local activity with little or no national benefit. Education had been accepted as a national activity administered locally since 1902, and, since

the service was thenceforth a co-operative effort between the Central and Local Authorities, it was the duty of the Government to take steps to ensure that Local Authorities were in a financial position to administer the service in the best interests of the whole country, and therefore in the interest of true economy.

To say that the percentage system was merely a money spending device was to lose sight of a fact stressed in the Final Report of the Departmental Committee on Local Taxation -

"They (the Local Authorities) are not, as it appears to be thought, co-ordinate authorities, and their revenues are not independent of Parliament. They and their revenues are, in fact, the creatures of Parliament and subject to its control."

But the Report then placed this statement in its proper relation⁽¹⁾ to the function of Local Authorities in Local Government.

"Local Authorities should be given considerable discretion in the administration of these services, and should not be reduced to the position of agents of the Government Departments."

Furthermore, the following extract from the Memorandum submitted to the Meston Committee by the Board of Education shows that the Board was not in agreement with the Geddes Committee.

"The Memorandum on Control which the Board have submitted to the Committee will, it is hoped, show that the present grant system is not merely a device for increasing expenditure, whether local or central, but is under present circumstances, a powerful engine for restricting expenditure. As the Board work out and apply, in the light of experience, suitable standards of cost, as limits to the expenditure which should be ~~xx~~ recognised for grant, the basis of the grant undergoes some modification; for the grant then becomes regulated by those standards, as well as by the expenditure. So long as the expenditure falls within the standards, the expenditure determines the grant; when it touches the standards, the standards determine the grant. This is more economical than to base grants on the standards only, without reference to the expenditure, for if the grants were paid on the standards, without regard to whether the expenditure is incurred or not, then the grant would be larger in the aggregate, and a portion of them, instead of being applied to educational expenditure, would go merely in the relief of rates."

(1) Final Report. Departmental Committee on Local Taxation. pp. 22-23.

This statement of the Board would apply to a scheme of fixed block grants with equal force, and for that reason particular emphasis was laid on the controlling factor of expenditure actually incurred. One method of preventing education grants paid on a fixed block grant basis from being used to relieve the rates would be a system of audit and inspection. But the corollary to such a system would be either a deduction in the grant paid to a Local Education Authority on a post-expenditure basis of payment, or a refund by the Local Authority on a pre-expenditure basis of payment. In either case the actual payment would be on a basis which would be essentially percentage, as the actual grant received by the Local Authority would bear a relation to the expenditure incurred.

The third criticism of the Geddes Committee was that the deciding voice as to expenditure was that of the Local Authorities, but the Board of Education did not share that view, for Circulars issued defining the general attitude and policy of the Board indicated that, as far as recognition of expenditure by Local Authorities for the purposes of grant was concerned, the Board possessed the deciding voice. No Local Education Authority can spend money as it pleases; it can only do so on lines laid down by the Central Authority, and the Central Authority has an efficient system of audit and inspection to see that these lines are adhered to.

The avowed object of the Select Committee was to find some means of restricting the demands made upon the taxpayer, and the President of the Board of Education indicated one manner of doing so when he introduced the estimates for 1922-23.⁽¹⁾

"Last year we estimated our probable liabilities and asked Parliament for the wherewithal to meet them. This year we require the claims upon us to be adjusted thereto. We do not discard the percentage grants system, but we subject it to limitation."

(1) Parliamentary Debates, 1922. Vol. 153. p. 735. Col. 1.

The financial question had actually been receiving the closest attention from the Board of Education since 1920, and the period inaugurated a system of central control through Official Circulars to Local Education Authorities. From 1920 most of these were concerned with impressing upon Local Authorities the need for rigid economies in the preparation of estimates. Circular 1190 put into operation the system of rationing expenditure foreshadowed by the President in the speech quoted above. The total aggregate grant for elementary education was fixed at £62,450,000, and limits were imposed upon recognisable expenditure of Local Education Authorities on teachers' salaries, special services, provision of meals, administration and other costs, and loan charges. Such limitation of grant was not, and is not, inconsistent with the percentage principle, provided that the limitation is made operative on the total expenditure because the grant available would have been distributed amongst the Authorities in proportion to their expenditure. But the difficulty concerning a limited aggregate grant lay in its distribution on an equitable basis between the various Local Education Authorities. Fortunately, the limits were not reached except in the case of the Provision of Meals, and the arrangement came to naught for all practical purposes. The principle of rationing was withdrawn in 1924, when Circular 1,190 was cancelled, but the Board was yielding to the pressure of the Geddes Report, and in 1925 the now famous Circular 1371 was issued on the 25th November.

The Circular announced that the Board proposed to adopt a policy of fixed block grants in such a manner that the grant would be fixed for each Local Education Authority on a basis defined by a formula. This proposed that each Local Education Authority would be apportioned a sum equivalent to the grant for the year 1924-25, less one per cent and less 30s. per child on the registers

~~registers~~ under five years of age. The fixed grant was to operate for the period 1926-27-28.

The Circular asked for the co-operation of the Local Education Authorities in meeting the financial stringency which had arisen, because the Board had come to the conclusion that "if they were to provide for expenditure by Local Education Authorities on new services without asking Authorities to make any counterbalancing economies, their estimates even after effecting certain economies in their own administration" would be £1,136,760 above the estimates for the year, and £1,063,800 above the actual expenditure of the previous year. The Board stated that the grant was to be a guaranteed minimum, but that certain conditions such as the payment of the Burnham Scales to teachers were to be fulfilled.

Neither the proposal for the revision of the grant system, nor the demand for drastic economy, met with any sympathy from the teachers or from the Local Education Authorities. The National Education Association issued a statement ⁽¹⁾ agreeing with the suggested abolition of the percentage system of the 1918 Act, but regretted the proposal for fixed block grants "should be based on such a flimsy and futile basis as the sums which happened to be payable to each locality two years ago." The Executive of the Association suggested a return to a per-capita basis together with a supplementary grant in aid of building or loan charges.

Local Education Authorities were against the terms of the Circular, and the Executive of the Association of Education Committees declared that the results would be disastrous in their effects upon the maintenance and development of Education. Local Authorities scented the Geddes Report in the new proposals and objected that the Circular was purely financial and took no heed of educational necessity; that it disregarded the financial

(1) The School Government Chronicle. November 12th, 1925.

position of Local Authorities and ignored all necessary expansion of the education service. Moreover, they protested that Local Education Authorities which had an inflation for the ~~set~~ period would continue to enjoy it for three years, and the fact that all benefits arising out of economy would accrue to the Local Authorities placed a premium on inertia. ⁽¹⁾ In addition, the reactionary character of such changes in policy was also stressed, for Local Authorities had initiated programmes on the undertaking that a certain percentage of the cost would be met by the Central Authority, and to carry out such schemes without that help would necessitate a considerable rise in the elementary education rates.

The National Union of Teachers also condemned the Circular as retrogressive, especially in its provisions relating to children under five and the effect it would have on special services. The non-admission of children under five, except at the expense of the rates, implied the destruction of the efficacy of the social and medical services, for experience had shown that the best work of these branches was preventive, and therefore the younger the children with which they dealt the better and more lasting were the results.

The President of the Board, Lord Eustace Percy, ultimately met representatives of the Local Education Authorities in conference, and Memorandum 44 was issued on 31st December, 1925. This Memorandum did not cancel the Circular as its full title - Administrative Memorandum No.44. on Circular 1371 - shows, but it was designed to provide an agreed working basis for one year. The Memorandum intimated that Local Education Authorities were to submit reduced estimates to the Board of Education before February 1st., 1926, and that no provision was to be made for new

(1) Corlett. Op.cit., p.120.

capital expenditure, except where previously sanctioned by the Board, unless it were for building new schools rendered necessary for the replacement of schools on list A of defective schools, for building new schools rendered necessary by movements in population, or for building new schools as part of reorganisation schemes where the initial capital outlay would be counterbalanced by subsequent economies. (1) The Resident stated in Parliament that he proposed to use the estimated expenditure of Local Authorities for the year 1926-27 as the basis of grant over the years 1927-30, and that the grant would be approximately equivalent to 50 per cent of the approved expenditure, such grant to be a minimum.

The connection between the Memorandum and the Circular was plain. The only relief it offered from the proposals of the Circular lay in the continuation of the percentage grant system for another year, and "The Observer" of 10th January, 1926, stated that "the best that can be said for Memorandum 44 is that it sails under recognisable colours. There is no pretence that the improvement of the education system is chiefly in view, or in view at all. It is economy at the expense of the schools, working straightforward injury." The President of the Board himself described it as a compromise, but the Local Authorities repudiated the description, and revolt amongst some of them was not long in appearing. The Director of Education for Lincolnshire (2) in a Memorandum published by the Education Committee stated "that it is impossible to reduce expenditure for 1926-27 substantially below that of 1925-26 without definite reductions of staff." whilst "Education", the organ of the Association of Education Committees, agreed that the feeling of disquietude had not been dispersed by a closer examination of the contents of the Memorandum.

(1) Corlett. Op.cit., pp.122-123.

(2) The Schoolmaster. 22nd January, 1926.

The National Union of Teachers compiled a statement showing
 (1)
 the effects of the Memorandum.

" In one county, for instance, the grant to a voluntary association for the care of mentally defective children is withdrawn. In another, there are to be no free places (in secondary schools) above 25 per cent. In a third the amount to be spent on mentally defective children is reduced by nearly half, on physically defective children by a third, and on evening schools by a fifth. At Cambridge a new open air school has been struck out by the Board. At Gosport a second school nurse is not to be appointed and an extension of dental work is postponed....The Chancellor saves, while the children who need open air, medical treatment and special remedial education are being sacrificed."

Representations and protests bore fruit, for in March 1926 the Board stated "that Circular 1371 was withdrawn and Administrative Memorandum 44 superseded."

In the midst of this economy campaign the Report of the Consultative Committee on the Education of the Adolescent, usually known as the Hadow Report, was published in December, 1926. The Report recommended a complete reorganisation of the educational system so that children would be transferred from the primary school at 11 plus to some form of post-primary ~~and~~ education, and also an extension of the school leaving age to 15 years. The Report emphasised that the transfer should not be made on a standard of scholastic achievement but on a chronological age basis. All schools were to have opportunities for post-primary education. Recognition of a diversity of talents demanded that the new system should have various types of schools, selective and non-selective, in order to cater for the different groups of children. In recognising differences of abilities and interests the Report gave a new and extended interpretation to the conception of a ~~liberal~~ liberal education. The Board endorsed the recommendations in a pamphlet entitled "The New Prospect in Education", issued in 1928.

(1) The Schoolmaster. 26th February, 1926.

The cost of reorganisation was placed at figures varying
 (1)
 between £7,850,000 and £10,000,000. Such estimates were
 (2)
 conjectural, but the Consultative Committee stated:

"The time has come, it seems to us, when the country should be prepared even at the cost of some immediate sacrifice, to take a step which will ensure that such education shall have larger opportunities of moulding the lives of boys and girls during the critical years of adolescence."

The cost involved lay largely in the inadequacy of the existing school buildings, and the quinquennial report of the Kent Education
 (3)
 Committee, 1923-1928, laid particular stress on this point.

"It is not commonly realised how many elementary schools throughout the country were built more than half a century ago, when ideas of education and of the school leaving age were vastly different from what they are to-day.....Having regard to facts of this nature, it will readily be understood that very few old school buildings lend themselves to modern educational requirements....It is this question of school buildings, many of which were already defective in 1870, which constitutes one of the gravest problems which the nation has to face in the reorganisation of its elementary school system.....satisfactory organisation is rendered impossible by defective buildings. Failure to provide the means to make the present large outlay fully productive would be the worst form of extravagance."

The problem of the inadequacy of school buildings was most serious in rural districts with a scattered population distributed amongst villages a great distance apart. Provision of effective post-primary education demanded at least a post-primary department, if not a separate school, in order to allow an appropriate classification of scholars and the necessary differentiation in courses of instruction. This was an impossibility in small rural schools, and the solution lay in the erection of schools centrally situated and fed from the surrounding districts. Such a scheme necessarily entailed additional expenditure, not only for the new school but also for the conveyance of children backwards and forwards from their homes, for the provision of meals during the mid-day recess, and last, but not least, for the adequate

(1) The Schoolmaster. February, 1927.

(2) Report, p.149.

(3) I am indebted to Mr. Salter Davies, M.A., Director of Education for Kent, for a copy of this Report.

staffing of the central schools. In rural areas the position was again complicated by the Non-Provided schools, for in many villages only this type of school existed. As far as the Local Education Authority was concerned it possessed no powers to compel the managers of a Non-Provided school to transfer children to a Provided school or even to insist in internal reorganisation which would alter the character of the school. Section 34 of the Education Act of 1921 gave the power to Local Authorities to group Non-Provided schools of the same denomination situated in the same neighbourhood, but such a provision was almost a dead letter in rural areas. Whatever means a rural Authority took to implement the recommendations of the Hadow Report it clearly involved the Authority in additional expense.

Yet the Board persisted in its policy of economy, for another Circular, issued in February 1927, intimated that although the grant for the year 1927-28 would continue to be paid on the percentage formula, the expenditure of Local Authorities under certain heads would be subject to "limiting standards", the meaning of which was explained in the Memorandum submitted by the Board to the Meston Committee. Grant for administration and "other expenditure"⁽¹⁾ was to be limited to 45s. per child in average attendance, whilst the Board thought it desirable that Local Education Authorities should not incur heavy commitments in respect of schools for mentally deficient children, or on enlarging existing schools. Authorities exceeding these "limits" would be called upon to justify such excess under penalty of losing the grant.

This Circular was criticised by Local Authorities on the ground that they differed in the items which were reckoned as "other expenditure"; that the clause relating to mentally deficient

(1) "Other expenditure" refers to that expenditure which cannot fall under the headings of teachers salaries, administration, special services and loan charges.

children was a retrograde step, and that the Circular as a whole was inimical to schemes of reorganisation. The Circular was accepted, however, for the year, but the Executive of the Association of Education Committees stated that the principle of limitations laid down was not acceptable as the basis upon which a permanent settlement of the grant question could be reached. (1)

Between 1927 and 1930 there was no further attempt to interfere with the percentage grant system of payment to Local Education Authorities, but the Local Government Act of 1929, though not dealing specifically with education, has had an indirect effect upon education authorities owing to the variation in the produce of a 1d. rate consequent to the de-rating clauses. The changes brought about by the Act (2) may be set down under three heads:

1. Complete de-rating of agricultural land and buildings, and partial de-rating of industrial and transport undertakings to the extent of 75 per cent of their rateable value.
2. The transference of certain services such as the Poor Law and Highways to County and County Borough Councils.
3. The substitution of fixed block grants as a method of payment to Local Authorities in lieu of certain individual grants.

In order to make good any deficiency in rates caused by these arrangements, the Central Authority agreed to provide an annual sum payable for each of the five years commencing 1st April, 1930, equal to £45,500,000. This sum will be allocated to County and County Borough Councils in such a manner that they will receive 75 per cent of the loss in rates and grants calculated on the accounts of the financial year ending 31st March, 1929., and the balance will then be distributed amongst County and County Borough Councils on a formula which takes into account the estimated population, the rateable value per head, the number of children under five years of age, the number of unemployed insured persons, and the number of persons per mile of public roads.

(1) Corlett. Op.cit.p.141.

(2) I am indebted to Mr. H. Bottomley, Accountant to the Durham County Council, for an explanation of the working of the Local Government Act of 1929.

In addition to the sum of £45,500,000, the Central Authority agreed to give an amount sufficient to guarantee to each County and County Borough Council not less than 1s. per head more than each Council had lost in rates and grants, equivalent to a sum of £650,00, and also provided an additional grant sufficient to guarantee that no District Council would suffer through the operation of the Act. The latter grant amounted to £1,680,000, but it will eventually cease.

In 1930 the Board of Education calculated that the decrease in the produce of a 7d. rate owing to the de-rating clauses would be £1,255,000,⁽¹⁾ but this would be compensated by a reduced deduction from the grant actually earned by the Local Education Authorities, for it will be remembered that the grant earned by a Local Education Authority for Elementary Education is subject to the deduction of an amount equal to the produce of a 7d. rate. According to theory the loss is made good by the Government, but in practice it does not work out quite as well, because the conditions of the grant also stipulate that no Authority will receive less than 50 per cent of its net approved expenditure on elementary education. Many Local Education Authorities derive benefit from this factor because the grant formula would give them a less sum than they actually receive under the 50 per cent minimum. In the year 1924-25, London, 4 Counties, 13 County Boroughs, 25 Boroughs and 6 Urban Districts received the 50 per cent minimum instead of the grant awarded to them by the percentage formula.⁽²⁾ To these Authorities, therefore, the percentage grant becomes a percentage block grant, so that the equalising factor of ~~of~~ the produce of a 7d. rate does not exist as far as these Authorities are concerned.

(1) Tyneside Papers. Second Series No.3. Ernest Dyer. "The Finance of Public Elementary Education". pp.9-10.

(2) Corlett. Op.cit., p.189.

But the effect of the Local Government Act is to reduce the permanent rateable value of an area, and therefore any development in education must be financed from a reduced rateable value which implies a higher education ~~rate~~ rate. To make this clear it is best to take a numerical example.

Suppose a Local Education Authority had to raise £500,000 for ~~the~~ the purposes of elementary education, and suppose that the 50 per cent clause came into operation. Then the Central Authority would contribute £250,000. Assuming that the de-rating provisions operated in this area and their effect was to reduce the rateable per head from £5 to £3.5, it is clear that a higher rate would be required to raise the £250,000 which had to be found by the Local Education Authority. To take an actual case. Before the Local Government Act was passed the rate required to raise £500,000 in Surrey was 14d., and 29d. in Durham, but after the Act it amounted to 14.5d. and 41d. respectively. The Act has had a similar effect in towns situated in industrial areas.

(1)

Rate Levied, for Elementary Education.

	<u>1930.</u> <u>Before the Act.</u>	<u>1931.</u> <u>After the Act.</u>
Barrow.	35.5d.	44d.
Hull.	31.9d.	41.4d.
Blackpool.	11.4d.	11.5d.
Bournemouth.	8.4d.	8.25.

It may be objected that the sums paid in compensation by the Central Authority will counterbalance the loss incurred owing to the operation of the Derating Act. But the compensatory sum of £45,500,000 mentioned earlier is fixed for a period of five years and will then be reduced to 50 per cent for the period ~~1943-47~~, 1938-42; to 25 per cent for the period 1943-47, and will eventually disappear in 1947. Moreover, this fixed block grant does not take into account the growing education expenditure

(1) H. Bottomley. Memorandum submitted to the County Council of Durham. 1931.

of the district with the result that a rise in rates will inevitably take place. As far as education is concerned it is almost certain that the school age will be raised sooner or later, and unless grants are again adjusted a further burden will be placed on the ratepayers.

Under the present working of the Act Part III Authorities appear to have the most justifiable cause for complaint.⁽¹⁾ The compensatory fixed block grant is distributed to them by the County Councils on the basis of population alone, with the result that all Part III Authorities within an administrative county having equal populations receive equal grants, and other considerations are ignored. A Part III Authority with a greatly reduced rateable value may not, therefore, receive adequate compensation when compared with its more fortunate neighbours with a rateable value that has only been slightly reduced.

The influence of the 1929 Derating Act has carried this inquiry beyond its definite limiting dates, but as its operation began in 1930 it seemed advisable to consider its actual and probable effects as they are so far capable of being estimated.

So far we have been discussing the history of the education grants and to complete the description we must return to the percentage grant introduced in 1919. This system of calculating grants was intended:

- a. To supersede the previous system of fixed unit grants which had proved unsuitable to secure educational development and initiative.
- b. To give Local Education Authorities a sense of financial responsibility and to secure them against future expenditure.
- c. To encourage the development of the service along the lines of local needs and requirements.
- d. To relieve Local Education Authorities from the danger of having to support fresh burdens without a corresponding financial contribution from Parliament.
- e. To bring the "Special Services" into definite relationship with the general educational system.

(1) Tyneside Papers. Op.cit.p.9.

f. To aid Local Education Authorities in proportion to their abilities to meet incurred expenditure.

To fulfil these conditions the grant was made payable on three factors, namely, the number of children in average attendance, the expenditure per child, and the produce of a 7d. rate as an equalising factor between rich and poor areas.

At different times it has been proposed to replace the percentage grant by a fixed block grant payable to Local Authorities for a number of years and therefore subject to periodical revision. The result of such a grant would be to leave all expenditure in excess of the grant to be defrayed out of local funds. This idea was last mooted in Circular 1371, but the resistance of the Local Education Authorities secured its abandonment. It is rather significant that the proposal emerges during periods of financial stringency when the cry for economy, really a plea to cut down expenditure, becomes rampant. The objection to such a scheme of grants are many, though no one would say that the present scheme of percentage grants is ideal. In the first place the fixed block grant is extremely likely to establish a principle of rationing expenditure to an arbitrary amount determined centrally and not according to the needs of the service.⁽¹⁾ Secondly, it allows for little elasticity or development in the service itself, and would compel an Authority to economise on some branches of education in order to find the money for a fuller expansion of some other branch. The alternative to this economy would be an increased rate. Thirdly, if the basic period on which the grant is fixed is one of low expenditure, then the period following, until the next revision, will be one of financial stringency, unless, of course, the Local Authority is prepared to make an increased demand on the ratepayer. Finally, unless the fixed block grant were to bear

(1) This criticism might be applied with all justice to the percentage system, because the actual percentage figures of 50 per cent of expenditure, and of 60 per cent of teachers' salaries are determined Centrally. These percentages

figures, however, relate expenditure and grant, and are, therefore, not in quite the same category as a fixed sum of money.

some relationship to the expenditure actually incurred, and about to be incurred, by each Local Education Authority, it would seem almost impossible to secure an equable distribution between rich and poor Education Authorities.

Whether the percentage grant has achieved the ends for which it was designed is an open question, but it is possible to state that it has not solved the problem of equalising the rate burden upon different Local Authorities. In the year 1929-30 the rates for elementary education in England and Wales varied from 8.75d. (Bournemouth) to 58.4d. (Merthyr) in the case of County Boroughs, and from 7.25d. (Hove and Bexhill) to 56.5d. (Rhondda) in the case of Authorities for Elementary Education only. ⁽¹⁾ But it is somewhat dangerous to draw conclusions merely from the range of rate variations, because different bases of assessment and other matters such as high cost of administration may be partly responsible for the wide differences involved. It is safer to go back to the produce of a rate and the net yield of a 1d. rate per child in the public elementary schools. ⁽²⁾ The following Table gives an indication of the extremes which existed in 1930.

