REPORT

OF THE

MENTAL DEFICIENCY COMMITTEE

being a Joint Committee of the

BOARD OF EDUCATION AND BOARD OF CONTROL

PART I — General.
PART II — The Mentally Defective Child.
PART IV — Report by Dr. E. O. LEWIS on an Investigation into the incidence of Mental Deficiency.

LONDON:
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY HIS MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE
To be purchased directly from H.M. STATIONERY OFFICE at the following addresses:
Adastral House, Kingsway, London, W.C.2; 120, George Street, Edinburgh;
York Street, Manchester; 1, St. Andrew's Crescent, Cardiff;
15, Donegall Square West, Belfast;
or through any Bookseller.

1929.
Price 5s. 0d. Net.

27-216

The estimated gross cost of the preparation of this Report (including the expenses of the special investigation) is £5,081 0*s.* 9*d.*, of which £385 represents the gross cost of printing and publishing those parts of the Report which are included in this volume.

Sir George Newman, K.C.B.,
Chief Medical Officer,
Board of Education,
Whitehall, S.W.1.

Sir,

I have the honour to submit the report* of the Committee appointed by you as Chief Medical Officer of the Board of Education on the 23rd June, 1924, to consider the problems presented by the mentally defective child. As you are aware, the scope of our deliberations was extended early in 1925 so as to include adult defectives, and our report is accordingly being presented also to the Chairman of the Board of Control.

The Committee met on 42 occasions. In addition a number of meetings of Sub-committees were held to consider those aspects of the question of which particular members were more closely cogni ant.

At an early stage we were forced to the conclusion that the only way of supplying an answer to the first of the questions which you put to us, namely, "How many mental defectives are there?" was to hold an investigation in a number of typical areas. We wish to express our thanks to the Board of Control and the Board of Education for having put at our disposal funds for this purpose With this assistance we were able to secure the services, as Medical Investigator, of Dr. E. O. Lewis, whose report on his inquiry is attached to ours. His investigation covered six areas each containing a population of about 100,000. Within these limits we believe that his investigation was more comprehensive than any similar inquiry hitherto held in this or in any other country, and we are convinced that Dr. Lewis' findings can be accepted not only as furnishing a reliable answer in regard to the question of incidence of mental defect, but also as affording very useful guidance to the Committee in their consideration of your second main question, namely, "What is the best way of dealing with mental defectives?"

Apart from the use which we have ourselves made of his report, we believe that it will prove of the highest value to all those who are concerned in any way with the various aspects, administrative, scientific, or social, of mental deficiency.

We realised from the first that if Dr. Lewis were to be given adequate time in which to complete his field work, tabulate his data and prepare his report, a considerable period must elapse before our own report, which is necessarily based to a large extent on his findings, could be completed, though all possible progress was made with its preparation while Dr. Lewis was at work. The preliminary arrangements for his inquiry, the investigation itself,

* Since this letter was written the form of the report has been altered on the lines indicated in the Prefatory Note.

(38173) Wt. 34788/107/1928 2250 4/29. Harrow G 304.

and the writing of his report occupied three and a half years, after which a further period was required by the Committee for the completion of their report. We are conscious that our report has grown to dimensions which we did not contemplate at the outset, but it seemed to us impossible to make our recommendations for the future fully intelligible unless on the one hand we related them to the background of a clear and detailed description of present conditions and on the other broke away from piecemeal suggestions and tried to look at the problem as a whole. We hope that sufficient value may be found in Dr. Lewis' report and in our own to compensate both for their length and for the delay in presenting them. The questions with which we have had to deal constitute one of the major social problems of our time, and we are convinced that treatment less thorough could have been of little or no permanent use to the Departments concerned, and through them to the country at large.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
on behalf of the Committee,
Your obedient Servant,
(Signed) A. H. WOOD,
Chairman.

Romeyns Court,
Great Milton,
Oxford.

19*th January*, 1929.

Members of the Mental Deficiency Committee.

Arthur H. Wood, M.A., C.B., late Assistant Secretary, Medical Branch, Board of Education, *Chairman.*

Ralph H. Crowley, M.D., M.R.C.P., Senior Medical Officer, Board of Education, *Vice-Chairman.*

Cyril L. Burt, M.A., D.Sc., Professor of Education, University of London, Psychologist, London County Council.

Cecil Eaton, M.A., Assistant Secretary, Medical Branch, Board of Education.

