Witness.	Description.	Subject of Evidence.	Page.
Holm, Mr. John, F.R.C.S.E., M.R.C.S.	Late Examiner in Physical Education for the School Board for London, &c.	Physical exercises for defective children.	241–247
Howard, Mr. W. - -	Superintendent of Visitors for the Marylebone Division of School Board for London.	School attendance of defective children.	86–88
Kerr, Mr. James, M.A., M.D.	Medical Superintendent to the Bradford School Board.	Special classes at Bradford -	17–25
Knollys, Mr. W. E. -	Chief Inspector and Assistant Secretary of the Local Government Board.	Powers of local authorities -	217–223
Lidgett, Rev. J. S. -	Warden of the Bermondsey Settlement, Chairman of the Committee of the St. Olave's Union Infirmary, and Chairman of the South Metropolitan Schools, Sutton.	Powers of guardians - -	106–112
Loch, Mr. C. S. - -	Secretary of the Charity Organization Society.	Voluntary agencies and legislation.	155–162
Major, Mr. H. - -	Inspector of the Leicester School Board.	Special classes at Leicester -	133–139
Mann, Mr. T. D. -	Clerk to the Metropolitan Asylums Board.	Provision for imbeciles at Darenth.	167–176
Martin, Rev. I. I. -	Member of Bristol School Board -	Special classes in Bristol -	142–149
Moberly, Major-General F. J.	Vice-chairman of School Board for London.	Special classes in London -	100–106
Newton, Mr. A. W. -	H.M. Inspector of Schools, Greenwich District, and a Member of the Committee.	Premises and statistics -	239–241
Nottingham School Board (Clerk to the).	- - - - -	Special classes at Nottingham (written statement).	199
Pooley, Mr. H. F. -	Senior Examiner in the Education Department, and a Member of the Committee.	Administration of the Blind and Deaf Children Act.	186–189
Price, Mr. Arthur W.	Manager of Broad Street Board School and the Highway Group.	Special classes in London -	195–199
Rose, Rev. John H. -	Vicar of Clerkenwell, and a Manager of Hugh Myddelton School.	Hugh Myddelton special classes	131–133
Sewell, Miss - -	Warden of the Women's University Settlement in Southwark, and a Manager of the Pocock Street special classes.	Charitable work amongst defective children.	189–195
Shuttleworth, Dr. G. E.	Late Medical Superintendent of the Royal Albert Asylum for Idiots and Imbeciles of the Northern Counties, Lancaster, and a Member of the Committee.	Definitions of terms - -	1–6
Synge, Rev. F., M.A. -	Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Schools, Eastern Division.	Defective children in Hackney	236–239
Tait, Dr. Edward -	Medical Adviser to Aubert Park Home.	Homes for feeble-minded -	139–141
Van Praagh, Mr. W. -	Principal of the Training College for Teachers of the Deaf and Dumb, Fitzroy Square.	Feeble-minded deaf children -	163–167
Verrall, Miss A. -	Member of Brighton School Board	Special classes at Brighton -	67–73
Walmsley, Mr. F. H., M.D.	Medical Officer of the Darenth School for Imbecile Children.	Darenth and medical advice as to defective children.	112–122
Warner, Mr. Francis, M.D., F.R.C.P.	Physician to the London Hospital -	Medical advice: statistics -	25–39
Wheeman, Miss Rosa -	Teacher at Hugh Myddelton special classes.	Hugh Myddelton special classes	78–86
Willis, Mr. J. A. -	H.M. Inspector of Schools, Brentford District.	Defective children in rural districts.	199–210

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

TAKEN BEFORE THE

DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE

ON

DEFECTIVE AND EPILEPTIC CHILDREN.

32, Abingdon Street, Westminster.

Wednesday, 10th February, 1897.

Present:

The Rev. T. W. SHARPE, C.B. (Her Majesty's Senior Chief Inspector of Schools), in the Chair.

Mr. H. F. Pooley (Senior Examiner, Education Department).
Mr. A. W. Newton (Her Majesty's Inspector of Schools).
Dr. G. E. Shuttleworth (late Medical Superintendent, Royal Albert Asylum for Idiots and Imbeciles, Lancaster).
Dr. W. R. Smith (Medical Officer of the London School Board).
Mrs. Burgwin (Superintendent of Schools for Special Instruction under the London School Board).
Miss Townsend (Member of the Council of the Association for Promoting the Welfare of the Feeble-minded).

Mr. H. W. Orange (Examiner, Education Department), *Secretary*

The Terms of Reference to the Committee are as follows:—

To inquire into the existing systems for the education of feeble-minded and defective children not under the charge of guardians, and not idiots or imbeciles, and to advise as to any changes, either with or without legislation, that may be desirable.

To report particularly upon the best practical means for discriminating on the one hand between the educable and non-educable classes of feeble-minded and defective children, and on the other hand between those children who may properly be taught in ordinary elementary schools by ordinary methods and those who should be taught in special schools.

To inquire and report as to the provision of suitable elementary education for epileptic children, and to advise as to any changes that may be desirable.

Dr. George Edward Shuttleworth (*a Member of the Committee*) examined.

Dr. G. E. Shuttleworth.

10 Feb. 1897.

1. (*Chairman.*) You were head of the Royal Albert Asylum, I believe?—I was Medical Superintendent for 23 years of the Royal Albert Asylum for Idiots and Imbeciles of the Northern Counties, and I was before that Assistant Medical Officer at the Earlswood Asylum for Idiots and Imbeciles.

2. Would that term "idiots and imbeciles" include the feeble-minded and defective children who come within our inquiry?—I think, as a matter of fact, the asylums for idiots and imbeciles include children of that class amongst their inmates, for the reason that till recent years there was no kind of provision made for the education of mentally defective children elsewhere.

3. In what proportion were the feeble-minded children to the imbeciles and idiots?—I am scarcely able to speak accurately without reference, but I should say that probably about 10 per cent. might be included under the term of "feeble-minded" in the Royal Albert Asylum.

4. Who were taken in against your rule?—No, according to rule, the term imbecile being supposed to include these feeble-minded children.

5. But by the Act of Parliament (there are, of course, several Acts of Parliament) they are now separated?—I think hardly by Act of Parliament. The idiot asylums are now under a separate Act of Parliament called the Idiots Act, 1886; and the only qualification for the admission of a child to such an institution is a certificate signed by a medical man to the effect that so and so—shall I give you the actual words?

6. I think it will be best to give us the actual words?—The form of medical certificate required previous to the admission of a child into an asylum registered under the Idiots Act is as follows: "I, the undersigned, A.B., "a person registered under the Medical Act, 1858, and "in the actual practice of the medical profession, "certify that I have carefully examined C.D., an "infant [*or* of full age], now residing at , "and that I am of opinion that the said C.D. is an "idiot [*or* has been imbecile from birth, *or* for "years past, *or* from an early age]," each of these phrases after the word "or" being alternative.

Dr. G. E. Shuttleworth.

10 Feb. 1897

7. Each medical officer putting his own interpretation on the word "idiot"?—Quite so; and if you will allow me to finish the form—"and is capable of receiving benefit "from [the institution (describing it)], registered under "the Idiots Act, 1886": and, as you say, these words allow any medical man, not necessarily the medical officer of an asylum but any medical practitioner whatever, to place his own construction on the word idiot or imbecile there used, and also to form his own opinion as to whether so and so would receive benefit from being in an institution.

8. Then it is more incumbent upon us to have some clear ideas as to what the meaning of the term is now?—I think so.

9. I will now read the memorandum which you and Dr. Smith have been good enough to prepare at the request of the Committee:—

MEMORANDUM ON DEFINITIONS OF TERMS.

Idiots,
Imbeciles,
Feeble-minded, and
Defective Children.

One of the earliest definitions of an idiot is that contained in Blackstone's Commentaries (Book I., p. 302), and is as follows:—"An idiot, or natural fool, "is one that hath no understanding from his nativity, "and therefore is by law presumed never to attain "any." This definition is, however, qualified by the statement closely following it (p. 304):—"A man is not "an idiot if he has any glimmering of reason, so that "he can tell his parents, his age, or the like common "matters." Sir E. Coke's definition of an idiot is "one "who from his nativity, by a perpetual infirmity, is "*non compos mentis.*" And in 1652 in 1 Fitzherbert "*Natura Brevium*," 583 (Shelford), we find published another legal definition in the following terms:—"He "that shall be said to be a sot and idiot from his birth "is such a person who cannot count or number twenty "pence, nor tell who was his father or mother, nor "how old he is, so as it may appear that he hath no "understanding or reason what shall be for his profit, "or what for his loss; but if he have sufficient under-"standing to know and understand his letters, and to "read by teaching and information, then it seems he is "not an idiot."

Drs. Bucknill and Tuke, in their standard work on Pyschological Medicine (p. 162), adopt a modification of Esquirol's definition, representing "idiocy as a "congenital deficiency of the mental powers."

Dr. W. W. Ireland, in his book on "Idiocy and Imbecility" (p. 1), defines idiocy as "mental deficiency, "or extreme stupidity, depending upon malnutrition "or disease of the nervous centres, occurring either "before birth or before the evolution of the mental "faculties in childhood."

Imbecility.

Dr. Ireland goes on to state that "the word imbecility "is generally used to denote a less decided degree of "mental incapacity (than does idiocy)."

Drs. Bucknill and Tuke remark with regard to the term *Imbecility* (*op. cit.* p. 174): "Some writers have "restricted the use of this term to the loss of mental "power supervening in infancy, others have applied it "indifferently to a congenital and infantile condition; "but all agree in employing the term to denote a minor "degree of mental deficiency than idiocy."

In the Report of the Royal Commission on the Blind, the Deaf and Dumb, &c., we find the following:—

651. "There is no clear line separating idiots and "imbeciles; it is merely a difference of degree, not of "kind. Idiocy means a greater degree of deficiency, "and imbecility means a lesser degree of such defi-"ciency."

It will be observed that the Royal Commissioners, in the recommendations to their Report, refer to "educable imbeciles" and their appropriate training. But they also refer to *feeble-minded* children as a distinct class, requiring to be separated for purposes of instruction from ordinary scholars in public elementary schools. (*See* Recommendations, p. cvi. Report of the Royal Commissioners on the Blind, the Deaf and Dumb, &c.) The term *defective*, as applied to children, has a somewhat indefinite range, and may be held to include all forms both of bodily and mental defect.

It is proper to add that the term *imbecile*, as denoting a degree of weakness of mind less than idiot, was for the first time legally adopted in the Idiots Act, 1886, which states (in its 1/th clause) that "idiots" or "imbeciles" do not include lunatics, and "lunatic" does not mean or include idiot or imbecile.

Reviewing the various acceptations of the terms under discussion, it would appear that *idiot* in its full legal sense (as laid down by Blackstone, Coke, and others), is not properly applicable to those capable of any sort of improvement by educational processes, and as a descriptive term had better, for the sake of simplicity, be disregarded for the purposes of the inquiry of the Departmental Committee. Moreover, it will be found practically convenient as a concession to the sentiment of relatives, to use the term *imbecile* as covering (besides the higher grades) the lower grades of mental defect, so that all children who may be found, by the discriminative tests concerning which information is sought, "not capable of being educated so as to become "self-supporting," may be designated imbecile, and as such recognised as fit subjects for such institutions as Darenth or the so-called "Asylums for Idiots."

With regard to the term *feeble-minded*, we quote the following extract from the report on "The feeble-minded Child and Adult," published by the Charity Organisation Society in 1893 (p. xvi). "The term feeble-minded is "used to signify a lesser degree of mental weakness, "while imbecility and idiocy represent the more marked "degrees of the malady. In America the word is often "used as equivalent to 'idiots' and 'imbeciles.' Thus "the Massachusetts Home was formerly a school for "idiotic and feeble-minded youths; now the latter "term alone is used. And in France, as for instance "at the John Bost Asylums at La Force, 'idiotes, "'imbéciles, ou faibles d'esprit,' are classed together. "The definition may be vague, but for practical "purposes it is sufficient." And it may be well to note in this connexion that the Royal Albert Asylum at Lancaster, the official description of which is the "Asylum for Idiots and Imbeciles of the Northern Counties," has adopted on the title page of its Annual Report that of "The Royal Albert Asylum for the Care, "Education, and Training of Idiotic, Imbecile, and "Weak-minded Children and Young Persons." This institution is a registered hospital under the Lunacy Acts, specially registered under the Act of 1886 as an institution for idiots and imbeciles.

Dr. Shuttleworth has, in his book on Mentally-Deficient Children (p. 15), suggested that the use of the term "mentally feeble" in preference to that of "feeble minded," which from its comprehensive use in America is open to ambiguity. The terms "mentally exceptional," "feeble gifted mentally," and other euphemisms may be discarded as tending to confusion.

In conclusion, some judicious observations by Dr. C. Mercier in his book on "Sanity and Insanity," may usefully be quoted as setting forth in clear language the various grades of mental weakness. ("Sanity and Insanity," p. 287 *seq.*).

"In weakness of mind there is every degree. At one end of the scale is the person who is not quite up to the average, who was in a lower class at school than others of his age . . .; who is incapable of entertaining ideas of a moderate degree of abstractness or complexity . . . . Beneath this class come those who are recognised as being definitely "deficient"; as being not merely below the average, but below the normal—as being more or less imbecile. The line that divides the dull or weak-minded man from the imbecile is the ability to earn a living. . . The distinction between imbecility and idiocy is less clearly marked. All agree that the latter is a more intense degree of the same defect as the former, but there is no precise criterion by which the one can be distinguished from the other. . .

"It is obvious that when an individual fails to reach the full development of the race, the failure will be first noticed in the activities that are left over after the livelihood has been gained; hence we find that in the first degree of weakness of mind the individual is able to earn his own livelihood, but that when this is done his energies are exhausted. . . . .

"In the next degree of weakness of mind—in imbecility—the standard of activity has sunk one degree lower. The imbecile is unable to earn his own livelihood. That is the test, and that is the criterion of imbecility. . . He cannot, unassisted, adapt himself to what I have termed his vital environment. His activities are not sufficiently developed, and this degree of deficient development is imbecility.

"In idiocy the deficiency is still greater. The imbecile fails to adapt himself to his vital environment, he fails to complete the second step in his intellectual development; but he surmounts completely the first step, that

which enables him to adapt himself to his physical environment. He can be trusted to go out by himself without running the risk of being knocked down by passing vehicles. He can be trusted to cut his own food without cutting his fingers. But the idiot fails to effect even these simple adjustments to his circumstances. He is not only incapable of earning his own living—of adapting himself to his vital environment—but he is incapable of preserving himself from the risks of physical harm that are present in his ordinary physical environment."

We, therefore, recommend that for the purposes of this inquiry the word imbecile be applied to all children who, by reason of mental defect, are incapable of being educated so as to become self-supporting; and the term will thus include all children certifiable under the Idiots Act, 1886.

We recommend that the word feeble-minded be applied to children who are too mentally defective to be properly taught in ordinary elementary schools, but not so defective as to be imbecile in the sense explained above.

The word defective, as limited in the terms of reference, will thus include both feeble-minded children and also children who come within this category by reason of physical defect or delicacy.

G. E. SHUTTLEWORTH.
February 1897. WILLIAM R. SMITH.

You have given us in this paper several definitions of idiocy; have you a preference for one over the other, or would you have a definition of your own to give us?—There is a definition which I am prepared to accept.

10. I see your conclusions come on the second page as regards idiots?—But I think on the first page we have two definitions of idiocy: that representing idiocy as a "congenital deficiency of the mental powers" is, of course, the simplest.

11. Where is that?—That is in the second paragraph. The first paragraph is devoted to certain legal definitions, going back to Blackstone and Sir E. Coke; the first medical definition is taken from Bucknill and Tuke in the second paragraph, and a second definition by Dr. Ireland defines idiocy as "mental deficiency, or "extreme stupidity, depending on mal-nutrition or "disease of the nervous centres, occurring either "before birth or before the evolution of the mental "faculties in childhood"; that, I think, is a very good definition.

12. With regard to the last paragraph, "before the "evolution of the mental faculties in childhood," does that fix any particular date or age; what age do you think they begin to be evolved?—Of course they are in process of being evolved in a normal child from the earliest age, but I suppose that Dr. Ireland would say he means by this phrase, "the evolution of the mental faculties," the date at which a normal child is able to perceive things and name them.

13. But not to reason upon them. I want to get some clear idea, if we can, what classes to exclude?—That is, of course, entirely a question of degree. I suppose the mere process of recognising the mother is a process of reasoning, and that comes very early with a normal child.

14. It is a process of association, but scarcely of reasoning, is it?—Then the knowing that another person is not his mother; I suppose that would be, at any rate, the beginning of reasoning.

15. We are getting out of our depth, perhaps, but that applies to animals as well, does it not?—Yes.

16. Then I think, after all, there is no clear definition—exclusive definition—to be obtained?—No, I think not.

17. What is the best definition for us to adopt?—I think I would take that (just quoted) of Dr. Ireland's as really covering the case along with the one that "follows it, viz.:—that "the word Imbecility is gene-"rally used to denote a less decided degree of mental "incapacity (than does idiocy)."

18. Allowing those definitions to stand then, what tests would be applied by an ordinary person, other than a medical man, for the purpose of deciding or helping him to decide upon the exclusion of a child?—I suppose an ordinary person, if he or she had to deal with a child, say seven years of age, would proceed to ask the child questions, and if the child could not answer in the sensible way that an ordinary normal child of seven does, he would conclude that there was either extreme stupidity or some degree of mental deficiency. I am speaking of an ordinary person—not a medical man.

Dr. G. E. Shuttleworth.

10 Feb. 1897.

19. Quite so, we want to get an ordinary test, but that you say would include both extreme dullards and imbeciles?—There, I think, it is again a question of degree, one shading into the other very much.

20. It seems to point to this, that we shall never have any very clear conclusive definition, because there must be a good many children on the border line, which must be determined by experience?—Yes, that is my opinion certainly.

21. How long would that experience be; would it vary with individuals?—I think it does; I think, as a rule, one could form an opinion in six months, but frequently it would be necessary to take a longer period than that. I mean in the case of a child being put under some form of instruction, probably six months might be taken up in the child adapting itself to its surroundings, and another six months would be required before one could test his capacity in a trustworthy way.

22. It comes to this pretty much, that an ordinary person can distinguish a feeble-minded or defective child, but it requires some experienced person to detect the lower class of imbecile or idiot?—No, I do not think I quite said that. You asked me how would an ordinary person proceed. I endeavoured to set forth how an ordinary person would probably proceed, but I do not put that forth as a scientific way of proceeding; I think there is a scientific way of proceeding both with regard to defective and feeble-minded children, and also with regard to the imbecile and idiot.

23. Do you not think that an ordinary person could detect a feeble-minded child?—I think an ordinary person might suspect it, but I do not think he or she could be sure of it with the same degree of certainty as a trained and scientific observer could be sure of it.

24. What I wanted to get at was this: would a teacher in a school, after three or four months experience in a school, be able to point to a child as unable to keep pace with the other children?—I think so. Of course, that would be the result of experience with the child after three or four months, but there are so many conditions on which feeble-mindedness depends that I think it is a matter for scientific and physical discrimination after that as to whether the child is to be denominated feeble-minded.

25. In all cases a medical certificate will be necessary to discriminate?—That is my opinion. I mean that the conditions of the feeble-mind are so mixed up with physical conditions that it is important that a person who has been trained to discriminate between various abnormal physical conditions should have the decision as to the state of the child.

26. (*Mr. Pooley.*) I should like to ask, do you go so far as to say that before a child is separated from ordinary children as feeble-minded, you think there should be a medical certificate?—Decidedly; I am strongly of that opinion.

27. Which do you think is of the most importance—which would you put first—the medical certificate or the evidence of the teacher who tried to teach the child, say, for six months?—I should put the evidence of the teacher as information which is essential for the medical man forming his opinion upon the child; but I should also think it most important that a person with medical training should look at the child as a whole, not only at what he or she may be able to do in the school, but also at the reason, the physical reason (if a physical reason exists) why that condition of things should be. It has been proved pretty conclusively, on the examination of a large number of children, that I was going to say nearly all, but at any rate a very considerable proportion of them, have inherent physical defects, defects in make and nutrition, defects in muscular and nervous action, and all those are matters which would lead one to discriminate between perhaps mere temporary stupidity and dulness, and actual mental defect amounting to feeble-mindedness.

28. Then it comes to this, that a certain proportion of children are found by observation to have some physical sign?—Yes, I should say nearly all of them to a skilled eye have a physical sign which denotes, and goes along with, feeble-mindedness.

29. But in many cases is not that physical sign one that could just as easily be detected by a person experienced in children as by a medical man?—Yes, if the

Dr. G. E. Shuttleworth.

10 Feb. 1897.

teacher had the same physiological training as a medical man: it certainly could not otherwise be as easily detected.

30. Do you put it in this way, that in determining whether a particular child is, or is not, feeble-minded—that is to say one of the children about whom we have to inquire for the purposes of this Committee—the opinion of the medical man is as important as the opinion of the teacher?—I say it is more important. My idea is that the teachers' opinion, unless it is founded on a physiological basis, ought not to be exclusively acted upon.

31. Not exclusively?—Not exclusively. I think both teacher and medical man ought, as a matter of course, to have a voice in the discrimination of such a child, but if you ask me which I consider has the most important part in the determination, I should say the medical man—a medical man, of course, who has had experience in that particular line of practice and of work; I do not mean *any* medical man.

32. (*Miss Townsend.*) Should you give any weight or greater weight to the opinion of the parents who know the child's home life, or to that of the teachers who see it only at school, that is to say, together with the medical man?—I think it is most important that the medical man should have information from both sources, from the home and also from the teachers; and I have do doubt it would be the case, that the teacher would inform herself of the circumstances of the child's home life, which would have a very considerable influence upon the appearance of the child in school, I mean that a child who comes from an unwholesome squalid habitation, where it is packed away closely at night, and breathing carbonic acid all night in excess, is likely to be exceedingly stupid next morning. Such matters as that would have to be taken into consideration and weighed; and that is one of the matters, amongst many others, that make me think that a medical opinion is in the last resort necessary before discriminating as to a child being of the feeble-minded class.

33. So you think that the parents, the teacher, and the medical man, should be in communication, and in accord in deciding whether the child is feeble-minded or not?—Decidedly.

34. Does the amount of feeble-mindedness vary much at different times?—It very often varies with different conditions of a child's health.

35. So that one medical examination would hardly be sufficient; the medical examination ought to be repeated before consigning the child for any length of time to the feeble-minded class?—I think medical inspection of classes arranged for these defective children periodically, would be of use, but I do not think that that is so important as that the medical man should examine the child previous to his admission to these classes, and have a definite opinion of the ground upon which the child differs from ordinary children.

36. Both in home life and in school life?—Both in home life and in school life, certainly—home life as much as school life.

37. I suppose, as a matter of fact, some children are fairly or almost normally intelligent in the ordinary affairs of home life, that are very stupid and deficient at school?—Yes.

38. And *vice versâ*?—Yes.

39. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) I think you said that in the institutions there are several grades of imbeciles?—There are several grades. Shall I go on with what I have said in the paper as to the grades?

40. (*Chairman.*) Yes, you had better answer the question in that way; take from your paper what you think necessary. Which paragraph touches upon the grades of imbecility?—I think I must take the paragraph at the top of page two. "Reviewing the various acceptations of the terms under discussion, it would appear "that *idiot* in its full legal sense (as laid down by "Blackstone, Coke, and others) is not properly applicable to those capable of any sort of improvement by "educational processes, and as a descriptive term had "better, for the sake of simplicity, be disregarded for "the purposes of the inquiry of the Departmental "Committee. Moreover, it will be found practically "convenient, as a concession to the sentiment of "relatives, to use the term *imbecile* as covering "(besides the higher grades) the lower grades of "mental defect, so that all children who may be found, "by the discriminative tests concerning which information is sought, 'Not capable of being educated, so "'as to become self-supporting,' may be designated "*imbecile*, and as such recognised as fit subjects for "such institutions as Darenth, or the so-called 'Asylums "for Idiots'" where some of them may be trained to useful industry; but with regard to the term *feeble-minded*, we have stated in the next paragraph that, for one purpose, it is used to signify a lesser degree of mental weakness, while idiocy and imbecility represent the more marked degrees of the malady. But there is a sort of tendency always to level up, if I may use the expression, that is to say, parents are very apt to call children properly called *idiots*, *imbeciles*, and very apt to call children properly called *imbeciles*, simply *feeble-minded*; and in some cases, in America at any rate, asylums originally designated for *idiots* have now been re-christened institutions for *feeble-minded*, without, I suppose, any very great difference in the class of children received therein. Mrs. Burgwin's question, I think, was with regard to the classes of children found in the English institutions for idiots and imbeciles.

41. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) Yes?—There are, of course, at the bottom of the scale children who are quite properly called idiots; children who cannot talk, are extremely defective physically, and have very little understanding indeed.

42. Then at the top what do you find?—And from that basis you gradually ascend by almost imperceptible gradations, through children who are defective perhaps in some respects and not in others, and then again through the class of children who are only very slow in all their mental attainments, until you get those that I have designated as feeble minded—a small proportion—I said about 10 per cent. at the Royal Albert Asylum I should think in that upper stratum; and those cases, the upper stratum, the 10 per cent., could be, I think—and were so far as my experience went—educated so as under favourable conditions to earn their own living, *i.e.* "to become wholly or partially self-supporting."

43. Might I now ask you this: I think we were, at least I was, a little confused as to what was the difference between what a teacher might do in selecting a child, and a medical man. I suppose you meant that the medical man could possibly tell the cause of the child's defect; but surely you mean that the teacher, an experienced and trained teacher, could detect that the child was not a normal child?—Certainly.

44. What the doctor would determine is the cause, which would not be material from a teacher's point of view?—Allow me to say that I think it is rather more than the cause. He would have the cause in view no doubt, but he would also be guided by certain physical characteristics of the child as well as its mental condition. The information as to mental condition, which he would derive from the teacher or the parent, would of course be a very valuable factor in his opinion, but feeble-mindedness is so much dependent upon a feeble or abnormal condition of the body, that I think to arrive at a thoroughly accurate conclusion the two things ought to go together; observation of the child's body as well as observation of the child's mind; and for the first purpose the doctor is certainly the proper person, and I think a skilful doctor who is used to defective children ought to be the person to determine as to whether the child is abnormal or not.

45. The difficulty arises really where the defect is not obvious. May I explain. As teachers we find at the end of the school a certain proportion of children who cannot at all keep pace with their fellows of the same age?—Yes.

46. For example, a child is brought to me who has been three years in one standard, that the lowest. Talking with the child you do not detect any obvious defect in it; at the same time it seems incapable of learning whilst it is not deficient of memory. Would such a child be admitted into an institution?—That would entirely depend upon the view that the individual medical practitioner took of the extent and meaning of the word "Imbecile." I have known such cases as you describe brought into the Royal Albert Asylum, but I do not think that they are properly brought into contact with children of very much lower grade than themselves.

47. Would you say then, from your knowledge of the special classes, that those children would be better in those classes than in an institution?—You mean the upper 10 per cent. that I spoke of?

48. Yes?—Yes, I should say so, provided that their home circumstances were sufficiently good. That of course is an important element in the case.

49. (*Mr. Newton.*) In cases where the teacher's evidence is not at hand, would a medical man be justified in forming an opinion as to dullness or imbecility?—I think he would have to go through the same process as the teacher has to go through. For instance, when I am asked to form an opinion of a child's mental condition, I do not confine myself to a physical examination of the child or an application of physical tests merely, but I proceed to talk to the child, noticing the degree of intelligence he displays in answering my questions, and whether he is quick or slow in his answers and so on, and then of course I attempt to find out for myself what degree of education he has attained to and compare that with the ordinary standard for the child's age, in forming an opinion as to whether the child is mentally defective. I mean I would ask a child to read out of a book and ask him to write his name, and above all apply some simple tests of powers of calculation; but those are matters that a teacher could do better than myself, and I should be glad to take the report of a skilled teacher thereon.

50. But in the case (and this is a common case) of a child seven or eight years old, practically quite neglected at home and never educated at school, the first step would be to send that child to an ordinary school and see what they could make of him, before they brought him to be examined by a medical man; is that so?—You mean only a very moderate amount of dulness, I presume.

51. I mean a boy or girl of seven or eight, of whom one could make nothing, who had been presumably neglected at home and had not attended school?—I think then that a medical man would be the best judge whether that child should go to an asylum for imbeciles or whether it should go simply to school. If you do not limit the degree of mental deficiency, I may say that it is very often the experience that a child who appears to be a downright idiot is very much worse than he would otherwise have been because his home circumstances have been unfavourable; and in such a case as that, a child might properly be sent into an asylum for idiots with the hope that he would benefit by withdrawal from bad surroundings. But then it is a question of degree. If he were only slightly deficient in intelligence one would judge that a certain amount of backwardness might be the result of neglected opportunities of education, or at least of the child having had no opportunities of education, owing to the neglect of his parents, and consequently what you suggest as to his being submitted to test at school would be the best thing in such a case.

52. But in the case of a child that has practically had no education except what he may have given himself, can a medical man say that such a child is wanting by any mere examination or asking questions?—Decidedly; if he is constitutionally deficient there is no question about it; and certain types of deficiency you can judge by merely looking at them.

53. In extreme cases?—No, not extreme cases alone. I have seen cases amongst others in an ordinary school, *i.e.*, in an institution where ordinary boys are received, who bore the impress on their countenance (in the one case) of Cretinism and (in the other case) of the so-called Mongol type. These were children moving in the ordinary school that had not up to the time of my visit been recognised by their teachers as being constitutionally defective; the teachers said they were dull, but they did not know that they were defective.

54. But will there not be a class of defective children as to whom the medical officer will be unable to decide until they have had some time at school?—I dare say.

55. Would it be a largish one?—I should think it would. I should think there would be a fairly large number of children who would require trial at school before one is able to pronounce upon them.

56. That is the point. Then when you speak of examination by a medical man, you imply, do you not, all along a medical man who has given special attention to this matter?—Undoubtedly.

57. Not a general practitioner?—Not a general practitioner; you do not want the opinion of a medical man who has only casually seen these cases, but of one who has turned his attention to this matter.

58. (*Dr. Smith.*) I only want to be quite clear as to these terms; if I understand you aright, from the various answers you have given, you propose that the use of the term imbecile should be general for all children who are so bad as to be inadmissible, in your opinion, to one of the special schools?—Yet, that is my own personal opinion of the matter.

Dr. G. E. Shuttleworth.

10 Feb. 1897

59. And you would apply the term feeble-minded to those children who are rightly admissible to these special classes?—That is so.

60. Then, so far as the admission of children to these feeble-minded classes is concerned, would you or would you not think it advisable to insist upon a certain length of time being passed in an ordinary elementary school?—I do not think so in all cases. I daresay in a large number of cases it would be desirable, but referring to such instances as I speak of, in which there is evidently a certain defect imprinted on the child's features, not sufficient to render it a proper subject for the imbecile asylum, but which yet one knows from experience will interfere with the exercise of its intelligence or with the development of its intelligence, I think a skilled man would *at once* send such a child to a special class. I have in mind such a case as the modified Cretin or the modified Mongol. There are also a large class of children, no doubt, whose mental deficiency is best found out by the experience of the teachers who have to instruct them, best found out (I mean) in a way that is presumptive. I do not think that the teacher should absolutely decide, but he will gather strong presumptive evidence of mental deficiency.

61. I am coming to that. If you do not insist upon their going to school you get rid of the evidence of the teacher. What I said was this: Would you in all cases, or in what proportion, in your judgment, would you insist upon such children, assuming they are properly admissible to this class for a moment, going first of all to an elementary school. The advantage of it would be, as at once you will see, that you would get the evidence of the teacher as to what the child could do?—I am really not sufficiently familiar with all the details of school management as to be able to answer that question with any weight. My own opinion is that the majority probably would be better for going to an ordinary school in the first place for the purposes of observation, and that the group I had in mind are a comparatively small group; I am willing to admit that.

62. Then—correct me if I misunderstand you—you would say that the large proportion of children whom subsequent experience would show to be properly admissible to these classes, would be better off if they went in the first instance to an ordinary elementary school?—Yes.

63. And that a small proportion would be properly admissible at once, the evidence in regard to such being so manifest as at once to impress the mind of the medical adviser that such a case was a proper one?—Yes.

64. Then, as regards the admission of these children to these special classes, if I understood your answers aright, you look upon a candidate for admission to a class in much the same sense as you would upon a patient?—I should do so.

65. And to come to a right conclusion as regards the illness from which a patient is suffering, of course, the physician would exhaust every source of information; that is so, is it not?—Yes.

66. He would obtain, for instance, if the patient were a child, from the parent all the information he possibly could to help him in his judgment?—Yes.

67. And that information in such a case is of the most important character?—Decidedly; information from the parent and from the teacher you would include, I suppose.

68. I am taking the parent for a moment for the purposes of illustration. Now then, if you come to a child who is a candidate for admission to a class, really there are two persons who can give information, the teacher and the parent?—Yes.

69. And the medical examiner, assuming such exists, would naturally obtain that information and attach proper value to it before he expressed an opinion?—Undoubtedly. It would be one of the chief factors of his opinion, I should say.

70. Very well. And having obtained that information, you say that it is necessary for a trained mind to

Dr. G. E. Shuttleworth.

10 Feb. 1897.

give full and proper weight to it?—That is my opinion.

71. And such a trained mind can only be found in a specially qualified medical man who has in addition to his ordinary training had special experience in this particular work?—Yes, I would say "A medical person," to include a medical woman, if you like.

72. That is understood, of course. Then, assuming that such a child is admitted, there may come a time when it would be wise for that child to go back to an elementary school, not necessarily to a class which you would expect a child of its age to occupy, but to go back to an elementary school it may be in a lower class. How would you suggest that a proper decision should be come to on that point?—I think in that case very much would depend upon the report of the teacher under whose observation the child had been during that time. There might be, of course, other elements which the medical man would be able to form an opinion upon. For example, differences in the child's health and the child's nervous action, and particularly the presence or absence of certain abnormal nerve signs; and in that case I think that the teacher's opinion should have very full weight indeed, but it should be corroborated by an inspection by a trained medical man.

73. Then, if I rightly interpret you, you wish the Committee to understand that at that stage the opinion of the teacher under whose care the child has been is, if anything, more important than the medical opinion, but that it should be supplemented by a medical opinion?—Yes, I think I may say that. I have in mind (if you will allow me to explain) such cases of nervous breakdown as those we sometimes see in schools, in children suffering from symptoms of chorea (St. Vitus's Dance). Those, I presume, sometimes find their way into some of the special classes, and it would be for the doctor in such a case as that to say whether the period of danger had passed or not, and whether it was safe for the child to return to the ordinary school.

74. (*Chairman.*) Do you think that a medical examination is necessary in all cases?—Yes, that is my opinion.

75. In the country, where a skilled medical officer can scarcely be obtained, if the child is a child of good behaviour and not mischievous would you not allow him to enter an ordinary village school without a medical certificate?—I did not mean that, I referred solely to the feeble-minded class, and admission to special classes.

76. We shall have no special classes in the country. There will be a great many cases scattered all over the country. If they are children of good behaviour and not mischievous, would you not let them go to an ordinary school without a certificate?—Yes, certainly; I never intended to be understood that a medical inspection should apply to all children; I only mean that these exceptional children should be seen and certified by a medical man.

77. I am speaking of exceptional children in the country?—I still think it is highly desirable; what the machinery should be for obtaining a competent medical opinion I am not able to say.

78. (*Mr. Pooley.*) You mean before admitting them to an imbecile institution or special class?—I think they should be passed in each case by a skilled medical man.

79. (*Miss Townsend.*) I suppose in the country an ordinary practitioner would be better than no medical man?—Much would depend upon who he was. Very often the ordinary country practitioner would from want of experience be in no better position for forming a complete opinion than the teacher, if as good.

80. (*Chairman.*) But it would be desirable to have a medical practitioner, because knowing the cause he would be able to point out the probable effects?—Yes, if experienced.

81. You spoke of information given by parents; I am sorry to say that most of the parents of these children are very ignorant and treat them not very well very often. Would the history which the parents would give you be of much use?—I think it would be if it were carefully extracted from them. I do not mean that one should accept as gospel all that the parents choose to tell one, but if there is any opportunity by an agency (such as that of the town missionary) of inquiring into the home circumstances, all that collateral information will be of very great advantage.

82. But would not the teachers themselves avail themselves of all that?—Yes, I daresay. The teacher might be the intermediary of all information from the parents, and probably she would obtain it better than the medical examiner could.

83. And could not the teacher be trained to detect by certain tests the state of the child's mental condition?—She could be trained up to a certain point, but I do not think without proper physiological training, such as a medical man or woman gets, her conclusions would be quite equal in value to those obtained by medical examination.

Mr. F. Beach, M.B., F.R.C.P. Lond.

Mr. Fletcher Beach, M.B., F.R.C.P., Lond. called in and examined.

84. (*Chairman.*) You are Physician to the Epileptic Colony, Chalfont, and to the West End Hospital for Epilepsy and Paralysis?—I am.

85. And you were formerly Medical Superintendent of the Darenth Schools for imbecile children?—For 18 years.

86. That is, of the branch for children, not for adults?—That is so.

87. Have you seen the memorandum which Dr. Shuttleworth has prepared for the Committee?—It has been handed down to me since I came into the room.

88. Without looking at it, perhaps you will tell us what your definition of imbecility or idiocy is?—I think one of the best definitions of idiocy is, "A state of "mental deficiency depending upon imperfect develop- "ment or disease of the nervous system coming "on at birth, or being seen at birth or in early "infancy, previous to the evolution of the mental "faculties."

89. That is taken chiefly from Dr. Ireland, is it not?—it is a modification of Dr. Ireland's definition.

90. It is your own modification?—Yes.

91. How does it differ from Dr. Ireland's definition; he says, "Mental deficiency or extreme stupidity "depending upon mal-nutrition or disease of the "nervous centres." In fact, you depend upon Dr. Ireland's definition?—To a great extent.

92. How does it differ?—Apparently he limits his definition to coming on before birth; he does not say anything about its coming on in early infancy.

93. I suppose by the last paragraph "or before the "evolution of the mental faculties in childhood" he means in early infancy?—I do not know whether he limits it to that; at any rate that definition may stand.

94. That is the one we have from Dr. Shuttleworth?—Yes.

95. The definition of imbecility you will see in the same paper, marked 651. (It is from the report of the Royal Commission on the Blind, the Deaf, and Dumb, &c.). "There is no clear line separating idiots and "imbeciles; it is clearly a difference of degree, not of "kind. Idiocy means a greater degree of deficiency, "and imbecility means a lesser degree of such de- "ficiency." You would adopt that also?—Yes. There is one rather important point, I think, from the legal point of view, which has been brought out lately. Mr. Wood Renton wrote an article upon the legal aspects of idiocy in the Dictionary of Psychological Medicine, in which he pointed out that apparently now the legal incidents of idiocy are not of such great importance as they formerly were, owing to the gradual displacement by modern scientific knowledge, and by recent legislation, as for example by the Idiots Act of 1886, of a former state of things. Formerly there was what was called the old *presumptio juris et de jure* that all idiots were incapable of being educated and trained. In old times, 50 years ago, of course there was no attempt at educating idiots and imbeciles, and therefore, no doubt that law held good; but, at the present time idiots are educated and trained, and, therefore, as he says, the legal aspects of idiocy are not of such great importance as they formerly were.

96. But for our purposes it is quite sufficient to adopt the definition on the first page of Dr. Shuttleworth's memorandum; you need not go into the legal aspect of it at all?—Very well.

97. Imbecility is merely a difference of degree, not of kind?—Yes, I may say that I have been opposed for a great many years to the use of the term "idiot" at all. It is taken from the old Greek word "'Ιδιώτης" which means a "peculiar nature." Formerly idiots were thought to be entirely uneducable, but that idea has long passed away; it was perfectly true in the old days, but it does not hold good at the present time.

98. But it is so encrusted in Acts of Parliament, that we had better continue its use, only assuming it to be the same as imbecility with a difference in degree only and not in kind?—Yes.

99. You have been conversant, I think, with three hospitals?—Yes.

100. And you have seen in all of these idiots and imbeciles mixed together, some capable of being educated?—Not in the epileptic colony itself. So far there, we make it the rule that no epileptic who is at all imbecile should be admitted. At the West End Hospital there are cases of nervous disease as well as epilepsy and paralysis.

101. But both at Darenth and in the West End Hospital, you have found children present who were capable of being educated?—Yes. In fact, I have sent several children to Mrs. Burgwin's special classes who have come before me at the hospital, when the parents have not known what to do with them, and I have told them the best thing to do with them was to apply to Mrs. Burgwin.

102. Was that from want of funds?—Yes, or from the parents not being paupers but people above sending their children to public elementary schools, and who did not quite know what to do with them. A good many people having heard that I had to do with the subject send them to me; and I always, in such cases, recommend them to be sent on to Mrs. Burgwin's.

103. For discriminating an imbecile from a mentally feeble child is the opinion of a medical person absolutely necessary in all cases?—I should think so.

104. You do not think that a trial under an ordinary teacher in an ordinary school for a certain time might be sufficient?—You see when a medical man leaves his hospital he knows everything about the general medical opinion, but very often you find that medical men in hospitals have never taken up the aspect of children at all; I have known many cases where they are not taught much about children's diseases, so that a medical man wants first of all to know something about the ordinary diseases of children, and then something about their mental and physical characteristics.

105. Then there are only a very limited number of medical men who are capable of discriminating between the imbecile and mentally feeble-minded children?—Very few.

106. Can you tell us how many there are in England?—I should think there are not more than half-a-dozen at the present time.

107. Then how can we utilise their services for medical purposes all over England?—If I may say so, the Education Department should appoint medical inspectors the same as under the Poor Law. You are no doubt aware that a large number of children are in Poor Law schools, and the children in those schools are annually visited by the inspectors of the Local Government Board.

108. Then an ordinary medical practitioner would be of comparatively little use in the matter?—I think that when any little difficulty arose a medical man would be of use especially in the country, but I think that in large centres of population we should have men specially trained to examine them.

109. You would not be satisfied then with the ordinary certificates given for admitting children?—Judging from my own experience at Darenth, as a matter of fact, a great many of the certificates sent in there were simply absurd; the medical men simply put down the child as an idiot; but what we wanted to know was the reason for their saying so.

110. Then they would be equally absurd for admission to special classes?—In some cases I think they would.

Mr. F. Beach, M.B., F.R.C.P. Lond.

10 Feb. 1897.

111. What test would you apply yourself?—I may say at the outset that you may find a child with scarcely any defect at all, but in the great majority of cases you will find some defect in malformation of the head; the head may be too small, micro-cephalic—that is to say from between 15½ to 17½ or 18 inches when it should measure 21 inches; or it might be too large in cases of hydrocephalic heads—that is to say heads which measure from about 23 to 24½ inches in circumference. We arrive at that by means of a measure round the head.

112. Could not those measures be used by an ordinary person?—Certainly.

113. You would not require a medical man for that?—Very little instruction would be necessary for that. I have brought one or two illustrations with me. This (*handing in the same*) is the outline of an ordinary head; these (*handing in others*) are outlines of the micro-cephalic head, which you see are very much smaller. Here is one of the hydrocephalic. Here is one of the scaphocephalic (*handing in the same*).

114. Then, as regards the shape of the head, you think certain tests might be circulated to the teachers to apply?—I think so, but they would want a little instruction as to how to apply the tape measure.

115. What other test would you apply?—Leaving the head, the next thing would be to examine the palate to see whether it is the ordinary flat shaped palate, or what we call a V-shaped palate, narrowed above to form the letter V, or narrowed from side to side, or whether the upper jaw projects over the lower jaw.

116. Could not a teacher observe that as well as a medical man if she gave her mind to it?—She would require instruction.

117. But no very great amount of physiological knowledge would be wanted for that, would it?—The difficulty would be that one person would see one thing, and another another; you would want to have very careful inspection, because you might have 20 people putting down one thing and 20 people putting down another.

118. But the medical men would not do so, you think?—A specially trained medical man who is constantly doing this every day of his life, and perhaps has been doing it for the last 20 years, is more likely to come to a decided opinion than one who has very seldom seen it.

119. What other physiological tests would you require?—The next thing would be to notice the ears. In a good many cases you notice that the ears are large, coarse, and outstanding, or there are deficiencies in different portions of the ears. Sometimes the lobe is attached to the skin behind. I may mention that most of these terms that I now employ relate to defects which the French call *stigmata*, that is to say, stigmata which are found in all cases of defect whether in weak-minded, or criminals, or others.

120. Not all together, but one or more of them?—Exactly. As a matter of fact, of course, no one can say at one point alone that a child is an idiot. I do not mean to say that because a child has a defective palate he is an idiot or a feeble-minded child, or because he has a mal-formed head he is an idiot or a feeble-minded child, but it is from a number of points taken together that you have to judge. Then the next point it is important to examine is the eyes. In most feeble-minded children you find that they have a fixed stare, not because they are blind, but because the waves of light which act upon the retina do not convey any impression of light to the child's mind. In the same way a child does not move its eyes when objects are passed backwards and forwards in front of them simply because, if I may say so, he sees but does not perceive the object. Then, on the other hand, you may have a child whose eyes are constantly on the move, what we call an over mobile child, whose attention cannot be fixed for a moment. These children are very deceptive. You may have a very good-looking child, and you may say, what a delightful child, I am sure he will improve, but directly you put that child to learn his lessons his eyes are all over the room, you cannot fix his eyes for a moment. Those children I have no doubt are met with in special classes as well as others.

121. There are also, of course, nervous tests to go by?—There are nervous tests which Dr. Warner uses; those are differently looked upon of course by different people. I have no doubt in addition to the other tests they are very useful.

Mr. F. Beach, M.B., F.R.C.P. Lond.

10 Feb. 1897.

122. They are not tests so much of mental feebleness you think?—I myself do not think they are so much tests of mental feebleness as the other points are.

123. Those are the chief tests, are they?—One has, of course, to examine the body to see whether the child is stunted in growth—to see the movements of the hands. A good many of these children have no power of fixing the hands, the hand moves constantly about and has to be trained. The movements of the body also have to be trained. The movements of the voice have to be trained; many of these children are unable to speak at all, others are unable to speak plainly; that is due to a want of co-ordination between the muscles of the chest, throat, and mouth. That has to be taught.

124. There are feeble-minded children, are there not, that no physical test would detect?—I think, as a matter of fact, in a few cases you would find a good many of a defects much less marked. One of the most important things of course is this: I do not believe that any of these children should be judged simply by the physical aspect only; I am very strongly of opinion that questions should be put to them as well. You are no doubt aware of the fact that very recently a report has been published upon the results of the inspection of 100,000 children who have been seen in different schools, and that report itself makes a very strong point of the fact that not only should a child be viewed, but that he should be asked questions. I mean to say, that in addition to the physical sign which you observe, it is necessary to put questions to the child to ascertain the amount of mental capacity that he has.

125. We have totally neglected children, I am sorry to say, in large numbers whom the parents perhaps have neglected and rather hidden away in corners; it is no use putting questions to them, of course?—I suppose that a child, especially if he was a street arab, would have a certain amount of voice; he would be able to say, "Ga long," or something of that sort.

126. I am sorry to say that in some cases they are quite mute, and you can get nothing from them whatever. What is to be done with that class?—I should depend especially upon physical inspection, and of course I should require to see the parents.

127. You would not propose to reject them merely on that physical inspection, would you?—No, I think one should put questions to the parents. I may say that the Darenth School is, of course, a pauper institution, and we have therefore a good many of the very lowest class of society there, although we have also people belonging to the higher classes of society who were unable to get their children into Earlswood, and sent them to Darenth simply because they could not. But taking the very lowest class, some of the very low Irish type (without putting anything on the nationality), by careful tests you can get a considerable amount of information out of them without their knowing it.

128. Would it not be necessary to let them stay in the school for a short time and experience kind treatment before you would reject them?—I think they should be sent to the elementary school first, then, of course, it would soon be found out as to what should be done with them, the teacher would soon be able to distinguish, and I think that the teacher in that case would be likely to call in the aid of a medical man.

129. Perhaps in all cases, except the very extreme cases, you would recommend their going to the elementary school first of all, to experience kind treatment?—Yes. You see all these classes dovetail into one another. First of all, you have the idiot, then the imbecile; the higher class of idiot approaches the lower class of imbecile; the higher class of imbecile approaches the lower class of feeble-minded, and then come the feeble-minded; it is practically an ascending scale from below: idiot, imbecile, feeble minded.

130. But any one of whom there was the least hope, you would give a chance in the public elementary schools?—I think so, certainly. There are a good many other characteristics, of course, that one could point out, besides those that I have already mentioned—that is to say, the head, palate, eyes, ears, movements of the body, movements of the fingers, and so on;—but perhaps it is hardly necessary to take up your time by giving you full details and descriptions, although I can do so if you wish it.

131. As to their being educable; in what direction would you expect improvement in education, and in what directions would you not expect it?—I am not sure that I understand the question.

132. Take arithmetic for example; would you expect them ever to become good reasoners in arithmetical questions?—I think not, because, unfortunately, arithmetic to both imbeciles and feeble-minded is always a great difficulty.

133. Starting from arithmetic as a point in which they could not improve, can you name the points in which you would not expect improvement, and the points in which you would expect improvement, to which the attention of the teacher should be especially directed?—First of all, the great thing is the improvement of special senses—touch, sight, hearing, taste and smell—all those are defective; and as a matter of fact we medical men always direct our attention first of all to the development of special senses.

134. By manual occupations and by pictures?—Taking touch first, by means of rough and smooth objects; then taking taste, by giving them disagreeable substances and sweet substances, and smell, by strong odours such as ammonia and other substances having little smell, and so on.

135. But in order to earn their own living they must be developed in some way?—What we were very careful to do at Darenth was this: as soon as a child had a little mental education, we always put him into one of our workshops; we had workshops there to teach them shoe-making, carpentering, and so on, and in other institutions there are workshops to teach them brush-making and cane-making, and, as a rule, I found that the child who got on best in school made the best workman.

136. You developed them chiefly through manual occupations?—Of course, there are exceptions where a child has a mechanical turn of mind and does not take kindly to education, but does take kindly to a trade.

137. You never expect a feeble-minded child to be a good scholar in the ordinary sense that he can either read or write, or do arithmetic?—Yes, I should.

138. You would?—Yes.

139. You know our standards; how high do you think that a feeble-minded child might rise?—I know the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd standards, because we used these books at Darenth. I am not quite sure I know the other standards.

140. You have never known them rise beyond the 3rd standard?—The children at Darenth did not rise beyond the 3rd standard, but I should say that feeble-minded children might rise beyond the 3rd standard.

141. So as to intelligently comprehend all the reasoning in arithmetic, do you mean?—I believe that in Christiana they train some of the feeble-minded children to go to the ordinary school. I have not, so far, had an opportunity of seeing them.

142. But there must be a difference of some years between them and the other members of the class?—Naturally they would be much older in years.

143. There would be a difference of four or five years probably?—Yes.

144. What is the advantage of sending them to an ordinary school if they are so far behind their fellows?—The question is how high are you prepared to educate in a special class?

145. Yes; it comes to that very much. How many institutions are there for this particular class?—I will first of all give you the pauper institutions. There are the Darenth schools; there is a separate department at the Northampton County Asylum, Berrywood. Then there is the Western Counties Idiot Asylum at Starcross, near Exeter, which also takes private patients, and is aided by charity. Then for children above the pauper class we have the Earlswood Asylum at Redhill, Surrey; the Royal Albert Asylum, which has also a branch at Brunton House, Lancaster; the Eastern Counties Asylum for Idiots at Colchester; the Western Counties Asylum for Idiots at Starcross, near Exeter; the Midland Counties Idiot Asylum at Knowle, near Birmingham; and the Magdalen Hospital, in Bath.

146. Those are chiefly for idiots and imbeciles?—Yes.

147. There are others for defective children?—Yes. I am coming to that. There are institutions in Scotland.

148. We need not go into Scotland?—Very well. Then we have private establishments registered under the Idiots Act, namely, Normansfield, Hampton Wick, and Downside Lodge, Chilcompton, near Bath; those are the only two private institutions.

149. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) The only two private institutions registered?—Yes, the only two registered under the Act; but I may say that at the present time they are building a block at the Middlesex County Asylum at Wandsworth, into which they are going to put idiot and imbecile children. You do not want to know about Ireland, but as a matter of fact they are building in Ireland an institution for taking in private cases.

150. Can you give us the institutions for the education of defective children?—I think those I have just mentioned should not be used for feeble-minded children, they should only be used for children who are idiots and imbeciles.

151. Are there none specially for feeble-minded children?—There are institutions for the education of defective children: Ancaster House, Richmond, Surrey; Bearstead House, near Maidstone, Kent; Grosvenor, Auckland Road, Upper Norwood; Winchester House, Kingston Hill, Surrey; Brook House, Southgate, Middlesex; and a small institution near Croydon. Those are all for children who are defective and not idiots and imbeciles.

152. And at a high fee?—Yes.

153. Which is prohibitive to the elementary school class?—They are not for children who go to public elementary schools.

154. I suppose that feeble-minded girls want special protection?—No doubt they do.

155. Are there homes for them?—There are six that I know of; there is first, Scott House, The Triangle, Hitchin. I know this one because I was put on the committee when it was first thought of, and I have followed it throughout with great interest. I have been down there once or twice since and seen how the children are improved. These are institutions certified under Act 25 & 26 Vict. c. 43., as Industrial Homes for Paupers.

156. Are they supported by the rates or voluntarily supported?—They are supported by what they can get out of the guardians, and by voluntary contributions. As a matter of fact the guardians pay so much. Would you like to know the names.

157. Are there many?—There are six altogether.

158. Will you give the names of the six?—The first is Scott House, The Triangle, Hitchin; the next one is the Aubert Park Home, 48, Highbury Park, N.; the third is The Laundry and Home of Industry, Barnt Green, near Birmingham; the fourth, Chasefield, Fishponds, near Bristol; the fifth is St. Mary's Home, Painswick, Gloucestershire, and the sixth is Adcote, Pilot Lane, Knotty Ash, Liverpool. None of these unfortunately are for boys, they are only for girls. There is no doubt that these homes are very necessary. The Metropolitan Association for Befriending Young Servants is much interested in the subject, and the National Vigilance Society some years ago made an inquiry into this very subject, and in 1889 they received replies from 203 boards of guardians, from which it was found that during the year 1889 715 weak-minded women passed through 105 workhouses, and from no less than 56 workhouses it was stated that the approximate number of such women leading immoral lives was 366, so that it is most important. Then the Reformatory and Refuge Union has also had the question before them, and the Charity Organization Society has also inquired into the subject.

159. Is there anything else that you wish to bring before us before the other members of the Committee examine you?—There is one point which I think is rather important. Your secretary asked me if I would bring the certificates by which children are taken into the Darenth Schools, and here they are (*handing in the same*). It seems to me that at present the tests employed for admitting children into schools, both by the Idiots Act and also into the Darenth Schools, are very incomplete. I have not brought a copy of the Idiots Act with me, but I have a book here which gives the form of inquiry which has to be filled up.

160. Would you read the form of inquiry and then state what you think is deficient?—The doctor is not asked for his reasons why the child should be sent to the institution; he is simply asked to state it in general on the form: "I, the undersigned A.B., a "person registered under the Medical Act, 1858, and "in the actual practice of the medical profession, "certify that I have carefully examined C.D., an "infant [*or* of full age], now residing at , "and that I am of opinion that the said C.D. is an idiot "[*or* has been imbecile from birth, *or* for years "past, *or* from an early age], and is capable of receiving "benefit from [the institution (describing it)], regis-"tered under the Idiots Act, 1886." You see there he says, "I am of opinion." The certificate does not say why.

Mr. F. Beach, M.B., F.R.C.P., Lond.

10 Feb. 1897.

161. Will you give us the exact form of words that you would add?—I think that the reasons should be stated below the facts that he has observed, and facts communicated by others.

162. You mean that he should give the evidence on which he bases his opinion?—I think so. I am sorry to say that at Darenth they have taken a very retrograde step. When I first went down there the Metropolitan Asylums Board had the certificate to a great extent modelled on the lunacy certificate, stating the facts observed by the medical man himself, and the facts communicated by others as to whether the child was an idiot, an imbecile, or of unsound mind. The word "lunatic" as far as I remember, did not occur at all. Then the mode of procedure was for the mother to go to the relieving officer and say that she had a child she wanted to get into an institution. The father and mother then had to go before the Board of Guardians and say what their means were, and how much they could afford to pay, because the guardians have always to get back from the parents what they can afford to pay. Then the certificate having been filled up the child was at once sent down to Darenth, but, unfortunately, when the Lunacy Act came into operation into 1891, there was a change. Previously to that I may say that I tried to get the Darenth Schools registered under the Idiots Act, but the Commissioners in Lunacy said: "You are not a regis-"tered hospital and you are not a licensed house, "therefore we cannot register you." So I told them the next time they came down I was very sorry about it, and they said, "Legally an idiot is a lunatic." I said, "That is very unfortunate, because I and many others "for the last 20 years have been trying to point out to "the public the difference between an idiot and a "lunatic."

163. Could not the Asylums Board take out a licence?—They said that they could not. They applied to the Commissioners in Lunacy and were told that they could not be registered under the Idiots Act, and therefore we had to remain as we were. I was going to say that unfortunately, when the Lunacy Act, 1890, came into operation, a law was passed that a person could not be be detained in the workhouse infirmary unless he was certified as a lunatic. Now our children at Darenth are certified as lunatics after being there a fortnight. I will show you the form (*handing in the same*).

164. That is an evasion of the law?—Yes, it is; or rather, I should say it is an unfortunate law.

165. Who is responsible for the evasion of the law in the first instance?—Up to that time there was no such law. A person could be detained in a workhouse without any further certificate.

166. But I understand you to say that they are illegally classed as lunatics?—Now they are.

167. Who is responsible for that illegal classification?—I believe the Commissioners in Lunacy, because they say that an idiot is a lunatic.

168. (*Mr. Pooley.*) Do you say that, before being sent from the workhouse to Darenth, a child has to be certified as lunatic?—No. Darenth technically is a workhouse school, and is similar to other workhouse schools, except that it takes in children of defective intellect; therefore, of course, being a workhouse school, the children all being mentally defective, have to be certified. But I may say, the old certificate still goes on for admission in Darenth schools, but this certificate is for detention in the schools. What happens now is, that a certificate for the child has to be applied for by the steward who takes the place of the relieving officer; the medical officer has to certify the child, and a neighbouring practitioner has to be called on to fill up on the certificate facts observed by himself and others. Then the child is taken before a justice of the peace at Dartford, who gives his authority for his

Mr F. Beach, M.B., F.R.C.P., Lond.

16 Feb. 1897.

being detained as a lunatic. It is a very retrograde step.

169. (*Chairman.*) No one certifies that he is a lunatic, but he is detained as such?—Yes, he is certified as a lunatic on the second page.

170. It also says "an idiot or person of unsound "mind"; is that scratched out?—Yes, that is scratched out, I believe, as a matter of fact.

171. But you do not know?—It is some little time since I was there. Of course, if he were an idiot, or a person of unsound mind, according to the contention of the Commissioners in Lunacy he is a lunatic.

172. But there is no false certificate given?—Not at all. I would also like to say that we endeavour, as much as possible, to get a history of the case. Those (*handing in some papers*) are copies of the questions that we have printed, and which we endeavour, as much as possible, to have answered.

173. You supply the Committee with the conditions of admission to Darenth, stating the whole history of the patient?—Yes.

174. Who supplies that information?—That we get from the parents.

175. Are they capable of filling up the form?—A very good many cases come in direct from the workhouse where the parents cannot be found, but, in all cases, I always have the parents down and send them the form to fill up. I supplement that by asking the parents questions when they come down. We have visiting days, and when the parents come down to see the children I have always a long conversation with them.

176. But then the history was always imperfect, was it not?—In some cases it was imperfect; but the great point I tried to get was as perfect a history as possible. For instance, I always endeavour, as much as possible, to go into the question whether there is any hereditary disease in the family; that is a most important thing, because a child's subsequent hope of recovery depends, to a large extent, upon the presence or absence of hereditary disease in the family.

177. Do you not find that such a thing is nearly always concealed?—No, these poor people do not mind telling you, and even the better class, if they are pushed, will always tell you. I think, as a matter of fact, they are sensible people. I always say "It is "important, not only for your own part, but for you, "to tell me all I want to know; both of us want to do "all we can to improve the child; if you conceal from "me any facts you diminish my power of improving "him, therefore, give me as much information as you "can."

178. Do you think that human nature is likely to disclose any facts that are a disgrace to itself?—There always is a tendency on the part of the parents to prove that the child has become an idiot from an accident afterwards, but sometimes they do not mind telling you the true state of the case at all. Poor people have not the same pride, if I may say so; they do not want to conceal things in the same way as people in the upper classes of society do.

179. You look upon these histories as trustworthy then?—I think so.

180. And supplying valuable information?—Yes. In fact, some years ago Dr. Shuttleworth and I drew up an account of about 2,500 cases, in which we went very carefully into the matter; it is rather important, and it may come in useful for the Committee to know the result. I may also say that a good many of the signs which have been so much talked about are not a matter that have come up now; they have been in use for the last 23 years in all the idiot asylums in England. I will show you a page of one of my own books, which will show you that we have been going into them all for the last 23 years. That is a copy of one of my books (*handing in the same*).

181. You ought to have a very valuable body of evidence?—We know the history of every child, whose parents we can get at, that comes into the institution. You first take the history, and then you pass on and examine the child. Perhaps it would be interesting if I were to give you the mode of treatment. Directly a child comes in he is put in what we call the observation block, or reception block, and is there kept for a fortnight. There are two advantages with regard to that: The first is, that if there is any infectious disease latent in the child, it gives it time to come out; and the second thing is, that it gives you an opportunity of examining the child and deciding into which block he shall afterwards be put, because there are a good many blocks, some for healthy children, some for epileptic children, some for paralysed children, and so on. After a fortnight he is put into his block, and the next thing is, he is sent to the school; then I go and speak to the schoolmistress and say "I want this child examined mentally, and as "much as possible done with him." She examines him as to whether he is able to read and write and use numbers, whether he can recognise his colours, what his powers of arithmetic are, and so on; or, if the child is a girl, whether she can hem or sew, and so on. Then periodically, every six months or so, a further examination is made and recorded in a book as to the progress that is made by the child, and he is moved up from class to class accordingly. The only defect, perhaps, at Darenth (and not only at Darenth, but in all the institutions throughout England) is, that we never had a sufficient number of teachers. The first and second class are always kept at about 25, but the other classes are always too large.

182. What sized class would you recommend?—I think a class should never be more than 20.

183. (*Dr. Smith.*) What number were they at Darenth?—The upper classes contained about from 20 to 25, but there were larger classes. I have been to a room and seen about 100, and the nurse and school monitor managing the lot, which is absurd. I always tried to point out to the committee that that was a great defect, but, unfortunately, the committee always took a pounds, shillings, and pence view of the matter and we could not get as much done as we wanted.

184. (*Chairman.*) What was the number of inmates?—When I left we had a thousand.

185. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) Not all in the school?—No, out of that number only about from 300 to 350 would be in the school.

186. I see the number is stated at 320?—Quite so.

187. (*Chairman.*) How many teachers would there be for those 320?—There would be the head schoolmistress, three school mistresses, and, I think, five school attendants, and three school monitors, that is to say, children who have been sufficiently improved but kept on as monitresses. The head schoolmistress did not teach, of course, at all; she only supervised. There were three teachers and five school attendants.

188. There were really only three teachers then for 320 children?—Assisted by five school attendants, that is to say, attendants who had to do work as attendants but were able to do something in the lower classes. Then, as we could not get more money out of the committee we got three girls who had passed through their education and were practically recovered, and we made them school monitresses.

189. Were they on a level with ordinary children?—No, they were treated as attendants.

190. But you say they were recovered patients?—Yes, perfectly.

191. And were they on a level with ordinary outside children?—Yes, certainly. I sent out a great many children from Darenth, whom, I suppose, would be called feeble-minded. I sent several to the Army and Navy. On one occasion that was the cause of three boys running away. A boy came down dressed up as a soldier, and our boys had a great idea of it, and used to say, "Doctor, cannot I be a soldier?" every morning. Presently, three ran away; two enlisted in the Army, and a third they would not take. The secretary also asked if I would bring you the cost per head. It is rather difficult to show that in this paper, because the cost per head of the children at Darenth Schools and of the patients at Darenth Asylum are included under one head.

192. Is that the cost of maintenance or the cost of schooling?—The cost of maintenance, and the whole cost.

193. What does it work out at?—The cost of maintenance just worked out at about 6¾*d.* a day, and the whole cost came to about 1*s.* 4½*d.* a day; it would come to about 9*s.* 7*d.* a week; that includes the total cost per head exclusive of works of a special character, building, &c.

194. (*Mr. Newton.*) Does that include all salaries?—Yes, it includes everything.

Mr. F. Beach, M.B., F.R.C.P., Lond.

10 Feb. 1897.

195. (*Chairman.*) This low average cost was obtained by starving the school staff?—Yes, the school staff is always starved; in fact, the school staff is starved throughout the whole of these institutions in England. In America it is very different; there they have a dozen schoolmistresses highly trained, and they have much better results in consequence.

196. So that the results of school teaching in Darenth are perfectly untrustworthy, because of the school staff at the present time?—Yes, we could get much better results if we had a better staff, no doubt. There is one point that I put down in the notes that I sent to you about the signs which are seen in ordinary children.

197. Signs of mental feebleness, do you mean?—Signs of defect which are met with in ordinary children.

198. You have given us some with regard to the shape of the head, the eyes, and so on; do you mean physical signs?—I refer to the most common forms of defect in children attending schools, and I did not give you what the most common forms were. I have worked this out very carefully, and I find that the most common forms of defect in ordinary children are, first of all, malformation of the head, secondly, a defect in the palate. I am now speaking of children among the 100,000 idiots and imbeciles that were examined.

199. We have had this before, have we not?—What I gave you before was the means of discriminating between an idiot or imbecile child and a feeble-minded child. These are defects which were found in ordinary children attending the public elementary schools at the present moment.

200. Who were not feeble-minded?—Who were not classed as feeble-minded.

201. You have found children in public elementary schools suffering from these defects?—Yes.

202. And you consider that they ought to have been in a special class?—Some of them ought, no doubt, to be put in a special class. I have no doubt they will be as time goes on and more schools are erected, but at present it is not done. There are only altogether seven signs that I look upon as of any great importance.

203. Are they different from those which you have already given us?—There are one or two that I did not give. I did not give you the epicanthic fold of the eyelid; I did not mention to you the defective expression in the eye; I did not mention to you the stunted growth that so many of these children have.

204. Passing on to epileptic children, are there some who should not be admitted to any school at all?—No doubt there are some who have fits so constantly that it is impossible they should be educated in school; they would upset the whole school.

205. Can you give us any definition of the class that might be admitted?—I think that a child who has epileptic fits only occasionally and very slightly might be sent to an ordinary school.

206. An ordinary elementary school?—I do not see why he should not.

207. Not if he frightened other children?—I think if he had fits very slightly and only occasionally he would not do so; the epileptic children did not frighten the children down at Darenth. About a third of our children at Darenth were epileptic, and I found the other children were most affectionate to them; if they found that the attendant was in another part of the block and could not go to one of them directly, they would put him on the floor, and untie his collar, and put their foot under his neck, and support him till the attendant came back. Then we had chairs especially constructed for epileptics in the schoolroom, and when a child had a severe fit he was put immediately into a chair.

208. Do you think it is right that epileptic children should mix with ordinary children?—I think not if they have fits very often, but if they have them simply slightly, say once a month, I see no reason why they should not. One of these children might go three or four months without a fit.

209. But would it not be better to supply special schools for them?—I think on the whole it would be better if the attacks were severe, certainly. I know that at Chalfont they are intending to build a home for boys and one for girls, and I believe General Moberly's idea is to send a good many of their epileptic children to those homes.

210. Do you know the proportion of epileptic children to the population; are there any statistics?—There are statistics—not in England but in Germany. It is supposed about one in every 1,000 is epileptic, and if you take that average we should have in England about 29,081 to provide for. Of course, out of that 29,081 a certain number would be idiots or imbeciles and a certain number would be sufficiently able to earn their own living, and the rest would, of course, have to be kept in colonies such as Chalfont, or in institutions for epileptics.

211. Have you any notion what the amount of the residuum would be; does that appear from foreign statistics?—I should say half. The Charity Organisation Society went into the question some years ago, and worked the matter out in that way. It is calculated, I think, at Potsdam, that 10 per cent. of the epileptic population should be provided for, and in other cases they say from 15 to 20 per cent.

212. At least 80 per cent. might go to the ordinary schools?—Yes. That would take in, of course, not only children belonging to ordinary schools, but the adult population as well.

213. And it would require some medical officer to decide whether those children should go to public elementary schools or to a special school, or should go to an idiot asylum?—Decidedly. A medical officer should decide first of all whether a child should go to a public elementary school; secondly, whether he should go to special classes; or, thirdly, whether he should be sent to some special institution erected for the purpose.

214. (*Mr. Pooley.*) Do you account low nutrition as one of the physical signs?—Yes, I do; there is a mass of information here that I have on that point, on which I have not been questioned, but I have it all here, and if you like to have it I can give it you. I have examined a good many of these children as well as Dr. Warner.

215. Is low nutrition a fair indication of feeble-mindedness?—It is an important sign in combination with other signs. You cannot say that any sign taken alone is a sign of feeble-mindedness; it is a combination of a large number of signs together that you must judge by.

216. That is a sign that could be noticed by an experienced teacher, of course, who had had a child under her treatment in school. I mean to say that it is not necessary to have a medical man to detect that sign?—Not thinness, of course; any teacher will observe a child getting thin under treatment.

217. Then as to the admission of children into idiot asylums and Darenth, is it clear that all the children admitted into these idiot asylums have been certified by the medical practitioner in the form you gave us?—By the parish doctor as a matter of fact.

218. By some medical practitioner?—Yes.

219. Do you think that in many cases children have been admitted who are capable of being educated so as to be wholly or partially self-supporting?—There is no doubt that there are a number of children (I sent out a good many) who are able to support themselves wholly.

220. Do you think they ought to be admitted when they were in that state?—No, they were not admitted in that state; they have commonly come into that condition by the education and training they received there.

221. But in some cases children may have been admitted who are capable of being educated (who were at the time capable) from an error of judgment on the part of the medical practitioner?—As a matter of fact I do not think so, because in many cases when the teacher says that child should be sent to Darenth, the medical practitioner says, "No, I do not think that child is bad enough to go."

222. You think that they do not err on the side of admitting them too easily?—No, never; it is always the other way. I do not think any cases were ever sent in who should not have been, the error was rather on the other side.

223. Then you found out that after being a certain time at Darenth, several of the children could be taught in the first standard, or even in the second?—Or even

Mr. F. Beach, M.B., F.R.C.P., Lond.

10 Feb. 1897.

the third; in fact, of course, they go on, until at last there were some children there who learnt their pence tables; these children afterwards became school monitresses, and there were children who could have gone to an ordinary school over 15 or 16 years of age, and over the age of the public elementary school.

224. You think they were mainly children who should be improved?—Yes, children of what I would call the feeble-minded class. No doubt, institutions of the present time contain idiots and imbeciles, and what we should now call feeble-minded.

225. And several of those children might be taught in ordinary public elementary schools with other children?—No, they should be taught in a special class. Practically, this question has gradually grown; years ago very little attention was directed to this class at all, and it is only within the last few years that we have gone into the question of the difference between idiots and imbeciles and feeble-minded.

226. Then these children are clearly children (some of them at all events) who might be taught with advantage in special classes if they did not happen to be at Darenth?—The only difference is that at Darenth they are pauper children, and at present there is no institution for the feeble-minded children belonging to the poor law.

227. But I mean so far as their mental power is concerned?—So far as their mental power is concerned there is no doubt that they should have been taught in special classes.

228. Do we understand aright that these children cannot be detained in Darenth without a periodical certificate that they are lunatics?—After they have been there a fortnight, this certificate comes into operation. After that there is no further certificate required; they can be detained for their lifetime if necessary.

229. The Lunacy Commissioners visit Darenth, of course, periodically?—Yes, this is an extract from the Lunacy Act of 1890-91 in the Appendix providing various certificates, some for admission of paupers into an asylum, others for the admission of paupers into a workhouse. Of course, as you are aware, all the workhouses in London have what are called lunatic wards, and a patient, an imbecile, cannot be detained in that workhouse ward unless this certificate is filled up; that is the law.

230. Then as regards the selection of children in ordinary elementary schools, to be taught in special classes, I understand you to agree that there is no marked line of division between the idiot and an ordinary intelligent child?—There is no marked line.

231. No definite division?—No definite division; they all merge one into the other.

232. I want to take the case of the child who is just defective enough not to benefit by being taught with the ordinary children. Which is the most important indication in such a case, do you think: the experience of a teacher who has had the child, we will say, six months or a year or two years, or a physical sign that can be detected by a medical examination?—I think it should be a combination. I think the medical officer should always come in in that case, and consult with the teacher on the point.

233. Are there cases of that sort where there is nothing that can be diagnosed very definitely by a medical practitioner, however skilled?—As a matter of fact, of course there is something or other generally found in these defective children or they would not be called defective. As a matter of fact with defects of mind you get defects of body; that we find in idiot asylums, and it is no doubt the same in special classes, there is some defect or other. But what I wanted to point out before was, that we must not go by visible signs alone, but questions should be put too, as I said just now, and the report on the scientific study of the mental and physical conditions of childhood itself admits that point, that not only the children should be observed but should be questioned as to their mental condition.

234. I want to ask you about the upper limit. Suppose a teacher says, I have taught this child for two years; it is nine years old. I cannot get it to pass in Standrd I., and I cannot teach it with the ordinary children; I think it would do much better in a special class; and supposing the doctor does not find any marked physical defect or any of these indications, would he be justified in deferring to the opinion of the teacher and putting that child into a special class?—He should put the mental points as well.

235. He should make the physical examination?—Yes, I want to put it strongly, that I do not believe any physical examination sign itself to be of use unless combined with a mental test of the child. You may get a child, shy apparently though he looks bright, who cannot fix his attention on any thing. A doctor will see that at once; he will see that he sees the thing but does not perceive it. There are many points on which a doctor's opinion is necessary. As I said before, you want a skilled medical man, accustomed to seeing these cases continually.

236. I understand you to say that you think a skilled medical man would always notice something?—I think so.

237. He would not have to rely solely on the opinion of the teacher?—I think he would be wise to consult the teacher in order to give his opinion. What I want to point out is this: Supposing that you see a child with an obvious defect or only a slight defect, the great point is that the doctor should at once examine that child as to his mental perception, his power of arithmetic, whether he can read or write, and put questions to him, and then, after consultation with the teacher on the whole matter, you can arrive at a very good opinion what the result should be, as to whether he should be kept or what should be done. The only point about it, I am sorry to say, is that only very recently the teachers have taken up the study of child life. In the last few years there has been an association formed, called the Child Study Association. That is not exactly what we call physical study, but the psychological study of children. It is a young movement at present, but it is being taken up by many teachers.

238. (*Chairman.*) Who is at the head of it?—Professor Sully is the head of it; it is an association formed by a number of teachers to which a number of doctors are allied, and they meet periodically and papers are read and discussed. Mr. Holman is a very prominent member of it.

239. (*Mr. Pooley.*) I should like to ask you one or two questions about epileptic children. You think a child who has an epileptic fit occasionally may properly be taught with other children in the elementary school?—I think so.

240. You think that such a child having an occasional fit would not frighten the other children sufficiently to make it necessary to forbid the child to attend school?—I think not; many of these fits are what we call *petit mal*—that is to say, the child goes suddenly pale, is unconscious for a moment, and then goes on again with his work. You would not remove that child from any school unless his mental condition required it.

241. Might his presence be even beneficial to the other children as having a humanising effect upon them, and teaching them to be sympathetic?—Yes, I think it would be. Children are always sympathetic, as a matter of fact, with other children suffering from any defect, and especially these children; they are of a very affectionate disposition, not only the idiots and the imbeciles, but the feeble-minded; and, practically, it is by working upon their affection that we do so much for discipline.

242. Then a child that has epileptic fits occasionally would be best taught with other children in the elementary school?—I think so.

243. And there would be no reason for sending such a child to a special class?—I see no reason unless his mental condition, as I say, required it. Of course, a good many children have epileptic fits, and their mental condition remains the same; other children have epileptic fits, and their mental condition is at once weakened. If there is that weakening of mental power, then, necessarily some special arrangement should be made.

244. Then in order to determine whether a child is unfit to attend an ordinary elementary school on account of epilepsy, would you rely mainly upon medical opinion?—Certainly.

245. (*Miss Townsend.*) I suppose the physical tests which you would apply for idiots and imbeciles would be the same, necessarily, that you would apply for merely feeble-minded children?—Yes.

246. You would apply the same tests, and judge by their relative importance whether the child was feeble-minded, or idiot, or imbecile?—Yes.

247. I should like to know at what age, as nearly as possible, or after how long a test, you would decide that the merely feeble-minded child had become idiotic, which, of course, happens sometimes?—It is difficult to say, because it depends entirely upon the condition of the child's brain—so much depends upon the congenital formation of the child. Most of the defects that I have mentioned are congenital—there are numbers of others that I have not mentioned. I wrote down about 60 showing signs of congenital deficiency, and not showing such signs.

248. So that further medical supervision is necessary in the case of feeble-minded children; it is necessary that they should be regularly or frequently inspected by medical men?—I think they should be inspected say once a year, or something of that sort.

249. To decide whether they are better or worse?—Yes.

250. In the case of a child who was supposed to be feeble-minded but whose home circumstances were so bad that it was difficult to judge whether it was merely neglect or imbecility, would it be desirable that such a child should be sent to the country for two or three months or put under happier auspices before you decide whether it could join other children or must necessarily be put into a special class?—I think it an excellent idea.

251. To avoid the danger of putting the merely delayed development together with the deficient development?—Quite so. There are many children, you know, paralysed, and there were some at Darenth, whom the doctor who sent them thought were mentally deficient, but practically they were fairly bright.

252. And a happier home life, boarding them out in the country for two or three months, would tend better to develop them than sending them at once to the elementary school?—I think it an excellent suggestion.

253. Would the fact of a child being unable to speak, say, at six or seven years of age prove it, in your opinion, at once to be mentally deficient, or only delayed. We have had two or three such cases in our home at Aubert Park, where quite old children have been unable to speak, but have slowly and gradually learnt to speak, and are apparently not otherwise deficient. Have you met with such cases?—Yes, a great number; in fact, a large number of the children admitted into Darenth were quite unable to utter other than an ejaculatory sound, and there is a speech drill that they go through.

254. So you would not take that muteness as an infallible test of mental deficiency?—No, not an infallible test, because other tests would have to be applied to it. I say that I do not consider that any one test alone, however bad or good, can be relied upon.

255. You have found, have you not, that many feeble-minded children are capable of acquiring a considerable amount of mechanical intellectual knowledge, such as reciting or learning by heart or singing, who are still incapable of taking care of themselves after school age?—Yes; those are what we call *idiot savants*—children whose memories have been unduly developed. Of course, as a matter of fact, it is done as a matter of advertisement; people say, if you send children to Earlswood they will show you what they can do; there is a boy there who will tell you the day of the week 20 years hence.

256. So that they can develop on one side and deteriorate on the other?—Directly you go into the matter, you will find the reasoning power, judgment, instinct of self-preservation, and all that kind of thing have not been attended to.

257. So that it is desirable that, after their school age, they should have some further training or test to decide whether they are capable of earning their living or taking care of themselves in the world, or are likely to do mischief?—Quite so. I think there is a great question looming in the distance, what should become of all the feeble-minded and imbecile girls who remain in the country. So far you are only providing six homes throughout England for them. What is going to happen to all the enormous number of feeble-minded girls who will pass out of your special schools and the idiot children as well? It seems to me that in many cases you will have to provide, as they do in America, what they call custodial houses; it is a question which the Committee will be bound to take in hand, because it is a very important question.

258. Then, might I ask about Darenth, if defective but teachable children, whose parents are not otherwise in receipt of Poor Law relief, improve sufficiently to live at home and go to special classes at the elementary school, are they discharged from Darenth and sent home?—We never had a case of that kind there. As a matter of fact, the gentlemen's children were always very bad cases.

Mr. F. Beach, M.B., F.R.C.P., Lond.

10 Feb. 1897.

259. I did not mean gentlemen's children?—I beg your pardon.

260. On the contrary, I meant poor people not receiving Poor Law relief?—Yes, a few cases I did send out in that way; they were improved, and sent to the elementary school.

261. Only a few?—Only a few.

262. You do not think there are many at Darenth who might be sent to special classes at the elementary school?—I do not think there are many.

263. Not among these 328?—No, I do not think so. You could not do it in that way, because they are Poor Law children, and you could not send them to an elementary school; at present all Poor Law children have to go to a Poor Law school.

264. (*Mr. Pooley.*) Are they taken from families sometimes—taken from home? (*Miss Townsend.*) That is my question, really. I know, as a fact, children that go to Darenth are taken from their own home.—Yes, I used to encourage it to a great extent, because the usual practice was to send the children to the workhouse, and for the doctor of the workhouse to certify the child, and then it was sent on. I have a great objection to children being sent to the workhouse at all. I was always glad if the child could be sent from its home direct.

265. Then, in the case of children sent from their own home, whose parents contribute 2*s.* or 3*s.* a week for their maintenance, supposing them to improve sufficiently in your opinion to leave the institution and go to the special classes of the board school, are they ever sent home?—There were no cases sent in my time, because special classes had hardly been formed, but, as a matter of fact, I do not see why they should not be; the only thing is, the teacher at Darenth might say: "I want to see how many cases I can improve;" and it is of course the interest of the doctor there to keep as many cases as he could improve.

266. But, looking at it from the child's point of view entirely, is it not desirable that he should be sent home?—I think it is desirable that he should be sent home when he has attained a certain condition, when he could go to special classes.

267. But as a matter of fact he very seldom is?—Yes.

268. May I ask one question about epileptic children. My experience has been that epileptic fits are so far contagious among the feeble-minded that it is very undesirable to have epileptic children among feeble-minded children. Would you agree with me in that?—Frequent epileptic fits, do you mean?

269. Yes, fairly frequent—not children with such fits as you have mentioned, where they scarcely hear for a moment what is passing, but ordinary epileptic children. Would you not agree that it is undesirable to have them among feeble-minded children—for instance, to admit them into feeble-minded homes?—I think where they are subject to them, they should be sent to an institution for such cases.

270. The fits are liable to be so far contagious that other children have an imitation of them?—Yes, they do that. Many of the children at Darenth have made most excellent representations of an epileptic fit.

271. And the same thing would hold in special feeble-minded classes in the Board schools?—Yes, if they had them very often.

272. Even fairly often, once a month?—Yes; I do not know whether once a month would make a difference.

273. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) You said that 50 years ago there was no attempt to educate the idiot; do you think that the State benefits (leaving out the individuals) by the education and the money spent upon the idiot?—I certainly think so, and no doubt the mother does. There are several cases in which the mother became a pauper and was on the rates simply because she had to attend to her idiot child. Directly the child was removed from the mother's care and

Mr. F. Beach, M.B., F.R.C.P., Lond.

10 Feb. 1897.

placed in an institution, the mother was able to earn her living, and come off the rates.

274. So that both the State and the individual are benefited by the education of the idiot?—Yes; the child's life is made more happy, he has a certain amount of knowledge, and if he is able to be employed in trade, is able to do something towards his maintenance.

275. For the moment I am not thinking of the happiness of the child, but as a factor in the State, the child is better so educated than left as it was 50 years ago?—Yes, I think so.

276. Could you compare the standard we here have set up for the feeble-minded child with that on the Continent; could you tell us whether we are taking a lower or a higher standard than they take in Germany, I mean?—Unfortunately I have never been through your classes, Mrs. Burgwin, but I know that in Christiana they have ten special classes; of course, you have seen them yourself, and would be better able to judge.

277. In Germany you will find the children up to our fifth and sixth standard work in the upper standards in the idiot school—that is to say, the children classed as idiots?—Yes.

278. You say that at Chalfont no epileptic who is imbecile is admitted?—No.

279. So that practically we have no accommodation for an imbecile epileptic except as a lunatic?—The only accommodation that we have at present is in an Idiot Asylum, or Lunatic Asylum. Of course, at present we have only two homes erected for epileptics, in each of which 18 men, that is in all 36 men, live; we are now erecting a home for women, but we have not done so much for women because, as you are aware, Lady Meath has a home at Godalming into which 50 female epileptics are admitted, and there is a home at Maghull as well. There are only three institutions at present, the National Home, at Chalfont; the Alexandra Home, at Maghull; and Lady Meath's Home at Godalming.

280. You spoke about the medical man examining the epileptic child, that he should determine whether it was fit to associate in the normal school, I will call it. Could he decide that without having seen the child in a fit?—Yes, he could tell by the amount of mental deterioration that has taken place.

281. That is to say, if he saw a child during the time in which it was affected by a fit?—Some children who have epileptic fits are always mentally deteriorated, the mental deterioration lasts continually; in some cases it comes on only after the fit, and then passes off; but there are other cases in which it is constant, and the child becomes practically feeble-minded and imbecile as the result of the fit.

282. Would you think that the atmosphere of a class of 60 children, all intelligent, and working at a high pressure, would be a fit condition to place that epileptic child in; would it be to its benefit or not?—It would be to the child's benefit, because he would be with children of equal, or certainly better, intellect than himself. I should not do it; as I say, I do not believe it should be done, when the child has many epileptic fits; but I think it would be a pity, because a child has an occasional epileptic fit, he should be passed off at once to a home where children probably have much worse fits than he has himself.

283. You do not think the pressure is bad?—Probably the child who has the epileptic fits would not be often a child in the highest class.

284. I have found that they are sometimes exceptionally clever, only that the work for a few days after a fit is distinctly, from my point of view, injurious to the child. What the medical man misses is the tone of the school; he wants to be able to judge, when there is a child before him, what its condition is in the school in its surroundings there, and I think it is there where you can judge for the child best in that way. Now, speaking about the Act for admission to the Poor Law schools, I think you meant us quite to understand that the parent becomes a pauper only in the case of admitting the child to Darenth?—Yes.

285. It may be so?—Yes.

286. But we should not usually understand that as a pauper person, I think?—No, I think it is wrong; I think the stigma ought to be removed.

287. That is what I wanted to bring out—that that is a point that should certainly be removed, you would think. In judging a child you say that you have to take it as a whole, there is no one sign you would judge a feeble-minded child upon?—That is so.

288. You spoke a good deal about calculation. In judging a child as deficient, would you call calculation the best test, or reading?—Calculation, of the two.

289. Well, I have found by five years' experience that I can get calculation very much better and readier than I can get reading; reading is much more difficult to teach, and you would find it the same at Darenth in going there and comparing the reading and arithmetic?—As a matter of fact that is so, because the children at Darenth did certainly take up numbers more readily than they did at other schools. Comparing it with Earlswood, Lancaster, and other places, I found our children far beyond them so far as arithmetic was concerned, and that no doubt was due to the fact that we had a large number of imbecile children and not so many idiotic children as they have in the other schools.

290. But the medical man in judging of children should have a very good knowledge of what the average child does at a given age in an elementary school, say, to judge them, I mean, educationally?—Yes; a good many children of course are backward in developing and the intellect seems to improve suddenly; they are backward at seven or eight, and at ten you find them up to the average of an ordinary school

291. Would you think it well to keep at a day school children of feeble mind to 16 instead of 14 as the Act now provides?—If they could be properly sheltered at home I think it would be a great advantage that they should be allowed to stay till 16 years of age.

292. I want to press that point. Would you make the law compulsory for the attendance of the defective child until it was 16 years of age?—I would.

293. From your knowledge do you think that there is a sufficient number of defective children just over school age, who are unfit to take their place in society, for the State to be asked to provide homes for this class?—I think there is quite a sufficient number.

294. To themselves and to the State they are a danger if left unprotected after 16 years of age?—Yes, in both cases, not only girls but boys as well.

295. You will have noticed that a feeble-minded child on certain points may be quite precocious; it may be money, it may be precocious in thieving, and yet on other points it would seem quite normal?—Yes.

296 You would admit that such a child is a great difficulty?—Yes; there are a great many what we call mentally exceptional children.

297. Moral deficiency I want to come to?—Yes, moral deficiency—they thieve and tell lies, they are cunning and very often set fire to houses; they are a danger to the State practically.

298. And yet if you came to examine that child, give it ten minutes examination——?—You would find it one of the brightest children you have. What is very commonly known as the moral imbecile is intellectually very sharp but morally is on as low a level as possible; in fact, so much so that Dr. Kerlin said he would not educate his moral imbeciles any more, for he found that the uneducated moral imbecile was not such a great danger as the educated moral imbecile.

299. You think that provision should be made for training these children?—Yes, I think they should be trained, but I think they should be trained in homes.

300. (*Mr. Newton.*) The London School Board has in one of its reports got certain figures about epileptics. Would you be disposed to accept them. They are like this. They make 210 epileptics only between 3 and 13 years of age out of a total population of 833,000 between 3 and 13. That is about one epileptic case only to 4,000 children?—I should think that proportion is very small. My idea would be that that is not enough, judging, as I said before, from what the general idea is, one per thousand. That is one per about every 4,000.

301. You think they cannot be trusted?—They cannot be trusted.

302. And in the same way they make out only about 777 defective children out of the same number, that is only about one defective child to every thousand children—that is wrong, I suppose?—It must be wrong.

303. Is epilepsy brought on at all by indigestible food, by bad diet?—Certainly, convulsions are brought on in that way, which may continue and then become epileptic. Indigestible food is one of the most common causes of convulsions in children, and unfortunately where the habit of convulsions has existed for a considerable time, it is apt to pass beyond the convulsive stage into what we call the epileptic stage, and the child is subject to epileptic fits from time to time.

304. Then that points, does it not, rather to the consideration that proper feeding, in the case of many epileptics, is as necessary as special schooling?—Yes, quite so; there is a special diet; all the epileptics at Chalfont have a special diet for it.

305. To go to something else, would you accept this statement of Dr. C. Mercier's: "The line that divides "the dull or weak-minded man from an imbecile is the "ability to earn a living"?—Practically, a weak-minded man can earn a living if he has been properly taught.

306. But the imbecile cannot?—The imbecile can earn a living in the institution but not out of it.

307. Not in the outside world?—No. You see we taught these children these trades for three reasons, first of all that they should be able to have something to do, secondly, that they should help to supplement their maintenance, and, thirdly, that if they recovered and were sent outside they should have some trade to fall back upon.

308. Do you think that the medical man who should admit a feeble-minded child to a special class would give the teacher any practical advice as to the way that child should be trained when once in the class?—I think he might inspect the child from time to time; the teacher would probably have some difficulties which he would like to consult him about.

309. Would he be able to say, for instance, that such and such a child should have more than the ordinary allowance of manual work, kindergarten work, and less reading and writing, and so on?—Yes, I think so.

310. And you think that the medical inspector should give advice of that sort?—I think so, certainly.

311. (*Dr. Smith.*) You said that the Metropolitan Asylums Board had taken a retrograde step. I was not quite clear what you meant by that?—That a child should be made a lunatic now instead of being kept as an idiot.

312. But has the Asylums Board any voice in that matter; is it not bound to do so?—According to law; but the Asylums Board has the power to apply to the Government to have it altered.

313. That is not quite the question. Under the law as it now is the Asylums Board has no option in the matter, has it?—No; but I say in my opinion it is a retrograde step as regards the child.

314. I made a note that you attributed it to the Board, but if I quite understood the position which you wish the Committee to grasp it is this, that a child is admitted into Darenth Asylum on the certificate which is given in the Idiots Act?—No, it is not so, for this reason. I brought the question up some time ago, and asked that Darenth might be made an asylum registered under the Idiots Act; I believe the Board applied to the Commissioners, and the Commissioners said, no, we were not a registered hospital, we were not a licensed house, therefore we must remain as we were, they could not let us be registered under the Idiots Act. The Idiots Act applies simply to so-called charitable institutions, and not to Darenth. I do not mean to reflect upon the managers of the Asylums Board at all; they cannot help themselves. I say it is a retrograde step so far as the child goes.

315. That is what I wanted to show. A child cannot be admitted into Darenth Asylum except through the Poor Law?—No.

316. And as it is looked upon as a Poor Law institution, after a child has been admitted for a fortnight you have to give this second certificate?—Yes.

317. But all that evil is brought about by the institution not being registrable under the Idiots Act?—Quite so.

318. But it is a pauper institution?—Yes.

319. Therefore to get rid of that difficulty, legislation would be desirable to remove the taint of pauperism?—Yes.

320. That is what you wish to say?—That is what I wish to say.

Mr. F. Beach, M.B. F.R.C.P., Lond.

10 Feb. 1897.

321. Now as regards epileptics in schools, the question of where you would place an epileptic depends altogether upon the amount of mental deterioration which is associated with the child, does it not?—Yes.

322. And by mental deterioration you mean a permanent condition of things?—Yes, clearly,

323. In other words, if you have a child suffering occasionally from an epileptic fit, but no mental deterioration, you see no reason why it should not be admitted to an elementary school?—No, provided he does not have the fits very very often.

324. That is an ordinary school?—Yes.

325. Can you conceive any condition of a child which would justify an epileptic being admitted into the special classes?—If the child had not fits very frequently, and his mental condition were such as applies to children admitted into the special classes, I think the child might be admitted there; I want to guard myself again by saying frequent fits naturally upset any school; it is an occasional fit I refer to, which I do not think would upset a school.

326. You will correct me if I am wrong. You would say you would admit a child into a special school who had an occasional epileptic fit, and who had in addition such an amount of mental defect as would, apart from the consideration of the epilepsy, justify its admission into a special class?—Yes.

327. How would you propose to deal with the others who are left?—Those who have frequent epileptic fits should be moved and put into some institution where they could be taught.

328. But then there is no such institution existing?—There is no such institution now.

329. You say they would not be admitted at Chalfont?—No, not if they are defective.

330. So, therefore, for that class of children some provision is desirable?—Yes. Where I think Chalfont may come in will be for children having epileptic fits, and who are not very much deteriorated, and whose parents would wish them to be put into some institution where they could be cared for out of school as well as in school.

331. Then it would be a question between Chalfont and special classes?—Yes.

332. Then I think we quite understand your definitions—if I understand you aright you say there are two classes of signs or symptoms which have to be taken into consideration to arrive at a proper conclusion relative to any given child from the point of view of these classes?—More than two, probably.

333. I am speaking generally, those are physical signs and mental signs?—Yes.

334. You have enumerated certain physical signs, and I do not think we need go into those, and you say a right conclusion cannot be obtained without proper consideration being given to the whole?—Certainly.

335. And that such consideration can only be properly given by a skilled person?—Certainly.

336. And by a skilled person you have said that you mean some medical person who has had experience in this matter?—Yes.

337. Of course, the measurement of the head is not a very difficult matter?—No; it is the consideration of the whole question, the consideration of several symptoms together, which a medical man is the only person who can possibly judge of.

338. And he is only capable of giving an opinion consequent upon the special training which he has had?—Quite so.

339. This paper which you have given us here, and which you say is in use at Dareuth, evidently has not a material bearing upon the advisability of admitting a case?—No, that is simply a history of the case.

340. You have this to complete your picture, as it were, of the whole case?—Quite so.

341. You have enough before you to justify the opinion which you have arrived at, but to complete the picture and make it fully representative of the case, you obtain this extra information?—Yes.

342. And your future treatment and direction of the case would, of course, be influenced by a consideration of the whole of the facts thus obtained of the case?—Certainly.

Mr. F. Beach, M.B., F.R.C.P., Lond.

10 Feb. 1897.

343. I want to clear up a little point which you made with the Chairman. You said there are only six medical men in the kingdom capable of arriving at a proper conclusion on this matter; I take it what you meant by that was that there were practically six recognised experts, if we may use the term?—Yes.

344. But you would see no difficulty in a medical man who has had a good medical training, and with the experience which would naturally come from association with such a department of work, being thoroughly competent to deal with this matter?—Quite so. I should consider yourself an expert to some extent.

345. I do not speak of myself, but you would see no difficulty in an ordinary medical man or woman obtaining sufficient knowledge to deal, as I say, efficiently with the subject?—He would want to have some instruction upon the point, as every man has.

346. I might give you an example. Medical officers of health only came into vogue in 1875; but prior to that there was no knowledge on the subject?—Yes.

347. Then there is a little difference too, as regards medical men of the present day, in this, is there not, that all medical students now, as a necessity, are obliged to attend an asylum before they can obtain a qualification?—Yes, an asylum for lunatics.

348. And that is only a recent regulation?—Yes, but there is no law to compel them to attend an asylum for idiots and imbeciles. As a matter of fact, I did what I could; I used to have about 60 students down every year, and train them upon this point, but that was simply a voluntary affair on my own part; there is no law to compel them, unfortunately.

349. But what I mean is, that they do have now a special training in lunacy, which was not compulsory a few years ago?—Quite so.

350. You think a class should never be more than 20?—Yes.

351. And your opinion is, that Darenth errs in the direction; that it has larger classes than that?—Yes.

352. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) I think Dr. Smith has asked nearly all the questions I had intended to ask, but I will just supplement them with a few more. First of all I would ask whether, in your experience, you have not been led to place considerable importance upon the antecedents of the child and the family history in forming a conclusion, not only as to the mental state at the particular time of the examination, but as to the prospect of improvement?—Quite so.

353. I had in mind certain inherited morbid taints, for instance; you perhaps can tell us something about that?—No doubt the history of intemperance in the father is a most important point, as the history of epilepsy and imbecility and weakness of mind is a very important point; in fact, there are so many important points that it is almost impossible to enumerate the number, but one is guided to a great extent, so far as prognosis of the child's improvement goes, by the history one gets of inherited mental conditions. Inherited mental conditions, I may inform the Committee, play a very important part in the production of these children. I do not know whether any histories are taken of feeble-minded children in special classes or not.

(*Mrs. Burgwin.*) Oh, yes.

354. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) Have you at times met with a child who has gone on very well through two or three standards, and then suddenly begun to retrograde, and have you been able by medical examination to determine some inherited taint?—Yes, there is a well recognised class of those children who, at the age of 12 or 14 suddenly retrograde, and go to the bad instead of improving; it is generally due to some morbid blood taint.

355 Very often inherited syphilis?—Yes.

356. But those are certain points which a person who is not a skilled observer must necessarily lose sight of?—Yes.

357. And you think they are important elements in explaining sometimes the mental deficiency of a case?—Yes.

358. And then there was a point with regard to manual training. Has it occurred in your experience that a child who has not got on at all well with book work will get on well with manual training, and the process of manual training intelligently applied has distinctly developed his intellectual powers?—Yes, there are a great many children, as I mentioned just now, who have great mechanical aptitude, but who are intellectually low. By a careful ascertaining of what employment is best for the child, we find that the child improves, not only manually but intellectually as well.

359. I had in mind a boy, for instance, who could not learn to read, but when put to the printer's press to compose became a good reader subsequently. That is a case within my own knowledge. You, no doubt, know of similar cases?—Yes, certainly.

360. You told us that all your patients on going to Darenth were put into an observation block, and during the time they were there you were able to gather something of their mental capacity?—That is where one examined the child, and decided on which block he should afterwards be put in.

361. The question suggested is, whether the ordinary elementary school is not analogous to some extent to that observation block with regard to the selection of children for special classes; that would be the place where their peculiarities are probably found out?—Yes, of course they would have to be judged by the medical officer as to whether they would be suitable subjects to be sent to the special classes.

362. And the medical officer would, of course, judge of that after they had been in school some time, and the teacher had first noticed certain deficiencies which would cause the teacher to bring the case under the notice of the medical officer?—Yes.

363. Then there was only one other question. You were asked a question about low nutrition; could you give us an account of low nutrition that would be perfectly clear as to what it depends upon?—Low nutrition is in some cases due to bad nutrition, and in some cases it is constitutional to the child.

364. That is the point. It has been found that children who are constitutionally subject to low nutrition cannot be made fat whatever you give them to eat?—Yes.

365. That is a matter on which medical knowledge is useful, I think?—Yes.

366. (*Dr. Smith.*) One question about mutes; assuming that a medical observer was in possession of the signs and mode of communicating with a mute, then in the case of a child who has been for some time under tuition in a deaf class, where a question arises as to his mental capacity, if he could utilize these methods he would be in a position to judge rightly of such a case, would he not?—Oh, yes.

367. If he knew the sign language of the mute he could deal with the case?—Yes.

368. Of course, in the case of a mute the evidence afforded by the teacher who had had the child under observation for a long period would be exceedingly valuable?—Quite so.

369. But to afford the Authority a skilled independent judgment, if the medical observer had knowledge of the language, then he would have no difficulty in dealing with such a case?—No.

370. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) I have only one or two additional questions to ask you. You spoke at the beginning of your evidence about children with peculiarly formed heads, microcephalous, hydrocephalous, and so on, and afterwards were asked whether the teacher could not by measuring arrive at a conclusion with regard to the mental deficiency of such a child?—I did not mean to say that.

371. Is there not also something in the form of heads as well as the measurement; is it a matter merely of tape measurement?—No, it is a matter of the form of the head in connection with the whole body. I simply meant that the teacher could put the tape round the head, but I did not think she would be much wiser after than she was before.

372. Then with regard to the question that was put as to whether a medical officer could furnish certain information to the teacher as to the mode of training, could he not point out that a certain child was of a nervous temperament, and that he must not be pushed too much in certain directions; that manual training should be substituted for head work in such a case, and so on?—Certainly.

373. Then with regard to the number of experts who are able to deal with these subjects at present, is it not the fact that these questions are settled by supply

and demand, and if there should be a demand there would probably be a supply of medical men who would take the trouble to qualify themselves?—I think so; demand always produces supply. Of course, they would have to be trained as to how to take the observations.

374. (*Chairman.*) Out of the 320 children at Darenth only 40 were educable, I believe?—Only 40 who attained a high degree of proficiency for an imbecile.

375. I was introduced the other day to two classes there of about 20 each?—Those were educable, but the third and fourth classes were educable as well. The first and second classes are the ones you can do most with, of course.

376. And the highest point these children had arrived at was working long mechanical sums which they did not in the least understand?—That is absurd, of course; they should have been grounded in the first place (as they are always) by reasoning power as well. I cannot understand a child doing multiplication unless it has been so grounded.

377. Do you think that mentally deficient children can be so well grounded in arithmetic as to reach the Third Standard?—We had children doing pence tables; I forget your Third Standard.

378. Compound sums?—In a few cases they work compound sums.

379. Mechanically or with intelligence?—Those that I speak of at the time I was there understood what they meant.

380. I am not clear about the epileptic cases; would you exclude all who did not produce a medical certificate?—I think it is most important that the medical certificate should be required. At the present time cases constantly come before me suffering from epilepsy very badly, and I always give them a certificate freeing them from attendance at school.

381. Would it not be simpler not to mix them with other children, but to divide them into grades?—Yes.

382. Into how many grades would you divide them?—I forget exactly at what age the children come under training at the elementary school.

383. At 5 it is compulsory; 5 to 14?—I think about two grades would do.

384. Now, about the age to which you would extend their training. The blind and deaf children are trained up to the age of 16; would you be disposed to carry the education of these mentally deficient children up to the age of 18?—Feeble-minded children, I think, certainly up to 16 or 18. It constantly occurs that as a child gets to the later time of his school life he makes greater progress in the last year or two than before, and it is always to my mind a great wrong done to children, because the children at Darenth were called adults, according to the Poor Law, at the age of 16. I pointed out to the managers that at 16 is often the time that a child is beginning to make improvement.

Mr. F. Beach, M.B., F.R.C.P., Lond.

10 Feb. 1897.

385. From 16 to 18 they develop more rapidly?—Yes, in many cases they do. I know the last year I was at school I learnt more than in the former years, because I was aware of the amount of good education was doing me.

386 (*Mr. Peeling.*) I want to ask about epileptics. You said that all epileptics except those who had frequent fits you thought might attend the ordinary elementary school; all those who became a little deficient in their intellect That leaves for the institution only those who have frequent fits. Do you think that such children should come naturally under the school authority or under some other authority; I mean would their education be a subordinate part?—I think the epileptic child in the matter of education should come under the education authority in every case where education comes in.

387. But as to the power of sending them to an institution, when you get them to the institution would the chief part of their treatment be medical or educational?—The chief part would be educational. The doctor would have to regulate their diet and give them medicines, and, of course, he would be in charge of the whole management of the case. I think if you had institutions sufficiently large you should have a medical officer resident there.

388. You would not class them with hospital cases?—Yes, but education should be the chief point supplemented by manual and industrial treatment. I am speaking of cases which have not much mental deterioration but which require treatment. What we have found so far, at Chalfont, in the matter of adults is this: we have a medical board, and six of us meet together, and every case comes before us to be judged whether the man is a proper person to be received. We first of all have a certificate from a doctor who sees this person and certifies that the case is a proper one for Chalfont. Then the medical board, consisting of six physicians in London, meet, and we go fully into the matter of the case, and decide whether the man is a fit case for Chalfont or not; then his name is put on a list and he waits his turn, because we have only room at present for 36; but there must be another 36 waiting to come in at the present time, I should think.

The witness withdrew.

Mr. JAMES KERR, M.A., M.D., called in and examined.

Mr J. Kerr, M.A., M.D.

389. (*Chairman.*) You are Medical Superintendent, I believe, to the Bradford School Board?—I am.

390. What are your duties as Medical Superintendent?—I have the general oversight of all matters relating to the health of all the children in all the schools under the Board.

391. And the pupil teachers and teachers?—I look after the pupil teachers at the central classes in an indirect way. I fill up Form 42 of the Education Department, for instance, and that means an examination of each teacher; I make a thorough examination and keep a record of it.

392. If a teacher breaks down does she come to you?—She may be referred to me by the Board; she does not necessarily come to me.

393. You say in the notes with which you have furnished me that mentally deficient children come before you in three different ways (1) either ordinary board school children, or (2) children unfit for school, or (3) doubtful children?—That is so. I go round, of course. I visit schools at irregular intervals. I go from school to school, and any child that a teacher has any difficulties about, or is doubtful or anxious about, will be presented to me for my opinion.

394. How often do you visit each school?—Possibly once in three or four months; sometimes I visit as often as twice a week.

395. If the children have any defect of any kind you see them?—If they have any defect or cause of anxiety I see them. Visual defect is a regular thing; we have a regular systematic examination of every child for that.

396. For colour blindness?—Not for colour blindness, simply acuity of vision.

397. How many children have you selected out of the Bradford schools to go to special classes?—The first time I went round a number of schools just to see the material that I had to deal with, and out of about 10,000 children in the schools I visited, I selected 117 as distinctly unfit for the ordinary school; there were probably twice that number that I passed over as able to go on with school work.

398. You found others defective in speech?—Yes, and some defective in articulation, and some defective in hearing—all sorts of defects; 117 children I put down as mentally deficient.

399. What about the others who were scarcely educable with other children, either through defect of vision or hearing?—Those had to go on in the ordinary schools, most of them; some are comparatively deaf and some are half blind.

400. But there were a great many more defective children than that?—A great many more.

401. Can you tell the Committee how many defective children there are in Bradford?—I estimated for the School Board 2 per cent. of the total number of children in attendance as being the number that they should supply special classes for.

402. How many does that give for the town of Bradford?—That will give about 350. I estimated

Mr. J. Kerr, M.A., M.D.

10 Feb. 1897.

2 per cent., roughly. I think Dr. Warner estimated 16 per 1,000, which is just a little below that; but he has not, of course, the facts at his disposal that I have about the children.

403. Two per cent., you say, require special teaching?—That was a rough estimate.

404. That is to say about 300 children in Bradford?—There are 28,000 children in the board schools; 20,000 children in the standards.

405. And that estimate is based upon a personal examination of each child and of the defects noted?—Yes, and that is an estimate derived from an examination of 20,000 children.

406. And for that you did not take the Standard I. children?—In some cases Standard I. was omitted in these schools, but I allowed for that and it came to about 2 per cent.

407. At what age do you draw the lowest limit at which there is a possibility of finding out mental defect?—Then I was taking them from seven years and upwards; now I draw the line at eight years of age.

408. You think that is a fit limit to take?—I think it is a safer limit to take.

409. You found that from seven to eight years of age in some cases you were wrong in the first instance, did you?—No; but I think they do just as well in the infant department until eight years of age, except in rare cases.

410. Do you test them for mental deficiency by the standard that they have reached?—The first method of selecting a child in all cases is that the teacher selects him for my observation.

411. But they do not get on on a level with their fellows, do they?—Because they are different from other children.

412. But there may be some of those who are only slow in development, may there not?—That is so; there are some that are a little bit backward.

413. There are 117 children that you were clear about; how many were you doubtful about?—I could not tell you distinctly because I did not keep notes of those children.

414. Then you have a special class in Bradford, have you not?—We have five special classes.

415. Are these 117 children divided into five special classes?—These 117 children were just the first basis to go upon, and were used as material for special classes, but we have had one special class open now since November 1894, and the other four were opened a year later.

416. Of what size do you make your classes?—About 20 is the limit; some are a dozen.

417. They were taught in classes of 66 or 70 before, were they?—Yes.

418. That would account in some degree for their making no progress, would it not?—I think so.

419. No class should exceed 40 or 45, should it?—Or less than that.

420. You have gone all through the board schools?—Yes.

421. But you have put 178 children down here; how is that?—After the first preliminary class had been started for some eight or nine months, and the Board agreed to start four other classes, I made a comprehensive list of all children who I thought would do for those classes, and I had a first list of 178.

422. How do you make out the difference between 178 and 117?—Because I went over more schools then.

423. Do you find the same proportion hold good of the larger number?—Practically.

424. That is to say 2 per cent. on the two different calculations?—About 2 per cent., yes; that is the top limit.

425. Perhaps you will tell the committee what process you went through in determining that?—As I have already said, the first thing I inquire into is what is known of the child, how the teacher has noticed that it is different from other children.

426 Does the teacher supply you with a history of the child from birth?—The teacher will show me a boy perhaps of 10 years of age, and say: "This boy has "been in Standard I. five years, and he will be there "another five years."

427. Has the teacher taken the trouble to ascertain the history of that child?—Sometimes the child has been in that school all the time.

428. I mean the history from birth?—You cannot expect the teachers to do that.

429. I thought they might have done it, perhaps from sympathy with the child?—No, I do not think so. They will often give you a rough idea of what the medical facts are, which, however, is scarcely worth listening to.

430. Have you asked them to learn as much as they can of the history of the child?—Yes in cases where the child has come before me I generally ask the teacher, do you know if he has had fits as an infant or anything else, and they often get a history given by the garrulous mothers; these children's mothers often are rather garrulous.

431. But the chief fact is that they have been so many years in the standard?—Yes.

432. Do you find the teachers keen observers of the general attitude and demeanour of the children?—The infant mistresses particularly observe well I think.

433. But the infants do not come under your notice, do they?—I often ask about a child who has been in their department; I say, "So and so was with you, "what do you think of him." But I examine the children as well for certain physical peculiarities; I daresay you have had them narrated to you.

434. The shape of the head, the ears and the eyes, and so on, you mean?—Yes, and the curved little fingers is one of my own tests.

435. Do you build much upon the curvature of the fingers?—Not very much, but I think it is as important a test as the arched palate or lobeless ear.

436. It is a test of the nervous system, perhaps?—I think it is a test of want of development of the finer muscles, as other tests are of the want of development of the coarser muscles.

437. But you do not look so much upon the nervous side, do you, as upon mental deficiency as shown by the school work?—There are various physical signs. There are the coarser signs and there are a series of finer signs that defy analysis almost; there is a *tout ensemble* about a child that is defective that you cannot describe, but which a medical man who has had experience knows at once.

438. Can you describe it to the committee?—No, I say that you cannot describe it.

439. I see you give some cases in your notes?—Yes, I have given you the notes of some special cases there.

440. They do not seem to give you much indication. One is, "With obvious signs of nerve defect"; the next one is, "Without obvious signs of nerve defects"; and the next is, "With or without other nervous signs"?—That was the first analysis, when I was using Dr. Francis Warner's classification as it was then.

441. You mean testing chiefly by the hands and fingers?—I was using "nervous signs" in his terms.

442. Then you found that that was not a sufficient test of the mental deficiency of children, and you applied other tests?—I found that, as a rule, I rather underestimated the mental deficiency of the children. I had a tendency to under-estimate it, going only by physical signs. As I got experience I have been able to gauge them better.

443. Do the parents consent to their children being taken out of the board schools and put into special classes?—There has been a good deal of opposition on the part of some parents.

444. Is there a nickname for those classes?—Yes, sometimes.

445. Are they sometimes called the silly classes?—Yes, and the idiot classes or lunatic classes.

446. What is the best name for them—special classes?—Special classes is a sensible name, and as we use it in Bradford it is the most correct name, because we have a few other children in them who are not mentally defective.

447. What other children do you put in them who are not mentally defective?—I drew up a practical rule. I said that any child who I thought was unfit to be in the ordinary school if it could be educated and could go to a special class should go there.

448. Can you describe more accurately what you mean?—I would take a child, for instance, with bad

heart disease, we have one or two like that. I have another case too in my mind.

449. But surely that is a very depressing element in the class?—It is a depressing element; still the child is right enough if he is not subjected to knocking about in the big school with 60 or 70 other children in the class.

450. We find, as a rule, that the other children are very kind to these children who are afflicted in any way, that they are very gently handled, and that a cripple, for instance, is carried up stairs?—Yes, but the cripple runs the risk of accident in a big school.

451. You think that that would outweigh the happiness of being there?—I will give you one case at the present time. I took a boy out of the ordinary school who was not blind, but was so blind that he had to feel his way about the corridors. I simply said that he was running the risk of his life.

452. Why did he not go to the blind class?—The doctor that he was under said he would improve.

453. He would not certify him as blind?—The parents would not allow it. He now goes to a private school. I find that a good many of the children are taken away and sent to private schools because of the compulsion to attend the special classes. Others are taken away and sent to the Church schools.

454. You find, that is to say, that they have to be coaxed instead of driven?—The parents cannot be driven.

455. In fact it is very like the anti-vaccination movement?—Yes.

456. Is that feeling spreading?—I do not think it is. Some people have found the benefit of the special classes, and the system is getting known now, and the people come and ask you to let their children go to the special classes.

457. Are the parents allowed to see the special class so as to become familiar with it?—Yes, they are encouraged to get to know them, and the teachers are also asked to get to know the parents as far as possible. I want to get them to know the parents so as to be able to give me an idea of what the parents are like

458. Defective children, of course, are not welcome in other schools?—The teachers do not like to have them there. Supposing you have a little boy who cannot be persuaded to sit on a seat in school, who lies on his stomach and kicks all day, he is better out of the school; he is no good in it.

459. If the special class can cure him why should not the ordinary school? Because of the number in the class?—Partly that; he cannot get the attention, and he has to be treated in special ways.

460. In fact, defective children are not welcome in a school and are not very well treated sometimes by the teachers?—I am afraid that is so occasionally.

461. The teachers must keep them out of the way for the sake of other children?—A teacher will send a boy to stay in the corner and play with a slate, for instance; and in another case, a little girl who suffered from constantly babbling was simply made to stand in the middle of the big hall until I saw her.

462. I should call that a punishment?—It was a punishment.

463. As a rule you do not find that the teachers inflict punishment of that sort, do you?—It was not intended as a punishment.

464. I should think that even the least sensitive people would feel that a punishment?—Even then, when I came into the school, the child began shouting to me.

465. If defective children are a nuisance to the other children, or intellectually a drawback to the teachers, they should be removed, should they not?—Yes. The teachers, of course, are anxious to get rid of these children to improve their own work and cause them less trouble.

466. And the children themselves do not like the ordinary school perhaps?—They prefer being in the special class.

467. Though the parents do not prefer their being being there?—Some of them.

468. The children you think do like the special class?—Yes.

469. Are they very affectionate children?—Most of them. I asked the same question of a mother about her boy, and she said, "Yes, he was very affectionate." I asked, was he cruel; she said, "No, he had pulled the "cat's head off, but that was nothing."

Mr. J. Kerr, M.A., M.D.

10 Feb. 1897.

470. Are most of them congenital cases, so far as you know?—I think they are generally congenital.

471. You do not know of any cases that have been brought on by ill-treatment in school?—No.

472. Or by ill-treatment in the street?—I cannot say. In a very few cases you get a history of accident of some sort, but even then you are doubtful of the history.

473. How do they classify these children; they are all very much on a par in the special classes, are they not?—The teacher has from 16 to 20, and that is left to her to do; at least, I do not look after that. You will find an analysis of the work in such class, in those books which I have handed in. You will see there what the children do.

474. Have you had the classes going long enough to be able to say how far the children can be improved, what stage of education they can arrive at?—One class has been going on for two years, and the others for over a year.

475. So that they have had no time yet. Very often the intellect does not stir for the first six months, does it?—That is what we find.

476. What is the best way of developing the intellect?—I have tried to get the teachers to work rationally, but unfortunately they are all bound up in the idea of standards and codes, and what not, and they have the inspector after them, and superintendents over them with the same ideas, and it is very difficult to get them to use rational means.

477. Well, we are more rational in London; Mrs. Burgwin has a free hand, I think?—They are too anxious to get the children to do Standard I. mental rather than to draw a straight line. I tell them that drill is the most important thing.