<u>Area.</u>	<u>Rateable value per head.</u>	<u>Net yield of a 1d. rate per child in P.E. Schools.</u>	<u>Elementary Education rate.</u>	<u>Expenditure per child.</u>
<u>COUNTY BOROUGHES.</u>				
Newcastle.	£7.19.8	4s.9.25d.	1s.10.25d.	£11. 3.11.
Tynemouth.	£4.15.0	2s.9.25d.	2s.11.62d.	£11. 9. 4.
Eastbourne.	£14. 0.3d.	14s.6.75d.	10.0 d.	£15. 7. 7.
Bournemouth.	£14.15.10.	16. 1.25d.	8.13d.	£13. 0. 4.
<u>PART III AUTHORITIES.</u>				
Jarrow.	£ 3. 8.11.	1s.6.5d.	3s.6.75d.	£10. 0.11.
Felling.	£ 2.15. 2.	1s.7.25d.	3s.7.75d.	£10. 9. 6.
Hove.	£15. 9. 6.	19s.5.5d.	7.25d.	£13.19. 9.
Bexhill.	£11.11. 5d.	16s.8.5d.	7.25d.	£13. 3. 0.

(1) Tyneside Papers. Op.cit., p.2.

(2) Ibid. pp.6-7.

One thing is shown very clearly by the Table, and that is that the Authorities expend practically the same amount per child, but that the poundage rate for elementary education varies enormously. The causes affecting the rate poundage have been officially (1) explained by the Ministry of Health.

"Many factors operate to produce diversity in the amounts per pound of rates levied in the several rating areas. In some areas the services charged on the local rates are more numerous and fully developed than in others. Amongst areas at the same stage of civic development the poundage rate is generally lowest in those in which the amount of valuation per head of population is highest. But this generalisation is subject to exceptions traceable ultimately to peculiarities of site, soil, climate or boundaries; the character and circumstances of the local industries (including rates of wages); diversity in regard to the amounts available in reduction of rates from non-rate sources....; profits or losses arising from municipal trading; local custom, and the efficiency or otherwise of local administration during - it may be - a long period of years."

With particular regard to education it is significant that the areas with the highest poundage rates are those with the most children to educate, and in those areas the produce of a penny rate gives the Local Education Authority the least money to spend on each child. (2) Thus in 1929-30, Hebburn in the County of Durham had 4,683 elementary school children to educate and a penny rate gave a sum equivalent to 20.25d. per child, whereas Bexhill had only 1,339 children and a penny rate gave a sum equivalent to 200.5d. per child. Both areas had approximately the same total population.

The formula upon which the present (1930) system of grants is based is not satisfactory when such a wide disparity results, but it should be possible to modify the formula without destroying the percentage principle upon which it is based. The provision in the formula respecting the deduction of the produce of a 7d. rate has been invalidated to some extent by the guarantee of 50 per cent of the net approved expenditure, but the fact that

(1) Quoted by H. Bottomley. Op.cit., p.17.

(2) Tyneside Papers. Op.cit., p.4.

an Authority may receive as much as two-thirds of its net expenditure cannot be ignored. The problem of the necessitous area presents its own difficulties, and, though no grant system can be devised which would work with mathematical exactitude as between area and area, the writer suggests that the application of the following formula would lighten the financial burden where it is heaviest without doing injustice to other areas. It will be noticed that the extra grant to be paid to a Local Education Authority is based on the yield of a 1d. rate per child in the public elementary schools of the type of area concerned. This is one of the principal factors in deciding the extent to which recourse must be made to the rates.

Let P = the grant payable to a County Council, Borough, or Urban District under the present grant formula.

(1)
Let A = the AVERAGE net yield of a 1d. rate per child in the public elementary schools of County Councils, County Boroughs, Boroughs, or Urban Districts. The average yield is 4s.4d. for County Boroughs, 4s.10d. for Boroughs, and 4s.0d. for Urban Districts.

Let 'A' = the ACTUAL yield of a 1d. rate per child in the public elementary schools of the particular County, County Borough, or Urban District.

The additional grant formula is -

$$\frac{P(A - A')}{A}$$

1. Example of a County Borough, viz. Tynemouth.

$$P = £61,579. \quad A = 4s.4d. \quad A' = 2s.9d.$$

$$\text{Apply formula } \frac{P(A - A')}{A}$$

$$\text{Extra grant} = \frac{£61,579 (4s.4d. - 2s.9d.)}{4s.4d.}$$

$$= £61,579 \times \frac{19}{52}$$

$$= £22,500.$$

(1) I wish to thank the Statistical Department of the Ministry of Health and the Board of Education for supplying the data which enabled me to make these calculations.

2. Example of a Municipal Borough, viz. Jarrow.

$$P = £44,071. \quad A = 4s.10d. \quad A' = 1s. 6\frac{1}{2}d.$$

$$\text{Apply formula } \frac{P(A - A')}{A}$$

$$\text{Extra grant} = \frac{£44,071 (4s.10d. - 1s. 6\frac{1}{2}d.)}{4s. 10d.}$$

$$= £44,071 \times \frac{39.5}{58.0}$$

$$= \underline{£30,014.}$$

3. Example of an Urban District, viz. Hebburn.

$$P = £27,130. \quad A = 4s.0d. \quad A' = 1s.8d.$$

$$\text{Apply formula } \frac{P(A - A')}{A}$$

$$\text{Extra grant} = \frac{£27,130 (4s.0d. - 1s. 8d.)}{4s. 0d.}$$

$$= £27,130 \times \frac{28}{48}$$

$$= \underline{£15,826}$$

In this formula;

Where A' exceeds A the factor $\frac{P(A-A')}{A}$ will be negative;

Where A' equals A the factor $\frac{P(A-A')}{A}$ will be zero;

Where A' is less than A the factor $\frac{P(A-A')}{A}$ will be positive.

Under the suggested formula the area is considered necessitous only when the factor is positive. The following results have been obtained by applying the formula to the undermentioned areas.

<u>Area.</u>	Element. School populat. <u>Approx.</u>	Grant paid on <u>present</u> <u>formula.</u>	Additional proposed <u>grant.</u>	Yield of a <u>£d.</u> rate per child in public element. schools <u>1929 -</u> <u>1930.</u>	Element. Educ. Rate 1929 to 1930	Total grant per child in public element. schools on suggested grant <u>formula.</u>
	£	£				£
<u>County Boroughs.</u>						
Newcastle.	39,680	240,400	Nil.	4/9 $\frac{1}{4}$	1/10 $\frac{1}{4}$	6.1
Tynemouth.	9,620	61,579	22,500	2/9 $\frac{1}{4}$	2/11.6	8.7
South Shields.	19,500	115,714	62,308	2/0 $\frac{1}{4}$	2/11.5	9.1
Eastbourne.	4,280	32,644	Nil.	14/6 $\frac{3}{4}$	10.5	7.6
Bournemouth.	6,820	44,416	Nil.	16/1 $\frac{1}{4}$	8.4	6.5
<u>Boroughs.</u>						
WallSEND.	7,660	45,265	21,852	2/6	2/8.5	8.8
Jarrow.	6,710	44,071	30,014	1/6 $\frac{1}{2}$	3/6.75	11.0
Harrogate.	3,080	21,412	Nil.	12/4 $\frac{3}{4}$	10.	7.0
Hove.	3,190	22,132	Nil.	19/5 $\frac{1}{2}$	8.	6.9
Bexhill.	1,340	8,707	Nil.	16/9 $\frac{1}{2}$	8.75	6.5
<u>Urban Districts.</u>						
Hebburn.	4,680	27,130	15,826	1/8 $\frac{1}{4}$	3/2	9.2
Felling.	4,650	32,107	19,398	1/7 $\frac{1}{4}$	3/7.75	11.1

An analysis of the foregoing Table shows that the present system of grants clearly fails to provide equal or adequate treatment for all schools; that it fails to abolish the unequal incidence of and education rate, and that it fails to distribute the cost of elementary education fairly over the whole country. The disparity (1) is very pronounced, and Mr. Ernest Dyer, from whose paper some of the above figures have been abstracted, has done a public service in drawing attention to the plight of the Tyneside areas. (2) Commenting on his pamphlet, "The Schoolmaster" says -

(1) Tyneside Papers. Second Series, No. 3.

(2) 3rd. December, 1931.

"These facts must be made clear to the people before Mr. Dyer's conclusions will be generally accepted. He asserts that there can be no satisfactory advance in education in the poorer districts on Tyneside and similar areas, until the State accepts a greater share of financial responsibility. When grant formulae are revised these facts must be borne in mind."

Until the time arrives, if ever, when the Exchequer will be prepared to make elementary education a wholly national charge, there appears to be no option but to press for revised formulae which will make a demand for additional grants in areas where the need is greatest.

No doubt "border line" Authorities would examine their positions very closely on the suggested formula, but there would be little inducement for them to modify their whole system of rating valuation in order to bring them into the category of "necessitous" areas for elementary education. Moreover, the Board of Education would insist upon its own standards of efficiency being reached before awarding any grants whatever. Appeals for revision of the limiting average yields of a 1d. rate per child in public elementary schools in the various types of areas of Local Education Authorities, based on the results of quinquennial valuations, might be considered. The position of Authorities where the yield of a 1d. rate per child may be slightly above the average might receive special consideration, but the method of making concessions would best be worked out in the light of practical experience.

In connection with the revision of the grant system, Mr. Bolton King, late Director of Education for Warwickshire, has suggested⁽¹⁾ that the true canons of educational expenditure are -

- a. That the great bulk of the cost should be met from national funds.
- b. That the backward Authorities should be encouraged to spend sufficiently to bring their schools up to the average of the country.
- c. That in order to stimulate local interest, a part, but not a large part, of the cost should be borne from local funds.

(1) Bolton King. "Schools of To-Day." p.106.

d. That any wide difference in the cost to rich and poor areas should be avoided.

e. That fancy expenditure should be discouraged.

These canons are not likely to be accepted in their entirety.

Underlying the financial proposals there appears to be an assumption that taxation is not a matter of immediate concern to the ~~tax~~^{rate}-payer, and Mr. Bolton King would be willing to transfer an unreasonably high share of educational expenditure from the rate-payer to the tax-payer. However, Mr. Bolton^{King} proceeds to elaborate his suggested financial arrangements.

"....if, in place of the present formula (the percentage formula) grants for elementary education are calculated on the simple basis of cost per child. The average cost of an elementary school child is £11.15.4d., with an extraordinary variation in different areas ranging from over £17 to a minimum of £7.10.0d. If London and its outer ring are excluded the average cost is considerably less, but even outside London it is doubtful whether a sufficient education even on the present standard can be supplied for less than £11.10.0. The following apportionment is suggested (for the London area a special calculation would be necessary.)

The State to pay the total cost up to £10 per child.
Any cost between £10 and £12 to be divided equally between the State and the Local Authority.
Any cost over £12 per child to be borne wholly by the Local Authority.
(These figures would need revision from time to time as the total cost per child increases....)?"

In other words, his plan seems to be a combination of fixed and percentage grants, the latter to be on a sliding scale depending on the cost per child in the different areas. Mr. Bolton King does not show how the scheme would work out in practice, but he states that it would cause necessitous areas to disappear, that it would stimulate backward areas, and that it would call a halt to extravagant Authorities. An application of his scheme to the Counties of Durham and Kent gives the following results.

a. Durham. Year 1929-30.

Total net expenditure on Elementary Education.	£1,422,993
Government Grant received.	£ 821,310.
Children in average attendance in Elementary Schools.	121,564.

Grant at £10 per head.	£1,215,640.
Average cost per head.	£ 11.14.1.
Excess of cost over £10 per head.	£ 1.14.1.
State to bear one-half of such cost.	17.0 $\frac{1}{2}$.
Additional Grant.	£ 103,583.

Total grant payable:

$$£1,215,640 \text{ plus } £103,583 = £ 1,319,223.$$

Amount to be raised from rates under Mr. King's scheme.

$$£1,422,993 - £ 1,319,223 = £ 103,770.$$

Thus Durham County would have to raise £103,770 instead of the sum of £601,683, actually raised.

b. Kent. Year 1927-1928.

Total net expenditure on Elementary Education.	£ 786,479.
Government Grant.	£ 418,668.
Children in average attendance in Elementary Schools.	67,948
Grant at £10 per head.	£ 679,480.
Average cost per head.	£ 11.11.6.
Excess of cost over £10 per head.	£ 1.11.6.
State to bear one-half of such cost.	15.9 $\frac{1}{2}$.
Additional Grant.	£ 53,509.

Total grant payable:

$$£679,480 \text{ plus } £53,509 = £732,989.$$

Amount to be raised from the rates under Mr. King's scheme.

$$£ 786,497 - £732,989 = £ 53,508.$$

Thus Kent would have to raise £ 53,508, instead of the sum of £367,829 actually raised.

Bearing these figures in mind, the scheme proposed by Mr. King seems to be impracticable, at least from the financial standpoint. It is more than doubtful whether the proposal would satisfy the canons advanced earlier. Some Authorities in the Country have an educational expenditure for Elementary Education well below £10 per head, and others are within a few shillings of that figure. It is not at all improbable that the award of a State grant of £10 per head, irrespective of all other considerations, would encourage the Authorities with an expenditure of less than £10 to stay at their lower figures and apply the balance to the relief of rates in general, whilst it offers the greatest of temptations to Authorities with an expenditure above the limit to exercise a little

more economy and bring the cost as near the £10 limit as possible. One weakness of the scheme is that no proviso is included to make Local Education Authorities spend the £10 per capita grant solely upon Elementary Education. It is by no means certain that the transference of the burden from the rate-payer to the tax-payer would lessen the gaps between wealthy and poor areas. The richer and more generally progressive Authorities would still draw upon the rates to a greater extent than the poor Authorities, and, with the larger amount of money available owing to increased grants, they would be financially able to embark upon schemes utterly impossible for their less wealthy neighbours. The problem of the necessitous areas has come about owing to differences in rateable values, and Mr. King's scheme does not take that into consideration. The main grant of £10 per head is not subject to any rate conditions; it applies equally to all Local Education Authorities, and that being the case it is difficult to see how it would do anything else, in the words of Sir L.A. Selby-Bigge, than heighten the peaks and leave the valleys untouched.

The whole question of grants and the financial relationship which should exist between the Central and Local Authorities has had a chequered history. Even now the relationship is not settled, but the progress made since the first feeble and hesitating effort in 1833 has been astonishing. From an attitude of "take it or leave it" there has developed a feeling of conscious partnership, until the time has come when such problems are threshed out in joint efforts between the Authorities concerned. At the present time adverse circumstances have called a halt to the development which every educationist wishes to take place. The Grant for Elementary Education has been cut according to the ~~following~~ following scheme:

- a. The 50 per cent minimum guarantee has been withdrawn.
- b. The grant for teachers' salaries has been reduced from 60 to 50 per cent.
- c. The special grant for reorganisation schemes has been reduced from 50 per cent to 20 per cent.

As a measure of compensation an extra grant of 9s. per child in average attendance has been awarded.

It is too early to note the effects of the change, but the ground gained by a century of hard work and unrelenting effort cannot be lost, and when the existing economic crisis passes away progress will be resumed. Even if the need for economy should remain, the right incidence of that economy will be realised as lying in some other sphere than that of Education.

(III)

The financial problems which have been under discussion are important, but some of the implications of the Act of 1918, bearing as they do upon the provision of continued education for adolescents and foreshadowing the later proposals of the Hadow Report, have opened up another line of inquiry. Attempts to proceed with proposals of this nature, working through the existing system of dual administrative areas for higher and elementary education, have revealed the weakness of the arrangements made under the Act of 1902. This Act gave final form to the present administrative scheme, but there have been many efforts to define the administrative unit which would combine the advantages of local interest, equalisation of rating and variety of types of educational activities.

In 1861 the Newcastle Commission suggested a division of the administration of elementary education into the Central Authority and County and Borough Boards of Education, though these Boards were to have only practically nominal functions. Subsequent Royal Commissions returned to the question. In 1868 the Schools Inquiry Commission favoured provincial boards or an organisation based on the County system, provided that towns with a population exceeding 100,000 inhabitants should be autonomous. This suggestion, however was confined to secondary education. In 1884 the Technical Instruction ~~Committee~~ Commission recommended that powers be granted to County Councils and Municipal Corporations to supply and maintain secondary and technical education, whilst the Cross Commission of 1886-88 suggested a scheme of elementary administration which would utilise the County and Municipal system of local government. Finally, the Bryce Commission of 1894-95 proposed that County and County Borough Councils should be made the Local

Authorities for secondary education. The Bryce Commission also published a Memorandum on the possibility of utilising the same authorities for administering both secondary and elementary education, a suggestion which bore fruit in the Act of 1902, though in a very much altered form.

The separation of the local administration of elementary and higher education countenanced by the Act of 1902 originated in the Elementary Education Act of 1870. Areas for the administration of elementary education had to be found, and School Boards and School Attendance Committees were set up on the precedent of the Board of Health.⁽¹⁾ Only elementary education was regarded as the concern of the State, and even that concern was limited owing to the existence of the Voluntary schools. The State did not admit responsibility for all elementary schools, and the School Boards were given no ^o powers over Voluntary schools except in matters relating to compliance with bye-laws affecting school attendance. Under the circumstances, it was impossible to utilise the County as an administrative unit, and no endeavour was made to correlate educational activities of different grades.

By 1902 there were three possibilities open to adoption by the Central Authority in devising a scheme of educational administration. This could have been entrusted to County and County Borough Councils, to local bodies specially elected for the purpose, or to all the local authorities already administering local government services. The Government found itself confronted with the fact that a large number of communities already had autonomy in elementary education, and it was forced to prepare a scheme to harmonise with the existing state of affairs. School Boards in some of the larger

(1) The Health of Towns Act of 1848 provided that Boards of Health should be established where one-tenth of the ratepayers demanded it in public meeting, or where the death rate exceeded 23 per 1,000 inhabitants.

towns had extended their operations beyond the strict limits of the Code, until they were sponsoring both elementary and higher education. To effect a sudden transference of their activities was hardly practicable, for they had developed a skilled administration based upon experience. Moreover, it was not possible to disregard the ties of sentiment which often linked a School Board with its area. On the other hand, the position was complicated by the existence of School Boards which were unfitted, either financially or geographically, for the successful administration of secondary and higher education. All these considerations affected the course open to the Government, and the solution adopted in 1902 was admittedly a compromise.

As explained in Chapter III, the Act of 1902 divided the country into Authorities for Elementary and Higher Education. Counties and ~~Santry~~ County Boroughs were given control over all forms of education in their areas, and non-County Boroughs with a population exceeding 20,000, and Urban Districts with a population exceeding 20,000, were given control over such elementary education as they provided. Under the Act of 1902 no area could obtain powers over elementary education by an increase in population only, but new areas have been created in various ways, namely;-

- a. By the conversion of an Urban District of a population between 10,000, and 20,000, on the 1901 Census into a Borough.
- b. By the extension of the areas of Boroughs and Urban Districts so as to comprise an enlarged area which had a population of over 10,000, or 20,000 respectively, on the 1901 Census. The population of the extended area is calculated from the 1901 Census, and if it exceeded 10,000, or 20,000, at that date, authority for elementary education is conferred. Recognition is independent of whether the population has ~~grown~~ or diminished in the interval.
- c. By the amalgamation of several local government areas in such a way as to produce a Borough or an Urban District with the prescribed 1901 population.

It should be noted, however, that if a Borough has relinquished its

powers to the County Council, under Section 20 of the 1902 Act, it cannot regain them by right. Should it eventually become a County Borough it simply starts afresh. A number of districts have taken advantage of this provision to surrender their rights (1) and the following Table shows the areas concerned.

<u>Authority.</u>	<u>Powers relinquished to County Council.</u>	<u>Date.</u>	<u>Population at the preceding Census.</u>
Bangor Borough.	All purposes of the Act of 1902.	5.12.1903.	11,269
Berwick-on-Tweed Borough.	Elementary education and education of defective and epileptic children.	31. 1.1921.	13,075
Eston Borough.	Elementary education.	1. 7.1915.	12,026
Grantham Borough.	Elementary education.	1. 4.1920.	20,070
Ryde Borough.	Elementary education and education of defective and epileptic children.	1. 4.1921.	10,608
St.Alban Borough.	Elementary education.	30.9.1903.	16,019
Stafford Borough.	Elementary education.	18.9.1903.	20,895
Stourbridge Borough.	Elementary education and education of defective and epileptic children.	1. 11.1915.	17,312
Thornaby-on-Tees Borough.	Elementary education.	1. 9.1903.	16,054
Truro Borough.	All purposes of the Act of 1902.	30. 9. 1903.	11,562
Warwick Borough.	All purposes of the Act of 1902.	1. 7. 1903.	11,889
Watford. U.D.	Elementary education.	30. 9. 1903.	29,327
Wenlock Borough.	Elementary education.	31.12. 1912.	15,749

The right of a County, County Borough, Municipal Borough or Urban District to control and manage the education provided in its area depends on the 1901 population, and the question was examined by the Royal Commission on Local Government of 1923-28. Sir L.A. Selby Bigge quoted in evidence from a Memorandum on Policy (2) furnished by the Board of Education, as follows.

(1) Report of the Royal Commission on Local Government. Minutes of Evidence, 1923. Part 11., pp.411 ff.

(2) Ibid.

"The Census of 1901 is of course now out of date, and it must become increasingly out of date as time passes. If the lists were now revised according to the Census of 1921, only one Borough would be removed from the list, but a considerable number of Boroughs and Urban Districts would be added to it... It is clear that at some date, perhaps distant, the adoption of the Census of 1901 will produce so many anomalies, that a revision will be necessary.....It would be extremely inconvenient if every ten years there was an automatic revision of Authorities according to the results of the new Census, and it may ~~be doubted~~ perhaps be doubted whether population is the only factor to be taken into account in determining whether an Authority should have powers for elementary education.

As Sir L.A.Selby-Bigge pointed out, mere population should be only one point in deciding questions relating to the powers of areas, but in actual fact it is the only factor taken into account. The Central Authority in deciding the powers and duties to be accorded to a new area works entirely on a population basis, and on a population basis now out of date. It is indeed productive of anomalies, as the following analysis shows.

At the present time there are 321 possible education authorities distributed as 63 County Councils, 82 County Borough Councils, 129 Borough Councils, and 47 Urban Districts. Of these Authorities 318 exercise all or some of their powers, and owe their educational status to the 1901 Census. According to the 1921 Census ⁽¹⁾ the population of the country was divided as shown below.

