The history of the system of direct grants to secondary schools

Partington, J. A.

THE HISTORY OF THE SYSTEM OF DIRECT GRANTS TO SECONDARY SCHOOLS

by

J. A. PARTINGTON

Submitted for the Degree of Master of Education of the University of Durham.

September 1967.

SYNOPSIS

The thesis deals with the government grants made directly to secondary schools, from their inception at the end of the nineteenth century to the present day. It discusses the establishment of the grant-making powers of the Board of Education and the relationship of the Board with the rapidly developing Local Authorities for education. Grant policy is shown in its administrative aspects, and the effects in the fields of school management and control are shown. Between the two World Wars the system was affected by the growing demand for free secondary education, and was the subject of government reports. Finally the effects of the Education Act, 1944, are discussed, and an assessment made of the reasons why the Direct Grant system was continued: following on this, a description of how the list was compiled, attitudes towards it, and developments in recent years.

-----oOo-----

Sir Michael Sadler on the future development of British education: " Is it towards an elaborately comprehensive system of all types of school, representing ..... every creed and many colours of conviction ? or is it towards some unified monopoly of education, administered by the State and bound to it by pre-suppositions sanctioned by the State and by the State alone ? ..... " (1)

(1) Lynda Grier, "Achievement in Education, the Work of Michael Ernest Sadler." Constable, 1952, p. 162.

CONTENTS.

----oOo----

ABBREVIATIONS

H.M.C.	Documents made available by the Secretary, The Headmasters' Conference.
P.R.O.	Files open to inspection at the Public Record Office, London. Class 24: Private Office Papers, Board of Education Class 12: Secondary Education, General Files. Records are quoted by Class number followed by Piece/File number.
H.C. Debates	Hansard Parliamentary Debates: vol. no. followed by column no.

-----oOo-----

The Direct Grant secondary school is an anachronism. Trends in the administration of post-elementary education in England and Wales since 1902, in particular the increased stature of Local Education Authorities, force this conclusion on the student of administration. Yet this anachronism is unlikely to wither away of its own accord, for this single group of 179 schools (1), 64 of them denominational, 22 of them under the control of the Girls' Public Day School Trust, and 57 of them members of the Headmasters' Conference (2) contains a high proportion of our most successful Grammar Schools: and it would be idle to assume that their success is in no way connected with their special system of financing and government. The present trend towards the establishment of local non-selective schools (3) would seem to cut right across the concept of the average Direct Grant school as a school which selects from a wide area, although it should not be overlooked that where a school continues to cut across administrative boundaries for its pupils, as in the case of denominational schools with a widely dispersed clientele, Direct Grant will continue to present an attractive method of financial support. The same might apply also to certain types of experimental school.

(1) D.E.S. List 73 (1964) gives details of all 179 schools.

(2) G.Kalton "The Public Schools", Longmans 1966, gives fuller statistics of these 57 Direct Grant schools.

(3) c.f. D.E.S. Circular 10/65:"The organisation of secondary education."

A government wishing to reap the benefits of a national system of education will usually as a first step pay other bodies to do its educational work: government itself at this stage has the money to maintain a system, but not the experience to control it. (1) The first grants of public money towards education in England followed this pattern (2) The second step is for the government to make its first tentative attempts to both finance and operate its own schools: under the Act of 1870 the British government set up State schools alongside existing schools controlled by other bodies (3). The final stage is reached when government has acquired sufficient experience to be able to offer assistance to those from whom it learnt. In this spirit the Education Act of 1902 made Local Authorities responsible both for provided and non-provided schools in their areas.(4)

The same stages can be clearly seen in the development of secondary education, albeit many years later. To quote Selby-Bigge, a senior Board of Education official during its early years: " Broadly speaking, the finance of public education was for many years, and, indeed, right up to 1902, a matter of the purchase by the state of the provision of education, or bits of education, or the improvement of education from voluntary

(1) c.f. Lewis and Loveridge,"The Management of Education" London, 1965.

(2) F. Birchenough,"History of Elementary Education" 3rd.ed. 1938, pp. 75 ff.

(3) Elementary Education Act, 1870, Sect. 5.

(4) Education Act, 1902, Sect. 7.

agencies and, in a limited field, from ad hoc or municipal local authorities." (1) The Butler Act of 1944 finally extended the dual system of control from the elementary field into the field of secondary education, bringing the voluntary secondary school firmly within the financial ambit of Local Education Authorities. But the modern Direct Grant school slipped though the net of this system, and stands nowadays neither entirely, nor entirely out of the national system of secondary schools. It is the background to these developments which concerns us here. Whether or not there is virtue in operating a mixed economy in the administrative systems of our schools; whether payment of public funds, either directly as a subsidy, or indirectly in the form of pupils' fees, should be made only to schools which are under local political control; whether or not school managements appointed by different means can be trusted to act in the public interest, all these are problems belonging to the domain of political philosophy rather than the administration of education. They will concern us here only insofar as they have been answered differently at various stages in the history of government grants to secondary schools.

(1) L.A. Selby-Bigge, " The Board of Education " Putnam, 1927 pp. 82 - 83.

Chapter 1: The origins of government grants.

The modern Direct Grant school can usually trace its beginnings at least as far back as the mid-nineteenth century, before grants from public funds were paid. Leaving aside the schools controlled and financed by religious Orders and those of the Girls' Public Day School Company, they were endowed Grammar Schools, drawing their income from investments and pupils' fees. Such influence as the central government could bring to bear upon them was through the agency of the Endowed Schools Commissioners, appointed in 1869, and subsequently through the Charity Commissioners in 1874. These bodies were empowered (1) to draw up schemes of management for endowed schools to make the best use of educational endowments. (2) The weakness here lay mainly in the fact that the Charity Commissioners were a quasi-judicial body and, as such, more concerned with legal problems in the administration of legacies than with educational matters. They were certainly not the type of central guiding authority for higher education which the Taunton Commission of 1868 had had in mind. (3)

This is not to say, however, that the Commissioners did not improve the quality of the endowed schools. (4) But they were hampered by the general decline in the value of endowments, a trend which was to continue well beyond the turn of the century.

(1) Endowed Schools Act, 1869, Sect. 9.

(2) c.f. Gosden, "The Development of Educational Administration in England and Wales," Oxford, 1966 pp. 57 ff.

(3) c.f. Royal Commission on Secondary Education, 1895, vol.1 p. 93. (referred to as the Bryce Commission.)

(4) ibid. p.9.

Thus more and more of the endowed Grammar schools found themselves faced with the choice either of raising fees to impossible levels or, from 1853 onwards, of adapting themselves to be in a position to earn grants from the Department of Science and Art. The latter choice was usually made with great reluctance since it meant largely abandoning the schools' traditional curriculum in favour of more scientific subjects: and after 1872 only 16 endowed Grammar schools out of 264 which were receiving grants from the Department chose to become "Organised Science Schools" and therefore qualify for a higher rate of grant.(1) When, after 1895 (2) the Science and Art Department relaxed its regulations to include commercial, literary and practical subjects, the number of endowed Grammar schools receiving grant rose to 169.

The effect of Science and Art grants on the financial position of the endowed Grammar schools should not be overrated (3). But it was a different matter with the "Whiskey Money", which, after the passing of the Technical Education Acts in 1889 and 1891, brought further financial aid through the local authorities to the endowed Grammar schools: this assistance came ultimately to three-quarters of a million pounds annually, more than the total value of endowments.(4) Whereas most of the Science and Art grants had been expended on voluntary and School Board schools,

(1) Gosden, op.cit. p. 48

(2) Bryce, vol 2, qq 1246 ff.: c.f. also A.V.Judges,"The Educational influence of the Webbs",Brit.J'nl.Ed.St.vol X no.1, 1961, p.41

(3) M.Argles,"South Kensington to Robbins"London 1964, p.21 ff.

(4) Bryce, vol. 1., p. 442 - 445: Lowndes, "The silent social revolution," O.U.P. reprint, 1941.p 44 f.

the endowed Grammar schools took a much higher proportion of the new aid. The two sources of funds were often interconnected, insofar as a Local Authority might build extra science facilities at an endowed school so as to enable the school to qualify for Science and Art Department grants. The general supervision of grants through Local Authorities also lay with the Science and Art Department.

The Bryce Commission of 1895 (1) brought to light a varied picture of the endowed schools. Some of the better-endowed were prospering, others were desperately short of funds:(2) "Many of the older Grammar Schools require judicious aid to render them efficient...."(3) The Commission also expressed its dislike of the bias in many schools towards technical subjects,which the grant-earning system hitherto had brought about, although it was ready to concede that the grant authorities had in many cases stretched their regulations to the limit.(4) The position as regards the introduction of technical subjects into the endowed Grammar schools was rapidly hardening, because many Local Authorities as a condition of grant, were gaining effective control of some endowed schools through nominations to the governing bodies.(5)

The report suggested that the endowed Grammar schools, with their emphasis on a predominantly literary education, should, as

(1) The Royal Commission on Secondary Education,1895

(2) Report, vol. 1., p. 45 (3) ibid. p. 79

(4) ibid. p. 35 (5) ibid. p. 45.

far as was reasonably possible, be maintained as going concerns. As a condition of receiving aid from public funds, the smaller endowed schools should be prepared to adapt themselves as part of "organised" secondary education. The administration of endowments should also be made much more elastic: in support of this proposal the Commission referred to the Archbishop Holgate Foundation at Hemsworth in the West Riding, where the attempt to move the school to neighbouring Barnsley had provoked a battle in the Courts lasting over nine years.(1)

On the other hand there is no suggestion in the report that the endowed schools ought to accept a degree of state control similar to that experienced, for example, by the elementary school. It was suggested in evidence (2) that the Charitable Trusts side of the administrative structure should be retained, but that the schools themselves should be persuaded to work more directly with the Education Department, and, by implication, with whatever local authorities were set up. Attention was also drawn to the special position of the non-local school to which scholars came from an area far outreaching that of any one Local Authority: the Commission was told, for example, that boys attended Manchester Grammar School from as far afield as Fleetwood and Huddersfield. (3) The Report suggested that such schools should not be under Local Authority jurisdiction. There would, of course, be some

(1) Report, vol. 1., p. 47 (2) ibid. p.89.

(3) vol. 5, p. 455.

difficulties of assessment, as some schools in the nature of things grew in status and size, while others diminished. But, in general, the compiling of this special list of schools should be in the hands of the proposed educational council, "whose experience, judgment and non-political character appear to fit it for this delicate work."(1) The central authority should be empowered to sanction and draw up schemes for schools included in the list.

These and other recommendations of the Bryce Commission exercised a great influence in the following decade and beyond. The year 1899 saw the creation of the Board of Education, which, by 1903 had finally taken over the educational work of the Charity Commission.(2) Both these developments were well received by the endowed schools as a whole. In 1899 the Headmasters' Conference carried by a large majority a resolution by the High Master of Manchester Grammar School urging that the powers of the Charity Commissioners should as soon as possible be transferred to the new Board.(3) Members felt strongly that the only alternative to the creation of an influential central authority would be the evolution of more powerful local authorities under the Technical Instruction Acts, to the detriment of what they held to be of value. For the same reason, the Conference played an important role in the struggle which resulted in the separation of the technical and secondary school work of the new Board, and the

(1) Bryce, vol.1, p.262.

(2) c.f. Gosden "The Board of Education Act 1899" Brit.Jnl.Ed. Stud.,vol X1,Nov.1962,p.52 ff.

(3) H.M.C. Annual Meeting, 22nd December,1899.

establishment of the Secondary Schools Branch.(1) Even then the idea persisted in the minds of many of those connected with the endowed schools that inspection by the Board was synonymous with inspection by the Science and Art Department, and several schools would have nothing to do with the Board's Inspectors.(2) In 1903, for example, the Board wrote to the Governors of St. Paul's School, suggesting a full inspection,(3) and indicating that several other schools of similar status had already been happy to receive the Board's Inspectors. The Governors declined the offer, and in turn challenged the Board to quote its statutory authority to insist on such an inspection. The matter was referred to the Board's legal experts, who concluded that in fact the Board had no authority to force an inspection on the school: under the Board of Education Act it was necessary(4) for schools to request inspection before one could be made. As for the powers of inspection which the Board had inherited from the Charity Commissioners, these were limited to matters relating to the financial administration of the school, and could not legally be extended to cover those educational aspects of interest to the Inspectors. It was against this background that the Board insisted on inspection as a condition of payment of grants to secondary schools.

From 1901 onwards the Board took some action to redress

(1) c.f. Gosden, loc.cit.,p.52. (2) H.M.C. Annual Gen.Meeting, 1900.

(3) P.R.O. Ed 24/394 (4) Board of Education Act, 1899: Section 3(i).

the imbalance in the curriculum. It made provision for two types of school; one with a curriculum mainly classical and linguistic, corresponding to the traditions of the endowed grammar schools, and the other predominantly technical and scientific.(1) In practice however, the latter group of schools (referred to as 'A' Division schools) earned grant on a much higher scale, and the trend to scientific studies was merely slowed,(2) rather than stopped. In the Commons in 1903 the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board, Sir William Anson, pointed out that the Board recognised 226 'A' Division schools as against only 160 'B' schools: the impoverished endowed schools were still being obliged to earn the higher grant if they were to remain solvent.(3) It was not until 1904 that the Board issued new Regulations for Secondary Schools which attempted to reconcile the opposing camps by insisting as a condition of grant on a thorough grounding in the subjects of a general education. " Nothing short of what...(the 1904 regulations)... require " wrote Michael Sadler, " is consistent with any sound definition of secondary education." (4)

By the end of 1904, then, a sympathetic relationship was being established between the endowed schools and the Board.(5) Until 1907 the Board used the very limited funds at its disposal for secondary education as " a lever for higher efficiency " (6)

(1) c.f. Banks,"Morant and the Sec. Sch. Regs.1904":Brit.Jnl.Ed.St. vol.3,Nov.1954, p.33ff.

(2)Eaglesham,"Implementing the Ed.Act 1902":B.J.E.S. vol.X, May 1963

(3) H.C. Debates, 125/173.

(4) Banks, loc.cit. p. 36.

(5) c.f.Graves, "Policy and Progress in Secy.Education, 1902-1942," p.65.

(6) Report of the Board of Education, 1904/5, p. 44.

and exclusively so. But a different story emerges from the relationships of the endowed schools with local authorities which evolved gradually after the passing of the Technical Instruction Acts. From its very ealiest days the Board found itself obliged to act as the adjudicator in disputes between the governing bodies of existing endowed schools and local authorities, disputes which arose because the interest of local authorities naturally tended to go beyond matters of educational efficiency into the administrative control of the schools themselves. It is interesting to note in passing that the Board had no statutory authority to decide these disputes, although it could of course make its opinions felt through the annual grant regulations and the acceptance or rejection of applications from schools or local authorities for grants in aid. The Board of Education Act laid a duty on the Board merely to "superintend matters relating to education,"(1) and the 1902 Act spoke only of consultation with Local Authorities over the supply of education other than elementary.(2) By contrast, in the field of elementary education the 1902 Act laid a specific duty on the Board of deciding certain disputes between Managers and Local Authorities.(3) Attempted legislation of 1896 which aimed at setting up local authorities had included such a provision aimed at reducing friction between them and the governing bodies of the endowed schools, but this had not been carried over into subsequent successful legislation.(4)

(1) Board of Education Act,1899 Section 1(i).

(2) Education Act,1902, Section 2(i).

(3) Education Act, 1902, Section 7 (3)

(4) c.f. H.C. Debates, 104/878. 10th.Mar,02.

A large number of these disputes originated in the last years of the Education Department, before its redesignation as the Board. Sir John Gorst, the head of the Department, was the author of the unsudcessful Bill of 1896, and in the belief that subsequent attempts at similar legislation would meet the same fate, he attempte to achieve the same end through the regulations of the Science and Art Department. After 1897 the regulations carried a clause under which local government authorities might apply for recognition as local authorities for secondary education: these became known later as the 'Clause V11' authorities (1). Almost immediately, however, the Board was inundated with protests from School Boards, Technical Instruction Committees and other bodies about each others' intentions: in Preston, for example, a heated dispute arose over who was to have the administrative control of the town's Grammar school.(2) Robert Morant, who joined the staff of the Department in 1895 and rose to be Secretary to the Board in 1903, cannot fail to have been impressed by the often petty nature of these local disputes: and although he was afterwards largely instrumental in planning the Bill which was to set up more comprehensive local authorities (3), he did much to prevent a situation arising in which the Local Authorities under the 1902 Act were able to keep as tight a hold on the administration of secondary schools as they exerted in the elementary field.

(1) Directory of Science and Art Dept.,1897, Cd 634, p.4, Cl.V11. c.f.also Eaglesham, "From Sch.Bd.to Local Auth."1956, p.62ff.

(2) P.R.O. Ed. 24/42b.

(3)c.f.Eaglesham,"Planning the Ed. Bill 1902", B.J.E.S.,vol X,1960, No.1.

A typical difficulty, and one which was to recur several times, was that of the Girls' Public Day School Company. Schools managed by the company had been receiving State aid in the form of "Whiskey money" since 1892, and the decision was taken to open additional schools in the London area at Highbury, Kensington, East Putney and Sydenham. This proposal met with fierce opposition from the London Technical Education Committee who feared that this would lead to some duplication of their own efforts. The Committee demanded that the new schools should teach only to a curriculum approved by the Committee. The matter was referred to the Board of Education by the Directors of the company in 1900,(1) together with the company's own proposal, namely that the new schools should be accorded the same status as existing ones, and remain independent of local authorities. The letter to the Board also pointed out that the Girls' Public Day School Company was a national rather than a local organisation, and was thus more fitted to deal directly with the Board: and its case against the proposal from the Technical Education Committee seemed to be supported by the wording of Clause V11 itself: "The rights of Managers of existing Schools and Classes will not be interfered with." In its turn, the Committee demanded a ruling from the Board as to whether an educational institution which had existed prior to the setting up of local authorities might subsequently carry on its work without regard to the existence of such an authority. The Board's reply made no attempt to deal with the

(1) P.R.O. Ed. 24/42b. Letter G.P.D.S.C./Board of Education, 29th. June, 1900 and subsequent papers.

question as put. It declared only that the Technical Education Committee had no authority in the matter, and that the Girls' Public Day School Company would continue to deal directly and only with the Board itself.

The Board was equally reluctant to make a bold pronouncement of policy in the queries raised in correspondence with Bromsgrove School.(1) It appeared from the regulations that a Clause V11 Authority would have control over the Science and Art grants paid in its area, and Clause V11 itself further stated that.... "grants will, in general, be made to Managers of new Schools and Classes only if they are acting in unison with such organisation." The Governors of the school inferred that it was now necessary, in order to receive grants under the Science and Art regulations, to satisfy not only the Board but also a local Clause V11 authority where one existed, and that any extension of the schools' work after the date of the regulation must come under the jurisdiction of a Clause V11 authority. They asked the Board to state how far a Clause V11 authority might thus claim to control a school. In its reply the Board reserved the right to adjudicate in "individual cases", and leaned heavily on the significance of the words " in general " in the clause.

Nor was the Association of Headmasters given a much more informative reply. The Secretary acknowledged that grants would be disbursed henceforth at the discretion of Clause V11 authorities,

(1) P.R.O. Ed.24/42b.: Letter Bromsgrove School/Board of Education, 8th. November, 1901.

but asked whether schools might,if they later chose, leave a Clause V11 organisation, or whether a decision to join was irrevocable. The Board's reply ran:" If an Institution which was receiving grants from the Science and Art Department prior to the insertion in the Directory of the present Clause seven should withdraw itself from the Clause seven organisation, the Board of Education would deal with any subsequent application for grants in accordance with the merits of the case and would have regard to the circumstances under which such an Institution had entered into the organisation."(1)

It was just such a case that obliged the Board to clarify its position with regard to the whole question of the relationship of Clause V11 and the Regulations for Secondary Day Schools to the endowed schools. The Bolton Grammar School (2) applied in 1903 for recognition by the Board as a Secondary Day School, Division 'B', and consequently to be relieved of unison with the local authority. The view of the head of the Secondary Schools Branch, Mr. W.N. Bruce, was that there was insufficient reason for treating the school abnormally, as it was a local school. "Now that there is a Local Authority of Secondary education, exceptions should, it appears to me, to be made more sparingly than ever:"(3)".... there is no doubt that the recognition of the Local Authority as "Managers" is sometimes difficult to reconcile with the legal responsibilities and duties of Governing Bodies under Schemes,

(1) P.R.O. Letter I.A.H.M./Board of Education, 1st.June,1900.

(2) I am grateful to Professor Eagleshan for drawing my attention to this matter.

(3) Minute W.N.B(ruce)/Sir William Abney, 24.3.03. P.R.O.

and very little guidance as to the limits of the authority of the "Managers" is to be found in the Regulation. There will, no doubt, be cases in which indiscreet and ill-qualified officials will make a mischievous use of their powers, but I doubt if such an evil has been, or is likely to be, general. The great difficulty in introducing more precise regulations lies in the infinite degrees of efficiency or the reverse to be found among 'Grammar Schools'. To many of the class the exercise of authority by the Clause V11 Authority is a distinct gain.

If a Governing Body work willingly and loyally with a Local Authority they ought to be able to check an improper exercise of authority by an Organising Secretary.

I do not, however, wish to deny the importance of the question. There is no doubt that the Secondary Schools are very uneasy about it, and I should be glad to see words introduced into the Clause to make it clear that the Clause V11 Authority cannot claim to exercise powers as Managers over an Endowed School which are inconsistent with the provisions of the Scheme."

Morant's reply ran as follows:(1) " I am very glad that so clear a case is before us on which to raise the difficulties of Clause V11. That Clause has done an admirable service since its original invention, in accustoming the County Councils and the educational public to think gradually into the question and to become slowly accustomed to the idea of local organisation of all

(1) Loc.cit, Minute R.L. M(orant)/Bruce, 5.4.03.

forms of education. But this task is now completed: for a real organisation is now set up by the Act. We can therefore, now, and we ought in any case, to reconsider the wording and effect of Clause V11. Its wording has always been far from clear. This was perhaps partly intentional and partly unavoidable: as it was meant to be a "try-on," to be used diplomatically in each case as far and as forcefully as circumstances in each particular instance might render possible. For myself I feel strongly that England cannot possibly afford to put all her Secondary Schools, still less all her higher education, under the control (in any full sense) of Municipal Authorities. Municipalities will no doubt have schools of their own. But I do not want to use our new Act to increase the control of Municipalities over existing, independent, Secondary Schools, or to subordinate all the State-aid to these Schools to the idiosyncracies of the Municipal Authorities. To do so, and to place all our grants wholly at the disposal of the Local Authority to disburse as it pleases, would be, I think, to betray the high trust committed to the Board of Education, of fostering a high standard of Secondary Education in the true sense, and of preserving it against the strong forces of " bread and butter " studies. Our grants are our leverage for securing this standard, and for checking any (any in our view) retrograde tendencies in a Local Authority's educational policy, and for preserving good schools, doing fine work for the intellect of the rising generation, from the otherwise overwhelming ravages of a powerful Local Authority seeking to technicalise every school in the place. ..... It will be well in this Bolton case not to seem,

just at present, to make any volte-face by a big new pronouncement on the points at issue, and not to rouse needless or premature opposition amongst vigilant and suspicious Municiplal Education Secretaries, that we are thinking of curtailing the powers which some of them have contrived to obtain under a free reading of the terms of Clause V11 in the past..... "

Morant's views here were quite consonant with Part 2, Higher Education, of the 1902 Act. The new statutory Local Authorities were given powers to supply and control their own schools, using "Whiskey money" and rate funds to a prescribed limit (1). They were thus able to support the erstwhile Higher Grade Schools, frequently adapting them to earn government grants under the Regulations for Secondary Schools. But nothing specific appears concerning the relationships of the endowed schools to these Authorities. Councils were told vaguely to " have regard to any existing supply of efficient schools or colleges, and to any steps already taken for the purposes of higher education under the Technical Instruction Acts, 1889 and 1891."(2) Furthermore they were specifically precluded from making any stipulations as to religious instruction in any school not provided by them,(3) and in fulfilling the needs of higher education for their area they were obliged to consult the Board.(4)

It needs to be remembered that in the period after the turn of the century the endowed schools, those run by religious Orders

(1) Education Act, 1902: Sec. 2(1). (2) loc. cit. Sec. 2(2).

(3) loc. cit., Sec. 4 (4) loc. cit. Sec. 2(1).

and those run by private ventures such as the Girls' Public Day School venture, formed the vast bulk of the provision of higher education: and, with the benefit of hindsight, it can be seen that demarcation disputes between Local Authorities and Governing Bodies were inevitable. The Board's tendency to give decisions in favour of these schools and to treat them as a race apart - albeit in the tradition of the Bryce Report - undoubtedly irked many Local Authorities who were thereby hampered in their plans. Although one might sympathise with Morant's reasoning on the matter of setting high standards in secondary education, it is probably fair to say that his policy created a legacy of antipathy between the Local Authorities and Governing Bodies of schools financed partly by the State but not subject to Local Authority control: one might see a reflection of this in the policy of the London County Council of using Direct Grant and Independent Schools at present only to accommodate excess numbers of children.(1)

The Local Authorities however had an influential ally. The Treasury was not slow to grasp the implications of their new statutory power to levy a Higher Education rate, and saw that a high rate of grant from the Board of Education under the Regulations for Secondary Schools might discourage some Local Authorities from digging as deeply into the rate fund as they otherwise might. The Treasury thus had a vested interest in keeping down the level of grants to Secondary Schools. It was pressure of this nature together with the declining value of endowments, which accelerated

(1) Letter to the "Guardian" from Chairman of L.C.C. Education Committee, 29th. June, 1964.

the process of municipalisation of endowed schools, by which the Local Authorities took over complete financial and administrative control. It is interesting to note that the Direct Grant to the Headmasters' Conference schools still accounts for only 34% of the schools' income.(1)

Thus as early as 1903 the Treasury notified the Board of Education that it expected to be notified well in advance of the conditions under which grants to secondary schools were to be made, and particularly of any alterations from year to year.(2) The Board was also told that correspondence between the departments on these matters would be conducted between Secretaries: although both Government departments shared the same political heads, " my Lords do not always grasp the financial implications of grant policy."(3)

Morant, however, was not one to acquiesce weakly in the demands from the Treasury. Within a few months the Board received an application for recognition from the London Orphan Asylum at Watford. The school wished to be classified as a Division 'B' Secondary School, but the Local Authority took the view that such recognition would run contrary to the Board's existing regulations. (4) The objection was based on the fact that the school consisted very largely of pupils from the British Dominions, and had no day scholars at all. Back in 1897 the Science and Art Directory had

(1) G.Kalton, op.cit. p.137. (2) P.R.O. Ed. 12/118

(3) P.R.O. Ed. 12/118: Letter Sir G.Murray/R.L.Morant, 20.3.03. (4) P.R.O. loc. cit.

provided that " recognition may be refused to any class which the Department considers to be unnecessary," drawing particular attention to this by the use of italics.(1) In the following year and again in 1899 the italics were abandoned but the clause itself remained intact. It was reworded in 1900 to read " Recognition may be withheld from any class which the Board considers to be unnecessary," and further modified in the next year to include ....." from any class, in any subject, which the Board considers to be unnecessary." However, the 1902 Regulations for Secondary Schools contained the following more expanded clause (2): " A school or class must be efficient and necessary for the circumstances of the locality; must not compete unduly with a neighbouring school or class; and from its character and financial position must be eligible to receive aid from public funds. It must be open at all times to the inspection of officers of the Board." Thus the question provoked by the application of the Watford School was: could a school which made little or no provision for the education of children from its immediate vicinity be eligible for Government grants ?

The Watford School had in fact been recognised for grant purposes since 1900, when, as Bruce put it, " our regulations were not so strict."(3) So had also the Royal Masonic School at nearby Bushey, which had been a Division 'A' Secondary School

(1) Science and Art Directory, 1897, Clause 6.

(2) Regulations for Secondary Schools,1902, Article 2.

(3) P.R.O. Ed. 12/110: Minute W.N.B(ruce)/ R.L.M(orant) 3.5.04.

since January 1903. The discussions of the policy now to be adopted by the Board towards the Watford school showed up a distinct division of opinion. The matter came first to the attention of J.W.Mackail, one of the Board's most able and distinguished Assistant Secretaries(1): he took the view that the phrase " for the circumstances of the locality " in the Board's revised regulation for 1902 only explained, and did not limit, the term 'necessary.' In fact " No school that is 'necesary' can be unnecessary for the circumstances of the locality."(2)

Bruce did not endorse Mackail's reading of the regulation. Some two months later he minuted the file to Morant with his own views.(3) He drew attention to the restrictive nature of the clause, in that no boarding school could ever qualify under it for grant unless, as was highly improbable, a large proportion of the boarding scholars came from the area in which the school happened to be sited. In the case of the Royal Masonic School, the President, Sir William Abney, had agreed to its inclusion in the grant list with the full knowledge and approval of the County Technical Instruction Committee concerned. The latter had been quite satisfied that subscriptions were an acceptable form of local support, although, admittedly, the locality served by the school was in effect the whole of England. " It was considered," wrote Bruce, " that the essential point was that State aid should

(1)c.f. Eaglesham "Implementing the Ed. Act 1902", B.J.E.S. vol. 10, May 1962, pp. 155 ff.

(2) P.R.O. Ed. 12/110: Minute JWM/WMB, 17.3.04.

(3) loc. cit: Minute WmB/RLM, 3,5.04.

be met by contributions from some other source." He went on to suggest to Morant that the words "for the circumstances of the locality " should in future be omitted from the regulations: " There may well be circumstances in which an institution may be necessary, in that it meets a real educational want, although it might not be necessary for the circumstances of the particular locality in which it stands, or for those of any particular locality taken by itself."