478. And manual work?—Yes; we have not done any actual manual work yet, partly on the question of cost.

479. Do you mean kindergarten work?—I mean wood work, and so on.

480. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) Cookery and laundry work?—No, not yet.

481. (*Chairman.*) Any sloyd work or advanced sloyd work?—No. Some children do clay modelling exceedingly well.

482. At the age of 13 they do not do more than clay modelling?—There are a few of 13 who cannot count up to five; it is a difficulty. Clay modelling, as a rule, is taken in these classes, but there is no further advanced work.

483. Up to what age do you suggest that children should be kept in these classes?—I think you would do very well to keep them to 15 or 16 years of age. Of course, at Bradford, as soon as a child has reached half-time age, off it goes.

484. But supposing that a special Act were passed raising the age, to what age would you suggest their being kept?—I think 16 is the best age.

485. Do you not think that they develop fast about that age, and that it would be better to have the age even higher?—Then there is the difficult question of bringing boys and girls over 16 years of age together in a little class. I think 16 is old enough.

486. What would they be able to do at the age of 16?—That depends very much upon the child.

487. Take a favourable specimen?—A favourable specimen might do Standard III. work in reading, writing, and so forth; it would be a very favourable specimen.

488. If the child was a girl, would she be a fair cook and washerwoman at that age?—Yes, I think they could learn that, and they do. I will tell you about these classes for a moment, and that will perhaps give you an idea. In these books I have notes of 80 boys and 43 girls, belonging to the classes altogether; 19 boys have left and 12 girls. Of that number there have been four boys and two girls half-timers, and the half-time work has been more like this: sweeping out (at the mill of course), putting bobbins on the board, all mere mechanical things, and so on.

Mr. J. Kerr, M.A., M.D.

19 Feb. 1897.

489. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) How old were they?—They leave at 13 for half-time. Now at work there have been four boys and two girls who left the class to go to work. Of these, there is only one boy and girl that can be said to be doing well.

490. (*Chairman.*) Are they earning their living?—Well, they are earning their living so far as they can be expected to do so. The girl gets half-a-crown a week for doing domestic work somewhere, and the boy is doing exceedingly well; he is getting 8s. a week, working at Leeds, 12 miles off, and he comes every three weeks to see his old teacher, he is so fond of her.

491. How many years had he been with that teacher?—He was only there 10 months.

492. Then you can scarcely attribute that advance to the school, can you?—I attribute it entirely to the school; you will find all the history in the book.

493. I thought you said that the children's minds did not stir for six months?—Some of them do.

494. Will you read the particulars of that case?—It is hardly worth reading, I think.

495. Then will you give us anything that you think of interest?—There is the case of a boy born in 1883. In 1894 I had to go and see his parents at home; the boy had brought a charge against his schoolmaster of thrashing him to within an inch of his life. He was black and blue all over, and said it was done at school.

496. What age was the boy?—Eleven.

497. And what standard was he in?—Standard II. I found his mother at home paralysed in the legs and weeping; whether she was suffering from chronic alcoholism or hysteria, I do not know; but that was an important fact in the child's history. The boy was a sturdy strong lad, sharp in a way but not amenable to any discipline. I noted him as small brained. I had previously reported him to the home as being deficient in vision.

498. He had never passed any standard?—No. By a little bit of threatening I got him to confess that the whole thing was done in a fight some days previously. He had brought the charge against the school people. He ran to leave school for offering to fight the master, and then he was taken to a special class, previously he was in Standard II. The first note the teacher made of that boy was "Very stupid and almost unmanageable." Then the next note was "Very confused; arithmetic and writing very backward." Ten months later, "Improving rapidly; got on to compound arithmetic; "does not do except by coaxing; gives no trouble here "at all, and does not play truant;" which was an old habit of his at the other school.

499. That was a case of gross neglect at home?—That was a case of gross neglect at home, and absolute neglect in the other school, apparently.

500. It was impossible to teach him, you say, in the other school?—Yes; he was unmanageable.

501. Because of the large number in class?—His two other brothers have also been at the special class since, so that it is a family failing, and they are worse than this one was. Now that is a case where the special class has absolutely saved a child, I think.

502. Do you think that before admission to a special class a medical examination is necessary?—It is essential, I think. If it was left to the teacher the teachers try to get rid of all the dull children; they try to pass them through their hands.

503. That is rather a sweeping charge to make?—They do, though. If they can reduce the amount of stupidity in their class they will do much better.

504. Do you attribute that to a want of teachers in the lower classes?—No.

505. If an extra teacher were provided for the lower classes, would you have so many defective children, do you think?—I remember a school where there was a very large dull class, and I thought the teacher had something to do with it.

506. Is it the case that there may be 70 in a class in Bradford of all degrees of ignorance?—In Standard I., possibly.

507. With an almost entire want of knowledge of all the work of Standard I.?—I should say so, possibly.

508. Do not you think that a class like that breeds the dullards and candidates for special classes?—A child gets left and it fails to keep up; it is a little dull, possibly, and gets left, and then ultimately becomes hopeless.

509. And the class itself has been the cause of that?—I think it has something to do with it.

510. But if better teaching were provided for the younger scholars we should have fewer dullards?—At the same time the children who go into special classes are not that class of very dull children.

511. Will you tell us what you do with the very dull undeveloped children; do you exclude them altogether?—There are a certain number of very dull children from about seven to eight years of age that I leave a year and they polish up, brighten up wonderfully.

512. You leave them for a year, you say?—Yes, I leave them over for six months or a year, and then see them again, and by that time the teacher tells me they are getting on nicely.

513. And if they have not got on nicely, what then?—Then I might try them possibly, in the special class, though I have not had a case that I have had to send back ultimately to the special class.

514. Those are the chief points in the evidence that you wish to give, I think, are they not?—I think so.

515. Is there anything else that you wish to say to the Committee?—There is one point. There is a good deal, I think, in heredity; you will find that several times in my notes I mention that. There are three brothers in one class, for instance.

516. Then it is very essential, you think, to know the history of the child?—Yes; and of the brothers and sisters and things like that. There is another case where there is a boy who was brought before me. I think I have a note of it on the paper that I gave you.

517. Do you think that the mothers are likely to tell you the history in the same way that they would tell a medical woman?—Yes; you can get it out of the mothers without any trouble.

518. Would they not be more ready to tell a woman?—No, I do not think so. I think they would have more confidence in a man.

519. About the epileptic children, would you exclude them altogether from ordinary schools?—Some doctors would. I have had a child certified as epileptic and not able to go to school, who had only had three fits in its life. A child like that I would allow to go to an ordinary school.

520. Can you lay down any rule as to frequency of fits?—You cannot lay down any rule; it depends upon the fits and the effects that they are producing. If a child does not have fits so often that it disturbs the ordinary school work and is of ordinary intelligence, I would allow him to go to an ordinary school. If he is defective mentally I would send him to a special class. If the fits are so frequent that the child is an invalid, he is not fit to go to the school, and has to be treated elsewhere.

521. Do you mix the epileptic children with other children in the special classes?—We have not got a single epileptic child in the special classes; that is strange.

522. What have you done with them?—I do not know; we have not got any. We have children who have had fits as infants, and two or three fits when young, but no children who have fits habitually.

523. Do you think that you know of all the cases in Bradford?—I think I know of all the school board cases.

524. Do you think that the epileptic children take refuge in the voluntary schools?—They do; occasionally the children selected for these special classes attend for a week or a fortnight, and then go to the voluntary schools.

525. What happens to them there?—They do not come before me. The worst cases that we ever had was a boy that we had to dismiss for treatment of the little girls, and swearing, and so on, and he was taken to a voluntary school.

526. And you have lost sight of him?—I do not know what has become of him.

527. How many grades of epileptics would you make if you had to separate them into classes?—I do not think we have enough in Bradford to make it necessary to consider the question. I look at it simply practically, that if a child has too many fits to go to school it must

Mr. J. Kerr, M.A., M.D.

10 Feb. 1897.

be kept from school and you have to seek education elsewhere for it.

528. (*Mr. Pooley.*) I gather that all the children who are sent to special classes in Bradford have been passed by you?—Everyone. All their histories are in the books here.

529. And you estimate that 2 per cent. of the whole number require education in special classes?—Yes, but there is nothing like 2 per cent. in the special classes; there are 130, about, who are either in or have been in the special classes.

530. And most of those are feeble-minded to some extent?—Yes.

531. But not all; you admit a few cripples, you say?—We have no cripples in the special classes.

532. Do you admit any defective children who are not feeble-minded; heart disease I think you said you did?—Yes, we have one child with heart disease, and that is about all.

533. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) And you spoke of one who was nearly blind?—That child has gone to a private school; he was to go to the blind class, but he went to a private school.

534. (*Mr. Pooley.*) Do you think that there are cases of children who are not feeble-minded but partly blind or partly deaf, or suffering from heart disease or from physical defect, who might properly be taught in these classes?—Yes, I think there are a few, but very few. You could not start a class specially for the purpose, but the child could be sent there and helped a good deal.

535. When you say that you think the age should be raised to 16 years, do you mean that it would be for the benefit of the child for it to be instructed up to 16 years of age?—I think it would be for the benefit of the child to be instructed up to 16 years of age, and it would be for the benefit of other people to prevent that child getting into trouble, and so on. Children between 12 and 16 years of age are easily led astray.

536. Would you propose to raise the age in special classes?—I think it would be advisable; they get on slower, and they want a longer school life if they are to do anything.

537. What is your view about compulsion; when you spoke of raising the age, I suppose you were thinking that it would be good for the child to stay at school up to 16 years of age?—Yes.

538. Would it be possible or desirable to make it compulsory that the children should stay till 16?—If you do not make it compulsory, they will go as soon as they can get the chance in Bradford; they will go into the mills or anywhere. Most of them come to hawking ultimately; that seems the occupation of feeble-minded children mostly.

539. Do you think that you could work compulsion to require these feeble-minded children to stay up to 16 when an ordinary child is free to leave at the present age?—You can do it with the blind and the deaf and dumb, and I think you could do it, if you insisted on it, with these children. Of course, the parents would try to keep the children from the classes as far as possible, if they knew of it.

540. Would the result of that be that there would be still greater objection on the part of the parents to send their children to the classes?—Yes. I may say that, after the first 12 months' experience of the special class, I thought that compulsion would be highly inadvisable. Since then I have altered my opinion. I think you cannot work the special classes well without it.

541. Then, if you have compulsion, there must be some very doubtful cases just on the edge; if a child was dull and was obliged to stay till 16, would you let those children who were just above that level leave at the ordinary age?—If you had any doubt about it, long before the question arose the child would probably have been able to try the ordinary school again. Only this week I have sent half a dozen children back to the ordinary schools out of these special classes.

542. Then, if the school board were empowered to require their attendance at the special classes till 16 years of age, do you think you could carry out such bye-law; do you think the magistrates would support the Board?—I cannot tell you about that question, I do not know enough about it.

543. I want to ask you one question about epileptic children. If an institution were provided for epileptic children, do you think that that would be a matter for the school authority or for any other authority?—I think it would be a matter for the school authority. There is one thing I would like to make a remark about, and that is the day industrial schools; in the big towns they do not seem to be used as they ought. We could do a good deal with one in Bradford in the way of many of these difficult children with bad homes.

544. (*Chairman.*) You mean truant schools?—Yes. The children are defective in some ways but not in others; in other ways they are exceedingly sharp, and these truant schools could be used also to some extent, I think, for some of these epileptic children.

545. (*Miss Townsend.*) Do you always inquire yourself as to the parentage of the children, independently of what you hear from the teachers?—That would take up time, which I cannot afford.

546. So that you do not. Is it not possible that a fall in babyhood or a blow in babyhood would produce a mental deficiency without any sign that would show it in later life, and that if you inquired thoroughly you would find it out?—Possibly, but it is very doubtful; and you will often get a history to account for the imbecility that is a doubtful history.

547. So that you do not inquire, as a rule; you take the children as they are, on the teacher's authority?—I take them as they are, and see what they have done.

548. Is any watch kept over them after they have left school; have you followed up any of your children?—The teachers have so far watched them, but we very soon lose them; they are a class that move about and change their houses, and so on.

549. Do you think that further training, I do not mean compulsorily remaining at school until 16, but a voluntary Training Home for these children, either boys or girls, at 14 years of age, would be acceptable to the parents, with a view to fit them for earning their living?—I could not tell you that.

550. There is no such thing in Bradford?—No. In many cases the mothers are very stupid people indeed in Bradford, and do not listen to reason; in fact, they are rather like the children.

551. Would such a thing, in your opinion, do better than the compulsory extra two years at school?—You mean that the children should stay till 14 at school and then go to a training home; there would have to be compulsion.

552. Putting aside compulsion, for the child's sake would it be advisable to remove it from its home as a rule?—I think it is better for the child to be beginning to mix with the world and to rub against other people than to be isolated.

553. Even although at 14 it has the same amount of mental capacity as an ordinary child of 10?—Yes, even then; it is having its capacity brought out, educated by natural means, and not by artificial.

554. So that you do not think that a child of 14, who is mentally deficient, is a danger to the community at all?—I think all mentally deficient people are a danger to the community unless they have been taught to feel that they are part of the community.

555. Do you think it is desirable for an intelligent child, who is crippled or half blind, to be put into the special class with the mentally deficient?—The intelligent child in that case goes there to get taught by the teacher separately and individually; it does not go there because it is deficient.

556. So that it really comes to the question of a small class instead of a large one?—That is why the child is sent there.

557. And the advantage of the small class you think outweighs the disadvantage of being with mentally deficient children?—I think so. I have only had to take one boy out of the special classes on account of contact with others, and he was himself morally deficient; we sent him to the ordinary school in order to remove him from two boys that he was associating with.

558. In the case of the boy you mentioned who was so troublesome in the ordinary school, if you had had a truant school would you have sent him there or to the mentally deficient class?—I think that boy should have gone to a truant school.

559. And you have more than one of such cases, I suppose, in which it is a morally deficient rather than

Mr. J. Kerr, M.A., M.D.

10 Feb. 1897.

a mentally deficient child that you send to the special class?—Yes, we have one or two moral imbeciles, you know, children who appear sharp and intelligent and you cannot say that there is anything wrong with them until you begin to find out the true state of the case from the history.

560. You keep those with the mentally deficient?—Yes, we have in two or three classes one child of that nature; we have a little girl who picks pockets, for instance.

561. Do you find her harmful to the others?—No; she is a nice good little girl at the class.

562. Do you happen to know whether there are many adult epileptics in Bradford, or has the reason that you have no epileptic children anything to do with the place?—I have a good many epileptics under my care at the Infirmary as patients.

563. Those are adults?—Yes.

564. They surely have been epileptic from childhood?—Most of them have, but still I do not notice them somehow in connection with the schools. I have let a good many children be excused from school altogether on account of a history of epilepsy; they come and tell you they have had hundreds of fits or "10 fits yesterday," and you cannot insist on any schooling then.

565. Still, epilepsy probably is as frequent in Bradford as elsewhere?—I should think so.

566. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) Have you had any difficulty in determining what children are suitable for the classes?—There is only one child that I had any doubt about whether I made a wrong diagnosis or not, and that child was very stupid in school, yet I stated in the notes that I could not find any stigmata about her, and I thought she ought to improve, and she improved at such a rate that they turned her out in about a month to the ordinary school; her parents came and asked about it, and no opposition was made. There I think there must have been something wrong in the history, but it was distinctly stated in my notes that she should improve. It was only through attaching undue weight to her history that she was tried in the class.

567. Then you build up your judgment as a medical man upon what the teachers and parents tell you, of course?—And what I see myself, that is most important; as I say, there is something indefinite that you learn to recognise these children by, which no one without training can do; even an ordinary medical man, I think, cannot do that. You get it and you do not fail in it.

568. I agree that it would be most difficult for a person who is not accustomed to children to determine?—It is so for a person who is not accustomed to see a good many of these children and a good many normal children.

569. And it is difficult always to explain in any individual case why in your judgment that child should be placed in the special class?—It is difficult. I have tried to make a note, and made a note six months later to see if it is the same note, and it has been practically, but yet I would not like to say that another man coming and examining the case would agree with me that its head was malformed and its fingers twitching. There is something that eludes description in diagnosis,—you must take the whole case.

570. In your judgment have your classes been open long enough for you to be able to tell us what has been the result of the special training that the children get?—There are a good many old children at present who had had no training till 10 or 11 years of age, till their minds were a good deal moulded by neglect, and so forth, and so it is difficult to say, but I should say on the whole that two out of three children distinctly improve who would not in an ordinary school.

571. And you suggested that those children if they had been taken at seven years of age——?—Eight is the period they take them out for special classes.

572. But you seem to infer that eight is the infant school age?—No, I leave them in the infant school till eight.

573. Seven is the infant school limit really?—Yes but before eight many children improve rapidly.

574. It would be best for the child you think to carefully examine it, then, at that age, between seven and eight?—Yes, I think so.

575. And then you would expect that there would be two extremes in the class; there would be that top part which would return to the elementary school benefited?—Yes.

576. There would always remain a middle lot that would finish their education in the special classes?—Yes, slowly improving.

577. And then there would come that other extreme, which possibly after a trial in the special classes you would not find educable; and so, taking it from the education point of view, you say, "Those are not for us"?—That would be so.

578 Would you tell us what becomes of those children?—So far, they have been allowed to expire their time in the classes; we have had two or three girls who have gone on till 14 that would not improve a bit.

579. But you must have in a town like Bradford children that are below your standard for the special classes and are not in any school?—You mean idiots, imbeciles, children who run about the room, babbling, or who cannot hold their water, and that kind of thing?

580. Yes, such that a medical man would pass them for an idiot asylum through the Poor Law officer. What becomes of them?—I cannot tell you. I have excused at least a dozen from schooling on that account.

581. And you have no record of them?—Only a record that I have examined them and excused them. There is a list at the end of the book that the Chairman has of all the children I have examined that I thought would be of any interest to this Committee.

582. Would you think then that it would be well for the State to establish, I do not mind whether you call it a custodial home, as Dr. Fletcher Beach did, or a sort of intermediate school to what we have at present, that is to say between what is now the Poor Law Asylum and the special classes; would you think it advisable for the State to establish such a school?—I should think with the experience of a child in special classes you could pass it straight on, that would be my idea, without any intermediate place.

583. (*Mr. Newton.*) How much manual work per week do the children in your special classes have?—I cannot give you the hours; I do not think they have enough, but that is all I can say.

584. You think the time given is insufficient?—I would make a very great deal of manual work compared with what the school authorities insist on.

585. Assuming that they have 25 hours a week at school, apart from the time given to registration, how many hours would you give to manual work?—Ten or twelve.

586. And of the remainder, how would you divide the time?—I leave that to the teachers, because it would depend upon every child.

587. For instance, object lessons; do you consider that those are essential as cultivating the child's powers of observation?—It depends upon the teacher.

588. You mean one teacher may give them better than another?—One teacher may give an object lesson of extreme value, and another teacher may give an object lesson that is a waste of time or next door to it.

589. Would the teacher that gave the worthless object lesson be fit to have charge of a special class?—No, she would not be fit to have charge of a special class. The teachers we have have been selected by the school superintendent as suitable for it, and they were sent to another special class to see it. The first one we started was sent to Nottingham, and then afterwards the teachers of the next classes were sent to her class; and I think teachers of a special class should have a considerable power of presenting things in a concrete way. I am afraid they are too much given to abstract reasoning; they are too fond of their "mental work."

590. Then you think the teaching in the special classes is not satisfactory?—I am not satisfied with it; the other people are; it gets some of the children back to other classes, and they get on with the work, and pressure is put on me and I consent to it.

591. What sorts of manual work do you think are the best?—They begin with knitting, and little wooden cubes and those things, and clay modelling and drawing; some of them do exceedingly well, colouring with

chalks, drawing outlines and colouring it in; and some of them do writing pretty well. That is all finger work.

592. Are there many boys in the special classes who could do the wood work?—Yes. I have been just raising that question in Bradford and arranging for them to do it if possible.

593. You think that they would be safe with sharp tools in their hands?—Most of them would; but I must say that I think a great deal of drill is necessary for these classes, and I do not believe in putting a child to write or do fine work before it can do drill properly; it should use its bigger muscles before its finer ones.

594. But there has been no wood work done yet?—No.

595. Or any cookery?—No cookery has been done yet.

596. Or laundry work?—No. All these questions I have just raised and we will have them all.

597. And as to needlework, is that done?—That is done by the girls; knitting by the boys. There is one point, I do not know whether you have had it brought up before you, that is about what is called eye movements. Dr. Warner dwells on it. If you hold an object up before a child and move it a little to one side, if the child's eyes follow that object it is a chance that it is quite a normal child; if its head follows it the chance is very much greater that it is not a normal child, that it is defective mentally. In one class where I have tried eye drill a stave is held out and a child has without moving the head to look at one end and then another; in one class we find the eye movements improve considerably, so much so that on testing them you could hardly tell that it was a defective class.

598. What records do the teachers keep of that?—They make an entry from time to time in the log books, and the only other records I know of are those I asked them to make for my benefit, and those I have brought up here and will leave with you.

599. How often are they instructed to make these entries?—I ask them to do it once in three months, and they have done it very regularly so far; I think a regular entry should be kept once in three months.

600. Showing its progress in each subject?—Yes.

601. Would you also record its progress in such things as character and conduct?—The teacher has attempted to do that.

602. And do they attempt to note things like observation and memory?—They have done it in a very crude way; they are not well enough educated, some of them, for that, but they will make an observation such as a little girl takes up sticks or ink-pots to throw at them, with another later observation that she had now got obedient.

603. With proper instructions do you think that teachers of special classes could be got to note accurately the characteristics of a child from time to time, say every six months?—I hardly think that teachers of a class like that could ever form an estimate that a medical man with a small amount of experience could. All medical men could not do it; it wants a certain amount of experience.

604. How often do you visit each special class?—Somewhere about once in three months I go to each one, but as a matter of fact I go once a month to some; it is a matter of convenience to me. I may be near a particular school.

605. Do you overhaul each child at each visit?—No, I make a note of some one child perhaps, or see them drill perhaps, but the time will not allow you to overhaul each.

606. Does the Board's Inspector visit the classes?—Yes, they visit them regularly; they are my chief trouble.

607. Does he examine?—Yes, he wants them to get on; he draws up schedules for them.

608. Does the Education Department Inspector examine too?—I think so; I cannot tell you; I think they are treated as infants by the Education Department.

609. But that would not involve a schedule surely, would it?—No; that is only an attempt to get them back to the ordinary schools.

610. One point more. Are there any dangerous children that have been known to take up slates and to attack other children or a teacher?—One little boy we have who has the suicidal mania in a very mild form, and many of the children have attacked a teacher and taken up slates or sticks or thrown books at them, but they very soon get broken in.

Mr. J. Kerr, M.A., M.D.

10 Feb. 1897.

611. Is corporal punishment used in the classes?—Some of the teachers do it, and do it very effectively, and the best teacher of the lot is the teacher who uses corporal punishment best; others do not use it at all, and in one case where a teacher told me she did not approve of it, the class are always laughing and smiling, and there is a want of order about them that she cannot get right. I think corporal punishment is necessary for the boys at any rate.

612. Have you seen those figures dealing with the number of defective children in London; they come from the Attendance Committee of the London School Board's report?—No, I have not.

613. It is rather a large order, perhaps, to ask anybody their opinion upon them straight off?—I would not like to give it.

614. I will only just ask you about one. There are 833,000 children between 3 and 13 years of age in London, and the number of defective children reported by the officers of the school board is about 770. Am I right in supposing that you accept that number as correct?—There is far more than that.

615. You think that is quite wrong?—There must be far more.

616. The number of epileptic children is put down as 210; would you accept that figure?—There is far more than that.

617. You would not accept that either, then?—There must be far more; we could provide more proportionately in Bradford, I think.

618. (*Chairman.*) Not in the schools? (*Mr. Newton.*) It is out of the total population?—No, we could not provide that number in Bradford, but there must be far more; it is one in a thousand.

619. (*Dr. Smith.*) Would you have an age at which you would admit these children to these special classes?—As a matter of convenience I have been using eight years as the lower limit for this reason: that with a lot of children about seven years of age the teachers have not got to understand them, and a number of children do not speak well, but they improve rapidly, and a number have not gone to school till late, and are deemed backward when they are not; they have not opened out.

620. Then you think that there should be a preliminary stage with these children during which they should be in the elementary school?—There is one as young as six whom I had no hesitation without any preliminary stage to send straight to the special classes.

621. Exceptions will always occur, but speaking generally I mean?—I think it is always better to observe them in school first.

622. Then you get the evidence of the teacher?—Yes, that is what I mean.

623. I think you made it perfectly clear that it was essential, in your judgment, that the admission of these children should be on a medical certificate?—It cannot be worked without. It is absolutely impossible for anybody who has not had an extensive medical training to judge of all the little things that go to make up a mentally deficient child. A marked case they will spot, as it were, but all round it wants a medical training, I think everyone will agree.

624. And further, I think you said that sometimes if the medical officer were asked to write an account of his reasons he would himself find a difficulty in doing so?—Sometimes he would.

625. Because a child makes a general impression upon a trained mind which would justify its admission to a special class, although he might not at the same time be able to give definite reasons why he thought so; that is what you mean, is it not?—Yes. Just let me give you one little instance,. A child was brought to me as an imbecile, and on examining it I felt quite certain that the child was not imbecile; he was a backward boy who had an opening mouth and somewhat protruding eyeballs and a general imbecile expression, but on examination I concluded that it was purely an obstruction of his throat, what they call adenoids. That was removed at the hospital, and the child did well at school after that. He was simply a boy that lacked concentration and the

Mr J. Kerr, M.A., M.D.

10 Feb. 1897.

power of thinking and using his brains; they were right enough.

626. And then you would retain a medical supervision of these children during the time they are in the classes?—I think an intermittent medical inspection is necessary. The superintendents of schools want children removing into an ordinary school that are quite unfit for an ordinary school, and I tried one or two just to see: children whom even their own teachers had said would do in an ordinary school have gone there, and in two or three months' time they will have to come back. I knew they would not get on there, and they have not done so.

627. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) I would only ask you have you had occasion to send any children that have been presented to you for special classes to an idiot asylum—to the Royal Albert Asylum, for instance?—It is rather interesting that one of the first boys I saw in a school presented to me as defective was a boy who had been in Standard I. from the age of five till he was 12 or 13; he was quite harmless, quite clean, a nice boy, but quite obtuse mentally. We had no special classes then in Bradford and he was sent to the Royal Albert. It was rather an interesting thing too, because his sister, who attained to Standard IV. in another school, is now 18 and has had three or four terms of six months' hard labour for thieving without any purpose, silly thieving, and she, no doubt, is a moral imbecile, though the police do not take that view of it.

628. Is there any practical suggestion that you could give us as to the means of distinguishing between children who are fit for special classes and children that ought to go to an imbecile asylum?—I have seen a good many children and have said straight away, "Not fit for "any school under the Board," in my report to the Board; "fit only for an asylum," or something of that kind; I mean a child that comes into the room and runs round the place, that you cannot get to sit down on a chair, or you cannot get to look at you, or a child that makes water in your presence; that is an extreme degree, but to draw a hard and fast line is a difficult thing, it must be left to your own judgment.

629. I am speaking now from my knowledge of the subject, from having been medical superintendent of the Royal Albert Asylum, and having received children from Bradford, and we certainly used to receive children into that asylum from Bradford who were very similar to what you have now. I should judge, in the special classes. In your opinion are they better in your classes or in the Royal Albert Asylum?—I am afraid they would not have so many show children in the Royal Albert now.

630. In your opinion is it better that they should be taught in special day classes in Bradford or go away to an institution?—I think the day classes are better; it makes them one of the community.

631. There was another question which Miss Townsend put to you with regard to whether it might not be desirable for girls of 14, 15, and 16 to be in some boarding house. Have you any real objection to that, to their being in a place where they would be taken care of and kept out of bad company if their homeli o were unsuitable?—Many of these girls are very useful a home, they get to be so.

632. But sometimes the home surroundings are of an exceedingly bad character?—Then there are the industrial schools; you can do something with them there. Sometimes even industrial schools are useless. I have a little boy, with favus of the head, in my mind now; he was defying every authority in the land until we could get him into the Bradford Infirmary, where he arrived with a large cigar and a pipe, and he is only 10. As soon as we get the favus cured he will go to the industrial school.

633. Then with regard to manual training, one of the things they would say at the Royal Albert Asylum is, that they are able there to teach boys a trade, whereas in a board school class they are not taught a trade, and they do not seem to have at Bradford any very special manual training?—No, they will have before long.

634. (*Chairman.*) You spoke of some children who are on the border line, who are not fit for special classes, and scarcely fit for imbecile asylums. Could there not be a very special class for children of that sort in Bradford?—We have only had one case, and that case was simply a little boy whose home surroundings were exceptionally bad, but there it was the trouble with the little girls that caused him to be removed; the mothers threatened to take the girls away if he continued at school.

635. Then have you fitted up special rooms for special classes?—We have just taken a class-room in the ordinary school in four cases, made a separate entrance to it and used it.

636. How would you fit up a room for these children if you had your way?—I would like each child to have its own desk, and I would like plenty of room for drilling, and I would like washing arrangements,—you want to teach them to be cleanly,—and apart from that there is nothing very special wanted I think. The room should be very nicely furnished.

637. With pictures?—Yes, I think so, and well warmed; some of these children suffer from cold hands and chilblains much more than ordinary children.

638. Would you have a gymnasium attached to it?—We hope to introduce what we call breathing drill in Bradford. We have tried it in the ordinary schools and find the children grow quicker.

639. How are your teachers qualified for teaching are they ordinary certificated teachers?—Yes, ordinary teachers; they were all assistants under the Board before.

640. Who desired that special work?—It was offered them and some took it.

641. Do they get higher pay for it?—10*l.* a year extra; I think it rules from 60*l.* to 75*l.* a year.

642. But do they lose all chance of increase of pay, such as they would get in an ordinary school?—I think they would get the ordinary increase of pay that they would as assistants; I could not tell you that.

643. They ought to be paid higher than ordinary teachers ought?—Yes, I think they ought to be paid very much more; they ought to be trained very specially.

644. Do you ever collect them for lessons in physiology?—No, I have not done that; there are only five of them. I talk to them as much as I can, and point out things to them, and they read books; they are improving their ideas now and getting out of the cast-iron groove they worked in.

645. How would you advise the Education Department to inspect these schools. The Department wishes not to press upon any school, to be as light as possible in its handling, so as to be consistent with spending public money?—I think that where a child is admitted to such a sch ol, a certificate or form should be filled up, partly by the medical man and partly by the teacher who receives it, showing what it can do, and then you would have a basis to know what it was doing. And the thing that I attach most importance to is the drill and general aspect of the class. A class that is all grins and smiles and wanting in attention, I should look upon as a bad class.

646. You would not test them by reading, writing, and arithmetic?—I would not press those subjects.

647.—But still you would use them as some test?—They are used as the sole test apparently, and in Standard I. singing and so forth in Bradford.

648. What tests would you substitute?—That should be part of the work.

649. You would not object to that if it was not unduly pressed upon children incapable of benefiting by it?—No, I would not object to that.

650. Are you obliged to exclude many for dirty habits?—There are a good many children that cannot hold their water, and that kind of thing, whom I have excused from school altogether; but in every case where they have been the children of poor people I have asked for them to go into the Infirmary to verify it.

651. Have you advised the parents that they could be admitted to school afterwards, if the habits were cured?—Yes, some we have cured; but some come with dirty habits, and the teachers cure that in a week or two.

652. You spoke of 10 to 12 hours' manual instruction, but the blind and deaf are only obliged to have four or five hours out of the 25, and they complain of that as too many?—The blind and deaf are a different class; they want to gain knowledge of another type.

653. But we find that the hours of manual labour will quicken deaf and blind children?—I think the manual labour will quicken these children too, because it is getting at defective brains by the most direct path.

654. But they say that they get tired of manual work, it becomes too monotonous?—But they can have variety.

655. But it is difficult to find 10 or 12 hours' variety, is it not?—Perhaps that is too much, but I would overdo it rather than underdo it. I include drill, and all that in it. I mean in comparison with mental arithmetic, and reading, and writing, I would have that amount of manual work.

656. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) Do you think it advisable to separate the special classes from the normal schools, so that they should have their own playground?—My own idea is that the more these children are taught to look upon themselves as part of the ordinary world, the better for them; and for that reason, though we started the classes a quarter of an hour before and after the others, I had it altered.

657. So as to be down in the playground at the same hour?—So as to be going to school and coming from it at the same time.

658. And out in the playground?—Yes.

Mr. J. Kerr, M.A., M.D.

10 Feb. 1897.

659. (*Miss Townsend.*) Do the other children behave well to them?—Yes.

660. (*Chairman.*) When they go to the offices, is there no one that has control over them, and to see that they are not ill-treated. When they are playing, they are under the teacher's eye, but when they go to the offices is there no one to befriend them?—The chief trouble in Bradford has been that they will not go to the offices.

661. And would you advise their having the same offices as the other children?—I think so. We simply have a class-room with a separate opening into the playground for boys and girls, but that has, of course, only been for convenience hitherto.

662. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) I take it you mean that the room should always be on the ground floor—no stairs?—Quite so.

663. (*Mr. Newton.*) Does the noise from the ordinary school penetrate into your special class-room to take off the attention of the children?—I think not.

The witness withdrew.

Adjourned till Friday next at half-past 2 o'clock.

SECOND DAY.

Friday, 12th February 1897.

PRESENT:

The REV. T. W. SHARPE, C.B., in the Chair.

Mr. H. F. POOLEY.
Mr. A. W. NEWTON.
Dr. G. E. SHUTTLEWORTH.
Dr. W. R. SMITH.
Mrs. BURGWIN.
Miss TOWNSEND.

Mr. H. W. ORANGE, *Secretary.*

Mr. FRANCIS WARNER, M.D., F.R.C.P., called in and examined.

Mr. F. Warner, M.D. F.R.C.P.

12 Feb. 1897.

664. (*Chairman.*) You are physician to the London Hospital?—Yes.

665. And you have had great experience in the question of feeble-minded children?—Yes.

666. You have given your attention to the subject for a great many years, and have written a good deal about it?—Yes.

667. As far back as 1884 you advocated classes for special instruction, at the Social Science Congress?—Yes.

668. And you have delivered various lectures also, and read papers before various societies?—Yes.

669. And you have published reports on the examination of children in schools from 1888 to 1896?—Yes.

670. That inquiry was under the direction of a Committee of Inquiry, and they published a report on 100,000 children?—Yes, that is so.

671. Which report showed the groups of children to be dealt with, followed by recommendations on their management, training, and education?—Yes.

672. The report embraces a history of the inquiry, its method of inquiring and reporting, the nomenclature required, the groups of children and groups of cases, with a catalogue?—May I suggest that that is what I have come to give in evidence. Those are the points that I propose to give evidence about which you are now reading.

673. I want to get before the Committee exactly what you have done?—I beg your pardon.

674. In 1888-91 you made some investigation into elementary day schools?—Yes.

675. In 1892-94 you made a report to the British Association?—Yes.

676. And in 1896 also?—Yes.

677. You have reported on epileptic cases also?—Yes.

678. And analysed them into their various classes, and have published tables showing how you would analyse and classify such children?—Yes.

679. Perhaps you will tell the Committee the main classes of defect that you have observed amongst school children?—There are four main classes of defects that we have noticed and registered. The first group comprises defects in bodily development, in points of physiognomy, shape, form and size of the head and the separate features; and these are defined and enumerated in the nomenclature of the report.

680. We had better not refer to the report; but make the facts clear in the evidence?—That is the first group of (A.) defects. The second (B.) is abnormal nerve signs or points of observation, in balance, action, movement, and response, as seen in the child; and in the third class (C.), the physical condition of the child, health nutrition; any child noticed as being pale, thin, or delicate would be entered as being of low nutrition. On that score I must just say, that in the inquiry we made it was impossible to handle the children so as to make a medical examination in the ordinary sense to discover disease, because that was apart from what we had undertaken.

681. And the fourth class?—The fourth class (D.) is mental dulness, as to which we took the report of the teachers on each case that had been noted, also after picking out the cases which were noted by points seen, we asked the teachers to present any children who were dull, backward, or of low mental power in their opinion. Those make the four main classes of defects that we speak of.

682. And you say that they include a larger proportion of boys than of girls?—They do.

683. Can you account for that in any way?—It is the universal law, it seems, that all defects are commoner

Mr. F. Warner, M.D., F.R.C.P.

12 Feb. 1897.

among the male than the female, not only at school age, but in after-life; that is as to numbers, not as to intensity of the evil that follows.

684. Is it possible that you know of all the cases of girls or women; they may be hidden out of sight possibly, may they not, which might account for the greater number of boys than girls?—I do not think anything could be said to account for it. The same law runs through animal life, irregularity of development occurs more often in male than the female.

685. Then we may now proceed to the groups of cases, having stated the chief defects?—Do you wish now to go to the groups of children who are the more difficult from an educational point of view?

686. It arises out of the evidence you offer yourself, which is this: that the main classes of defects are much associated in the groups of cases. Having got the defects, the next point is to get the groups of cases and show how you associate them?—You may speak of a group of cases as where you have two sets of signs associated. You may speak of a group of cases of developmentally defective children who are dull, that may be spoken of as a group of cases, developmental defect seen and recorded; and, on the other side, the child is also found to be mentally dull.

687. What you mean by groups of cases are really sub-heads of defects?—The defects is the thing you actually see in the body of the child. The group of children is the group of cases put together that had those defects.

688. And they fall under the head of one of the four defects?—The most important cases are those which have one, two, or three classes of defect.

689. (*Dr. Smith.*) Let me put it down diagrammatically; what children do you call these (*describing a diagram*)?—A, B, C, and D groups of defect you mean.

690. These are two, three, and four which you have given us, which I have noted in this diagram, what kind of children do you mean here; what do they represent; they are sub-divisions of what?—They are not sub-divisions of anything; they are classes of defect; they are not children.

691. (*Chairman.*) You have given groups of cases suffering from one or more of these defects?—Yes.

692. Groups of cases suffering from one defect?—Yes, they may have one defect only, and they may show some defect in the make of the head or cranium, and nothing else whatever.

693. That is to say, it is the greatest possible number of combinations of four things taken together?—Yes, we make up our groups from those four in 16 primary groups, those that have (A) developmental defect only, or (B) nerve defect only, or (C) low nutrition only, or (D) those that are mentally dull only.

694. I think we need not proceed any further, then; we understand that you mean by your groups of cases those suffering from one or more defects?—Yes.

695. Therefore we need not take down the whole number of such groups?—I shall presently offer different advice as to the different groups, therefore it is important that you should understand how we get at those groups. I think it is perhaps understood now.

696. And this relation of the classes to the different cases varies with their sex and their age and their environment, you say?—It does, which can be all shown; all those details can be shown.

697. We will call these defects A, B, C, and D?—Yes.

698. Refering to defect (A), which is developmental defect, you see also present other signs of brain disorder?—Yes, and low nutrition and mental dulness.

699. By low nutrition you mean delicate children?—Yes, they tend to become delicate, and this fact of a child with developmental defect tending to become delicate is specially marked in girls, a matter of very great importance in social matters. There were fewer girls than boys who had any defect of development, but when a girl has any developmental defect she is much more likely to suffer from it and acquire additional trouble, especially delicacy in health, than a boy, this fact is the foundation of a great deal of the trouble which occurs in connection with education.

700. You say delicate children are often dull?—Yes.

701. And dull children are often also delicate with indications of brain disorder?—Yes.

702. You cannot say which is cause and which is effect?—I do not think dulness is the cause of low nutrition; I think low nutrition is a cause of dulness, and the main cause of low nutrition is the original defect of the child.

703. What led up to my question is, that you put it conversely, that delicate children are often dull, and dull children are often also delicate with indications of brain disorder?—It follows conversely; I did not say which is cause and which is effect. The great cause of dulness is the presence of the nerve signs which can be removed, or a brain condition indicated by the nerve signs.

704. And girls with these developmental defects are more apt to receive harm and less good from their environment than boys, you say?—I think so.

705. As to the treatment of these children you advocate strongly good physical training?—I have evidence to give you that good physical training does tend to remove these points in irregular action, slow action, bad response, inaccurate response, which in detail are called nerve signs.

706. And you diminish the number of cases with signs of brain disorder by using physical exercises?—Certainly. If you will allow me, I think I have used the word brain disorder amiss, I do not mean disease when I say that. I mean disorderly brain, just in the same sense as you speak of disorderly mental action—it does not mean disease. We do not say that all these children have disease, or anything of the kind.

707. You say it is desirable that the Education Authority should make inquiry in their districts generally, as well as in their schools for children not in school attendance, on account of mental as well as physical infirmity, and that they should be separately reported upon by the medical officer, and that this should be done annually by Her Majesty's inspector with an assessor?—Yes.

708. And that the attendance of all classes of infirm children, including those deaf and blind, should be encouraged under seven years of age, and the age extended to 16 for the feeble-minded, the school age, that is to say?—Yes.

709. And that after the school age is finished continuation classes should be provided for their benefit?—Yes.

710. Which should not be confined to industrial training, but extended to some mental training?—Yes.

711. And that, as many cases of cripples occur among the feeble-minded, they should be conveyed to school?—There are many cases of feeble-minded, and there are many cripples; it does not follow that the cripples are feeble-minded.

712. There are cases of cripples who are feeble-minded?—Yes, certainly; and cases of feeble-minded who are crippled.

713. For those conveyances should be provided, you think?—The suggestion has been made, and it has been carried out, I believe, at Stepney; I have been told so.

714. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) As in Berlin?—Yes.

715. (*Chairman.*) And with the training of the teacher should be included some knowledge of this class of children for the purpose of discriminating and classifying them, and the methods of observing them, and of applying mental tests, you say?—What I have advocated is, that it would be advantageous if in the training colleges they were given some knowledge of the description of children, I did not say only feeble-minded, but of children for the purposes of classification, and these would come among them.

716. And a teacher who had had one year's work in a school might return to the training college or day class for one year's special training in the care of defective children?—Yes, that appears to be it.

717. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) Continuing where the Chairman left off, after having mentioned that you are connected with various committees and associations for inquiring into the condition of children and schools, I refer you to the committees of inquiry of 1888–96, and the Report on 100,000 children, showing the groups of children to be dealt with, and making recommendations as to management, training, and education; what would you like to tell us about that report?—In that report first of all, there is the question of how the inquiry was

conducted, which is a matter of importance, if you accept any evidence of the results of that inquiry. After I had worked upon the subject myself for a good many years, in 1888 a Committee of the British Medical Association was formed to make some kind of scientific inquiry into the mental conditions of childhood. They reported in the following year, on 5,000 cases they had seen, to the British Medical Association, and that report was published. Following that, as the work appeared to be useful, the Charity Organization Society formed a committee to continue such work of inquiry, and 50,000 children were seen. A full report was drawn up and presented to the President of the Local Government Board, Mr. Ritchie, I think it was at that time. They were asked in Parliament to publish that report, which contained an account of a considerable number of these feeble-bodied children, who were then beginning to be cared for under the School Board. It was not published by our English Government, but it was published by the American Government, and a copy of that I have upon the table here. It was published in the Report of the Commissioner of Education, 1890–91. Then there came the Congress of Hygiene and Demography in London in 1892; they appointed a committee to continue this work, so that by 1894 100,000 children had been examined, and a full report on the 100,000 children was drawn up with the conditions as said. That is the history.

718. By whom were they examined?—I was responsible for seeing each of these children and taking the notes, and that work I did in conjunction with other medical men who kindly attended with me, about eight names in all, and on two of those occasions the Chairman of this Committee was present, as he will, I think, remember, and various medical men and visitors were present on other occasions.

719. That is the history of the inquiry?—Yes.

720. The next thing is the method of the inquiry, and the reporting on cases; you can give us a brief account of that?—The method of inquiry had to be limited to certain modes of procedure. We had communicated twice with the London School Board, and had not been allowed to make any observations in their schools. When, however, the School Board understood that we were not going to question the children themselves, or handle them, then they allowed us to see their children, so that our method of inquiry had to be conducted by points seen in the children, and such facts as the teacher could communicate to us which were written down concerning each child on such a form as I have here, a scheduled form (*producing the same*). The points were of the four classes which have previously been given in evidence. In the first column you see the points seen in the child's body, bodily development, class A.; in the second, indications of the movements and balance, class B. Then we come to the child's physical condition, and in another column the report of the teacher on the case. Such schedule was filled in for each of the children noticed, 18,127.

Mr. F. Warner, M.D., F.R.C.P.

12 Feb. 1897.

721. 18,000 of those particular schedules were used?—Yes, about that.

722. (*Chairman.*) The schedule leaves out one of the causes of defects, mental dulness?—The teachers' report is the account that they gave as to mental ability; we could not take their place; we never stepped into their place. If the report of the teacher was that the child was dull and below par, it was accepted as evidence, and that child was entered in our subsequent records as being a dull child.

723. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) Did you ask any questions of the child?—In the bulk of the cases we did not.

724. You accepted the teachers' statement?—Yes, we accepted the teachers' statement; it was generally a statement made by the teacher of the class, through the head teacher of the school; the two would be together, and give their report at the table.

725. Have you anything more to say about the method?—We found, as a matter of experience, as time went on, that instead of giving that rather bulky mode of reporting, it was convenient to report upon each child on a card, a card for reporting, similar to those we have here (*producing and handing in a card*), which for the purpose of preparing statistics is more convenient. The card is as follows:—

School ..... *Card No.* .....
Infant ..... *Reg. No.* ..... **GIRLS.**
Age .... *Spl. Rept.* .....

A		Development Defects
a	1	Cranium
	2	Large
	3	Small
	4	Bossed
	5	Forehead
	6	Frontal ridge
b	11	External Ear
c	12	Epicanthis
d	13	Palate
	14	Narrow
	15	V-shaped
	16	Arched
	17	Cleft
	18	Other types
e	19	Nasal Bones
f	20	Growth Small
g	21	Other Develmt. Dfts.
B		Nerve-signs
	43	General balance
	44	Expression
	45	Frontals overact
	46	Corrugation
	47	Ococuli lax
	48	Eye movements
	49	Head balance
	50	Hand weak
	51	Hand nervous
	52	Finger Twitches
	53	Lordosis
h	54	Other Nerve-signs
C		Nutrition
D		Dull
E		Eye-cases
	64	Squint
	65	Glasses plus
	66	Glasses minus
	67	Myopia, no glasses
	68	Cornea disease
	69	Eye, lost accident
	70	Eye, lost disease
F		Rickets
G		Exceptional Children
i	82	Cripples

A B C D E F G

On the schedules a written account was given of each point in the child; on the card where the defects are printed, the presence of any defect seen was indicated against the name of that defect. The numbers correspond to the numbers of the defect in the report. So that we have two modes of primarily reporting the cases. At the present time I should prefer to use the cards instead of those more bulky schedules. As illustrative of that, I have a pack of cards here that represent all the children in a Brighton School, as to which I have sent in a copy of the report I made to that School Board, and upon which they have founded their action at Brighton for the feeble-minded children. That is as to inquiries.

726. That is all you wish to say on that head?—That is the mode in which the records are taken. Then, there are the statistical methods of working them out; that is a longer matter.

727. Then the next head on this paper is the nomenclature of the points observed, to which you have already alluded?—A list giving a definition of each point observed, as put on the card, has been published in the report of our committee; 43 such signs are given in class A.

728. Those were the 43 different signs to which you referred just now?—Yes, that make up the group of defects, Class A.

Mr. F. Warner, M.D. F.R.C.P.

12 Feb. 1897.

729. Would you kindly describe what you mean by a sign, briefly?—For instance the developmental signs are mainly those which you see in looking at the head, the size, shape, form, and proportion, of the cranium; the external ear, whether the parts, the rim, and the pleat of the ear are present or absent; if absent that is a defect. The eye openings may be defective in size and also in shape; the bridge of the nose likewise, and so also the size of the mouth, the lower jaw, conditions of defect may be observed in each of these points. As to the next group, the nerve signs, that consists mainly in conditions of balance and attitude and movement, such as the balance of the head, spine, shoulders, symmetry of balance, equal planting of the feet, balance of the hands as held out symmetrical on the two sides on a level with the shoulders, and a hand with its parts straight and not drooped. In the face we may see horizontal creases which are very frequent in children mentally dull, or drawing of the eyebrows together making vertical creases, very frequently present in children who are mentally confused rather than defective, while movement of the angles of the mouth as in grinning is a well known sign, also appearing with defective brain. Others could be mentioned in detail. One other sign is of great importance in the matter of training, that is eye movements. A considerable number of children, if you hold a small object, such as a shilling, two feet from them and move it slowly, follow it simply by moving their heads, the eyes not turning in their sockets at all. That is a point that can be got rid of readily with a little attention in the detail of training, and has much to do with the cultivation of good seeing and accuracy in reading and writing; it is a point that can be removed by training like most of the other signs that indicate brain disorderliness.

730. The Committee would like to know how these signs came to be selected as significant?—The first means of selecting those signs was looking among children of known brain defect, observing the points that occurred in the face and in movement of imbecile children in whom each of these signs was found to be very frequent. But when, having described the separate points, one looked for them among a large number of ordinary children, one found that each separate sign was exceedingly common also among the whole body of children. Looking over a school of children for such signs one found that the percentage of the children who presented these nerve signs who were reported dull by the teacher was very considerably higher than the percentage of children in the school.

731. The percentage of children showing signs in the school?—Yes, the percentage of children with an abnormal nerve sign of any kind who were dull, who the teacher said were dull, is much higher than the percentage of the general children in the school. If you take 100 children who have this horizontal frowning you will find that a very high percentage of them are reported by the teacher as dull, viz., 41·4 per cent. of these boys and 46·2 per cent. of these girls.

732. Is there anything more that you would like to say about the points observed?—It is shown also in our report (which is on the table) that where a child has two or more conditions of defect it is much more probable that it is dull; the more abnormal points that occur in a child the greater is the probability of its being dull.

733. That will come rather in the consideration of your next heading, I think, as to the groups of children?—Yes, it may come in there.

734. You have already explained a little, I think, how the groups of children are formed, and I daresay you would like to supplement what you said just now?—There are certain groups of children whom we were led to put together which are of considerable social, practical, and educational importance. First of all I turn to what we term children who are definitely exceptional. They include the idiots and imbeciles; and children whom you are specially concerned with, that are termed feebly-gifted mentally; children termed mentally exceptional, by which we mean children who, not necessarily dull in lessons, are we believe organically deficient in moral sense, social sense, and belong to the class of those technically termed moral imbeciles, a small group but a very important one, who exist in considerable numbers among the criminal classes of the population. We further include under the term exceptional children, epileptics, and children with a history of fits during school life, the dumb, and also children crippled, maimed, paralysed, or deformed, and we say that all these children require to be considered individually upon the merits of each case. The numbers are enumerated in our tables. But it was thought that there was a further group of children who ought to be considered in seeking for those who require special care and training, and that is the children who are reported by the teacher as dull mentally and in whom observation shows defect in development (our Class A.) the presence of abnormal nerve signs, the brain acting disorderly, and low nutrition. If we see those three classes of defect in children who are said by the teacher to be dull children, we are inclined to think they probably are dull from some physical cause. Thus making up a group of children (our group 12) whom we think should be considered individually as probably requiring special care and attention, and taking different portions of the inquiry that appears in number to amount to between one and one and a half per cent. of the child population.

735. One to one and a half per cent. of the children you have yourself seen?—Yes, on the number seen, which we take as representing the child population, the population of children of school age.

736. Is that the average on 100,000 or 50,000?—On an average of 50,000 you have to go down a little lower in decimals. It is impossible to be really sure between the one and one and a half per cent.

737. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) Does that apply to the 50,000 or the 100,000?—It varies in different portions of the inquiry. Taking the average all through it is something like a trifle above one per cent.

738. (*Mr. Newton.*) But does this apply to boys, girls, and infants of all ages?—When I speak of 100,000, it applies to children of all ages as seen in schools.

739. And you took the normal proportion of infants?—We took all the children there were in the school. We did not a portion of a school only.

740. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) We are rather anxious to ascertain definitely, if you can tell us, whether it will be safe for the Committee to conclude that according to your observations the percentage of from one to one and a half of the children noted as being defective is drawn from observations of 100,000 cases?—Yes, that is the basis. I only hesitate as to the decimal, whether it is to be 1·5 or 1·2.

741. You put it generally from one to one and a half per cent.?—Yes, from one to one and a half per cent.

742. I do not know whether I have made a slip in asking the question; the question intended was whether of all the children *seen* by you (I did not mean the children *noted* only) the proportion of children so defective as to require special care amounted to from one to one and a half per cent.?—The children noted as such that we consider should be considered individually as to whether they do not require special care and training comes to one to one and a half per cent. of the population of children of school age.

743. (*Dr. Smith.*) If I understand it aright, you say that you find that one to one and a half per cent. of the population of school age are defective children?—Children who are so far defective that we think their cases should be considered individually. The statistics will not bring us nearer than that.

744. Upon what do you make that estimation? How many children did you examine to come to that conclusion?—100,000.

745. And then you say that finding that in 100,000 you apply it to the whole?—That is so.

746. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) May I ask—though we are not in this inquiry seeking to know about idiots and imbeciles specially—are such cases included in this one to one and a half per cent.?—Yes.

747. In what proportion do you remember does this table, which I have before me, include such cases?—I can give you particulars as to the number of children out of those seen in public elementary schools, who fall into each of the groups of children "who require special care and training."

748. That is to say, out of the total 100,000 whom you saw?—100,000 was the total number of children seen in public elementary schools and other institutions; but the number seen in public elementary schools was: boys, 45,925; girls, 41,453; total, 86,378; and perhaps it will be more to your purpose

to give you from among these the proportion of those "who require special care and training."

749. Thank you. Will you first state what description of children are comprised under that head?—The heading "who require special care and training" includes (1) idiots and imbeciles, (2) children feebly gifted mentally, (3) children mentally exceptional, (4) epileptics, and children with history of fits during school life, (5) children crippled, maimed, deformed, or paralysed, (6) children dull and delicate, with defect in development and abnormal nerve signs.

750. What was the total number of children falling under this heading?—The number of children "who require special care and training" was: boys, 516; girls, 435; total, 951, or 1·1 per cent. They are distributed as follows:—

No.	——	Boys.	Girls.
1	*Imbeciles*, not epileptic or crippled	17	6
2	*Imbecile and epileptic*, but not crippled	2	2
3	*Imbecile and crippled*, but not epileptic	2	1
4	*Feebly gifted mentally*, but not crippled or epileptic.	92	76
5	*Feebly gifted mentally and epileptic*, but not crippled.	8	7
6	*Feebly gifted mentally, and crippled*, but not epileptic.	3	4
7	*Feebly gifted mentally, and blind*, or nearly so.	—	2
8	*Mentally exceptional*, not epileptic nor crippled	7	9
9	*Epileptic*, but not mentally defective nor crippled.	39	43
10	*Epileptic and crippled*, but not mentally defective.	3	1
11	*Crippled*, but not mentally defective or epileptic.	142	99
12	Children blind, dumb, or with chorea, &c.	4	5
13	Children dull, delicate, with defect in development and abnormal nerve signs, but not given above as "exceptional children."	197	180
	Total number of children "who require special care and training."	516	435

751. Will you kindly give the definition of idiots and imbeciles, as used in that table?—"Idiots," includes all children who, on account of their bodily and brain defects, and the absence of mental power, might be certified as idiots under the Idiots' Act, and sent to an asylum. "Imbeciles," includes all children who might be certified as mentally imbecile, and transferred to an asylum. Speaking generally, these are less hopeless cases than the idiots, and more educable under industrial training. Some of these cases were the result of disease, not of congenital defect of brain.

752. How do you define "children feebly gifted mentally"?—These children are distinctly deficient in mental power, but might not be certified as imbeciles, and are therefore not fit for such medical certification. No child was registered in this group unless it was believed upon evidence observed and the teacher's report combined, to be incapable of school work in the ordinary classes It is difficult to define what physical conditions seen, as apart from mental tests, indicate the child as unfitted in mental capacity for the usual methods of education, and an arbitrary attempt to do so has not been made. There appears, however, to be a large class of "children feebly gifted mentally" with defect of mental power short of imbecility, but still with some deficiency.

753. How do you define "children mentally exceptional"?—These children, while not necessarily mentally dull, and without brain power, appeared deficient in certain mental characteristics and in moral sense, such as habitual liars, thieves, and incendiaries; others were liable to attacks of total mental confusion, or periods of total mental inaptitude or violent passion, or were moral imbeciles. Some of these children were the offspring of insane parents or criminals. It is quite possible that some of these children were really epileptic or subject to *petit-mal*. Some of these children, while thus mentally exceptional, were not ordinarily dull pupils in schools.

Mr. F. Warner, M.D., F.R.C.P

12 Feb. 1897.

754. How do you define epileptics and children with history of fits during school life?—In every school inquiry was made for children subject to fits, whether occurring in school or alleged to occur at home during school life, and given as a reason for absence from school. A report given as to history of fits was recorded, and the case was entered in this group; but at the inspection of a school facts could not be usually observed, proving the child to be epileptic.

755. How do you define children crippled, maimed, deformed, or paralysed?—Any child crippled, maimed, deformed, or paralysed was included in this group. Conditions of disease and paralysis were in various stages; but in all cases the child appeared to be at some permanent disadvantage. The conditions causing crippling were in various stages; many of these children were quite capable of work and play, some were mentally defective; they varied greatly in brain power and in physical health. Eye cases are not included in this group.

756. How do you define "children dull, delicate, with defective development and abnormal nerve signs"?—Each case presents one or more defect in development and one or more abnormal nerve-sign with low nutrition and mental dulness.

757. Then the total number of "children who require special care and training" is 951, or 1·1 per cent.; but if we omit the 30 idiots and imbeciles, there are 921, or 1·06 per cent.?—Yes.

758. How many of the 921 were epileptics?—101.

759. Then without reckoning idiots, imbeciles, or epileptics, there were 820 children who require special care and training out of a total of 86,378?—Yes.

760. That is to say ·94 per cent.?—Yes.

761. And all those children were actually in attendance at school?—Yes, they were seen at school.

762. The 820 includes also children physically defective?—Yes.

763. Of whom there were 248 crippled?—Yes.

764. And nine blind, dumb, or with chorea?—Yes.

765. Making a total of 257 physically but not mentally defective?—Yes. By not mentally defective is meant not idiots, or imbeciles, feebly gifted mentally, or mentally exceptional (moral imbecile).

766. Then what was the total number of mentally defective children found in public elementary schools, not idiots or imbeciles, and not epileptics, who are to be classed as requiring special care and training?—563.

767. Out of a total of 86,378?—Yes.

768. What percentage is that?—That is ·65 per cent.

769. And all these children were in attendance at ordinary public elementary schools?—Yes.

770. It does not include any at special classes?—No.

771. Nor in the poor-law schools?—No.

772. Nor in certified industrial homes and orphanages?—Those also are excluded from the table I have now given you.

773. (*Miss Townsend.*) Your whole inquiry relating to 100,000 children included these?—Yes; it included poor law and other institutions, chiefly Dr. Barnardo's homes.

774. Asylums are not included in the inquiry?—No.

775. (*Mr. Pooley.*) In the table you have just given us is the same child put under two different heads?—No.

776. Each child only appears once?—Only once.

777. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) Some interest having been expressed as to the group of crippled and maimed, &c., may I ask you to define maimed cases?—Children who have lost a hand, children who have lost a leg, children who have had some part of the body amputated, leaving them at a disadvantage.

778. Would children who had lost a finger be included in maimed?—I daresay they would; I should think so.

779. (*Miss Townsend.*) Anything that incapacitated them?—Yes; they are analysed fully in Table IX.

780. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) Then I think we have now gone over the groups of cases in schools. Children

Mr. F. Warner, M.D., F.R.C.P.

12 Feb. 1897.

requiring special care and training you have already alluded to?—Yes.

781. Is there anything more that you wish to say about them?—Only as to their discrimination. I should think that that is a very important matter; it is a heading I was going to speak to from your own syllabus, the discrimination of these children.

782. You have not got it further down in your précis, have you?—I had your syllabus sent to me to speak from, I thought.

783. Then, if you will kindly tell us what you wish to say on that point we shall be glad?—Under the head which forms an important part of your reference and of your syllabus, that which is termed discrimination of cases, we think that discrimination should be in considerable part dependent upon points seen in the child; points seen in looking at the child, not only on mental examination and report upon its mental work in school. We think there are two modes of approaching the matter. Personally, I have advocated separate reports on the two matters: (1) what would be termed the teacher's report from experience in mental action on the mental work, and also, (2) on the same case a report upon the points seen in classes A, B, and C, that is to say, in development, in nerve action and in physical condition. That is, of course, following the basis of the State method in dealing with the certificate upon mental cases where facts seen have to be given. It seems to add accuracy to the work, and certainly supplies a great many details as to method of management. As showing that such descriptions can be given, I have submitted to you, at least to your Secretary, beforehand a memorandum of the report of a school sent to the Brighton School Board. That is an illustration, I take it, of what we mean by reporting—means of discriminating cases.

784. We are coming to that presently?—That is an illustration then of the mode of discrimination which I thought was a convenient way of putting it in evidence. I think I sent in another memorandum, also, on the question of discrimination.

785. Some members of the Committee do not exactly know how you proceed in forming discrimination. Would it not be as well to give a short description of it?—I think if you take it upon that report it will come conveniently systematically. In inspecting a school as to method of procedure it is best to see the children in a large room or hall, if there is one, where you have the children standing in line. The inspector standing in front of each child finds it convenient to let the child look at an object he holds, to prevent the child from looking at him. The observer can then carry his eye rapidly over the separate features of the head and face, at the same time observing the expression of the face and any over action in the upper or lower portions of the face, or fulness under the eyes, as described among the nerve signs; while on moving the object held laterally it is seen whether the child follows it accurately and readily with his eyes. Then, telling the line of children to hold out their hands straight in front of them, and momentarily showing them what is meant, you get further opportunity of describing the action and balance as seen in each child. The palate is then examined in each case, a matter of considerable importance. Throughout the inspection any child presenting an abnormal point is asked to stand aside, and after thus inspecting the line of children the teachers are requested to pick out any not already selected whom they may consider dull and backward. Notes of each case thus selected are taken, and the teacher's report is added in each case. I should recommend that any case that is considered really exceptional, either by such inspector or by the teachers, should have a detailed report written out.

786. (*Chairman.*) As to "defects of cranium," did you measure the cranium?—I did not measure every child because it would not do, it would interfere too much; but in many cases one did measure the cranium where it was small. I give you as a standard, that if any child has a cranium under 19 inches in circumference, that we call small.

787. Were all the signs noted upon your cards entered in the case of each child so far as they applied?—Any sign present in each child was recorded on the written schedule placed before you.

788. Which corresponds with the card?—Or if we were using cards instead of the written schedule, the pen would be struck through, or the number of the defect added, as a means of recording it. Thus a record is taken of each child on any point below the normal, either in the opinion of the inspector or of the teacher. Thus, for a given school, as the school at Brighton of which the report lies upon the table, we had a packet of cards describing what we saw wrong in each child.

789. When a teacher spoke of a child as being mentally dull, did they give you any test of mental dulness or did you merely accept the statement of the teacher?—I never questioned it.

790. You do not know in the least what tests they applied?—No, I had to accept whatever the head teacher said with the help of her staff.

791. (*Miss Townsend.*) Did they ever call a child mentally dull in whom none of these defects had been observed by you?—Yes.

792. And you accepted it?—I have no doubt it was dull.

793. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) I think you have now gone through the tables so far, at least, as you have had an opportunity; and now we come to cases of developmental defect in relation to sex and residence; have you any remarks to make specially on that subject?—With regard to the question of sex, I have said already that the larger number of cases of each kind of defect, except lower nutrition, that is to say, defects in development and signs of disorderly brain action, are more frequent among boys than among girls; but when you come to deal with a case that has some defect of development of body we find that the girls in a much larger proportion tend to become pale, thin, and delicate, so that a condition of ill-development which in a boy may be passed over as not so very material if existing in a girl is of much more importance and likely to lead to her permanently falling into a condition such as is termed medically, anæmia, hysteria, neurosis. That is perhaps the first point.

794. Then with regard to residence?—With regard to residence, the largest group of children that we deal with who present some class of defect, is the group of defect in development of body. Now, these children tend in a much larger percentage to become pale, thin, and delicate, as seen living at home and attending day schools, than similar cases as we saw them in resident schools. Conversely, development cases removed from a resident institution to a day school tend to become pale, thin, and delicate, I believe, and this specially applies to girls. Another point with regard to sex is that although boys, as you will see, present a larger proportion who have these abnormal nerve signs, they tend to pass on to become socially harmful, pathologically interfering with their life among the girls. It does appear that the conditions of developmental defect are not equally distributed as to locality, and so far as the facts go that we have (quite an insufficient number to prove anything) it appears that the distribution of developmental defect is very different in the areas of London. The evidence was brought before the Statistical Society, who thought the report sufficiently valuable to republish it, though it had been published before. I do not want to say that these statistics are finally true.

795. Does that finish what you have to say about the constitutional differences between boys and girls in relation to their educational requirements?—Then comes the question of age. The tendency of these different groups to develop according to their environment varies considerably at certain ages. To go fully into that would require a larger body of statistics than is at present available. Briefly one may say, that children under 10 years of age prove to be much more delicate when placed out in the world unless protected, than children of older age. Younger children, if they have any conditions of defect, are much more delicate under 10 years of age than over. I take the age of 10 because certain recommendations have been made with regard to children under 10 years of age or over 10. I can give you the figures in a moment.

796. Then the next heading that you have put down is the child material in a school?—I took that from the syllabus you have prepared, that in dealing with recommendations as to what is to be done with children, you consider the question not only of what are termed classes of special instruction, but also what are known as classes Standard 0, or as they are called in some schools, classes of primers. I presume the two things mean the same. Now, our inquiry showed a good deal

M F Warner, M D., F.R C.P.

12 Feb. 1897.

about the relations of secondary education as represented by a Standard ex-VII. to the number of children in Standard 0, and the position in school of the children who are so far deficient that they require special care and training.

797. (*Chairman.*) You mean the same number at the head of the school?—There is a bearing between a school having an ex-VII. Standard, and the number of children you will find in a Standard 0, and the number of children in it who will be said to be so exceptional that they are not fit for the school at all.

798. That is to say, you would find the same number of abnormally clever children, and abnormally stupid children?—No, it is an artificial point in the question of school organisation. Where there is a Standard ex-VII. there is no doubt there is a greater difficulty in a small child getting out from Standard I. in the infant school to Standard I. in the upper school, and that has been pointed out to me over and over again in the school.

799. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) That would be a question of organisation; it has nothing to do with the child?—That is not a physiological fact, that is a social fact.

800. (*Miss Townsend.*) From the fact that the attention of the school staff is more directed to Standard ex-VII.?—But it results in this, the child getting out of the school instead of remaining in it. They will not have him in the upper school; when it is too big to be in the infant school, they will not have him in the upper school, and he goes away from school.

801. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) Then the next head is Schools of Special Difficulty?—You have not taken Assessment. I have been asked at other inquiries whether it would be possible to make anything like an assessment, or judgment, or business-like statement of the kind of material in a school. That could be arranged for, and is best illustrated by that report of the Brighton school, as I have put it here, showing the different physiological groups of children as we found them. The proportion we found by an established average of 100,000, and it is well illustrated when you come to that report. An assessment can be made of the child material in the school, and it is possible to show whether it is true or not, from our point of view, that a school has a more difficult set of children to deal with, or not. There were, as you know, certain schools in London which were called schools of special difficulty. You will find an account of those schools in our tables, and will see the proportion of defective development cases there were, showing whether or not it is probably true that they had greater difficulty there. That is an illustration, perhaps, of the usefulness of being able to show what kind of general material there is in the school, and possibly allowance may be made for that; it has a bearing as to the welcomeness of these dull children being kept in the school. If you can make an assessment allowance for the material in the school, possibly some of these children may be more welcome there.

802. (*Chairman.*) That is to say, if instead of 1 per cent. of exceptional children you find 2 or 3 per cent., you would say that it was a school presenting special difficulties?—That is not what I meant. If I found in a school 8 per cent. of the children with some defect of development instead of the ordinary 5 and 6 per cent., I should say that it was a school presenting certain difficulties, and such a one might be existing.

803. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) Then the next point you refer to is the recommendations in this report. Have you anything special to say about those?—I should like to direct attention to the fact that the committee who drew up the report referred to have made certain recommendations which, as having been asked to give evidence to you, I submit to you. It is at page 55 of the report.

804. If there are any points that you specially wish to impress upon the Committee they will be glad to hear them?—Most of the points there recommended have been touched upon already in the evidence. We think it is very desirable that an independent inquiry should be made by an authority for the State as to the conditions of childhood; and we also think it is a matter of great importance that a staff of trained teachers, if possible, should be provided, not only for these day schools, but for others, to take charge of feebly-gifted children if they are segregated and put together. I would also point out that our work has shown that a great deal more information about such points as you are considering could be obtained from official reports, such as those of the Education Department, if they kept boys and girls in separate columns. Many of the points in the public report, do not give information anything like as usefully as they would do if they had the boys and girls separated.

805. With regard to expert scientific advice what do you wish to say?—It was thought that, considering the many questions of public importance that are raised concerning children, it was of great importance that the public department dealing with children should receive expert advice on points occurring under their cognisance. I should like to say that that point was gone into very fully in that Report of the Home Office on the Reformatory and Industrial Schools.

806. Could you give us just a brief account of what you mean by expert scientific advice?—Answering questions as they occur. Shall I give you an illustration?

807. Yes, if you please.—There has been the question of eyesight raised, and we know that an official report has shown that there is a deficiency of eyesight among a larger proportion of children in towns as compared with the country. Looking further into that matter, it appears to be very doubtful whether that is really a *bonâ fide* condition of eye defect, it is not quite proven yet. There appears to be evidence (and this can only be gone into as a definite scientific matter), that it is a want of training to use and move the eyes in looking at objects in towns only.

808 (*Chairman.*) So Mr. Brudenell Carter says in that Report?—Yes; that has been very well gone into by Dr. James Kerr, of Bradford, who shows the acuteness of vision as shown simply by test type in central and suburban portions of his town; and, inasmuch as he has analysed his facts very carefully, looking over them (I have not got his tables here), it struck me that there was a considerable amount of evidence there, that this deficiency of sight is not a question of eye defect so much as a matter of not learning to use the eyes for the purposes of vision. That is an item, I take it, in which expert advice is a matter of considerable importance.

809. You mean that as the occasion arises, somebody scientifically expert in that particular department should be called in?—Yes.

810. You do not make a general recommendation beyond that?—That I leave. Expert advice, we say; no one man would be up in everything.

811. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) Is it not that the town child looks at the object from a nearer point of view than the country child?—Yes; then, when serious questions have been raised, involving much expense in which experience has been gained with regard to girls, it has been assumed that the same thing is to be considered good for boys. Nothing but something like expert analyses of facts will tell you that.

812. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) Have you anything to say about the suggestions that follow those recommendations. They are included in the paging you mention here, from 65 to 71?—I have referred to the question of statistics as a very important matter if it could be attended to in drawing up an official report.

813. Then the question of discrimination, I think that is a point you have given a good deal of information about, I see there is a recommendation in the report about discrimination of the feebly-minded and defective children; the question is who is to make the discrimination. We will not say how a discrimination is to be made?—My view with regard to the discrimination of groups of children is that it should depend upon the report of two persons: one the teacher who has had experience with the child for a certain length of time in work, and also an independent report by someone who sees the case and describes what is seen in that case. I lay great stress upon giving the description of the points seen in that child; whether it agrees with the report upon mental character or not I do not think matters very much. No doubt the authority to whom the report is submitted will again clear the ground for judgment by comparing the two. Such a form of certificate I have used largely in many cases, and a bundle of certificates describing such children lies on the table here.

814. Are there any other matters, any suggestions that you wish to bring forward prominently?—There is the question of legislation, which is referred to in recommendation D., on page 66, and I gave the secretary

Mr. F. Warner, M.D., F.R.C.P.

12 Feb. 1897.

beforehand a memorial, drawn up by the committee and extensively signed, as to the extension of the Education Act for blind and dumb children; that memorial was extensively signed and Lord Egerton of Tatton, as president of the committee, communicated it to the President of the Council, who considered it favourably personally, but at that time the Education Bill was about to be withdrawn and the matter dropped; but what the committee thought right is there drafted.

815. What is the gist of it?—It amounts to an extension of the Elementary Education Acts with regard to blind and deaf children, 56 & 57 Vict. c. 42, extending its action to include children with mental and bodily defects as well as the epileptic. Personally I also think that in any amendment of that Act the age should be altered. I think I am right in saying that it is up to 16 now for the blind and deaf, then if so it is contemplated that if the mentally deficient are brought under it they will also be under education to 16 years of age. But, personally, in dealing with children in connection with the London Hospital and so forth, it is at the other end I have found a difficulty, the non-admission of cases up to seven years of age. Many parents have complained greatly of not being able to get their defective child—a blind child or dumb child—under education till seven, wishing and demanding education for it at the earlier date. I would suggest that while the Act remains compulsory at seven, it certainly would be advisable that these children with any physical or mental deficiencies should be admissible at the earlier age.

(*Mrs. Burgwin.*) Do you mean five years of age, because at that age they come in now?

816. (*Chairman.*) In this Memorial we have the actual number given us here for the three classes, children feeble mentally and deficient, 347; dull mentally and feeble in body and brain, 473; and epileptic, 110. Those three classes are all exclusive, making a total of 930 in 100,000 children, and for the whole of England 62,773 in the same classes?—I had forgotten that clause in that particular paper; I have no copy of it with me.

817. That is rather less than 1 per cent., 930 on 100,000?—Yes, it is. I would rather, of course, accept those figures in front of you there.

818. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) Then I think we come to the point of the organization of a class of special instruction under the Brighton School Board, following a report upon so many children examined in one of their schools?—I sent in a copy of that report because I thought it very well illustrated some points which you raise in your syllabus of inquiry. It came about in this way. At Brighton they had appointed a sub-committee to consider what could be done for this class of child, trying to find out how they could deal with the question which is the subject of your reference, and as a practical means arrangements were made and I went down to Brighton and saw the school of which the report is there, Elm Grove Board School, containing 800 and odd children, the numbers are on that paper. During the day members of the Board, some of them, were present; some medical men were present and others interested, so that they saw the children themselves. The report as sent in indicated the number of children of the different groups as you have taken them this afternoon, showing also the names of the actual children who required special care and training. It also showed other points. It showed the children who required glasses from the presence of squint. It showed a case or two that required medical attention and other points, and the Board were satisfied that ten children there (of whom they had a description) were mentally feeble children. They thereupon assigned a room where they could be taught under special teachers to look after them. They began by selecting their children, secondly, by appointing a teacher whom they thought the most suitable to look after the work, and then began their work, which, I believe, has been extended since. I do not know whether they have more than one class,

819. That I think we shall hear about?—I daresay you will. But that work was, therefore, done in a day, not the writing of the report but the seeing of the school; it is not exceptionally laborious. And, more than that, it enabled an account to be given of each of these children. There (*producing the same*) is a packet of cards corresponding to the children seen, a card for each child that had any defect; in fact, the schoolmaster said to me, "If you will leave the cards "with me I shall know what to do with each of my "boys." I could not do that, but there is no reason why he should not have had a card corresponding to each of his boys who we said had some point that required care and attention. You will see there an illustration of what was spoken of as the assessment of material in the school. That school was a newly opened one, and there is no doubt that it presented certain difficulties, and you will see if you look down the table of the groups of children the percentage in which they were present, parallel with the column giving the average that I found among 100,000 children, which shows the large proportion of nerve cases that that school had on the boys' side, not upon the girls' side; this is suggestive of the importance of further physical training.

820. Do you account for that in any way?—Because they did not have physical training. I should like, as you put the history of the movement in towns, to mention one other fact as regards Leicester. I had something to do with that. I believe the movement for the care of these children in Leicester began with a single case. Mr. Ellis was Chairman of the Board at that time, and he had the case of a boy who could not be received into the asylum because he was not imbecile; no doctor would certify him. He could not be without difficulty retained in a school because he was troublesome and could not learn at all. That single case was sent up to town and I gave a report upon it, and said that it would be well to look for other cases in the town.

821. (*Chairman.*) We shall have a witness from Leicester who will tell us about that?—Very well. That is how it was started.

822. Then, supposing that an Act were passed providing that the care of the State should be given to these children as to the deaf and blind, would this be a satisfactory course to follow: That the school authority should take expert advice upon all cases reported by the teacher as requiring exceptional treatment; that the judgment of the teacher and of the expert together should be taken as a necessary qualification for admission to a special class; that instructions based upon each case should be given to the teacher as to the care of each of those children; and also, that the children should be periodically examined from time to time as to their progress or deterioration. Would you consider that a satisfactory mode of procedure?—I think that that would secure a very great portion of what seems to be necessary. I would only make one point in addition which seems to me very important. You say upon the nomination of his teacher, and I heartily agree that the teacher should be the nominator; but I would also put in the parent, because I have come across a great many cases in connexion with my hospital work. I would say, also, upon the application of the parent to the school managers; that is to say, in a case where the child has never got into school yet. Probably you include that, but I put it in in so many words.

823. Quite so. There would be cases outside the school whom the school board officers would report to the school authority?—There are cases, I must say plainly (for I have nothing to do with any official body myself), that are not reported by the school board officer; there are cases that are not even known to any one except the parents, and the parents of many of these children are forward to demand education for their children, and are told that they cannot have it. That is the worst case; and I say that every parent should have the right to education for his child on applying to the local managers; and if they cannot provide for that child, they should put the case before the central authority, and then the parents' nomination should be on a par with the nomination by the teacher.

824. You are aware that the school board officer has orders to schedule every child in every house in London?—I am aware of that, perfectly.

825. Do you think, then, that he is unaware of the existence of many children who are feeble-minded?—I know this very well, as the result of a great many years' work in the out-patients' department of the London Hospital, that a great many parents come to me there because they want to claim for their child that it shall be educated, and they cannot get it done.

826. But you do not say that it is not known to the school board authorities?—That, of course, would be saying that I know a negative; I cannot say that I know it is not known. I can say that the parents tell me that they cannot get education for their child, and to that I adhere.

827. That is merely the statement of the parent?—Yes; and the school managers have, many of them, admitted the same thing to me. I could refer you to neighbourhoods now where there are groups of children waiting to be cared for, that the Board will not, or in other words cannot, at the moment accept. I could name Whitechapel, Poplar, and a district towards Kilburn, in which I know groups of these children who are known, whose parents cannot get education for this class of children. There they are; they are waiting.

828. You know that there are groups of feeble-minded children who cannot get admission to school in Whitechapel and Poplar?—I do in Whitechapel and Poplar. I have not seen them in the North-Western District, but I have heard of them.

829. (*Mr. Pooley.*) You are speaking of the feeble minded?—Yes.

830. Not of ordinary children?—No.

831. (*Chairman.*) Do you think it would be possible to give the teachers some directions in each individual case as to how these children should be treated?—I think so. You can give hints to them. That is what one's experience is in dealing with these cases in private practice. I always give a teacher hints as to what are the first points that I think they should deal with, and some indication as to how they should deal with them. The carrying out of those instructions is their affair; just as in dealing with disease one always gives directions to a nurse as to how to manage the patient, but it is the nurse's business to see that she carries them out.

832. Have you any idea as to what size of class should be adopted for these feeble-minded children?—That is a very difficult matter; I am not aware that it would apply equally to girls and boys. If I must say something provisional, I would say that the number should be something like 15, but that is not upon direct evidence. I should think that that is the utmost that a single teacher could do.

833. And as regards the qualifications of the teacher, should she be a specially qualified person?—My experience is, that if you want to get the most benefit for children of this class you want the best woman that you can get, the most intellectual and the best trained. I like them, first of all, to have had some training as Kindergarten teachers, and, if possible, to have some general knowledge on other matters also. I always make it my business, in any particular case that comes before me, to tell the teacher the particular points in the individual child with which I want her to deal: technical knowledge of the individual case I consider it my business to give in private practice.

834. And in testing children you would not be too rigorous in exclusion in the first instance?—I think it is most difficult to make anything approaching a definition as to what child may or may not be admitted. I do not feel at all able to say what child is to be excluded. I certainly do not think it is necessary to be too particular in excluding every case that may be certified as imbecile. I would not raise the question.

835. That is to say, you would allow a great latitude?—I would.

836. But what length of time would you say would be necessary for experiment in order to see whether the child was likely to profit by the teaching of the school?—There you come to the question. Is the definition of the child to be whether it is going to profit up to the point of becoming self-supporting.

837. You will notice that we put on our syllabus "partially or wholly self-supporting," even in the smallest degree self-supporting?—I should like to put it just a step or two lower. I should run it like this: "So as to become wholly or partially self-supporting, "or, at least, to lessen the probability of becoming "pauper vagrant and criminal"; and it is equally worth the public paying for, not only to become self-supporting, but to lessen the probabilities of becoming pauper vagrant or criminal. I could give you evidence, if you like, upon the point. I am sorry to say I have not got it here to-day, but I am quite prepared with evidence to show that probably these children do become pauper vagrant or criminal. And other reports have touched upon that point. The Home Office have recognised that the exclusion of these children has in the past helped to fill their schools.

Mr. F. Warner, M.D., F.R.C.P.

12 Feb. 1897.

838. (*Mr. Pooley.*) In the case of children whom it is proposed to admit into a special class, supposing a teacher reports a child to be dull, and the medical examiner finds that no other defect either (A) (B) or (C.) is present, so far as he can see, do you think that in such a case he would necessarily say that the child ought to be retained in the ordinary school?—You cannot make a really hard and fast rule there, because some of these cases of moral imbeciles do not show any defect in class (A), do not show any defect in class (B), and do not show any defect in class (C); but when you get the history you feel that you have abundant proof before you of a certain degree of mental deficiency. You cannot make it absolute. I should not like to refuse under all conditions the report of the teachers, although I saw no facts backing it up.

839. Would you say that, as a general rule, those children who come within your class (D) only should not be turned out from the ordinary school into a special class?—I do think so, indeed, they should not be turned out if possible. There is a class of child, especially of boy I believe, who has good movement, good expression, good reaction and everything good about him except that he cannot learn his lessons, and if he is to be prevented from being among bright children I doubt if he will make so good a man for employment as if he were trained among his fellows.

840. Have you any opinion as regards selecting children to be admitted into these special classes from the ordinary schools, as to whether the selection should be made at a meeting at which both the medical examiner and the teacher should be present?—I think that you would get through the work very much quicker if it is to be done upon a large scale (and quickness of professional work will come to pounds shillings and pence), if it is done separately, and I am not sure that it will not save friction.

841. Upon whom should the decision ultimately depend, if it is to be done separately; upon whose report?—I think it must finally depend upon the report of the committee of managers, or some lay authority like that; having the evidence before them, I think they must make the final decision.

842. Do you think it necessary that each case should be referred to them, or that it is desirable?—Is not that partly a question as to whether it is going to be an expensive matter or not. I do not know what sum you intend to spend upon them. I do not think I am an authority to advise definitely on expenditure.

843. Then may I ask you this; Your observations have been mainly confined to children in schools?—I have got a batch of cases not in schools.

844. I was going to ask you about a child who had not been in school, but applies for admission to a school; do you think that such a child should, as a rule, be admitted into the ordinary school for trial?—I do not see that there is any harm in that. I think I should take other teachers' opinion to a considerable extent upon that item.

845. What I mean is, that in such a case, a child coming to school for the first time, there can be no report of the teacher upon the child?—That is so.

846. Would the medical officer, upon examination, be justified in sending that child to a special class to begin with?—I should have thought that it would perhaps have been better to try the child in some standard in the school first. What I have had occasion to complain of is the child's being sent out in three or four days and dismissed, from the hospital point of view I mean.

847. You think that such a child should, as a rule, be tried by the ordinary school test?—I think so.

848. Would you advocate an annual medical inspection of all scholars in ordinary schools, or only of all children in special classes?—I think the former is almost too big a question to raise. I meant an annual medical inspection of all children in special classes where presumably the cost of examination is very much greater.

849. Then just a few words about the proportion of children. If I understood you aright, you divided all children into two classes; ordinary children, and children definitely exceptional?—Yes, they can be so divided.

850. May we take it, then, as correct that from your investigations about one per cent. of the whole of the children in schools are properly admissible to classes for special treatment?—There is a difficulty there; the

Mr. F. Warner, M.D., F.R.C.P.

12 Feb. 1897.

question is, that one is not sure what you are going to do with them. I think the one per cent. are cases that require to be considered individually. As to what you should do with them, that is a matter that should be brought up before the committee of managers.

851. But you say that one per cent. are children who cannot be properly taught by ordinary methods in ordinary schools?—I suspect that is true.

852. You have, no doubt, that that is about the percentage?—Yes, it is about that.

853. Have you considered in detail at all, what legislative amendments are desirable; I mean with reference to an extension of the Act for blind and deaf children to these classes of children?—Yes, I have considered that point, and I think the result is expressed in a memorial which is in the hands of the Chairman, which was presented to the President of the Council on the late Education Bill. The only point that I had an opinion upon further, was, I think, upon the question of a grant. I have an idea that if the same grant is given for these children as is given for the blind and dumb under a guarantee that they really do get special training—not only are grouped together—it will lead to the largest proportion of those children being collected and trained, and I think it will lead to immense benefit.

854. May I take it, then, that you think it is desirable that a larger grant should be paid to children of this description in special classes?—I should suggest a five guinea grant, the highest ever given.

855. If you put the grant too high, might there not be a danger of children who might properly be taught with ordinary children being put into these classes, in order to get the larger grant?—I should hope that the double mode of reporting upon them that I have spoken of, would check all that. I think it would.

856. Would it not be desirable to keep the grant down to such a limit that the education of children in these special classes would not cost, at all events, less per head to the school managers than the education of ordinary children?—It must cost more if you are to have smaller classes.

857. But do you not think that the grant should be kept down, so that there should be no danger of children being put into special classes, in order to get more money?—It would be very sad if that were to be the result.

858. It would not be a desirable result at any rate?—Certainly not.

859. Then as to extension of age, you think that these children ought to be taught up to 16 years of age?—Yes; and I do not go beyond 16, because I take it that the scope of age that you are dealing with at this table does not go higher. I said also that the age should be extended down: I said that it should also be compulsory upon the school authority to receive a child at five years of age; I think it is not now compulsory until seven years of age.

860. In the case of the deaf I think it is seven?—I would alter it both for the deaf and blind, and for the defective children, so that it should be compulsory upon the school authority to receive a child at five years of age, but not compulsory upon the parent necessarily to send it until seven years of age.

861. You are, of course, aware that it is compulsory to educate the children now, unless there is a reasonable excuse for excluding them?—I know that it is the law; but I also know that it is not possible to carry it out, because I have had so many children to do with whose parents cannot get provision for them and do not, according to the information that comes to me, which I distinctly believe.

862. Under the Deaf and Blind Act it is compulsory by law to give a blind or deaf child special instruction suited to him; do you think that it should be compulsory upon the school authority to give to these defective children special instruction suitable to them?—Yes, I think it is just as important, as it is simply to have a special class to have suitable instruction given in that class, whatever is the best.

863. Then, of course, it would be a reasonable excuse if there were no means of giving suitable instruction?—Excuse for default of the authority or for excluding the child, do you mean?

864. Excuse for default of the authority?—No. I should say the authority was an offender, and ought to make provision for the child.

865. Let me put this case: Take the case of a child in the country, where there are not sufficient children to have a special class; under the Blind and Deaf Act the school authority are bound to send such a child to an institution. Do you think that that provision could be extended to these defective children?—I think that exactly the same thing should be extended to one of these children, and that if possible the school authority should have the power to make the necessary monetary arrangements, and send the child to a home where it may be trained, making, as a condition of its going, efficient mental training.

866. You would give power to the school authority to send these children away from their homes to some central institution or home?—Yes.

867. At the same time, is it not your opinion that these children do better in a day school than in an institution?—Yes, if you can manage it. I do think that a considerable number of these mentally feeble children do better, from the point of view of benefit to the child, if they are not too much put among other feeble-minded children; but looking at it from the practical side it is difficult to see how you are to do it. I like to see it done.

868. Then, supposing that the Blind and Deaf Act were extended, and you were dealing with a particular child, it would be a serious question whether it would be better to allow the child to remain at home and get what instruction it could with ordinary children, or to send it to an institution at a distance?—I do not think that any great harm is likely to happen even from a mistake, whichever is done. The great harm arises when a child is sent away from a day school, or any school, because it is dull and backward and cannot learn, and remains at home doing nothing. And that is the great complaint of the parents whom I have come across as a hospital physician in the last 17 years—that the school authority refuse to have their child at school, and are not making any other provision for educating him. And the same may be said of the action of magistrates. I have had many cases come under my notice of a magistrate fining a parent because the boy would not go to school.

869. In a country district might it not be better for the child to remain at home—at all events if the home is not a bad one—and get some instruction at school, rather than that he should be removed from his parents and get instruction in an institution at a distance?—In some cases it would probably be better. The great point that I argue is, that the child should go to school, that he should not be refused by the local school because he is dull and defective unless they do something better for him.

870. Then, would it not be sufficient if institutions were provided to which such children could be sent without making it compulsory upon the parents to send the children to an institution—I mean especially in the case of children in the country?—I should have thought that you would not compel a parent to part with his child if his child were attending the local school; but I do think it is necessary that you should bring compulsion to bear upon the educational authority of the district (I do not say whether board or voluntary) to receive that child into a school, or, if not, to make some other provision for it.

871. To receive him into a school, you think, is the best plan?—Yes, to keep him in the locality, to see what he will do.

872. Do you think that parents usually would be willing to allow their children to be sent to institutions?—I am quite sure that the class of parents who come to me about their children (I am speaking of the poor now who come before me as hospital cases) are, very many of them, demanding that their children shall be taken care of for them in the schools, and do not want them to go away to any residential institution.

873. If that is so, then, if the school authority had power to provide special classes or institutions, would that not be sufficient, without extending the law of compulsory attendance?—I want to bring the compulsion to bear upon the school authority to make provision for this class of child, rather than upon the parent to send his child to school; it will do better, I think, to begin in that way.

874. Compulsion upon the parent is a secondary matter, you think?—I should put it secondary to compulsion upon the school authority.

875. And if you had compulsion upon the parent (I mean on the principle of the compulsion under the Blind and Deaf Act, that is to say, up to the age of 16), have you considered that, if the child were an ordinary child it could only be compelled to go to school until 14 years of age, whereas, if it were in any degree defective, it could be compelled to go to school up to 16 years of age?—There is good reason for that, because that child tends more to become unemployed and vagrant than a normal child. I think it is State policy that that child should be liable under the Education Act up to 16.

876. Would there not be a difficulty in enforcing that law much more than the Blind and Deaf Act; because blindness or deafness is a definite thing, whereas whether a child is defective and feeble-minded or not is a matter which it is extremely difficult to determine?—That is so, and the condition of the child may get better, we hope. There again, the same principle applies, in my opinion. I do not want the child turned out till he is 16, when the parent demands for him to remain; that is my strong point. Nowadays, I think, you will find that in the special classes for instruction in London the children must be discharged at 14 years of age, whatever the parents' wishes are.

877. That is a rule of the school authority, I take it?—I am not quite up in the law on that point.

878. (*Miss Townsend.*) I should like to know whether the parents who complain that their children are not taught, complain, for the most part, that they are sent out of the ordinary classes, or that they have no special classes provided for them?—The greatest difficulty is when the child should pass from the infant school to the upper school, and has been a little while in the upper school, then the parents tell me they are told that they cannot do with him in the school.

879. Do you think that the parents recognise the need for special instruction for these children?—I think that the parents who take the trouble to come and consult me at the hospital about the mental aspect of the case do care about it; that is a selected set of parents.

880. But is it not the case that many of these defective children are neglected, that is to say, are the children of parents who care very little whether they are taught or not?—I daresay they are; then they would not come to me. A parent who does not care about his child would not take the trouble to come and see me.

881. Your 1 per cent. of 100,000 would exclude a good many neglected children?—Yes; there must be a great many children at home beside those that I saw in the schools.

882. That is my point. And the parents of those children who you say complain to you that their children are not taught, will be the good parents who wish their children to be taught?—Yes, there are two kinds of parents of these defective children; parents who are themselves somewhat degenerate, and there are parents who are much better than the average of their own families.

883. Have you noticed whether the children who are called by the teacher mentally dull, but who are not included in your classes (A), (B), and (C), are neglected children?—I cannot answer your question.

884. You make no inquiry about their homes?—No.

885. Then there is one other point, the training that you would provide for the teachers; is there anything special or technical about it, or is it merely that you would have the best teachers that you could get?—I think that there is a great deal that is technical about it. I think that, on taking charge of a child who has a degree of deficiency or defect, the first thing is to study the child, and observe it so far as to be able to say whether there are any points in its brain action that can be benefited, as in many cases there are.

886. I thought you said just now that that was the office of the expert?—Yes; but the teacher will not very well understand any description that is given to him unless he is capable of understanding the points that show brain deficiency.

887. You would give the teacher technical training so as to be able to understand the instructions that are given?—Yes; and so as to know how to carry them out.

888. Do you think that the individual care given to the child is the main point in the special teaching, the power of giving individual attention to each child?—It must be very important to give individual attention to each child, but I do not think it is at all the whole of the matter in improving the child. Given an individual child and an individual teacher, it does not follow that that individual teacher will necessarily improve that child.

Mr. F. Warner, M.D., F.R.C.P.

12 Feb. 1897.

889. So that teaching children in small classes is not sufficient without technical instruction as to how to teach them?—No, not at all.

890. Are any voluntary schools included in your inquiry?—Yes.

891. You took them indiscriminately in the different districts?—Yes.

892. And you found the conditions prevailing pretty much the same?—Oh, no, I think not. I think that the class of children that you are dealing with are admitted in larger numbers in voluntary schools in certain quarters than they are, on the average, in the board schools.

893. Do the parents not complain so much that their children are excluded from voluntary schools?—I cannot say. I can say that I have seen a larger proportion of these children in some voluntary schools than, on the average, in the board schools. I can name them if you wish it.

894. But you do not give any reason for that?—Oh, yes; I think the reason is because the managers of the voluntary schools encourage the teachers to do it; they say that if the results are a little inferior in the examination report because they have kept, say, three defective children, they will not look upon them as having failed in their duty. I know a schoolmaster at an endowed school, an elementary school in London (of course he can afford to do it), who makes a point of never refusing a child who is in the school and belongs to his district because it is a weak-brained child, and, of course the examination results are by so much diminished; I think all honour of him. There is a less hard cast-iron system in the voluntary schools, and they can do more as they like. I suppose that is so.

895. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) Would you tell us at what age physical defects or mental defects become obvious?—I think in many cases we can determine it within a very few weeks of life. Certainly I see a considerable number of cases of babies in their first year in whom one can point out to the mother that there is a brain that will very probably show indications of mental defect, and which requires special care and nursing.

896. And at what age would you recommend school life for such a child?—The sooner some sort of training is begun the better; it is difficult to say exactly what the school life would be, as early as is practicable is all I can say. I have already said that I would have them considered admissible, as the rule, at five years old; I would not have them refused if it can possibly be helped then.

897. (*Mr. Pooley.*) Admissible to school?—Yes; if you have to make an age as a matter of law, I think you should make them admissible to school at five, not at seven simply. I would not put compulsion then, but the earlier they could begin the training the better.

898. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) Do you think that a highly nervous child should be separated from the children of an ordinary class in an elementary school?—Not a nervous child who is not defective.

899. I say a highly nervous child, a neurotic child?—No; a child tending to seem very dense, I would not separate it and put it into a special class of defective children.

900. You think that such a child would not suffer from being in a class of 60 brighter children?—No, I do not think so. I do not think it should be dealt with among deficient children.

901. I have not quite gathered from your evidence whether you are in favour of separating those children who are on the border line from their fellows?—The great point that I go for is that you shall not refuse to take them in, as was at one time the case.

902. (*Mr. Pooley.*) Into the ordinary schools?—Yes. The great outcry was at one time that these cases were sent away from schools, and were refused admission because there was not a place for them; and there is no doubt that the same thing is going on to-day in certain

Mr. F. Warner, M.D., F.R.C.P.

12 Feb. 1897.

districts where they are trying to form classes for them. I do not want to be too positive, or to say that they should be taken out if any experience shows that they are doing well in the classes where they are.

903. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) But are you not considering the one child rather than the 60 others?—I am inclined to think that even the 59 others might put up with one distinctly below par, they do not know what they will meet with in the world outside. I do not think that one among 60 need necessarily, for the sake of the 59, be turned out into a special class. I have never advocated that anyone should go round and take these children out into a special class; but it may be necessary.

904. Let me give you an example. A child without special training absolutely refuses to sit in any one seat, but walks about the class, do you not think that that would be a hindrance to the education of the 59 children?—I should think it must be a hindrance to the education of the 59.

905. Would you separate that child (that is a highly neurotic child) from a class of 60 children?—I am not prepared to say. I cannot answer such questions without seeing the child, at any rate.

906. Do I rightly understand that you would extend the school life of a defective child to 16 years of age?—Yes; and I would also wish that there should be continuation of industrial training after that, but I thought that that did not come within your reference.

907. (*Chairman.*) Yes, it does?—Then I should wish to say, distinctly, that when they leave these classes for special instruction, whether at 14 or at 16 years of age, for many of them it is desirable that there should be some form of continued industrial training, and also some continuation of mental culture.

908. Up to what age would you say?—I think, having got up to 16——

909. You would stop there?—No, I should not stop there, I should say up to 20 years of age. I have kept these cases, when they have come to me in private practice, under training up to 23 and 24 years of age, and, in fact, as long as they do not rebel against it, the longer the better. But it is the principle of continued training, industrial and mental, even after 16 years of age, that is necessary in order to prevent pauperism.

910. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) I know it is a delicate question, but is it your experience that children have been excluded from school upon the certificates of medical men?—Oh, I think there is no question about that at all.

911. I had not finished my question; children, I mean, who ought to be in school?—You see the ethical question comes in.

912. I think that a great many of those cases will be found to cover very many of the cases that you meet with in hospitals?—Of course there will undoubtedly be a difference of opinion over the general condition of a child as to whether it should be in school or not. I can give my opinion upon an individual child, but it does not at all follow that another medical man will form the same opinion as I do as to whether that child can benefit by school life or not.

913. You would say, then, that the school authority must accept any medical certificate that is submitted to them?—I think the school authorities will have endless difficulty in the matter that you are referring to until they do their medical work for themselves by their own medical officers.

914. In your experience have you found feeble-minded children in attendance at elementary schools?—Yes, happily of all grades.

915. Although they could not be educated in the ordinary sense of the term?—Oh, yes, certainly.

916. Have you found epileptic children in attendance at elementary schools?—Yes, in the voluntary schools; they are very seldom to be found now in the board schools, I think.

917. Can you give us any explanation why they are found in the voluntary schools rather than in the board schools?—They are not sent away.

918. I daresay another explanation may be given by and by?—There may be other reasons; I cannot, of course, explain it.

919. Would you tell the Committee how many hours a day you think these defective children might attend school?—With regard to the duration of the school day of a child that is mentally feeble, I believe that the time spent in occupation under the care of the teachers needs to be quite as long as for other children if means are taken to vary the occupation with play, and to prevent fatigue.

920. You spoke of the technical training of teachers; do you not think that a fully trained teacher would be able to observe a child in the way you suggest?—I do not think that the fully trained teachers, as a rule, have been able to describe what are the points they are trying to deal with in the child always, and I take that from experience of the teachers at training colleges, the head teachers of schools, and others. I also judge of the same from the fact that many teachers have told me when I have been seeing a group of children that one has picked out the dull ones by points seen, although there were many more present than the dull ones, whereas the experience is that the teacher has taken six weeks or more to decide on the mental capacity of a child and where it should be placed.

921. Could you, then, as a medical man, point out all the defects in a child in, say, a quarter of an hour's examination, or 10 minutes' examination?—I think I could do that and give a description of him too, after looking at the group of cases that have been described as deficient.

922. In what time, may I ask, can you do that?—It does, as a matter of fact, take about 10 minutes; that is the time I allow in consultations which I have held in various parts of London to give an account of feeble-minded children present. I take on an average six an hour.

923. And you think that you can diagnose any case in 10 minutes?—Yes, about that on the average, I think.

924. (*Mr. Newton.*) Can you tell me how the curriculum of a school for special children should differ from the curriculum of an ordinary school?—I do not think I can tell you that.

925. You have not paid attention to that?—I have not been into the special classes for instruction in London.

926. You would believe, I suppose, that manual work, or a good deal of it, is a good thing for many of these defective children?—Some manual work must be useful for them.

927. Such as kindergarten work?—Some kindergarten work.

928. There is only one more question that I want to ask you: could you formulate any legal definition of a feeble-minded child?—I do not think I could frame a legal definition. I have often tried. I think that any attempt you make at description cannot really define a child. I do not think there is any definition possible; I think you can only state your opinion both as to the account of its mental status and facts seen. I cannot help you further.

929. Then let us take the case of the age of compulsory attendance at school being raised from 14 to 16, what might happen would be this: say in the case of London, Dr. Smith would say, I think so-and-so is a feeble-minded child and ought to be kept at school till 16 years of age. The parents of the child would, no doubt, find some other medical man who would say, I do not think so-and-so is feeble-minded at all. Would not a prosecution under such circumstances break down?—I should think so, but I should think that whoever was the authority would be advised by Dr. Smith. That raises a point that I have raised this afternoon—the description of facts seen. The question is whether these two gentlemen cannot agree upon the facts seen. If they cannot, no doubt there will be differences of opinion.

930. I have no doubt that the school attendance authority would agree with Dr. Smith, and would be right in doing so; but in the last resort the matter has to rest with either a magistrate or a bench of magistrates?—Yes, and they would go according to the weight of evidence, as they do in cases of insanity in legal cases.

931. Would you get a conviction, practically?—I think not.

932. Then, I think, it would be impossible to raise the age of compulsion?—I think you would have a great deal of difficulty in carrying it out. My great

Mr. F. Warner, M.D. F.R.C.P.

12 Feb. 1897.

argument is that you should allow the parent, if he demands it, to have his child kept in school, and you should require the authority to keep his child in and not dismiss it till 16 years of age. What I say is that the classes should be open to 16 years of age. There would be great difficulty in making compulsion as you suggest.

933. (*Dr. Smith.*) I suppose you will admit that the education of children depends very much upon their environment—their surroundings?—Oh yes, it is part of their education.

934. And a very important part?—A very important part.

935. You cannot, in fact, over-estimate the importance of environment, can you?—Yes, you can overestimate it, I think. I think it is a very important part.

936. Now, you have told us that your experience as physician to the London Hospital is that there are a large number of children who are refused admission to school mainly on the ground that they are backward or mentally feeble, and that the schools are not desirous of having them?—The schools say they cannot have them—that is what I am told.

937. Cannot have them?—Yes, they will not have them.

938. Do you know whether that opinion is confirmed by any other physician to any hospital, especially a physician to a children's hospital?—I do not know that I can quote anything that they have written on the matter.

939. I do not know it myself, but you have spoken upon it so strongly that I should have thought such an important fact as that would have come under the notice of physicians to children's hospitals especially and to some of those of the other large hospitals?—I cannot prove whether it has or has not come under their notice; they have not written on the subject to my knowledge.

940. You do not know of any writing or record which will bear that out from any one source?—I do not.

941. In speaking of your work you have frequently used the term "we" and spoken of "our work." I take it that you use that word rather in an editorial sense. Nobody has been associated with you in this work, I think?—Certainly, I have since 1888 worked with a committee; the names are on the table in the copies of the report.

942. Yes, I know, of course, of the committee, but these actual observations of this actual work have been made by yourself?—It was done by myself in conjunction with other medical men who were present on many occasions. If you would like the names I will mention them.

943. I do not think you need do that, for I have had the privilege of going with you myself. What I mean is that, as a matter of fact, these observations and this work is practically your own?—I have been engaged in it ever since 1888, and for a good many years before.

944. I wanted to clear up any doubt which might exist about the use of that word "we." You also said that one of these reports was presented to the Local Government Board. I suppose it was sent by the committee to the Local Government Board for their information?—No, excuse me; it was sent by the request of the President of the Local Government Board and forwarded to him by the Council of the British Medical Association.

945. There has been no actual work done on behalf of the Local Government Board in this respect, has there?—There has been no actual work done on their commission and their payment. They have used our results largely, but they have not given any commission for the work to be done.

946. Then, so far as 18,000 of your observations are concerned, those have been confined to what I might call the physical side; I mean your own personal observations?—Of course an observation is a physical observation of things seen.

947. We are not all medical men, and we have been using the terms "physical signs" and "mental signs," and it is in that sense I meant the words "physical sign"; that so far as 18,000 of these cases are concerned, your observations were confined to what I may call the physical side; you contenting yourself with the mental evidence from the report of the teacher?—The mental evidence was taken from the report of the teacher in almost all cases without other means.

948. You have made no inquiry into that side of the question yourself?—We did not speak to these children to question them as to their mental powers. We were not allowed to do so.

949. You did not yourself inquire into the mental condition of these 18,000 children?—I inquired, inasmuch as I spoke to the teachers about it. I did not make a mental examination of the children except in a few cases; we were not allowed to do so. I do not admit that there was no mental examination made because the teacher was accepted as a witness upon the question.

950. My point is that you made no personal examination into the mental capacity of these 18,000 children; you contented yourself with the evidence afforded by the teachers?—The mental account was the evidence afforded by the teachers.

951. As regards these signs, I want to get at the value we must give to them—these signs which you have spoken of at great length, you may have several of them present or one of them present, and yet they may not be indicative of a mentally feeble child, is not that so?—Certainly, in an individual child.

952. Therefore it would not be wise, would it, to advise reliance upon them alone?—When you say reliance, I must be careful as to phrases.

953. It would not be wise to advise reliance upon these physical signs alone as a justification for admission into a class for defective children?—I should imagine that nobody ever proposed to take a child into a special class unless the child had been found by somebody t be exceedingly dull. The question would never be raised, I take it.

954. Do you not quite understand what I mean?—I do not think your point is one that has been taken; I think it contradicts itself.

955. (*Chairman.*) What you said was that you observed these signs, but they had to be confirmed by the history that the teacher gave you?—That was not Dr. Smith's question. I should take a double report, that is what I said.

956. (*Dr. Smith.*) I may be wrong, but I am inclined to attach very great value to these mental signs?—Pardon me, mental signs or nerve signs, do you mean.

957. Which do you call the nerve signs?—The signs that I have given a quotation of, which are enumerated from 43 to 67.

958. I mean by mental signs those which you say you have accepted upon the evidence of the teachers?—They do not give mental signs in their descriptions generally.

959. What descriptions do they give?—All sorts of things. Sometimes the teacher says, this child is dull; sometimes, this child is idiotic; sometimes they say, this child is bright in reading but bad in arithmetic; sometimes they say, this child is good at sums but bad in mental arithmetic; sometimes they say, he is a dull child but a very good one. One gets whatever information one can.

960. I will take one thing that you mention. A teacher says "this child is idiotic," do you accept that?—I should put it down as dull; I should not say idiotic unless I found signs of idiocy, certainly not.

961. (*Chairman.*) What the teacher means is mental incapacity, I take it?—That is the sense in which they use the term; they do not mean that the child is an idiot.

962. (*Dr. Smith.*) Then I will leave that point. Now, as regards these special classes, at the present time these classes are not a department of a school in the sense of the infant's department or the girls' department or the boys' department?—No, I understand.

963. And one is apt to think that any child who does not succeed in any way in any one of these departments should be sent into one of these special classes. You would admit some classification in these classes then?—I should first of all put down, as a means of dealing with a child who is much more dull than his confrères, the question whether he should or should not be placed in Standard 0 if there is one in the school; secondly, whether he cannot be dealt with in the infant department in Standard I., even if he is above

Mr. F. Warner, M.D., F.R.C.P.

12 Feb. 1897.

the age of seven, before I should consider the question of putting him in a class of defectives simply because he is dull and learns with difficulty.

964. That you would not advise?—Not as a first step, unless I was sure that he was defective; I should not put him in a class of defectives unless I saw signs proving to me that he was defective.

965. But if he learnt with difficulty, you would not necessarily put him into one of these classes?—Certainly not, myself; but I have not had any communication with the managers of those classes. I take it that whoever has to do with the discrimination, takes the tone of the class of the child, of course, from the managers.

966. Do you know anything about the committees of management of these schools?—Not of these defective classes.

967. What you have advised, so far as I understand, is that the ultimate admission to these classes should rest with the committee of management?—I should think so, and I should think that a lay authority of some sort would be much better.

968. To decide upon whether the child should be admitted to such special class?—I should think so.

969. And you would think that it would be sufficient to put before them a report from the teacher and the report from some medical examiner?—Yes, I should have thought it was much pleasanter for the two authorities, both the teacher and the doctor.

970. Who do you mean by the teacher—the teacher under whose care the child had been?—I should suppose that if the report comes from a certain school, it goes through the hands and bears the signature of the head teacher of that department. I suppose so.

971. That, as Mr. Pooley has suggested, is assuming that these children in every case passed through the elementary schools?—Yes, I see your point; I grant that. Then I think, there being no teacher in the case, it must fall upon the doctor or some officer connected with those schools, who is an educationist, to make the mental examination, instead of the teacher. The mental report might be filled up either by the doctor, of course, or by some officer (such as the superintendent of the classes) who is an educationist.

972. You can see that there might be a collision in the matter of management, in a question of this sort, if you had several authorities dealing with it. Naturally, the parent will give you valuable information, and the teacher will also give you valuable information; but should it not be the duty of some one person to deal with this evidence thoroughly and exhaustively, and bring his judgment to bear upon each individual case?—I incline to think that the best thing is to do as is done in a court of law, bring your evidence, and let a neutral party decide.

973. That is, assuming that the judge is a qualified person to exercise a judgment?—He can decide upon evidence. I do not think they are capable of collecting evidence, but they are surely capable of deciding upon evidence.

974. If you do not know the construction of committees of management, I think we need not pursue that?—I cannot tell you what committees of management are like.

975. That alters the whole case. Now you draw a distinction between an imbecile child, a *bonâ fide* imbecile child, and a child who is backward in the sense that we have been speaking of in learning. Do you think it is a desirable thing for him to associate in a class of children with imbeciles in that way?—I have seen imbeciles, to my thinking, very kindly and carefully, and even usefully, placed in public elementary day schools, and I have felt that there was no reason whatever to suppose that any benefit would follow from those particular cases being moved out (they were particular cases); it did not do any harm, and there was strength enough in the teaching power to prevent their being teased, hurt, or disrespected. Imbecile cases differ, of course, immensely.

976. Of course the question of deciding whether a child is backward, in a sense which would justify its admission into a special class, requires experience?—It requires, I should think, the experience of the teacher mainly.

977. How do you mean?—In the case of a child who is backward in his learning, I think it is probable that the teacher would be able to decide as well as an expert in mental science as to whether the child is backward for its social class or not.

978. Then would you advise that admission to these classes should be left to the teacher?—I have said already that I would leave it to some lay authority to act upon the evidence derived from the teaching profession and an expert from the medical profession. I should leave the authority to decide finally to such a body.

979. Would you mind telling us what is the technical instruction which you think it is necessary that teachers should have in these special classes?—There are two great points, I think; first of all, in observing children, and in being able to see for themselves, and in being able to describe, some of the conditions of defect, so that they may have an idea how to set about the difficult task of dealing with the individual child; and then, again, I think they should understand more than most of them do the adapting of physical exercises which are one of the great means of getting a child's brain into something like good order for the processes of mental training.

980. But I am assuming now a class of the size that you advise the Committee—15,—and that there is one teacher to this class. What is the technical training that that one teacher wants?—I have had abundance to do with these children and their training, but not with your classes of special instruction in London, for the special reason that I kept out of them because I was not asked to go into them.

981. Then it is not from actual experience that you suggest it?—Certainly it is. I have had a large experience in conducting the training of feeble-minded children; but it does not happen to have been acquired from the special classes of the London School Board. I have said already, I think, that among the points which I think would help teachers greatly in training for the purpose of undertaking the very difficult work of training these children who are mentally feeble, should be a knowledge how to describe a child that they have to deal with, so as to be able to see what are the points that shall be dealt with in its bad action as it comes to me. I have had a considerable amount of experience about that.

982. (*Chairman.*) It is the wish of the Committee that we should have some idea as to what the technical training of the teachers should be.—The first point is that I would have them trained in the observation and description of children, so that they may be able to recognise and describe what the points are that can be seen in a child, indicating the disorderly action of its brain; secondly, I should wish that they should have knowledge imparted to them of the best means of dealing with those conditions of disorderly action, one by one, for their removal. That this is desired by many teachers I have evidence. I have been asked by a good many of them to take some part in providing it.

983. Does that comprise the whole of the technical training that you advise for them?—No.

984. Perhaps you will go on, and state the points as briefly as you can.—I think there are other points in which a knowledge of how to observe children with accuracy enables a teacher to get an explanation of certain mental faults in the child, and the means of correcting them. I have also said already that it is important in training to avoid conditions of fatigue; but it is useless to say that to the teachers unless they are ready and apt to observe, and know what to observe, as first indications of fatigue coming on. They might have as much more training as you like. I should wish to add that several books have been written upon the matter, of which I hand in a list to you with pleasure. To run through all the points would take a long time.

985. (*Dr. Smith.*) I am quite content with that answer.—It has been made a very definite instruction to teachers, for instance, in Cambridge University and in other places.

986. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) I have already had an opportunity of asking you a good many questions; but I think there is one more that I should like to ask. We have been talking about the training of teachers. May I ask about the training of the expert? Do you consider that any medical man, by virtue of his medical training, is qualified to form an opinion on the points referring to feeble-mindedness?—If I may be allowed, I would say, first of all, that that question has been gone into very fully in that report of the Home Office. It is a delicate subject to say who are qualified in our profession to do certain work. Secondly, I would say that there are a considerable number of medical technical points, which become of great importance in the care of these children, for many children have been brought to me at the hospital and at these consultations of the Charity Organisation Society as feeble minded in whom the main condition was a condition of deafness and disease at the back of the throat, interfering with their hearing; and this, especially when combined with defect of sight, as is not at all uncommon, leads to very great difficulty in acquiring any education. In proof of that point, I should like to refer to the fact that down at Poplar there were several cases brought to me, that I should see them unofficially, from a little school connected, I believe, with the Settlement for Women Workers at Canning Town. They brought, if I remember, eight children, and as regards those, I have here a letter which I received this morning concerning four out of the eight. They were all brought to me as feeble-minded children, and had to be referred to the hospital on that very point, and I found that four out of those eight children all had naso-pharyngeal obstruction, which is a very important point, as well as eyesight, of technical medical importance in connexion with reporting upon these children. Of course there are other points of equal importance.

987. That is an instance, of course; but the idea that was running through my mind when I put the question was this: ought a school board to be satisfied with any ordinary medical adviser as to these points, that is to say, any ordinary medical practitioner, (I should say), or ought they to have someone with special qualification to advise them?—I think that there is no more difficult and responsible piece of medical professional work than giving a mental report upon any patient, child, or client, and that it is a matter that requires the highest skill that can be brought to bear upon it, and considerable technical knowledge.

988. And certain special experience?—That is included in technical knowledge.

989. There is only one other question I should like to ask you, and that is, is there not a certain difficulty in forming an opinion as to a child's condition of feeble-mindedness or otherwise, simply from observing the external signs without having an opportunity of asking the child questions? What I mean is, would it not be an advantage to judge from the child's response whether quick or slow (not to say the character of his answers) as confirmatory, or otherwise, of what has been observed from external signs?—As I said before, I would use the two methods of examination and reports the record of signs seen, and also a mental examination of course. Before I gave my signature to any paper stating that a child was mentally deficient, I should certainly make some mental examination of the case myself.

990. You would not take it at second-hand?—No. And so with regard to our report, although the rule that we made on going to a school was that we were not going to talk to the children in any particular case where the child was obviously feeble-minded, or the teacher thought the child was feeble-minded, one put aside the rule and did make a mental examination. A mental examination must be made as well as observation of the physical signs; the two should run concurrently.

991. (*Chairman.*) There is one question I want to put to you about the employment of women?—As teachers, do you mean?

992. In all capacities. First of all to visit the homes. Would not a woman be more acceptable to visit the homes than a man?—I do not think that I have any special knowledge of that, except my own imagination; I do not know.

993. Which do you think is the more likely to get a history of the case?—I think that a woman would be more likely to get it out of them if she was clever.

994. Which do you think makes the better teacher for boys in a school?—I think that women deal better with them. Here and there in private practice I have dull lads up to 17 and 18 years of age, under women teachers.

Mr. F. Warner, M.D., F.R.C.P.

12 Feb. 1897.

995. And, as superintendent of the system which do you think would be better, a woman or a man?—I have no experience.

996. And, as a medical adviser, which do you think would be better, a woman or a man?—It is rather difficult to say. It so happens that I have had a good many lady doctors come to these consultations here and there, and I am rather inclined to think that the men know the most on mental matters.

997. (*Mr. Newton.*) In the case of defective children over 14 years of age, would you teach the boys and girls in the same school, or would you separate them?—That question has been considered before, and I adopt the answer which has been officially accepted elsewhere; that is to say, that they may be certainly taught together up to 12 years of age, even in resident schools. For day schools, I take it, there can be no real difficulty, except in special instances, up to 14, and I would not wish to make a law against it. Beyond 14, I do not know, really.