	Over 500,000	250,000 500,000	100,000 250,000	50,000 100,000	20,000 50,000	10,000 20,000	below 10,000
Counties.	21	14	13	10	3	1	-
County Boroughs.	4	8	28	38	4	-	-
Boroughs.	-	-	-	11	82	53	106
Urban Districts.	-	-	5	6	74	177	504
R ural Districts.	-	-	-	5	88	233	326

If the population limits of the Act of 1902 be retained, but the Census of 1921 be substituted for that of 1901, there would be the following possible Local Education Authorities-63 County Councils, ⁽²⁾ 82 County Borough Councils, 146 Borough Councils, and

(1) Report of the Royal Commission on Local Government. Part I.p.27.

(2) Including London.

85 Urban District Councils. But, in addition to these 3⁷~~6~~ Authorities, there are 93 Rural Districts with a population exceeding 20,000 which have no educational powers ~~whatever~~. The anomaly is brought out in a more pronounced fashion if individual Counties, County Boroughs, Boroughs, and Urban Districts are examined. An analysis of the Local Education Authorities and their assessable values given in The Report of the Royal Commission on Local Government (1) shows that the following Counties and County Boroughs possess powers for all forms of education.

<u>Authority.</u>	<u>Population.</u>	<u>Assessable Value.</u>
Rutlandshire.	18,368	£149,475
Canterbury.	23,738	£133,858
Chester.	40,794	£238,536
Soke of Peterborough.	46,954	£234,034
Burton-on-Trent.	48,927	£301,824

Yet there are twenty non-County Boroughs and Urban Districts which include such places as Gillingham in Kent, and Willesden in Middlesex, with populations of 54,038 and 165,669, and assessable values of £194,322 and £970,623, ~~respectively~~, which have statutory rights for elementary education only. Thus as regards population a number of areas for elementary education are considerably larger than some County Boroughs, and even larger than some Counties, all of which enjoy full autonomy. (2)

The objection advanced by Sir L.A.Selby-Bigge in the Memorandum quoted earlier in this Section, that it would be inconvenient to have a periodical revision of Authorities based on the returns of the latest Census, loses some of its force when it is remembered that the Board of Education does adjust its administration when new authorities are created or old areas extended.

(1) Report . Minutes of Evidence. Part 1. p. 204.

(2) Ibid.

If the number of areas for elementary education were increased, administrative difficulties would probably present themselves, but the education service must be adapted to meet changes in local conditions. Such areas would be for the most part small and scattered, and it ^{is} ~~is~~ problematical whether their admission to the number of autonomous authorities would be advantageous, as small authorities are generally unsuitable for the heavy burdens of modern requirements. One indication of this has been the general tendency shown by small authorities to look towards the County Councils for assistance in meeting the demands of the Public Health Service. ⁽¹⁾ Again, small authorities may be below the unit of size best suited for good administration, or financially unable to provide properly qualified officers or the necessary institutions, except in combination with other authorities, but, on the other hand, a more active interest in local affairs is often characteristic of such areas, for there is a closer personal relationship between the people and the governing body.

A more serious objection is that the withdrawal of small areas from larger areas might react unfavourably on the ability of the latter to carry out their obligations. Where the County Education Authority is responsible for higher education the cost of all the services is much higher, and a re-arrangement might have the effect of imposing a financial burden upon the rest of the County. Thus for 1919-20 the percentage costs on higher and elementary education were as quoted below. ⁽²⁾

	<u>County.</u>	<u>County Borough.</u>	<u>Borough.</u>
Total expenditure.	£49,500,000	£69,900,000	£13,400,000
Percentage of expenditure on Higher education.	9.0	6.0	2.5
Percentage of expenditure on elementary education.	32.0	25.0	27.0

(1) Report of the Royal Commission on Local Government. Part 1. p. 1928.

Mr. I. G. Gibbon, on behalf of the Ministry of Health.

(2) Ibid., p. 38.

The problem of the withdrawal of areas from larger authorities is of great importance under the present scheme of administration, owing to the creation of new County Boroughs and Municipal Boroughs, and the extension of the areas of existing authorities.

(1)

The creation of new County Boroughs is a particularly serious matter for small rural Counties such as Bedfordshire and Cambridgeshire. In Counties which contain only one, or at the most two, municipal areas of outstanding size and importance, the abstraction of such areas would leave the administrative Counties only a collection of rural and small urban communities to carry on the services with which County Councils are concerned. For example, if Cambridge~~shire~~ became a County Borough the largest centre of population in the County would be Soham with 4,662 inhabitants, whilst the population of the remaining County would be 70,332, on the 1921 Census, with an assessable value of £371,715. The result would be a dislocation of the machinery of County Government, the impossibility of framing an administrative scheme, or the uncertainty that any scheme would remain practicable for any length of time. The growth of Boroughs has already led to the elimination of many Urban Districts and Rural Districts, and the question affects educational administration particularly when the duties of County Authorities with respect to the provision of higher education are considered.

(2)

A reply to this argument was put forward by Mr. Spurley Hey on behalf of the County Boroughs, and as he dealt with education in considerable detail the relevant paragraphs from his Memorandum are quoted below.

"Under existing conditions, the administration of education in certain parts of the country, is confronted with a group of

-
- (1) In this paragraph I have freely used the evidence given before the Royal Commission on Local Government, Minutes of Evidence, Part III, by Mr. Dent on behalf of the County Councils Association.
 (2) Ibid. Minutes of Evidence, Part VII. Mr. Spurley Hey.

contiguous populations, which together constitute a homogeneous community, but within which the local administration of education devolves upon several separate authorities. The different authorities, some with full powers, others with partial powers, operate within the homogeneous area independently of one another.

A good example of the state of affairs referred to by Mr. Spurley Hey is found in the case of Birmingham. If the City boundaries has not been extended the educational scheme in the "town" of Birmingham would have been as follows. (1)

- a. Birmingham City Council would have prepared a scheme for the Old City area in respect of elementary and higher education.
- b. Aston Borough Council would have prepared a scheme for Aston in respect of elementary education.
- c. Warwickshire County Council would have prepared a scheme for Erdington in respect of elementary education and higher education, and also a scheme for Aston in respect of higher education.
- d. Handsworth Urban District Council would have prepared a scheme for Handsworth in respect of elementary education.
- e. Staffordshire County Council would have prepared a scheme for ~~Kings Norton~~ Handsworth in respect of higher education.
- f. The Kings Norton Urban District Council would have prepared a scheme for Kings Norton for elementary education.
- g. The Worcestershire County Council would have prepared a scheme for Kings Norton in respect of higher education.

The result would have been eight areas concerned in the administration of education in one community.

The Memorandum submitted by Mr. Spurley Hey continued:

"The unifying process arising from the elimination of multiple authorities, which invariable proceeds in a particular case from the modification of Local Government Areas, is a distinct gain to education, and it would be unfortunate for education if obstacles were placed in the way of the natural extension of the boundaries of County Boroughs. The effect would be to retard the building up of the comprehensive and co-ordinated system which Parliament in successive enactments contemplated.It is well known that the education service of a large County Borough is used by a wider constituency than that of its own area....But if the growth be restricted and extension discouraged, there could be little expectation of material educational development in the towns, particularly in the provision of central higher institutions which are essentially confined to

(1) Report of the Royal Commission on Local Government.
Minutes of Evidence, Part IV., Sir D. Brooks.

~~255~~ the large centres of population and which almost alone provide for the advanced student.

"County pupils other than secondary pupils are also accommodated to a considerable extent in County Borough Schools. Recent information has been obtained from 73 out of the 82 County Boroughs in England and Wales, and in the case of 60 the number of County pupils in these schools is appreciable enough to warrant the regulation of the matter by means of agreement or working agreement with the Counties concerned.

"These are the figures for the various types of pupil.

Number of County Boroughs with agreements or working agreements.	60 out of 73.
Number of County Boroughs with agreements or working agreements relating to:	
Elementary School Pupils.	43
Secondary School Pupils.	42
Higher Education Students.	31
Number of County Boroughs with no working agreements.	13
With arrangements for one class of pupil.	22
With arrangements for two classes of pupils.	20
With arrangements for three classes of pupils.	<u>18</u> <u>73</u>

The number of County ~~Boroughs~~ Authorities concerned in these arrangements is 29, including the County of London."

The evidence submitted to the Royal Commission on Local Government showed quite clearly that the County Authorities were apprehensive about their future, and that the lines of demarcation between the different authorities are being obliterated by mutual agreement. Such a condition of affairs must sooner or later break down through sheer force of administrative confusion. The solution of the problem would appear to lie not in extending the present dual system, but in the creation of new Education Authorities having complete control over all forms of education in their areas.

At the present time there are no less than 173 areas in which two authorities, the County and the Borough or Urban District Council are operating the education service as provided for in the 1902 Act. The problem has been spasmodically attacked from Mr. Birrell's suggestion in 1906, in which it was proposed that autonomy for all forms of education should be given to Boroughs and Urban Districts with a population exceeding 50,000, to

Mr. Fisher's proposal of 1917 that the Board of Education should have power to deprive Part III Authorities of the autonomy and merge them into the areas of the County Councils. Instead, however, the Act of 1918 contained only an exhortation to both Authorities to work together.

From information furnished by the Directors of Education of the Counties exemplified, three ways of approaching the question of Part II Authorities exercising their powers within the areas of Part III Authorities emerge.

a. Arrangements as in Middlesex.

The area of the administrative county is divided into ten divisions. A Divisional Organiser is appointed for each Division, and he is responsible, as far as possible, for both higher and primary education. For the portion of the County in which the County Education Committee is responsible for elementary education there are four additional officers, known as Divisional Clerks, who deal with the work of the primary schools and evening classes. In the case of Urban and Rural Districts in which the County Authority is responsible for all forms of education, and which cannot be brought in touch with a Joint Committee for Higher Education, the Divisional Organiser is the responsible officer. A Division may be larger than an area autonomous for elementary education, and in a Division there may be more than one Joint Committee for Higher Education. Thus Middlesex contains 13 Part III Authorities - Acton, Isleworth-Heston, Chiswick, Ealing, Edmonton, Enfield, Finchley, Hendon, Hornsey, Tottenham, Twickenham, Willesden and Wood-Green - and Division F of the County includes Acton, Chiswick and Ealing.

In each of the areas autonomous for elementary education, a Joint Committee for Higher Education has been formed, two-thirds

of the members being appointed by the Part III Authority and one-third by the County Part II Authority. The following powers and duties are delegated to the Committees.

- a. The management of County Secondary Schools within the lines of the model scheme in force for the time being.
- b. The management of Day Continuation Schools.
- c. The management of Polytechnics, Technical Schools, etc.
- d. The appointment of Teachers with salaries in accordance with the scale adopted from time to time by the County Education Committee.
- e. The preparation and submission of schemes of work, and an annual estimate of expenditure, for approval by the County Education Committee.

The County Education Committee retains the right :

- a. To erect any necessary buildings after consultation with the Joint Committees.
- b. To approve all schemes and estimates of Joint Committees.
- c. To settle scales of salaries for all Teachers employed in higher education.
- e. To deal with all matters affecting the whole County, but which are not peculiar to any one district.

The Secretary of the County Education Committee or his deputy, together with the Chief Education Officer of the Part III Authority, have the right to attend all meetings of Joint Higher Education Committees, and to receive all agendas and reports. The County Organising Officer in the Division in which the Joint Higher Education Committee carry out their duties, acts as secretary to the Committee and performs all matters of administration in the area. At the request of the Joint Higher Education Committee, however, the Chief Education Officer of the Part III Authority may take part in the administration in cases which the County Education Committee think suitable and provided that the Part III Authority concerned signifies its approval. In such cases the scheme of administration must receive the consent of the County Education Authority.

Payment~~k~~ is made by the County Education Committee to the Part III Authority for such work as may be performed by the members ~~of~~ the staff of the Part III Authority, on such terms as may be agreed upon between the County Education Authority, the Local Higher Education Committee, and the Part III Authority. The general expenditure of the County Council on higher education is financed by means of a rate levied over the whole of the County area which includes the autonomous Part III areas.

b. Arrangements made as in Lancashire.

Two types of Local Higher Education Committeess have been established in the County. One type~~s~~ operates in Part III areas, and the other type~~s~~ in the Urban and Rural Districts which are not Part III areas. In the case of the Part III Authorities the Secretary or Director of Education is also the County Local Officer for higher education, and in Urban and Rural areas the office of Clerk to the Local Higher Education Committee is held by an official appointed by that body. This arrangement has undoubtedly been an important factor in securing the high degree of co-operation which exists in Lancashire between the County Authority and the Part III Authorities.

The Local Higher Education Committees of the first category, that is, those which function in Part III areas, are constituted in 19 Boroughs and 6 Urban Districts. There are also 66 Higher Education Committees of the second type, that is, those which function in Urban and Rural Districts which are not Part III Authorities. The constitution of the Local Higher Education Committees is as follows:-

In non-County Boroughs and Urban Districts autonomous for elementary education -

"..the Local Committee for Higher Education purposes shall be a Sub-Committee of the Local Education Authority, and shall consist of such number of persons as the Borough or Urban District Council shall determine. Two the members may be women."

In districts which are not autonomous for elementary education -

"..the Local Committee for Higher Education purposes shall be a Sub-Committee of the Urban District Council, consisting of such members as the said Council may determine. In constituting the Sub-Committee, the District Council shall be empowered to co-opt members from persons outside the Council interested in Education; two representatives of the ~~the~~ Local Elementary Education Sub-Committee must be included. Two of the members may be women."

The duties of such Local Higher Education Committees are :-

- a. To draw up and submit an Annual Scheme and Estimate for the approval of the County Education Committee.
- b. Within the limits of the Scheme and Estimate and of any regulations framed by the County Education Committee:-
 - i. To appoint and dismiss teachers.
 - ii. To provide and maintain suitable accommodation and to arrange that the premises provided shall be properly heated, lighted, and cleaned.
 - iii. To make, from funds at their disposal, all payments for Teachers' Salaries, and all other purposes connected with schools or classes.

In Part III areas, the Local Higher Education Committees act either directly as the Governors of the provided Secondary and Technical Schools, or they appoint Sub-Committees from amongst their own members for the same purpose. In Urban and Rural Districts the personnel of the Governors of the Secondary Schools and of the Local Higher Education Committees are very similar.

The Lancashire County Council has also attached great importance to co-operation with other Authorities for Part II and Part III of the Education Act of 1902 in the County Palatine. An Association has been formed on which all Authorities in the County, with the exception of Manchester and Liverpool, are represented. The Association has appointed an Executive Committee, constituted as follows:-

- One representative of each County Borough.
- Four representatives of the Lancashire County Council.
- Five representatives of the non-County Boroughs.
- Three representatives of the Autonomous Urban Districts.

c. Arrangements as in Kent.

The administrative County includes 17 Authorities which are autonomous for elementary education, and two of these, the Borough of Maidstone and the City of Canterbury, have decided to co-operate actively with the County Education Committee for the development of all forms of education. After the Education Act of 1918 the County Education Authority devised a system of District Boards of Education for the better co-ordination of education by means of co-operation between the County and the autonomous Part III Authorities, but a considerable number of the Authorities for Elementary Education declined to participate in the scheme. As a result the County Education Committee was obliged to re-model the proposed Boards and constitute them as District Education Committees, revising the scope of their duties with regard to elementary education, but leaving them, as in the original proposal, responsible for the local supervision of all forms of higher education.

Each District Education Committee consists of not less than thirteen and not more than twenty-one members appointed by the Kent Education Committee, and ~~is~~ is constituted as follows:-

- a. Eight, or more, members appointed directly by the Kent Education Committee.
- b. Four, or more, members appointed by the Kent Education Committee on the nomination of the Borough Council or Urban District Council which is a Local Authority for Elementary Education.
- c. The Mayor of such Borough, or the Chairman of such Urban District Council, or the Chairman of the Elementary Education Committee, as may be determined by the Local Authority for Elementary Education, is appointed a member of the District Education Committee during his period of office.
- d. The members appointed include at least one member of the Kent Education Committee, and not less than two women.
- e. A member ceases to hold office when he leaves the District administered by the Committee, but this provision does not apply to the representatives of the Kent Education Committee.

Each District Education Committee is constituted as a Local Sub-Committee of the County Authority, and each District Committee

may elect a District Sub-Committee should such procedure be considered desirable.

The County Education Committee reserve the right to dissolve any District Committee, to extend or curtail its powers, or to adopt a special constitution for the District Committee of any District. The powers of District Committees with regard to elementary education do not apply in the case of any Borough or Urban District which is autonomous for that purpose.

Each District Committee appoints its own Secretary without reference to the County Education Committee, but the Secretary is regarded as the Local Officer of the Kent Education Committee, and is responsible to them through the Director of Education. All other appointments to the local administrative staff are made by the County Authority, and they are responsible for the salaries of all local officials including the District Secretary.

The duties of District Education Committees are:-

- a. To act as the Governing Body of every schools and institution for Higher Education in the District maintained by the Education Committee, for which a separate body of Managers has been constituted.
- b. To advise as to the co-ordination of, and to supervise generally, the working of secondary schools, technical institutes, schools of art and art classes, and other schools or classes for Higher Education in the District.
- c. Except in the case of autonomous Part III Authorities, to consider and advise on general matters affecting Elementary Education.
- d. To act as a Sub-Committee for the purpose of awarding Special Exhibitions to be held at secondary schools, travelling and maintenance allowances to holders of scholarships, and exhibitions, and scholarships and allowances to students at classes for further education.
- e. To appoint a Juvenile Welfare Sub-Committee to administer the scheme for the exercise of powers under Section 107, Education Act, 1921, and under Section 6(1) Unemployment Insurance Act, 1923.

Any other powers are reserved to the County Education Authority, unless authority is given to the contrary all actions of the District Committees require confirmation by the County Education Committee.

The Characteristic procedures adopted by the County Education Authorities mentioned may be summarised as follows:-

- a. County Education Authorities delegate certain powers to a Local Higher Education Committee composed of representatives of the Part III Authority and of the Part II Authority. The Local Committee reports its proceedings to the Higher Education Sub-Committee of the County. The cost of administration is borne partially by the County Education Authority.
- b. The County Education Authority arranges with the Part III Authorities to delegate powers concerning Higher Education to Joint Higher Education Committees which report to the Local Education Committees and act as Sub-Committees of those Committees. The Part III Authority then administers on behalf of the Part II Authority.
- c. Certain powers are delegated to District Education Committees which function as County Sub-Committees. Each Local Committee is placed in charge of a District and administers all forms of education (except where a Part III Authority is included), the County Education Committee being responsible for general policy and finance.

If these schemes be examined dispassionately they can only be described as makeshifts, and the situation becomes more complex as schemes of re-organisation based on the Hadow Report are put into operation.

Before leaving the subject of devolution of powers and duties by County Authorities, a procedure adopted by the Lancashire Education Committee is worth noticing, even though it does not fall within the province of elementary education. (1) Recently the County Education Committee started a series of local surveys, and in one of these surveys Preston was taken as the centre. Preston and Blackpool, two county boroughs situated in the survey area, were invited to co-operate through the medium of a Joint Committee. The invitation was accepted and the whole of the district was explored, not from the point of view of the Education Authorities, but from the point of view of the student living in any part of the area. Local Government Areas were ignored, and with the aid of teachers and Board of Education Inspectors the Joint Committee succeeded in

(1) In this account I have freely used the address given by Mr. P.E. Mendon, M.A., Director of Education for Lancashire, given at the Annual Meeting of the Union of Lancashire and Cheshire Institutes, October, 2nd., 1931.

linking up the area.

"We say, "Here is a natural catchment area. The centre of it is this County Borough. That is the centre for the advanced work. All work should be concentrated and lead up to that. Now, what do you want in the fringe areas? There are certain stages you do not want. You do not want all your students to have expensive travelling commitments in going to their junior schools. Very well, work by a system of branches and a centre, but let these branch institutions know what is going on in the technical college."

A combined syllabus or prospectus for the whole area was issued, and the institutions co-ordinated with equal access to all students irrespective of place of residence.

Similarly, through the vision of their respective Directors of Education, Mr. P. E. Meadon and the late Mr. Spurley Hey, Lancashire made arrangements with Manchester for the admission of County students to the Manchester College of Technology on exactly the same terms as students residing in Manchester.

An arrangement of a like nature exists between Blackpool and Lytham St. Annes. Blackpool specialises in advanced work in some subjects, Lytham St. Annes in others, and students go wherever the classes they wish to attend are held. The result has been a saving in cost, better teaching, bigger classes, and a general sense of stimulation.

As the Kent Education Committee point out in their official handbook ⁽¹⁾, all reciprocal arrangements depend on the goodwill of the authorities concerned, and even when that spirit is manifest friction some-times arises. A case in point concerns the position between the Borough of Hove, a Part III Authority, and the County Council of East Sussex, the superimposed Part II Authority. ⁽²⁾ Hove cannot of itself build a secondary school, and some years ago, in 1919, the Borough petitioned the County Council for a secondary

(1) "Education in Kent.", 1923-1928.

(2) The dispute has persisted beyond the limits of this Thesis, but as it commenced well before 1930 and is an excellent example of the point under discussion, I have not hesitated to refer to the matter.

school for boys and girls. The County Council replied that other towns in the area had a greater need than Hove, and that until provision was made in these areas it was not possible to accede to the petition. Since 1919 the County Council has managed to provide secondary schools for some six districts, and recently it agreed to build a school in Hove and purchased a site for the purpose. ^hNot~~ing~~ more was heard of the offer of the County Council, and when Hove protested that it was entitled to some consideration as it provided the East Sussex County Council with approximately 31 per cent of its rateable value the County Council replied ~~that~~ the time was not appropriate to raise the question of considerable capital expenditure, and that it had adopted the resolution of the County Finance Committee to defer consideration of all such proposals for twelve months. Hove still protested, and on what appear to be legitimate and fair grounds.

At present Hove parents have the following options:-

- a. The Brighton, Hove, and Sussex Grammar Schools for Boys, a private school charging a fee of £31.10.0 per annum. This school is jointly aided by the Education Authorities for Brighton, Hove, and East Sussex, the annual rate contribution from Hove approximating to £1,000
- b. The Brighton and Hove High School for Girls, a private school charging a fee of £31.10.0 per annum.
- c. The County Borough of Brighton Secondary Schools at which an "extra-district" fee of about £28 is charged to Hove residents. In approved cases the East Sussex County Council pays the difference between that fee and the fee of £12 charged to Brighton ratepayers.
- d. East Sussex County Secondary Schools situated at Lewes and Haywards Heath. The nearest of these schools, that at Lewes, is about ten miles from Hove.