On the other hand, Bruce was shrewd enough to realise that the interpretation presented to him by Mackail was one which would be more favoured by the Treasury. He thus went on to ask Morant:" Is it part of our understanding with the Treasury, or is it generally desirable, that our grants should be limited to schools which form part of the supply required for the circumstances of some definite locality ? ..... It appears to me (i) that under the current regulations they are so limited: (ii) unless our regulations are altered, recognition could not be given to the London Orphan Asylum and should not be renewed in the case of the Royal Masonic School, Bushey: (iii) any amendment would need Treasury sanction." In practice, however, applications for grant aid from essentially non-local schools would be very rare, although he himself saw nothing wrong with the principle: schools such as orphanages would mostly come into this category.

Morant sympathised with Bruce's views. He referred the papers to the President for a policy decision(1) advising the

(1) P.R.O. ed. 12/118: Minute RLM/Sir W.Anson, 8 June,04.

omission of the offending words from the clause. The Royal Masonic School had quite legitimately been recognised for grant, since at the time the regulations had contained no reference to 'locality.' " Therefore, " he continued, " in order to continue the grants already given to such places as the Masonic School, and probably St. Peter's, York, and possibly many others on our list, we ought properly to remove from the regulations any phrase requiring the school to fulfil a strictly local need - assuming this to be the right policy.

" On the question of policy, I confess I feel strongly the desirability of extending the supervision of this Board over as **varied** a field as possible of secondary schools - barring always the subsidising of schools attended by boys able to pay without difficulty for the whole of their education. This latter point can in my view be properly, and only properly met by a limit of the fees charged in schools recognised, and by careful scrutiny from time to time of the financial position of the school as shown by its accounts and so forth. Therefore the prohibition of recognition of wealthy schools need not be an element in the consideration of the particular regulation now under review." His own suggestion was that a revised regulation should emphasise that the Board would not recognise a school which was started with the intention of depleting a neighbouring school: for this he had Bruce's support.

Morant conceded that the policy of the department in recognising secondary schools for grant purposes had been at times inconsistent with the intentions of the regulations.

Nevertheless, " it must be remembered in considering the recognition of any school, that its eligibility for State aid depends in part on the financial condition of the boys' parents, and in part on what will be done by the State subsidy. It is for the former reason that we stand fast by a fee limit, and it is for the second reason that we are now going to require schools to be under a Trust. Given these two safeguards, I think nothing but good can arise from an extension of the Board's supervision and subsidy to Secondary Schools providing education for the poorer among the socalled professional classes; since it is the faulty education of the latter which has been so serious a defect in English education in the last thirty years. It is no use to say that such persons ought to send their boys only to Local Authority schools. In the first place there are not nearly enough of these as yet, and in the second place, English Tradition is so strongly against it that it is not likely to take place." (Perhaps as an afterthought, Morant subsequently pencilled in the words 'very rapidly') "The Board ought therefore to consider all these circumstances and do their best as trustees for education to secure that the education provided for this large number of Secondary School pupils is as good as the Board can get it to be, - subject always to the two limitations I have already described."

In his reply to the Secretary, the President briefly summarised the views presented to him.(1) The Board might either

(1) P.R.O. Ed. 12/110: Minute Anson/Morant, 8.6.04.

give grants to supplement, stimulate and control local effort, or influence secondary schools of every type in all parts of the kingdom, where their pecuniary condition and standard of efficiency entitled them to aid. He recognised that schools might be classed into three groups. Firstly, those essentially local in character, with no boarders or perhaps a few from the vicinity: " These," he commented, " range in size and quality from Manchester Grammar School, where there are no boarders, to a place like Burford, where the Boarders come from just so far as a boy cannot go to school on a bicycle." Secondly, schools which were local in their origin, but which had become wealthier, or had had a successful Headmaster, and had become essentially non-local. Here the President referred to schools such as Berkhamsted and Tonbridge. Lastly, schools which were non-local in inception and development, such as Eton, Winchester and Wellington, and no less the Watford School which had provoked this matter. The last category would contain also Roman Catholic schools set up for a special non-local purpose.

The President then declared the policy of the Board to be " not to supplement local effort by a painful process of discrimination between these different types of school, but to set the standard for the moment and continually to raise the standard of secondary school teaching throughout the country. Therefore we should assist every school which needs assistance, and which conforms to our requirements..... I would not refuse grant to a school which consisted wholly of boarders and was planted in an area ab extra." He agreed to the removal from

the regulation of the 'locality' concept, and instructed Morant to inform the Treasury of his decision, which, he thought, would affect expenditure only to ' an infinitesimal degree. ' The Treasury consented with reservations (1) and the new form of the grant regulation read: " The school must be efficient: must not compete unduly with a neighbouring school; and from its character and financial position must be eligible to receive aid from public funds." (2)

But the fact that the Board had now clarified to its own satisfaction the policy to be adopted with regard to non-local schools did not mean that the Local Authorities accepted it passively. Within a year or so, several Authorities, notably Ipswich, Nottingham, Norwich and the London County Council, lodged strong protests with the Board about the status of the Girls' Public Day School Trust schools in their areas. Clearly the point at issue was still whether or not these schools should be subject to Local Authority jurisdiction, although this was not always plainly stated.(3) The Ipswich Authority, for example, argued that the Ipswich High School should be removed from the Board's grant list because it was a company school (4). The Board notified the Local Authority of its intention to insist that the Directors of the Company should declare a Trust,(5) whereupon the Authority asked the Board pointedly (6) " what arrangements are proposed

(1) P.R.O. Ed.12/110: Letter Treasury/RLM: 24.6.04.

(2) Regulations for Secondary Schools 1904/5: Article 14.

(3) P.R.O. Ed. 12/152.

(4) P.R.O. Ed. 12/152: Letter Ipswich LEA/Board: 23.11.05.

(5) Loc.cit. Letter, Board/ Ipswich LEA: 12.2.06.

(6) Loc.cit: Letter Ipswich LEA/ Board: 21.2.06.

to enable the Local Education Authority to co-ordinate a school constituted in the manner proposed (and maintained partly by public funds) with all other forms of education in their area." Acting under Morant's instructions, Bruce replied cautiously that " in similar cases elsewhere no difficulty appears to be apprehended by the Local Education Authorities concerned, which, on the other hand, have welcomed the existence of a High Grade Secondary School for Girls as lightening the task which they would otherwise have had to undertake in providing an adequate supply of Higher Education of all kinds."(1) This, as the Ipswich Authority tartly pointed out in its reply, was quite untrue.

The " strenuous " complaint of the Nottingham Authority against the status of the local Girls' High School also drew attention to the fact that a private company appeared to be making profits from public funds, but stressed equally the lack of local representation on the governing body. It was argued that the return for some five hundred pounds annually of government grants was the admission of only some two per cent of pupils from schools controlled by the Authority. Even granted the conversion into a Trust as the Board hoped, the Local Authority was of the opinion that the constitution under which the schools were governed would not permit the formation of a local governing body.(2) The Norwich Authority took up this latter point,(3) as did very shortly afterwards the London County Council (4) which

(1) P.R.O. ed.12/152: Letter Board/Ipswich LEA, 3.3.06.

(2) loc. cit.: Letter Nott'm LEA/Board, 21.12.05.

(3) loc. cit.:Letter Norwich LEA/Board, 14.1.06.

(4) loc. cit.: Letter L.C.C./ Board: 12.2.06.

argued " that the establishment of the Trust, without any provision being made for the public control of the Trust referred to or to the schools managed by it, is undesirable, and ..... the Council is of the opinion that, before the schools of the Company are recognised under the present Regulations for Secondary Schools, the governing body should be reconstituted under a scheme to be drawn up by the Board."

Called upon to decide this issue, Morant showed himself, as he put it, " disinclined to argue out the questions involved with the Local Education Authority."(1) " I am inclined to think that we should be well advised in recognising the school (i.e. at Nottingham) ..... It would be well to point out in our letter to the Local Education Authority very distinctly that the powers of the Local Authority under Section 2 (i) (2) do not override the discretion of the Board to aid such schools as they think fit and that the consultation under Article 17 of the Regulations for Secondary Schools does not mean that the Board are bound to withhold aid from a school simply because the Local Education Authority objects."

This bald, uncompromising statement of policy in no way helped to pacify the Local Authority. Morant held firm, and almost immediately refused to receive a deputation from Nottingham to discuss the matter further.(3) However, within

(1) P.R.O. Ed.12/152: Minute RLM/Bruce: 3.1.06

(2) i.e. of the Education Act, 1902.

(3) P.R.O. Ed.12/152: Letter Board/Nott'm LEA: 17.2.06.

a few weeks, the General Election had given the Board of Education a new political head, the Liberal Augustine Birrell: within days the new President had reversed Morant's decision and agreed to receive the Nottingham deputation.(1) The members made several suggestions about the Board's policy on grants, but drew particular attention to four points which were to have a great influence on the subsequent Liberal amendments to the Regulations for Secondary Schools in 1907. Briefly the points were:

(i) that Local Education Authorities should have 'due representation on all governing bodies of grant-aided schools,

(ii) that such schools (and particularly the schools of the Girls' Public Day School Company) should be obliged to accept suitable children from Public Elementary Schools,

(iii) that profits from grant-aided company schools should be abolished, and

(iv) that grants for educational purposes made from public funds should be applied entirely towards educational facilities in the district in respect of which such grants are made. Birrell agreed to make representations to the G.P.D.S.C. and to take action on the other proposals when he could: in practice, however, matters dragged on for many years, and the Board continued to receive protests connected with the Company.

Perhaps with an eye to the more conciliatory attitude of his superior towards the Local Authorities, Morant appeared to

(1) P.R.O. Ed.12/152: Letter Board/Nott'm LEA: 6.3.06.

shift his ground slightly on the matter of the G.P.D.S.C schools. In helping Bruce to frame his reply to the London County Council he suggested that the Authority was mistaken in its attitude towards the public control of a Trust: it was a matter of legal fact that the new Girls' Public Day School Trust was tantamount to a scheme under the Charitable Trusts Acts, and as such was subject to the administrative control of the Board. " The London County Council really have in mind local public control," he told Bruce.(1) However, " ..there are real points which differentiate the case from Municipal Secondary or Endowed Schools generally, especially in the fact that the central governing body at Queen Anne's Gate has no other duties to perform besides looking after these schools, which is not the case with Town and County Councils, so that there being only one real governing body for sixty schools, and sitting far away, is nothing like so mischievous as it is when a County Education Committee tries to do this for all the schools in a County." On the related matters, Morant stressed to Bruce that the Board must work hard to increase the number of free or subsidised places in the Trust schools, and might be prepared to recognise local Trust Advisory Panels with local representation, although these would have in practice no real authority.

Having taken this line, and strengthened by a communication from the Birkenhead Authority which welcomed the admission of its local Company school to the grant list, but asked for some

(1) P.R.O. Ed. 12/152: Minute RLM/Bruce, 2.3.06.

representation at local level,(1) Morant took the matter up with the schools' governing body. Their reply indicated a willingness to cooperate fully with Local Authorities, but not to change the traditional form of management. The Council felt that this was quite unnecessary, since there was no intention at any stage of seeking funds for the schools from Local Authorities. Morant concluded that it would be unwise at this juncture to push the matter further, and instructed Bruce and Mackail to bring the matter to the President's attention when the new conditions of grant were discussed after the summer recess of 1906.(2)

More progress, however, was being made on the question of grants to schools run for financial gain. The Science and Art Directory of 1896 had specifically precluded such schools from receiving grant aid, but in the following year this provision had been relaxed: " Schools managed by a public corporation, in the Articles of Association of which provision is made that no dividend shall be paid exceeding five per cent, are not considered as conducted for private profit." In March 1902 the Commons brought some pressure to bear,(3) and the clause was again amended to include the provision that " the capital is not nominal, but has actually been expended in buildings or maintenance." (4) The Memorandum of Association of the Girls' Public Day School Company limited dividends to four per cent, which entitled it to be considered for grant. A formal application for grant was made in

(1) P.R.O. ED Ed. 12/152: Letter Birkenhead LEA/Board,13.2.06.

(2) loc. cit.: Minute RLM/Bruce, 24.5.06.

(3) H.C. Debates: vol. 184/878.

(4) Regulations for Sec. Sch.02/03: Art.4(d).

1902. In the meanwhile however, the Board had decided in conjunction with the legal branch of the Treasury that the mere relinquishment of dividend would not be sufficient to qualify for grant aid, but that the declaration of a Trust would also be needed: " because in the absence of a Trust, there would be no security against a winding up and distribution of assets, and the Company would probably be able to raise new capital by debentures bearing interest, and the object of the Treasury would be defeated."(1) Thus in the early part of 1904 the Treasury ordered that the five per cent concession be removed from the Regulations for Secondary Schools. Notified of this, the Girls' Public Day School Company decided to convert itself into a Trust, and the Board appointed Mr. A. F. Leach to act as negotiator with the Company for the Board: the schools were recognised for grant with effect from 1905.

Other private ventures were not so fortunate. The Church Education Corporation could not see its way clear to revising its Articles of Association, and the Board reluctantly refused to pay grants. Another, the Church School Company decided to apply for grant aid in 1903, but experienced great difficulties with the purely legal aspects of the conversion. Matters dragged on well into 1906: by this time Morant realised that considerable changes were imminent in the Board's grant policy, and instructed Bruce (2) that " ...the whole question of grants to the Church School Company (which required that the governors should be

(1) P.R.O. Ed. 12/118: Letter Sir George Murray/RLM 13.5.04.

(2) loc. cit. Minute RLM/Bruce 27.7.06

practising members of the Anglican Church) would have to be carefully considered in the Autumn, when the Government come to a final decision as to the terms on which, if at all, Denominational Secondary Schools are to receive Exchequer grants."

A recurrent theme in the early annual reports of the Board is the emphasis on quality rather than quantity in secondary education.(1) It was for this reason that the Board usually insisted on recognising only those secondary schools which charged fees to their pupils, and stipulated a lower limit of three pounds per annum. Nevertheless, in the three years from 1903 to 1906, recognised schools on grant rose from 482 to 677, an increase which was to continue at a steady rate. One of the difficulties was that many Local Education Authorities had conceptions of the nature of secondary education which did not conform to those of (2) the Board: and thus the Board regarded its powers of financing schools both directly and through Local Authorities as a means of maintaining influence over local developments and setting standards locally. Whatever their shortcomings in other directions, the governing bodies of the older Endowed Schools had in many cases experience of the administration of secondary schools which was not shared by the newly arrived Local Authorities. This goes some way to explain why Morant prior to 1907 seemed concerned

(1) c.f. Report of the Board of Education, 1905/6: p. 46.

(2) c.f. O. Banks, "Parity and Prestige in English Secondary Education", London, 1955: pp. 62/63.

to preserve the status quo in the administration of existing schools after 1902: the argument that he was concerned to maintain an existing class structure by organising a system of secondary education for the middle classes as a thing apart is probably true only in part.

Yet the Board had so far failed to deal with two problems which became more and more insistent. Access to a high proportion of the schools on grant was limited by the ability to pay fees or to gain one of a very limited number of scholarships from Local Authorities: and secondly the large number of Denominational Schools on grant meant that religious denomination was an effective bar to secondary education in many areas. Behind these lurked as ever the Treasury, keeping a watchful eye on the level of local expenditure on education. The time seemed ripe then for major changes in policy, and in the Board's report for 1905/6, which appeared in December 1906, Morant hinted broadly that more responsibility might shortly devolve onto Local Education Authorities He explained that the Board was considering the desirability or otherwise of making grants from public funds directly to schools not under local public control and continued: " ..... Local Authorities have as yet themselves provided Secondary Schools to a very limited extent and in many cases have shown great reluctance to incur rate expenditure in this direction. The number of Secondary Schools in England subject to full popular control is now only about 178 out of a total of about 800 Secondary Schools receiving grants from the Board. It is obvious therefore that

very much will have to be done by Local Education Authorities and a large expenditure incurred by them before a system of Secondary Schools on this basis can have been completely attained." (1)

(1) Report of the Board of Education, 1905/6; p. 63.

Chapter 2: The Regulations for Secondary Schools, 1907.

Planning at the Board.

Morant had been dissatisfied with the existing grant structure for some time. He felt that the ascending scale of capitation grant in operation since 1904, under which schools received two pounds for first year pupils, three pounds for second year pupils, four for third year pupils and so on, coupled with a special flat rate grant for specialised courses, gave a pecuniary incentive to schools to cram children and push them into unsuitable courses. For this view he was able to claim the support of the Chief Inspector of Secondary Schools, Mr. W. C. Fletcher. In drawing the attention of the Treasury to this, Morant suggested the introduction of an increased flat rate grant of five pounds per annum, coupled with an extra grant for schools which would thereby make a loss.(1)

At the same time he came to believe that the system of grants in aid was open to more serious abuses. Early in 1906 Morant was under pressure from the Treasury, as he put it to Bruce, " to create more stringent conditions for our grants to Secondary Schools." (2) He asked Bruce to set up a committee to investigate the schools on the grant list to determine firstly whether they were really in need of government grants: secondly, whether children from financially well-to-do families were making

(1) P.R.O. Ed. 24/267: Letter Morant/Treasury, January 1906.

(2) P.R.O. loc. cit.: Memorandum RLM/WNB, 22nd. February,1906.

use of these schools; and thirdly, whether government grants were not directly encouraging Local Authorities to reduce or at least hold down their own expenditure in this field.

The committee duly presented its findings to Bruce. It was suggested that a school which was in a position to charge a fee of twenty pounds or more should be ipso facto ineligible (1) to receive grant. The members expressed their dislike of any attempt to vary the government grant in relation to individual schools' income from endowments. On the whole, it was considered more expedient to ignore income from investments and local finance, except, of course, where this was so high as to make government help unnecessary. In the case of small schools, the committee proposed the introduction of a minimum grant of two hundred or two hundred and fifty pounds per annum. It recommended also that those denominational schools in which it was the practice not to pay the staff should be debarred from any higher rate of grant.

On the second issue referred to it, the committee came to the conclusion that it was impossible to prevent rich parents from placing their children in grant-aided schools. It would, however, be quite feasible for the Board to insist on the reservation of a number of places in such schools for children who had been educated at Public Elementary Schools. The numbers of such places might be negotiated with individual

(1) This principle still holds: when the Direct Grant List was last opened in 1957, schools with fees of over 80 pounds per annum were debarred.

schools, but the agreed figure, it was emphasised, should on no account exceed twenty-five per cent of the total school roll. This proposal was quite in line with the findings of the Bryce Commission, which had suggested that governing bodies should be authorised to subsidise the education of poor children, and to this end should keep down the cash value of scholarships: for a child from a wealthy family to win a high value scholarship was unjust. (1)

In general, the committee endorsed Morant's own view. The Board's grants should be used only to aid schools, not to finance them entirely. As a guide line, a school in which the Board's grant could be shown to account for more than half the aggregate salaries paid to teaching staff, should be inspected and if the Inspector agreed, removed from the grant list. At this point it would close, or, more probably, be municipalised and subsequently financed by the Local Authority.

While, as we have seen, the Board wished to admit a wider range of children to Secondary Schools, opinion was divided as to the best way of achieving this. The Board had no powers to compel a Local Authority to create scholarships for poor children at established Secondary Schools. Indeed, where Local Authorities maintained their own Secondary Schools, or where there was a history of friction between the Authority and the governing body of a non-provided school, there was an incentive for the Local Authority not to create scholarships. On the other

(1) Bryce Commission: Report vol. 1, p. 303.

hand, if the obligation to provide free places were to be laid upon the school, the Local Authority would no longer be the sole arbiter of whether or not a poor child should attend a Secondary School. A deserving child could, in fact, completely by-pass the Local Authority. However, as several committee members pointed out, to oblige non-provided schools on the present rate of grant to create large numbers of free places would be to invite them to commit financial suicide, and the least that could be expected would be a sharp drop in standards, the very aspect which the Board had hitherto exclusively fostered. Mr. Shepherd, a member of the committee, proposed that the Board should not insist on this measure in areas where Local Authorities already maintained their own Secondary Schools.

The committee's findings were sent to Bruce for the addition of his own comments.(1) He rejected Shepherd's proposal on the grounds that it assumed that all Secondary Schools were equal in character and quality. The upper average fee limit of twenty pounds was accepted as reasonable, although Bruce showed himself to be uneasy that public funds would thus probably find their way into the funds of the Orders which controlled some Roman Catholic Schools. Here it needs to be remembered that any action which might be interpreted as discrimination against Church schools would run counter to the spirit of the 1902 Act and thus in a sense the Board's hands were tied. Bruce went on

(1) P.R.O. 24/267.

to express the wish that any regulation relating to the provision of reserved places should include the words " children from all classes of the community," so as to make the Board's intentions unmistakeably clear.

Turning to the question of the relationship of the endowed schools to the Local Authorities, Bruce recognised that many schools cherished their independence of political control: nevertheless he saw an unanswerable case for Local Authority representation on governing bodies. " But " he warned, " this would mean the withdrawal of recognition from the Royal Masonic Institution at Bushey, and the schools run by Orders." If this were accepted, grants should be made only to schools which make adequate provision - Bruce, however, made no attempt to define this - for local needs. Governing bodies should be essentially local in composition, and schools should have a minimum of twenty day scholars. One of the effects of this would be to stimulate rates support for these schools; if, however, this did not happen, the Board could choose either of two ways to achieve the same end. It could either bring administrative pressure to bear on recalcitrant Local Authorities, or go further and give a higher rate of grant to those schools which received rates support. Both the committee and Bruce stated their preference for the former. The latter, Bruce feared, " would hasten the municipalisation of Endowed schools," a trend which neither he nor Morant wholeheartedly favoured.

Two memoranda written by Bruce to Morant during April 1906 summed up the points at issue. " We are aiding large classes

of schools, " he wrote, " which do not come under that description (i.e. Local Authority controlled.)..... Schools which are, or could be made, independent of local aid and cherish their independence. The recognition of some of these schools has grown up out of a system which has been profoundly changed and the principle on which it is to be justified has never been clearly laid down." Three courses now seemed open to the Board. Firstly, it might decide to recognise for grant no school which was not also supported from local rates: this would bring about an immediate reduction, and a drastic one, in the number of schools on the Board's grant list. Secondly, a higher rate of grant might be paid to schools which were supported by Local Authorities: this would discriminate in favour of municipal schools to the detriment of non-local schools. Bruce himself preferred the third possibility, namely a general increase in the rate of grant, with no conditions attached as to local support.

" The question has to be faced whether the Board's grants should be used for any purpose other than that of encouraging and supplementing the efforts of LOcal Authorities to co-ordinate and supply Secondary Schools as tested by their expenditure out of their own funds.

It may be argued that this restriction is necessary because the Local Authority has not a free hand to carry out its statutory functions so long as the Board can and do recognize and support schools independently of the local system. And from the

Board's point of view it may be said in supportn of the same conclusion that State aid, or at any rate, increased State aid, might otherwise have the effect of diminishing the contribution from the rates and that a contribution could not be insisted upon in the case of provided schools, while other schools could obtain recognition without it." (By 'contribution' Bruce meant rates support: payments from 'Whiskey money' were largely beyond Local Authority control.) Bruce then listed the advantages of making recognition for the Board's grant conditional upon some measure of rates support:

(i) Secondary education would immediately become a matter of Local Government.

(ii) State aid would stimulate Local Authorities, not diminish their efforts.

(iii) The thorny problem of the recognition of denominational schools would devolve onto Local Authorities from the Board.

(iv) Tuition fees would be reduced in areas poorly supplied with facilities for secondary education.

(v) Local Authorities would be more disposed to accept Higher Grade Schools where these were more suitable than Secondary schools for local children.

The disadvantages of such a move were:

(i) The Board would lose its power to aid non-local schools and other institutions.

(ii) The Local Authorities would probably decide to foster only lower types of Secondary Schools, and the Board would have

lost its powers to foster the higher.

(iii) There was a real danger that municipalisation would produce undue uniformity of type.

(iv) Many Local Authorities relied on the endowed schools for the provision of secondary education, and did not raise a rate for secondary education: this they would have to do.

(v) There would be a general increase in rates.

(vi) Taken together, the increased Board grant, assistance from the rates, and fees would probably produce more funds than were necessary. A reduction in fees would be most unpopular with the electorate.

Bruce asked for a policy decision on the four points: Should any school be recognised for grant which is not maintained or aided by a Local Authority? Was Whiskey Money to be counted as a local contribution ? If recognition was not to be thus limited, should schools with support from Local Authorities receive a higher scale of grant ? Lastly, if schools not locally aided are to be eligible for grants, should any new conditions be attached to their payment: for example, their local character, denominational nature, accessibility to children of the poor ?

Morant immediately sent Bruce's memoranda to the President, (1) adding a note in his own hand that " decisions on these points are of absolutely VITAL IMPORTANCE to secondary education. They are questions of policy, not of mere administrative decision." It is perhaps not surprising that no decision was forthcoming.

(1) P.R.O. Ed. 24/267: minute RLM/Pres. 21.4.06.

Since the 9th. April, when he first introduced it to the Commons, Birrell had been occupied with his Bill aimed at settling the problem of denominational schools once and for all, by transferring them to the Local Authorities, granting 'ordinary' or 'extended' facilities for religious instruction as appropriate.(1) This Bill was, however, so badly mutilated by the Conservatives in the House of Lords that it had to be withdrawn. It subsequently became known as the abortive 'Birreligion' Bill. Birrell knew well, then, the opposition he would create to any attempt to bring the denominational schools under local political control, opposition which would be particularly fierce from the Orders. Entirely to cut them off from government grant would have been most inopportune in view of the antagonism he had already caused: Bruce's other suggestion, namely that a higher rate of grant might be paid to schools which accepted a degree of local representative control, depended on extra funds being available from the Treasury. Birrell thus waited.

There is no evidence to suggest that the problems of the Board's grant policy were dealt with for nearly a year. During this period, in January 1907, Birrell was replaced as President of the Board of Education by the Rt. Hon. Reginald McKenna. Of the two men, McKenna was to prove himself the more determined and positive administrator and it was he who finally implemented many of his predecessor's ideas. The extra funds for grant which

(1) c.f. M. Cruikshank, "Church and State in English Education": London, Macmillan, 1963: pp. 90 ff.

Birrell had lacked became available, and on the 11th. April 1907 the President called a meeting of the Secretary, Bruce, the Chief Inspector and Mackail, who had headed the earlier committee, and outlined to them his proposals. The records suggest that at this stage there was little or no discussion.(1) A few days later McKenna presented a confidential paper to his Cabinet colleagues.(2) In it he proposed to increase the Board's grant to schools already on the grant list if they would agree to certain new conditions: in particular he hoped to introduce a conscience clause to bring the Secondary Schools into line with Elementary Schools, a reasonable percentage of free places for pupils who had previously attended Public Elementary Schools, and lastly to insist upon the inclusion in each governing body of a Secondary School a majority of local representative governors. Schools which at the time were not recognised for grant would not in future be considered unless these conditions were complied with in full. " However," the President continued, " these new restrictions will make considerable outcry; it is possible that a large number of Endowed Schools may be able and even willing to comply; but Catholic Schools will certainly be unable and unwilling and will, therefore, be debarred from the increased grants; and no new Roman Catholic School if brought into existence,

(1) P.R.O. Ed. 24/267: Minutes of Meeting, 11th. April, 1907.

(2) P.R.O. Ed. 24/389: Confidential Cabinet Paper, 17th. April, 1907: " The Denominational Difficulty in Training Colleges and Secondary Schools."

will be able to receive any government grants.

It has been urged in certain places, such as Liverpool, that a definite portion of the population is Catholic, and needs Catholic Secondary Schools. If my colleagues agree, I am prepared to waive the above requirements (both as to increased grants for existing Secondary Schools, and to allowing grants for new schools) where the Local Authority passes a resolution asking the Board to waive the new requirements on these grounds. But I am doubtful as to the expediency of this, as it is tantamount to entrusting to the Local Authority the responsibility of deciding what kind of schools can properly be aided by Exchequer grants."

Warning his Cabinet colleagues that " Roman Catholic resistance will be so strenuous," McKenna continued: " The effect of such a line of decision would, however, be more consonant with the spirit and intention of the Higher Education portion of the Act of 1902, Section 4, which we have not yet been able to modify (1) and will therefore be less open to attack on this score than if we seemed by our regulations to tempt the Local Authority (indeed, to put pressure on it) to act against the spirit of statute not yet repealed or modified." In fact, Mckenna's proposed policy would apply to the Board's grants requirements which Section 4 endeavoured to prevent in the case of Local Authority grants.(2)

(1) For a fuller treatment of the Liberal opposition to the 1902 Act see M. Cruikshank, op. cit.

(2) c.f. p. 18, supra.

The wording of McKenna's new radical clauses was to be: (1)

Article 5 (a)

' No catechism or formulary distinctive of any particular religious denomination may be taught in the school, except in cases where the parent or guardian of any scholar requests the governors in writing to provide for the scholar religious instruction in the doctrines, catechism or formularies distinctive of any particular denomination. In such cases, the Governors may, if they think fit, and if the instrument under which the school is governed requires or does not prohibit the giving of such instruction in the school, comply with such request and provide such instruction accordingly out of funds other than those from grants made by the Board of Education or any Local Authority. '

Article 18 (a)

' No scholar shall be required as a condition of being admitted into or remaining in the school as a day scholar to attend or abstain from attending any Sunday School, place of religious worship, religious observance, or instruction in religious subjects in the school or elsewhere; and the times for religious worship, or for any lesson on a religious subject, shall be conveniently arranged for the purpose of allowing the withdrawal of any scholar therefrom.'