Miss Evelyn Fox, Honorary Secretary, Central Association for Mental Welfare.

Mrs. Hume Pinsent, M.A., C.B.E., Commissioner, Board of Control.

Miss Hilda Redfern, Head Mistress, Monyhull Colony School for Mentally Defective Children, Birmingham (since 1927, Inspector, Board of Control).

Frank C. Shrubsall, M.D., F.R.C.P., Senior Medical Officer, London County Council.

Alfred F. Tredgold, M.D., M.R.C.P., F.R.S. Ed., Lecturer in Mental Deficiency, London University, Assistant Physician in Psychological Medicine, University College Hospital, etc.

F. Douglas Turner, M.B., Medical Superintendent, Royal Eastern Counties Institution, Colchester.

N. D. Bosworth Smith, Principal, Medical Branch, Board of Education, *Secretary.*

To the Right Hon. Lord Eustace Percy, M.P.,
President of the Board of Education.

My Lord,

I have the honour to submit the Report of the Special Committee appointed by me in 1924, to consider the problems presented by Mental Deficiency among children of school age.

The Report is a most valuable survey of the whole problem, and, as I understand that you are anxious that Local Education Authorities and others interested should be afforded the opportunity and advantage of seeing the Report at the earliest possible moment, I submit it forthwith.

I have the honour to be,

My Lord,

Your obedient Servant,

GEORGE NEWMAN.

WHITEHALL,
January, 1929.

(58173)

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

PART II.—THE MENTALLY DEFECTIVE CHILD.

CHAPTER IV.

PRESENT ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS AND PROVISION FOR MENTALLY DEFECTIVE CHILDREN.

CHAPTER V.

DESCRIPTION OF THE COMMITTEE'S SPECIAL INVESTIGATION AND DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS.

CHAPTER VI.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MENTALLY DEFECTIVE AND RETARDED CHILDREN.

CHAPTER VII.

SUGGESTED FUTURE ALLOCATION OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR CHILDREN BETWEEN LOCAL EDUCATION, MENTAL DEFICIENCY AND OTHER AUTHORITIES.

CHAPTER VIII.

APPLICATION OF THE COMMITTEE'S SCHEME AND THE PROBLEMS WHICH IT PRESENTS.

CHAPTER IX.

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.

APPENDIX I.

PREFATORY NOTE.

The Committee in their Report as originally presented, while naturally distinguishing between the functions of Local Education and Mental Deficiency Authorities and between the requirements of older and younger defectives, endeavoured to deal comprehensively with mental deficiency, a subject which must be regarded as a unit problem. The Board of Education however were of opinion that it would be more convenient for their purposes if the Report were divided into two parts, one dealing with children and the other with adults, and inasmuch as the Committee were appointed with the object of advising the Board in matters affecting their administration they felt bound to comply with their wishes. The Committee are conscious that this division increases the difficulty of presenting the several aspects of the problem in their proper sequence and in the right perspective, but they hope that the advantages which the Board are anxious to secure will compensate for any loss of coherence and force which the Report may thus have suffered.

The Report is now arranged on the following broad lines :—

Part I, consisting of Chapters I, II and III describes the functions and work of the Committee, discusses the meaning of Mental Deficiency and states the legal basis on which administration rests. This Part forms a general introduction to the whole Report.

Part II, which consists of Chapters IV to IX, deals with the problem of the mentally deficient child. A brief description of the contents of this Part of the Report is given in Chapter I.

Part III describes the present provision for adult defectives, makes suggestions and recommendations for the future in the light of the findings of the Committee's special investigation and discusses the wider aspects of Mental Deficiency as a social and genetic problem.

Part IV is the Report of the special investigation into the incidence of mental deficiency by Dr. E. O. Lewis.

APPENDIX A.

The Conference of 25th March 1926 decided that the Committee on co-operation between Universities and Training Colleges should consist of eighteen members distributed as follows :—

Universities :—	
Oxford, Cambridge, London, Wales	1 representative each
Combined English Universities	2 representatives.
Local Education Authorities	4 ,,
Governing Bodies of Voluntary Training Colleges.	2 ,,
Training College Associations and Teachers	6 ,,

A Secretary was to be provided by the Board of Education and each body represented on the Committee was to be responsible for the nomination of its own representative or representatives.

At their first meeting the Committee decided to co-opt as their Chairman Mr. R. J. G. Mayor, formerly Principal Assistant Secretary in the Universities and Training of Teachers Branch of the Board of Education.