Expressing these facilities in terms of finance for the year 1929-30, the amount of money spent by the County on the provision of higher education for Hove pupils reached a total of £6,972. In the same year, the County Higher Education rate produced £10,053 from Hove, which represented a gross expenditure of £20,106, allowing

for grant at the rate of 50 per cent on the formula for Higher Education. Yet, in addition to this, Hove contributes to the support of the private Grammar School by raising a special rate for the purpose, and in this way pays twice for the same service, for the County Higher Education rate also includes the County share of the expenses of the Grammar School. (1)

This unsatisfactory arrangement has persisted for some years, but the Brighton Education Committee has notified Hove that it will be unable to admit any but Brighton boys after 1932, whilst the school at Lewes can no longer admit boys from Hove. The feeling in Hove over the matter has been one of deep resentment, and the attitude of the townspeople is described in the local newspaper, "The Brighton and Hove Herald", of 8th August, 1931.

"The Herald was not represented at this meeting, but accepts from a Hove representative the statement that Hove's chagrin was increased by the contemptuous air with which the County Council rejected all consideration of the matter. The Council would not wait to hear the arguments of Alderman Gushman, the best equipped of the Hove representatives by reason of his forensic training, to put Hove's case, but applied the closure as he rose to speak. So Hove feels that the County Council absorbed in its farms and its prize cattle, has failed to appreciate what secondary education means in a town of culture and influence like Hove. Some effort is being made, therefore, to revive the question. The moral, of course, is that it is intolerable that the education of great town like Hove should depend upon the outlook of the essentially rural representatives of East Sussex."

After making all allowances for partisanship, it seems that Hove has just cause for complaint, and a scheme of administration which allows such incidents to arise cannot be suitable to the ever changing and progressive character of modern education.

There also seems to be confusion over the actual interpretation of the Acts of 1918 and 1921. Two instances will suffice. In the matter of exercising powers under Section 107 of the Act of 1921

dealing with choice of employment, the Authority for Elementary

(1) I am indebted to the Secretary for Education to the Hove Education Committee for confirmation of the account given in the text of the position between Hove and the East Sussex County Education Committee.

Education which proposes to exercise these powers may find itself unable to do so ~~owing~~ to the attitude of the County Authorities. It is within the power of the County to refuse to exercise its powers and also to delegate them to the Elementary Authority which may desire to have them. Again, Section 3(b) of the Act of 1921 states that the Councils ~~and~~ of Boroughs and Urban Districts, though not Authorities for Higher Education, shall have the powers as respects Higher Education given under the Act. The powers are those mentioned in Section 70 (2) under which Part III Authorities may spend such sums as they think fit, for the purpose of supplying or aiding the supply of Higher Education, providing the rate of ld. in the pound is not exceeded. The Board of Education in reply to resolutions passed by the Association of Education Committees stated that a Part III Authority expending money in such directions was not acting as an Authority for Higher Education, and therefore such expenditure did not rank for grant. The result of this decision is that a Part III Authority desirous of providing extra scholarships, classes, etc., must find the money exclusively from the rates, whilst a Part II Authority providing identical facilities is re-imbursed to the extent of one-half of the net expenditure.

The Hadow Report contemplates the development of "Modern" schools giving a full-time post-primary education. At present schools of this type fall under the administration of elementary education, but as, and if, they develop, these will be distinctly secondary in character though not with the "academic" bias of the existing secondary schools. In areas which are autonomous for elementary education there is the possibility of overlapping by the erection of schools in the area of a Part III Authority close to the border of the area of a Part II Authority. Two schools might be built where one would suffice if the authorities concerned

entered into working agreements. In this way competition might arise between Part II and Part III Authorities. If the proposed schools were transferred to higher education, as was hinted at (1) by Lord Eustace Percy in an address at Rotherham, it would certainly diminish the powers and duties of Authorities for Elementary Education, and controversial decisions would doubtless be made. An acute problem arising out of a transfer of this nature would be connected with the remuneration of teaching staffs. According to present arrangements, a Part III Authority is only able to administer the Burnham Scales for Elementary Teachers, whilst a Part II Authority administers the Burnham Scales for Elementary and Higher Education. If schools catering for children over 11 years of age were considered as institutions for higher education, the staffs would doubtless be paid on the Burnham Scale for Secondary Teachers, whilst their colleagues remaining in the primary schools would remain on the lower Elementary Scale. The present distinction between the Burnham Scales is based on the grade of work performed by the different institutions. If the transfer of all schools containing children over 11 years of age to higher education were effected, the distinction would be one of chronological age only, and a feeling of discontent amongst the teachers in the primary schools would inevitably arise.

If the developments foreshadowed in the Report are put completely into practice, the educational system will be divided into two clear cut sections, primary and higher, at the age of 11 plus. It may be suggested that this division is incomplete, and that a threefold division into primary, intermediate and advanced education would be more adaptable for future expansion of the service. The breaks might be arranged at the age of 11 plus between primary and

(1) Bolton King: "Schools of To-Day." p. 44

intermediate, and at sixteen between intermediate and advanced. Primary and intermediate education differ considerably from what has been called advanced education, as they are comparatively localised in the area from which scholars are drawn. On the other hand, centres of instruction like schools of technology cannot be identified with any particular locality. Students are drawn to them by the fact that the education given meets individual needs, and administration must be carried on with this factor emphasised. It seems, therefore, somewhat illogical that such institutions should be classified with secondary and "modern" schools.

The ready acceptance which has met re-organisation proposals must not be allowed to obscure the fact that the work of true re-organisation will be only half accomplished unless there is a connexion between primary, intermediate and advanced education. They cannot be efficiently dealt with in isolated sections. This proposal strengthens the case for an overhaul of the dual system of educational administration.

It has been suggested that areas for local administration of education should be revised in accordance with modern needs. The suggestion is really part of a much bigger question concerning the suitability of present administrative areas for local government in general. The Royal Commission on Local Government, to which reference has been made earlier in this Section, examined the whole question of local government, and as a result of its recommendations the boundaries of local government areas are undergoing modifications. These re-arrangements affect education as far as Counties and County Boroughs are concerned, though they are more in the nature of an adjustment of boundaries than of radical alterations. With regard to Boroughs and Urban Districts the status quo has been preserved through the operation of the Education (Local Authorities)

Act of March, 1931, which provided that new Local Education Authorities should not be established by reason^{only} of the creation of new boroughs or other urban districts, or by the extension of the boundaries of existing boroughs or urban districts. The Act does not apply in the event of the council of a borough or of an urban district already being a Local Education Authority. Thus, if two or more urban districts united, and if the council of any one of these districts was a Local Education Authority before the union, the council of the urban district formed by the union would be ~~the~~ Local Education Authority for the new urban district.

A second suggestion for the reform of local administration of education has been put forward based on the replacement of existing Local Authorities by something in the nature of a Regional Scheme. A proposal of this kind was made by the Bryce Commission on Secondary Education of 1895, and the principle has been advocated on many occasions since then. All the schemes have a common basis on which the country would be divided into a number of Regions or Provinces, and in each of these Regions a Board of Education would be elected with comprehensive powers of control and management over all forms of education.

There is something attractive about the idea of a Regional scheme, and many cogent arguments have been advanced in favour of the proposal. If education is to be regarded as an organic whole from the primary school upwards, some method must be devised for securing that every grade of education is brought within the reach of all children capable of profiting by it without any consideration of their financial circumstances or place of residence. For some of them, though not for all, this implies a continuity of administration from the elementary schools to institutions of university rank, and if the Local Education Authorities are to remain responsible only for sections of the ladder, as the present

organisation into Part II and Part III Authorities specifies, they may fail to secure this necessary continuity. A plea for such continuity is the subject of a chapter in Maxwell Garnet's, (1) "Education and World Citizenship", in which he advocates a Regional scheme of administration. Maxwell Garnet suggests that the Provinces or Regions should be planned so that each would contain at least one university in its area, and also that the function of the Provincial Authorities should be to correlate all forms of education from the university downwards. It is true that some Authorities fail at the present time to provide adequate means whereby scholars may be transferred from elementary or primary education to post-primary education. In reply to a questionnaire recently sent out by the writer to representative Local Education Authorities, the following are extracts from two communications received.

"As regards Central Schools, this being a rural area, no such schools have been established, but by arrangements with the County Borough Education Authorities, whose boundaries adjoin thearea, County children attend Central and Senior Schools established by such Authorities."

"In answer to your letter....I am to state that the reorganisation of Schools is suspended in view of the present need for economy in public expenditure. Only two or three Schools have, so far, been reorganised...."

(2)
An article in the "Universities Review" of October, 1929, advanced other arguments in favour of "Regionalism". In this instance the fact that the Inspectorate of the Board of Education is regionalised was emphasised, but the writer laid most stress on the point that the need for a regional administration of education had been made evident in connection with the expansion of industry.

"Industry does not wait upon ancient boundaries, and if technical education is to be properly developed, it must grow in close contact with industrial conditions, often much wider in extent than the areas administered by the local authorities."

The writer of the article then quotes the Board of Education pamphlet,

(1) Pp. 453 ff.

(2) S.H. Watkins. "Regionalism in Education."

"Education in Industry and Commerce", to confirm his contention:

"It is clear that the local education authorities are often working under a distinct handicap, owing to the fact that while most important industries of the country have become highly organised on a national or regional basis, the administration of technical education has remained local."

In further support of the practicability of Regionalism, Mr. Watkins drew attention to the development of adult education.

"Most local authorities have given generous aid to the classes, but the organisation has not been dependent upon the education authority, rather has it covered the area normally served by the university or university college. England and Wales have been divided conveniently into districts, each centring round a university. Thus the unit of administration is the university area and not that of the local authority."

Mr. Watkins again sought confirmation of his position by reference to an official report. He quoted from the "Report on Adult Education ~~in~~ in Lancashire and Cheshire" of 1928.

"...it is now possible to record the growth of a new branch of public education adapting itself to the needs and aspirations of the people and developing rather definitely on regional lines."

Neither Maxwell Garnet nor S.H. Watkins do more than advocate a Regional scheme, but in the "Forum of Education" of June, 1924, Professor John Strong put forward concrete proposals. He suggested that Provincial Education Authorities should be instituted intermediate between the Local Authorities and the Central Authority, and that Non-County Boroughs and Urban Districts should be merged, for the purpose of educational administration, into the County Education Authorities.

"With respect to the provincial education authorities the proposal is put forward that the constitution of these authorities should be based on a pro-rata representation drawn from the local education authorities. Each provincial education ~~authority~~ authority would then appoint a provincial education committee, which would consist of a majority of members of the parent authority and a minority of members co-opted from persons interested in education. This minority would be drawn from the Universities, Technical Colleges, and other educational institutions in the province...In addition, an assessor appointed by the Board of Education would be a member of the committee and would act as liason officer between the province and the Central Authority.....

The function of the provincial education authority would have to be carefully defined, and would naturally include such matters

as the consideration simply with a view to co-ordination, of schemes of development proposed by local education authorities. the representatives of the local education authorities, acting as a provincial authority, would be able to adjust these according to provincial requirements, which they would well know."

The suggestion for Regional Boards of the types described above has its own particular difficulties. The commonest objection emanates from the power of local tradition. Local Education Authorities like to preserve their autonomy and to perform their duties free from dictation of outside influences. There is no doubt that the present organisation into Part II and Part III Authorities is productive of serious anomalies. The wider outlook of the Regional Boards would be better for the organisation of education than the more local one affords, yet the proposed administrative change brings many complicated questions in its wake. The exact function of the Regional Boards requires careful consideration. Advocates of the scheme hold divergent views, for, as we have seen in the extracts quoted above, some suggest that they should exist primarily for the correlation of educational activities, leaving the existing Local Authorities to continue with the administration and so preserving their autonomy, whilst others propose a re-arrangement of the present Local Education Authorities. At first sight the proposal to retain the Local Education Authorities may seem quite satisfactory and likely to lead to minimum interference with educational administration, but the simplicity of the suggestion disappears on examination of its implications. Education is no longer believed to be synonymous with instruction, and the rate nominally levied to cover the provision of educational facilities covers many other services such as the provision of meals, medical inspection and treatment, and vocational guidance. The activities of a Local Education Authority cannot be separated from the other duties of its Council. They overlap with those of Public Assistance Committees,

with the Ministry of Labour in the provision of Labour Bureau and Juvenile Employment Committees, and with the Home Office in the maintenance of Industrial Schools. Before Regional Boards could correlate educational activities, the question of the meaning and content of "educational activities" would have to be threshed out. Would it include all the social services of the modern Local Education Authority?. If so, how would a single Regional Board maintain contact with the Education Committees situated in the Region, and what would be its relationship to the various County, County Borough, Borough and Urban District Councils which are the titular Local Education Authorities?

As we have seen, County Education Authorities, which are much smaller and more compact than the proposed Regions or Provinces, have found it expedient to devolve some of their powers and duties to local committees in order to obtain that local interest ~~which~~ which many people consider ~~is~~ necessary for good and efficient local administration. Presumably Regional Boards would not be unmindful of past experience and would therefore delegate routine and supervisory duties almost entirely to the contributory Local Education Authorities. The question arises as to the manner in which this assignment of functions would be best made, and whatever arrangements were ultimately decided upon an artificial division of the education service would result. It is true that the Regional Boards would be in a position to require Part II and Part III Authorities to co-operate in order to remove disabilities attached to the provision of educational facilities, but in this connexion the net result would be an exchange of one type of division for another. Regional schemes of this kind would fail to remove the very thing which the supporters of Regionalism condemn as the unsatisfactory feature of the present administrative system.

Regional Boards would cause further complications on the financial side with regard to the raising of rates. Two procedures are possible. Either there would be one education rate levied over the whole of the Region, or each autonomous Authority would be allowed to raise its own rate as at present. In the first place it must be emphasised that a Local Education Authority cannot raise a rate, but can only present an estimate to the Council. The Council is able to reject the estimate or to demand a reduction in the rate suggested by the Education Committee. In the case of a Regional rate would the Regional Board be able to levy a precept upon the local Councils which they would be bound to honour, or would the Councils be able to approve, modify, or ~~reject~~ the proposed rate as at present? If Regional Boards were empowered to demand a rate, then Education would be removed from the province of existing local government authorities, and the general position would resemble that under the old School Boards except that the areas involved would be much larger. The important question of finance brings in the constituent Councils, and it is doubtful whether such bodies would willingly consent to raise money for the benefit of a Region in which, generally speaking, they had but a detached interest. Under a Regional rate system progressive Authorities might lose much of their incentive to improve their educational provision. On the other hand, if each Local Authority continued to raise its own rate as under existing conditions, it is difficult to see how the Regional scheme could fulfil one of its main objects which is the abolition of the necessitous area. Furthermore, even if Local Education Authorities agreed to raise a Regional rate, some Regions would still be necessitous when compared with others, and to obviate this difficulty Government aid would have to vary from one Region to another. In consequence each Region would probably be paid on a ~~separate~~ separate grant formula, and endless discussion,

if not dissension, might arise.

The alternatives to retaining the existing Local Education Authorities under a Regional Board would be either to place the Regional Board in complete control of the education service, or to create new Local Education Authorities. The establishment of centralised Regional Boards would make English administration approximate in some respects to the French. France ⁽¹⁾ is divided into seventeen territorial divisions or "Academies". These Academies contain several Departments, each of which comprises a number of Communes. In every Academie the principal educational institution is the local University, at the head of which is the Rector who is nominated by the Minister of Public Instruction. The Rector is responsible for the efficiency of all forms of education in the Academie, but he generally reserves his attention for higher education. He is assisted by a Council consisting of representatives of the University, Secondary and Normal Schools, of the Councils of the Departments, and of the Councils of the Communes. In addition to the Council of the Academie, there are Academie Inspectors who devote the greater portion of their time to Secondary education, and Primary Inspectors whose duties are confined to the Primary Schools. All these officers are appointed by the State, and are in no way dependent upon, or subordinate to, local bodies.

The Prefect of each Department is the head of the Primary School system. He is assisted by a Department Council for Education composed of four representatives of the general Department Council,

(1) N.Hans. "Principles of Educational Policy." pp. 51-54.

I.L.Kandel. "French Elementary Schools". Part I.

Publication of the Teachers College, Columbia University, New York. 1926.

an Academie Inspector, the Primary Inspectors, the Principals of the Primary Schools, four teachers elected by their colleagues, and representatives of the Private Schools. By virtue of his office the Prefect is Chairman, and the Council supervises general administration, decides on the necessity for school provision, and makes arrangements for medical inspection. It possesses no power to interfere with the instruction or with the teachers. Under the Chairmanship of the Maire, each Commune elects a School Committee upon which the Primary Inspector has a seat, and the Committee enforces school attendance and has general oversight of school buildings.

The cost of elementary education is shared by the State and the Local Councils. The State provides the salaries of ^eteachers, ~~and~~ the cost of inspection, and the maintenance of Normal Schools less the cost of repairs and equipment. It may give extra financial aid to Communes which are considered to be necessitous. The Departments pay a subvention towards the expenses of inspecting Primary Schools, provide sites and buildings for Normal Schools, and bear the cost of repairs and equipment for all State schools. The Communes provide the site and buildings for Primary Schools. The expense is met locally by levying a tax or by raising a loan, but the State may assist up to 50 per cent of the cost of Normal Schools, and up to 80 per cent in the case of Primary Schools.

Thus the French have developed centralisation on a Regional basis far beyond the dreams of the most advanced supporters of Regionalism here. A change in the educational administration fashioned wholly on the French pattern would have little likelihood of adoption in this country. The English system stands mid-way between the highly centralised French conception of educational administration and the decentralised ideal of American educational administration and responsibility. To a very appreciable extent it has been founded upon local interest secured by local rate

participation, and although we may learn from a comparative study of educational systems and experiments in other countries, we must ultimately develop our own solution in conformity with our own particular difficulties.

In formulating any scheme for the re-adjustment of educational areas it is well to remember that its eventual adoption depends upon the approval of a very considerable section of the rate-paying electorate. Educationists are agreed that there is need for a revision of the existing system, and their view is shared by parents, who, through financial limitations or inadequate means of conveyance, find it difficult to obtain suitable facilities for the further education of their children at conveniently situated centres. A scheme based on the following lines might prove acceptable as its object is to reduce the number of Local Education Authorities, to simplify organisation, and at the same time, to preserve a measure of local interest which is one of the dynamic forces in successful local administration.

Every County Borough, Borough, and Urban District which is a Local Education Authority should have a statutory right to be merged into the administrative County for the purposes of educational administration, should it so desire. This would ensure that under any re-arrangement of areas no part of the country would be overlooked. This precautionary condition would not deprive County Boroughs of their present independent status as Local Education Authorities if they desired to retain it. It is very improbable that any appreciable number of County Boroughs would surrender their powers and duties by throwing in their lot with the County Authorities, but there seems no valid reason for denying them a right which is accorded to other areas. County Boroughs take civic pride in their education services, their citizens are enthusiastic and keenly alive to their own educational achievements,

and their administrative machinery is usually efficient in personnel and organisation. Their educational provision makes a wide appeal to students residing outside the boundaries of County Boroughs, and it is from a consideration of this fact that the suggested scheme has been evolved. London has proved that County or Borough boundaries, or even the Thames itself, are not real obstacles to effective educational consolidation, and it has also demonstrated that size is not a barrier to efficiency. As a matter of fact the consolidation of populous Boroughs with somewhat indetical interests has led to a better distribution of public educational institutions of all types, to an almost ideal system of organisation, to a unity of educational interests, and to the ~~pro~~ provision of a floating staff of general and specialist teachers who are always available to meet service requirements wherever or whenever they are requisitioned.

County Boroughs should be allowed to enter into agreements with contiguous or neighbouring County Boroughs, Boroughs, or Urban Districts for the formation of composite Local Education Authorities on which due representation should be afforded to all contracting areas. The powers and duties of non-contracting Boroughs and Urban Districts should be automatically transferred to the County Education Authority, but local interest should be maintained by a delegation of duties such as those in operation at the present time. Newly created County Boroughs should have the option of exercising the functions of County Boroughs or of remaining in status quo. A decennial revision is suggested in order to ensure a fairly lengthy period of administrative continuity, to allow for the normal expansion of the service, and also to discourage the premature formulation of proposals of an experimental and disorganising nature. The scheme would effect a diminution in the number of Local Education Authorities, and, at the same time, lessen the overlapping confusion which is part and parcel of the present

system of dual administrative areas.

For some years past there has been a growing tendency throughout the country for County Boroughs to considerably extend their boundaries, and the policy has generally been looked upon with favour by the contributory districts. This fact seems to encourage the belief that gestures for the amalgamation of educational interests of adjacent Local Education Authorities would meet with approval. Education would benefit through the increased facilities and opportunities it could afford to a greater number of pupils at uniform fees, and a unification of Authorities, particularly in these days of financial stringency, would make an appeal to many who would appreciate the proposals from the view of increased efficiency, speedier administration and lower working costs. A modified form of centralisation would arouse a certain amount of opposition on the ground that, despite assurances to the contrary, it would discourage local interest, but as the question of association or non-association would be a purely voluntary matter and the decision would rest with the affected areas, the objection would carry little weight.

It is impossible to overlook the fact that a number of populous and progressive Boroughs that are geographically unsuited for amalgamation would examine the scheme very critically, but it should not be difficult for the Board of Education to compile a list of "Reserved Boroughs" with a view to conferring upon them the educational privileges of County Boroughs. They are few by comparison with the Boroughs that exist as Part III Authorities solely by virtue of the fact that they are so recognised owing to their 1901 population. Boroughs which failed to find a place in the "Reserved" list would probably oppose the suggested transfer, but a good precedent for such a course is to be found in Scotland where, after May 16th, 1930, the powers and duties of Parish and

Through School Boards were transferred to the County Councils and to the Town Councils of the four Counties of Cities, viz.,
 (1)
 Aberdeen, Dundee, Edinburgh, and Glasgow.

The existing arrangement into Part II and Part III Authorities which is characteristic of the English system of administration has grown up with the service, and bears too little relation to present day needs. For the purpose of a fully co-ordinated system of schools and administration it must ultimately come to an end. In 1927, the Executive Committee of the Association of Education
 (2)
 Committees appointed a deputation to wait upon the President of the Board of Education urging the opinion of the Executive -

"That the time has come for the Board of Education by means of a Departmental Committee or otherwise to institute an enquiry into the relationships of existing Local Education Authorities, including reference to administrative areas."