(b) This provision shall also apply to boarders as well as day scholars, provided that in cases where the school is governed by a Scheme made under the Endowed Schools Acts, and

(1) 'Regulations for Secondary Schools", 1907. (Cd 3592) The clauses are quoted here in the final version, including several amendments made during the period April-June 1907.

containing the provisions prescribed by Section 16 of the Endowed Schools Act, 1869, compliance with such provision of the Scheme shall be regarded as compliance with this regulation.(1)

Article 19.

The school may be with or without fees, but any scale of fees must be approved by the Board.

Article 20.

In all schools where a fee is charged, arrangements must be made to the satisfaction of the Board for securing that a proportion of school places shall be open without payment of fee to scholars from Public Elementary Schools who apply for admission, subject to the applicants passing an entrance test of attainments and proficiency such as can be approved by the Board for the school in question, having due regard to (i) the age of the applicants, (ii) the subjects in which they have been receiving instruction, (iii) the standard of attainments and proficiency required for the admission of fee-paying scholars. (2) The proportion of school places thus required will ordinarily be 25%

(1) S.16 of the Endowed Schools Act, 1869, stipulated that exemption could not be demanded in a boarding house if the authorities were unwilling to grant it. However, in such cases Governors were obliged to admit the pupil as a day scholar. This clause had to be written verbatim into all Schemes under the Act.(Halsbury's Statutes: 1st. ed,vol.12, p. 107.

(2) c.f. the current Regulations for Direct Grant Schools, 1959, para. 17(2):'The minimum educational standard qualifying a pupil for admission to or retention in a school shall be the same for all pupils of similar age.'

of the scholars admitted, but this requirement may be reduced by the Board of Education on sufficient grounds in the case of any particular school..... '

Article 23.

The Instrument under which the school is governed (whether in the form of a Trust Deed, Scheme, Charter, Act of Parliament, Statutes, Regulations or Minutes)

(a) must not require any members of the teaching staff to belong, or not to belong, to any particular denomination;

(b) must not require a majority of the governing body (whether in virtue of their tenure of any other office or otherwise) to belong, or not to belong, to any particular religious denomination;

(c) must not provide for the appointment of a majority of the governing body by any person or persons who, or by any body the majority of whom, are required (whether in virtue of their tenure of anyother office or otherwise) to belong, or not to belong, to any particular religious denomination.

Article 24.

The Governing Body of the School must contain a majority of representative governors appointed or constituted by local representative authorities (such as County or Borough Councils, Urban or Rural District Councils, Parish Councils, Boards of Guardians etc.) or elected by popular local constituencies (such as Parish Meetings etc.) provided that:

(i) a person who is entitled to act as governor in

virtue of holding the office of Chairman, Mayor or Vice-Chairman of a representative council or body shall be counted as one of the governors so appointed or elected; and

(ii) if any authority or constituency abstains from exercising or fails to exercise any powers of appointment or election exercisable by it and by reason only of such abstention or failure the Governing Body does not contain a majority of representative governors, the school may nevertheless be regarded as complying with these Regulations.

Article 43.

If, as regards the conditions set out in Articles 5, 18(b), 23 and 24 (but not as regards the conditions set out in Article 20) of these Regulations, the Local Education Authority pass a resolution informing the Board of Education that the school is, in their view, required as part of the Secondary School provision for their area, and that one or more of these conditions may be waived with advantage in view of the educational needs of the area, the Board of Education may, if they see fit, pay the grants in full under Articles 36 to 41 of these Regulations.

Article 44.

No grants are payable under the provisions of Articles 42 and 43 in respect of schools not on the Grant List for the year 1906 - 1907.

Article 48.

If any question arises as to the interpretation of these Regulations, or as to the fulfilment of any of the conditions

of grant, the decision of the Board shall be final.'

Back at the Board McKenna was faced with the task of winning the support of his senior staff for his new measures - which Selby-Bigge, incidentally, was later to describe as 'political.' (1). Bruce by this time had come out against the free place policy: in his view it would cause unnecessary financial hardship and the extra money available would be better spent on the fully maintained schools and an extension of the scholarships supported by Local Authorities. He could see no reason for digressing from the Board's declared policy of spending money only for educational efficiency.(2) Fletcher, the Chief Inspector, had similar misgivings. He submitted to Morant a confidential memorandum (3) in which he argued that the introduction of free places would take from Local Authorities the responsibility of financing pupils at Secondary Schools, and consequently that the already financially hard-pressed schools would have to find the necessary funds either by raising the fees of other pupils, or by cutting back expenditure on such important items as salaries, and thereby lose efficiency. Girls' schools, he felt, would be particularly vulnerable, since, as they were relatively new foundations, they usually lacked substantial incomes from endowments. Fletcher pointed out also from his experience that some schools, just those at which, in all probability, the free place regulation had been aimed, could

(1) L.A. Selby-Bigge, op. cit. p. 165.

(2) P.R.O. Ed. 12/122: minutes of conference of Heads of Departments, 11th. April, 1907

(3) P.R.O. Ed. 12/122: Memorandum WCF/RLM, 2nd. May, 1907.

offer free places in the certain knowledge that they would not be taken up. If a school was in fact, or supposed to be, exclusive in spirit;'if the school expenses (other than fee) are heavy, ex-Public Elementary School scholars will be unwilling or unable to attend.' Thus the regulation would be nugatory where it was wanted and oppressive where it was unnecessary. He feared also that the free places might be financed from funds which had been used to create University bursaries: he pointed out that many recipients of these were ex-Public Elementary School pupils.

The Chief Inspector advanced his own answer to the dilemma. He proposed to ignore those schools which already by natural evolution contained many pupils from Public Elementary Schools. This would leave only what he termed " the really disputable cases". " The only requirement that would actually reach the obnoxious schools is that part of the grant should be actually given in scholarships or withheld." He suggested that the Board should make clear to itself whether it wished to make education free, or to make schools more accessible. If the former was the intention then the responsibility lay with either the Board or Local Authorities to take full financial responsibility. Grants were already inadequate: " ..... if what is desired by the Government is a large scholarship scheme, it should be properly financed."

Clearly impressed by Fletcher's comments, Morant asked him to draft a regulation incorporating his ideas.(1) Fletcher's proposal ran: " The school fees must be approved by the Board as

(1) P.R.O. Ed. 12/122: Minute RLM/WCF: 6th. May, 1907.

suitable and the Board may recognise a school in which no fees are charged. In all cases it must be established to the satisfaction of the Board that the school is, in fact, accessible to scholars who have been in attendance at Public Elementary Schools.

Where the number of ex-Public Elementary School scholars in attendance is less than 25% of the whole number of the school, and the fee exceeds 12 guineas, the Board may require that a part of their grant, not exceeding half, shall be devoted to maintaining scholarships enabling such scholars to attend the school, and, if not so devoted, shall be withheld."

In his accompanying memorandum to the Secretary, Fletcher admitted that he really did not like the whole idea, but his proposed clause " forms the only reasonable step towards the provision of free places by the school which I have been able to think of." It admitted schools on satisfying either of two tests: either that they contained free places in excess of 25% of the school population, or that the fee was less than twelve guineas. He stressed to Morant that it was highly important to admit schools which satisfied only one of these conditions, since " ... the reasons for the absence of ex-Public Elementary School pupils in such cases are other than exclusiveness: other schools available, poverty of neighbouring Public Elementary Schools, want of ambition amongst scholars, and the existence of good Public Elementary Schools retaining more pupils than usual."

During the drafting stage of the new Regulations Morant asked Fletcher to supply him with details of their probable efect.

(1) The reply gives some indication of the size of the problem:

	TOTAL SCH.	DENOM.	WRONG Gov.Body	FREE PL. below 25%
Provided:	157	-	-	51
Municipalised:				
A:	12	-	-	4
B:	7	-	-	7
Endowed:	335	82	194	212
G.P.D.S.T:	32	-	32	32
Catholic:	42	42	42	40
Others:	15	5	6	12
TOTALS :	600	129	274	358

(Figures from P.R.O. Ed. 12/122: Office Memoranda: 1907)

On the new rule for the composition of governing bodies Fletcher pointed out to the Secretary that the divergeance of the schools of the Girls' Public Day School Trust, and those of the Catholic community was " total and probably permanent." Apart from the G.P.D.S.T. school which was now controlled by the Carlisle Local Authority, local control did not exist: the new 'Advisory Bodies' had no real power. By contrast, the schools controlled by the Wesleyan Methodist School Board had local representative governing bodies: they unfortunately would be cut off from grant by the new denominational requirements. Of the

(1) P.R.O. Ed. 12/122: Minute RLM/WCF: 1st. May, 1907.

bulk of the endowed schools, the Chief Inspector remarked that they had acquired with the passage of time a considerable number of local representative governors, who " have been a useful lever in getting the Local Authorities to help school finances." In any case, the Charities Acts permitted Local Authorities already to appoint governors in return for financial assistance. Fletcher feared that where a Local Authority was hostile to a school, and the governing body was unwilling to change, "..... one evil result of the new regulations may be ..... a recrudescence of bitter feelings, and an intensification of the difficulty in cases that remain---- to be municipalised .... "

It is interesting to note that the denominational requirements in McKenna's proposals seem from the available evidence to have provoked little reaction at the Board. At the next meeting called by the President it was the other clauses which were principally debated.(1) The President took the defensive line that schools which did not comply with the new terms of grant were in fact no worse off than they had been; the new terms were for increased grant. He emphasised to Bruce and Morant that the Board had the power to waive most of the new requirements in certain cases, " a power which would undoubtedly be freely exercised." The schools which would be debarred would be those of the G.P.D.S.T., the Roman Catholic Church, and a handful of endowed schools. To be set against this were the advantages that the new system would cheapen the education of the

(1) P.R.O. Ed. 24/267: Minutes of meeting; 9th. May, 1907.

poor, and open all State-aided schools to those most able to profit by attending them.

It seems also that at about this time the President decided to make two concessions. His paper to the Cabinet indicated that the waiver clause had been intended primarily to appease the outraged Churches: now its provisions appeared to cover other schools also. Turning to the free place requirement at the May meeting, the President insisted that the 25% should be " rigonously extracted " in any school where most of the scholars came from the Public Elementary Schools, after, of course, consultation with the Local Authority and an examination of the school's financial standing: but he went on to add that in areas where a Local Authority ran Higher Grade Schools, the Board might not extract the full 25%. In doing this, of course, McKenna was patently ignoring the difficulty of the 'obnoxious schools' to which Fletcher had dawn his attention. The President justified his new line of thought by indicating that in such cases many children would not come up to the qualifying standard for the Secondary School proper, thus leaving the school with vacant free places; furthermore, many would be deterred by the four-year course demanded by the Board.

The implementation of the new policy.

McKenna announced the general trend of his thinking to the House of Commons on the 15th. May, 1907, and on the 13th. June received a deputation on the subject from the Headmasters' Association. The members regarded the 25% free place requirement

as a dangerous financial imposition: they produced written evidence indicating that a large London boys' day school would be two hundred pounds yearly worse off under the new arrangements. In the case of a smaller boys' Grammar School ' in a Northern manufacturing town,' the loss would run at least to four hundred pounds, added to which must be the costs of extra accommodation if the school was to grow in size by the 25%. The Headmaster of Watford Grammar School calculated his school's loss as 150 pounds yearly. The members claimed that their biggest loss would arise from the early departure from the Secondary Schools of holders of free places; this would leave vacant places in the uppper school. (1)

From the letter which Canon Swallow, a Honorary Secretary of the I.A.H.M. wrote to Morant after the meeting with the President,(2) it appeared that McKenna was placatory in tone but adamant in principle. The President subsequently informed the Inspectorate (3) that the assessment of the percentage of free places to be demanded from individual schools would be dealt with territorially: " Into the 10% class are put first grade schools in towns where a lower grade school is available - also a few isolated first grade schools. Some of these, it is recognised, would suffer loss even by providing 10%; but some at least will be otherwise ineligible for the full grants. A few schools have

(1) P.R.O. 24/373:Minutes of Deutation to President:13.June 07.

(2) P.R.O. loc. cit.: Letter I.A.H.M./RLM: 15. June, 1907.

(3) P.R.O. Ed. 24/375: Confidential to Inspectors: "Memo. as to the new Free Place Reuirement for Schools.": 1.July 07.

been put into this class which are not in themselves first grade but where a lower school is available.

Some schools will make no profit on the new grants, because of the high grants they have already. Except in the case of the 10% schools and those on the minimum grant of 250 pounds, it will not be expected that more than 75% of the increase in grant will be spent on the provision of free places. In smaller schools - especially those on the minimum grant - the full 25% of free places will be asked for."

As for the assessment of free places on the basis of the four year secondary course, to which the Headmasters had drawn attention, the Board's Inspectors were told specifically to work on the basis of a four year course. Thus, quite simply, a school of 340 pupils should expect to give, at the 25% rate, 21 free places yearly.

There were some instances subsequently in which the Board's free place policy threatened to cut off schools somewhat unfairly from grant. Lancashire County reported for example that for many years it had awarded Exhibitions and Junior Exhibitions to promising pupils from its schools: " The County Exhibitions are, however, tenable at any convenient approved Secondary School, whether within or without the County Area, and in many cases the Exhibitioners who are resident in districts in which there is no Public Secondary School proceed to schools situated in the neighbouring County Boroughs. The result is that..... the number of Exhibitioners from Public Elementary Schools who entered these schools during the session 1907 - 1908 was considerably

greater than 25% of the total number of pupils who entered in 1906-1907, and in the 17 schools taken as a whole there were 28.4% of such Exhibitioners, the percentage of free places held in 11 schools was less than that required by the Board of Education. In the case of the remaining school (Chorley) the number of free places required to comply with the Regulations of the Board of Education could not be determined by the method of computation adopted by the Board, inasmuch as the school was only opened in September last." The County Authority thus urged the Board to relax its free place requirements for the area, but without success. The best that could be achieved was a twelve month extension. Under renewed pressure, the Board agreed to reduce the requirement in the problematical schools from a total of 41 to 23 free places: " Even thus, and accepting for this purpose a comparatively low standard of attainment, it was possible to fill only 13 out of the 23 free places, and it was decided to notify this to the Board and to forward in support of the Committee's contention, the papers worked by the candidates next in order of merit." This approach achieved for the County only a further year's grace. Some of the schools were then taken off grant, and were taken over by the County Authority. (1)

The effect on Denominational Schools.

While it is true to say that acceptance of the new Regulations for Secondary Schools was purely voluntary from the

(1) Minutes of the Lancashire County Education Authority, 1907 - 1909: Ref: EKR 5; County Record Office, Preston.

point of view of most schools, in some instances the governing bodies were powerless. In the case,for example, of the St. Mark's College Upper School at Chelsea (1) there was in existence a Trust Deed stipulating that the school should give an education in accordance with the tenets of the Anglican faith. On taking legal advice in 1907 the governing body was informed that the acceptance of the conscience clause in McKenna's regulations would be tantamount to a breach of the Trust: furthermore, all the schools of the National Society, of which St. Mark's was one, ran the same risk. In the absence of a waiver of these requirements, the schools must remain on the lower scale of grant. And in another case, this time of the Anglican College at Liverpool, the Board itself, acting in its capacity under the Charitable Trusts Acts, expressly forbade the school to earn grants from the Board of Education by operating a conscience clause.(2).

Similarly, the Ranelagh Foundation had decided after consultation with the Berkshire Education Committee to open a new school in that county. Only the Board's grant, however, would make this into a viable proposition.(3) Birrell's administration had agreed to the project and the new school was well on the way to completion, only to find that the inviolable Anglican commitments in the foundation now excluded it from grant. Very much the same happened in the case of the Ursuline Convent School at Wimbledon, which first applied for grant in the Summer

(1) P.R.O. Ed. 24/390: Memo. RLM/Pres. 15 Oct. 1908.

(2) loc. cit.

(3) H.C. Debates: 179/23.

of 1906. The Board's Inspector in due course presented a satisfactory report on the school, after the school had made several costly changes. On writing again to the Board, the school was informed that the grant regulations were under review, and in August 1907, at least eighteen months after the original application, the Board confirmed that the school would have to comply with the new regulations.(1)

On the whole, however, the application of the conscience clause to Secondary Schools as a condition of grant caused less furore than most of the other clauses. In practice, the wording of the regulations did not take from school authorities the power to take only children of a certain denomination if they so wished. Furthermore, there was a sharp division between the Roman Catholic schools and those of other sects. During the planning stage of the regulations Fletcher had informed Morant that " most of the Church of England Schools would be glad to be relieved of what shadowy denominational labels they still had." However, he had described the prospect of doing the same for the Catholic schools as " hopeless."(2) All the Church schools were, however, prepared to accept the requirements of Article 5 and Article 18(b), so much so that the Board in the following year felt able to declare that the waiver provisions no longer applied to these two clauses.(3)

In the months after the publication of the 1907/8 grant

(1) H.C. Debates: 178/974.

(2) P.R.O. Ed. 12/122: Memo. WCF/RLM, 2nd. May, 1907.

(3) P.R.O. Ed. 12/167.

regulations, the Roman Catholic community brought considerable pressure to bear on the Board. There was a particular fear of the management clauses in the regulations: it was stressed to the Board over and over again that a popularly elected Protestant majority on the governing bodies of erstwhile exclusively Catholic schools might go so far as to refuse to give denominational instruction even if requested under Article 5 to do so. The regulation empowered governing bodies to give denominational teaching only " if they think fit." Bruce took the view (1) that no restriction had been placed upon the Catholic community from running its schools without the assistance of public funds, and that, furthermore, any school regarded as 'efficient' by the Board, regardless of whether or not it was on the grant list, was entitled to accept Bursars for Teacher Training out of State monies. This latter was an attempt to meet the second complaint of the Roman Catholic community that without denominational schools the supply of Catholic teachers would dry up. The Board did, in fact, subsequently make some small concession by permitting schools which had not previously been receiving grant to be included in the grant list, subject to the provisions of the 'waiver' clause, and provided that they were registered Pupil Teacher Centres.(2)

Apart from this, McKenna stood firm. He told a deputation from the Catholic Schools that he would consider waivers only

(1) P.R.O. Ed. 12/160: Historical Memo. 4th. December,1911.

(2) P.R.O. Ed. 12/123: Minute Pres/RLM: 30.7.07.

for existing Catholic schools, and that any school wishing to receive grant for the first time must comply in full with the regulations. "..... If Roman Catholic schools are unable to keep pace with a growing Roman Catholic population, it would always be possible for the Board to revise the regulations, but the case would have to be a very powerful one for this." He further pointed out that that there was already quite an evident tendency for Roman Catholic parents to send their children to Local Authority schools, and that it was by the erection of municipal schools that, he thought, the supply of seconday education would be increased."... The Government are determined to abide by the three main principles that all schools should be open as widely as possible, that teachers should be free from religious tests, and that no pupil should be compelled to receive denominational instruction."(1)

One result of the regulations was that during the years 1907 - 1914 only seven Roman Catholic schools applied for the Board's grant for the first time. Of these, four were accepted under the concession extended to Pupil Teacher Centres, and the remaining three were rejected: in the case of the Holker Street School, Barrow in Furness, because it did not satisfy the Board's definition of a Secondary School; and the Liscard High School, Wallasey, together with the Ursuline Convent, Ilford, because they felt unable to comply with the requirements of Articles 23 and 24. In fact, the overwhelming majority of Roman

(1) P.R.O. Ed. 12/160: Minutes of Meeting with Deputation from R.C. Schools' Authorities: 25th. June, 1908.

Catholic schools which continued to receive grant did so as the result of the waiving of the requirements of Articles 23 and 24. In order also to accommodate Article 18(b), some partially boarding schools divided off their boarding house under a separate administration, and ran the main school as a day school under the Regulations for Secondary Schools.

By contrast, so successful was the Board in implementing its new regulations in non-Catholic denominational schools that many Members of Parliament and sections of the national Press began to feel that school authorities had made things too easy for the Board. The "Yorkshire Post", for example, in a leading article of 12th. August, 1910, argued that it was necessary to keep " ..... a watchful eye on the Board of Education.... It is believed that the Governing Bodies have in many cases either thoughtlessly or for want of expert knowledge, submitted to their schools being made undenominational..... It is feared that in too many cases Churchmen give away their rights unthinkingly, when a timely communication with Church educational experts would result in a better understanding." Similarly the " School Guardian " took the " Christian World " severely to task for praising the introduction of a practically undenominational system of Secondary Schools: " ..... this is a strange reaction. The strangling of schools to make them undenominational is to make the success of the Regulations a ground for national humiliation." The writer expressed the hope that governors of schools would

continue to make extensive use of their powers of choice in matters relating to denominational instruction.(1)

McKenna's success in this field may perhaps be finally guaged from the fact that, despite their bitter opposition to the regulations when they were introduced in 1907, the members of the Unionist and Irish party did nothing to repeal them after the party was elected to power in January and December, 1910.(2) In fact, members lent their support to the principles involved in the Commons on 15th. July, 1911.

Article 43: The ' waiver ' clause.

This was a superficially attractive move in McKenna's attempts to implement his radical ideas. In the case of really intractable schools, particularly those which were held in high esteem both at the Board and by Local Authorities, the clause would open up a honourable way out of deadlocked negotiations. In very many cases amicable settlements were reached between school authorities and Local Authorities: a typical example is the resolution passed by the Manchester Education Committee in July 1907; " That the Board of Education be informed that, in the opinion of the Manchester Education Committee, the Manchester Grammar School is required as part of the Secondary Education provision of the City, and that Article 24 of the Regulations may be waived with advantage on its behalf, subject to the condition that the governors of the school agree to the proportion

(1) The " School Guardian," 23rd. October, 1909.

(2) c.f. Letter to the " Times " by the Reverend Leslie Scott: 17th. July, 1911.

of free places for scholars from Public Elementary Schools being not less than fifteen per cent of the scholars admitted."(1)

Yet McKenna's judgment as an administrator was to some extent warped by his enormous faith in the system of local government. He was, indeed, well known both inside and outside the Board as a supporter of the autonomy of Local Authorities in educational matters (2) a policy which, as we have seen, can only have brought him in several areas into collision with Morant and the permanent staff. There is, however, nothing to suggest that Morant did not act with the greatest impartiality in carrying out the new policy. So well known for his views was the President that the Durham County Council, in submitting to the Board a scheme for the municipalisation of Wolsingham Grammar School, threatened to report the Board's officials to the President if they were at all obstructive. (3)

It was this bias which led McKenna initially to place the power to waive the new requirements in the hands of Local Authorities, rather than retain the sole authority of the Board. He did this in spite of his own misgivings, as he had expressed them to his colleagues in the Cabinet,(4) and in spite of the Secretary's warning: " .... an application of local option principles to the solution of denominational difficulties in

(1) c.f. Mumford, "The Manchester Grammar School" Longmans, 1919: p. 430.

(2) P.R.O. Ed. 24/404: Minute Selby-Bigge/Bruce 21.10.07.

(3) loc. cit.

(4) See p. 47, supra.

education seems to me extremely dangerous and likely to lead to the election of members of Local Authorities on religious instead of educational grounds." (1) In Leeds in particular political and religious strife flared up. The Headmaster of Leeds Grammar School, speaking at the Headmasters' Conference meeting in 1907, expressed the dislike of many members present of Local Authority control: " it will not be found - even in a great city, much less in a scattered agricultural district,-that local control is efficient control". On the other hand, he argued the thesis of the Bryce Commission that national control or influence was both desirable and á reasonable return for the Board's grant. In the case of his own school, the governors had approached the Local Authority, which had agreed to pass a waiver of the clause requiring a majority of representative governors. By the end of the Summer vacation, however, it had become a matter of party politics, and, so evenly were the major opposing factions balanced, that the prospect of an annual renewal of the waiver, as required by the Board, was bewildering. At the time of speaking, the waiver had been passed: next year it might well be withdrawn. He further drew his colleagues attention to the fact that all the Secondary Schools of the City, with the exceptions only of his own school and the Roman Catholic Grammar School, had been taken over by the Local Authority in the five years since 1902.

A letter to Morant from the Leeds Education Committee

(1) P.R.O. Ed. 12/123: Minute RLM/?; 17th. April, 1907.

expressed the exasperation felt by the administrative staff at the waiver clause: " Is not Mr. McKenna defeating his own object in introducing the waiver clause ? Authorities such as Bradford avoid the regulations by postponing any decisions about the representative majorities on governing bodies. In writing to the Board they describe this as a waiver: this is a subterfuge.

The present position is a farce. In the great majority of instances where the Board will this year pay the higher grants, owing to Local Education Authorities adopting the provisions of the waiver clause, such waiver clauses have been passed, not on the merits of the case at all, but as the purchase of Catholic votes in municipal elections, and Mr. McKenna's department will pay the piper." (1)

By the Spring of 1908 the President was beginning to have second thoughts. He decided that the Regulations for the coming year would immediately relieve Local Authorities of the power to waive. Those waivers already granted would continue at least for a further twelve months, and the power to extend these or end them would lie now with the Board: furthermore, no new waivers would be granted after July 1909. (2)

A comparison of figures relating to schools on the grant list on the 31st. July 1908, within twelve months or so of the publication of the new Regulations, with those relating to the year 1911 - 1912 gives some indication of the success of McKenna's administration:

(1) P.R.O. Ed. 24/391: Letter Leeds C.B./Morant, Feb. 08.

TABLE 39.—POSITION OF SCHOOLS ON THE GRANT LIST ON 31ST JULY, 1907-8 ON WHICH THE HIGHER

See Explanatory Notes,

Reference Number.	Classification of Schools.	Total number of Schools.	Number of Schools regarded as complying				
			Total.	Article 5 (*re* Denominational Religious Instruction).		Article 18 (*b*) (*re* Conscience Clause for Boarders).	
				Complied with.	Waived.	Complied with.	Waived.
	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
	1. ACCORDING TO TYPE OF RESPONSIBLE BODY :—						
1	(*a*) Council Schools	239	238	238	—	16	—
2	(*b*) Girls' Public Day School Trust Schools	31	1	1	—	—	—
3	(*c*) Roman Catholic Schools	48	28	28	—	17	—
4	(*d*) Foundation and other Schools	418	379	379	—	193	1
5	(*e*) Total	736	646	646	—	226	1
	2. ACCORDING TO POPULATION OF PLACE :—						
	(*a*) Schools in Places, other than London, with Population of—						
6	(i) under 5,000	114	109	109	—	79	—
7	(ii) 5,000 and under 20,000	177	165	165	—	78	—
8	(iii) 20,000 „ 50,000	132	116	116	—	25	1
9	(iv) 50,000 „ 100,000	73	64	64	—	16	—
10	(v) 100,000 „ 200,000	69	57	57	—	11	—
11	(vi) 200,000 „ 400,000	50	43	43	—	8	—
12	(vii) 400,000 „ 800,000	40	26	26	—	1	—
13	(*b*) Schools in London	81	66	66	—	8	—
14	(*c*) Total	736	646	646	—	226	1

ENGLAND.

1908, AS TO COMPLIANCE WITH THOSE ARTICLES OF THE REGULATIONS FOR SCALE OF GRANTS DEPENDS.

pages xlii–xlvi.

with the Regulations, classified according to their compliance with individual Articles.

Reference Number.	Article 23 (*re* Denominational restrictions for Teachers and Governors).		Article 24 (*re* Majority of Representative Governors).		Article 20 (*re* Free Places).						Number of Schools regarded as not complying with the Regulations.
					Percentage of Free Places normally required.						
	Complied with.	Waived.	Complied with.	Waived.	25 °/₀	20 °/₀	15 °/₀	12½ °/₀	10 °/₀	Total.	
	8.	*9.*	*10.*	*11*	*12.*	*13.*	*14.*	*15.*	*16.*	*17.*	*18.*
1	238	—	238	—	221	2	1	9	5	238	1
2	1	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	1	30
3	2	26	2	26	17	5	2	2	2	28	20
4	366	13	335	44	308	11	3	27	30	379	39
5	607	39	575	71	547	18	6	38	37	646	90
6	108	1	101	8	100	5	1	2	1	109	5
7	161	4	155	10	141	3	—	17	4	165	12
8	111	5	109	7	103	2	—	6	5	116	16
9	63	1	58	6	53	2	—	4	5	64	9
10	48	9	44	13	41	—	1	5	10	57	12
11	35	8	30	13	31	4	—	2	6	43	7
12	21	5	19	7	20	—	3	—	3	26	14
13	60	6	59	7	58	2	1	2	3	66	15
14	607	39	575	71	547	18	6	38	37	646	90

ENGLAND.

TABLE 35.—POSITION OF SCHOOLS FOR 1911–12 AS TO COMPLIANCE WITH THOSE ARTICLES OF THE REGULATIONS ON WHICH THE HIGHER SCALE OF GRANTS DEPENDED.

See Explanatory Notes, pages xli–xliii.