998. (*Chairman.*) Is there anything further that you wish to bring before the Committee?—There is one point that I distinctly wish to mention. In your syllabus you refer to another report, a report of the Local Government Board; you refer to page 78, and there are a few points in that report in which recommendations have my name attached to them with reference to the evidence, but with regard to which I desire to take this opportunity of saying that the recommendations there made are not in accordance with my views, or with the evidence that I gave upon them, and I think it is necessary that I should distinctly state that at this table. I refer to the Report of the Local Government Board on Poor Children. Referring to page 78, the first point is that a question is put as to the number of children in the Mile End schools. There the question that was asked of me has been inserted in place of the answer.

999. Does it make sense?—That is for the gentleman who asked the question to decide; but these questions have led to a good deal of discussion. The question was: "At the Mile End schools you arrived at the "conclusion that 47 out of 359 children needed special "training, on account of mental defect?"

1000. What do you object to in that paragraph?—That they have put the question in the report, instead of the answer. The figures are totally wrong. It is a clerical error.

1001. What is the next point?—Then comes the question of the difficulty of dealing with children and of boarding-out these feeble-minded children who are attending public elementary day schools; that is on page 80.

1002. You do not wish to be responsible for that?—I had no evidence at all that children were boarded out and attended public elementary schools, and I certainly gave no evidence that they should be. The point of my evidence is that the worst thing that you can do for a child that has any defect is to board him out. Those are the children that pre-eminently require care and attention, all the more because they are mentally feeble.

1003. You do not agree with that recommendation. Is there anything else?—Then I am reported to have said that I had had some experience of the beneficial results of placing these children in families. I have to point out that I was asked that question with reference to my private practice. I have found in my private practice great benefit in placing feeble-minded children where there can be a lady to look after them, and a governess under her, so that the child can be taught during a certain number of hours every day. But to say that that is applicable in cottage homes is a thing that I cannot agree with at all.

1004. Is there anything else?—Those, I think, are the principal points.

The witness withdrew.

Adjourned to Wednesday next at half-past 10 o'clock.

NOTE.—*The report on 100,000 children, referred to in the evidence of this witness, is published by the Parkes Museum, Margaret Street, W., under the title of: "Report on the Scientific Study of the Mental and Physical "Condition of Childhood: with particular reference to Children of Defective Constitution and with recommendations "as to Education and Training."*

THIRD DAY.

Wednesday, 17th February 1897.

PRESENT:

The Rev. T. W. SHARPE, C.B., in the Chair.

Mr. H. F. Pooley.
Mr. A. W. Newton.
Dr. G. E. Shuttleworth.
Dr. W. R. Smith.
Mrs. Burgwin.
Miss Townsend.

Mr. H. W. Orange, *Secretary*.

Mr. Frank Drew Harris, M.B., D.P.H., called in and examined.

Mr. F. D. Harris, M.B., D.P.H.

17 Feb. 1897.

1005. (*Chairman.*) You are Assistant Medical Officer under the School Board for London?—Yes, temporary Assistant Medical Officer.

1006. And you hold that office chiefly for the purpose of deciding which children are more suitable for a special class, and which should be relegated to the schools for ordinary children?—That is largely my work.

1007. Are you of opinion that suitable special classes should be provided for certain children?—Yes, very strongly.

1008. For the sake of the community, in the first instance?—Yes.

1009. You mean for the future benefit of the children, that they may not be a burden upon the community afterwards?—Yes, that is my principal reason.

1010. And for the sake of the children themselves?—Yes.

1011. You are aware that imbeciles and idiots are excluded from our inquiry?—Yes.

1012. And we have agreed that we cannot give an exact definition of an imbecile or idiot, but that each case must be judged on its own merits?—Yes.

1013. But there may be many children, may there not, who have been neglected when they were young, who have to be individually examined?—Yes.

1014. And perhaps a year or two's teaching in a special class may be sufficient to enable them to take their place afterwards in the ordinary schools?—Quite so.

1015. But there are others who must be kept in the special classes throughout the whole of their school life?—Yes, quite so.

1016. You have, of course, formed some idea as to the classes of children who must be left in the special classes for the whole of their school life. We may dismiss for the present those who may be developed before being sent to the ordinary schools. Can you give us some idea of your classification of the chief causes of mental feebleness. First of all, you say, children suffering from low nutrition?—Yes, that I think is the commonest cause.

1017. And does that last throughout their school life, or does it disappear after a certain time?—I think that it tends to disappear.

1018. By better feeding?—By better feeding and by better surroundings, and by the attention which they get in the special classes.

1019. But have you found that many of them have improved?—Yes, I think many of them have improved a great deal.

1020. And been able to leave for the other schools?—A very fair proportion have left, I think.

1021. Then your second class are excessively neurotic children?—Yes.

1022. Those will never be sufficiently cured, I suppose, to go to other schools; they must be retained all their time in the classes?—No, I should not like to say that at all. I have found a good many children whom I should put under the class of highly neurotic, and who, after two or three years in the special classes, have been able to return to the ordinary school.

1023. Then as to strumous children, the third class, that of course develops at different periods of their child life. At what period does it affect them most; generally about the age of 14 or 15, is it not?—Yes, I believe somewhere about that.

1024. And your fourth class is that of the epileptic children?—Yes.

1025. Have you had much experience of those among the School Board classes?—Not a great deal; I should think about three or four cases in most of the centres would be about the extent of it.

1026. They are cases ranging from very slight epilepsy?—To rather severe epilepsy.

1027. Do you recommend the case of a very severe epileptic being mixed with other children?—The practice that we have generally adopted is to admit them until any cause is shown why they should not be admitted; that is to say, if they have a severe fit in school it would be necessary, I think, to reconsider the point.

1028. For the sake of the other children?—Yes, but until some special arrangements have been made by which you can deal with epileptics, I have thought it best to always admit them into the classes.

1029. Have you had any cases of their doing harm to the other children?—No, I have never met with a case at all. As a rule the parents are very careful, and are often able to keep the children at home just before the fits are coming on. Then, of course, in cases of minor epilepsy, I do not see that there is much objection to their being present.

1030. The fifth and sixth classes that you have are the paralytic and syphilitic children. You have no idea, I take it, that either of these can be permanently improved so as to go to other classes?—I should think the paralytic are probably the most hopeless. I should say that a syphilitic case might possibly improve.

1031. Then there are certain classes of physically defective children, not mentally defective, who also would benefit by being in the special classes, either for a certain time or for the whole of their school life, such as children suffering from congenital heart disease, or spinal curvature, or hip disease?—Yes, or any other form of disabling disease—a disabling form of crippling, for instance.

1032. At what age would you admit these classes of children to special classes, supposing you considered them fit subjects for those classes?—At present, of course, it is the rule not to admit them before the age of seven and until they have had a trial in the ordinary elementary school.

1033. Not all these classes; you mean those who are thought to be abnormally dull?—Yes, I believe with all children who are admitted to the special classes at the present time, none are admitted till the age of seven, unless under evidence of very special circumstances, of course, or until they have been in the ordinary elementary schools.

1034. Are they excused by the Board visitors from attendance at school till the age of seven, or is it the parent's wish that they should be kept away?—That I really could not tell you. Most of them, by far the majority, do attend the infant school.

1035. They attend there after the age of seven?—Till the age of seven.

1036. But the teachers have a certain discretion to retain them after the age of seven if they think fit?—Yes, but it is not a discretion which they generally employ, I think.

1037. They are generally glad to get rid of them, are they?—I think so.

1038. Do you consider the age of seven too early?—I think in many cases it is; I think the age of eight years is preferable.

1039. For what classes would you suggest the age of eight—for all or some?—A cripple, of course, should not wait, and I doubt if it would be any good keeping an epileptic, paralytic, or syphilitic in; but in the other cases I think very often they do make a real advance between the ages of seven and eight.

1040. Then you would not introduce them as a rule until the age of eight, and you would give them a trial, first of all, in the ordinary schools?—In the senior departments of the ordinary schools.

1041. How long would you keep them there?—From three to six months, I think.

1042. Do they get the best teaching in the lowest class of those schools?—I could not tell you that.

1043. As a rule, when they are sent to you, do you find an intelligent apprehension of their state, or are they merely sent down to you as dull?—They are generally sent down to me as dull.

1044. There has been no consideration of the history of the child before it came to you?—Sometimes, but it is rather rare.

1045. So that the knowledge of the teacher is comparatively of little use to you?—Comparatively, yes.

1046. Would it be well to submit some sort of form which should be filled up before they come to you, showing what care has been taken of them in the ordinary school?—A form is filled up by the teachers before they are brought down to us.

1047. What does it contain?—I have brought it on with me.

1048. If you give it me I will ask some questions on it?—Certainly (*handing in the document*).

1049. By whom is the form drawn up?—The form was drawn up by Professor Smith.

1050. And it requires some knowledge of the mental capacity of the child in the matters of observations imitation, attention, memory, and so on?—Yes.

1051. Do you find that that is well filled up as a rule?—No; the usual plan is to put "Nil" opposite the first head "observation," and then put "Ditto, ditto, ditto, ditto" down to the end.

1052. That is not much use to you?—Not very much

1053. Could you suggest a better and shorter form which should call the attention of the teachers to the fact that they ought to take notice of these children for the children's sake, and for your guidance also?—I can only suggest that when the forms are sent out the teachers should be requested to fill them up with great care and accuracy, and also that some indication should be given which would show you the regularity of the child's attendance at school, and, secondly, in case of absence, the reason of such absence.

1054. They are asked the question, "Is the child affectionate or otherwise?" do they put "Nil" to that?—No, they do not put "Nil" to that; they generally put "Yes," or "No," or "Fairly."

1055. Because, of course, it is understood that these children are very affectionate if properly treated?—Yes.

1056. But you do not find that the teachers consider them generally as affectionate?—Not as a rule.

1057. Do you think that they have had proper attention before they come under your hand?—Too often I am afraid not.

1058. And very often do you think that children may be sent down to you who never ought to be sent down?—I should think that quite one-third of the children who come down, should not have been sent down.

Mr. F. D. Harris, M.B., D.P.H.

17 Feb. 1897.

1059. Do you attribute that to want of feeling?—attribute it to the fact that they are very dull, and the teachers are only too glad to get rid of them; they are a drag on the school.

1060. Of course, where a teacher has a very large class, perhaps of 70, she cannot give much individual attention to the children?—Quite so.

1061. Then you reject at once about a third when they come down to you. They are selected by the teacher, and the medical officer, the superintendent, and one of Her Majesty's inspectors, attend together to discuss the suitability of the children brought down for these classes?—Yes.

1062. Do you carry in your head any definition of a child suitable to these classes?—No, I do not; really I think it is impossible to define.

1063. It is a matter of test?—Yes.

1064. But you would not say that the examination should be purely a medical one, would you?—The question of admission should be purely a medical one.

1065. The ultimate voice should rest with some medical authority?—Yes.

1066. But he should lay great stress upon the opinion of the teachers so far as it is trustworthy, should he not?—It would aid him in forming his opinion by supplying the history of the case, just as in any case of illness you appeal to the friends for the family and personal history before the illness came on.

1067. Is the opinion of the inspector at all valuable?—Yes, I think so.

1068. What does he contribute to your judgment?—He tells you what would naturally be expected from a child of that age in the ordinary school, and in that way he is able to help you.

1069. If you had any doubt of a case would you give it a chance in a special class?—You mean whether I think it is an imbecile or not?

1070. Yes?—Certainly I should give it a chance for three or six months, and see it again on my next visit.

1071. What tests do you apply, are they chiefly tests of number?—I usually try to talk to the child, and try to get out its power of observation and its memory; I watch it to see if it has any power of calculation; I test its reading, its sense of colour, and sense of form, and I also keep a look out for any physical signs which I may see.

1072. Do you test it by a knowledge of the common objects of its home?—Yes, a great deal.

1073. Would not that be the most reliable test of all; the observation of the common things that it sees in its own home?—Yes.

1074. Do you find that they do not readily talk with you, that it is difficult to engage them in conversation?—Not always. Very often they are a little frightened of one at the start.

1075. Till you get upon the right subject?—Yes.

1076. While they are talking, of course, you observe the physical signs?—Yes.

1077. Which are the physical signs that you rely upon mostly for your final judgment?—Hydrocephalic heads, of course, would be important.

1078. Do you measure the heads for that purpose?—No, I have never actually measured the heads.

1079. You have no record of the abnormal size of the heads?—No; microcephalic heads, too, would be an important sign.

1080. Do you notice also the nervous state of the child?—I watch for twitching of the muscles, and examine the palate and the teeth, and sometimes test their power of grasp, and I see them walk. But I lay greater stress on the mental signs than on the physical, though I think the physical signs form a very valuable aid to you.

1081. Have you tried to see them in their simple and natural state, so far as you can?—Yes.

1082. It is a combination of a good many signs, rather than on particular signs, that leads you to a final judgment, of course?—Yes.

1083. When they are admitted to the classes, after a period of three or six months, you say, you would re-examine them?—Only those cases which I am doubtful about.

Mr. F. D. Harris, M.B., D.P.H.

17 Feb. 1897.

1084. Some you consign to the classes for their school time do you?—No, I think that the classes should be inspected periodically by a medical officer.

1085. Each school should be periodically inspected by a medical officer?—Yes.

1086. I thought you said not; but you think each school should be inspected periodically by some medical authority?—Yes.

1087. And you would have the history of the child since it was admitted, and a progress book stating what progress it had made in each of the subjects of instruction, and also in general information?—Yes, I have brought up a book here which is employed in the special classes.

1088. Perhaps you had better pass it up to show us what is done?—Certainly (*handing in the book*).

1089. Are all the pages the same?—Yes, they are all the same.

1090. The teacher, I see, is supposed to report upon all the subjects of instruction, the regularity of attendance, and the habits of the child, and the moral sense. These are the chief heads, I think?—Yes.

1091. Is this book generally well filled up?—That is usually very well filled up.

1092. And the family history of the child, upon whom does that fall, upon the teacher?—It falls upon the teacher.

1093. And she generally (if it is a woman) is able to get a considerable knowledge of the family history?—She usually gets a very fair family history; of course there are certain cases in which she fails, but as a rule she gets a very fair family history.

1094. The parents are more likely, you think, to communicate these facts to a woman than to a man?—Yes.

1095. Then would you advise that the Board should employ women to visit the homes of these children?—Women teachers, do you mean.

1096. Women officers, specially deputed to visit the houses of these children?—Yes, I should say that a woman in that instance would be better than a man.

1097. And this report, you say, is generally well filled up?—It is usually well filled up.

1098. And is a great help to you?—A family history affords a very great help.

1099. So that you can form some judgment whether the child should be continued in a special class?—Yes; or sent back to the elementary school, or sent to an institution.

1100. Having brought the child in, and visited it every three or six months, and recorded its progress periodically, how long would you say, with the better class of children, it would be necessary to keep them in the special class?—I should think about two years.

1101. If they attended at eight, would you keep them till ten years of age?—Yes. A good many of the best class would go out in a couple of years time.

1102. But some of them, of course, would never go out?—A large proportion would take a great deal longer time than the two years, and some would never go out at all.

1103. Up to what age would you recommend the retention of children in such classes, supposing they were never allowed to attend an ordinary elementary school?—Fourteen I should say; as long as they would be really well looked after in the special class. If they are not fit at that age to go out into the world I should say an institution would be the best place for them, because there is always an objection, I think, to keeping the sexes mixed at the older ages, and I think after that age they want more industrial and manual training than they get in the special schools.

1104. Would it not be better that they should stay at their homes, and the manual training should be supplied at some separate place, for the two sexes separately?—That would be a good idea.

1105. You would prefer some day institution at which they could attend for manual work?—Provided the home was good.

1106. And the two sexes taught separately?—Yes.

1107. Some occupation suited to boys and girls respectively?—Yes.

1108. Would you advise that there should be a separate department for such children with special inspectors?—I should, most certainly.

1109. You have already a medical officer who reports, who has the schools under a certain degree of control, and suggests to the teacher the way the children should be handled; why would it be necessary to have a special inspector, a special department?—Because I take it that places throughout the kingdom will be starting these special classes, and unless you have some central authority, you would have no uniformity in your classes, or in the class of children who will be admitted.

1110. The Education Department has preferred to place the blind and deaf children under the inspectors in the various districts, believing that they will get more constant attention, as the inspector of the district can visit them from time to time in any emergency, and help the teachers with advice. The medical officer that you suggest would be able to pay only one visit annually, perhaps, whereas the Education Department's inspector can visit several times a year?—I should certainly let the Education Department's inspector go on visiting the classes, but I should let him have the benefit of a medical inspector to go with him on certain occasions.

1111. On periodical inspections?—Yes, periodical inspections.

1112. But if there were a medical officer appointed by each board to visit these cases, would it be necessary to have a general medical officer?—I certainly think so.

1113. Would there not be a conflict of opinion?—Not necessarily, if proper tact is exercised.

1114. But if you have already one competent adviser, why employ a second?—I think you require to have one man, who shall be final, to get uniformity of result.

1115. You would have a skilled body of teachers, and a skilled medical officer, and an inspector who is skilled in knowing the habits of ordinary children?—Yes.

1116. Would not all those be sufficient precautions without establishing a new central authority?—It seems somewhat anomalous that there should not be a proper medical authority, a central authority, to settle disputed points.

1117. You think disputed points would arise?—I think it is quite possible.

1118. Between whom; between the medical authorities, or whom?—Between the medical authority and possibly the inspector.

1119. If the medical authority has the final decision, I do not see how conflict can arise?

1120. (*Mr. Pooley.*) You have divided these children into classes. Your first is low nutrition?—Yes.

1121. May that arise either from insufficient food or from physical causes which cannot be remedied by food?—Certainly.

1122. Then you have neurotic children?—Yes.

1123. Does that correspond, do you think, with the divisions which were given us the other day, those which are indicated by nerve defects. I may remind you that Dr. Warner and other witnesses have made four divisions:—(*a*) developmental defects, (*b*) nerve cases, (*c*) low nutrition, and (*d*) mental dulness. May we take it that your neurotic cases correspond in their physical signs with the nerve division which Dr. Warner gave?—More or less, I should say.

1124. Then you have got the strumous cases?—Yes.

1125. And then the epileptic, paralytic, and syphilitic?—Yes.

1126. May we take it that the strumous, epileptic, paralytic, and syphilitic cases are those in which either developmental or nerve defects show themselves, so that they might be divided among those two classes, developmental or nerve?—Yes.

1127. Would you say that your division is rather according to the causes of illness, or of weakness, and the other division according to the signs noted?—Yes, I suppose that would be more the case.

1128. The epileptic cases would stand by themselves, would they not?—I suppose they would come in under the nerve defects again.

1129. Or if the epilepsy led to great defects they would come, of course, under the other classes?—Yes.

Mr. F. D. Harris, M.B., D.P.H.

17 Feb. 1897.

1130. Then I want to ask you why you think that the medical officer should have the ultimate decision as to the admission of particular children to these special classes. May I put it shortly, that it is because, as a rule, only those children should be admitted who have some defects which can be diagnosed by a doctor?—That is so; that is one of the reasons.

1131. A dull child as a rule would not be admitted unless he had some defect which can be diagnosed by the medical man. Would you go so far as that?—Yes, unless he has some such defect.

1132. Unless he has some defect which a trained eye can see?—It would probably require a trained eye to see it.

1133. I mean, that unless you go as far as that, it is not easy to see why you say that the medical man should have the ultimate decision?—I do not think anyone who has not had a proper medical training can properly diagnose these conditions.

1134. That is the reason why you think the ultimate decision should be left to a medical man?—Certainly.

1135. Then how much weight should the opinion of the teacher have as to the admission of a dull child into the special class?—The opinion of the teacher would be used to aid the medical man in forming his opinion. He would give it a good deal of weight, undoubtedly.

1136. Do you think that the teacher and the medical officer together should have the ultimate voice, or the medical officer by himself?—The medical officer by himself.

1137. Then how about the opinion of the inspector. Is it important to have the inspector present?—It is desirable.

1138. The inspector will not know as much about the individual children as the teacher, will he?—No, that is quite true; but he would be able to tell you, as I said before, the standard which would be expected from a child at that age in an ordinary school.

1139. Will not the teacher know that better than the inspector?—But you have to look upon this fact, that the teacher is very often anxious to get rid of the child.

1140. Then you think it is useful that the inspector should be present?—I do.

1141. You say that as medical officer you usually talk to the child and test its power of reading, sense of colour, and so on, and observe physical signs. I suppose if you had a report from the teacher you could get all you want as to the child's dulness, capacity for reading and writing, and so on, better than you could by examining it yourself?—No. I do not think so, with certainty. I do not think the forms which the teachers fill in are at all to be relied on.

1142. But if you have the superintendent present or a teacher from the school from which the child comes?—You can get a good deal of information in that way, of course; but it is surely better to test the child's knowledge yourself.

1143. If you have sufficient time?—Well, you should have sufficient time.

1144. How long does it take to examine a child for this purpose, do you consider?—It varies very much, because with some children you can see at a glance whether they are fit, others require a great deal of examination. I should think on an average it would take about five minutes.

1145. You could do about 10 or 12 in an hour?—Yes.

1146. May I ask what experience you have had of these special classes in London?—I have been visiting these special classes now for about 18 months. I think I have visited every special class, and I suppose I have examined something like 700 or 800 children.

1147. Have you had sufficient experience, then, to know that a good many, a large proportion, of children from these classes will be able to return to the ordinary elementary school in two years?—I do not think I said that they should return to the ordinary elementary schools in two years.

1148. I think you said a good many of the best?—A good many of the best would certainly; but then the best after all are a smallish proportion of the whole.

1149. Can you say what proportion might be expected to return in two years?—No, I could not.

1150. That must depend, must it not, very much upon the tests of admission?—Yes.

1151. Is it easy to be mistaken in admitting children, to admit those who ought to have been retained in the ordinary elementary schools; have you found it so from your own experience?—No, I have not found it so.

1152. When you say that the age of 14 is old enough to keep them to, do you mean because the special classes under the existing arrangements are not suitable for children over 14 years of age?—That is so.

1153. Supposing you get a child who at 14 years of age is not fit to go back into the ordinary elementary school, is it desirable to give him continued special training up to a later period?—It would depend upon the child. I think that is a question which must be judged in each case.

1154. The child, I mean, being a defective child who is not fit to be taught in an ordinary school?—The question would then depend upon this—either the child must go to an institution for the rest of its life, or else it should be trained for another two years at some institution such as the Chairman suggested.

1155. I am taking the feeble-minded child (not the idiotic) who might become wholly or partially self-supporting, and therefore need not necessarily go to an institution for the whole of his life. Is it desirable that such a child should be taught for a longer period?—I think so, certainly.

1156. And you said that you think a very satisfactory way of teaching him would be to keep him at home and let him have industrial training?—Provided that his home was a good one.

1157. Have you an opinion as to whether as a rule it would be better that he should continue at a day school with special instruction or be sent to an institution; can you say generally, or not?—No, I could not.

1158. I should like to ask you a question as to this medical inspection: Did I correctly understand you to say that there should be a central medical officer in connection with the Education Department?—Yes.

1159. Was that what you meant by a central authority?—Yes.

1160. You did not mean that there should be a special authority for the education of these children, that they should be removed from the Education Department?—No, that it should be a special department of the Education Department.

1161. But when you say special department, do you mean more than that there should be a medical officer?—There should be a medical officer, I consider, and several medical inspectors, as well as education inspectors, who have devoted attention to this subject.

1162. You would also have the medical officers of the various school authorities?—Yes.

1163. What do you want a medical inspector for from the central office—for what purpose?—You want to secure uniformity of result; because I consider that in some of these smaller towns, where the number of defective children would be very small, the medical officer there would probably have insufficient experience to enable him, at any rate at once, to deal with the cases.

1164. You mean uniformity of result as regards the admission of children into these special classes?—Yes, throughout the Kingdom.

1165. And their retention there?—Yes.

1166. And the decision, when they leave, as to what should be done with them?—Yes, I should suppose it would be necessary to give a special grant to these classes, and if you give a special grant to these classes, you want to see that only the children who are suitable for admission are admitted.

1167. Would it not be quite sufficient for that purpose, inasmuch as it is a question of decision upon each individual case, to have one medical officer connected with the central department, who might advise upon difficult questions?—I think he would find himself very much overworked unless he had two or three medical inspectors, if he had the whole Kingdom to look after.

1168. (*Miss Townsend.*) As regards children that you speak of as passing to the ordinary school before being placed in special classes, have they for the most part been through the infant school?—I believe so.

1169. Do you examine them before they enter the probationary class in the ordinary school, or not until they have been there?—As a rule, we examine them from the senior department.

Mr. F. D. Harris, M.B., D.P.H.

17 Feb. 1897.

1170. You do not examine the children passing from the infant school to the probation class?—No.

1171. You say that such a class is useful and necessary—that the children should be in the ordinary class first. Is not, then, the constitution of the probation class a very important matter?—Yes, I certainly think so.

1172. Would it not often happen that a child who was considered dull in the infant school, after being three or six months, or perhaps a year, in an ordinary class, could, if it was well managed, then pass into the ordinary school?—Yes.

1173. Although, if the class was not well managed, it would pass into the special class for dull children?—Yes, it might deteriorate.

1174. As a matter of fact, can you give me any idea what is the size of the class into which the child would pass from the infant school?—I believe it is about 60 or 70, as a rule.

1175. So that a dull child would stand very little chance there?—Yes.

1176. And would tend to deteriorate?—Yes, probably.

1177. Is that the reason why you mentioned so short a time as three or six months for probation?—One of the reasons. I do not think you want to lose much time in admitting children to special classes; but, on the other hand, I do not think you should admit them too young.

1178. Are there any schools in which there is a small class, not special, for these children?—I do not think so; I have never come across such a class.

1179. You examine them from this class, in which they have been often more than three or six months, I suppose?—At present the children that come up, of course, vary; sometimes we get them from the infants when they are about six years of age, and the age goes on to about 12.

1180. They may have been in this low class of the ordinary school for three or four years?—Yes, that I think is a great mistake.

1181. When you examine a child, do you give the parents' opinion a voice in the matter as to whether the child is defective in the ordinary affairs of life?—I should ask the parent if I can get hold of her, for any information which I could gain as to the home life.

1182. But you do not make a very strict point of that?—We make as strict a point as we can of it; but it is, of course, very difficult to get the parents of these children to come up.

1183. As a rule, you take from the teacher what she knows personally?—Yes.

1184. Is it not the fact that these children are very often neglected or ill-treated or starved?—Yes, often very neglected.

1185. In that case do you think a special class affords all that is necessary?—No, I think that if you could apply the provisions of the Blind Act as to boarding out, for a time at all events, that would do a great deal towards ameliorating their condition; and it would have a second advantage, that whereas at present you must multiply your centres all over London, you would then be able to concentrate your forces more.

1186. Then you say that children after 14 years of age would be better with special instruction outside the school classes altogether?—I think so.

1187. You told the Chairman that day instruction for such children as had good parents would be the best?—I think so.

1188. But there are cases of children with bad parents who would be more benefited by a stay in a training-home, would there not?—Yes, or, of course, you might employ your boarding-out principle.

1189. Between 14 and 16 years of age?—Yes.

1190. You would not make a hard and fast limit of age at 16, would you?—I think if a child is not able either to partially or wholly support itself by that time, it is a question whether it should not go into an institution for life.

1191. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) I want to ask you about the suggested age of admission, when you think would be the best time; would you think it was when the child had finished its time in the infant school, and was about to be promoted to the senior department?—I should give it three months in the senior department, I think, three or six months.

1192. You are aware that the child would then have to go into a class of at least 60 average attendance?—Yes.

1193. And though you know that, you think it would still pass out at three months?—I think I should give it the chance.

1194. You said that on the form of admission to a special class you would like to see the attendances of the child at school. Would you expect a delicate child to attend school regularly?—No, but I should want the reason of its absence, so far as possible.

1195. Exactly, that is to say, you only want the reason of its irregularity assigned?—Yes; I mean to say that, as you doubtless know, we get children up, big boys of 10 and 11 years of age, who are very backward, but who are simply backward because they have played truant.

1196. You said that you had had about one-third of the children sent for admission to the special classes rejected?—One-third rejected; it varies of course at different admissions.

1197. Then that seemed to imply that the teachers had not given proper thought to them; but would it not be true to say that they did not quite understand the class of child to be admitted?—Very often.

1198. It was not wilful negligence on their part in any way?—No.

1199. For instance, you say that on that form you ask them about the child's observation, and the teacher says "Nil," and then you say she goes on to put "Ditto," "Ditto," after that?—I do not wish to say in every case.

1200. But I want it quite clear, because my experience is that a teacher does not quite understand the meaning of the form?—Very often, I think, they do not take the trouble to fill it up.

1201. Oh yes, it is filled up?—Yes, it is filled up; but they do not take the trouble to really think what is wanted.

1202. I think it is because we have never decided upon a standard (would you not say so), so as to be able to know what is meant. Let me show you what I mean, I see on your form, "5. Reading," the teacher, say, writes "Fair"; that is in her judgment as compared with the children she has to deal with; therefore "Fair" from her point of view would be quite right, would it not?—Yes; but they often write "Nil," and then you find the child can read words of three and four letters.

1203. Ah, I have never seen that. Now, do I correctly understand you to say that the examination should be purely a medical one?—The admission should be a purely medical question.

1204. Have you ever met with the case of a child of 10 years of age who has been in perfectly regular attendance at school, and is yet unable to do Standard I. work?—Yes.

1205. And has no obvious defect?—No obvious defect apart from the dulness, yes.

1206. How would you arrive at the conclusion that that child was a defective child?—I should conduct the usual examination. I should ask the teacher, and I should take everything into consideration.

1207. Then in reality it would be the teacher's judgment that would cause you to form the opinion?—It would aid me to form an opinion.

1208. Would you consider a child who is unable in two years to make progress without any obvious defect, a suitable child for admission to the special classes?—After two years in the senior school, do you mean?

1209. After it had been two years in the senior school?—And made no progress whatsoever.

1210. Well, that would be comparative?—It would depend upon the amount of the dulness of the child.

1211. Now after the child is in the class, I take it as you say, passed by a medical man, do you think that the medical man would be the best person after that, from a purely educational standpoint, to judge whether the child should be returned to the normal school?—Oh, dear no.

1212. Who do you think would be the best judge there?—The superintendent of the classes.

1213. Or the teacher?—Yes, but I think the medical man should be consulted as to the physical fitness of the child to cope with the ordinary school.

1214. Now, would this be your experience: that it has been most difficult to define the class of child that should be admitted to the special classes?—Yes.

1215. You would say that each case wants to be considered upon its own merits?—Yes.

1216. That is to say that the best benefit to the child should be the first consideration; I mean by that where it can make the greatest progress?—Provided that its association with other children has no deleterious effect.

1217. Now about raising the age from 14 to 16; you are aware that many of these children at 14 years of age are not as developed as many children of 10 years of age?—Yes, or 12 years.

1218. Again, it would not do entirely, would it, to say that, because a child was 14 years of age it should be separated?—How do you mean?

1219. Separated from a mixed class?—I think that the special classes, as at present constituted, are not so constituted as to be fit for children after 14 years of age, they might be made so possibly.

1220. I would like to refresh your memory. We have in the Hugh Myddelton school a boy who is 14 years of age, and during the last three months he has done more than he has ever done in his previous school life. Do not you think that such a case would be better in the class till he is 15 years of age?—Very probably, yes; but I think that those cases should be considered individually.

1221. That is exactly what I wanted to get from you, that the children really require individual consideration to receive the greatest benefit?—Quite so.

1222. And you suggest that there should be some manual training for both the girls and the boys?—Yes.

1223. And you would suggest that special instruction in that department should be provided?—Yes.

1224. But in the case of the London School Board, you are aware that we have laundry, cookery, and manual training classes?—Yes, but they are so limited apparently, that it is very difficult to get more than four hours a week in.

1225. For dull and delicate children you would not suggest, would you, that every day they should be employed in manual training?—As to delicate children, I do not know. I would for dull children; if there is no physical reason why they should not do manual work, I should let them do it.

1226. (*Mr. Newton.*) Can you tell me who is meant by the teacher, in this big book; does "teacher" refer to a teacher of the ordinary school which the scholar has been attending, or the teacher of the special school?—A teacher of the ordinary school.

1227. This is the teacher of the ordinary school then?—Yes.

1228. Then is this paper intended to be a transcript from this form?—Yes, I believe so.

1229. You agree, do you not, that the word "Fair," as applied to the child's progress in reading, writing, and arithmetic, is unsatisfactory?—Yes.

1230. What would you enter instead; what would be the best form in which to make entries as to the child's progress in reading or writing?—Something a little more definite I should say, "Can read words of four letters," or "words of two syllables," or something like that.

1231. And similar things in arithmetic?—Yes.

1232. Would you suggest a specimen of the questions in arithmetic that a child can answer, as being a desirable entry?—It would be well to know about what the child could do in arithmetic, certainly.

1233. Now, as to the children of between 14 and 16 years of age, would you make the attendance compulsory or optional?—Compulsory, I think.

1234. Then, if you made it compulsory, could you contrive any legal definition of a defective child?—Yes, I should think such a thing might be done.

Mr. F. D. Harris, M.B., D.P.H.

17 Feb. 1897.

1235. Of course, in the case of a blind child it is comparatively easy, because everybody must agree whether the child can see or cannot see; but could you ever convince, first of all, a school attendance committee, and, secondly, a magistrate, that any particular child fell within the limits of any possible definition of dulness?—I should think a certificate of a medical officer would be sufficient.

1236. But then if the parents did, as they would undoubtedly do in many cases, produce the certificate of another medical man to the contrary effect, what would happen?—Then you would have your Medical Department of the Education Department to come in.

1237. Then would you, in such a case, have the Education Department's medical officer called as a skilled witness to say whether he agreed with the doctor employed by the attendance committee, or whether he agreed with the doctor employed by the parents?—He should be the final authority.

1238. You think the magistrates would accept that? I should think so.

1239. To go back to the question of manual work, the children in the classes of the London School Board have, generally speaking, about six hours a week of what you may call hand-work—that includes needle-work, drawing, and everything else. Do you think that is enough, or not enough?—I should think it was as much as is good for them in the earlier years.

1240. You think the six hours is enough?—Yes.

1241. Do you think that the forms of work that they have, say, the string work and so on, are suitable for the big boys from 11, 12, and 13 years of age?—I think when boys come to that age they should do more of the manual work, such as carpentering, joinery, and such things.

1242. You would make the work more like the work in the out-of-door world?—Yes, but there is no doubt that the string work is of great benefit to them.

1243. You spoke of concentrating the children at the centres, would there be any great advantage in so concentrating them?—I think that a centre with at least three classes in it is the ideal centre.

1244. It is a matter of degree then. You would concentrate to some extent, but not more?—To some extent. I would not suggest the formation of a huge school.

1245. Then, as regards the big boys of 14 years of age, there is no reason, I suppose, why such boys should not walk a mile or a mile and a half to school, is there?—No, provided there is no physical defect.

1246. Precisely. Then you might have a smaller number of centres for those big boys, might you not?—Yes.

1247. It would be possible, say, to make four or five regular centres feed one centre for big boys who were unfit for work in mixed classes, would it not?—Yes.

1248. And your idea was, I suppose, not to draw a hard-and-fast line at the age of 14, but simply to enable the medical officer or the managers to say, That boy has grown too big for work here, let him go to the special class for big boys?—Yes, that is my idea, certainly.

1249. Not simply to say, You have passed your 14th birthday, therefore you must go?—No.

1250. (*Dr. Smith.*) I do not think you quite made it clear why you spoke so emphatically about the necessity for a medical examination in these cases. You look upon it, I take it, that all children properly admissible to these classes are abnormal children?—Yes, certainly.

1251. And, therefore, it is a question in the admission of these children, of properly interpreting the extent and the importance of the abnormality?—Yes.

1252. And the abnormality may show itself in various ways?—Certainly.

1253. It may be confined to what we should consider as mental evidence?—Yes.

1254. Or you may have associated with the mental evidence one or more physical signs?—Quite so.

1255. And, therefore, to rightly determine in every case, it is requisite to have a skilled mind to interpret the importance of all these features?—It is, certainly.

1256. About a separate department. I take it you meant that it should be a separate branch of the work of the Education Department?—Certainly.

Mr. F. D. Harris, M.B., D.P.H.

1st Feb. 1897.

1257. And inasmuch as this work is dealing with abnormal children, it should be looked upon in a sense as a separate part of the work of that Department?—Yes.

1258. You spoke about the inspector being present, and that his opinion was valuable, and that it was valuable to the extent that he could advise as to the standard which the normal child should have reached. But supposing that the medical officer is thoroughly conversant with that, would there be any object then in having the inspector present?—No, except that I think the inspectors, as a rule, have a very clear idea as to the class of children in the district, and as to their capabilities. I mean in the different districts of London.

1259. That is not quite a special knowledge in the inspector, is it?—No.

1260. When you say a knowledge of the district, what exactly do you mean by that?—I mean to say that at these various centres in different parts of London I find the children of one centre vary very much from the children of another centre in the form of their abnormality, and in the type of children you have brought up to you.

1261. But then you yourself get experience?—Certainly, in time you do.

1262. And of course the inspector can only get experience by time?—Yes.

1263. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) First of all, with regard to the classification that you gave us, I do not think you specifically mentioned what we have heard of before as the developmental class of defect; that is to say, defect in make of body. Do you not think that that sometimes helps in forming an opinion as to the probable mental condition?—Certainly.

1264. I mean a child defective in the make of his body—a child with an exceptionally small head, for instance?—I think I mentioned those.

1265. You mentioned, I think, the examination of the palate, for instance?—Yes.

1266. And sometimes there are certain stigmata, as they are called, ears badly formed and badly placed?—Yes.

1267. These, you would consider, distinctly help in forming an opinion?—Yes.

1268. And also, for instance, such signs of defective development as you get in the so-called Mongol type that one occasionally sees among children?—Yes.

1269. And amongst the class of Cretin children?—Yes.

1270. So that those are matters that would be best known to a medical observer, which would be of considerable use in forming an opinion as to the state of a child, and the desirability of his being put into a special class?—Yes, though, of course, with the Mongols they would hardly come into these special classes.

1271. But there are degrees of Mongol defect; there is just a taint of the so-called Mongol type, which does not render the child absolutely disqualified for going about in the world; they pass muster with their friends?—Certainly.

1272. Then, with regard to the paralytic cases, you spoke very hopelessly of those. Have you had, in your experience, children who have suffered from birth-palsy, and have had a certain amount of paralysis, with involuntary finger movements, what is called athetosis?—Yes.

1273. Who do very well in these special classes?—I have not noticed that they have done particularly well.

1274. I had in mind children who were called imbeciles of that type, who were able to read, write, compose, carve wood, and so on; notwithstanding their physical defects their mental condition seemed to be very good?—They have always struck me as the most hopeless class, those I have seen; I have not seen a great many.

1275. Then, with regard to the syphilitic class, did you say they were a good class?—I have seen very few really syphilitic children; I mean children who you could definitely say were syphilitic. A few I have noticed have improved.

1276. And some of them break down, do not they, altogether?—Yes, they do.

1277. Then why do you think that the feeble-minded child should remain in the infant school up to seven years of age; would there be any advantage in separating such a child at an earlier age from the ordinary scholars?—Not as a rule, I think.

1278. How many children are taken together, in the infant school in one class of instruction?—I believe about 50 or 60 in most of the classes; more in the very lowest of all.

1279. So you do not think it would be well to weed them out sooner?—No, in most of the infant schools there is so much of the kindergarten element.

1280. That is what I wanted to get at, what I was not quite clear about myself. Then, with regard to these schedules that you have shown us, have the teachers any instructions sent out with them, as to the class of children they are intended to separate from the others?—No, I do not think so. Mr. Chard will be able to answer that better than I can.

1281. Then, with regard to the children of defective mind that have no obvious physical defects—that is to say, children who are found by experience not to be able to keep up with the standards, or to fall very much below the standards of their age—may I ask if those cases are common, or are they exceptional?—They are fairly common.

1282. And those without any obvious defect at all?—Yes.

1283. Nor an approach to it?—Yes.

1284. In such cases, would not looking into the family history help sometimes in forming a diagnosis?—Yes, certainly.

1285. For instance, if you found that a child was the child of drunken parents and had been neglected in infancy?—It is difficult to get your family history correct till after the child has been admitted into the special classes.

1286. That shows the value of trying to get it, does it not?—Yes.

1287. Or if you had heard, for instance, that a child was born prematurely, and the mother had had a severe illness previous to the child's birth, that would help you?—Yes.

1288. Could you give us any definite test whereby you would exclude a child from the feeble-minded class and send him to an institution for imbeciles?—No, I cannot give you any definite test, I should look at the *tout ensemble*.

1289. The imbecile child would be of a decidedly lower mental standard than the other children?—Yes.

1290. And then, with regard to a child over 14 years of age, have you in your mind at all the advisability of dividing the two sexes at that age?—Yes.

1291. That is a matter that differs in different individuals very much; I mean as regards physical development?—Yes, certainly.

1292. So that you would not invariably draw a hard and fast line?—No, I do not think there is any necessity to draw a hard and fast line.

1293. Is it not your experience that some of these children are almost as backward physically as mentally, I mean as regards the development of their functions?—Some of them are; some are rather precocious.

1294. With regard to manual work, a question was asked a moment ago as to the amount of manual work that is advisable. Are you aware that in institutions for imbeciles many of the boys, and girls too, are employed half the day in manual work; at any rate the children over 12 years of age?—Yes.

1295. Regularly half day manual work and half day at school?—Yes.

1296. And with regard to string work there was a question asked; but may I ask you, do not you think it is useful for getting the fingers into working order sometimes; I mean a specially good exercise, when there is a defective use of the fingers, especially spasmodic defect in the use of the fingers?—Yes, I think string work very valuable work.

1297. And generally should we not look on manual work for the feeble-minded classes not so much for what it is worth in itself, as for its value in training?—Yes.

Mr. F. D. Harris, M.B., D.P.H.

17 Feb. 1897.

1298. (*Chairman.*) In cases of very dull children, I want to know whether there is always some physical cause, in your opinion?—I do not think there is always a discoverable physical cause.

1299. That is another matter; but you think there is always some physical cause?—Yes.

1300. Which may be unseen?—Yes.

1301. And may be removed in course of time?—Possibly.

1302. Have you any instances of that—of a child that you found had been suffering from some physical cause, which was removed in the course of its training?—I cannot think of any at the present moment.

1303. The Education Department is desirous, of course, to decentralise as far as possible, which would be an objection to your new department of the Education Department. Do not you think that decentralisation is a very valuable thing, so as to throw as far as possible the onus of any charge of these children upon those best acquainted with them, provided they maintain a proper staff?—I think a central authority is required.

1304. What would be the function of a central authority in that case, if all the duties were properly discharged in some decentralised position?—Possibly the duties would not be discharged properly in some decentralised position; I should say there would be many cases in which the central authority would have to come in.

1305. You weaken the responsibility of others, the more you devolve their duties upon outsiders, do you not?—I do not think necessarily so. If you take a somewhat parallel case, the Local Government Board have their medical officers and inspectors, who exercise a certain amount of supervision over the medical officers of health of the country, and I think it would be a great pity if you had not that central authority.

1306. Have you ever visited the lower classes of schools for older children?—Yes.

1307. Have you noticed that the lowest class is generally composed of about 70 children, of whom 25 or a smaller number will be almost entirely ignorant?—That is very often the case.

1308. Have you had any opportunity of seeing how far these children were properly taught?—No, I have not.

1309. You cannot form an opinion as to whether they are neglected in the upper school in comparison with the more forward children?—I could not say.

1310. But if you had to teach a class of 70 children, 25 of whom were very much behind the others, what plan would you adopt to teach them?—I am afraid I should be tempted to push on the forward children and leave the backward ones.

1311. So that in all such cases you would say that there should be a separate teacher for the backward ones, otherwise you cannot form a proper opinion when they come down to you, whether they have been properly taught?—Yes.

1312. Have you found that most of these dull children are forming a large truant class in London?—I should not like to say that. What I have noticed chiefly, is that at certain examinations, big boys have been brought down who are terribly backward, but when you come to inquire, "Are they regular attendants?" "Oh, no," says the master, "they are hardly ever here."

1313. Would you not say that, as a rule, they are the most irregular attendants at the school, these very backward children?—Very often, I think, that is the case through illness and delicacy.

1314. Through distaste for the school?—Very often.

1315. So that truancy has increased by this practice of not giving sufficient attention to the more backward children in school?—Yes, there is a most marked improvement, I believe, on their admission to the special schools. They like the school, and they come regularly.

1316. You spoke of three classes being sufficient for one of these special schools. Are you aware that in some of the classes there are two or three divisions very often in each class. Do you think a classification of three is sufficient?—I think you should have at least three.

1317. But should you not have at least nine if you can get room for them?—I do not think it is necessary.

1318. What number would you suggest?—I should say that five classes is quite as many as you want.

1319. Someone asked you a question about coming a mile and a half to school. Are these children coming without guidance?—Many of them are.

1320. But the majority of them would require to be guided to and from school?—Yes, at first, certainly; but many of them are small children

1321. I want to ask you your idea as to how the special centres should be arranged. You would have more than three class rooms, I understand?—Yes, if you have some means of filling them.

1322. And what furniture would you advise for these special classes. I have found, in every case but one, dual desks applied. They seem to be objectionable on every account for this class of children. Only in one case have I seen a single desk?—The single desk is much preferable.

1323. Would it not be as well to suggest to the London School Board that the single desk should be applied in every case for this class of children especially?—It would be a very good suggestion.

1324. As the result of your experience, would it come within your duties or Dr. Smith's to suggest that?—Dr. Smith's, possibly.

1325. Would it come within Dr. Smith's province to suggest such a reform to the London School Board?—I should think so, possibly.

The witness withdrew.

Mr. Walter Baynes Chard called in and examined.

Mr. W. B. Chard

1326. (*Chairman.*) You are correspondent for special schools under the School Board for London?—Yes.

1327. The special schools include the classes for the deaf, blind, and mentally feeble?—Yes.

1328. And they are now examined for admission to the special classes for feeble-minded children by the medical officer of the Board and the superintendent of schools for special instruction, and the Government inspector of each district is invited to be present?—Yes.

1329. At one time the School Board inspector and the local head teacher were also present?—That was the rule which the Board made when the special classes were first started, but it was not adhered to; it was altered by a subsequent resolution.

1330. It never was acted upon, was it?—It was not acted upon.

1331. What was the reason of the Board discontinuing the practice; that so many authorities meeting would be likely to disagree?—It was thought it would not work well.

1332. As to the number of children in London not attending school, I see from your précis that there were 1,665 blind, deaf, mentally defective, crippled, and epileptic children absent from school without reasonable excuse?—That is the number absent who have not been excused attendance; in addition there are those who are exempted either partially or permanently.

1333. I was coming to that afterwards; but that is the number who are absent from school without any excuse?—Yes.

1334. Can you give the reasons for their non-attendance. In the case of the blind, is it because the school is so distant?—I think in most of the blind cases it would be, because the child is either suffering from some brain trouble, or there is some contagious complaint.

1335. At that particular time?—Yes.

1336. Do you think that there is sufficient reason for all these 1,665 not attending?—These cases are all looked into from time to time, and in many instances

Mr. W. B. Chard.

17 Feb. 1897.

medical certificates are furnished, but medical certificates are not required in every case.

1337. Supposing the Education Department was to ask for a return of every child under these heads by name, and ask how the Board had provided for their education, would it be possible to have such a return?—It would be possible to have such a return, but, of course, it might be found in some cases that no suitable provision had been made for education.

1338. And it would be wise then to ask for the reason why no provision was made?—It would be rather a difficult question.

1339. There would be some answer—either that there was no excuse, or that there was some excuse?—Yes.

1340. Would this be a sufficient definition for any legislative action—to say that the child was mentally so defective as not to be able to profit by the teaching of the ordinary public elementary schools?—I think so: that is somewhat of the definition which the School Board have recommended the Education Department to adopt, I think.

1341. Can you give us the exact words of the recommendation?—Yes; "The expression 'defective' means "too defective, owing to mental or physical disability, "to be taught with other children the ordinary subjects "of instruction in an elementary school."

1342. The term physically defective was meant to include the cripples?—Yes, and cases of heart disease, spine complaint, and anything of that kind.

1343. It would be sufficient, would it not, to say: "So defective as not to be able to profit by the teaching "of an ordinary elementary school"?—Yes, I think so.

1344. Omitting the words "physical" and "mental"?—Yes.

1345. You have no exact statistics for the whole of London as to the approximate proportion of children suitable for special classes?—Not for the whole of London.

1346. Besides those 1,665 there are a number of children attending schools. Why cannot you give the exact number of those, and so obtain the proportion between the population and the children who ought to be attending these classes?—We have made no inquiry in schools as a rule, excepting in some cases that have come under the notice of the Board. In certain schools, where one case after another has been brought to the notice of the Board, it has been decided to make an inquiry. I can give as an instance two neighbourhoods in which we have lately made inquiries, where we found a large number of these defective children, but no provision has yet been made for them.

1347. Which two districts are you speaking of?—The districts of King's Cross and Old Ford.

1348. And are there no special classes at present for these children?—No.

1349. But my question was, you have the number out of the schools and the number in the schools, so that you think you have ascertained the total number of children in London?—I think so.

1350. What is the total number of blind, deaf, and crippled: 1,665 out of school—how many in schools?—It is, roughly speaking, about 1,700. We have from about 1,000 to 1,100 on the rolls of the special schools, and 500 on the roll of the deaf, and about 200 on the roll of the blind.

1351. Is London mapped out into areas for the purpose of these special classes?—Not for the purpose of the special classes. We have lately had three maps of London printed, one to show the blind centres, one to show the deaf centres, and one to show the special instruction centres—there are others showing the cookery and laundry classes. These maps give a clear idea of the special school accommodation provided. A radius of half a mile has been thought to be the area for which a centre for defective children would provide.

1352. And, of course, you take main thoroughfares as determining the areas within which you build the schools?—That has to be the boundary very often.

1353. For the sake of these children, who cannot cross the thoroughfares without danger?—Yes.

1354. You would advocate larger areas if the expenses of going to and fro to school were provided, as in the case of the deaf and blind?—It would be quite possible then to take larger areas.

1355. And that would involve less expense of site and of buildings?—We have found it so with the deaf and blind. We pay the expenses of most of the blind children, and a few of the deaf.

1356. Some centres have already been erected at very great cost. They cost more than the ordinary elementary school per head. What is the cost per head? I see you give Pocock Street to accommodate 120, at a cost of 19*l.* 0*s.* 6*d.* per head; and Shillington Street to accommodate 120, at a cost of 22*l.* 4*s.* 2*d.* per head?—In the case of Pocock Street we had to buy no additional land, and therefore that is the cost of the building only. But in ordinary schools, reckoning the cost of land and building as well, it works out to 19*l.* 13*s.* 1*d.*

1357. That is the total cost?—Yes.

1358. Exclusive of furniture?—Yes, exclusive of furniture. The furniture works out to 10*s.* 7*d.*; but our furniture and fittings in the special schools comes to slightly over 1*l.*

1359. I see the number is fixed at 120. Was there any reason for fixing that number?—No; the larger centres are for 150, where we have five class rooms. Shillington Street and other centres lately built are for 120.

1360. For how many class rooms is that?—Five for 150 children.

1361. The number contemplated by the Board is 30 in a class, is it?—Yes.

1362. Do you think they could be classified to as many as that? How came the number 30 to be adopted by the Board?—I think the idea was to take half the size of the usual classes The maximum number was not to be more than half the size of a class in the ordinary school; but you will see by the proportion of teaching staff that we have nothing like 30 in a class, the average is only 16·9.

1363. But if a class room were built for 30, the natural tendency would be to fill it, to economise in the staff?—Yes; but I think you will find that when a class approaches anywhere near that, it is usually divided. We have a case at the present time at Abbey Street, which has just reached 30; and I know the superintendent is anxious there to open a second class, and have a second teacher.

1364. The amount of area and of cubic space is the same as that for ordinary schools, is it not?—Yes, it is.

1365. But these children require more drill and movement. Was that considered in planning the class rooms?—I think you will find that the class room accommodation is really more than for 30. Although we reckon our rooms to accommodate 30, if they were measured up on the usual basis, they would provide accommodation for more than that number. In some cases we have the corridors or a central hall, as in Sayer Street, that is used for drill.

1366. I have a return here of 56,653 children; those are all children requiring special instruction, are they?—That return was got in order to show the ages of the children in Standard I. in boys' and girls' and mixed departments.

1367. I will read it out: "In March 1892 the Board "had before them a return showing the ages of "children then in Standard I. in boys', girls', and "mixed departments, which showed the need for "providing some special instruction in certain cases." Am I to understand that 56,653 children is the number that you found to require special instruction?—No, but those above 11 years of age in that return were mostly fit cases for special instruction. Those between seven and eight might mostly properly be in Standard I.

1368. You mean those under 8 years of age—the 20,854?—Yes.

1369. And probably the greater part of the 19,616 under 9 years of age?—Yes.

1370. It is not much of a clue, then, to the actual number?—No.

1371. Then, in March 1896, 21 centres for special instruction were open, having a roll of 896, all in or below Standard I., and all but 14 of them were over 7 years of age. Can you give the Committee a clear idea as to the number of children requiring instruction in special classes, say, by taking a particular neighbourhood, and so getting your proportion for the whole

of London?—No sufficient inquiry has been made in London or in any one whole Division of London to show the approximate proportion of children who are too defective to be properly taught in the ordinary schools, and the figures quoted above as exempted from attendance do not supply an answer to this question, as they deal only with children out of school, and not with those attending schools, for which they are unfitted by reason of their infirmity. Sub-divisions or blocks have been examined, and perhaps the following instances would give some idea of the approximate proportion:—

Mr. W. B. Chard.

17 Feb. 1897.

(*a.*) Sub-divisions in which there is sufficient special school accommodation:

District.	Number of Ordinary Schools.	Roll.	Special Instruction Schools.	Number admitted to Special Instruction School.	Percentage of Roll.
Notting Hill - -	14	10,302	St. Clement's Road - -	79	·77
City Road - - -	9	8,698	Bath Street - - -	50	·58

(*b.*) Sub-divisions in which no special school has been provided:

District.	Number of Ordinary Schools.	Roll.	Number Nominated for a Special School.	Number considered by Medical Officer fit for a Special School.	Percentage of Roll.
King's Cross - - -	13	12,307	93	58	·48
Old Ford - - - -	9	9,615	65	28	·3

Of course the number varies in different parts; but I think that the neighbourhood of King's Cross has provided more cases than any neighbourhood we have taken yet, and I think you will notice that the percentage works out there to ·48 per cent.; say a half per cent. It is hardly fair to say that that is a half per cent. of all the children in the boys' and girls' departments; it is a half per cent. of the whole child population.

1372. Between what ages; between 5 and 13?—Between 3 and 13; and we should therefore exclude all those under 7 if we wanted to make it a percentage of those in the boys' and girls' and mixed departments.

1373. It is less than a half per cent. on 800,000 children, is it?—It is less than a half per cent. on 12,000 children. I give you the neighbourhood of King's Cross.

1374. Of course the same percentage applies to the whole number throughout London. If it is a half per cent. in King's Cross, we assume it is a half per cent. throughout London?—Yes.

1375. So that a half per cent. on 800,000 would give us 4,000?—4,000.

1376. Is that approximately true, do you think; about 4,000 for the whole of London?—I should think so.

1377. And you have at present 896?—We have at present just over 1,000.

1378. So you think that there must be 3,000 more for whom special classes should be provided?—About that number.

1379. Then about the staffing of the schools. For 150 you have five teachers; but you consider that from about 16 to 17 children is sufficient to be under the charge of a single teacher, on the average?—The Board, as a rule, have considered about 24 the proper number; but our average does not work out to more than 17.

1380. Was that number, 24, founded upon some report of the superintendent, or was it evolved out of some other facts?—I think it was settled in the very commencement of the work, almost before the Board had any experience of the work.

1381. Have the Board decided to make any change; have they thought that the number 24 was too great?—They have not. It has been talked of occasionally.

1382. How are the teachers paid in these schools; are they paid higher salaries than the teachers in the ordinary schools?—They are. The first year they come out of college, if we take them straight from college, which we do not, as a rule—as a rule, we wait for them to get their certificate—they are paid 10*l.* extra beyond the amount they would get as assistant mistresses in an ordinary school, and in the second year that 10*l.* is increased to 15*l.*; so that they are 15*l.* in excess of other teachers.

1383. But they have no prospect of promotion?—I do not think that is so.

1384. What is the pay of a head teacher in a special class?—There is no head teacher in a special class.

1385. Then there are no prospects of head teacherships coming to them?—No; I think the teachers of the special classes will stand as well for promotion to head teacherships as any other teachers, and so far as pay is concerned they are mostly equal to the Grade I. head teacher.

1386. But supposing they have no experience at the ordinary schools, but devote themselves for 10 or 12 years to the special classes, do you think the Board would be likely to promote them to ordinary schools?—In all but one case, the 48 teachers we have now have been elementary school teachers first of all, and the idea is that they are to go back to the elementary school again. It was on account of that that the Board passed the rule that all these appointments should be reviewed at the end of five years.

1387. And they are so reviewed, are they?—We have not come to the end of the five years yet, but that is the intention.

1388. What do you mean by reviewing them—with a view of raising salaries?—No, with a view of their going back to the ordinary elementary schools, if it is found that they are not fit then for the special work.

1389. Then these children are visited at the schools every quarter?—By the medical officer and the superintendent.

1390. Are they under the District Board Inspector?—They are not.

1391. They are out of his purview altogether?—Yes.

1392. Why are they removed out of his purview?—The Board inspectors have no special knowledge of this work, and as it comes under a sub-committee of the Board, who act as managers, it was thought that, like the blind and deaf, they had better be quite removed from the Board inspector's care. Of course, the superintendent of special schools acts as board inspector.

1393. How does it work, having no head teacher in these separate schools, in the case of the blind, deaf, and feeble-minded. Who is responsible for the whole conduct of the school?—The teacher in charge; the senior teacher is responsible for the centre to the superintendent; and the superintendent is responsible

Mr. W. B. Chard.

17 Feb. 1897.

to the Board. There has been no difficulty, I may say, with regard to the teachers in charge.

1394. As regards these children, what legislation would be desirable, do you think. After you have provided the class, at what age do you think they should be tested for admission to these special classes. Would you test them before the age of seven?—I think not.

1395. There might be some physically defective children; would they be properly handled in the infant schools?—They would be properly handled in the infant schools, and most of the infant schools are on the ground floor; there would be very little reason why they should be removed before seven years of age.

1396. Would you leave them a little longer in the infant school, to see if they developed?—I think that would have to depend upon the circumstances. I think, as a rule, that seven would be the proper age.

1397. Then there would be two classes of these children, some who might be made entirely self-supporting, and some only partially self-supporting; but you would have them all taught in the same school, up to what age?—I should think up to 14 years of age, the present limit.

1398. And the same grant to be paid by Government for the education of these children as to the blind and deaf, three guineas for elementary education, and two guineas for manual instruction?—I do not know that. The elementary education grant no doubt would be the right amount. I do not know whether the two guineas for manual instruction would be right; I do not know that it works quite well in the blind and deaf centres at the present time.

1399. In what way?—The amount paid for the manual instruction is out of proportion to the amount paid for elementary education.

1400. In proportion to the number of teachers employed upon it?—Yes. For instance, three guineas is paid for elementary education, to which we give the whole of the time in school, excepting four hours—two attendances of two hours each during the week—and for those four hours we get two guineas.

1401. When four hours was fixed as the minimum for the blind and deaf, it was meant they should not fall below that; but there is no reason that you should not extend it above that?—That is so; it was a much more fitting arrangement for an institution or a residential school than for day classes.

1402. Why should they be differently treated in day classes and at an institution?—Because they have more time in the institution. A good deal of manual instruction can be given out of school hours, whereas we have our set times; and the complaint in the deaf classes now is very loud against taking the children away so much as we do; they say we are spoiling the instruction that is being given in language.

1403. But in an institution the time for manual instruction is generally taken out of school hours, is it not?—And frequently they have, I think, some instruction either in the morning or evening.

1404. Then at what age would you send them to institutions. If they were only found to be partly self-supporting, or scarcely able to support themselves, would you keep them in school in the ordinary special class till 14 years of age?—Yes, I think so.

1405. Or would you extend the age for some of them to 16?—I should like to see the age extended, but I think not made compulsory.

1406. I suppose compulsion could not possibly be worked?—I think not.

1407. The parents are very unwilling to part with their children are they not?—Yes.

1408. And in fact unwilling to place them in special classes very often?—At first.

1409. They think there is a stigma on their child?—Yes, at first, but some parents afterwards are only too grateful, and speak highly of the special classes.

1410. How are they won over, by visits from the superintendent or the teacher?—I think mostly because they see how the child has developed.

1411. But to get them to let their children be placed in the special classes to begin with, are they coaxed or driven?—We have tried no compulsion. We had a case a little while ago at Hackney where the parents refused to allow the child to go to the special class, and it was decided that the child was to be excluded from the ordinary school where he was attending, in order that the parent might be summoned for non-attendance of the child at the special class.

1412. To make it a test case?—To make it a test case; but, unfortunately, in the meantime, the parent sent the child to a voluntary school that would take the child, and so our test case broke down.

1413. Had the case been settled as one for a special class?—It had.

1414. After a medical examination?—Yes.

1415. Was the voluntary school aware of the fact?—I do not know. We always send to all the voluntary schools in the neighbourhood, when the medical officer is visiting to examine for admission to a special class, to give them a chance of presenting any children they would like to have sent to a special class.

1416. Do you think the children take refuge in the voluntary schools in order to escape the Board?—Perhaps so.

1417. How would you coax them to school; would you invite the parents to come and see the school?—I think the parents can very often be influenced by the teacher. The teacher of the class has, in many cases, I believe, got an influence over the parent in that way.

1418. Then you do not advocate compulsion at all for the special classes, though there must be compulsion of course to go to some school?—I think it would be hardly possible; there would be many difficulties in the way of compulsion.

1419. (*Mr. Pooley.*) It was stated by a witness the other day that there were several feeble-minded children who came before the hospital physicians whose parents stated that they could not get them into the board schools. Do you think that is correct?—I think so.

1420. Do you think that is owing to the unwillingness of the teachers in ordinary schools to admit very dull or defective children?—Teachers are naturally unwilling to take children that they consider unsuitable for the instruction given in the school. I have had two or three cases lately of the kind you are speaking of, and I am thinking of one case at Battersea, where we have had a lot of trouble with a child of this kind. This child was in the infant school, up to, I think, about eight years of age, and then should have been transferred or was transferred to the boy's school, and the headmaster says the boy is unfit for his school—he considers him imbecile; and, as we have no special school in the neighbourhood, he is out of school.

1421. Is it practically left to the headmaster to decide in such a case whether a particular child shall come into the school or not?—Yes. The Board have lately made an alteration in the rule, so that when a head teacher refuses a child on such ground the matter shall be reported to the School Management Committee of the Board.

1422. Then, if a parent finds that his child is refused admission, what is his proper course to take if he wishes to claim his right?—To report the matter to the Board.

1423. When a school is practically full, is the teacher allowed to make a choice between children?—The teacher must take the names in their order of application for admission.

1424. But, practically, he could exclude a child who he thought was defective and would not do him credit?—Yes, if he thought the child unsuitable.

1425. One or two definitions have been mentioned which might be applied to mentally or physically defective children. I suppose the application of those definitions in any particular case would be difficult, would it not. I mean to say there would be many cases in which it would be difficult to decide, whatever definitions we adopted, whether a particular child was or was not defective?—It would be a question for medical evidence.

1426. Whoever had to decide; if it was a doctor who had to decide it would be difficult for him in many cases to decide, would it not?—Yes, you would have many cases on the border line.

1427. That is what I meant. Then, is not that an almost insuperable objection to compulsory legislation?—I think it is.

1428. What I mean is, that compulsory legislation may apply when you can draw a hard-and-fast line between those who come under the particular legislation and those who do not, but it is a very different thing in a case where there is no hard-and-fast line?—I had that in my mind in the answer I gave the Chairman.

1429. I take it, as to a blind child or as to a deaf child, there is no hard-and-fast line; there are doubtful cases, but the number of doubtful cases must be a very much smaller proportion than the number of doubtful cases of defective children?—We have doubtful cases among both the blind and the deaf, the blind more especially after they reach the age of 14. It is rather extraordinary that in some cases where we teach children as blind up to 14 years of age, they are afterwards found to have more sight, or perhaps getting stronger physically, and we are unable to keep them; that is to say, we can get no medical certificate that would enable us to make their attendance up to 16 years of age compulsory.

1430. In those doubtful cases you do not attempt to enforce compulsion?—Not if it is very doubtful.

1431. You advocate the payment of the expenses of defective children attending these special classes, do you not?—I did; that is merely following the Act of 1893. We have the same regulation for blind and deaf children.

1432. As a matter of fact, do you find it work. There was a sensational case in the papers the other day; I was thinking of that—do you find it work satisfactorily as a rule?—Quite satisfactorily.

1533. In that particular case did the Board make a payment of expenses?—Yes.

1534. And it was said that that was not sufficient?—It was not a question of expenses at all. It was a question of the payment of a guide; we pay the expenses of the child and the expenses of the guide, but we had only allowed 1*s.* a week for payment of the guide's services, and it was alleged that the guide should at least have been paid 2*s.* a week.

1435. (*Miss Townsend.*) Or fed?—That was a mistake about feeding; I inquired into that.

1436. (*Mr. Pooley.*) Do you think that the School Board should have the power of paying the expenses of the guide in these cases?—I do not think there is any possibility that you would want a guide; I merely meant the travelling expenses.

1437. Then supposing the school authority has no power to pay a guide, what could be done with defective children not able to travel considerable distances?—I hope you would not require them to travel considerable distances. I meant only where the school was on a line of tram route that they might perhaps take a penny ride, or something of that kind, that would bring them close to the school.

1438. Then you think it would be necessary to have special classes in a considerable number of centres, and will continue to be necessary?—At the present time we have 30 centres, and there are about 30 more in contemplation, but I think that 60 will not be a sufficient number for the whole of London. I should say that 100 is nearer the number that we should ultimately require.

1439. And you think that we cannot hope to be able practically to collect these defective children at a small number of centres?—No.

1440. That a centre must be within fairly easy reach of the homes of the children?—It would be desirable that they should be.

1441. You say you look forward to having 100 centres in London?—I think we should want at least 100 centres.

1442. What would be the number of children at each centre?—The numbers, of course, would vary considerably. At some centres I expect the lowest number at the present time is only like 12 or 13 at a centre; and in others, again, it would be higher. I think Edward Street is our highest number at the present time, where we have from 80 to 90.

1443. Do you agree that it is advisable to have at least three classes in a school?—I think not in neighbourhoods where the number is small. If you get a neighbourhood where you have ascertained that you can only get a small number for a special class, say something under 20. I should certainly think the better way would be to use some of the existing accommodation, use a room in an ordinary school that will do for the purpose very well, and have only one class.

Mr. W. B. Chard.

17 Feb. 1897.

1444. If you had 100 centres, what do you think would be the average number in each centre?—I should think, as a rule, you would require three rooms, especially in the centres that we build purposely for this work, and I should think the average number would be about 60.

1445. That would give you accommodation for 6,000?—Yes; we should not have 6,000. I should say considerably less than that; but still, you must have more accommodation than you have children.

1446. You have come to the conclusion that about one-half per cent. of the total number of children might be put down as defective in London?—So far as I can see, that is about right.

1447. Do you know that Dr. Warner estimated 1 per cent. of the child population?—I was under the impression that he had estimated 2 per cent.?

1448. I think we got it out the other day 1 per cent.; and Dr. Kerr from Bradford 2 per cent. Is your information definite enough to lead you to think that those estimates are too high?—I think it is not so many, but if there is a difference between the conclusion at which I have arrived and Dr. Kerr's conclusion, it is because Dr. Kerr has not taken the whole of the children; I should say he has taken the children in the senior departments; that is to say, boys, girls, and mixed, whereas I have taken the whole children from 3 to 13 years of age. I have taken the children that are actually upon the rolls of the schools.

1449. In getting that ½ per cent. at King's Cross, you took the children actually on the roll of the special classes, and you added some proportion for those out of school altogether, did you not?—No, those out of school altogether. I explained, were not dealt with in these figures. These figures relate only to the children that were actually in school at the time when the medical officer and superintendent visited to examine the children.

1450. This ½ per cent., then, only relates to the children actually in school?—Children actually in school.

1451. Then in order to ascertain what proportion of the child population belongs to this defective class, you would have to add very considerably to that ½ per cent.?—1,600 for the whole of London; but a considerable number of these children would probably not be cases for the special instruction schools.

1452. Then to get at the whole number, do you think it would be correct to take your 4,000?—I think so.

1453. And to add to that for the defective children who are out of school?—I think so.

1454. Then, as regards the age of attendance at special classes, do you think it would be sufficient if it were made clear that it was the duty of the school authority to retain them in the special classes, and that they had power to do so up to 16 years of age if the parents wished it?—I think the parent and the school authority should have the option of allowing the child to remain there till 16 years of age.

1455. That the school authority should be required to do it if the parent claimed it?—Yes.

1456. Compulsion on the school authority to that extent?—Yes.

1457. Then, as regards the amount of the grant, you have told us that you thought the two-guinea grant in day schools for deaf and blind children was too large a proportion?—I do not think that the deaf and blind grant is satisfactory at present, because you make no difference as regards the children who are sent to institutions and the children who are taught in day centres. That has a very bad effect in some cases, it has the effect of keeping in our day centres some cases that it would be most desirable to place in institutions; and if you made the same condition with regard to defective children, possibly the same result would follow.

1458. You mean to say it is too high—it is an undue premium upon sending the children to the day classes?—The elementary grant is right. I question as to whether more manual instruction should not be given than we have in day classes for the two guineas, and, whether some grant similar to that given by the Local Government Board in the case of Poor Law children sent to institutions should not be paid for the maintenance—I mean, something like 4*s.* per week in the case of every child who is boarded out or sent to an institution.

Mr. W. B. Chard.

17 Feb. 1897

1459. Whatever the scale of grant is, do not you think that it would be necessary not to make the grant so high as to be a temptation to school authorities to take a child from the ordinary school and send it into a special class who might very well go on in the ordinary school?—I think you would safeguard that anyhow by your examination for admission. I do not think it should be possible to do so.

1460. You would make the examination sufficiently strict?—Yes.

1461. But you agree that unless there was a very strict examination, if the grant were high there might be a temptation to push off these children to special classes for the sake of the grant?—The examination must be strict in order to safeguard against that; but the point that I wanted to make with regard to the grant is that there should be a residential grant, where it is necessary to send to an institution, as apart from the grant for instruction.

1462. Well, you have that already, in the case of institutions for the deaf and blind; the school authority have the power to pay maintenance?—Yes; but there is no grant for that; and the result of that is, that children who ought to be sent to institutions by the school authority are not sent, because the day centre is so much cheaper.

1463. You think that there should be a Government grant in respect of maintenance?—There should be, similar to that given for the Poor Law children.

1464. You would put a portion of it upon the Government grant instead of putting the whole of it upon the rates?—Yes.

1465. (*Miss Townsend.*) I have little to ask you. I only want to know this: You say that in districts where there are very few of these children, they could be as well taught in the special class, housed in a class-room of an ordinary school, as in a special centre built or set apart for them?—I think that has been found to be so.

1466. In that case, how would such a class differ from the lowest class of an ordinary school, except in being smaller?—The class would be receiving exceptional treatment as regards the methods of instruction, classification, &c.

1467. It would be an additional lower class of the ordinary school with special instruction?—With special instruction.

1468. In such a case, would you have the defective children mingle with the other children out of school hours?—I see no objection.

1469. The only reason for keeping them apart is that they should receive special instruction?—Yes.

1470. That is the only reason for gathering them together in centres?—I think so.

1471. Otherwise, neither they nor the ordinary children would take harm from intercourse, in your opinion?—No, I think not.

1472. Then, in the case of what you call the residential grant, is that an advisable thing from the parents' point of view?—I think so, most decidedly. The Blind and Deaf Act gives the school authority the option to go before the magistrate to get the contribution that the parent should pay for maintenance fixed. The London School Board have endeavoured to make all parents, so far as possible, pay something, and I see now that out of about 150 cases we are maintaining, the average fee obtained from the parents is only 1*s.* 1*d.* a week.

1473. With the utmost endeavour to make it what they can afford?—Yes.

1474. So that your residential grant would include some amount from the rates, some from the Department, and some from the parents?—Yes.

1475. As much as possible from the parents?—Yes.

1476. Of course, the parents' consent would be necessary before sending a child to an institution?—Yes.

1477. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) I am not quite clear about this 1,665 children not in attendance at school. Are they children of school age?—Yes.

1478. On what grounds are they exempt?—On the ground of some disability, either blind, deaf, epileptic, or some physical infirmity.

1479. Then, if there were sufficient special classes (and for the moment we will include blind and deaf), these children should be in attendance at school?—Many of them.

1480. What I want to get from you is this: that many of these children would be exempt, because of medical certificates?—They would.

1481. Do you place implicit confidence in those medical certificates; is it your experience that they are worth anything?—Some are worthless.

1482. You do know of certificates having been given where you could not see at all why those children were exempt from school?—Yes.

1483. I am wondering if you answered the Chairman quite clearly about the averages. We really, on the Board, have no knowledge of the exact number of children requiring special attention, have we?—We have not, for the whole of London—only for the districts that we have examined.

1484. Before a class is started there is always a preliminary examination of children to show the need of such a class?—Yes.

1485. And so far we have not nearly covered London?—No. I should say with regard to that percentage that it is not based on the number which the teachers in the locality recommended. If you take the number which the teachers in the locality recommended it is usually much higher than that, but it is the percentage that is actually passed by the medical officer and the superintendent, after they have examined the children.

1486. There is another point I should be glad if you could clear up. You spoke of doubtful cases of attendance not being enforced. What did you mean by the doubtful cases. Did you mean that the attendance was not to be enforced at the special class?—I think not, so long as you enforce attendance at school. If it is a case that is on the border line, and there is a doubt whether it is fit for the special school or the ordinary school, if the parent objects to attendance at the special school I think you should not enforce attendance there.

1487. But if a child is a very troublesome child, would you still say he should have the right of attending the ordinary elementary school?—I should exclude him from the ordinary school if he were unfit for the instruction there.

1488. And what would become of that child?—The parents would then be summoned for the non-attendance of the child.

1489. Then you would make the attendance compulsory?—If it were a case which was undoubtedly fit for a special school I should certainly endeavour to secure its admission to a special school.

1490. By a doubtful case, you meant a case that was not sufficiently obviously deficient?—I did.

1491. (*Mr. Newton.*) Can you say what is the cost of maintenance per child in average attendance in a special school?—I think I can. I have taken two schools. In East Street the gross cost was 8*l.* 15*s.* 7¾*d.*, and the net 7*l.* 18*s.* 8½*d.* At Abbey Street the gross cost was 7*l.* 18*s.* 3¾*d.*, and the net 6*l.* 13*s.* 3¾*d.*

1492. Then the gross cost in the ordinary schools of the Board is about 3*l.* 10*s.*?—3*l.* 14*s.* 5*d.*, with a net of 2*l.* 4*s.* 1*d.*

1493. Then there is a difference of between 4*l.* and 5*l.* in the gross cost of the two?—Yes.

1494. What rate of grant do you think might fairly be paid in the case of these children?—I think the same grant should be given as for elementary instruction in the case of the blind and deaf, that is, three guineas, with a further grant in cases that are sent to institutions—that is, a residential grant.

1495. But with the elementary instruction in their case you include everything, do you not?—I should include everything.

1496. Then would you think that there should be a fixed grant, or a grant that is partly fixed and partly variable?—There should not be a grant upon average attendance, because if it is a grant upon average attendance, it would considerably reduce the amount inasmuch as our average attendance falls very far short of the average in the other schools; that is to say, the average in the ordinary schools is something over 80 per cent., whereas our average is less than 70 per cent.

1497. There are great advantages, though, in keeping to the average attendance, and could not that be allowed for in fixing the rate of grant? Could not irregularity of attendance be taken into consideration?—I rather hoped that the grant given would be something like it is in the case of the blind and deaf, only that you would not insist upon complete months of attendance; that is to say, you would pay a grant for those on the roll, and perhaps allow a 75 per cent. attendance.

1498. Do you reject altogether these figures that are given in the accommodation report for Lady Day 1896 as untrustworthy—these figures referring to the number of defective children in London?—We have not found that the divisional superintendents and the school attendance officers have always gone far enough into the question of defective children to be quite reliable, so far, in the returns they have made.

1499. Then do you think you will be able to get returns next Lady Day that are decidedly more accurate?—They will be more accurate.

1500. In that case I will not ask you anything more about these; but, as to the number of deficient children, you compare the number of deficient children in this table, between the ages of 3 and 13, do you not?—Yes.

1501. And the number of children that are attending the special classes will all be over 7 years of age?—There is only one under 6, and 14 under 7.

1502. Then no percentages could be worked out from the proportion attending the classes. The numbers attending the classes would not give, would they, the proper percentage of defective children, inasmuch as all the infants would be left out?—That is so.

1503. I want to ask you if this calculation is worth anything. In the case of the Edward Street Board School the children seem to come from five blocks in Greenwich of which I can give the names, if necessary. Those subdivisions had 7,938 scheduled children in them over 7 years of age and under 13. That I have compared with the average number on the roll of the special class. Would that result be a satisfactory measure of the number of defective children to be provided for all over London?—I think so. You would get a few coming a long distance, perhaps a few outside the five schools you have mentioned, but I think it would be approximately correct.

1504. And there is one case where there is no possibility of anybody doing that, that is in the case of the Isle of Dogs?—We have one centre, British Street.

1505. In that case the number of children in the special class works out as very nearly 1 per cent. of the scheduled children between 7 and 13 years of age. In the Isle of Dogs there are 2,904 scheduled children between the ages of 7 and 13, and the average number on the rolls in the Isle of Dogs is 24. In the case of Edward Street there were 7,938 scheduled children, and the average number on the roll in special classes was 94?—Of course you notice that you are not calculating on the same basis as I have; that is to say, you are not taking the children from 3 to 13 years of age; you are taking the children from 7 to 13.

1506. Then, in the case of Choumert Road, would this be fair; this is fed, not from any complete blocks, but from part of four blocks in East Lambeth?—More than four blocks, I think. There are some children at Choumert Road that come rather long distances.

1507. Then they must come very long distances. In those blocks there are 6,130 scheduled children, and the average number on the roll is 49. Would you be prepared to accept Choumert Road and Edward Street and the Isle of Dogs as three representative districts?—I think so.

1508. This Choumert Road is a well-to-do district; the other two are poor?—Yes, quite fairly representative.

1509. Then you think that from those figures one may be warranted in supposing that about one per cent. of the children between 7 and 13 years of age should be provided for?—Yes, I should think so.

1510. And that would give something under 5,000 for all London?—I should fancy it would be rather under one per cent. if anything, but I think you might be quite safe in taking that.

1511. It would give something near 5,000 for the whole of London?—Yes.

1512. (*Dr. Smith.*) I am not quite clear where you get that extra thousand from?—If we had taken a half per cent. on the whole child population from 3 to 13 years of age, it would come to 4,000, but Mr. Newton has taken it in another way, I think, he has taken from 7 to 13, which is no doubt the more accurate calculation.

Mr. W. B. Chard.

17 Feb. 1897.

1513. Then you think, judging by the figures in connexion with King's Cross, which is an exceptionally bad district, that 5,000, taking it from the ages of 7 to 13, would be a fair number to provide for?—I think so.

1514. I think you said that 7 was the best age for admission to these classes?—Yes, I think not before 7.

1515. Previous to that you would suggest that they should be in the elementary school?—I can see no reason for moving them from the infant school before that age.

1516. You would keep them in the special schools up to what age?—14.

1517. Do you think there might be cases where it would be desirable to retain children beyond the age of 14 years?—I am sure there are.

1518. How would you suggest that those should be dealt with?—In some few cases you might be able to profitably employ their time in the day centres, but mostly they should be sent to some institution for industrial training.

1519. Then as regards the amount of grant, I think you said that three guineas would be enough?—I think three guineas for the day centres would be sufficient.

1520. That is up to the age of 14 years?—Yes, but it would not be a sufficient grant for the children you send to institutions.

1521. What additional grant would you suggest?—I think the same payment should be made as the Local Government Board make in the case of Poor Law children, that is to say, four shillings a week for each child.

1522. And the mode in which that grant should be given you think should not be as it is now, but in some other method. What is that?—I think not on average attendance. It should be a grant on the roll of the school, for the children who have made 75 per cent. of attendances.

1523. You think that this is necessary in this case because of the ill health or weak condition of the children who are attending?—Yes.

1524. And therefore they are liable to absences on account of that?—It is so. We find that the average attendance of the special classes falls below 70, whereas the average attendance at the other schools is above 80 per cent.

1525. I see here two returns of the results of examinations of these classes in the School Board, and that a number of imbeciles were noted; can you tell us what became of these imbeciles?—The number of imbeciles on the two following quarterly examinations has decreased by their being excluded from the school, but we have no return as to what has become of them, and I am afraid that in most cases they are simply excluded, and are now at home, with no instruction whatever.

1526. You think these children, then, owing to their exclusion from the schools, have now been left free in London?—I am afraid so.

1527. Have you anything to suggest as to what should be done in connexion with those imbeciles?—If they are found fit cases to go to an imbecile institution, some arrangement should be made, as in the case of the blind and deaf, to allow them to go without pauperising the parents.

1528. You think that some means should be devised by which their admission should be facilitated?—Yes.

1529. And that the pauper taint which is now attached to them if they obtain admission into an institution in London should be removed?—I do.

1530. What provision is made for getting rid of the mentally defective children in the classes of the deaf and the blind?—No provision has been made. In any case where it has been found that the child is absolutely unfitted for the school (we have had a few such cases) they have been excluded; but the children in blind and deaf schools have never been medically examined, and therefore unless the child

Mr. W. B. Chard.

17 Feb. 1897.

happens to have given very great trouble, it would never come to the notice of the Board.

1531. Therefore you do not take any steps in regard to the exclusion of imbeciles from the deaf classes?—No steps have been taken unless the case has been reported.

1532. I will just ask you about the 1,665 cases. They were practically all excluded on medical certificate, were they?—No, I think not on medical certificate in all cases, but no doubt, in the majority of cases.

1533. And you think in a great number of those cases the certificate is not to be relied upon?—I would not say a great number; I think very often we have medical certificates that cannot be relied upon.

1534. I quite agree with you; but has the Board taken any steps for dealing with cases such as those?—No.

1535. Was not there a resolution passed some few weeks since referring all cases of doubtful certificate to the medical officer?—That has not been acted upon yet, so far as I know. I have no knowledge of it.

1536. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) I wish to ask you whether the fact that some centres are simply class-rooms in ordinary school buildings for ordinary children, and some are special buildings by themselves, is a matter of local convenience only?—Yes; I think it has been mostly that we have had accommodation to spare in the school, and the number requiring the accommodation has been small, so it has been found convenient to use a room instead of building a centre.

1537. But the children in this class-room in an ordinary school are under the same conditions as to supervision as the children in the centres?—Precisely.

1538. I mean they are apart from the ordinary discipline of the ordinary school, and under the superintendent of special instruction?—Yes.

1539. Then, with regard to the amount of space allowed, I am really not familiar with the amount of space allowed for ordinary children—can you tell me what it is?—Ten feet is the basis in the ordinary school, but in the case of the blind and deaf we have 20 feet for each child instead of 10.

1540. Do not you think it is desirable that the feeble-minded children should also have a larger allowance of space?—They have. I cannot say it would work out to 20 feet the same as the blind and deaf, but it would certainly be much more than the ordinary school.

1541. My idea was that, probably they might require it on account of their physical conditions as well—they would be malodorous, and so forth?—Yes.

1542. Then, with regard to manual training, do you think that the deaf and blind children are altogether parallel with the feeble-minded children in that regard?—Not quite. The cases of blind and deaf, although they are treated under the same Act, are not really parallel; and certainly the special instruction would not fall in precisely with either case.

1543. What I meant was, do not you think the manual training is probably more important in the case of the feeble-minded children than in that of the deaf children, for instance?—I think so; at any rate after 14 years of age.

1544. May it not be important also as an approach to their intelligence, training their intelligence through their fingers, and in that sense be of importance to that class?—I think a great deal of the instruction that they would get in the centres, I mean what we should call the ordinary instruction, would be of such a kind as would make them use their fingers, and perhaps might be termed manual instruction.

1545. Would that come under the grant that you spoke of, the two-guinea grant for manual instruction?—It would not under the present conditions, because, by the present conditions laid down for the blind and deaf schools, the manual instruction grant is only given after the age of 11 to those who attend the special centres, either cookery or laundry or wood-work.

1546. It would not include such things as macramé or sewing work?—No, that is taken in blind and deaf schools for children under 11, and accepted as a manual occupation.

1547. Then you said that the voluntary schools were always asked to send children who were suspected of being feeble-minded for examination by the medical officer when he happened to be in the neighbourhood; do they respond to that invitation?—We have not had many cases; I have met with two or three.

1548. So that they may have some feeble-minded pupils who are not sent for examination by the medical officer?—They may, but I think they would generally be glad to get rid of such cases.

1549. Then you instanced the case of the head teacher who refused to take a boy into his school because he considered him an imbecile; had he any other authority than his own to form that opinion upon?—No.

1550. What would have happened—(I do not know what did happen in this case)—supposing the parent took the child to some medical man who certified that he was not imbecile?—The case would have been referred to the Board's medical officer if there had been any dispute about the matter.

1551. You said, I think, there was sometimes, at the age of 14, or between 14 and 16, a doubt raised by the parents, I presume, as to whether the child who had been considered blind and deaf up to that time was blind and deaf?—I said blind more particularly; we have had several cases of blind.

1552. By whom is that question settled; by any medical authority?—Well, we have usually asked for an oculist's certificate, and if the oculist states that the child is too blind to receive instruction in an ordinary school and to use the ordinary reading books, we treat the case as being a blind case.

1553. After the age of 14?—Yes, up to 16 years of age.

1554. (*Chairman.*) I want to get the numbers clear. The only reliable statistics that you have got show $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the children on the roll?—Yes, of the total number from 3 to 13 years of age.

1555. You may assume that $\frac{5}{13}$ of those are between 7 and 13 years of age?—Yes.

1556. And that works out, for the whole of London, at about 2,500 of the children on the roll?—Yes.

1557. On the statistics that you have supplied us with for King's Cross and Old Ford?—Yes.

1558. And besides that we have to add 1,600 who are out of school for various reasons, making altogether 4,100?—Yes; and you also have to add those we have at present in the special centres, that would not be taken into account in those.

1559. And adding the children in special centres, who amount to 900, is that so?—1,100, I think.

1560. That brings the total number to 5,000 and upwards?—Probably about 5,000 would be approximately correct.

1561. Which we may consider as the minimum number?—Yes.

1562. You spoke of small centres with only one teacher, a teacher for 13 children. There may be 13 children of different habits, different degrees of intelligence; how would you propose to put 13 children under one teacher under those circumstances?—We have three or four such centres at the present time, and they have been considered very satisfactory. The one at Matthias Road, Stoke Newington, is the one I have particularly in my mind at the present time. There are, of course, three or four divisions, but the centre is very satisfactory for all that.

1563. Speaking of the manual work, you are aware the teachers always endeavour to create an interest in the other work by beginning with manual work?—Yes.

1564. Would not that complicate the difficulty for such a teacher?—I think not.

1565. You think she could attend herself to 13 different people?—I do not think the difficulty has been felt.

1566. About the average attendance, you say it is below 70 per cent.?—Yes.

1567. Would you consider that as attending "with due regularity," which are the words of the Act?—I hope you would consider it so, considering the infirmities of the children.

1568. But for healthy children you would not consider it sufficient?—No.

1569. But it might be sufficient for children in weak health?—I think that for blind and deaf children, or

children under special instruction, an allowance should be made—that you could not expect the same attendances as in ordinary schools.

1570. But you might expect something like 75 or 80 per cent. for a healthy child?—Yes.

1571. You spoke of 4*s.* as the boarding-out rate; is that the ordinary rate, or rather higher?—No, the rate paid by the Local Government Board for Poor Law children is 4*s.*, but they pay more; in fact, we pay for the children we board out at the present time 7*s.*, but my suggestion was that the Government should find a grant of 4*s.* towards it.

1572. The Government have already sanctioned in the case of the blind and deaf a much higher payment to go to institutions—as much as 25*l.* a year?—Of course, the Royal Normal College is a case in point, where we have paid 35*l.* a year.

1573. That is for special advantages connected with music; but for the case of ordinary scholars the rate has been reduced to 25*l.*?—And I think the Jew's Home at Notting Hill is 26*l.*

1574. So that there is a precedent for paying higher for boarding out these children?—You see, if you take the cost of the education, which possibly is from 8*l.* to 10*l.* a year, that means that the school authority pays a large amount for maintenance, which comes entirely out of local rates.

Mr. W. B. Chard.

17 Feb. 1897.

1575. That would be a reason for paying a higher rate for maintenance in the case of these children?—Yes.

1576. Though you only get 1*s.* 1*d.* a week from he parent?—Yes.

1577. Your schools were originally planned for 30. What security have we, that unless we fix some higher number than the ordinary basis of school area, the Board will not fill up to 30 in each case. Is it not advisable in that case to demand the same area for feeble-minded children as for the blind and deaf?—Yes, I think it would be a very good thing to do.

1578. Twenty square feet instead of 10 square fee?—Yes.

1579. So that your class-rooms for 30 would then become class-rooms for 15?—I think you will find that our class-rooms for 30, according to the 10-feet basis, would accommodate more than 30 children.

1580. Would you advise our going beyond 20 feet?—No, I think not.

1581. You think 20 feet would be ample?—Yes.

The witness withdrew.

Miss MATILDA MARY BLACKMORE called in and examined.

Miss M. M. Blackmore.

1582. (*Chairman.*) You are head mistress of the St. Michael and All Angels' School, Woolwich?—Yes.

1583. A voluntary school of the Church of England?—Yes.

1584. How many have you in your school?—I have 230 on the books this last week.

1585. And your staff consists of how many?—A certificated assistant, two teachers under Article 68, and three pupil teachers.

1586. By whom is the lowest class taught?—By a first year pupil teacher.

1587. Do you consider it a good arrangement to put an unskilled girl over the lowest class?—She is the best teacher I have, with the exception of the certificated assistant; I teach that class myself.

1588. How many children do you put under her?—There are 51 in the whole class. I superintend the class and she takes it under me.

1589. What does superintendence mean; it is a very vague term?—I do the best part of the teaching, and then she follows out my instructions while I teach Standard II.

1590. Who teaches Standard II. at other times?—One of the teachers under Article 68.

1591. Then you oscillate between the two?—Yes.

1592. In fact, you are responsible for both these classes?—Yes.

1593. Neither of the teachers is responsible for them entirely?—No.

1594. You hold yourself responsible?—Yes.

1595. Would it not have been better to have reversed it, and put the Article 68 teacher to the little ones?—The other teacher understands them so well that she is really splendid with them.

1596. How old is she?—15, I think.

1597. And she has 51 children to look after?—Part of them.

1598. Three children for every year of her age?—It is the best arrangement we can make there. That is why we have done it.

1599. Among these children she has a certain number of feeble-minded children?—Yes.

1600. They are all in this lowest class, are they?—With the exception of one who left a week or so ago, because she was over 14 years of age.

1601. How many are there at present in the class?—Four. One left this week to go to a Roman Catholic School, her parents being of that religion.

1602. You have only three left?—Four still.

1603. Four, who are mixed up with the other 47?—Yes.

1604. Do you consider that they are neglected?—In a certain way they are. At first we had them in a desk by themselves and all together; but we found that they were happier when they were mixed up among the other children, and they get more attention as well.

1605. And are they so feeble minded that they cannot speak, some of them. Will you describe the mental condition of the four, if you can?—One is between 12 and 13 years of age; sometimes she can speak, but at other times she cannot answer to her name when the register is called.

1606. It depends upon the state of her nerves, does it?—I think it must, and upon the state of her health; and sometimes she cannot even step up the step—we have to help her as she comes in, and sometimes she can hardly walk at all, and then the children who live near bring her to school; and occasionally she can read a word or two. Then another is about 10 years of age. She can scarcely speak; she can just say Yes or No, and one or two little words, and sometimes she cannot make herself understood. But then she is a very vicious child.

1607. Is she mischievous to the other children?—She would tear her pinafore, and that sort of thing, and tears up the sponges if she is allowed to use them. That is at times, and sometimes she is quite a good little girl, and has once or twice done some needlework nicely; so she varies.

1608. And the third case?—She is a naughty girl, generally. She does not try at all, but she can speak quite plainly, and goes errands for her mother. She is quite incapable of learning.

1609. And the fourth?—Then the other is about the same as the last. One can knit beautifully and do needlework. She does things with her fingers and she writes fairly well. She cannot do anything mentally.

1610. Do you consider that you can improve these children very much under these circumstances?—We have noticed that they have improved a little—a very little.

1611. Chiefly through their own exertions, rather than through your teaching, is it?—Yes, because we do not have time really to teach them properly.

1612. In what way have they improved in your school?—They can copy from the board, and do mechanical work, and one girl can do dictation, which she could not do when she came to me.

1613. Do you mean that she can spell or transcribe?—She puts down the letters as she sees them, but she cannot spell properly.

1614. She can transcribe, you mean?—Yes.

Miss M. M. Blackmore.

17 Feb. 1897.

1615. Are they a nuisance in the school; do they fight?—Sometimes; sometimes it is a great strain to the teacher to keep them quiet at all, and, occasionally, they will burst out laughing or crying. One of them, the eldest one, cries occasionally.

1616. Have the managers considered that they were in their proper place?—I have spoken to Mrs. Baker about them.

1617. Is Mrs. Baker the wife of the vicar?—Yes; she was talking to me about some others; there was a whole family belonging to one—two boys and one girl.

1618. And the managers considered it was fit for you to undertake the charge of these children?—They would like them in a special school if there was one near.

1619. You all do it out of compassion for the children, managers and teachers, thinking you are doing the best for the children?—Yes.

1620. Knowing that they would be in the streets or getting into mischief if you did not take them?—Yes.

1621. But, of course, they have a very bad effect upon the discipline of the school?—Not really a bad effect. Of course being in Standard I. they are with the little children, who will play with them; they have not the same powers as the others.

1622. You do not think that they keep the other children back, retard them?—Oh, no. They would if we waited to help them on, and worked with them, as we should really like to do, but we cannot do it.

1623. Have you tried the plan of putting them under the charge of another child, to teach them and bring them on?—Yes. All last summer I had them under a monitor, and I told her to take the bright pictures off the wall and to talk to them about them, and to begin drawing with them on their slates. They seemed to improve a little in that way.

1624. Was she a paid monitor or a monitor changed weekly?—A paid monitor—a girl who will be eventually a pupil teacher.

1625. She took these four children specially?—Yes.

1626. And the managers were willing that she should do it?—Yes, I spoke to Mrs. Baker about it.

1627. In fact, it is a special class of your own creating?—Yes; she did not like the work herself, that is why I gave them back to the pupil teacher.

1628. Then they can keep pace with the other children in some things, can they, in transcribing?—With the exception of one, and she does everything backwards; so her sight cannot be right, I should think; everything she does she does backwards.

1629. (*Miss Townsend.*) Does she begin to write at the wrong end of the page?—No, she will begin at the right end, but forms the letters backwards.

1630. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) "On" for "no"?—Yes.

1631. (*Chairman.*) Do the other children behave nicely to them?—Yes I do not think there has been one instance in which I have found the girls unkind to them.

1632. They have a humanising influence, then, upon the class?—Yes, they let them join in all the games in the playground. I have often noticed that if they tumble down the other children pick them up; and they take them home, some of them. Two or three cannot go home by themselves.

1633. A special class might easily be formed in your neighbourhood. I suppose there are many schools quite close to you?—Yes, I put down a few.

1634. You have enumerated about eight schools?—Yes; two rather far away, Union Street and Powis Street; I did not think about those, they are right in the town, but in a different direction from the others.

1635. So that a special class might easily be formed in your neighbourhood?—Yes.

1636. Probably one is in contemplation; do you happen to know?—I have heard there is one, but then it would be too far for us. I think it is to be at Plum Street.

1637. Is there anything more you would like to say about the treatment of these children in your school?—I think not: only, of course, if we could get a special centre we should like to send them, because we feel some of them would get on; the teacher said so herself.

1638. You are not tired of them yet?—No, not tired of the children, but it is all for their own good that we should like to have something of the kind.

1639. (*Mr. Pooley.*) You think these children would get on better in a special class?—Yes, I do.

1640. Do you think they would get on better in an institution where they would live; supposing they found themselves in an institution, do you think they would get on better there?—Yes, I do; for the home surroundings are not what they should be with some of our children.

1641. But do you think the association with other children of the same kind or feeble minded children would not neutralise the benefit that they might get?—I think not, not if they were under instruction.

1642. Have you considered that question, whether it would be for the benefit of children of this sort to be herded together in an institution?—Yes; that was one point that I was talking over with Mrs. Baker yesterday, and she thought that it would be a good plan to board them out in that way.

1643. I mean that they should live in an institution?—Yes, because their home surroundings are so bad. In two cases that I know of the children are very badly treated by their parents.

1644. Supposing the children were the same, but that their home surroundings were fairly good, would you think then that they would do better in an institution?—No, then, I think, they would do better among children more as they are now, just to go daily. Then, of course, they would have the companionship of their own brothers and sisters at home.

1645. Supposing that your school were in a rural district entirely, where there was no chance of forming a special class, you would consider that they might do fairly well, as they do with you?—Yes.

1646. Do you think in that case they would be likely to do better in an institution if they had to be sent some distance. I gathered that you did not think the arrangements for instruction in your school were quite unsatisfactory, and I gathered that you thought they got some benefit?—Yes, they do gain some benefit.

1647. I want to ask you, supposing your school were in a rural district, a school of the same size, and you had these poor children there, do you think they would be better off by being sent to an institution; do you think that they are cases that could properly be sent to an institution, necessarily at some distance, not within reach of their homes?—I think perhaps two cases would be benefited by special teaching, and perhaps the other two would be better in their own school.

1648. Then would you give the school authority the power to send them to such an institution if the parents were willing that they should go?—You mean the children that I have?

1649. Children of the same sort as yours?—Yes, I think they should go.

1650. You think they should go if the school authority had the power to send them, and if the parents were willing?—Yes.

1651. Do you think that the School Board ought to be empowered to send them against the wish of the parents, if the parents liked to have the children at home, and if they were receiving this sort of instruction that you have been describing, in their own school?—Yes, because there are things which the children could do in which they could be properly trained, that we have not time to give to.

1652. I quite understand that you think they would be better taught in certain subjects, but do you think that in such a case as that the school authority would be justified in forcing them into an institution away from their homes, against the will of their parents—that the parents should be punished although they were anxious to keep them at home?—I do not think that.

1653. (*Miss Townsend.*) If you had a teacher who could give her whole time to these four children, should you like to keep them in your school then?—Yes, I should.

1654. If you could teach them properly by themselves, you would rather have them than be without them, as things are?—Yes, I would just as soon have them, as long as I felt they were improving.

1655. You think their influence on the morals of the other children is good?—Yes, I do; they take care of them.

1656. Then, speaking of sending them to an institution, supposing that instead of sending to a large institution these children, whose parents and home surroundings are bad, there was power to put them in another family in the country and send them to an ordinary school, with good home surroundings, should you like that; supposing the school authority had power to say, we will board these children out in the country, and let them go to the country school away from their parents?—In the cases of two of them I should, but two of them are really very very bad.

1657. Too bad to live in a strange family?—Yes.

1658. Do you give your children any drill?—Yes.

1659. Do these children join in the drill?—Yes.

1660. Do they like it?—Yes.

1661. Better than their other lessons?—I do not know whether they like it better.

1662. You have not noticed whether they like doing thing things with their hands and feet better than with their head?—Yes, they do like hand work.

1663. They like drilling to music, perhaps, do they?—Yes, they do.

1664. So that that is part of the special training that you would give them if you were able?—Yes.

1665. And you think you could give them that in your school if you had a special teacher for them?—No, I have not the accommodation for that. Our accommodation is limited.

1666. So that the training that you think best for these particular children would not be easy for you to give them in your school, even with a special teacher?—No, it would not; we have only one class room.

1667. And a proportion of them, those whose homes are bad, and who are more improvable than the others, you would like to send into the country, or you think it would be good to send them into the country, and let them go to an ordinary school away from their home surroundings?—Yes.

1668. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) Would you tell me how many children you have in Standard I. in your school?—51 on the register now, including these four.

1669. Besides these four that you have mentioned have you some amongst them that you would class as very dull?—Yes, I think there are two, one especially so. When I was talking it over with the teacher yesterday she mentioned this child. I do not think she is really mentally defective, but she is very dull.

1670. How old is she?—Seven; she came out of the infant school in June.

1671. Have you any children 10 years of age in Standard I.?—Only the defective children.

1672. You say you have taught them yourself. Do you find it a great strain to have those four children?—Yes, it is a strain in teaching.

1673. Because you have one between 12 and 13 years of age, and yet they are being taught with a child of seven on the average?—Yes.

1674. That is not good for the teacher or for the child, is it?—No.

1675. I gathered from your answer to Mr. Pooley that you really never thought of the advantages of a child leaving its parents and going into an institution?—I have not thought it over.

Miss M. M. Blackmore.

17 Feb. 1879.

1676. You said you did not think a child should be sent to an institution against the parents' wish; but supposing you left out the parents, do you think it would be better for the child that it should go into an institution, say in the case of two out of those four you mentioned?—Yes, I do, certainly; it would be the one between 12 and 13 years of age, and the one of 10 years of age, two little girls.

1677. What would happen if you refused to take these children into your school now; what would happen to the children?—They would probably go to the board school, or be sent to one of the other voluntary schools if I refused them.

1678. You think they would gain admission somewhere?—Yes, I think so, because one has gone to St. Peter's.

1679. That is another voluntary school?—Yes, a Roman Catholic school.

1680. Was she a Protestant child?—No, a Roman Catholic child.

1681. And yours is a Protestant school?—Yes.

1682. So that religion was no difficulty in that respect?—No, we have several Roman Catholic children.

1683. (*Mr. Newton.*) You have told us about the four who are still in your school; is there anything remarkable to say about the two who have left?—One girl, the one that left at 14 years of age, went up as far as Standard IV. We managed to teach her reading and writing; she could not do the arithmetic.

1684. Would you think that she was a proper subject for the special school?—Yes, I should think so. She could have special training in those things that she could do.

1685. What about the one that went to St. Peter's; was there anything remarkable about her?—No, she is not vicious; she is a quiet sort of child; she is not one of those that really upset the class.

1686. Was she very dull?—Yes, she was very dull.

1687. Do you think your Standard I., as a class, has suffered from the presence of these four or five children we have been talking about?—The class did not suffer from them.

1688. You do not think that these children took an undue share of the teacher's attention off and so made the class suffer?—No, they did not do that.

1689. But they upset the class sometimes?—Yes, sometimes.

1690. Then it did suffer a little?—Yes, a little in the discipline in that way.

1691. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) I am rather curious about this vicious child who says only yes or no; do you think she is just an ordinary feeble-minded child, as they are called now-a-days, or an absolute imbecile or idiot; is that the sort of child that ought to go to an institution for idiots, do you think?—I think she can be taught.

1692. They do teach the children in institutions for idiots, you know?—We make her speak after us, and she does try sometimes. It all depends upon what mood she is in.

1693. What does her viciousness consist in?—In tearing up various things, and doing naughty little tricks like that; she tears the sponges with her teeth, and tears her pinafore. She is under the care of an aunt and the aunt has been up to me several times about her tearing her clothes.

1694. Does she attack the other children in school?—Sometimes she fights with them.

1695. She does not bite them?—No, she does not do that.

The witness withdrew.

Adjourned to Friday next at half past 10 o'clock.

FOURTH DAY.

Friday, 19th February 1897.

PRESENT:

The Rev. T. W. SHARPE, C.B., in the Chair.

Mr. H. F. Pooley.
Mr. A. W. Newton.
Dr. G. E. Shuttleworth.
Dr. W. R. Smith.
Mrs. Burgwin.
Miss Townsend.

Mr. H. W. Orange, *Secretary*.

Miss Marion Hoatson called in and examined.

Miss M. Hoatson.

19 Feb. 1897.

1696. (*Chairman.*) You are the head mistress in charge of the whole of the better class of feeble-minded children at Darenth?—Yes.

1697. That is to say all children of any degree of educability come under your charge?—Not all, all that I have room for in my school block.

1698. What becomes of the others?—They are kept in the wards.

1699. Mixed with other children of lower class?—Yes.

1700. Is it simply because the Asylums Board has not provided sufficient school accommodation for them?—Yes.

1701. How many children have you under your charge?—323.

1702. In how many classes?—In eight classes.

1703. With a teacher to each class?—In some cases two teachers.

1704. How many teachers are there on the staff?—I have two assistant school mistresses, six attendants, and three monitresses.

1705. Eleven altogether?—Yes.

1706. What age are the monitresses?—From 20 to 24.

1707. You call them monitresses?—Yes.

1708. Eleven teachers for 320 children, or an average of about 30 to each teacher?—Yes, that is our usual average.

1709. Who are the monitresses?—They were formerly patients under our care.

1710. The monitresses are feeble-minded persons themselves, are they?—No, they are discharged.

1711. As being equal to the ordinary outside people?—Yes, and they are receiving salaries.

1712. Do you consider them fit to have the charge of these classes?—Certainly, to assist.

1713. But I understand they have the charge of a class?—No, not a class.

1714. Then the classes would be larger than 30?—No, not larger.

1715. They must be nearly 40—320 divided by 8 gives 40?—We never have the whole 323 children at school; we have 36 half-time children at present.

1716. At what age do they become half-time children?—There is no standard age.

1717. Is it according to their educability?—No.

1718. On what principle of selection is it, then?—The medical superintendent decides that.

1719. On what grounds, do you know?—I think he will be better able to answer that question than I can.

1720. He has some reason for his selection which you do not know?—Yes.

1721. At what age do you think children of this class ought to be admitted to school?—At the age of five, if possible.

1722. Why do you select the age of five?—Because they are more amenable to training at an early age than later.

1723. In the case of deaf children they prefer not to have them before seven on the ground that they cannot train them?—We have very few deaf, comparatively.

1724. You have both boys and girls?—Yes, all the classes are mixed.

1725. Are there more boys than girls in the upper classes?—We have more boys in the school; two-thirds of the whole school number are boys.

1726. And you have found no inconvenience from their being mixed?—None whatever.

1727. They mix out of school, of course?—No, not out of school, only at dances and entertainments.

1728. They have separate playgrounds?—Yes.

1729. And separate dayrooms?—Yes.

1730. How do you classify the children when they come to you?—That is a very difficult subject to answer, and it is a difficult thing to do.

1731. Have you one test more than another that you apply?—If a child's mind is a blank altogether I put it into what I call my preparatory room.

1732. And what is the work in the preparatory room?—To teach them to grasp, to hold, to talk, and in many cases to help them to walk.

1733. To use their senses and their muscular powers?—Yes.

1734. You develope the mental powers through the use of the muscular powers and manual work?—Yes.

1735. You begin by manual work?—Yes.

1736. Would you describe the manual work you first use to awaken an interest in these children?—Threading reels, grasping and holding balls, putting small nails into holes, fitting forms into squares or rounds prepared for them; later on putting pins into pin-cushions and physical exercises.

1737. And of course some continue longer at this lower manual work than others?—Yes. Time is no limit to us; sometimes a child will be in that room two or three years.

1738. What is the earliest time at which they pass out of your preparatory room?—Sometimes after six months they begin to show signs of improvement.

1739. That is to say, you separate the educable from the non-educable as soon as you can?—Yes.

1740. You have said nothing about the teaching of colours?—We teach colours and we teach the clock as a lesson.

1741. Have you all the kindergarten exercises in your school?—Yes.

1742. You have brought specimens with you, basket-making and matmaking?—Clay-moulding, knotting and looping, colouring and paper folding.

1743. Those are the earlier stages?—Yes, these specimens are the results of our early work.

1744. And what are the later stages that you advance to?—The industrial work comes after.

1745. Do they begin to read and write immediately they leave this preparatory class?—They begin to learn their letters only.

1746. Of this percentage of 323 how many learn in the long run to read with ease?—Fluently, very few.

1747. And how many learn to write so as to spell with a fair degree of correctness?—From 40 to 50.

1748. And, of course, mental arithmetic they are fairly capable of grasping?—Only in the simplest forms.

1749. Not formal arithmetic?—No.

1750. Except so far as it is merely imitative?—Adding and subtracting simple numbers.

1751. I believe your first class do multiplication?—Yes, a few do, but those are mostly children who have been into the board school before they came to us, and are very disappointed if they cannot go on with sums.

1752. You are aware that they do not understand the process, or the reasoning they are using, but are simply copying some form they have acquired before they came to you?—Some of them understand.

1753. Partially or wholly understand?—Partially.

1754. It would be no use to endeavour to teach these children anything beyond the simplest processes of addition and subtraction, mentally, would it?—No.

1755. At what age do they begin their industrial occupation?—From 10 to 14 years of age usually.

1756. Will you enumerate the industrial occupations?—Mat making, mattress making, tailoring, shoemaking, laundry work, and general domestic work.

1757. There are three grades of industrial training, the easy kindergarten work, the advanced kindergarten work, and the industrial occupations?—Yes.

1758. They begin the first at infancy, the second about the age of 10, and the third about the age of 14?—Yes, in some cases before 14.

1759. Have you anything to add as to the sort of teaching you give them? Do they learn music?—Only singing by ear.

1760. Have you attempted to teach them singing by note?—Yes, we did attempt some few years ago, but the routine was too monotonous for the children.

1761. Cannot you cultivate the power of distinguishing sound?—The children take no interest in it at all.

1762. Physical exercises, of course, are a great favourite with the children?—Not with all. Some of the children will not attempt them.

1763. Are they not in all cases accompanied by music?—Yes, in all cases; even in our worst cases the exercises are always accompanied by music.

1764. And in those cases the children always take an interest in them?—In the music, but many of them will not attempt the exercises.

1765. You say you separate the children of all ages in the playground?—Yes, each block has a separate playground.

1766. And when do you decide that the cases are improvable in your preparatory school?—At the end of two years, if we see any advancement whatever.

1767. You allow two years as a test?—When there are other children waiting to come into the school.

1768. But they may be dormant for a certain time and then suddenly wake up?—We have children at present in the school who were obliged to be taken out on account of want of space, they have come back to me after an absence of two years, and they are waking up.

1769. Is two years a long enough time to ascertain whether they will wake up?—Certainly not, in many cases.

1770. You cannot name any definite time within which you can pronounce any judgment?—No.

1771. But it is desirable to separate them as soon as possible, because the non-educable may do harm to the educable; is that so?—No, we do not find that.

1772. You allow them to mix freely, each sex that is to say?—During school hours.

1773. At what age do they leave you?—They are supposed to leave me at 16.

1774. Can you describe the mental state of the average child when they leave you at 16 years, and say what becomes of them after 16?—In many cases they are transferred to the adult asylum; in a few cases they are sent back to the workhouses; in fewer still they are sent out into the world.

Miss M. Hoatson.

19 Feb. 1897.

1775. Have any girls gone out into the world at the age of 14?—Not 14; not under 16 years of age.

1776. Are they fit to take care of themselves?—Not quite. There is a very great need of an intermediate stage for the first 12 months after leaving us.

1777. But why they are sent out is not your business?—No.

1778. But you think they should be retained in an institution, or a separate home, and prepared for the outside world?—I think there should be an intermediate home for them, to prepare them for the world, and to be the final preparation after leaving school life to fit them to go out into the world. They need care.

1779. Is there any authority that has power to set up such a home?—I think the Asylums Board ought to be able to get the power.

1780. Perhaps you will tell us how many have gone to homes?—Are you speaking of the girls?

1781. Yes, girls only?—I think to the Association for Befriending Young Servants we have sent six at various times.

1782. How many have you sent out, to begin with?—During the number of years we have been working, do you mean?

1783. Yes, as fit or fairly fit to go out into the world?—I think about 30.

1784. In how many years?—We have been working 22 years.

1785. Can you tell us what has become of those 30 girls?—With some I am in touch at present. One is in service at Holloway, and another girl is in India as nurse. I have several out in domestic service in different parts, earning from about 1*s.* to 2*s.* 6*d.* a week.

1786. But none of them went to homes to be prepared?—None of these went to homes; the six that went through the homes were other girls.

1787. Which part of their work do they take most interest in while they are with you?—In the kindergarten work.

1788. And which part of the mental work?—Reading, as a rule.

1789. If the books are full of pictures, I suppose?—Yes.

1790. Now passing on to the teachers, you have eight teachers who are adults, and three monitresses. Were your teachers trained anywhere for this work?—No; we have had the very greatest difficulty always in getting teachers for this kind of work.

1791. Do the Asylums Board think that a highly trained class of teacher is necessary?—I think a sort of all-round intelligence, not any special training.

1792. By whom are they selected?—By the Committee.

1793. After advertising?—After advertising.

1794. What salary do they offer?—My senior assistant mistress has 35*l.* and my junior 30*l.*

1795. Are their duties confined to the school?—To the school alone.

1796. All the other duties connected with these children are discharged by other officers?—Yes.

1797. What are the school hours?—Four hours a day, 10 to 12 and 2 to 4.

1798. You do not vary the hours of work so far as the teacher's time is concerned, but vary the hours as regards the character and style of the work?—Yes.

1799. Are you satisfied with the qualifications of your teachers?—My present ones, yes, and they are taking up new industries themselves now.

1800. To qualify themselves for exercises?—Yes.

1801. Do they know music?—Not the second. One is our organist, the senior.

1802. Should not these be absolute qualifications; a good knowledge of kindergarten work; a fair general knowledge, and a knowledge of music and physical exercises?—Yes, they should.

1803. What qualifications would you add to those?—A knowledge of manual work so far as possible.

Miss M. Houlson.

19 Feb. 1897

1804. Of some one special manual work?—A good all-round knowledge of various kinds of manual work.

1805. What are the ages of your teachers?—Thirty-four and 32, I think.

1806. Do they stay long in the work or soon get tired of it?—One has been with me 15 years and the other 10 years.

1807. These children are very affectionate, are they not?—Very.

1808. That reconciles the teachers in a good measure, I suppose, to the task of teaching them?—Yes, but I think they take a keen interest in their work.

1809. They would not if they were bad-tempered children that they were teaching, perhaps?—I think the class of abnormal child is as a rule more trying than the ordinary developed child.

1810. And it would add very much to their difficulties if these children were not affectionate?—Yes, it would.

1811. I do not think I have got clearly from you to what age you would advocate an extension of the training; you keep them to 16 years of age and then you send them out, and you say even then a preparatory stage is necessary; to what age could you keep them at your own institution so that they might go straight out into the world?—We have them of all ages in the institution.

1812. You could not fix any definite age that might be used as the basis for legislation?—I am afraid not.

1813. Each case must stand on its own merite and its power of development?—Yes.

1814. But development ceases after a certain time, does it not?—I very much doubt that; some of the children do not begin to wake up until 14 or 15 years of age.

1815. The development may go on all their lives, you think?—Up to 20 certainly.

1816. Do you know of cases where it would have benefited these people to have been left in the institution up to the age of 20?—Yes.

1817. And then they might have gone out into the world?—Then they might with an intermediate training.

1818. In all cases you say there must be an intermediate preparation?—There should be an intermediate preparation, because our children are so sheltered in their life with us from contact with the world or the streets, that it would bewilder them at the first, and does.

1819. They must lose the atmosphere of the institution before they go out into the world?—Yes.

1820. Have you anything else that you want to say upon that particular part of the work?—No.

1821. These children do not need to be kept under continual supervision, with the exception of the epileptics?—No, we trust them. Part of our training is to trust the children to do things, and be able to assist in doing things, without actual supervision.

1829. How many does that apply to—all the children?—No, only the best.

1823. The highest 30 children are the only ones capable of taking care of themselves?—Yes.

1824. The rest must be kept under continual supervision?—Yes.

1825. Especially the epileptics?—The epileptics always.

1826. For their own sakes more than for the sake of the other children?—Yes.

1827. But you try to cultivate a habit of taking care of themselves as soon as you can?—Yes.

1828. Do they wash themselves in the morning?—Yes.

1829. And dress themselves?—Yes, as far as possible; some of the little ones can dress themselves completely.

1830. And they take a pride, I suppose, in doing everything for themselves at the earliest possible age?—Yes, they do.

1831. Do you keep records of all these children?—The history, do you mean?

1832. Yes?—That is in the doctor's department.

1833. But do you keep a record of the educational progress?—Yes, just a very slight one.

1834. Would it not be better to keep a full record of observations of the progress made by the children in the various subjects, and also as determining their character and habits?—Yes, it would be a very great help.

1835. Do you keep nothing of the sort?—Yes, I keep an attainment register, and examine each child every year.

1836. How do you decide attainments in reading?—We take reading and spelling.

1837. In reading, how many stages would you have on the question of attainment—the alphabet?—We take the alphabet.

1838. That is one stage?—And the primer and first standard.

1839. You have three stages, the alphabet, easy monosyllables, and reading narrative with words of one or two syllables?—Yes, and spelling the same.