In the interests of education viewed as a social and national service the present local isolation must give place to some scheme of local administration better calculated to secure a progressive development of the education service. The Education Acts of 1918 and 1921 made an appeal to Local Education Authorities to co-operate, but some degree of amalgamation would appear to be a happier solution.

(1) Personal information given by the Scottish Education Department, London.

(2) "Education" 16th December, 1927.

(iv)

The Act of 1918 required Local Education Authorities to submit schemes to the Board of Education indicating the manner in which they proposed to exercise the powers and duties conferred upon them. The President of the Board urged upon them the desirability of providing in those schemes for different types of education suitable to the needs of children capable of profiting by them. In order to expedite progress in this new and difficult labour imposed upon the Authorities, the long and varied experience of the Inspectorate was made more available by an early reorganisation of the existing system, which had been evolved following the Act of 1902.

Inspection in English Local Government services arose out of the principle that expenditure of public money gave the State the right to approve the method of spending, and also the obligation of seeing that the best value was obtained for the money expended. It is, therefore, an instrument of State control working with a two-fold object, and both objectives are, and always have been, present in State Inspection of Education. Apart from the financial aspect, the objectives of Inspection may be stated as the discovery of the needs of schools, the evaluation of the worth of schools, and the educational guidance of schools. (1)

In the "Instructions to Inspectors" issued by Dr. Kay in 1840 the Inspectors were instructed to collect facts and information for the future guidance of the Committee of Council on Education, and to disseminate new ideas on teaching when and where such information was desired by the Managers of the schools. Emphasis in those early years was naturally placed on discovering the actual requirements of schools receiving financial aid from (1) Indian Bureau of Education. Occasional Reports.No.7.,p.3.

the Central Authority. With the publication of the Minutes of 1846 and 1847, the functions of the Inspectorate widened, and under the wise supervision of Kay-Shuttleworth came to include in its purview not only the organisation and discipline of schools, but also the methods, manner, and content of instruction. In an Education Bill introduced by Mr. W.J. Fox, in April, 1850, it was proposed that the Government Inspectors should report to the Committee of Council on the means of secular instruction existing in the parishes covered by them in the course of their duties, and that after consideration of the reports, the Committee of Council should take the necessary steps to remedy deficiencies. Thus by 1850 the constructive function of Inspection was recognised as an important factor in the provision and maintenance of effective and efficient elementary education.

The scheme of Annual Examinations introduced by the Revised Code of Robert Lowe in 1862, relegated the idea of educational stimulation to the background as one of the "impalpable essences", and it did not entirely emerge again until the abolition of the Annual Examination in 1895. The Revised Code compelled the Inspectors to act as assessors of the worth of a school, placing a very narrow interpretation on the word "worth". Ultimately under the influence of this interpretation the progress and efficiency of schools became synonymous with the number of passes in the Annual Examination. Mr. G.A. Christian, one of the first London County Council Inspectors of Schools, describes the position in these words.

(1)

" The (Education) Department's Inspectors virtually became assessory and financial agents whose function was to prepare and mark schedules, record individual passes and failures and dispatch the documents to the clerks at Whitehall who

(1) "English Education from Within." p.148.

totted up the columns and noted down the grant.

"As the variations between Inspectorial standards were considerable and pressed hard upon the schools and districts under the more severe officials, the Education Department secured some approach to uniformity by the issue of an appendix to the Code known as "Instructions to Inspectors". These "Instructions" were openly published and served as a guide to local authorities and teachers. Some...jibbed...and consequently about the middle of the "sixties" assistants were appointed to deal with the drier and more mechanical details of filling in schedules and deciding individual passes....It was expressly ~~stated~~ stipulated that they were not "assistant inspectors" but "inspectors assistants"

Speaking of his experience as a teacher under the same Code, Mr.

Christian continues with a description of one of the Inspectors.

"His attitude towards the teachers generally was ungenial, and he treated with undisguised cynicism many well meant efforts that came under his notice. The teachers, provoked to greater boldness by growing discomfort, invited him once or twice to a friendly discussion of grievances. "That", said the Inspector, "would be against the practice of the Education Department."

Speaking of Annual Examinations, Mr.G.Girling, afterwards a London County Council Inspector of Schools, when Chairman at the Annual Conference of the National Union of Elementary Teachers in 1887, said -
(1)

"We have set up an educational Juggernaut, percentage; we fall down and worship it and it crushes us...Before it was the percentage of passes in the 3 Rs.; now it is the percentage of all the percentages of every subject, and in many cases to work out the merit grant it requires as many figures as a mathematical problem."

The Act of 1870 withdrew religious instruction from the scope of Government Inspection, and denominational organisation of the Inspectorate was replaced by one based on districts in which all schools were inspected by the same officers. The spirit of the Revised Code remained, for the "Instruction to Inspectors" drew attention to the fact that the responsibility of managers and teachers for the condition of their schools was final, and that such efficiency would be tested in due course by the Annual Examination. Even as late as 1881 the attention of the Inspectors was directed to the fact that they were not to
(1) Quoted by G.A.Christian. Op.cit. p. 122.

originate or suggest schemes of work, but only to assent, modify, or reject those submitted for their approval. After 1890 there was a gradual relaxation in the routine of formal inspection. Curricula became more liberal and elastic, and after 1895 Inspectors were advised ~~that~~ their reports should neither contain personal comments on individual teachers nor special mention of school]-work, unless exceptional circumstances such as special excellence or serious defect rendered such a course necessary.

The reorganisation of 1902 involved changes in the Inspectorate and a preliminary adjustment was then effected. Previously there had been a Senior Chief Inspector in charge of the Metropolitan Division and eleven Chief Inspectors. The Senior Chief Inspector was replaced by a Chief Inspector, not attached to any district, ~~and~~ whose function it was to exercise a general supervision over the whole Elementary Inspectorate, and ~~to~~ be the educational adviser of the Board of Education in matters affecting elementary schools. The former Chief Inspectors were re-named Divisional Inspectors. They were placed in charge of divisions coterminous with the areas of a group of Local Education Authorities, and their duty was to exercise a general control and supervision over their divisions. Each Divisional Inspector was given a small district in his own division in which he personally inspected the schools, but the remainder of the area under his charge was split up into districts, and a District Inspector was placed in charge of each district. Each District Inspector had a staff of one or more Sub-Inspectors⁽¹⁾ whose duties were confined to the more routine parts of the work. In 1904 the Report of the Board of Education (p.8) included the following passage which

(1) This grade of Inspector~~s~~ was later replaced by Junior Inspectors who were in their turn superseded in 1913 by Assistant Inspectors who were required to have had at least eight years experience in elementary schools, and were eligible for promotion to full rank.

contained the first statement of the policy enunciated in the Act of 1918, that of co-operation between the Central and Local Authorities.

" It is essential if the Board is to work with the Local Authorities that they should be well informed as to what each Local Authority is doing and as to the condition of the schools of various grades and types throughout the country. Their duty is to approach the problem of the national service of education from a point other than that of the Local Authority. The Local Authority has to consider the supervision and provision of the different grades of education in their relation to one another, as that is found and as it may seem desirable to make it within the given area. The Central Authority needs to take a more comprehensive survey of educational conditions. It should not merely test the efficiency of schools to which it distributes Parliamentary grants, but also and in particular organise efficient sources of educational information and dissemination in convenient fashion, results, criticisms and suggestions derived from continuous observations of ~~these~~ each kind of schools over a wide area."

As a result the Inspectorate was further reorganised upon a basis which is essentially that in use at the present time. The inspection of Public Elementary Schools was assigned to one branch, Secondary Schools to a second, Technical Institutes and Evening Classes to a third, Training Colleges and Schools of Art to a fourth, whilst the fifth branch of the Inspectorate consisted of Women Inspectors.

The origin of the Women Inspectorate extended back to 1883, when a Directress of Needlework was appointed. In 1890 an Inspectress of Cookery and Laundry was also appointed, and the numbers were further augmented in the "nineties" so as to include other subjects in the Code peculiar to girls and infants schools. In 1904 there were six women Inspectors who ranked as Junior Inspectors and worked under the supervision of the male Chief Inspector. As part of the reorganisation the Women Inspectors were constituted a separate branch, a Chief Woman Inspector was appointed, and eleven Junior Women Inspectors were given the rank of District Inspectors. Their work was not assigned on a geographical basis, but according to qualifications and experience

they were seconded to work under the Chief Inspectors of the different branches of the Inspectorate.

With the object of unifying the work of the different branches of the Inspectorate a plan to place a Chief Inspector in each of the nine divisions was considered but rejected. According to this scheme the Chief Inspectors were to control and supervise the work of the Inspectors in all grades of education in their areas, but the Central Authority held that the inherent difference between Central and Local Administration made the proposal
(1)
impracticable.

"The province of the inspectors of the Central Authority was to supervise education over a wide area, for the purpose, not merely of safeguarding the Parliamentary Grants, but of disseminating in convenient fashion results and suggestions derived from continuous recorded observation. For this purpose it was essential that each officer should cover a wide area, and he would necessarily be unable to cover a wide area if he had to inspect all kind of schools and institutions. It was, on the other hand, the special province of the Local Authorities to supervise and provide for the various grades of education taken together, and in their actual relations within the particular area. The problem of the Local Authority was, in fact, a local problem, that of the Central Authority a central problem, and these considerations will always have a bearing on any changes of organisation, which may hereafter be contemplated."

The arrangement arrived at after the 1902 Act worked in a satisfactory manner until the Act of 1918 laid its demands for schemes upon the Local Authorities. Details of the schemes required were set out in Circular 1,119 of 3rd. July, 1919, and Section 12 of the Consolidation Act of 1921 enabled a Local Education Authority to submit fresh schemes to the Board of Education, whilst Section 14 made special provision to secure co-operation between the Local Authorities for Higher and Elementary Education in the preparation and submission of schemes. The work involved in the preparation of such schemes revealed any flaws in the provisions made by Local Authorities, and gave
(1) Report of the Board of Education, 1922-23., p.40.

This Report is quoted in connection with earlier years because it was not until 1922-23 that the Board gave official reasons for its earlier decisions.

the Central Authority the opportunity to criticise and advise in a constructive manner, whilst the fact that every Authority was compelled to put an approved scheme into operation implied that defects would be remedied in due course. In addition, the Part II Authority was obliged to submit a report as to the measure of co-operation expected from autonomous Part III Authorities, and the smaller Authorities were encouraged to approach the Board on the subject of the schemes.

As these schemes included all forms of education it became clear that the Government Inspectors were in a position to give invaluable help to the Local Authorities, and in order to facilitate the consultation between different Authorities and the Inspectorate, Divisional Committees were set up in each Inspectorial division, composed of Inspectors from all branches of the Inspectorate.

Owing to the declaration of partnership between the Central Authority and the Local Education Authorities inherent in the Act of 1918, the necessity for systematic Central Inspection has from time to time been questioned on the grounds that Government officials duplicate the work of Local Inspectors employed by Local Education Authorities. Thus the Select Committee on the Estimates for 1928 reported that they considered it advisable that the Board of Education should concentrate on special inspection of schools, leaving routine work to Local Education Authorities, and urged that the system should be revised to ensure that there was no overlapping.

In this connection the double function of Inspection must be taken into account. As stated earlier, the Inspectorate of the Board of Education has always been charged with the duty of making sure that public money is spent in accordance with the conditions

of award, and as recently as 1922 the Board of Education repeated the injunction that it was the duty of its officials to see that the Parliamentary grants was spent in a manner of which the State approves, though the means and methods by which these objects were to be attained had returned more to the ideas of Kay-Shuttleworth than to those of Robert Lowe. The increased education grants of recent years entitle the Board of Education to look more than ever for good results from its expenditure, and in this work the Board and the Local Authorities must co-operate. (1)

"The Board must exercise a measure of supervision over all Authorities on some regular plan; while the amount of administrative work which a Local Authority itself has to perform, and the number of officers it must consequently employ, is bound to vary according as its area has the population of London, or of the smallest county borough."

The Act of 1918 aimed at the establishment of an avenue by which any capable child might progress from the elementary school to the university, or be afforded the opportunity to train for any particular calling in life by continued education of different types. This purpose placed a great responsibility on Local Education Authorities. If they are to carry out the implied obligations those of size must employ out-door officials covering elementary, secondary, and technological education. These officers and those of the Board have complementary duties. The Board of Education issued a "Memorandum on the Employment by Local Education Authorities of Local Officers for Inspection of Schools or work analagous to Inspection" as early as 1923.

The Memorandum stated that Local Education Authorities employed 532 officers of all grades in Inspectorial work, but of these 274 were organisers of special subjects. Of the remaining 258 only 123 were specified as Inspectors discharging duties which might cover the same ground as the Board's Inspectors. The Board (1) Report of the Board of Education, 1922-23.

enquired very carefully into the work of the local Inspectors and came to the conclusion that the duties performed by them were not parallel to those of the Central officers, but were of a nature which it would be neither possible nor appropriate for officials of the Central Authority to undertake. The word "Inspection" does not fully describe the activities of local officers. They are the connecting link between the Education Committees and the schools, but in addition to these duties they collect data on specific points of particular interest to the localities, carry out inquiries, and investigate complaints. During the last few years Inspectors appointed by Local Education Authorities have published special reports on subjects such as the following:

- (1)
"On the Standard of Attainment in Public Elementary Schools."
- "Memorandum on the Teaching of Laws of Health." (1)
- "Arithmetical Ability of Boys and Girls." (1)
- "Agriculture as a Career for Boys." (2)
- "Nursing as a Career for Secondary School ~~Boys~~ Girls." (2)
- "An Investigation into the Educational Possibilities of Wireless Broadcasting." (2)

The Inspector of a Local Education Authority also sees that the rules and regulations of his Authority are complied with; he deals with matters relating to schemes of work which are generally influenced by local conditions both economic and industrial; with records of progress made by pupils; with the suitability of Staff and its disposition by methods of transfer and recommended promotions in the case of Council schools; with causes of fluctuation of school rolls, and with such incidental duties as the examination of time-tables and teachers' note-books and diaries. He also deals with the allocation of contributory schools to Central Schools, to Manual, Dining and other Centres, and the checking of school records such as the Punishment Book, the Admission Register, and the Attendance Registers.

(1) London County Council.

(2) Kent Education Committee.

In the words of the Memorandum, the work of the Government Inspectors is primarily to -

"....ascertain whether educational value is obtained for the expenditure of state money, and they are therefore required to report systematically on educational standards of schools and areas, a function which, so far as it is performed in certain areas by Local Inspectors, is usually one of many other duties.

Furthermore, the Board's Inspectors do enter into working agreements with the local officials to avoid the risk of duplication, and in the case of large areas which employ a comparatively large number of Local Inspectors the Board of Education employs only a small staff chiefly for the purpose of conducting general inquiries. In London the Board no longer carries out any systematic detailed inspection of elementary schools, leaving such work to the London County Council officers. The concluding paragraph of the Memorandum deals effectively with the theory that schools are over-inspected.

"The restriction of the Board's staff for inspecting elementary schools renders any danger of over inspection very remote. The Board's Inspectors have great difficulty in reporting on schools at regular intervals, and the most recent figures, excluding London, show that 26 per cent of elementary schools have not been the subject of a formal report for three years or more."

In 1926, in the light of experience gained by eight years of the working of the 1918 Act, the Board further reorganised the Inspectorate. Details were given in Circular 1,328, of 21st July, 1926. The new scheme provides for three Chief Inspectors, one for Elementary Education, one for Secondary Education, and one for Technological Education, and a Chief Woman Inspector. One of the Chief Inspectors is appointed Senior Chief Inspector, and the holder of that appointment is responsible to the Board of Education for the control and co-ordination of the whole Inspectorate. In addition, he is also specially responsible for the work of inspection in his own particular branch. The other

Chief Inspectors, including the Chief Woman Inspector, are responsible for the organisation and control of inspection in their own particular branches, and are not attached to any Inspectorial Division but cover the whole country. The Chief Woman Inspector is responsible to the Senior Chief Inspector for the inspection of Domestic Subjects and for the co-ordination of information on educational matters affecting women, girls, and young children.

Nine Divisional Inspectors, one in charge of each Division, are directly responsible to the Senior Chief Inspector for the co-ordination of the work of the Inspectorate in their Divisions in all matters relating to Elementary, Secondary, Technological, and Continuation Schools, and Domestic Subjects. In addition, they have taken over functions previously entrusted to Divisional Committees especially as regards inquiries, investigations, and inspections which necessitate co-operation between Inspectors of two or more branches. To assist in this work there is a body of Staff Inspectors whose services in respect of their special subjects are available at the discretion of the Senior Chief Inspector for use in schools of all types. Subject to this provision they usually work in connection with one branch of the Inspectorate, and are immediately responsible to the Chief Inspector concerned.

A body of Women Staff Inspectors is available for work in their particular sphere, but the manner of the distribution is different from that of the Staff Inspectors previously referred to in the above paragraph. One Woman Staff Inspector is allocated to each Inspectorial Division, and works under the direction of the Divisional Inspector to whom she is responsible for the organisation of such inquiries and inspections as he may direct.

The principle of unification of the Inspectorate is not carried

below the ranks of Divisional and Staff Inspectors. There are separate District Inspectors for Elementary, Secondary, and Technological Schools, whilst Assistant Inspectors help in the work of Inspecting Elementary Schools. The District and Assistant Inspectors are responsible to the Divisional Inspector in charge of the Division in which they work.

In the case of a particular Division, the Inspectorate of the Board is arranged somewhat on these lines.

Northern Division.

Divisional Inspector.		Mr. A-	
Woman Staff Inspector.		Miss. B-	
<u>Secondary Schools.</u>	<u>Technological Schools.</u>	<u>Public Elementary Schools.</u>	
District Inspector.	<u>AREA.</u>	District Inspector.	Assistant Inspector.
Mr. C-		<u>NORTHUMBERLAND.</u>	
Mr. D-. Also for Cumberland Secondary Schools.		Area under the County Council. Blyth Borough. Wallsend Borough.	
Mr. E-		Mr. F- Mr. H-	
		with	
		Miss G- Mr. J-	
		Newcastle County Borough. Tynemouth County Borough.	

The complete scheme of reorganisation of the Inspectorate provided for:

- a. One Senior Chief and Three Chief Inspectors.
- b. Nine Divisional Inspectors.
- c. Twelve Staff Inspectors, one of whom is responsible for the Inspection of Training Colleges.
- d. Ten Women Staff Inspectors, one of whom assists in the Inspection of Training Colleges.
- e. District Inspectors for the Inspection of Elementary, Secondary and Technological Schools.
- f. Assistant Inspectors to assist the District Inspectors for Elementary Schools.

The duties of present day Inspectors may be conveniently summarised under three headings. (1)

(1) Report of the Board of Education. 1922-23.

- a. The actual inspection of schools.
- b. Administrative work, and work in connection with the Local Education Authorities such as conferences with officials.
- c. General advisory work, including short courses for teachers.

These duties are carried out by a staff of Inspectors far smaller in proportion to the number of school children than the number who worked in the time of the Annual Examinations or in the years before the Revised Code. This affords clear evidence of the confidence reposed in Local Education Authorities by the Central Authority.

The Reports sent in by the Inspectors are of two kinds; first, those of a general nature relating either to the work of all schools in a certain area, or to instruction in a particular subject, and secondly, reports concerned with particular schools. (1)

"There has always been a general agreement that the schools should be visited at least once a year, and this yearly visit is, so far as possible, still maintained. It is also the aim - an aim, however, which cannot be universally achieved - to send in a report on the work of each school, based on these visits, once in three years. The Inspector reports to the Board alone and to no other Authority, and the Board transmit the report to the Local Authority, and the managers of the school, with comments, if necessary."

The inspection takes the form of criticism of written exercises, observation of teaching methods, examination of apparatus, maps, text-books and literary readers. By means of friendly chats, the Inspector gleams from the children themselves matters relating not only to the curriculum but to their recreations, their educational visits and school journeys, their social environment and their ambitions. Children are no longer ~~and~~ scheduled and labelled; they no longer dread the advent of an Inspector either autocratic by nature or made dictatorial by the system under which he labours. At the conclusion of a visit, His Majesty's Inspector usually invites an interchange of views with the teachers,

(1) Report of the Board of Education. 1922-23.

and where there is an efficient and enthusiastic staff the conference is remarkable for the free and candid expressions of opinion, though at times, such opinions run counter to those of the Inspector. He appreciates frankness and neither seeks acquiescence nor corroboration, for he recognises that, though methods of approach may vary, the ultimate good of the children is the common goal. In this connection the Board of Education (1) stated that -

"It seems fairly certain that the Board will never again attempt to give "instructions" to inspectors in the detailed manner of the documents which bore that name...The change in spirit was shown by the title of the publication, which in some sense, replaced them, viz., "Suggestion for the consideration of teachers and others concerned with the work of Public Elementary Schools.", a volume which first appeared in 1905. Effective inspection had come to be regarded as too flexible a matter to be prescribed in a set of rules, or condensed in a formula. There are, of course, ~~definite~~ definite points on which the Board must be informed, but to deal with these is only a small part of the inspector's duty."

Their duties are not confined to the children or to the Local Education Authorities. An important part of the work of the Government Inspectors is to place their experience unreservedly at the disposal of the teachers in the schools. To do this Inspectors run "short courses" for teachers in various subjects, assist in the periodical revision of the "Suggestions to Teachers", prepare Reports, Circulars, and accounts of School Experiments which are often issued by H.M. Stationery Office for the information of the general public as well as for the profession, and attend meetings to discuss ideas and methods.

The internal arrangements of the Board of Education Inspectorate underwent considerable modification after the passage of the Act of 1918 with a view to a greater correlation of functions and duties. In every division Inspectorial Committees of two types were set up -

(1) Report of the Board of Education. 1922-23.

(1)

"The Committee of Divisional Inspectors of the three Branches, and under them District Committees composed of the District Inspectors of the three Branches. Thus although the three main Branches of the Boards Inspectorate remain separate, these various Committees provide a means for the interchange of views on questions of common interest.

"This fund of knowledge and experience is rendered available for the administrative officers of the Board by a number of Committees, which usually work at Whitehall. Inspectors possessing special qualifications or experience are invited to sit on these Committees. It is sufficient to indicate that each important educational subject or class of subject has its appropriate committee prepared to investigate any relevant important matter, collect and sift information, construct Memoranda and Circulars or frame suggestions for the guidance of teachers and others concerned with educational method or matter.