1.	Total number of Schools. 2.	Council Schools. 3.	Girls' Public Day School Trust Schools. 4.	Roman Catholic Schools. 5.	Foundation and other Schools. 6.
1. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS ON LAST DAY OF SCHOOL YEAR REGARDED AS—					
(*a*) complying with the Regulations -	831	382	—	42	407
(*b*) not complying with the Regulations - - - - - - -	54	—	28	6	20
(*c*) Total - - - - - - -	885	382	28	48	427
2. PARTICULARS AS TO THEIR COMPLIANCE WITH INDIVIDUAL ARTICLES OF THE SCHOOLS INCLUDED UNDER HEAD 1 (*a*) :—					
(*a*) Article 5 (*re* Denominational Religious Instruction) - -	*	*	*	*	*
(*b*) Article 18 (*b*) (*re* Conscience Clause for Boarders) :—					
(i) Complied with - - -	284	42	—	17	225
(ii) Waived - - - -	1	—	—	—	1
(*c*) Article 23 (*re* Denominational restrictions for Teachers and Governors) :—					
(i) Complied with - - -	773	382	—	3	388
(ii) Waived - - - -	58	—	—	39	19
(*d*) Article 24 (*re* Majority of Representative Governors) :—					
(i) Complied with - - -	746	382	—	3	361
(ii) Waived - - - -	85	—	—	39	46
(*e*) Article 20 (*re* Free Places)—classification of Schools according to percentage of Free Places normally required :—		*			
(i) 25 per cent. - - -	708	355	—	28	325
(ii) 20 „ „ - - -	15	3	—	6	6
(iii) 15 „ „ - - -	16	5	—	4	7
(iv) 12½ „ „ - - -	34	11	—	3	20
(v) 10 „ „ - - -	58	8	—	1	49
(vi) Total - - - -	831	382	—	42	407

* Article 5 was complied with in all cases.

Article 5 (re denominational religious instruction) and Article 18(b) introducing the conscience clause for boarding pupils, were accepted immediately by all but one of the 736 schools on grant. By 1911 - 1912 the position had not changed, and Article 5 was complied with in all cases.

As we have seen, Articles 23 and 24 had caused particular concern to Roman Catholic schools. 20 out of a total of 48 schools refused to comply in 1907 - 1908 and remained on the lower grant scale. Of the remaining 28, 26 had been successful in causing waiver resolutions to be passed by the appropriate Local Authority, which entitled them to the higher scale. It was thus clear to the Board that pressure through grant regulations was insufficient to implement these two points of policy: and when the Board later took back to itself the powers to waive the requirements, the number of Catholic schools regarded by the Board as satisfying the conditions for higher grant rose to 42 out of 48 schools. Of the 6 schools remaining on the lower scale in 1911 - 1912, 2 at least were regarded by the Board as unnecessary for local provision. These were the St. Mary Mount School at Liscard, Wallasey,(1) and a similar school at Southampton.(2) In the latter case, the school authorities had agreed to 25% free places and to a conscience clause. The Board, however, took the view that, since many non-Catholic children were attending the school, the shortage of

(1) H.C. Debates: 28/537.

(2) H.C. Debates: 174/906.

secondary education provision in the town was of the undenominational type. Insofar as it was McKenna's policy to compel all new denominational schools to comply in full with his regulations, it will be noted that no new Catholic schools were added to the grant list between 1908 and 1912.

The endowed schools felt themselves on the whole aggrieved only by the requirement of a majority of representative governors. A large majority, stimulated mostly by the econmmic necessity of gaining the higher grants, accepted the clause at once: but 83 of the 418 schools either remained on the lower grant or were allowed to waive this requirement for higher grants. By 1911 - 1912 the position had changed slightly: of 427 schools now receiving grant, only 66 were now on the lower scale or working under a waiver of Article 24 for higher grants. It was in the main this group of schools, together with those which in future years became eligible for grants under revised regulations, which was subsequently to pass into the Direct Grant system as we have it today.

The effect on the Girls' Public Day School Trust.

The complex scheme devised at the Board by Mr. A. F. Leach, which, briefly, empowered the Council to create a Trust by buying back from shareholders all dividend earning shares within a period of fifty years, was accepted as the basis for earning grants in April, 1905.(1) A few months later negotiations were

(1) P.R.O. Ed. 24/388: Letter Board/G.P.D.S.C.: 12 April, 05.

opened with a view to securing the higher grants for the Trust schools. Three problems presented themselves.

The Memorandum of Association of the group stipulated that the schools were intended for " .... the education of girls of all classes above those provided for by the Elementary Education Acts." Taken at face value, this clause would prevent the implementation of the free place requirement. The Secretary to the Board referred this to the Legal Branch, which concluded that the Council of the Trust was now quite entitled itself to amend this clause. In any case, even if no actual amendment was forthcoming, there was no definition at law of the term 'class', so that the Board's regulation might be accepted in practice with impunity.

The question of Local Authority representation on the governing body was, however, much trickier. Because the G.P.D.S.T. schools had had hitherto one central authority, it would be impracticable, without considerable reorganisation, to have representation of the order suggested for each separate school. The Council was, however, willing to accept representation from the County Councils' Association, but when this leaked out, there was such opposition from Local Authorities that the suggestion was dropped.(1) The Council then suggested that representatives might be acceptable from the London County Council. The Board agreed to this in principle, but insisted that such a move would satisfy its

(1) P.R.O. Ed. 24/388.

grant requirements only in the case of the Trust schools in the London area. At this point, the Board drew attention to a third difficulty: the pooling system of the Trust, by which the richer schools subsidised the poorer, would have to be discontinued if some schools were accepted for the higher grant, and others only for the lower. This was one of the perhaps unforeseen implications of placing the powers to waive in the hands only of the Local Authorities. Much as the Board may have wished to pay the Trust schools the higher rate of grant, it found itself in the position, as Bruce had warned (1), that it could not do so without Local Authority permission through the 'Waiver' clause. This amounted, in effect, to a complete reversal of the Board's grant policy of earlier years. The attitude shown by many Local Authorities towards the Trust schools, as we have seen, suggested that waivers of Article 24 (the management clause) would not be readily forthcoming. In all probability, then, only a few of the Trust schools would qualify for the higher grant by waiver, and the cost of this would be the abolition of the pooling system, which in turn would reduce the efficiency, or even close, the poorer schools. The Council protested to the Board, and matters dragged on until early 1909, when the President finally warned the Council's representative, Sir William Bousfield,(2) that a decision must be reached by the 31st. of July that year, when the waiver provisions were due to end. The Board was not prepared to

(1) see p. 43 supra.

(2) P.R.O. Ed. 24/388: Letter Board/G.P.D.S.T. 26th.April 09.

meet some of the suggestions put forward by the Trust. There was no possibility, for example, that the Board might accept a free place requirement below ten per cent. Quite adamant on this point, the Board had already turned down a request from the Sheffield City Council, which wished to see only seven per cent free places at the local King Edward School. About this time too, a further element entered into the discussions. The Board drew attention to the range of quality to be found among the Trust schools, and was not prepared to recognise the weaker institutions merely because they were administered by the same central authority. In fact, Bruce went so far as to suggest to the Trust that one way out of the dilemma would be to close the educationally weaker schools. The President took up this idea, adding that the Trust schools might be much better advised to devote themselves to " preserving a very high standard of education" and to give up the idea of taking the higher grant.

It was this latter view which prevailed in 1909. But by the summer of 1910 the financial side of the Trust had so deteriorate that it was necessary to re-open negotiations with the Board. It was now clear that Leach's scheme was financially unworkable, and Morant confessed to the President (1) that he (Leach) had " Hopelessly mishandled it." He urged the President to accept some responsibility for the difficulty on behalf of the Board, stressing that the Trust schools must not be allowed to close.

(1) P.R.O. Ed. 24/388: Confidential memo RLM/Pres. 29th. October, 1910.

The President duly conceded that the Board would be prepared now to accept in the Trust schools the " lowest possible percentage of free places," even to the extent of creating a precedent. Morant took over the matter at this stage, and drafted a revised plan to supersede Leach's: this was approved by the Treasury in February 1911.(1)

Here the matter rested for several years, as far as the Board was concerned. By the end of 1912, the Trust had reduced its schools from 31 to 28 in number,(2) and all continued to receive grant on the lower scale. The Local Authorities, however, continued to protest strongly; as late as 1914, the Nottingham Education Authority lodged, as before, " emphatic opposition " to the recognition for grant of the local G.P.D.S.T. school, on the by now familiar grounds of lack of local representation, and the opening of the schools to all classes of society. The Board felt itself helpless: " The wording of the letter suggests rather that they want a reasoned reply, which, on grounds of policy, it might not be thought expedient to give them. As to ..... their complaint, I imagine that if we do reply, we can only point out that the school is one of a class of schools, admission to which is now closed, earning grant on the lower scale." (3) In Croydon the G.P.D.S.T. is sharing the administration of its school with the Local Authority, " but from the present attitude of the Nottingham Local Authority, it seems hardly likely that so desirable

(1) P.R.O. Ed. 24/388: Letter Board/Treasury, February,1911.

(2) see pp. 70 - 71, supra.

(3) P.R.O. Ed. 12/398: Minute Secy./Pres; 11th. August 1914.

an arrangement could be achieved at present in this case."

The Municipalisation of Endowed Schools.

The Board's attempt through its Regulations for Secondary Schools to impose a high degree of local representative control on all grant-aided schools was not only inspired by Liberal Party dogma. In many ways it was the culmination of many years of scrutiny of the powers and responsibility of governing bodies in relation to the schools they served. The Public Schools Commission of 1861 - 1864 (the Clarendon Commission(1)), on looking into the management of nine major Public Schools, recommended that a governing body should be permanent in itself, being the guardian and trustee of the long term interests of the school. Although it should not be unduly large, its numbers and the position and character of its individual members should protect it from the domination of personal and local interests, and of personal or professional influences or prejudices: " ..... and we should wish to see it include men conversant with the world, with the requirements of active life, and with the progress of literature and science." (2) Some members of governing bodies, it was also recommended, should be appointed by the Public School Commissioners.

The Commission attached great importance to leaving the internal management of the school firmly in the hands of the Headmaster, although the curriculum, and the significance of

(1) The Clarendon Commission, 1864: Cd 3001.

(2) loc. cit: Report, 1, p. 5.

individual subjects within it were properly matters for the governors, after, of course, consultation with the Headmaster.(1) The Headmaster should also have complete powers of appointment and dismissal of assistant staff.(2) The subsequent adoption of this principle by the Endowed Schools Commissioners was, however, sharply criticised by a Select Committee of the House of Commons in 1873. The Public Schools Act of 1868, in pursuance of the Clarendon Report, called for a greater representative element in governing bodies; the Universities of Oxford, Cambridge and London should be asked to nominate and provide members.

In the meanwhile the Schools Enquiry Commission of 1868 considered the constitution of governing bodies of secondary day schools, and declared itself in favour of " a special body of Trustees with ample but clearly defined powers, and the complete responsibility of the Master to them..... , " (3) as distinct from a body of persons associated for some other puppose. A normal Trust for the management of a purely day school should consist of:

(i) a fixed number of co-optative trustees, selected in the first place from the existing trustees, and between 3 and 5 in number,

(ii) an equal number selected by householders of the town or parish, or in Boroughs appointed by the Town Council, or in other places by the local Board,

and (iii) an equal number appointed by the Provincial Board. In

(1) Report 1, p. 53. (2) Report 1, p. 6.

(3) Schools Enquiry Commission, 1868, vol.1, pp. 244-276.

all cases appointments should last for a period not exceeding five years. (1) " In a good school trust three interests should if possible be combined: the representation of the interests of the parents, of the interests of education and of the past management of the school." In the case of a day school, therefore, there should be added to representatives of parents or householders " some Trustees appointed on the grounds of their larger knowledge to represent education generally," and in order to secure continuity in the life of a school the method of co-optation should be admitted to a limited extent. " When a school has been enlarged or improved or aided by the rates, ratepayers would have a claim to share in the management, and the number of members elected by them or appointed by the Town Council should bear a proportion to the funds added to the endowments from the rates." (2) As in the report of the Public Schools Commission, it was furthered urged that the powers and duties of both Governors and Headmasters should be clearly defined.

The Schools Enquiry Commission had, however, to contend with a situation in which there were no local authorities for education. The need for such bodies - the Commission chose to name them Provincial Authorities - was recognised insofar as it would become necessary to determine the grades of individual schools with an eye to co-ordination and the prevention of any unnecessary overlapping. This authority would also sanction any

(1) Schools Enquiry Commission, 1868, vol.1, p. 645.

(2) loc. cit. p. 656.

proposed scale of fees, the subjects of the curriculum and the arrangements to be made for scholarships.(1) This Provincial Authority would itself take the form of a Board for each of the Registrar General's divisions of the country, and would consist of:

(i) an official District Commissioner, to be appointed by the Charity Commissioners, who would act also as an Inspector.

(ii) six or eight unpaid District Commissioners, resident in the districts concerned and to be appointed by the Crown, " to represent the feelings of the district, and whose decisions would be acquiesced in with little or no murmuring." Alternatively, should a County wish to set up its own Board, this might consist of the Chairman of the Board of Guardians, together with half the Board nominated by the Crown and the official District Commissioner. A third suggestion was also advanced: that an ad hoc authority might be set up, comprising the official District Commissioner, one or two members elected by the ratepayers, and half as many more members nominated by the Crown. (2)

Where a town had a population in excess of 100,000 inhabitants, the Provincial Authority should have representatives from among the governors of all the larger endowed schools in the area, together with equal numbers from the Town Council and any school authorities which had previously existed in the area. " This plan would prevent any thing like a collision between the

(1) loc. cit.: pp. 617 - 619.

(2) loc. cit.: pp. 639 - 644.

Council and previously existing school authorities, and secure the necessary continuity in school management." If the town possessed no important endowments, then all members of the Authority were to be from the Town Council. In both cases, of course, the official District Commissioner should be an ex officio member.

Thus it will be seen that the proposed Provincial Authorities were to have a large proportion of their members nominated by reason of educational experience and interests, and it was to such ad hoc bodies, and not to popularly elected bodies such as County Councils (or in most cases, Education Committees) that it was intended to entrust the nomination of governors of endowed Secondary Schools, who, together with the third elected by the householders, would control the schools. In general, governing bodies should be especially appointed for that purpose, be of a composite character, and have precisely defined powers vis-à-vis the Provincial Authority and the Headmaster.

There was no immediate legislation to set up local authorities, and it was therefore left to the Endowed Schools Commissioners to supply the elements of continuity, skill and wider interests out of the official and co-optative portions of the governing bodies. In their first report,(1) the Commissioners described the usual constitution of governing bodies as " ex officio, representative and co-optative," with the proportions of these varying with the locality. This principle was defended

(1) Report of the Endowed Schools Commissioners, 1872, Cd 1872.

by the Commissioners on the grounds that it enabled them to gain the services on such bodies of valuable persons who would not normally undergo the process of popular election, and that such members had a distinguished record in the past.(1) For the same reasons the Report defended the principle of co-optation, with the suggestion, however, that it might be part of the duty of the Charity Commission to oversee the arrangements for co-opting governors.(2) The Report also contained an appendix (3) which the Commissioners also issued later as a memorandum to Trustees of educational endowments, suggesting that governing bodies ought to determine the general character of a school, and have also the powers to appoint and dismiss the Headmaster.

This latter document later came to the attention of a Select Committee of the House of Commons in 1873.(4) Lord Lyttelton explained that the Commissioners had taken it as axiomatic that a strong administration required a strong popular element in governing bodies.(5) In his view, co-optative governors were usually conservative in their approach, whilst the elected members reflected rapidly the feelings of the constituency. Much the same spirit is evident in the resolution passed in the Commons on the 18th. May 1886: " That in the opinion of this House, every scheme of the Charity Commissioners ought to provide

(1) Report cit.: p. 15.

(2) loc. cit.: p. 16.

(3) Report cit.: App. 2 p. 46:"Paper F."

(4) Select Committee 1873, No. 254.

(5) Select Committee cit.: 1,325 - 1,333.

for the majority of the Trustees or Managers being directly appointed by the ratepayers of the locality to which the charity extends." Within a year the matter came to the attention of another Select Committee (1): all the witnesses called to give evidence proclaimed their allegiance to the principle of only composite governing bodies. Mr. D.R. Fearon, Secretary to the Charity Commission, indicated that the Commissioners usually provided sparingly for ex officio governors, and largely for co-optative members, who were selected largely on their standing educationally. Almost every scheme made provision for elected representatives, very frequently in second and third grade schools, but rarely in case of first grade schools: election was usually by the ratepayers directly or through the Vestry. In other cases, election was through Boards of Guardians, School Boards, or, increasingly, Town Councils. It was further pointed out that the elected members had in practice the power to add to their numbers within certain limits through the power of co-optation.(2)

Nevertheless the emphasis on some governing bodies came under attack from some witnesses. It was claimed that some schemes of government drawn up by the Commissioners showed a "... most sincere distrust of popular government altogether;" " .... it is simply a farce to suppose that the representative principle exists at all with any power to give effect to it.""You will

(1) Select Committee; House of Commons,1887, no. 120.

(2) loc. cit.: 1483 - 1486.

find that the representative principle is altogether swamped by the other form of government.... " The representative element, it was claimed, ".... is not representative of the people whom the matter in hand affects..... " " By their principle, the Charity Commissioners are against popular representation...." (1)

Opinion was divided, however, on the best way to bring about local representation. Sir John Swinburne, who had been the author of the recent Commons resolution, argued that direct election by ratepayers was preferable to nomination by Town Councils, on the grounds that the latter were not ad hoc educational bodies. He wanted to see special elections for this purpose in the areas covered by school foundations. He was warmly supported in this by Sir George Young, who reminded the Committee that those who made use of a school were the most appropriate electors and could usually be relied upon to show a greater interest in the affairs of the school.(2)

Surprisingly enough, the Committee reported finally that they had " ..... failed to satisfy themselves that the (Commons) resolution could be practically carried into effect." (3) The Report report argued that local elections such as had been suggested were irrelevant to charities covering a wide area, and too costly to be supported by small local charities. It did, however, remind the Charity Commission that the interests of education would be best served by enlisting local support where possible.

(1) loc. cit.: 7664, 7651, 7637, 7120. (2) loc. cit.:Evidence 896 - 898.

(3) loc. cit.: Report, p. 10, para. 20.

The first statutory powers for the nomination of Secondary School governors by local authorities were introduced by the Technical Instruction Act of 1889, which implemented the earlier recommendations of the Schools Enquiry Commission: (1) " Where such other Managers of a school or institution receive aid from a Local Authority in pursuance of this section, the Local Authority shall, for the purposes of this Act, be represented on the governing body of the school or institution, in such proportion as will, as nearly as may be, correspond to the proportion which the aid given by the Local Authority bears to the contribution made from all sources other than money provided by the local rate and money provided by Parliament to the cost of the technical and manual instruction given in the school or institution aided." This section was repealed by the Education Act of 1902, but reference is made to it in a schedule to that Act:(2) " References in any enactment or in any provision of a scheme made under the Charitable Trusts Acts....., or the Endowed Schools Acts ....., or the Elementary Education Acts ....., to any provisions of the Technical Instruction Acts 1889 and 1891, or either of those Acts, shall, unless the context otherwise requires, be construed as references to the provisions of Part 2 of this Act,..... " As a result of this legislation, it became customary to insert into schemes and Trust Deeds for schools a clause to the effect that " ... there shall be added

(1) Technical Instruction Act, 1889: Section 1 (i)(e).

(2) Education Act, 1902: Schedule 3, para. 11.

to the Governing Body such additional representative governors, if any, as may be appointed for the purposes of the Technical Instruction Act, 1889, by a Local Authority under that Act." As the scope of financial assistance to endowed schools from the rates grew, the clause was broadened to read: " Additional governors may be appointed by a Local Authority in consideration of a grant by the Local Authority in aid of the school in such numbers as may be fixed by the Authority with the consent of the governors, subject to the approval in writing of the Board of Education." It was these amandments which paved the way for the municipalisation of many endowed schools after the 1902 Act.

The Charity Commissioners, on the other hand, were not wholeheartedly in support of these changes. They took the view subsequently adopted also by the Bryce Commission (1) that only " limited " representation of Local Authorities was desirable: " ..... a leaven, even if a small one, of representative Trustees in a close body may be sufficient to dispose of the chief abuses to which such bodies are liable."(2) They stressed that whereas co-optation had formerly been exclusively the means of appointing governors, it was now almost the exception. This was regretted, because they attached great importance to gaining the services on governing bodies of citizens who had much to contribute, but who for one reason of another were unlikely to seek popular election."

Many of the Secondary Schools which the Local Authorities

(1) c.f. Bryce Commission: vol. 1, pp. 280, 298.

(2) Report of the Charity Commissioners, 1892, paras. 29-37.

after 1902 were empowered to foster were developed from established Higher Grade Schools, which, in turn, had been developed out of Elementary Schools towards the end of the nineteenth century. With the expansion in the field of secondary education, Morant and the Board were very conscious that the administrative practices of Local Authorities in the elementary field would now be carried over as a matter of course into the secondary; thus, as Professor Eaglesham has shown, Morant made great efforts to give Secondary Schools of all types a different administrative status from elementary schools;(1) he saw the key to this as some degree of independence for governing bodies. One of Morant's first decisions in this matter after he became the Board's Secretary was to take a stand over the municipalisation scheme prepared by the Education Committee for Liverpool for the Liverpool Institute High School. Morant declared that it was the Board's policy to see that some genuine independence was secured for the governing body, together with necessary safeguards. He wanted to see representatives from the University appointed, together with other specified citizens of rank, and expected the Local Authority always to seek advice from the governors and to delegate as much authority as possible to them.(2)

The Institution of the Board's grant system provided an effective lever in implementing this policy in 1904. The " Times "

(1) Eaglesham, "The Centenary of Sir Robert Morant." Brit. Jnl. of Ed. Stud.; vol.X11, no. 1, 1963; p. 11-12. and " Implementing the Ed. Act, 1902 ": loc. cit. vol. X no. 2, May 1962: pp. 159-160.

(2) P.R.O. Ed. 12/590: Sir W. Anson's Private Papers. Minute RLM/Anson, 15th. December, 1903.

devoted a leading article to the Regulations for Secondary Schools of that year. " There has always been a lingering fear among Secondary Schools in receipt of rate aid that the excessive and minute oversight which characterised the defunct School Boards should be copied by the new Local Authorities in their dealings with Secondary Schools. The present regulations insist on the need of the Headmaster remaining ' boss ' within his proper sphere, for without freedom there can be no responsibility. They also recognise that the governing body must likewise enjoy some measure of autonomy, if it is to secure the services of the right sort of persons(1) It would indeed be a serious thing if the governing body of a rate-aided Secondary School should be reduced to the level of managers in an elementary school. The Board rightly recognises that a strong governing body is a necessary buffer state between the school and the Local Authority. Politics that have done so much harm to the Elementary School should at all hazards be kept out of the secondary."(2)

To the extent that the maintained secondary school of today enjoys a different status, it may be said that the Board's policy succeeded. But the Board made the tactical mistake in the early years of trying to insist on equal status between endowed

(1) c.f. sixty years later: "It is sometimes said to be difficult to find enough suitable people willing to serve on Governing bodies, but Authorities that are prepared to leave a reasonable amount of worthwhile activity to their school governors seem able to find sufficient candidates." Gosden, "Educational Administration in England and Wales." Oxford 1966: p. 208.

(2) The " Times " : 2nd. July, 1904.

schools proper and municipalised endowed schools, while at the same time being less demanding in the case of provided secondary schools. Thus it appeared to Local Authorities that they were being told for no satisfactory reason to deal differently with some schools for which they were financially responsible than with others. In comparing various schemes for municipalisation, the Board reluctantly concluded: " ..... the variations of procedure are due partly to the experimental character of the schemes themselves, partly to local circumstances and partly to the idiosyncracies of Local Authorities. The most that schemes secure as against control by the Local Authority is the initiative of some sort of advisory body, but even on the advisory body a majority is, as a rule, given to the Local Authority. In a few cases they have not this majority, but they have the powers of the estimate clause, which, by enabling them to veto proceedings of governors in a matter vital to the progress of the school, actually places them in a position of supreme command. ..... What may be called the defensive provisions of thec scheme actually effect so little that it may be questioned whether it is worthwhile to insert them at all..... If circumstances arise which render municipalisation necessary, these circumstances are usually so strong on the side of the Local Authority that they can drive a very hard bargain and their actions are not likely to be controlled very effectively by any provisions they can be induced to accept. It would probably be better to accept the

facts of the situation and trust the Local Authority to conduct their business in an enlightened manner." (1)

One of the effects of the 1907 Regulations was, as Bruce had foreseen, to increase the rate of municipalisation of the poorer endowed schools, who wished to receive the increased grant. Although the Board had been concerned with this problem since as early as 1903, no real urgency had attached itself, as Morant conceded, until about mid-1908. (2) The regulations for 1907 contained a clause requiring all secondary schools to be governed under a specific set of Articles to be approved by the Board (3). In the Board's report for the following year Morant urged Local Authorities to support the Board in this matter.(4) At the end of 1908, the Board issued its Model Articles of Government for the attention of Local Authorities, and at once found itself in conflict with Local democracy: the Buckinghamshire County Council, for example, wished to insert into the Instrument of Government of one of its schools the provision that "... the school shall be open at all times for inspection by members of the Buckinghamshire Education Committee." The Board insisted on adding the words " ..... who are authorised by the Buckinghamshire Education Committee....," a seemingly harmless request, but one which had to be backed up with dire threats. Selby-Bigge, too, complained of the " unusually tight hold"of the Durham

(1) P.R.O. Ed. 24/406.

(2) P.R.O. Ed. 12/138.

(3) Regulations for Secy. Schools, 1907/8:Article 22.

(4) Report of Board of Education, 1908/1909: pp. 127 ff.

County Authority over its schools, which simlarly tried to insist on an indiscriminate right of access.(1) It is much to the credit of the Secretary to the Board that he presevered with what to many must have appeared to be trivial matters. Indeed, the official at the Board who was charged with co-ordinating matters relating to Articles of Government under Article 22 complained on one occasion to Bruce that " ..... much irritation is caused on the part of Local Education Authorities and the net result is not to the good. Such good as does result could be gained otherwise." (2) Morant scribbled in the margin of this minute sheet in his characteristic blue pencil " But how ? and is there any conceivable other way unless we first prevent this way ? " He added his own comments about ".... busybodies roaming around in schools..." and asked the President to reaffirm his support for the Board's policy.

It seems likely, too, that the Board's difficulties in this field had some bearing on the withdrawal of the waiver powers from Local Authorities. Those Authorities which believed in tight political control of Secondary Schools were obviously less likely to pass Waivers of Article 24, thus restricting endowed schools to the lower grant. This in turn would increase the likelihood of more municipalisation schemes for otherwise excellent schools under 'difficult' authorities. Morant urged this on McKenna at a special meeting in November 1907: he spoke

(1) P.R.O. Ed. 24/404 : minute Selby-Bigge/Bruce, 21.10.07.

(2) P.R.O. Ed. 12/138 : minute J.Sykes/Bruce, 5. 11. 09.

of the difficulty of enforcing the conditions of schemes for municipalisation. If, as frequently happened, the schemes were afterwards patently ignored, what could the Board do ? The schemes, however desirable educationally, had in fact no statutory backing.(1) Furthermore, the Board could not insist on conditions in such schemes which it was not prepared to enforce as conditions for grant. And to extend the conditions for grant to co ver also detailed matters of school administration would undermine the Board's policy of giving grants only ' in aid ', and provoke also considerable resentment in the endowed schools. (2) As a result of this meeting, the President decided that it would be expedient henceforth for the Board to insist on a written scheme also for provided Secondary Schools.

It was the latter decision which caused the greatest outcry. The Lancashire County Education Committee, for example, discussed the " Model Articles of Government " issued by the Board and requested the Board " ..... to accept the Committee's revised regulations as constituting the required form of Instrument of Government of all Municipal Secondary Schools for which the Committee had accepted financial responsibility." The Board replied, however, that they " ..... were unable to regard the requirements of Article 22 of the Regulations for Secondary Schools as satisfied unless a separate Instrument of Government is drawn up for each of the schools." It was several years before the

(1) This has now been rectified: Education Act, 1944, Section 17 (3)(b).

Articles were finally agreed.(1) Some Authorities were more difficult to persuade. Leeds, For example, was one of several which wished to introduce the so-called ' interposition clause ' by which the Director of Education acted as go-between between the Headmaster and his Governors. The real difficulty was that the Board had never before insisted on the creation in the case of provided schools of a position analagous to that of Clerk to the Governors of an endowed school: thus it had seemed to Local Education Authorities that their Director of Education was an obvious choice. Matters became further complicated in time by the Board's insistence in many cases on powers for Headmasters which went far beyond those granted to Headmasters under schemes for endowed schools, almost to the extent of regarding them as the partner of Local Education Authorities and their equal in status.(2) The Leeds Authority took such exception to the Board's involvement - although, as an official at the Board commented to Bruce, " .. the Local Education Authority objects to Article 22 on principle, not to the form of Instrument.... "(3) - that it began to circularise other Local Authorities with the intention of persuading them to refuse to submit draft Articles to the Board. The " Yorkshire Post " joined in: " The Local Authorities ..... have been given a wide and general power. Casting envious eyes upon that authority - without any suggestion that it has been abused - the Board are seeking to limit it by insisting ....

(1) Lancs. County Record Office: Ref: EKR 7 (1910.)

(2) P.R.O. Ed. 12/138: Memo. Bruce/RLM, 30. Jan. 1911.