The Committee was finally constituted as follows :—

Chairman .. .. Mr. R. J. G. Mayor, C.B.

Representatives of Universities.

Oxford	Mr. F. J. R. Hendy (Head of the Training Department).
Cambridge	Rev. T. C. Fitzpatrick, D.D. (President of Queen's College).
London	Professor Graham Wallas. (Note 1).
Combined English Universities.	Professor John Strong, C.B.E. (Leeds).
	Professor C. W. Valentine, D. Phil. (Birmingham).
Wales	Professor C. R. Chapple (Aberystwyth).

Local Education Authorities.

Sir Percy Jackson, J.P. (Chairman, West Riding Education Committee).
Mr. Percival Sharp (Director of Education, Sheffield).
Dr. J. Graham (Director of Education, Leeds).
Mr. G. H. Gater, C.M.G., D.S.O. (Education Officer, London).

Governing Bodies of Voluntary Training Colleges.

Mr. G. L. Bruce (British and Foreign Schools Society).
Rev. H. B. Workman, D.Litt., D.D. (Wesleyan Education Committee).

Training College Associations and Teachers.

Mr. T. P. Holgate (Leeds City Training College).
Miss Spalding (Principal, Bingley Training College). (Note 2).
Miss Richards (Principal, Stockwell Training College).
Professor A. A. Cock (University College, Southampton).
Miss Lloyd Evans (Principal, Furzedown Training College).
Mr. Frank Roscoe (Secretary, Teachers Registration Council), with Mr. J. Wilkie (Board of Education) as Secretary. (Note 3).

Note (1) Dr. Deller (Academic Registrar of London University) attended some of the later meetings as representative of London University in place of Professor Graham Wallas.

(2) Miss Mercier (Principal, Whitelands Training College, Chelsea) attended some of the later meetings as a representative of the Training College Associations in place of Miss Spalding.

(3) Mr. G. A. N. Lowndes, M.C., Board of Education, acted as Secretary for the second stage of the Enquiry.

APPENDIX B.

List of persons invited to act as conveners of group meetings of Training Colleges :—

Area I. ..	Northumberland and Durham.	Mr. A. J. Dawson, C.B.E., Director of Education, Durham County.
Area II. ..	Yorkshire	Sir Percy Jackson, J.P., Chairman, West Riding Education Committee.
Area III. ..	Lancashire and Cheshire	Mr. Spurley Hey, Director of Education, Manchester.
Area IV. ..	Midlands	Professor C. W. Valentine, Professor of Education, University of Birmingham.
Area V. ..	Notts. and Derby ..	Professor H. A. S. Wortley, Professor of Education, Nottingham University College.
Area VI. ..	Eastern Counties ..	Miss Allan, Principal of Homerton College, Cambridge.
Area VII. ..	West	Miss Wodehouse, Professor of Education, University of Bristol.
Area VIII. ..	London	Mr. W. H. Webbe, Chairman, L.C.C. Education Committee.
Area IX. ..	Southern Counties ..	Mr. F. H. Toyne, Secretary for Education, Brighton.
Area X. ..	South-West	Rev. R. L. Collins, Principal, Exeter Diocesan Training College.
Area XI. ..	Wales	Mr. D. R. Harris, Principal, Bangor Normal Training College.

APPENDIX C.

List of Training Colleges arranged in Groups.

I. *Northern Group.*

University of Durham ..
- Darlington Training College.
- Durham, Bede Training College.
- „ Neville's Cross Training College.
- „ St. Hild's Training College.
- Newcastle, Kenton Lodge Training College.
- „ Northern Counties' Training College of Domestic Science.
- „ St. Mary's Training College.
- Sunderland Training College.

II. *Yorkshire Group.*

University of Leeds ..
- Bingley Training College.

University of Sheffield ..
- Hull, Municipal Training College.
- „ Roman Catholic Training College.
- Leeds, City Training College.
- „ Yorkshire Training College of Domestic Science.
- Ripon Training College.
- Sheffield, City Training College.
- York Training College.

APPENDIX C.—*contd.*

III. *Lancashire and Cheshire Group.*

University of Manchester ..	Chester Training College.
	Crewe Training College.
	Liverpool, Calder Training College of Domestic Science.
University of Liverpool ..	,, Edge Hill Training College.
	,, Mount Pleasant Training College.
	Manchester, Training College of Domestic Science.
	Salford Training College.
	Warrington Training College.