1840. So you have not many stages or standards to record?—No.

1841. Do you record their advance in industrial work, or does the medical officer take charge of that?—The medical officer takes charge of that.

1842. Who supervises it?—We have a shoemaker and a tailor.

1843. In the preparatory class, as regards the power of using the hands or the other members according to the exercises that you have told us of, who records the progress in that?—I superintend it myself.

1844. Do you keep a record of it?—No, not a written record.

1845. Have you anything more to add; have I taken you through most of your notes?—Yes, I think so.

1846. How many epileptics have you?—I have 40 in the school at present.

1847. Of various degrees of severity?—We find occupation for the epileptics, which prevents a number of fits.

1848. Have you any serious trouble with any of them?—Never.

1849. And the other children are not frightened?—Not at all, the abnormal child does not have the nervous fear of epilepsy that the normal child has.

1850. They accept it as one of the ordinary conditions of life?—Yes, I think they do; they take little or no notice of the child except to assist it.

1851. Then you would see no objection to mixing the epileptic children if they were slightly deficient, with other mentally feeble children?—I have seen no evil effects from it at all.

1852. Have you any cripples in the institution who are feeble-minded also?—Yes.

1853. In the school?—No, not in the school; we have them in the institution.

1854. Are those cripples tried with the preparatory class whether they are educable or not?—No, for the last three or four years I have had no crippled children come down to the school.

1855. Then they are not tried, so far as you know, in the preparatory class?—No.

1856. Have you any reason to suppose that there are some who are educable?—Yes, I think so.

1857. What ground have you for saying so?—From talking to the children themselves.

1858. To the crippled children?—Yes.

1859. Do you think you might have done something for them if you had had them under your charge?—Yes.

1860. There is nothing more, I think, that I have to ask you; is there anything you wish to add?—No, I think not; not in a general way.

1861. (*Mr. Pooley.*) Can you tell us whether all the children in Darenth are sent by the guardians?—All must come through the relieving officer of the various parishes.

1862. And can you tell us what proportion have been in the workhouse before they come to Darenth?—That I cannot tell you; but our steward's office could provide you with all that information.

1863. And you cannot tell us the proportions that come direct from home and from the workhouse?—No.

1864. You said that there were 323 children but were educated, I understood?—Being educated.

1865. Can you tell us how many there are that are not under education?—About 700.

1866. Children?—Children and adults.

1867. But were the 323 you spoke of children under 16 years of age?—Yes

1868. Can you tell us how many children up to 16 are not in the school at all but in the institution, and not educated?—Not the number of children, because we have children and adults together in the schools.

1869. In the institution?—In the schools part of the institution.

1870. But the 323 are children only?—They are children only.

1871. Then you cannot tell us the number of children there are in the institution, but not under education in the schools?—No, not the number of children.

1872. You told us that there were a good many waiting for admission: you cannot tell us how many?—No.

1873. Then you told us you had two assistants and six attendants; have the attendants as regards their education and training about the same amount of educational training as the two assistant mistresses?—They are ex-pupil teachers.

1874. And the three monitresses have been in the institution themselves among the feeble-minded?—Yes.

1875. They are not put in charge of classes?—No.

1876. I just want to get the number to the class, you said you had 36 half-timers?—Yes.

1877. And 323 altogether?—Yes.

1878. So that you would have nearly 300 in ordinary attendance?—No, my daily average this week is 261.

1879. Then they do not attend very regularly?—They attend fairly regularly, but there are always children that perhaps have some small ailment and do not come down.

1880. All these children have been certified to be idiots, you can tell us that?—Yes, they are all certified.

1881. Then are any of them able to come into your preparatory class on admission?—They do not always come straight to me.

1882. They do sometimes?—Yes, the first fortnight after admission they are in what we call our probationary block.

1883. And then they come into your preparatory class?—Then they are transferred to the different blocks of the institution, but I do not always get them at once.

1884. But you do sometimes?—Yes, sometimes.

1885. And if you find them sufficiently intelligent how long do you keep them in your preparatory class? Do you pass them out quickly if you find them sufficiently intelligent?—Quickly into the next room.

1886. I wanted to ask you if you could say what proportion, or how many, of the newly admitted children you find above the level of the preparatory class able to go into your rather more advanced class?—Five per cent.

1887. As small a number as that?—Yes.

1888. You told us that when they went out they suffered from the atmosphere of the institution and were not fitted to go into the world at once?—Not directly into the world, for the first 12 months they require a little care after leaving.

1889. Have you any opinion as to whether some of these children, the more intelligent of them, would have done better at day classes?—I should say not. I think the home surroundings help us materially in our work.

1890. You should say not, what do you mean by that?—That they are better residing where the school is.

1891. In the institution?—In the institution.

1892. But you spoke of the home surroundings?—Yes, our blocks are really homes for the children. We always call them our homes.

1893. Then if one of your children had a good home, do you think such a child would have done better in a day class?—Not to have to go through the streets to school.

1894. But such a child would not have the atmosphere of the institution against her, would she, if the child were living at home; in a fairly respectable home attending a day school she would not be subject to these bad influences that you speak of in the institution?—Do you mean the association?

1895. Association with other children of a similar feeble mind, and being herded together with a number of other children and all those things?—The classification in our wards is this, we put all our bright healthy children together.

1896. You try to do that?—Yes.

1897. But still the brightest must be defective or they would not be there?—Yes, the brightest are defective.

1898. As regards the qualifications of the teachers, you mentioned some. Do you think it is an advantage that they should have some physiological training or medical training?—No, in institutions our doctors take all that work.

1899. But in knowing how to deal with a particular child, that they should have some physiological training to know what its symptoms indicate and what sort of treatment should be applied in individual cases?—I think sympathy and tact in dealing with them is brought out from the work itself.

1900. But I suppose your classes are so large that they are scarcely able to give much individual attention to the children?—We give a good deal of individual attention to the children, we know each child separately and each child's little peculiarities.

1901. Should you prefer smaller classes?—25 is a good number, and an easy number for one teacher to take because you can over-do it with individual attention and you weary the child.

1902. You think a teacher could manage 25?—Yes.

1903. When you said you had no cripples, I do not know whom you call cripples; have you a good many children, for instance, partly paralysed?—I have only two at present attending school.

1904. Have you none that are lame?—Only from rickets, but I cannot call them lame. They can walk, though they do not walk very uprightly.

1905. Then there are children partly paralysed and partly crippled and partly lame in the institution?—Yes.

1906. And none of them come to your class?—No.

1907. Do you think that many of them would be improved if they did?—I think they would be improved.

1908. (*Miss Townsend.*) Will you kindly tell me how much interest in the children is shown by bodies outside the school staff, yourself, and your assistants and the matron; is there anybody who visits the school periodically, and takes an interest in it?—Our own committee.

1909. What does your own committee consist of?—Twelve members.

1910. Are they guardians, members of the Metropolitan Asylums Board?—Guardians.

1911. Are they guardians from the differen unions who send the children into the schools?—Yes.

1912. And do they periodically visit the schools; go round the schools and see the children?—Yes, as far as possible, every Tuesday; every other Tuesday is devoted entirely to visiting.

1913. Do they make any note of what they see, or make any recommendations to be carried out?—Yes.

1914. And who has power to carry out those recommendations?—The instructions are sent down to the various officers to whom they apply.

1915. Is that often done, as a matter of fact?—Yes, very frequently.

1916. And are the instructions always carried out?—As far as possible all instructions issued by the Committee are carried out.

1917. As to the management of the children generally, and as to their management in school?—Yes.

1918. And you, as the head of the whole school department, are responsible for carrying out those instructions?—Yes, certainly.

1919. Is any other interest taken in the children by outside bodies; have they any visits from ladies anywhere; does anyone ever come to play with them?—No. We have theatrical entertainments given.

Miss M. Houlson.

19 Feb. 1897.

Miss M. Hoatson.

19 Feb. 1897.

1920. By the staff?—Yes, and by visitors from London.

1921. But there is very little contact with the outside world for the children?—Very little.

1922. Do the children in the playground play alone, or have you always an attendant?—The attendants are with them.

1923. Always?—Yes, always.

1924. Do the attendants help them to play?—Yes, in the games; the boys have cricket, football, and various games, and the girls skipping ropes, hoops, and the usual things.

1925. Do you consider that a very important point?—Certainly.

1926. As to the children's age, I gather that the age of these children, especially of these so feeble-minded as yours, is an arbitrary distinction sometimes?—Yes, very.

1927. So that you can scarcely measure a child either mentally or physically by saying it is 14 or 16 or even 20 years of age?—No.

1928. As long as it is a child you feel you may be able to do it some good, whatever its age may be?—Yes.

1929. Your children are docile as a rule?—Very.

1930. You do not find punishment in the class necessary?—We have no punishment whatever.

1931. Why do you think they are more docile than feeble-minded children in day schools who are not so feeble-minded as yours?—Because of our out-of-school surroundings.

1932. You ascribe it entirely to that?—And the habits of discipline and order that are carried on after school hours are over.

1933. You do not think there is anything in the actual feeble mindedness of a child to give it less power of resistance, less wish to resist the will of another?—I think they are very dependable; but my early experience of the children before we had them under our control in our very early days was very different from the experience I have now.

1934. What do you think has improved it, your own experience or the general experience?—Partly, and partly the control that we exercise over the children that are with us, which re-acts on new children coming in. When we first commenced the children were all alike, had been subject to no discipline and no control; the first six months of our work was spent entirely in trying to control and govern the children themselves.

1935. That is how many years ago?—Twenty-two years ago.

1936. You consider that the training you are able to give to your teachers with the children is more valuable than any training they could receive before coming among the children?—No, I do not say that. I think that school training helps us very much indeed; but our pupil teachers have to forget a very great deal before they can come down to our platform. The first 12 months that we have an ex-pupil teacher with us she has not the patience.

1937. The moral qualities you have to train them in; but the school qualities that they get before they come are very useful to them?—Yes, they help us materially.

1938. You have among your children, as well as those that are so dull from brain defect, a few that are too sharp, too precocious, from brain defect, have you not?—Yes; but our children that are too quick are very few.

1939. But they do exist?—They do exist.

1940. And they are benefited by special training?—Yes, by the brain being allowed to lie dormant for a time; but those children I do not put to any mental work at all, I simply let them do the manual work.

1941. They would be injured by being put with healthy children and doing mental work?—Yes.

1942. How many girls left during the last year for service or work?—Two during the last 12 months.

1943. Is that the usual average?—Yes; some years we do not have any girls go out to service at all. That is where the difficulty comes in, we cannot get people to take them.

1944. Do you think you could send out more girls if you were able to pass them through a small training home to fit them for service?—Certainly.

1945. You would send out more girls if you had such an opportunity?—Yes.

1946. In the meantime what do you do with those girls whom you would send out?—We keep them, and after they are removed from school they are put to the domestic work in the institution for a certain number of hours during the day; or they are returned to the workhouse, because of our want of room for other cases.

1947. I was going to ask you that. You spoke just now of want of space, that is, you have to refuse cases, or put them in the wrong place because of want of space?—Yes.

1948. Supposing you were able to send out your improved children, to pass them through some smaller training home, it would enable you to make room for these fresh children coming in?—Yes, it would.

1949. Would the adults you spoke of as mixed with the children remain in your institution, if there was room for them in the larger asylum?—No, we have a certain number of helpless adults that there is no room for in the adult asylum.

1950. Mixed with the children?—Yes.

1951. And treated more or less as children?—Yes, we have quite 500 helpless cases out of our thousand.

1952. Who are not children?—Some are children, but a very great many are not children.

1953. And ought to be in the permanent asylum?—Yes.

1954. Have you any domestic training as part of your school curriculum for the elder girls, any cookery class of your own independent of the cooking of the institution?—No, I should very much like that.

1955. Have you any laundry where laundry work is taught in a small way?—No, I should like to have both cookery and laundry work as part of the school education.

1956. You think it would be valuable for the elder and more sensible girls?—Yes.

1957. All industrial occupation at present is done for the benefit of the school?—Yes.

1958. Are the majority of the girls that are sent out into the world epileptic or feeble minded?—Feeble minded.

1959. Epilepsy has a tendency to increase rather than to diminish, has it?—No, but epileptic cases are not sent out as recovered cases.

1960. Unless they recover from the epilepsy?—Yes, and that is only in very rare cases.

1961. So that the epileptic cases, even if mentally improved, are kept in the institution?—Yes.

1962. Do you think that is to their advantage?—Certainly not.

1963. You would like to pass them on to an exclusively epileptic establishment?—Yes, a home colony.

1964. As to the 30 girls you speak of as having been sent out in your time, were the majority of them entirely educated at Darenth?—Entirely.

1965. Girls that came to you as little children?—They have been girls who have spent from six to eight years with us and have come in to us knowing nothing.

1966. You have more hope of them when they come to you young than when they come later from the workhouse?—Yes, very much more.

1967. Have you a large number of older children who have evidently been feeble minded from babyhood, sent in to you late?—Yes, we get a good proportion from 12 to 14 years of age.

1968. Who, in your opinion, ought to have been with you earlier?—Very much earlier.

1969. Do they come from the workhouses?—Yes.

1970. Or a workhouse school?—No, not a workhouse school.

1971. Straight from the workhouses?—Yes.

1972. Can you gather generally any reason why they have been detained there?—No, because I do not know how long they have been in those workhouses

1973. You do not know their previous career?—No.

1974. That is not part of your work?—No.

1975. You think that some occupation would be good for some of what you call the helpless cases, children who are considered too bad for the schools?—I think a little occupation would brighten them.

1976. But you have no officer who gives that occupation?—No.

1977. Only officers who watch them to see that they do not come to any harm?—Yes.

1978. What is your whole staff for these 1,000 children?—One hundred and fifty.

1979. That comprises day attendants and night attendants?—Yes.

1980. Nurses?—Nurses, charge nurses.

1981. Ward room attendants?—Yes, the whole of the staff. We have, I think, 110 nurses and attendants alone.

1982. Do you know anything of the asylum?—They have 1,000 inmates there.

1983. Adult inmates?—Yes.

1984. And you have another 1,000 children and adults?—Yes.

1985. Are there any children amongst the 1,000 in the institution?—None; they are not received under the age of 16 years, I think; all under the age of 16 come to us.

1986. And you say that you have 500 who ought not to be with you?—Roughly speaking, we have 500 helpless cases.

1987. Including children and adults?—Yes.

1988. How many adults do you suppose you have who ought to be in the other block if there was room for them?—Among the helpless I should think we have considerably over 100. Then we have 44 healthy boys who work, who have passed through the school, and that fills one block entirely; and we have 40 or 50 girls who have passed through the school.

1989. Who are working in the institution?—Yes.

1990. Some of those, both boys and girls, you would like to send out?—Very much.

1991. Do you think that the intermediate training is as necessary for boys as for girls?—Yes, in industries and manual training.

1992. But not in taking care of themselves?—No, I think the boys are more reliable than the girls.

1993. Less likely to get into harm or to cause harm to others?—Yes.

1994. They know nothing of the value of money I suppose?—Yes, we teach them the coins from the actual coins themselves, and in a very simple way to add up small sums of money, and occasionally when they are out for their walks they go and buy sweets and those kind of things for themselves.

1995. But naturally you have no opportunity of teaching the girls to shop or the boys to dispose of their wages?—No, that they have to learn after they leave us.

1996. And all that you think they might be taught with advantage at a small institution?—Yes.

1997. About your sick children; you have a proportion of the children always in the infirmary from some cause or other, I suppose?—We have a few chronic cases kept always in the infirmary as chronic cases.

1998. Do you make any separation between the stronger minded children who are ill, and the very feeble minded who are always in the infirmary?—No.

1999. So that one of your better children who happens to be ill is put with the very bad children in the infirmary?—With the infirmary cases for the time.

2000. Longer or shorter as the case may be?—Yes.

2001. Should you like to see that altered?—Yes, I should, very much.

2002. You would like to see a separate infirmary for chronic cases and for healthy children?—Yes, and their ailments to be attended to separately.

2003. In convalescence, while children are recovering, say from measles, what do you do with them?—We have only one isolation block for all.

Miss M. Hoatson.

19 Feb. 1897.

2004. So that they also have to be with the very bad children?—Yes.

2005. Who are often very painful to look upon and to listen to?—Yes.

2006. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) You have been 22 years in Darenth?—Yes.

2007. Could you compare the children that you received 22 years ago with those you receive to-day; would they be about the same on admission?—No, decidedly better.

2008. Then is the standard of admission raised?—No, but the children themselves are decidedly better than the children we received in the early days.

2009. Can you account for that at all?—I account for it in this way, that when we first commenced work the children were gathered from the different asylums in the country, not only London, but from various parts where they had been boarded out, and they had acquired a very great many of the evil habits of the adults with whom they had mixed.

2010. They suffered painfully from the want of training?—Yes, painfully.

2011. I am not quite clear about your classification; are you satisfied yourself with your present classification?—Do you mean in the school or out of it?

2012. I speak entirely of in the school?—It is impossible to classify to any standard among these children, because a child may be able to read but cannot write, or may be able to add a few numbers together, but cannot either read or write, or may be intelligent in understanding simple things and not be able to do anything but manual work.

2013. But you would think it would be both to the advantage of the children and your own arrangements if you could have more sub-divisions?—Yes, if I could have more class rooms.

2014. That is what I mean?—More class rooms, more space entirely, we need very much indeed.

2015. And you would like to see over each class a trained teacher?—Yes.

2016. And you find that a trained teacher coming in (we presume she has patience and tact) manages these children and teaches them very well?—Very well indeed after the first 12 months, but during the first 12 months I think they get disheartened with their work. They have been accustomed to bright normal children, and they cannot understand the waiting and the patience required with the children of our class. They get disheartened, and think it is no use trying.

2017. Now, the children admitted you know nothing yourself of, that has nothing to do with you?—That has nothing whatever to do with me.

2018. I mean there may be 100 children admitted and you do not know whether they are sent down or not; you do not know how many are admitted?—I only receive the admission papers of those that are transferred to the school buildings.

2019. Who transfers these children to you?—The Medical Superintendent.

2020. He judges that?—Yes.

2021. And you know that outside your school there are children who would benefit by being in your school?—Yes.

2022. All your classes, I think you said, are mixed?—Yes.

2023. And you think that a good training for feeble-minded children?—A very good training.

2024. It is hardly a fair question to ask you, because I do not suppose you would, but can you recall any of the eight children that have been in special classes under the London School Board who are in your school now?—I have no knowledge of the special schools, but I have school board children, and they tell me themselves which schools they have attended.

2025. Might I recall a boy to see if you recollect him, Tom C———?—Yes, Thomas C——— has been with us.

2026. About a year?—No.

2027. Tom C——— came to you about a year ago; he came from one of the special classes of the London

Miss M. Hoatson

19 Feb. 1897.

School Board?—I have only one C—— who entered school May 2, 1894.

2028. Are the children in the classes taught in desks?—We change our lessons every half-hour, and they are taught in desks.

2029. What kind of desks?—We have the usual dual desks.

2030. In all class-rooms?—Yes, in all class-rooms.

2031. Do you think that is quite satisfactory?—So far we have found them so. If I was furnishing I should prefer single desks.

2032. Now, in your classes, I suppose, they really roughly divide themselves into three parts. There is the extremely low part which you have no hope of going out into the world at all?—Yes.

2033. Then you would come to what we will term the middle stage, where there is a doubt?—Yes.

2034. And then there is the upper part, where you have hope that they may be partially or entirely self-supporting?—Yes.

2035. I take it that it is with regard to this upper part you would like to see an intermediate home?—I should.

2036. And you would not fix a precise age?—No. I think it is utterly impossible to fix an age.

2037. Do you think that such a home might be perfectly satisfactory if it formed a part of your present institution?—Yes, I think it would materially help us.

2038. Would you not think that a home placed in ordinary surroundings, I mean with regard to the streets, would be a better training for the children?—I would give the children, whether they were in town or whether they were with us, liberty to go into the town to learn to act for themselves, but I think the country life and the country air helps them so much better than the town.

2039. But many of them would not be able to get a living in the country?—No, they would not.

2040. Therefore, would not town life be better for them in that intermediate stage?—Not altogether.

2041. You spoke of each block having a separate playground; will you tell us what a block is?—Our blocks contain from 40, 44, to 50 children; some are one story, others are three stories.

2042. I suppose your ground floor is for your paralytics, and so on?—Yes.

2043. How are these children separated into the blocks; is it on mental attainments?—No, that is entirely in the medical superintendent's hands: he has the classification.

2044. So for as I remember, I think I saw some very hopeless ones in a block and some very good ones in a block?—In the epileptic block that would be the case.

2045. I think your evidence would be very useful to us on this point. After 22 years you could speak very well as to the results of the educational training of these children. Would you tell us, as fully as you can on that point, please, what does the State get as a result?—Bright, happy, and useful the higher grade become; in the lower grade lives are brightened, and they are rendered not only less destructive to themselves, but less destructive to their clothing by occupation.

2046. So that not only the individual, but the State does benefit?—Would benefit and does benefit.

2047. As to those cases that you mentioned as having gone out into service, could you tell us if any of them have come to any harm after leaving the institution?—Not one that we have ever heard of.

2048. And you thought that the boys were less likely to suffer from contact in the world than the girls?—Yes.

2049. But you only mean, I take it, that we know when trouble comes to a girl and we do not know the boy's life perhaps so well?—Our boys have gone out into the world directly, and they seem to have been able to fight better for themselves than the girls have done.

2050. But you would not say that morally they were more capable of taking care of themselves than the girls?—No, I do not think morally they are.

2051. (*Mr. Newton.*) Will you tell us, please, how many class rooms you have for your eight classes?—I have four class-rooms and one large schoolroom.

2052. How many classes work in the big schoolroom?—Three.

2053. Then one of the class-rooms holds two classes, is that so?—No, two of the class-rooms I have to divide into larger classes that the others, because I have a sewing class.

2054. Do you think it is desirable to have two classes of children of this sort in one room, do you like the arrangement?—No, I do not like the arrangement.

2055. What is the size of your largest class?—Fifty, with two teachers.

2056. What are the teachers?—The two attendants, who are pupil teachers, or an attendant and a monitress.

2057. Have you ever thought about the question as to the employment of pupil teachers with classes such as yours; have you thought whether it would be desirable to employ them or undesirable?—To train them, yes, I think it would be a very good thing if we could get them.

2058. Would it be possible to get them if proper terms were offered, and if they were boarded in the institution and allowed to see their friends and so forth?—I am afraid it would be with us, we are so far out in the country.

2059. But you think that in towns where defective children are taught it would be a good thing to have pupil teachers?—Yes, I think it would be a distinct advantage.

2060. Given a fully trained assistant teacher and give her a pupil teacher to help her, what class do you think might be taught?—I do not think I quite understand.

2061. How many children would you put under one trained teacher with a pupil teacher to help her?—Not more than 30.

2062. And when the trained teacher is by herself without the pupil teacher, how many would you put?—From 20 to 25.

2063. Do you employ any special methods in teaching reading to your children?—We have picture reading and word reading, but we have no other special method.

2064. What does picture reading mean, exactly?—Pictures with words underneath, just the object itself with the word belonging to it.

2065. At what stage do you take that?—We take that at any stage, because what will attract one child will not attract another.

2066. Do you use any special methods in teaching arithmetic?—No, excepting the sticks and the cubes.

2067. In a special class that I went to in London the other day I saw sums of this sort given to children who were beginning to learn Standard I. work, a subtraction sum with 4,000 and odd for the top line and 3,000 and odd for the line below. Would you consider such a sum as that suitable or unsuitable for your children?—Unsuitable for the majority of my children.

2068. On what grounds would you condemn it?—Because it would be too intricate for them.

2069. Have you any other reason?—No, if they were capable of doing it I should give it to them, but I do not think they would be.

2070. I should take a different ground, but that we will not go into. Do you find that object lessons have a good effect on the children?—Very good.

2071. By an object lesson do you mean what we call an observation lesson, or a talk about things in general?—I mean a talk with the object itself in front of you.

2072. And when the object is described by the child?—Yes, by the child, as far as it is able, with assistance.

2073. Can you get all your children to take an interest in lessons of that sort?—Most of them do, some of course, are too apathetic.

2074. You find a certain number too apathetic to derive any benefit from such a lesson?—Yes.

2075. But most of them do?—Yes.

2076. From objects it is a very natural step to animals or plants; do you find live animals and live plants appeal to the children at all?—Very much.

2077. Have you pet animals of any description?—Every home has its cat, and in many homes they have birds.

2078. You think that they have a good effect on the children?—Yes, a very good effect.

2079. And you would think that they would have a good effect, I suppose, with children of a little greater calibre, such as we have in the special classes in London?—Yes, much greater than even with our children.

2080. Then I want to ask a question or two about the discipline. You say the discipline is so good out of school that there is never any punishment required?—No, we have no punishment.

2081. Then it follows from that, that though the discipline is a kind one it is a very strict one?—Yes, it is very firm.

2082. Then do you think if a child is very likely to be sent out into the world it is a good thing to put it under discipline so different from the discipline of an ordinary home?—We find it helps them.

2083. No doubt it will help them if they are to remain in Darenth all the rest of their life, but will it help them if they are likely to go out of Darenth eventually?—I can only tell you what has been told to me by the superintendent of the boy's working home that has had boys from us. He told me that the boys that came from us were the most obedient industrious boys he ever had in the home.

2084. In the home, but in the world?—Of course they were in the working home, and out in the world at the same time; they are both working at a large printing establishment.

2085. But there would be a good deal of discipline in the working home, would there not?—No, the boys have freedom in those homes.

2086. Then one more question. You spoke of the children being employed in doing industrial work for the institution; are the conditions under which that industrial work is done similar to the conditions under which industrial work in a small house or cottage?—Yes.

2087. For instance, is the cooking on the same sort of scale?—Not the cooking; the cooking is done in one large kitchen.

2088. Do the children help in the cooking?—No, not in the kitchen.

2089. What sort of industrial work do they help in?—In laundry-work and in the general cleanliness of the wards, the preparing of the tables for meals, and the washing up of the crockery afterwards.

2090. How far do you carry the distribution of labour; Does one child do all these things in turn?—Yes; it would commence with sweeping in a ward.

2091. It is not, then, as if one child would spend the whole industrial training in cleaning floors, and another in cleaning doorsteps?—Oh no.

2092. (*Dr. Smith.*) Is that domestic part under your control?—The domestic part comes under the matron.

2093. Do you have any conference with her as to the capabilities of the children?—Yes, and I am responsible myself for the cleanliness of my own school block, and there I have children that we teach that kind of work to.

2094. But when you say they do one thing at one time and another thing at another time, is that consequent upon some system that you have?—Yes, training them to work.

2095. It is a regular organised scheme that you have for these children?—Yes.

2096. You have not sent out many children from Darenth, have you?—No.

2097. What becomes of all these good children, then, that are educated up in this way?—Some are returned to the workhouses, some we keep as our own industrial staff, and some as teachers.

2098. I mean you do not keep them all in your institution for their lives?—No.

2099. You send them back to the workhouse which has sent them to you, and you do not know what becomes of them afterwards?—In some cases we do not, in some we do.

2100. When you say you have only sent out such a small number, you mean that you have only sent that number out directly into the world by themselves?—Yes.

2101. But you have really discharged a larger number?—Yes, for workhouses to deal with; in some cases they have gone out from workhouses into domestic service, and the boys have gone out into the world.

2102. Then it is hardly fair to represent that only 30 have gone out directly into the world?—Those have gone directly from us.

Miss M. Hoatson.

19 Feb. 1897.

2103. Could you give us any idea as to the number you sent out in other ways?—No, I am afraid not, because they often pass out of my hands before they are sent out.

2104. Then, so far as the size of the classes is concerned, you think that 25 would be a desirable number?—Yes, I think a teacher could well take 25 children; I think if she has fewer the children are not so stimulated.

2105. I was struck with what you said—that you think the children are wearied by too much individual attention?—Yes, they get weary of individual attention.

2106. In other words, you may have too much of a good thing; that is what it comes to?—Yes; I think you want to vary the lessons as much as possible.

2107. As regards the teachers themselves, if I gathered rightly from what you said, you would prefer a teacher who had had no, what we call, technical training in this particular direction?—Not a highly intellectual teacher, but a good all-round one.

2108. What you think is the best kind of teacher is a good teacher in the ordinary sense of the term with a power of adaptation to the surroundings, patience and kindliness, and so on?—Yes.

2109. And those are more necessary qualifications, you say, than physiological training?—Certainly; they are more in touch with the children themselves.

2110. You spoke about the cripples you have and their not coming to your class; is not anything done as regards the education of those cripples?—No.

2111. Are they absolutely neglected?—Yes.

2112. Is there any reason for that that you know?—I used to have them brought down in wheeled chairs, but I have the number of children in my school without them, I have no more space

2113. We both understand by the term cripples that we do not mean those thoroughly hopeless one that you have in that special block, but cripples who could be educated in the same sense as your better children?—Yes.

2114. And you say so far as they are concerned such education is absolutely neglected?—Yes.

2115. And the only reason you assign for that is that your school is already full?—Yes.

2116. The parents, I suppose, visit these children?—Every week we have visitors.

2117. Of course, in a general way, visitation is rather prevented by your distance from London and your distance from the station?—Yes, but our rules are very elastic. We have one set visiting day, but Sunday is open to fathers and brothers who are working during the week to visit the children.

2118. So that so far as your regulations are concerned they are sufficiently elastic to give every facility for general visitation?—Yes, and the visitors have a cheap railway ticket to visit.

2119. There are facilities given by the railway company also?—Yes.

2120. Would those facilities be extended to others than relatives of the children: I mean people simply coming down for the purposes of amusement for the children?—No.

2121. I do not know whether you are quite clear about this home beyond your institution; would you send the children to a large institution or would you think a smaller institution desirable, or what is your idea exactly on that point?—Small homes with industrial workshops attached to them.

2122. You have 1,000 children in the schools alone?—Yes, in the schools and pavilions.

2123. The pavilions are part of the school building?—Yes.

2124. And there is another thousand of adults?—Yes.

2125 I suppose these hopeless cases are not taken into the adult asylum because that is full?—Yes, it is quite full.

2126. But these thoroughly helpless children have no communication, direct or indirect, with your educable

Miss M. Hoatson.

19 Feb. 1897.

children, as we will call them, have they?—Yes, in some blocks they are mixed, not so much as they were but they are still.

2127. Where are they mixed, do they have their meals together?—They live some of them together in the same block.

2128. Then they do have their meals together and sleep together?—Yes.

2129. Would you prefer that that were altered?—I should prefer that they were entirely separate.

2130. And that the children who really come under you should be kept separate from those who do not come under you?—Yes.

2131. Does that organised scheme of instruction, so far as house work for girls is concerned, extend to the laundry?—Yes.

2132. Is that really an organised adjunct of your teaching?—Yes, it always has been.

2133. But the cooking is not so?—No, the cooking is not so. We have had girls in our kitchen but we have none at present.

2134. Do you know of any reason for that?—I think now there is an idea to try some boys in the kitchen. One boy is being tried just at present as a sort of experiment.

2135. Then the taking away of the girls is only a temporary arrangement, is it?—That I cannot say, whether for the future they will entirely have boys there or whether they will go back to the girls.

2136. Then am I right in assuming that up to the present the same kind of organised training has been available for girls with regard to cookery as is available now with regard to laundry work?—Not to the same extent.

2137. It has never been so thoroughly recognised as a part of the education of these children?—No.

2138. Is 12 years about the average age at which you get children now?—No, we have had children three years old, but we get a very great many between 12 and 14 years of age.

2139. And with those you think if you had had them earlier you could have done better for them?—Very much better.

2140. What leads you to think that?—Because our little children turn out so well.

2141. There has been no attempt made to obtain the help of pupil teachers in the schools, has there?—No.

2142. Has it ever been suggested?—No.

2143. The only assistants that you have are really trained assistants?—I have the three monitors who were formerly patients.

2144. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) May I ask you as to the size of the homes in which the groups of children are taken care of out of school, how many are grouped together?—In the healthy block 44; in the hopeless 50; in the epileptic 40.

2145. And of course they are classified in those homes on a different principle from the school classification?—Yes.

2146. Classified, I suppose, under the order of the medical superintendent as to residence?—Yes.

2147. Then, with regard to the school attendants, those who you say have been pupil teachers, have they any duties besides those of assisting in the school?—Yes, their duties are in the different blocks to which they belong.

2148. They not only have to teach in school but have to work in the blocks?—They have to assist in washing and dressing the children, preparing them for school, assisting with the meals, and generally helping.

2149. Do you know how much salary they get for that? Twenty pounds a year to commence with and uniform.

2150. Is that in excess of the salary of the ordinary female attendant?—Two pounds more.

2151. But they have in fact the duties out of the school of the ordinary attendant plus the duties of the teacher in school?—Yes, excepting night duty.

2152. Then the monitresses, may I ask what salary they receive?—Eight pounds a year and uniform.

2153. And what do they do out of school?—Assist in the ward in exactly the same way.

2154. The teachers, I presume, have no duties outside the school, the assistant mistresses that is to say?—No.

2155. Then with regard to teaching, do you find that a number of children who are imperfect in speech require teaching to speak?—A very great many.

2156. Speaking lessons?—Yes.

2157. Have any of your teachers had experience with regard to oral teaching?—No.

2158. Nothing but what they learn in practice?—No.

2159. With regard to calculation, have you what they have in some institutions, what is called the shop lesson, where they go through the routine of buying and selling?—Yes.

2160. And weighing and measuring and paying, I suppose, for their purchases?—Yes.

2161. Have you found that useful in bringing home to them the meaning of figures?—To some extent, but the children say: "This is not going to a shop. "teacher." They understand a farthing's worth a very great deal more than they do any other amount.

2162. But I suppose at the shop lesson they have to tender money for their purchases and see that they get their proper change?—Yes.

2163. So that they have a certain exercise in mental arithmetic?—Yes, it is exactly the same with the imitation coins; my children look upon them with disgust because we have always taught with the real coins, they say: "This is not money, this is only paper."

2164. You have told us a good deal about the occupation of girls who have been discharged, do you happen to know anything about the occupation of boys who have been discharged to situations?—Yes. I have two boys working at a large printing establishment, they have been there two years now, taking off the sheets from the machines, they are earning with overtime 16*s.* 6*d.* a week, and till very recently they have been living in one of the working boys' homes. Now one is at home and the other one has gone out, entirely on his own account, into rooms.

2165. I think we heard the other day about one or two who had enlisted in the Army?—Yes, I have two boys in India in the Dragoons, I think.

2166. And is their record satisfactory in the Army?—Very satisfactory indeed, we constantly hear from them, and one in the Dragoons has just learnt saddle-making, so that it gives him an extra salary in addition to his usual pay. Then I have another in the Marines.

2167. Had the boy who practices saddle making any preliminary training—had he learnt shoemaking at Darenth?—He was taught shoemaking and could make a pair of boots perfectly before he left us.

2168. So that the training he had there would help him in that industrial work in the Army?—Yes.

2169. Are any of your boys employed in out-door occupations in the garden or farm?—Yes, the farm work is principally done by the adult boys who have passed through the school and have been transferred.

2170. And that, I suppose, consists chiefly in tending cows; amongst other things, you have a herd of cows?—Yes, and weeding and picking up stones, and general heavy work; they cannot help with the ploughing; but they help with the sowing, the potato digging and all that kind of thing. I think that with very few exceptions the whole of the workers at the adult asylum are boys and girls who have been passed through the school.

2171. And are any of those such cases as could go into situations in the outside world, if such situations were open for them?—Some have gone from there.

2172. So that really the result of the training of the schools would be shown to a greater extent than it actually appears to be if these boys were working in the outside world instead of in the adult asylum?—Yes.

2173. I mean that you lose sight of the result rather when they are simply transferred from one institution to another?—Yes, we do.

2174. Do you happen to have any knowledge of girls who have been trained by you being helped by an association called the After-Care Association, to find situations?—I have no knowledge of that.

2175. I may mention that there have been two who have recently been helped to situations, one successfully and one not?—I am glad to hear it.

2176. That is an association for helping to find situations for persons discharged from insane asylums,

and amongst the applicants were two young women who were trained at Darenth. Then, with regard to epileptics, you do not seem to think the presence of epileptic children undesirable amongst other pupils?—No.

2177. Have you found other children not epileptic imitating the contortions of an epileptic fit?—We have never had such a case.

2178. You have heard of such a case elsewhere?—Yes, I have.

2179. You cannot tell us, I suppose, the average stay of the children in the schools; that would be a difficult matter to work out?—Yes, that, of course, depends upon the age of the child when it comes in.

2180. Do they stay up to 16 years of age?—I have a few cases now over 16. I am always pleading for those cases to remain.

2181. May I ask what you mean exactly by adults who are in the buildings which belong to the school department?—They are, some of them, 20 years old and up to 29; others, I think, even more than that.

2182. But are those adults who have been educated in the schools, or have they been sent there without going through the schools at all?—Some have gone through the schools and some have not.

2183. I suppose those who have not gone through the schools have resided in the school blocks as young people?—Yes.

2184. I mean they do not introduce from the outside people of adult age?—No.

2185. Then do you recognise any difference in the designation of "feeble-minded" and "imbecile"?—A very great difference.

2186. Kindly give us in a few words your practical notion of the difference?—I think a feeble-minded child is a little morally deficient and a little mentally deficient. I think an imbecile child is a child who is born imbecile and will not recover. A feeble-minded child does recover.

2187. You spoke of some of the girls who were discharged as being feeble minded when they were discharged?—Not when they were discharged; I am sorry to say that I differ from the medical superintendent on that, I do not think they were feeble minded when they were discharged.

2188. Not even to a small degree?—I think they are handicapped by having no knowledge of the world; but give them their chance and they will mix with the world; I do not say that they will be so intelligent as the majority of the people in the world, but they will earn their own living and will keep themselves straight, as they do. And my boys, I am proud to say, everyone signs the pledge directly they leave school and go out into the world, I have not one exception.

2189. What I was really aiming at is to ascertain whether in your opinion there would be an objection to these improved cases that you say are not feeble minded going to a home of employment. There are certain houses in the country for young women, girls at any rate above 16 years of age or thereabouts, who are called feeble minded, but not recognised as imbecile, and the idea in my mind was whether you would consider such a home a proper intermediate training institution. There are small homes, some in town and some in country; would it be better than continued residence in the asylum and then turning them adrift?—It would be better, but still it brands them as feeble minded.

2190. But is not the fact of their having been at Darenth at all rather a stigma in that way?—But if we could get this intermediate training they could forget Darenth. Our boys, when they go out, say they have been to an industrial school, they never say they have been anywhere else.

Miss M. Hoatson.

19 Feb. 1897.

2191. (*Chairman.*) Have you the same objection to the institutions that your boys have?—I do not quite understand.

2192. You said that the boys did not wish it to be known that they had come from Darenth; why should they have that feeling?—Simply because the boys have sense to know that they would be considered not quite right, to put it in their own words; that is the answer they give me.

2193. What is your general view of the children that leave you; would you divide them into three classes: (1) those that cannot do anything for themselves and must go to an asylum; (2) some that might be planted out in the colonies; and (3) some that would find their way in the world?—Yes, some that would be entirely self-supporting, and some partially so, and some not at all.

2194. What would you do with the self-supporting, gather them into colonies?—Yes, pass them out, teach them industries; you must give them something to start with.

2195. There must be some not fit to go out into the world, but yet ought not to be shut up in asylums?—They could make themselves partially self-supporting.

2196. Would you plant them in colonies under supervision?—Yes.

2197. But you objected just now to collecting the feeble minded together?—But I should not call them feeble minded.

2198. What should you call them?—I should call them Homes for training in British industries.

2199. (*Miss Townsend.*) Is not the knowledge that they are feeble minded sometimes a protection to them; people do not expect too much from them?—Yes, but I think it acts very prejudicially against them.

2200. (*Chairman.*) Would it not attract the interest of benevolent people?—So it might, but not of the world at large, I think.

2201. Do you see any other way of providing for intermediate people who must really be collected into colonies and are not fit to take care of themselves?—That applies more to epileptics. Epileptics are never able to take care of themselves.

2202. But they would be a class of your scholars who had been collected into colonies?—Yes, and would become partially self-supporting.

2203. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) I think you said you found that your new teachers were discouraged during their first year by observing the difficulties and slow rate of progress in the training of these children?—Yes.

2204. Do you think that there would be any objection to such a training of teachers as would point out to them, in a theoretical way, in the first instance, the differences between these children and other children; and, secondly, give them an opportunity of seeing the instruction of such children in special classes or otherwise, without the responsibility themselves of instructing them?—I think it would help them.

2205. You do not think there would be objection to training founded on those lines?—No.

The witness withdrew.

Miss Annette Verrall called in and examined.

Miss A. Verrall.

2206. (*Chairman.*) You live in Brighton?—Yes.

2207. And have taken great interest in the defective and epileptic children there?—Yes.

2208. Do the School Board give you authority over this particular class of children?—I am chairman of the sub-committee of the School Board. I am a member of the School Board myself, and was at the time I first began my visitations. I carried them on for a short time while I was off the Board, and resumed them more energetically when I joined the Board again after about 18 months.

2209. And you have, practically, a free hand in looking after the children?—Yes. At present, I think, we all feel that we are rather in a tentative stage, as we are feeling our way.

2210. How do you get hold of the children in the first place?—Sometimes the parents themselves bring them to the school.

2211. The mothers bring them?—Yes; some we hear of through the school attendance officers, and some make application to the clerk to the Board. Those are the three ways chiefly.

Miss A. Verrall.

19 Feb. 1897.

2212. You find no reluctance on the part of the mothers to bring them to these classes?—No, none so far.

2213. What do you call your class—a special class?—It has become labelled the class for afflicted children, I have done my best to prevent it, but the office seems too strong for us.

2214. What would you like to call it yourself?—A special class for children, a class of special instruction I would rather call it.

2215. So as to avoid any reference to their mental condition?—Yes.

2216. When they come to you are they tested in some way by a medical officer?—The medical officer sees them, and we give them about three weeks probation in the school. When we first hear of the cases we let them go straight into the school for probation, then when the committee meets the cases come before them, and the teacher is present.

2217. In an ordinary school you mean?—No, into the special class. As soon as we hear of the case we allow the child to go into the special class.

2218. Have they been in an ordinary school before they come to you?—Most of them.

2219. Then they are three weeks on probation?—Yes, generally.

2220. Can you learn much about them in that time?—The teacher can form a very good idea whether she can do anything with them in three weeks.

2221. It is generally thought that about three or six months is the shortest time for probation, but you think that you can tell in three or six weeks?—We do not deal with any case that has been less than three weeks in the school; but as the sub-committee does not meet very often they have sometimes been really as much as a month or two.

2222. What tests does the teacher use to see whether they are specially qualified for the class. Absolute ignorance is one, I suppose?—Yes.

2223. And after that?—I myself make preliminary tests sometimes in the schools if I come across the children in the schools, and then I simply ask to see what they can do in simple reading, and test them in addition of units, mental addition of units, and see if they can write their names.

2224. And very few of them are above that stage?—A great many cannot do anything in the way of mental arithmetic.

2225. You test them first for three weeks, and then either turn them out into the ordinary school or consider them fit subjects for the special school?—Yes.

2226. Are they then put permanently into the special school, or is there a chance of their being transferred after that?—Sometimes the committee have said that they would admit a child for a certain time, and then the case must come again before the sub-committee.

2227. That is really another probation of about six months, then?—Yes.

2228. Do you reject many of these cases that are brought to you; are you very strict?—I think we have rejected four out of the 45 who have come before us so far.

2229. Has the medical officer concurred in that?—We rejected them because the committee thought they were too good, that they ought to be in the schools. The committee were divided on all these cases; but at the time they came before the committee there were one or two members who were exceedingly anxious that children who were too good should not be admitted to the class, and if they found the children had any attainments at all, had got to some kind of standard, they were not admitted.

2230. Have you become more lenient as time went on?—We have not had any cases lately. The sub-committee was changed last September, we have had another election, and two members who were on the committee retired.

2231. The term "defective" includes, besides those mentally feeble, those physically defective, such as crippled, or children suffering from heart disease. Are those all included in your case?—Yes.

2232. The cripples?—Yes.

2233. What do you understand by a cripple; You do not mean merely one who is maimed, but one who has lost power in some limb, say through paralysis?—We have one child suffering from St. Vitus' Dance, who cannot walk. We have one child who could not walk when he came in, because he was epileptic. We have no cripples in the limited sense of the term, that is, using crutches or anything of the sort.

2234. Then some children are excused in Brighton permanently. In Brighton you have some permanently delicate children, do you take them in?—That is a point of difficulty, and was rather a point of division on the old committee. The new committee has hardly met, and I do not know what its views will be, but the old committee was rather divided on that point, I think. But my experience shows that if we exclude these delicate children because they have reached Standard II., we shall be excluding several children, very likely, who are away from school under what may be called a permanent medical certificate, and, as a matter of fact, do not get any education.

2235. Would you like to take them into your special class?—I think they ought to have education, because they are quite educable, more so than some of the others; but as the special class has only been at work for this year I can hardly give an opinion upon that.

2236. Because, I suppose, you would expect them to reach Standard III. or Standard IV., whereas the ordinary defective children would never get beyond Standard I. or Standard II.?—They do require sometimes special circumstances, but what they specially require is that they should not be allowed to stay away from school simply because the doctor will constantly give a medical certificate to say that they are not fit at the moment.

2237. There are a great number of blind and deaf children who cannot get admission to the blind and deaf schools, because they are not sufficiently blind or deaf. Do you take those in also?—Yes.

2238. And for all these various kinds of children, how many teachers have you?—We have one head teacher, and a girl of 16 or 17, and the teacher herself is now employing in the afternoon a child who helps her.

2239. Do you know how many classes they have to teach?—Three; the teacher divides them into three classes.

2240. You have not gone so far as to find out the total number of defective children in Brighton yet; have you formed any idea approximately as to the number that there may be with regard to the child population. We have had it in evidence that it is from about 1 to 1½ per cent.?—I do not think that we have yet sufficient evidence to give a definite answer.

2241. Have you board visitors, who schedule the children?—We have no visitors. I do not quite understand your question.

2242. Attendance officers, I mean?—Yes.

2243. Do they schedule all the children?—They work by the registers of the schools.

2244. But not by the homes of the children. In London all the homes of the children are scheduled, and every child that exists in London, and its fitness for school or not is also recorded; so that in London we know pretty well all the defective children, and all who are suffering from any disease?—I do not quite know on what method the school attendance officers work.

2245. The children are not scheduled in Brighton; you do not know how many children there are of school age?—I am afraid I cannot tell you that.

2246. So that you cannot give us any idea of the proportion of defective children to the rest of school children?—Our impression is that they are 1 per cent. in the poor neighbourhoods, but I am sure we have not come to the end. We have not put any pressure to bring the children in, because we did not want to prejudice the parents against it.

2247. You have discovered 41 at present; 38, and three rejected as imbecile?—45 have come before us, and four were sent back to the schools, because their attainments were considered too great by the committee, and three were eventually sent to the schools because they were not considered desirable cases to take in.

2248. The 38 are in the school?—Yes.

2249. What is the total child population of Brighton, do you know?—19,000.

2250. This is 40, then, in 19,000?—Yes, roughly.

Miss A. Verrall.

19 Feb. 1897.

2251. You have at present discovered only ½ per cent.?—Yes.

2252. So that you really have only got, perhaps, about one-fourth of the children in your special class who ought to be there, if 1 per cent. is a fair calculation?—I think we shall be found very likely to have fewer in Brighton than in other places, it is a very healthy place.

2253. You classify the children in three classes: blind, partially blind, deaf, or suffering from ill-health and all degrees of mental defects?—Yes.

2254. And you find that you do not require more than three classes?—No.

2255. But as your numbers grow you will, of course require more teachers?—Yes, three, or possibly four our teacher says.

2256. What do you pay your teacher in Brighton?—She is getting 80*l.* a year.

2257. That is the head teacher?—Yes.

2258. And the others?—4*s.* a week is paid to the young teacher.

2259. What are their ages?—The head teacher is a woman of 40, or a little more. Until she came to us she had not worked regularly in a school; she was the daughter of a clergyman in the country, who obtained her certificate for the purpose of helping forward her own school at times when they found it difficult to get a teacher. She is exceedingly interested in work of this sort, and she was a very old friend of my own, and when the Board were talking of starting this class, I was very glad to find that she would like to come to take charge of it.

2260. So that she is a person of higher education?—Yes, quite.

2261. How long has the class been going?—Since September 1895.

2262. And you began with only 10 children?—Yes.

2263. The children cannot all walk to the school?—The worst cases happen to live near the school.

2264. What is the greatest distance that any child has to walk?—I think about a mile and a half or a mile and a quarter.

2265. Does it come with another child to guide it?—Generally. Some come alone.

2266. And you are going to make permanent buildings?—Yes.

2267. In some central place on the higher grade school playground?—Yes.

2268. Has the building been specially planned with reference to the wants of these children?—Yes, the plans have just passed the department.

2269. Could you describe the plan?—There are two class rooms and the mistress's room on the ground floor, and an entrance at the junction of the two class-rooms, so that the boys can enter into one class-room and the girls into the other, if necessary, and cloak-rooms from the entrance to right and left for boys and girls.

2270. And these class-rooms will be for how many each?—We propose to make one for 50 and the other for 30.

2271. Would you have a class of 50 or would it be two classes?—Two classes; because the idea is that we should not in that school ever have more than two teachers.

2272. Two teachers in each class-room?—No, two teachers altogether, two responsible teachers, certificated teachers.

2273. Assisted by monitors or pupil teachers?—Yes.

2274. How many are you going to build for?—80.

2275. You will probably find that insufficient; is the plan capable of additions?—I think if we find it necessary we would rather put another centre in another part of the town.

2276. On the first floor what have you provided?—A school of cookery above.

2277. Is that for other children besides?—Yes, a general school of cookery.

2278. But it would be used by these children?—So far they have not had any cookery lessons; they have not gone outside their own school at all.

2279. When you say that this class-room will hold 50, that is, on the ordinary basis of the public elementary schools, 10 square feet per child?—Yes.

2280. Supposing that 20 square feet was required for these children, it would only hold half that number?—Yes.

2281. Do not you consider that they want more space than the ordinary children?—Yes, I should think they did.

2282. And they ought to have separate desks; each child should have a separate desk, and they should have sufficient space for playing and marching in the room, there is no central hall?—No.

2283. The corridor is not wide enough for drill?—No.

2284. Where would the drill be taken?—In the larger class-room, I imagine; but then, if there were 80 children, I see there would be a difficulty.

2285. Do not you think that they ought to have a much larger space than the children in the ordinary schools?—That would be very advisable, certainly.

2286. But it is the greater cost that has induced the Board to build on the ordinary scale?—Yes.

2287. Of course, your staff is not very expensive at present. On your present number you can teach at a comparatively small cost, about 3*l.* a child?—Yes.

2288. Supposing that the classes were limited to 15 and 20, your cost would be considerably increased?—Yes, considerably.

2289. Almost doubled?—Yes.

2290. In fact, the Board are proceeding tentatively with a view to curtailing the expense as much as possible as well as with the consideration of benefit to the children?—The people most interested in it, so far, are the teachers and myself, and the teacher is very anxious indeed not to make the classes too expensive, because she does not want to prejudice the Board against them.

2291. You would find it very difficult in the long run, if you accept the position, to get the Board to reconsider it. Would it not be wiser to take up a firmer position at once in the interest of the children, and tell the Board what is necessary?—If the Department strengthen our hands in demanding these classes, we can press the Board, but it is very difficult to press the Board unless someone behind us is supporting us. We are very anxious to press the Board.

2292. What would you advise the Education Department to do, without any notion of additional grants, with their present powers. Would you advise them to give notice to the school boards that these children should be provided for at a higher rate of area?—Yes, that would be advisable, I think.

2293. And to suggest qualifications for the teachers?—Yes.

2294. And to suggest higher pay for the teachers. It might be well to suggest that higher pay should be given for such responsible work?—Yes, and also to give an opinion as to the number of children that ought to be allotted to a teacher.

2295. On those points the advice of the Department might be useful?—Certainly.

2296. And would lead, perhaps, to a sensible idea of what should be done for the children if legislation were called in to provide a special class. But the plans should be settled in the inception, should they not, rather than reconsidered afterwards?—Yes.

2297. At what age do you advise that children should be brought into the special class?—At about 7 years old, because up to that time the infant school generally can provide for them.

2298. The infant schools do not object to have them at all?—No.

2299. They do not teach them much, do they?—They are not nearly so much neglected in the infant schools as they are in the higher schools.

2300. But they sometimes wander about in the infant school because they cannot check their movements?—Sometimes in cases in which the child did not seem to be learning anything in the infant school, we have admitted it at five.

2301. Has your superintendent formed any idea of what she can teach the children. Has she visited the London classes?—She worked in the London classes six weeks before she was appointed to our class.

2302. Which centre was she attached to?—She was with Mrs. Burgwin.

Miss A. Verrall.

19 Feb 1897.

2303. So she learnt all she could from London experience?—Yes.

2304. Did she consider the London centres to be working well?—She said there was a great difference in the centres.

2305. What deficiency did she find in them as regards apparatus or staff?—I do not remember her making any criticism about apparatus or staff. She thought in some of the centres, I think, that more might be done to get the children to read, and she said that the discipline was better in some classes than in others; but then that applies to all schools, does it not?

2306. What would you consider a reasonable attendance for such children. We do not expect them, of course, to attend with quite the same regularity as the ordinary school child?—Our attendance is unusually high.

2307. What percentage is it?—About 87; 87 to 90.

2308. Though some of them come a distance of a mile and a half?—Yes.

2309. I think that I have gone through the chief points of your evidence, have I not?—Yes, I think so.

2310. (*Mr. Pooley.*) Have all these children, before they are admitted into the special class, been passed by the medical officer?—Yes.

2311. And some of them have come straight without having been in the ordinary school, is that so. You said that the mothers sometimes bring them to you?—I think they have almost all, if not all, been in schools before. One child had been in a private school, but I think all the others had been in the elementary schools.

2312. And some of them have been in schools for older children, and it has been found that they made very little progress?—Yes.

2313. Have you had enough experience to form an opinion as to whether these children have got on better, distinctly, in the special class than they would have done if they had been left in the ordinary schools?—Yes, they have improved immensely, some of them.

2314. Have you had to reject any because they are too deficient to get benefit from the instruction, or turn them out of school because they are too deficient to get benefit from the instruction?—We have turned out three children for various reasons; one girl because it was found not safe to let her come to and fro, and no proper arrangements could be made with any responsible person to bring her. She has now gone to the workhouse. Another, a boy, was returned to the schools as unmanageable, to the schools from which he came; I do not know what became of him afterwards; and the third case is a boy who must be turned out also. He is a boy of 15 years of age, and is at times violent and not safe to the other children. Four of the cases now in the school the teacher does not think will improve at all, but only four out of the 38.

2315. Have you any epileptic children in the class?—Yes, two now in the school, another ceased to come because there were difficulties about bringing the child.

2316. Do those in the school have fits frequently or seldom?—One used to have them constantly, but has not had any for a year now; the other has frequent fits, but never in school.

2317. And such a child, of course, is no inconvenience?—No.

2318. Then, as to the crippled children, you say you like to have them in your school—you like to have some children of that kind in your class, partly because they get no education at all if they do not come to such a class. I was referring to the children that you said were constantly ill and get medical certificates which practically would exempt them altogether from attendance; do you see any objection to taking children of that kind into your special class?—No, none, so far as I can see.

2319. Such children will necessarily be backward, will they not; because, as you say, they must have attended either very irregularly or not at all?—Yes, they are probably children who, at their age, ought to be in Standard IV., and are in Standard II.

2320. Do you anticipate that any evil will arise from what was mentioned, that you might expect them to be taught and go up regularly through the standards, whereas the ordinary defective children would never get beyond the second. Would it not be the case that these children, being backward, would very seldom be able to get up to a high standard?—It might make a little difficulty in teaching, because the children would probably learn faster than the others, and therefore the standard of the school would be higher, and there would be more differences between top and bottom.

2321. But, on the other hand, they would be likely to be irregular?—Yes.

2322. And might it not be an advantage to the feeble-minded to have a few children more intelligent to be taught with them, such as these crippled children?—I think it would.

2323. (*Miss Townsend.*) Are the tests you apply for the admission of children all intellectual? You mentioned hearing them read, and write, and so on, but do you apply any test concerning the ordinary affairs of life, their home life, to judge whether they are mentally defective, or is it entirely according to their progress in the school?—A few simple questions to show whether they know where they live, what their surroundings are, and a little about their homes, I sometimes ask them.

2324. Do you take the parents into consultation as to whether the child is feeble-minded or not?—No, I have not seen any of the parents. In the early stages the parents used, themselves, to bring the children to the committee, but we do not now ask for that. That had advantages and disadvantages. I do not think the children showed naturally when they were brought down to the committee—they felt nervous.

2325. You take for granted that the parents would not allow them to attend the classes unless they considered them to be feeble-minded?—Yes; and then we have a probationary time in which to judge for ourselves.

2326. You think the probation is better conducted in the special class than it would be if there were a small class in the ordinary school, where the child did not feel itself separated, and put into what they call the afflicted class?—I do not think the children mind it at all. They do not know anything, except that this is a nice school; I think they like the school.

2327. Then, who is it that calls it the class of afflicted children?—It is the office which has done that.

2328. The children themselves are not known as afflicted children?—I do not think that they are; I have not heard the class so spoken of by anyone, except by the office and the Board.

2329. Do they mingle with other children in the playground?—No; at present they are in a temporary school in connexion with one of the chapels.

2330. Should you have any objection to their mingling with other children in the playground?—I think it is much better not, because they are apt to be roughly treated or teased.

2331. You have found, then, that they are roughly treated or teased by the healthy children?—In some cases the parents have specially asked that the children might be admitted to the class, because they are not well-treated by other children at the schools.

2332. Is your new building connected with or adjoining an ordinary school? You spoke of a cookery class for the ordinary children above it; does that imply that it is within the same enclosure as an ordinary school?—Yes.

2333. Then, should you take great pains to keep them separate from the other children when they are in their new building?—Yes; I hope they will have a small piece of playground to themselves.

2334. You think that is very advisable?—Yes.

2335. And drill, that you cannot conduct for yourselves in your own class-room; would it be possible to drill your children in the larger room of the ordinary school at any time, or would you object to that?—It is a school without any central hall, and I do not think there is any room available for us.

2336. But if there were, would you approve of that amount of intermixture with the other children?—I do not think that they could be drilled with the other children.

2337. But I mean in the same building at other times?—There can be no reason why they should not if it could be arranged, because one teacher could take them over and bring them back again.

Miss A. Verrall.

19 Feb. 1897.

2338. Do you know anything of the home surroundings of the children?—Not much myself.

2339. You do not know whether they are exceptionally bad in many cases?—I know that they are of all sorts. Some parents are very much more well-to-do than others.

2340. Would it be advisable in some extreme cases to remove them from their home surroundings?—I have not come across any cases in which it has been desirable.

2341. Have any of your children been passed out?—Yes, three have left.

2342. Not in the natural course?—No.

2343. So that you have no experience of their after-life at all?—No.

2344. Having only one teacher, you cannot make any distinction between physically incapable and mentally incapable?—No, they are classed according to their attainments; the first class works Standard I. work.

2345. You have found it possible to do that?—Yes.

2346. You make the mental standard the only test?—Yes.

2347. Have you met with any exceptionally over-active brains that have been passed to you?—The first class has some children in it who, I think, are rather more intelligent than usual, but from extreme delicacy they had had no education. They have only been a year now in this school, and in those cases they knew absolutely nothing when they came in, so they are only now in Standard I. We can hardly tell where they will reach to; they have not had time.

2348. You can imagine that there might be some cases that would require checking rather than pushing forward?—Yes, we have found two or three children that have exceptional ability in drawing; two of the children can do Standard V. drawing.

2349. Do you give them any manual instruction, kindergarten work?—They have kindergarten work, and a little carpentering has now been introduced for the boys.

2350. Do they enjoy it?—Very much, but they like to do things that they can see made. You could not give them the same kind of carpentering that the other children have, that is to say, just keep them doing one thing.

2351. It is rather with a view to training than actual attainment, then?—Yes, you must let them make something from the beginning.

2352. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) You think seven is a very good age to admit children to the classes?—Yes.

2353. How old would you like to keep them there?—Up to 16, I should think.

2354. You think it would be advisable to extend the school age to 16?—Yes.

2355. With regard to the management, are you the only lady manager, as it were, now for them?—No, the other lady on the Board is also a member of the sub-committee, and takes great interest in the school, but we have no body of managers; it is managed by that sub-committee of the Board.

2356. Do the other schools have managers specially appointed to a school?—Yes.

2357. Would you think it advisable to appoint some ladies who would take a special interest in these children as managers?—Yes, I should think it would be.

2358. I mean those who could really visit the homes and advise the parents as to a child who was wanting medical treatment, and such points; you think it would be a great advantage?—Yes.

2359. It is too early, I suppose, for you to give us any idea of what you think will be the result of the teaching, I mean with regard to assisting a child to get its own living; how many do you suppose amongst those you have, your 38, would become wholly or partially self-supporting?—I think most of them will be able to earn their own living, partially at any rate, provided openings can be found which come within the range of their capabilities.

2360. Do I rightly understand that you have a girl, a pupil teacher. Do you mean to train that girl. You call her a girl helper; do you mean that she is of the pupil-teacher class?—No, neither of these girls is of that class, they are simply girls that the teacher has found. She took the elder girl on herself at first, and when the class increased the Board undertook the payment of that girl, and now the teacher has taken on her own responsibility another young girl. But I do not think either of them intends to become a teacher.

2361. Have you any idea yourself whether it would be advisable to take pupil teachers into such classes?—I do not see any reason, so far as the class is concerned, against it.

2362. (*Mr. Newton.*) Do you see any reason, so far as the class is concerned, in favour of having pupil teachers. Of course, I do not mean to say that the pupil teacher would be as good as another assistant teacher, but in many cases, might it not be better to have a pupil teacher than not to have her?—Yes, I think that sometimes young teachers are good for these children.

2363. Do you find very often that a child wants individual attention in reading, and that the mistresses are unable to give that individual attention?—Yes.

2364. Then, on the whole, you would be in favour of having pupil teachers, at all events as an experiment, in special schools and classes?—Yes, I am looking at it solely from the point of view of the school.

2365. And the pupil teacher would herself get a training that would enable her in time, I suppose, to take charge of such a class?—Yes.

2366. You spoke of raising the age of attendance, where defective children are concerned, up to 16 years of age; do you mean you would compel those children to attend until they were 16, or that you would compel the School Board to provide accommodation for them if they wish to attend up to 16?—The latter.

2367. You would make it optional, not compulsory?—Yes.

2368. Then, at admission, do you have any medical examination?—Yes, the doctor examines the children. Now he examines them in the school and reports to the sub-committee—a written report.

2369. Does he examine them at the same time that you examine them, or that the teacher examines them?—No, at a different time, and has made a written report.

2370. In the manual work, can you tell us which of the kindergarten occupations you find work satisfactory?—No, I do not think so, because our teacher finds a great variety is advisable, and, therefore, she constantly changes the occupations.

2371. I suppose she uses three or four?—Yes.

2372. How many hours a week are the school hours?—The ordinary school hours.

2373. What is that in Brighton, 25?—No, 27½.

2374. What proportion of that is given to manual work, including needlework and drawing?—Generally the ordinary subjects, reading and writing, and that sort of thing for those children who can do them, in the morning, and occupations of various sorts in the afternoon.

2375. That is much the same as in London. Are object lessons given?—Yes, of all kinds; they are very useful.

2376. Then, so far as the course of instruction is concerned, I suppose you have practically followed London?—Yes, generally.

2377. Is there any feeling amongst your colleagues on the Board that the class costs more than it is worth?—I have not heard of that so far. We have not courted criticism much at present.

2378. Would an additional grant from Government have a good effect, would it make it easier to establish such classes in London, and to conduct them efficiently?—It would diminish the dissatisfaction of those members of the Board (if there were any) who do not care much about the class and think it costly.

2379. Is there generally much criticism in Brighton on your school board expenditure?—No.

2380. But you would be in favour of a special grant, I suppose, for that purpose?—Yes, it would make our work easier.

2381. (*Dr. Smith.*) You have a medical officer to the Board, have you?—Yes.

2382. Is he in practice in Brighton?—Yes.

Miss A. Verrall.

19 Feb. 1897.

2383. But the admission of children to these classes rests entirely with the sub-committee of the Board?—Yes.

2384. What influences their judgment in the matter?—So far the committee has been chiefly occupied in trying to make up their minds where a line of distinction between the children to be admitted and the children not to be admitted is to be drawn; but we have not had a very long time yet to work.

2385. But then, as I understand you, the admission depended upon the votes of the Committee?—Yes.

2386. Does that strike you as being a satisfactory mode of admission to these classes?—I do not know whether it would be eventually, when the Committee have had more time to make up their minds, but at present, we have only been making observations, as it were, and trying to make up our minds ourselves.

2387. How many have you on the sub-committee?—Five members.

2388. So that the votes of three members would obtain the admission of a child, this is really what it comes to?—Yes.

2389. Do you know what becomes of those children who are too bad (I take it they are imbeciles) for the classes?—Two children are now in the workhouse.

2390. They go to the workhouse?—Yes, the parents have sent them there. As to the other, I do not know whether he was kept in the school that he was returned to or not.

2391. Are the boys and girls kept separate in these classes?—No, it is a mixed class.

2392. I thought in your arrangements you made provision for the boys going one way and the girls the other?—I only thought in assembling the children it might be advisable to send the boys into one side and the girls another, before the starting of the classes.

2393. Then you think there are some children who are unnecessarily kept away from school because of the medical certificate?—Yes.

2394. Do you suggest any remedy for that?—No, that is my difficulty. I do not see how the matter is to be met except by making these classes general, and by bringing them before the notice of doctors, and urging upon them not to give medical certificates in cases in which the child might with advantage be in school, if there were any school where it would be considered enough.

2395. Do you not think that the difficulty arises from the medical practitioner in the case seeing only the patient or the friends of the patient, and knowing nothing, and perhaps caring nothing about the Board?—Yes, I think very likely.

2396. Then would not the difficulty be got over if the Board had some one medical officer to whom these cases could be referred, say, in a district, or one for the town?—You mean that there should be only one doctor who should be allowed to give a medical certificate which should be accepted?

2397. Yes, for exclusion?—I do not know how it would work practically.

2398. Do not you think that he would look at it more from an official point of view than from the surroundings of the case, influenced probably by the opinions of the patient's friends?—Yes; he might, perhaps, be made aware that there were two points of view.

2399. I think that is the main difficulty now, from my experience in London?—Perhaps.

2400. Another difficulty which strikes me about your mode of admission as at present is, that of course your Board may be changed in three years, and might have a sub-committee with no interest in these classes at all?—So far, I may say that the present sub-committee has not appeared at our meetings, with the exception of myself and the other lady. I cannot at the present moment remember who the others are. The members of the former sub-committee took a great interest in it; two of those who have now retired from the Board were very much interested.

2401. That rather confirms what I suggested?—Yes, it does.

2402. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) Might I ask you, please, who the medical officer of the Board is?—Dr. Macrae.

2403. Is he in ordinary practice; he is not restricted at all, I suppose, by the Board?—Oh, no.

2404. He sees all the children that are suggested as unfit for the ordinary schools, I suppose; what is the process of bringing a child under his notice?—We send word to him by the clerk that there are children whom we wish him to see in the class, and he comes to the class and sends a written report.

2405. In the first place is the child picked out by the teacher in the ordinary school?—Upon the request of anybody that a child should be admitted, it is admitted on probation; then the names are brought before the sub-committee and they consult with the teacher, and the doctor is asked to make a report.

2406. And he makes the report without, necessarily, any conference with the teacher?—Yes.

2407. He makes it on his own responsibility, so far?—He takes his own course entirely.

2408. May I ask you on what principle were the first children selected for the special class; I suppose you had a certain number of them picked out from the ordinary classes?—The first admission of children occurred during the 18 months that I was off the Board, so I do not know quite so much about that; but in the very beginning I visited myself all the schools, and made a list of about 100 names. While I was making this, I lost my seat on the Board. Then I applied to the Board for permission to continue my investigations, and when I had made them, I attended at the Board and gave a report upon them and handed the list in. I do not know exactly what they did with that list or how they proceeded, but I knew that they were going to use that list as the basis. I rejoined the Board in June, and we opened the special class in September with these ten children, but I do not know how those ten were selected.

2409. I had in mind the evidence of Dr. Warner, who was here last week, who brought a memoranda of his observations with regard to the school children at Brighton, and I was anxious to ascertain how far his report was acted upon in the selection of the first children?—I do not think it had anything to do with it at all.

2410. The impression left upon my mind, at any rate, was that it was as a result of his examination that the children were selected?—No, I think not.

2411. Does the medical officer take account, not only of the general physical condition of the child, but of the peculiar movements, "nerve signs," and so on that the child displays; you know what I mean, perhaps, by the method of Dr. Warner? Do you know whether your medical officer uses any of those tests?—No, I have never seen him examine any of the children.

2412. Then, as to epilepsy; I suppose you consider it a question of degree whether an epileptic child should be admitted to a special class or not?—A child who had frequent epileptic fits would hardly be eligible, I should think.

2413. Then the doctor, as I understand, does not see the cases before they are picked out for the school, but only when they are picked out in the school?—Yes.

2414. (*Chairman.*) What grant are you claiming for this class; under what head do you claim the grant?—Only for their attendance.

2415. In London they claim the grant as infants, I believe; they are attached to the infants, and the infant school grant is claimed for them?—I think we claim the grant for the other schools, because our hours are the same as the other schools; they are not shorter, as in the infant school.

2416. I will read this for your information: "The "grant for these children is paid as for infants, because "the attendance is only of the kind required of infants "—an hour and a half—and would be paid as for other "scholars if the attendance were two hours"?—Our attendance is the same as other scholars.

2417. So you are claiming the grant only for the attendance of these children?—Yes.

2418. On the average attendance?—Yes.

2419. (*Mr. Pooley.*) Do you not get the full grant, the same amount as the ordinary children in public elementary schools?—No, because we have nothing to base it on.

2420. On the average attendance?—Yes, the full grant on attendance.

2421. You get the full grant?—Yes.

Miss A. Verrall.

19 Feb. 1897.

2422. (*Chairman.*) You get also the grant for geography and grammar earned by the children in the ordinary school?—We do not get those.

2423. Yes, you would get those if the grant is paid as for children in the ordinary school?—Perhaps my evidence may not be very correct about that.

2424. I wanted to see whether you knew what your privileges were: that if you are attached to the older school you get the grant for the older children, but if you are attached to the infant school, you only get the infant school grant?—I think we have had only the attendance grant.

2425. There is no such thing now as an attendance grant. It would have, perhaps, some influence with the Board, if they knew they were paid for on the higher scale?—Perhaps.

2426. You said the parents sent two of their children to workhouses after they left you. Were the parents paupers?—No, but I think they got admission to the imbecile ward of the workhouses. One I know did. The parents paid 2*s.* a week.

2427. The parents become paupers to that extent that the children are sent to the infirmary of the workhouse?—Yes.

2428. How are they treated in the infirmary, as scholars or as patients?—As patients in the adult imbecile ward.

2429. As regards the medical certificates, it is not wise to provoke a conflict between two authorities; you would try, so far as possible, to coax the children to school rather than to drive them by compulsion or set the authority of one medical man against that of another?—Certainly.

2430. And you think you will be able, by allowing the parents the benefit of the class, to prevail upon most of the children to come in without employing any medical certificate, except such as should qualify them to come in?—This is what will happen at present, if our committee of five continues to act as it does, that even if the parents of the child of tolerable attainments but very delicate were to apply for admission, it would not be admitted. The four we have rejected have been rejected by the last committee, because they were in the second or third standard.

2431. They would interpret the term defective as mentally, not physically, defective?—Yes. The majority of that committee was anxious to keep down the level of the class to make sure that children who would be better off in other schools were not allowed to drift into the special class.

2432. Is there any resolution of the Board excluding these children?—No.

2433. By what power then are they excluded?—The sub-committee send them back to the other schools

2434. But there must be some resolution of the Board giving the sub-committee this power?—There was none.

2435. You do not know your own rights and powers as a member of the sub-committee?—We recommend for admission, but do not report on rejected cases.

2436. (*Mr. Newton.*) Is the medical officer, when he examines the children, supplied with a history of the child's previous attendance at school?—No, he has no regular information beyond what he can get from the teacher. He goes to the school, and can ask the teacher anything.

2437. He goes to the ordinary school?—No, he goes to the special school.

2438. Then he may not always be able to tell whether the child's ignorance is due to its incapacity, or failure to attend school in the past?—I do not think he tests the child's attainments at all in reading and writing. If the child is so ignorant as not to be able to answer ordinary questions that he may put to it, he can judge of that, but I do not think he goes further; he investigates the case entirely as a medical case.

2439. He does not do as is done in London, then, see if the child can read particular words, or answer particular questions in arithmetic?—I do not think the doctor does that; the committee do that.

2440. Do you think it would be better if the doctor and the committee examined the child at the same time?—At first the doctor and the committee did examine the child, in the Board building, at the time of the committee meeting; then we brought the parent and child down, and they saw the committee in one room, and the doctor in another, and after the child had been seen by both, the doctor came in and consulted with the committee; but we found that it was not very satisfactory to bring the children down, because we could not really judge of their normal condition under the circumstances, the children were nervous; so we lately substituted the plan of considering the cases of children without them in the sub-committee (I myself having seen the children, and the teacher having seen the children, and reporting to the rest of the members of the committee), and asking the doctor to go into the school at another time and make us a written report. I do not know whether that will work better; no doubt we shall find that there are disadvantages in it as well as in the other course.

The witness withdrew.

Miss G. Dale.

Miss GERTRUDE DALE examined.

2441. (*Chairman.*) You are a member of the Birmingham School Board?—Yes.

2442. And you have taken a great interest in the welfare of defective children?—Yes.

2443. Including both mentally and physically defective children?—Yes.

2444. Have you ascertained in some way or other the number of such children in Birmingham?—Yes; our superintendent of visiting officers states the proportion to be* 1·46 in 1,000.

2445. Can you tell the Committee what that is based upon?—It is based, in the first place, upon the visits of the ordinary attendance officers, who report if they find children obviously incapable of attending school. Then, in the second place, it is based upon the reports of teachers who have children called defective in their schools who give the ratio of defective children to those on the roll of the schools; and, thirdly, it is based on the reports of special teachers, where there are centres, who visit the homes of the children in their districts. We have now two special teachers who visit the homes of all the children within a certain area.

2446. The attendance officers first sift the cases?—Yes, a report is first given by the attendance officer, who is not qualified to make a careful discrimination between ordinary children and defective children—he can only report obvious cases.

2447. You estimate the number of defective children for the whole of Birmingham at 120?—Yes. The total number of children on the books of the schools is 87,518, and the average attendance is 74,344, and we calculate that there would be about 120 defective children.*

2448. You have established two centres in Birmingham for treating defective children?—Yes, one at Benson Road, and the other at Moseley Road. These centres were placed in districts where such children appeared to be most numerous.

2449. At the Benson Road centre you have a special class of 21, where the number in the ordinary schools is 7,102, and at the Moseley Road centre you have a special class of 18, where the number in the ordinary schools is 6,713?—Yes.

2450. That is more than 1·46 in 1,000?—Yes.

2451. How do you account for that?—It is rather difficult to account for it. In the second centre (Moseley Road) the population is near a crowded and criminal population, and we believe we find more of such children in those neighbourhoods, but in the other centre (Benson Road) we cannot account for it.

2452. You have not sufficient information upon which to form a judgment?—The suggestion has been made (we do not know what to think of it), that the Winson Green Lunatic Asylum is close to that neighbourhood, and that people who have husbands or wives in the

* A note now appended to this evidence.

* Miss Dale has since explained that the number 120 refers to feeble-minded children not attending any class.

Miss G. Dale.

13 Feb. 1897.

asylum, and whose children in many cases have inherited insanity from one of their parents, come with their children into the neighbourhood so as to be living near their relatives.

2453. You have two centres in Birmingham; do you consider that preferable to having one large centre?—Yes; to suit the needs of Birmingham we require four or five moderately small centres. It would not be any use to have one large centre. The means of communication in Birmingham are not so very easy—we do not find that the children come great distances. It would suit our needs more to have five or six centres dotted about the town than to have one large centre.

2454. That would not admit of the same classification as if you had one large centre?—No.

2455. But you think a few small centres preferable to one large centre?—Yes, I think so.

2456. Your centres would be planted close to tramways or other means of communication?—Yes, as far as possible.

2457. You hope to have about 60 children before the end of the year, or in the near future?—We have now about 40, and we are opening a class this month for 20 more.

2458. How do you construct your schools; have you any special architect for your schools, or do you prepare your plans yourselves?—We have not built any special school, we have only had one class in one class-room in the ordinary school in each of the two centres. We had some structural alterations made so as to allow of separate entrances for boys and girls, and separate playgrounds and lavatories.

2459. In the case of the Benson Road centre, how many square feet do you allow per child?—30 square feet.

2460. And in the case of the Moseley Road centre?—20 square feet. In that case the room had been built for deaf mutes to meet the requirements of the Department, and we put the defective children into the deaf mutes' room.

2461. Though you have not constructed any schools specially for the purpose of dealing with defective children, have you any idea how such schools should be constructed?—My only idea is that the lavatory and class-room arrangements should be suitable, and there should be a large amount of space allowed to the children in the class-room where there is no central hall.

2462. Where you have no central hall as an alternative you would have large class rooms?—Yes.

2463. Are these two centres attached to the public elementary schools?—Benson Road is attached structurally to the infant school at Benson Road, the other one (Moseley Road) is attached to the Deaf Mute School, which in its turn is attached to the Moseley Road Board School. In the case of Benson Road, the room appropriated to defective children is a class room taken from the infant school. In the case of Moseley Road, the children are taught in a separate building built for deaf mutes.

2464. Have you a certificated teacher at either of those centres?—No.

2465. As to the cost of construction of schools for teaching these children, the cost of building would be rather greater than that of building an ordinary school, because a larger space is required?—We cannot calculate what the cost of building such schools would be, because we have not built a special school for this purpose.

2466. You have provided special accommodation for deaf mute children?—Yes.

2467. That would be, I presume, on the same scale as these other schools?—Very much the same.

2468. What was the cost per head of providing that accommodation for deaf mutes?—Without the site, 65*l.* per head.

2469. How do you account for the expense in that case being 65*l.* per head, the expense in the case of an ordinary school being 15*l.* to 20*l.*?—I can only account for it by the fact that you are obliged to have separate lavatory arrangements, and a little place always costs more in proportion than a big place.

2470. You account for the greater expense in the one case as compared with the other by the necessit of separate offices, and by the necessity of having larger space?—Yes. I have here what it cost to build three class-rooms, lavatories, and a teachers' room. The cost was 2,960*l.*, and the furnishing came to 77*l.* 16*s.*

2471. Such a cost would be prohibitive, I am afraid, with many boards?—I think it would be.* I do not think we should feel justified in building rooms of that kind. The preferable mode of dealing with these children, so far as Birmingham is concerned, is to set aside a room in an ordinary school, and try to make it suitable.

2472. An additional room might be built upon the playground?—Yes, but that is very expensive.

2473. Having set aside a class room specially for these children, would you contemplate their using the same playgrounds and offices as the other children?—I should not contemplate their using them at the same time, but the play time can always be arranged, and they are always under the supervision of their own teachers.

2474. It is not advisable to send weak-minded children into a playground among a lot of rough boys and girls?—Practically we have had no difficulty.

2475. You see no objection to that?—I see there might be objection to it, but we have not met with any difficulty in that respect.

2476. As to the cost of maintaining these schools, you have no certificated teacher, I understand?—We have no certificated teacher.

2477. Are the teachers specially qualified for the work?—We thought they were specially qualified for the work when they were appointed.

2478. By character more than training or attainments?—We knew them to be good teachers, and one of the teachers was trained in London.

2479. Under Mrs. Burgwin?—Yes, and she has trained the others.

2480. They were qualified by character and by previous knowledge of the particular class with which they had to deal?—Yes.

2481. And their attainments, you considered, were fairly good?—Yes. We selected the teachers in this way. We thought good infant teachers would be most suitable, and two members of our Board, who take an interest in the subject, were asked to look round and nominate a certain number of teachers for the Committee to see. We found one who really, by her skill as a teacher and her intellectual attainments, was quite capable of becoming a head mistress; but through private circumstances, she had not been able to take her certificates, and we nominated her as one of our teachers.

2482. Both of your teachers were ex-pupil teachers?—Yes.

2483. You considered that a sufficiently high standard for teachers of children of this class?—We did not consider that their attainments were lower than those that would be possessed by a certificated teacher; it was only that from certain circumstances their attainments had not been tested by examination. We should not advocate choosing teachers of lower attainments.

2484. Do you pay them less than ordinary certificated teachers?—We pay them the same. The scale of the Board is 55*l.* for an uncertificated teacher. We pay one 70*l.* and the other 80*l.*, and a trained certificated teacher, on leaving college, begins at 70*l.*

2485. Have they assistants in each case?—One has no assistant, the other practically has had an assistant up to now. She has always had a teacher in training with her.

2486. You say your classes consist of 18 in the one case and 21 in the other; do you consider that one teacher is sufficient to cope with that number of children of varying capacities and tempers?—No, I think, looking to the work that is done in the class-room, and the supervision required in the playground, there should be a second teacher.

2487. Do they get any assistance from scholars?—Yes.

2488. In what way?—In getting out books, and putting them away, and so on.

2489. As to the cost of maintenance, what does it work out at per head?—In one class (the class of 21) 4*l.* 3*s.* 6*d.*, and in the other class (the class of 18) 4*l.* 8*s.* 10*d.*

* Miss Dale has since explained that this cost includes new boundary walls to a large playground.

Miss G. Dale.

19 Feb. 1897.

2490. Is that much higher than the cost in the case of an ordinary school?—The average for the ordinary schools in Birmingham is 2*l.* 14*s.* 9*d.*

2491. Have you laid down any rules as to the age of admission, and of leaving?—We admit them at seven.

2492. You excuse them from five to seven?—Yes.

2493. Why do you excuse them in those two early years?—I think we have excused them on the experience of the teachers; they think it better not to take them till they are seven, and also we think those children are very suitably taught in the infants schools.

2494. You leave them in infant schools to cultivate their senses?—Yes.

2495. Classification is scarcely possible, I presume, when they first come to you?—In both these classes they fall into two divisions, the upper and the lower.

2496. What is the distinction between these two divisions?—I should say in the upper division the children are beginning to speak, they are beginning to know their letters, beginning to write and to draw; in the lower division they are just as we get them when they come in, they are sometimes unable to speak, and their senses are very little cultivated; and, perhaps, they are quite unaccustomed to discipline, and unable to behave decently, unless they have previously been in school.

2497. The lower division would want a teacher to itself I should suppose, seeing that it would consist of children with different tempers to control, and with bad habits to be rectified?—Of course, the children vary very much. We have found that at Moseley Road the children come from better houses than the children who come to the other class.

2498. Under what conditions are they admitted, does the medical officer see them?—No, if the child is already in the elementary day school, one of the special class teachers visits the teacher of that school, and confers with him or her about the child. If the child is not in school at all the special teacher visits the home of the child. We have entirely trusted to the special teacher to tell us what children should be admitted, and what should not.

2499. In London it has been found that some of the teachers are very anxious to put their dull children in the special class, is there any tendency in Birmingham to do that?—No, there is no tendency to do that in Birmingham.

2500. Are you satisfied that you have the right subjects in your special classes?—We have only been accustomed to this work for two or three years, but I am satisfied that the children we have in our classes should not be in an ordinary school.

2501. Is there a medical officer attached to the Board?—Yes.

2502. Has it ever been suggested that he should have a final voice in the selection or rejection in such cases?—No, no difficulty has ever occurred.

2503. If a special grant were paid for these children, would it not be necessary to have a medical certificate that they were fit subjects, as in the case of the blind and the deaf, or would you be satisfied with the present arrangement?—I should be satified with the present arrangement.

2504. Would not there be a tendency to put children into a class where they would be earning a grant of 5*l.* 5*s.* in preference to keeping them in a school where they would only be earning 1*l.* 6*s.*?—I do not think there would in the case of any decent board.

2505. Does any medical officer see these children after they have been admitted?—There has not been any systematic visitation of the classes, but Mr. Sturge, who has taken a very great interest in our classes, has got the medical officer of the borough asylum to visit one of the classes, and tell him whether he thought anything could be done for these children medically or surgically. I have done the same with reference to the other class, and a lady at the Children's Hospital at Birmingham visited the children in that class, and gave us some valuable suggestions.

2506. Were those inspections confined to the physical condition of the children, or did they extend to their mental condition?—In the first visit, the visit to Benson Road by the doctor of the borough lunatic asylum, he looked particularly to the mental condition of the children; but he did not give us any advice as to medical or surgical treatment.

2507. You keep records of improvement in these children in regard to speech, sight, and hearing?—Yes, I have brought a copy of the record which the teacher keeps; she tests the sight, hearing, and taste of the children, and she marks the result as "good" or "fair," and she also tests their mental condition. She puts down their age and tries to get a record of their family history, and she writes up the book every three months.

2508. Are there any epileptic children mixed with these children?—I think there have been two epileptic children in one class.

2509. Are there any crippled children among them?—We have one crippled child.

2510. Have you any children suffering from heart disease?—One.

2511. Have you any figures to show how many of these feeble-minded children there are in Birmingham who do not attend any school?—With regard to the Moseley Road district, the visiting officer states that there are 11 children in that neighbourhood not cared for in any way.

2512. You have seen a great deal of these children yourself?—Yes.

2513. And you keep private records of their development and history?—No, I see the teacher's record.

2514. And you agree with it generally?—Yes.

2515. What is your system of instruction?—Every lesson lasts not longer than 20 minutes; every lesson is, as it were, sandwiched with an occupation or drill, or singing—something of that nature. I have the time table here, and this is an analysis of it. (Probably it is on Mrs. Burgwin's model.) About 5 hours are devoted to manual occupations. Reading, two Divisions, First Division, 2 hours 25 minutes; Second Division, 2 hours. Writing, First Division, 2½ hours; Second Division, 2 hours. Arithmetic, 1 hour. Word-building, 1 hour. Singing, 1 hour 35 minutes. Drill and Marching, 1½ hours. Recitation, 40 minutes. Object lessons, 1 hour 5 minutes. Conversational lessons, 50 minutes. Knitting and sewing, 2½ hours. Occupations, 4 hours 50 minutes. Recreation, 2 hours 55 minutes.

2516. So the time devoted to manual occupations and recreation is double what is devoted to what are commonly called the serious subjects of education?—Yes, quite.

2517. How many hours a week are the children in attendance?—22½. The morning session is from 9.15 to 11.45, and the afternoon session is from 2.15 to 4.15.

2518. When are the registers marked?—I think the teacher marks the registers at 9.25 and at 2.20.

2519. A good deal of the time is occupied in manual work, singing and drill?—Yes.

2520. Do you find that that has a good effect upon the children in making them more intelligent and lively?—We have found the manual work a very great means of improving them.

2521. Have you to resort to corporal punishment at all?—At the Benson Road class it has been found necessary to inflict corporal punishment. At the other class I have not asked a question about it yet. We do not forbid corporal punishment.

2522. The teachers have to record it in a book?—Yes.

2523. The magistrates are apt to look very severely at cases of corporal punishment of feeble-minded children?—I asked the teacher at Benson Road how often she had had to resort to corporal punishment, and she said perhaps two or three times during the course of two years.

2524. With regard to attendance, these children come some distances to school?—In one centre, the Benson Road centre, they come very long distances—a mile and a half some of them.

2525. Are they pretty regular in their attendance?—The average attendance is 85 per cent. (82 per cent. in the one case, and 87 per cent. in the other), which is quite equal to the average attendance for the whole of Birmingham. In the case where 82 per cent. is the

Miss G. Dale.

19 Feb. 1897.

average the children come from very much worse homes than in the other case.

2526. You do not wish to exercise compulsion upon these children—you would rather coax the mothers to send their children to your classes, pointing out to them the advantages of attendance at those classes?—At the present stage we should do harm by exercising compulsion—I should not like to say that we should never wish to exercise compulsion.

2527. Is there anything else you wish to add?—I have a little information about the occupations of children who have left.

2528. At what age do they leave?—14.

2529. Are they fit to earn their living when they leave at 14?—One boy is getting 8s. a week—he is 14—he is engaged in some mechanical occupation in glass-blowing. Then there are two girls particularly weak-minded, who are hardly fit to earn their living, they are living at home. Then there is a boy we have lost sight of. When we last heard of him he was helping in a coal yard at 2s. 6d. or 3s. a week.

2530. What do you suppose will be the fate in life of those two girls?—The teacher thinks they will not be fit to earn their living.

2531. Do you suppose they will gain admission to some asylum?—It is to be hoped that they will gain admission to some institution where they will be taken care of. They might do laundry work—they are not fit to take care of themselves.

2532. How much could they earn a week by manual work?—A laundry girl would earn 8s. or 9s. a week. I do not think these girls could earn as much as that.

2533. Are they physically weak as well as mentally?—They are physically rather weak.

2534. (*Mr. Pooley.*) How long has the first of these classes been open?—Not quite three years.

2535. And the second?—It has been in operation since last July, and a third one will be opened this month.

2536. You said that it was estimated that the number of weak-minded children needing special instruction was 1·46 per 1,000 in Birmingham—is that figure based on any systematic inquiry over the whole of Birmingham?—Yes, in this sense, that the head of the visiting officers was asked two years ago to prepare a census for us; and on their ordinary daily visits the officers were asked to make special records.

2537. Was any medical examination made of the children in every elementary school?—No.

2538. Do you think the children who ought to go to special classes can be discriminated from ordinary children satisfactorily without a medical examination?—I think the teacher who had the children in charge could discriminate.

2539. She could discriminate which children were dull and which were bright?—Yes.

2540. But if she had not had some medical training, would she be able to distinguish certain physical signs and indications which denote feeble-mindedness?—She would be quite ignorant of the physical signs.

2541. She would judge simply whether the child was dull or bright and capable of being educated or not?—I suppose so.

2542. Do you think that is a sufficient test?—I am in no sense an expert myself. I am not quite qualified o answer that question.

2543. I gather that in Birmingham you do not find that the teachers in the ordinary schools are anxious to get rid of dull children?—No; there is not any tendency to force ordinary dull children into these special schools.

2544. Probably there are a great many weak minded children in the ordinary schools?—That may be the case.

2545. And is not it likely that some of those children in the ordinary schools have certain physical signs which would be detected by a doctor, which would show that they were feeble minded to such an extent that they could not profit by the ordinary instruction?—I think it is possible, but then, I think, the teacher would select those children.

2546. She would only judge by whether the child was dull or not?—If the teacher found that the child could never learn to read she would at once think there was something particular about that child.

2547. Would you say that all those children who are dull are reported by the teachers as fit for special schools?—We have not covered the whole of Birmingham yet. When we have been able to form a centre we have communicated with all the teachers in the neighbourhood, and asked them whether any of the children attending their school were subjects for special instruction.

2548. Would not it be more satisfactory to have a medical inspection of the dull children who might be selected by the teacher in an ordinary elementary school?—That seems to be a question for an expert rather than a person who is not an expert.

2549. Do you know that some witnesses have estimated the number of feeble-minded children at as much as 1 per cent.; that is nearly eight times the proportion that your 1·46 per thousand gives?—No, I did not know that.

2550. Did I rightly understand you to say that you found that a larger number of children had actually come to one of these special schools than you would have expected from the estimated proportion of weak-minded children to the whole of the children attending the elementary schools?—I think I said that the attendance at the special school in Benson Road must not be taken as a sample of Birmingham because we first found where the children were thickest according to the report of the visiting officer and set the school down there.

2551. I understood you to say you had a larger number of children at one of these centres than you expected, and you tried to account for it?—I was asked how I accounted for the attendance at the two centres being more than the 1·46 per thousand, and I said that at the one centre I accounted for it by the fact that the population is very crowded and of a very low type—many would say almost criminal, and I accounted for it at the other centre by the fact that the borough asylum is close to it, and that the families of insane persons in the asylum, among whom one would naturally expect to find weak-minded children, have gone to live near the asylum so as to be close to their relatives.

2552. How did you find there were so many weak-minded children in those particular spots?—By the census we asked the visiting officers to take; we found by our officers where the children were and then opened a class.

2553. You say some children come long distances to your classes—has that been found to be a disadvantage?—We anticipated that difficulty would arise from their coming long distances, but we have not found any, except in one case—in one case the girl was exceptionally feeble minded, and we hardly thought she was fit to come through the streets alone—we got her an escort for a time—that failed after a time, and the girl left the class—she was a girl of 13 or 14.

2554. If you organised a school for feeble-minded children, what is the least number of classes you would have?—I should think three; I have not had any experience of a large organised centre. My experience has been with little groups of 20 children. Children of the ages of 7 to 13 seem to fall easily into three groups.

2555. If you had your choice between three classes and one large centre, by which would you get the better organisation?—I think it would be better organisation to have three classes.

2556. If this special instruction were to be provided for the whole of Birmingham, would not it be better not to have several small centres but to have a reasonable number of fairly large centres?—It is rather a question of degree and a question of how the town is built. In Birmingham, though we have four good omnibus and tramway routes to the centre of the town, there is no way of coming 'cross-country. We always feel that a mile or a mile-and-a-quarter is the greatest distance that we ought to expect these children to come.

2557. If the communication were fairly easy may I take it that you would see no objection to having a small number of fairly large classes?—I should rather want to know how far, on the average, the children were able to travel. I can only look at the 40 children I know about—I find it difficult to generalise.

2558. The question turns upon the facility of access to the school?—Yes. Where you have small classes the children come from a comparatively short distance: if you had a large centre they would come from a larger radius, and the distance they would have to come would create a difficulty.

2559. As to the age of leaving, you say that they leave at the age of 14?—Yes.

2560. Is that a hard and fast rule made by the Board?—No rule has been made by the Board that they shall leave at the age of 14. In the cases of the two girls to whom I referred, who left at 14, I do not know whether their parents wanted them, in the other cases the parents wished the boys to go to work.

2561. There is no legal reason why they should leave at the age of 14, if the Board were willing to retain them?—I do not know that there is.

2562. How long would you wish to retain them for their own sakes?—I think I would rather have to deal with the cases individually. Some children come in at 11 or 12 years of age, and therefore they have not had the advantage of the previous training.

2563. Those children would be very unfit to go out into the word at the age of 14?—Yes.

2564. They would be more fit if they were retained longer?—Those children would be.

2565. (*Miss Townsend.*) Do any considerable number of these weak-minded children pass into the ordinary schools?—We have had two cases where children have passed into the ordinary schools. In one case, I got a letter from the head master, who said that the boy had passed into Standard II., and was doing like any ordinary boy.

2566. Had he been some time in your class?—He had been two years in our class.

2567. You said two girls had been removed, or had gone home from the classes?—Two girls have left, having reached the age of 14.

2568. You would have been glad to retain them?—They would have been better at school.

2569. Would it have done them good, do you think, if they could have been placed in a training home?—I think on leaving they should have gone into some home and remained there, but that would have required a certain amount of money to be found by the friends of the girls, and that was not possible in those cases.

2570 Is there no organisation in Birmingham to which you could have referred the girls?—No.

2571. In individual cases, you would welcome the opportunity of so placing girls on leaving your classes?—Yes.

2572. You think that would answer better than keeping them in your classes till they were 16?—I am speaking of those two special cases, where the girls were not really fit to take care of themselves. I should have been glad if they could have remained in the class a little longer, or if they could have gone into some home, such as Miss Stacey's.

2573. Do the parents like the classes?—We had great difficulty at first in starting the classes, there was a prejudice against them, but that seems to have been overcome. After a few months the parents began to speak very warmly of the classes.

2574. Have you more girls or boys?—More boys.

2575. In what proportion?—In the proportion of 8 to 5.

2576. Are there any cripples, incapacitated children of ordinary intelligence?—No.

2577. You would refuse such cases?—We would not consider them proper cases.

2578. Even if the medical officer certified that they were not proper subjects for ordinary schools?—Such a case has not arisen.

2579. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) Have you refused children of school age because they were too imbecile for the classes?—We refused one case after a six months' trial.

2580. What happens to the child you so refuse?—In that case the parents left the town, but in ordinary cases when our visiting officers meet with imbecile children, after a time we try to get the guardians to send them to the borough workhouse, where they get handed on to the lunatic asylum.

Miss G. Dale.

19 Feb. 1897.

2581. Have you a difficulty in persuading parents to part with their children, and let them go into an asylum?—Very great, especially when they young; when they are older they are more willing to part with them.

2582. (*Mr. Newton.*) Have you any special furniture in use in your class-room?—No, we have no special furniture.

2583. Do the children use dual desks, or long desks? Dual desks.

2584. Have you ever considered whether it would be better to have single desks for these defective children?—I have not considered it specially with regard to them, I think single desks are better for all children.

2585. But especially desirable for these children, you think?—Yes.

2586. Assuming that it is necessary at Birmingham to ave small centres, with 20, or 30, or 40 scholars, what staff would you recommend?—In our own class of 20, we should have two teachers present in the class.

2587. One head teacher?—Yes.

2588. And the other an assistant?—Yes.

2589. Would ex-pupil teachers meet your requirements?—I should very much prefer not to be restricted to taking a person with certificates, but it is a question of cost.

2590. In such a class, you might train a girl of 14 as a pupil teacher who might eventually take charge of a similar class?—You might, but I do not think girls of 14 should have to decide what class of work to do in after life.

2591. Say 15 or 16?—I think it would be too early then, it is trying work to the nerves, and to the character of the girl altogether.

2592. What manual work have you found most useful?—We have found clay modelling most useful As regards all the other occupations, after three or four months we look out for a change; we have found macramé work very successful.

2593. Have you tried drawing, and work in colours?—Yes.

2594. And have you found that a success?—A great success.

2595. Your view, on the whole, is that the occupations should be varied as much as possible?—Yes, I think any occupation should not be persevered in for too many months at a time.

2596. Has anything been done in cookery and laundry work?—We hope to be able to do something in cookery this year.

2597. Do you think wood work would be a good occupation for the boys?—I think they might do a little—you would require to have a teacher to look sharply after them.

2598. What standard have the best scholars reached in reading, writing, and arithmetic?—In writing, Standard II.; in reading I do not think that they were up to Standard I. work.

2599. In arithmetic?—Barely up to Standard I.

2600. Are the kindergarten beads for teaching arithmetic used generally?—Yes.

2601. And found to answer?—Yes.

2602. (*Dr. Smith.*) You have a medical officer attached to the Board?—Yes; he is consulting medical officer—his whole time is not occupied in work for the Board.

2603. Whenever you want medical advice you call him in?—Yes.

2604. He does not hold the office of medical officer of the Board?—No.

2605. With reference to these children, it has not been found necessary systematically to consult him?—No.

2606. Whatever has been done in the way of testing the capacities and capabilities of the children has been done by the teachers?—Yes.

2607. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) Are these classes in Birmingham called special classes?—Yes.

2608. You said you had had some medical advice given in one instance by the doctor of the borough asylum, and in another by a lady doctor; is the doctor of the borough asylum Dr. Whitcombe?—Yes.

Miss G. Dale.
19 Feb. 1897.

2609. You say he did not give you much advice?—He simply looked round the class—he did not make any suggestions, except that the children should have a gymnasium.

2610. He did not see any children that he thought too imbecile to be in the class?—I think not, or he would have mentioned it to the teacher.

2611. That was voluntary and gratuitous advice?—Yes.

2612. You said something about imbecile children being sent to the lunatic asylum by the guardians; those imbecile children you distinguish from the children that you have in the special classes?—Yes.

2613. They are of a lower grade altogether?—Yes.

2614. The imbeciles go to the lunatic asylum, do they?—There are two asylums in Birmingham under the Corporation. There is one large asylum in the town where they sort out cases, and where they keep them a few months, hopeless cases and children being sent to Rubery, where there are about 600 patients.

2615. Is there any special classification of children in that asylum, so that they may be specially trained apart from the insane inmates?—They are not trained at Rubery, nor kept apart from the adults.

2616. Not far from you, at Knowle, there is an institution for idiots and imbeciles; is that made use of by the guardians?—No the terms there are prohibitive and they will not receive any pauper children; 60*l.* a year is the ordinary fee, and their regulations put it out of the question.

2617. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) Are children excused from attendance at school on medical certificate; that is to say, any children of school age?—Yes, any child of school age is excused on medical certificate.

2618. Have you ever had reason to doubt the value of that certificate?—I sit on the appeals every month, and I have great reason to doubt the value of the medical certificates.

2619. You mean the medical man is rather in touch with the parents, and does what the parent wants done?—That is sometimes the case, and sometimes a doubt arises whether the person sending the certificate is properly qualified; I have a certificate handed to me saying that so-and-so is unable to attend school; I cannot see whether the person signing the certificate is a properly qualified man—I cannot look up all these things.

2620. (*Chairman.*) You said that it was estimated that the number of defective children in Birmingham was 1·46 in 1,000, that estimate being based on the reports of the attendance officers and teachers. Probably, if a proper census were taken, it would be found to be eight times as many; could you have such a census made, or extracts made, from the books of your visitors, so as to tell us the proportion more exactly; you have reports from your visitors of all such children?—Yes.

2621. Could not you get them to give you the number more exactly?—We could do that. You would only have the evidence of the visiting officers, you would have no expert evidence. Practically what takes place is this. If a visiting officer went into a house and saw a child which he thought clearly imbecile, he would put him down as imbecile; if he was not sure that he was imbecile he would make an entry in his book and consult his superior officer, and if he was not sure about it he would ask for a medical certificate.

2622. (*Mr. Newton.*) The visiting officer might easily pass over a feeble minded child thinking he was an ordinary child?—If he was an ordinary child he would be in a school; a certain number do escape, but only the migratory class. The visiting officer has only included children of the ages of 7 to 14; he has not taken in children of 5 to 7. Her Majesty's inspector asked for a census of children of the ages of from 7 to 14, so he is making a fresh census for him.

Adjourned to Friday next.

ADDENDUM (by Miss Dale).

The figures in the evidence giving the percentage of defective children are incorrect. Owing to a misunderstanding the reports of teachers on children actually in school were not included. The corrected figures give a percentage of about 1 per cent., instead of 1·46, per 1,000. The figure 1·46 per 1,000 refers to children not attending any day school who have been excused attendance because of their obvious inability to profit by the ordinary school work. The corrected figures are as follows:—

1. Number of children in public elementary schools in Birmingham reported *by the teachers* to be mentally deficient		638
N.B.—The teachers in 11 departments in denominational schools decline to give the information which was asked for by a member of the school board. It was not asked for officially or through their managers.		
2. Number of children reported by the officers to be attending no school because they are too defective to profit by the ordinary course.		
Epileptic	3	
Idiots	4	
Mentally deficient	119	
		—126
3. Number of children mentally deficient in attendance at two special classes		41
Total		805

All numbers have been taken on children between the ages of 7 and 14. The figures have not been checked by any general test of the children, but on the whole, and, with one glaring exception, I believe them to be correct. The case of exception is one where two schools standing side by side report, school board, none; denominational school, 32. We know the children in this board school to be of the poorest class in the town, and those in the neighbouring school to be of a decidedly better class.

FIFTH DAY.

Friday, 26th February 1897.

PRESENT:

THE REV. T. W. SHARPE, C.B., in the Chair.

Mr. H. F. PECKET.
Mr. A. W. NEWTON.
Dr. G. E. SHUTTLEWORTH.
Dr. W. R. SMITH.
MRS. BURGWIN.
Miss TOWNSEND.

Mr. H. W. ORANGE, *Secretary.*

MRS. FLORENCE ANDERSON, Miss EDITH CATTLE, and Miss ROSA WHENMAN called in and examined.

Mrs. F. Anderson, Miss E. Cattle, and Miss R. Whenman.

2623. (*Chairman. to Miss Whenman.*) You are a teacher at the Hugh Myddelton special classes for feeble-minded children?—Yes.

2624. How many are there on the roll of your school?—79.

2625. And the ages are 7 of six years old, 26 of seven years old, 20 of eight years old, 8 of nine years old, 7 of ten years old, 5 of eleven years old, 4 of twelve years old, none of thirteen years old, and 1 of fourteen years old?—Yes.

2626. So that most of them are very young children; between seven and nine years of age?—That is when they are first admitted into the centre; that was the question, I think, not the age they are now.

2627. How is it they drop off so much after nine years of age, or, rather, after eight apparently?—Those were the ages when the children were admitted.

2628. The ages of the children in the school?—Yes, when they were admitted into the centre.

2629. Not the present ages in the school?—No, the age on admission.

2630. So that they generally come to you between seven and nine years of age?—Yes.

2631. You have divided them rather according to their future ability of earning their living, and you say some will be totally self-supporting, 38; partially self-supporting, 31; and not likely to be self-supporting, 10; as to those 10, would you class them as imbeciles or idiots?—No, they are not idiots, but still they certainly would not be able to earn their own living.

2632. Not in any way?—No, I do not think in any way.

2633. Will they not work at home?—They would be able to do very little indeed, scarcely anything, not certainly to earn money.

2634. How would you distinguish them from an imbecile or idiot?—They are able to learn something, even if it is only to work with their hands.

2635. It is their ability to learn something?—Yes.

2636. Especially to work with their hands?—Yes.

2637. And, besides those, you have some cripples or delicate children to the number of 15?—Yes.

2638. Are those 15 crippled children of average intelligence?—Yes, crippled and delicate children, not all cripples.

2639. How many are there who are very delicate?—15 very delicate and two cripples.

2640. Very delicate and crippled, two out of the 15?—Yes.

2641. You do not think they are, any of them, fit subjects for an ordinary school?—No, I do not.

2642. How long have you been in the class?—I started work on July 29th, 1895, at the Hugh Myddelton School.

2643. Nearly two years ago?—Yes.

2644. And since that time you have sent out 26, eight have gone to the ordinary schools, one has gone to Darenth, and three have gone to work?—Those are taken from the beginning of our work here.

2645. Since the opening of the school?—No, not before we were there.

2646. Besides that there are four at home?—Yes.

2647. Unable to do anything?—Helping, I think, a little; doing very little indeed, not earning money.

2648. And 10 whom you cannot trace?—No, they have left the neighbourhood at different times.

2649. You have had some children who were almost imbeciles or idiots, have you not, at various times?—Yes, we have had a few.

2650. Besides the one who went to Darenth?—Yes; we have one at the centre now who, I am afraid, will have to go.

2651. Because she is dangerous?—Not dangerous, but unable to learn anything whatever; we have been keeping her to see if she could do anything.

2652. How long do you keep them to see if they can do anything; is there any rule of the Board?—No, there is no rule. We keep them from three to six months, and sometimes even longer.

2653. Do you know how many children you have had at different times who have been unable to do anything, either mental or manual work?—I think four since we have had the work.

2654. And they were incapable of being taught?—Yes.

2655. In fact, you could not rouse any interest in them?—No.

Mrs. F. Anderson, Miss E. Cattle and Miss R. Whenman.
26 Feb. 1897.

2656. Not through any kind of work—not through manual work of any kind?—No.

2657. Did they sing, or play, or dance?—One boy was very violent, and he had to be removed. We have a child now who never speaks to the teacher, but she speaks at home, and always sings her school songs, but we have never been able to get her to speak to us since we have had her. That is the one who seems imbecile.

2658. Do you find that if you once create some interest, the interest grows?—Oh, yes.

2659. Do they get so far interested as to be curious and ask questions?—Yes, very often.

2660. You say that they also get interested about mental pursuits of a very humble character, I suppose?—Yes, but still they want to learn; they want to do what the others are doing when once their interest is awakened.

2661. You have gained a great deal of experience; do you consider yourself able now to judge between the educable and non-educable child in a short time?—Not always in a short time—no.

2662. How do you judge?—In various ways; first of all there is the general appearance of the child.

2663. Would you describe some of the signs or tests that you bear in mind when you are judging?—The head of the non-educable child is very often larger or smaller than the head of a normal child, and the movements are very different.

2664. Have you ever taken the measurement of the head?—I have got the measurements of them all at the centre. I have not got them with me.

2665. Have you made a chart of them?—No, merely noted them.

2666. Could you draw a chart expressing by lines the measurements?—Yes, I will do so.

2667. Then you would see at a glance the degree of non-educability. How about the palate of the children?—It is often very high, sometimes cleft.

2668. Do you find that imperfect articulation and feeble-mindedness go together?—Very often the articulation is poor, nearly always.

2669. Is that from want of effort?—In some cases, but in some cases from the palate or teeth.

2670. You look at the tongue and the teeth also?—Yes, the tongue is very often furrowed in lines from side to side.

2671. Then you look at its walk and its gait generally?—Yes, they do not walk in an erect manner; they have not the power of balance.

2672. Can you educate them to stand upright and walk straight?—Yes, we endeavour to do so, and they can in time, but it takes a long time with a great many of them.

2673. How do you treat the very delicate and crippled, have you chairs for them?—Yes, we have chairs.

2674. Provided by the Board?—Yes, folding chairs.

2675. And the epileptic children, how do you treat them at your school?—When they have a fit we have to remove them from the class. A teacher usually looks after them until they get better. We cannot do much for them.

2676. Have you had severe cases?—No, we have had no severe cases.

2677. Have the other children been frightened?—Some seem frightened, so now we always remove the child if possible.

2678. And you have also some examples of chorea or St. Vitus' dance?—Yes.

2679. You would not like to see many of those children in an ordinary school?—No, I do not think they are suitable cases. They are very nervous as a rule.

2680. Now, about the wrinkles in the forehead; that is another sign that you look at?—Yes.

2681. What is it generally connected with?—I think too much mental effort.

2682. There are some children who try too hard as well as some that do not try at all?—Yes.

2683. You have to curb some, while you encourage the others?—Yes.

Mrs. F. Anderson, Miss E. Cattle, and Miss R. Whenman.

26 Feb. 1897.

2684. You suffer a good deal from imperfect articulation in one way and another—from stammering?—Yes, throughout the centre with the majority of the children the articulation is very bad.

2685. When the children are brought to you you inquire a good deal as to the circumstances of their birth and their family history?—Yes, we have a book in which we enter all those details, the progress book.

2686. Have you found the mothers reluctant at all to give you the facts at first?—Yes, sometimes.

2687. But afterwards, when they see that a child is benefiting, they are less reluctant?—Yes, they seem to get interested in the child's work, and then we can get more facts from them.

2688. They take you into their full confidence?—Yes, in many cases; sometimes we get facts from other members of the family who come up with the children.

2689. Do you get much valuable information from the board visitors?—No. You mean the visitors who visit for the attendance?

2690. Yes, the attendance officers?—No, we only see one, and he does not have all the cases under his care. The cases are distributed amongst different officers.

2691. They do not give you information of any value?—Yes, in a few cases; but so few cases are under that one officer, and then the other officers we never see, which makes it rather awkward to get information.

2692. They have all been in public elementary schools, before they come to you?—Nearly all of them.

2693. And they have generally been in the infant school?—The younger ones; a great many have come from the boys' and girls' departments.

2694. You have admitted some, you say, at the age of 11 and 12 years?—Yes.

2695. Those have always been in schools for older children?—Yes; in a few cases they have not been to school at all where they have been too delicate, or too afflicted.

2696. Do you think that the infant school tends to develop the children or make them more dull?—I am not in a position to say. We think we should like to get them younger; we might perhaps, do, more for them.

2697. You would not keep them in the infant school till eight years of age?—I think not with the large classes in the infant school.

2698. Would you take them at the age of three?—We thought that if we could have them at five years of age we should like it.

2699. That is the better class of cases, not the worst?—Any of them, to try them to see if they are too bad for the centre.

2700. But the teachers do not seem to fill up the forms that they are asked to do very well?—We think so, but I think it is very difficult for them to judge. They have large classes; they cannot follow every child individually, I think, so far as to be able to fill up the forms very fully.

2701. They get lost in the class?—Yes, I think they do, the majority.

2702. Because the classes are 60 or 70 in number?—Yes, and even larger in some cases, I think.

2703. Larger in the schools for the older scholars, but not in infant schools, are they?—I really do not know.

2704. What information do the teachers generally give you that is of any value: do they simply say that they are too dull to learn?—No, they take every subject and tell us the progress made by the children since they have had them, and in some subjects they think they will never be able to learn, and they tell us the general habits of the children, whether they are truthful, and so on.

2705. Then you do get some valuable information?—Yes, so far as they are able to give it.

2706. And, as a rule, you find them very sympathetic?—Yes, generally.

2707. Not in all cases?—Not quite all, perhaps.

2708. Do you see the scholars brought down to be tested by the medical officer of the board and the superintendent. The number of them varies in different schools, does it not?—Yes.

2709. You get a great many from some schools to be tested?—Yes.

2710. And very few from others?—Yes.

2711. Do the children of your centre come from long distances?—Not the majority. The majority live just round about the school.

2712. What is the greatest distance that any child comes?—The greatest distance is about a mile, but I think that we have only three children who come so far.

2713. There is no centre more convenient for them?—Not for these children.

2714. What is the distance of the nearest centre to you?—I think about a third of a mile; half a mile.

2715. But these children do not lie in that direction?—No.

2716. Now you have a few children who are either deaf or blind, have you not, or partially deaf or blind?—Partially deaf or blind.

2717. How many have you partially blind?—One partially blind.

2718. And how many partially deaf?—Three.

2719. What can you do for those children?—We feel we cannot do as much as we should like to do for them. These we have quoted are cases which we think we shall have to ask the superintendent to transfer to deaf schools; they are really too deaf for us to teach; we teach them hand-work, of course, but find the greatest difficulty in arithmetic and reading.

2720. You cannot cultivate their intellects?—Not well in the reading.

2721. Now perhaps each of you will give us an account of her own class; which is the lowest?—Mrs. Anderson's is the lowest.

2722. (*To Mrs. Anderson.*) How many have you in your class?—There are 23 on the register.

2723. In how many divisions?—I have to work two divisions really, but they cannot keep together even then; I have to work them individually.

2724. Ten in one—do you divide them equally so far as you can?—The two divisions are of about the same size.

2725. Can they do their manual work together?—Yes, they do their manual work together.

2726. The whole of the children do manual work at the same time?—Yes.

2727. But for what purposes do you divide them?—For reading, and counting specially.

2728. For object lessons and colour lessons?—No.

2729. For manual training, you can take them all together?—Yes.

2730. Are there some in your class upon whom you have made no impression at all?—There is one child upon whom we have made no impression at all.

2731. How long has she been with you?—Since I have been at the centre, about 18 months.

2732. Have you any hope for the child?—No. I have no hope for that child, although her mother tells me she does so much at home; she does nothing at school, but she says when she is at home she goes over all her school work and sings the songs.

2733. That is the case that you spoke of?—Yes, she just begins to say little words aloud, but for quite a year I could not get her to make a sound at all.

2734. Which of the occupations do you find the most educative for backward children to begin with; can you put them in order of merit?—I generally begin with letting them thread beads and then they learn colour and number.

2735. You cultivate the sense of touch first?—Yes.

2736. And then the sense of sight?—Yes, and then the sense of sight.

2737. What other occupations besides beads and colours do you give them?—Then I generally see if they can prick on a line; some children cannot do that at all; it is a very simple occupation; they prick outlines of objects.

2738. And they learn to count, do they?—Yes.

2739. Can they recognise the number 3 if you ask them what it means?—Not the very backward ones.

2740. And you have not got so far as addition yet with your children, have you?—Only with objects.

2741. And can your class sing at all?—They are very fond of trying.

2742. And can they drill and march?—Yes.

2743. In a way I suppose?—Very imperfectly.

2744. Can you say anything more about the lowest class?—I see great progress in some of them; I have seen some when I went to the class that I thought would not be able to do anything at all, but I find just lately that a great many of them are making great improvements.

2745. Are you more discouraged or more hopeful with the result of your work now?—I feel a great deal more hopeful now than some little time ago.

2746. The children encourage you by their affection and docility?—Yes, they are very affectionate as a rule.

2747. (*To Miss Whenman.*) We will now pass to the middle class?—I have 22 on the roll.

2748. Perhaps you will describe your occupations there; they are higher than the lower class, I suppose?—Yes.

2749. What occupations do they follow?—They take macramé work; and with the boys (I have the boys of the three classes, while the girls do needlework), with them, I take clay modelling and painting.

2750. Brush work?—I take painting, not brush work.

2751. Do they paint from natural objects?—They usually paint little sketches, illustrative of the object lessons they have had, and flowers; they do not paint from the flower, we have the copy on the board, but they have the real flower when I can get it always. Then I also take designing with the boys; I encourage them to make designs on Kindergarten paper and colour them in, as a thing that might lead to designs for oil-cloth patterns.

2752. How many of Fröebel's Gifts do they use?—Not any in my class.

2753. In reading have they arrived at words of one syllable?—Yes, past that.

2754. Can they read a sentence?—Yes, they begin to read very nicely, some of them. I take the books that the normal child of six years of age would be reading.

2755. And then from the primer?—Yes.

2756. And in arithmetic?—In arithmetic I have three divisions, the highest division doing addition of thousands and subtraction with borrowing.

2757. Is it worth while to teach them addition of thousands?—Yes, I think so, when they understand the numbers thoroughly, and they always do that before they go on to work on slates and paper; they always understand the mental process thoroughly.