"Certain Inspectors are selected to represent the Board on Choice of Employment Committees, Inter-Departmental Committees, Juvenile Advisory Committees, and certain Inspectors represent the Board in inspections of an educational nature in institutions which are under the control of the Home Office or of the Ministry of Health."

In addition to the Divisional Committees, an Annual Conference of the administrative officers is held to deal with subjects which have arisen during the year, whilst another annual meeting of all the Divisional and Chief Inspectors is held at Whitehall. The reorganisation of 1926 abolished the Divisional Committees on the unification of the Elementary, Secondary, and Technological branches under the Divisional Inspectors, but the other arrangements still hold good.

Further correlation of work takes place, though it is of a more informal nature. Inspectors visit the areas of their colleagues, usually at the request of Inspectors who wish for another opinion in assessing schools which are considered to be unsatisfactory. Staff Inspectors are also available for assistance in dealing with special subjects of instruction. Again, the Inspectors often meet the officers of the Local Education Authorities to decide points of procedure or division of labour, but such conferences are not officially prescribed. Meetings of this kind

(1) H.E. Boothroyd. "A History of the Inspectorate." pp. 1068.
Printed for private circulation by the Board of Education Inspectors Association. 1923.

are valuable in discovering the needs and problems of particular areas, for many members of the staffs of Local Education Authorities are well versed in educational methods and theories. One of the marked features of the staffing of Local Education Authorities has been the general advance from the secretarial conception of the holders of office to that of men who combine great business acumen with real educational outlook and initiative. In the actual routine of inspection the Divisional Inspector often formulates special points of inquiry for his subordinate staff, and the reports are circulated amongst the Divisional officers for comment. In this way every Division keeps in touch with its neighbours, and the result is often the issue of a pamphlet showing what is being done in various parts of the country or suggesting common lines of advance.

The Local Authorities also have their own associations such as the County Councils Association, the Association of Municipal Corporations, the Association of Urban Districts, and the Association of Education Committees. The Association of Education Committees represents 258 Local Education Authorities. (1) These Associations form a clearing house on matters of administration and policy; they give collective evidence before Royal Commissions and Departmental Committees, and conduct negotiations with the Board of Education on general issues. Thus, according to Sir L.A. Selby-Bigge, the settlement of the Burnham Scales for Teachers (2) could not have been achieved without their help.

The idea of Inspection visualised by Kay-Shuttleworth and Matthew Arnold has come near to realisation. But now it is to link up the Local systems which have superseded the individual schools of the earlier period, for the work of the Central and Local Authorities is directed towards a common end of educational progress.

(1) Sir L.A. Selby-Bigge. "The Board of Education." p.194.

(2) Ibid. p.194-95.

CONCLUSION.

CONCLUSION.

Less than a century ago, except in a few slowly dying or decaying trades, the adolescent in industrial England was fast forgetting, or never knew the use of his fingers as far as manual dexterity was concerned, unless it were for the manipulation of ~~an~~ spindle or a lever; the few leisure hours at his disposal were spent or ~~all~~-spent beyond the ken of a wholesome home influence, and his education was that of the unlighted street or gutter. Parents who desired an "education" for their children were
(1)
exploited in so-called private schools or dames' schools.

"If a man failed in everything else, or if he were too stupid to succeed in a profession or a business he opened a school. It was the recognised refuge for incapacity. Very often he flourished...If a man broke an arm or a leg, and so could work no longer, if an old age pensioner found time hang heavy on his hands, or an old woman could do no more active work, he or she often set a scrap of paper in the window inscribed "School" and took in their neighbours children....The children often gathered in very unsuitable places, sometimes a cellar, sometimes a garret, sometimes a barn or outhouse."

For the middle classes there were Academies which conjure up visions of twenty guineas per annum at Mr. Wackford Squeers's Academy at Dotheboys Hall.

In 1833 a grant of £20,000 in aid of the work of the National Society and the British and Foreign Schools Society was given by a luke-warm Government fearful of raising sectarian agitations. The State undertook ~~no~~ supervision and accepted no responsibility, but from that step has arisen the whole system of national education of the present time. Out of the struggles of elementary education for recognition as a public service, national education has been built up.

(1) Finnemore. "Social Life in England." Vol. II. p.207.

The formation of the Committee of Council on Education in 1839, established ^{elementary} education in isolation, and for many years the provision of schools for the masses of the people was philanthropic rather than educational. ⁽¹⁾ The State declined to do more than aid Voluntary Associations in their attempts to provide school accommodation, though Central supervision and control were indirectly extended by varying the conditions of award attached to the grants. Elementary education was regarded by the Central Authority as complete in itself without any reference to other fields of educational activity. The demand for local responsibility and rate-aid became more and more insistent, but the conception of elementary education as a separate entity persisted, and in 1870, in making its first venture in Local Education Administration, the Government restricted its scope to elementary education.

Nevertheless, the formation of School Boards was a noticeable advance. For the first time a degree of cohesion was found in the service, and through the later activities of the more progressive Boards the idea of elementary education as a self-contained unit gradually lost ground. The experiments of some of the School Boards in higher elementary education and their illegal entry into the domain of secondary and technical education forced the hand of the Government, and in 1902 the first "Education Act", as distinct from previous "Elementary Education Acts" was passed.

The creation of new Local Education Authorities with powers and duties over the secular instruction of the Voluntary Schools, and the right to initiate schemes for higher education gave the education service a unity it had never before possessed. From being an isolated unit, elementary education became part of a whole administration. Education took its place as a Local Government

(1) Frank Roscoe in the "Schoolmaster". December 3rd. 1931.

Service, and the State assumed responsibility for a larger proportion of the expenditure. This, in turn, gave rise to a conception of a national minimum of efficiency, and the gradual working out of the content of a satisfactory minimum is still in progress.

In 1918 the education service was still further consolidated when Local Authorities were obliged to make full provision for all forms of education in their areas, and to ensure that children were physically able to profit by the instruction given them. The social work in elementary schools is a common platform which knows no distinction of race or creed. The care of the hungry child, the care of the afflicted child, the general well-being of the child, and the general well-being of the adolescent are no longer "nobody's business", they are the responsibility of every Local Education Authority. A consideration of the growth of the administrative side of the public elementary school system would be incomplete were we to ignore these services which, from small beginnings, have grown to be integral parts of our present day conception of education. The work began in 1893 when School Boards were required to provide for blind and defective children by building schools for the purpose or by sending them to certified schools established by approved societies. Previously, mentally and physically defective children sat in class with normal pupils to the detriment of all concerned. In 1899 a further Act was passed which gave School Boards power to make special provision for physically and mentally defective children, and for epileptics. In 1906 Local Education Authorities were given powers relating to the feeding of necessitous children, and in 1907 they were obliged to make arrangements for the systematic medical inspection of all children attending public elementary schools.

Under the guidance of paid officials and organisers, the

philanthropic agencies which operated prior to these Acts have been superseded by Voluntary Care Committees of the Local Education Authorities working in sympathetic co-operation with the Scouts, Guides, Brigades, Religious Bodies, and a multiplicity of organisations which exert a disciplinary and elevating influence on ~~these~~ children who need outside supervision, advice and assistance. Pride of place should, however, be given to the School Care Committees who meet at convenient intervals and decide upon the kind of meal to be given to the necessitous child and the share of the cost, if any, to be borne by the parent. The head teacher attends the meetings in an advisory capacity, and his advice carries great weight owing to the fact that he is intimately interested in the child and conversant with his home circumstances and environment.

In populous centres the usual practice of a Care Committee is to appoint a representative to attend meetings of the Local Association of Children's Care (School) Committees. For administrative purposes the sphere of a Local Association is either a Parliamentary Electoral Constituency, or a mutually convenient centre. Besides representatives of the Care Committees, the Local Education Authority usually appoints other voluntary workers to membership, and also undertakes the duty of convening the meetings. Though working in close co-operation with the other administrative branches of their Councils, the relations between the newly formed Public Assistance Committees and the School Care Committees are at the moment very vague and ill-defined. Broadly speaking, necessitous children should not be in receipt of school meals if their parents are obtaining a measure of relief from a Public Assistance Committee, but until more detailed and explicit instructions are forthcoming Care Committees who consider relief scales inadequate for the proper nourishment of underfed children

are not prepared to accept suggested modifications of their procedure without demur. As already indicated, the feeding of necessitous children proved to be but the first step towards a thorough overhauling of the elementary school system, for in 1907 the Education (Administrative Provisions) Act compelled Local Education Authorities to take steps for the enforcement of medical inspection of all elementary school children committed to their care.

Parental consent must be obtained before a scholar can be examined, and though in the earliest years difficult parents objected to the generally accepted routine, common sense has reduced opposition to a minimum. A long interval elapsed from 1870 to 1907 before class-room work was in any way correlated with medical inspection, nevertheless Dr. Hamer, formerly Medical Officer of Health for London, spoke an epigrammatic truth when he said, "The Education Act of 1870 was the greatest public health Act ever passed."⁽¹⁾ Great strides have been made since 1907. In his Report for 1930, Sir George Newman, Chief Medical Officer of the Board of Education and Chief Medical Officer of the Ministry of Health, stated that the number of children inspected in the specified age groups for 1930 was 1,770,779, or 35.8 per cent of those in average attendance. In addition, 968,518 children were referred for some special reason by parents, nurses, school teachers or attendance officers. In a reference to the Primary School Report issued by the Board of Education in 1931 he says there are good psychological reasons for grouping together children of the age range 7 to 8 years to 11 or 12 years. He also asserts that physical conditions should be placed first, and that the school surroundings and curriculum should admit this priority of need:

"To yield good fruit, adolescence must be assured of a sound
(1) London County Council. "The Special Services of London
Education." p. 16.

root formation, and this it is the opportunity of the primary school to provide."

Every entrant to an Infant School is medically inspected as soon as possible after the commencement of the first term. As a rule he undergoes two further "age-group" examinations, and the final medical examination as a "leaver" is held during his last scholastic year. On this occasion the doctor decides whether the scholar is "Fit " or "Unfit" for his choice of employment, and may advise as to the ~~class~~ of work to be avoided; for example, a child suffering from heart weakness would be totally unsuited to perform heavy manual work, a child with myopic tendencies would obviously be out of place as a printer, and indoor clerical work should be avoided by a pupil who would benefit by an outdoor occupation. The endorsement of the medical sheet by the doctor proves very useful to the After-Care Committee who interview the parent and the pupil at the end of the school leaving term. At this critical period in the history of the pupil the advice of the Committee is most highly prized, and the negligent parent is willing and anxious, in his own interest, to take steps to remedy his former shortcomings, by consenting to provide spectacles, to procure dental treatment, or to acquiesce in suggestions for curative measures concerning the long-standing physical defects of his child. An official of the Juvenile Advisory Committee of the Ministry of Health and the responsible teacher of the local continuation school, evening institute, or juvenile educational centre are usually present at these meetings to perform their duties of assisting the "Leaver" to obtain suitable employment, and to encourage a course of further education adapted to his social, technical, or cultural needs. Very often it is evident that a child requires a more elevating supervision than his ~~home~~ home surroundings afford, and where such is the

case a member of the After-Care Committee volunteers to pay domiciliary visits until the age of sixteen has been reached, and even longer if such supervision proves acceptable. Sir George Newman wrote appreciatively of the services of these wonderful helpers -⁽¹⁾

"The continuity of sustained effort displayed by these committees, chiefly in unobtrusive ways, in the service of the children is admirable, and no voluntary service within the manifold activities of the school medical service is more beneficial or remunerative."

With the recognition that the scope of educational administration was no longer confined to the mere provision of intellectual opportunity, there arose a wider view of the function of the elementary school. The Act of 1918 stressed the conception of education as a training for life, by its insistence upon the need for the continuance of the process of education for all adolescents. The Hadow Report of December^e, 1926, implemented the Act by its suggestions for the Reorganisation of Elementary Schools. At the age of 11 plus children were to be transferred from elementary schools, or primary schools, to other schools or classes giving some form of post-primary education. Many Local Education Authorities have taken advantage of the endorsement by the Board of Education of the Hadow Report to reorganise the schools in their areas on this basis. The writer recently sent out a questionnaire to representative Local Education Authorities on this subject, and the replies show the advance made in a comparatively short number of years.

London appears to have led the way in reorganisation of this type, for the change from the standard organisation of boys, girls, infants, or less frequently boys, girls, junior mixed, infants began to operate, as far as London is concerned, in 1924.

"In that year a pair of schools in North London and another pair in South London were each grouped to provide departments for senior boys, senior girls, junior boys, junior girls and

(1) "The Special Services of Education in London" p.16.

infants, the break between juniors and seniors being at the age of eleven plus not only for children who were fortunate enough to obtain admission to secondary and central schools, but also for those children who remained in the ordinary elementary schools.....In London, the development begun in 1924 proceeded at first on experimental lines, so that by the end of 1929 the number reorganised in this way amounted to 77, all of which were Council schools.

"As the number of schools organised on the eleven plus basis increased, a change occurred in the size of the group. It was found that a pair of schools frequently provided insufficient senior children for good classification, and groups were therefore formed comprising three schools with one senior department for each sex or, in many cases it was found better to group five, six, or seven schools with two senior departments for each sex. During 1930 two groups of non-provided schools, one consisting of three schools and the other of six schools, were formed. In addition, many negotiations indicative of the interest taken by the non-provided school authorities in the new types of organisation were carried out.

"The total number of schools reorganised by the end of 1930 was 141 council and nine non-provided, out of a total of 554 council and 358 non-provided schools. These numbers by no means represented the extent of the advance in respect to reorganisation for the year, as negotiations for the subsequent reorganisation of as many more schools were already in an advanced stage"(1)

In the Parliamentary divisions of Battersea reorganisation is almost completed as far as Council schools are concerned, whilst the Church of England schools are either grouping with Council schools or undergoing internal reorganisation. It is only fitting that Battersea should be in the forefront of educational advancement because its citizens are still endeared to the memory of Dr. Kay who, in Old Battersea, gave education its big impetus by founding the first training college almost within a stone's throw of the river Thames. The old college of St. John is now more, the site having been utilised to make part of a housing scheme, but the Borough Council has preserved the original Principal's House and made arrangements for its future preservation.

The questionnaire mentioned has shown, in the replies given, that the participation of Non-Provided schools in schemes of reorganisation is not confined to London. Examples of such reorganisation have been furnished by the Local Education

(1) Local Government Journal. Dec. 26th., 1931.

Article of the Annual Report of the Education Officer of the London County Council, Mr. G. H. Gater, for 1930.

Authorities of Wiltshire, the City of Nottingham, Norfolk, the City of Plymouth, and the West Riding of Yorkshire. In cases where Provided and Non-Provided schools have co-operated in schemes, it appears to be the common practice for the senior pupils, those over eleven years of age, to transfer from the Non-Provided schools to the Provided schools owing to the general superiority of school accommodation. In Wiltshire, however, the County Council has, with the consent of the managers of the schools, grouped under one body of managers schools belonging to the Church of England and to the Nonconformists. This grouping has taken place at Mere, and there is an agreed scheme of religious instruction. In other schools under the same Authority, some of the children from Non-Provided schools are withdrawn from the Council Senior Schools for religious instruction at the ^{Non-}Provided school from which they were transferred. The West Riding of Yorkshire has concluded a concordat with the Education Association of the five Dioceses in the area which allows for denominational instruction on two days per week for all children whose parents desire the same. The trustees or managers of the contributory Non-Provided schools are responsible for all expenses occurring from this arrangement. In other areas an agreed syllabus of religious instruction is carried out, whilst in some, like Plymouth and Nottingham, no special arrangements are entered into. In some areas Non-Provided schools have undergone internal reorganisation or have grouped within their own denominations, but such arrangements are made at the wish of the religious bodies concerned, the Local Education Authorities having no powers of compulsion.

Throughout the country where parental objections to schemes of reorganisation were raised, they were based on sentimental and practical motives rather than on educational grounds. A

transfer might mean the breaking of a school tradition, the division of the family unit, the lack of suitable means of transport, or the risks inseparable from modern traffic. In some areas, however, there seems to have been little parental opposition to contend with,⁽¹⁾ whilst others state that opposition to suggested schemes has disappeared as soon as parents have realised the benefits which their children receive under⁽²⁾ reorganisation. In the case of some Authorities which include rural districts in their areas, it has been the practice to provide special means of conveyance where public services are not in operation, or to provide bicycles at a reduced cost. As an example of the latter procedure, the Secretary for Education to the Northamptonshire County Council gave the following information.

"It is not the usual practice of this Authority to provide conveyance for the children where the distance to be travelled is less than the By-law distance of three miles. Where the distance is less than three, but more than two and a quarter miles parents are given the alternative of purchasing bicycles at reduced rates or receiving a small money allowance if they can satisfy the Committee that their circumstances demand it."

Replies to the questionnaire revealed an unexpected number of instances in which reorganisation resulted in the closure of small schools. In other cases the number of separate departments has been reduced with beneficial results. Thus the Secretary for Education to the City of Plymouth wrote that -

"Senior departments are fewer in number...enabling two and three divisions to be found in each standard. Furthermore it is a four years' course to fifteen, and not a three years' course to 14.

The Junior departments are frequently larger, too, providing similar advantages of organisation and with a clearer objective in preparing children for the various types of post-primary schools.

Practical work has been much developed in the former schools following investigations as to the occupations the children generally enter, and in the latter schools as providing fundamentals for subsequent courses with which their work is duly correlated."

(1) Tottenham, Shropshire, Plymouth, Wallsend, Norfolk, Nottingham.

(2) Wiltshire, West Riding of Yorkshire, Northamptonshire, London.

Nottingham, on the other hand, has taken advantage of the opportunity to close some of the older and more defective school buildings in the City.

Re-organised Schools still come under the category of elementary schools, though their work as Post-Primary Schools is of a higher grade for all who can benefit thereby than was the case previously. These schools are meant to take a definite place in the educational system of the country by providing an education alternative to that of the usual Secondary School. They are intended to be more practical in their outlook, and more fitted for children whose intellectual ability or interests do not mark them out for entry into Secondary Schools. The difficulty immediately arises as to the manner in which this extension of elementary education can be related to a complete system. The problem is an inheritance of the Act of 1902 with its division of Local Authorities into Part II and Part III Authorities. Part II areas are not so much concerned with the question as are Part III areas, for the latter have no ^o powers with respect to anything but elementary schools, and the problem may become even more complex when schemes of re-organisation include schools for physically defective children. Higher education is outside the province of Part III Authorities, and to correlate their activities with those of the superimposed Part II Authorities is a difficult proposition. The Act of 1902 gave strength to the old tradition that elementary education could be regarded as separate and distinct from all other educational activities. The result has been a false statutory division of interests between the two types of Authorities, and although the Act of 1918 sought to break down the barrier by means of permissive co-operation between Part II and Part III Authorities, the line of demarcation has become too pronounced to be easily obliterated, and it is doubtful whether it will ever disappear as long as the system

of dual administrative areas remains.

Apart from the difficulty arising out of the dual administrative areas, a greater set back to the realisation of the "New Prospect" opened up by the Hadow Report has been the failure to raise the school leaving age to fifteen years, and to meet the demands of the sectarian bodies for more public assistance to help them to meet the burdens imposed by reorganisation and the School Attendance Bill. On November 6th, 1930, Sir C. Trevelyan, President of the Board of Education in the Labour Government, introduced the Education (School Attendance) Bill with the object of raising the leaving age to fifteen years. The Government tried hard to frame a non-contentious measure, but a strong opposition, led by a former President of the Board, Lord Eustace Percy, soon made its presence felt. The Bill, which contained provision for maintenance allowances, found little favour with either the Liberals or the Conservatives, though it managed to secure a third reading by a mixed Liberal and Labour majority of 67. In Committee, the Liberals were in a position to force Sir. C. Trevelyan to agree to insert words in the Report stage which would empower Local Education Authorities not only to inquire into the means of applicants for allowances, but to decide the time, place and manner in which such allowances should be paid. Sir Donald Maclean, President of the Board in the existing National Government, insisted that the Bill should be presented in an amended form which would postpone the operation of the Act from April 1st, 1931, to September, 1932. To this arrangement, the Cabinet reluctantly consented, for Ministers realised the possibility of sectarian storm-clouds gathering, and they were desirous of getting the measure on the Statute Book as speedily as possible and with a minimum of controversy. The

rank and file of the Labour members were by no means placated by the concession, but the amendment was carried by 260 votes to 183.

When the House rose on December 19th, the Report stage of the Bill was nearly completed, and there seemed a great possibility of the Bill being placed on the Statute Book in the course of a few months. As the fate of the measure was unsettled when Parliament re-assembled, a brief incursion in 1931 to complete this account of its history is unavoidable. On January 13th and 14th, 1931, Sir C. Trevelyan met representatives of the Church of England, the Roman Catholics, the Nonconformists, the Local Education Authorities, and the National Union of Teachers, in conference at the Board of Education, but the discussions proved fruitless as the Nonconformists could not agree to the proposals for the re-conditioning of Non-Provided schools. Mr. Scurr, a Labour member and Roman Catholic leader, warned the Government that unless they announced their intention to introduce legislation to ease the burden on Non-Provided schools, he would move an amendment proposing that the Bill should not come into force until an Act had been passed to provide public assistance for Non-Provided schools in order to enable them to carry out the provisions of the School Attendance Bill. The Anglican group in the Labour Party, headed by Commander Kenworthy and Mr. Lovat Fraser, supported the action of Mr. Scurr. The Prime Minister, however, insisted upon the Bill being put to the vote, and the Government was defeated over the amendment by a majority of 33 votes, no fewer than 36 members of the Labour Party voting against their own Government. The Bill, with the incorporated amendment, passed its third reading on Wednesday January 21st, by the narrow margin of 18 votes. In the House of Lords the Bill received a first formal reading on January 27th, but on Wednesday

18th February it was refused a second reading by 168 votes to 22 votes.

This was the third unsuccessful effort of the Government to pass a measure to raise the school age. The first Bill was introduced on December 17th, 1929, and was withdrawn on May 12th, 1930. A second Bill was introduced on May 22nd., 1931, but on June 25th the Prime Minister announced that it could not be passed before the end of the Session, and it was also withdrawn.

The failure to reach agreement was followed by an unexpectedly severe economic crisis which had the effect of transforming a Party Government into a National Government, and an intensive economy campaign began. Pending the recovery of our economic life there must be a slowing down of education expansion.