(3) loc. cit.: minute Campbell/Bruce, 1. 3. 1910.

that each school shall be governed by a definite Instrument approved by the Board and incapable of being varied to suit new conditions unless the alteration has their consent. This attempt is stretching very far the powers of the Board, and it is to be hoped that Local Authorities will resist it to the utmost."(1) Although,as Eaglesham has shown, Morant subsequently made an error in his dealings with the Leeds Authority and had to apdogise, so much public interest had been fanned by the issue that the President of the Board, Walter Runciman, felt obliged to make the following statement to the Commons on 13th. July, 1910: " I should like to refer, briefly, to the position of Headmaster in Secondary Schools. I fear that they are too much under the control of officials. As I have stated publicly elsewhere, if there is one thing in the organisation of education of localities which seems a serious danger, it is the over-control of officials. In Secondary Schools this is particularly harmful. The Headmaster ought to be properly consulted in the management of his school, and he should have immediate access to the governing body of that school. The appointment of assistants ought never to take place without consultation with him. The governing body on that subject ought only to act after full consultation with the Headmaster. He ought to be the responsible executive officer, through whom, and after consultation with whom, the responsible authority act. I do not believe for a moment that this undermines

(1) " The Yorkshire Post." 9th. June, 1909.

popular control. I believe that it is very much better than bureaucratic control. The Governing Bodies themselves ought to have control of the Secondary Schools, and I do invite them to get into closer touch with the Headmaster. In urging this, we are really fighting the battle of the teaching profession. If this right of direct access to the governing body is not granted, and, indeed, if it is not demanded by the Local Authorities themselves, it will mean that men and women of character and education will be driven away from the Secondary Schools. That would be most lamentable, and not to the best advantage of this great service."

Roman Catholic Schools were affected rather more than most by the requirements of Article 22, and to some extent also by Article 28 which forbade the creation of private profits. The Board had been aware for some time (1) that even where a Board of Governors existed for these schools, and they were few in number, their powers were in practice subordinated to those of the ecclesiastical authorities. Hitherto the Board had treated them as if no profits were made, despite the lower salaries bill; furthermore the usual absence of a Trust for these schools meant that there was no legal guarantee of permanence, or that the Board's grants would not be used to improve the buildings or increase non-educational resources by passing to the accounts of the Orders. This was much more lenient than the treatment doled out to schools operated under the Companies Acts, which, as we

(1) P.R.O. Ed. 12/160 : App. to Draft Regs. 08/098 Pres.

have seen, were obliged to declare a permanent Trust for education. McKenna realised that the Roman Catholic authorities were most unlikely to declare a Trust of that nature, but stood firm on his resolve that they should comply with Article 22. It was agreed, however, that the concept of permanence might be accepted by the Board if incorpprated in the scheme in the following fashion:

(i) No building operations should be carried out by the school authorities without prior notice to the Board; the Board might then investigate whether government grants were being used for buildings.

(ii) There should be an agreement that any surplus funds at the close of the financial year should be used to reduce fees.

(iii) The Board reserved the right to withhold grant at any time.

This was generally acceptable to the Roman Catholic authorities The President also gave his word that no new requirements would be made of schools on the lower scale of grant, a concession that was to remain unaltered until 1919.

Review.

Several points of interest to the administrator of education arise from a scrutiny of the 1907 Regulations. The rapidly growing Labour movement had given considerable support to the Liberal campaign during the 1906 election for the immediate revision of the 1902 Act.(1) McKenna himself, as the Member of

(1) c.f. B.Simon,"Education and the Labour Movement." 1965. p. 253 ff.

Parliament for Monmouth, owed considerable allegiance to his Nonconformist following and support, and both he and his party had the popular reputation of being violently opposed to the existence of denominational schools. During the heated arguments which followed the publication of the 1907 Regulations, one Member claimed in the House on the 11th. July that it had been Aclands campaign against Church schools which had cost the Liberal Party the election of 1895.

In view of his predecessor, Birrell's, devastated attempt to solve the problem of Church schools by legislation, McKenna knew well that he was unlikely to bring his desired reforms onto the statute book. Indeed, he admitted as much to the House.(1) He acted therefore, as we have seen, through his Departmental regulations: the interesting point is that the Regulations do not appear to have been contested on the grounds that they contravened to some extent the law of the land. The President and his colleagues in the Cabinet were fully aware that the Act of 1902 demanded parity of treatment for all types of school, indeed, a legal action of 1908 established, albeit in the field of elementary education, that public funds should be used to maintain non-provided schools in the character in which they were first maintained.(2) The 1907 Regulations amounted to a major revision of goverment policy for secondary education. As the " Christian World " of October, 1909 pointed out: " .. we have got by administration what, while the House of Lords exists

(1) 11th. July, 1907.

(2) Attorney-General v. West Riding C.C.: 1908.
23 Times Law Reports 171.

unfettered, we could never have got by legislation - a practically undenominational system of secondary schools."

During the July debate, Sir William Anson, the ex-Parliamentary Secretary to the Board speaking now for the Opposition, put his finger on the weakness in McKenna's administration by indicating that departmental regulations could be equally easily changed, that they had no guarantee of permanence and that for this reason " legislation by regulation " was unsatisfactory. Mr. A. J. Balfour undertook moreover to repeal the offending clauses when his party was returned to power. McKenna, however, pointed out that ever since it had been the practice of the Board of Education to make grants, these had been disbursed through annual regulations: the 1907 Regulations were thus not at all unusual.

The Conservative attack on McKenna was not really sincere, although it was heated. Sir John Gorst had himself legislated through administrative channels by including Clause V11 in the Science and Art Directory of 1897. Furthermore, there was no statutory obligation laid upon schools to accept the Board's terms, and the imposition was defensible because of the increase in grant. This is not to deny, however, that many of the poorer endowed schools on grant regarded themselves as faced with Hobson's choice. Despite all the protests in the Commons, no attempt was made either then or later to place any finer limits on what might be prescribed by the Board as conditions of grant, Parliament being able to have its say only during the passing of the annual Appropriation Bill. The Education Act of 1921 confirmed that "....

the Board of Education shall, ... by Regulations provide for the payment to Local Education Authorities out of monies provided by Parliament of annual substantive grants in aid of education.... "(1) History was to repeat itself on several occasions: in 1932, for example, during the Commons debate on the Board's Circular 1421, which permitted an all-round increase in fees, a means test, and some restriction of the numbers of free places, several members protested against the impossibility of debating such regulations before they were implemented. Not until the passing of the Statutory Instruments Bill in November 1945 did it become obligatory for such regulations as the central authority might prescribe to lie before the House prior to being implemented.(2) Among the latter are included the present Direct Grant Schools Regulations.(3)

The second issue on which McKenna invited driticism was his apparent confusion of two separate roles which he was appointed to play. As an administrator he was entitled to act in accordance with political directives and principles; his powers under the Charitable Trusts Acts, however, must be exercised in a quasi-judicial manner. At the time of the passing of the Board of Education Act of 1899, Fearon of the Charity Commission had advised the Duke of Devonshire against transferring the powers to amend schemes for endowed schools to the newly created Board. He had

(1) Education Act, 1921: Section 118, subs. 1.

(2) Committee Report, 1945, Oct/Dec., p.622:Clause 3 of Bill.

(3) Direct Grant Schools Regulations, 1959 (as amended). Statutory Instrument 1959, No. 1832.

stressed the value of the Charity Commission as a buffer state between Trustees of Foundations and the central government.(1) McKenna perhaps confirmed Fearon's suspicions when he showed a tendency to bend schemes to suit his administrative expediency. The Endowed Schools Act of 1869, which governed most of the endowed and foundation schools, contained a provision which prevented any alterations from being made to the position of denominational instruction in the school without the permission of the governors. This, however, did not apply to the possible introduction of a conscience clause.(2) So when a complaint was received by the Board that the West Riding Education Committee, in contravention of Section 4 of the 1902 Act, had refused to subsidise the Wheelrights' School at Dewsbury on the grounds that it was a denominational school (and had been since 1888 under an agreement of that year with the Charity Commissioners,) the Board's reaction was not to censure the Local Authority, but immediately to insert the conscience clause.(3) McKenna went a step further when, in early 1908, he issued a letter to Trustees of endowments in which he invited them to apply to the Board to change their deeds. However much one may sympathise with the President's intentions, this was a clear case of saying : ' bring your problems to Court, and you will find the judge biased in your favour.'(4) It is worth noting in passing that the same blurring of the dividing line between the two functions

(1) P.R.O. Ed. 24/63.

(2) c.f. Halsbury's Statutes, 1st. ed'n, vol. 12, p. 108.

(3) H.C. Debates: 28/537

(4) H.C. Debates: 29/944.

was again evident during the controversy surrounding the revision of the Direct Grant List after the Second World War.

One final point from McKenna's regulations is significant. Article 44 provided for grants on the higher scale to be paid in general only to those schools which had been in receipt of grant in previous years. Together with the recognition that the lower scale of grant was becoming increasingly inadequate, this meant that schools might in future receive the Board's grants only by accepting control by Local Authorities. Thus the trend of the Regulations was really towards the gradual abolition of payment of direct grant to schools. The figures show that by the end of the First World War, for example, four fewer Roman Catholic Schools were still receiving grant. By contrast, the number of schools maintained and controlled by Local Authorities had risen to 455, and, for the first time, was greater than the total of all other non-maintained schools. The spirit of Article 44 remained a part of government's educational policy right up to 1957, when, for the first time, the Ministry opened its doors to applications for Direct Grant status to schools not previously in receipt of grant.(1)

(1) c.f. Circular 319: 7th. January, 1957.

Chapter 3: The inter-war period.

The substance of the 1907 regulations remains to the present day. McKenna's achievement was to link the grant-aided Secondary Schools in a positive way with Local Authority provision, and with Public Elementary Schools in particular. It is some measure of his success with the latter that several years later, Canon Swallow of Chigwell School, who in his capacity as Secretary to the Headmasters' Association had led the deputation to protest to McKenna in 1907, referred to the provision of free places as " an unqualified success."(1) Direct Grant schools continued to form about half the total provision of secondary education, supported by several changes in the rate of grant (2). There still remained, however, the difficulty of tidying up the administrative inconvenience of those schools on ' waiver,' and, more particularly, those schools which were receiving grant on the lower scale.

This problem was aggravated by the growing clamour for higher education.(3) The schools on the lower grant were, on the whole, less perturbed by the free place requirements than by the provisions relating to school government: the difficulty was that, being on the lower grant, they were often obliged to make up the difference by increased fees or fewer free places.

(1) c.f. H.C. Debates: 92/1927.

(2) Financial data of direct grant is given at App. 'A'

(3) c.f. Banks, " Parity and Prestige in English Secondary Education " : p. 70 ff.

Thus the new President of the Board, Mr. H.A.L. Fisher, announced that he was considering the implications and effects of Articles 23 and 24, particularly with regard to denominational schools.(1) The Board recognised in 1919 that since 1907 there had been a significant tendency to reduce the importance of endowments and to bring the maintenance and provision of schools more and more within the financial ambit of Local Authorities. This had been furthered by the Education Act 1918, which established the principle of Local Authorityresponsibility for all forms of higher education in their areas, (2) and by increases in the expenditure on teachers' salaries. The Board then decided to revoke the Clauses relating to the religious beliefs of members of staff and governors, and the requirement of a representative majority. For the latter was substituted a requirement that a grant-aided school should have only one third of its governing body appointed by the Local Authority, although this could be regarded as a minimum. " In these circumstances the Board have no fear that the changes made ..... will ..... cause any embarassment to Local Education Authorities, or diminish their control of public education in their areas, or that they will make the local schools which take advantage of them less amenable to public opinion or less accessible to children of all classes and all denominations than the schools which have

(1) H.C. Debates : 114/2719.

(2) Education Act, 1918: Sect. 2(I).

applied for and received grants during the last twelve years. On the other hand, the Board are confident that the balance of public advantage lies on the side of opening the entrance to the system of State-aided schools to a larger number of efficient Secondary Schools." (1)

The preamble to the Grant Regulations for 1919 further drew attention to the possibility that the elective constituencies set up by McKenna would not necessarily ensure that governing bodies would contain representatives of Local Authorities which exercised powers under Part two of the Act of 1902. Those constituencies reflected the peculiarities and difficulties of Trust Deeds and Schemes made before there was any systematic provision for higher education or any clear theory of school organisation. The Article concerned was more appropriate to a period in which endowments were all-important and the special attached to them were all-important and dominant, than to a period in which the conception of a public system of education is more fully developed.(2)

The Board's aim in these changes was clearly only to enable the full rate of grant to be paid to more schools: nothing was done to prejudice Local Authority jurisdiction." It will of course be understood that compliance with conditions of grant in no way prejudices the arrangements which a Local Education Authority may wish to make with a school as conditions of grant

(1) Regulations for Senondary Schools, 1919-1920. Cmd 341 : p. 6.

(2) loc. cit.

out of the rates in aid of its provision or maintenance."(1) Nor did the Board intend to release from public control those endowed schools which had already accepted a two-thirds majority of representative governors: there was to be no " .... revision of Trust Deeds or Instruments of Government of schools which have already complied in respect of the constitution of the governing body, with the existing conditions of grant, unless such revision is clearly advantageous to the organisation of higher education in the area."(2) It was further pointed out that schools were now expected to comply in full with the grant regulations, and that the Board would shortly fix a date on which the 'Waiver' provisions would end.

Fisher's changes were not universally popular, and the Leader of the House, Bonar Law, attacked them as essentially retrograde steps.(3) The particular fear was that the Board might also now amend the free place requirements in such a way as to enable the wealthy Public Schools to qualify for grant. There was in fact some pressure from certain elements in the Commons to do just this, and Fisher ultimately felt called upon to repudiate the idea.(4) This went some way to restore the confidence of the House, and Fisher further agreed not to make any further changes of this nature in grant policy without first consulting Parliament.(5) Nevertheless he felt that there was

(1) Regulations for Secondary Schools, 1919-1920: para. 6

(2) loc. cit. para. 7. (3) H.C. Debates: 118/1350.

(4) H.C. Debates: 118/2110. (5) ibid.

a case for relaxing the rigidity of the free place requirements, particularly where the full requirement of 25% bore too heavily on a school's finances. As he subsequently indicated,(1) in some areas the total of free places was already more than adequate, and lastly, the regulation put excessive pressure on schools which had a large, non-local element of boarding scholars. The second reason given, the Board's unwillingness to condone more than the minimum number of necessary free places, revealed what was to be the Board's policy in this matter for several years to come.

The Fisher administration was also responsible for the introduction and implementation of the Education (Compliance with conditions of grant) Act of 1919, which eased the transition of schools onto the grant list. This two-clause Bill which was passed without dissent,(2) provided that " .... any provisions contained in any Instrument regulating the Trusts or management of a school or educational institution which are inconsistent with the conditions prescribed for the receipt of grants out of monies provided by Parliament in the Regulations of the Board of Education shall, if the governing body of the school or institution apply to the Board of Education for a grant under these Regulations, cease to operate, or operate subject to such modifications as may be necessary in order to render the Instrument consistent with those Regulations and as

(1) H.C. Debates : 160/2153.

(2) H.C. Debates : 118/1709.

may be made by the governing body, so long as grants are made by the Board under those regulations and during any school year in which the school has been recognised by the Board for the purposes of grants."(1)

These changes brought 41 schools more onto the grant list, of which 33 still have Direct Grant status.(2) Of 48 schools which in July 1919 were receiving grant at the lower rate, 11 immediately complied with the revised regulations, one was removed altogether from the grant list, and the remaining 36 which included the schools of the G.P.D.S.T. made " substantial progress."(3) Similarly, of 78 schools who were receiving full grants under the 'waiver' clause, 35 complied immediately, and the Board expressed confidence that the others would follow in time.(4)

A further boost was given to the new grant policy by the results of the deliberations of the Burnham Committee which reported on teachers' salaries in 1920. The Board rapidly gave its approval to the new pay scales, and in consequence threw new burdens onto school finances. The G.P.D.S.T. schools, for example were obliged to raise fees in their schools substantially and finally to apply for the increased grant. The application was accepted in 1921, and in the matter of free places the Board kept its earlier word and agreed that the admission of

(1) 9 and 10 Geo. 5 c. 41: Halsbury's Statutes, 3rd. ed. p. 544.

(2) Bd. of Ed:"Abolition of tuition fees in grant-aided Secondary Schools": 1943: Appendix A.

(3) Bd. of Ed. Report,1920:p.26 (4) ibid 1921: p.28.

pupils should be 10% of the admissions of all pupils, including those in the Junior Departments, in the previous year. (1)

In order to comply with the other aspects of grant regulations, the Trust now decided to establish Local Committees of Management and Governing Bodies for each school or County group of schools. Their powers were defined in Articles of Government which were duly approved by the Board: these were the same in all cases but for the Croydon and Ipswich schools, where special arrangements were put into force as the result of an agreement with the Local Authority by which any deficit would be underwritten by the Authority. At Croydon the Trust agreed to have equal representation with the Authority on the Governing Body, and at Ipswich five out of nine Governors were to be appointed by the Authority.

At the same time, other influences were being brought to bear upon the grant system. Under the Education Act of 1918 the Board of Education undertook to meet half the expenditure of Local Authorities, or, more precisely, the expenditure after deduction of all other income from fees, rents and the like. Thus provided schools were no longer to receive grants directly from the Board, but through the agency of Local Authorities. This arrangement came into force as from the 1st. April, 1919, but grants directly to provided schools under the Regulations for Secondary Schools continued to be paid for two or three years longer to allow for a period of adjustment. Local Authorities

however continued in general to give financial assistance to non-provided Secondary Schools, both by way of maintenance grants and through fees paid on behalf of pupils attending the schools: this latter expenditure continued to rank for the usual 50% reimbursement from the Board of Education, even though at the same time the non-provided schools were receiving direct grant.

This new financial structure thus had a distinct tendency to favour the non-provided school as against the provided, insofar as they shared the same sources of income, from rates, fees and taxes, whereas the Endowed Schools had also considerable private resources. It was this latter point which engaged the attention of the Geddes Committee, which was set up in 1921 to look into Government spending during the years of post-war austerity. In its first interim report, the Committee spoke of an " alarming " increase in the costs of state-subsidised higher education, (1) and wondered why schools which could hardly be considered impecunious were nevertheless receiving aid from both rates and taxes. Singled out for special mention in this respect were Dulwich College, Bedford Modern School, Blundell's School, Tiverton and Berkhamsted Grammar School: the last three had been on the grant list for almost twenty years. The Geddes Committee took the view that Local Authorities supported these schools and made them the basis of their secondary education

(1) Lord Geddes: " Committee on Public Expenditure " 1922: Cd. 1581: p. 114. First Interim Report.

provision because on the whole they were cheaper.(1) Put in another way, the Committee was echoing the Treasury's view that the Board's grant system tended to keep down, rather than expand, Local Authority expenditure on secondary schools. The report went on to advise that the grant list should be urgently revised, and made the suggestion that, where a school received financial assistance directly from a Local Education Authority, then aid from the Board as direct grant should cease.

The Geddes Committee, of course, did not set out to be an educational body, and its recommendations had difficult implications for the Board. In the first place, as Mr. Trevelyan told the Commons, it was not on the whole the endowments of the non-provided schools which made them cheaper on the rates, it was their generally higher scale of fees. Furthermore, having only as recently as 1919 brought onto grant those schools which would not accept Local Authority control, and mindful of McKenna's attempts at enforcement, the President could hardly arbitrarily cut off direct grant as the Geddes Committee wanted, without endangering the provision of free places. There was no reason to suppose that the schools which had held out against Articles 23 and 24 until 1919 would now willingly put their financial affairs into the hands of the Local Authorities. (2)

For this reason the Board settled for the principle of choice by the school itself. Under Circular 1259 of the 2nd. May

(1) Report, p. 115.

(2) H.C. Debates: 652/359.

1922, the Board announced that aid to non-provided schools by way of maintenance grant (but not, however, by way of fees paid on behalf of pupils attending the schools) would not in future be reimbursed by the Board: however a period of five years was to be allowed in order to allow Local Authorities to adjust to the new arrangements. At the end of this period in 1926, the Board issued a further circular which gave the non-provided schools the option of receiving all their aid indirectly through Local Authorities or directly as hitherto directly from the Board.

Circular to Local Education Authorities for Higher Education and Governing Bodies of Secondary Schools, etc.

Circular 1381
23 July, 1926

All communications should be addressed to THE SECRETARY.

BOARD OF EDUCATION,
WHITEHALL, LONDON, S.W.1.

HIGHER EDUCATION.

1. In order to give effect to the policy announced in Circular 1259 and Article 3 (c) of Grant Regulations 4, under which after 1st April, 1927, no expenditure of an Authority in aiding a school is to rank for grant if the school is also in receipt of grant from the Board, the following arrangements will apply.

2. Secondary Schools not provided by Local Education Authorities for Higher Education that are now in receipt of grant under Grant Regulations 10 or 11 may, if they choose, cease to receive such grant as from 1st August, 1926. Grant under Grant Regulations 10 or 11 for the year to 31st July, 1926, will be payable to any schools so ceasing, and that will be the last payment of direct grant made to them. If Local Education Authorities aid those schools in the financial year 1926–27, the Board will recognise for grant to Local Education Authorities only so much of the aid given by the Authority to any such school as exceeds the aid given by the Board to the School. The full amount of such aid given by Local Education Authorities in subsequent financial years will be recognisable for Grant.

3. Secondary Schools not provided by Local Education Authorities for Higher Education that are now in receipt of grant under Grant Regulations 10 or 11 may if they choose, continue to receive it until 31st July, 1927, and give notice, before 31st July, 1927, of their intention to cease to receive it from 1st August, 1927. Grant under Grant Regulations 10 or 11 for the year to 31st July, 1927, will be payable to any schools so ceasing and that will be the last payment of direct grant made to them. If Local Education Authorities aid those schools in the financial year 1927–28, the Board will recognise for grant to Local Education Authorities only so much of the aid given by the Authority to any such school as exceeds the aid given by the Board to the School. The full amount of such aid given by Local Education Authorities in subsequent financial years will be recognisable for Grant.

4. Secondary Schools not provided by Local Education Authorities for Higher Education that are now in receipt of grant under Grant Regulations 10 or 11, and do not give notice before 31st July, 1927, of their intention to cease to receive such grant after that date may (other conditions being satisfied) continue to receive it after 31st July, 1927, but no Local Education Authority's aid given to such schools in the year 1927–28 or any subsequent year will be recognised by the Board for grant to the Local Education Authority.

5. Similar arrangements will apply in the case of Institutions for Higher Education other than Secondary Schools, the appropriate date being substituted for the 31st July where the school year does not end on that date. As regards Schools and Courses aided under the Adult Education Regulations (Grant Regulations 33), however, the arrangements set out in the third paragraph of Article 3 (*c*) of Grant Regulations 4 will continue in force.

6. Local Education Authorities and Governing Bodies should confer at an early date with a view to determining which of the alternatives they desire to adopt.

7. Any amendments of the existing Regulations necessary to give effect to these arrangements will be made in due course.

8. In the above, where reference is made to the recognition or non-recognition by the Board of Local Education Authority's expenditure after 1st April, 1927, it should be understood that in the event of the introduction of any new grant system whereby a block grant would be payable to Local Education Authorities, the block grant would be adjusted so as to give effect to the principles stated above.

AUBREY V. SYMONDS.

(27992) Wt. 7844/12 500 7/27 Harrow. G.31

The schools were thus faced with a rather complex choice. The Board's grant, determined through its own regulations, was made on the basis of an annual calculation: once this had been assessed, for example for advanced courses, it could not be varied for that year. Grants from Local Authorities on the other hand were infinitely variable and flexible and could be adapted to meet special circumstances at short notice. Furthermore there was no limit, at least in theory.

The implications of the circular came up for discussion at the Headmasters' Conference meeting in 1927. Mr. Cholmondly of Owen's School pointed out that it was not a straight choice between two sources of grant, merely a statement to the effect that henceforth Local Authority aid to a Direct Grant school would not qualify for the 50% reimbursement by the Treasury. In practice, therefore, the opinions of Local Education Authorities would be very significant. Where a school was receiving more financial aid from the Board than from the Local Authority, the Local Authority would want the school to continue to receive Direct Grant. If, for example, the Board was making an annual grant of 3,000 pounds and the Local Authority only 2,000 pounds, then it would be expedient for the school to opt for Direct Grant, for the Local Authority could be expected to continue to pay the 2,000 pounds. If the school decided to take all its aid through the Local Authority, then the latter would have to find a total of 5,000 pounds: 2,500 would be reimbursed by

the Board, leaving the Local Authority with an increased expenditure on the school of 500 pounds.

Several Local Authorities, notably the larger ones did not however treat all the schools in their areas separately. In 1926, for example, Owen's School received 3,600 pounds from the Board, and 3,300 from the London Authority. On the face of it there was a case for continuing with Direct Grant. The Authority on the other hand decided to treat schools in its area as a group, which presented a different picture. The Authority thus resolved that Direct Grant Schools should in future receive no assistance from the Authority.

It is of interest to note that the question of administrative status rested this time with individual schools, and not, as under the McKenna regulations, with the Local Authority. Circular 1381 spoke of governing bodies conferring with Local Authorities to arrive at mutual agreement.(1) This is not to deny, however, that many schools were faced with Hobson's choice: many had accepted costly building loans from Local Authorities, which they could not afford to service from fees and Direct Grant alone. And where, as in London, the Local Authority had lent money to a school in order to increase the provision of free places over 25%, Direct Grant status was likely henceforth to reduce this provision to 25% or below. Equally, schools which cherished their independence of Local Authorities were loth to become

(1) Circular 1381: para. 6.

financially dependent on them. A typical difficulty was faced by certain denominational schools: the Christian Brothers' and Saint Francis Xavier's Schools in Liverpool accommodated pupils who on the whole could afford only very low levels of fees, and consequently needed aid from both Board and Local Authority. If the Local Authority withdrew its support, then the schools might have to close. If, on the other hand, the schools were to offer to come under the Local Authorities financial umbrella, then the whole question of ' Rome on the rates ' threatened to rise again (1)

These administrative rearrangements served to divide the country's Secondary Schools into three distinct categories:

(a) Provided and maintained schools, usually built, equipped and fully financed by Local Authorities, but including also a large number of municipalised schools,

(b) Aided schools. Theywere usually governed under Schemes or similar Instruments of Government. The Local Authority grant was agreed annually or at convenient intervals with the school authorities, and the school was obliged to offer at least 25% free places. In practice, the Aided schools fell in with the arrangements of the Local Authority as regards admission of pupils.

(c) Direct Grant schools. The term was first used specifically to describe the group of schools which elected to continue to

(1) H.C. Debates: 157/1929.

receive grant directly from the Board of Education after 1926. After a short period of fluctuation after the Board decided to extend the period for decision, approximately two-thirds of the non-provided schools chose to relinquish the Board's grant. By the end of 1930 there were 238 Direct Grant schools, out of a total of 671 recognised non-provided schools.(1) The Board also let it be known to the Headmasters' Conference that it would consider applications from schools which wished at a later date to reconsider their status, although it would not take kindly to schools which proposed to change their allegiance annually for the sake of a small financial gain.

Most of the Direct Grant schools continued to receive help towards improvements, repairs and maintenance from Local Authorities. Schools which joined the grant list after 1930 were normally obliged as a condition of grant to offer a minimum of 25% free places, and were not accorded the provisions by which the Board might reduce this requirement. However the Board regarded this condition as fulfilled if the Local Authority sent pupils to the school and paid their fees to the 25% mark. A number of Direct Grant schools continued to provide their own free places, and thus to receive no subvention in any form from Local Authorities. This latter group of schools tended to draw from a large catchment area, rather than from the area of one Local Authority.

(1) Board of Education Report 1930: p. 21.

Free Secondary Education for all.

The movement towards free education in the secondary field grew in impetus during the inter-war years. A detailed description of it is out of place here, except insofar as it came ultimately to affect the whole issue of direct grants to schools. Even in 1922 34.2% of the places in Secondary Schools on the grant list were held without cost to the holder, although, of course, this is an average figure which takes no account of the extremes in both directions. By 1925 the figure had risen to 35.1%. Until 1924 the matter had been left to natural evolution and the foresight of Local Authorities(1) but in the September of that year, one month before leaving office, the Labour Government introduced an extra annual grant of 3pounds for each free place awarded by the school over the usual 25%.(2) At the same time, grant-aided schools were given discretion to raise the number of free places to 40%. The incoming Conservative administration withdrew the increased free place grant within six months, but nevertheless free places during the year 1927 rose to 37% of the total. By 1930 the discretionary limit of free place provision had been raised to 50%, and in the same year free place provision stood at 42.7%.(3)

In 1932, in view of the economic depression, the Board revised the regulations, arguing that the free place system

(1) c.f. Graves, op.cit. p. 103. (2) H.C. Debates: 180/1050.

(3) Board of Education Report,1930: pp.19-20.

showed no regard for parents' capacity to pay for their children's education. Accordingly the Board introduced the special place system: the 25% provision of free places was to remain, but a further 25% of places in the schools was to be supported by a sliding scale of fees, variable with parental income. On the whole, however, the Direct Grant Schools were unaffected by the special place provision: their fees were usually high, and exemptions granted by the governing bodies did not have any effect on the Treasury. By 1938, of a total of 1398 recognised secondary schools, 304 were entirely free or had a small element of special places: and a further 957 had a percentage of free and special places together of between 25 and 100; of the latter 461 were in the range of 50 to 100%. In a sense, then, the free education provisions of the Education Act of 1944 were in effect a levelling out of the provision over the country as a whole.

Chapter four : The effects of the Education Act, 1944.