2758. Do you think they understand anything beyond 10 or 20, to realise it?—Yes.

2759. Can they realise 100?—Yes, we have 100 small objects, but I count with them first; I take all concrete till they really understand it.

2760. I understand that they do subtraction sums up to 100 and 1,000, but they cannot realise much beyond 10 or 20; is not that so?—It is very difficult for them to realise it, but I think they thoroughly understand all they are doing.

2761. (*To Miss Cattle.*) Taking the highest class now, what are the occupations of the highest class?—All kinds of needlework, macramé work, basket weaving, drawing, and some of the girls, just one or two, I have taught to cut out their own garments.

2762. What age are those girls?—About 12 years of age.

2763. Do they cut out by measurement?—No, by pattern. I have to stand and watch them.

2764. They follow the pattern, but could not measure?—They could measure, but I have not taught them to do it that way yet.

2765. In reading, how far have your children got?—I have five reading in Standard III., and nine in Standard II., and the rest are not quite in Standard I., but are preparing for that.

2766. Are those five children that are in Standard III. children that ought to be removed to an ordinary school?—Not in all cases. I have two epileptics, and the others are exceedingly delicate.

2767. But there are no mentally feeble among those five?—No.

Mrs. F. Anderson, Miss E. Cattle, and Miss R. Whenman.

26 Feb. 1897.

2768. Then, in the next section, how many feeble-minded children have you?—Those reading Standard II., most of them, are not normal.

2769. A little below the normal type?—Yes.

2770. But not much?—Not much.

2771. Do they understand the book they read?—Yes, we always make a great point of talking about the words, and having conversation generally about the lesson.

2772. You have conversation lessons about common objects, have you—about what they have seen on their way to school, and so on?—Yes.

2773. And what they see in their homes?—Yes.

2774. (*To Miss Whenman.*) Have you anything to add as to the curriculum of your school that we have not already taken notice of?—I think I have given you everything. Crochet work is taught, knitting and crochet work, with some of the girls. I think all the other occupations we have dealt with. Kindergarten embroidery in the lowest class, I think, was not mentioned.

2775. Who decides whether the children shall go to the other school?—The superintendent.

2776. That is to say, you would recommend that they should be removed?—Yes.

2777. Are the children willing to go, or are they sorry?—I do not think they are very willing as a rule.

2778. Do they feel that they are rather below the level of the other children, and so do not like to go back?—No, I do not think that is the feeling, I think our school is more like a home for them, and when they get into the larger school they cannot get quite so much consideration.

2779. You have separate playgrounds and offices?—Yes.

2780. They do not mix at all. I think I have seen the boys at play in their own ground?—Yes, the boys have their own playground, but the girls use the large playground belonging to the large school—girls and infants mixed.

2781. Could not the boys use the large boys' playground?—No, it is in a different part of the building, too far removed.

2782. Do you prefer that the girls should use the girls' playground, or would you rather that they should have a playground of their own?—We should prefer a playground of our own.

2783. Do you find that they do not play together as a rule?—No, they do not mix readily.

2784. Do you encourage them to mix?—No, because we have not been out at the same time as the other Departments. The children do not seem to care about it. I think the other children look upon them as curiosities rather, and the children do not like that.

2785. That is a thing we wish to avoid. Would it not be better that they should go out at the same time, and mix, and not be looked upon as curiosities?—I do not think that is a thing we can alter; it remains with the teachers in the large schools to do that.

2786. What size of schoolroom ought you to have for a class of 20. They want much more room than the ordinary children, do they not?—Yes, they do want larger rooms.

2787. Do you think they ought to have twice as much space?—Yes, I think so.

2788. To enable them to come out and drill and move about, and then go back to their seats?—Yes, just between the lessons.

2789. Do you get them out of their seats every 20 minutes?—Not every 20 minutes, but once or twice during the morning to give them a little change.

2790. Would it not be well to do it between each lesson?—I think it would excite them too much.

2791. Are your rooms fitted up with dual desks?—Yes.

2792. Do you prefer the single desk?—Yes.

2793. On what grounds?—We think that the teacher would have better access to the children if we had single desks.

Mrs. F. Anderson, Miss E. Cattle, and Miss R. Whenman.

26 Feb. 1897.

2794. She could approach every child on one side with dual desks, could she not?—Yes, but we want to approach them on both sides; we think we could correct bad habits better.

2795. Why do you wish to separate them?—Many of these children have habits that are not at all nice when they come first, and we want to correct those; and sometimes the children are quarrelsome, and sometimes spiteful.

2796. This applies with special force to children of the lowest class?—Yes.

2797. Of course you have great difficulty in preserving discipline at first?—Yes.

2798. But not after they have been with you a little time?—Not as a rule, except with some exceptional cases.

2799. What do you do with those exceptional cases. Do you punish much?—Not much. We have different forms of punishment.

2800. Do you use the cane?—Occasionally, but only as a last resort, when every other means fails.

2801. In very bad cases?—In cases of repeated insubordination or bad language or actions; one boy we had to cane because he was spiteful with the little children; we warned him repeatedly, but that did not answer, so we had to cane him, and find that he has improved ever since; we have not had to cane him again.

2802. What other punishments have you? — We isolate the children when they are very tiresome sometimes.

2803. Do you put them in the corner?—No, in the hall usually; the corner is not sufficient isolation.

2804. They are out of your sight, are they not?—No, we have glass windows, and we put them nearly opposite the glass windows, where we can see all that is going on.

2805. What other punishments have you? — Sometimes we take their occupations away for a day. In the afternoon, instead of having the occupations they have a writing or reading lesson, which they do not like quite so much.

2806. Those are the chief forms of punishment?—Yes, the chief forms of punishment. In the case of a child who takes her boots off and throws them at other children and occasionally at the teacher, sometimes we keep her boots for the rest of the morning until she goes home, because it is really dangerous to allow her to have them; we have little forms of punishment like that; and with different children of course different forms of punishment.

2807. Do you take in some children that really ought not to come to you, they are so repulsive from dirty habits?—Yes; but we do not have many.

2808. Can you not tell the parents you will not take them in till they have cured them?—We must take them in and try them first; we often do not find this out for a week or two.

2809. But if they are repulsive, you are not bound to keep them. The parent is the person who should bear that responsibility?—We usually keep them six months to see if we cannot make an improvement.

2810. Is it not a bad example to the other children?—I do not think so, if they are kept apart, as we always do at first, if they are like that.

2811. I have taken you through nearly all you want to tell us about; is there anything you wish to add?—A little about the time table.

2812. About the length of the lessons?—No, about the time table. We admit the necessity of the time table being rigidly adhered to as a rule, but I think sometimes, under exceptional circumstances, we ought to be at liberty to put the time table on one side.

2813. Who is the master you are complaining of now?—This is a suggestion. We do not like to do it, because we feel that if we have a time table we ought to follow it.

2814. I should have thought that you were at liberty to do what you liked for the good of the child?—That is a point we did not know.

2815. The teachers in ordinary schools have full liberty to depart from the time table, you know?—Yes, but it is seldom they want to do it.

2816. Provided it is entered in the log-book, or if it is a permanent change, then a fresh time table should be drawn up in that case and submitted to the inspector for his signature; but you are at liberty to make alterations any day you like, provided you enter it in the log-book, and give your reasons for it?—Thank you. Then I should like to ask, if I may: In the case of children who seem incapable of mental effort or improvement, but can be taught to work with their hands, might we set aside the time table entirely for those children and only follow manual occupations?

2817. I should say it would be very unwise not to follow the best methods of teaching a child. That applies, I take it, chiefly to the lowest class?—Chiefly, but not altogether.

2818. Do you put the very big boys and girls in the lowest class with the little ones?—They are arranged according to what they can do; sometimes they are rather big.

2819. (*To Mrs. Anderson.*) What is the age of the oldest?—I have one of 15.

2820. I should have thought it would be undesirable to put a child of 15 with little children?—She is a very innocent child; she is deaf. We find these big children mix very well with the little ones, provided they are gentle.

2821. (*To Miss Whenman.*) The ordinary school day for ordinary children is five hours long; is that too long for your children?—No, they can manage the five hours.

2822. And I suppose your lessons are like infant school lessons, about 20 to 30 minutes?—25 to 30 minutes.

2823. They cannot bear more than that?—Except in the occupations, then we have longer lessons.

2824. Have any of your older girls gone to cookery and laundry?—Yes, to the laundry.

2825. By themselves, or with others? —By themselves.

2826. You would not advise their being mixed with the other children?—No, because they have to be taught differently.

2827. And in what way differently?—I understand from the laundry teacher that all the writing part is left out; they cannot follow it.

2828. But the practical part is the same?—Yes, but they take longer over it. She has taken them on for a year, and that is longer than the ordinary course.

2829. What are your recreations?—For the boys we have cricket, quoits, ninepins, marbles, skipping; sometimes jumping and baseball. I think those are the principal.

2830. And the girls?—The girls have skipping, I think, battledore and shuttlecock, and games of ball.

2831. What weight are your quoits for the boys?—They are not very heavy ones; they are made of rope.

2832. The books used in the special classes are often not very suitable, I think?—We have found ours very suitable.

2833. Have they pictures?—Yes, plenty of pictures, and most of them very brightly coloured.

2834. By the children?—No, printed.

2835. You are all three certificated?—Yes, certainly.

2836. Are you paid higher than ordinary certificated teachers for the work you do?—Yes, we are paid at the rate of 15*l.* extra.

2837. And is your hope of promotion as great in the special school as in the ordinary school?—Well, I can hardly answer that; I am afraid not, from what Miss Cattle has experienced.

2838. You are changed every five years if you find you do not like it, are you not?—The five years will be up in July; we do not know what will happen then. I think we have to go up for re-appointment; but the time has not come yet.

2839. You still like the work, all three of you?—Yes.

2840. I find that is universal in special classes. There is scarcely a teacher that takes to it that does not have a sincere affection for it?—Yes, it is much more interesting than ordinary work.

2841. (*Mr. Pooley.*) At what age generally do the children leave your school?—They leave at various ages according to the way that they have got on.

2842. Do you ever keep them after 14?—We have two children over 14, at the parents' request; we do not like to turn them out.

2843. Do you know whether there is any rule of the Board against their remaining over 14 years of age?—I do not know.

2844. Would you like to keep them until 16 years of age for their own sakes if you could, for their own benefit?—Yes, we should like it if it was optional; in some cases the children would benefit greatly by being kept a little longer.

2845. You think they would benefit by being kept till 16 years of age?—Not in all cases; it should be optional.

2846. Do you think that there should be any rule laid down as to the size of a class for one teacher?—I think the lowest class should be limited to 10 if possible; it is quite as many as a teacher can teach individually.

2847. (*To Miss Cattle.*) And for the upper classes?—I think with children preparing for Standard I. and II. a class of 25 can be taken, 20 to 25, not more.

2848. And how many divisions would such a class be divided into?—Three or four divisions.

2849. Three or four for each subject, or only for some subjects?—Two in reading, three or four in arithmetic, according to how they get on.

2850. Do you think that one teacher could manage as many as 25 if they had to be divided into four divisions?—Twenty.

2851. Twenty would be better, but you think 25 would be possible?—Yes, in some cases.

2852. (*To Miss Whenman.*) Have you found that these children attend irregularly?—Yes, they do as a rule.

2853. Very irregularly?—Yes, some of them; but I that is owing to ill health. We do not find them truanting much. We have some cases of really very delicate children who really cannot attend regularly.

2854. Then if a special grant were paid, and only paid to those who attended regularly, do you think it would create a difficulty?—Yes.

2855. Do you think it would be possible to insist upon regularity of attendance as a condition of their getting the grant?—No, I do not think so.

2856. Could you expect them to attend as regularly as children in an ordinary infant school, say?—No, certainly not at our centre, where there are so many delicate cases.

2857. Have you got the average attendance in proportion to the roll?—No, I have not got it here; we can forward it to you.

2858. If you please. You mentioned several signs which indicated feeble-mindedness. I suppose you have read what has been written by Dr. Warner, and so on, about indications of feeble-mindedness?—Yes.

2859. Do you think from your own experience that you generally find some of those signs present in children who ought to be in your class?—Oh, yes, decidedly.

2860. Always, do you think, or generally?—Generally; I cannot say always.

2861. You would not find them in the case of crippled children or very delicate children?—No, nor epileptics.

2862. In epileptics you might I suppose?—Yes, you might, but not always.

2863. As to epileptic children, might not such a child have a fit so slight that he need not be removed from school?—I have not had any in my class; we take them out of the room generally, but we do not send them home.

2864. Do not they sometimes have tremors, very slight fits?—Yes, I have one child that puts her head on the desk for a little while and then gets up again.

2865. In that case she does not interfere at all with the other children?—Sometimes she wanders about the room and then I have to follow her.

2866. (*To Miss Whenman.*) As to the age at which you like to have the children. Your teaching in the lowest class is very much the same as it is in the ordinary infant school?—Yes.

2867. And you say that these children like to imitate other children. In common with most children they like to imitate what others are doing?—Yes.

Mrs. F. Anderson, Miss E. Cattle and Miss R. Whenman.

26 Feb. 1897.

2868. Then would not a child up to seven years of age be better off in an ordinary infant school as a rule, because she would be with brighter children?—Yes, but I think she is likely to get passed over in a large class, and the other children would not play with or take much notice of her.

2869. What class of an ordinary infant school would such a child be found in?—Among the babies.

2870. So far as regards Kindergarten work and occupations she would have as good a chance there, would she not, as in your class?—Yes, she might if the class were not very large. With our Kindergarten work she would get individual teaching.

2871. Supposing you take a child of five or six into your special class, he or she would go into the lowest division, of course?—Yes.

2872. And be with children, even in your class, a good deal older, up to 11, 12, and 13 years of age?—Yes, in some cases.

2873. Would not that be to their disadvantage?—I do not think so, because if they are older they only compare with normal children of four and three sometimes.

2874. I do not quite see what special advantage you think a child would get by being removed from the ordinary infant school to your lowest division?—We think they get into little habits and ways that we might prevent if we had them earlier, instead of being amongst so many where they cannot be looked after so well, and in the playgrounds also.

2875. That would only apply, I take it, to large special classes; it would not apply to a special class of 15 or 20 children of all ages with only one teacher?—No, we are thinking more of our own centre. You see we have three classes, which makes the difference.

2876. Do you think that all your girls, up to a certain age, would be better for having laundry or cookery work?—Not all of them; there are always some who cannot take it; but the majority of them would be able to take it.

2877. How would you decide which are fit for laundry and cookery; would you go by age?—No, not by age at all. We watch them in school and see that some children seem able to help in little ways; then we send for the parents and ask them if they think that the child would benefit by it. We have a case of a child now in the lowest division whose parents want her to go in for laundry work; she is almost imbecile, but not quite, she has been getting so much better lately that we think of letting her go into the laundry.

2878. Do you make any limit of age for going into laundry work?—No.

2879. Would you let them go in quite young?—Not at six years old; not till they are old enough to handle the irons and the different things that they have to use; from nine years of age, I should think.

2880. You would not prefer to have nothing but single desks, I take it—no dual desks?—Speaking for myself, I think I should. (*Miss Cattle.*) I should.

2881. (*To Miss Whenman.*) I find some mistresses say that a few dual desks are useful; they like to put two children together—one to help the other; would you say the same?—Yes, in some centres, where there is one class for all the children, it would be useful; but you see we have three divisions, and we do not want one child to be with another to show her; we teach every child ourselves.

2882. Do you not think that generally it would be better to have some dual and some single desks?—I cannot say how it would be generally. In my own case I would prefer to have them single.

2883. Would you like to employ a pupil teacher in such a class as yours. First of all do you think it would help the instruction—help the teaching?—It would depend very much upon the pupil teacher. If you were to get the proper kind of pupil teacher, I daresay she would be very useful.

2884. If you could find a pupil teacher suitable to help in the work, you think it would be a good plan?—Under the mistress; not to leave her with a little class of her own; but we should not give her very defective cases, or cases of epileptic children; she might do well

Mrs. F. Anderson, Miss E. Cattle, and Miss R. Whenman.

26 Feb. 1897.

with delicate children—children of average intelligence but delicate.

2885. Do you think it would be right for a pupil teacher to be employed in these classes; do you think it would be for her advantage or disadvantage?—I do not think it would be to her advantage; I think the children are too old perhaps—the boys especially—to have a young pupil teacher over them.

2886. Would she not get a knowledge and experience in the peculiarities of the children, which might be useful to her afterwards?—Yes, I daresay she would if she intended to take up that particular kind of work afterwards. It is a subject that I have never thought about at all.

2887. (*Miss Townsend.*) Can you tell me what proportion of the 79 children are boys—are there more boys than girls?—No, more girls than boys; I think there are 26 boys out of the 79.

2888. Only 26 out of the 79?—Yes, we have many more girls.

2889. Do you find it grows more difficult to teach the mixed classes as the children grow older?—We keep the boys apart from the girls; the boys on one side of the room and the girls on the other, and they have a separate playground; so that they do not have much to do with each other.

2890. You find that necessary, or at all events better?—Yes.

2891. Supposing that the age for remaining at school were raised from 14 to 16, should you absolutely separate them then?—Yes, I think we should like to separate the elder ones then.

2892. Do you find that the parents at the beginning object to sending their children to the class?—Some of them do.

2893. Do you find that it makes a difference when the parent has been approached beforehand from the special class, that is to say, when it is more that the children are asked to come to the special class than that they are turned out of the ordinary school?—Yes, we find that when the parents have been interviewed by the teachers in our school they are more willing to send their children; they seem to understand better what the classes are for.

2894. But they would resent a teacher sending the children to the special class without consulting them?—Yes, I do not think that is done as a rule; but they would resent it, and also they have an idea that the classes are for silly children; but if the object of the classes is explained to them they are often very grateful.

2895. It requires a little explanation beforehand, and then the parents very rarely object?—Very few of them do.

2896. Even careless or indifferent parents?—Yes.

2897. Have you children who have come from the senior school because they were found too troublesome there?—No, the only case we had that was too troublesome was a boy from the infant school.

2898. You have had no children from the upper school who have been thought too troublesome there?—No.

2899. Your objection to the infant school classes is mainly on account of their size, I gather?—Yes.

2900. The sort of instruction is the same, or nearly so, as you give yourselves?—Yes, except that I do not think they have so much Kindergarten work.

2901. But your objection is mainly that the classes are too large to give them proper attention?—Yes, that is the main objection.

2902. Do you separate the delicate children who are intelligent from the feeble-minded children, or do you put them together?—They are put together until they begin to get on with their work; then they pass on to the upper class. The teacher of the upper class has really more delicate children than feeble-minded.

2903. (*To Mrs. Anderson.*) How long have you had the child that would not speak?—She has been with me 18 months; she just begins to speak a little, but very imperfectly; we can hardly understand what she says.

2904. You are hopeful that she will; you think you have got over the worst?—I am afraid she will never do very much.

2905. (*To Miss Whenman.*) Does anyone play with the children in the playground?—Yes, one teacher goes into the boys' playground, and the other two stay with the girls.

2906. And they teach them to play?—Yes, and they prevent quarrelling, and organise games.

2907. How much open air do they get?—Half-an-hour a day.

2908. And they are five hours in school?—Yes. There is one little thing I should like to correct; it is not five hours in the schoolroom, because the half-hour is taken out of the school hours, a quarter of an hour in the morning and a quarter of an hour in the afternoon.

2909. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) Have you found any children imitating a child who makes wry faces in any way?—We had a complaint from one parent of that—only one. This child was transferred into the next class, and we have found all complaints have ceased; the boy whom he used to imitate has now left; he is over age now.

2910. That was the only occasion?—Yes.

2911. Could you tell us what is the occupation of any of the children who have left the class?—One girl is earning 4*s.* a week tying down scent-bottles; she bottles the scent and ties the stoppers down.

2912. You think the finger-training she got has enabled her to get her living in that way?—Yes; she will soon be raised to 5*s.*, so she must be doing well.

2913. (*To Mrs. Anderson.*) As to the numbers in a class, can you tell me how many you think one teacher can teach in the lowest class?—Twelve.

2914. (*To Miss Whenman.*) And in the second class?—From 15 to 18.

2915. (*To Miss Cattle.*) And in the upper class?—Twenty, thoroughly well.

2916. That would be the size you would like to have the class?—Yes.

2917. (*To Miss Whenman.*) Which subject do you find the most difficult to teach?—We find reading the most difficult.

2918. You are all agreed that you find reading the most difficult?—Yes.

2919. You have not told us anything about the drill; do your children have drill?—Yes, they have drill collectively in the hall, but the worst cases are taken by themselves in the class-room, those that need the most attention.

2920. (*Mr. Newton.*) How many class-rooms have you?—We have five class rooms.

2921. Is each class-room to accommodate 30 children?—Yes.

2922. Would it be possible in such a neighbourhood as yours to get together enough children to fill all five rooms?—I am not in a position to answer that. We have three rooms occupied and are expecting to occupy a fourth soon; I do not know about the fifth one.

2923. Are the children still coming into school rapidly so to speak, is the school growing?—Yes.

2924. Then, in a thickly-populated neighbourhood like yours, when you were building a centre, how many rooms would you build?—I think five.

2925. You would build with five?—Yes.

2926. That would be erring on the safe side, I suppose?—Yes.

2927. I think you told the Chairman that you would like to have 20 square feet of floor space for each child, did you not; you said double the usual allowance?—Yes.

2928. Would you rather have 10 square feet of that in the class-room and the other 10 square feet in the hall or corridor, or would you rather have the 20 feet all in the class-room?—I do not think we could do without our hall.

2929. Then, do you want 10 square feet in the hall and 20 square feet in the class-room?—We should like it.

2930. You would like them to have 30 square feet altogether?—Yes.

2931. But supposing you could not get that, supposing they would only give you 20 square feet, now would you rather have the 20 square feet?—Half in the class-room and half in the hall.

2932. You think the hall is essential or very desirable?—I think it is essential.

2933. Do you take drill in the hall or in a class-room?—We take the drill in the hall collectively, but the bad cases are taken in a class-room by themselves; there are only a few of them.

2934. (*To Miss Cattle.*) How many of the children are reading Hans Andersen's fairy tales?—Five.

2935. Are they among the delicate children or the dull children?—Two of them are epileptics and the rest are very delicate.

2936. But none of the defective children, properly so called, have got up to that standard in reading, have they?—No.

2937. How many of the children are doing these long sums, such as in the old days were given to Standard II. in examination?—You mean the long multiplication?

2938. Yes?—I have four children doing multiplication.

2939. Would those be the defective children?—They are just below the normal.

2940. But I suppose you would not give a distinctly defective child such a sum to do as I have here copied from your blackboard, would you?—No, not the distinctly defective.

2941. You would keep them for the delicate children?—Yes.

2342. (*To Miss Whenman.*) There is only one more question I have to ask you. You said that most of the children lived close at hand; could you say at what distance?—In the streets just immediately surrounding the school.

2943. May we say within a quarter of a mile?—Some of them are just in the same street that the entrance to the school is in; most of them would be within a quarter of a mile.

2944. I suppose you cannot give any rule as to the distance that those children could come to school?—No, not any rule. Those that come the furthest distance come to us as the nearest centre; there is no other centre nearer.

2945. And you have some big boys and girls who might go a considerable distance, if it was necessary?—Yes.

2946. I noticed five or six big ones in the school, would it be safe to send them a mile, or a mile and a half, to school?—Most of them, but not in Mrs. Anderson's class; they have to be taken charge of, somebody brings them.

2947. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) I would ask you, please, about those that you said were not likely to earn their own living. Are they the better for the training they have received in your classes, that is to say, are they more self-helpful and less helpless, and are they able to assist in minor offices at home, any of them?—Yes, all of them, with the exception of one, and she really cannot help in any way. She cannot use her hands.

2948. So that the training has not been thrown away?—No, certainly not; it has been most beneficial.

2949. To that extent?—Yes.

2950. With regard to the violent child that you mentioned, what course do you adopt to get rid of such a case; what is the course of proceeding?—We report to the superintendent, and leave the matter in her hands.

2951. You report to the superintendent and leave it to her to make a further report?—Yes.

2952. Your objection to the infant schools was not only, I think, on account of the number in the classes in which they are taught, but also that you think that if you got the children at an earlier age you could prevent bad habits from being acquired, or, at any rate, would combat the bad habits at an earlier date?—Yes, we think so; but I think that is due to the large class in the usual way, because the teacher, of course, has not the opportunity of observing the child so much. The child is lost amongst such a number.

2953. May I ask what sort of school you were in before you took up this special class work?—I was in a board school in the infant department.

2954. So that you have a practical acquaintance with the interior work of the infant school?—Yes, a thorough acquaintance.

Mrs. F. Anderson, Miss E. Cattle, and Miss R. Whenman.

26 Feb. 1897.

2955. Had you in your infant school any exceptional cases, cases that you think ought to have been in a special class?—Yes, we had several; in fact, it was those cases that made me first think of going to the work, because I found they were nearly all put into my class, and I got interested in them, and when the work was started I left the school to go into it.

2956. Was your class the lowest in the infant school?—No, it was not the lowest one.

2957. Then how was it that you came to have these defective children?—I think I was supposed to have a little more patience with them. I think that was the real reason they were put there.

2958. Then there was one other matter which interested me. You said that reading is the most difficult subject to teach these children?—We have found it so.

2959. May I ask what methods you use in teaching reading?—We combine the phonic with the look-and-say.

2960. That is to say, you do not begin teaching the letters first of all?—No, they usually learn the words first and the letters afterwards. (*Mrs. Anderson.*) We take the letters as well as the words, only we make them as interesting as possible; we take cardboard forms, and then boxes of letters, and then we take pictures.

2961. You have pictures with the names under?—Yes, the object and the name.

2962. They get to know the names and then the letters of which the word is composed?—Yes.

2963. (*To Miss Whenman.*) Have you much difficulty with arithmetic? What rather surprised me was that you said that reading was the most difficult subject. Is reading more difficult than teaching arithmetic in your experience?—We find it so, but I think the teacher in the upper class differs in that experience. (*Miss Cattle.*) No, I find the reading the most difficult. (*Mrs. Anderson.*) The counting is almost as difficult in my class as the reading.

2964. I do not mean the counting by rote, but actual calculation, and the meaning of numbers?—Yes, the recognising.

2965. Do they have anything in the way of a shop lesson which demonstrates the meaning of figures?—Yes, they had that occasionally, and they consider that lesson a good treat. (*Miss Whenman.*) We give them money lessons, too.

2966. Do they have money lessons with the real coins, or counterfeit?—We have real coins. We make a special collection of coins, and they enjoy those lessons very much.

2967. Then I think I understood that 4½ hours in school and half an hour in the playground makes up the school day?—Yes.

2968. What interval is there in the middle of the day?—From 12 till 2; two hours.

2969. Do any of the children remain on the school premises during that time?—Yes, a few.

2970. Do they bring their food with them?—Yes.

2971. Do you find there is a falling off in the afternoon attendance of those that go home?—No, not as a rule.

2972. And with regard to the 4½ hours in school, I suppose that time is not all spent at the desks; they are moving?—Yes.

2973. What proportion of the time have they for physical exercise, indoors I mean, apart from the playground?—They have a quarter of an hour's drill in the morning, and then we have little drills in between the lessons which we do not really count in the time table. That is just a change of lessons.

2974. May I ask by whom is the time table drawn up?—By the superintendent.

2975. Then I suppose if you represent to her that any deviations in the time table are desirable, it is for her to make them if she thinks fit?—Yes.

2976. Do the parents object to their children leaving your school when the time comes?—Most of them do.

2977. What is the highest age to which you are allowed to keep them now?—I do not know the limit.

Mrs. F. Anderson, Miss E. Cattle, and Miss R. Whenman.

26 Feb. 1897.

2978. What, practically, is the highest age that you have in the school just now?—We have two of 15; those are the two oldest that we have.

2979. And they are not objected to?—No.

2980. Then there was a question put to you about pupil-teachers I really do not know exactly what is the usual age of pupil-teachers when they begin their work. What is the usual age?—Fifteen, I believe.

2981. Do you think it is desirable that a girl of 15 should go to this special work before having had experience in an ordinary school?—No, I do not think so.

2982. It is better, you think, that she should have some general knowledge of school work before she specialises?—Yes.

2983. There is just one question I want to ask you about the signs that were mentioned as Dr. Warner's criteria. Have you ever seen an examination of school children by Dr. Warner?—No, I have not.

2984. You have read up the subject?—Yes, I have.

2985. Have you applied the tests that he uses?—Perhaps not the tests he uses so much as what we read in your book, your tests of educable and non-educable children.

2986. You mean what I mention as to Dr. Warner's tests?—Yes.

2987. In your answer to the question, do you mean that you do not take these signs as necessary criteria of a defective mind so much as you see that they occur in certain cases?—Yes, they do occur in certain cases, not always.

2988. Have you seen them occur in children who were not proper subjects for special classes; twitchings and movements?—No.

2989. Perhaps your attention was not called to it?—Most of the children that we have admitted with those twitchings we find suitable for the class.

2990. (*Chairman.*) You say that the children stay till 15 years of age, some of them?—We have two of 15 years of age.

2991. But those are children who are incapable of earning anything, are they not?—One boy, I think, will partially earn his own living when he leaves, but the parents, unfortunately, had not heard of the classes until lately.

2992. But directly they are capable of earning anything, do not the parents wish to have them away from the class?—No, these parents do not; they would like them to stay as long as possible.

2993. But you seem to lose them, generally, at the ordinary age of 13; is that because they are able to earn something, and so can benefit the parents?—I have not had many leave since I have been there, and those that have left mostly left under the age of 13.

2994. Can you give the causes of their leaving?—Some went to the ordinary schools.

2995. But those that left altogether?—Four went to work.

2996. At what age?—Fourteen.

2997. Then, of course, the age of compulsion ceases?—Yes.

2998. As a rule, the parents do not wish them to stay at school after 14 years of age?—No, they do not.

2999. Mr. Newton asked you about a central hall and a class-room, rather as contrasting them; but, of course, the uses of the two are quite different?—Yes.

3000. You cannot use the central hall for purposes for which you would use the small space in a class-room?—No.

3001. The central hall is for collective drill?—Yes, and singing.

3002. But you want extra space for these children in their own class-rooms?—Yes, so that they can stand for certain lessons.

3003. And come out for special lessons?—Yes.

3004. Have any of the children met with accidents while going backwards and forwards in the streets?—Not to our knowledge.

3005. Do you know how they are treated by the other children in the streets?—We have never heard any complaints.

3006. You think they are generally kind to them?—I think so, if they notice them at all.

3007. But, as a rule, they do not mix with them?—No.

3008. Are some of them obliged to come with guides, their brothers or sisters?—Yes.

3009. Nearly all of them, would you say?—No, not all.

3010. A large number of them?—Yes.

3011. (*Miss Townsend.*) Have you a piano at your centre?—Yes, we find it very useful; we could not do without it.

3012. And you cannot imagine a class of your size properly worked without it?—No; it is very attractive, we find, to the children.

3013. In giving them their drill and singing?—Yes and some of them have little dances in between.

3014. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) Will you explain a little more fully why you want power to alter the time table?—Really from certain atmospheric conditions. Sometimes, if there is a thunderstorm coming on, we have found it impossible to take the ordinary lessons, if they happen to be reading or anything of that sort; whereas if we took a singing lesson, or read a fairy story, or something more interesting, or took manual work, we could do more good.

3015. (*Chairman.*) But in ordinary schools, on hot summer afternoons, they depart largely from the time table?—We have done it very occasionally, but not often.

3016. I have known cases where the girls have sewn the whole afternoon because the atmosphere was so oppressive that it was not worth while trying to do intellectual work?—That we did not know.

The witnesses withdrew.

Mr. W. Howard and Mr. W. Mead.

Mr. W. Howard and Mr. William Mead called in and examined.

3017. (*Chairman, to Mr. Howard.*) You are Superintendent of Visitors for the Marylebone Division under the London School Board?—Yes.

3018. How many years have you held that post?—Nearly 26 years.

3019. The chief part of your work is to see that the children come regularly to school?—Yes, that is so.

3020. You have all classes of children, ordinary children, and deaf, blind, and mentally defective?—Yes.

3021. And they are all recorded under these heads in your books?—Yes, they are all tabulated.

3022. How often are the children scheduled?—Once a year under certain headings.

3023. That is to say, any peculiarities are noticed attaching to the child?—Yes, any marked ones.

3024. How many such marked categories do you make of the children?—I should think we have a dozen headings.

3025. Could you give us them?—Subject to correction (I am speaking now from memory), blind, crippled, deaf and dumb, mentally defective, sick, absent in the country.

3026. The rest are occasional causes of absence?—Yes, under surveillance.

3027. You say you have mentally defective?—Yes.

3028. Are all your visitors qualified to judge of that?—We have nothing to do with that. In the case of a mentally defective child, the superintendent and the staff will take the necessary steps to enforce its attendance at the ordinary school.

3029. Can you decide whether he is mentally defective or not?—We do not decide that.

3030. But you seem to form some opinion of them by scheduling them?—No doubt there is some idea.

3031. How is it tested whether a child is mentally feeble before they enter him in that way in their schedule?—The school roll, of course, contains an entry as to the state of the child.

3032. But there are a great number who have never been to school at all; how do your visitors classify them?—We have had to be satisfied that there was a reason for it, such as total inability to attend from bad health.

3033. But, besides health, do you judge of mental disabilities also to attend school?—Up to a certain point.

3034. And excuse them?—To a certain extent.

3035. Without medical authority for doing so?—No, we should have some authority.

3036. The doctor of the family?—Yes, or the Medical Officer of Health, or somebody who knows the child in the parish.

3037. Are those certificates generally reliable?—Yes I think so.

3038. You think you can fairly take such a certificate?—Yes. Then if there is any doubt upon it, it is referred to the medical officer of the Board.

3039. Have you any statistics to give us as to the number of defective children in Marylebone?—In the last return made up to Lady Day 1896, I find there were 36 attending board schools, 2 attending voluntary schools, making a total of 38, and 22 not attending school at all for some satisfactory reason.

3040. In all, there were 60 children out of a population of how many?—123,296.

3041. That is a school population of about 16,000?—Yes, at least. I am corrected by Mr. Mead. I find by the latest information—which, of course, Mr. Mead knows—there are 53 now attending at Capland Street, one of the centres, that is since Lady Day. The returns are, of course, made up to a fixed date.

3042. Would you be able to state what percentage to the population these mentally defective children bear?—Not off-hand.

3043. But so far as it is ascertained?—Yes.

3044. Itwould only be a rough test, because it is only your visitors' opinion?—To some extent that is so.

3045. Are they capable also of judging of deaf, blind and delicate children?—Yes, I should say so, from long experience.

3046. That is to say, whether a child was fit for a deaf school while unable to profit by an ordinary school?—I think so. They would have very good rough knowledge, anyhow.

3047. A certain number of children do not go to school at all?—That is so.

3048. Would you call those imbecile?—Yes, I should think verging on it; unteachable, anyhow.

3049. Are the parents willing to part with them to go to an institution?—A good many would only be too glad to do so.

3050. There is, of course, power for every board of guardians to send them to an institution?—Yes.

3051. Do you know why they do not avail themselves of that power?—I cannot say.

3052. Your duty ceases when the doctor declares that it is no use trying to drive them into school?—Yes, our compulsion is bounded by the police court, and the magistrate would not inflict any penalty on such evidence as that.

3053. Are these defective children less regular in their attendance than others?—I think Mr. Mead can answer that better than I can. (*Mr. Mead.*) No, I find them about the same as the others. Out of seven I have only two really irregular ones; the others attend most regularly. I have seven in my district.

3054. Who go to Capland Street?—Yes.

3055. Do you find that the parents are at all unwilling that they should go to Capland Street?—No; in fact, I may state that one lad, since he was transferred from Stephen Street Board School, has attended better than he ever used to do at Stephen Street; for what reason I do not know, whether it is any influence at the school of the teacher, or what not.

3056. But the parents are generally willing that they should go?—Yes.

3057. In some districts they call them the silly schools, and are unwilling that the children should go; but you have not found that to be the case?—No, they never raise any objection.

Mr. W. Howard and Mr. W. Mead.

26 Feb. 1897.

3058. Do you first explain the advantages of their going there, or do you simply name the school to them when you advise the parents?—That never comes under my heading. I find them transferred from the ordinary school to the mentally deficient school; they are simply marked off the register of the ordinary board school, and I certify them as attending the other school.

(*Mr. Howard.*) We really have nothing to do with the selection or the transfer; we are not consulted in any way.

(*Mr. Mead.*) That, I believe, rests with the board's doctor so far at present.

3059. (*To Mr. Howard.*) You never take proceedings about mentally defective children?—Never.

3060. In fact, the magistrate would not listen to you if you did?—I should say probably not.

3061. But you must have some children that have attended badly?—If so the magistrate would probably adjourn the case from time to time, and it would be most difficult to get a conviction, if not impossible. Mr. Mead reminds me that two children had to come up to the Sub-divisional Committee, that is the Attendance Visitation Committee.

3062. You mean the B. Committee?—Yes.

3063. What have the B. Committee said?—I think Mr. Mead can tell you. (*Mr. Mead.*) The one I had up last has improved since, but that child I had previously summoned when he was attending an ordinary board school. Then he was transferred to this mentally deficient school in the latter part of 1895, or early in 1896.

3064. (*To Mr. Howard.*) When they are mentally defective, do you allow them to go to the infant school or to the special class according to the wish of the parents?—We are satisfied if they go to a school; as soon as they get into the doors of a school our work ceases; we have nothing further to do with them.

3065. Do you give information to anybody that there are so many defective children in the district?—We return it to the board.

3066. And the board acts through Mr. Chard?—No doubt.

3067. And Mr. Chard acts with the superintendent of special classes?—No doubt.

3068. I think we have the machinery quite clear?—I think so.

3069. (*Mr. Pooley.*) You schedule the children once a year, I think you said?—Yes.

3070. What is the process of scheduling; do you mean to say that once a year you visit all the houses in the district?—Yes.

3071. You visit all the schools and all the houses, is that so?—Yes.

3072. And you put on your schedules children who were not on before?—Yes.

3073. Then when you go to a house, do you make any inquiry as to whether any of the children are defective or feeble minded?—It is generally volunteered.

3074. But would you make any inquiry?—No, not specially; it would be volunteered as a matter of course.

3075. Then if it is not volunteered you would not know it?—I think we should.

3076. How would you know?—They are talked about—the neighbours would know; the other children. (*Mr. Mead.*) If there has been a removal from another district, probably the child has been removed from, say, the blind or deaf school in the centre, and the neighbours talk about it, and if there is anything like parents trying to evade the law, we ask if there are any blind or deaf or dumb children living in the house.

3077. That is to say, if the family have come from another district?—Yes, especially if the case is removed from one district to another and we cannot trace them, and have reason to believe that they are in the neighbourhood.

3078. In case of a younger child coming on to the schedule who was not scheduled the year before, would you ask whether it was feeble minded or not?—As Mr. Howard says, they volunteer that statement.

Mr. W. Howard and Mr. W. Mead.
26 Feb. 1897.

3079. (*To Mr. Howard.*) But if they do not volunteer the statement, would you make such inquiry?—The majority of children not feeble minded would be so enormous that it would be absurd to ask the question in each case; we should not get above 1 in 2,000. It would be a waste of time to ask the question in each case.

3080. But you would not find it out?—Yes, I think we should; it would come out, I think, by indirect means. (*Mr. Mead.*) When a child comes to the age of five we should know; we have them in the schedule from three.

3081. (*To Mr. Howard.*) You think the parents are anxious to let you know all about their children?—I think so.

3082. (*Mr. Newton.*) Do you think that in the scheduling the existence of children is often concealed from visitors?—Sometimes it is attempted, no doubt, but not successfully for any length of time.

3083. Do you not think that parents who have a child who is very delicate might sometimes try and keep it home simply by trying to conceal its existence?—No doubt.

3084. Then to all statistics about the defective and very delicate children we ought to add something to allow for those cases of concealment?—A very fractional allowance, I should think.

3085. You think it would be small?—Yes; but Mr. Mead would be better able to answer that question, because he practically does the scheduling portion of the work.

3086. (*Dr. Smith.*) Is there any reason for believing that there are any of these mentally deficient children who are not in attendance at school other than those imbeciles you have mentioned?—I should not like positively to say there were not, but the concealment would be very difficult; we should be almost certain to find it out.

3087. And if you found it out you would take action to secure their attendance?—Yes.

3088. (*Mr. Newton.*) Then could you explain why the proportion of defective children in some divisions of London is so much greater than it is in others?—No.

3089. For instance, in West Lambeth, according to the Board's return, speaking from memory, there is one defective child to about every 2,000, and in other parts we have one returned in every 300 or 400?—I should say that there is some difference in the estimate they put on the word "defective."

3090. You would account for it in that way?—Undoubtedly.

3091. You do not think it could be explained in this way, that the demand produces the supply, so to speak, and that in the places where there are no schools for defective children, defective children are not distinguished?—There may be something in that. I have an impression that where the schools are established some of the teachers may be not unwilling to get rid of stupid children and troublesome children who are defective in one sense, but not according to the Act. That, I think, is Mr. Mead's impression too.

3092. (*Dr. Smith.*) You think that the number of defective children depends upon the definition of the word defective?—Yes, and the population of the schools.

3093. But you think that if a school exists the necessity for sending children arises?—Yes, it will be felt.

3094. (*Mr. Newton.*) Then, if we have no schools in London for defective children, very few defective children would be discovered?—I cannot say that.

3095. (*Dr. Smith.*) Have you really any experience about the parents being willing to get rid of these imbecile children; you said they were only too glad to do so in many cases?—Yes. I cannot say for the imbeciles, but it prevails to a considerable extent with children of a low class; they are only too glad to get rid of them at any cost or no cost, that is to say, a certain percentage of the very lowest class.

3096. They do not care what becomes of them?—That is so, so long as they have nothing to pay.

3097. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) Supposing that you have a recognised imbecile, do you consider that dealing with him is out of your province to a certain extent?—No.

3098.—Supposing the parent says: "This child is imbecile, and therefore cannot attend school"—what then?—There would have to be a recognised excuse for the consideration of the Sub-divisional Committee; they might, of course, accept the statement and excuse it. I personally have no power in the matter.

3099. But the Sub-Divisional Committee would not have any compulsory power that the child should be sent to an asylum for imbeciles?—No, but they might recommend it, and in that case it would be passed on to the guardians. That is optional; but they cannot enforce it.

3100. And it would be left with the parent?—Yes.

3101. (*Chairman.*) In your own division you compare the schedule with the visitor?—Yes.

3102. Is there any communication between the different divisions. Mr. Mead spoke just now of a report of these children coming from other visitors?—Yes, there is most intimate communication. As soon as a family removes it is the duty of the officer in their division to inform the superintendent of the other division into which the migration has occurred, and they are traced as far as possible.

3103. So that in the case of a family migrating from one division to another any child with any peculiarity would be noticed at once?—It would be followed up at once.

3104. (*Mr. Pooley.*) If you find in your scheduling that a child is not at school, and has not been to school and is of school age, what is the process—to whom do you report?—The process is to summon the parent to appear before what is called the "B." Committee.

3105. Would you do that as school attendance officer?—Yes; and there the parent will have to show cause virtually why he or she should not be summoned before the magistrate and fined.

3106. If you found a particular child who had never been at school, and was stated to you to be feeble-minded, should you take the same steps with regard to that child?—Quite so; it is for the Committee to decide whether the feeble-minded excuse is valid or not.

3107. Have you any reason to think that many feeble-minded children are unable to gain admission into schools at present in London?—No, I do not think so unless there is great pressure; unless there is want of accommodation all round, they would have the same facilities as an ordinary child.

3108. A medical witness stated to us the other day that in his practice he came across a large number of feeble-minded children, and that nearly invariably the parents told him that they were unable to get admission into the board schools?—That may be so; I should think it is very likely true, the board schools being mostly full.

3109. He did not know the reason; he thought they were refused admission?—No, that is not so; that I can answer. In my opinion it is not so; it would be impossible to refuse, so far as I know.

3110. If that is done anywhere, then it is because the school is full?—No doubt.

3111. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) How many feeble-minded children have been excused by your Committee?—I could not say. I see in a return that there are 22 not attending.

3112. Twenty-two feeble-minded children not attending school?—Mentally defective they call them.

3113. And they have been excused by your Committee?—They are not attending with leave, the reason being, probably, because they cannot attend; that is 22 in 92,472.

3114. Twenty-two feeble-minded children are excused attendance by the Committee?—Yes.

3115. And who decided that they were feeble-minded; the Committee alone?—The Committee; on medical evidence, no doubt.

3116. I think I can give you the names of five children in your Division who are excused, but in whose case I have never seen the medical certificate?—I should be very happy to look after them.

3117. Is Camden Town in your division?—Yes. We shall be very much obliged to you, and will look after any cases.

The witnesses withdrew.

Mr. THOMAS ALDIS called in and examined.

Mr. T. Aldis.
26 Feb. 1897.

3118. (*Chairman.*) You are Her Majesty's Inspector of Schools for the Tower Hamlets Division, and you have been there how many years?—For 11 years.

3119. And how many years have you been an inspector altogether?—25 years.

3120. You were asked to make inquiries in various schools, and to find out as many of these defective children as you could?—Yes, I inquired at a large number of our schools.

3121. Nineteen departments for older scholars you inquired into, and out of 10,438 children on the roll you discovered 56 defective cases, that is to say, one in 200, or half per cent.?—That is not of my own personal knowledge, but from the statements of the teachers who have had long experience of the children.

3122. That was of the children who come to their schools, but they did not know anything of the children outside?—No, it is entirely confined, of course, to the children in the schools.

3123. But those 56 included children who had gone to special classes from their schools?—In one or two cases it did, but only a few.

3124. You seem to have had various evidence from the teachers of infant schools?—They differ very much.

3125. Do they differ in the tests they applied, do you suppose? I will read the figures out first. Five out of seven infant mistresses denied any perceptible percentage of defective children?—One was very strong; she said she did not believe any such thing existed. She was quite sure that in all cases it was due to the child's passionate nature not being properly under control.

3126. Do you not think she must treat some children very badly and not as their nature would require?—She gave a very long account to me of her treatment of one small child that she had saved; I do not know whether you would care to hear it.

3127. Will you tell it us as briefly as you can?—The mother brought the child to school and said: "This is a regular fiend." "Very well," said the teacher, "I "will take him if you will let me do with him what I "think right." All she could do with him at first was to sit him on a table and check his bites and his kicks by occasional slaps.

3128. I think you need not go any further, we understand the character of the teacher?—When the child was nearly brought into subjection, and knew that it could not hold out much longer, it appealed to its father, and the father weakly gave way, and withdrew the child.

3129. Do you think that was proper treatment for a child of that sort?—It was the only possible treatment. You must remember that I am not now talking about a possible state of things in a perfect society; but what are you to do with children?

3130. This teacher having 70 other children to teach at the same time——?—She has 500.

3131. She was necessarily obliged to use a short and sharp method by which she could attain an end that ought to have been attained by some other methods?—I do not know about that. That is a question about which different people have different opinions.

3132. Do you think she had any pity for the child?—She loved it as her own—she had children of her own. The result was that after this unfortunate interval through the father's interference, the mother brought the child back, and it is now a well-conditioned, happy child. Every child, you see, has to learn to obey.

3133. It is now a happy, well-conditioned child in that same school?—Yes, and getting on nicely.

3134. Had the mother corrected it in the interval; how had she brought it to its senses?—It became such an awful tyrant in its home that the mother had to bring it back with tears.

3135. And then what was the result, was it slapped again in school?—As soon as the child found it was going to be firmly dealt with again, it gave way, and has been a good child since.

3136. Was that a mentally afflicted child?—No, but it would probably have become so if left alone.

3137. You think it would have become a mentally defective child if it had not been treated in this way?—Their indulgence in their passion destroys them.

3138. Another teacher, I see you say, knew of no children whom she could call defective out of 4,500 admissions?—That is so.

3139. Another recognised three out of 5,215?—Yes.

3140. On the other hand, you say that one teacher had seven out of 353 on the roll?—That is in a very bad district.

3141. And another had selected nine out of 660, but they were mostly ill-fed, and the master of the boys' school, who has now some of them, did not regard them as defective?—That is so.

3142. Then you would leave all these children, whether mentally defective or not, to the infant school?—There is nothing else you can do for them; a good infant school is surely the best place for them.

3143. You have seen some of the special classes, have you not?—I have not seen any except those in my own district.

3144. But you prefer that mentally defective children should be placed in the infant school rather than in a special class?—Certainly.

3145. From your knowledge do you think they would improve as much in an infant school as in a special class; what ground have you for your statement?—Simply because we do not meet with them. The infant mistresses again and again tell you that a child has stood still for two or three years and then it moves at last.

3146. But we are not speaking of very dull children, we are speaking of children who are congenitally defective, are there no such cases in these infant schools?—Yes, a few, but very few.

3147. But I understood you to say that they did not exist in some schools?—The teachers say they do not have them at all.

3148. Then you think that no child in London, excepting perhaps very few, require any exceptional treatment?—Not in the infant schools.

3149. You would place children of this sort in a class of 60 or 70 children?—I do not see any reason why they should not be.

3150. But in a school for older children you would teach them in a separate class?—Our experience of separating dull and backward and mentally defective children, putting them by themselves, has been most disastrous.

3151. Is that different from the former state of things?—In the former state of things children were, of course, driven through, and the result was that there was never any accumulation of them. It is the getting an accumulation of them that is so disastrous.

3152. Do you think it is desirable that any child should be driven beyond its natural pace?—I could perhaps illustrate that best by an example that occurred some little time ago. There was a girl in one of the schools without any brains at all, she could do no work whatever, and she was kept among the young children year by year, and she became gradually dirty and untidy and even spiteful; but the mistress thought she would promote her and put her up into standard IV. with the children of her own age, and the result of that was that the next year when I went the mistress was delighted; the child could not do anything and never would, but she was now good and orderly and attentive and very glad to help in all sorts of ways.

3153. She was moved from Standard I. to Standard IV.?—Yes, simply because of her size.

3154. Simply as being very backward?—She could not do anything.

3155. And she passed in Standard IV. the following year, did she?—No, she did not pass in Standard IV., but she appeared a bright happy capable girl.

3156. But equally ignorant?—Yes, equally ignorant; she never could learn anything. And that is where I think a great many children are damaged, they are kept down in company with little ones for whom they are totally unsuited.

Mr. T. Aldis.

26 Feb. 1897.

3157. Then it is on the ground of happiness that you would advise their being put forward, not on the ground of mental attainment?—Just so. And another thing is this, if you have only two or three, the teacher can give them special attention and get other children to help them.

3158. I quite share with you the objection to what is called Standard 0, but which I prefer to call a preparatory standard; but do you not think that the organisation of board schools rather tends to aggravate the evil by having a large class of mixed children, by placing these preparatory children in a large aggregated class, perhaps of 70, under one teacher?—What I always recommend is, that if a child does not move at all and you cannot make anything of him as a Standard I. scholar, he should be put up in Standard II. before leaving school, and then put up in Standard III. partly in order that you may not have so many of them together and partly because he has more suitable companionship.

3159. I am speaking of the child's own sake. He has learnt nothing in Standard I. or Standard II. because he has not learnt the preparatory work of Standard I., and yet you would put him in Standard III., being ignorant of the work of Standards I. and II.?—You must remember that supposing you were teaching an adult to read you would not put that adult, of course, through the primer, you would at once take some book that he could read and let him work straight away at that.

3160. I agree that you must build up by stages, but you gave us an instance of a child that had no lower stages on which to build up an upper stage, which is quite a different thing from teaching an adult by a rather quicker method?—It is an instance of doing in an ordinary school all that anybody could probably do for that child.

3161. You think that they are not capable of mental improvement and that therefore they may as well go forward?—There are some, certainly, who are not capable of mental improvement.

3162. Not of any kind?—Not of any kind.

3163. Do you not call those mentally defective?—They are mentally defective clearly

3164. Then if they can be improved by special treatment, would you not put them in special classes rather than push them through school without improvement?—Yes, if you had the convenience for doing it. But the grave danger is lest we discourage the teacher from doing the best with them.

3165. You are aware that there are special classes for these children, but you would prefer pushing them up through the school learning nothing, to sending them to a special class where there they could be developed and learn something?—Will they learn anything in the special classes that will be of use to them when they leave?

3166. You must take it for granted that they do, we have evidence of that, and we cannot enter into that question?—I see.

3167. You have seen a great many of these defective children in these special classes?—Yes.

3168. And you do not think it is so much lack of faculty as want of balance and power of attention and self control?—Yes.

3169. But if a teacher in one of these schools said that she found teaching even the elements of reading and arithmetic very difficult would that not modify your judgment?—Yes, but as a rule they have no power of memory, they will get hold of a thing one day, but the next day it is gone.

3170. Surely that is lack of faculty?—Yes, it is lack of faculty it is true, but there are many points on which they are very sharp and quick.

3171. I wish they were, could you name the points on which they are very sharp and quick?—Well, they are many of them quick with their fingers.

3172. We have evidence that they are not at all quick with their fingers, that the sense of touch has to be developed in the first instance?—That would depend upon the class of children you pick up.

3173. I am speaking of mentally defective children whose senses and faculties have to be developed by a slow process; you seem to contend that they have faculties equal to other children only they have a want of balance?—The simple test which I gave them certainly did not differentiate them from the other children.

3174. What was the test?—The simple test of memory, just remembering articles. They take six things and put them into bags for me, and I test how many they could remember, and the proportion that they could remember was quite as good as that of the children in ordinary schools.

3175. Then you think the Board is entirely wrong in building these special classes?—No, I do not say that.

3176. Then what advantage comes to the children or to the community from providing these special classes?—The whole question at present in our district is in a perfectly experimental stage.

3177. Have you any special classes of some date?—They have been three or four years or something like that.

3178. I must correct one error that you fall into. You say several children are probably insane?—I do not know that, that is what I am told, what my colleagues seem to think.

3179. Are you aware that the Medical Officer of the Board has seen every case and certified that they are not insane?—I am very glad to hear it.

3180. Then you will withdraw that statement, that some are insane?—I did not say that they are, I said probably.

3181. What was your ground for the probability?—Simply the statement of my colleagues who have been at the schools.

3182. But they are not experts in defining insanity?—No, but many of these children are so violent that they are a terror to the teacher.

3183. Can you tell me how many of such cases there are?—They have had to turn two out of Chrisp Street.

3184. You would scarcely call two many?—Out of the 30 children that are there two is a considerable number.

3185. Of course you are aware that they do not develop this violence at first, sometimes it appears afterwards, and sometimes it is modified by treatment?—Yes.

3186. What staff would you think the right number for a special class?—The difficulty, you see, is this: we have 30 children varying very much in age, I think some of them are 15 and some about 7; 30 of them from 7 to 15 years of age under one teacher.

3187. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) There have been two teachers at Chrisp Street since Christmas?—That has been a very great improvement, but where there is only one teacher to so many children one feels that the chance of teaching is less than in an ordinary school.

3188. (*Chairman.*) The only children that you would exclude from the special classes necessarily would be children so violent that they would be a danger to the other children?—Yes, when the children break out there is no moral control among the rest to keep them steady.

3189. But if the teachers are willing to receive them; they are better judges, are they not, than we are?—All I know is that in those two cases the teachers were very much relieved to have them go; and that was the thing that pained me most, the evident tension that there is on the teachers at these centres.

3190. But you are aware that they are very happy in those positions?—Two would be, when there are two at the centre; but when you have a teacher by herself with 30 of these defective children, it is a difficult matter.

3191. But if there is an adequate staff provided that is not the case?—It is a totally different matter if they have an adequate staff; but it is a centre with one teacher to 30 children that I dislike so much.

3192. Perhaps you have not seen a centre worked under an adequate staff?—At Chrisp Street it is so now; there is a temporary teacher just put on. At British Street there are two separate rooms altogether.

3193. You cannot speak of special classes under favourable circumstances?—No.

3194. Then, besides mentally defective children, there is another class to whom our inquiry extends, paralysed, crippled, and epileptic children; what have you to say about them?—That is one of the things in

which it appears to me that the centres are likely to work mischief. I met the other day with the case of two little paralysed children, nice intelligent children I was told, whom it was proposed to send to a centre; surely what was wanted for them was a chair that they might be carried up to their proper department and put into the proper room.

3195. Do you mean into the girls' room, up a steep flight of stairs?—Yes, if proper chairs were provided, certainly, and it would be far more satisfactory to the children. What seems to me so undesirable in these centres is putting into them children who ought to be elsewhere.

3196. Have you any epileptic children in your district?—Yes, I have had 14 cases I think, and the teachers talked very differently about them.

3197. Were they severe cases?—One master only came in contact with two severe cases, and the result was that he said they ought never to be allowed in the school. Then another, a mistress, has three, and they are all light cases, and she thinks it is very desirable that they should be allowed to be in school; and another has two, but they never have fits in the schools; another has three, but then they are very slightly epileptic. They all seem to imply that if the epilepsy is slight it is better for the child to be with the other children.

3198. Have you formed any idea what the percentage of afflicted children in your district is?—According to what the teachers say it is something like 1 in 200. I took a large number of schools, but of course that seems to be changed by the fact that the infant school teachers, most of them, refuse to recognise any of these children.

3199. (*Mr. Pooley.*) I did not gather when you made this inquiry and for what purpose?—Just recently, in the last two or three months, since I had been round to the schools for other purposes, I have inquired on this special point.

3200. Was it a voluntary inquiry?—I had heard of this inquiry, so I inquired when I went round to the schools.

3201. Then you say you made an inquiry in schools which had 10,438 children on the roll, as I understand you?—Yes.

3202. That was in your own district?—Yes.

3203. Then how did you ascertain the number of defective children, what steps did you take to ascertain the number?—I spoke to the head teachers about it.

3204. What did you ask the head teachers?—I spoke to this effect: if there were such centres available how many children are there that you think should go to them?

3205. It was in reference to some centres?—Yes. How many do you think would benefit by going? and of course the number varied greatly in different schools; some said very few, some said several.

3206. You asked how many the teachers thought would benefit?—Yes; of course they know the children thoroughly well.

3207. Did you find that the teachers as a rule thought some children would benefit by the school?—Yes, in some cases they did.

3208. How many special centres have you in your district?—We have four now; but of course they do not anything like cover the ground.

3209. Then when a teacher told you there were a certain number of defective children in that school did you look at the children?—No, I did not see the children myself, I could not tell by looking at a child at all whether it was really defective, I simply took the teacher's word for it.

3210. And did you ask whether the children in question showed any physical indication of feeble-mindedness?—No, I did not make any inquiry of that kind.

3211. Do you know that all the children who are admitted into the special classes are children who have been certified by a doctor?—Yes, I know that.

3212. And that in the great proportion of cases he has observed some physical signs of feeble-mindedness?—In most of the cases you notice that for yourself when you are at the centres.

3213. Now as to that child that you told us the story about, that got into a great passion, was not that child in a school where the teacher said they had not any defective children; did I not understand you to say so?—Yes, that was so.

Mr. T. Aldis

26 Feb. 1897.

3214. That child, then, was not represented to you as a defective child, but a passionate child?—The teacher simply asserted that if they were all firmly dealt with, and brought into discipline, most of them kept straight in consequence.

3215. But this particular child was not a defective child at all?—No, simply self-willed and allowed to have its own way at home.

3216. Then, really, the fact of that particular treatment, being sat on the table and slapped, which you say brought that child to its senses, does not help us at all?—No, I simply brought it in by the way.

3217. I understand you to express an opinion that the children now in special classes would do better in the infant school?—Not when they are older than seven, when they have no business in the infant school.

3218. You limit it to the age of infants?—Yes.

3219. Now take them when they get, say, over eight years of age. You do not say that children over that age, who are clearly defective, would do better in an ordinary school than in a special class, do you?—No, I do not say that they would, but you must remember what our experience has been. Out of five children, whom a teacher considered proper subjects for a defective class, only one was admitted; the other four were rejected by the doctor.

3220. Because the doctor did not think they were defective?—No, because he considered they were likely to die.

3221. Then these would surely be altogether exceptional cases?—I do not know how that is—that is what I was told; five were presented and only one was taken; four were rejected, not because they were not defective, but because they would not pay for the special trouble.

3222. Let us take some of the particular children now in these special classes; do you agree that, as a rule, they would get on better in a special class than in an ordinary school, I mean children over the age of infants?—I can only refer to one instance. There was a little boy sent to one of these defective classes, the father withdrew him, and he is now at the junior mixed. I took pains to see where he was, and I found that, while he could do his sums fairly well, he was only a moderate reader. I went to Chrisp Street, from which he had been withdrawn, and all the children there were precisely in the same position.

3223. Was Chrisp Street the special class?—Yes, he was sent to Chrisp Street, and the father brought him back; but educationally his position seemed to be apparently about the same, whether he had gone back to the junior mixed or had remained at Chrisp Street.

3224. Did he get on fairly well when he went to the junior mixed?—Yes, he got on tolerably.

3225. Do you not think that a child over eight years of age who cannot get on at all in the ordinary school and who, when he gets to be nine or ten years of age is still very low down and not fit to be higher than the infant class, would have a better chance of being instructed if he were sent to a special class?—Many of the teachers tell me they do not think so.

3226. You said yourself that these children wanted individual attention?—Yes, but they can get it in the large classes.

3227. You said that a child should be moved up into Standard IV. if he was only in Standard II. or III., and that the master could give him special attention?—I said the other children can; that is the main thing. That is where the help comes in.

3228. How do you mean that the other children can?—If you go into a class, it is a very common thing to see a certain number of children without books, two looking over one book. When you look more closely you see that one has the finger of the other and is guiding his hand along the page, so that the dull, backward child has his finger put, word by word, to every word, and so is helped in that way.

3229. Do you think that a defective child in a class where all the children were above him would get better instruction by being helped by one or more sympathetic children in a class, say, of 70, than if he were removed into a special class with a small number of

Mr. T. Aldis.

26 Feb. 1897.

children under a mistress could herself give him individual attention?—You must remember what the class is. I go to Chrisp Street, where, until recently, there was one teacher with 80 children.

3230. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) Not in average attendance?—That makes it worse; there were 90 when I was there, and I should say that practically the amount of attention that each child gets from the teacher is very small.

3231. (*Mr. Pooley.*) Even then would you not get more individual attention than in a class with 60 or 70 children?—The 60 or 70 are all selected, and the mass of them can go on with little help.

3232. But the particular child cannot?—But it can be helped by the bright children to a certain extent.

3233. You think that the example of a few bright children is better than special individual teaching given in a special class?—No, I do not say it is better, but we have to deal with practical things as we find them. It would not be better than, perhaps, an individual teacher helping, say, half-a-dozen; but when the numbers are so large you reach a point, of course, at which things are reversed.

3234. I am afraid I do not follow you?—The masters often tell me: "If we have a few backward children, "we can get them on; they go on slowly, but they do "do get on."

3235. (*Miss Townsend.*) You spoke of a rebellious child as if it was a type of defective children. I suppose you know, as a matter of fact, that defective children are not often rebellious; some are even too docile. Would you not think that children of that kind would interfere with the discipline of an ordinary class, because they require special indulgence and special kindness?—The discipline of an ordinary class is largely maintained by the general feeling of the class. You have an enormous mass of children working with perfect regularity in regular discipline, and the effect of that is tremendous on any child who is subjected to it. A child requires to have a very strong will to assert itself in the presence of a whole mass of children regularly conforming to rule.

3236. But I am supposing a child with too weak a will?—Then it would never be rebellious and disturb the discipline.

3237. I think it might; a child might infringe the discipline because it is feeble minded?—But the teacher would know and recognise and make allowance for that, of course.

3238. As to your treatment of putting a child up standard by standard, though it did not pass in any, is not such treatment as that just as exceptional as it would meet with in a special class, and would it not mark it out quite as plainly?—The thing we are always trying to do is to get the teachers to recognise that a large number of children can never learn anything really thoroughly, and therefore they had better pass them on as they can be passed on.

3239. I should think that refers more to backward children than to really defective children?—You cannot draw the line absolutely between them.

3240. It is a very difficult line to draw?—It is.

3241. Then as to the paralysed children that are sent to the special class because they are crippled, do you think that they necessarily feel that it is a feeble-minded class; do you not think that they might feel that it is a class for children who are afflicted like themselves, more helpless than other children?—But is not it faulty organisation to put them there; ought you not to put them with the class that they are intellectually fitted for?

3242. Intellectually, but not physically?—Yes.

3243. Surely the physical disability is as great as the intellectual one?—Yes, but they are collected in classes mainly by intellectual progress.

3244. Still, you are bound to consider their physical condition although they are at school, and a paralysed child may be physically injured by being in a class although intellectually it is up to its level, may it not?—I do not see how that can be, if the teacher has sympathy or the doctor looks after it to see that it is not overpressed in any way.

3245. It is a difficulty in a large class in an ordinary school. If that was possible there would be no need for a special class?—But is it not a case in which we want to get at those children who simply have physical disabilities, and keep them as far as possible in the running with the others?

3246. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) Do you think that a child would continue to make effort if it was always associated with its superiors?—Well, of course all these things want care. They are cases for individual attention, are they not? You can only rely on the individual teacher.

3247. Do you not think that the effect is that the child ceases to make effort, finding that it can never do work like its neighbours?—I think if it can do work that the teacher can praise, it would make some effort.

3248. With regard to Chrisp Street, the average attendance was under 20, and when it was over 20 a second teacher was placed in charge; did you know that?—I did not know that she was placed in charge in consequence of the number; I understood it was simply a temporary arrangement. But still when you have 30 on the books you may have those 30 in at any time, and those that come in least regularly are the most intractable and least helpful of them all.

3249. We never have found that they are all there, and at British Street there are two certificated teachers for 25 children?—Yes; but they are apart from each other—they do not keep each other in any countenance or comfort.

3250. They are on the same ground floor?—That is better.

3251. And at Broad Street there is a certificated teacher for 18 children?—Yes.

3252. (*Mr. Newton.*) Have you ever considered the question whether manual work is a good thing for defective children?—Certainly it is; but then, of course, all our schools that are considered worth anything have manual work for the children.

3253. But supposing you take a defective child, and put him, say, in Standard III., can you give him the same amount of manual work that you would in a special school?—No, you would not; and that would be a great advantage, of course, for him; there is no question that in that direction they get a great advantage in special classes.

3254. Do you not think that if you take a boy of 12, 13, or 14 years of age, who is making very little progress indeed, it is better to put him in a class where he will give the greater part of his time to manual work, than that he should stand still while his neighbours are studying vulgar and decimal fractions?—There is no doubt that it is better if you can get the boy into a suitable class; but I doubt whether you do not keep him back to a certain extent. There is no child at Chrisp Street, I think, that can read anything beyond the primer.

3255. But would those children be better if they were in class rooms with children of their own age but of absolutely different attainments, would they gain anything by such a change?—The children in the classes are all very different in attainments—it is a question of degree. There may be cases in which you may say it is desirable for a child to come, but many of my masters tell me that they feel they can get on with these dull and backward children and get them on slowly.

3256. But practically wherever I see these defective children in an ordinary school they are put in Standard I.?—Then that should not be, that is bad, I should hold.

3257. But you would never get any teacher to take a boy because he is 13 years of age and put him in Standard IV., V., or VI., would you?—No, but they get into Standards II. and III. I think.

3258. Occasionally into Standard II., but I saw three or four, unfortunately, yesterday in Standard I., is not that your experience?—Yes, and a sad experience too.

3259. Then you think that practically we have to choose between the preparatory class at the end of the ordinary school and the special class?—That is bad. Of course, if we have to chose between the two there is no question whatever that the special class is better.

3260. Then there is another point. You say that in the matter of instruction the teacher of the special class is hindered by the fact that the children are of different attainments?—Yes.

3261. Everybody agrees that that is true of course; but when you come to discipline, has not the teacher of the special school advantages in studying character that the teacher of a large class in an ordinary school cannot have?—I should have thought it was far harder to bear in your mind the characteristics of 30 altogether abnormal children than to have a fairly working idea of 60 or 70 normal children.

3262. Thirty is the extreme number?—But they are on the roll.

3263. Is it not possible in a special school to adapt the discipline to the peculiarities of the individuals, which you cannot do with a large class. For instance, you may have very nervous and fidgetty children and you can treat them differently when you have only a small class from the way in which you would have to treat them if you had a very large class. Is not that so?—But is not one result of that that the discipline of your special class has to be fitted into the conditions of the very weakly, nervous and feeble ones, and therefore you cannot keep a firm enough discipline for those who need a much firmer hand.

3264. I should put it in this way, that in a small class you can have a different discipline for everybody according to their character, in a large class you must have the same discipline for the whole lot?—In a small class the tone of work of the whole must be fitted practically to these who constitute the majority, and the majority are so feeble that those who would be better for something firmer have to be, so to speak, in a relaxing atmosphere.

3265. Then you do not think it would be possible to treat the children individually in a small class?—You cannot do it, the atmosphere of the place acts upon them very strongly.

(*Mr. Newton.*) I do not quite follow you there, but I will not ask any further questions about it.

3266. (*Dr. Smith.*) I do not think I want to ask you very much. I suppose, as a result of your inquiries, you find that there are different ideas prevalent as to the object of these classes?—No, I do not know that there is any very clear idea.

3267. That is what I mean; there is no very clear idea of the distinct object which is intended to be met by the formation of these classes?—No, I do not think there is.

3268. That you gather from conversation with the various teachers at the different schools?—Yes. I gather that on the one hand they are supposed to meet the needs of crippled children, whose needs are totally distinct from the needs of children whose wits are defective.

3269. Speaking generally, there is not a clear idea of the object that these classes have?—The object is too multiform.

3270. Then, if it is one of the objects to take in cripples, you think there are objections to that?—I think arrangements should be made to send them to the ordinary schools; I think the Board should have the power of arranging for having them fetched, and things of that kind.

3271. But assuming now that the desirability of forming these special classes is admitted, then I take it that you would think it desirable that the admissions should be safeguarded?—They should be most carefully safeguarded.

3272. I did not quite understand what you meant by saying that there were five children sent up from a certain school, of which number only one was admitted, and that the reason given for the rejection of the others was because they were too bad?—The expression used was that they were Mongols, a technical term that is sometimes used for children who are supposed to be certain to die of consumption before a certain age.

3273. Well, I do not know that; but they were said to be too bad as they were Mongols, you say?—That is what I was told, I was not there myself.

3274. You mean, that they were more imbecile than were generally admitted?—What I was told was that were they rejected because, though they were imbecile and of low type, they were certain to die and not grow up.

3275. I do not think that the fact of their being certain to die would have operated?—Then I was misinformed there.

3276. It might have been that the four cases were too imbecile for admission?—Yes, I see; but that striking out of a proportion at once renders it impossible to get a centre in all districts within reasonable walking distance. *Mr. T. Aldis.* 26 Feb. 1897.

3277. I am afraid I did not follow that?—If all the children that are reported as needing special assistance were capable of being admitted to the centres, we could understand that it might be possible to put a centre here and there and fill up all the ground; but if so many for one reason or another have to be rejected, we shall not have enough within a reasonable distance, unless the plan is adopted of having them fetched.

3278. But I think you are assuming that there are a very large proportion of imbeciles in London by that statement, are you not?—Well, you see, you cannot have these children cross large thoroughfares.

3279. But I mean in this you are assuming that such a large proportion will be rejected as four out of five. In this particular case it might have been so, but that is not by any means the rule; it is an exceptional experience?—Of course my experience has been, when I have been at the centres, that a large proportion of those children who were sent in have been rejected, and rejected often because they were simply the victims of ill-feeding.

3280. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) And irregularity?—Yes, all sorts of things came out.

3281. (*Mr. Newton.*) By a large proportion would you mean the majority?—I think the majority when I was at Chrisp Street.

3282. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) No, not the majority?—Then I will say a proportion.

3283. (*Chairman.*) The number of cripples in London is very small indeed comparatively, is it not?—I was told that at the Jew's school there was a sort of fund for cripples started some time ago, and they made inquiries and I think 120 poor Jews applied.

3284. We have it in evidence that the number of cripples is comparatively small as compared with the feeble-minded, therefore we must consider these classes not as meant for cripples, but for feeble-minded children specially; and we find that when these cripples and delicate children quickly find their way to the first class where the other children are of rather a higher type, they suffer comparatively little, from being kept in this mentally feeble class. So that we may consider that the lower classes of these schools are meant entirely for feeble-minded, though there may be a small admixture in the first class of cripples?—But would it not be better to leave the cripples out?

3285. I think we must leave that question out, it is more a question for the superintendent and the doctor to decide than for you or me. Now you put your own experience against the experience of all the masters who put all the feeble-minded children in Standard I. invariably. What ground have you for putting your experience against theirs?—Because I have seen cases where they managed to get them forward.

3286. But the great mass of cases are to be found by the universal practice of teachers in Standard I. or thereabouts?—And they never do any good there.

3287. But the masters say that they do more good there than they would do anywhere else, that is the universal experience?—Well, it is what we are always trying to fight against in the schools.

3288. But you would not put your own experience, would you, against the invariable experience of all the teachers?—I should look upon it as a point in which it was desirable to fight the other way.

3289. Against the invariable experience of all the teachers?—I will give you the case of that child who was pushed up.

3290. There may be a few exceptional cases of which we do not know the whole value. Where would you put all these children that the teachers with one consent put in Standard I., about the school according to their ages?—I would try and get them up.

3291. But if the teachers said they could not do that, would that modify your opinion?—Yes, if they said they could not possibly do it, but then the question of size must come in.

Mr. T. Aldis.

26 Feb. 1897.

3292. The School Board for London has drawn up a map showing the proper positions for placing schools for feeble-minded children, and there seems to be a certain number of schools wanted, so that your limit of distance fails altogether?—Then they will be able to get enough children.

(*Chairman.*) Yes, in proximity to these centres.

The witness withdrew.

Adjourned to Wednesday next at half-past 10 o'clock.

SIXTH DAY.

Wednesday, 3rd March 1897.

PRESENT:

THE REV. T. W. SHARPE, C.B., in the Chair.

Mr. H. F. POOLEY.
Mr. A. W. NEWTON.
Dr. G. E. SHUTTLEWORTH.
Dr. W. R. SMITH.
Mrs. BURGWIN.
Miss TOWNSEND.

Mr. H. W. ORANGE, *Secretary.*

Miss FRANCES ALICE COOPER called in and examined.

Miss F. A. Cooper.

3293. (*Chairman.*) You are the Secretary of the National Association for Promoting the Welfare of the Feeble-minded?—Yes.

3294. Are there certain homes under the charge of the association?—There are at present 10.

3295. Can you give us the names of those homes?—St. Mary's Home, Painswick, in Gloucestershire; two Homes of Industry at Birmingham, of which the secretary is Miss Stacey; a home under the Metropolitan Association, Scott House, Hitchin; Adcote, near Liverpool, where half of the girls are not feeble-minded, but come under the Ladies' Association, in Liverpool.

3296. Are they waifs and strays?—No; I am not quite certain, but I think it is under the Ladies' Association which Miss Ellice Hopkins started some years ago. Then there is a home at Chasefield, near Bristol; there is one started this year, Orde House, near Morpeth; there is one just started, the Mary Carpenter Home, at Bristol; and there is one opened this year also, at Halifax, in Yorkshire.

3297. How many are there altogether in the homes?—174.

3298. Boys or girls?—All girls.

3299. Which is the largest of these homes?—Those at Birmingham, I think. There are 39 inmates in the Birmingham homes.

3300. Have you a great number of applications for these homes?—Miss Stacey told me last year that she had over 300.

3301. And Miss Stacey can only take in how many?—39 in her two homes.

3302. Were they all suitable applicants?—No, I think not; some of them came under the class of idiots and imbeciles.

3303. Can you give us the proportion?—No, I have not got the proportion. The proportion of those who have applied to us in London since we first started our association, I can give you; we have had 91 applications for our London home since last October twelvemonth. Of those, one was an imbecile and one was subject to epileptic fits.

3304. When they make application have they to fill up a form?—We have a form which we have just drawn up.

3305. Can you give us the words of the form?—I think Dr. Shuttleworth knows it better than I do; he drew it up.

3306. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) I have a general remembrance of it, but would it not be well to have a copy before us in print?

3307. (*Chairman.*) You can supply it?—It is as follows: In addition to a form to be signed by some responsible person, guaranteeing the weekly payment, the following particulars are asked for: Name and address of candidate. Date and place of birth. Name and address of parent or parents. Creed of parents. Average weekly earnings of parents. What is the character of the parents? In what way does the feebleness of mind show itself? What has been her conduct as regards: (1.) Honesty; (2.) Modesty; (3.) Truthfulness. Has she shown any propensities of a dangerous character? Is she of cleanly habits? (State especially whether there is incontinence of urine.) Is the weakness hereditary? At what age first shown? What kind of manual work can she do best? Has she been in service or in any training home? (If so give particulars.) What school standard has she passed, and in what school? Has she been vaccinated? What illness or complaints has she had? Is her general health good? Name and address of referee responsible for weekly payments. Here add any particulars as to family or personal history that may aid the committee in forming a judgment as to the suitability of the case for the Alexander Home. In the event of her proving unsuitable to remain at the Alexander Home, at any time, from whatever cause, to whom should she be returned? (N.B.—The first three months to be considered as a time of probation.) Then there is a form to be signed by a registered medical practitioner.

3308. Is it drawn up to include idiots and imbeciles?—No, to exclude them. It is as follows: I certify that I have examined of and that in my opinion she is so far mentally feeble—not imbecile or insane—as to require special training in a suitable home for feeble-minded persons. is in fair bodily health and free from any infectious or contagious disease. Signed . Dated .

3309. What is the superior line generally; where do you draw the superior line?—That is left to the doctor to certify, I think.

3310. A paid doctor or a family doctor?—All the institutions that at present exist have an honorary medical officer. Our association has two honorary medical officers who have to countersign the certificate that comes from the ordinary medical officer who has signed it originally. Their certificate is given in the following form: Name. Age. Physical health and condition: (1.) Defects and development; (2.) Defects in nerve power; (3.) Defects in mental power. Facts communicated by others, stating by whom. Opinion and recommendation as to case. Dated. Signed.

3311. That certificate is given after seeing the applicant?—Yes.

3312. Do you reject many as unsuitable because they are fit to be educated in the elementary schools?—Not that I know of. You see, most of these homes only take them after 13 years of age.

3313. After school age, in fact?—Yes; the one at Hitchin takes them over 12, but I think that is the only one.

3314. These are small homes comparatively?—Quite small.

3315. You have a great variety of inmates in each, Ought they not to be better classified?—That is one great work that we are wanting to do.

3316. Could not Birmingham exchange with London and *vice versâ*, in certain cases?—It could if they were all affiliated or amalgamated under one head; but at present they are all isolated little homes, each starting on its own little pet ideas, and there is no one general rule for any of them.

3317. Have you any idea how many classes of homes you would make if you had your way?—No, but I should think it would come to at least four or five different homes.

3318. Tell us roughly what you mean?—There would be a home for fallen girls for one thing. Then a home for educable feeble-minded; and then there must be a home for those not educable. Already we find that they are a tremendous block on these homes, because the girls never can be turned out; they never will be fit to do anything except under very strict supervision.

3319. That makes three classes; are there any others you could suggest?—Then you see those are all divided—at least our idea is that they would have to be divided into those that are dangerous, that is to say, girls with very strong animal instincts; and those which were only feeble-minded and not at all vicious in any way.

3320. And then there is one more class, I think you say?—I do not know; I think those others might be put together. I think the four would, perhaps, cover them all.

3321. Some of these, of course, are really imbeciles and idiots?—No.

3322. They are dangerous, without any power of self-control?—They have very weak wills; but I do not know that you can say that they have no power of self-control, because they can be taught, or their wills might be strengthened.

3323. In fact, one medical man might classify them as imbecile, or idiotic, and another as feeble-minded?—That I do not know.

3324. You would sooner that these children were placed in homes for girls and not in institutions?—Yes. I do not think they would stop in institutions for one thing; and for another thing the whole life of an institution does not develop what one wants to develop in them.

3325. Many of them could have been placed in institutions by the guardians, I suppose?—Yes, many of them. A large proportion of the girls at present in the homes are paid for by the guardians.

3326. Have you any paying patients?—All our patients are paying.

3327. By the parents or the guardians?—Yes, by some charitable person, if not by the guardians.

3328. What is the cost per head?—It varies from 3*s.* 6*d.* down at Painswick, which is the lowest, up to 7*s.*

3329. Per week?—Per week; but, of course, that does not pay the cost of the patients, or anything like it.

3330. But it is the mere cost of maintenance?—I do not think it is even that in all homes.

3331. (*Miss Townsend.*) It is the charge that is made?—Yes, it is the charge that is made.

3332. (*Chairman.*) That is the highest payment paid by the guardians?—Yes.

3333. Is that the highest payment authorised by the Poor Law?—No, I believe the Poor Law pays 10*s.* a week; 7*s.* under 16 years of age, is it not, and 10*s.* over 16.

3334. Why do not the guardians pay you those allowances; are they penurious?—Very.

3335. Perhaps they are not aware how much they might pay you for your benevolent work?—I do not think that some of the country ones could very well pay more; it is always a difficulty getting it. The London guardians are much more liberal.

3336. If you had to plan a home how many inmates would you plan it for?—Not more than 20, and 15 would be much better.

3337. Between the ages of 13 and 18?—Between 13 and 18 would be the best if we could get it.

Miss F. A. Cooper

3 Mar. 1897.

3338. If they are fit to do anything you can send them out into life at 18; but otherwise, must they be retained all their lives as dangerous?—No, I do not think so. None of the homes have been started more than six years, so it is rather a short time to go by; but as to those who have been longest in the home, we find that every year the girls get stronger in their wills, and are more able to guide themselves; but I do not think under two or three years it would be useful to put them into these training homes.

3339. What is their state at admission generally, one of blank ignorance and inability to control themselves?—They vary so much, that that makes one of the great difficulties of the home; there are no two girls quite alike. Their idiosyncrasies are different, and their habits and everything; they have to be studied individually, and that really makes it necessary to have small homes.

3340. Have many of them been to school up to 13 years of age?—Yes, I should say the greater proportion of them have been to school up to 13 years of age.

3341. Do you know how they have been treated at the schools?—They have been left behind in every way, and they have just been put wherever the teacher would put up with them.

3342. They have really received no education whatever, or very little?—No, very few can either read or write.

3343. Is the school life thrown away upon them altogether, or have they succeeded in forming some habits?—I should think it has been of very little use.

3344. But if there had been a special school provided for them it would probably have been of great benefit?—Yes, because many of these children can be taught separate things. Some can be taught to write, but not to read, and others to draw who cannot be taught to read at all.

3345. But the ordinary school is of very little use for the class of girls that you take in?—Very little I should think.

3346. At what age do the parents find their children defective and unlike other children?—We find that the mothers and fathers never find it out till they want the girls or boys to begin to earn their living, that is to say, about 13 or 14 years of age. They had accepted them as they were, and they did not call them more stupid than their neighbours, but when they come to want them to earn their living they find they are of no use.

3347. But they must have known that they did not get on in their schools?—But few seemed to take much heed of that, I think.

3348. Are there many employments open to these girls when they leave you?—Nothing beyond small places as domestic servants at present, because if you put them into factories, or anything of that sort, which they could do, there are no homes where they can be kept out of harm.

3349. They could be employed as a sort of colony in laundry work, could they not?—Yes, some of them are very good laundresses.

3350. But they must work together, and not mix with other women?—Yes, they must be under supervision.

3351. Do you train them for any special employment in your homes?—Some of the homes do. At Painswick there is a pin factory near the home, and they send the girls to it and they do very well; but then they come home, of course, for their meals and to sleep.

3352. What kind of wages do they earn as compared with others?—Very small; they are so slow in all their work. I could not say the proportion.

3353. Is the same system of education followed at all the homes?—No.

3354. Have you any control as a Central Association, any power to suggest a system of education?—Not at present.

3355. But you have, of course, a scheme of your own that you would like to see adopted in all the homes?—Yes.

3356. Could you suggest to the Committee some idea of your scheme?—The idea was (I am talking now

Miss F. A. Cooper.
3 Mar. 1897.

after the age of 13 or 14) to give them about an hour a day of what you call book learning, but not more than that; and then to vary their work very much with musical drill and physical exercises.

3357. How would you divide the day, one hour of book learning?—We divide the one hour into half hours, half an hour in the morning and half an hour in the afternoon.

3358. There is no special time table drawn up for the guidance of the homes?—No.

3359. It is left to the matron to decide what she shall do?—It rather depends upon what work is carried on in the homes. If it is a home where laundry work goes on the hours are adapted then to the work, and if the girls go out to work at little day places (as they do at one or two) then we have to alter the hours according to the hours they go out.

3360. Then you do not place much reliance on book learning?—No.

3361. What do you mean by book learning?—Reading, sums, and geography, and that sort of thing.

3362. You do not place much reliance on object lessons, or seeing pictures, or conversation lessons?—Yes, in way of that sort they seem to be able to be much more got at than by ordinary school lessons.

3363. Of course they are too old for ordinary kindergarten work, but they might do the more advanced kindergarten work?—Yes.

3364. What staff do you employ for a home of 20 girls—a superintendent or matron?—Yes, and three people at least under her for 20 girls.

3365. What would the character of those three be?—There would be an assistant matron, and then the working matron who would do the housework with the girls, and the cooking, and if they did any washing there would be a laundry matron, they really want two for any amount of washing; supposing they did all the washing of the house, I do not think that 20 girls' washing could be done without two women to assist them.

3366. You prefer voluntary homes, you say, to institutions?—Yes, I think our association is very strong on voluntary homes.

3367. What number of managers have you for each home; is there a large committee of ladies in each case?—No, at some of the homes it is very small, only two on the committee.

3368. Are gentlemen allowed on the committees?—Yes, I think they are on all the committees, either as treasurer or in some capacity of that sort.

3369. To do the business part of the work?—Yes.

3370. But the ladies practically conduct the management of the whole thing?—Yes.

3371. Have you any power of retaining these girls if the parents wish to take them out?—No.

3372. Are they withdrawn in many cases?—Occasionally. I believe, so far as I have been able to arrive at the number, the cases that have left have been very few; that is to say, that out of the seven homes that have been going during the last four or five years, only about 12 girls have been taken away or gone away of their own accord. Some have been sent away as unsuitable, but they have not voluntarily withdrawn.

3373. If the parents found out that the child was self-supporting they would probably take her away?—The parents do, of course, try it, the more worthless parents, but they are talked over and asked to wait.

3374. Can most of the girls maintain themselves?—No, I do not think you can say that any of these girls support themselves so that they would be able to support themselves away out of the home.

3375. Then it is the affection that prompts the parents, not their interest, to take them away?—I suppose they think they could bring in something they could be useful in the house.

3376. You will not give the parents credit for any affection?—We only, as a rule, have come across the indifferent parents or vicious ones.

3377. Then it would not be necessary to have legal power of detention in that case if it is left entirely to you?—I do not say that, because as the work increases most probably we should get a better class of girls in. I think the homes, as a rule, have taken the more pitiable cases.

3378. Have you any idea of the number of such cases that ought to be dealt with, in proportion to the population?—We have it on, I think, Dr. Warner's statistics that there are 23,000.

3379. For the whole of England?—23,000 for England alone.

3380. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) That is calculated on children of school age, I think, is it not?—Yes, I should think it was.

3381. (*Chairman.*) You must add to that a certain percentage between 13 and 18 years of age if they are to be taken charge of between 13 and 18?—Yes.

3382. Can you give us some general account of any cases in any particular home that you have in your mind?—As to the status of the children?

3383. Yes?—I should think the Aubert Park Home would be the best account.

3384. Do you think you can describe it?—The number there that they take is 11 or 12; 12 is, I believe, their limit in number, and they have girls there of 24 years of age; they have taken them in from 13 to 14 and keep them up to 20 and over 20 sometimes.

3385. Have they any hope of those over 24 years of age?—No, I should think there is no hope of their being able to do anything for themselves.

3386. Do they intend to retain them or ask the guardians to withdraw them and place them in the workhouses?—I should think they meant to retain them.

3387. For life?—Yes, I should think so; I do not know that we have really gone into what is to happen to them in the future.

3388. How many such cases are there?—There were 13.

3389. And any epileptic or cripples?—No, they do not take epileptics or cripples; they only take feeble-minded.

3390. Supposing that children were left to the ordinary elementary schools, do you think it would be good that they should go to some holiday homes as a sort of break in their life?—During their holidays it would be very valuable; the only difficulty is in getting the homes to take them. Our association has been trying. I have been writing to a great many homes all round the country and they are very willing to take them in in the winter, but, of course, the schools' holidays are just the time when everybody wants the homes, and I can find no homes that will make arrangements for taking these children specially by themselves.

3391. You cannot board them out as ordinary children are boarded out in the summer?—No.

3392. They must be under supervision?—There would not be enough supervision.

3393. What are the aims of your association; you might perhaps read out a few of the rules?—The objects of the association are as follows: (1.) To collect and diffuse information on the subject of the feeble-minded. (2.) To suggest and initiate the formation of homes for the feeble-minded. (3.) To make grants in aid of such homes and to issue appeals for them, as circumstances may permit. (4.) To assist, by information or advice, matrons, teachers, parents, and others, who have the care of individuals of this class. (5.) To collect funds for printing and publishing appeals, circulars, and leaflets and, generally, for assisting the objects of the association. (6.) To promote the formation of branches of the association in town or country.

3394. Of course, it is a great struggle to maintain these homes?—Yes, the money is extremely difficult to get.

3395. In fact, it is got from personal friends of the managers?—Chiefly.

3396. The public themselves do not feel the want of them?—No.

3397. And it is very difficult to arouse public interest?—It is.

3398. And you think that State aid is almost necessary?—I think it must be, to do any really large work here. Of course, a few rich people can keep up these small homes, but they are very small in number.

3399. What is the cost of maintenance, on the whole, for each girl per year?—It is very difficult, because the homes vary, some being in towns and some quite in the country, to arrive at any estimate, but so far as we can make out it is between 20*l.* and 25*l.* per head. It is 20*l.* in the country homes, where rent and food are cheap and they have a garden. Then in the towns, of course, it is more, always past 24*l.*

3400. Then a grant of five guineas per head would not be much for an institution, it would not go far towards maintenance?—You mean a grant over and above the weekly payments by the guardians or friends?

3401. Yes, a grant from the State?—It would go some way.

3402. Perhaps you could tell us the amount of voluntary subscriptions per head; for a single home would perhaps be better?—I believe it is 100*l.* for 12 girls at Aubert Park.

3403. So that the voluntary contributions are about 8*l.* or 9*l.* per head?—They have raised about 500*l.* at the home at Adcote, near Liverpool.

3404. Is that for building or maintenances?—That is the total receipts, exclusive of the girls' payments.

3405. For how many girls is that?—23; but you cannot arrive at what that has been expended; it is very difficult to find out.

3406. Do you think that you could give us some information of that sort dividing the cost per child, the part that comes from the rates, the part that comes from voluntary subscriptions, and the part that comes from the parents?—You see all these people keep their accounts in totally different manners, and they send us up the whole receipts and the whole expenditure.

3407. (*Miss Townsend.*) They could divide their receipts, surely?—I have asked them to do so, and have tabulated the replies as follows:—

HOMES FOR FEEBLE-MINDED.

Name and Address of Home.	Maximum Number.	Number Staff.	Total Receipts.	Total Expenditure.
			£	£
Adcote, Knotty Ash, Liverpool.	17	3	509	483
Aubert Park, Highbury (closed).	12	3	340	317
Scott House, Hitchin, Herts.	20	4	514	579
Chasefields, Fishponds, Bristol.	22	4	No returns.	
Arrowfield Top 1, Enniskerry 2, Birmingham.	41	12	763	798
St. Mary's Painswick, Gloucestershire.	18	4	650	665
Orde House, Morpeth.	12	3	Only opened 5 mths.	
Mary Carpenter Home, Bristol.	15	3	Opened 1897.	
Home at Halifax, Yorks.	20	4	Opened 1897.	
Alexander House, Shepherd's Bush, London, W.	13	3	Opened 1897.	

3408. (*Chairman.*) I have gone through the main points of your evidence, have I not?—I think so.

3409. (*Mr. Pooley.*) Could you give the number of girls in these institutions, say under 16 years of age; you said 174 in all?—Yes. I do not think there would be any now under 16 years of age, unless it were at Hitchin.

3410. And at Hitchin they take them in at 12 years of age, at least they can?—Yes.

3411. Have you any under 18 years of age now?—Yes, there must be some under 18; I cannot give you the number and the ages.

3412. There is no fixed age of leaving, you say?—No, in none of the homes.

3413. Then, if you take them, as a rule, over 16 years of age have they come immediately from school?—No, I should say that the greater proportion had not come direct from school in any of the homes; that it is when the parents find the difficulty of getting them something to do and they begin to loaf about and get into mischief that they want to get them into homes.

Miss F. A. Cooper.
3 Mar. 1897.

3414. Do you profess to continue their elementary education?—Yes, they do in some of the homes, but not in all.

3415. Do you consider that they are educated in the same way as they would be educated if they remained in an elementary school?—No, I think not, because they are more educated by lectures so to say, at least by talks; they are not put down to regular lessons with sums and things of that sort.

3416. Would you consider it desirable that children of that age should continue to be educated as they are in elementary schools?—No, I should not think it was.

3417. Under a regular time-table, morning and afternoon?—I should think not. Their education is much more done by the daily discipline and the daily routine instructions than by any real what you call school work.

3418. Do you know how many are sent by the guardians out of the 174?—I cannot find out from all the homes, but out of 22 that were sent to the Bristol Home 14 were sent by the guardians.

3419. Do you know under what power they send them; I mean are the institutions certified?—Yes, they are approved at least by the Local Government Board; there is onl yone certified.

3420. Do you know under what title?—No.

3421. As a home for feeble-minded children?—Yes, as a home for feeble-minded children; I thought you meant the poor law.

3422. Then it is not considered boarding out?—No, I think it comes under a different heading.

3423. (*Miss Townsend.*) Do you think it is advisable that the school teaching of the girls should come from outside, and should be given by a trained teacher?—It would be very much better, because it would be a change to the girls and a variety and rest to the matron, and a great variety to the children.

3424. And do you think that these teachers should be specially trained?—Decidedly.

3425. Trained in special instruction, or more for the proper understanding of feeble-minded children?—More for the better understanding of what they can grasp.

3426. For recognising at once, or sooner than an ordinary teacher, what they can learn and what they cannot, and setting them to do what they can do?—Yes.

3427. You think that is the sort of training that a teacher for the feeble-minded should have?—Yes.

3428. A general comprehension of the feeble-minded child?—Yes.

3429. You think that the kind of training for the teacher would differ from what is given to a teacher of the ordinary workhouse child, because, instead of having to be repressed and treated in the mass, you have to recognise the fact that every child is different and has to be treated differently?—Yes, that they have to be individually taught.

3430. You said just now that so far as you know none of these girls were self-supporting?—I find from the homes that I have written to (those that have been the longest established), that they all deny that more than two out of the whole number have ever supported themselves.

3431. I think more than that number from Aubert Park are doing well in service?—I could not get hold of those particulars.

3432. I think, as a matter of fact, it is hardly so hopeless as you represent it?—I hope not.

3433. It is rather hard to say that none of them can be made self-supporting, I think?—Yes.

3434. Do you think it would be advisable to have permanent homes to which the failures could be passed on from these small homes?—Yes, very advisable.

3435. That is a difficulty that will be recognised more in the future than it is at present?—Yes.

3436. A mass of failures will probably accumulate in these small homes?—We have hardly had time to say what are failures at present.

Miss F. A. Cooper.

3 Mar. 1897.

3437. At what age would you pass the girls to permanent homes?—Would not that depend upon how long they have been in the homes.

3438. I suppose you would consider that age was almost an arbitrary distinction for these girls?—Yes, it does not convey much, because these girls are sometimes 10 years beyond the ordinary age.

3439. So that you might still have hope of a girl of 18?—Yes, I should think it would more depend upon the length of time that they had been in the training homes, and if, after four or five years, they have been found hopeless, then would be the time to pass them on. At present there have been no girls in the homes more than four years, so that one can hardly really judge.

3440. You think that the medical advice and inspection of these homes is a very important part of the work?—Yes.

3441. Each home should have a medical officer who takes a lively interest in the girls?—Yes, I believe it has been the making of the Aubert Park Home—the interest taken in that.

3442. Then that is as valuable a part of the speciality of these homes as any other?—Yes, quite.

3443. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) All these homes called themselves voluntary homes, I think?—Yes.

3444. Because they are mainly supported by voluntary contributions?—They all are.

3445. Do you think it is well that they should come under an Act of Parliament and so get grants?—I think it would be excellent, provided you did not take away the voluntary homes, if they could have money grants, and their powers not taken away from them.

3446. That is exactly what I want to get from you. Would you fear this might interfere with the home life of the home?—Yes; if they were put under what we call official supervision, they would come down then, not to be treated as individuals, but in the mass more.

3447. You would fear the restrictions which this would give?—Yes.

3448. Would you tell me at what age you would prefer to take these children into the training home?—As young as we could get them; that is to say between 10 and 11 years of age would be much the best.

3449. Then you would necessarily have more, as it were, school life if you took the children younger?—Yes.

3450. Then with regard to the age of leaving, you do not suggest a maximum age at which you would retain them?—I do not think you can.

3451. But what I fear is this: that yours would cease to be a training home, you would get congested with these old inmates?—But if we had numbers of homes we ought to divide them up so that they could be passed on after school life to other homes. Some would develop a liking for laundry work, and I would let them go to laundry work; others might take to basket making, or mat making, or some other work.

3452. And, irrespective of age, you would still keep them in some one of the homes?—Yes, I think so.

3453. They would hardly be training homes. Would you still continue to call them training homes if you looked upon them as permanent residences for these girls?—I suppose they are trained; I think they would go on being trained.

3454. Do you know anything of the custodial homes of America?—Only by their Reports; I have never seen them.

3455. You could not give us any idea whether you thought well of them or not; No; it reads very well in their Reports; they keep the inmates there till they are 50.

3456. But they call them custodial homes, separating the school life of the children from their adult life?—Yes.

3457. Could you tell us, in your own mind, what you think would be a fair cost per child in a town, say in London?—Including everything, do you mean?

3458. Yes, rent and all; I should like the actual cost, if you could tell us?—Only approximately; I believe that 25*l.* would cover it for a home that contained 15 children.

3459. Now about the special training of the teachers for these homes; how could a teacher get the training that you speak of?—There is a small training home now in West Kensington for these teachers of feeble-minded girls, and they are trained at the Fröebel Institute after the ordinary training for pupil teachers. I believe most of the teachers now being trained there have been pupil teachers, or have been trained to teach.

3460. So that that special training would consist in lectures, at present?—Yes, I think chiefly.

3461. You spoke about each child having its own peculiarities; how would any teacher get a knowledge of that except by experience with the actual child?—I do not think they would. Only a teacher trained to look out for those things would see them much more quickly than an ordinary person who had taken the child in class, I should think.

3462. But a trained teacher, of course, has been trained to observe child life, so she starts well, you would say, for that special work?—Yes.

3463. Are there any homes where the sexes are mixed?—No, there are no homes, at present, for boys—not one in England.

3464. Could you give us your own opinion as to mixing the sexes?—I should think it would be rather dangerous.

3465. After what age, or do you mean all through their life?—No; I should think after 12 or 13 years of age.

3466. (*Mr. Norton.*) If you admitted children, as you wish to do, at 10 or 11 years of age, how would you employ them, at school or in industrial work?—They would have to have their school for a portion of the day, and then they would do the light work of the house and such work as children of that age would do in their ordinary homes.

3467. What proportion of the day would you send them to school?—I should think if the home was an ideal home, that would depend upon each child's capabilities.

3468. But taking a rough average; I am speaking now, of course, of children between the ages of 10 and 14?—I do not think they would stand more than two and a half to three hours a day.

3469. Would you like to give that instruction inside the school, or in such classes as there are under Mrs Burgwin's care in London?—I should think decidedly it ought to go on in special classes; the ordinary school life would not do for them.

3470. I did not mean choosing between a special class and an ordinary elementary school, but choosing between instruction inside the home and instruction in the special class; which would you choose then?—I think instruction in the home.

3471. You have spoken of the children who have been in a public elementary school, and you said they had not derived much benefit from their schooling?—So far as we have seen of girls that have been admitted to these homes.

3472. Have you been able to make any observations about girls who have run wild altogether, and practically never attended a public elementary school?—We have now, at this moment, one such girl of 18, who has never had any instruction whatever; she ran wild until two years ago, when she was put to a home at Weymouth.

3473. Are those girls that run wild worse than children who have been at the elementary schools?—I do not think that we have enough basis to go upon to say that.

3474. I wanted to know if you thought that the elementary school, although it may not have done the child much good, may have to some extent kept her out of mischief by inculcating regular habits, a certain amount of cleanliness and obedience, and so on?—Personally I should think so, but I do not think we have had enough to go upon; I should think any rules that would be inculcated would be good.

3475. Then you would not take your statement that the elementary school has done no good at all without some qualification?—No.

3476. Now, as to the matter of grants. First of all, would a grant of 5*l.* a child, as is given to children in these schools for the deaf and dumb, help you?—It would be a great help decidedly, because our funds are now very difficult indeed to raise.

3477. Would such a grant tend to multiply the number of homes?—Yes, I should think so.

3478. Then, would it be possible to give such a grant to the girls over 16 years of age?—I do not know; I do not know the law about that.

3479. I suppose grants could only be given where girls were under education; and would you be able to say that the big girls, over 16 years of age were being educated in your homes?—Yes.

3480. You think you would?—Decidedly, because at 16 years of age many of them are quite as much in need of training as normal children of 10 and 11.

3481. And I suppose, if a girl of 16 is teachable, you would continue to attempt to teach her reading and such things?—Yes; this girl of 18 is now being taught who has never been taught before.

3482. And in the same way with writing or drawing, if they showed any signs of educability you would, I suppose, teach them so far as they could be taught?—Yes.

3483. Then, at the same time, I suppose there are many children of that age for whom industrial work is much fitter than school work?—I should think decidedly so.

3484. How long does it take to find that out as a rule?—I should think a few months would find that out.

3485. And if, at the end of the few months, the child was not making any progress in what you might call its book learning, you would drop it?—Yes, and teach it drawing or writing, or something that it can learn.

3486. That rule would, I suppose, apply to children of all ages in the homes?—Yes.

3487. And I suppose you would apply it to the children in the special classes. I am not speaking of your homes now, but of children in special classes, such as we have in London?—Yes, I should think so.

3488. That if they were not likely to make anything of scholars, you would employ them in any work they could do?—Yes.

3489. (*Dr. Smith.*) You have seven homes now, I think?—Ten.

3490. In different parts of the country?—Yes; but they are not all under our association—not intimately connected with our association.

3491. Are they all for girls?—Yes.

3492. What is exactly your object in these homes; is it to have them in the sense which has been suggested as custodial homes, or do you look forward for a circulation through them?—The hope is that, after some years of course, the girls will be able to earn their own living. That is really the object—to enable these girls in some way or other to support themselves and not be a drain on the workhouse or rescue homes or refuges, where they generally drift.

3493. Your experience has not, however, been very favourable in that direction up to the present time, has it?—I think most of the girls we have had to do with have been girls who would have drifted on to the streets if we had not had them; I am not saying all, but a good proportion, so far as I can gather.

3494. Do you, then, in these homes actually teach them any manual work other than they find in the ordinary routine work of a home?—Yes, I think that, in all the homes, they are taught some kind of work, laundry work in a great number. Some are taught mat making, and some knitting for rugs, and such like.

3495. You said about the laundry work that, so far as the general home was concerned, it in itself would occupy the whole time of these children?—Yes, in some of the homes, but in others they take in laundrying for profit, and then in those homes they have to employ a good many outside laundry women, and the girls help to what extent they can.

3496. Has that idea been successful at all?—I think so.

3497. Financially successful?—No. I do not think it is financially successful; but it is successful in training the girls so that in one or two cases they have been able to take small places as laundry maids.

3498. Then, as you say you have only one home in a town; have you facilities for teaching them varieties of occupations at that one home?—They have at the Birmingam home three or four occupations, and so they have down at the home at Painswick.

Miss F. A. Cooper.

3 Mar. 1897.

3499. You intend these homes for children beyond school age?—Yes.

3500. That is really the object?—Yes.

3501. Then, how would you admit a child to these homes?—By medical certificate do you mean?

3502. I do not quite know how you do it; how do you admit them now?—Well, when someone has a troublesome child they do not know what to do with, the mother applies to some charitable persons, and they write and say, I will apply to some home. Then the particulars are taken down, and it is placed with the medical officer, and he decides whether the case is suitable or not; he sees the child and says whether it is a suitable case.

3503. Then, you admit the child to your home finally upon a certificate from a medical officer?—Yes.

3504. And I suppose the retention of the child would be influenced by his opinion also. I mean if after a number of years you found that no progress was made in the way you suggest?—I think they would be kept as a means of keeping the girls out of mischief more than anything else.

3505. Supposing you found a girl was practically an imbecile, what would you do; would you still continue to keep her?—No, it would be put before the medical officer, and if that was the case, he would certify it, and the child would be sent elsewhere.

3506. That is what I mean; the retention of the child would be governed in that way?—Yes.

3507. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) I think you have stated practically that the homes are useful for the protection of adolescent girls as well as for the work that they do?—Yes, decidedly.

3508. But in some homes do they not contribute by their earnings to the cost of maintenance of the homes; at Hitchin, for instance?—They have a rule there by which they pay the girls a sort of nominal sum for the work they do, but so far as I can gather it is simply more a system of rewards than merely the actual work that they have done.

3509. I had in mind a statement that the laundry brings in a certain income at Hitchin; a certain proportion of the income?—Yes, but the amount of laundry women that they employ is very great, I think, and it really practically comes to what an ordinary laundry would be, that you start the laundry and then get the women in.

3510. Then, with regard to the children of school age, what is your objection to such children in a home in London, for instance, going to a special class outside the home, supposing there was a special school board class conveniently near?—I do not think there would be any objection, but I think my answer was that it would be better to teach them in the homes.

3511. May I ask why you think it would be better to teach them in the homes?—I was, perhaps, thinking of the practical difficulty of getting them to and fro.

3512. But it would be the same sort of teaching in the home, I suppose, practically, as would be received in special classes?—Yes.

3513. You have nothing against the system of special classes?—Oh, no.

3514. And then in the sort of instruction given in the home, I suppose you would include a considerable amount of physical and manual training, would you not?—Yes.

3515. A training leading up to useful work; training the hands to do useful work?—Yes, a training that would fit them to earn their own living by manual labour.

3516. But I referred to girls who have not been in the habit of using their hands at all, sometimes from physical defect; there would be preliminary training in school for that purpose, to enable them ultimately to use their hands in actual work?—Yes.

3517. Then with regard to grants and inspection, I suppose, of course, grants would necessarily involve inspection of some kind?—Yes.

Miss F. A. Cooper.

3 Mar. 1897.

3518. Are any of the homes at present inspected?—Hitchin is, but none of the others.

3519. By what authority is the Hitchin Home inspected?—By the Poor Law.

3520. By the Local Government Board Inspector?—Yes. The other homes are only what they call approved. What that means nobody seems to know.

(*Miss Townsend.*) Aubert Park is certified and inspected, as a matter of fact, only twice in 10 years.

3521 (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) That is to say, its condition as exceptional is known to the Local Government Board?—Yes; the others are all what is called approved by the Local Government Board; that means that the guardians send cases to them, I believe.

3522 It has been suggested that these girls should be inspected by the Lunacy Commissioners; have you any opinion as to that?—It seemed to be thought by all our committee that the Lunacy Commissioners would be a mistake; it would give the girls' friends the idea that it was a lunatic asylum, and also give the public that idea.

3523. Then I presume you hold that there is an absolute distinction between feeble-minded girls and imbecile girls?—Yes.

3524. And that you take precautions to exclude imbecile and idiot girls from these institutions?—Yes; we have tried in every way to guard the establishment against it in our prospectuses and our certificates.

3525. You have not brought the form of certificate. Perhaps I may remind you that we have in the certificate (you will correct me if I am wrong) a phrase that so-and-so is feeble-minded or mentally feeble (I forget which), but not imbecile or insane?—Yes, that is how it runs.

3526. Then, with regard to the training of teachers, some questions have been asked, and you have given some information about teachers undergoing training in connexion with the special course at the Fröebel Institute. Are you aware that they have had the privilege also of seeing the children taught in the special classes?—I believe they have attended some of Mrs. Burgwin's classes.

3527. Do you consider it very important that they should do so as a means of qualifying for their duties?—Yes, we hope to get them into the home at Alexander House, Shepherd's Bush, to help them on and help ourselves by their being taught.

3528. Then with regard to the utterly unimprovable cases, supposing that the county council should by and bye (as they propose to do in Lancashire, for instance) constitute custodial institutions for imbeciles, would the cases that after trial have proved failures be properly taken care of in such custodial institutions, do you think?—Yes, I should think so.

3529. The distinction between them and the imbeciles would not be so well marked?—No.

3530. Not if they had been tried and found to be incapable of improvement?—No. The great thing would be that they would be out of harm's way and out of the way of doing harm to the public at large; there would not be the danger that they are now to the public.

3531. Their being a danger to the public and danger to themselves is really the *raison d'être* of these homes?—Yes.

3532. (*Chairman.*) Do you agree with Dr. Warner's definition of these feeble-minded children, and if you agree with it do you think the number is 20,000 for the whole of England?—I have no data to go upon.

3533. But you have read his definition of children who fall under this class?—Yes.

3534. Does that agree with your own ideas?—Perhaps it is a little extended, but I have no authority to say.

3535. Twenty thousand children would require 1,000 homes, you see, at 20 apiece?—Yes, I should think that was rather a large number; but my experience is very limited, of course, compared to Dr. Warner's.

3536. Is it not unwise to waste voluntary effort in keeping incurable girls in the homes, as you do at present?—No, I should not have thought so. Every movement in England has begun in a voluntary way.

3537. But your homes seem to be devoted to the worst class of feeble-minded, almost incurable in every case?—I do not think we have been working long enough to say that; I can only tell you that of the cases in the three homes that have been working longest very few have been turned out. Miss Townsend corrected me and said Aubert Park had turned out some; but the letters that I have from the homes at Birmingham, Liverpool, and Bristol gave only two in one, and one in another, and three in another, that they have turned out in the four years; but then they have only worked four years.

(*Miss Townsend.*) And at Aubert Park also we returned the incurable cases; we did not keep them, so that that made room for others coming in.

3538. (*Chairman.*) The Local Government Board, you say, inspects the homes. What do you mean by "inspect"; do they examine the children as to their mental capacity, or merely the general arrangements of the home?—I think it is merely the general arrangement of the home, but I have not had anything to do with that inspection, so I cannot say.

3539. Under what Act of Parliament have the Local Government Board the power to inspect homes for the children?—I do not know.

3540. (*Mr. Pooley.*) Do you know that the guardians have power under the 42 & 43 Vict. c. 54 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, "to subscribe towards any asylum "or institution for blind persons, or for deaf and dumb "persons, or for persons suffering from any permanent "or natural infirmity or towards any association or "society for aiding such persons, or towards any "other asylum or institution which appears to the "guardians, with such consent as aforesaid, to be "calculated to render useful aid in the administration "of the relief of the poor"?—That is the Act and the clause under which we get help from the guardians.

3541. The section goes on: "Provided that nothing "herein contained shall authorise any subscription to "any asylum or institution unless the Local Govern-"ment Board be satisfied that the paupers under the "guardians have or could have assistance in case "of necessity"?—That is so.

3542. (*Chairman.*) In the case of the blind and deaf children the guardians had power to make grants towards the maintenance of those children without making the parent a pauper?—Yes.

3543. But it seems that in other cases they have no such power unless the parent is a pauper?—Well, they do it (I do not know about their powers) because we have a girl now paid for by the guardians.

3544. Whose parents are not paupers?—So far as we know. I do not know very much about the parents, except that they are very bad.

The witness withdrew.

Major-General F. J. Moberly.

Major-General FRANCIS JOHN MOBERLY called in and examined.

3545. (*Chairman.*) You are Vice-Chairman of the School Board for London?—Yes.

3546. You know the terms of reference to this Committee?—Yes.

3547. We have agreed to say that the word "idiot" or "imbecile" may be said for the present to mean "not capable of being educated so as to be wholly or partially "self-supporting"; and so we have to deal in this Inquiry with the class of children intermediate between those who are incapable of earning their living and those who can properly be taught in ordinary elementary schools by ordinary methods; that is to say, children who ought to be taught in special classes. Would you agree with that?—Are you going to give them any special name? You have taken away the term imbecile.

3548. They are called feeble-minded in the reference, and we have rather tried to extend that definition to mean children who are capable of earning their own living wholly or partially in after life; but if they were idiots or imbeciles they would not be capable of being educated so as to become, in a degree, self-supporting?—We have been rather inclined to hold that an imbecile was something better than an idiot.

3549. Capable of earning his own living?—Capable of doing something, at any rate, towards it.

3550. You have a considerable number of such children under your care in the special classes?—Yes.

3551. And each case is sifted by a committee before it is admitted to a special class?—Yes.

3552. This committee consists of the medical officer of the Board and the superintendent of schools for special instruction, and the inspector of the district is invited to attend?—Yes.

3553. The head teacher sends down a batch of children to be discriminated by this committee, of whom a good many are sent back at once to the ordinary schools as not being really defective, a certain number are admitted to the special school, and a few rejected as uneducable?—Yes, I do not know that the words "good many" are quite fair, when you say that a good many are sent back to the school.

3554. It varies with the different schools, I suppose; I have seen a good many sent back in some, and in other cases scarcely any?—You have more information than I have, no doubt.

3555. But it is impossible to set up a similar standard in all parts of London, because the types of defective children seem to vary with the localities in some degree, so that each case is really individual, and has to be considered on its own merits?—Yes, quite so.

3556. There are a certain number of children who do not attend school at all, because they are excused by your attendance officers; but they bring up the cases before the committees of the board, and when they are sanctioned by medical certificate, then the attendance officer is authorised to excuse them from attendance at school?—Yes; I am not at all sure that some of the attendance officers do not excuse them on their own discretion.

3557. By leave of the superintendent of their district?—I suppose so.

3558. And there must be some cases of doubt, I suppose?—Oh, yes.

3559. But your medical officer is in the last resort the final authority whether they should be admitted to the class or not?—No, I think the committee have overruled him sometimes.

3560. On medical grounds or on grounds of common sense?—On grounds of common sense. We could not attempt to go into the medical grounds.

3561. We have had great difficulty in ascertaining; in fact, we have not yet ascertained what proportion of children to the population really falls under the head of our inquiry. So far as we have gone at present, it seems to be some number between 1 per cent. and 1·5 per cent. I think the London School Board has taken typical districts, and obtained information very much to that effect?—I understood so from the clerk of the committee—that they did do that in some districts.

3562. And that agrees with Dr. Warner's investigation that the percentage should be about 1·5 or 1·3 of the children of school age?—Yes.

3563. What number would that be for the whole of London, taking the school population of London at 800,000; that would be 12,000 children?—Yes, I used to put it down as about 9,000.

3564. Twelve thousand from 3 to 13 years of age; but of course we should not take any notice of them so long as they were in the infants. It is generally agreed that it is better to leave them till seven years of age in the infant school, where they obtain some sort of suitable instruction?—Yes.

3565. So that you would leave about 8,000 or 9,000 for the children between 7 and 13 years of age?—That is what I put down roughly.

3566. You have not, of course, anything like that number at present in the special schools?—No.

3567. Can you tell us the number that there are in the special schools at present?—Mrs. Burgwin could say better than I.

(*Mrs. Burgwin.*) Up to Christmas we had just about 1,012.

3568. (*Chairman.*) We had it from Mr. Chard the other day that there were about a thousand?—Yes, I think he would know best.

Major-General F. J. Moberly.

3 Mar. 1897.

3569. Perhaps you can give us a history of the movement so far as the London School Board is concerned; how they came to take it up?—It was my own doing originally, partly that I was aroused to the idea generally that we were responsible for all the children of London before the Royal Commission upon Afflicted Children some years ago, and then I came upon one child in the Harrow Road School that I could not get sent to Darenth. The medical officer of the board of guardians would not certify her as sufficiently an idiot to be sent to Darenth, and they could not teach her in the school, and through some friends I got the child sent to a private school, where she improved so very much that she is her mother's help, and is doing some fair work. She has got no mental power, but she has a little memory and is able to do something to help her mother in her laundry work.

3570. How many years was she at the private school?—I do not know that she was there a year even

3571. But even that short time produced such a great effect?—Yes. When I first knew her her mother could not let her out without the younger sister to be her mouthpiece in any errands that were required. I met the girl the other day alone, carrying some of the clothes home, and she stopped and spoke to me and asked me who I was, and so forth, which showed an amount of curiosity which she had never done before. Then I tried to get a special class in Capland Street, in 1899 I think it was, and failed; the School Management Committee accepted the motion and dropped it very quickly; and then it was only in 1891 that there was a sudden motion in regard to it, and everybody agreed that it was a very good thing to do. We started it then systematically, engaged Mrs. Burgwin, and opened more than one class room.

3572. I see you state the number of centres here as 27 centres open, with a roll of 1,070?—Yes.

3573. Are you contemplating centres for the whole 8,000?—I cannot tell you; I have to fight for almost every centre that I want.