IV. *West Midlands Group.*

University of Birmingham ..	Birmingham, Saltley Training College.
	,, Selly Park Training College
	Dudley Training College.
	Hereford Training College.
	Peterborough Training College.

V. *East Midlands Group.*

Nottingham University College	Bishop's Stortford Training College.
	Derby Training College.
	Lincoln Training College.
	Norwich Training College.

VI. *Western Group.*

University of Bristol	Bath, Training College of Domestic Science.
	Bristol, Fishponds Training College.
	Cheltenham, St. Mary's Training College.
	,, St. Paul's Training College.
	Gloucester, Training College of Domestic Science.
	Leicester, Training College of Domestic Subjects.

VII. *London Group.*

University of London	L.C.C. Avery Hill Training College.
	Battersea, Polytechnic Training College of Domestic Science.
	Chelsea, St. Mark's and St. John's Training College.
	,, Whitelands Training College.
	L.C.C. Furzedown Training College.
	Gipsy Hill Training College.
	L.C.C. Graystoke Place Training College.
	Hampstead, National Society's Training College of Domestic Science.
	Isleworth, Borough Road Training College.
	Kennington, St. Gabriel's Training College.
	Kensington, St. Charles' Training College.
	Stockwell Training College.

APPENDIX C.—*contd.*

VII. *London Group.*—contd.

University of London—*contd.*	Strawberry Hill, St. Mary's Training College.
	Tottenham, St. Katherine's Training College.
	Wandsworth, Southlands Training College.
	Westminster, National Training School of Cookery, etc.
	Westminster Training College.
	Wood Green, Home and Colonial Training College.

VIII. *Reading Group.*

University of Reading ..	Brighton, Municipal Training College.
	,, Women's Training College.
	Chichester Training College.
	Culham Training College.
	Portsmouth Training College.
	Salisbury Training College.

IX. *Southampton Group.*

Southampton University College	Southampton Roman Catholic Training College.
	Winchester Training College.

X. *South-Western Group.*

Exeter University College ..	Exeter Diocesan Training College.
	Truro Training College.

XI. *Welsh Group.*

University of Wales	Bangor Normal Training College.
	,, Women's Training College.
	Barry Training College.
	Caerleon Training College.
	Cardiff Training College of Domestic Science
	Carmarthen Training College.
	Swansea Training College.

Note 1.—The following Training Colleges are not included in any of the above groups for examination purposes :—

Bedford Training College.
Brondesbury, Maria Grey Training College.
Froebel Educational Institute.
Homerton Training College.
Norwood College for the Blind.
Saffron Walden Training College.
Shoreditch Technical Institute.

Note 2.—This list does not include the Goldsmiths' College, provided by London University, nor the Training Departments for Two Year Students which are provided by certain other Universities and University Colleges.

APPENDIX D.

Constitution of the proposed Central Advisory Committee.

We have suggested in paragraph 18 of our Report that the Central Advisory Committee for the Certification of Teachers which we propose might suitably be constituted by assigning representatives as follows :—

	Representatives.
Universities and University Colleges	8
Local Education Authorities	4
Governing Bodies of non-University Training Colleges ..	4
Teaching Staffs of Training Colleges	4
The teaching profession as a whole	4

The method of nomination of the representatives of the Universities will need to be considered in consultation with persons who can speak for the Universities.

With regard to the representatives of the other bodies, we make the following suggestions :—

(*a*) The representatives of the Local Education Authorities should be nominated :—

1 by the Association of Education Committees.
1 by the County Councils Association.
1 by the Association of Municipal Corporations.
1 by the London County Council.

(*b*) The representatives of the Governing Bodies of non-University Training Colleges should be nominated as follows :—

1 person representing the Municipal and County Training Colleges, to be nominated by the Local Education Authorities providing Training Colleges.

1 person representing the Church of England Training Colleges, to be nominated by the Board of Supervision of Church of England Training Colleges.

1 person representing the Roman Catholic Training Colleges, to be nominated by the Catholic Education Council.

1 person representing the other Non-University Training Colleges, to be nominated by the Governing Bodies of those Colleges.

(*c*) The representatives of the teaching staffs of Training Colleges should be nominated by the Joint Standing Committee of the Training College Association and the Council of Training College Principals.

(*d*) The representatives of the teaching profession should be nominated by the Teachers Registration Council.