The policy decision to support the entire costs of secondary education from rates and taxes rather than directly from fees had profound implications for the whole concept of the direct grant system. Once a statutory duty had been laid upon Local Education Authorities to secure (1) that there should be sufficient free places in secondary schools for their area, then it followed that these Authorities would look askance at the purely voluntary nature of the Direct Grant schools. An Authority which relied heavily upon these schools ran the risk that legitimate decisions of the governing bodies, in such matters as, for example, the over-all size of the school or its catchment area, might adversely affect the Authority's policy or even place it in default. For the same reasons difficulties would arise over long-term planning: a Direct Grant school might, for example, decide to relinquish grant altogether and become entirely fee-paying, thus involving the Local Authority in extra expenditure. Thus in general the Local Authorities favoured the abolition of the direct grant system: " ..... in all schools the education should be free. This necessitates ... that all grant-aided schools should receive their aid from the Local Education Authority, subject to conditions of aid

(1) Education Act, 1944 : Section 8.

laid down by the Local Education Authority and approved by the Board of Education. One effect of this will be that the system of direct grants to individual schools will be abolished." (1)

It appears to have been widely held during the planning of the 1944 Act that the direct grant system would disappear. Secondary schools not provided by Local Authorities might opt as they saw fit for either Voluntary Aided or Voluntary Controlled status under the Act (2). The effect of this was to introduce into the administration of Secondary Schools the same type of dual system which had hitherto been characteristic of the administration of Elementary Schools, but with the significant difference that the new Minister was to confirm the elected status by order (3) and was now empowered to give directions in the event of default or unacceptable behaviour on the part of governing bodies of aided schools.(4) The Minister would also confirm by order the approved Articles of Government for the schools, and was obliged therein to have regard to the manner in which the school had been conducted before accepting the new status. (5) Of the governing bodies, one third of members would be appointed by Local Education Authorities in the case of Aided schools, and two thirds in the case of Controlled

(1) " Education - a plan for the future," Association of Directors and Secretaries for Education, Oxford 1942, p. 13.
(2) Education Act, 1944, S.13(2). (3) ibid. S. 15.
(4) ibid. S. 68, 99. (5) ibid. S. 17.

schools. (1) It was clearly expected that most Secondary Schools would opt for one or other of these categories, regardless of their ealier status: and the Act further contained provisions intended to ease the transition from Direct Grant to Voluntary status, by limiting the powers of objection by offended parties if the Local Education Authority and the governors of a Direct Grant School wished to take advantage of the financial terms offered by the new status.(2) At the same time the Board of Education was stressing, largely through the agency of organisations such as the Headmasters' Conference and the Governing Bodies' Association, that the essential individual characteristics of schools would not be lost sight of in the attempt to forge a neater national system of Secondary Schools.

On the other hand, the better endowed and more successful Direct Grant Schools were in a good bargaining position, since the Government had no statutory powers to enforce their compliance with the terms of the Act; despite the fact that many owed their solvency only to the generosity of Local Education Authority subsistence and deficiency grants, it was equally true that a considerable number would probably give up state aid altogether if pressed too hard. The effect of the latter would be to create more fee-paying schools at a time when 'free' education was Government policy. Perhaps with

(1) Education Act, 1944: S. 19.

(2) ibid. S. 13(3) : c.f. Taylor and Saunders, " The New Law of Education," 6th. ed., 1965, p. 105 (f).

such possibilities in mind, the President of the Board, Mr. R.A. Butler, announced to the Commons on the 19th. January 1944 that he intended to preserve " tradition and variety " in the education system, and to that end to keep the direct grant principle in existence. Nevertheless, Local Authorities must be able to count on places in these schools to supplement their own provision, and furthermore these places must be without cost to the parent. If these principles were observed, the President argued, then there was no need entirely to abolish fee-paying, and he went on to warn Members of the probable outcome of what he called " heavy-handed insistence." He also reminded the Commons of the requirement in the Act (1) that the character of a school should not be essentially changed by accepting a new status: the existing system of Local Education Authorities was not perhaps best suited to administer non-local schools.

The schools' associations, notably the Headmasters' Conference and the Governing Bodies' Association founded in 1942, were worried throughout the preparatory work on the Act about the effects on the professional independence of the schools. Immediately after the President's announcement to the Commons, the Headmasters' Conference pressed him for an assurance that any school aided under the old regulations could apply for Direct Grant status if the alternatives were not to its liking. A deputation from the same source was

(1) Education Act, 1944: S. 17.

received by Mr. Butler on the 26th. January 1944: the members pleaded the case of those head teachers who, as a result of the Act, would have to submit to a much greater degree of Local Authority control. It was urged upon the President that they would be helpless in the face of a hostile or unintelligent authority, unless the President would give guidance, in White Paper form, on the constitution and functions of all governing bodies. Several recommendations were made:

(i) Every governing body should include automatically persons of educational experience, who need not be members of the Local Education Authority or any other committee.

(ii) The governing body should have clearly defined spheres of responsibility, including the appointment of the Headmaster and, with his recommendation, of the assistant staff.

(iii) In the case of girls' schools, at least one third of the governors should be women.

(iv) The Headmaster should have access at all times to the Chairman of the Governors, and should be entitled to be present at all meetings, except when they so determine.

(v) The Headmaster should have complete control of the internal organisation, management and discipline of the school.

The President accepted the majority of these points, and, after further talks with Local Authorities, incorporated them in a White Paper " The principles of government of

maintained secondary schools ",(1) which became the basis of schemes drawn up under Section 17 of the Act. A notable difference of opinion concerned the appointment of the Headmaster, which, in the White Paper, is left ultimately to the Local Authority.

This document went some way to reassuring the Associations and the Headteachers of grant-aided schools that the Government was concerned that they should keep their own identity and not be submerged in a uniform scheme. Mr. Butler further conceded to their fears that no Local Education Authority could make a scheme of government to include a voluntary school in a group of schools under one governing body without the consent of the governing body concerned.(2) Yet at the same time there were fears that the Goverment might break faith. It was widely held that the Govemment during the period 1919 - 1926 had given its word that schools which gave up Direct Grant in favour of Local Authority support might opt again for Direct Grant later if they wished: now the rumour was spreading that only schools which had been in receipt of grant immediately prior to 1944 might continue to receive it. Both Mr. Butler and Mr. Chuter Ede were pressed on several occasions in the House to deny that such an undertaking had been given at the time. At best, the replies were non-committal: " This point was made many times during the debate..... and

(1) Cd 6523, May, 1944.

(2) Education Act, 1944 Section 20.

my Right Honourable Friend never agreed that it was right."(1)

The Headmasters' Conference continued to press for the right of any grant-aided school to be considered for inclusion in the Direct Grant list. The Chairman, the Reverend Spencer Leeson of Winchester, wrote to Mr. Butler in February 1944 urging him " not to restrict unduly " the numbers of aided schools passing to the Direct Grant list. The President replied that he was not prepared to give the schools themselves the final choice. There would have to be some limit anyway, as Leeson himself had admitted. Mr. Butler followed this up on the 9th. of May with a statement to the Commons that it was definitely not goverment policy to allow a large class of schools to slip into what he called an ' amorphous ' state, and thus continue to charge fees.

Closely related to the question of the schools' autonomy was the matter of fee-paying. The latter seemed to many, particularly in the Commons, to run directly counter to the spirit of the new Act. The Headmasters' Conference, however, while approving wholeheartedly of the policy of a suitable education for each and every child, did not agree that the wholesale abolition of fees was necessary to that end, and felt strongly that such a move would endanger important principles of educational, religious and parental freedom at present enjoyed by both parents and schools.(2) The position of the President vis-à-vis the grant-aided schools was thus delicate. No matter how attractive financially Voluntary Aided status

(1) H.C. Debates: 393/1403: 409/1984 (2) H.M.C. 7th.Jan.44.

might be made, it would not satisfy those governing bodies which looked upon fees as a legitimate safeguard of a reasonable degree of independence. If such a school became independent, then a valuable source of free places would be lost, since it was a matter of simple economic fact that the grant from public funds alone raised the level of the school's finances to the point where free places became viable. On the other hand, the majority of these schools were administered under schemes made under the Endowed Schools and the Charitable Trusts Acts, and the permission of the President, in his capacity as Charity Commissioner, was needed for an increase in fees charged. But in the event of a refusal to allow this, a school might reduce its level of efficiency or even close, thus creating greater problems for a Local Education Authority trying to find sufficient school places. The Board was thus obliged to proceed cautiously. The Government White Paper preparatory to the Act, " Educational Reconstruction," spoke of extending the prohibition of fees to " all secondary schools for the maintenance of which the Local Education Authority is responsible," (1) a phraseology which suggested to many M. P.'s, and no less to the Headmasters' Conference, that the abolition of fee-paying was contemplated in all schools receiving aid by whatever channels from public funds.(2) In fact, of course, the way was left open to admit limited fee-

(1) Cd. 6548 : para. 34

(2) c.f. H.C.Debates: 9th.May,1944: 1839-49.
also: 415/1687.

paying in Direct Grant schools, since the term 'maintained' was used in the sense in which it is used in the Act proper, and therefore not applicable to Direct Grant schools. A belated attempt was made in the Commons on the 9th. of May 1944 to amend Section 61 of the Act to ensure that tuition fees in grant-aided schools also were abolished, but was turned down on Mr. Butler's advice.

Time, too, was a factor entering into the Board's policy. The obligation to provide free places meant that Local Authorities were obliged to make use of places in fee-paying schools, regardless of their attitude to them in principle. Lancashire County, for example, prior to 1945 had 51 Direct Grant schools, a sizeable proportion of the total schools available.(1) One might see in a similar light the recent (1965) decision of the Local Education Authority for Bristol no longer to take up places at local Direct Grant schools, because the Authority was now able to accommodate all children of secondary school age in its own Maintained schools. Although it was Mr. Butler's avowed intention to 'link up' schools of all administrative categories, (2) there is nothing in the Act which specifically obliges a Local Education Authority to make use of any Direct Grant school. The section of the Act which calls upon Local Authorities to submit their Development Plans simply asks for " information

(1) c.f. "Abolition of Tuition Fees in Grant-aided Secondary Schools," 1943, H.M.S.O.: pp. 30-32.

(2) H.C. Debates: 410/1849.

as to any arrangements proposed to be made with respect to schools not to be maintained by the Authority for the purpose of helping to secure that there shall be sufficient primary and secondary schools for their area."(1) It was, of course, originally intended that the Minister would confirm Development Plans from Local Authorities by order, and thus presumably perpetuate agreements made with non-maintained schools.(2) But as the result of a subsequent policy decision aimed at keeping local administration flexible, this latter part of the Act was never implemented.(3)

It would be wrong to assert, however, that the Board's decision to retain the Direct Grant system was caused solely by the logistics of free places. At the instigation of the Headmasters' Conference, the Board of Education set up the Fleming Committee to ".... consider means whereby the association between the Public Schools (by which term is meant schools which are in membership of the Governing Bodies Association or Headmasters' Conference) and the general educational system of the country could be developed and extended; also to consider how far any measures recommended in the case of boys' Public Schools could be applied to comparable schools for girls." Only a few months later, in November 1942, Mr. Butler asked the Committee to present its views as soon as possible on the question of the general abolition of fees.

(1) Education Act,1944:S.11(2)(d). (2) ibid. S. 12.

(3) c.f. Wood and others v. Ealing London Borough Council: 1966 3 W.L.R. pp. 1209 ff.
also H.C. Debates: 604/103, 29.4.1959.

The interim report of the Committee which appeared in April 1943 came out in favour, among other things, of the continuation of a Direct Grant system, albeit with certain modifications.(1) It was recognised that the question of fee-paying could not be considered apart from the previous history of the schools concerned and their place in the general organisation of the nation's education. The abolition of fees would increase the schools' financial dependence on public authorities and thus strengthen the case for an increased measure of public control. On the other hand, a large number of the Grammar School foundations had long enjoyed a tradition of independence, and, whilst the Committee fully agreed that their association with the national system should be kept close, it argued that this should not be allowed to obscure the case for a reasonable degree of autonomy: ".... a proposal to abolish fees unrelated to safeguards of reasonable independence would be strongly resisted not only by the schools, but by a considerable body of public opinion."(2)

The Committee had received a considerable body of evidence suggesting that Direct Grant schools should be assimilated to the rest of the schools receiving financial aid from Local Education Authorities, and thereby placed under their financial control, although some witnesses suggested that an exception might be made in the case of predominantly boarding

(1) "Abolition of Tuition Fees in Grant-aided Secondary Schools" 1943: Special Report of the Committee on Public Schools appointed by the President of the Board in 1942.

(2) ibid. p. 5.

schools. The Committee took this to mean that there was a conviction that Direct Grant schools should play a full part in the provision of secondary education in their areas, and accepted this fully. It hoped that the new proposals for a Direct Grant system would eliminate the difficulties sometimes experienced in the past at the local level.

Firstly, the Direct Grant list ought not to be preserved as it stood. Its composition at the time was based largely fortuitously on the 1926 choice. Since that time the rate of grant had increased, and the private resources of many of the schools had fallen to the point at which subsistence grants from Local Authorities were increasingly necessary. The whole basis for inclusion in the grant list must be reconsidered. Secondly, there were many Direct Grant schools which were to all intents and purposes indistinguishable from other Local Authority schools in the area they served. Such schools, it was recommended, ought to come under Local Authority control. Two categories of school, however, ought to be excluded from Local Authority jurisdiction: old-established foundations, mostly for boys, whose history extends far beyond the creation of the Local Authority system, and which have continued to exist successfully alongside the provided secondary schools, even where on a numerical basis the latter might be considered adequate to the needs of the population; and a number of more recent foundations, mostly for girls, which now supply, each over a comparatively wide area, the same kind of alternative

to the Local Authority provision as the old foundations already mentioned.(1) Insofar as schools of these types had continued to prove successful in the face of competition from Local Education Authorities since 1902, "..... they must be regarded as having justified their independent existence."(2) The report drew attention to the variety of types of school which had long characterised the education system in Great Britain, and, while in no way denying that Local Authorities had amply demonstrated that variety was wholly possible within their own organisations of schools, nevertheless could not accept that this was sufficient reason for making all schools conform to a common administrative pattern.

" We have given careful consideration to the question of determining how schools should be selected in future for Direct Grant, and we have examined various suggestions for a basis of admission to the Direct Grant list. It has been proposed for example, that only those schools which have a considerable boarding element, say 25 per cent or over, should be admitted. If this principle were accepted the list would shrink to almost negligible proportions. A number of Direct Grant schools of educationally very high standing would be omitted, and the proposal is practically tantamount to the abrogation of the principle of Direct Grant altogether. We have already stated our reasons for deciding against this. It has been suggested, alternatively, that any school, whether boarding or day, should be admitted if it could show that less

(1) ibid. p. 12. (2) ibid. p. 13.

than half its places for pupils over eleven are required as an integral part of the local provision of secondary education. We feel that this proposal ignores the facts of the situation. Many schools which have no boarders draw their pupilds from the areas of more than one authority. To accept this proposal would be to ignore all other characteristics which the Direct Grant Schools may be held to possess, except that of their place in the organisation of secondary education in the area in which they are situated. Certainly one reason which may be advanced for the retention of the Direct Grant system is the flexibility which it allows, making it possible for certain large and very successful day schools to serve conveniently the areas of more than one, and often several, Local Authorities. It may also be noted that the existence of Denominational Schools in receipt of Direct Grant has done much to prevent the emergence of what might have been a difficult problem for Secondary Education. We have, therefore, come to the conclusion that the selection of schools should be made by the Board, on the application of the Governors, after consideration of these factors:-

(i) Their claim to non-local character.

(ii) Any special characteristics which they possess.

(iii) Their financial position.

(iv) The observations of the Local Education Authorities on the circumstances of the area." (1)

(1) Report, p.14.

The Committee then turned to the question of whether there was a valid case for allowing fee-paying exceptionally in the Direct Grant schools, whilst recommending that it should be abolished in other Grant-aided Schools. It is interesting to note in passing that one of the arguments quoted by the Report in support of fee-paying, " ..... that the income from fees enables these schools to develop high standards towards which it is hoped other schools in the locality will eventually approximate..... "(1) is essentially the principle held by Morant some forty years previously in using grant list schools as pace-setters for Local Authorities. The Fleming Committee rejected this argument, and equally the view that fees were the only real safeguard of independence for governing bodies. It believed that the safeguards it had devised in the Report were just as reliable as fees. It was therefore recommended that no distinction should be made between Direct Grant and other aided schools in the matter of fee-paying: in both the practice should cease. " ..... There may be a few schools in which the complete abolition of fees will appear difficult to justify. We have in mind especially those schools which possess a large boarding element or whose reasonable contribution to the total local provision is likely to be relatively small. We cannot regard such exceptional cases as affording any ground for modifying our general conclusions but we think it possible .. .. that such schools will more appropriately play their

(1) Report, p. 18.

part in association with the general educational system outside the list of Grant-aided schools."(1) As for the loss of income implied by the end of fee-paying, it was suggested that the rate of Direct Grant be increased to cover the new situation: the abolition of fees in the Direct Grant schools was recommended on the assumption that there should be no lowering of educational standards.

All the members of the Committee agreed in principle with the continuance of the Direct Grant system, but several took up a different attitude towards fee-paying. The Committee split 11 to 7, the minority led by the Chairman Lord Fleming favouring the retention of fees in Direct Grant schools. They argued that the Model Articles of Government supported in the majority report were just as consistent with an excessive measure of control by the Local Education Authority as with a proper degree of freedom; this being so, fees remained the best safeguard of independence. Furthermore, the Minority Report " ..... saw no reason at all why it should be a condition of receipt of grant-aid that a school should form part of the local provision of the area in which it happens to stand. It is ..... the business of the Local Authority to ensure such a provision of free secondary education as will make it possible for every child in its area to receive the kind of education best suited to it. The Local Authority may ..... find it convenient to do this in part by sending some

(1) Report, p. 19.

children to a Direct Grant school ..... If the school cannot provide enough places, then the obligation to do so reverts to the Authority. We are entirely in favour of such arrangements between Local Authorities and Direct Grant schools and in such cases particularly we welcome suitable representation of the Authority on the Governing Body of the school. But that the school should give up its right to charge fees and the financial and general independence which results from this, does not seem to follow at all. Whether or not it deserves assistance from the State ought to be a question for the Board of Education."(1) A further point at issue was the method suggested for filling places in Direct Grant schools. The majority of members had suggested straightforward negotiations between Local Authorities and Governors, the minority however recommended specifically that at least fifty per cent of the places available should be awarded at the discretion of the Governing Body. It was considered most important that there should be a considerable number of Direct Grant schools, and that both Aided and Maintained schools should be eligible for consideration. Direct Grant schools had a particular role to play in bridging the gap between the fully independent, fee-paying sector, and the State system. "We believe the gulf which abolition (of fees) would create would be little short of disastrous, and that any social

(1) Report, p. 24.

division which may exist at present would be widened."(1)

July 1944 saw the appearance of the Fleming Report in its final form. The Committee drew up the so-called 'Scheme 'A' ' which, it was recommended, should replace the existing Direct Grant arrangements. It was recognised that the existing administration of the grant system was open to three main objections: firstly, it was illogical that in a fee-charging school public funds should be applied towards reducing the cost of education for pupils whose parents could well afford the full cost; secondly, there was a technical duplication involved in subsidising from the Exchequer both the school fees and the expenditure of the Local Authorities in meeting them. Thirdly, it was clearly unsatisfactory that the total percentage of free places in the schools should have been fixed in most cases so long previously and not changed.(2)

Scheme 'A' then accepted the principle that the Board should invite applications from schools wishing to be associated, and select them according to the criteria laid down in the Interim Report. A significant difference, however, is to be found in the emphasis laid in the final Fleming Report on the need of associated schools to " ..... take their place in a national system side by side with the County and Auxiliary Schools for which provision is made under the Education Bill."(3) A fifth criterion of acceptance for association was thus added to those contained in the Interim Report: the Board should have

(1) Interim Report, p. 25.

(2) Board of Education: 'The Public Schools and the gen. Ed. System',1944: para. 173.

(3) loc. cit.para. 176.

regard to " .... the value and extent of the contribution which the school could make to the national provision of secondary education, including the education of pupils who had previously attended grant-aided primary schools."(1) Taking as its keynote the principle of the 1918 Education Act that " .... adequate provision should be made in order to secure that children and young persons should not be debarred from receiving the benefits of any form of education, by which they are capable of profiting, through inability to pay fees..", (2) the Report argued that fees should be abolished, or, failing this, that they should be graded in accordance with parental incomes, to the point of total remission in necessary cases. Local Authorities would have the right to reserve a number of places at the schools for their own pupils, a number to be determined by local negotiations, and would pay the full cost for these pupils. This would attract exchequer grant to the Local Authority, because it would in effect constitute a part of the free secondary provision for the area.

The governors of a school under the Fleming proposals were to be responsible for the improvement and alterations of premises, and were to be empowered to use the income and, under proper conditions, the capital of any endowments available under the Scheme or other Instrument of the school. The Governing Bodies Association had urged, both in deputations to

(1) Fleming Report: para. 177(i)(c). (2) Education Act, 1918: S. 4(4).

the Board and in its evidence before the Fleming Committee, that schools should be allowed to take into account, when settling the approved fee, current loan charges and sinking funds, and, in certain special cases, other similar charges. The Committee was prepared to agree to this, but drew the line so as to include only those financial commitments undertaken by the schools at the time of their application for membership of Scheme 'A'. Ultimately the Fleming Committee further conceded to the Association's request that for special reasons the Board might authorise the Governors to take into account similar charges incurred subsequently with the Board's approval. This enabled many schools, which, by the criteria set up by the Committee, were clearly entitled to become Scheme 'A' schools, but which for exceptional reasons were unable to finance their capital expenditure entirely from endowments or subscriptions, nevertheless to gain consideration. This would cover, for example, those schools which expected in the foreseeable future to have to incur heavy loan charges in connection with entirely new school premises. The Committee, however, clearly recognised that any over-emphasis of this provision might stimulate an enormous demand for inclusion in the Scheme and stressed that it did not " ..... recommend that advantage should be taken of this provision to enable schools to enter Scheme 'A' on any other grounds than those already stated..... "(1)

(1) Fleming Report: p. 65.

Although the Fleming proppsals were an important influence on the future of the Direct Grant system, the final decision to retain the system had been taken momths before the report appeared. The President told the Commons that he wished to maintain in the educational system a " diversity of choice " during 1943,(1) and stated specifically in May 1944 that his desire was " ..... that there shall be a direct-grant list, and that schools entering this list shall fulfil certain definite conditions..... "(2) It is noteworthy that the subject of the Direct Grant schools was not fully debated by the Commons until November 1945, nearly eight months after schools had been invited to submit applications for membership of a revised list. The existence of the Fleming Committee and the approach of its report caused the issue of the Direct Grant schools to be omitted from the crucial debate on the 1943 White Paper " Educational Reconstruction " (3), during which Sir Richard Acland protested vehemently that the Public and Private Schools were being deliberately forced out before the debate so that they might escape the new Act.(4) Certainly the text of the White Paper itself excluded the Direct Grant Schools from consideration at that time.(5) Thus nowhere in the text of the 1944 Act is there any reference to Direct Grant status, whereas the category of all other schools in receipt of public funds is carefully defined in every case. Direct Grant schools continued, as they had since

(1) H.C. Debates: 391/1825 (2) ibid. 399/1848.

(3) ibid. 391/1852 (4) ibid. 391/1968

(5) "Educational Reconstruction", 1943: Cd. 6548: para. 32.

Morant's day, to be administered through departmental regulations, now classified as Statutory Instruments. The actual statutory authority to make these regulations and to pay Direct Grants is contained in Section 100(1)(b) of the Act, under which the Minister was empowered to make provision " ... to persons other than Local Education Authorities of grants in respect of expenditure incurred or to be incurred for the purposes of educational services to be provided by them..... " In view of the strong feelings held by many Members on the subject of the Direct Grant schools, it is perhaps remarkable that this clause passed through Committee in the Commons on the 4th. April 1944 without provoking discussion. Several Members of Parliament for example had been part of a Labour Party deputation to the Board, which had urged that the Direct Grant schools should be brought under Local Authority control.(1) The House of Lords, on the other hand was generally in favour of an extension of the Direct Grant principle. Lord Soulbury indicated to the Lords that it would have been preferable to bring the Senior schools onto an equal administrative footing to the Secondary schools: instead the Government had seen fit to bring the Secondary schools onto the same administrative footing as the Senior.(2)

The Revised List.

Circular 32 was issued by the Ministry in March, 1945, calling for applications for membership of the new list. Fleming's

(1) c.f. 'Times Educational Supplement', 6th. March, 1943.

(2) Lords Debates: 128/1058.

Scheme 'A' with which the Committee had hoped to replace the Direct Grant system,was not accepted in its entirety and the system continued under its old name. Membership was restricted in the circular to schools which had previously been grant-aided, thus cutting out applications from Public Day Schools which might have bben attracted by Scheme 'A' as it stood. It was also confirmed that a 'special case' would have to be made out before schools which received their grant-aid through the Local Education Authorities could be considered for Direct Grant status. No reference was made to applications from maintained schools, again ignoring one of the Committee's proposals.(1)

In some ways, however, the new conditions were an improvement on the Fleming proposals. The Fleming suggestion that Local Authorities and Governors should negotiate in each individual case the numbers of places to be reserved by the Authority at each school was open to the criticism that it could lead to local disputes which would wreck the very harmony that Fleming had aimed at creating. Under the new regulations, the principle of 25 per cent free places was continued: these might be offered directly to the community, or through the agency of the Local Authority. In the latter event, the approved fees were to be paid to the school by the Authority, this factor in itself tending to encourage schools to offer their places to the Authorities. If, on the other hand, the Governors were unwilling to offer free places to the Local Authority, and thus

(1) Interim Report, p. 22.

created a shortage of such places for the Authority, then the Local Education Authority, with sufficient notice, could now require the Governors to put so-called reserved places at its disposal. Taking up the suggestion contained in the minority Report, the circular required Governors to admit to free and reserved places a total of no more than 50 per cent of the previous year's admissions.(1) Permission was however given for Governors to exceed this figure voluntarily, and it is usually found, for example, that most Roman Catholic Direct Grant schools give a very high percentage of their places to Local Education Authorities, making them to all intents and purposes in this respect indistinguishable from maintained schools, except insofar as the pupils tend to come from a far bigger catchment area. This principle particularly holds good in areas where the Direct Grant school is the only available Roman Catholic Grammar School. Places remaining, the so-called 'residuary places' were for fee-paying pupils: fees were however to be remitted upon application by parents in accordance with and income scale for the school to be approved by the Board. Finally, Local Authorities might make capital grants to Direct Grant schools, but, contrary to what the Fleming Committee had recommended, these would not attract grant from the Exchequer (2)

During the latter part of 1945, interest began to centre on the results of the schools' applications for Direct

(1) Interim Report: p. 22 (2) cf. Fleming Report: p.64.

Grant status. Many of the Ministry's decisions caused little reaction. The Girls' Public Day School Trust, for example, based its case for inclusion on the evidence it had already given to the Fleming Committee: " ..... It has also been suggested that schools in receipt of Direct Grant should, unless they are non-local (i.e. Boarding Schools), (a) cease to receive Direct Grant and (b) be brought under the control of the appropriate Local Education Authorities. The cessation of Direct Grant, like the suggested abolition of fees, would cripple the finances of the Trust schools, and the Council do not know by what process, short of an Act of Parliament, the schools of the Trust could be compulsorily transferred from the Trust to the Local Authorities. The proposal to abolish Direct Grant (once universal but now regarded in some quarters as needing special justification,) is presumably made with a view to securing that all Secondary Schools receiving State aid should, unless they are non-local, be brought under the control of the Local Authorities. The circumstances and administrative arrangements of Direct Grant Schools vary, and there may be Direct Grant Schools which might, without loss to themselves or the community, have elected to become non-provided (aided) schools when the choice was given them. But what may be true of some schools is not true of all; and the Council, while fully recognising the good work done by a number of Local Authorities in the matter of educational provision, cannot believe that it would be in the best interests of education that all Secondary Schools, other than Boarding

Schools and schools conducted for private profit, should be brought under Local Authority control and that no room should be left for the conduct of schools by a voluntary body such as the Trust, which desires nothing more than that it should be allowed to continue its work for the common good of education in a spirit of friendly co-operation with the Board and the Local Authorities.

The Council believe that in the matter of recruitment of staff, the size of classes and the scale of staffing, the quality of the teaching both in the main school and in the junior departments, the output of pupils who pass on to the Universities, as also in the matters affecting the physical and moral well-being of the girls, the schools of the Trust have nothing to fear by comparison with other Secondary Day Schools for girls in the country.

The Council do not regard it as in the best interests of national education that all Day Schools providing Secondary, i.e. Grammar School, education should be of the same pattern, as they would inevitably tend to be if administered and controlled by Local Authorities, and they hold that the Trust Schools have distinctive features which make them worthy of preservation as part of the national system. The Council of the Trust and its Local Committees are composed of men and women who belong to these bodies solely because of their special interest in education, and their particular concern for the schools of the Trust. These schools are sufficiently numerous to provide opportunities for

comparison between school and school, and for the pooling of experience by the several Headmistresses, and are at the same time not so numerous as to make it impossible for the Council to maintain close personal touch with individual schools and the Headmistresses in charge of them. The Headmistresses enjoy a measure of independence, especially in the all-important matter of the recruitment of staff, which is unlikely to be enjoyed by those who serve under a Local Authority. Lastly, the schools are so organised as to provide for those who desire it continuous schooling from the age of seven or eight, or even earlier, up to eighteen, without any necessary " break at eleven," and at the same time it is made possible for late developers, who might otherwise miss the chance of Secondary Education, to enter at a later age than eleven. It is educationally advantageous that, side by side with the Local Education Authority schools, there should be schools with this wider age range and less rigid organisation.

If the Trust Schools cease to exist as such and came under the control of Local Authorities, these distinctive features would disappear. Not only so, but if Local Authority control was combined with the abolition of fees, it is more than likely that many parents would prefer to send their children to private schools - one of the consequences of a uniform system of free Secondary Education under public control which has made itself evident in the United States of America and Canada, and which few would desire to see copied in this country..... " (1)

(1) G.P.D.S.T.: Memorandum for the Fleming Committee: January, 1943.