3574. Are there a good many more centres proposed?—Yes.

3575. And a map of London has been prepared, showing where the special centres might with advantage be placed?—The object being that when we were building anything else in that neighbourhood we should include that at the same time because it is economical to build at once; and we have placed them in such sites that they should be more easily fed by surrounding schools, not with any knowledge of what children there are there, but merely with the idea of there being so many schools around it within easy access.

3576. What distance do you think a child should come to school?—Up to this time the radius is about a quarter of a mile, it may be a little more.

3577. That is in the crowded parts; of course in the outskirts it must be more?—Yes.

3578. In the Greenwich district, for instance, they have to travel long distances to the special classes?—There is very little doing in Greenwich and that neighbourhood at all.

3579. Is it very expensive to build these centres; do you know how it works out per child?—It costs more than the others, because there are fewer children in each class-room, and because of the provision of cloak-room and corridors; the corridors are made somewhat larger than ordinary corridors to serve the purposes of a hall.

3580. Do you propose any particular size of centre. It has been suggested that there are three classes of these children that might be arranged in each centre, who would require three class rooms; have you any general plan?—No, my original idea was to have had five class-rooms, but I do not think we have ever built any centre with five class-rooms.

3581. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) Except at Greenwich?—With five class-rooms?

3582. Yes?—Not with five class-rooms, I think.

3583. (*Mr. Newton.*) Yes, there is one that you did not build, but there are five class-rooms?—Yes, that was incidentally, the room being fitted for the purpose. But my idea was originally to classify as much as we could, because I felt there was an immense variety of children that we should have to deal with and an immense variety of capacity amongst them.

Major-General F. J. Moberly.

3 Mar. 1897.

3584. (*Chairman.*) Therefore you think it would be better to build one large centre with three or four class rooms, than a greater number of small centres all over London?—Yes, I think so; but in some instances we have been obliged by the size of the site and the neighbourhood generally to restrict ourselves to only two classes. At Harrow Road we have only two.

3585. It is thought that these children require more area in their class-rooms than the ordinary children, because they require a greater amount of movement and must get up from their seat and move about in drill between lessons, a purpose for which a corridor can scarcely be used, and it has been thought that 20 square feet should be provided, as in the case of the blind and deaf. Do you agree with that? You are building at the same rate per child as the schools for ordinary children at present. What do you suggest?—I do not think it is necessary to have so much as 20 feet. You see we have allowed for the children on the roll, but they have never come up to that. I do not think we have any experience of children attending so well as to fill the class-room, and, therefore, practically they get considerably more space than theoretically they are allowed.

3586. But there would be a danger, of course, of children being compelled to fill up the full number at 10 square feet per child. Would it not be better to accept some higher space at first, and to limit the classes from 30 children, as at present, to 20, that being the largest number that any teacher of a special class can properly teach with comfort in any single class?—I have no experience of that.

3587. Do you think a teacher of a special class can teach as many as 30 children at once?—I did think so, but I have not experience enough to say.

3588. Of course, the classes are very much smaller?—They are, practically.

3589. But the teachers at present have as much as they can do, with any comfort, with these special classes. I believe the board is at present considering how to reduce the cost of construction of buildings generally?—Yes.

3590. Would that reduce the cost of buildings for these special classes; I suppose it would to some small degree?—That is merely a matter of materials.

3591. We had it in evidence the other day that a special class cost 65*l.* per head?—That must have been rather luxurious, I think.

3592. That was stated in evidence by Miss Dale, a member of the Birmingham School Board; but that, as you say, is luxurious?—Yes, I should think so.

3593. You think that they should not be admitted to special classes before seven years of age?—Yes.

3594. That they are better in the infant school till then?—Yes.

3595. The classes are all mixed classes, I think, except in one or two cases?—I thought they were all mixed; I do not know of any exceptions.

3596. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) Broad Street?—Yes, that was because there were no offices which they could easily reach.

3597. (*Chairman.*) Do you think they should be mixed up to any age, or is there some age at which you would begin to separate them?—At the age of 13 I should like to separate them.

3598. Most witnesses seem to say that at 12 or 13 you should separate this particular class of children?—Yes.

3599. How do you select your teachers; is there any special training which they go through before they come to you?—They are generally teachers in our own employment; there are a few that have been taken from other schools, but generally a member of the committee goes to see them at work in their school, and if they show any particular aptitude for the purpose, they are entertained, and then they are sent to one or other of the schools that are actually in work to see what is the process of teaching.

3600. Are they teachers who volunteer for the work?—Yes, they all volunteer.

3601. Do they lose their future prospects as to promotion by taking these classes?—I hope not.

3602. They are not lost sight of?—No.

3603. You have some rule, I believe, of bringing them up every five years?—That was an idea that struck some members of the committee when it was first originated, that we should be killing off teachers, that the work was going to be specially hard, and they were going to examine it; but I do not think any of the teachers have suffered; I think they have rather improved in health.

3604. I have found that they have not suffered, that they are all very cheerful and like their work, and they like it more the longer they stay; therefore, you are not likely to remove them, I should think, after five years?—I do not think so.

3605. Then would not that affect their prospects?—I think not. I will give you an instance; Miss Wilde, from Peacock Street, has just been sent up as one of three to be selected by the managers for the headship in a Grade III. school.

3606. I only thought that perhaps their special experience in that line would not qualify them very well for head mistress-ships of other schools of the ordinary type?—They have all had some considerable experience in the ordinary schools before they come to us.

3607. I think those are the points that you wish to bring before us?—Yes.

3608. (*Mr. Pooley.*) Can you tell us whether it is a rule of the board that a feeble-minded child is not to be excused from attending school on account of feeble-mindedness?—I think if there was any doubt about it, the board would insist upon the child being seen by the medical officer.

3609. I understood the attendance officer of your board to say the other day, that, if he found a feeble-minded child not attending school, he was bound to report the case, and not to accept that as an excuse?—Yes.

3610. Can you tell us what, as a fact, becomes of the children who are turned out of the special classes because they are uneducable; there are a few cases?—I do not know at all; I cannot tell you. There is no power to influence their parents. Personally, I have more than once induced the attendance officer to see the parents, and get them sent to Darenth.

3611. And to get them sent to Darenth it is necessary to apply to the guardians, is it not?—Yes.

3612. Do you know whether the guardians send them straight to Darenth from their houses?—I believe so.

3613. Or whether the child has to be sent to the workhouse first?—I suppose that would be a matter of great difference in procedure in different boards. But the going into the workhouse is really going into a different part of the place altogether, not amongst the ordinary inmates. I was a guardian myself in Holborn, and we certainly should not have sent a child there into the workhouse.

3614. Do you know when a child is sent by the guardians to Darenth, whether the parent of child is thereby pauperised?—I think not, I will not be sure.

3615. Do you think it is desirable that the children in the special classes for their own sakes should be retained after the age of 14 years?—In some cases no doubt it would be.

3616. Up to what age; would you have a limit of age?—I would not go beyond 16 years of age, certainly.

3617. You do not think it would be practicable to have a different age of compulsion for feeble-minded children, to make it the duty of the board to compel their attendance at special classes up to 16 years of age?—Not all, because I think many children would be very useful, practically, to whom we can give no large amount of mental instruction, and therefore they might get out and earn their living.

3618. Would it be desirable that some should get out before 16 years of age?—Yes, therefore I would not make it compulsory on the board to retain them, although, if we could draw the distinction, I should leave to the board the power to compel a child if we thought right to do it.

3619. You would have a sort of optional compulsion which the board might or might not enforce?—Quite so.

3620. You said that you think a large centre in which there could be several classes is a better organisation than a smaller centre where there can be only one or two?—Yes.

3621. In order to facilitate the erection of large centres, would you give power to the school board to pay the travelling expenses of these feeble-minded children from their homes?—I think the power would be useful, though I do not think we should use it much. It would be as well to have the discretionary power.

3622. Then if the board did not use such a power it would be necessary to have a number of classes within reach of the children's homes?—Yes.

3623. Then as a practical measure you would advocate small classes, at least, you would advocate classes within easy reach of the children's homes?—Yes. Then there are instances, in the outlying schools, for instance, where it might not be worth our while to have many centres. Generally speaking, we do put our centres where they will feed the largest number of schools.

3624. Would you give power to pay a guide as well as to pay travelling expenses?—I think it would be necessary in many cases.

3625. Do the board pay the expenses of a guide for the deaf?—For the blind we do, but I think it is confined to the blind.

3626. Do you think the school authority, either alone, or in combination, ought to have power to provide institutions for feeble-minded children?—I think so.

3627. Where there were special classes accessible, would you provide an institution for any children?—Homes do you mean?

3628. Yes, would you provide a home?—No, I think not; there would be very few I should have at all. I do not think it would be anything like as necessary as it is for the other classes, the deaf and the blind. The numbers are so much larger that we should have more centres.

3629. But you think it might be advisable to give power to provide institutions to meet cases where there was no special class accessible?—Yes.

3630. Would you prefer an institution, or arrangements for boarding out in the neighbourhood of a special class?—I think it would be as well to have both the powers.

3631. Have you any views as to the size of an institution?—No, I have not thought of that at all. I do not think we should really, so far as my experience goes, do much in that way, but I think it would be a good thing to have it in the Act at once, and not have to extend the powers afterwards.

3632. Would you limit it by the Act to power to provide small homes for not more than a certain number of inmates, say 20?—I think that would be too small. There could be no classification with only 20.

3633. No, I mean the homes for the children in the neighbourhood of special classes, not to educate, but homes in which they could live while they were attending a special class?—Yes, I should not object to that at all.

3634. You would not object to the number being limited to 20?—No.

3635. Do you think it would be satisfactory to provide for the payment of a Government grant for the special classes at the same rate as the present Government grant for the blind and deaf children, 3*l.* 3*s.* for elementary education, and 2*l.* 2*s.* for manual instruction?—Yes; it would not cover the expense, or anything near it.

3636. Do you think it is desirable that there should be a Government grant towards the maintenance of an institution supposing an institution were set up by the school authorities?—I think that would make it more popular than it is now, because there is a great deal of opposition to these homes on the ground that the ratepayers have to pay for them.

3637. Do you see any objection to empowering the school board or the school authority to pay a grant for the maintenance of the institution?—No.

3638. As distinct from education?—No, we are doing that in the case of the deaf and blind.

3639. You see no objection either to a Government grant or to a grant by the school board?—No.

3640. Which should you prefer?—I should prefer a Government grant decidedly; certainly.

3641. For the maintenance?—Yes; and as I say, it would make it more popular. The opposition on the board of those who are constantly calling out as to the objections from the ratepayers would be overcome very much by a Government grant instead of the school board grant.

Major-General F. J. Moberly.

3 Mar 1897.

3642. I do not quite know the law, but is it the case that guardians can send feeble-minded children direct from their homes to an institution?—Not without the consent of the parent.

3643. With the consent of the parents?—Yes, I believe they can in all cases.

3644. And if power should be given to the school authorities to do the same thing, would it be advisable to take away any power from the guardians, as was done in the case of the blind and deaf children, so as to prevent a conflict?—No, I would rather leave it with the guardians, but I should like to remove that consent of the parents.

3645. You would rather leave the power with the guardians to send the children?—Yes, to overrule the parents in cases of exceeding idiotcy, where I think there is danger in many cases to the people around them, and certainly as regards themselves.

3646. Yes, as regards idiots; but I mean children above the class of idiots who are merely feeble-minded?—I hope you are not going to send them to Darenth at all. As long as they can remain in our centres I want to leave them free. It is because I think they are made such utter prisoners in an asylum like Darenth, that I have upheld these special classes. As long as they are fit for any education at all, I want to keep them in our own hands and in their own homes if possible, with our centres.

3647. I was not referring to the powers of guardians to send children as idiots to Darenth, but to their power to send feeble-minded children not idiots to institutions, or to subscribe for them?—I do not know what their powers are with regard to children who are not idiots; in fact, they decline, so far as I know, to send children who are not idiots, and certified to be idiots by the medical officer of their own board.

3648. We have just been hearing evidence that feeble-minded girls are sent to homes by the guardians and paid for by the guardians?—I have no experience of that.

3649. Then, if guardians have such a power as that, you think it would be necessary to take away such power from them?—No.

3650. Or might they safely be left to work side by side with the school authorities?—Yes, I think so. I presume that the medical officers of the poor law would be more strict as to their inquiry of such children when they knew that we were able to educate them out of the institutions; but that is a mere presumption on my part.

3651. (*Miss Townsend.*) Supposing the age of education to be raised from 14 to 16, would you between those ages decidedly separate the boys from the girls?—Yes, certainly.

3652. Making provision for having them absolutely separate?—Yes.

3653. Would you welcome the alternative of sending the children between those ages for manual and physical training into small homes rather than keeping them at the special classes?—No, I think not; because we have got the power of manual training very near, if not actually in the same premises as our special classes.

3654. Would you turn the attention of the teachers of the children between those ages more to manual training than to continuing the schooling?—Yes.

3655. Whether it was in the classes or whether it was in training homes, if it seemed well to remove them from their homes between those ages?—Yes.

3656. They often become more troublesome at home as they grow older, so that it might be well to remove them later?—Yes.

3657. You know that there are a considerable number of what are called educable children at Darenth; children taught in classes?—I was surprised to find them there.

3658. Should you welcome the idea of removing them from Darenth, and placing them under the Education Department and the School Board?—Yes.

3659. Do you think it would be a reform for Darenth?—Yes, I think so.

Major-General F. J. Moberly.

3 Mar. 1897.

3660. (*Mr. Newton.*) Have you any actual rule that the children must leave the special classes at the age of 14 years?—No, we have no rules at all that we keep; we are very elastic in all our action.

3661. Then at present may a child remain at the special class until it reaches the age of 16?—I do not know that there is anything to prevent it, though I have no doubt we should remove the child.

3662. Then, at present, a child cannot remain after 14 years of age practically?—We have never got any experience of that. Mrs. Burgwin can answer that better than I can. I think, as a rule we remove them at 14 years of age.

3663. Do you think it is wise or unwise to remove them at that age?—There are a great many members of the board who would be averse to their staying there, because they say they get no grant after they are 14 years of age.

3664. Is it the fact though, that they will get no grant after they are 14 years of age?—The children do not get the grant after 14.

3665. There is no limit of age. The fee grant is limited to 15 years, but the other grant I think, goes on to any age, unless the children have passed the Seventh Standard?—I thought all grants stopped at 14 years of age.

3666. No?—It is one of the delusions that I have then.

3667. Is there any objection then, beyond that fear of some members of the board, that they might lose grants by keeping the children, to keeping them up to 16 years of age?—I think I was saying just now, that at the ages from 13 on to 16, they had better be removed from those particular classes where they are mixed up with other children.

3668. But could not the separation of the sexes be brought about by allowing the girls to stop to any age, and forming a certain limited number of classes for the bigger boys?—That could be done, no doubt.

3669. Do you think it would be a good plan?—It has never occurred to me, I have not really thought of it; I have always been under the impression that we were obliged to rid ourselves of the children at 14 years of age.

3670. I suppose if that was done a comparatively small number of classes would meet the needs of the bigger boys, because big boys, say, from 13 to 16 years of age, can walk a considerable distance?—Yes, but some of them are physically incapable, therefore a difficulty would arise there.

3671. With a few?—Yes.

3672. Then as to compulsion. Can you suggest any possible legal method by which children between 14 and 16 years of age, who are feeble-minded could be kept at school?—We have had the power under the Deaf and Blind Act, 1893.

3673. But then you can always say whether a boy is deaf or not deaf, and blind or not blind; but whether a person is feeble-minded or not feeble-minded it is very difficult to say, is it not?—I suppose that the child will have been with us some little time before; we do not receive them at 14 years of age, we are not likely to do that I think.

3674. But no definition will work unless it can be maintained in the last resort at the police court; can you think of any definition of a defective child that would hold water there?—No, really not before a magistrate; they are as various as doctors generally.

3675. One of the medical witnesses (I think it was Dr. Warner) told us he could not suggest any definition?—No, I do not see how anyone can really.

3676. Then if such a definition cannot be suggested, I suppose all idea of compulsion must be given up?—I do not know. Of course, there we are in the hands of the magistrates if they will not accept the definition, as they do not now, of all kinds of children. It is most difficult to get the magistrate here to agree with a magistrate at the other end of London.

3677. Then practically you do not think the compulsion over 14 years of age is workable?—Yes, it is, because it is workable with other children; I think it is quite workable. Of course, as I say, two magistrates on the same bench on different days may come to utterly different decisions.

3678. But what definition, then, would you suggest that could be embodied in an Act of Parliament. You see the Act defines "Blind" and the Act defines "Deaf"; "blind" is "too blind to read the ordinary "school books," and "deaf" is "too deaf to be "together along with children who can hear." What would be the corresponding words with feeble-minded children?—I can only suggest, "difficult to teach" up to that age, or even to some years young than that.

3679. Simply "difficult to teach"?—Yes; I really have not thought of it, but on the spur of the moment I am suggesting that. Could we come to some such words as that, they are in the standard of children of 12 or 14 years of age instead of what they are, their real age?

3680. What is the best plan of dealing with children in outlying districts, whether outlying parts of London or country towns?—I think in the outlying districts of London, we should have one or two class rooms instead of the larger establishments that we have in the more central parts.

3681. But they are places that have a considerable population when it is all added up, and yet will not even make a class. For instance, in such a place as Sydenham you might perhaps find six or eight feeble-minded children. What would you do with those?—There, I hope we might bring them in under that clause that was mentioned just now, their travelling expenses being paid with a guide if necessary.

3682. Or there is the other alternative of boarding them out near a special class?—Yes.

3683. Which would be best?—I should prefer if possible that they should live at home.

3684. And go up and down with a guide?—Yes.

3685. In a case like that, where a railway journey would be necessary, I suppose the guide would have to be an adult?—Not necessarily, it might be an elder sister. But there must be exceptions to all this, because if it is any distance or a tiring journey, the child would come in much more tired than if it were boarded out.

3686. Then, in the case of country towns, with two, three or four thousand inhabitants, many of those places would have just two or three or four defective children, what does your experience say is the best way of treating those?—I should think a central class room would be the best for them.

3687. That would involve sometimes a teacher for three or four children?—Yes, that certainly would be necessary I do not think that you would find the teacher of an ordinary class could take up those three or four children with the others, it would not be fair to either.

3688. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) I think the special classes include children who are feeble in body as well as in mind, do they not?—Yes.

3689. Do they include, for instance, cripples?—Yes.

3690 And are there any epileptics?—No, they do not include epileptics. There are some special classes of children who have very slight fits or who have them very occasionally; there are some in the ordinary school in the same position, but as a rule we rather exclude them.

3691. Might I ask what your idea about providing for epileptics is?—I was in hopes that we should have sent them down to some of the large institutions; that one at Chalfont St. Peters was in my mind particularly.

3692. We shall be getting information about that, so it is desirable that we should know what your ideas are?—I thought that being under the same medical supervision, it would be a immense advantage to the children if the school board was authorised (or I should like to put a stronger word than that), to send them down to start with the epileptics; but we are not at all ready to do that as yet; perhaps we shall, when a little more action is taken. I have been working with that society for a colony of epileptic children for some years; I am on their committee.

3693. Would further legal power be required to enable the school board to send the children?—Yes, we cannot start a home there at all as yet.

3694. And that I suppose, would come somewhat under the same footing as the residential establishments which you contemplate for some feeble-minded

children?—Yes, I think it is very much more important that they should be sent in to a home than the feeble-minded children, because I think the feeble-minded may very well be left with their parents; but an epileptic child as I understand would be far better if it was sent out of the climate of London into the country and with more agricultural pursuits.

3695. And regular feeding and so on, judicious feeding rather?—Yes.

3696. You alluded to having seen the patients at Darenth Asylum. I think you also saw some other asylums for so-called idiots. I know you were at the Royal Albert Asylum, Lancaster?—Yes.

3697. Did you see a difference there between the children in that asylum and the children you have in the special classes, or did you see some that are very much like children in the special classes?—Yes, in one class at Darenth I certainly saw many who would be very much on the same footing as some of our children.

3698. And also at the Royal Albert?—Yes.

3699. I speak in regard to that in view of the possibility of certain northern towns establishing special classes, as Bradford has done. In your opinion do you think children would be better living at home (such a class of children as you have alluded to) and attending special classes in their own towns, or as inmates of such institutions as the Royal Albert?—I think they would be better attending the special classes.

3700. May I ask you on what grounds you think so?—In the case of this particular child that I was telling you of in the Harrow Road School, when I asked the medical officer there, he said the child was not sufficiently idiotic to be sent to Darenth, so I went to Darenth to see what the standard was. That child we could not teach her letters, but the Darenth children went, many of them, through the multiplication table. I moved again to get the child sent to Darenth and could not get it done. Now the child is a help to its mother. I do not suppose it has learnt its letters yet, that I do not know; but its memory has been improved, and it has been made altogether a different child.

3701. Then, I suppose, it was the view of the medical officer that the child was not imbecile?—Yes.

3702. That view might have varied if there had been another medical officer; he might have taken a different view possibly, and the child might have gone to Darenth?—Yes.

3703. But the point I wanted to ascertain rather was, that with the better class of defective children (call them higher imbeciles, if you like, though we are trying to draw a line between imbeciles and defective children) are you of opinion that they are better out of institutions attending special instruction in connexion with the ordinary school system, than being in institutions like Darenth or the Royal Albert or Earlswood?—Yes, I think so. I understand the number of children who are allowed to leave Darenth after a certain time is exceedingly small, whereas at home I believe they might be made useful and earn, or help in earning, their own living.

3704. Are you aware that at Lancaster, for instance, the asylum authorities say they help children to learn trades and teach them technical work, and turn them out sometimes able to earn their living?—Yes.

3705. Still you think the isolation that they have at institutions is undesirable?—Yes.

3706. And, perhaps, the association with worse cases; is that in your mind?—Yes.

3707. And, I suppose, occasionally amongst the children that are sent to the special classes there are some absolutely imbecile or idiotic?—They are sent there, no doubt. I have seen one or two cases like that and sent them away myself.

3708. Who is the ultimate authority for sending them out of school; would the medical officer be consulted; would he have a voice in their being sent out if they were imbecile or idiotic?—All these children are sent before the committee, consisting of the medical officer and superintendent of this particular branch of work, with, I hope, generally one of Her Majesty's inspectors present.

3709. But I mean it would not be the medical officer's duty specially to report or certify that such a child is imbecile or idiotic, and unfit for being with the others in the school?—The committee reports to the sub-committee of the board that this child is unfit, and the child is rejected.

Major-General F. J. Moberly.

3 Mar. 1897.

3710. But the medical officer's report would not be taken as final; it would be an element in determining?—Yes.

3711. Then such a child who was sent out of school you would have nothing more to do with?—Yes.

3712. Is it optional with the friends whether a child is neglected or sent to an institution for idiots and imbeciles?—Yes.

3713. And you do not take account of the child being in a state of neglect?—No, we can do no more.

3714. Did I correctly understand that you wished the school authority to have compulsory power to compel parents to send their children to a resident institution if such should be instituted for the feeble-minded children?—I think it would be as well if we had that power.

3715. But, at the same time, you are not certain that it would be necessary to exercise it?—No.

3716. It is only that you wish it to be put in an Act of Parliament, to be used if needed?—Yes, we have not the power to send the children into the classes now, I should like to point out to the committee. The child is named by the master or mistress of the school, is passed by the committee that sees them, the medical officer, and the superintendent, and then the parent can refuse to send the child, and we have no power to send it; the parent falls back upon the option given in the Act of 1870 to send his child to any school he likes.

3717. Do you mean that he would send it to a voluntary school?—Yes, or he can send it to a school board school.

3718. Then if the teacher rejected it and said it was an unsuitable child for an ordinary school, what would happen?—So far as I can see at present I do not see that we can overrule his discretion, and say, this child is not fit for an ordinary board school, and we insist upon its going to a special school. I am afraid we cannot do that.

3719. Then would you wish to have compulsory legal power to send a child to a special class?—I think that is very important. I think when our medical officer has examined a child, and reported that it would probably be better educated in a special class, we ought to have the power of sending it.

3720. When your medical officer certifies it?—Yes.

3721. (*Chairman.*) You have the power, in certain cases, of discriminating what school the child shall attend, I believe?—No.

3722. I mean in the case of capricious removal from one school to another?—Still they do that you know, and I do not think it has ever been attempted to prevent it unless the school is full.

3723. If you found a child who ought to be in a higher standard in a school, which only went up to a lower standard, you would say to the parent that that child must go to a higher standard school, would you not?—But they will not go.

3724. But you have power to say that that is the proper place for instruction?—Yes, but we must induce the parents to send them; we cannot compel them.

3725. But if two schools are provided, one of which is suitable and the other unsuitable for a particular child, would you not have power to tell the parents that they must send the child to the school that is suitable?—Unfortunately we have no power to compel the child to go, and over and over again we have had instances of the parents refusing to send them.

3726. You have power to compel the child to go to school?—Yes.

3727. And it has no right to go to an unsuitable school?—But we have no right to say that it is unsuitable if it is a board school.

3728. I think you have, because the children cannot receive proper instruction there; would that not be a proper ground for saying that it is an unsuitable school?—It is difficult to draw the line. We did that in one case with the Copland Street Junior School; there we said, "This is nothing but a Third Standard school; "your child is in the Fourth Standard, and therefore

Major-General F. J. Moberly.

3 Mar. 1897.

"must go to a Fourth Standard school;" but I do not think we have any power to compel it.

3729. Would you object to try a case and see whether you have the power. Supposing that there was one suitable school and one unsuitable school, why not say to the parent, "This is an unsuitable school, and we "compel you to send the child to some suitable school"?—That has been refused.

3730. Could you not summon the parents before a magistrate?—There would be a difficulty, because the proper school in that case would be the higher school, and the special school that we want to send these children to is an inferior school, as it were.

3731. It is a suitable school, and the other is an unsuitable school?—Yes, for that particular child; but then the parent stands up and says, "My child is not "such an idiot as you call him, and I will not have him "sent to the silly school," that is the name they give the special class.

3732. I think the Board should press it, as far as they can, and say, "One is a suitable school and the "other is unsuitable; we refuse you admission to the "unsuitable school, and compel you to go to the suitable "school." Would not that be a legal position for the Board to take up?—But the difficulty would be to say that the normal board school was unsuitable. It is unsuitable for that particular child, no doubt.

3733. Would the magistrate go against the opinion of the committee?—I shall be glad to try a case. I will suggest to the committee to have it done.

3734. Then, as regards special schools that are set up, they are no additional cost to the rates, because they are part of the supply of London, are they not?—Yes, but they are additional, because we are paying the teachers more.

3735. I am speaking of the cost of building first?—They are separate buildings generally.

3736. But they come into the general supply of London, and therefore they do not cost more?—Individually they cost more per child.

3737. There may be a slight difference in the cost of building, but they come into the general supply of London?—Yes, and they are paid for from loan.

3738. And, therefore, the whole cost of building does not fall as an extra upon the rates?—No.

3739. Do you know what the whole cost is per child?—I think it comes to 22*l.*, but I had better send you that information.

3740. Is it anything approaching that for the cost of teaching?—No.

3741. We had it from Mr. Chard that the cost of teaching is 6*l.* 15*s.*, so that if you had a grant of five guineas it would be rather more than you ought to have?—It would not come up to our 6*l.* 15*s.*

3742. It would be rather more than they ought to have, because the cost of educating deaf and blind children is far greater than that?—But it is, supposing that we are also to carry these children, and perhaps maintain them.

3743. But, considering that the classes are larger, the grant ought not to be so great in the case of the feeble-minded children as in the case of the deaf and the blind, ought it?—No.

3744. You cannot exercise compulsion very well unless you have a good definition, as Mr. Newton said; but, supposing that you sent them before the magistrate, and said that they were not capable of earning their living, and that you could benefit them in that direction, the magistrate would be more likely to listen to a definition of that sort than to a medical definition, probably?—Possibly. I do not know whether that is not a rather wide definition, because a great many children in the board schools are not capable of earning their living.

3745. You might say not capable through mental deficiency to earn their own living?—I have not gone into that.

3746. I gather that the general drift of your evidence is, that as long as a child had a good home, you would leave that child at his home, and have him educated in a special class for the feeble-minded?—Yes.

3747. But that if it had a bad home you would feel inclined to have the power of sending him to some institution, where he would be removed from the influence of that home?—Yes.

3748. It is really a question whether the home is a good or bad home whether you would keep them at home or send them to some institution?—Yes.

3749. But if you could possibly keep them at home you would do so under the mother's influence?—Yes.

The witness withdrew.

Adjourned to Friday next, at half-past 2 o'clock.

SEVENTH DAY.

Friday, 5th March 1897.

PRESENT:

The REV. T. W. SHARPE, C.B., in the Chair.

Mr. H. F. POOLEY.
Mr. A. W. NEWTON.
Dr. G. E. SHUTTLEWORTH.
Dr. W. R. SMITH.
Mrs. BURGWIN.
Miss TOWNSEND.

Mr. H. W. ORANGE, *Secretary.*

Rev. J. S. Lidgett, M.A.

The Rev. JOHN SCOTT LIDGETT, M.A., called in and examined.

3750. (*Chairman.*) You are warden of the Bermondsey Settlement, chairman of the committee of the St. Olave's Union Infirmary, and chairman of the Finance Committee of the South Metropolitan District Schools, Sutton?—I am.

3751. As warden of the Bermondsey Settlement, do you see a good deal of crippled and defective children of all ages?—Several of our workers are connected with work for cripples and defective children.

3752. And there is an Association for helping invalid children. Are you a member of that?—Some of our workers assist in Bermondsey and Rotherhithe the Invalid Children's Aid Association.

3753. Have they branches all over England?—I am not sure whether they have all over England, but there are branches throughout London.

3754. The Bermondsey settlement is a settlement, is it not, of ladies of University position?—We have two branches, one for men, and the other for ladies, some of whom are members of Universities. The settlement for men is in Bermondsey, and the settlement for ladies is in Rotherhithe.

3755. As chairman of the Finance Committee of the South Metropolitan District Schools, I suppose you often visit them?—Every week.

3756. How many of the guardians go down weekly?—The Board number 24.

3757. Is Mr. Brooke-Lambert one of your members?—He is.

3758. One point which you want to bring before the Committee is that defective children cannot become chargeable to the Poor Law, except by reason of ordinary destitution, unless they are either lunatics or idiots, or imbeciles?—That is so.

3759. Have you had a number of cases in the Poor Law schools of these defective children?—In cases of ordinary destitution a large number of children come who are passed on to the schools if they are supposed to be capable of receiving any education; if not, they are either sent on to Darenth, or perhaps left in workhouses or infirmaries.

3760. And there is no special provision for teaching such a class in any workhouse that you know of?—Not that I know of.

3761. Have you any means of ascertaining as to any other workhouse but your own?—I think I am speaking with perfect accuracy when I say that there are none at present.

3762. You have conferences, of course, and consider how to deal with these children, among other points?—The subject has been occupying our attention lately, partly because it was brought before the Departmental Committee of the Local Government Board, and in our schools at Sutton we invited Mrs. Burgwin down a few weeks ago to see a number of these children, and to make us a report, which is at present occupying our attention.

3763. How many children did she select as proper subjects?—She went throughout our schools, and something like 50 children were set aside as more than ordinarily defective.

3764. Out of a total of how many?—Out of about 1,000 to 1,500 that she saw. You must not take my figures as strictly accurate.

3765. No; that is 50 out of a thousand—that is 5 per cent.?—Yes.

3766. And, of course, the evils are far greater for girls than they are for boys?—They are.

3767. At what age does the evil specially begin for girls?—My view of the special danger in the case of girls is that when they first go out into life or situations and so on, they are very little able to take care of themselves; and as a member of a Workhouse Committee which has to do with lying-in wards, I have frequently seen cases of girls who come before that committee who are more or less defective.

3768. Then from your experience what sort of scheme would you sketch for carrying these girls on beyond the dangerous age?—I believe that institutions such as are to be found at present at the Aubert Park Home carried on by the Metropolitan Association for Befriending Young Servants, should be largely developed, and that these girls should be trained to support themselves and kept under supervision, kindly personal supervision, until such time as they may be with fair safety left to take care of themselves.

3769. Have not the guardians power to provide such homes without resorting to voluntary contributions?—They have not after the age of 16, I think it is.

3770. The girls might become paupers and yet be placed in colonies or homes?—We have at present some power to deal with them as paupers, but not to take steps to prevent them from becoming paupers.

3771. But they are already paupers, are they not?—They are not paupers at such times as they are out in the world in situations trying to earn their own living. Directly they get into trouble or lose their situations they come back to the workhouse. They are then over the age to be sent to any such institution, and they are practically left in the workhouse until the master or matron can find a fresh start for them.

3772. Have you any right to send them out into the world at this stage, or can they claim their own liberty?—We have no right to keep them in ordinary circumstances after 16 years of age unless they can be certified as fit inmates for the infirmary, that is, unless they are sick.

3773. What does an infirmary include,—sick cases?—Destitute sick cases chargeable to the poor law.

Rev. J. S. Lidgett, M.A.

5 Mar. 1897.

3774. You would not call these sick cases?—I am afraid not.

3775. They have been so included, I believe, repeatedly in workhouse infirmaries?—But even if you did treat them as sick cases, and could by law do so, it would be a very imperfect solution of the problem to leave them in the workhouse infirmaries.

3776. Could there not be assistant or auxiliary infirmaries?—That, I think, would not do; so long as you call such an institution an infirmary that does not meet the major part of the difficulty, which is to train them for something better.

3777. They must be sick in body; they need not include those sick in mind?—Of course, if they are more than ordinarily sick in mind they become lunatic and are sent to lunatic asylums.

3778. You would acknowledge that they are sick in mind and ought not to be sent out?—That is rather a difficult question, the definitions of sickness are somewhat difficult. They are not fit to take care of themselves; they know nothing of the world. In some cases their animal impulses are strong and they have not been taught self-restraint, and they are the prey of those with whom they come in contact.

3779. Then there is no power to retain them; there is need for some further legislation to provide for such a class?—Yes.

3780. Would you give power to the guardians to provide such homes?—My own feeling would be, though I speak with some amount of hesitation, that the best course would be to establish such institutions for the community generally, and to permit the guardians, by means of some boarding-out system, to have the advantage of them.

3781. You value the voluntary management of these places?—Yes; special training is wanted as well as maintenance, and it seems to me that it would be somewhat wasteful to have two classes of institutions, one for those who actually come from Poor Law schools, and one for similar cases that come from ordinary Board Schools. It seems to me that on the education side there should be one institution, and that the maintenance is a subordinate matter which the guardians might well undertake for those who are actually destitute.

3782. It has been reckoned that 1 per cent. of the children of school age are children deficient in some way or other; that would mean that there would be 60,000 of such children in England and Wales. What proportion of those would you suppose would be in a dangerous condition if they were sent out into the world, dangerous to themselves, I mean?—I should not like to speak as to the proportion, it is a very difficult matter.

3783. But a large number of them would probably be so, out of the 60,000?—I think so.

3784. Then there are other defective children who are not inmates of Poor Law schools, and not attending School Board centres, but are chiefly prevented by defective powers of locomotion, either through paralysis or accident?—I have reason to believe so.

3785. From your experience of Bermondsey?—From my experience, and from reports which have been supplied to me by those who visit such cases.

3786. Have you any statistics as regards your own neighbourhood?—I have had some supplied to me by the Invalid Children's Aid Society. I have here a statement that there are something like 59 children at the present time known in Southwark and Bermondsey who are not attending any special centre. Of those, four are said to be mentally defective, five are said to be idiots, three are said to be imbecile, and three to have fits, but the majority are said to be paralysed or crippled.

3787. What is the residue of the paralysed or crippled; I did not gather the number?—44.

3788. There are actually 44?—That is reported to me.

3789. Out of what population is that in Bermondsey and Southwark, do you say?—The population of Bermondsey is 80,000; I do not know what the population of Southwark is.

3790. That is not an exhaustive return by any means?—It is not an exhaustive return.

Rev. J. S. Lidgett, M.A.

5 Mar. 1897.

3791. In your opinion, do you think such children can ever be made even partially self-supporting?—I think that in some cases they can, because certainly, of course, the minds of many crippled children may be perfectly bright; and even where paralysis affects children it does not always affect the mind; and even if they cannot be made wholly self-supporting, I think that a humane policy would at least try to alleviate the misery of their existence, and to do something for them better than leaving them, as is constantly the case in the workhouse for the remainder of their life.

3792. Do you think that if they could maintain themselves in some degree, their friends or voluntary agencies might be called upon to supplement their small earnings and keep them in comfort, but outside the workhouse?—I think they might be.

3793. And for cripples or paralysed children, there is no doubt that they should be collected in some home where they could be trained in some way?—I think so. The great want is a medical institution where medical treatment can be combined with specially adapted methods of education.

3794. And that is especially so, for the reason that they cannot go to and fro to any other training places that might be set up?—They cannot.

3795. They must be close at hand to their work?—They must be close at hand; and even if they could go to and fro, the special medical attention that they need cannot be given them in their own homes.

3796. What sized homes would you contemplate?—I should contemplate small homes.

3797. Such as one matron could superintend?—Yes.

3798. So that they would have the motherly care of a single woman?—Yes.

3799. Your attention has also been drawn to epileptic children, and, of course, they vary; there are a great many varieties of this disease, some suffering from very violent epilepsy, and some from occasional fits which are not very distressing,——

3800. Which do not prevent them attending school?—That is so.

3801. The majority of them are extremely irregular at school?—Extremely irregular, and very often tend to drop into becoming absentees. I have some cases reported to me of that kind. For example, J. B., who is aged 10, and is supposed to go to school, is very irregular owing to fits; it is stated that when at school he is made to sit on a back seat to pick up what he can as best he can, and his mother has no idea if he knows anything at all. F. A., aged 11, has not been to school for more than a year, owing to fits and defective brain and deafness. He used to go to school, but the teacher said she did not want him because the other children were frightened at his looks.

3802. We find, as a rule, that they are very kindly treated at the schools?—I think they are kindly treated, but I think the difficulty of their going there is that the mothers are afraid of their being seized with a fit in the streets; and the difficulty of having them there is such that they are gradually allowed to drop out.

3803. But if the fits were not very violent, would not you prefer their going to school and mixing with ordinary children rather than being drafted into an institution?—Yes.

3804. You would leave every child at home if it had a good home, and if it did not suffer very much?—Yes.

3805. But you know a good many epileptics who are entirely uneducated?—There are a good many.

3806. What usually happens when they become rather distressing cases—what is the usual process?—If they are more than usually troublesome, and their parents have not sufficient means, they probably become chargeable to the Poor Law, and are sent to infirmaries.

3807. Does that make the parent a pauper?—I believe so, yes.

3808. Though the parent himself is not an inmate of the workhouse, the presence of the child in the workhouse makes the parent a pauper?—Yes.

3809. You know a good deal of workhouse infirmaries; how are they managed as a rule, is there any education at all?—There has not been; one or two attempts have been made lately, and the union which I represent, the St. Olave's Union, has lately appointed a teacher to give one or two hours a week instruction to these children.

3810. It is very difficult to obtain any hours, I suppose for school-keeping in the infirmary?—They are taught from 2 to 4 each day.

3811. And you would be glad to remove them from the infirmary if you saw your way to do it, and so put them in special institutions under medical treatment, and give them special education?—That is what I want.

3812. And you would keep them there until they are either able to maintain themselves, or are fit to be passed into special settlements where they may be as far as possible self-supporting. What do you mean by "settlements"?—I think many of these cases which have a tendency to become cases of insanity want very special segregation, at any rate for some years, for several reasons. As a workhouse master said to me the other day, "These epileptic cases always marry," and that introduces considerations, which I think can only be met by some kind of separation of that kind. In the next place I think that under favourable conditions of open air and medical treatment many of them might gradually grow stronger, and be prevented from becoming actual lunatics.

3813. How has this workhouse master's attention been called to the fact. Have the children of epileptic parents returned to the workhouses?—Many able-bodied men, so-called, who drift in because they are continually out of work, are what the workhouse masters call fitty cases—weak-minded cases.

3814. Do their children generally return to the workhouse with the parents?—Yes.

3815. The whole family comes back?—Yes.

3816. And it would be very desirable that some authority should have the charge of these children other than the Guardians of the Poor?—I think so, because it is a distinct hardship that the parents should come under disabilities of the Poor Law simply because their children are afflicted.

3817. You think there is a certain taint about it, both for the children and the parents?—Yes.

3818. Which is never got rid of in after-life?—Yes.

3819. And it would be better that they should be classed with other children so far as possible, and placed under the education authority that has the charge of ordinary children?—I think so.

3820. Do you approve of the proposed new local board authority for special classes of children?—I approve of the principles of the scheme; the details as to the precise constitution of the committee I am in doubt about.

3821. Those are the chief points of your evidence, I think?—Those are the chief points.

3822. (*Mr. Pooley.*) Supposing that one or two children in a family are feeble-minded, what power have the guardians to send such children to an institution or school?—They have no power at all unless the family is destitute, or unless the case is such as the relieving officer can treat as a case of *quasi* lunacy.

3823. Have they any power to take one child of a family which is not destitute, supposing the mother is a poor woman, say a widow?—They have no power unless the mother applies for ordinary relief on the ground of destitution, unless she is able to obtain from the relieving officer an order for the child to be admitted to the infirmary on the ground that it is practically a lunatic, and therefore can be treated as a lunatic.

3824. And in the case where the child is not a lunatic but feeble-minded, do the guardians ever take a single child of a family and send it to the workhouse and from the workhouse pass it on to a district school?—Never, except on the ground of destitution.

3825. Then do we rightly understand that when a child in a district school is 16 years of age it must be turned out?—That is the rule.

3826. Do you think the age of education in district schools should be extended?—I do not; because I think in the first place these classes of children, who are the only classes likely to be retained after 16 years of age, ought to be provided for elsewhere, and that at any rate the utmost good they can get at the district school is attained by 16 years.

3827. But are there not cases of feeble-minded children who would be benefited by being taught to a later age?—I think their teaching after that age should be a special kind of instruction with a view to fitting them to earn their own livelihood in some way, or at least to be partially self-supporting.

3828. Do you think they might be benefited by some industrial training?—It ought to be industrial training rather than ordinary education.

3829. Or special instruction?—Yes.

3830. Then you would not propose to alter the age of instruction as far as the guardians are concerned?—Not at all.

3831. You think it would be advisable that the school authorities should have power to give special instruction to feeble-minded children, and have power also to send them to institutions?—I think so.

3832. And you think that that power should continue so long as they are capable of being benefited by education?—I think it should, and I think it would be economical in the end; because if they are dismissed from such institutions before they are able to take care of themselves they gradually drift back and the Poor Law has to bear the burden of them.

3833. Then as regards any possible conflict between the guardians and the school authorities, I understand your recommendation is that a child over 16 years of age should cease to be under the guardians for the purpose of education and could then be dealt with by the school authority?—I think if such institutions were set up they should be set up for the community generally; that is to say, for certain classes of children, some of whom are destitute and some are not; that then in that case the school authority should be the authority for the education and training, but that the maintenance probably should be entrusted to the Poor Law authority.

3834. You think no difficulty would arise if both school authorities and guardians had power to send young persons to institutions?—I see no reason that that should be so, because the settled policy of the Local Government Board at the present time is to encourage Poor Law guardians throughout the country who have not schools of their own, to send children to an ordinary school. I am thinking now of a west country workhouse where the children are sent every day to the ordinary day school and no difficulty arises. But my suggestion is based rather on the lines of what Parliament has already done in the case of the Act for providing for blind and deaf children in its boarding-out provisions.

3835. You would not think it necessary to take away any power of the guardians?—No, certainly not.

3836. Then you were speaking of these homes like Aubert Park Home; I think you were then thinking not of education only but of the custody of young people?—Yes, very largely.

3837. Then the sending of young persons to such homes who have passed the age of education, or cannot be much benefited by further education, would be a matter for the guardians?—That would be a matter for the guardians.

3838. You would not suggest that the school authority should have the power to send young people to these homes, except for their education?—Except for their education.

3839. Have you any idea as to the limit of age; would you have any limit of age, or give them power to send them as long as they were educable?—I cannot speak as an expert in these matters, but I believe the experience of such homes has shown that after two or three years probably, even in serious cases, the girls could fairly be trusted, and there is at any rate a great diminution to the moral danger of their being allowed to be by themselves in their own care. The guardians can, of course, pay towards the maintenance of such girls as apprentices towards earning their living, just as with apprentice boys.

3840. Can you tell us what the powers of the guardians are to send feeble-minded children to institutions for their education, or to contribute to institutions for that purpose?—They could contribute probably to institutions, that is to say, their contributions would be considered by the Local Government Board, and, I should take it, allowed. I take it that at the present time the guardians are themselves responsible for the education of their children, unless they are actually idiots or imbeciles or lunatics.

Rev. J. S. Lidgett, M.A.

5 Mar. 1897.

3841. But, as a matter of fact, they do not contribute to the education of the feeble-minded children, except in the case of blind and deaf, beyond the age of 16?—They do not.

3842. (*Miss Townsend.*) After passing through such homes as Aubert Park, or other homes of the kind, there are a certain number of these feeble-minded girls who are found to be not capable of earning their living. What would you do with these?—I think, eventually, the only provision that could be made for such classes is to have special institutions which are recognised by the State, in which they may be taught to be at least partly self-supporting; because if girls are so unable to earn their own living they become simply permanent inmates of workhouses, doing the manual work in workhouses.

3843. Then, of course, you would have to make the detention in such institutions compulsory?—I am not quite sure that that follows; I should be delighted if they could be made compulsory.

3844. I am a little afraid it follows, if they are to do any real good. You know, I suppose, also that these feeble-minded children very often, after first being in such training homes, improve to a certain point, and those who have the care of them are very hopeful; then they begin gradually to go downhill again, and become even worse than they were before. In such cases, I suppose you would give power to send them to institutions where they could be detained?—I take it that power exists, because such a child, if destitute, would naturally fall back to the Poor Law authorities.

3845. Yes, if destitute; but they are not always without parents, quite destitute?—No.

3846. That is a difficulty that has to be met, I suppose you would say, as it arises?—Yes.

3847. You said just now that epileptic and defective children were kept in workhouse infirmaries, although their parents were not treated as paupers; is that the case?—I think my remark was limited to epileptic children; and what I meant to say was this: that a family which is not in the ordinary sense destitute may be obliged to surrender the care of an epileptic child as too troublesome to be maintained at home, and that child is taken to the infirmary on the ground that it is practically lunatic.

3848. The child cannot be admitted to the infirmary without the parents, unless it is lunatic, and can therefore be detained by the guardians?—Unless they are destitute.

3849. Unless the parents become paupers for the purpose?—Yes.

3850. Unless they themselves go into the able-bodied house?—That depends upon the strictness with which the guardians deal with such cases. Some Poor Law boards would not bring the whole family in on account of such a case.

3851. And also, I suppose, some boards of guardians keep a very small proportion of epileptics in the workhouse in the infirmary; they pass them on to epileptic hospitals?—Many of them do; but these epileptic hospitals simply treat them as patients, they do nothing for their education.

3852. I was not thinking of the education at the moment, but simply of the epilepsy. Have you noticed whether the girls who come to the workhouse later in life are those who have been in the schools and been feeble-minded in the schools?—I have no means of saying to what extent that is so.

3853. You have not observed that in your own experience?—It is a very difficult thing indeed. On a workhouse committee, you see the inmates pass before you, and you take mental notes of them.

3854. What makes me ask the question is, that you said the girls who were sent out to situations failed in their situations because of their feeble-mindedness, and returned to the workhouse?—I was not speaking of the guardians sending girls into institutions, but of various agencies; and I was not so much thinking of their failing to do their work, as falling into moral mischief, though probably the two go together.

3855. You were not thinking of girls sent out from the schools into service?—Not specially.

3856. Those girls are, of course, taken charge of by the Metropolitan Association for Befriending Young

Rev. J. S. Lidgett, M.A.

5 Mar. 1897.

Servants, for the most part, and do not return to the workhouse?—Yes.

3857. May I ask what you do at Sutton with your 50 defective children; have they any special training?—They have no special training; we are at present considering the subject, how far we can by special methods deal with those cases apart.

3858. Hitherto they have not come under special care?—Hitherto they have taken their chance in the existing standards.

3859. They will come under the care of the new authority if constituted, I suppose?—Yes, if defective children are included amongst special classes.

3860. As sick children?—Yes.

3861. If the education only of feeble-minded children were transferred from the guardians to the school authorities, and children were sent by the latter to institutions, would there be any difficulty on account of the divided authority? suppose the guardians thought the parents ought to be supporting the child?—I take it that in such a case, if my suggestions were followed, the guardians would summon the parents of those children (as is done at the present time), and would have the power to arrange with them for weekly contribution.

3862. Lunatic children are not kept in the infirmaries?—Actually lunatic children would be sent to the lunatic asylum.

3863. But feeble-minded children who are made lunatic in order to be admitted without destitution, as you inferred just now, are treated as lunatic though they are not actuallylunatic?—They would be kept in the infirmaries.

3864. It seems rather a defective arrangement to call a child lunatic in order for it to be admitted to the infirmary?—I do not know that a child is actually called a lunatic, but, of course, the law is fairly definite. Things have to be decided very often by rule of thumb; the officer has to exercise his best discretion when a case is brought before him.

3865. Is there a medical certificate for every child so admitted?—The doctor certainly would see such a child.

3866. Would the doctor certify that it was of unsound mind?—No, probably he would certify that he was suffering from epilepsy, and recommend the infirmary.

3867. Is there a special form for such a case as that?—Not a special form; it would be certified for in the ordinary forms used by the medical officer as to all cases which he saw.

3868. But is that done in order to relieve the parents of the taint of pauperism?—No, not at all. Supposing a woman applies to the relieving officer either about a member of the family who is ill or about a child who is defective, the relieving officer takes care that the parish medical officer sees the case, and that there is a certificate as to the child, or grown-up person, as the case may be, brought before the relief committee; then the relief committee deals with it by its resolution.

3869. And having the child in the infirmary, how is it dealt with?—As an ordinary patient.

3870. Although it is defective in mind and needs special training?—Exactly.

3871. I suppose there is a rule, is there not, that medical relief does not pauperise the parent?—Ordinary medical relief?

3872. It does not pauperise like out-relief?—Ordinary outside medical relief; but the inmates of the infirmary are pauperised.

3873. But ordinary outside medical relief does not pauperise?—No.

3874. Is the reception of this child taken as medical relief?—No, he is an inmate of the institution.

3875. So that the child is a pauper, and has the additional disadvantage of being virtually classed as a lunatic and detained as a lunatic?—I do not know that we could say that; but this case, not being exactly dealt with by Act of Parliament, the relieving officers and the relief committees have to go upon some practical theory.

3876. To stretch a point?—Yes.

3877. That will be so far relieved if the care of such children is taken from the guardians?—The point of pauperism, do you mean.

3878. And the point of detaining the child in that condition in the workhouse infirmary to take its chance with the adults?—You do not detain the child; the child can be discharged to-morrow if its mother asks for him.

3879. But it stays there as long as its parents are willing it shall stay?—Yes.

3880. That will not be the case if the care of the children is passed over to a children's board?—I suppose if the care of the children was passed over to another authority it would simply be that they would be detained by that authority if the parents chose; it would simply be a case of detention by another authority.

3881. The child would be dealt with by another authority in the place of the guardians?—Yes.

3882. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) I want to ask you about those crippled children which I know one of the ladies connected with the settlement takes great care of. Do you only provide for their amusement; you do not attempt to educate them?—Very little has been done for their education. We have begun to carry out a series of inquiries, which are still in process, as to what education they are receiving and what they might be capable of receiving. But I should supplement that by saying that the kind of recreation which is provided for them at the meetings which are held for them is educational, for instance, they are taught a little drawing and other subjects of that kind, but in a recreative way.

3883. And you find even that has considerably brightened those children?—Very much indeed.

3884. So that it would be right to suppose that if you gave these children a training they would not only be happier themselves but better able to assist themselves?—I think so, in every way.

3885. Do you know, in your own district, of epileptics in the homes staying in the home with the parents?—Yes, the cases that I quoted just now are in our district.

3886. And you also said they are not in attendance at school?—Yes, they are not in attendance at school, according to my information.

3887. So that there is some provision needed other than that which we have at the present time for such cases?—I think so, certainly.

3888. Would you think that they should go into certified small homes, containing about 20 inmates?—I think it would be a great advantage.

3889. Now, with regard to these children in the Sutton schools, would it be right to say that many of them are sent out into the world as fit, who are unfit if you closely examine them?—I think that is so; and there are a certain proportion always drifting back into the workhouse, because on trial when we have placed them out, both boys and girls, they prove unable to keep in the position into which they are put.

3890. So that if they had been specially treated during their school life they would be more likely to be fit at 18 years of age than they are now?—I think decidedly so.

3891. There was one very big girl I saw whose term was more than expired in the Sutton girls' school. She was a feeble-minded girl—I should not like to describe her as imbecile,—but you cannot keep her any longer; what will become of her?—When a girl of that sort is 16 years of age the managers would not be in a hurry to get rid of her; they would cast about and see whether they could place her at all. After a little while they would call the attention of the guardians to the case of A. B., who is past age, and if nothing could be done either by the guardians or by the managers to find some opening in life for this girl she would be received as an inmate of the workhouse, and there probably she would spend the rest of her days.

3892. That was the answer that I received, that she would be under notice to go to the workhouse, and I thought it a great hardship on the girl. Do you approve of the system of sending the Poor Law children to the ordinary day schools?—I do in preference to the old-fashioned workhouse school. And I am in favour of placing the education of children, even in district and union schools, under the Education Department; I am not in favour necessarily of breaking up the existing institutions in order to send them out to school.

3893. You would like to see them under the Education Department?—For the purposes of education.

3894. Have you had much trouble in placing the girls after the school age?—A good deal, I believe, in these cases; but I am not a member of the girls' committee, therefore I cannot speak in detail as to that.

3895. (*Mr. Newton.*) Would you compel school authorities to provide special day school accommodation for feeble-minded and defective children?—I think distinctly so. I consider that these are a class of children who ought to be educated, and that if they cannot be educated by the ordinary methods it ought to be the duty of the school authority to provide the extraordinary methods.

3896. Up to what age should such special day schools take the children?—That I would rather leave to greater experts than myself; it is a point that I have not carefully considered.

3897. Have you considered whether the present age of 14 years is sufficient in the case of defective children?—I think it would be distinctly insufficient.

3898. Do you think it would be possible to compel defective children over 14 years of age to attend school?—I think if the community is willing to bear some share of their maintenance, probably it is so. The line which I think would have to be taken in case of parents unable to afford to maintain them would be that they should not be gainers (that is the ordinary line, I think, taken by guardians or magistrates) by having their children off their hands, that they should be made to pay a certain weekly payment according to their means for the maintenance of the child.

3899. And would it be possible to frame a legal definition of the term "feeble-minded"?—That I should like to leave too. I think that is a question rather for experts on the medical and educational side than for me.

3900. We have had one such expert who said he was unable to do so?—Then where he feared to tread, I would not attempt to rush in.

3901. Then in the case of defective children who live in rural places or small towns, what treatment would you suggest?—My experience has been limited to experiences of London conditions, and I would rather you get that from somebody who has experience of rural communities.

3902. (*Dr. Smith.*) If I understood you aright, you said that the disabilities of pauperism did not apply in cases where out-door medical relief is given?—No voter is struck off the list because he happens to go for a bottle of medicine to the medical officer.

3903. But in the case of admission into an institution under the control of the Poor Law then that would mean pauperisation?—Yes.

3904. With the exception perhaps of the fever hospitals?—Yes, except fever hospitals.

3905. Then would a child admitted into Darenth, whose parents subscribed something towards the maintenance of that child, suffer from the disability of pauperism?—I am not quite sure.

3906. There are many of those cases, are there not?—Yes.

3907. How would you propose that the imbeciles in London, other than those which up to the present have gone to Darenth, should be dealt with?—I have not had much experience of the treatment of actual imbeciles, except in the way of sending them to Darenth, and I should not like to give a very confident opinion.

3908. Probably you are aware that there are a number of such cases?—Certainly.

3909. And you have no suggestion to make as to the way of treating them?—I have no suggestion to offer.

3910. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) You would not venture a definition of feeble-minded; but as a matter of fact, do the medical officers of the workhouse discriminate between the low grade that they would certify as idiots or imbeciles, and a higher grade that they would send to the Sutton schools, or allow to go in cases of doubt to the Sutton schools?—Unless the child could be actually pronounced to be mentally diseased he would be passed on, if he were free from all infection, to the Sutton schools, and there they would deal with him if there were any hope of dealing with him at all. If he proved to be hopeless, if, for instance, he became subject to bad fits, he would be returned upon the workhouse, and there he would stay.

Rev. J. S. Lidgett, M.A.

5 Mar. 1897.

3911. But he would not be returned, because he was feeble-minded?—No.

3912. You keep such cases?—Unless feeble-mindedness is practically indistinguishable from lunacy.

3913. That, of course, is the question. There is a degree of lunacy, if we must call it so, or of mental defect which is certifiable under the terms required to certify a case to go to Darenth; and there is also a degree of mental deficiency short of that which I suppose would give trouble in the schools, but would not be sufficient for certification?—Short of that, unless he were subject to fits that made him difficult to deal with, he would be allowed to drift into the first and second standards and do the best he could.

3914. Now you propose instead of that, a plan of separating such children, a possibility at any rate of separating such children, for special instruction?—We are thinking of it.

3915. Has your attention been called at all to Dr. Warner's inquiry which he made, I think in 1890, as to the number of defective children in the Poor Law schools?—It has not.

3916. He visited the Sutton schools, I believe; but you are not aware of that?—I am not aware of that.

3917. He tabulated (I was looking at the table just now) as seen 1,744 cases, of whom 118 were at that time reported dull by the teachers; but 341 were noted by himself as displaying some of the physical signs which he considered indicative of weakness or abnormality. With regard to epileptics, you are aware, I daresay, that there is a colony founded at Chalfont for epileptics?—I am.

3918. And I believe it is proposed to take children into some of the homes. Would it be a feasible arrangement for the guardians to send their children to such a place on payment?—It would be perfectly so if the Local Government Board certified it.

3919. When you spoke of a child being practically a lunatic or certified as a lunatic I suppose you included "idiot or imbecile" under that term?—Yes.

3920. "Lunatic" being the term required by the Poor Law?—Yes.

3921. (*Chairman.*) The feeble-minded children at Sutton seem to be three or four times as large in number as the average number so far as we have ascertained at present for the country—5 per cent., can they be classified in any way for us; can you get a return for us from Sutton?—Of course, the figures that you found upon are simply my impression of the children placed in rooms for Mrs. Burgwin to make a special examination of, and she is as competent to give you her impression of the number as I am. If this Committee applied to the Sutton managers for any special report upon those children, I certainly would do my best to see that the managers responded and did what they could.

3922. That would be very useful to have. Your chaplain is supposed to know what becomes of all the feeble-minded children after they leave the institution and go to service?—Yes.

3923. Can he supply us with any information as to what becomes of these girls when they leave you and when they return?—I have no doubt that we have a great deal of information.

3924. Your present chaplain has only been about a year with you?—More than that—two or three years I think; but he would not have any information. And of course in the case of district schools the matter is not as simple as it is in the case of union schools, because five Poor Law unions or parishes share in the maintenance of Sutton schools; the children, of course, become chargeable to the particular one of those five parishes from which they come, and therefore Sutton schools rather lose sight of them in after-life.

3925. But I have always understood that one of the duties of the chaplain was to know what became of these girls and follow them up; is that your rule?—I cannot speak positively.

3926. (*Miss Townsend.*) The girls at all events are handed over to the Metropolitan Association?—Yes. they are.

3927. These statistics ought to be obtained from them?—Yes.

Rev. J. S. Lidgett, M.A.

5 Mar. 1897.

3928. (*Chairman.*) When do your powers of boarding out cease—at what age for ordinary children?—We have never boarded out. I take it that the power of boarding-out ends at the same age as the power of maintaining at school.

3929. If you send them to the Epileptic Hospital would that be under your power of boarding-out?—I am not sure whether it is under our present powers; but that, of course, would not meet the side upon which I have felt strongly for a long time, the side of their education.

3930. But, supposing that a colony was provided where they were educated as well as trained, would your boarding-out powers extend to that?—If they do not, I take it you would simply need an order, which could be easily got, from the Local Government Board, to make them so.

3931. So that you might send all teachable defective children to homes, with the leave of the Local Government Board?—Yes.

3932. You spoke of dividing the care of these children between two authorities, the Education Department and the Local Government Board, the Education Department being only competent to conduct the education of the children. Why should not the Education Department be capable of inspecting the homes or the institutions to which the schools are attached?—In that suggestion I was following very largely in my own mind the lines which I understand to be laid down in the Blind and Deaf Act. The Blind and Deaf Act provides, I understand, for institutions and for boarding-out in the neighbourhood. It seems to me that, if the guardians are actually responsible for these children, it might be simpler for them to board out and do the maintenance, while institutions which were available for similar classes of the whole community were attended by these children.

3933. How do you draw a distinction between institutions under the Local Government Board and voluntary institutions, as regards their organisation?—Institutions under the Local Government Board, strictly speaking, are institutions managed by local governing bodies who are subject to the control of the Local Government Board. A voluntary institution is simply an institution which is reported to the Local Government Board and inspected by one of their officers and certified as fit for children or grown-up people to be sent to for certain purposes.

3934. In institutions for the blind or deaf, the organisation of the institutions generally is inspected by the Education Department inspector as well as the education of the children. Why should not that be applied?—I see no reason why it should not.

3935. I thought you wished to divide them?—I do not lay any great stress upon that.

The witness withdrew.

Mr. F. H Walmsley, M.D.

Mr. Francis Henry Walmsley, M.D., called in and examined.

3936. (*Chairman.*) You are the medical officer of the children's part of the Metropolitan Asylums Board's Asylum at Darenth?—Yes.

3937. How many children are there under your charge?—One thousand.

3938. How many of them do you consider to be educable in a greater or less degree?—50 per cent. in a greater or lesser degree.

3939. You have 500 children who can be in some way developed to earn partially or wholly their living?—Not so; there are 50 per cent. who are capable of some improvement, but of that 500 there are about 300 who are capable of substantial improvement; in other words they might be called educable; the remaining 200 may be improved somewhat, their habits may be improved, they may be taught some little self-control.

3940. In all these cases that you have under you there is some organic or structural defect, which an experienced eye can detect?—Yes.

3941. And if that defect exists you can never expect a development of normal brain power?—No.

3942. And though there is no absolute cure for idiocy or imbecility there may be some improvement?—Yes, some improvement.

3943. But the mark of organic defect will always be observable?—Always.

3944. And even after they have left the institution and entered the common life you think that their children will inherit these same organic defects?—They will, undoubtedly. I think it most undesirable that the imbeciles should leave an institution. From my point of view imbeciles require life-long care and supervision, and life-long detention.

3945. And for the sake of the community they should not be allowed to marry?—Distinctly not.

3946. Have you observed many cases of such marriages where the children have returned to you?—No, hardly so; because, you see, after the children leave us we lose sight of them, so that even though they had offspring they might not come under my observation.

3947. You do not remember any cases as the result of the marriage of such people?—Not of the children in the institution.

3948. But you would expect in all such children peculiar organisation?—Yes, certainly.

3949. How would you describe that organisation; what would the signs be,—they would be nervous perhaps?—Yes, they would present the ordinary mental and physical signs of imbecility or idiocy.

3950. Not necessarily insanity, but in some cases epilepsy?—Yes.

3951. Or in some lower cases still, feeble-mindedness?—Yes.

3952. It is very desirable for the sake of the community, that they should be retained in the institutions, because you say the ranks of criminals, prostitutes, and tramps are largely recruited from the highest grades of imbeciles?—Yes, from the higher grade imbeciles.

3953. And you have reason to say that a large percentage of illegitimate births that occur in the country is also to be charged to those whose mental condition makes them partially or wholly irresponsible for the evils they produce?—Yes.

3954. Does that appear in any official return?—Many of the children that are admitted into Darenth are illegitimate.

3955. Out of proportion to the rest of the illegitimate population, do you happen to know?—I should say so.

3956. Do you happen to know the exact numbers?—No.

3957. Many of these children can become partially self-supporting, you say, but the great difficulty is to produce habits of self-control and self-direction?—Yes.

3958. And the result is that after the girls go out to service (especially the girls), they eventually drift into vice?—They do, *i.e.*, speaking of the unprotected high-grade imbecile generally.

3959. From that want of self-control?—Yes.

3960. In fact they often return, you say, to the workhouses to be confined?—Yes.

3961. And the children are born idiots and imbeciles?—Yes.

3962. And for their own sakes and in the interests of society, you would separate them so far as you could in institutions?—Most certainly.

3963. There is a large intermediate class rather higher than that, is there not?—Yes.

3964. How would you describe that class? They are defective children; would you describe them as a degenerate class, who are not quite imbecile?—I should describe a defective child as being one degree, or several degrees, below the average normal child in intelligence.

3965. And not only in intelligence, but in mental energy and the power of will?—Yes.

3966. Which would be the less developed, the will or the intelligence?—If you have want of intelligence you necessarily have want of will or controlling power.

3967. Which is cause and which is effect, the want of will or the want of intelligence?—I should rather say that with those children who have structurally deficient brains, the mental centres have not been sufficiently evolved, and that, therefore, they are lacking in control or will, and therefore it is the effect of the want of cerebral development, the controlling centres are those that are the latest developed. In the imbecile they are very imperfectly or never developed.

3968. And in how many cases is it the result of bad nutrition?—A large number of them. In those cases one would describe them as being anæmic, poorly nourished and practically suffering from starvation of the brain cells.

3969. Supposing that these children were the children of defectives themselves and become defective afterwards, they very seldom reach maturity, do they?—Yes, many of them do; they live some time.

3970. What is the per-centage of deaths among your children; is it higher than in the outside world?—I suppose it is about the same as the normal schools. For 1895 the mortality rate was exceedingly low, only two and a half per cent., that is very low. In ordinary asylums the mortality rate is about 12 per cent.

3971. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) In asylums for the insane?—Yes.

3972. (*Chairman.*) But there are a great number of sudden deaths, are there not? The deaths of lunatics very often are very sudden, caused by some special accident?—No, I should hardly say so; ordinary complaints carry them off. Of course, occasionally an epileptic will die suddenly in a fit, from spasm in the windpipe.

3973. Will you give us the signs by which you distinguish a defective child from a normal child. I see you divide them into three classes?—I have written them down there with a view of presenting them in as few simple words as possible, and the avoidance of technical terms as far as possible.

3974. Those are the physical defects which are apparent on the surface, the physiological defects which are not so apparent, and the mental defects?—Yes, quite so.

3975. Which are the chief physical signs you notice when you first look at a child who is suggested to be defective?—The general bodily conformation is a very great guide, and then you would take the different organs separately which I have enumerated there.

3976. Chiefly the size of the cranium?—Yes, there are cranial-anomalies.

3977. A want of symmetry in the face size?—Facial asymmetry.

3978. And deformities of palate?—Yes.

3979. And anomalies of the teeth, tongue and lips, nose and eyes, and, in fact of all the parts?—Yes, and of the ear.

3980. The ear, the limbs, the skin, and the body generally?—Yes.

3981. And as regards the body generally you say it is generally imperfect development that makes them awkward and unsteady in gait?—Yes. I have some drawings here which explain it very well (*handing in the same*).

3982. Have you notes of all these defects?—I have notes in the case books. They are kept there in the records of these patients.

3983. Are all these points noted in the case book?—Yes, I have here a form that we make use of (*handing in the same*). All the children are very carefully examined, and any peculiarity is noted; we get, as far as possible, information from their friends. This form (*handing in the same*) is sent to the parents, so that we get as much information as possible.

3984. And as to the physiological signs, you mention anomalies of the motor functions, namely, the retardation of learning to walk, tremours, chorea, and epilepsy?—Yes.

3985. Then anomalies of the sensory functions and of speech?—Yes.

3986. Delay in the acquisition of language, stammering, stuttering, and retardation of puberty?—And there are other purely medical signs which can only of course be really understood by a medical man.

3987. Now as to the mental test; you say that it is rather seeing what they cannot do than what they can do?—Yes, the symptoms are not positive in the imbecile and idiot; there is rather amentia, mindlessness in the patient; the symptoms are negative.

Mr. F. H. Walmsley, M.D.

5 Mar. 1897.

3988. And it is only the very simplest ideas that they retain?—Yes. One great aid and guide to us is the power of speech that they possess.

3989. I see you say that of 950 patients 360 articulate distinctly, 219 indistinctly, and 300 cannot articulate at all?—Yes. Therefore if a child is presented to one with imperfect articulation it immediately arouses ones suspicion that there is some brain defect.

3990. Have any deaf mutes among your children?—Yes, we have about 12, I think.

3991. So mentally feeble that they cannot be taught?—Yes, there are 12 deaf and dumb patients.

3992. After observing the articulation you examine the power of attention and observation?—Yes.

3993. And this power of receiving impressions is very slow in imbeciles and idiots, but varies very much in the duller children?—Yes.

3994. But they never get the same power of hearing or seeing or feeling, you think, that other children do?—No, their senses are generally dulled or blunted. The general sensibility also of the body is blunted.

3995. And after trying their senses you then try their intellectual powers, and then their social conduct, that is, I suppose, how they behave to each other, whether they are mischievous or not, whether they are clean or dirty, and so on?—Yes, or degraded in their habits. In other words, one tries to discover the extent of the moral and intellectual perversions. Of course it is difficult for me to give a very clear account of it to the non-professional mind. Those are purely medical questions, and I should almost have to give a lecture on idiots and imbecility in its entirety before I could make myself understood.

3996. But it is important to us as showing how many signs are required before passing judgment on the state of the child?—Yes.

3997. To prevent us who are laymen in such matters from passing too rash a judgment?—Yes, it is as difficult often, I should imagine, to the ordinary lay mind to distinguish between a defective and an imbecile child, as it would be to ask them to discriminate between a case of typhoid fever and typhus fever, I mean that it is purely a medical question.

3998. As regards these 300 children who are educable, are you satisfied with the condition of the school at Darenth?—Yes.

3999. You think it is perfect?—I think it meets the requirements of the Metropolitan parishes.

4000. That is so; it is sufficient in number; but are the teachers of the proper kind that you would yourself select for training the children. There are two or three head teachers, a number of assistants, and there are some monitors, who are themselves recovered patients?—Yes.

4001. Do you think that such are fit persons to take charge of defective children?—With regard to the monitors, they as it were simply look after them generally; they do not actually teach them, they endeavour to preserve a little order among them, and so forth, and they look after their clothing and their habits, and so on.

4002. But for their mental and intellectual training they are of no use whatever?—I do not know that I should go as far as that. They themselves have acquired a fair amount of information and they have practically been discharged from the asylum as inmates and have then been engaged, with the consent of their parishes, as monitors, but their function does not go beyond that of some slight direction and supervision of the children.

4003. What size class would you advise for defective children?—Of course you must make rather a distinction between the training of a defective child and the training of an imbecile. Certainly, better results may be brought about with a defective child than with an imbecile, and therefore you would not require perhaps for the training of the imbecile the same grade of teacher that you would look for in the case of the defective such as are being taught in the special centres of the School Board.

4004. Now with regard to the defective children in Darenth, how many of those do you think can be so trained as to go out into life and hold their own fairly,

Mr. F. H. Walmsley, M.D.

5 Mar. 1897.

of the 300 whom you call educable children?—I do not think there is one.

4005. The head mistress told us that about one in each year on an average went out?—The average is about 2½ per cent. for the 22 years that the place has been established, but I should not place those children who have been discharged as recovered, in the category of imbecile or idiot. I look upon those children as rather upon the border line, children who by being exposed to unfavourable conditions have fallen away.

4006. They were children who had certain normal defects?—Yes; I should rather call them defectives.

4007. Have those defects been improved?—Yes, they have been improved.

4008. But not altogether got rid of?—No. You see they have been in unfavourable surroundings; they have been placed in adverse conditions and exposed to such influences as are destructive of all healthy life.

4009. I thought you said that your school conditions were very good?—I mean before they come to us; and then after residence with us they are brought up to their ordinary average condition.

4010. Do you not think that the surroundings are very depressing at Darenth for these children, would it not be better if they mixed with some other children of a little higher class than themselves. Take the two first classes of your children, they might possibly be mixed with some of the special classes of London, with some advantage to themselves, might they not?—Yes, I think there are some that might, although, as I have stated, I think that it is very important that these children should be, as far as possible, segregated for their own sake, and for the sake of society.

4011. It is scarcely segregation if you mix them with a great number of other children of the same class as themselves; it is segregation from the community but not separation of the better class from the lower class?—Where could they be put?

4012. We thought that they might be left, as far as possible, at their own homes and sent to the special classes, provided that they had good homes?—If they had good homes, certainly.

4013. Do you think that instead of being sent to institutions they should be allowed to stay at home, and sent to a special class, so that they might have all the surroundings of home, and pass through the streets, and see a good deal in school that they are never likely to see at Darenth?—Are you speaking now only of defectives?

4014. Yes?—Not of imbeciles.

4015. No, those do not come into our question at all?—Yes, I think that, of course, the great hope is that if these defective children are placed in favourable surroundings there is a tendency to revert to the normal in the offspring, that is very important indeed, in fact, I consider that it is the one ray of hope in this system of special centres which the School Board have established.

4016. But if you retain them in Darenth they degenerate, and their children degenerate also?—No, I cannot say that. Of course the surroundings at Darenth are very bright and cheerful and healthy. I wish to be absolutely impartial in this matter, but all children who are imbecile I would certainly keep in institutions.

4017. That is granted I think on all hands?—As to the children who are defective, the higher grade of them certainly, if a favourable environment can be instituted for them. I am disposed to think it is better that they should mix with other children in the outer world, of course.

4018. That is the chief point?—We are all the creatures of our environment, therefore it is desirable to place these children in as favourable an environment as can be devised for them, obviously.

4019. That is to say, a good home and good food, and a good school with healthy conditions?—Yes, if they get that with the necessary direction and supervision.

4020. There are a good many of your children whom you would be glad to see placed out under such conditions if possible, but if it was a bad home with very little care they ought to go to institutions?—Yes.

4021. Not to an institution like Darenth. Would you prefer a home or a large institution?—Honestly, I must say I should prefer a home.

4022. So as to retain Darenth for those that cannot be improved, or improved so little as to be dangerous to the community and of very little use to themselves.

4023. Now you have two schoolmistresses with some degree of training, but I do not understand that any of the others have received any training for their work?—No, they have not. They are taught by the head schoolmistress.

4024. Nor did I see that you had much brightness about the schools of pictures, or anything of that sort. There was a small amount of kindergarten work, but a very small amount comparatively; they seemed to be hurried on too soon to manual work of not very much interest to them. Is that so?—No, that is hardly the case. They are kept in school until they are 16 years of age or over, if they are suitable cases for it. But there, of course, again an imbecile requires the very simplest forms of training, even more simple than would be used in the case of defective children, because they really cannot understand it. There is an enormous proportion of the children at Darenth who have the very slightest intelligence, and therefore you do not require, as I said, a highly trained teacher for them.

4025. I think you want teachers who would detect the least sign of intelligence, which requires of course a very high degree of training, but I agree with you that the imbeciles would not need so much classification as defective children?—No.

4026. But your defective children are really classed in a great measure as imbeciles, are they not?—They are kept apart from the others. They are, as it were, in the highest class.

4027. They are in separate blocks in fact?—Quite so. Of course, it is desirable that the teacher should have a knowledge of the ordinary kindergarten teaching, and she will then readily discover what is necessary in the case of these children who are at Darenth.

4028. The cost of education in Darenth and the maintenance of these children at Darenth is very low as compared to many other institutions?—Yes.

4029. Do you not attribute that rather to starving the education staff?—I do not, indeed.

4030. Have you worked out at all what the cost of teaching per head is? It is over 3*l.* 10*s.* in the board schools of London; therefore, with 300 children, you ought to spend at least 900*l.*, if you are to pay them on the same scale as the London School Board. What is spent, do you know?—The cost per head weekly of all charges, except rent, for all the children is 8*s.* 2*d.* a week.

4031. It is rather more, is it not?—All except rent; the rent is not included in the 8*s.* 2*d.* The cost per head weekly for all charges except rent is 8*s.* 2*d.*

4032. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) That is everything but the rent?—No.

4033. (*Chairman.*) This does not give us the teaching staff at all?—Yes.

4034. Perhaps you could supply in your answer the salaries of the teaching staff, and then we could make out for ourselves the cost per head?—Yes, I can send it; but I want to make myself very clearly understood in this matter. Having regard to the class of children that we have to deal with, I consider that the teaching staff and the accommodation for them is all that is necessary or justifiable.

4035. To meet the wants of the children?—To meet the wants and requirements of the children.

4036. Both intellectual, moral, and physical?—Yes, in every sense. And you see the per-centage of those that recover is exceedingly small, although of course, the usefulness of the institution must not be gauged by the per-centage of discharges. The lives of these imbeciles (for imbeciles they are) is, of course, improved materially; it is made wider and broader, and they are trained so that they become useful in some degree. Of that 500, there are 200 who are engaged in domestic and industrial pursuits, and there are 300 attending the class-rooms; but, of course, the number of those who derive substantial benefit, I think one would place at 25 per cent. I think, speaking now from memory, there are perhaps 30 or 40 children how

Mr. F. H. Walmsley, M.D.

5 Mar. 1897.

might certainly, if suitable homes could be found for them, be trained in the special classes, but those are defectives, they are feebled-minded children, they are children as it were of unstable mental, equilibrium, easily unhinged when exposed to adverse conditions. If these adverse conditions can be guarded against and provided for I am disposed to think they might, with advantage, be trained in the special centres.

4037. Are these older children who have been some time with you?—Children of all ages; they are now about 15 or 16.

4038. And are there some in the lower classes who would also be able to be trained in the special centres. Why should they not be boarded-out from the first?—We receive them from the guardians; that is a matter for the guardians.

4039. Besides the 30 or 40 older children, probably a larger number could be boarded-out with benefit to themselves near the classes?—Not a larger number; I should say the total would not exceed 50.

4040. If you have 30 or 40 older children why should not the same class be found in the younger ones?—At present it is not the case, as a matter of fact.

4041. But perhaps those 30 or 40 were despaired of in lower classes and have developed since?—No. I should say that they were the highest grades that entered the schools.

4042. There is a curious dislocation then in the schools if all the cleverness is to be found in the top school?—Of course, it makes itself more apparent after some years of training.

4043. Is it not possible that some of the younger ones will eventually prove to be equally improved with the older ones?—Yes.

4044. And might, if they had not been sent into the institution, have done better for themselves altogether in life?—I do not think so in their early age.

4045. The age of seven is contemplated for attending special classes?—We receive them into Darenth at five years of age; but the great point is, I take it, with imbeciles and defectives, to improve first of all the physical condition before you attempt very much teaching. Of course, that is the very great point in sending children to these institutions, that they are placed out in the country and get all the benefits of country life.

4046. It is thought that these children by mixing with children in the infant schools would follow their games of marching and drill, and attempt to sing and have the senses cultivated by kindergarten work. Would you agree to that?—Yes; that is carried out at Darenth very largely.

4047. But not the mixing with children of a better class in the ordinary infant schools. It is proposed to leave these specially defective children in the ordinary infant schools to mix with them to the age of seven, and then I suppose there is a certain period of mental development that begins at seven years of age, which distinguishes them from the infants, when it is thought advisable to have special classes for them. Do you think that would be a good scheme to follow?—Yes, quite.

4048. (*Mr. Pooley.*) I think, throughout your evidence you have divided the children into imbeciles and defectives?—Yes. Imbeciles and defectives, or degenerates.

4049. Would you accept the term imbecile as meaning those who will not become wholly or partially self-supporting in after-life?—I could hardly do that, because a number of our imbeciles are partially self-supporting, at Darenth, as a matter of fact.

4050. I understand they are able to do work in Darenth which helps towards their support; but I meant rather, whether you would accept, as a definition of imbecility, a person who is not likely to become wholly or partially self-supporting out in the world?—Unless under supervision, he cannot stand alone; he certainly cannot stand alone; he cannot stand unaided; he will find his way back again into the gutter and the workhouse.

4051. And that is a class of persons for whom Darenth and such institutions were intended?—Yes, it is.

4052. Then, in addition to the imbeciles in that sense, you do, as a matter of fact, have a certain number of defective children not imbeciles, I mean, not imbeciles in that sense?—Yes. I consider all those who have been discharged as recovered would not be called imbeciles; I should call them defectives, certainly. I should call those children just as it were on the border line, but requiring protection and guidance.

4053. And one reason for your getting a greater number of defective children, I suppose, is from the difference of opinion among medical men as to what is an imbecile or an idiot and what is not. One man will take one basis for his certificate and another man another; there must be a difference of opinion?—Yes, there is, and, of course, there must be some difference of opinion; but, I take it, that that has been so because in the past these special centres were not established.

4054. And you have all grades (you agree to that) from the person who is clearly an idiot to the person who is only just a degree below the normal child?—Yes, we have some. Of course, we have not many of those, probably, I should say, 50, in round numbers.

4055. Well, then, I understand you to think that for a child who is not an imbecile, but who is capable of being improved by education and individual attention, such child would be likely to do better at a special class, if he had a good home, than in an institution like Darenth?—Yes, I must say so, frankly, if carefully guarded and protected.

4056. But something depends upon home life?—Yes, a very great deal. These children ought to be placed in the most favourable environment if they are to do well, and their physical condition must be toned up. I think Mrs. Burgwin will allow me to say that at one or two centres that I visited, I saw some children who were suffering from anæmia in a poor weakly physical condition, who would certainly have done well in the country. It appears to me that it is impossible to expect any marked intellectual results from such children in such a feeble anæmic physical state; they want to be toned up, braced up.

4057. In order to separate defective children from ordinary children who are fit to be taught with other children in the ordinary schools, do you think it is necessary that there should be a medical examination?—I do indeed.

4058. Because, as a rule, such children will present some physical signs to distinguish which it is necessary to have a trained eye?—Undoubtedly. As I have already stated, I felt that to be rather my difficulty this afternoon in expressing myself clearly, because part of medical training is a knowledge and acquaintance, of course, with insanity, in fact with every branch of medicine.

4059. You said that you thought it undesirable that imbeciles should leave the institution; that remark applied only to the imbeciles?—Only to the imbeciles.

4060. Not to the defectives?—No, not to the defectives; because, as I say, if these defectives, or degenerates, are placed in a favourable environment there is a tendency to revert to the normal healthy type, fortunately; it is the one ray of hope, as I say.

4061. That tendency would be fostered in special classes for children who have good homes, or special classes connected with homes, better than it would be in an institution like Darenth, the tendency, I mean, to become like ordinary children?—I should rather put it in this way: that perhaps the more varied surroundings would tend to develop their perceptive faculties to a higher degree.

4062. Just one word about epileptics; you had some experience of epileptic children at Darenth?—Yes.

4063. Do you agree that a child who has epileptic fits occasionally only, is not a disturbing element in a class of other children?—I will answer that question with a certain qualification, if you will allow me. I should say in the case of purely sane children, it is undesirable that they should come into contact with epileptics. In the case of an imbecile, whose senses are so dulled and blunted, I do not think that the effect is harmful. Only those epileptic children at Darenth are sent to the class-rooms who have very infrequent fits, probably once in three, four, or six months; and in the case of these children they are some of our brightest children. Epileptics at an early age are often exceedingly bright and sharp, and therefore it is undesirable to keep those children from the class rooms, because I think a greater amount of good is brought about than harm done. But I am speaking now only of the

Mr. F. H. Walmsley, M.D.

5 Mar. 1897.

imbeciles. In the case of sane children I think it undesirable that they should mix with epileptics, most decidedly.

4064. I did not quite understand why you thought it did harm to keep these epileptics in these classes. Was it because they were really fairly bright children?—No, I say it would be a pity to keep them from the classes, because they are bright children.

4065. But you find at Darenth that these fits do not frighten the other children?—No, they do not, as a matter of fact; as I say, their general sensibility is not so acute.

4066. You have not had really much experience as to whether children with occasional fits would frighten the ordinary children?—I should say they would.

4067. But you have not had much experience?—No.

4068. And you find at Darenth that they do not frighten the ordinary children?—No, as a matter of fact they do not; but as I say, only those children are sent to the class rooms who have very infrequent fits. Many epileptics in the earlier years are very bright, intelligent, and exceedingly sharp; but, of course, the history of epilepsy, unfortunately, is that with the recurrence of fits their mental powers become blunted and dulled, and they would have, say, attacks of acute mania, finally lapsing into dementia.

4069. You would not get that class of bright and intelligent epileptics at Darenth, I presume?—We have a few.

4070. They must have been certified as imbeciles?—Yes, they are certified as imbeciles.

4071. Is it in your opinion a mistake that they should be so certified?—There is rather a difficulty in that matter.

4072. If there were any institution for the education of epileptics, then you would say, I presume, that they were not proper cases for Darenth?—Yes, I should; but I have no doubt it is well understood that epileptics, as I say, lapse into dementia in the course of time, and I notice with our epileptics whom we get at seven, eight, or nine years of age, when they become, say, 16 years of age, they will have attacks of post-epileptic excitement and then they are transferred to the county asylums, and they will remain in the county asylums for some years, and finally they become utterly and absolutely demented in time. Some cases possess greater mental powers than others. Some of our ablest men, as we know, have been epileptic.

4073. But that is anticipating. It might be quite sufficient to leave it to the time when they are really imbeciles before you send them to an idiot asylum?—True, but all the epileptics sent to Darenth do suffer from mental alienation.

4074. Can you tell us whether, as a matter of fact, all the parents whose children are sent by the guardians to Darenth are thereby pauperised, and suffer under pauper disabilities?—No, I think not. I think some pay a small amount.

4075. But supposing their children are sent by the guardians, do not the parents become paupers, and suffer under some disabilities even though they may be required to contribute something?—I rather think they do as a matter of fact; but we receive the children from the guardians; so that I have not really made inquiries into that point. I know that they are sent from the workhouses of course, and brought down to us by the workhouse officials.

4076. (*Miss Townsend.*) You told us that there were about 50 children, older and younger, who might be called defective, and not imbeciles, and who would probably do well at the special classes. Supposing that no such provision was made for them, what future do you look foward to for those 50 children; what will be the natural course?—Of course, in the case of those children, their parents very frequently take them out when they have improved so far; a large number of them are taken out by their parents, but I cannot say that they have recovered, though they have improved considerably.

4077. Then those are not included in the numbers you give as having improved sufficiently to go out?—No, they are discharged as improved simply.

4078. But nevertheless it is presumable that if their parents take them out to live with them they consider that they have sufficiently improved to live at home?—Yes, and we have no power to detain them of course.

4079. Would you detain them in many cases if you could, when a parent wishes to have them at home?—Yes, I should, except in the cases of those that may be called defective; I should not allow any imbecile children to leave the institution, but unfortunately they are taken out.

4080. Can the parents take out the imbeciles as well?—The parent has simply to express a wish to remove a child, to the guardians, and we have no power to interfere with them.

4081. I thought there was a special power from the Lunacy Commission to detain them?—We could not detain them against their wish; that is specified in the Local Government Board regulations, although it is the duty of the guardians to ascertain if the parents are able to maintain that child, and look after it, of course.

4082. To prevent its being dangerous to the community?—Yes; and being starved, not properly looked after. But if the parents are working-class people, and have homes where they can maintain the children, the children go to them.

4083. And a considerable number of these defective children do so pass out?—Yes, certainly, some of them do.

4084. You have 50 defective children, not idiots now; do you think, allowing for those who are removed, and those who die, and so on, you will have 50 next year and the year after; is that about the rate at which they evolve?—I should say so, 50 educable defectives or children on the border line discharged to the guardians as they recover.

4085. Then if they are left to you, and not taken out by their parents, what becomes of them?—If, in the opinion of the medical superintendent, they have improved sufficiently, the guardians are informed of that fact, and they are removed by the guardians; and then it is the duty of the guardians to make provision for them, and send them to homes, if possible, and board them out, and so on. The guardians do that, and of course, we have nothing more to do with them.

4086. Then that number also is not included in the one a year that Miss Heatson told us of?—Yes, I would include in the $2\frac{1}{2}$ those who are recovered, as it were.

4087. So they do not all pass out into the world?—No, they are all transferred to the guardians, and it is then the duty of the guardians to look after them.

4088. The greater proportion of them remain at Darenth, and are put to work in the institution?—Yes, in industrial and domestic pursuits.

4089. That is particularly the case with boys?—Yes.

4090. Do many of them work on the grounds?—Yes, about 150 on the grounds, workshops, and institution generally.

4091. Do you think that accounts at all for the low rate of charge, the fact that a great number of these boys work on the ground and do the work of the institution?—I do not; because the value of the work that they do is not very great; it is rather difficult to assess it. For instance, in the tailor's shop the value of the work done in 1893, I think it is, was 185*l.*, and in the shoemaker's shop, 193*l.*

4092. And that has, of course, to be put down to the support of the people who do it, to a considerable extent?—Yes, of course.

4093. Their earning hardly exceed the cost of their support?—They do not come anywhere near it.

4094. Not the 8*s.* 2*d.* a week?—No.

4095. Are they paid even a little, to make them imagine themselves self-supporting?—They are not paid in money, of course; they get tobacco and little extras of that kind, luncheon, and so on.

4096. So far as they are aware they are still patients on the same footing as the other patients?—Of course, but they are rather looked upon as better class patients.

4097. As the *elite*?—Yes, and they get their luncheon and tobacco.

4098. So that it is an encouragement to them to improve, to be put to work and have their luncheon and tobacco?—I do not know that you can put it exactly

that it is an encouragement to them to improve; other efforts are made to improve them.

4099. Is the incentive to improve as great, keeping them in Darenth, as it would be if they were put out with the avowed object of making them self-supporting?—You are speaking now of defectives, of course?

4100. Yes?—All these defectives as they recover are discharged to the guardians.

4101. So that on that ground also with a view to their future it would be as well to put them out of the surroundings at Darenth?—Yes, the small number that I have indicated.

4102. How many hours schooling a day have the educable children at Darenth?—The younger children are there for an hour and a half in the morning and an hour and a half in the afternoon; the elder children two hours in the morning and two hours in the afternoon.

4103. How do they pass the rest of the day, these educable children; are they apart from the others?—Yes; the younger children, of course, play in the grounds; there is a very large recreation ground there, and they have games, and so on, and the elder children are taken out frequently for walks beyond in the asylum grounds; then, of course, there is a very large number of entertainments; there is something every week.

4104. But in their ordinary life and movements, getting up, lying down, going in, and going out, they are together with the less educable children?—No, the better ones are kept from the others; I brought some pictures which perhaps will give you some information about that (*handing in the same*). The better grade of children are warded apart from the others, and they do not come into contact with the helpless cases.

4105. I think they do, do they not, when they are not well. You have only one infirmary, I think?—No, we have something like 12 infirmary wards.

4106. Then are the children who have the ordinary ailments of childhood, in the same wards with the chronic cases of imbecility?—No; occasionally it happens so, but as a rule they are not.

4107. And when they are convalescent, are they then separated from the chronic cases?—Yes, as far as possible.

4108. It is not always possible?—No; we have 400 totally helpless cases there.

4109. And are they quite kept in separate wards from the educable?—Yes, as is indicated in these photographs.

4110. (*Chairman.*) Are some of the bad cases in these photographs?—Yes, they are all there.

4111. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) Will you tell me what is a child in the eyes of the authority that sends them to you, I mean what age?—Five years of age.

4112. And to what age?—To 16; between 5 and 16.

4113. So that in the eyes of the law then a child is from 5 to 16 years of age?—Yes, for the schools; over 16 they would go to the adult asylums.

4114. When they are over 16 they leave you?—No, not always is that the case; some of them we retain if they are deriving marked benefit.

4115. Under what power do you retain them if your limit of age is 16?—As a matter of fact, there is an adult asylum at Darenth, and many of them are transferred to the adult asylum after they become 16.

4116. So that there is over-lapping between what you call the adult and a child?—Yes.

4117. You do not call that good organisation do you?—Yes, I rather do. I am not certain that 16 is not too early an age to send them away.

4118. I am coming to that. I wanted to ask you whether you think it necessary or wise to increase the age at which you would retain the children?—Yes, I should increase it to 18; because, of course, a defective child at 16 is younger than a normal child at 16, obviously.

4119. How many children (and when I speak of a child, I mean a child up to 16 years of age) are discharged per year?—You mean under 16?

4120. Yes, as a child. By "discharged," I do not mean sent over to the adult asylum?—You mean improved or recovered?

Mr. F. H. Walmsley M.D.

5 Mar. 1897.

4121. Yes?—Last year there were discharged recovered 14 children; there were discharged improved, 25; and not improved, 10. Those are the exact numbers for 1896,—49.

4122. You say that 14 were recovered?—They were discharged recovered.

4123. They are classed as recovered?—Yes.

4124. Then 25 are improved?—Yes, probably they have been removed by their parents.

4125. And 10 not improved?—Yes.

4126. Do we understand then that 49 children were sent out fit to mix in society?—No, certainly not.

4127. They why are they discharged?—We speak now of the 25 improved.

4128. Very well?—Their parents have made application for them to be removed.

4129. Do you mean, as medical officer, that you would not have discharged any of those children?—No, I should not have discharged any of the 25.

4130. You would have discharged the 14?—Yes.

4131. But did I rightly understand you when you said that once defective, always defective?—Once imbecile always imbecile, is what I said.

4132. These children you were speaking of then were simply defective children?—Yes, these 14; they were not imbecile; they would not come under the category of imbecile.

4133. Could you tell us at all, have you any knowledge what becomes of these 10 not improvable?—They are frequently discharged to county asylums; they are suffering from epileptic excitement, and so on. Even some of those their parents insist on taking out when they have not improved.

4134. You would think that most undesirable?—It is most undesirable that they should go out.

4135. I think you gave us to understand that you considered that the children were benefited by training?—Distinctly.

4136. Then if you could have better training it would be fair to suppose that the children would improve more?—At Darenth.

4137. Yes?—No, I do no think that. I think, at Darenth, they get all the training that they require or are capable of benefiting by.

4138. You think that a teacher with 40 of these children can give them the best training that they can get?—I do, indeed, having regard to the mental capacity of these children, which is so very limited.

4139. You do not think that they could have increased those improvable cases if they had had better training?—I am certain that they could not.

4140. I put it, if they could have had more individual training?—I am certain that they could not. I am very confident indeed about it.

4141. That would mean, would it not, that it is hardly worth while to train them, which would almost defeat what you said?—No, I said that they could be trained up to a certain point, a certain per-centage of them, to become useful, but they could not be improved beyond that point.

4142. Are many of the parents of these children related before marriage, do you think?—Yes.

4143. You have a thousand children, and I think you said that 200 of those may be considerably improved?—In their habits and conduct.

4144. Would you not then propose to give that 200 more individual attention than they get now?—No, I think they get quite sufficient individual treatment, that is my experience in the four years I have been there.

4145. Could you tell us how you divide the classes of children which you get in the institution?—It is by their degree of mental capacity, that is the main guide. It is very difficult, of course, as a matter of fact, to form them into standards, because their intelligence is so limited. The only guide we have is that some are a little brighter than others.

4146. I thought, perhaps, something like this, that you could say that you had the hopeless cases, and then there came a certain number hardly hopeless; then you had quite a superior class; those were about the three divisions, I thought, in passing through?—It is so.

Mr. F. H. Walmsley, M.D.

5 Mar. 1897.

4147. I want to get from you whether you would think that that upper part could be got to do more than they do?—No, I do not, indeed.

4148. Do not you think that many of the children that you have are physically strong?—Yes, physically strong.

4149. A feeble-minded child is often a physically strong child?—Yes, quite so; they are in good bodily condition.

4150. Did I rightly understand that you said that 360 out of the 1,000 children had good articulation. I thought that seemed a large number?—Yes, it is so; there are the figures.

4151. That surprises me very much, because talking with them I thought the articulation was a distinct difficulty?—It is so, decidedly; but 360 out of 1,000 is not very many.

4152. I thought it seemed a large proportion?—It is practically a third; you may divide them into thirds really.

4153. Is it part of your duty to see to the education of the children at all?—Yes, to generally confer with the schoolmistress, of course, on the point.

4154. Would you, as the medical man, point out to the teachers what to look for in each child?—Yes.

4155. And do you think that the occupations are varied enough for each child?—Yes, quite.

4156. Then you would be able to tell me this: Do not you think that a child can be largely taught by pictures?—All object lessons, certainly.

4157. I mean conversational lessons in pictures?—Yes.

4158. You have not many pictures, have you, in the schools?—A fair amount of pictures I thought, and picture-books also. I certainly think we might have more in the wards, and that matter is engaging the attention of the committee at this moment, in fact some are being framed now.

4159. Then with regard to object lessons, I think you will agree with me that your children are often cruel in their disposition to animals?—No, I do not find it so.

4160. Then how do you test that; you have no animals for the children about, have you?—There are a number of birds; there is the usual domestic cat in each ward, several of them.

4161. None of the children, I think, have any pets. There is no place for them to have pets?—No.

4162. And there is no means of teaching them any gardening?—Yes, some of them engage in gardening, those who are capable.

4163. But they have no little gardens of their own, I mean?—No.

4164. So that the advantages that we hope to get from a country residence are hardly obtainable for the children in Darenth, are they?—The class of children is not suitable for that kind of amusement, so many of them, as I say, are almost mindless.

4165. As regards those 50 children that you would send out, have they any specific training in the institution?—Yes.

4166. Of what kind?—They go into the workroom. Some are employed in the laundry, and they do the usual domestic offices in the wards in which they are located.

4167. Do they have any cookery?—No, they are not really fit for that.

4168. Not even the 50?—No, hardly.

4169. (*Mr. Newton.*) How many hours, do you think ought the defective children, that is the higher imbeciles, to be taught in school in the week?—Two hours in the morning and two hours in the afternoon. Wednesday afternoon is a holiday, and Saturday afternoon is a holiday.

4170. Then you think that in London, where they have 25 hours per week in the special classes, that is too long for the defective children?—How many hours a day is that?

4171. Five hours a day, five days a week?—Yes, I think it is too long.

4172. You would recommend a shorter time?—Yes, not more than four hours a day, because there is a great difficulty in arresting and fixing their attention, and, of course, they soon weary.

4173. What proportion of manual work should be taken out of the school time for defective children?—I have not had so much experience with defective children, of course, as the School Board teachers have had, but I should think that half the time should be manual work, certainly with the view of training them as much as possible by the hand.

4174. Is there any particular sort of hand training that you have found especially helpful?—The basket-making and cane-seating for chairs, and they do modelling in clay.

4175. After examining the children are you able to tell the teacher to give a particular child particular treatment?—No, not immediately of course, that requires some little testing. They have to be tried at several pursuits before their special aptitude, if they have one, is discovered.

4176. But eventually do you regulate the treatment of the children in the school?—Yes.

4177. And what sort of advice would you give in any particular case, to a teacher say?—I should, of course, advise her to dwell most upon the aptitude that the child discovers, decidedly.

4178. Is corporal punishment found necessary even in the case of your higher imbeciles?—Not at all, we have no punishment whatever, it would be most illogical.

4179. I have heard it threatened in the classes for defective children in London; is that wrong or right in your opinion?—From my view it is not desirable.

4180. In a case where a boy inflicted pain on another child, would you consider it wrong to make the punishment meet the crime by inflicting pain on him?—I should not do it.

4181. What would you do in such a case? For instance, this is what I saw the other day in a class for defective children. A boy first teased another boy and then gave him a most unprovoked kick about the ankle; what would you do in such a case?—I simply find in those cases that you can only speak kindly to them, and wait until the outburst of temper has subsided.

4182. But if it was repeated, as I was told in this case it had been, what would you do?—I should wait again until the outburst of temper had subsided. I think it is a case that requires great patience.

4183. But in the meantime the other boy is getting kicked?—Then he must be removed.

4184. What is the ideal number of defective pupils for one teacher?—I should think not more than 20.

4185. That is what you would propose?—Yes.

4186. And how long do you think it is desirable to keep defective children at school?—Actually in the class rooms?

4187. I mean up to what age?—I should not keep them there certainly beyond 16 years of age. I should rather develop the manual training.

4188. Would you keep them up to 16 if it was possible to get that?—I should be guided by each child. I think children might be put to manual occupation at 10 or 11 years of age for, say, half the day, because in the case of these defective children so much depends upon the training of the hand. I mean to say that the hand has had more to do with forming the brain, than the brain has had to do with forming the hand, and, therefore, manual pursuits develop the mental and motor centres of the brain upon which the intelligence depends.

4189. I suppose in the case of boys who could be trusted with carpentering tools you would think that the wood work is a very good thing?—Yes, decidedly, if they can be trusted with them.

4190. And cookery and laundry work for the girls you would approve of that, too?—Yes, certainly, for the defectives, not for the imbeciles.

4191. I am speaking of the defectives all the time. Then do you think that the age of attendance at school should be raised by law, or only by persuasion. I am speaking of defectives?—Above 16 years of age do you mean?

4192. No, up to 16. At present it is 14?—Yes, I think it might be 16.

4193. Could you define the term "defective" by Act of Parliament?—It is always difficult to draw up a definition of anything, is it not?

4194. It is; but "blind" and "deaf" have been defined by an Act of Parliament; could "defective" be defined in a similar way?—I do not think it could. It would rather be suggested that there was defect owing to their physical basis of mind being in some way at fault, either functionally or organically. You see to the medical mind the word "defect" immediately means something wrong with the brain cells; that is very important. The defect is simply an indication of a deeper-seated cause; and that is some derangement, either functional or organic, of the brain cells which form the physical basis of mind. I can only define it so, but that would not be a very workable definition, perhaps, for the ordinary lay mind.

4195. You mean that the magistrate by whom the thing in the last resort must be decided, cannot be got to understand anything about the brain cells?—Just so.

4196. Then as regards the entrance of children into a class for defectives, you think that should be decided by a medical man?—Yes, I do indeed, because of the question of the brain cells or degree of mental incapacity.

4197. But do you not think that a teacher who has had long experience of those children will be able to form an opinion?—Yes, I think undoubtedly from constant association with these children, the teachers must necessarily acquire a considerable amount of experience. All our knowledge is derived through and from experience.

4198. I am going to take an analogy from another branch of science, and you will tell me whether it is a fair one. It is that people who have lived for a long time in the country, and have observed acutely, are able to distinguish different species of plants, and to recognise many varieties though they do not know any botanical terminology.; is that, in your opinion, a fair analogy?—Yes.

4199. Then do you not think that a teacher with great experience of defective children would be able to do almost as well as a medical man?—No, I do not, indeed.

4200. Not even as well as a medical man who had not given much attention to that particular subject?—No, I do not, indeed.

4201. You stand up for the medical man, under all circumstances?—It is not a case of standing up for the medical man.

4202. No, I know that is a wrong expression?—I think it is a purely medical subject, and must be, as it depends upon purely anatomical and physiological knowledge, which a man only derives in the dissecting room.

4203. (*Dr. Smith.*) How many admissions have you into Darenth in a year on an average?—In 1896 there were 138.

4204. That is last year. Could you make any rough classification of those 138 cases?—Yes. I should say that a third of them are quite incapable of deriving benefit; one-third would derive substantial benefit; and one-third would be improved more or less; in other words they might be taught cleanly habits, a certain measure of self control, and to restrain their kicking propensities.

(*Chairman.*) Which is the highest of those three?

(*Dr. Smith.*) The third that would receive substantial benefit.

(*Chairman.*) That was the second.

4205. (*Dr. Smith.*) Yes. It ought to be one-third unimprovable, one-third improvable in the sense defined by Dr. Walmsley, and one-third who would derive substantial benefit. (*To the witness.*) All those cases are admitted into Darenth on a medical certificate?—Yes.

4206. And I suppose the medical certificate is confirmed by the medical superintendent of the asylum?—Yes.

4207. In other words if you had any doubt about the advisability of admitting any one of those cases you would not admit it?—I should probably admit it for a while to observe the child, such is the custom of asylums, to give an observation for at least three months after the children have been certified, and then if they betray no marked symptoms of mental alienation they are returned to the parishes.

Mr. F. H. Walmsley, M.D.

5 Mar. 1897.

4208. Have you any idea whether after the observation of those children in 1896 you discharged any of them?—No, I do not think so.

4209. You do not recall any?—No.

4210. Therefore, you admitted last year 138; how many did you discharge?—We discharged as recovered 14.

4211. Would that 14 be the average number of recoveries?—No, it is rather above the average.

4212. What would be the average number?—The average number of recoveries I take it is about 2½ per cent.

4213. Two and a half per cent. of total number?—Of a thousand.

4214. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) That is the average number resident?—Yes; say 3 per cent. now of the average number resident.

4215. (*Dr. Smith.*) You have 1,000 inmates?—Yes.

4216. And 3 per cent. would be 30?—No, this is the per-centage of recoveries on admissions.

4217. What would you consider an ideal method of dealing with these recovered cases?—If it were possible, to place them in homes where they would be supervised and directed and sympathetically treated, or to place them with foster-parents, in other words, to board them out.

4218. You think that the whole of those cases of recoveries would require some supervision?—I do, indeed.

4219. You do not think it would be safe to trust them alone?—No.

4220. But yet they would be self-supporting to a certain extent?—Yes, under direction.

4221. And you think then that for that class it is desirable to have homes?—Yes. I should like to say with reference to one or two remarks of Mrs. Burgwin's that we get a number of children from the special centres where they fail to do anything with them, so that it is hardly likely that we can do much for them at Darenth.

4222. (*Chairman.*) You would regard a comparison of your children with Mrs. Burgwin's classes as scarcely fair?—Just so; and we get a number also from other schools where they have failed to do anything with them, and of course we get the residuum, we get other people's failures, therefore it is obvious that no very great results can be brought about at Darenth under any system of training, because those children have already been tested at the different schools and even at the special centres.

4223. But that is what you were meant for, is it not, to take other people's failures?—We get the residuum.

4224. (*Dr. Smith.*) Then how do you account for having these 50 children that you speak of?—I think they have been sent to us, as it were, by mistake. They are children who have run down in health and so they have become as it were very much depressed, and they do not respond. Theirs is a case, as it were, of temporary mental stupor owing to starvation of the brain cells; but as soon as they are restored to normal vigour they recover and we discharge them; but they will not come in the catagory of imbeciles.

4225. Have they been long inmates of the asylum?—No, we do not keep them long. Perhaps they will recover in a year, but unfortunately some of them relapse and come back to us so soon as they are exposed to unfavourable conditions of life.

4226. Do you wish the Committee to understand that those 30 or 40 children would have been better in the special classes of the school board in the first instance than with you?—No, I do not think so, in the first instance; but having been improved physically, then I think perhaps they might be returned to the special centres, having been well toned up, braced up and brought into a good physical state of health.

4227. Your institution has been a sort of convalescent home to them?—Yes, it has in fact.

4228. Do you know anything about the special centres of the London School Board you have seen some of them, I think?—I visited two centres.

Mr. F. H. Walmsley, M.D.

5 Mar. 1897.

4229. Have you anything to suggest about those?—I saw some children there that I thought ought not to be there.

4230. From what point of view?—Because I thought they were too imbecile,—they would certainly come under the category of imbecile, not defective; 25 per cent. I saw I should think in two schools.

4231. What methods have you for teaching the blind at Darenth—I mean the defective blind imbeciles?—We have not many and they are almost unteachable of course,—they are almost mindless. You see the main avenue of having been shut off knowledge-sight, it reduces them to a state of mindlessness.

4232. You have no special method of instruction for blind children then?—They are sent in and taught by raised letters, and they are taught to sing, and spoken to and taught to articulate.

4233. Then you have a system?—Yes, and we have one blind boy who plays the piano extraordinarily well.

4234. Then for deaf mutes have you any special instruction?—Only the hands, the finger vocabulary. That is all they can really appreciate, because they are imbecile to begin with. They are not sane children.

4235. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) I will begin where Dr. Smith left off, because that question of blind and deaf children is very interesting. Do you not think that there are some cases in which blindness is misunderstood, that is to say, an uneducated blind child, a blind child who has not been instructed becomes, from want of education, in a condition approaching imbecility?—Quite so; his brain is not developed.

4236. His brain is not developed, because there is not a stimulus through the senses?—Yes. He may have structurally healthy brain cells, but they have never been appealed to.

4237. And the condition of such a blind child, one who has been neglected, is very often approaching imbecility?—Yes, it would be mindless.

4238. Have you any option as to receiving blind and deaf and dumb children?—No, we receive all that come under medical certification.

4239. In what form are they certified?—There is one medical certificate.

4240. What form of medical certificate?—The ordinary form of lunacy, facts observed by myself, and facts communicated to me by others.

4241. That is to say, imbecile children are certified in the same way as adult lunatics?—Except that only one certificate is required instead of two.

4242. That is the case with paupers, is it not?—No, I think for adults they require two. Our children, in fact, have to be re-certified at the age of 16.

4243. However, they are certified as lunatics, not specifically as imbeciles or idiots?—No.

4244. I ask the question because perhaps you will be able to tell us whether medical men attach any special significance to the term "imbecile"?—Yes, I should say they do clearly differentiate between an imbecile and a lunatic, from the wording of their certificate.

4245. Might not some medical man hesitate to designate a child lunatic in a certificate, who was only an imbecile?—I do not quite understand you.

4246. You say that your form of certificate requires that the children should be designated lunatics?—It says a lunatic, or idiot or imbecile, I think.

4247. Does it give the term "imbecile"?—Yes.

4248. I rather understood not?—It certainly gives the term "idiot."

4249. "Idiot or person of unsound mind," that is the phrase?—Yes.

4250. But the same objection might perhaps apply, some medical men would hesitate to sign such a certificate for the higher class of imbecile, I imagine?—Quite so; and I can quite understand their hesitating, because, as I say, many of the symptoms are negative rather than positive.

4251. But I suppose you are rather in favour of a distinction being made between the class you call defective and simply dull children?—Yes.

4252. You recognise that there is a classs that may be called dull, but who, at the same time, are not defective?—Most distinctly.

4253. Would you kindly tell us what difference you see between the two classes?—As I say, I should consider that a defective child had some functional or organic derangement of the brain cells. I should consider that a slow child was slow because its mental operations were slow, that it was a normal child but spoke slowly because it thought slowly, to put it in simple language.

4254. I gather that you think that it requires some medical knowledge to distinguish satisfactorily between those two classes?—I do.

4255. Have you, in your capacity of medical superintendent of Darenth, the general direction of the place?—Yes.

4256. And does that imply a certain amount of direction of the educational operations?—Yes.

4257. Is it for you to say whether a child shall go to school or not?—Yes, it is; but, of course, I invite the schoolmistress if she sees any child that she thinks would benefit, to let me know, in case I should overlook it.

4258. You have her assistance, in fact?—Yes, and she visits the wards with me for that purpose. I am only too pleased to get assistance or advice on that point from anybody, because it is possible that I might overlook one in a thousand. I do not know that I have done so, but I might, and, therefore, I invite the schoolmistress to go into the wards whenever she wishes.

4259. So that you do go and look out all the cases that the schoolmistress and you think educable?—Yes.

4260. And send them to school?—Yes.

4261. And have you room for the number that you think ought to be at school?—Yes, quite room.

4262. Then, with regard to the occupations of the children, is that also prescribed by you, I mean the occupations out of school?—Yes.

4263. May I ask what occupations you have going?—There is shoe-making, mat-making, upholstery, and gardening, working on the cricket ground and in the garden generally; but we have not many fit to work in the grounds.

4264. Do you mean that they are not physically strong enough to work in the grounds?—Many of them are not, and also, they have not enough intelligence, and they would wander about and get into trouble and do more harm than good, in fact.

4265. You do not send them out to work in the open air for the sake of improving their health and strength?—In some cases, yes, but a smallish number.

4266. Without regard, I mean, to the effectiveness of their work?—Yes.

4267. Without regard to the actual work that they do?—Yes.

4268. Is not that very much the case with the other occupations, I mean that you have to consider not so much the profit of the work as the effect of the work on the health, and as a means of training?—Yes, as a means of developing the motor or mental centres.

4269. And do you not find that out-of-door work is superior to indoor work in improving the health generally?—Yes, it probably would be; but the mat-making is very suitable to their limited intelligences.

4270. Passing on to another department of training, I think you said that you never had any punishments at all?—We have not.

4271. Do you think that punishments are not applicable to the class of defective children?—I do indeed.

4272. Do you not think that they have a limited understanding that wrong-doing is reprehensible?—This is of course my own personal view of the matter, but it seems to me that you do not punish affliction, you punish crime. These are afflicted beings, and their conduct is only such as you expect from their limited understandings. Most of their actions are instinctive actions, instinctive movements, and it appears to me that it is most cruel and exceedingly illogical to punish them.

4273. But is it not part of training to try and cultivate their self-control?—Certainly, but I do not think with the rod.

4274. No, I did not say by corporal punishment?—I thought you were referring to corporal punishment.

4275. I think you told us that you had no punishments, did you mean no corporal punishments?—No, I meant any kind of punishment.

4276. Would there be any harm, in your opinion, in keeping a child from part of its food?—Yes, great harm.

4277. I mean only such a luxury as pudding at dinner, if he had been guilty of some bad action?—No, I should not do that; I am very strong on that point.

4278. You would not under any circumstance punish an imbecile child?—No.

4279. But then as the child grows up and is discharged from the institution, what do you think the effect of no punishment would be on its moral character?—The child has been admonished again and again, and so a certain amount of self-control has been instilled into it.

4280. But do you not think that the child might consider that in the outer world probably there would be no reason to refrain from crime because he had not been used to punishment, and would not realise that there would be punishment?—I do not think that punishment is at all a deterrent from crime, so far as relates to the insane or the feeble-minded.

4281. Do you not think that it is to the animal nature at least—say in the case of a dog; if you punish a dog for doing something he ought not to do, he probably remembers it and does not transgress again?—Yes, that is so.

4282. However, we will pass on. What I had in my mind was that you stated that it was always unsafe for your improved cases to be discharged into the outer world, that they fall victims to temptation?—Yes, it appears to me that they are not able to stand alone—they cannot stand unaided. For instance, their judgment is very slight and very feeble, they cannot make allowances for the ordinary expectations of life, and so they fail.

4283. Does not that often arise a good deal from want of knowledge of the environments of ordinary life—I mean with the higher class of defective children?—Very possibly that may have something to do with it.

4284. It has been suggested in evidence that possibly some sort of half-way house between an institution like Darenth and the outer world might be an advantage for the defectives that you discharge, as you say, recovered, who have lived for several years in an asylum atmosphere, or in an institution atmosphere. Do you think it would be an advantage for them to be drafted off to smaller homes for a time where they might become gradually accustomed to the external world?—Yes, I think so; in fact the guardians do that whenever they can, it is already in operation.

4285. You think that would be better really than sending them in large numbers to the adult asylum, for instance?—Only those unfit for discharge we sent to the custodial institute.

4286. You have cases which have improved very much in training, but does it necessarily follow that they are discharged from the asylum altogether, or could you transfer them, if they had no parents or no friends to look after them, to the adult asylum?—If they have improved sufficiently to be sent out, they are returned to their parishes through the guardians.

4287. That is, if, in your opinion, they are capable of doing some work in the outside world, I suppose?—Yes, under direction. Then they are returned to the guardians, of course. Such cases are not sent to the custodial institution.

4288. Is the custodial institution meant then for those that have not improved much?—Yes.

4289. You told us that you got a good many particulars as to the family history. Do you find that a very important element in making up your mind about a case, and the progress of a case?—Yes.

4290. You find that heredity comes in to a large extent?—Yes, and the effect of drink.

4291. Those are the two prominent causes?—Yes, those are the two main factors in the production of insanity, idiocy, and imbecility.

4292. Do you find those forms of yours fairly well filled up?—Yes.

4293. And that you get reliable information?—Yes.

4294. I think you have a large proportion of epileptic children amongst your children?—Yes, about 260.

4295. In all degrees of severity I suppose?—Yes.

Mr. F. H. Walmsley, M.D.

5 Mar. 1897.

4296. In your opinion is that a drawback (looking at the matter broadly and taking the average) to the possibility of much improvement?—Of course, as I say, a child or a juvenile may be trained in the earlier years, and that I take it is what, with the existing conditions, has to be dealt with at the moment; but ultimately that epileptic will pass through acute mania, finally lapsing into dementia. That will be the history of the case.

4297. Does not the fact of your having so many epileptics rather load your educational system, as they are not good subjects for teaching?—No, they are not of course, because after an attack of epilepsy they will have post-epileptic stupor perhaps lasting a week, when they forget all they have been taught in the previous month or two.

4298. Then with regard to the death-rate, I was surprised and pleased to hear that your death-rate last year was 2·5; can you tell us what the average death-rate has been over a succession of 10 years, say?—Perhaps 4 per cent.

4299. Again, do you know what the rate of mortality of children between 5 and 16 is in ordinary life?—In a normal school?

4300. In ordinary life?—Speaking generally of an ordinary school, I think it is about 3 per cent.

4301. I would not be sure, because I have not the figures before me, but I may say I went over carefully some years ago the statistics of the death-rate at Darenth and other Institutions (the Royal Albert, and Earlswood), and I found that the death-rate of those asylums was about nine times as much as that of the ordinary population of school age?—I suppose one would expect it to be because so many of them are physically feeble and of low vitality.

4302. At the school age I believe the mortality is much less than one would expect; that is to say, taking the general mortality at 20 per thousand, I believe that the mortality at the school age is not more than five or six per thousand?—Yes, I believe so.