We have suggested in paragraph 19 that the Board should, in appointing the Committee, reserve to themselves discretion to make any addition to its membership which they might at any time think desirable, with a view to providing for the representation on the Committee of any point of view or experience which might seem to them to be not sufficiently represented among the nominated members. We suggest that in exercising this discretion the Board should endeavour to secure :—

(*a*) That some representation should be given to any area not already represented.

(*b*) That there should be some person on the Committee specially appointed to represent the interests of the Training Colleges of Domestic Subjects.

APPENDIX E.

Correspondence as to the co-operation of the Board's Officers with the new Examining Bodies.

16th December, 1927.

Sir,—The Committee on Universities and Training Colleges has had under consideration the question, which was raised in the President's statement to the Conference on 25th March 1926, of standardising the new examinations instituted under Circular 1372.

They are proposing to include in the Report which they will submit to the Conference a recommendation that the Board should be asked to appoint a "Central Advisory Committee on the Certification of Teachers" which should represent the various bodies or interests chiefly concerned in the training and recognition of teachers, and the functions of which should be to maintain a general survey over the examinations instituted under Circular 1372 and to advise the Board upon questions arising thereon.

The Committee do not propose in their Report to make detailed recommendations as to the manner in which the proposed Central Advisory Committee should discharge its functions, since this matter can in their view be more usefully dealt with in the light of later experience. It seems to them, however, a matter of immediate importance that steps should be taken to ensure the maintenance of a proper continuity of standard during the early years of the working of the new examinations system, and for this purpose they think it essential that advantage should be taken of the experience of the Board's Officers, who alone possess full information as to the standards and methods adopted in the past.

They feel assured that the new examining bodies would in all cases welcome the assistance which the Board's Officers would give in this matter, and they observe indeed that in most of the schemes which have been framed express provision is made by which representatives of the Board will be invited to take part in the proceedings of the examining bodies. The Committee are anxious to see the experience of the Board's Officers made fully available for this purpose, and they hope that arrangements may be made by which representatives of the Board may be enabled to give active assistance to the new examining bodies as well as to the Central Advisory Committee if it is established.

The next meeting of the Committee will be held on the 19th January 1928 and the Committee's deliberations at that meeting would be assisted if they could receive an assurance of the Board's willingness to make arrangements on the above lines.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient Servant,
R. G. MAYOR.

The Secretary,
Board of Education,
Whitehall, S.W.1.

10th January, 1928.

R. 486/12.

Sir,

In reply to your letter of the 16th December, I am directed by the Board of Education to say that they gather that your Committee consider that experience of the working of the various local schemes should be awaited before any attempt is made to establish a permanent system for focussing and standardising the various examinations such as was indicated in the President's statement to the Conference on the 25th March 1926. They

note, however, that your Committee attach importance to the maintenance of a proper continuity of standard during the early years of the working of the new examinations system, and they agree that for this purpose their officers, who, as you say, alone possess full information as to the standards and methods adopted in the past, should be instructed to render all possible assistance to the new examining bodies, as well as to the Central Advisory Committee if it is established. In order to meet the wishes of your Committee the Board will include an express provision to this effect in their approval of any scheme submitted to them.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

A. J. FINNY.

R. G. Mayor, Esq.

APPENDIX F.

Correspondence as to Board's grant towards cost of Examination.

6th December, 1927.

Sir,

The Committee on co-operation between Training Colleges and Universities have had before them a letter from Mr. G. H. Gater, in which he states that a scheme of co-operation between the University of London and the Training Colleges, especially in regard to the examination of students for the Teacher's Certificate, was approved provisionally at a Conference of Chairmen and Principals of the Training Colleges which was held on the 22nd September, at the County Hall. The letter stated further that the Senate of the University have agreed in principle to undertake the examination of Training College students and to co-operate with the Colleges on the general lines of the draft scheme, subject to certain provisos, one of which is that no part of the cost falls on the University or the University Colleges; that the University estimate that the cost of the examination will be £4 per student; and that the Conference of 22nd September decided that, if the draft scheme is approved by those concerned, the Board of Education should be approached with a view to their bearing the whole of the cost or, at least, a larger part than the 30*s.* per student, which is the maximum grant at present offered by the Board.

My Committee note that the Board's present decision as stated at the Conference on 29th October 1926, was that

> "they would be prepared to consider an arrangement under which they would meet by means of a direct grant half the cost of the new examinations subject to an over-riding maximum of 30*s.* per student examined. This figure is based on the assumption that it should be possible to carry out the new examinations at an average cost of £3 per student examined and that on an average half the cost would be borne by the students."