Stage by stage we have traced the evolution of local administration in our elementary educational system. Synchronising with coldly prosaic considerations we have witnessed a marvellously elevating and cultural advance of which no previous century dreamt. From decade to decade progress may have appeared almost imperceptible though the quickening years of momentous decisions and realised hopes stand out as peaks on the century old landscape. Were we suddenly carried back to 1833 and enabled to survey the prospect to 1930, we could follow and better appreciate the wonderful transformation from educational indifference to present day enthusiasm, and we would not deny our Local Education Authorities the credit which has been their due since they took over the duties of the old School Boards. By their very persistence and initiative they have prevailed upon the Central Authority to adopt and co-ordinate schemes of social, physical and educational progress which are assuring for the people of England a foremost place amongst the most enlightened democracies of the world.

Old methods and old ideas have given place to new, but though we pride ourselves on the achievements of our own times we are conscious that finality in educational evolution has by no means been reached. Should the time come when Central and Local Administration will have the whole range of education within their sphere of activity, the part played by the erstwhile oppressed, opposed, and even distrusted "Elementary Administration" in stimulating educational interest in the community will have been no mean one.

APPENDIX.

Statistical Tables Abstracted and Compiled from Official Documents.

TABLE A.Comparative Ages of Scholars 1850-1870.Percentage.

<u>AGE.</u>	<u>1850</u>	<u>1851</u>	<u>1852</u>	<u>1853</u>	<u>1854</u>	<u>1855</u>	<u>1856</u>	<u>1857</u>	<u>1858</u>	<u>1859</u>
Under 4 yrs.						2.98	6.08	6.58	5.45	5.07
4- 5						4.59	7.15	7.89	7.22	7.10
5- 6						7.18	9.33	10.05	9.30	9.70
6- 7						10.75	11.40	12.21	11.84	12.04
7- 8				14.19	13.67	13.26	12.76	12.40	12.70	12.48
8- 9	14.13	14.94	14.73	14.65	13.84	14.15	11.94	11.94	12.26	12.22
9-10	13.62	14.09	13.98	13.72	13.62	13.65	11.74	11.03	11.56	11.81
10-11	12.54	12.73	12.56	11.81	11.34	12.03	10.47	9.91	10.20	10.16
11-12	10.00	9.36	10.31	9.02	8.72	8.99	7.93	7.70	7.98	7.82
12-13	6.84	7.19	7.85	6.24	5.86	6.44	5.77	5.26	5.80	5.88
13-14	4.24	4.12	4.61	3.44	3.28	3.64	3.29	3.04	3.40	3.33
Over 14.	3.55	3.35	3.96	1.86	2.04	2.34	2.14	1.99	2.29	2.39.

Percentage of Scholars under 10 years of age.

62.83 63.25 60.71 67.63 68.76 66.56 70.40 72.10 70.33 70.42.

Table A.Comparative Ages of Scholars 1850-1870.Percentage.

<u>1860</u>	<u>1861</u>	<u>1862</u>	<u>1863</u>	<u>1864</u>	<u>1865</u>	<u>1866</u>	<u>1867</u>	<u>1868</u>	<u>1869</u>	<u>1870</u>
5.36	5.09	5.47	6.41	6.11	6.32	6.53	6.72	6.51	6.38	6.25
7.26	7.43	7.38	7.45	7.38	7.54	7.75	8.14	8.34	8.36	8.29
9.75	9.94	9.66	9.56	9.80	9.94	10.19	10.36	10.62	10.80	10.76
11.60	11.97	11.70	11.55	10.86	10.85	11.10	11.29	11.28	11.28	11.48
12.48	12.75	12.92	12.77	12.84	12.71	12.50	12.67	12.23	11.95	12.00
12.26	12.08	11.68	11.85	11.87	12.02	11.88	11.75	11.97	11.90	11.83
11.91	11.55	11.26	11.42	11.57	11.72	11.67	11.43	11.33	11.44	11.34
10.05	10.45	9.75	10.19	10.31	10.27	10.19	9.98	9.91	9.91	10.06
7.99	7.70	8.37	7.99	8.11	7.97	7.96	7.82	7.85	7.88	7.85
5.70	5.81	6.17	5.81	5.87	5.74	5.54	5.43	5.52	5.63	5.60
3.29	2.95	3.22	3.10	3.25	3.09	2.92	2.77	2.81	2.84	2.88
2.35	2.28	2.42	1.90	1.93	1.83	1.77	1.64	1.63	1.63	1.66

Percentage of Scholars under 10 years of age.

70.62 70.81 70.07 71.01 70.43 71.10 71.62 72.36 72.28 72.11 71.95

Table B.Comparative Attendance at the same school. 1853-1870.Percentage.

<u>Year.</u>	<u>Less than</u> <u>one year.</u>	<u>From 1-2</u> <u>years.</u>	<u>From 2-3</u> <u>years.</u>	<u>From 3-4</u> <u>years.</u>	<u>From 4-5.</u> <u>years.</u>	<u>Over 5</u> <u>years.</u>
1853.	47.82	21.00	13.01	8.48	4.82	4.87
1854.	42.00	28.18	12.84	8.00	4.75	4.23
1855.	37.02	28.82	14.51	9.47	5.69	4.49
1856.	42.02	22.65	15.14	9.72	5.78	4.69
1857	41.26	23.61	14.95	9.74	5.50	4.92
1858	38.81	22.66	16.29	10.48	6.54	5.22
1859	37.80	22.57	16.81	10.89	6.46	5.46
1860	35.98	21.92	16.97	11.55	7.11	6.47
1861	36.79	23.19	16.21	11.46	6.97	5.44
1862	37.43	21.17	16.86	12.09	7.27	5.18
1863	39.13	21.85	15.59	10.58	6.73	6.12
1864	38.15	22.18	15.51	10.57	6.86	6.73
1865	38.97	21.93	15.33	10.22	6.80	6.75
1866	34.63	21.88	16.85	11.79	7.82	7.03
1867	39.14	22.38	15.10	10.03	6.53	6.82
1868	40.54	22.92	14.88	9.60	5.90	6.16
1869	40.99	23.31	14.86	9.34	5.70	5.91
1870	40.31	23.30	15.00	9.44	5.80	6.15.

TABLE C.

Comparison between the main sources of Annual Income of Day
and Evening Elementary Schools from 1871 to 1902.

<u>Year.</u>	<u>Voluntary</u>	<u>Schools.</u>	<u>Board</u>	<u>Schools.</u>
	<u>Contributions</u>	<u>Government Grants.</u>	<u>Rates</u>	<u>Government Grants.</u>
	£	£	£	£
1871	437,401	580,258	—	—
1872	492,851	657,606	3,254	2,876
1873	535,908	759,203	57,052	12,869
1874	601,173	861,657	129,735	37,886
1875	673,203	941,286	230,682	79,254
1876	748,319	1,014,335	369,918	143,784
1877	782,424	1,103,658	447,710	219,918
1878	770,846	1,245,741	570,193	322,743
1879	751,292	1,398,503	636,792	430,200
1880	737,257	1,464,635	726,226	517,560
1881	726,139	1,536,115	738,737	619,550
1882	723,301	1,551,209	808,121	683,110
1883	715,669	1,620,878	840,947	771,250
1884	732,525	1,667,510	915,474	848,266
1885	755,936	1,772,213	1,140,046	965,755
1886	741,936	1,819,541	1,189,150	1,047,159
1887	742,416	1,846,535	1,194,900	1,120,341
1888	745,340	1,874,315	1,213,783	1,195,070
1889	749,821	1,922,474	1,229,037	1,257,809
1890	757,529	1,967,021	1,320,487	1,322,264
1891	779,095	1,979,119	1,450,187	1,354,425
1892	785,128	2,304,173	1,704,371	1,622,910
1893	807,824	3,112,159	1,705,021	2,239,806
1894	807,747	3,471,109	1,742,238	2,612,140
1895	834,663	3,517,859	1,942,710	2,799,857
1896	850,968	3,575,046	2,182,372	2,968,184
1897	843,847	3,658,557	2,325,301	3,108,898
1898	785,947	4,057,934	2,470,035	3,210,855
1899	781,706	4,440,736	2,704,564	3,390,508
1900	811,504	4,528,162	2,959,717	3,474,819
1901	844,435	4,476,886	3,340,975	3,580,922.

As the Day and Evening Schools accounts were kept in a composite form they cannot be shown under separate headings.

Table D.

Comparison of the Rate of Income per scholar in Average Attendance in the Denominational and Board Schools from 1871 to 1902.

YEAR	National.		Wesleyan.		Roman Cath.		British.		Board.	
	Includ.	Less.	Includ.	Less.	Includ.	Less.	Includ.	Less.	Includ.	Less.
	Grant.	Grant.	Grant.	Grant.	Grant.	Grant.	Grant.	Grant.	Grant.	Grant.
1871	25/6	16/8			21/9	12/-	26/5	16/11		
1872	27/6	27/8			23/4	14/-	26/9	17/7	28/7	19/8
1873	29/8	18/10			25/9	15/8	29/7	18/10	35/4	20/7
1874	30/4	19/4			27/3	16/5	30/8	19/3	35/7	29/7
1875	31/7	20/-			28/4	16/10	31/7	20/-	37/3	29/9
1876	33/3	21/1			30/2	17/11	33/3	20/10	41/8	31/11
1877	33/8	21/3			31/1	18/8	33/11	21/1	41/4	30/5
1878	33/11	20/9	33/0	19/1	30/8	17/6	35/-	21/6	41/10	29/8
1879	34/9	20/6	34/3	19/2	30/7	16/8	35/8	21/-	42/1	28/9
1880	34/8	20/1	34/-	18/10	30/1	16/1	35/11	21/-	42/-	28/3
1881	35/3	20/3	35/-	19/2	30/8	15/11	36/5	21/1	41/7	28/11
1882	34/9	20/-	34/2	18/10	30/3	15/6	36/2	20/11	41/7	28/11
1883	35/3	19/10	35/-	19/-	30/9	15/9	36/4	20/19	41/4	28/2
1884	35/2	19/10	35/3	19/2	32/-	16/8	36/4	20/8	41/9	28/3
1885	35/11	19/10	36/2	19/2	32/7	16/8	37/5	20/11	45/5	29/-
1886	36/4	19/11	36/5	19/2	33/-	16/9	37/11	20/11	45/-	28/-
1887	36/3	19/8	36/5	19/2	33/3	16/9	38/5	21/4	44/8	27/6
1888	36/2	19/7	36/5	19/-	33/3	16/5	38/9	21/7	44/8	27/2
1889	36/7	19/8	36/9	19/4	33/9	16/11	38/9	21/6	44/7	28/11
1890	37/-	19/8	37/3	19/4	34/4	17/2	39/5	21/8	46/-	28/-
1891	37/5	20/-	37/5	19/6	35/5	18/1	39/11	22/1	46/2	28/1
1892	36/5	16/-	35/9	15/3	34/4	14/11	38/10	18/2	48/8	27/9
1893	37/-	11/4	36/2	10/1	35/3	10/-	39/-	12/11	48/2	21/8
1894	38/6	10/10	37/4	9/7	36/4	9/-	40/10	12/9	48/10	20/3
1895	38/11	10/4	37/8	9/-	36/10	8/11	41/-	12/-	50/2	20/6
1896	38/11	10/4	38/5	9/3	37/6	9/1	41/1	12/7	52/-	22/-
1897	39/5	10/-	38/8	8/11	37/6	8/11	42/5	12/11	53/2	22/10
1898	41/9	9/5	41/5	8/3	38/10	7/1	45/4	12/8	53/10	23/7
1899	44/8	9/5	43/2	8/3	42/3	6/11	47/11	12/4	55/7	23/7
1900	45/6	9/8	44/11	8/4	43/3	7/2	48/5	12/5	57/8	26/5
1901	45/5	9/9	44/4	8/4	41/11	7/8	48/8	13/3	60/2	26/8
1902	45/5	10/-	44/8	8/7	42/5	7/8	49/4	13/8	60/9	30/1

Table E.

Comparison between Expenditure per scholar in Average Attendance
in Denominational and Board Schools from 1871 to 1902.

<u>Year.</u>	<u>National Schools.</u>	<u>Wesleyan. Schools.</u>	<u>Roman Catholic. Schools.</u>	<u>British. Schools.</u>	<u>Board. Schools.</u>
1871	25/9		20/5	26/3	-
1872	27/8		23/9	27/8	28/4
1873	30/1		27/6	30/5	34/5
1874	30/11		28/10	31/4	35/4
1875	32/-		29/5	32/2	36/11
1876	33/7		31/-	33/9	41/4
1877	34/-		32/-	34/2	41/4
1878	34/-	33/1	31/5	35/4	41/10
1879	34/8	34/5	39/11	35/10	42/1
1880	34/10	34/7	30/6	35/-	42/-
1881	35/3	35/2	30/8	36/3	41/6
1882	34/9	34/3	30/6	36/2	41/6
1883	35/-	35/-	30/9	36/3	41/3
1884	35/2	35/5	32/1	36/10	41/8
1885	35/10	36/2	32/8	37/4	45/4
1886	36/5	36/9	33/-	38/-	44/11
1887	36/4	36/9	33/3	38/6	44/7
1888	36/3	36/7	33/5	38/8	44/7
1889	36/4	36/6	34/-	38/6	44/6
1890	36/10	37/4	34/6	39/3	46/-
1891	37/7	37/7	35/6	39/8	47/2
1892	37/8	37/5	35/11	40/3	48/5
1893	37/5	37/4	35/7	40/-	48/2
1894	38/1	37/10	36/3	40/7	48/10
1895	38/11	38/7	36/8	41/7	50/2
1896	39/6	39/2	37/9	41/11	52/-
1897	40/5	40/-	38/8	43/3	53/2
1898	42/4	42/1	40/-	45/7	53/10
1899	44/11	45/4	43/1	48/11	55/7
1900	46/3	46/8	44/4	49/5	57/8
1901	46/7	46/4	44/3	50/5	60/2
1902	46/3	45/11	43/5	50/4	60/9

Comparison of the Number, Average Attendance, and Accommodation in Denominational and Board Schools from 1871 to 1914.

<u>Year.</u>	<u>Number of Board Schools.</u>	<u>Average Attendance.</u>	<u>Number of Voluntary Schools.</u>	<u>Average Attendance</u>	<u>Total Accommod- ation.</u>
1871	-	-	8,768	1,231,434	2,012,679
1872	82	8,726	9,772	1,327,432	2,295,894.
1875	1,136	227,285	12,081	1,609,895	3,146,424
1880	3,433	769,252	14,181	1,981,664	4,240,753
1881	3,692	856,351	14,370	2,007,184	4,389,633
1882	3,868	945,231	14,421	2,069,920	4,538,320
1883	4,049	1,028,904	14,491	2,098,310	4,670,443
1884	4,181	1,115,832	14,580	2,157,292	4,826,738
1885	4,293	1,187,455	14,690	2,183,870	4,998,718
1886	4,402	1,251,307	14,620	2,187,118	5,146,292
1887	4,492	1,315,461	14,662	2,211,920	5,278,992
1888	4,552	1,378,006	14,659	2,236,961	5,356,554
1889	4,624	1,424,835	14,686	2,257,790	5,440,441
1890	4,676	1,457,358	14,743	2,260,559	5,539,285
1891	4,747	1,491,571	14,761	2,258,385	5,641,360
1892	4,831	1,570,397	14,684	2,300,377	5,730,888
1893	4,904	1,688,668	14,673	2,411,362	5,789,501
1894	5,081	1,777,797	14,628	2,448,057	5,873,098
1895	5,260	1,879,218	14,479	2,445,822	5,966,272
1896	5,432	1,956,992	14,430	2,465,919	6,098,669
1897	5,524	2,016,547	14,418	2,471,996	6,220,156
1898	5,555	2,072,911	13,427	2,481,254	6,345,906
1899	5,632	2,137,805	14,444	2,499,133	6,441,145
1900	5,691,	2,177,253	14,409	2,488,877	6,544,092
1901	5,797	2,239,375	14,319	2,492,536	6,610,416
1902	5,878	2,344,020	14,275	2,546,217	6,682,295
1903	5,975	2,442,901	14,238	2,587,318	6,787,486
1904	6,145	2,553,614	14,140	2,588,663	6,877,641
1905	6,800	2,696,907	13,713	2,552,578	7,005,041
1910	7,839	3,107,206	12,926	2,258,195	7,016,627
1913	8,359	3,260,020	12,544	2,105,877	6,922,504
1914	8,603	---	12,439	---	7,039,606.
		a		a	

The statistics given in this Table apply only to England and Wales.

a. Figures for 1914-1918 were not published in statistical form.

Table G.
Cost of Public Elementary Education. 1840-1921.

<u>Year.</u>	<u>Building Grants.</u>	<u>Books Maps.</u>	<u>Teaching Power.</u>	<u>Teaching in Night Schools.</u>	<u>Drawing.</u>	<u>Training Colleges.</u>	<u>Indust. Schools.</u>
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
1840.	9,909						
1841.	29,783						
1842.	29,618						
1843.	27,337						
1844.	34,284					2,250	
1845.	46,085					2,750	
1846.	50,053					2,250	
1847.	48,628					2,590	
1848.	57,002	617	7,988			3,615	
1849.	53,735	2,937	29,561			4,883	
1850.	85,784	1,878	65,712			6,680	
1851.	36,394	1,715	93,474			10,513	
1852.	49,468	2,646	96,562			17,545	192
1853.	32,678	2,895	165,899			19,197	281
1854.	59,607	1,866	178,662			39,394	865
1855.	77,443	2,884	193,241			39,960	1,678
1856.	84,057	3,957	215,367			45,785	8,159
1857.	119,664	7,808	262,283			57,221	19,105
1858.	151,214	5,718	299,714	1,595	359	73,732	27,026
1859.	137,207	6,145	345,573	1,321	750	89,588	18,028
1860.	118,127	4,833	366,498	1,636	1,490	92,329	9,748
1861.	110,455	5,992	440,165	2,192	2,253	104,431	9,311
1862.	65,988	630	445,696	1,842	2,488	104,701	3,991
1863.	41,157		344,007	1,448	2,057	114,217	2,409
1864.	28,306		67,658	305	133	96,167	180
1865.	18,883		70,030	292	138	75,624	110
1866.	23,216		70,950	550	165	77,442	107
1867.	25,002		71,433	574	66	74,478	91
1868.	32,889		74,462	517		73,692	58
1869.	32,889		87,631	659		75,900	56
1870.	29,832		94,278	637		82,666	65

<u>Year.</u>	<u>Building Grants.</u>	<u>Pensions.</u>	<u>New Day.</u>	<u>Code. Evening.</u>	<u>Training Colleges.</u>
1871.	28,375	525	581,358	26,285	81,584
1872.	45,608	450	698,249	25,946	93,882
1873.	114,451	484	829,628	18,691	86,413
1874.	70,353	395	945,617	18,106	92,187
1875.	34,492	439	1,074,411	18,968	94,377
1876.	19,196	712	1,253,079	19,417	96,368
1877.	5,445	1,890	1,582,142	24,445	100,029
1878.	4,041	2,619	1,861,697	24,116	103,541
1879.	3,054	4,737	1,999,929	22,541	105,441
1880.	1,438	4,941	2,170,287	18,599	106,303
1881.	476	5,379	2,282,633	14,972	108,656
1882.	180	5,416	2,467,388	12,694	110,339
1883.		5,538	2,510,621	11,945	112,146
1884.		6,085	2,770,856	11,516	113,542
1885.		9,894	2,898,829	11,950	115,109
1886.		11,111	3,087,567	13,103	115,913
1887.		12,382	3,114,138	15,663	116,538
1888.		13,024	3,190,371	17,298	117,087
1889.		14,051	3,352,588	19,455	118,673
1890.		14,958	3,293,164	23,001	120,882.

Table G.
Cost of Public Elementary Education. 1840-1921.

<u>Pensions.</u>	<u>Capitation Grants.</u>	<u>Grants under Revised Code.</u>		<u>Adminis- tration.</u>	<u>Total Expend.</u>	<u>Year.</u>
		<u>Day.</u>	<u>Night.</u>			
£	£	£	£	£	£	
				733	10,642	1840.
				1,587	31,370	1841.
				2,286	31,904	1842.
				2,019	29,356	1843.
				2,168	38,702	1844.
				5,492	54,327	1845.
				5,979	58,282	1846.
				10,904	62,122	1847.
				14,195	83,407	1848.
				18,833	109,949	1849.
				32,929	193,026	1850.
				22,117	164,346	1851.
70				22,373	188,856	1852.
138				29,571	250,659	1853.
147	5,957			39,538	326,036	1854.
259	10,126			44,011	369,602.	1855.
394	20,080			45,834	423,633	1856.
717	39,362			53,814	559,974	1857.
620	49,523			59,373	668,874	1858.
538	61,183			62,783	723,116	1859.
639	63,897			65,206	724,403	1860.
785	77,240			69,106	821,930	1861.
793	82,527			66,087	774,743	1862.
640	63,852	82,186	1,172	68,247	721,392	1863.
625	200	380,101	6,623	74,744	655,042	1864.
660		386,304	9,821	74,948	636,810	1865.
631		413,038	12,473	76,963	675,535	1866.
626		412,331	14,581	79,975	679,157	1867.
564		465,493	18,308	84,503	750,486	1868.
506		516,014	21,575	87,483	822,713	1869.
520		570,189	26,124	90,250	894,561.	1870.

<u>Organisation of Districts.</u>	<u>Grants to School Boards.</u>	<u>Payment of School Fees.</u>	<u>Adminis- tration.</u>	<u>Total Expend.</u>	<u>Year.</u>
-			90,972	809,099	1871.
29,809			108,950	1,002,894	1872.
19,231			106,889	1,175,787	1873.
18,579			114,328	1,268,565	1874.
7,602	318		126,141	1,356,748	1875.
3,405	385		140,051	1,532,613	1876.
2,332	566		163,792	1,880,641	1877.
505	813	2,634	172,465	2,172,431	1878.
301	1,071	7,522	179,404	2,324,000	1879.
228	1,345	7,317	186,759	2,497,217	1880.
256	1,488	7,853	193,170	2,614,883	1881.
284	2,326	6,449	196,929	2,802,005	1882.
151	2,626	2,593	200,408	2,846,028	1883.
141	3,161	596	205,016	3,110,913	1884.
92	4,103	53	207,572	3,247,602	1885.
105	5,712	1	208,418	3,441,930	1886.
132	4,896		210,322	3,474,071	1887.
164	6,779		214,668	3,559,391	1888.
190	7,557		217,174	3,729,688	1889.
59	6,975		219,501	3,678,540	1890.

Table G. (Continued.)