4303. So that I think that rather points to the fact that in the mortality of an institution like Darenth, notwithstanding that yours is certainly low, there are a great many physical infirmities to cope with which complicate the matter?—Distinctly.

4304. Have you much trouble with tubercular ailments, phthisis, and so forth?—Yes, idiots and imbeciles are, of course, very liable to develop tuberculosis.

4305. I suppose a great many of your deaths are owing to that?—Yes.

4306. I rather gathered from what you said that you thought that the 50 of highest mental grade would really have done better outside the asylum than in it if they had had suitable education provided for them?—No, I do not say that, but I think that having arrived at the age that they have it would be desirable that they should mix with children in the outer world.

4307. That is to say, after you had given them a start?—Yes, and after their physical condition had been improved.

4308. You lay a great deal of stress upon their physical condition being improved as a condition antecedent to the possibility of mental improvement, I understand?—I do.

4309. And so far as children from London are concerned, a great many of them, of course, are under unfavourable conditions as to hygienic surroundings?—Yes, almost every child that we receive from London is anæmic, badly nourished, and in a fortnight you would hardly know the child.

4310. Do you find that as he improves physically so his facility for being educated improves?—Yes, very considerably; he becomes more observant and more responsive, more acute and displays more energy, both mental and physical.

4311. Have you any statement as to what has become of those children who have been discharged recovered; have you been able to trace their history after leaving Darenth?—No, because we hand them over to the care of the guardians who are responsible for them; our responsibility ceases when they are handed over to the guardians or to their friends.

4312. Do you happen to know of any cases that have really got on all right in the outer world?—There are several lads who are doing fairly well, I think. But, as I say, I should not call those imbeciles;

Mr. F. H. Walmsley, M.D.

5 Mar. 1897.

these are what you would rather call defectives, not imbeciles.

4313. Those are cases which need not necessarily have been through the routine of asylum life if their homes had been favourable?—Exactly, if under direction and supervision.

4314. If they had been sufficiently near a special class you think that they might have gone to that special class outside the asylum?—Yes, I think so, quite; they are very similar to such cases as I have observed doing well at the special centres which I visited.

4315. (*Chairman.*) I want to ask you a few more questions. You say that every child at Darenth reaches its highest educational point in your school?—Yes.

4316. But supposing that an expert were to say that your school-rooms were insufficient, and were not well supplied with proper desks and so on, would that modify your opinion?—Yes, it would.

4317. If that expert went on to say that your apparatus was defective, especially such apparatus as is suitable for such children, would that also modify your opinion?—Yes.

4318. And again if he said that, instead of having three trained teachers, you ought to have 15, so as to have classess of 20 children; would that modify your opinion?—I certainly should have some regard for such an opinion coming from an expert.

4319. If those facts were correct, you would not say, would you, that your children had reached the highest point of education that they were capable of reaching, assuming those statements to be correct?—Assuming the premises to be correct; but of course my point is that our children are so low in the scale that no more can be done with them. I mean to say that they are lower than the defectives for which something can be done, as is shown by the fact that we receive at Darenth defectives (I presume we must call them so), who have failed in the special centres even, and therefore have failed with these extra appliances that you have indicated, or that an expert would indicate.

4320. I do not understand what you mean by the term recovery; does it mean that the children are so far recovered as not to be dangerous to the community?—No, it means that they have not been absolutely cured; it means that they have returned to their average normal state.

4321. That is to say, that they have reached to the highest point that can be expected from them?—Yes; but I should not call them sane. If I made use of the word cured it would rather suggest that they had become normal children. They are not normal children; they are abnormal, but they have recovered their average condition.

4322. The physical defect has been remedied, so far as it was possible to remedy it?—That is so.

4323. As regards defective children in whom you see no outward signs of physical defect, would not the teacher, who knew the child, be a better judge to say that such a child was defective. You spoke of judging them by their talking slowly?—No, I do not think that she would.

4324. What other evidence would you have that the teacher would not have?—I should have my own evidence; the anatomical, the physiological, the pyschological, I should see the child frequently.

4325. But I understood you to say that there might be physical defects, which were not apparent on the surface?—Yes.

4326. And then you would judge by their talking slowly and thinking slowly; but would not the teacher be a better judge of such things than you would be?—No, I do not think so. Of course I express myself in that way, as I said, rather in every day language, as it were, in order to make myself understood by the lay mind; but in addition to this question of speech there are other signs and indications which a medical man would detect where perhaps the lay mind might fail.

4327. Your experience of epileptic children seems to be very unfavourable. You say that most of your epileptic cases drift into dementia?—Yes.

4328. Is that contrary to the ordinary experience, generally?—No, it is the ordinary experience of an asylum life.

4329. Your experience is not worse than the average, you think?—No.

4330. Mr. Newton asked you for some practical definition of the term defective that might be embodied in an Act of Parliament. Would it be sufficient to say that the children were not able entirely to govern themselves according to some practical test that a medical man could detect, either by physiological signs or by observing their habits, that they were not entirely or partially able to govern themselves?—That they were not self-directing, would that do?

4331. Yes. Would it not be better to have a practical test to be embodied in an Act of Parliament rather than a medical test?—Yes, it would be, if you can discover one; but you require to observe a child for some time—conduct is the test both for the sane and insane. We judge of a man's mental capacity by his conduct, and general demeanour.

4332. Could you not judge of these defective children in the same way by their conduct?—Not immediately, you require to keep them under supervision awhile; you cannot say in five minutes what their conduct is and may be.

4333. And the evidence of the teacher would not be sufficient for you?—It would be valuable.

4334. How many visits does a medical man pay to a lunatic before he certifies him as a lunatic?—He certifies him at once frequently in a case of lunacy; but that is rather a different case. In the case of lunacy the signs are exceedingly positive—acute mania lapsing into dementia.

4335. How many visits would you think you would usually require to pay to a defective child before you could say that he was a fit subject for a special class?—I should like to observe that child myself some half dozen times, say; but I am really speaking now without experience.

The witness withdrew.

Adjourned to Wednesday next at half-past two o'clock.

EIGHTH DAY.

Wednesday, 10th March 1897.

PRESENT:

The REV. T. W. SHARPE, C.B., in the Chair.

Mr. H. F. POOLEY.
Mr. A. W. NEWTON.
Dr. G. E. SHUTTLEWORTH.
Dr. W. R. SMITH.
MRS. BURGWIN.
Miss TOWNSEND.

Mr. H. W. ORANGE, *Secretary.*

Mr. G. PENN GASKELL called in and examined.

Mr. G. P. Gaskell.

4336. (*Chairman.*) You are Secretary of the National Society for the Employment of Epileptics?—Yes.

4337. How long has the society been in operation?—The institution established by the society has now been opened nearly three years—since August 1894. I distinguish between the society and the institution, because the society had been in existence for two or three years in the preliminary stage of ventilating the

subject and getting funds, prior to establishing an institution.

4338. You have heard a great deal of epileptic children, and you know how difficult it is to educate them in our present schools?—Yes.

4339. Perhaps you will state the principal obstacles that you think there are to educating them in ordinary schools?—Very many parents of epileptic children come to us for advice, and I find that the chief obstacles to their children being educated are, first of all, the very great difficulty there is in their going from their homes to the schools. Of course, if an epileptic is liable to frequent or severe attacks, it is obviously a very dangerous thing for him to go unaccompanied through the streets; consequently it is necessary, in order that he should attend school, that some person should accompany him, and, unless his fits are of the mildest character, it would be necessary that that should be a grown person and not another child.

4340. Of course, you know there are a great number of children slightly epileptic in our schools?—A very large number. Where the child is only slightly epileptic, there is no obstacle to his attending, and I should think probably it is the best thing for him to attend the ordinary school. The next obstacle is, if the fits are severe, that they cause a disturbance in the classes, and probably considerable danger to other children. If another child is of a nervous disposition, possibly attended with some predisposition to epilepsy, the fright of seeing a child in a fit is very likely to bring on epilepsy, because fright is one of the very common causes that produce this disorder in those who have a predisposition to it.

4341. A child suffering from a fit in that way may do more harm to a normal child than to a child who suffers in a similar way?—Far more, judging from our experience at the "colony" (our institution is called the "Colony" for Epileptics) judging from our experience there, it produces no bad effect upon one epileptic to see another in a fit. On the contrary, it is rather the other way, because their first thought always is to help one another. Of course, I am speaking now of grown-up people, though I think it would probably be the same with children. Amongst our grown-up cases in the colony, directly a man is in a fit all the others who are in the neighbourhood immediately run to assist him, and the only cases in which I have ever known this to produce a fit in others was where the attack has been an exceedingly severe one, and then (particularly when the colony was first started, and we did not have a very large staff) the patients used to actually assist in holding a man when he was in a fit, and if the fit was very violent, and he struggled very much, then it did sometimes happen that the excitement involved in holding the man down for a long time was the cause of several of the others having attacks. But that was chiefly owing to the physical labour, combined with the actual excitement in holding him down, and was not the mere effect of seeing him in a fit; and such cases have not, I think, occurred more than two or three times since the colony was instituted.

4342. I suppose our ordinary teachers would scarcely know how to treat cases of epilepsy?—I should say there is really very little difficulty in regard to the mere treatment of a person in a fit; but, of course, the sight of the person in the fit would be very alarming to another child. It is not so alarming to other epileptic children, because they realise that they suffer in the same way, and it does not produce in them the fear that they *will* suffer, because they know that they already *do*.

4343. Have you any statistics as to the number of epileptic children in the country which you can give us?—I have not any actual statistics. I can only say that we receive a very large number of applications from parents of epileptic children, and particularly when, as from time to time happens, notices appear in the press of the opening of new homes, or the laying of foundation stones of new homes, and then it has sometimes been mentioned that we are going to build homes for children, and that always brings in a crowd of applications. But we have not as yet any actual homes for children.

4344. Could you distinguish at all between the number of those that might attend an ordinary school and those which should go to an institution?—It is very difficult to answer that. There are milder cases of epilepsy which one never hears about. I might illustrate that by the figures given by the London School Board, figures which I cannot help thinking do not at all represent the actual number of epileptics, because many of the milder cases are never heard of. I mean that many children might be attending school who suffer from fits at very rare intervals without its being really known that they were epileptic at all.

Mr. G. P. Gaskell.

10 Mar. 1897.

4345. But you certainly would know all the serious cases?—The serious cases, of course, force themselves upon notice.

4346. Would you assume that all those cases which are down in the London School Board return are serious cases?—I should think that all those that are down in the London School Board's return as "not under instruction" would be serious cases, and as to those that are in the returns as "under instruction," the probability is that those would be serious; but in some cases they might happen to know them, even if they were not serious, because it might have happened that the child had a fit while actually at school.

4347. What is the number in the London School Board returns?—According to their returns of last year, speaking roughly, I think the number is about 250 under instruction, and about the same number not under instruction; but on inquiring I was informed that that includes epileptics who also suffer from other forms of affliction—for instance, it would include epileptics who are also blind, epileptics who are also crippled, and epileptics who are also deaf and dumb—and, of course, there are a very large number who suffer not only from epilepsy, but from other afflictions. Eliminating those, and taking the ones that are purely epileptic, the London School Board informs me that last spring (their returns are made at Lady Day, I think) there were 65 under instruction, and 145 not under instruction.

4348. Do you consider it very dangerous to send an epileptic blind child to a blind class with a blind teacher?—Very dangerous to the other children.

4349. A case actually occurred the other day of a child being in a fit, and the blind teacher not knowing in the least what to do with it. In fact, she did the wrong thing altogether; and if it had not been for the another teacher coming up and doing the proper thing, the poor child would have had to suffer very much?—Yes, I can well understand that.

4350. That is all the information you can give us as to the number of children, but are there any statistics that you know of for the whole of the Kingdom?—No. I have some figures in regard to London as to the workhouses, which are very interesting from one point of view. The Local Government Board supplied me with figures in 1893 relating to the number of sane epileptic adults and sane epileptic children. When I say "sane," perhaps I ought to qualify that by saying "not certified as being of unsound mind." The figures are interesting in this way, that they showed a very large number of epileptic adults as being paupers; the number was over 600.

4351. In the metropolitan area?—In the metropolitan area. On the other hand, the number of children in the workhouses and infirmaries was only 22. I must explain that that did not include the Poor Law schools; but the figures obtained by Dr. Warner, with which you have probably been furnished, in the course of the investigation which he made a few years ago, showed that among 9,000 children in the Poor Law schools there were only five epileptics; consequently, if one adds to the number in the Poor Law infirmaries and workhouses the number in the schools, one finds that the total is exceedingly small. As I say, there were 22 in the workhouses and infirmaries of the whole of London, and at the schools Dr. Warner found only five in 9,000. On the other hand, there are over 600 adults. This seems to me interesting as pointing to this: that epilepsy is not a disease that is found particularly amongst the very poorest classes, but that pauperism among epileptic adults is due, not to their belonging naturally to the pauper class, but to their affliction, and to the consequences that follow from it.

4352. You mean that they are abandoned by relatives to the workhouses when they become epileptic?—When they become adults, in many cases, of course, they may have no relations who would continue to be able to support them. Their parents would possibly be dead, and they might have no relations. Taking the estimate which is arrived at in the Charity Organisation report, of which probably you are aware, the

Mr. G. P. Gaskell.

9 Mar. 1897.

epileptics number about 1 in 1,000 of the population. It would follow from that that the 600 epileptic adults that there were in the workhouses and infirmaries was one-fifth, or nearly, of the whole number of epileptic adults in the metropolitan area; that is to say, that one-fifth of the epileptic adults is not only a pauper, but an indoor pauper.

4353. Do you happen to know whether the epileptic adults in the workhouses were altogether uneducated or not?—Many of them would have been educated, because epilepsy often does not commence till after the school age is past. Moreover, under present conditions, epileptics who are afflicted from childhood deteriorate so much, that, when grown up, they would probably more often be found in the asylums than in the workhouses. Amongst the applicants to us we find that, as a rule, about one in every three has been epileptic from childhood—using the expression childhood as denoting from birth up to 11 years—and I notice among the applicants, and also amongst those of them whom we receive at the colony, a very great difference between those who have been epileptic from childhood and those who have become epileptic later. By far the worst cases that we have, and the most hopeless cases—the cases that are most unfit morally and mentally in any way to be at the colony—are those that have been epileptic from childhood. That is due, generally, but not always, to the fact that they have been uneducated. In some cases they have been educated, but, usually, the home conditions of an epileptic are so very bad. It is very difficult in a poor family to deal with an epileptic. Usually he is on the one hand spoiled and allowed to have his own way, and yet, on the other hand, the family hold aloof from him. He becomes often more or less of an outcast, and feels a sense of aloofness from his relations. So he suffers from two almost opposite things, from that of being spoilt and undisciplined, and from that of feeling himself rather an outcast and a pariah. I refer only to serious cases. In the case of those very lightly afflicted, who are able to participate like normal children in the ordinary family life, I think it cannot be doubted that the influences of a good, or even a moderately good, home are far more beneficial than those of any institution; for institutions, when wisely conducted, strive merely to imitate the family ideal, but the imitation is always an imperfect one. But even in the more serious cases the discipline and training of an institution will to a large extent qualify the epileptic child to participate more fully during its holidays in the home life of its relations, and it is for this reason that it seems to me important that these institutions should not be so few and scattered, that distance should absolutely cut off the child from going to stay with his friends.

4354. In the serious cases the want of education intensifies the feeling that the epileptic is an outcast?—The want of education intensifies this in two ways. If a child is uneducated it causes him to be more at home, and more under these rather bad home influences, and at the same time it leaves his mind unoccupied, and I think that there can be no doubt that an unoccupied mind is the very worst thing for epilepsy. Certainly we find that the effect of occupation at the colony not only effects an improvement as regards their disease, but it improves them morally and mentally. Usually, when colonists come to us, they have a thoroughly downcast look, they seem utterly dejected; they seem to have felt that they have always been in a dependent position, and the occupation at the colony, and the feeling that they have something to do takes their minds off this, and they rapidly assume a much more cheerful look.

4355. At what age do you take them into the colony?—At any age above 16; we have not any definite age limit, it depends upon the mental and physical development in each case, but at about 16 we consider them as being suitable. The colony being intended only for adults, we simply judge in a particular case whether an applicant is an adult, or is a child at the time. Another point about the want of occupation either in the way of education amongst children or employment amongst adults is that it causes them continually to brood over their complaint, and they become excessively hypochondriacal. Occupation tends to benefit them very greatly in that respect.

4356. With regard to these epileptics that are mixed with the other children in the ordinary schools, would you recommend a great amount of manual work as against book-learning?—I think that anything that occupies their minds is useful. No doubt they ought to have a good deal of exercise, but whether that is taken in the form of manual work in school or recreative exercise afterwards is not, I think, very important. The chief thing is that their minds should be, as far as possible, occupied, and that they should not have an opportunity of brooding over their own misfortune.

4357. Would you advise their staying at the infant schools to the age of eight or nine, and afterwards being transferred to a special class?—In many cases, of course, though not in all, epileptics would be just as forward and just as advanced as other children, and I should think that, in the case of those who are epileptic from their infancy, it would be very dangerous for them to be mixed with ordinary infants in a school.

4358. Our ordinary rule is to draw a line at seven years of age?—What I meant was that in the case of epileptics, it would be, I should think, even more dangerous among infants for them to be with ordinary children than it would be afterwards. I should have thought that, probably in most cases, it would be best that they should be sent as early as possible to special institutions.

4359. From five years of age?—Yes, of course the number who become epileptic before that time is not very large. In most cases, I mean, epilepsy would not proclaim itself before that age.

4360. Of course, there is a difficulty in the parents consenting to their being taken from home; but if it is a choice between the special class with the parents' consent, and the refusal to send them to any class at all, which should you suggest?—I think it would be better that the epileptic should suffer, and should not be sent to any class at all, rather than that the ordinary children should suffer by his being sent to be educated amongst them.

4361. I meant by special classes, classes for mentally-defective children?—I take it, for an epileptic to be educated amongst mentally-defective children would be far worse than for him to be educated in an ordinary class, because, of course, mentally-defective children almost invariably suffer from some kind of nervous affection, and, in many cases no doubt, they would have predispositions to epilepsy, which would be developed by their seeing a person in a fit.

4362. You see no other way of dealing with children except sending them to special homes?—No; that is, in the case of epileptics whose cases are too severe for them to be dealt with in ordinary classes; but I quite think, so long as it is not a sufficiently bad case for it to be necessary to send the child away, it would be the best thing for him to be educated with normal children, that is, as long as he can be so educated without risk to the normal children.

4363. And not taught in special classes at all?—I do not think that special classes would be of use, and they do not get over the difficulty of the epileptic passing from his home to the school; in fact, it would probably intensify that difficulty, because if there were special classes they would in all probability be in a few centres, or, at any rate, there would be a smaller number of them than of ordinary schools, so that the distance to travel would become greater.

4364. The special class would retard its mental developments, and it would be a nuisance to the other children?—Yes, in many cases the epileptic would not be suitable to be educated with defective children, because he himself, apart from the epilepsy, is not defective. I think there is this distinction to be drawn between the case of epileptics who are not also feeble minded, but who are normal minded, as many of them are, and the case of other defective children. Epileptics do not really require any special methods of education as the feeble-minded do; they simply require to be in a place where they can be educated without danger to others and to themselves.

4365. If they were not dangerous you would recommend the cottage or family system, would you not?—I should recommend the cottage or family system in any case as being the lines upon which homes for epileptic children should be established; that is to say, that they should not be large institutions, but should be homes accommodating, say, 20 or 24 children, because I think that with children with the nervous temperament, and with the usually very affectionate disposition which epileptics have, it is very highly important that they should be treated individually, and that they should not be mere units, as they are so apt to become in large institutions.

4366. The family institution would be better than the boarding school: they would get more individual treatment under the family system?—I should say that the family system would be worked in this way: that at an institution for epileptics there should be a number of homes, each taking some 20 to 24 children, and that they should all attend school together, so that the homes and the school would together constitute a special institution for epileptics.

4367. You would enlarge your homes to 24, would you?—I think that that is not too many. If you have a smaller number of epileptic children the expenses of supervision are so enormous, because it is absolutely necessary that epileptic children should have somebody constantly present to avoid the dangers that might happen in a fit if they were unsupervised, and the cost of supervision becomes very great if you have to deal with a less number in a home than 24.

4368. Have you any idea what the cost per head would be in such a home?—I should find it rather difficult to say, but I should think that probably the total cost of maintenance, judging from the experience of our homes, would, including schooling, be not less than 12*s.* a week.

4369. About 30*l.* per year, per head?—Yes, I should think not less.

4370. Most institutions of this kind seem to vary from 20*l.* to 30*l.* per head?—Yes.

4371. They are a good deal more expensive than in the case of other classes of afflicted children?—It would be only slightly more expensive. Epileptics require rather more supervision than other kinds of afflicted children. But perhaps the extra cost in regard to that might be almost counterbalanced by the fact that the education of epileptic children would be less expensive.

4372. So that school boards might have the same opportunities that they have in the case of other afflicted children to send them to such homes, the homes providing one-third of the cost of maintenance?—Yes, it strikes me that that would be the best method of dealing with the matter, but at the same time, I think that any future legislation on the subject ought to provide for the possibility of school boards forming homes for themselves, to meet the case of there being no suitable and efficient voluntary homes within reasonable distance.

4373. My question was whether the institutions might not provide a third of the cost?—Yes, certainly, I think that is a very reasonable provision—the same as is provided by the Blind and Deaf Children Act.

4374. It would not be any hardship to expect the institutions to find a third of the cost?—No, I think not. The only point that occurs to me upon that is, that if future schools for epileptics are part of the epileptic colonies, it might sometimes be a matter of some difficulty to distinguish precisely the cost of the schools from the cost of the adult homes, as regards those expenses which would be general, while institutions for the deaf and dumb are usually, I take it, institutions for only one set of people—that is, children.

4375. Children up to the age of 16?—Yes, but if schools for epileptic children formed a part of epileptic colonies which would take children and adults both, then it might be, as regards the general expenses of management and so on, a somewhat difficult matter to apportion the cost.

4376. There would be some difficulty in apportioning as between the adults and the children?—Yes, but doubtless the difficulty could be overcome.

4377. How would you draw the line between the serious and the less serious cases?—I think that in all probability it would ultimately be found best that all epileptics, unless actually imbecile—that is, epileptics who suffer from other forms of affliction as well as epilepsy—should be treated as epileptics. That is to say, if an epileptic is blind, or is deaf and dumb, it would be very dangerous to send that epileptic to a blind institution, or a deaf and dumb institution, and I think that ultimately, when there is the necessary accommodation for the purpose, the probability is that epileptic colonies might find it advisable to take all epileptics except those who are actually imbecile, and who are at present very adequately provided for by the imbecile schools.

4378. Could you devise a medical certificate that would enable a school board to decide who was a fit inmate for a home?—I think it would be possible.

Mr. G. P. Gaskell.

10 Mar. 1897.

4379. It must be left to individual medical men, you think, to say that this particular child would be dangerous in a school, and therefore ought to go to a home?—The principle, of course, would clearly be that the child must not go to school if it would be dangerous to itself to pass through the streets unattended, or dangerous to others to associate with it in school. Laying down this principle, I think it would then have to be decided in each case whether the child came within that principle or not.

4380. A certificate might run that a child was dangerous to himself or others and should be removed to a home?—Yes.

4381. It might be removed to a home if the school board so desired?—Yes.

4382. Would that be sufficient, do you think, for legislative purposes?—I think perhaps it would need a little further definition.

4383. Perhaps you will suggest the form which the certificate should take?—I would suggest such forms as the following:—

"I, the undersigned *A.B.*, a person registered under the Medical Act, 1858, and in the actual practice of the medical profession, do hereby certify that *C.D.*, of (being a child of the age of years) is an epileptic, that he [*or* she] is, in my opinion, capable of receiving and of benefiting by education, and that by reason of his [*or* her] fits, he [*or* she] is unable to journey unaccompanied to and from school without serious danger to himself [*or* herself].

"Dated .

"Signed ."

The second form of medical certificate would similarly state that the child is "capable of receiving and "of benefiting by education, and that having regard to "the nature and frequency of his [*or* her] fits, his [*or* "her] presence in school with non-epileptic children "would be a serious danger to such children."

A third form of medical certificate might similarly state that the child is "capable of receiving and of "benefiting by education, and that having regard to "the nature and frequency of his [*or* her] fits, his [*or* "her] presence in school amongst non-epileptic "children would be a source of serious disturbance to "the work of the school, but would not be a serious "danger to the other children."

4384. You are proposing to extend your colony, if you can get the means, I suppose, so as to have homes for children?—We at present have the means, that is to say funds have been specially given us for building two homes for children, which will be built almost immediately and probably will be open in the course of a year or so and perhaps less.

4385. Are you reckoning the future cost of those homes to be about 25*l.* per head?—I should think probably rather more than that, about 30*l.*

4386. Do you know whether epileptic children have the same amount of sympathy from the public that blind and deaf children have?—No, I do not think so. I think they are so little known about. It is very curious how in many cases parents of epileptic children seem to have a desire to conceal the fact. Of course, it can be concealed, perhaps that is really the reason. Blindness or deafness cannot be concealed, so that parents make no attempt to conceal it; but epilepsy can, and they very frequently do conceal it, and the result is that many people appear really to have no sympathy at all with epileptics, because they do not know much about epilepsy.

4387. Institutions for the blind and deaf who have no funded property find it very difficult to raise the third which is demanded before they can obtain the Government grant, but would you find the same difficulty in the case of epileptic children?—Judging from our past experience I should hardly think we should. As I say, hitherto people have not known much about epilepsy, but I think that the movement initiated by our society has led to its already being partly known and no doubt it will be very much better known in the course of a few years. At present, of course, in the absence of legislation enabling school boards to pay for cases at our homes, we should have a difficulty maintaining the poorer children there, because the parents would in most cases find it very difficult to make a payment that would at all cover the cost of maintenance.

4388. But it would relieve you very much if you were enabled to obtain from the rates, or from school

Mr. G. P. Gaskell.

10 Mar. 1897.

boards, or any other source, two-thirds of the expenses?—Yes; that would really simplify the matter very much, and, of course, the probability is that charitable people would more readily come forward if they felt that the rates were paying a considerable share.

4389. It has acted both ways I am told, but has, on the whole, acted in favour of institutions. Some people discontinue their contributions when they find the rates being drawn upon; others, when they find *it.* of theirs produces two more, have contributed?—Quite so.

4390. In your homes you would not receive these feeble-minded or blind or deaf children, would you?—Not in our first homes. But speaking personally, and merely expressing my own view, as it is a matter that has not been discussed by the committee of our society, I should rather contemplate that eventually it would be found desirable, if we got a sufficient number of homes, and sufficient accommodation, to have epileptics who are feeble minded as well as those who may be suffering from other forms of affliction otherwise than imbeciles, who can be provided for elsewhere.

4391. Do you draw upon the whole of the United Kingdom or from the Metropolis only?—At present from the whole of the kingdom.

4392. Have you any branches in the large towns?—No, my own personal view is that it is very desirable that epileptic colonies should be established more or less locally. On the one hand, it is a great disadvantage that they should be small, so that it would not do to have them too local; but, on the other hand, it is a great disadvantage that they should be at a very great distance from the homes of the parents. I mean, if we took a child into our colony whose parents live, for instance, at Durham, it would mean, practically, that the child and the parents were absolutely separated from one another which, obviously, would be a very bad thing. So that although epileptic colonies, in order to be of sufficient size and economically managed, ought not to belong to very small areas, yet I think that, on the other hand, they should not be so few that the distance from the homes would be very great.

4393. You know that there are many more schools set up by the school boards for the deaf than there are for the blind?—Yes.

4394. The deaf children are about three to one of the blind, and, therefore, very few school boards find it worth their while to set up small schools for a small number of blind children, whereas they find they have sufficient deaf children to set up a deaf school. Now in the same way with regard to epileptics, if there were a large number of epileptic children in one place they would set up a school or home probably, but if there were only a few they would probably combine with other places?—I think, perhaps, I did not make my meaning clear. I think it is very desirable that boarding schools for epileptics should not be quite so small as that, because, if they were, the expenses of management would be so very much greater. What I meant was, that instead of there being one colony dealing with the whole country, it would, I think, be very desirable that there should be, say, a dozen.

4395. But if there are to be more than that, the number in each would be so small that the expense would be very great?—Yes, he number of epileptics is calculated to be 1 in 1,000—30,000 of all ages for the whole country.

4396. That is including mild cases?—Yes, I should think that probably not more than 15 or 20 per cent. of those would be likely to be applicants for admission to a colony. About 6,000.

4397. That is, adults and children together. Then there would be about 1,200 children who would require to be placed in homes?—Yes.

4398. And you would have homes to what size?—It appears to me highly important that the homes for schools should be part of what one may call the epileptic colonies; but, at present, there is only one epileptic colony in England, namely, our own; but I look forward to the time when there will be probably several, and I think it is highly important that the schools for children should be part of the same colonies that deal with adults. If that were so, of course, it would happen in many of the more serious cases that a child, after being educated and trained, will not be fit, owing to his still being subject to fits, to make his way or get employment in ordinary life; but he might be very useful and able to do good work under proper supervision at an epileptic colony, and then if the schools were part of the colonies, the whole treatment of that case from childhood onwards would be continuous both as regards medical treatment and otherwise. Then, again, it would probably afford very valuable opportunities for the scientific study of the disease that there should be epileptics of all ages who could be observed from their infancy.

4399. Fifteen schools of 80, or 20 of 60, to provide for the 1,200 children whom we have to provide for?—Yes, or 12 of 100.

4400. (*Mr. Pooley.*) I think you agreed with the estimate that about 1 in 1,000 of the whole population were cases of distinct epilepsy?—Yes; that would include the mild cases.

4401. And would you say about one-sixth of those would be not mild cases?—Yes, probably, I should think one-fifth or one-sixth. But in stating the numbers I gave just now, I would like to say that I intended to include sane epileptics only, not insane. If insane epileptics were included, the number would, no doubt, be very much larger.

4402. You think that epilepsy very often comes on in later life?—Very often indeed. Amongst our applicants for admission to the colony one-third have become epileptic up to 11 years, and I think that nearly one-third have become epileptic after 20. But I can say that almost exactly one-third have become epileptic in their childhood prior to the age of 11.

4403. You think that there is some danger to nervous children from the presence in school of children who are often subject to fits?—Yes, I think there is very great danger.

4404. Is that because there is a tendency to epilepsy in a great many children?—It would be partly that, because where a child has a predisposition to epilepsy, the fright that is occasioned by a fit would be quite likely to cause that epilepsy to manifest itself. It is a very common occurrence for epilepsy to appear after there has been some sudden fright.

4405. If a child in school developed epilepsy, and had a fit occasionally, would it be safe to let the teacher, who had seen it in a fit and seen the effect upon other children, decide whether that child ought to be removed?—I think if you left it to the teacher to decide you would be quite right in assuming that the teacher would give a decision that would be safe as regards other children; but there might be too strong a tendency on the part of the teacher to be a little nervous about the other children. So I do not think it would do to leave the absolute decision to the teacher.

4406. As to these epileptic children that are admitted into homes, could they, as a rule, have regular school hours the same as ordinary children?—I should think that there would be no difficulty in that. Of course, if a child had a fit in school, it would probably disable it for some little time; but, generally speaking, the children would be able to be educated during regular school hours.

4407. Would you give them the same school hours as ordinary children, say five hours a day?—I think, generally speaking, an epileptic ought to be a little less hard worked than an ordinary child.

4408. And you would give half the time for object lessons and occupations, and physical exercises rather than book work?—I should doubt whether, in the case of epileptics who are not feeble minded, they would need to be educated at all differently from ordinary children of the same age, except probably that they ought not to be subjected to quite such a severe strain and not quite such long hours.

4409. Then the teaching should be similar to that of ordinary schools?—Yes. I am speaking now of epileptics who are normal minded. Epileptics who are also feeble minded would need to be educated upon the same principles as other feeble-minded children.

4410. I understand you would give power to school authorities to send epileptic children to institutions if they thought fit in suitable cases?—Yes.

4411. And you would leave the discretion with the school board to decide what were suitable cases, they acting upon the best advice they could get?—I would make it incumbent upon them to send certain classes of cases.

4412. Do you think it would be possible to lay down a hard and fast rule, as to what children ought to be sent to homes, and what might go into ordinary schools, and make it the duty of the school board to send to homes all of the class suitable for homes?—I think you can lay down the principle that, if an epileptic child is in such a state that its presence in the ordinary school would be a danger to the ordinary children, or if it is in such a state that it cannot without danger to itself go from its home to the schools, then it should be sent to a special institution.

Mr. G. P. Gaskell

10 Mar. 1897.

4413. Do you think it would be desirable that the school board should be the authority to decide which cases should be sent to institutions?—I think certainly school boards would be the best authority to deal with the matter. If it were left to the guardians, as was the case with the blind and deaf prior to the Act of 1893, there would be rather a hardship, because, as I think I have already pointed out, epileptics do not in most cases belong to those who are of the pauper class or approaching to the pauper class.

4414. What I meant by my question was whether you think the school board should have a discretion, rather than that the school board should be compelled by law to send all epileptics to institutions?—I think that the school board ought to be compelled by law to send all children of the class I have described to institutions, but not necessarily to send them to the charitable institutions that I have been speaking of. I think it ought to be at the option of the school board to provide institutions itself in the same way as in the case of the blind, under the Blind and Deaf Act, under which school boards can either provide institutions themselves or send children to charitable institutions. I think it would be highly important that they should have the power of taking either course.

4415. If you make it the duty of the school board to send all cases of serious epilepsy to institutions, you must make some definition of what a case of serious epilepsy is?—Yes. The definition that I propose is that the principle should be laid down that any child whose state is such as regards epilepsy that he is dangerous to other children in the schools, or that his state is such that it is a danger to himself to go through the street to school, should be sent to a special institution. I would add that where the fits are not so severe as to be dangerous to others, but are so frequent as to cause constant disturbance in the school, there should be a discretionary power to send to institutions.

4416. Supposing you make it the duty of the school board to send such children to an institution, how are you to decide whether the child belongs to that particular class or not?—You mean that there must be some power above the school board to say in each case whether that child ought to be sent.

4417. You see, under the Blind and Deaf Act, it is the duty of the school board to send every blind child or deaf child to a suitable school?—Yes.

4418. But if you make it the absolute duty of the school board to send every serious case of epilepsy to an institution, how could it be decided which were the serious cases: what definition would you give?—I think the difficulty is not a difficulty of definition, but a difficulty of determining what authority shall say whether the school board is performing its duty.

4419. I take it that that would be for the Education Department to say. It is so in the case of the blind and deaf?—Yes, but there must also be some provision for safeguarding the just rights of parents; for ensuring that their control over their children shall not be interfered with except where such interference is really necessary.

4420. What I want is your opinion as to whether it is practicable to give such a definition of epileptic children that if the school board declined to send epileptic children to institutions, the Education Department could come down and say, "You are neglecting your duty"?—As I said in answer to the Chairman, I think, if you lay down the principle that any child who is dangerous to others in the ordinary schools, or any child who is in such a state that it is dangerous for him to go to school through the streets, then it is a matter of evidence in each case as to whether a child comes within that principle. Epileptic fits vary so much in character that, in some cases, the dangers to which I have alluded will co-exist, while in other cases one of these dangers may exist separately. For instance, the fits may not be of such a nature as to be alarming to other children, and yet may be such that it is dangerous for the child to journey unaccompanied to school, or so frequent as to cause constant disturbance in the classes. There are, therefore, three classes of cases which I would propose to provide for. There are those which might be certified by a properly qualified medical man to be such as to render it dangerous for the child to go unaccompanied to school; those which might be certified to be such as to cause danger to other children in school, and those which might be certified to cause inconvenience and disturbance in the schools. In the first case the difficulty might be met either by providing a companion or escort to take the child to the day school or by sending the child to an institution; and there being this alternative, the latter course would seem to be one that ought not to be adopted without the consent of the parent or guardian, though it would, no doubt, be right that the cost of providing a companion should (like the cost of sending a child to an institution) be recoverable wholly or in part from the parents in cases where they are able to afford it. In the second class of case, to provide for the child in an institution seems to be the only course, and it appears to me that, subject to safeguards against unnecessary interference with the rights of parents, it should be made obligatory upon the school authority to deal with these cases in that way. On the other hand, in cases coming under the third category (where there is no actual danger but only inconvenience) I would suggest that the matter should perhaps be left to the discretion of the school board, either to educate the child in the ordinary school or send him to an institution, power to take the latter course being conferred without any absolute obligation to do so being imposed I do not think that medical evidence should, in cases where the parents object, be taken as conclusive. There should, it seems to me, in regard to the second and third class of cases, be some safeguard against any interference with parental rights, except in cases of real necessity. Possibly this protection might be afforded by a form of inquiry before a magistrate, somewhat similar to the inquiry upon which reception orders are made under the Lunacy Act. Some such safeguard would seem to be even more necessary in such cases than it is in relation to lunacy, for, in the latter case, the medical man is able to some extent to form his opinion from his own examination and conversation with the patient, whereas in cases of epilepsy he must usually rely very largely upon information given him by others as to the nature and frequency of the fits.

4421. (*Miss Townsend.*) You gave us the number of Poor Law children in workhouse and district schools who are epileptic, I think you said five in 9,000?—Five in 9,000 in the schools, and 22 altogether in the whole metropolitan area in workhouses and infirmaries.

4422. That, of course, does not include the epileptics at Darenth?—No, because, as I think I mentioned, it includes only those epileptics who are sane. But in the same way, with regard to the adults, of which I gave you the figures, those do not include adults in the lunatic asylums or imbecile asylums, but in each case the figures only refer to sane epileptics.

4423. Then one would gather that a large proportion of the child epileptics are also more or less imbecile?—I do not think you could quite gather it in that way. What I mean is that at Darenth there are many children who are not naturally pauper children; children who are sent there because they are imbecile and not because their parents are paupers; they would never become paupers except for the fact that, they can be sent to Darenth only through the machinery of the Poor Law.

4424. As a matter of fact they are legally paupers, but they do not belong to the pauper class?—I mean their parents are not ordinary paupers, but they are simply sent to Darenth as being the only place they can go to. In many cases the parents are able, I believe, to pay the whole cost of their maintenance at Darenth.

4425. I gather that among poor children, either paupers or just above the pauper class, a large proportion of the children who are epileptics are also feeble minded?—Undoubtedly there is a considerable proportion. The only point I wanted to urge was that you must not compare the imbecile epileptics at Darenth with the non-imbecile epileptics, the numbers of whom in the workhouses I gave you. In the one case, those children that I mentioned have become paupers simply in the ordinary course of things. In the other case they become paupers simply because Darenth is the only

Mr. G. P. Gaskell.

10 Mar. 1897.

place where imbeciles can be provided for; they are not natural paupers, so to speak.

4426. In your opinion, all the epileptic children at Darenth are imbecile; there are no children there simply because they are serious cases of epilepsy?—I do not think there are any there who are absolutely of sound mind, at least I should imagine not. One knows, of course, that epileptic children are sent to Darenth who are not quite as imbecile as the ordinary children sent there who are not epileptic.

4427. There are some children who could probably be treated in your epileptic colony for children?—I should think it is very possible.

4428. As far as the adults in the workhouse infirmaries go, the large number there is also to be accounted for by the fact that the workhouse infirmary is very often the only place they can apply to; they go there as epileptics, and not as paupers?—In the workhouse infirmaries, and also in the workhouses, the numbers as regards adults would simply represent those who are incapable of maintaining themselves.

4429. Adult epileptics go to the workhouse infirmary because they cannot go into hospitals, very often?—But most of the epileptics in the infirmaries or the workhouses are not there for the sake of treatment; they are there, I take it, simply because they are unable to maintain themselves. But in many cases, when they become paupers the Poor Law authorities place them in the infirmary rather than in the workhouse, because they can be better attended to as regards their fits.

4430. We have heard from other witnesses that mentally deficient children were less sensitive than normal children, consequently that an epileptic child was less likely to cause an alarm or give rise to irritation amongst the mentally deficient than among normal children; I gather that is not your opinion?—No, certainly not.

4431. We have heard from two or three witnesses that mentally deficient children have not observation enough or notice the fits, whereas normal children very often were much affected?—I do not agree with that view, and one may judge, I think, from the fact that there are a large number of imbeciles who are also epileptics, that there is a distinct tendency for feeble mindedness and a predisposition to epilepsy to be combined in the same person.

4432. Are there more boys or girls epileptics?—There is very little difference. I really doubt whether one can say that there is any distinct difference in the figures either way. The school board figures show almost equality, and, so far as I have been able to observe, there is no distinct difference either way.

4433. Would you leave epileptic children in their own homes, if they were good, even supposing they were not able to go to the ordinary school, or would you make it compulsory to remove every seriously epileptic child from its own home?—I should make it compulsory to remove every serious epileptic case from its own home, because generally, as I think I have already mentioned, the home influences are so very bad, that is, even in good homes. But the difficulties of dealing with the epileptic child in the poor home are such that however well intentioned the parents may be they cannot deal with it properly.

4434. Do you consider the aggregation of epileptics in itself good or bad, apart from the question of convenience?—The aggregation of them I consider to be distinctly good. I am not speaking now of aggregating them in large institutions, but of aggregating, as we aggregate adults at the Colony. We have homes each containing 20 or 24. The aggregation is good in this way, that the epileptics amongst one another become far more sociable than they have ever any opportunities of being outside. They become very helpful to one another, which also is a very good thing for them, because in outside life they usually feel themselves utterly despondent, and they lose their sense of dependence when they are aggregated. Then, again, to my mind great good is done by the fact of their being amongst other afflicted children or persons. We find at the colony that the fact of there being degrees of affliction amongst them is good. Instead of each of these men feeling himself every much weaker than his neighbours, he finds in some cases that there are those who are very much weaker than himself.

4435. As a rule they are a sympathetic and helpful class of sufferers, are they not?—They have very affectionate dispositions indeed.

4436. You would divide your children's colony into small homes of 25 or so in the same way?—Yes.

4437. And make them in their home life absolutely apart?—Yes, as regards the ordinary life of the home, each home would be distinct. But we have found it most important, from the point of view of economy, that the home should not be distinct as regards the feeding arrangements. We find it much better to cook the dinners for them at a central place, and then distribute the dinners to each home. They dine in their own homes.

4438. That is a matter of organisation which does not affect them personally?—No, but to that extent, I mean it is not like an ordinary family in each home.

4439. There is one point I should like made a little clearer. You said you would make the fact of the child being epileptic the first consideration in dealing with it; that is to say, supposing it was epileptic and blind or deaf, or feeble minded, you would treat it as an epileptic?—Yes, that is ultimately, when there is sufficient accommodation for dealing with such cases at the epileptic colonies. My meaning is this, that I think it would be unsafe for a child seriously affected with epilepsy, who was blind, to be educated with other blind children, just the same as it would be dangerous for him to be educated with ordinary children.

4440. But at present that rather excludes these doubly afflicted children from either place, because you said you would not take them at the epileptic colony?—Not at present.

4441. And if you would not have them in blind or deaf asylums, what is to be done with them?—Of course it is very desirable that accommodation should be provided for them as soon as possible. I meant that I thought that in the future it would be better that they should be dealt with as epileptics than as blind.

4442. But in the meantime?—In the meantime it is simply a question of possibilities. One would wish, of course, that they should be dealt with at once, but it seems to me doubtful if it is possible.

4443. You think the epilepsy should be made the first consideration?—Yes.

4444. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) Could you tell me whether the defects increase most in the girls or in the boys?—You mean taking two epileptic children, one a girl and one a boy, whether, when they become grown up, the girl or the boy would be likely to be most affected?

4445. Yes?—I do not think that I have ever observed anything that would enable me to answer that question.

4446. You cannot help us on that point?—I do not think so.

4447. With regard to compulsion, you said you agree that the parents should be compelled to part with children in severe cases of epilepsy?—Yes.

4448. Do you mean that you would keep those children right through their lives in an institution?—I think that probably, in many cases, if a child was educated up to the age of 15 or 16, it would after that be able to earn a living outside the colony, and, of course, I would always regard it as far better that an epileptic should be outside the colony than in it, provided that he can make his living outside. Even now, a very large number of epileptics do make their livings, although everything has been against them. If they were educated as children, I think a large proportion would probably be able to earn their living. At present a very large number of epileptics in mild cases undoubtedly do manage to get on.

4449. You mean the training would enable these children to support or to partially support themselves in adult life?—Yes, in a considerable proportion of cases, of course, not in all cases.

4450. You told us that epilepsy was not common amongst the pauper class of child?—I meant that it was not more common amongst that class than amongst others; hardly, I should think, so common.

4451. But would not you think it probable that that class of child dies through want of proper attention frequently?—That is very possible, I think. Children of that class who might have developed epilepsy later on die before that epilepsy becomes pronounced.

4452. Children suffer a great deal, do not they, both before and after fits. Do not you think there appearance, and possibly their habits, are bad at such times—I mean, more so than when they are quite well?—It is not always so, but in many cases for some time before and after fits there is a very distinct difference in the patients.

4453. And that is where, I take it, the cost of supervision would come in?—I think the chief difficulty in supervision would come in in this way; that you must always have somebody present with them. For instance, at night there must always be somebody who is prepared to get up and attend a child who has a fit.

4454. When you have these children in the colony how do you propose to employ their time?—The children of school age would be educated in the ordinary way. As I said before, in the case of an epileptic who is not feeble minded, I do not think there would be any necessity for any method of special methods of education. All you want to do is to get them into a place where they can be educated without danger to themselves or others.

4455. In that case you would not think it necessary that the teachers should have any special technical training for their work?—The teachers would not, I think, need any special training so far as it was a question of teaching children who were not weak minded. But if at these homes epileptics who are also weak minded are taken, then, of course, the same special knowledge would be required that is required by a teacher who teaches ordinary feeble-minded children. I mean, speaking generally, I would say that an epileptic who is normal minded otherwise would be educated as a normal child, and an epileptic who is weak minded would be educated as a weak-minded child.

4456. If you have 20 or 24 children in your home, you would have them of various capacities, would you not?—I think that the probability is that while we only have that small number (of course I anticipate that we shall rapidly be building other homes) it would be necessary that our committee should either take weak-minded epileptics, or else take epileptics who are not weak-minded; that amongst so small a number it would not do to combine the two, because of the difficulty of providing for the education of both.

4457. You would agree that those children should be taught what we now call varied occupations in school time?—Yes, I think so.

4458. What I mean is, it would be so helpful to them in adult life if they are trained as children?—Yes, and then also, of course, if the period of education were extended, as it is in the case of the blind and deaf and dumb, during the latter part of the time it would, no doubt, be right that they should receive training in some industrial occupation.

4459. Is it your experience that the people you have have distinctly suffered through the want of training in childhood?—That is most distinctly the case. One sees very distinctly at our colony the difference between those cases who have been epileptic since childhood and those who have been epileptic only since they have been grown up. The latter are by far the better class of cases in every way; they are morally better; they are more amenable, and they work better. Those who have been epileptic since childhood, in almost every case—I cannot say absolutely in every case, but certainly in a great majority of cases—have distinctly suffered from the fact that they have not been educated, and that their home life has not been good.

4460. What I want to get from you is whether it is really necessary that there should be compulsion to put these children away. The epileptic child is very useful in a poor man's home at times; she can clean the house, and she can mind the baby (badly, of course), and do other things, and, therefore, there is, perhaps, an inducement to the parent to make the child's illness an excuse to keep it from school?—That would be so in a certain number of cases. On the other hand, there is a very large number of cases where the inconveniences of having an epileptic child at home are such that the parents would show a willingness to part with that child, which they would not show with regard to any other kind of afflicted child. Taking it on the whole, I should say that there is a very large number where the parents would gladly part with the children. But, of course, for that number where they would not, compulsion would be necessary.

Mr. G. P. Gaskell

10 Mar. 1897.

4461. Then you would say you must have compulsion for all?—Yes, that is what I say; compulsion is necessary in order to enable you to deal with that class of cases where the parents would not be willing to part with the children.

4462. In your homes, do you propose that the parents should contribute to the maintenance of the children?—Supposing the school board to have power given to them to pay for maintenance at the homes as well as the education, I think in all probability our committee would be prepared to take cases either from the school board, or directly from the parents. In the case of their being taken from the school board, then, of course, any payment received from the parent it would be for the school board to obtain, assuming it to have similar powers to those given under the Blind and Deaf Act. Probably one of the difficulties of the case is that it is not easy for School Boards to collect the payment from the parents.

4463. I understand you to say that you think these children being gathered together with other similarly afflicted children, really, is a stimulus?—Yes, decidedly.

4464. Because they often feel that others are worse than themselves, and, therefore, it is really better for them to be together?—Yes, I am sure it is.

4465. (*Mr. Newton.*) Would you send slight cases to the ordinary schools?—Yes, I think those cases which would not be dangerous to ordinary children would be better dealt with in the ordinary schools.

4466. What would you make the age of compulsion of those cases?—I should not think it necessary that the age of compulsion should be extended, I mean such a case can be dealt with as an ordinary child.

4467. And where the severe cases are concerned, what should the age of compulsion be?—I should think 16; that is, I think where one of the advantages of having schools for epileptics, not as separate institutions, but as part of the general epileptic colony where adults also are taken, would come in—that whatever age you may fix, it is quite certain the children will differ considerably when they reach that age. In some cases they would be ready before that age to be transferred to the adult department, and no longer dealt with as children; whereas in other cases they would need to stay up to the very limit of time that is allowed. That would seem to me to be one of the advantages, that their training can be regulated according to the individual cases, if they are dealt with in an institution which takes both adults and children.

4468. With regard to those severe cases, should you direct your training primarily to life in the outside world, or to life in the institution?—Where there is any hope of a child being so trained that he is likely to be able to get on in the outside world, that would certainly be the object to be aimed at; but where there is practically no hope of that, one would direct it to future life in the institution.

4469. Is it your experience that epileptics are generally children of epileptics?—No, I should say it is not. Of course, in a very large proportion of cases epileptics would be children of parents who are in some form or another, afflicted or weak—sometimes consumptives—and sometimes they show other forms of weakness.

4470. If epileptics go into the outside world, are they likely to have healthy children?—Very often their children would not be epileptic, but they would probably be in some form or another inferior children. I am speaking now of serious cases, and of cases in which the epilepsy of the parent is due to constitutional taint and not to mere accident or injury.

4471. If they go into the outside world they are likely to marry if they succeed at all, are they not?—Yes, but, seeing that the epileptics bring no greater danger than, for instance, consumptive people do, I do not think, unless you are prepared to confine consumptive people in an institution, you ought to confine epileptics.

4472. It is not so much a question of confining them, as of whether you should direct your training so that they are likely to go out into the world and marry?—I quite admit the force of that consideration; it would be distinctly a reason in favour of their remaining, though not always, I think, a reason strong enough to outweigh other considerations.

Mr. G. P. Gaskell.

10 Mar. 1897.

4473. You think there is a real danger of what I have pointed out?—A distinct danger, as I say, not necessarily that the children would be epileptic, but that their children would be in some form or another inferior.

4474. Below par in mind or body?—Yes.

4475. (*Dr. Smith.*) In an ideal colony how many of these homes for children would you have?—I do not think that the number could be too large for convenience as long as the homes are distinct; but the limit to the size of the epileptic colony, to my mind, should be this, that the area it deals with should not be so large that its distance from the homes of the parents would preclude the parents and the children from ever seeing one another. I think I gave an illustration in answer to the Chairman, that if we at our colony took children whose parents lived at Durham, it would practically mean that that child and its parents would be cut off from each other altogether. Now, it is highly desirable that that should not take place, but that the child and the parents should be able to see one another either by the child sometimes going home for holidays, or by the parents coming and visiting it at the colony.

4476. Then, as I understand you, the extent of the colony would depend more upon the area from which you are going to draw the children?—Yes, it is desirable from one point of view, that the colony should be as large as possible; that is, it may be more economically managed, and perhaps it is better to have it as large as possible from that point of view. But, on the other hand, it must not draw from too large an area.

4477. Taking London as an example, do you think one colony would be sufficient for its necessities?—Yes.

4478. And the necessities would be met by the erection of homes for 25 to 30 children?—24 or 25, as a maximum, I think I said.

4479. Twenty-five would be the limit you would put?—Yes.

4480. Then, if I understood you aright, you think these children ought never to be admitted to the special schools?—I think they should not be admitted to the ordinary schools or to the schools for defective children.

4481. And that, therefore, they should be admitted to the ordinary schools, and if found to be too bad for the ordinary school, they should go to such a colony as you have given us particulars of?—Yes.

4482. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) You said, I think, that the existence of epilepsy was concealed; do you think that the parents ever conceal the existence of epileptic children by keeping them in the background, so that they escape being enrolled for school attendance?—I cannot help thinking that there must be that or some other cause which prevents the school board from discovering them.

4483. The numbers seem to be extremely small?—Yes, the numbers given by the London School Board are nothing like so large as I should expect them to be.

4484. Then, do you think the fact that if children are epileptic in their early years they are probably also more or less defective in mind sends a large number as patients to imbecile institutions?—I think that if the epilepsy continues, and they remain uneducated and under bad influences, it does, in a very large proportion of cases, result in their becoming imbeciles.

4485. What I rather meant was that the co-existence of epilepsy and imbecility is common in very early life?—Yes.

4486. Therefore that would account for a certain number of epileptic children being sent to idiot asylums, and their not being enumerated as epileptics; they would be counted rather as imbeciles than epileptics?—Very possibly.

4487. No doubt there is a considerable number of children in London, for instance, who are sent to Darenth as imbeciles at an early stage, and we gather from the evidence that there were certain children comparatively bright for imbeciles who were sent there because they were also epileptic, the forms being, perhaps, a little strained for the purpose?—Yes.

4488. Do you think it is an important thing that children should be removed from their homes, not only on account of the difficulty parents have in managing them, but on account of the desirability of their being under continued judicious, and, I may add, medical care so far as food and treatment are concerned?—Yes, I think that is very important indeed. I think that the proper feeding of epileptic children is very essential.

4489. Is it your experience that judicious feeding diminishes the severity of the attacks?—Yes.

4490. Have you any form of certificate which by its wording excludes persons who are imbecile as well as epileptic from the colony?—No, our form of certificate does not in so many words exclude those. It excludes those who are dangerously insane, and, as a matter of fact, as a rule, cases that are actually imbecile are excluded, but the medical certificate is not worded exactly with a view to that.

4491. Is it not the fact that some of your patients at the colony are occasionally after fits affected to a certain extent in mind?—Yes, some of them, occasionally.

4492. That does occasionally occur with all the severe cases of epilepsy, I suppose?—With many such cases.

4493. So that the distinction is a little difficult sometimes I imagine, is it not, between those who are affected in mind by epilepsy and those that are not?—Yes, and no doubt the one class sometimes rapidly drifts into the other. I might, perhaps, mention that amongst the candidates waiting for admission to the colony, about 1 in every 15, on the average, in the course of each year, drops out of the list through insanity supervening, I am speaking now not of mere temporary derangement but actual insanity necessitating the transfer of the patient to an asylum. On the other hand, under the more favourable conditions prevailing at the colony only one patient, since its establishment, has had to be removed thence to an asylum.

4494. Then, as regards the degree of severity necessitating the exclusion of an epileptic pupil from the ordinary school, do you think that that is a question that ought to be settled by a medical man?—I think it ought to be decided on medical evidence. It might be left to the teacher, however, I think, in the first instance, to point out any epileptic child that was dangerous, because I think the inclinations of the teacher would naturally be to protect the interests of the ordinary children who form the majority, and that then from the teacher it should be referred to a medical man.

4495. Has it come within your knowledge that sometimes competition with ordinary children in school is hurtful to the brighter class of epileptic children?—I have known of one or two cases of bright epileptics who have worked very hard at school, and the parents have thought it has injured them. That has been where they have worked excessively hard.

4496. (*Mr. Newton.*) Do you mean when trying for scholarships, and such matters?—No, I mean rather amongst children younger than that.

4497. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) Some of these bright epileptics have an idea of competing, and perhaps the competition may be a strain to them?—Yes.

4498. You spoke, I think, of homes for about 20 as being the number intended at Chalfont, but I suppose that you would not object to a central school establishment which should receive children from various homes, perhaps three or four?—Yes, I should think that at the colony in all probability there would be a school to receive the children from all the homes.

4499. Have you had any discussion as to whether it would be desirable to have mixed classes in that school—I mean classes of boys and girls?—It has been discussed, but our committee have never come to any final decision upon the question.

4500. That, I suppose, would be a matter for future experience?—Yes.

4501. And as to the ages at which they would be taught together?—Undoubtedly an experiment will be made in that direction.

4502. Has the lowest age for admission to the school been determined?—To commence with, the age has been fixed at seven, but I think it is not at all certain that children would not be received at a younger age, when there are more homes and more accommodation.

4503. In the organisation of these homes for children, is there any idea of making distinctive accommodation for a better class of children on payment?—I would like to say in regard to that, that when we first

Mr. G. P. Gaskell.

10 Mar. 1897.

opened our colony it was proposed to have three classes of patients, both as regards adults and children, but the necessities of the case as regards the third class have been found to be so much the greatest that hitherto we have only had third-class adult patients, and although it would always be an object to aim at to provide for better class patients among both adults and children, the probability is that that would be rather in the future; that the case of the poor children will be felt to be by far the most necessitous and urgent.

4504. There is another institution for epileptics, I think, at Maghull?—Yes.

4505. Do you know how many patients they have there?—They have, I think, about 118 or 120.

4506. There are some children, are there not?—There are a few children, but I do not think they have any special arrangements for children.

4507. The inmates are drawn, I suppose, from the northern counties chiefly, Maghull being near Liverpool?—Yes, chiefly.

4508. (*Chairman.*) According to our calculation there ought to be 240 children in London who should be transferred to institutions; we find that there are actually not in school 145, that would show that there must be 100 children who are attending school who are rather dangerous, if these statistics are true?—Or else it would show that the school board are not always able to include all epileptic children in their returns.

4509. It is a matter of question whether there are 100 epileptics who are dangerous to other children, or who are not discovered by the school board?—The returns of the London School Board would show that there are only 65 epileptic children attending school—that is to say 65 that are epileptic, and not otherwise afflicted.

4510. That must be undoubtedly wrong?—Yes.

4511. The number must be undoubtedly larger?—The number must be undoubtedly larger. In regard to the number attending school, I do not know whether you have had before you the figures given in the report of the Charity Organisation Society, where the figures collected by Dr. Warner are given.

4512. You say you would send the children to the ordinary school; but supposing they have a fit, could you give directions to the teacher as to how to treat them, during the few days after the fit had occurred, so that they should not be pressed at all during that time; or probably they would not go to school?—I should think probably in those cases where the results of the fit remained, they would not go to school. In some cases the results of the fit remain for some time; in others the child is quite well again immediately afterwards.

4513. I think, as a rule, we find the teachers in blank ignorance as to how to treat these cases?—Yes, but I should think probably a very few simple directions would quite meet the case. For instance, in our colony, we find it quite possible to take as attendants men who have had no previous training; and in the course of a day or two they quite know how to deal with an ordinary fit.

4514. If you have four or five homes attached to a colony, would those homes be classified in any way, so that the inmates of each would be of different characters?—I think probably they would be classified according to the condition of the patients. They would not be classified according to age, because, of course, in carrying out the family system, it is highly important that children of different ages should be mixed together.

4515. Would you have all the severe cases in one home, and the less severe in another?—I think the classification would be in that direction, but the principle must not be carried too far. It is, I think, advantageous within certain limits to have differences between the inmates of each home as regards the degree of their affliction.

4516. Do you expect that many of your inmates would be self-supporting?—I should think that probably in the future a good many would be, I mean to say, that their work would be of sufficient value in the case of those who have received technical training. Amongst our present colonists it is not so, but they are mostly people who have not received any technical training, and in many cases have been totally unaccustomed for years past if not always to do work of any sort.

4517. That would be a strong argument for the State, taking up these children from the first, and giving them a good technical manual training and so qualifying them to earn their living?—Yes, I should think in a considerable number of cases the probability is that they would be able, after receiving technical education, to leave the colony and make their living outside in the ordinary way, and amongst those who were not sufficiently well to be able to do that, the probability is that there would be several whose work would be of value at the institution.

4518. What occupations do you suggest might be open to them in after life?—I should say, speaking generally, such occupations can be carried on at home.

4519. Are sedentary occupations good for them?—They are probably not so good from the point of view of their health; but any occupation that takes them out of doors is almost impracticable for epileptics.

4520. What do you say to gardening, for instance?—I was speaking of occupations to be carried on outside the colony. At the colony such an occupation as gardening is one of the best to which they can be put, but whether an epileptic would be able to retain employment as an ordinary gardener outside the colony is, I think, very doubtful, unless he were fortunate enough to find a very indulgent employer.

Rev. JOHN H. ROSE called in and examined.

Rev. J. H. Rose.

4521. (*Chairman.*) You are the Vicar of Clerkenwell, and one of the managers of the Hugh Myddelton School?—Yes.

4522. How many years have you been a manager?—Of the ordinary school since the school board has been established, and as a voluntary manager for many years before that.

4523. The Hugh Myddelton schools are about the largest there are under the London School Board?—Yes, I believe they are the largest schools.

4524. How many children are there in the defective school?—In the defective school there are at the present time 80 children on its rolls, or one or two more than that I think.

4525. Have you been present at any of the examinations of the medical officer for reporting on the cases?—No, I have not. I am only a kind of informal manager of these particular schools, because the board manages them by a sub-committee of their own body, but they wrote and asked me to be a kind of informal manager as living on the spot, so that I might look in and communicate with them from time to time.

4526. And you have seen these schools from time to time?—Yes, frequently.

4527. Do you think that all the children there were fit subjects for it, or would you have excluded some, either as being too high or too low?—Some of them, from just looking at them. I would have said might be in an ordinary school, but when I came to inquire, I found that the children were deficient in some way, either physically or mentally.

4528. Do you find the teachers of other schools very anxious to push off upon the special school a very dull child?—No, I have not found any special desire to do that. The great difficulty at the outset was to get parents to consent to the children going to a defective school at all. They will admit anything except that their children are defective in intellect.

4529. They do not discover it till five years of age very often, perhaps?—They do not want to discover it, I think.

4530. The special classes have really, in your opinion, been always filled with cases that required special treatment, either for development of the intellect, or for some physical or mental defect?—I have never come across any which I did not think required it.

4531. Were there any so imbecile that they should not be there?—If you took the children when they

Rev. J. H. Rose.
10 Mar. 1897.

went in first probably I would say so, but from looking at how they progressed afterwards, I have always seen that those who have sent them there were quite right.

4532. Have any of them been transferred to idiot asylums?—Not that I am aware of.

4533. But you have noticed great improvement in the children, not from week to week, but from month to month, perhaps?—Yes, you can see the changed happy look on the children's faces. One particular child on coming into the school could hardly articulate at all, and there seemed to be no means of teaching the child anything. Now she can articulate a little—not very well, and only the other day she produced to me her frame with some beautiful macramé lace that she had made. Her needlework is excellent, and she is very fond of cleaning up for the teacher, and anything of that kind, and although it is difficult to speak to her, her intellect has certainly improved, and her handiwork is quite equal to anything of a child of ordinary intelligence.

4534. She has a good sense of touch?—Yes.

4535. And has she a good sense of colour?—There is not very much of colour perhaps in that particular case, but she seems to understand what is said to her now when the teacher instructs her.

4536. Have you noticed a very great difference between the children of these schools and dull children in large classes?—Yes, in the olden time, when we had to put all the children to the same standard, these defective children always had such a hopeless look, and did not understand in the least what the teachers were trying to do. That seemed especially apparent afterwards when you selected them and said they must have some special treatment, but had no special teacher who could understand it. School was a drudgery, and a hopeless kind of business to them. But now there is no happier looking class in the Hugh Myddelton school (and we have 2,000 scholars in the ordinary school) than you will find in the defective class.

4537. Are they all happy throughout the school?—Take them all round they are. School life is very bright for our children now.

4538. Have you any statistics to show how many have been transferred to the other schools after improvement?—I find in 1894-95 there were 14 children transferred. In 1896 they seemed to have transferred none. They seem to have been keeping them longer; but so far as I can judge, there are children now in the school who are quite as good as the children who were transferred in 1894-95. I do not quite know why they have not been transferred in 1896.

4539. Would you have transferred some of those that are now retained?—Some cases I think I would.

4540. They would probably have only gone into the First Standard upstairs, would they?—To the First Standard, or the second division of the Second Standard.

4541. And how long would they have stayed in such class if they had been transferred?—I can tell you exactly what became of those 14 that were transferred if you wish to know.

4542. It will be interesting to know?—To begin with the girls, there were only three transferred in 1894. One of those was a delicate child, and has since died. The other two are still in the school, and when they were transferred from the defective school in 1894 they were placed in the Second Standard. Both of those girls are now working in Standard V. I saw them the other day. As often happens, the mechanical work is exceedingly good. Of course, when you come to test them in intellect, they are not quite up to the mark of other children; but so far as the mechanical work is concerned they are quite up to the average of other children.

4543. Do they answer you when you speak to them?—Yes.

4544. And have you got the boys' report too?—Yes, there were 11 boys transferred; that is, in 1894 and in 1895. One of those boys was 14 years and 8 months old when he was transferred. That would be in May 1894. He was placed in the lower Second. He only remained until February 1895, and left without having advanced at all.

4545. Do you happen to know how long that boy had been in the special class?—The special classes were only established, I think, at the end of 1893, so that he could not have been there very long. Another boy, Charles C——, was transferred when he was 10; that was on the same occasion, and he remained until July 1896. He then left, being in the second division of Standard IV., and near the top of his class. Then John M—— was transferred at 10 years and 7 months, on the same occasion.

4546. Can you tell us how long he had been in the special class?—These were all from the opening of the classes. That boy left again in 1894. He only remained five months in the ordinary school. He does not seem to have made any progress. He was not transferred to any other form. Alfred R—— was transferred at nine years and seven months. He was placed in the lower Second. He is still in the school, and is now in the second division of Standard V., quite up to the average, and has good common sense. Thomas R—— was 12 years of age when he was transferred on the same occasion; he is still in the school, and is in the second division of Standard IV., a good average lad. Alfred T—— was transferred when 10 years and 5 months old; he is in the school now in the upper Third. He was placed in Standard I., and is now in the upper Third, and stands among the first half-dozen boys. At the last examination he got 58 marks out of 60. Then two boys were transferred in 1895, and were placed in the lower Second, and one, Frank M——, is now in the second division of the Third Standard, near to the top of his class, and Arthur R——, who was transferred at 10 years and 7 months, left in January 1896, and he was then in the same standard as when he joined the school. Albert D—— was 13 years and 3 months when he was transferred; he was placed in the upper Second, and left in June 1895 still in the same standard. George G—— was transferred at 12 years and 1 month; he was placed in the First Standard; he is in the school now, and is in the second division of the Second Standard, a very dull boy. He has progressed somewhat, but not very much. John K—— was 11 years and 9 months old when he was transferred; he was placed in the lower division of the First Standard, and he is now in the same place, very dull, almost imbecile.

4547. How many cases are there of real improvement?—There are four cases of very real improvement going up from Standard I. of the lower division to Standards II., III., IV., and V.

4548. Four cases of real improvement and the rest stationary?—Almost.

4549. Why were they transferred so soon from the special class after only a year's training?—It probably may have been for want of space for one thing, because when the class was first established we only had a classroom in the ordinary school with a special teacher, but since the special school has been erected and opened they are remaining longer.

4550. Is there any school board regulation as to transferring them to the other school?—I do not know that there is.

4551. The medical officer certifies that they are fit subjects for this class; then he also certifies that they are fit to go out of it?—I do not know. I know some of the teachers have told the medical officer that they are very strict in letting the children go into the defective school.

4552. Do you think they should be transferred after some medical examination, just as they are certified at entrance?—I do not know that.

4553. Those who had made no advance would, I suppose, be better in the special class?—Probably. They get, of course, more special treatment in the defective school, and naturally the longer a boy is there the better he will get on, because when he gets into a large First Standard at that particular school, all the standards nearly have to be divided into two, it is a very large class, and they cannot get individual treatment. I picked out some cases in the defective school, and I can tell you of their progress there if that would be of interest to you. There is Francis B——, he is 14 years of age; he has been in the class five months; when he entered the class he knew a few letters, and could scarcely articulate. He is preparing now for Standard I. His articulation is better, and he is much brighter.

4554. Was he certified by the medical officer?—I presume so, because he has only been five months in the school. Then there is Gertrude W——, nine years of age at present; she has been in the school one year and eight months. She knew a few letters, but was very backward in everything. She is now working in Standard II.; generally intelligent. Emily M——, nine years of age, six months in the class; when she entered she was said to be utterly incapable of learning arithmetic. She is now a good all-round Standard I. girl. Joseph M——, 12 years of age; he has been 4½ years in the school. When he came he was supposed to be idiotic; he could scarcely articulate at all. He is now going on well for Standard I.; he articulates plainly, and is generally brighter. I have one case of a girl, Jessie H——, 13 years of age; she has been 3¼ years in the school. She entered in Standard I., and she is now in Standard IV. This is a case where the girl would hold her own in a girls' school, only she is epileptic; her hand work is excellent.

Rev. J. H. Rose.
10 Mar. 1897.

4555. (*Mr. Pooley.*) As regards the 14 children who were transferred to the ordinary school, could you give us their intellectual condition when they were admitted into the special class?—You may take it they were children whom the teachers thought almost hopeless.

4556. But I wanted to know whether you could actually get us notes showing their condition, in each case, when admitted?—I think it is very possible.

4557. Will you send those to the committee?—Yes. I fancy the teacher has a record of every child that has been admitted, and would tell you the history.

4558. (*Miss Townsend.*) Do you consider, in the special class, that the special treatment of the children, or the individual care they are enabled to get, is the more important?—The two things, I think, go together. To begin with, we have a trained teacher who understands children of this kind, and, having a much smaller class, she is able to give that individual treatment to the children which they cannot get in an ordinary school.

4559. In an ordinary school it is quite impossible on account of the size of the class?—I think so.

4560. (*Mr. Newton.*) Do you remember one big boy who went to Darenth, and then came back again to Hugh Myddelton because his parents could not spare him?—No, I do not remember the case.

4561. Do you think the curriculum is suited for the bigger boys of 12, 13, and 14?—I think so, because the teachers, so far as I can judge, set the boys to do what they are capable of doing. They are not tied as they are in the ordinary classes, and the boy of 13 in this particular school may be a baby of seven or eight.

4562. Would not those boys have done well to have gone to the wood-working classes?—I think so. I think most of the children I have seen have developed most in using their hands, both boys and girls.

4563. Do you think there is enough manual work at the classes?—I think there might with advantage be a good deal more of it, especially now that we have got a very good new centre built upon the same site.

4564. You think it would be a good thing to have more manual training?—I think it would.

4565. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) Do you think that sometimes it might be a question of home surroundings as to whether a child should go to these classes or should be sent away from home to a place like Darenth?—I have no doubt that home surroundings have a good deal to do with it in many cases. Many of these children come from very poor homes, and their parents are sometimes drunken people; they do not look after them, and they have a difficulty in getting food. I may say we have a centre for providing dinners for children during the winter months, and to every case that I know of, or which the teacher thinks would not be fed, we give a dinner at the centre three times a week.

4566. And that is an important aid, no doubt, to their development?—Yes.

4567. (*Chairman.*) Would it be possible to work the system of compulsion with the class of parents from whom these people generally come; would it be possible to compel them to send them to asylums?—If the law said so, and they were taken by force from them, of course they would.

4568. But the law might break down as it has done in the case of vaccination. Would it be impossible to enforce byelaws?—You remove imbeciles now, and people who are insane; and I do not see why you could not remove any other classes of children that the law said must be removed.

Mr. Henry Major called in and examined.

Mr. H. Major

4569. (*Chairman.*) You are inspector of the Leicester School Board?—Yes.

4570. And you have paid particular attention to these special classes?—Yes.

4571. How long have the classes been in operation?—Since Easter, 1892. I think we were the first of the school boards to take up the question.

4572. How many schools have you?—Only one.

4573. That is a central school attended by all the defective children in the borough of Leicester?—Except a few who on account of distance are unable to attend—about four.

4574. Are not you bound to provide for those?—Yes, but we have a practical difficulty in the matter of getting them to attend because of the distance.

4575. You cannot pay, of course, for locomotion?—No, the auditor would not allow that.

4576. Your method of selecting the children is different from that of the London School Board in some degree; will you explain in what way?—My notice was first called to the fact that there were some children who were not imbecile on the one hand, nor merely dull in the estimation of the teachers, on the other hand. I therefore asked the board to take up the question, which they did, and we asked the teachers in the first instance to send to the office all such children as they thought ought to be in a special school. They sent about 400.

4577. Did they give any grounds for sending them?—Yes; but, judging from the results, they were not sufficient grounds. The consequence was that they had to be weeded down rather rapidly, and the number was finally reduced to a dozen. From that time to the present there have been 33 through the class, and I have made a statement here of the results of the 33.

4578. Will you tell us how you weeded them first of all from 400 to 12?—There was a committee formed of five different members of the board, who examined these children and looked at them and came to such a judgment as they could with regard to the question. Then they were finally handed over to me and to a doctor who is a member of the board, and to a doctor who is a medical officer to the board.

4579. You mean these few that were selected by the committee?—Yes.

4580. But those that were discarded by the members of the committee were never before you or before the doctor?—No, except that they came before me in my duty as an inspector of the schools.

4581. So that there might have been among the rejected many probably who were fit subjects for a special class?—There may have been at that time, but I do not think there can have been any during the five years that have since elapsed.

4582. In the first instance you were obliged to have a very rapid weeding process, but how do you proceed now as to admission?—All the children are first presented to me who are brought up by the visitors as being children who in their judgment ought to be sent to the special class. I examine them from a reading book, not to see whether they can read, but to see whether they have a certain amount of intelligence in the interpretation of pictures and in the answering of social questions limited to their own surroundings.

4583. How many visitors have you in Leicester?—Twelve.

4584. Do they schedule every child in Leicester?—Yes.

4585. Do you know the mental condition of every child?—Yes.

4586. Whether it is epileptic or defective or otherwise?—We have a periodical house to house visitation.

4587. Are not the people migratory?—To some extent, but not so much so as in some towns.

4588. So that it is comparatively easy to get the mental state of every child in Leicester?—We could do so; yes.

Mr. H. Major.

10 Mar. 1897.

4589. You have it recorded perhaps in the returns of the visitors?—Yes. May I correct myself. The mental condition of every one of these special children is noted. No record is taken of the ordinary children.

4590. They would be considered as normal if no entry is made against them?—Yes.

4591. Can you give us the particulars, under each head, of defective children in Leicester?—I am afraid I cannot, because we take them on the ground that their intelligence is arrested, or that it is imperfect, but we do not sub-divide them except that we reject all epileptics, with one exception. There is no provision for them.

4592. May there not be some more cases of epilepsy?—They have not come under observation.

4593. No serious cases of epilepsy?—No, but I am afraid I can give you no information on the point.

4594. Is not that an entry in your visitor's return?—No.

4595. How many special defects do you note for your visitors to enter?—I do not know whether I am quite answering your question. I note that they are most deficient in "number."

4596. I was speaking of ruled columns?—The child comes up before me, and is tested individually as to its condition.

4597. Is there any form that is filled in first?—No, he is generally presented to the committee, and the committee hand him over to me, and if I have any difficulty in the case I take the advice of the medical officer.

4598. What does the visitor report?—That he has found a child in the house not attending school on the ground stated by his parents that he is of defective education, or that the teacher has reported him as being of defective education, and not fit to attend school.

4599. But that does not give the cause?—It is the only entry. We ignore the epileptic cases. We have no provision for them, and I do not know that we have a case of defective intelligence plus epilepsy.

4600. So that all cases of children who cannot march on with other children are all put together into one category?—Yes, with the exception that there are liberal interpretations made of the exception clauses in the code, and all the children who are merely of dull intellect are presented by the teachers, and passed through my hands, and are kept down a standard, or put into Standard 0. We make provision for the same class that the London School Board make provision for.

4601. How many are there now?—There have been 33 during the last five years, and 12 are left at the present moment.

4602. What is the population of Leicester?—175,000 in 1891, and calculated to be 200,000 in the borough now.

4603. Then you have 12 out of 200,000?—Yes, besides the few epileptic cases that may be left out, and the few that are left out on account of distance.

4604. That is four?—Yes.

4605. Have you any crippled children?—If there are children who are slightly crippled they are taken in as ordinary scholars. No special provision is made for them.

4606. Have you paralysed children?—I have not noticed any.

4607. How many children have you at the schools?—We have 21,000 in average attendance in the board schools and 9,000 in the voluntary schools; total, 30,000. There are 35,000 on the roll.

4608. That is the total number of children of school age?—Then there are private schools and our large public schools, some 500 in one of those. I think we have a rather larger school population than the average population gives, because we have a large working population.

4609. What tests do you apply to the defective children?—The child comes to me, and I notice what his age may be. Then I take a book fitted to the age of the child, if he be a normal one, and ask him to talk about the pictures, and if I can get from him fairly intelligent answers, and if he can count up a few numbers from objects in the pictures, and can talk about his brothers and sisters, his mother and father, and also if he can read a little—a word or two, and can count up to 1, 2, 3, then I come to a judgment as to whether I ought to recommend the committee to send him to the special class or not, and if I do, and the case be a doubtful one medically, I then refer him to the medical officer.

4610. If he can add 1, 2, 3, would you send him to an ordinary school?—I should do so if he were of a very young age, say six years, because I take it from my experience that young children are more deficient in number than in any other direction, and that the number faculty develops with the development of the other faculties. I have a tabulated result of the 33 cases if the Committee would care about hearing as to them.

4611. Yes?—Out of the 33 cases, four have been sent to the ordinary school into Standard I., and are still there. One has been sent to Standard I., and has passed subsequently to Standard III. Four boys have been sent to work, and are earning wages, not at home. Three girls have been put to work at home, but are not capable of earning their living out of the house. Two were not really weak enough to be retained, and they were sent back to the ordinary school. One has been sent to the Deaf Mutes' School, two have died, two have been sent away as uncontrollable, interfering with the moral discipline of the rest of the children, one of these being 14 years of age, and beyond the control of the female teacher. One subsequently went to the asylum, one to the union, 12 are at the school at the present time, and three have become lost sight of, or have gone out of the town. In addition, I would lay before the Committee a statement which I drew up at the end of the first year from a ledger account of every individual, showing his initial condition and his condition at the end of the year. I have asked the head teacher to supplement that with manuscript dealing with the cases that have been admitted subsequently, and those same cases in their subsequent treatment. I thought perhaps it might be of use to the Committee if I were to leave those documents with them. I have also brought a copy of the time table that was drawn up. Our first time table was a tentative one, but this is the one on which we are working at the present moment. You will see that we give a quarter of an hour to a great many subjects. We began with a quarter of an hour with every one of them.

4612. At what age do you take the children at the special school?—As early as six.

4613. It is generally thought that they should be left at the infant school as long as possible?—We found before the class was established that when they were so left the children were not well treated by the other children, and I am afraid in some cases they were not sympathetically treated by the junior teachers. I dare say this was a good deal owing to want of knowledge; therefore I would deprecate their being kept in the infant school if they are not fit to be kept there.

4614. If they are uncontrollable?—I did not mean that; I meant if they are deficient in their intellect, and so cannot get on with the others.

4615. Would you transfer them at six to the special class?—Yes.

4616. We find in London they are very sympathetically and kindly treated as a rule by all the teachers and the children?—There is a certain amount of shouldering and elbowing off among the children themselves. I have noticed that other children of non-defective intellect do not treat these defective children quite so thoughtfully as is desirable.

4617. We find the opposite in London; that they have a humanising effect upon the children, and that the children are all very kind to them. I am afraid the Leicester children must be a little rougher than the London children?—They must be, according to that.

4618. To what age would you retain them in the special class?—We have not retained any further than 14, because at that age we have had them go out to earn their own living.

4619. You have no power to retain them?—No.

4620. How many teachers have you for those 12 children?—One, and an assistant.

4621. What are the qualifications of the teacher?—The first teacher was chosen from the infant school as one who was very clever in kindergarten, and very sympathetic in her treatment of infants. She has been succeeded by a similar one; but neither had any special training whatever.

Mr. H. Major

19 Mar. 1897.

4622. And the assistant?—The assistant has had none, except such as she has got from the head.

4623. What is the cost of this class?—About 10*l.* per child, or a little more. The head mistress gets 90*l.*, and there is the assistant to pay for besides. I am reckoning nothing for room, apparatus, books, &c.

4624. The cost in salaries is 10*l.* a head?—Yes.

4625. Was the room specially designed for the purpose, or was it a class-room for ordinary children?—It was made suitable, so far as we could make it.

4626. Is it furnished with special desks or ordinary school furniture?—We have a very limited number of desks for the 12 children, a few round the walls, and there are cages for doves and canaries, and a tortoise is kept.

4627. You make the room as bright as you can by making it full of animal life?—Yes, and flowers. Everything is done to make the children as happy as we can make them.

4628. Do the parents object to sending their children to these schools?—They did a good deal at first, but we are overcoming the difficulty now to such an extent that five of the parents have shifted their residences so as to be near the school for the sake of their children. But there has been, and still is, a difficulty. The parents rather ignore the fact that the children are deficient. I think this arises from sensitiveness more than anything else.

4629. By what name is your class known in Leicester?—We call it the special class, so as to avoid wounding susceptibilities.

4630. Are the school hours much the same as those of other schools?—Nearly the same.

4631. The lessons are shorter?—Very much shorter.

4632. More manual work than they have in other schools?—Very much more manual work from the very beginning, but more industrial work now, if I may so term it, than at the beginning, though not more manual.

4633. Why do you put them to industrial work at that age; is it to enable them to earn their living immediately they leave?—Yes, but that age reaches up to 14, so that some of them are getting on in years.

4634. At what age do the children leave school in Leicester, as a rule?—When they have passed Standard VI.

4635. And half time?—The half time exemption is at Standard IV.

4636. Do not they leave school without passing Standard VI., in a great many cases?—They leave school and go into the streets, unfortunately, without passing Standard VI. if they are 14.

4637. Does the board connive at that?—We cannot help ourselves after they have passed Standard VI. and are 13.

4638. You have many cases of children who have not passed Standard VI. in the streets?—I think not. Every case of a child not at school is reported to the clerk, who has a record from the visitors as to what has been done with him in the next quarter.

4639. Do the magistrates enforce the fines?—We have an admirable bench in that direction.

4640. With your population you ought to have 33,000 children in school, but you only have 30,000 apparently, is that so?—There are 30,000 in average attendance.

4641. And how many are on the books of the schools?—Thirty-five thousand.

4642. Does that include all children who are attending schools where they pay less than 9*d.* a week; you have no private schools on your register?—No, there are some private schools where the children are not paying 9*d.* a week, and the children are not scheduled. We have had a fight with those, and we cannot get our way with regard to them.

4643. But you ought to schedule all children who pay less than 9*d.*?—Yes, but there are a few cases where it has been difficult to do so.

4644. Have you a very large Standard (0) in the other schools?—Not so very large now, as we had at first, because they have all to pass through my hands, and some children are kept down in the infant schools for another year's infant treatment, and that, of course, reduces the number.

4645. What do you mean by another year; up to the age of eight?—No, they would be seven at the next Government examination in the upper school.

4646. Do you transfer them all before they are seven?—We transfer them within such limits that they must be seven and over at the next Government examination in the upper school.

4647. Then you give them an extra year if they are dull, and allow them to stay till they would be over eight at the Government examination?—Yes.

4648. So that you thin your Standard 0 in that way, or rather, do you disguise it by keeping them down in the infant school?—I do not know which is the proper way to express it, but I think, if I may say so, that keeping them in the infant school is better for the children. Many of these cases are children who, though they will be seven at the next Government examination, are immigrants, and who have not had a year's training in the infant school.

4649. So that a stranger coming into a Leicester school would not find very many dull children in the upper classes; he would have to go to the infant class to find very dull children?—He would find in our schools a very limited number of Standard 0's.

4650. They would be the older children of eight to nine?—Eight to nine.

4651. Up to eight they would be in the infant school if they were very dull?—Yes.

4652. (*Mr. Pooley.*) I think you said that there are 35,000 children in school in Leicester?—Yes.

4653. Of whom 30,000 are in average attendance?—Yes, 30,500.

4654. Does that include the voluntary schools as well as the board schools?—It does.

4655. There are only 12 at present, I understand, in your special class?—Twelve at the present time.

4656. Do you think it probable that there are a considerable number of children as deficient as those 12 who are attending the ordinary schools?—I think that there may be a certain number, probably a proportionate number to our own, in the denominational schools over whom we have no control.

4657. Do you know the number of children in the voluntary schools?—There are 11,380 children on the books of voluntary schools.

4658. Do you think it probable that there are a number of children as deficient as those 12 now attending the board school?—I know that there are four cases, and there might be one or two left out whom the visitors have not yet picked up, or who have not come under my notice in examining the schools.

4659. When you say which the visitors have not picked up, those would be cases not attending schools?—Yes, in the house to house visitations.

4660. Is your special class full?—Yes.

4661. Has it room for only 12?—Only 12. In my opinion we ought to have two classes for the town, and not one central one. We ought to have two at such a distance as to divide the town in two halves, and then, though the classes would be smaller than they should be at first, as the town is very rapidly increasing, we should, I think, finally get about 24 in, say, three or four years' time.

4662. In selecting these children I understand that the teachers of the school report cases to you?—Yes, that is how some of them come in; that is, those that are attending school.

4663. And other cases the visitors report to you?—Yes.

4664. Can you tell us about how many cases are reported to you by the teachers in, say, a year?—I think the greater number are reported by the visitors. Beyond that I cannot say.

4665. Cannot you say how many cases are reported by the teachers?—Only that it is a less number than half, and I had 33 in all during the five years, and that there are 12 now.

4666. How many cases do the teachers report to you as children for the special class?—Only about one or two out of a dozen that I accept.

Mr. H. Major.

10 Mar. 1897.

4667. I wanted to get at the number that they report to you among whom you have to discriminate?—We have not a record; I can only speak haphazard and say that probably during the last year I have had seven or eight.

4668. Can you tell us what directions you give to the teachers as to the sort of children that they ought to report to you?—They have not had instructions of a very formal character as to that, except that if there are children who in their opinion are defective in development, they should report it.

4669. Of course they know that the class is full, that it is a very small class, and that it would be useless for them to report many under the circumstances?—I do not know that they know anything about that. We have not had to reject a child because the school is full yet. We have only got our maximum number just now.

4670. You have told us how you examine these children in order to see whether they are fit for the special class, hearing them read and so on?—Very little "hearing them read."

4671. You said they had a book and they looked at the pictures?—Yes.

4672. And you asked them questions?—Yes; not very much hearing them read, and still less questioning as to number.

4673. Then you reject some?—Yes.

4674. And the others go before the medical officer?—No, not unless I feel I ought to call the medical officer into question.

4675. Do you only call him in where you have a doubt?—That is all.

4676. Do you look at them with a trained eye, if I may say so, for physical defects?—I can only say that I seconded the honours list in physiology in the London University, but I do not think it helps me very much.

4677. Do you pay attention to size of the head, nerve signs, low nutrition, the eyes, and physical indications of that sort; I dare say you know that I am mainly referring to Dr. Warner?—Yes, I am principally determined in my judgment by such matters. I have very little else to go upon.

4678. I understood you to say you went principally by their intelligence as judged by the answers to questions put to them?—Yes, but I think that a good deal shows itself, or does not show itself, in the face whilst the child is being examined.

4679. Then you do pay a good deal of attention to those physical signs?—A good deal, as far as my judgment and knowledge extend.

4680. Then do you think that it would be desirable that all these cases should be seen by the doctor before they are sent back to the ordinary schools?—I do not know that it is, because I have had a case out of the limited number that have been sent to the doctor where the child has been obliged to be sent back again to the ordinary school.

4681. You mean because the doctor did not pass him?—The doctor passed him to go into the school; but, in my judgment, based on an experience of three months afterwards, the child was not fit to be sent to the special class.

4682. But was suitable for the ordinary school?—Yes.

4683. Do you think it is desirable to have an examination occasionally of all the children in the ordinary class, and not simply to rely upon the report of the teacher?—I do not think it is needed because we have such a grip of the town through the school board, and the teachers are so desirous of getting rid of the difficulty that I think we meet all requirements.

4684. When you say "get rid of the difficulty," do you mean get rid of these children?—I mean get rid of the children out of the ordinary school and put them into a special one.

4685. Is that the case when you have only seven or eight reported for the whole year out of the whole of the board schools at Leicester. Does it look as if they were desirous of getting them into the special class?—I think so; because the cases we touch are so different from the cases that are touched by the London School Board. We have only the narrow margin between a greater inefficiency on the left side and ordinary dulness on the right. I do not think it would be right to take children out of the ordinary school if they are at all fit, notwithstanding dulness and want of knowledge, to be kept in the ordinary school.

4686. You think your children in a special class may be very much more defective and dull than those which you find in London?—A good deal. We do not, in my opinion, cater for the same class as the London School Board caters for.

4687. Have you visited the London School Board's special class?—No, I have only made inquiries on that point.

4688. Would you be surprised to hear that almost all the cases which are to be found in the London special classes are reported by doctors to show physical signs indicating feeble mindedness and defective intellect?—No, I should not, because I think the whole question is relative. It seems to me that you cannot draw a hard and fast line between the children we specially cater for, on one side or upon the other.

4689. You think if a visitor were to visit a defective class at Leicester he would find a very much more feeble-minded set of children than in the special classes of the London School Board?—I think so. You will see by the reports I have presented to you that the 33 cases when they came to us were most deficient, though there was hope in them. They cannot count up to 1, 2, 3, in many cases.

4690. Do you think that there are in the ordinary schools many more children, beside those 12 now being taught in the special class in Leicester, who would be much benefited if they could be admitted to the special class?—You mean on the basis of the London School Board?

4691. I will not say on the basis of the London School Board, but children who have not a fair chance of being taught efficiently in the ordinary schools with the large classes?—I am not very much pressed to say "yes" in that direction, because our curriculum is made so educative now, and so recreative in Standard I., and we have such a fair number in Standard 0 who are specially treated, that I do not think there is so great a necessity.

4692. Then there may be some feeble-minded children in Standard 0 probably?—Yes, relatively feeble-minded.

4693. May I ask what sized classes you have of Standard 0 in the ordinary board school?—That very much varies with the character of the school. There are some schools that are in almost a middle-class neighbourhood where there are very few of them indeed—only 3 or 4 out of 600.

4694. But I was asking how many there were in a class?—Only three or four in such a school.

4695. Have you a separate teacher for that class?—Yes, special provision is made for them.

4696. In the ordinary school?—Yes.

4697. (*Chairman.*) Do I understand that you devote a teacher to teach three or four children in the school?—Yes, but those are all middle-class neighbourhoods, and we have other schools in the slums, where there is quite a fair class—15 or 20.

4698. (*Mr. Pooley.*) 15 of this standard, not children under a teacher of their own?—Yes.

4699. And they constitute, in fact, a special class?—A special class of a different character from what we call specifically our "special class."

4700. They constitute a special class of some 15 children in Standard 0, many of whom, if they were not so dealt with, would be passed into the higher standard?—Yes.

4701. So that you have in the ordinary board schools a special class of, I was going to say, deficient children?—If you like to put it so, yes; but of a different grade from our special class.

4702. Not so defective?—No, they have two years' work instead of one in Standard I.

4703. (*Miss Townsend.*) Would you consider those children in Standard 0 to be of the same kind as are admitted into the London School Board's special class?—They are cases not of congenital want of development or arrested development, as in the case of some of our cases in the special class, but are cases of children who have come in as navvies' children in the building of railways, and immigrants from country districts where they are not very well looked after, and cases of scarlet fever and arrested development along those lines.

Mr. H. Major.

10 Mar. 1897.

4704. And they have special provision in the smallness of the class and the care of the teacher in the ordinary schools?—Yes, but not to a very great extent, they do their writing, and arithmetic with the others.

4705. Have you any special provision for cripples or physically incapable children?—None whatever.

4706. They are not admitted to the special class under any pretext?—No.

4707. Are they to be found in the ordinary schools?—I have met a few cases of physically incapable children.

4708. Are there any cripples or physically incapable children remaining at home?—I think not, except where they are absolutely incapable of getting to the school.

4709. Is there any provision made for their going upstairs when they get to the school?—Yes.

4710. You have them carried up?—Yes, we have a little chair in one school.

4711. You consider they do better among the ordinary children than they would in a special class?—Yes.

4712. The special class is too defective for them?—Yes, it is, as you know, a very depressing atmosphere for a child to be in the special class unless he absolutely belongs to it.

4713. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) Did you draw up this time table?—No, the head mistress drew it up. It was passed through my hands, but I do not think I was of any use in the matter.

4714. What constitutes a school attendance?—Nine to 12 and two to half-past four.

4715. Your time table does not show that; it begins at 9.15, and I make your attendance 4½ hours per day?—Yes. Then I must correct my statement. I think it is the infant school time-table that I thought of. The time table will be correct.

4716. That is 4½ hours per day?—Yes.

4717. I notice that you only give about an hour and a half in the week to reading, do you think that is enough?—I think it is with the children we have.

4718. Does your special class in Leicester contain 12 children who are more or less idiots?—On the verge of it.

4719. You do not class them as idiots?—No.

4720. What is your aim and object in teaching these children?—Firstly, to make their lives a little happier than they otherwise could be, and, secondly, if possible, to draft a few of them into the ordinary school, and, thirdly, to try to put them in the way of earning a living, if possible.

4721. Do you think if they are to go out into the world 1½ hours per week is sufficient time to give to reading?—Yes, from six years of age.

4722. At six years, I see you only give about an hour and 10 minutes?—I am thinking rather of the continuity of time than of the intensity of the subject in the early stages.

4723. Do you know which of these occupations is the most helpful?—I am afraid I cannot tell you. You would get that kind of information, I think, better from the head teacher. I am only struck with the fact that number is the greatest difficulty in the matter.

4724. That is quite different from the evidence throughout England and abroad; do you not find reading a great difficulty?—It is a big difficulty. They do not leave us with the capability of reading in the end.

4725. What standard have they arrived at when they leave you?—That varies with every individual. Some can only read a Standard I. book.

4726. Can they all read a Standard I. book?—No, at the beginning they know absolutely nothing in some cases; in other cases they know a letter or two; in other cases they have extreme difficulty in remembering three or four letters at a time, and you will see by the report of each individual I have left with the Committee what the condition of their reading is.

4727. What have the children on leaving you accomplished in reading?—They cannot read anything more than Standard III., the very best of them.

4728. Have they got as far as that?—A very limited number. One has been sent into an ordinary school who has gone through Standard III., and a few others have about reached it on their leaving without going through the Standard III.

4729. Would you not amongst your children have some that would not be able to read a Standard I. book?—Yes.

4730. Would not have made any progress whatever?—I think in one or two cases you might say so.

4731. Of course they would benefit morally by attendance in the class, but intellectually they would not benefit much?—Not much.

4732. So that you do not separate what would be termed non-educable children?—No, we take them *en gros*—the whole 12; but the teachers individualise themselves; there are two teachers.

4733. Would you think it helpful to pay for the conveyance of the children rather than to establish separate classes in the town?—I think there would be a great practical difficulty in doing it. Our tramways would not help very much. They would not go along the right lines, and we can hardly pay cab fares.

4734. But it would be better to have a centre with three classes than it would be to have three separate classes dotted about the town?—I think it would bear grading, but not for distance.

4735. There would be better organisation?—Decidedly. We have adopted that idea in similar classes for the deaf mutes. They get three classes of these in one centre.

4736. I take it that the standard of admission to the special class at Leicester is very much lower than it is with the London School Board?—Yes.

4737. It would surprise you, perhaps, to know that a medical man said that the London School Board had 25 per cent. of imbeciles in one of the classes?—It would surprise me very much.

4738. I notice that you give as much time to religious instruction as you give to reading?—Yes.

4739. Can you give us any idea what the religious instruction consists of?—The same as at all the board schools—little Bible stories, with a few simple children's hymns, which they sing.

4740. Do you find they like singing?—Yes.

4741. And have you a piano?—Yes.

4742. You agree they are most wanted there?—Decidedly.

4743. (*Mr. Newton.*) Can you say if there is more idiocy in Leicester or in London?—I could not say, officially, but I have no doubt in London.

4744. I do not know whether any of the figures in the asylums would help you?—I could not say, and our asylum takes in the neighbouring counties.

4745. Can you give any statistics about the number of idiots in Leicester?—Yes.

4746. If we found the proportion of bad cases in the two towns, we might, to a certain extent, infer the number of slight cases?—Yes.

4747. Could you make some calculation of that sort for us?—You want the number of cases in the asylums, the county and the borough.

4748. The number of pauper idiots from the district of the Leicester School Board would be useful?—That will include, of course, the adults.

4749. Certainly, that, compared with the number in London, which we can obtain otherwise, would give a sort of measure of the amount of idiocy?—Then we shall have the workhouse infirmary as well.

4750. Certainly, I should include that?—The number of pauper idiots in Leicester Asylum is 53, of whom two are children, and the number of pauper idiots in the workhouse is 24, of whom six are children.

4751. From those figures we might be able to infer whether the amount of dulness is really the same. Have you any reason to think that in Leicester there is a smaller class of drunken or dissolute people than in London?—Yes, I think so, from what I know of London, but I should think we figure badly, comparing Leicester with the average of the country, apart from London.

4752. As drunkenness and so forth are the causes of mental deficiency, if you have fewer people of that sort you would expect to find a smaller proportion of defective children than in London?—Probably so, but I was

Mr. H. Major.

10 Mar. 1897.

comparing Leicester, in my own mind, say, with Brighton.

4753. Brighton would be exceptional the other way, would it not?—Yes.

4754. What is your reason for saying that in London children are admitted to the special class who would not be admitted to your special class?—Only the reports I have had from the teachers of our special class who have made visits to the London special classes.

4755. Your teachers have reported to you that they have seen children who would not be admitted into your classes?—Yes.

4756. Do they say they have seen those children in any numbers?—I have not had any evidence one way or the other, but I understood there were nine classes in London.

4757. There are nearly 30. Your teachers have not made any calculation?—No.

4758. It is only their impression from the classes they have seen that the standard is different in the one place to what it is in the other?—Quite so.

4759. Then we could not give very much weight to that evidence?—No.

4760. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) With regard to the medical officer and the medical member of the school board, I think you said there were two medical men interested in this matter?—Yes.

4761. Who is the medical member of the board?—Dr. Bennett, who is a specialist in throat and ear diseases, rather than a general medical practitioner.

4762. Who is the medical officer to the Leicester School Board?—Dr. Pope. He is only consulting physician. He is not appointed at a fixed salary. He deals with special cases.

4763. He is not medical officer for all purposes?—No.

4764. Only when it is necessary to consult him?—That is so. It was his reports to the board years ago, as to whether children ought to be sent to school or not, that first called my attention to the fact that there were mental deficiencies that wanted attending to when I looked through his report book.

4765. And looking at the individual reports in the report of this special class, I quite agree that those children must be on an average of decidedly lower grade than those in the London special class, and two of them strike me as cases which, in London, would perhaps be considered too low for admission to the special class at all?—We say in Leicester that in London the child is sent away, and not taken care of by the board, but that the Leicester board does take care of him. The London board deals with him in another direction.

4766. Have you any training institution for idiots or imbeciles at all available for the population of Leicester?—There is a workhouse on the one hand.

4767. That is not really a training institution, I think. Is there any such place available for Leicester as Darenth is for London?—No, before moving I put myself in correspondence with such institutions as there were up and down the country, to see if the board could send its children to them; but I found such a course was so difficult that I suggested this other course.

4768. The asylum that has been alluded to just now for the borough of Leicester is an asylum for the insane?—There is one asylum for the borough and another for the county.

4769. They are fundamentally asylums for insane people—not for imbeciles?—Yes.

4770. They do not profess to give imbeciles special treatment?—I cannot answer that question. I do not know whether they have idiots as well as lunatics.

4771. I believe most county asylums are obliged to have them under special circumstances, but they do not care to have them. They have not, so far as you know, any special system of dealing with them if they do take them?—I cannot answer the question.

4772. You say that the medical officer of the board sees the child only when you have any doubt about him?—Yes.

4773. So that you do not get medical assistance in forming a judgment?—No, not very frequently.

4774. Your experience of the physical as well as the mental features of the case, you say, helps you in forming a judgment?—I think so.

4775. That is a matter, I suppose, that comes of experience?—Yes, and some mistakes are made, as I have pointed out in the 33 cases, the case of a child being relegated back to the ordinary school.

4776. Have you specially studied the methods that Dr. Warner has recommended?—No, I have nothing except what I have indicated as tests.

4777. With regard to the teaching of reading, is there any special mode of teaching reading in those classes—anything different from that which prevails in the ordinary school?—No, it is the combined method, with a little alphabet and a little phonic.

4778. Do you use pictures in aid?—Yes.

4779. Of objects with the names printed?—Yes, the usual school primer of that character, and a sheet.

4780. Music, I suppose, is found exceedingly useful for the special classes?—Yes; it is taught by ear only, of course.

4781. And you have some musical instruments there?—Yes.

4782. Is Leicester a straggling place, and what distance have the children to go to the centre?—Leicester is a rectangle of an irregular character, longer from north to south than from east to west, and the school we have is in about the centre. The extreme distance on one side would be 1¾ miles, and on the other about 1½, the other distances being shorter.

4783. (*Chairman.*) With regard to the 16 that you have sifted out and declared to be fit for the special class, do you consider them educable?—Yes, with the limitation that I do not expect very much advance from them.

4784. You consider the money paid out of Leicester rates is not wasted upon such results as you make of these cases?—No, especially if you take into account the happiness of the child's life that is secured. I reckon that to be a big factor.

4785. The chief result is a certain amount of happiness and brightness brought into the child's life?—Yes.

4786. But the actual amount of education or training is otherwise almost nil?—I should not call it nil if a boy arrives at Standard III.

4787. I was going to ask you a question about your Standard 0; the classes vary from five in number in some schools to 14 in others, I think you said?—When I said 14 I was only speaking from memory.

4788. I understand that each of these classes has a separate teacher?—Yes, but the teacher in the smaller schools would be a very young one.

4789. How old or how skilful was the teacher who has a charge of the Standard 0?—In the case of the limited number it would only be a junior teacher.

4790. Of what age?—We do not allow them to teach until they have gone through the candidate's and the first year's course.

4791. Do you consider these young persons qualified to teach very backward or very dull children?—No, I should very much prefer to see one of the best teachers in the school put to them.

4792. Why should not that be done?—It is a question of economy, I think.

4793. They are taught by very young teachers who have very little skill?—Yes, in reading; in the other subjects they are taught by the ordinary skilled teacher.

4794. I understand for reading, writing, and arithmetic, they are mixed with the other children?—No. In reading they would be specially separated.

4795. And in writing and arithmetic mixed with the others?—Yes.

4796. Are they fit to march on with the others in arithmetic?—I think so. The requirements of Standard I. are so small that as we give them two years to do it in we do not find any practical difficulty, and a great deal of it, as you know, is mechanical.

4797. How many children in this class never rise above Standard I.?—Not any.

4798. Every child in Leicester advances beyond Standard I.?—If a child has been in Standard I. two years, he must be sent to Standard II., and if he is in Standard II. two years he must be sent into Standard III.

4799. Whether he has learned anything or not?—Yes. I take it if a child is deficient when he has been in the same standard two years, it is no good keeping the child in that standard any longer.

4800. You would teach him something more difficult?—Yes, because he would not be deficient in all directions. We find some cases, for instance, where a lad will do his elementary science work well, but he cannot read well or he is deficient in number. I have had a case where a boy has failed in arithmetic five years running in five successive standards, but I should not have liked to have kept that lad down in one standard for five years.

4801. Did he know anything of arithmetic at the end of his course?—He was always uncertain.

4802. One important thing in arithmetic is accuracy?—Yes. He was always inaccurate throughout his course, and I take it would have been just the same if I had kept him at Standard I. all through.

4803. Would he never have learned accuracy in doing simple sums?—Not to be certain of them.

4804. You never keep a child in any standard or in any class above two years?—No.

4805. Your visitors have never reported any idiot or imbecile children to you?—No.

4806. Do you mean to say that you never have had reported a single case of a child being an imbecile or an idiot in the whole town of Leicester?—If they occurred they occurred in this form—that the visitor will bring them before Leicester committee, then the committee gives a decision as to whether the child ought to be at school or not, but I am not on that committee.

Mr. H. Major.

10 Mar. 1897.

4807. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) When you mentioned that 400 children were sent up by the teachers you do not intend to cast any reflection upon the teachers' selection, but they were sending you what they thought were their dull children?—No reflection in the least. We have no difficulty with regard to them now. It was the initial difficulty due, I dare say, to ignorance of the lines the board wanted to lay down.

4808. So that in your judgment they had 400 dull children?—Yes?—but not "special" children.

4809. (*Chairman.*) Have you visited any London centre at all?—No.

4810. May I call your attention to this: most people who have given evidence here say 1 per cent. or even 1½ per cent. from Birmingham, Brighton, and other places are proper subjects for these special classes. In Leicester your proportion is $\frac{3}{5}$ per cent.?—Yes, we have, out of 30,000, 12 in a special class.

4811. To what do you attribute the difference?—As I said, I should be glad if we had some more children in special classes. I have no doubt we have as many dull children as other average towns.

4812. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) But you do not deal with them in the same way?—We do not deal with them in the same way.

Dr. Edward Tait called in and examined.

Dr. E. Tait.

4813. (*Chairman.*) You were for some years connected with the Aubert Park Home, which is now closed, and the children have been transferred to another home, the West London Home?—Yes.

4814. It is a home for feeble-minded children?—Yes.

4815. Can you tell us on what terms they were admitted and at what age?—There was no fixed age, but we preferred to get them at about 14. They were sometimes older than that, but occasionally younger.

4816. Had they had much education before they came to you?—That varied very much.

4817. Had they passed through any special classes before they came to you?—Not necessarily.

4818. They may have been taught in the ordinary schools?—Some had, and some were incapable, and had not got through any standard at all.

4819. Would you call those imbeciles?—No, we do not take imbeciles, only those that we consider capable of improvement.

4820. But you are aware that some medical men speak of higher and lower imbeciles?—These were higher imbeciles, then.

4821. There was no definite line?—No, the rule was to only take those girls as to whom there was a reasonable prospect of teaching them to earn their living.

4822. Either partially or wholly?—Yes.

4823. And was the result of the training that some of them could earn their living entirely, and some of them only partially?—Yes, and some failed.

4824. How many inmates were there of the home?—Twelve.

4825. You would advocate a larger number than that as a rule, would not you?—I should not advise going above 20.

4826. The cost of management, of course, becomes great with so small a number?—Yes, but I think if one increased the number to more than about 20, it would be very difficult to carry on such a home.

4827. Without duplicating the staff?—I am not sure, even then, that the superintendent could give that independent attention to the cases that seems to be very necessary.

4828. What staff had you for that number?—Three.

4829. A matron?—Yes. There was the lady superintendent, and she had an assistant and a matron.

4830. And did the girls do all the housework?—Yes.

4831. Are they good at needlework as well as housework?—Yes, some of them did very fair needlework, but there was no fine needlework. We did not find that any of them were really capable of any skilled labour.

4832. You only took them in, if you thought they were capable of some distinct improvement?—Yes.

4833. How long did you keep them if you found they were failures?—We took them first on a month's probation. Later we made it a hard and fast rule to do that. If, at the end of a month or so they did not show any prospect of being improved, we did not keep them; but sometimes they were kept several months, and then found not to be improving. Beyond the month there was no hard and fast rule.

4834. When they came to you, of course they were of very varying capacity, and very varying degrees of education?—Yes.

4835. Would not it be advisable to have a school attached to a home of that sort, so that they might be transferred from the school to the home when the time came for their receiving such final instruction as was good for them?—Yes, I think it would be very desirable.

4836. What was the cost per head at your home?—About 21*l.* a year.

4837. The usual cost of institutions of that kind varies from 20*l.* to 30*l.* a year?—Yes.

4838. It is very difficult, of course, to raise the money?—Yes.

4839. Do you think some of the girls of that class might be trusted to go out into the world, and earn their living as general servants?—That was the aim in this home, to train them for general service.

4840. At what age would they be suitably fitted for that?—That would vary very much according to their capacity and their improvement.

4841. Sometimes at 16?—Yes.

4842. But I suppose the majority of them not till later?—No, but certainly some did start at 16 or 17.

4843. It would not be any use attempting to teach them any skilled handicraft?—No, we find they do not do skilled work very successfully.

4844. But general housework?—General housework, scrubbing, washing, mangling, and such like.

4845. Had you good characters with them when they went out, or were many of them returned to you as incapable of service?—A few were returned, but a large proportion of those that really started continued

Dr. E. Tait.

10 Mar. 1897.

in their places, and are self-supporting. They have been so for some two or three years now.

4846. Do you think it probable if a child came to you at the age of seven, and stayed till 16, that she would be fit to go out and earn her living?—I have not had any experience of them so young as that. I have not seen them till they left school.

4847. They required great change of occupation while they were with you?—We were decidedly of opinion that change of occupation was very desirable. We had some cases that came from other homes, where, for instance, perhaps, one girl might have done nothing but turn the mangle, or fold linen; another would only carry coals, and so forth. We became distinctly of opinion that it was very bad for them to be kept in that way at a definite and monotonous occupation of that sort, and from some homes where they had been trained in that way, their tempers were bad, they were often sullen and morose; but that entirely disappeared after giving them a more varied occupation, with less monotony in their lives.

4848. It was entirely want of previous training you think?—I would not say entirely, but I think it was very much so. In fact, the lady superintendent was much struck by the fact that there was a certain school from which the girls frequently came who were said to have ungovernable tempers, but we saw very little of that after they came in. I remember three or four came in one after another with the character of being morose and sullen, each of them (it may have been a coincidence) happened to come from another institution. Thus the bad tempers came from one and the sullen ones from another.

4849. About how many had passed through special classes for the training of such children before they came to you?—I do not think we had any that had been in any home previously.

4850. Or who had been in special classes under the London School Board for training these children?—No.

4851. You have no experience of the success of such a scheme?—No, I have not.

4852. Have you seen many feeble-minded children of school age?—No.

4853. Your only experience of them is after the age of 16?—Yes, or 14.

4854. (*Mr. Pooley.*) What was the youngest age at which girls were admitted into this Aubert Park Home?—I think we had a little girl of 11, Annie G——.

4855. But what is the ordinary age of admission?—I should say 14 to 16.

4856. Would the average be 16?—Probably about 16.

4857. What provision is made for their education? Is their elementary education continued?—We found they did not make any great headway, but they were taught in the evening. There does not seem to be any necessary connection between their not being able to read or write and their being trained to earn their living. There was one little girl, for instance, who if she were given a letter O could not select another O from a lot of letters; and yet she has done very well. She was never taught to read but she has learned housework and is earning her own living.

4858. As a rule do they get some regular instruction in reading or writing or in anything they are capable of each day?—I do not think that latterly they did. They did for a time.

4859. Was that principally in the evening?—Yes, principally in the evening. But they were chiefly taught to do housework, and cooking, and ironing, and to go out on errands and bring back the right change—practical work.

4860. If children were sent by the school authority to an institution of that sort there would necessarily be some little alteration in the routine?—Yes. This was not started with the idea of teaching younger children. I remember, however, that this little girl of 11, whom I have mentioned, was taught reading, writing, &c., but most of the girls who came were 15 or 16 years of age—after the ordinary school age.

4861. (*Miss Townsend.*) The schools from which the girls came to your institution were the district and workhouse schools, were they not?—Yes.

4862. And those girls you found had been brought up under a system of monotonous routine?—Yes, we were very much struck by that.

4863. You found less violent and sullen temper among the girls who came from their own homes or from other schools?—The bad-tempered girls generally came from the district schools.

4864. And do you think that supposing these girls of 16 had had good mental training in ordinary schools they would in many cases not have needed such a home as Aubert Park, but would have properly developed; in other words do you think their condition there at all due to want of early training?—I should think in part, but I should doubt if it was entirely.

4865. You think there was some natural mental defect in them all?—Yes, I do not think they were simply backward children.

4866. But still, they were children who had been more or less neglected; better training might have made them better?—I think if they had had individual training early in life they would have been much better.

4867. You began a little too late?—Yes, I think it is most important to begin early.

4868. One great difficulty in carrying on a home for younger children is the school difficulty?—Yes.

4869. If they had had their school training before they came, it would have been easier to give them the industrial training?—Very much, I think.

4870. You would think that it is almost impossible to give school training in such a home as Aubert Park?—Yes, I do not think the school training and the industrial training can be well combined.

4871. The smallness of the numbers would be against it?—Yes.

4872. So that it would be well if the school training came before the industrial training?—Yes, I think so.

4873. And you prefer that the girls should not be handicapped by not being able to write their own name, for instance?—I should suggest that children should have school training up to 14, and then should be drafted into such a home as this.

4874. You think that would give a better chance to the children and a better chance to the home for turning out improved material?—I do decidedly.

4875. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) What occupation would you suggest as suitable for these girls?—I think housework is probably the best and most suitable occupation. I doubt very much whether any of these girls could have been brought up to do or do well at skilled work, such as in a manufactory, for instance.

4876. (*Miss Townsend.*) Of course service is the most protected work for a girl?—It is the most protected work, and it is more varied. These girls do not do well under a monotonous system.

4877. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) And it would be safer for a girl to be in a home than to have to go to a factory?—No doubt that would be the case, but I was thinking rather of the work you would get out of them. I think housework is more suited to their capacities, and a mistress can look after them, and of course they want looking after.

4878. You would not place such a girl with children in a home?—They have done very well with children. Of course our plan has been after they entered the home to teach them housework and to take it in rotation to wait upon the lady superintendent and to do laundry work and so forth. After they have been in the home some little time, then they go out to day-work, coming home to sleep at night. They take books with them showing the time they leave the home, and the mistress fills in the time they get there, and *vice versâ* coming back, so that it can be seen that they do not loiter on the way. After they have done day-work for a certain length of time, then they go out to places in the neighbourhood where they can still be under the supervision of the lady superintendent.

4879. Do you look forward to every girl leaving the home?—Yes, no permanent cases were supposed to be taken in.

4880. How did you determine which girls were suitable for admission?—That was very difficult, and, of course, one had failures. I do not know any hard and fast rule which can be laid down. One by experience began to have a shrewd suspicion what girls would do, but then one made mistakes.

4881. Experience really guides you in determining what a girl is likely to be able to do?—Yes. One girl we took in did remarkably well, but she was refused for another home. She was a candidate for a home for training feeble-minded girls, and they would not take her in. We took her in, and she did extremely well, and has been in service now for a year or two doing well.

4882. What have you to say with regard to the discipline in such a home?—First, there are very few hard and fast rules. Much has to be left to the tact and discretion of those in charge. The fewer rules the better we find, and even as to those, experience showed they had to be somewhat elastic. There were very few punishments. Supposing all the girls had tea, and one girl was singled out from the other girls and was given milk, that acted as an efficient punishment. The girls did not like it at all. But they were never punished in the ordinary way, except being occasionally sent up to their rooms, or something of that sort.

4883. Do all the girls rise and go to bed at the same time?—Yes.

4884. Have you not found that some of the girls require much more sleep than others?—These girls all seem to require a good deal of sleep.

4885. And have you found by experience that some want more sleep than others?—I should think very likely, but I cannot say I have paid special attention to that.

4886. Are all these girls able on admission to wait entirely upon themselves?—Yes.

4887. They have no special bad habits?—I think the little girl of 11 whom I mentioned had to be dressed and looked after for a little time, but most of them were quite able to look after themselves.

4888. So that the training these girls receive is well repaid by what they are able to accomplish?—I am not quite sure that I follow you.

4889. Do you think the training the girl gets fits her to partially support herself?—Yes. In fact, some entirely support themselves.

4890. Would you say that all become either partially or wholly self-supporting?—No, some are failures.

4891. What becomes of the failures?—Some go back to the workhouse, if they have come from the workhouse, or are sent back to where they come from.

4892. And you would not know any more about them?—In some cases we do not. In some cases we do. Where it is possible the lady superintendent finds out, but we do not always know what becomes of them. Some have been undoubted failures, but not the majority. On the whole I have been impressed by the success.

4893. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) Do you know what the percentage of failures is?—The evidence I gave before the Parliamentary Committee on the 30th November 1894 shows that out of 20 cases started in service, 15 succeeded and were self-supporting.

4894. Had you a very large number of applications for admission into the home, applications in excess of the number you could accommodate?—Yes, we could not take them all in.

4895. As a rule you would select the best that were offered you?—The most suitable.

4896. Did it rest with you as medical officer of the home to make the selection?—It did practically. There were none admitted that were not passed by me.

4897. Had you any form of certificate or statement?—Yes, there was a certificate. I have not brought it with me. It is to give the name of the girl, and to state what she had been doing; whether she had any bad habits, and matters of that sort.

4898. Is that statement made by the friends or by the medical officer?—Generally by the friends, not by the medical officer.

4899. The statement would be brought under the notice of the medical officer when he formed a judgment on the case?—It would be brought under the notice of the medical officer connected with the home.

Dr. E. Tait.