The schools of the Trust were duly given Direct Grant status en bloc. However, a considerable political storm blew up in connection with the bulk of the applications to the Ministry. The Headmasters' Conference had pressed the Minister for as much notice as possible of the revised conditions of grant, as the purely financial aspects would be critical in most cases. Early in 1945 Mr. Butler let it be known that he hoped to have the matter settled by the beginning of the school year 1945 - 1946, that is, by September 1945. A joint deputation with the Governing Bodies' Association and the Governing Bodies of Girls' Schools' Association met the Minister on the 9th. February, but failed to gain any extension of the time limit. When Circular 32 appeared in March, applications were called for immediately, and were expected to be at the Ministry not later than the end of the following June. One can only surmise at the reasons for this haste: clearly there would be some advantage to be gained by settling the question of Direct Grant status before Local Authorities got down to the complicated matter of drawing up their development plans. Perhaps, too, there was something to be said for finalising the matter before the political power at the Ministry could change hands.

One of the earliest reactions to this haste was a wide-spread concern lest schools chose in considerable numbers to become fully independent. In May, for example, the Direct Grant Schools sub-committee of the Headmasters' Conference reported that very few grant-aided schools were contemplating

applying for Direct Grant status, and that several were ready to become independent. Mr. Richard Law, who had succeeeded Mr. Butler at the Ministry of Education in May, 1945, was pressed on this matter in the Commons in June. He supported the system against criticism, but confessed some worry about those schools which proposed to relinquish grant altogether. They were, however, few in number, and, in any case, the fact that they were mostly governed under Schemes under the Charitable Trusts Acts meant that any increase in fees proposed as the result of the cessation of Direct Grant would need his approval as Charity Commissioner. The Minister intended to safeguard the legitimate interests of poor scholars: nevertheless, he refused to state categorically when pressed to do so, that he did in fact have the power to determine the level of fees with a view to forcing recalcitrant schools onto the grant list.(1) This Commons exchange was seen at the Headmasters' Conference as veiled threat: in fact of course it was evidence of the same intermingling of administrative and judicial functions to which McKenna had eadier succumbed, and only a few months later Mr. Butler had to rebuke Miss Ellen Wilkinson for the same misdemeanour. The Minister's answers did not reassure all his audience, who showed themselves very concerned lest a too lavish provision of Direct Grant schools affected the availability of free secondary education. It was pointed out, for example, that the King Edward Foundation in Birmingham controlled seven Grammar Schools, a sizeable part of the local provision: similarly in Bedford, it was claimed

(1) H.C. Debates: 411/1311.

the two Grammar Schools of the Harpur Trust would become independent, and the remaining two Secondary Schools wished to become Direct Grant.

A second effect of the haste in dealing with the new applications was that they tended to accumulate rapidly at the Ministry and it was widely felt that they were inadequately scrutinised. A further complication lay in the fact that a General Election had by this time brought a Labour Government to power, and Miss Wilkinson to head the new Ministry. The new Minister was far less sympathetic to the Direct Grant principle, but was presented almost with a fait accompli: already several schools had been granted Direct Grant status. Within two months of taking office, she clashed with Mr. Butler in the Supply Committee on Civil Estimates. The ex-Minister, now in Opposition, stated that he " ..... attached the utmost importance to the Direct Grant List remaining substantially as before... "(1) and revealed that he had given an undertaking to the Governing Bodies' Association on behalf of the war-time coalition government to this effect.(2) Miss Wilkinson informed him that there had been an election, and that her " ... policy was not the same as that of her predecessors."(3) Mr. Chuter Ede had given some indication as to why Labour opposition to the Direct Grant principle had not been very vocal: it had been thought that all the existing Direct Grant schools would continue to be so, and that this was

(1) H.C. Debates: 414/1087 (2) ibid. 414/1088

(3) ibid. 414/1085.

preferable, as long as the Party was in Opposition, to the creation of an even larger class of independent schools.(1)

Miss Wilkinson gave an assurance that the provision of free places would be at all times an " .. overriding.." consideration in the selection of Direct Grant schools.(2) She supported the system to the extent that, since it was no longer possible to buy a place in a Secondary School because of the uniform entrance requirements, then there was some virtue in keeping a " ... certain number..' of schools for the sake of variety.(3) However, subsequent developments showed that it was by no means the case that schools surplus to Local Authority free provision requirements had a good chance of Direct Grant status. The Governors of the Ashby-de-la-Zouch Endowed Schools' Foundation, satisfied of their financial competence under the new conditions, submitted an application which was warmly supported by the Leicestershire Education Authority: this was rejected by the Minister, and no reasons were advanced. On instigating enquiries through the Inspectorate, the Foundation was informed that only in "exceptional circumstances was Direct Grant status being given.(4)"

Matters came to a head in November, 1945, in the House. Members referred to the Minister's earlier statement that she intended to continue Direct Grant to schools with " ..... very old tradition, with very high standards in teaching technique

(1) H.C. Debates: 411/1366.

(2) ibid. 414/1087.

(3) ibid. 414/1521

(4) Minutes and Records of Boys' Grammar School, Ashby-de-la-Zouch.

and various other claims to special consideration..." and argued from an investigation of the circumstances of the schools so far approved that " .... we are totally unable to find evidence of any consistent policy under which these grants are now being made." At that time, just over half the schools admitted to the list were denominational, and a high proportion of these were Roman Catholic Girls' Schools. Members felt that this did not accord with Miss Wilkinson's earlier statement that no special action was to be taken with regard to denominational schools.(1) Yet in retrospect it may be said that the relatively scattered nature of the Roman Catholic population made strictly local control of its schools impracticable, and Direct Grant status enabled them, particularly in the case of selective schools, freely to cut across Local Authority areas. Equally importantly, it cannot have escaped the Minister's notice that the threat of cutting off Direct Grant to a number of denominational schools might well have upset the religious settlement which had been one of Mr. Butler's great achievements in planning the Act.(2) There had been strong pressure in the Lords to preserve the independence of Roman Catholic schools (3): even so, Mr. Butler admitted surprise that so many had gone for Direct Grant rather than for the Voluntary Aided status he had tried to make so attractive.(4)

During the debate, Mr. Butler deplored the sudden reversal

(1) H.C. Debates: 414/1087

(2) ibid. c.f. M. Cruikshank,"Church and State in English Ed." Macmillan, 1963.

(3) Lords' Debates: 128/1058.

(4) H.C.Debates: 415/1687.

of Government policy.(1) He wished to convince the Minister that the remission scheme for fees, together with the prescribed uniformity of entrance standards, meant that no child would be excluded on other than educational grounds from a Direct Grant school: the unknown authors of the ' Green Book ' had thus decided that fees might be retained in Direct Grant schools. Mr. Butler stated that he knew from his time at the Board that there was only one city in England where the provision of secondary education was entirely in Direct Grant schools, which would, in effect, justify a revision of the list. He challenged Miss Wilkinson to produce figures to the contrary.(2)

The Minister was, however, by no means friendless. Her Labour colleagues supported her restrictive attitude to the new Direct Grant list. Dr. Corlett expressed the feelings of many with the argument, which, incidentally, had the support of many Grammar School Headteachers in the country, that the existence of Direct Grant schools meant " ..... the creaming of our children, the sending of them to be indoctrinated with a privileged outlook, which none of us would like them to have."(3) Her own defence of her actions was based however on more practical grounds. She pointed out that the choice granted to the schools in 1926 had resulted in a very uneven spread of Direct Grant schools throughout the country. She regretted that her predecessors had not seen fit to implement Scheme 'A' in its entirety, but had nevertheless instructed her officials to deal with the

(1) H.C. Debates: 415/1694ff. (2) ibid. 415/1697.

(3) ibid. 415/1687.

selection of schools along the lines laid down in the Fleming Report. The only concrete change in policy had been to raise the income level below which no fees would be payable from the 5 - 10 - 0 suggested in Circular 32 to 7 - 10 - 0. (1) She confirmed her policy thus: " If the Local Education Authority do not want a school, it would be extraordinarily difficult to give it to them. If the Local Education Authority feel that the school is necessary to complete their secondary provision, clearly that ought to have great consideration." As to the case of Warwick School raised by Mr. Eden, it had been excluded from the list because it was the only Grammar School for boys in Warwick, and thus came under the policy she had just defined.(2) There was no truth in the allegation of undue favour being shown to denominational schools: most of them had very few strictly local pupils, were well-financed by the great teaching Orders, and many were closely linked to Convent Houses. " I am told that these schools will be roughly in the same proportion to other schools, finally, as was previously the case."(3) Nor could her administration be blamed for the fact that 16 schools had declared their intention of becoming independent. In every case the decision had been made by the schools before Miss Wilkinson came to office, and was morely probably linked with the failure fully to endorse Scheme'A'.

The Minister's statement did little to calm the wide-

(1) H.C. Debates: 415/1703 ff. (2) ibid.

(3) ibid.

spread dissatisfaction in the schools concerned. The sub-committee of the Headmasters' Conference decided in October 1945 that the best course of action for grant-aided schools which had been refused admission to the list was to become independent, if only to give themselves more time for the consideration of the issues involved. In any case, no time limit had been set by the Ministry on applications for Voluntary Aided status, thus leaving themselves in a position to accept schools later if independence turned out to be impracticable. A deputation to the Ministry on the 19th. of November put this point of view. Miss Wilkinson subsequently wrote to the Chairman, Sir John Wolfenden: there was no question of re-opening individual cases, and her officials would continue to apply the criteria laid down in para. 177 of the Fleming Report. Nor could she permit any further delay in the timing of applications. The Minister expressed her sincere regret that several schools wished to become independent, since this would make them " .... even less accessible than before." For this reason she was prepared to allow hitherto grant-aided schools which had been refused re-admission to the list, to continue to receive Direct Grant for some time, in the hope that this would help them to think over their status. This was the only concession made.

After the closing date for applications had gone by and the Ministry's deliberations were complete, the Direct Grant list had been reduced from 231 schools to 164. In fact, however, only 191 of the existing Direct Grant schools applied to continue,

and a further 36 applications came from schools which had hitherto received their grant through Local Authorities. In all, 63 applications were rejected, 32 of them from the latter group. At the same time, 35 schools had announced to the Minister their intention of becoming independent.(1) This last group was to be most affected by subsequent developments.

The re-opening of the list.

In 1956 the Governing Bodies' Association began to consider whether to press for more schools to be granted Direct Grant status. It seemed that the then Conservative government might be more favourably disposed to the idea than the Labour government had been in 1945. Some of the schools which regarded themselves as having been forced reluctantly out of their ties with the state system into independence in 1945, were beginning to find a growing need for some outside financial help. There was some opposition, however, from other members of the Governing Bodies' Association, and this was shared particularly by the Girls' Schools and the Headmasters' Conference: the main objection to a possible re-opening of the list was that it might easily lead to a lowering of educational standards by admitting schools which were generally weak in this field and thus bolstering them up. One must suspect also that few wanted a resurgence of the earlier difficulties. Despite this, a deputation from the Governing Bodies' Association, with representatives of the

(1) The full statistics of the applications can be found in Hansard; 423/233-9 (Written Answer.)

Association of Governing Bodies of Girls' Schools made a formal request at the Ministry that the list should be re-opened.(1) In accordance with the proposals put forward, the Minister subsequently announced that he was prepared to consider applications from independent and transitionally assisted schools.(2) The Associations had declined to make application on behalf of any particular schools, leaving individual schools to make out their own case for inclusion.

The Ministry circular(3) inviting applications from governing bodies was rather more explicit about the criteria of acceptance than the earlier Circular 32 had been. The conditions of grant themselves remained unchanged (4), but the Minister would "..... be prepared to accept schools only if he is satisfied that they have established a high educational standard. In considering whether any particular school fulfils this requirement, he will have regard to such matters as the qualifications of the staff; the ratio of staff to pupils; the size of the Sixth Form in proportion to the total size of the main school; the average age at which pupils leave the school; and the proportion of pupils who on leaving proceed to a University or comparable type of further education..... Schools with Sixth Forms numbering less than 60, or with less than 300 pupils in the main school will not normally be regarded as eligible for admission.."(5) As before, Local Education Authorities likely

(1) 26th. October, 1956.

(2) H.C. Debates: 562/120 (Written Answer.)

(3) Circular 319: 17.Jan.57.

(4) Schools Grant Regs.: S.I. no.1743, 1951: Part IV.

(5) Circular 319: para. 3(a).

to be affected were to be consulted, and the Minister needed to be satisfied either that they would take up annually at least the 25% proportion of free places, or that, if they were not prepared to do so, that the Governors themselves would be able and willing to meet the obligation from their own resources. The financial difficulties in which some of the independent schools were finding themselves was recognised by the Ministry, and it was laid down that applicants should satisfy the Minister that,"failing admission to the Direct Grant list, the financial circumstances of the school are likely to impair its value to the community. At the same time it will be necessary for the school to show that it would, if admitted to the list, have sufficient funds, either from its endowments or from other resources, to enable it to meet its financial liabilities, including any necessary capital expenditure. Further, in order that the tuition fees of any school admitted to the Direct Grant list may be comparable with those of schools already in receipt of Direct Grant, the Minister will not normally be prepared to consider schools whose tuition fees, after taking account of Direct Grant, will be more than 80 pounds per annum..... "

Circular 319 put no time limit on applications, and the last applications were dealt with in 1961. During the four year period 44 applications were received at the Ministry: a total of 15 schools were admitted, and one other school ceased to receive grant. The figure comprised 8 boys' schools and 7 girls' schools: with the exception of two, all were independent schools, and all had received grants from public funds before

1945. It is also worthy of note that nothing was done to disturb the status of those schools which, after rejection in 1945, had accepted administration under one of the categories of the Act. The 1957 re-opening was concerned solely with increasing on the list the number of hitherto independent schools and rectifying some of the disagreements over the 1945 selection of schools. In fact, the list has not officially been closed since 1957: however it was announced in the Commons in 1965 that the Government has no plans for adding to it.(1)

(1) H.C. Debates : 716/258.

Chapter four : The present day; Direct Grant schools and the problems of re-organisation.

The Direct Grant schools with which we are here concerned are selective Grammar Schools, some of them very highly selective. This means that they are frequently attacked not only for their allegedly privileged administrative status, but also increasingly because they are Grammar Schools. Whereas however, Local Authorities have been obliged to submit new development plans to the Department of Education and Science showing how they propose to re-organise their schools along comprehensive lines,(1) the future of the Direct Grant schools is at present left to negotiations between Authorities and individual schools at the local level(2). In general this gives the schools three choices.

In the event of deadlocked negotiations, independence and the complete rejection of assistance by grant would be possible for many schools, just as it was in 1945. It seems likely, too, that the greater prosperity of the country since the immediate post-war years of austerity would be able to support more entirely fee-paying schools. On the other hand such a move, by restricting entry to those able to afford fees, would seriously damage the comprehensive social admixture which is an often under-estimated feature of the Direct Grant school. For example, of the 97,000 pupils in Direct Grant schools in

(1) Circular 10/65. (2) ibid. para. 39.

1964, 62,000 held Governors' free places or had their fees entirely remitted by the school or were paid for by Local Authorities. A further 9,000 pupils had at least part of the school fees remitted under the sliding scale arrangements. (1) Independence might well arise from changes which could be introduced into the Direct Grant Regulations themselves, which as we have seen, would be easy to achieve. At the moment, however, there is no suggestion that Direct Grant to schools is to cease: in any case, such a proposal would no doubt be unpopular with Local Authorities on financial grounds, unless, of course, their own grants were to be increased correspondingly. A further consideration is the initial exclusion of the Direct Grant schools from the field to be covered by the Public Schools Commission: one might speculate that the Commission will recommend an extension of the Direct Grant principle to the Public Boarding Schools, a recommendation which would be made impracticable if the whole principle of Direct Grant was at this stage called into question. It is, perhaps, with this in mind that the Headmasters' Conference Direct Grant Schools have pressed to be included in the Commission's terms of reference.(2)

A second choice open to the schools is to become fully comprehensive schools as part of local arrangements. This is administratively easy, for nothing in the Direct Grant Regulation requires a school to be selective, merely that pupils shall be

(1) Ministry of Education Statistics,1964: Part 1, p. 50.

(2) Report in "Guardian" 1. December, 1965.

" ... capable of profiting from the education there." (1) It has further been acknowledged by the Secretary of State that the wider spread of ability to be found in some Direct Grant schools would make them suitable to become comprehensive schools. (2) It is difficult to see, however, how a school selected for Direct Grant because among other things it was a non-local school could successfully become an essentially local, neighbourhood school: for if school authorities were prepared to make such changes in the character of their schools - and it is, of course, within their power to do so voluntarily - they would thereby bring their schools so much into line with Local Authority provision that one of the principle reasons for a Direct Grant system would disappear. In other words, a non-local school must by definition be selective on grounds other than local residence. If intellectual selection is discredited, then other acceptable grounds would appear to need discovery if the system can continue. Some pressure is at present being exerted by some of the Direct Grant schools for recognition as schools catering for the exceptional child, the top five per cent of the ability group drawn from a wide area.(3) The strength of this argument lies in the fact that the removal of so few children to special schools would not have the same detrimental effect on the development of comprehensive schools as the existence, as at present, of local Grammar Schools which cream off as much as twenty per cent of the higher ability groups

(1) Direct Grant Schools Regulations, 1959, para.17.

(2) H.C.Debates 717/1856.

(3) "Observer" report: 12 July, 1965.

If properly organised, such a system could provide valuable information about the needs of the gifted child. Nevertheless, any solution along such lines could be regarded only as a compromise measure by those who oppose selection by ability on doctrinaire grounds.

A matter of increasing significance in these deliberations is that of parental choice of school. Mr. Butler's policy after the passing of the 1944 Act was to make all types of school available to all types of children. Yet despite gentle pressure from the Ministry on Local Authorities, suggesting the criteria for allowing parental option,(1) and further legislation imposing upon Local Authorities a duty in certain circumstances to take up places in Direct Grant and Independent Schools,(2) it is still true that in the public mind parental choice of school is identified more with moving outside the state system than between schools within it. It is reasonable to infer, therefore, that to align the Direct Grant schools with local comprehensive provision would considerably reduce the scope of choice of those parents who wish to exercise choice and are not able to afford Public School fees. The more Local Authorities are urged to control the social structure of their schools (3), the less must become the scope for choice. This is not the place to join in the heated debate (4) as to whether parents are the most competent people to exercise choice: suffice it to say

(1) Manual of Guidance, Schools No. 1: August, 1950.

(2) c.f. Education(Misc. Provisions) Act, 1953: Section 6.

(3) Circular 10/65:Sect.36.

(4)e.g.in "Education - A Framework for Choice" I.E.A.: 1967: p. 36ff.

that the principle, however circumscribed, is part of the law of the land.(1) Although there are undoubtedly enormously varied patterns of education open to choice within the comprehensive school, and probably in fact more than were available under the older system, the fact remains that several types of education cannot by definition be fused under one roof: a school which is co-educational cannot include a single-sex school for example. In many areas, for example, Direct Grant schools, since they are predominantly single sex schools, are the only single sex schools reasonably available. And if choice is conceded, as it often is, on denominational or single sex grounds, then society is in honour bound to consider other grounds for legitimate parental preference, or, at least, to justify the selection of these two grounds to the exclusion of all others.

The existence of fee-paying in the Direct Grant schools may also be seen as an obstacle to full integration. Despite the claims of the Interim Fleming Report that the independence of governing bodies can be safeguarded by means other than the retention of fees, a comparison of the powers of governing bodies inside and outside the state system suggests that at least such independence has not come about. Furthermore the concept of finance through several different channels simultaneously has in recent years gained added respectability from being advocated, albeit in the University field, by the Robbins Report(2) One might also recognise signs that the cherished concept of the immediate post-war years of universally free

(1) Education Act, 1944: S.76. (2) Robbins Report: Chapter 14.

welfare provision is being superseded by the idea of selective welfare and graded personal, direct contributions (1). In the field of education, a note of reservation within the Plowden Report suggests that fees might be charged as a means of financing more nursery provision (2), and the argument used, namely that adequate state finance will not be forthcoming, could well apply also to other fields of education. More remote at the moment is the suggestion that the state should restrict its activities to financing education, rather than attempting complete provision also as at the moment.(3) But it is interesting to note that if this idea and the others outlined above become popularly accepted, then the Direct Grant schools will have far more to teach than to learn, and much of what Morant strove for would be realised.

The Roman Catholic community faces considerable difficulti in re-organising its schools. Very few areas have a Roman Catholic population large enough to support a comprehensive school of the minimum size suggested by the Department of Education and Science. A typical area would be Scarborough, where at present about 300 children attend the Secondary school and a further 40 attend the Grammar school. The key to the problem is likely to be the Direct Grant schools, which form a high proportion of the Grammar school provision. Lancashire County, for example, has 27 such schools, offering a total of

(1) c.f. 'Universal or Selective Social Benefits?', Seldon and Gray: Inst. Econ.Aff.,1967

(2) Plowden Report, Volume 1, pp. 487 - 9.

(3) c.f. E.G. West, " Education and the State" Institute of Economic Affairs: 1965.

some 19,000 places. The tradition of independence maintained by the teaching Orders shows little sign of disappearing, and it is also very unlikely that they would agree to become mixed Sixth Form Colleges or Senior High Schools.

A compromise solution seems the most probable. Public opinion seems not to countenance the abolition of the Public Schools, and for this reason alone there is much sense in preserving a system which, if nothing else, does bridge the gap between the private and public systems and at the same time bringstogether in the same schools the extremes of society in a way which no other class of schools can rival. Such a solution may well be based on a form of selection at the age of 13 rather than 11 as at present: this solution has been suggested already by the Lancashire Education Committee which has arrangements with no fewer than 46 Direct Grant schools(1). The same number of places would be offered as are now offered at 11. Added to this is the likelihood that the Sixth Forms of Direct Grant schools, undoubtedly one of their greatest strengths in that 23.5% of the schools' pupils are in them(2), will be more open than at present to pupils previously educated in other schools. In this way the schools will retain most of their distinctive features and at the same time share in the rapid expansion in secondary education which is the real driving force behind current educational thinking.

(1) Official Press Report: 'Guardian': April, 10th 1965.

(2) Ministry of Ed. Statistics 1964. Report p. 43.

Yet a compromise would mean that the nation is not yet prepared squarely to face the real problem posed by the Direct Grant schools, namely what role an independent system has to play in our society. In the final analysis, an independent governing body has the power to differ: the constitution of governing bodies of Direct Grant, and to a lesser extent of Voluntary Aided schools (1) makes it clear that the planners of the 1944 Act foresaw that governors may sometimes wish to pursue courses of action not necessarily in conformity with current Local Authority policy, or, indeed, with national policy in some cases. The governors of Bristol Grammar School were well within their rights to continue as a Direct Grant school, but to offer free places directly to parents rather than through the Local Authority. It is impossible to say whether this question will ever be dealt with as such, or what the outcome will be. " In any event, and as a very condition of what happens in the arena, where economists and teachers and parents and dons are wrestling it all out and the administrators perhaps are slightly amused at all of them and especially at the academics, it remains true that competition is a good; that without it standards are unchallenged and innovation and variety are in jeopardy; that ' choice is the classic touchstone of human dignity ' ; and that one of the profoundest of poverty's degradations (which social security exists to banish) is unavailability of choice. Nineteenth century humanitarianism and 20th. century welfare have

(1) Direct Grant Schools Regulations; para. 7.
Education Act, 1944: Section 19(2)(b).

consolidated the war on poverty, but the 'choice' released has gone less to the person than to state-channelled administration. In the long run this is educationally a tremendous pity; for social security should have meant, on the contrary, a maximising of choice, since human dignity depends upon it, and human dignity is just what education is about."(1)

---oOo---

(1) Professor A.C.F. Beales: In "Education - A Framework for Choice": I.E.A. 1967: p. 20.

APPENDIX 'A' - Financial data relating to Direct Grant.

1904 1. Direct Grant has been paid to Secondary Schools since the first Regulations for Secondary Schools properly so called were issued. The rates of grant at this date were as follows:-

(a) First year of Course 40/- for each pupil.
(b) Second " " 60/- " " "
(c) Third " " 80/- " " "
(d) Fourth " " 100/- " " "

In addition to the above a special grant was payable under certain conditions on account of each pupil attending a special course.

1907 2. The Regulations of this year may be regarded as the forerunners of the present Regulations.(see Chapter 2.) The new higher rates were:-

(a) 5L. on account of each pupil between the age of 12 and 18 on the first day of the School Year.

(b) 2L. on account of each Public Elementary Scholar between the ages of 10 and 12.

The lower rate for pupils below the age of 12 was intended to mark the fact that Secondary School work did not begin at 12 and to counter the financial objections to transferring pupils from the Public Elementary School to the Secondary School before the age of 12. The rate of 2L. was chosen as a rough equivalent of the state contribution then made in respect of a pupil in a Public Elementary School.

Schools already on the grant list, but unable to meet the requirements for the higher grant, were

paid grant at a lower rate, viz. 2L. for the Public Elementary School pupil as above and L.2 - 10 -0 for the normal pupil (i.e. in lieu of 5L.) The 1907 Regulations also fixed a minimum grant of 250L. and made provision for extra grants for approved educational experiments.

1909 3. The rates set out above continued in force until 1909 when an additional grant of 1L. per pupil became payable to those Schools which made provision for the preliminary education of Elementary School teachers as Bursars and which offered not less than 25% of free places (Article 28) This particular grant was withdrawn as from 31st. July 1912, but a commuted grant in lieu of it was paid in 1912 - 1913. In the latter year the ordinary capitation grant was increased by 1L. and the minimum grant raised to 300L.

1914 to 1917 4. Although changes in the Regulations giving increased grants were proposed in 1914, the new Regulations were not, as a result of the First World War, issued until 1917. These new Regulations provided for grants as follows:-

(a) 2L. for each ex-Public Elementary School pupil between 10 amd 11 (not 10 and 12 as previously.)

(b) 7L. per pupil for pupils aged 11 to 18 years at the beginning of the School Year.

(c) A minimum grant of 350L.

(d) A grant not exceeding 400L. for a recognised advanced course. In 1922 these grants were limited to a total not exceeding 1,200L.

(e) A grant not exceeding 20L. for a teacher visiting another school for observation or study.

(f) The lower scale rates became 2L. for the Public Elementary School pupil and 4 - 10 - 0 for pupils between 11 and 18 years.

1918 5. In 1918 the capitation rates introduced in the previous year were continued, and a new grant not exceeding 2L. per pupil became payable in respect of each pupil entered for an approved first or second examination.

1926-1927 6. The Secondary Schools now in receipt of "Direct Grant" were those which did not exercise their option under Circular 1381 of July 1926 to cease to receive grant under the Regulations for Secondary Schools (Grant Regulation No. 10) as from 1st. August, 1926, or from 1st. August, 1927.

1929 7. In 1929 Direct Grant was increased to 9L. per pupil, except in the case of pupils whose fees were paid wholly or in part by Local Education Authorities. The latter continued at the rate of 7L. per pupil. This increase was intended to ease the increased burden laid upon the schools by the introduction of the Burnham Scales. In 1930 the age limit on pupils was raised to 19.

1931. 8. The Economy Circulars of 1931 involved a temporary reduction of the rates paid to schools. The 9L. rate was abandoned, and a new uniform rate of 7.7L. was brought in. In the case of the very few schools still only on the lower rate, the new figure was 3L. In 1933 the 2L grant for Public Elementary School pupils in Secondary Schools was dropped partially as an economy

measure. In the following year the 7.7L. was increased to 8L, and the lower scale grant to 3.15L., in order to meet the partial restoration of the reductions in teachers' salaries: in 1935 the full rates were restored and fixed at 8.13L. per pupil. The lower scale was set at 4.10L. per pupil.

1935-1936 In this year the Advanced Course grant was discontinued and a new Sixth Form grant was introduced. The main aim of the new grant was to secure a fairer distribution of the amount available for advanced work and to secure greater freedom and elasticity for this kind of work in general. The rates were assessed as follows:-

(a) 16L. for each of the first fifteen pupils.

(b) 12L. " " " " next " " "

(c) 10L. " " " " pupils in excess of 30.

Sixth Form grant was payable in respect of recognised pupils who were not more than 19 years of age, had passed an approved first examination and pursued a course higher than the stage of an approved first examination.

1939-1945 During the war certain emergency grants were made:-

(a) The Board had power from year to year to make special grants, not exceeding a fixed maximum of 900L. for any one school, (originally 700L.) where as the result of a decline in the number of pupils or of an evacuation plan, or of other circumstances arising out of the war, the school was unable to meet reasonable expenses of maintenance.

(b) A meals grant of 4d. (originally 3d.) was

introduced in 1942 to help Direct Grant schools to reduce the charge for meals supplied on the School premises.

In addition, grant was payable to all Direct Grant Schools under Grant Regulation No. 3 at the rate of 50% of the sum contributed by Governing Bodies in respect of their contributions as employers to the Teachers' Superannuation fund.

1946 The existing capitation grant, sixth form grant, examination grant and meals grant were withdrawn, and collectively replaced by a capitation grant at the standard rate of 16L. for every registered pupil in the Upper School between 10 and 19 years of age. A proportionate grant was paid if some pupils remained for one or two terms only. The Minister took the power to increase the capitation grant by an amount not exceeding 25% in the case of certain schools which were required to offer less than the usual 25% of free places. Any additional grant was calucalted with regard to the extent to which the additional free places were to be filled by pupils whose fees were paid by Local Education Authorities.