The record of the Conference shows that the President said in the course of the discussion that if it turned out that the amount he had mentioned was insufficient he would be quite willing to consider whether it could be increased.

My Committee do not consider that they could reasonably approach the Board with a view to their bearing the whole of the cost, but they think that they may properly represent to the Board that the cost of the examinations appears to them on the evidence now available likely to exceed

APPENDIX F.—*contd.*

the figure of £3 per student examined, which was mentioned at the Conference in October 1926. While the arrangements proposed in the London Examination Scheme are in some ways more complicated than those proposed in other schemes, owing to the large number of students involved, the Committee do not think that it would be safe to estimate that the examination could be carried out in other areas at a lower cost per head than in London. It might, on the other hand, be expected that the cost per head of an examination for a small number of candidates would in general be higher than the cost per head for a large number of candidates.

So far as the Committee are aware, London is the only area for which an estimate of the probable cost of the new examination has yet been worked out in any detail. My Committee observe that in one scheme (Birmingham) a figure of £3 was mentioned as the estimated cost, but they have been informed by Professor Valentine, who represents Birmingham University on the Committee, that this estimate had not been worked out in detail, and Professor Valentine has since written to say that he has consulted with the Vice-Chancellor on the matter and they are of opinion that the cost will probably come to £4 per student.

My Committee will regret to see the negotiations, which have been proceeding with a good prospect of success in London and other areas, imperilled through financial difficulties, and in the circumstances they venture to hope that the Board will take into consideration the possibility of raising the over-riding maximum for their proposed grant from 30*s.* to £2 for each student examined.

I have the honour to be,

The Secretary,
Board of Education.

Your obedient Servant,
R. G. MAYOR.

9th February, 1928.

R. 486/16.

Sir,

In reply to your letter of the 6th December last, I am directed to state that the Board have given careful consideration to the representations contained therein, but they regret that they do not see their way to raise beyond 30*s.* per student the limit of their direct grant towards meeting the cost of the new examinations. Where, however, Local Education Authorities pay the examination fee of necessitous students, the Board are prepared to recognise these payments for grant under Grant Regulations No. 4.

The Board have further had under consideration, on application from individual Examination Boards, the question of the payment of clerical, travelling and other expenses incurred in setting up their schemes. I am to state that the Board would consider applications for the refund of any reasonable initial expenses necessarily incurred by the Joint Boards in bringing into operation their new schemes for the Final Examination of Training College Students, subject to the Board being satisfied that no part of the expenditure is attributable to the opening examination itself, or the preparation of courses of study for that examination. Such expenditure as in the case of subsequent examinations, is properly chargeable against the fees to be paid by the candidates. The Board will of course expect these expenses to be kept down to as low a level as possible.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient Servant,

R. G. Mayor, Esq.,

A. T. BAINES.

APPENDIX G.

President's Statement as to grant.

On Recommendation 10 ("That the Board be requested to raise the over-riding maximum for their proposed grant from 30*s*. to £2 for each student examined") the President, at the Conference on May 3rd 1928, said that the decision of the Board of Education to pay half the cost of the new examination up to an over-riding maximum of 30s. per student examined, was not based entirely upon the assumption that in no case would the examination fee be greater than £3. It would be realised that in coming to such decisions, it was necessary for the Board to pay regard to a number of factors, and, on the information before them they came to the conclusion that £3 represented as high an estimate of the average cost for the country as a whole as they could reasonably take into their calculations for this purpose. The Board had agreed to pay, in addition to the 30*s*., half the cost of any contribution made by the Local Education Authority in necessitous cases towards meeting the balance of the examination fee, and he could not agree with the suggestion that had been made that a balance up to £2 10*s*. was too much to ask the average—non-necessitous—student to pay. Such a proposition would be difficult if not impossible to defend. It had to be remembered that success in the examination opened the door to entry to a profession, the salaries of which were governed by the Burnham agreements. Moreover, it was a question for consideration whether it could really be held to be in the best interests of the teaching profession itself that the intending teacher should not be expected to make such a reasonable payment. At the same time, he was prepared to admit that in this, as in other directions, the new examination system was experimental, and if, in the light of experience, substantial evidence was produced that real hardship was involved, the Board would not close the door to re-consideration of the question.

Printed by H.M.S.O. Press, Harrow.