<u>Year.</u>	<u>New</u>	<u>Code.</u>	<u>Fee Grant.</u>	<u>Blind, Deaf, Defective.</u>	<u>Grants to School Boards.</u>	<u>Training Colleges.</u>	<u>Pensions</u>
	<u>Day.</u>	<u>Evening.</u>					
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
1891	3,348,263	28,361	351,453		7,453	128,318	16,552
1892	3,687,188	36,610	1,842,931		8,898	138,333	18,477
1893	3,805,173	45,629	2,122,197		12,196	146,528	20,532
1894	3,907,705	92,622	2,139,202		17,860	151,887	24,404
1895	4,137,713	113,271	2,183,072	11,155	20,459	155,824	27,859
1896	4,167,322	129,830	2,217,614	15,700	39,774	157,994	30,910
1897	4,610,274	160,284	2,270,245	16,724	51,682	163,479	33,667
1898	4,468,088	190,668	2,275,197	18,041	231,233	172,793	35,834
1899	4,734,973	181,338	2,310,765	19,103	167,284	178,478	38,891
1900	5,095,930	195,642	2,341,813	19,840	205,866	195,345	47,711
1901	5,247,779	204,994	2,406,138	29,481	219,841	221,532	54,022
1902	5,396,074		2,500,267	33,774	241,911	228,735	59,883

<u>Year.</u>	<u>Grants for P.E.S.</u>	<u>Grants for H.E.S.</u>	<u>Grants for Special Schools.</u>	<u>Aid Grants.</u>	<u>Special Grant.</u>	<u>Grants to Board Schools.</u>	<u>Building Grants.</u>
1903	7,947,672		33,886	1,566,807		283,586	252
1904	8,214,342		37,086	2,340,513		77,411	
1905	8,338,765		52,657	2,429,813		8,160	
1906	8,525,059	25,002	57,993	2,469,462	170,862		
1907	8,292,277	28,518	65,166	2,451,758	185,713		4,700
1908	8,289,620	25,144	77,346	2,445,860	201,648		21,815
1909	8,339,842	26,073	76,347	2,453,157	200,000		26,855
1910	8,598,345	28,713	88,784	2,467,613	325,606		5,112
1911	8,694,298	22,621	90,013	2,472,604	350,000		
1912	8,614,616	23,301	98,282	2,454,481	350,000		
1913	8,538,584	27,050	99,683	2,452,112	350,000		
1914	8,624,904		120,993	2,447,178	785,748		
1915	8,616,584		138,123	2,437,698	785,748		
1916	8,519,778		188,331	2,401,573	785,748		
1917	8,468,320		188,306	2,353,982	778,079		
1918	8,360,496		247,877	2,311,410	1,012,583		
1919	24,938,110		243,920	2,163	33,874		
1920	32,924,615						
1921	35,680,189						

This Table is a Summary of the Annual Government Expenditure on Public Elementary Education to the Consolidation Act of 1921.

Table G.(Continued.)

<u>Administration.</u>	<u>Organisation of Districts.</u>	<u>Special Inquiries.</u>	<u>Aid Grant.</u>	<u>Refund of cost of Training.</u>	<u>TOTAL.</u>
£	£	£	£	£	£
226,168	89				4,106,657
232,938	141				5,965,516
241,410	488				6,394,153
251,935	562				6,586,267
257,284	654	595			6,907,886
261,460	507	1,297			7,022,408
267,594	506	2,570	201,122		7,778,247
261,838	587	1,788	715,492	266	8,391,825
291,944	670	1,753	798,260	79	8,723,538
294,207	750		576,760		8,973,864
296,360	627		639,271		9,320,045
287,238	458		728,433		9,496,773.

<u>Pensions.</u>	<u>Training Colleges.</u>	<u>Pupil Teachers.</u>	<u>Inspect. & Examin. & Adminst.</u>	<u>Medical Treat- ment.</u>	<u>Supplement. Grant.</u>	<u>Grant to/on L.E.A.</u>	<u>Total.</u>
68,775	265,408	57,829	412,876				10,637,091
75,866	283,669	36,251	417,370				11,482,508
83,162	312,673	175,254	421,609				11,822,093
92,302	371,545	181,091	419,120				12,312,456
101,520	428,851	294,809	423,222				12,276,534
113,031	491,097	199,387	432,868				12,297,816
123,841	521,087	143,413	438,764				12,349,379
134,807	555,759	127,379	437,068				12,769,186
145,853	571,143	101,802	435,638				12,883,972
156,883	582,806	80,921	431,006	50,344			12,842,640
176,005	581,095	72,291	439,093	129,829			12,865,742
194,041	555,553		439,647	236,389			13,404,453
208,885	487,869		421,095	365,032			13,461,034
228,672	399,535		410,592	303,761			13,231,990
236,674	377,687		438,747	298,736	3,365,716		16,506,247
259,387	459,560		490,526	359,697	3,481,236		16,982,772
945,143	642,363		636,910	183,484	939		27,626,905
1,245,392	1,005,391		957,460		-	88,410	36,221,268
1,550,687	803,261		904,675				38,938,812.

The Government Grant and the Expenditure of Local Education Authorities on Public Elementary Education during the period 1922 to 1929 are given in TABLE L.

Table H.

Analysis of Grants paid to Inspected Day Schools from 1863-1883.

<u>Year.</u>	<u>Examination.</u>	<u>Attendance.</u>		<u>Special grants to small schools.</u>	<u>Grants in respect of P.Ts.</u>	<u>Exceptions to Article 10.</u>
		<u>Average. Infants.</u>				
	£	£	£	£	£	£
Up to						
1863	52,423	49,693	12,281			
1864	164,627	150,087	38,770			
1865	184,287	164,396	46,660			
1866	182,425	164,875	50,326			
1867	193,445	174,158	56,158			
1868	223,659	187,657	62,584			
1869	250,863	204,065	69,673			
1870	282,162	222,331	75,212			
	<u>Specific Subjects.</u>	<u>Class Subs.</u>				
	£	£				
a.						
1871	2,411		272,705	96,024		
1872	10,139		383,152	140,383		
1873	11,506		433,052	157,984		
1874	11,664		487,808	180,214		
1875	14,582		537,503	194,394		
1876	13,372	73,566	579,535	209,056	2,178	13,278
1877	11,122	204,616	630,846	229,285	6,575	35,964
1878	15,147	246,694	712,668	257,252	11,810	38,817
1879	20,538	276,302	766,829	266,759	15,315	40,484
1880	26,459	297,089	819,940	271,703	18,247	38,955
1881	28,971	314,051	853,599	286,545	21,401	39,511
1882	23,592	328,824	900,059	305,652	24,011	40,680
1883						527
b.	25,482	251,950	669,545	230,165	15,489	29,405
						3,866.

a. For four months only.

b. For eight months only.

Table J.

Analysis of Grants paid to Inspected Day Schools from 1885-1902.

<u>Year.</u>	<u>Average Attendance.</u>	<u>Specific Subjects.</u>	<u>Cookery Laundry Dairy Gardening.</u>	<u>Manual Inst.</u>	<u>Remote Schools & small Populatn.</u>	<u>Pupil Teachers</u>	<u>Excpt. to be paid under Art. 95.</u>
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
A.							
1883	687,890	3,848			10,402	10,342	33
1884	2,661,797	13,246			27,475	37,960	1,202
1885	2,818,992	14,623			28,547	33,941	773
1886	2,909,394	16,423			29,580	31,289	61
1887	3,020,905	17,747			30,888	31,246	608
1888	3,105,352	12,306	8,274		31,523	38,006	6,151
1889	3,170,756	12,707	11,220		32,450	43,609	31,326
1890	3,204,171	13,603	13,102		33,795	41,700	61,564
1891	3,347,410	15,595	13,680	C.	D 66,611	28,439	
1892	3,463,500	16,185	18,481		70,591	31,896	
1893	3,686,938	16,821	22,134		68,434	35,177	
1894	3,828,466	19,244	25,198	E.	70,208	34,583	
1895	3,972,618	22,525	28,059	F.	74,220	41,053	
1896	4,102,754	24,931	32,203		77,872	34,261	
1897	4,200,006	28,198	35,930		79,965	38,505	
1898	4,352,796	32,273	38,778	6,352	82,154	44,369	
1899	4,598,496	36,619	42,597	27,867	85,225	47,881	
1900	4,661,183	40,734	45,925	30,990	87,455	47,582	
1901	4,818,743	30,151	48,555	34,630	88,208	55,309	255 G.
1902	5,040,368		46,746	34,058	87,598	69,429	15,288 H.

A. For four months only.

B. Cookery only.

C. Cookery and Laundry.

D. Grant for small populations under Article 105 of the Code.

E. Cookery, Laundry, and Dairy.

F. Cookery, Laundry, Dairy, and Gardening.

G. Payment of arrears.

H. Grant to Higher Elementary Schools.

Table K.The operation of the Fee Grant.

<u>Year.</u>	<u>Amount.</u>	<u>Scholars</u>		<u>Number of Schools.</u>		
		<u>Free</u>	<u>Paying.</u>	<u>Free</u>	<u>Fee grant and Fees.</u>	<u>Not in receipt of Fee Grant.</u>
	£.					
1892	1,842,931	3,880,722	1,126,257	15,170	3,503	842
1893	2,122,197	4,236,867	889,506	15,914	3,531	132
1894	2,139,202	4,377,741	821,000	16,289	3,303	117
1895	2,183,072	4,519,159	780,310	16,493	3,132	111
1896	2,217,614	4,661,842	761,147	16,712	3,031	105
1897	2,270,345	4,771,897	735,142	16,912	2,945	101
1898	2,275,197	4,870,615	706,251	17,008	2,834	95
1899	2,275,197	4,983,810	670,282	17,248	2,725	91
1900	2,341,813	5,036,793	649,321	17,349	2,660	91
1901	2,406,138	5,116,384	644,275	17,457	2,568	91
1902	2,500,267	5,248,052	633,226	17,575	2,484	94
1903	2,548,992	5,369,322	605,805	17,684	2,397	92
A 1904	2,620,897	5,564,173	410,954	18,867	1,334	84
1905	2,667,993	5,755,720	269,823	19,733	722	68
1906	2,689,180	5,859,436	184,958	20,062B.	456B.	48B.
C 1907	2,640,864	5,376,783	174,231	20,132	437	45
1908	2,662,066	5,394,156	163,615	20,194	430	45
1909	2,674,396	5,414,450	156,263	20,296	402	43
1910	2,699,109	5,443,032	149,953	20,414	382	43
1911	2,696,028	5,437,091	141,655	20,477	367	41
1912	2,680,596	5,441,593	139,186	20,561	357	39
1913	2,680,895	5,584,635	138,693	20,619	349	38
1914	2,691,115	D	D	D	D	D.
1915	2,658,646					
1916	2,627,499					
1917	2,590,535					
1918	2,563,099					
1919	496,912					
1920	-					

A. Statistics extracted from "Civil Services and Revenue Departments Appropriation Accounts" from 1904-1919.

B. The figures under the head of "Schools" are not published, and for the data relating to 1906-1913 I am indebted to the Board of Education.

C. Figures apply only to England from 1907.

D. The information is not available to complete the Table.

Table L.

The Percentage contributed by the State to the cost of
Elementary Education from 1851.

<u>Year.</u>	<u>Government Grant.</u>	<u>Total Income.</u>	<u>Percentage contributed by the State.</u>
	£	£	
1851	119,743	303,814	39.4
1852	127,475	388,222	32.8
1853	175,596	425,642	41.3
1854	207,913	544,165	38.2
1855	242,347	628,008	38.6
1856	278,717	690,410	40.4
1857	380,646	791,766	48.1
1858	454,796	919,213	49.5
1859	483,269	997,533	48.4
1860	477,202	1,073,293	44.6
1861	546,201	1,184,966	46.1
1862	595,962	1,169,361	43.3
1863	439,846	1,116,402	39.4
1864	395,176	1,118,542	35.3
1865	400,627	1,186,851	33.8
1866	430,085	1,240,857	34.7
1867	439,080	1,282,688	34.2
1868	501,852	1,395,332	36.0
1869	557,291	1,462,021	37.6
1870	614,566	1,611,937	38.1
1871 A.	580,258	1,635,431	35.4.
1872	660,482	1,851,391	35.6
1873	772,072	2,166,046	35.6
1874	899,543	2,568,082	35.0
1875	1,000,540	2,994,111	33.4
1876	1,158,119	3,454,276	33.7
1877	1,313,576	3,838,282	34.2
1878	1,578,884	4,354,293	36.2
1879	1,828,703	4,776,914	38.2
1880	1,982,105	5,178,259	38.2
1881	2,155,665	5,349,840	40.3
1882	2,234,319	5,566,804	40.2
1883	2,402,828	5,829,781	41.2
1884	2,515,776	6,121,539	41.2
1885	2,737,968	6,656,580	41.1
1886	2,867,700	6,787,189	42.1
1887	2,966,876	6,982,640	42.4
1888	3,069,385	7,154,116	42.8
1889	3,180,283	7,333,312	43.4
1890	3,289,285	7,575,439	43.5
1891	3,333,544	7,813,706	42.7
1892	3,963,083	8,057,989	49.2
1893	5,352,965	8,586,057	62.3
1894	5,928,594	9,178,178	64.6
1895	6,155,997	9,658,748	63.7
1896	6,543,230	10,144,054	64.5

<u>Year.</u>	<u>Government Grant.</u>	<u>Total Income.</u>	<u>Percentage contributed by the State.</u>
	£	£	
1897	6,765,455	10,507,465	64.4
1898	7,268,789	11,068,509	65.7
1899	7,831,244	11,668,227	65.9
1900	8,002,881	12,336,968	64.9
1901	8,058,708	12,801,640	63.0
1902	8,061,218	12,889,831	62.5
1903	B	B	
1904	B	B	
1905	9,867,421	18,830,814	52.4
1906	10,038,605	19,591,927	51.2
1907	10,567,399	20,527,725	51.5
1908	10,297,930	20,539,532	50.1
1909	10,479,999	21,377,633	49.0
1910	10,596,007	21,927,079	48.3
1911	10,650,163	22,481,302	47.4
1912	10,833,406	23,120,272	46.9
1913	10,846,973	23,560,760	46.0
1914	12,275,500	27,110,000	45.3
1915	12,343,143	26,658,000	46.3
1916	12,267,861	27,128,474	45.2
1917	15,415,164	31,265,299	49.3
1918	16,170,729	35,836,018	45.1
1919	25,679,807	46,522,404	55.2
1920	32,933,877	59,854,763	55.1
1921	35,687,505	62,118,101	57.4
		Expenditure of Local Education Authorities.	
1922	32,667,000	58,424,000	55.9
1923	31,716,000	56,736,000	55.9
1924	31,740,000	57,529,000	55.6
1925	32,110,000	58,375,000	55.9
1926	32,289,000	58,787,000	54.9
1927	33,444,000	58,614,000	57.0
1928	32,950,000	61,472,000	53.6
1929	35,000,000	63,121,000	55.4. 0.

A. Full returns not available owing to differences in "Appointed Days."

B. Statistics not available for complete years owing to differences in "Appointed Days."

C. Estimated.

For a Note explaining this Table see over.

Note on Table L.

Through lack of annual data the problem of determining the relative proportions contributed by the State and the Voluntary agencies is most complicated, but from the figures available in the publications of the Central Authority a comparison has been made on the following basis.

The Annual Grant made to the various Societies is compared with the Annual Income of the schools under the superintendence of these Societies. The figures are only a general indication of the financial position for several reasons.

1. All schools did not furnish complete returns.
2. From 1851 to 1862, the returns of the Roman Catholic schools in England, Scotland, and Wales are combined in the statistics of the Committee of Council.
3. From 1851 to 1856, the returns for Annual Grant Schools and Simple Inspection Schools were not separated.
4. The returns for 1853 cover only a period of ten months.
5. Building Grants are included under the head of "Government Grant". The yearly expenditure of the Voluntary Societies for that purpose is not available.
6. The total amount under "Government Grant" comprises the annual award made to Church of England, British, Wesleyan, Roman Catholic, and Parochial Union Schools in England and Wales, less the Annual Grant to Training Colleges.
7. The total given under the head of "Total Income" is the Annual Grant together with sums received from Endowments, Subscriptions, School-pence and other sources.

Table L. commences with the year 1851 as the form in which statistics were published previous to that year continually changed.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

<u>Adams, F.</u>	The Elementary School Contest.	1882.
<u>Adamson, J. W.</u>	A Short History of Education. English Education 1789-1902.	1919. 1930.
<u>Aggs, W. H. and Knowles, G. W.</u>	Handbook on Education.	1922.
<u>Binns, H. B.</u>	A Century of Education 1808-1908.	1908.
<u>Birchenough, C.</u>	A History of Elementary Education.	1925.
<u>Boothroyd, H. E.</u>	A History of the Inspectorate. (Privately printed.)	1923.
<u>Christian, G. A.</u>	English Education from Within.	1 922.
<u>Corlett, J.</u>	A Survey of the Financial Aspects of Elementary Education.	1929.
<u>Craik, Sir H.</u>	The State in Education.	1914.
<u>Cubberley, E. P.</u>	History of Education.	1920.
<u>Dobbs, A. E.</u>	Education and Social Movements.	1 919.
<u>Dyer, Ernest.</u>	Tyneside Papers, Second Series, No. 3. The Finance of Public Elementary Education.	1 931.
<u>Findlay, J. E. W.</u>	Children of England.	1923.
<u>Finnemore, J.</u>	Social Life in England. Vol. II.	1 930.
<u>Gregory, Dean.</u>	Elementary Education.	1901.
<u>Grice, Watson</u>	National and Local Finance.	
<u>Hammond, J. L. and B.</u>	The Town Labourer.	1917.
<u>Hans, N.</u>	Principles of Educational Policy.	1929.
<u>Hey, Spurley.</u>	Education Finance and the System of Government Grants. (Privately printed.)	1922.
<u>Holman, H.</u>	English National Education.	1896.
<u>Hutchins, B. L. and Harrison, A.</u>	A History of Factory Legislation.	1911.
<u>Kay-Shuttleworth, Sir J.</u>	Four Periods of Public Education.	1862.
<u>Kekewich, Sir G.</u>	The Education Department and After.	1920.
<u>King, Bolton.</u>	Schools of To-Day.	1929.
<u>Knowles, L. C. A.</u>	Industrial and Commercial Revolutions in Great Britain in the Nineteenth Century.	1921.
<u>Kandel, I. L.</u>	French Elementary Schools.	1 926.

<u>Leach, A.F.</u>	English Schools at the Reformation.	1896.
<u>London County Council</u>	The Special Services of Education in London.	1929&
<u>Montmorency, J.E.G.</u>	The Progress of Education in England.	1904.
	State Intervention in English Education.	1902.
<u>Newton, A.W.</u>	The English Elementary School.	1919.
<u>Owen, Sir H.</u>	Education Acts Manual.	1903.
<u>Parry, A.W.</u>	Education in the Middle Ages.	1922
<u>Sadler, Sir M.E.</u>	Summary of Statistics of Elementary Education in England and Wales, 1833 to 1870.	
<u>Selby-Bigge, Sir L.A.</u>	The Board of Education.	1927.
<u>Smith, Frank.</u>	Life and Work of Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth.	1923.
	A History of English Elementary Education 1760-1902.	1931.
<u>Thomas, A.H.</u>	The Education Act, 1918.	1919&
<u>Report of the Consultative Committee on the Education of the Adolescent.</u>		1926.

Official Documents.

The Kerry Returns.	1833.
Report on the State of Education.	1834.
Minutes of the Committee of Council on Education.	1839-1858.
Reports of the Committee of Council on Education.	1858-1898.
Reports of the Board of Education.	1899-1930.
Report of the Newcastle Commission on Elementary Education.	1861.
Reports of the Select Committees on Education.	1865-1866.
Report of the Cross Commission on Elementary Education.	1886.
Report of the Bryce Commission on Secondary Education.	1895.
Report of the Royal Commission on Local Taxation.	1901.
Report of the Departmental Committee on Local Taxation.	1914.
Reports of the Royal Commission on Local Government.	1925-1928.
Report of the Select Committee on National Expenditure.	1917-1920.
Codes, Instructions, and Minutes to Inspectors.	1858-1818.
Education Department. Correspondence relating to the Revised Code.	1862.
Board of Education Regulations.	1901-1907.
Board of Education Circulars.	1899-1930.
Education Department. Returns of Expenditure and Results.	1874-1899.
Board of Education Statistics of Public Education.	1900-1914.
	1919-1922.
Cost per Child and Memoranda on Estimates.	1922-1930.
Civil Service and Revenue Departments Appropriation Accounts.	1903-1922.

Reports of the Local Government Board.	1914-1919.
Ministry of Health. Annual Local Taxation Returns.	1922-1929.
L.C.C. Memorandum on Education Grants.	1908.

Private Communications.

I wish to thank the following Directors and Secretaries for Education who were good enough to furnish me with Memoranda, Statistics and other Data bearing on this Thesis.

J.H.Baines, Esq., M.A.	Director of Education to the East Sussex County Council.
H.P.Barwood, Esq., B.A.	Secretary for Education to the Hove Borough Council.
H.Bottomley, Esq.	Accountant to the Durham County Council.
E.Chandler Cook, Esq.,	Secretary for Education to the City of Plymouth.
E.Salter Davies, Esq., M.A.	Director of Education to the Kent County Council.
J.S.Davies, Esq.,	Secretary for Education to the Norfolk County Council.
J.H.Hallam, Esq., M.A., B.Sc.	Education Officer, The County Council of the West Riding of Yorkshire.
J.L.Holland, Esq.,	Secretary for Education to the Northamptonshire County Council.
F.A.Hughes, Esq., M.A.	Director of Education to the Staffordshire County Council.
P.E.Meadon, Esq., M.A.	Director of Education to the Lancashire County Council.
H.Morris, Esq.,	Secretary for Education to the Cambridgeshire County Council.
W.H.Pendlebury, Esq., M.A.	Secretary for Education to the Salop County Council.
Dr.C.F.Strong.	Director of Education for Tottenham, London.
Keith Struckmeyer, Esq., M.A.	Director of Education to the Wiltshire County Council.

Thos. Walling, Esq., M.A.	Director of Education for the County Borough of Newcastle.
A.H. Whipple, Esq., M.A., B.Sc.	Director of Education for the City of Nottingham.
C. Williams, Esq.	Director of Education for the County Council of Northumberland.

The London County Council.

The Middlesex County Council.

The Ministry of Health.

The Board of Education.