Governing Bodies also became entitled to receive annually a grant eqivalent to the difference between the parents fees under the approved income scale for residuary places and the approved fee of the school.

Grant in respect of employers' superannuation contributions continued to be paid at the rate of 50%.

1954 Between 1945 and 1952, the capitation grant of 16L. was raised in gradual stages to 28 - 5 - 0L. New salaries were agreed by the Burnham Committee as from April 1954,

and after consultation with representatives of the Direct Grant schools the principle of a separate Sixth Form grant was reintroduced, at the rate of 20L. per pupil. At the same time, the definition of eligibilty for the grant was revised: the grant is now payable in respect of each pupil in the Sixth Form who is either:-

(a) not less than 17 years of age on the 1st. of July of that year; or

(b) intends taking not less than two subjects in G.C.E. at 'A' level within the following educational year.

A further grant became payable equal to half the sum payable as salaries of Foreign Assistants and Interchange teachers appointed under the Ministry of Education Schemefor the Interchange of Teachers with Overseas Countries.

1955 As a result of the introduction of equal pay for teachers, permission to raise school fees over 7 years by between 5 and 10 guineas was granted. In the same year, the Special Responsibility Allowances recommended by the Burnham Committee necessitated further increases in capitation grants: the standard rate was increased to 30L. and the Sixth Form grant to 40L.

1956 Increased costs caused a general increase in fees. the Sixth Form grant was raised to 36L.

1959 The grant towards employers' superannuation contributions was discontinued. To compensate for this, the standard rate of grant was increased to 39L. and the Sixth Form grant to 50L. with effect from 1st. April. In October of the same year, the Sixth Form

grant was again increased, to 66L.

1961. It was decided to increase Direct Grants to meet half the combined effect of the increase in teachers' salaries and other costs. The standard rate became 43L., and the Sixth Form grant 81L.

1963 Fee scales were again raised, and the two rates of grant became 45L. and 84L. respectively.

----oOo----

APPENDIX 'B': The origins of the present Direct Grant list.

1926 - 1966

Key:

Type of school:

1. Schools provided by Local Authorities and Endowed Schools municipalised as to government and finance.
2. Schools of the Girls' Public Day School Trust.
3. Schools conducted under Schemes of Charity Commissioners, Court of Chancery or the Board of Education.
4. Other schools on educational Trusts, under special Acts, Companies Acts, or Royal Charter.
5. Schools of Roman Catholic teaching Orders.
6. Other schools, not on specific Trusts. e.g. under other religious organisations: Church of England United Methodists: also R.C. Diocesan authorities and Voluntary Associations.
7. Welsh Intermediate Schools.

App. Applied for Direct Grant status. Rej. Rejected.

V/A Voluntary Aided School V/C Voluntary Controlled

M. Maintained.

Name of School	Type	On Grant since	Post-war status			
			1945	Res.	1957	1967
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)
BEDFORDSHIRE						
Dame Alice Harpur School	4				App.	DG.
Bedford School (B)	3	1919	Ind.			Ind.
Bedford High Sch.	3	1918	Ind.			Ind.
Bedford Modern Sch. (Boys)	3	1902	App.	DG		DG
Bedford Modern Sch. (Girls)	3	1917	App.	Rej.		V/A
Dunstable, Ashton Grammar School (B)	3	1906				V/C
BERKSHIRE						
Abingdon School	3	1904	App.	DG		DG
Abingdon, School of St. Helen and St. Katherine	6				App.	DG
Newbury, St. Bartholom-ews Grammar Sch.(B)	3	1903	App.	Rej.		V/A
Reading, Abbey Sch.(G)	4	1940	App.	DG		DG
Wantage, King Alfred's Grammar School (B)	3	1902				V/C
Bracknell, Ranelagh School (B and G)	3	1908				V/A
CAMBRIDGESHIRE						
Cambridge, Perse Sch. for Boys	3	1902	App.	DG		DG
Cambridge, Perse Sch. for Girls	3	1917	App.	DG		DG
CHESHIRE						
Birkenhead School	6	1935	App.	DG		DG
Birkenhead, Convent of Faithful Companions of Jesus School (G)	5	1903	App.	DG		DG

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)
Birkenhead, High School for Girls	2	1905	App.	DG		DG
Birkenhead, St.Anselm's College (B)	5	1938	App.	DG		DG
Cheadle Hulme, Warehouse-men and Clerks' Orphan Schools (B and G)	4	1902	App.	DG		DG
Chester, Convent Sch.	5	1921	App.	DG		DG
Chester, King's Sch.(B)	3	1904	App.	DG		DG
Chester, Queen's Sch(G)	3	1906	App.	DG		DG
Macclesfield Grammar School (B)	3	1908	App.	Rej.		Ind.
Northwich, Sir John Deane's Grammar Sch. (B and G)	3	1905	App.	Rej.		V/C
Stockport Grammar Sch. for Boys.	3	1904	App.	DG		DG
Sandbach School	3	1909	App.	Rej.		Ind.
Wallasey, Maris Stella High School (G)	5	1926				V/A
CORNWALL						
Truro School (B)	4	1904	App.	DG		DG
Truro High School for Girls	3	1905	App.	DG		DG
CUMBERLAND						
Keswick School	3	---	App.	Rej.		V/A
DEVON						
Bideford, Edgehill Girls' College	6	1920	App.	DG		DG
Exeter School	3	1904	App.	DG		DG
Exeter, Maynard's Girls' School	3	1904	App.	DG		DG
Exeter, Bishop Blackall School for Girls.	3	1906	App.	Rej.		V/A

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)
Plymouth College and Mannamead School (B)	3	1906	App.	DG		DG
Plymouth Notre Dame Convent H.S. (G)	5	1905	App.	DG		DG
Plymouth, St.Boniface College (B)	5	1935	App.	DG		DG
Shebbear Methodist College (B)	6	1920	App.	DG		DG
Tiverton, Blundell's School (B)	3	1902	Ind.			Ind.
West Buckland School (B)	3	1902	App.	DG		DG
DORSET						
Shaftesbury Grammar School (B)	3	---	App.	Rej.		V/A
DURHAM						
Barnard Castle Sch. (B)	3	1902	App.	DG		DG
Darlington, St. Mary's Grammar School (B)	3	1925	App.	Rej.		V/A
Darlington, Immaculate Conception Sec.Sch(G)	5	1904	App.	Rej.		Ind.
Stockton-on-Tees Grammar School (B)	3	1902				V/A
Stockton-on-Tees, Queen Victoria High School (G)	3	1909	App.	DG		DG
Sunderland, St. Anthony's Sec. Sch(G)	5	1906	App.	DG		DG
West Hartlepool, St. Joseph's Convent Sch. (G)	5	1903	App.	DG		DG
ESSEX						
Brentwood, Sir Antony Browne's Sch. (B)	3	1902	App.	DG		DG
Brentwood, Ursuline High Sch. (G)	4	1920	App.	DG		DG

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)
Chigwell School (B)	3	1904	Ind.			Ind
Ilford, Ursuline High School (G)	4	1920	App.	DG		DG
Westcliff, St. Bernard's Convent School for Girls	5	1923				V/A
West Ham G.S. (B)	5	1904				V/A
Woodford, Bancroft's School (B)	3	1920	App.	DG		DG
GLOUCESTERSHIRE						
Bristol, Cathedral School (B)	3	1921	App.	DG		DG
Bristol, Christian Bros. College (B)	5	1904	App.	DG		DG
Bristol, Clifton High School for Girls	4	1906	Ind.			Ind.
Bristol, La Retraite High School (G)	5	1921	App.	DG		DG
Bristol Grammar School (B)	3	1903	App.	DG		DG
Bristol, Queen Eliz. Hospital (B)	3	1919	App.	DG		DG
Bristol, Redland H. Sch. for Girls	4	1905	App.	Rej.	App.	DG
Bristol, Red Maids' School (G)	3	1920	App.	DG		DG
Bristol, Colston Boys' School	39	1903	Ind.			Ind.
Bristol, Colston Girls' School	3	1903	App.	Rej.		V/A
Cheltenham, Pate's Grammar School (B)	3	----	App.	Rej.		V/A
Cheltenham, Pate's Grammar School (G)	3	---	App.	Rej.		V/A

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)
HAMPSHIRE						
Bournemouth, Talbot Heath School (G)	3	1903	App.	DG		DG
Fareham, Price's Sch.	3	----	App.	Rej.		V/C
Petersfield, Churcher's College (B)	3	----	App.	Rej.		V/A
Portsmouth Grammar School (B)	3	1902	App.	DG		DG
Portsmouth High Sch. for Girls.	2	1905	App.	DG		DG
Portsmouth, St.John's College (B)	5	----			App.	DG
Southampton, King Edward V1 G.S. (B)	3	1902	App.	Rej.		V/A
Southampton, St.Anne's Convent Grammar School	5	1904	App.	DG		DG
HEREFORDSHIRE						
Hereford, Cathedral Grammar School (B)	3	1918	App.	DG		DG
Lucton, Pierrepoint's School (B)	3	----	App.	Rej.		Ind.
HERTFORDSHIRE						
Berkhamsted Girls' Grammar School	3	1906	Ind.			Ind.
Berkhamsted Grammar School	3	1902	Ind.			Ind.
Bishop's Stortford Grammar School	4	1920	Ind.			Ind.
Elstree, Haberdashers' Aske's School	3	----			App.	DG
St. Alban's School (B)	3	1902	App.	DG		DG
HUNTINGDONSHIRE						
Kimbolton Grammar Sch.	3	----	App.	DG		DG
KENT						
Bromley High Sch.(G)	2	1905	App.	DG		DG

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)
Erith, St. Joseph's Convent School (G)	5	1920	App.	DG		DG
Harbledown, Kent College (B)	4	1921	App.	DG		DG
Mottingham, Eltham College (B)	3	1921	App.	DG		DG
Sevenoaks, Walthamstow Hall (G)	3	1921	App.	DG		DG
Sevenoaks Grammar Sch.	3	----	App.	Rej.		V/C
Sutton Valence School(B)	3	1918	Ind.			Ind.
LANCASHIRE						
Blackburn, Notre Dame Convent (G)	5	1907	App.	DG		DG
Blackburn, St. Mary's College (B)	5	1935	App.	DG		DG
Blackpool,Arnold Sch(B)	6	1937	App.	DG		DG
Blackpool, St.Joseph's College (B)	5	1927	App.	DG		DG
Blackpool Convent Sch(G)	4	1929	App.	DG		DG
Bolton, Canon Slade Sch. (B and G)	3	1904	App.	DG		DG
Bolton, Mount St. Joseph School (G)	4	1905	App.	DG		DG
Bolton School (B)	3	1903	App.	DG		DG
Bolton School (G)	3	1904	App.	DG		DG
Bolton, Thornleigh College (B)	5	1927	App.	DG		DG
Bury, Convent H.S.(G)	4	1905	App.	DG		DG
Bury Grammar School (B)	3	1902	App.	DG		DG
Bury Grammar School (G)	3	1905	App.	DG		DG
Crosby,St.Mary's Coll(B)	5	1925	App.	DG		DG
Crosby,The Merchant Taylors' Boys' School	3	1904	App.	DG		DG
Crosby, The Merchant Taylors' Girls'School	3	1911	App.	DG		DG
Crosby, Convent Sch(G)	5	1904	App.	DG		DG

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)
Liverpool,Bellerive Girls' School	5	1921	App.	DG		DG
Liverpool,Belvedere School for Girls	4	1905	App.	DG		DG
Liverpool College for Girls	4	1904	App.	Rej.		V/C
Liverpool, Notre Dame Collegiate School(G)	5	1902	App.	DG		DG
Liverpool, La Sagesse Convent School (G)	5	1929	App.	Rej.		V/A
Liverpool, Notre Dame High School (G)	5	1903	App.	Rej.		V/A
Liverpool, St. Edmunds College (G)	4	1907	App.	DG		DG
Liverpool, St.Edwards College (B)	5	1904	App.	DG		DG
Liverpool, St.Francis Xavier's College (B)	5	1902	App.	DG		DG
Liverpool,West Derby, Broughton Hall Convent High School (G)	5	1935	App.	Rej.		V/A
Lytham, King Edward V11 School (B)	3	1908	App.	DG		DG
Lytham, Queen Mary School (G)	3	1930	App.	DG		DG
Manchester, Fallowfield F.C.J. Convent H.S.(G)	5	1920	App.	DG		DG
Manchester Grammar School (B)	3	1903	App.	DG		DG
Manchester High School for Girls	3	1903	App.	DG		DG
Manchester, Hulme Grammar School (B)	3	1913	App.	DG		DG
Manchester, Loreto High School (G)	5	1919	App.	DG		DG
Manchester, Notre Dame High School (G)	5	1905	App.	DG		DG
Manchester, St. Bede's College (B)	4	1920	App.	DG		DG

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)
Manchester, Withington Girls' School	6	1919	App.	DG		DG
Manchester, Xaverian College (B)	5	1920	App.	DG		DG
Oldham, Hulme G.S.(B)	3	1902	App.	Rej.	App.	DG
Oldham, Hulme G.S.(G)	3	1904	App.	Rej.	App.	DG
Oswaldtwistle, Paddock House School(G)	5	1930	App.	DG		DG
Preston Catholic College (B)	5	1902	App.	Rej.	App.	DG
Preston Lark Hill House School (G)	5	1920	App.	Rej.	App.	DG
Preston Winckley Squ. Convent School (G)	5	1907	App.	Rej.	App.	DG
St. Helens, Catholic Grammar School (B)	5	1925	App.	DG		DG
St. Helens, Notre Dame High School for Girls	5	1907	App.	DG		DG
Salford, Adelphi House School (G)	5	1904	App.	DG		DG
Salford, De la Salle College (B)	5	1926	App.	DG		DG
Wigan, Notre Dame Convent High School(G)	5	1904	App.	DG		DG
LEICESTERSHIRE						
Ashby-de-la-Zouche Boys' Grammar School	3	----	App.	Rej.		V/C
Ashby-de-la-Zouche Girls' Grammar School	3	----	App.	Rej.		V/C
Loughborough Grammar School (B)	3	1902	App.	DG		DG
Loughborough High School for Girls	3	1906	App.	DG		DG
LINCOLNSHIRE						
Grantham, King's School (B)	3	----	App.	Rej.		V/C
Stamford School (B)	3	1903	App.	Rej.	App.	DG

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)
Stamford High School(G)	3	1909	App.	Rej.	App.	DG
LONDON						
Battersea, Salesian College (B)	5	1929				V/A
Dulwich, James Allen's Girls' School	3	1908	Ind.			Ind.
Hampstead, Haberdashers Aske's Boys' School	3	1905				V/C
Hampstead High School for Girls	2	1905	App.	DG		DG
Hampstead, University College School (B)	4	1919	Ind.			Ind.
Hammersmith, Latymer Upper School (B)	3	---	App.	DG		DG
Hammersmith, St.Clement Dane's School	3	---	App.	Rej.		V/A
Kensington High School for Girls	2	1905	App.	DG		DG
Lewisham, Blackheath High School for Girls	2	1905	App.	DG		DG
Sydenham High School for Girls.	2	1905	App.	DG		DG
Lewisham, St. Dunstan's College (B)	3	----	App.	Ind.		Ind.
Stepney, Davenant Foundation School(B)	3	1918	App.	Rej.		V/A
Putney High School for Girls	2	1905	App.	DG		DG
Streatham Hill and Clapham High School for Girls.	2	1905	App.	DG		DG
MIDDLESEX						
Acton, Haberdashers' Aske's Girls'School	3	1905	App.	DG		DG

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)
Notting Hill and Ealing Girls' High Sch.	2	1905	App.	DG		DG
Edgware,North London Collegiate School	3	1907	App.	DG		DG
Finchley, Catholic Grammar School(B)	6	1939				V/A
Twickenham, Lady Eleanor Holles School (G)	3	1902	Ind.			Ind.
Wood Green, St.Angela's Convent School(G)	4	1930				V/A
NORFOLK						
Norwich High School for Girls	2	1905	App.	DG		DG
Norwich, King Edward V1 Grammar School (B)	3	1909	App.	DG		DG
Norwich, Notre Dame High School (G)	5	1927	App.	DG		DG
NORTHAMPTONSHIRE						
Brackley, Magdalen College School (B)	6	1902	App.	Rej.		VC
Northampton High Sch. for Girls	6	1919	App.	DG		DG
Northampton, Notre Dame High School (G)	5	1920	App.	DG		DG
NORTHUMBERLAND						
Morpeth Grammar Sch(B)	3	1902	App.	Rej.		V/C
Newcastle,High School for Girls	2	1905	App.	DG		DG
Newcastle, Sacred Heart Convent School (G)	4	1919	App.	DG		DG
Newcastle, Dame Allan's Boys' School.	3	1919	App.	DG		DG

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)
Newcastle, Dame Allan's Girls' School	3	1919	App.	DG		DG
Newcastle Royal Grammar School (B)	3	1902	App.	DG		DG
Newcastle, St.Cuthbert Grammar School (B)	6	1902	App.	DG		DG
NOTTINGHAMSHIRE						
Newark, Magnus Grammar School (B)	3	----	App.	Rej.		V/C
Nottingham High Sch(B)	3	1917	Ind.			Ind.
Nottingham High School for Girls	2	1905	App.	DG		DG
OXFORDSHIRE						
Oxford High School for Girls	2	1905	App.	DG		DG
Oxford, Magdalen College School (B)	6	1920	App.	DG		DG
RUTLAND						
Oakham School (B)	3	1902	App.	DG		DG
SHROPSHIRE						
Shrewsbury High Sch. for Girls	2	1905	App.	DG		DG
SOMERSET						
Bath High School for Girls	2	1905	App.	DG		DG
Bath, King Edward's School (B)	3	1920	App.	DG		DG
Bruton Sunny Hill Grammar School (G)	4	----	App.	Rej.		Ind.
Crewkerne School (B)	3	----	App.	Rej.		V/C
Taunton School (B)	4	1919	Ind.			Ind.

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)
Wellington School (B)	4	1902	App.	DG		DG
STAFFORDSHIRE						
Burton-on-Trent Grammar School (B)	3	1906				V/C
Stoke, St. Dominic's High School for Girls	4	1906	App.	DG		DG
Stoke, St. Joseph's College for Boys	5	1937	App.	DG		DG
Walsall Grammar School (B)	3	1902	App.	Rej.		V/A
Walsall High School for Girls	3	1905	App.	Rej.		V/A
Wolverhampton Convent High School	5	1920				V/C
Wolverhampton Grammar School (B)	3	1902	App.	Rej.		V/A
Wolverhampton, St. Chad's College (B)	5	1927				V/A
SUFFOLK (EAST)						
Framlingham College(B)	4	1903	App.	DG		DG
Ipswich High School for Girls	2	1905	App.	DG		DG
Woodbridge School(B)	3	1920	App.	DG		DG
SUFFOLK (WEST)						
Bury St. Edmunds, Culford School (B)	4	1903	App.	DG		DG
Bury St. Edmunds, King Edward V1 School (B)	3	1920	App.	Rej.		V/C
SURREY						
Caterham School (B)	4	1902	App.	DG		DG
Croydon Convent Sch.	5	1902				V/A
Croydon High Sch. for Girls	2	1905	App.	DG		DG

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)
Croydon, Old Palace Girls' School	6	1904	App.	DG		DG
Croydon, Whitgift School (B)	3	1919	Ind.			Ind.
Croydon, Whitgift Middle School (B)	3	1919	App.	DG		DG
Kingston-on-Thames Grammar School (B)	1	1902	App.	DG		DG
Sanderstead, St.Anne's College for Girls	5	1919	App.	DG		DG
Sutton High School for Girls	2	1905	App.	DG		DG
Wimbledon High School for Girls	2	1905	App.	DG		DG
Wimbledon, King's College School (B)	4	1912	Ind.			Ind.
Wimbledon, Ursuline Convent School (G)	5	1936				V/A
SUSSEX (EAST)						
Brighton and Hove High School for Girls	2	1905	App.	DG		DG
WARWICKSHIRE						
Birmingham, King Edward's School (B)	4	----	App.	DG		DG
Birmingham, King Edward V1 High Sch(G)	4	----	App.	DG		DG
Coventry, Bablake School (B)	3	1902	App.	DG		DG
Coventry, King Henry V111 School (B)	3	1902	App.	DG		DG
Solihull School (B)	3	----	App.	Ind.		Ind.
Warwick School (B)	3	----	App.	Ind.		Ind.
Warwick, King's High School (G)	3	----			App.	DG
WILTSHIRE						
West Lavington, Dauntsey School(B)	3	1902	App.	DG		DG

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)
WORCESTERSHIRE						
Dudley Grammar Sch(B)	3	1903	App.	Rej.		M
Worcester, Cathedral Grammar School (B)	3	1920	App.	DG		DG
YORKSHIRE (EAST RIDING)						
Hull, Hymer's Coll(B)	4	1902	App.	DG		DG
Hull, Marist Coll.(B)	5	1936				V/A
Hull, St. Mary's Sch. (G)	5	1905				V/A
Pocklington School(B)	3	1910	App.	DG		DG
York, Archbishop Holgate's G.S. (B)	3	1902	App.	REj.		V/C
York, St. Peter's School (B)	3	1903	Ind.			Ind.
York, Bar Convent School (G)	5	1929	App.	DG		DG
YORKSHIRE (NORTH RIDING)						
Middlesborough, St. Mary's College (B)	5	1905	App.	Rej.		V/A
Middlesborough, St. Mary's Convent (G)	5	1903	App.	Rej.		V/A
Redcar, Coatham Sch(B)	3	1902	App.	Rej.		V/C
Scarborough, Ladies of Mary Convent School(G)	5	1920	App.	DG		DG
YORKSHIRE (WEST RIDING)						
Aireborough,Woodhouse Grove School (B)	3	1902	App.	DG		DG
Bradford Girls' G.S.	3	1903	App.	DG		DG
Bradford G.S. (B)	3	1902	App.	DG		DG
Bradford, St. Joseph's College (G)	4	1905	App.	DG		DG

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)
Halifax, Crossley and Porter Boys' School	3	1918				V/C
Halifax, Crossley and Porter Girls' School	3	1918				V/C
Harrogate, Ashville College (B)	4	1906	App.	DG		DG
Leeds Girls High Sch.	3	1906	App.	DG		DG
Leeds Grammar Sch.(B)	3	1906	Ind.		App.	DG
Leeds, Notre Dame Collegiate School(G)	5	1905	App.	DG		DG
Leeds, St. Mary's College (G)	5	1903	App.	DG		DG
Leeds, St. Michael's College (B)	5	1906	App.	DG		DG
Sheffield, de la Salle College (B)	5	1927	App.	DG		DG
Sheffield, High School for Girls.	2	1905	App.	DG		DG
Sheffield, Notre Dame High School (G)	5	1904	App.	DG		DG
Wakefield Girls'School	3	1903	App.	DG		DG
Wakefield Grammar Sch. (B)	3	1902	App.	DG		DG
WALES						
CARDIGANSHIRE						
Lampeter, St.David's College School (B)	4	1902				M
GLAMORGANSHIRE						
Cardiff,Howell's Sch. (G)	7	1919	App.	DG		DG
Cardiff, St. Illtyd's College (B)	5	1929	App.	Rej.		V/A
MERIONETHSHIRE						
Dolgellau, Dr. William's School(G)	7	1904	App.	DG		DG

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)
MONMOUTHSHIRE						
Monmouth School (B)	3	1908	App.	DG		DG
Monmouth School for Girls	3	1908	App.	DG		DG

Aided and Maintained Schools: Applications for Direct Grant.

DORSET						
Dorchester Grammar School	3	1902	App.	Rej.		V/A
HAMPSHIRE						
Winchester, Peter Symond's School	3	1902	App.	Rej.		V/C
LANCASHIRE						
Blackburn, Queen Elizabeth's G.S.	3	1902	App.	Rej.	App.	DG
LONDON						
Dulwich, Alleyn's Sch.	3	1902	App.	DG		DG
STAFFORDSHIRE						
Newcastle High School	3	1902	App.	Rej.		V/A
SUFFOLK						
Ipswich School	4	1902	App.	Rej.		Ind.
WARWICKSHIRE						
Warwick School	3	1902	App.	Rej.		Ind.
WORCESTERSHIRE						
Stourbridge, King Edward Vlth. G.S.	3	1906	App.	Rej.		V/A

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)
Worcester, Royal Free Grammar School	3	1902	App.	Rej.		V/A
YORKSHIRE						
Beverley Grammar Sch.	3	1903	App.	Rej.		V/A
Ripon Grammar School	3	1904	App.	Rej.		M
WALES						
PEMBROKESHIRE						
Haverfordwest Grammar School	7	1906	App.	Rej.		V/C

-----oOo-----

BIBLIOGRAPHY and SOURCES.

Alexander W.P. and Barraclough F. "County and Voluntary Schools" London 1946.

Allen B.M. "Sir Robert Morant - A great Public Servant." London 1934

Archer R.L. "Secondary Education in the 19th. Century." C.U.P. New edn. 1966.

Argles M. "South Kensington to Robbins" London 1964

Association of Directors and Secretaries for Education : "Education - a Plan for the Future." Oxford 1942

Bamford T.W. "The Rise of the Public Schools" London 1967 (Nelson)

Banks O. "Parity and Prestige in English Secondary Education." London 1955

"Morant and the Regulations for Secondary Schools, 1904." B.J.E.S. vol. 3, Nov. 1954.

Birchenough F. "History of Elementary Education" U.T.P. 1932.

Craik, Sir Henry. " The State in its relation to Education." London 1896 (Macmillan)

Cruickshank M. "Church and State in English Education." London 1963 (Macmillan)

Curtis S.J. and Boultwood M.E.A. " An introductory History of English Education since 1800." 3rd.ed.U.T.P 1964

Dancy J.C. "The Public Schools and the Future." London 1963.

Dent H.C. "The Education Act, 1944." 10th. Edn. U.L.P. 1964.

" Secondary Education for all-origins and development in England." London 1949.

Eaglesham E. "From School Board to Local Authority" London 1955 (Routledge)

"Morant on the March" Year Book of Ed'cn. Evans 1957

"Planning the Education Bill of 1902" B.J.E.S. vol 9: Nov.1960.

"Implementing the Education Act of 1902." B.J.E.S. vol 10: May 1962

Fisher H.A.L. "An unfinished Autobiography."	O.U.P. 1940.
Gosden P.H.J.H. "The Board of Education Act 1899"	B.J.E.S. vol. 11 : Nov.1962
"The Development of Educational Administration in England and Wales."	Oxford 1966 (Blackwells)
Graves J. "Policy and Progress in Secondary Education"	London 1943. (Nelson)
Grier L. "Achievement in Education - The wok of M.E. Sadler."	London 1952 (Constable)
Kalton G. "The Public Schools"	Longmans 1966
Headmasters' Conference "The Direct Grant School"	H.M.C. 1958.
Kekewich G. "The Education Department and after."	Putnam 1921.
Lester Smith W.O. "The Government of Education"	Penguin 1965.
"Education"	Pelican 1962
Lewis and Loveridge "The Management of Education"	London 1965.
Lowndes G.A.N. "The Silent Social Revolution"	O.U.P. 1941 (Reprint)
de Mortmorency J.E.G. "State Intervention in English Education."	C.U.P. 1902
National Association of Governing Bodies of Aided Grammar Schools:"A Brief Guide for Governors of Aided Grammar Schools."	1964.
Porter G.R. "The Progress of the Nation."	London 1912 (Methuen)
Selby-Bigge L.A. "The Board of Education"	Putnam 1927.
Taylor and Saunders "The New Law of Education"	6th. edition, London 1965 (Butterworths)
Seldon A. and Gray H. "Universal or Selective Social Benefits?"	Inst.Econ.Aff. 1967.
Tawney R.H. "Secondary Education for All."	London 1923.
Peacock A.T. and Wiseman J. "Education for Democrats"	Inst.Econ.Aff 1964.

Ward A. "The Educational System of England and Wales and its recent History." C.U.P. 1939

West E.G. "Education and the State" Institute of Economic Affairs 1965.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS.

Circular 1259 "Higher Education" April, 1922

" 1381 " " July, 1926

" 32 "Direct Grant Grammar Schools" March, 1945.

" 319 "Reopening of the Direct Grant List." January, 1957

" 10/65 "The Organisation of Secondary Education" July, 1965.

Board of Education: Regulations for Secondary Schools (Annual) 1904 -

: Reports (Annual) 1903 - 1944

Ministry of Education / Department of Education and Science } Annual Reports 1945 - 1966

Direct Grant Schools Regulations (S.I. 1832) 1959.

Schools Regulations (S.I. 364) 1959.

Board of Education: Abolition of Tuition Fees in Grant-aided Secondary Schools. (Interim Report of the Fleming Committee.) 1942

: The Public Schools and the General Education System." (Report of the Fleming Committee.) 1944

: Educational Reconstruction 1943

: Explanatory Memorandum on the Education Bill. 1943

: The Principles of Government in Maintained Secondary Schools 1944

Department of Education and Science. "List of Direct Grant Grammar Schools in England and Wales." List 73.

Report of the Public Schools (Clarendon) Commission, 1861 - 1864.

Report of the Schools Enquiry (Taunton) Commission, 1864 - 1868.

Report of the Royal Commission on Secondary Education (Bryce) 1893 - 1895.

Report of the Royal Commission to Inquire into the working of the Elementary Education Acts in England and Wales. (Cross) 1886 - 1888.

The Education of the Adolescent:(Hadow Report) 1927.

Secondary Education, with special reference to Grammar Schools and Technical High Schools (Spens Report) 1938.

----oOo----