10 Mar. 1897.

4900. Had you any trouble at all to exclude cases that were too imbecile?—Yes, that was rather a difficulty.

4901. Were there a good many cases pressed for admission, which, in your opinion, were too imbecile?—Yes.

4902. Did you endeavour to keep out those that were capable of being legally certified as being idiots or imbeciles?—Yes, we did not take them in, or those that were subject to fits.

4903. Had you any difficulty as to the parents removing children without due notice, or without any notice?—Yes, we had one or two disappointing cases of parents removing children when they were getting on very well.

4904. They became impatient, I suppose?—Or sometimes they thought the girls could now make money for them—that they were getting intelligent.

4905. Had you any difficulty in retaining the girls themselves; were they quite willing to remain?—Yes, always. We never had any difficulty.

4906. Did any of them run away?—One or two ran away, but they came back. One ran away, not because she did not like the home; but she went off, I think, with somebody, and came back again.

4907. As a rule there did not seem to be any need of compulsory power to retain them?—None whatever.

4908. They remained of their own free will?—They seemed to like it very much. They did not show any signs of wanting to go.

4909. (*Chairman.*) You have said you sent them out as general servants. Were they capable of cooking?—Yes, they did cook.

4910. Very rough sort of cooking, I suppose?—I fancy that two or three of them turned out really very fair cooks, but that was not the rule, of course.

4911. Had you any difficulty in placing them out?—No, apparently not at all. People seemed rather anxious to have them. They did not pay very much for them.

4912. Did you in most cases guarantee their moral character?—I do not know that we actually guaranteed it. Once or twice we had a difficulty about that, but not as a rule.

4913. You felt bound to tell the employers, I suppose, in cases where there was a want of moral character?—Certainly, and for the girls' own sakes.

4914. What were their special vices; were they given to thieving or greediness?—One or two would pilfer small things.

4915. But on the whole you were quite satisfied with the general result?—Yes, I was very much. They could not be allowed out by themselves at first; we would not let them out in the street by themselves, somebody went with them; that class of girl would be easily led away.

4916. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) You are of opinion, from your experience, that girls like these are much better in a home where they have a certain amount of labour such as you have described rather than in an asylum such as Darenth?—I should think so decidedly. I should think they would develop much more satisfactorily.

4917. And have more experience of the world?—Yes, and more self-reliance.

4918. They would be more able to take care of themselves when they went out into the world?—To teach them self-reliance was one of our objects.

Adjourned to Friday next at 2.30.

NINTH DAY.

Friday, 12th March 1897.

PRESENT:

The REV. T. W. SHARPE, C.B., in the Chair.

Mr. H. F. POOLEY.
Mr. A. W. NEWTON.
Dr. G. E. SHUTTLEWORTH.
Dr. W. R. SMITH.
Mrs. BURGWIN.
Miss TOWNSEND.

Mr. H. W. ORANGE, *Secretary.*

Rev. J. J. MARTIN called in and examined.

Rev. J. J. Martin.
12 Mar. 1897.

4918. (*Chairman.*) You are a member of the Bristol School Board?—Yes.

4919. And chairman of the committee for special classes?—Yes.

4920. How are the children for the special classes selected. Are they presented by the teacher first of all?—Nominated by the head teachers of the different schools. Then they are examined by the board's own inspector. Then they are submitted to a medical gentleman.

4921. There are some children who never appear in school at all; how are they discovered?—We have made known the commencement of these classes, and children have come, and the teacher of the defective class observes their defective characteristics, and gives them a place in her class in the first place. Then they are examined by our inspector as to their attainments, and then they are examined by the medical officer as to their fitness for receiving such instruction as we can give them.

4922. Some of the teachers, of course, discover more than others?—Yes, that has been so.

4923. And have you had to reject a large number of those that were presented to you by the teachers?—No. On the contrary; I was speaking to our inspector the other day, and he said that he himself had only had to reject one out of a very large number. Of course, the large number that were discovered by the teachers have not all yet been got into the classes, so that there may be some more to reject by-and-bye; but up to the present we have between 30 and 40 in the classes, and the inspector told me he had only had to reject one.

4924. How do the teachers discover their deficiency; by any special subject more than another?—No, I think not, except that there is a general complaint of their deficiency in arithmetic. They get on with some subjects, but that seems to be a very drastic test.

4925. Do you know what test the medical officer of the board applies?—I have been with him once or twice when he has examined. He examines the child's head and its general appearance, and then asks a few simple questions; tries it in reading, on pictures, and simple questions in arithmetic.

4926. Does he reject any as not fit for the special classes because they have no physical defect, or does he discover physical defects in all that he admits?—I think he will discover physical defects of some kind or another.

4927. Are those all recorded?—They are all recorded; we have family history books. Of course we are only just commencing at Bristol. As soon as we can we shall have these family histories more fully made up than at the present time. The teachers are gradually getting the parents to come and tell them the particulars of their families.

4928. This class has not been established very long?—No; with the commencement of this school year.

4929. At the commencement of January?—About the second week in January the school year commences.

4930. And as a rule the children have proved defective?—That is so, I think I may say, in every case.

4931. One child has been sent back to the ordinary school, and two children have proved so violent and uncontrollable that they could not be retained in the class?—Yes, that is so. Of course the child was only discovered to be eligible for an ordinary school after a little of our instruction. It was not immediately, if I remember correctly; but in a very short time after having the special education given the child was discovered to be capable. With regard to another child one of the teachers told me (I do not think it is referred to in the notes that we have sent up) that the child would have to be sent back to school because of its proved capability after special training.

4932. Do you look at them before they are eight years of age, or do you leave them in the infant school to do what they can till eight years of age?—Of course we have only just commenced. I do not suppose there are any under eight years of age at present.

4933. When they come to the older school they are generally put in the lowest class, and then their deficiencies become apparent?—That is so.

4934. How are the lowest classes of your schools worked; have you very large Standards I. and Standards 0 mixed with them?—No, we generally have Standard 0 separate.

4935. Under a skilled teacher?—Under a skilled teacher.

4936. How many Standards 0 attend in the school as a rule?—I should say our usual number is from 12 to 20; but in the poorest districts from 50 to 60, at beginning of school year, reduced to about 12 by end of year.

4937. The usual number is about 15 or 20 in a very large class in London?—I am very glad to hear it.

4938. But you have 50 or 60 in a school of 300 who come in and classify in Standard 0?—Yes.

4939. Do you take a very high standard of attainments for Standard I.?—No, I think not higher than usual.

4940. Then Bristol seems to be very full of very dull children, or very ignorant children, or very untaught children; which is the category you put these children into?—I am afraid we cannot lay claim to any special exemption from the ordinary ills of humanity. They are prolific in that locality. I do not plead guilty to my being a Bristol man myself, so that my criticism is perhaps not so generous as it might be.

4941. You have a great many large classes of Standard 0, but you have only selected 30 for your special class?—We have had a very large number selected, but those were all that we would get accommodation for at first. We had indications of there being over 200, I think. From a return recently prepared—November 1895—it is found that there are about 20 epileptic and 260 mentally deficient children in the board schools alone, and of that number all those that we have tested have been found fit subjects with the exception of one sent back after education.

4942. Then you have as many as 260 who ought to be in special classes?—It would seem so.

4943. The population being 221,000?—Yes.

4944. And the children of school age being 33,500?—That is so.

4945. One per cent. would be 335; you have about ·6 or ·7 per cent.?—I think it will work out about that.

4946. You think you have exhausted all the defective children in the area of the school board?—I am afraid not. The questions sent out were drawn up somewhat loosely. It was the first time that questions had been sent out, and I think that we may discover others after a very strict investigation who would be greatly benefited by being brought into special classes.

4947. Who are now not being taught at all?—Who are now not being taught at all, attending school, forced into school, but deriving no benefit from their attendance. That is my opinion.

4948. Are they on the school register, or are they not attending school at all?—They are attending school.

4949. Do you consider you have every child in Bristol attending school?—Not quite.

4950. That is to say, there may be some at home?—Yes, I think there are some who are at home. I do not know what the custom has been, but I suppose when an officer discovers that they are mentally deficient—he is quite certain about the matter in some cases—we have had them before our rota and had them excused legally; but I have an idea that they have not all been brought up to us.

4951. There is a form provided in which all exceptional children are marked or noted?—Yes, we had a system of that kind,

4952. Do they schedule the children regularly every year?—Not throughout the borough.

4953. Have you had a schedule recently which you can give us the result of, accurately taken?—No.

4954. Could you have a schedule taken minutely of the condition of every child within a certain area?—I can ask our clerk, who would be far more likely to be able to do so if it is possible.

4955. A comparatively small area could be taken from a poor part of the town?—Bedminster, for instance, where we have one special class, or St. Philips'; they are both poor parts of the town.

4956. A clearly marked area, so that you can give good average information?—Yes, I think we can manage that for you.

4957. Is you board in favour of special classes?—The majority of them are.

4958. What resolution have they passed?—We have had some difficulty in getting classes. Some of the members thought we were trying to do too much, and were opposed to it.

4959. On the ground of expense?—I think so. That is a very considerable objection, as you know.

4960. What is the expense of these classes? Does it work out at 3*l.* or 4*l.* a head?—It will work out at more than that, I should imagine. We sent two teachers to London to receive a month's experience under the care of Mrs. Burgwin. They are trained certificated teachers, chosen for their brightness, originality, and patience, and receive an increment of 10*l.* because of this special work. We have not built any special building, but we really ought to do. I find that in visiting the classes. The rooms we have are the best that we could provide in existing buildings, but it is really very wrong to have the little children there under the conditions; but to erect a special building would, I think, be, so far as Bristol is concerned, quite out of the question.

4961. Why should it be if it meets the needs of the town? Would they be more expensive than other buildings built to meet the needs?—No, but we go on the principle of doing things very economically, and we have found rooms. For instance, in Bedminster we have a room originally intended for a teacher's room, and we simply turn out the teachers and put the defectives in.

4962. What right have you got to do that?—Only the right of power.

4963. Would not the grant of the Education Department be stopped if you put the rooms that had been built out of public funds to a wrong use?—I do not think they would. I think the Education Department are meeting us. We are trying to help on the work.

4964. It is robbing Peter to pay Paul, is it not, to take the teachers' room away in order to place the little children in it?—It looks something like that, but we have been helpless. We have got the class started, and now we may be able to do something better.

Rev. J. J. Martin.
12 Mar. 1897.

4965. Is the whole town supplied? Is there a place in Bristol for every child now in school?—Every ordinary child.

4966. You have accommodation for every child?—Well, I am not certain of that.

4967. If you have not school accommodation for every child, you ought to build such accommodation, and this extra class would involve no additional expense except perhaps some little planning?—They would require some planning, and you see when we are building a new school we generally build in a new locality, and we are able to secure a site with considerable difficulty. There is great opposition to all educational progress, and we find a considerable difficulty in that respect.

4968. The London Board builds its special classes generally on the playground of some existing school?—That is something like robbing Peter to pay Paul, is it not?

4969. They lose a certain portion of their playground, of course, but that is better than the expense of buying an additional site and getting a Parliamentary title, and so on, because they can at once build on their own ground a small building?—It is a suggestion well worth thinking about.

4970. Do you think that the classes are so large in the lower part of the school that they cannot receive sufficient attention?—Mentally defective children cannot. I do not think they would if they had very small classes.

4971. And is it not your experience that they are likely to become idle and lose all interest in their work?—Precisely so, and not care about going to school. Parents find great difficulty in getting these mentally defective children to school, simply because there is nothing for them to go for. Now that we have got them in this special class, and given them this special training, they are glad to come to school, and the parents have no difficulty whatever in regard to them. We shall never have to bring the compulsory clauses of the Act into force to enforce their attendance, they seem so willing to come.

4972. Are the other children kind to them as a rule?—Yes, I think so.

4973. But they are glad to get out as soon as possible, and go home, I suppose?—I am not able to say. I have never seen them leaving school. In some cases their parents bring them in.

4974. Have you any paralysed or epileptic children?—Not attending the classes. In fact, I do not know anything about that class at all; we have not got any information in reference to them.

4975. Defective with you means only mentally defective?—Well, physically and mentally, perhaps I should say. We have one boy who is a cripple. He could not attend an ordinary school, but he seems to be a quite fairly bright boy. His mother brings him every day.

4976. And there is a girl also I see?—Yes, one crippled girl.

4977. You have already two special classes in operation?—Yes.

4978. You expect to open another shortly?—Yes. We are seeking a teacher now. We only want the teacher.

4979. One supplies 27 and the other 20, and you have projected one for 20 more?—Yes, that is so.

4980. Are they put in places of easy access for the greatest number of children?—That was our principle.

4981. Access by tramway?—No, the children can all get to the schools without using the tramway at all.

4982. They use the ordinary cloak-rooms and lavatories, and are not separated from the other children in any way except during the hours of study?—That is so. Of course all these things are very regrettable, but we have commenced the schools as soon as ever we could, and we have not made the most perfect provision for the children. I was present in one of the special classes about a week or so ago, and it has a room that has been built in connexion with a large new school that is not quite full yet. I noticed that when the

Rev. J. J. Martin.

12 Mar. 1897.

ordinary scholars are passing out of the school into the playground it aroused the attention of the defectives, and they were all inattentive to their lessons. The noise of the children playing in the playground caused us to have to close our windows in the defective class.

4983. Do you consider they ought to have greater area in their rooms than ordinary children?—I should think they ought to have. They have at one of our schools. At the Barton Hill School they have really a room that was constructed for an infant class-room, and there are only 20 of them.

4984. You get 20 or 30 square feet of area per child?—I should think so.

4985. You have not furnished your rooms with single desks yet?—Not with single desks.

4986. Of course that would be preferable for isolating children?—Quite preferable for that purpose. If for no other we should like to have them.

4987. They are now organised chiefly as infant schools?—Yes, we have had to organise them as infant schools. You see there is no other provision made as yet for them.

4988. And no classification scarcely is possible because they are so backward and ignorant?—That is so.

4989. Do you admit some sort of classification?—The teachers know about where they are.

4990. Are they all below Standard I.—Yes, I think so.

4991. Do you ever hope to get them to read an ordinary book or work any calculations?—Yes, we are hoping to do that. Of course our experience is very brief, but it is very encouraging.

4992. Your chief object at present is to cultivate their senses?—That is so. Of course the doctor cannot be present whenever a child comes into the school. He has to make visits, and he was examining a boy when I was present, and this boy was altogether defective mentally—I mean so far as arithmetic was concerned—but he could tell every colour that the doctor tested him with; he was quite right about colour; he was not colour-blind at all, but on other questions he was a feeble little boy.

4993. And your teachers keep full records of progress and development?—Yes, they do.

4994. The experience is too short to notice much at present?—Yes, that is just the case with us.

4995. I believe you have a very good body of managers in Bristol. I have seen some of your schools, and the managers are very active in supervising them. Have you a strong body with regard to this special class?—Not a strong body for that purpose; only the members of the board visit constantly. I am not aware that we have anyone specially for this class; I do not think we have. I think we ought to have persons specially appointed for their fitness and for their sympathy with defective children.

4996. Do you find any difficulty in persuading the parents to send their children to these schools?—None whatever. We are quite delighted with that part of our experience.

4997. Are the parents admitted freely to the school?—Yes, they are urged to come so that they may give information.

4998. They write grateful letters acknowledging the progress the children have made?—Yes, we have had some letters of that kind. The parents indeed are very grateful.

4999. What are the best sort of teachers for these children; of course they must be women?—Yes.

5000. And they must be well experienced in kindergarten work and highly trained?—Yes.

5001. The more highly trained the better?—Yes, and they should have very considerable sympathy with that kind of work. They were selected by the committee on account of their special qualities, brightness, originality, good drawing qualifications, aptitude for managing children tactfully, and expressed interest in this class of children.

5002. Are they paid more highly than other classes of teachers?—Yes.

5003. How much?—Not much more; I think they have an increment of 10*l.*

5004. Does teaching in these special classes debar them from promotion in the other classes?—I do not think it will do.

5005. You think there is no fear of their getting out of the ordinary groove of teachers?—We hope not, for their own sakes. We are very pleased with their ability and patience and their success, and we should not like them to suffer at all. They will be ready for promotion indeed if there is any post that we can promote them to.

5006. You keep the class small—15 to 20 under each teacher?—That is what we are trying to do.

5007. What length of study—three hours in the morning and two hours in the afternoon?—Yes

5008. Is not three hours rather long for children of this character?—We do think it is rather long, and our doctor has expressed himself rather strongly on that point, the last time I had an interview with him.

5009. Would he shorten the hours or make longer intervals between the lessons?—He suggested 10 o'clock in the morning—10 to 12. I should be in favour of that, because the children come from the very poorest homes and I regret to say they are often very dirty and neglected, and I think an hour in the morning would give the parents a greater opportunity for sending them to school in something like proper condition.

5010. Two hours is as long as you think they can be taught with effect?—With effect, yes.

5011. The teachers are left very free to carry out their own system?—Quite so.

5012. It is in the experimental stage and you think it better that they should try experiments for themselves, and find out what are the best and most natural methods of teaching?—Yes.

5013. You lay great stress upon object lessons and drawing?—Yes, and it is quite wonderful to see. The children take an interest in these things. They are really very successful with their fingers; one boy in one of the classes who is quite unable to grasp reading or ordinary school work, has really done some very fine work with his fingers. He is clever with his fingers but poor with his head.

5014. We were told the children did not appreciate drill at all; they cannot carry themselves sufficiently well. But you have the ordinary Swedish drill in your schools?—Yes.

5015. Is not that rather too strict a discipline of this sort?—I do not think it is carried out strictly in the classes. The teachers have very considerable latitude.

5016. And I suppose after a time you hope to introduce some sort of work higher than kindergarten work?—That is our hope.

5017. You will form classes for laundry and cookery and woodwork for boys?—Yes, that is what we are dreaming about.

5018. Of course you have such schools for the ordinary children?—Yes, we have cookery.

5019. We were told the other day the best way of dealing with these children was to slap them?—Our teachers do not seem to think so. They coax them.

5020. Is there any corporal punishment in your schools?—None whatever, not with infants at all.

5021. Your teachers do not believe in slapping the children?—Not the teachers of the special classes. I am quite certain about that. I could not speak so freely about the other teachers.

5022. The children are very affectionate and very obedient?—Yes. I have been very pleased with them.

5023. Suppose there should be a child that is too unmanageable to be brought into order, what would you do?—Well, one little fellow seems as if he cannot keep still, and another girl breaks things with her mouth, pencils, and the kindergarten knitting needles, and everything that is given to her; smashes them.

5024. But the teachers, I suppose, do not like to be beaten and they persevere?—They persevere. I have been quite sorry for one of them. One of the classes seems to have more wilful children than the other, and it is distressing to see the work the teacher has to do in order to keep their attention.

5025. I see the attendance is very good, as it has been reported to us in other classes—99 per cent.?—It is exceedingly good; the children seem delighted with their work, and the parents seem delighted to have them go to school.

5026. I do not quite see how you get 99 per cent. with 20 children?—I did not work out the figures myself.

5027. Perhaps what the clerk meant was that only one was absent?—Perhaps so.

5028. Would you introduce these children into the school at 7 or 8?—Yes.

5029. And keep them till 16?—Yes, if we may be allowed to do so, and I think there will be no difficulty because they would be no use to their parents, I am afraid.

5030. Who is to prevent you doing it if you choose to do it?—We have not got power to keep them.

5031. Any child of any age may stay in school?—Yes, may stay.

5032. If you allow them, and the parent consents, they may be retained in the special school till any age?—Yes.

5033. Are you aware that you can have the ordinary grants for these children up to any age, but that you cannot have the fee-grant after 15?—I am very glad to hear that we can have the ordinary grant up to any age, though it is only a small crumb of comfort.

5034. But you would wish to have higher grants from the Government because these classes are more expensive?—Very much more expensive.

5035. You would not wish the whole expense to be paid by the State?—Personally, I should, and I daresay my board would go with me.

5036. What would be the reasonable part of the expense for the State to bear. In the case of blind and deaf children it is two-thirds?—Five guineas.

5037. That, of course, is fixed by the rate paid to the blind and deaf children?—Quite so.

5038. But the teaching of these children would not be so expensive. The classes would be nearly twice the size for the special children that they are for the blind and deaf?—Yes.

5039. Therefore the grant should not be as great?—It costs us a very large amount of money, and if we could get a larger grant from the State our work would not be so difficult, because that part of the Board which objects to this work at all objects to it on the ground of expense, and those of us who are wanting to do the work, of course, find it difficult to do it.

5040. Therefore the larger the grant the less your trouble would be with your constituents?—Quite so.

5041. (*Mr. Pooley.*) You told us that there are three children who have been rejected from the special class as violent and uncontrollable?—Yes.

5042. Were they too feeble-minded or too imbecile for the special class?—I should think that would be the case.

5043. Do you know what has become of them—whether they are in any school?—They are not in any school. I feel quite certain about that, although it is only an opinion. We could ascertain for you.

5044. Do you know whether guardians have dealt with similar cases by sending them to idiot institutions?—I have no knowledge of their having done so. I should suppose they will have done, but I cannot give you that information.

5045. You said that there were over 260 defective children in the board schools alone?—Yes.

5046. And I think you said there were 33,500 children in all the schools?—Yes.

5047. Can you tell us what is the number of children in the board schools alone?—The accommodation in the board schools is for 17,818 children.

5048. That is the number of the children, but are the places pretty full?—Yes, fairly full in most cases.

5049. Then we get 260 defective children out of 17,818, according to those figures?—Yes.

5050. That is nearly 1·5 per cent.?—Yes.

5051. Do you think these special classes would be suitable for pupil-teachers?—I think they would be. They would get very helpful experience in dealing with difficult children and become infant school teachers. We are proposing to have pupil-teachers present with the ex-pupil-teachers presently. It seems to be such trying work. The doctor suggested that each teacher should have what he was pleased to call "an understudy" to take up the work if the teacher failed at all.

5052. I think you did not tell us the number of children under each teacher?—I can do so, one 27, one 20, and we are projecting one for 20.

5053. Would you desire to have compulsion up to 16 for these children?—I do not think it would be necessary, but I should think it would be very desirable.

5054. Of course compulsion would imply that the Department would recognise them right through their school life for the purpose of grants; and that might be done without compulsion. But do you think it is desirable that the board should have power under their bye-laws to enforce the attendance of defective children up to 16?—Yes.

5055. They can only do it up to 13 or 14 for ordinary children?—At its very best the education can be but partial, and I think that the children should have the opportunity of benefiting by as much education as ever we can give to them.

5056. Would you wish that the board should have power to retain them and teach them up to 16?—Yes.

5057. But then, being obliged to compel their attendance in all circumstances up to 16 is a different matter; do you think it is desirable that their attendance up to 16 should be enforced?—I should be doubtful as to expressing an opinion in the affirmative. There might be cases, of course. If we had the power given us, our own board could deal with the cases and exempt them.

5058. Might it not lead to difficulty if an ordinary child could only be forced to attend up to 14 and a defective child, who may be very little inferior to the ordinary child (because the gradations are so imperceptible), would be obliged to stop to 16?—Yes, I think I can say that it might be difficult. We were examining a boy the other week as to whom it seemed that there was some hope of his being able to do some kind of work by the time he was 14 or 15, and I daresay that the parents would be very anxious to get such assistance as early as they could. Still I think in the interests of the children themselves, it would be extremely desirable to keep them until they were 16. But as you have pointed out if the parents are quite willing and there are some other means of securing all fees and grants as long as we keep them, that I think perhaps would be sufficient.

5059. I think you said that in Bristol all the children were within reach of a special class?—No; the children who do attend are within reach of the special classes that they attend. We should have to establish more centres if we wanted to bring all the children within reach.

5060. You would propose to establish enough centres to be within reach of the homes of all the children?—I should hope that the Board will do so ultimately. It will be a work of time.

5061. If that were done there would be no need in Bristol to provide an institution or to send such children to a boarding institution?—No, we think not. We have thought about that.

5062. Do you think it is better that they should be taught at day classes rather than sent to an institution?—Expressing my own opinion I do not. I think they had better go to an institution, but it is preferable so far as the rates are concerned.

5063. Why do you think it is better that a defective child should be sent to an institution?—Because I feel pretty certain myself that the care of such persons as for adequate remuneration we could secure, would be superior to the care exercised in many instances by the children's own parents.

5064. Are there not objections to their being herded together with a great many other children of the same class in institutions and not getting out into the world, so to speak?—Of course there would be objections of the kind you suggest.

5065. If the home is a good home then you would not send the child to an institution?—No. Of course there are instances of that kind. Some children who attend the classes are evidently well cared for, but the majority of them are not. Indeed, that seems to be one of the causes of their condition; their poverty and dirt is dreadful. They do not seem to be cared for. They have sores; these are very unpleasant things to mention, but they do not seem to be attended to. The

Rev. J. J. Martin.

12 Mar. 1897.

Rev. J. J. Martin.

12 Mar. 1897.

doctor gave an order for two of the defectives to attend the hospital. The teacher undertook to see that they did attend upon the days that the hospital authorities required them to attend in order that they might have the care that any good mother would give to her children.

5066. It is principally for the cases that have bad homes and insufficient food, and are improperly cared for, that you think an institution would be preferable to a day class?—Preferable for that class of children.

5067. (*Miss Townsend.*) Are the children in the special class acknowledged by their parents to be actually feeble-minded, or do they merely call them backward and dull for the most part?—I cannot say. I have had no interviews with the parents, but I should think that in many cases they must acknowledge that they are feeble-minded because of the teaching that we propose to give. We made it known through the newspapers, and the parents recognised that that was the kind of education that their children wanted.

5068. Do you think that the desire to send the children to special classes would survive the trouble of sending them a considerable distance to school, or is it the convenience of having them near that pleases them?—We are not very near in some cases; there is one girl lives over a mile away from school.

5069. Does she come alone?—Yes; she is a child that is accustomed to the streets.

5070. If the hour of going to school were altered to 10 o'clock would not there be the practical difficulty that these feeble-minded children could not be brought by their elder brothers and sisters who are not feeble-minded?—That is one of the difficulties that I have myself thought of, but in our case at present I do not think it would affect us.

5071. You think that alteration in hours would be better than giving feeble-minded children an extra hour in the playground with their teachers?—I had not thought of that, but I think it would. I think we should then have a greater right to almost demand from the parents that they should, seeing that they had now plenty of time, send the children in a better condition.

5072. Are there any imbecile children in this class who might be sent to an asylum—whom a doctor would certify for an asylum?—I do not think so—no; I do not think there are any such children as that.

5073. Where are imbecile children sent in Bristol—what is the nearest asylum?—I am not able to answer that question.

5074. Probably a good many of them are at home and not going to school?—I think that is very probable.

5075. You said that even in small classes in an ordinary school under a skilled teacher, the feeble-minded children could not be well taught. Why do you think absolute separation is better?—It appears to me quite clear, when you are teaching a class, in class-teaching there is one lesson given to the whole of the children; in some cases, of course, there is special teaching, but I never think that that is very good or effective. I think that the children should be of the same calibre and should be taken through their lessons as a whole.

5076. What I rather meant was whether the special class might not be considered as part of the ordinary school. For instance, the greater proportion of your 260 feeble-minded children are at present in the ordinary schools?—Yes.

5077. Do you think it necessary to remove them from the ordinary school and put them in a special building?—Most certainly. They are actually receiving no benefit. They come before the rota committee when they are 13 or 14 years of age to get off, and they are not above the 1st or 2nd Standard then. That is the kind of children that I have in my mind—the children who actually receive no benefit—remain in school till their school years are gone and they are no further advanced.

5078. Would you teach the special classes as mixed classes of boys and girls if the age were raised from 14 to 16?—I suppose that would be a matter for thought. We have had no experience yet. It had not occurred to me to think of it in that way.

5079. You have had no experience in regard to the desirability of mixing children after 14?—No. We have some big children now who have been sent to one of the defective classes. They had never been to school before. I should think they are above that age, and the teacher deals with them.

5080. Would you like to have power to send children over 14 to small industrial training homes where they would be taught to earn their own living?—I think that would be very desirable, but I had not thought of it before.

5081. That might be more desirable than keeping them in a special class over 14?—Yes, I think so, and they would be so far fitted and prepared for the work, and the parents would have received encouragement, so that they might be willing for their children to go.

5082. And the parents might be more willing to continue them, if they were learning what would help them by-and-bye?—Yes, I think so, I think that is a very good idea.

5083. I suppose you wish to guard against removing the parents' responsibility in the case of feeble-minded children as well as in the case of ordinary children?—I should try to do that, but I am afraid that you cannot. We have very great difficulty in Bristol now. Parents shirk their responsibilities, and are very glad to have the children put under our care. We have blind chilldren and deaf children, and the parents seem to want us to do everything for them.

5084. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) Have you most boys or girls in the two classes you have already established?—I do not think I can say accurately. I should prefer not to say, I know there is not a great preponderance either way, from my memory of the classes, as the children sit, before my mind's eye.

5085. You think they are about equally divided?—Yes, I think so, at present.

5086. In the case of a child becoming very troublesome, what instructions would your teachers have, I mean during the course of a session at school?—I am afraid they have no instructions. We so thoroughly trust to them that they would act on their own responsibility.

5087. You do not think it would be well at times to send the child home?—You mean during the lesson?

5038. Yes?—I do not know but what the teacher might have tried that.

5089. What I meant was, with your one room you have no means of separating a troublesome child from the whole class?—None whatever.

5090. And I can see that that must be a great difficulty?—You have separate rooms in the London schools, I presume?

5091. In several cases?—And you can put a child into another room?

5092. Yes; I want to ask you whether you have any idea of what will be the ultimate result of the training which you are giving these special children?—I think that, so far as the girls are concerned, it will certainly fit them to be useful at home, and fairly independent. There is every probability of several of them becoming very fair at reading, and doing little sums in arithmetic, so that they could be very useful at home, and some of the boys, as I have mentioned, would seem to give indications of taking up some kind of simple work. Perhaps I might mention an illustrative case. We were asking a boy a few questions about his family, and he told us about the occupation of a brother who goes round with a railway van, and he seemed to understand all about it. I thought, well, that boy will do for that kind of work ultimately. Of course it would only be a boy's employment, and he would get some 5s. or 6s. a week, I do not know whether he would be able to do anything else. He might find some simple kind of occupation of that sort.

5093. You pay a great attention to the varied occupations?—I think they do; yes.

5094. About half the time is spent in that?—Yes, about half the time—I think the afternoon—not quite half the time, because we have three hours in the morning at present and two hours in the afternoon.

5095. Are the children all there for the three hours, or is it not a fact that some living at a distance from the centre will come about half-past 9?—Whether it is in consequence of the thing being new or not I do not know, but we give them a red mark for early attendance, and they seem to very largely preponderate in the register. That I have observed.

5096. I thought perhaps that three hours might very well be considered to be two hours and a half in reality?—No, I do not think so. I have been in a little after 9 myself, and I have found 15 out of 16 in this class at Bedminster a short time after 9, going through the Scripture lesson.

5097. What standard do you think these children will ultimately reach?—I could not say at all. I do not think we have any idea as to that.

5098. You do not look forward to their reaching the 6th Standard and 7th Standard?—By no means. If they showed indications of learning we should send them, of course, to the ordinary schools, and I should think it was a very great triumph to be able to send such children back. If they get to the 4th or 5th Standard, that is the rule for Bristol children. Our 6th and 7th Standards are very small for ordinary children.

5099. You would think, then, that the defective children in Bristol must be rather worse than those in Pennsylvania, where they leave the defective class having passed about equal to our 7th Standard?—We shall strive for that.

5100. You are quite satisfied that the children have already been improved by being separated from the classes in the ordinary school?—Oh, yes. I have been astonished myself at the progress they have made. They were poor little things who did not know anything practically, and it has been quite a joy to have anything to do with this work.

5101. So that where they have failed in mental training you have been able, through the varied occupations, to get to their senses?—That is so.

5102. (*Mr. Newton.*) You said there were 260 defectives in the schools of the board?—Yes.

5103. Does that mean 260 boys and girls, or does it mean 260 boys, girls, and infants?—It would mean, I presume, 260 boys and girls. I do not know whether they really sent the question down to the infant school, but if they did it would be inclusive. I am not quite certain as to that.

5104. Could you find out for us whether that includes infants?—Yes. I should like to make it plain, for I do not want to make Bristol worse than it is. We just sent out a question; we tried to draft it from a paper that we had sent down to us from the London School Board, I think. We formulated a question and sent it out, and that was the return of the teachers. These children had not been examined or tested in any way before.

(*Chairman.*) Children are admitted from 7 to 14, so that the probability is they would not come from the infant school.

5105. (*Mr. Newton.*) Probably they did not come from the infant school?—I should think probably that is so.

5106. Do you think there would be the same number or very nearly the same number of defective children in the voluntary schools?—The committee thought so.

5107. The probability then is there are about 500 defective children in Bristol?—Yes.

5108. Then we come to the Standard 0. At what age do you turn your children out of the infant school?—Seven, most of them.

5109. Do you make that a hard and fast rule. Has everybody to go out when he is seven?—I could not answer that question. That was the impression I had; That they did not stay any longer after they were seven years of age.

5110. That would, of course, necessarily make Standard 0's larger than they would be if you allowed them some latitude; would not that be so?—Yes, that would be so.

5111. So far for the numbers. Then we come to another point. Can you tell me what salaries you paid to the teachers in charge of the special classes?—I think the two we have at work are in their first year as trained certificated teachers after being trained in this case, and they would have increments of 10*l*. They would get 60*l*. normally, but now they are getting 70*l*.

5112. Then their special training consists simply in their experience in Mrs. Burgwin's class?—None whatever beyond that, I am sorry to say. We could not get any teachers that had been trained as teachers of defective children.

5113. Do you think it desirable that teachers employed in this special work should be fully certificated?—I think very desirable.

Rev. J. J. Martin.

12 Mar. 1897.

5114. You do not think the present plan is satisfactory?—It is not perfect by any means. We have had no one in authority to tell the teachers what to do in the case of children who were unruly. Now if we had a superintendent or chief teacher who could guide them or give them definite instructions, it would be very helpful to them no doubt.

5115. Can you say what age these ladies are?—About 20 to 21, Mrs. Burgwin informs me.

5116. Then these girls of 20 or 21 are put in these very responsible positions?—Yes.

5117. You would think that was quite unsatisfactory, would not you?—Personally I do, but the board does not. The board think they do very nicely.

5118. The board think that anybody is able to teach an idiot, I am afraid that is what it comes to?—I am afraid that several of them think that. One of them defined the position in this way that it was just this defective class that we were to cater for; the children that were not defective did not want teachers.

5119. Could you employ, what for want of a better word, I may call "a labour test" for children between 14 and 16? That is to say, would it be well for an Act of Parliament to say that these children must attend school if their infirmities prevent them from obtaining regular work for wages?—That might be a wise provision, but they might not then have advanced sufficiently far educationally. I should be very sorry to give the parents of these children the opportunity of getting anything by means of their employment.

5120. Do not you think the fact that an employer is ready to pay wages is *primâ facie* evidence that the child is fit to make its own way in the world?—No.

5121. You think not?—I think not. Lots of children that we are turning out are not fit to go to work, but are taken on and employed by employers. Small wages are given for some poor kind of work. The child is employed at it till well advanced in their business, then they are set at liberty and they become a drug in the labour market.

5122. I am afraid that is true of ordinary children?—That is true of ordinary children, and I was speaking of it in the case of ordinary children; but I think it would be still worse in the case of these defective children.

5123. Would you like to make all deficient children stop at school till they were 16?—Yes.

5124. For that purpose of compulsion how would you define a defective child?—I should have to have the assistance of an expert to tell me—Dr. Shuttleworth, perhaps.

5125. We have asked two or three experts, and they say they are unable to frame a definition. Is it really an insoluble problem?—My committee, in consultation with the clerk, say that defective children should be retained till they are 16, just as blind and deaf children are, in cases where it is thought expedient by the school authority, and of course we cannot keep them at present. They kindly say that we can keep them, but we cannot afford to keep them.

5126. The committee should decide autocratically, so to speak?—Where it is thought expedient by the school authority, was our suggestion.

5127. (*Dr. Smith.*) But they would probably decide upon some advice?—Doubtless they would.

5128. What advice should you suggest they should avail themselves of?—We should avail ourselves of our own inspector, upon whom we invariably fall back in these cases, and upon the doctor that we have, and I think, too, we should use our own judgment.

5129. You said you had 260 cases sent in from the schools?—That is a fact, but I do not want you to dwell too much upon that.

5130. I was going to ask you this: those 260 cases were not all confirmed, were they?—No, by no means.

5131. That was a preliminary selection?—Yes, by teachers who had had no previous experience in making selections.

5132. That is what I wanted to clear up for Bristol's sake. The medical officer did not examine those 260?—No, certainly not.

Rev. J. J. Martin.

12 Mar. 1897.

5133. Therefore no authoritative expression of opinion was given relative to them?—No.

5134. Do you know how many he did examine?—Those that we have.

5135. Simply those you have in your schools?—Forty-seven have been examined now.

5136. Those were examined by the medical officer, and decided to be by him suitable for admission?—Yes, we have had no case rejected by the medical officer. The teachers found out after a week or two's tuition that one child whom the medical officer had passed was educable, and he has been sent back to the ordinary school.

5137. What are the duties of the medical officer of the board?—We have not one appointed by the board.

5138. You spoke of him as the medical officer; what is he?—He is an ordinary practitioner.

5139. You simply call him in if you want advice?—Yes, we have a truant school and an industrial school which he has to visit periodically—girls' industrial school under our care—and a boys' industrial school, and a day industrial school, all of which he attends officially and periodically, and we simply ask him to undertake these other duties.

5140. This is the additional work that has arisen, and you have asked him to do it?—Yes, quite so.

5141. Apart from that question of the fully certificated teacher, and the possession of those other general qualities which you mentioned, do you think that any special training is necessary for teachers for these classes?—Yes, I do think it would be a very great advantage to have teachers who are specially trained.

5142. What do you mean by special training?—More special than they can get by merely coming to London for a month, and going about the classes.

5143. You mean that they should have had actual experience of these particular classes?—I think so, if it were possible; and also more instruction. Of course there are books accessible to us, such as Dr. Shuttleworth's and Dr. Warner's, and we have read and studied them, and the teachers have too. But, even more than that, I think it is very desirable that experience should be obtained.

5144. You think knowledge of that character is of advantage to them?—I certainly do.

5145. Do you make any special provision for epileptics?—None whatever.

5146. What do you do with them?—We do not do anything with them.

5147. Do you take them into your ordinary school?—They have been in evidently, but we did not know that there were any, I think. They must be very slight cases of epilepsy that are in the ordinary schools, if at all. There were 20 returned to us as being epileptic. I suppose it meant that they had a tendency to epilepsy, or had had a very occasional fit. I have not thought myself that they were very bad cases or the teachers could not have kept them.

5148. Supposing you had known of them what would you have done?—I should say we should have exempted them.

5149. Then what would have become of them?—They would just be left alone, I suppose. I have, as a minister, visited amongst the poor, and I know cases of children just in that position; nothing is done for them.

5150. Children who are epileptics?—Epileptics. It is very sad and grievous, but nothing is done for them.

5151. And have you had the same experience of bad mentally affected children? Are there such children left in Bristol?—Not to my knowledge.

5152. What would naturally become of a child excused from school as being too mentally defective?—I have known of such cases. They would be a simple burden upon their parents. I do not know of anything else.

5153. They would remain at home?—Just remain at home in the streets probably, and altogether there is a very sad outlook for them.

5154. Are all these children you have in these classes suffering from some mental deficiency?—No; one or two of them have physical defects. They cannot attend an ordinary school. We have one little fellow who is brought to school by his mother, and our special class happens to be upstairs, and the caretaker meets him at the bottom and carries him upstairs. He is defective in his legs but seems to be all right in the upper part.

5155. Why could not that child go to an ordinary school?—We find it very much more convenient to have him in this special class.

5156. In what way more convenient?—He cannot move about. He can have a low seat, and we may by-and-bye get him a surgically adjusted seat. I myself am taking a little interest in him. We never could get him to school before. The teacher is very patient with him.

5157. But what I am thinking is this. You are compulsorily associating that child with backward children because of something which you are going to remedy some day. Why could not that provision have been done in an ordinary school?—I could not say why, but it has not been done.

5158. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) I think you said the selection was made by three persons, the head teacher, the inspector, and the medical officer?—That is so.

5159. Do they always agree in their verdict as to suitability?—They have done as yet.

5160. In the case of a difficulty, who would decide?—I should think the doctor's word would. His is the strongest position. We should submit ourselves to him as we do generally.

5161. That is to say, the committee would absolutely decide on the advice of the doctor?—Yes.

5162. And I think you say the medical officer is a gentleman in ordinary practice in Bristol?—Yes, Dr. Griffiths.

5163. He is taking an interest in these now, for the first time probably?—I think so.

5164. He has not been the medical officer attached to any institution for defective children or defective people?—No.

5165. Do you know of any institution for defective children in your neighbourhood where bad cases might be sent?—I do not know of any such institution.

5166. You are not acquainted with the institution at Bath—Magdalen Hospital for idiots?—No, I have not been very long in Bristol.

5167. There is a large institution which embraces the western counties of England, including Bristol at Starcross, Devon, where they take imbecile children for training. Then with regard to the class of Standard 0, which is 50 to 60 strong, I think you said the teachers of those classes had no special qualification for teaching dull children?—No, not beyond special fitness of patience and natural aptitude.

5168. They have not been trained in any of the classes for defective children?—No.

5169. But the teachers in charge of the special classes have had that advantage?—Yes.

5170. If it were possible for them to get instruction in the way of observing the defects of these children so that they might be ready to observe defects and know what to do to meet them, would you think that would be desirable?—It would be very desirable.

5171. That might be done in the way of lectures perhaps and demonstration?—Yes. The Department has set on foot a plan giving assistance to teachers in finding out the deficiencies of children, and we have had a lecture given to our teachers of the elementary schools, and they have been shown how to pick out children who had defective vision. Some of them, of course, have been able to do that for some time, but now they are all in some sense qualified, and if something similar could be done it would be very desirable.

5172. It would help them to select suitable children for the class?—Yes.

5173. Of course, they would have to submit their judgment to a more skilled person?—In every case.

5174. Then with regard to the training of the fingers of the children in the special class, what varieties of training are there?—At present it seems to be kindergarten work—plaiting with cloth and making mats.

5175. Various kindergarten occupations?—Yes.

5176. They do not get beyond that?—They have not done at present; they only commenced in January. We have only had it three months as yet.

Rev. J. J. Martin.

12 Mar. 1897.

5177. They have not got to any form of woodwork yet?—No.

5178. (*Chairman.*) I want to have it quite clear as to the number of children. 260 children, I understand, were first presented to you?—Yes, that is so.

5179. How many of those should be rejected?—We have rejected none. We have simply commenced our class, and they have come in as far as we could accommodate them, but we do not think that the whole of them would be proper cases for our special class.

5180. Only 47 have been examined by the medical officer?—Only 47 have been examined by the medical officer.

5181. Why have the others not been examined?—We have done nothing yet. If we had examined them we could not give them any school to go to.

5182. Could not you give them a special teacher in their own school for a small class in the interim?—There are only three or four or so, and a few more in some cases in a particular school.

5183. Would it not be worth while teaching by a separate teacher. We had it in evidence that in Leicester there was a separate teacher for all these Standard 0's in the school, and in some cases only four children in the class, I believe. Could not you follow the same plan for the present?—I shall be very happy to make the suggestion, but it will appear to some of our friends a great piece of extravagance. However, as you have suggested it to me I shall be very happy to refer to it.

5184. And you could quote the precedent of Leicester. Do not you think it would be well to do something of the kind till your board makes up its mind to build additional rooms?—It would probably.

5185. What was the total number you expected from the whole city of Bristol?—You quite understand how very general and superficial the inquiry was. We calculated that there were slightly more children in the voluntary schools than in the board schools, and we thought it very probable there would be about as many more children of this class.

5186. If your attendance officer reported to you that such and such a child was mentally defective, and was attending school very irregularly, you would have the power to require that information from the voluntary school. Have you attempted to do that?—No.

5187. Would it not be well to give your officer directions to obtain such information in the case of mentally defective children?—Yes.

5188. And require their attendance?—Yes.

5189. You eventually will require something like 12 or 14 schools?—If we find these numbers to be at all correct?—Yes.

5190. Consisting of 20 or 30 under a single teacher?—Yes.

5191. Altogether unclassified?—I scarcely follow you.

5192. There would be one teacher for every variety of child from the age of 8 to 16?—I daresay that some attempt at classification will be made when we find out our children.

5193. There would be, probably, five or six divisions?—Yes.

5194. But classes would be impossible. A class represents a body of children who have a teacher to themselves?—Yes.

5195. Therefore there could not be more than one class; there might be five or six divisions under one teacher, each of whom would require special attention?—Yes.

5196. Would it not be better to build special schools which would contain three or four classes than to disperse them over a city in 12 or 14 separate special classes?—I think it would ultimately, when we build.

5197. You have spoken of some form of advertisement to the parents making known those special classes. Did you do that through the newspaper?—It was simply some information that we put in the newspapers that this work was being commenced.

5198. Can you give us the form of the advertisement; had it an attractive appearance?—It was simply a report of the proceedings of the board, and a special article got up by one of the newspaper men.

5199. Do you repeat that from time to time, so that everybody may know what is going on?—We have not done so yet. I was surprised to find that parents had found out about these classes by that means. My own idea would have been that the attendance officers would have brought the facts under the attention of all the people who had defective children. I thought they would have known of the existence of defective children.

5200. It would be well to have the information at the house in the form of leaflets, or something of that kind, so that no one should be ignorant of the advantages of the special classes?—I should not imagine that to be necessary; the per-centage of these children is so small, and it has got to be known now.

5201. You spoke of parents shirking their responsibility. What do you mean by that?—I am on the blind and deaf and dumb committees, and the parents of those children try to get off with as little payment as possible, and sometimes with no payment at all.

5202. Do not you think the infliction of having such a child rather justifies parents, especially if they are very poor, in endeavouring to get as much help as possible?—I am the more pleased with parents who try to do their duty under such circumstances. We have some who do it. We have one case of a poor woman who, when her child was 15, got to know about our deaf schools. The guardians of the poor could only pay for one year, until the child was 16, and she came and besought us to allow her child to continue at the school, promising to contribute something towards the money that the guardians had paid up to the time that the child was 16.

5203. No doubt it is right that parents should pay something, but I want to know how far that responsibility should extend. Should a man earning 30*s.* a week contribute 5*s.*?—No, certainly not. If you knew Bristol you would know that all its people are great philanthropists, and we make it very light and easy for them.

5204. How far do you feel philanthropic—to the extent of 1*s.* 6*d.*?—Yes, and in some cases 6*d.* We have to write hundreds of pounds off our day industrial schools.

5205. A great deal is said as to developing the intelligence of the children. Do you develop the moral sense of the children so as to give them a feeling of responsibility when they go out into the world? Is special attention given by the teachers to that matter?—I think the teachers will be giving special attention to it. They will try to, but the time has been so very short as yet that we have had no evidence of success or failure in that direction.

5206. As to the extreme cases unfit for your school would you like it that the school board should have power to send them to institutions?—Yes, most certainly; I think that all children ought to be cared for.

5207. (*Dr. Smith.*) With regard to these 47 children, were they all found to be fit for education?—Yes, with the exception of one. No, I should say that the 47 that we have have all found to be fit, and one has never been seen by the doctor; he was sent back by the inspector, who thought that he had some mental power, so as to learn in the ordinary classes.

5208. Was there any preliminary selection of these 47 children, or were they all just as they first came to hand?—Just as they first came to hand. We got the addresses of those within the radius, and the means we adopted to get them to school were to ask our superintendent officer to wait upon all the parents within a radius, which made it practicable for the children to attend the classes and tell them that this provision was made.

5209. Were the parents willing to co-operate?—We were afraid that the parents would be afraid of the mentally defective classes, and our officer went and explained to them what we purposed doing, and the parents very readily responded in every case.

5210. (*Mr. Newton.*) As far as your doctor's examination has gone it has confirmed the teachers' estimate of the 260?—Yes, so far as it has gone it has done so.

5211. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) Have you formed any idea about how many children ought to be under a single teacher in these classes?—No, I cannot say that I have.

5212. There are actually about 20, I think?—Yes.

5213. Do you think that one teacher can well look after 20 of these children?—Yes.

Dr. D. Ferrier, F.R.S.

12 Mar. 1897.

Dr. DAVID FERRIER, F.R.S., called in and examined.

5214. (*Chairman.*) I believe you are Professor and Physician to King's College Hospital; Physician to the Chalfont Epileptic Colony; and Physician to the National Hospital for the Paralysed and Epileptic?—Yes—but not exactly Physician to the Chalfont Epileptic Colony. I am one of the honorary medical staff, and member of the executive committee of the Chalfont Colony for Epileptics.

5215. The Committee find great difficulty in distinguishing feeble-minded children from imbeciles and idiots. Can you assist us at all in that matter, either by definition or by giving us some idea as to the lines which can be drawn between the classes?—I think the line is a very vague one. We do distinguish between defective children and imbeciles, or absolutely idiotic children, but I do not think there any hard-and-fast line is capable of being drawn.

5216. There are a very large number of grades of children between the normal child and the idiot and imbecile?—Yes, a large number.

5217. And those can only be determined by expert advice?—Expert advice.

5218. Is it desirable that mentally deficient children should be associated with idiots and imbeciles, or should they be kept separate from them?—I should say it is best to keep them separate.

5219. In the idiot asylums, is it your experience that they are such children?—Yes. That is simply owing to the difficulty of knowing what to do with them, because they cannot be taken care of elsewhere.

5220. They have bad homes, and they must be put somewhere or another?—Yes, or allowed to drift.

5221. And if they are put in these institutions, under what head are they classed?—I do not know that they are classed separately from the others. I cannot speak positively as to that. But they would be put into classes by themselves if they were capable of learning a little more than the true idiots.

5222. Of this large class of mentally feeble children, some, I suppose, who are not very much afflicted, would go to the ordinary elementary schools, and others would be taught in special classes by themselves, both for their own sake and for the sake of the children?—I should think that would be so.

5223. It would be difficult to draw a line between these two classes?—Very difficult.

5224. But if they have insanitary homes, or bad homes, or a drunken mother, they should in no case be left at home, but should be sent to some home or institution?—Yes.

5225. And I suppose a home for about 20, under a mother or matron, is preferable to an institution?—I think so. That is the principle that has guided us in our colony for epileptics. The home life is much better than the life in large institutions, where the children do not get the individual care that they require.

5226. The practice of the London School Board is to keep them at home as much as possible, and send them to day classes; but they have to reject a great number who are at present, we believe, on the streets, though we have not quite ascertained their fate, who certainly ought to be in institutions. Do not you think the School Board ought to have the power of sending such children, who are not fitted for special classes, or for the schools for ordinary scholars, to some institution where they could be taken care of?—I think it would be very desirable.

5227. At present the guardians have the power, if they choose to exercise it, but they seem not to do so?—As to that, I do not know.

5228. If the children go to such institutions, they must be certified as idiots or imbeciles, or else they cannot obtain admission?—They cannot obtain admission, I believe, into an idiot asylum without certificate, but I think it would be desirable to have institutions where they would not require to be certified.

5229. Not set up by the guardians but by the school authorities who have the best means of distinguishing such children from the better class of feeble-minded children?—I cannot speak on that point. I am afraid I have not considered that point so thoroughly as to give any advice or opinion upon it.

5230. Of course these children vary at different ages, and they may, perhaps, be rather better at one time than at another through temporary causes?—Yes, I quite believe that.

5231. So that it is essential that they should be under the same guardianship, so as to be brought out of the institution into ordinary life again, or transferred as the case may be?—Yes, I think that would meet the requirements.

5232. Dr. Warner gave us some evidence as to a great number of signs by which he tested these children. Have you employed such yourself, or have you formed any opinion as to the value of the visual signs which he used?—No, I am afraid I have not gone into that question. Dr. Warner is a great authority on it, but I have not been able to follow all his results.

5233. We are very much in the dark as to the number of school children that should be called mentally defective; can you help us at all with your experience?—No, I am afraid I cannot say anything on that point.

5234. If the school board wishes to find out whether a child is feeble-minded, the method they generally adopt is to have a number of children sent down from the schools for children over eight years of age, and a sort of council is appointed consisting of the medical officer of the board, the superintendent of the special class, and Her Majesty's inspector is asked to be present, and the experience of all three is brought to bear upon the child to see whether it should be classed as feeble-minded or not—the medical officer having in the end a deciding vote. Would you think that a good sort of council to appoint?—A council so composed seems to me an excellent one.

5235. You think that a medical adviser's expert advice is absolutely necessary on such a council?—Undoubtedly.

5236. And that the medical officer should have the final voice in the matter, though perhaps the teachers are not likely to be mistaken in many cases after six or eight months' experience?—I should think that a certain amount of experience with a child must be necessary even before a medical officer could determine.

5237. But there would be some physical signs that he would observe?—Possibly.

5238. Would it be possible to instruct our teachers as to certain signs by which they might detect such cases after a short experience?—I should very much question it.

5239. Are there many medical officers in England capable of discriminating?—It is very difficult.

5240. We were told that there were only six persons in England qualified?—It is very difficult. When I am consulted in such cases I often cannot say from the appearance of the child whether it is defective or not. I have to inquire into the whole life history of the child, and consider many points, and not merely the physical appearance. It is very difficult indeed to judge; but, on the other hand, there are many whom you can at once pronounce to be defective.

5241. Of course you have to see a good many feeble-minded children in hospitals, either epileptic or otherwise?—Feeble-minded children are not so often brought to hospital. I see them more in private practice.

5242. They are of a higher class that are brought to you?—They are of a higher class, and do not generally come to hospitals.

5243. So that you would not be likely to hear of children being refused admission. Dr. Warner said he had had considerable experience at a hospital of children being refused admission to elementary schools. That has not been your experience at King's College Hospital?—No. My experience lies chiefly in private practice when parents consult me about their children who appear to be backward or deficient.

5244. Have you any idea of the proportion of children of school age who are epileptic?—That is very difficult to decide. It has been stated, I think, to vary from 1 to 2 per cent. I do not know whether that is accurate. I have no means of judging.

Dr. D. Ferrier, F.R.S.

12 Mar. 1897.

5245. Do you know what that estimate is founded upon; can you give us any source from which we can derive information?—This per-centage has been, I think, very largely founded upon the statements as to the number of epileptics upon the Continent, Germany, France, and so on. I do not think that very accurate statistics have been made of the per-centage of epileptics to the population in this country; at least I do not know them.

5246. That would mean severe cases of epilepsy, not slight cases, would it?—That might probably be so—those that are so strikingly epileptic that they cannot escape notice.

5247. The officer of the London School Board registers every child who has some defect under some head. But they appear to classify them rather loosely. We could get certain statistics from them but they would not be trustworthy. They would classify them probably as mentally feeble or epileptics simply on the word of the parents?—I cannot speak on that point.

5248. You have had great experience of epileptics; should they be educated with other children if they were only slight cases of epilepsy?—I think they might be, and I believe that a good many epileptic children are attending schools, only they do not have their fits in school. They may have fits at home, and then it is not known. So far as their intellect is concerned they might pass amongst the others, no one knowing anything about it. It is only when they have fits in school that they are considered epileptic, and sent away.

5249. Is it likely to injure them if they attend the ordinary school after a fit? I suppose they are not in a proper state then to receive ordinary elementary instruction?—They would not be immediately after a fit, but in the intervals they might be perfectly capable of attending school.

5250. And they would not suffer from such attendance if the teacher were reasonable?—No, I think not.

5251. But if the fits were severe you would not advise them in any case to be placed with ordinary children?—No, not so much on account of the children themselves as on account of the disturbance they are likely to create in an ordinary class.

5252. And they are more likely to create a disturbance among feeble-minded children than an ordinary class. Feeble-minded children are more sensitive?—I should not like to say that, I should think their sensibilities would be rather blunted, and not so acute as those of normal children.

5253. A medical officer alone should certify whether they ought to be sent away from home?—That would, in my opinion, be the most efficient manner of dealing with them.

5254. There must be a home where there is constant medical supervision of some kind?—Do you allude to the sending epileptic children away from an ordinary board school to a home?

5255. To sending them from their home to a home for epileptic children?—I think it would be much the best plan.

5256. They would have special care and supervision?—Yes, special care, special supervision, and education.

5257. Our ordinary hours of school work for a normal day are five hours a day. Would those be too many for an epileptic child?—Epileptic children differ so much that I do not think you can lay down an absolute rule. That must be determined by the case itself.

5258. You would say generally they should be lighter than for an ordinary child?—Yes, I do not think they are capable of the same prolonged exertion as healthy children.

5259. What modifications of the school course would you make for them. Do you think that anything that required severe mental effort should be avoided?—I go generally on the principle of keeping epileptics always employed. I believe it is better for them.

5260. But with things that occupy their brains or their hands?—Both. I think that idleness always intensifies the epileptic tendencies. I altogether approve of occupation—brain work and physical work.

5261. On the other hand, there are some children of very active brains?—Epileptic children differ much; some are bright, others are dull, and others actually demented, and you must classify them according to their actual state. That would necessarily require medical skill and medical selection; that is one of the reasons to my mind for placing epileptic children in homes where they can receive the requisite care and attention.

5262. And I suppose you would say that epileptic children of the wage-earning class ought to receive some sort of industrial training that would enable them to get their living in some way?—Undoubtedly.

5263. Partially or wholly?—Yes.

5264. Are there any occupations that are better for them than others?—I prefer out-door occupation for children of this class or some occupation not of a dangerous character, *i.e.*, dangerous if anyone should happen to fall in a fit. Our experience, and I believe the experience of Bielefeld is that out-of-door occupation is far the best for children of this sort, and for adults as well. These are the principles that have led us to establish our colony at Chalfont.

5265. They are not likely to earn their living by such work as that?—No, epileptics will always require a certain amount of supervision and assistance.

5266. And should be in colonies where they can earn some portion of their living rather than be scattered about the world?—Yes. Some of our epileptics at Chalfont are doing very well under supervision as carpenters, gardeners, and so forth. I doubt whether a chronic epileptic is capable of earning his living altogether.

5267. Would you keep the sexes apart in the colonies?—Yes.

5268. And avoid any opportunity leading to marriage?—Certainly.

5269. Is the colony at Chalfont for men?—It is for men at present. We have just founded a home for women, but we consider it to be absolutely essential to keep them separate from each other.

5270. This Committee has to consider the case of physically defective children, as well as mentally defective children, crippled children, and paralytic children. Crippled and paralytic children are very often put in a special class, because they can be more gently handled; but, on the other hand, it is said that they suffer by being put with the mentally feeble children, so that they do not develop as well. Would you advise that they should be placed in the ordinary school and special care taken of them?—Yes, they would be better. If they are merely crippled, but have active brains, it must have an injurious effect upon them to be classified among imbeciles, or idiots, or backward children.

5271. (*Mr. Pooley.*) I think you said you often could tell from the appearance of a child whether it was feeble-minded or not?—Yes, that is true; but you cannot always. Some defective children look extremely well, have refined features, and are well developed physically, and yet they are backward.

5272. In determining for educational purposes, whether the child is feeble-minded or not, the opinion of a medical expert is, would you say, the most important factor?—No, I should say that you must have the opinion of the medical man, and also the life-history of the patient, as well as the experience of the teacher as to how far it is capable of education. These factors have to be taken into consideration, together with the appearance and the general bodily health.

5273. You want the opinion of the medical expert, judging from the examination of the child, the life-history (if you can get it), from the parents or guardians, and the opinion of the teacher who has attempted to teach them?—Yes, I think that is what you would require.

5274. And do you think for proper selection you ought to have all those three factors?—That is my opinion.

5275. As regards epileptics, do you think that when the epilepsy is slight and fits infrequent the epileptic child can be taught with ordinary children in school?—Yes, and I believe many are.

5276. Supposing a child has a fit in school, we have been told that if it is with other epileptic children those children are not frightened, but are disposed rather to be sympathetic and help it, and that it does not have any terrifying effect upon them?—Yes, that is my belief.

Dr. D. Ferrier, F.R.S.
12 Mar. 1897.

5277. We have been told that if a child has a fit, and there are nervous children present of ordinary brain power, it very often has a terrifying effect on them?—Yes, a severe fit is a very alarming affair, and might easily do harm to a highly sensitive child. In fact, fright is one of the assigned causes of epilepsy. The first fit occurs after a very great mental shock, and a highly sensitive child with a pre-disposition to epilepsy might become epileptic at seeing a serious fit.

5278. And a child might have a kind of simulated epilepsy without having the real epilepsy?—No, I do not think that. I do not believe in that.

5279. You think if there is an epileptic tendency there might be a danger of producing actual epilepsy?—Yes.

5280. Is it not the fact that crippled children and paralytic children are often delicate in their health?—They become delicate on account of their enforced inability to take active exercise. A child may be crippled from hip disease, but may be a very bright child. There are many forms of paralysis. There is a form of paralysis in children called hemiplegia. The child is paralysed on one side. This is sometimes associated with weak-mindedness and sometimes with epilepsy, but not necessarily so. You see there are all classes. You cannot lay down a general rule with regard to paralysis. The paralysis may be attributable to so many different causes, that unless you have medical advice you cannot determine what should be done in any particular case.

5281. Would you agree that there are cases of delicate children with no actual deficiency in brain power who would do better in these special classes than with ordinary children?—I should not educate a delicate child with a defective child. A delicate child may be very bright and precocious, and many of them are, and I would not put him with defective children.

5282. It would depend upon whether the delicacy has affected the vigour of the mind?—Entirely.

5283. You think there is no satisfactory plan for dealing with epileptic children who have frequent fits except that of sending them to institutions or homes?—I do not think there is, because there are great difficulties. First there is the objection to putting epileptic children among healthy children owing to the disturbances their fits create. You might educate them in special classes, but then there is the difficulty of bringing these poor epileptic children from their homes to the school. They are liable to fits in the street and may be run over, and unless each epileptic child has an attendant to bring it to school and take it away again, I do not see how you can avoid running risks. On the other hand, in the homes their physical health would be attended to, their amusements would be provided for, and their comfort would be much better than if you sent them to the day schools, and let them return after school hours.

5284. In all cases you say they are not suitable for day schools?—They are not suitable for day schools. Then when you have educated them, so far as they are capable of education, you have the further difficulty of fitting them for some work in life. The homes, I should add, should be capable not only of providing the elements of education, but should also be capable of teaching such trades or occupations as may be useful in after life if recovery should ensue.

5285. Up to what age do you think the elementary education and industrial training of an epileptic child should be continued by the school authority?—Just the usual time, but if the child appeared more backward than other children, then I would keep him longer.

5286. The ordinary child is kept, as a rule, up to 13 or 14; would you keep them up to 16 in the case of epileptic children?—If they were deficient, but I should have to qualify that answer. You cannot lay down an absolute rule with regard to that. If an epileptic child were otherwise clever and intelligent he might pass his standard at the same time as an ordinary child.

5287. Is there any particular age at which epilepsy becomes usually developed; is there any rule as to that?—There is no rule; it may be practically congenital, and it may occur at any period of life.

5288. Is it the fact that a smaller proportion of children between 5 and 16 are epileptic than of adults?—No, I should say that epilepsy is rather a disease of early life. It more often shows itself early in life than later.

5289. We were, I think, given to understand by a witness the other day that epilepsy often became developed after the age of 10. Yes, it often does. But one sees crowds of epileptics from infancy.

5290. Do you think there would be as large a proportion of epileptics among children from 5 to 16 as you would find among people of, we will say, between 16 and 30?—I think so. I cannot quote accurate statistics on this point, but believe so. In fact it is a common belief that epileptic fits are likely to cease at puberty—showing the prevalence of epilepsy before this age.

5291. If the epilepsy goes on till the end of school age, say to 16, is there much chance of perfect recovery?—No, I think very little.

5292. I suppose there are several cases of recovery?—There are cases where the fits cease, but you can never give assurance they will not return, however well they may be treated.

5293. A very small proportion of complete recoveries?—Very small.

5294. You say it is very desirable that the epileptic child should be taught, and should have plenty of occupation, and various interests?—Undoubtedly.

5295. (*Miss Townsend.*) In your opinion is defective mindedness more prevalent among boys than among girls?—I cannot speak positively on that point.

5296. The difference is not great?—I think not. So far as my own practice goes I see as many of the one as of the other.

5297. Does deficiency more often develop into idiocy with boys or with girls?—That is also a point on which I cannot express an opinion.

5298. Are the physical consequences more serious with girls or boys? I mean does mental deficiency affect more permanently the general health of girls or of boys?—I should think it would have an equal influence in regard to both sexes. I do not see any reason for considering one sex is likely to suffer more than the other.

5299. Could you fix any approximate age at which you would despair of a feeble-minded persons improvement?—I do not think so, so far as I know of the subject. But I cannot consider myself an expert in matters of this kind.

5300. When one is interested in homes for feeble-minded girls or boys it becomes an important question at what age one ought to reject them altogether as being incapable of improvement?—I do not think I can answer the question.

5301. You judge each case by itself?—I would judge each case by itself.

5302. You told us that outdoor occupation was good for epileptics, but out in the world they are of course debarred from such occupations by the dangers attending them?—Yes, by reason of their fits.

5303. Consequently for epileptics colonies are almost essential if they are to be properly dealt with, and given a proper chance in life?—That is my belief.

5304. That would not, however, hold good of the ordinary feeble-minded child?—No, the feeble-minded would be feeble-minded throughout life I should think, and would have to be more or less taken care of.

5305. What should you say was the best kind of employment for feeble-minded girls over school age; if you had to train girls what would you try to train them for?—It would have to be something very simple not requiring much exercise of brain power.

5306. Should the occupations be varied or monotonous?—They should be varied. I suppose they could do a little washing or simple domestic service—something very simple, not demanding much intelligence.

5307. If the school age for such children were raised from 14 to 16, do you think it would be advisable to keep them at school, or to send them to training homes where they could have industrial training?—I am afraid I cannot answer that question. I know so little about the organisation of schools that I think it would be a question for the management rather than for me.

5308. What is your opinion about the punishment of feeble-minded or epileptic children? One expert told us that he advocated no punishment whatever of any kind for such children?—I should use a system of rewards and punishments, otherwise you will never develop a sense of responsibility.

Dr. D. Ferrier F.R.S
12 Mar. 1897.

5309. You think you can develop moral sense?—Undoubtedly I should endeavour to do so. Even in the asylums that is done. Although people are not responsible, still we have to keep up the idea that they responsible, otherwise one could never manage a place at all.

5310. You would not deprive them of the knowledge that certain consequences followed certain actions?—Certainly not. I should hold them before them very vividly.

5311. Is there not a form of hysteria, particularly in the case of girls, that might be mistaken for epilepsy?—Yes, but only I should think by an ignorant person: not by any physician who knows what epilepsy is.

5312. But still it does more or less take the form of epilepsy?—Yes, very often; but when the attack is once seen it can be recognised by anyone who is accustomed to deal with such affections.

5313. But might not such fits as those be brought on by imitation?—Yes, certainly—hysterical fits. I would not call it mock epilepsy, but hysterical convulsions.

5314. And in that way the association of epileptics with ordinary girls or boys, or feeble-minded girls, would be undesirable?—Yes, undesirable. A severe fright or shock might easily produce the effect that you allude to—might develop hysteria in a normal child; or chorea, or St. Vitus' dance, or other nervous ailments.

5315. Is it not the case that the infantile paralysis you have mentioned sometimes exists in the case of children with specially good brains. I have known cases of girls where the brains were exceptionally good, so much so, that they had rather to be checked?—I am afraid that perhaps I did not use the proper term. Infantile paralysis is one form of paralysis, but infantile hemiplegia is another, and we must differentiate. Infantile paralysis is a spinal disease; it has nothing to do with the brain, but infantile hemiplegia is a cerebral disease—a disease of the brain. But when there is disease of the brain there is very often associated with hemiplegia, weak-mindedness, but never with spinal paralysis. You must therefore distinguish between the different forms of paralysis; you cannot lump them together.

5316. Consequently you could not say that all paralytic children ought to be taught with feeble-minded children?—No, that would be a great mistake.

5317. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) Is there a tendency amongst normal children to imitate the defects of the feeble-minded?—Children have a wonderful faculty of imitation of all kinds of abnormalities, and I should think there might be.

5318. Would defective children imitate one another?—I suppose the principle of imitation is also in them, but I cannot speak positively to that point. I have not had much experience of the effect of the association of defective children with each other.

5319. Do you think a teacher could correct and prevent this?—I should think it would be possible in a measure to prevent defective children from imitating each other.

5320. Could you give us any idea as to what would be the best way of training a feeble-minded child—I mean by that a child who is not sufficiently feeble-minded to be sent to an idiot asylum?—A child of that kind cannot be educated with ordinary children because it gets left behind. Therefore you require to give it extra care and attention; treating it as a delicate plant that needs protection, and use the simplest methods of evoking its powers of intelligence. Children of that kind are incapable of keeping up with ordinary children; they get left behind, and they learn nothing at all, unless special methods of teaching are adopted.

5321. Do you think an epileptic child would be better resident in the country or in towns?—I should like them away in the country where their physical development would be favoured, and therefore their brains perhaps favoured as well.

5322. But if they are to live afterwards in cities would that be still desirable?—They will go back to the city with a good country constitution.

5323. But being mentally weak would not they find it very difficult to live in a city?—I should think they always will find it difficult to live, because defective children will very rarely, if ever, attain to the normal standard, and therefore will always want extra care.

5324. You think that the feeble-minded child will never be really self-supporting?—That is my belief.

5325. Would you then go so far as to say that they require, and ought to have lifelong guardianship?—The worst of them must. Some may be able to engage in simple occupations and gain a living, but in the competition of the present day I should think that the defective ones must go to the wall, and in the end land in the poorhouse.

5326. But if they remain in the world they would very probably marry, and would not their offsprings suffer?—That is what I should be afraid of. Therefore, for the sake of posterity, I should keep them in institutions.

5327. Is there much hope that a really feeble-minded child will ever become mentally strong?—I do not think so.

5328. Under a trained teacher, to what age do you think boys and girls can be taught together?—I am afraid I cannot answer that question. It is a matter I should refer to school teachers. It is not, I think, a medical question.

5329. With regard to the classification of children, I suppose the age is no proper standard?—No, the physiological age is different from the age in years, and we must, therefore, consider the child by itself altogether apart from the mere number of years it has lived in the world.

5330. So that a boy of 14 might very well be taught with a child of seven?—Quite easily.

5331. I notice in the evidence which you have previously given about epileptics, that you find many of those in the ranks of the unemployed?—Yes, many.

5332. Do you think that is owing to the want of training in childhood?—To that, and to the fact that having fits nobody will employ them. Employers do not like them; they cannot rely upon them. With regard to domestic servants, for instance, a housemaid tumbles down with the tea things and is at once sent away. A mistress has only to say, "This servant has fits," and, of course, that shuts the door to further employment.

5333. Then, for the epileptic you would prefer lifelong guardianship?—In a way I suppose it comes to that. They might get occupation for a while until it is known that they have fits, and then they would be sent away again, so that in the end they must become paupers. A great many of them, however, can work perfectly well in the intervals of their fits.

5334. (*Dr. Smith.*) First about those physically defective children. I think I have gathered that you would not under any circumstances, admit those into classes for defective children unless the physical defect is associated with some mental defect?—Unless the physical defect is associated with mental defect I should not educate those children with mentally defective children.

5335. Take a case, for instance, of a boy suffering simply from heart disease, but otherwise quite bright and precocious; you would not put him with mentally defective children?—Certainly not.

5336. You do not think there would be any justification for that?—No, in my opinion, no justification whatever. That is putting, as it were, a disgrace or stigma upon the child.

5337. And in the same way with regard to cripples who have no mental defect?—Quite so.

5338. As regards these feeble-minded children, or mentally defective children, you understand that they are of a sort of half-way (of course, with gradations) between the ordinary child and the imbecile?—That is so.

5339. What age do you think they ought to come into a special class?—I am in the habit of sending children of that class to be educated and drilled at about the age of six or eight, I should say an average age of seven.

5340. Do you think it would be desirable that such children should have a trial in the infants' department of an ordinary school?—I do not know the age of such infants.

5341. (*Chairman.*) From three to seven and a half?—I think they might have a trial unless they were so obviously defective that it was no use to send them there.

5342. (*Dr. Smith.*) You mean, unless the case was very clear?—Yes, quite so.

5343. Then the kind of experience so gained would be helpful to the medical officer in determining upon the question of admissibility afterwards?—Undoubtedly.

Dr. D. Ferrier, F.R.S.

12 Mar. 1897.

5344. He would have that from the teacher of such a school?—From the teacher of such a school.

5345. Then the family history, so far as it can be obtained, would be also helpful?—It would be of very great use to learn from the mother the habits of the child, and the age at which it began to talk and to walk, and so on. All those things are exceedingly important in determining the degree of development of a child's brain.

5346. And those are the essential points before the strictly professional medical examination of the case commences at all?—Yes, that is so. That is what I do myself. When the case is brought to me, I ask the father or mother, or anyone that has had the care of the child, what has been the result as regards its education. Then I consider its physical appearance generally, and form my opinion upon the whole of the factors taken together.

5347. And that is the course which you would recommend should be adopted with reference to all of these children admitted into the special classes?—Certainly.

5348. Therefore, you think it is the medical officer who should determine all those points after proper consideration?—That is my belief.

5349. Do you think that the teachers should have any special training as regards their treatment of these children?—I should think that would be necessary.

5350. What kind of special training would you advise?—I should like Dr. Shuttleworth to give you information on these points, because when I come to deal with such cases I generally appeal to Dr. Shuttleworth to help me.

5351. You mentioned incidentally about those signs which are so well known in connexion with Dr. Warner. But in addition to those signs, the mental examination would be of importance, would it not?—Undoubtedly. I question whether there are any physical signs that you can absolutely rely upon, except in cases of undoubted imbecility or idiocy; I do not think that there are any absolute signs as regards mental defectiveness simply, and I doubt if you can establish them.

5352. Therefore to rely upon those signs would not be advisable?—I should not myself.

5353. Can you tell us anything as to continental methods in connexion with the treatment of epilepsy?—We have modelled our institution on that of Bielefeld in Westphalia, where they have an enormous number of epileptics adults as well as children. I do not know whether there is anything to be said about it except that this institution is on the home system. Children and adults are admitted and are placed in homes and not in large barracks. In these homes there is a so-called "house father" and "house mother," who give individual attention to the patients, and look after them in all their relations of life; and special attention is of course given to the fact of their being epileptics and precautions are taken against any dangers resulting from it. We want to do the same in our colony at Chalfont. We have not admitted any children yet, but we have already the plans for a home for boys and a home for girls, and I shall be glad to give you our experience after we have established these homes. At present we do not practically know what will be the result of associating these children together, or how far they will be capable of education like normal children.

5354. How many children do you propose to put in one of these homes?—We are going to have 24 in each to begin with, but on this and on the methods of dealing with them and educating them we shall have to be guided by experience. We are only beginning, but we have seen enough and learned enough of the Bielefeld system to feel quite confident that we shall be doing good.

5355. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) You spoke of some children whose physical appearance was not much help in forming an opinion as to their mental condition. But in such cases does not the child's history help a great deal. Take, for instance, the case of a child who has had in early life inflammation of the brain. His physical appearance need not necessarily be altered?—Quite so. I meant to include that in the life-history of the individual which I said was necessary in forming an opinion.

5356. The necessity of making inquiries into matters of that kind is a thing which would strike a medical observer, but not perhaps a lay observer?—That is so.

5357. Is it not your experience that often physical development is in these feeble-minded cases considerably retarded as well as their mental development?—Very often.

5358. Have you seen any of the special classes in London, may I ask?—No, I have not.

5359. I think I am right in saying that there are certain highly sensitive children as well as very dull children there. I mean some of those highly nervous children who can never sit still. Now do you think it would be desirable to associate together epileptic children and highly nervous children?—No, certainly not.

5360. You know the plan which is adopted in Paris of sending epileptics to Bicetre and Salpêtrière along with feeble-minded children, but do you think that is a good plan?—I should not send them there unless they were actually feeble-minded themselves.

5361. We are told that the plan at Darenth is to stretch the law to admit epileptic patients who are not imbecile; but you do not think that is a good plan?—I do not think it is at all a good plan. I should not send epileptic children there unless they showed also distinct signs of imbecility or idiocy. But chronic epileptic children tend to deteriorate, and when they become demented then they are not fit for the ordinary epileptic institutions, but should be sent to special institutions like Darenth.

5362. I had a question put to me which you will forgive me putting to you as to whether you think much information is to be derived from small heads of the Mongolian type and epicanthis?—I think those signs might be very useful in determining degrees of imbecility and idiocy, but I do not think they would help as regards mere backwardness.

5363. Do you see many children of school age as patients at the epileptic hospital?—Yes, a great many.

5364. We have been struck, I think, with the small number returned by school board officers; do you think that the existence of these children is kept quiet?—I have come across a great many children who have been sent away from the board schools on account of epilepsy. At King's College Hospital and Queen Square Hospital I am continually asking the question, and getting the same answer, "Yes, sent away from "school on account of fits." A great many have been sent away, but it is quite possible that in the case of children epileptic from birth, when the parents explain to the school board officer that they have fits, he does not insist on their going to school.

5365. So that there is a large number probably of which the school board knows very little?—Of which the school board knows nothing at all.

5366. With regard to paralytic children some of them you said were very bright. Are you aware of any that are excluded from school by the teachers, because they are paralytic?—I have not heard of such.

5367. Your answers show that you think that medical discrimination of these cases very important. If the Education Department has the supervision of these children ought it not to have some medical officer to deal with these cases?—Undoubtedly so. I should think that is absolutely necessary.

5368. (*Chairman.*) Are there any institutions which it would be useful to visit?—I should recommend Bielefeld. It is not a very long journey from London. I spent two days in the place, but one might spend a week or a fortnight with great advantage.

5369. (*Miss Townsend.*) Are they all epileptics?—Yes.

5370. There are no feeble-minded in the institution?—Yes, they also take feeble-minded, and those epileptics who become feeble-minded remain in the institution—that is to say, they are not sent to idiot or lunatic asylums.

5371. When they are hopelessly feeble-minded?—Yes.

5372. (*Chairman.*) Is there in Holland or Belgium any institution?—There is, I think, one at Antwerp.

5373. Do you know the one at the Hague?—No, I do not know it.

Adjourned to Friday at 2.30 p.m.

TENTH DAY.

Friday, 19th March 1897.

PRESENT:

The REV. T. W. SHARPE, C.B., in the Chair.

Mr. H. F. POOLEY.
Mr. A. W. NEWTON.
Dr. G. E. SHUTTLEWORTH.
Dr. W. R. SMITH.
Mrs. BURGWIN.
Miss TOWNSEND.

Mr. H. W. ORANGE, *Secretary.*

Mr. C. S. LOCH called in and examined.

Mr. C. S. Loch.

19 Mar. 1897.

5374. (*Chairman.*) I believe you are the secretary of the Charity Organisation Society?—I am.

5375. That society has taken great interest in this question of defective and epileptic children?—That is so; yes.

5376. I do not know whether you have seen our definition of defective children as distinguished from idiots and imbeciles: we have attempted to draw some line of demarcation between them, and have not succeeded very well?—I have seen the definition, but I have not examined it critically.

5377. You have not a definition of your own beyond this: "that feebleness of mind which, being congenital "or originating in infancy or childhood, may be checked "or alleviated by special care and education"?—That was the definition we arrived at. It was difficult to find one, but that answered at any rate the purpose of our report and of our working committee.

5378. In some of the institutions they are anxious to call them "higher imbeciles," but we wish to keep them out of that category altogether; would you agree to that?—Yes, quite so. I think that the word "defective" which has come into use is as good as any.

5379. And it would be exclusive of imbeciles and idiots?—It would be so understood now, I think, quite.

5380. Dr. Warner has been one of your chief advisers on this point?—Yes; he made a great many inquiries, in conjunction with one or two others, in reference to a special committee, the report of which was published in 1893. In fact, he may be said to have originated that inquiry. The names of the members of the committee are given at the beginning of the book. It was a very large representative committee. We made inquiry as to the numbers of defective children, as far as we could, but I do not think that the report gives a return of what we called defective children distinctively. It includes those that are called feeble-minded, but the class (*see* p. 37) would include also a certain margin that might be placed either higher or lower. It is, I think, extremely difficult to be quite precise as to this class. The boundary is a very shadowy one.

5381. It can only be determined by medical experts in some cases?—Yes.

5382. The extreme cases are evident to ordinary people, but the cases at the upper and lower boundaries can only be distinguished by medical experts?—I think that will be so.

5383. Have you made an abstract of your information as to the numbers on page 32?—I would refer to page 53 as the main conclusion—about seven per thousand is the estimated proportion of these children among the child population scheduled for school purposes (ages 3 to 13) or in Metropolitan Poor Law schools. That must be taken as an estimate. At page 32 I think you will find the total number of children examined was 50,000.

5384. Perhaps you need not go into those statistics?—I think that it would be hardly necessary to go into these statistics, partly because they have, subsequently to that date, been considerably enlarged, and Dr. Warner himself has made a further return which probably he will submit, or has already submitted, to you. But I thought that for a general indication of number this seven per thousand was sufficient.

5385. It probably is considerably below the right number?—I am afraid I cannot tell you that. It seems to me that we ought to have a more precise local inquiry to ascertain what that number should be.

5386. We are having certain areas taken in London, Bristol, and other places, and a house to house inquiry instituted. Perhaps that would be more trustworthy if done on a sufficiently large scale?—Yes. I think this may be taken as approximately right. I notice Dr. Warner in his subsequent paper put it at 9·3 per thousand, and sets out these three classes: "(1) the "feeble mentally and deficient; (2) the dull mentally "and generally feeble in body or brain; and (3) "epileptic or with history of fits during school life." Those three together he connects, and that covers really the whole of those classes which I understand the Committee is dealing with.

5387. Does that include all that should be dealt with in special classes?—I think there, again, it is very difficult to state precisely. My own impression is that those cases must be dealt with in various ways, and you could not say at all of those nine or seven per thousand that all those should be dealt with by special classes.

5388. He draws a distinction between the feeble mental and the dull mental. The dull mental may be developed, and the feeble mental must continue very much as they are throughout life; is that the distinction?—I think that is what is aimed at, but at the same time there, again, I am very doubtful about the rigidity, at any rate, of the line.

5389. We have come to the conclusion in regard to any special case upon which there may be any doubt, to require the united testimony of the teacher, the parent, and some medical officer who may be appointed by the local authority or otherwise. I suppose you would agree that the testimony of all those three is very valuable in deciding any case?—Yes. I should like on that point to refer to the experiments that we have been making since this report was issued, and I think they may be of service in showing how to deal with this problem, much of which I think is unexplored ground. We have found that the system of consultations which we have arranged in different parts of London is a very useful one. We arrange that a number of children, 15 as a rule, should be taken in an afternoon, and we have had 21 of these consultations in different parts of London. The cases are sent by workers among the poor, district visitors and others, by our own committees, by guardians, and sometimes by managers of schools; and with the case there is always sent in the first instance a form, to which I attach a great deal of importance, which gives a kind of history of the case before the child is seen at all, and introduces it; this I think is of very great advantage. Then, besides that, we have a report of each case, and that ends with a recommendation. Of course the recommendations are very various, but I feel sure that by having the parent or the persons who care about the child present, and by considering the whole matter with very great deliberation, a very fair conclusion is arrived at as to what should be done. I do not think that any other shorter method would be sufficient for the purpose.

Mr. C. S. Loch.

19 Mar. 1897.

5390. Dr. Warner appears to be the only medical officer that you have selected?—We have arranged this particularly with him. I see no reason at all why it should not be worked in conjunction with others; but he was specially interested in it, and we found that we could get on with our work, as it were, on this plan.

5391. The form filled up is a common sense sort of form without any technical terms in it?—That is the object of it. It is what we thought the people who sent children or had to do with them would understand.

5392. It merely notices facts which would be patent to anyone who is in the child's society for any length of time?—Yes.

5393. Especially the mother?—Especially the mother. I can show you those filled up. I did not bring one filled up, but you can see from that form the way it is used.

5394. Were they generally filled up with care?—I think very often. That form itself resulted from the difficulties we experienced when we had no such introductory information. Finding that we did not get enough information at the start the parents or others in charge of the children were asked a few days before the consultation to send in that form filled up. Then we have an honorary secretary, who is a medical practitioner; she goes through these, and everything is quite ready for the afternoon meeting. I may say that not more than, say, 15 children as a maximum are taken.

5395. You ascertain the whole history, as far as it can be ascertained, before you begin to look at the child?—Quite so.

5396. The classification of these children is of course very difficult, and the variations are great; but you have eventually come to a determination to form five classes of them?—Yes. That is rather with a view to the way in which we should treat them. I think it only has that value. Those are rather in the nature of suggestions, which are made by way of advice.

5397. Will you state the divisions?—A., that the child should go to an ordinary class: B., that it should go to a special class or be kept at school at Class 0. That is to say, it would be better that they should be there than nowhere else, and yet perhaps they would not have opportunity of picking up very much, judging from their age at any rate. Then C., that they should go to some special institution. D., that they should be taught at home; and E., that they should go to an institution for imbeciles. Of course a certain proportion of these are really imbeciles, and have to be provided for elsewhere.

5398. With regard to your division B.: "To go to a "special class or to be kept at school at Class 0." We have all a special dislike to the term "Class 0." Instructions are going to be issued to the inspectors to inquire into these Standard 0's more fully than has hitherto been the case, and to insist upon arrangements being made for the proper teaching of the children either by themselves or in some other way?—I think that is entirely right.

5399. At present standard 0, as it is called, is a very neglected class?—Yes.

5400. But there are great difficulties in the way of distinguishing between children who may be fairly taught in school and those who should go elsewhere?—Quite so.

5401. With regard to your Division D.: "To be taught at home"; how would the children have the chance of being taught at home if they are the children of poor parents?—I think that again has to be arranged. The ladies of the Women's University Settlement teach some of the crippled children at home, and I cannot help thinking that a certain number of these might be dealt with in that way if we were only to organise it. I am not sure whether it would not be better done under some kind of supervision from the school authorities, but yet as a kind of semi-detached arrangement.

5402. The children might have one or two lessons a week like the blind and deaf have at their own homes?—Yes, that is the sort of thing.

5403. Would that be of much value to them?—I think it would keep up the connexion with the child, and of its value you would judge after a little time.

5404. If the child had a good parent who would carry on the same treatment it might perhaps be of some value?—Yes.

5405. You seem to think that this examination might be enforced before the age of eight. But most of the witnesses think, and we ourselves seem to agree in that opinion, that it would be better not to have the child up for examination before the age of seven certainly, and probably not before the age of eight. We think they are better left alone in an infant school. But you think they had better be examined at three or four years of age?—I think if the mother had anything to say about them she might very well say it even although they were only three or four years of age. It is only in that way that I think they should be at all looked after before the age of seven or eight.

5406. Do not you think that the mothers themselves, unless something very serious affects a child, take very little notice of it before the child reaches the age of six years?—It was rather to stimulate the parents' notice of the children that I had this idea.

5407. It might be very useful, of course, to take notice of them at the first in the infants' school, though not with a view to removing them from the infants' school?—Entirely so. Not with a view to removing them.

5408. Then you agree that the examination should be made after leaving the infants' school at the age of seven or eight years?—Yes.

5409. There are a certain number of children who escape the notice of the school board who are reported to be at home. Have you examined any of those that you happen to know?—I cannot help thinking that some of the children that are sent to us to see are children that are non-attending.

5410. There seem to be 1,860 "permanently disabled non-attendants"?—At the time of our report it was so returned.

5411. The school board officers report these to be suffering from some degree of mental feebleness?—That is their total number: "of the 1,860 'permanently "disabled' non-attendants 51 are blind, 82 partially "blind, 152 deaf and dumb, 805 crippled, 397 idiots, "and 372 'other causes.' For the blind and the deaf "and the dumb the school board has special schools. "Presumably the present system has only to be "extended in order to give them the benefits of "education, unless they be partly imbecile or feeble "minded. In so far as this might be the case, provision would have to be made for them also. The "'other causes' included 61 cases of epilepsy. How "the rest are made up is shown by the following "statement of 'other causes' in one—the St. Marylebone Division—the entry there includes 66 cases. "They are: 10 spinal disease, 5 paralysis, 1 St. Vitus's "dance, 7 diseased brain, 10 dumb, 1 bad speech, "3 deaf, 2 split palate, 1 no roof to mouth, 12 fits, "2 skin disease, 1 dropsy, 3 consumption, and 7 miscellaneous—truly a pathetic list when we turn the "figures into children."

5412. What is the number of feeble-minded children included?—The phrase is not used here. So the classification would not be made from that point of view. All one can say is that there was a fairly large number who from various kinds of infirmities could not attend, some of which no doubt had reference to defective minds.

5413. I think we were told by an officer of the board the other day that they did return "feeble-minded children" as one of their distinctions?—I think they do now, but they did not, I think, when this was written.

5414. But that is done by a comparatively ignorant person who would not take much trouble about it, so that the classification would not be worth very much?—I think it would be very difficult for anyone to do it quite well.

5415. I think you have an analysis of one of the classes that you attended?—I had a note sent me. This shows one afternoon's work, I take it, as a kind of sample. There were 12 children that afternoon. Two were attending school; three seemed to be hopeless imbeciles and naturally would be sent to Darenth; two were delicate and not feeble-minded, but so far as we could ascertain not attending school. Then there came five cases, all of which it was thought might go to school or a special class. The first one had slight fits; but the child could talk with some sense. Two children were deaf and dumb. One had a bad home and attended school for a time, and was then certified as an imbecile and sent away. But now it appears doubtful if he is more than very backward and very ignorant. That is the note. Then in another case in which the mother's statement was not relied upon, it was said that the child was not going to school, that it had been refused; but I do not know whether that was true. All these five cases it was thought might go to a special class. That statement, I think, shows the variety of cases that turn up, the people not knowing quite what to do with them.

Mr. C. S. Loch.

19 Mar. 1897.

5416. Were those children part of the 1860?—No; this was only the other day. But they would possibly come out of what would answer to that number in the recent returns. These are sent to us merely by people who are interested in the children and do not know what to do.

5417. I suppose you must know all the helpless children in London?—No, I should think not. Each of these consultation centres no doubt as it gets known attracts a larger number. I have noticed that as they have become well established, they are more sought after for advice; but I do not think we know about the defective children at all sufficiently yet.

5418. Can you give us any idea how many such special classes would be needed for London?—I am afraid that is a question which one cannot answer positively. I think that there ought to be smaller classes, but I see of course the difficulty of it. When the children have been carefully sorted in the way I have suggested, if there were co-operation between the school people and the charitable people who are looking after the cases, I believe you would get the maximum of good results, because I think you would find that the cases would be periodically considered from many points of view, and also, the evidence being noted and recorded, we should get to a good method. I believe that in this matter we are still at the beginning of our search for a good method for dealing with these cases.

5419. I believe the School Board for London has mapped out the whole of London, showing the centres at which the special classes will be formed?—I understand that that is in process of being done. My feeling rather is that only by the kind of scrutiny that I have described will the real number for which a special class (as contrasted with other forms of treatment) is desired, come to light.

5420. When you speak of the charitable people, do you mean certain agencies, your own included?—At most of our committees there are ladies who do this kind of work. Sometimes also there are school managers who are interested, and they work with us. Then, of course, there are agencies besides these. Sometimes we have found that if we have told the clergy and their visitors that a consultation is going to take place, they, too, will interest themselves, and through them you hear of children that you would not hear of at all otherwise.

5421. Do you know whether there are more defective children in voluntary schools or in board schools?—I cannot tell you.

5422. It was said by one of the witnesses that they took refuge in voluntary schools to escape the board's attendance officers; but you cannot say?—No.

5423. You think that these classes should be small?—Yes.

5424. Have you any opinion as to what size—20 or so?—Yes. I am not for more than 20, anyhow. I am interested to a certain extent in kindergarten work myself, and I have seen some classes—not the London ones: but the range of ability seems to me to differ so much that the children require a great deal of attention, and a large class is, I think, very difficult to handle.

5425. They require at the early stage almost individual teaching?—That is so.

5426. The London School Board have built rooms for 30 children on a basis of 10 square feet per child; but we think that these children require a much larger space, and it would be a happy coincidence if we could say these children require 20 square feet, and so reduce the class from 30 to 15?—I agree.

5427. Of course it is very desirable to carry the parents with us in all these matters?—Yes.

5428. If we once rouse the spirit of opposition we shall be unable to carry any large measure. It is desirable, I suppose, that the parents should see all that goes on from time to time, and have reports of their children, or be made satisfied that their children are doing well?—I think the less formal you can make it the better. That is my feeling. Therefore I think a consultation which is on quite a simple basis, where the parent can come in and sit quietly down and talk matters over is the best introduction. Why I press so strongly for connecting the groups of schools with associated voluntary work is that I think that in that way, if you are at all fortunate, you would have the help of people who know the parents, and who would bring them in in a manner that would keep their confidence and trust. I do not mean to say that that is not done at all now, but I think it is the key to progress. So much in this case depends upon the home and upon the goodwill of the parents.

5429. Has your society any network of organisation that deals with these special classes?—We have 39 committees in London, and then round these committees there are people working at these cases.

5430. So that you ought to be able to find out, I suppose, almost every child in London?—If it were systematic, I think that could be done, I think it is a great advantage to be able to hold these little consultations in different places. We generally have them in a committee room in the locality.

5431. Can you suggest any way, either through the school board or otherwise, for getting at the number of children in a more exhaustive manner?—The only way, I think, would be first of all a local scrutiny.

5432. Like the official scheduling?—No, I meant rather a scrutiny by such people as the ladies at the Women's University Settlement. That, I think, would be a very good thing. I believe if one was asked to do that in some other districts, and there was informal consultation between the local workers and the school board people, we should get very nearly at the truth of the matter after a little inquiry. It would take a little time, but I think that one could get, at any rate, comparatively larger areas pretty well reported upon.

5433. Would your society assist in the matter?—I think very likely it would; yes.

5434. You think a combination of charitable people—associated voluntary workers—with the school board attendance officers would be sufficient?—I think that that would be the way to begin. Then one would work from that. One would then have all the available knowledge at the start.

5435. Such a form as you have given us would, I suppose, be sufficient to distribute to the attendance officers?—If I were to try to do it I would like to have a talk with them first about it and just see what they do, and then work from that.

5436. It is desirable that we should ask the School Board for London to make a more exhaustive inquiry under certain headings into these children at the next scheduling?—Yes, but still more desirable is it that they should be able, through the local groups of schools and local authorities to obtain the information—not in the official scheduling fashion so much, as in the manner of a person who is trying to find his way into the facts of a difficult class of cases.

5437. Could we give the officers sufficient heads to fill up in the forms?—The more one sees of these cases the less does it seem that they can be classified. What you want is a little description of each case, and then when you get your little description you can classify those descriptions.

5438. You think it must be done systematically by voluntary people, not by official people?—I do not say it could not be done by official people, but there are many small points which make a difference in your general conclusion and those must come in; and you cannot make tables enough for them.

5439. We find that parents are very willing to send their children to the special classes when once they see their advantage, and that really enforcing their attendance by Act of Parliament is scarcely necessary?—I think it will be far better to work with the goodwill of the parents, but hereafter it may be necessary to do something in the other direction.

5440. It would be impossible to enforce attendance up to 16 in the case of a slightly feeble-minded child, whose wages might be of great assistance to the parents?—I think it would be very difficult.

5441. On the other hand, if the child was very defective, the parents would probably be very glad to let him remain longer if the school board had the

Mr. C. S. Loch.
19 Mar. 1897.

power to keep him?—Yes, I think very likely the parents would feel one way or the other about that, according to their degree of contentment with the way in which the child was being treated—their belief that he was getting on at school, and so on.

5442. In fact, a hard and fast rule for enforcing compulsory attendance in the case of children of all degrees of feebleness of mind would not act at all?—No.

5443. You have spoken of sending some children to institutions, but, as you know, there are scarcely any institutions to send them to?—That is no doubt a great difficulty.

5444. But do you think such institutions would spring up if grants were made by the State, and power were given to the school authorities to aid from the rates?—My theory about it is this: that the school authorities might have power to send children under all necessary safeguards to institutions, but I should leave those institutions in the hands of charitable people, subject to inspection. I should not assist them except by payment upon the case.

5445. Take the case of blind and deaf children. The School Board for London has bought the large institution at Norwood and set up an institution for blind children. Would you object to such an institution as that for these defective children?—Entirely.

5446. Would you say that the children must be sent to voluntary homes under voluntary care?—Yes, this particular class that we are referring to. I am not referring to imbeciles.

5447. You would not object to the institutions having grants from the local authorities for their support or to their having aid from the State?—I should prefer that the grants were distinctly made as for the maintenance and education of a particular child.

5448. That is the case with regard to the blind and deaf at present?—Yes, only I understand under the Act of 1893 you have larger powers.

5449. The authorities have power to erect such institutions as well as to aid in the maintenance of children at such institutions?—Yes, I am rather against that latter power as unnecessary at the present stage. I do not think we understand the problem well enough to go so far.

5450. A great many school boards have separate classes for the deaf, though very few have separate classes for the blind, because, I suppose, of the smaller number of blind children?—Yes.

5451. I cannot say that those that are set up by the school authorities themselves are always satisfactory. As to admissions to institutions for imbeciles, is it within your knowledge that certain children go to asylums for idiots who are not really either imbeciles or idiots?—I cannot say that that is within my own knowledge. I have heard so.

5452. But there is no other refuge for these feeble-minded children at present?—No. The truth is that there is a definite want of institutions for this class. It may not be that many should go, but some might.

5453. But you recommend institutions for the lowest class of the feeble-minded?—Distinctly.

5454. And homes for all who can be brought under a fair degree of control, or who can in some measure control themselves?—Yes. I think with regard to the idiots and imbeciles, the provision ought to be much larger and completer.

5455. The three proposals you make as to legislation are that the school age should be up to 16, a rather wider power of dealing with children, either by sending them to institutions, or providing classes for them, and that half the total extra cost of the child's education should be paid for by the State?—The last point is a mere suggestion.

5456. In the case of the blind and deaf two-thirds of the cost is defrayed from public sources?—Yes; perhaps that would be better.

5457. With regard to epileptics all the evidence we have had hitherto seems to show that if there are slight attacks of epilepsy they may be treated in the ordinary schools, but if the fits are likely to be injurious to other children, or to the afflicted children, there is no other alternative but to send them to some institution?—Yes, but it seems to me most important that if we are to have institutions they should be on the colony plan and not on the ordinary building plan. I went to Bielefeld, and I have taken a great interest in the Society for the Employment of Epileptics, and I cannot help thinking that with a little care and with the approval of the school board and other authorities the system might be so extended that every county or group of counties should have its proper institution, and that the class you have last referred to might have their education there.

5458. In no case should any epileptic child go to the special classes?—No. I should rather treat them from the other point of view.

5459. They should either go to an ordinary school, or to a home, or a colony?—Yes. At the same time one must allow a margin for combinations of infirmities which often affect this epileptic class as well as others. We have noticed that constantly.

5460. The witnesses appear to agree that if a child is suffering from two natural defects, epilepsy and blindness, for example, in all cases the epilepsy must be first considered?—I think that is so. Your blind institutions will not take epileptics as a rule knowingly.

5461. I have found they are generally very glad to get rid of them?—Quite so.

5462. (*Mr. Pooley.*) You said you advised small classes in London; I understand that you mean a small number of children under one teacher?—Yes, under one teacher, or two; one and an assistant.

5463. I think you did not mean that the number of children at one centre must necessarily be small?—No, I think that depends entirely upon distances.

5464. Do you think if you could get 150 children, or 160 children, within reach of a large centre the work could be better organised than in a small one divided up?—Yes, that is so; but I must say that my judgment would tend towards having a small centre, because then I think that possibly the many smaller difficulties of this work might be attended to more thoroughly. Yet I cannot speak as an expert on that point.

5465. But you can see that with a fairly large centre the organisation would be easier if you had different children of different capacities?—Oh, entirely.

5466. As to the establishment of institutions by school authorities, you think it would be objectionable to provide for defective children by institutions such as Norwood. Is that mainly on the ground that you would not collect a large number of children together in the institution?—Yes, I certainly would not, particularly of this class.

5467. Would you see any objection to school authorities having power to board out children or to place them in homes near a special day class?—Not if you have a very trusty local boarding-out committee. But I think if the children are bad enough to go away from home, they will often want the care of a small institution; still it may be that you would have to arrange for boarding out so as to bring the children within reach of your classes. This may affect the country more than the town. Then possibly some arrangements such as you have mentioned would do; but in the main it seems to me it is either home work or very careful work in an institution; and, as far as possible, one would keep the children at home.

5468. Then in rural districts, where you may find here and there a very defective child who cannot be put with ordinary children, although he is not an absolute imbecile, would you see any objection to power being given to school authorities to collect a few of such children together, either with foster-parents or in a small home, and provide for their instruction in connexion with that?—No, I think you would have to do that. I should myself prefer that it should be a home managed by charitable people and supported in the manner I have indicated.

5469. If the only thing that school boards could do was to send these children to charitable institutions, would not there be a danger that no such institutions would exist or would be likely to be founded?—My impression is that, if the authorities are ready to take those steps, the institutions will come into existence. I think the interest in the work will grow; and the fear in work of this kind is lest the systematic or institutional element in it should be extended in a greater ratio than the real interest in it developed itself or than the ability to deal with the problem can be fostered.

5470. I think you would not go so far as to object to power being given to school authorities in their discretion either to board out defective children or to send them to small homes?—I should give them the power; yes.

5471. (*Miss Townsend.*) This 7 per 1,000 which you have mentioned refers to children between 3 and 13?—Yes.

5472. Of children between 8 and 13 there would be a smaller proportion?—Yes.

5473. Would you be in favour of dealing with neglected children (children whose feeble-mindedness is largely owing to neglect) apart from their parents? I mean would you give the school board authorities power to remove them from their parents?—Personally I should prefer dealing with those cases in the kind of way I have indicated, through the local association of charitable people.

5474. You mean that a good manager attached to a special class would investigate the child's home circumstances, and try to improve them?—Yes, or, if it is really a case for a home, charitable people should intervene and arrange for it. I think it would be difficult to make rules by which that class were definitely legislated for.

5475. Would you like each case to be dealt with on its own merits by charitable people, if possible?—Yes, and with no public recognition of them as a class.

5476. Suppose there were power to place these children in homes, you would be in favour of making the parents contribute as much as they could to their maintenance?—Yes, I should adhere to that.

5477. What sort of provision would you make for the children that have been tried in special classes, and found to be too deficient for them, but still not idiots?—You are speaking, I understand, still of children under 16?

5478. Yes?—It is just there, I think, that we are badly off. I think we must have before long some special arrangements for these children. I should like to try them in various ways. It seems to me that we might send some of them to homes in the country, where, under, new conditions, you might find that new powers were developed. This is the most tentative and difficult work; but it certainly should be undertaken.

5479. Then you would not make a hard and fast line in dealing with that class?—No, of course, you might find that some would require supervision and attention later than other children, and it ought to be so arranged, I think, that a girl, when she reaches the age of 16, should be able to stay on, and that I think is the great advantage of dealing with a voluntary home. Such a home could keep the child, or the child might be transferred somewhere else. The whole arrangement need not come to an end when the school term came to an end.

5480. Of course, that is the great drawback to fixing 16. Very often they are just beginning to develop at 16, but yet you cannot expect the school authorities to keep them on indefinitely. So that you would have the older children in homes or institutions under the care of voluntary if not charitable agencies?—I should; yes.

5481. It occasionally happens that children of 13, 14, 15, or 16, who have not been sent to school because of their deficiency, get into these special classes, and they are rather a difficult factor. Do you think you would still keep them at home or send them to homes?—That is one of the reasons why I argue for what I call a small class. It seems to me that those children should be tried first of all almost individually from the point of view of their education, and then the case would have to be reconsidered, say, in half a year or a year, and the question would possibly arise as to their going to a home. Possibly on the other hand it might be found best that they should just learn what they can for the present and remain at home.

5482. Very often you will see a couple of big boys of 15 or so sitting at the back of the class doing practically nothing,—sent there to be out of mischief, but still are doing no good. Would you like to send those boys to homes?—I should have liked to have dealt with those boys earlier if possible.

5483. Do you know anything of the so-called educable children at Darenth?—No, I do not.

5484. You do not know whether it would be advisable to take them away from Darenth?—No, I could not speak with any authority about a point of that sort.

Mr. C. S. Loch
19 Mar. 1897.

5485. (*Mr. Burgwin.*) Who fills up form A.?—That is filled up by the person sending the case. It might be a local visitor, or it might be a school manager; but in any case we try to get some one who knows the child well to fill it up, and it is generally filled up in consultation with the mother, or whoever it may be that has the care of the child, after consideration.

5486. My experience is that parents will rarely tell you the truth when the answer to the question would be against their family history?—The idea is that in a form like that the information really has been obtained independently of any form. The person already knows the case, and is jotting down what he has picked up.

5487. This is in no sense the statement of the parent?—Not in the least.

5488. This is built up by experience of the case, which is by far the best way?—Yes; that is the idea of it.

5489. I think you know that there are many children who have escaped the School Board Act?—Yes.

5490. Are many of them, would you think, feeble-minded children?—I should think that many of them, in the broad sense of the word, were defective, with tendencies which, to use the ordinary phrase, are rather anti-social, with physical infirmities of some kind, that make lessons and regularity a trouble.

5491. You have experience of what we may call moral deficiency in children?—Yes.

5492. For instance, I have in my mind now a girl 12 years old, who seems incapable of learning the three R's, but she is a most expert thief, and she reasons, and she seems to act in the most logical way in stealing. Would you class that child as a feeble-minded child?—Personally I should class that child as a feeble-minded child of a type, and deal with it from the feeble-minded side, and not from the criminal side.

5493. You would really deal with that child by special training?—I should, as early as possible, at say, the infant school period.

5494. With regard to occupations for boys, could you give me any idea as to how best to employ boys, say over 12?—In London you mean?

5495. Yes?—In school hours?

5496. Yes; or could you suggest how their time could be most profitably spent?—You mean boys of this class?

5497. Yes?—Do you mean boys who can be taken a little distance, or boys that have to be dealt with in a classroom?

5498. I will not draw the line in regard to that now?—If a boy can be given any kind of physical exercise, that, I think, is good for him. Anything of that kind that the doctor said would not be amiss for him would, I think, be of enormous importance. Simple physical exercise of some sort is what I should begin with, believing that in that way you would strengthen other abilities as the physical frame was strengthened.

5499. Would you in the country suggest that a boy should be employed gardening for half the day?—Only if the gardening was regular, and not play work. It must be real work.

5500. What one feels is a wish to train these boys to get their living. That has always been the object of one's work, and if they cannot be taught reading is it not waste of time to try and make them read?—I think you will find, as is natural, that there is a certain class whom you cannot do very much with. They may be educated up to a point; they may be educated to do a few things tolerably well, but they will not be able to read. They may probably in those cases be never able to do more than take part in a kind of institutional life later on. They will gravitate to some place; the community will have to keep them.

5501. When would you begin the custodial life?—My impression about that is this, that the only way to judge is by what I have called the periodical examination of the child, and supposing a child is leaving the infant school, I should be inclined to let it go to a special class, and see what comes of that—test it from time to time, and if eventually it is shown that the education is doing the child no good (that though it is not an imbecile, yet it tends so much to become one that it would be absurd to try to make it learn its primer and so on), then I should be inclined to accept that position, and let it be sent to an institution, but an institution in

Mr. C. S. Loch.

19 Mar. 1897.

the country, which was really what might be termed a school and "colony"—differently managed from an asylum.

5502. That is to say we now require an intermediate school or institution?—I think so.

5503. Do you agree that many of these children will require life-long guardianship?—I should imagine that a material proportion would. I should imagine that under any circumstances many of them would require that. Either they would live with their own people in a haphazard kind of way, or else they would drift into the workhouse or infirmary.

5504. And you would object to these children living in this haphazard way, would you not?—I should. If the community can provide something better, well and good; but I think we do not really know quite sufficiently what we can do with them. It must be remembered that we have not one single institution available for experiment. We can judge only from the fringe of cases in the asylums for imbeciles.

5505. I think you were very emphatic that homes or institutions for this class of children should be in the hands of voluntary associations?—Yes.

5506. Will you tell us why?—I think that plan admits of much more adaptibility. Take the very point that was mentioned as to the child staying beyond the age of 16, a voluntary institution would be much more elastic. Then again, I think that the homes should be small homes and managed with a certain strictness, but with very great personal devotion; and I think that what happens is this, that the people who care a great deal for work of this kind, when they find an opportunity afforded them, gravitate to it, and they are the people who really do the work well. The fear about an institution is that you may get a very good method and yet lack a good matron, and then the institution might just as well not exist. So I am rather for allowing these institutions to grow up where the interest of the people in them is such as to guarantee that, on the whole, they will turn out well and have the right spirit. I think you get that on voluntary lines.

5507. And the voluntary home is to be supported by State aid?—Yes. As to that, I was really judging by the analogy of the Poor Law, under which a proportion of the cost of maintaining children in institutions is provided by the State; and I thought that that might be a fair arrangement to make, particularly as we are in a tentative stage.

5508. What control over the institution would the State have in return for its payment?—The home should be visited by whatever authority sends the child, and besides that, there should be some central inspection.

5509. You think that would be sufficient guarantee to the State?—I think it would.

5510. (*Mr. Newton.*) Would you raise the age of attendance of defective children?—Yes, I think to 16, as in the case with the blind and deaf and dumb, but I think also the custody of the child would very likely have to be extended beyond that age.

5511. Would you allow a defective child to go to work as soon as it was able to obtain work—say, at the age of 14?—That has to be settled, I think, in regard to the special conditions, but I should not like to have a rule laid down by which a child was prevented under all conditions from going to work.

5512. Do you think we could define a defective child as a child who is unable to obtain work?—I do not think you could. I think you would have to define it really as a child which required special care and education, leaving to those who are in authority the power of dispensing with further attendance in school, if in the interest of the child they think that it is desirable.

5513. Do you think such a definition as that "a child "requiring special care and education" could be maintained in a court of law?—No, I think the only way in which the matter could be dealt with from that standpoint would be a certificate which would be accepted as a doctor's certificate *ad hoc*. I have tried to arrive at a conclusion on this point, and it has seemed to me that practically the acceptance of a doctor's certificate, drawn in accordance with certain specified conditions, would be the sole means of enforcement, and yet I admit that it is imperfect in many ways.

5514. You would then establish a special medical officer whose certificate would overrule that of any other doctor?—I thought of establishing a special medical certificate which would be accepted, so to speak, as against others; and as to the doctor, I thought that it might be that the whole of the arrangements should be in the hands of the official doctor, but that certificates (provided there are safeguards, such as I think you might desire) might also be accepted from other medical men.

5515. But there is this difficulty, that it is always possible to get a medical certificate for almost anything, and parents who wanted to keep the child away from school could obtain such a certificate which would be produced in a court of justice in opposition to that of the medical officer. How would you meet that case?—I think your point is good. It would be well to have the check of the officer present, and unless the cases are out of the way numerous, it might be possible.

5516. The only definition I can think of is the labour one, and at the same time that seems to me to be very unsatisfactory?—It seems to me too wide.

5517. Have guardians power to make grants towards the maintenance and education of defective children whose parents are not paupers?—No, strictly speaking, not.

5518. (*Dr. Smith.*) As a matter of fact, they do make such contributions?—I think it is very likely they do; yes.

5519. For instance, in London, what can you do with imbeciles?—The imbecile goes to Darenth.

5520. Darenth is a poor law institution, is it not?—It is.

5521. And the only mode of admission to Darenth is through a board of guardians?—Yes.

5522. But the board of guardians would, if possible, get some subscriptions from the parent of the child?—Yes.

5523. So that parents do contribute something?—I doubt whether it would come to very much, but I could not speak definitely as to that.

5524. I also doubt whether it amounts to much, but they have the power?—They do it in certain instances; yes.

5525. This question of imbeciles in London going to institutions is a very important one. Do you suggest any alteration in the mode of admission to Darenth of imbeciles?—What occurred to me was this, that the school board authorities might send direct to an institution of that kind, either the existing one or another enlarged Darenth, so to speak.

5526. Do you think it would be an improvement for the school board, for instance, to send an imbecile direct to an institution such as Darenth without using the poor law machinery?—Yes, I think it would. I see no objection to that.

5527. What is the object of the examinations that you have at the 21 centres that you have mentioned?—The object really is, to advise people who are trying to help these children what to do.

5528. It is simply an invitation to come and seek advice relative to these defective children?—Yes. You see these people apply for relief; very often they are distressed. At any rate they have come under the notice of some of the local workers, and then they are rather in a dilemma as to what is best to be done, and by these means they get guidance as to what they should try.

5529. And the guidance emanates from your society?—Not exactly; we are very glad that anybody should attend these consultations, though they are not members of our society.

5530. The advice is given on the authority of your society?—It is really given on the authority of the medical man.

5531. The society acts on the doctor's advice?—You see there is a space for the report at the bottom of the form.

5532. I see at the bottom there is a heading, "opinion and recommendation as to the case." That is filled in by the medical officer?—Yes, that is what would be told to the person who is interested.

5533. You do not go further than that?—No, we do not go further than that. The person who is interested would very often be in attendance and so could ask any questions. That is what it comes to.

5534. Do you say you have a number of charitable agencies of this kind all over London?—We have committees all over London, 39 of them, and then they form centres to a large extent for all kinds of work, and persons who are working in the locality bring these cases to us or otherwise co-operate with us.

5535. And are these committees in touch with the 30 centres of the London School Board?—Much more so in some instances than in others. It depends entirely upon the managers. Sometimes there is a good deal done in communication; sometimes next to nothing.

5536. Do not you think it would be a wise plan if there were some agency in direct touch with those centres?—Yes, it would be most useful. What I have urged is that the schools should be treated in groups; that there should be an almoner attached to a group—a person who is trained and knows this and other kinds of work which refer to the children, including the questions now under discussion; there might be some kind of co-operation between the school authorities and our people through an almoner, or with the committee if it was desired.

5537. Judging by my own experience, more than 50 per cent. of the children would be benefited by some charitable aid of this sort?—I think it is quite likely.

5538. Of course the school board can only give education?—The school board, as a school board, can only give education. But even education cannot be what it should be unless other things are done.

5539. That is exactly what I feel, and therefore I ask again, would it not be a very prudent course indeed to have, in direct touch with these centres, charitable agencies such as those you have referred to?—Yes, I think so.

5540. You have spoken about cripples. What is your definition of a cripple, I mean in the sense in which you have been speaking of them to-day. Do you mean a child who is crippled, without any mental defect, or associated with a backwardness mentally?—Primarily, I mean without mental defect.

5541. Have you any view about dealing with cripples without mental defects in schools at all?—Yes, I should like very much to have an experiment tried for extending the plan of teaching them where it is necessary at home voluntarily, and to have them reported on carefully, and I think also that more might be done possibly in taking them to school, that is to say, in providing the means of locomotion. But there again I should prefer that this should be done voluntarily by the kind of association that we have just referred to as between the school authorities and the local charitable people.

5542. There has never been any objection urged on the part of the school authorities to this voluntary assistance, has there?—No, but I do not think it has been much encouraged. It has not been organised in any sense from the other side.

5543. From which side do you mean?—From the school side.

5544. They have not organised it?—No, I do not think much has been done except by managers independently.

5545. I think as a board they have not done anything?—No.

5546. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) I have not got the words of your definition, but I think it would almost include some imbeciles as well as feeble-minded children, would it not?—Yes, I think it would. This was the wording, "that feebleness of mind which, being congenital or "originating in infancy or childhood, may be checked "or alleviated by special care and education."

5547. I had reference to the feeling that the managers of idiot asylums have, that they do both care for and educate defective children. We want rather to draw the line between children who ought not to go to these institutions, and children who should; that is to say, children who can be taken care of and taught either in special centres or in connexion with their own homes?—Yes.

5548. Can you help us at all to frame any definition?—No, I am afraid I cannot. I do not think that the limits are sufficiently understood by us intellectually to be able to frame a definition.

Mr. C. S. Loch.

19 Mar. 1897.

5549. It is a matter really that requires individual consideration in each case?—That is my view.

5550. And by persons skilled in the matter?—Yes, the lowest degree of imbecility might be treated, I suppose, in some institution, and in some instances outside the institution. It would depend upon one or two conditions altogether outside the definition.

5551. It would depend somewhat upon the home circumstances of the child?—Yes, quite so.

5552. Is it your opinion that if home circumstances and other circumstances are favourable it is better that a child shall be treated outside an institution than in it?—If the home circumstances are favourable, I should do all I can to work in accord with them in the home.

5553. You think it is a disadvantage that a child should become an institution-branded being belonging to an isolated community?—I think if the home circumstances are favourable and the child is taken from the home, there should be helps and arrangements by which the home link is kept up. I believe educationally that would be the right thing.

5554. So that the parent should still continue the full responsibility for the child?—Yes. It may be that the child will eventually return to him, and it ought not to feel as if the parent had been, as it were, out in India all the time.

5555. With regard to the matter of statistics, and the 7 per 1,000 which you mentioned, I was turning to the table in this book, which I suppose is the one you referred to, or corresponds to it?—That book which you have there is of a later date.

5556. I see in arriving at the figures here there are a large number of crippled and paralysed cases which contribute to make up the number that appear to require special care on the ground of physical or mental defect?—That is so, I think.

5557. In the examinations which are made for the Charity Organisation Society by Dr. Warner, I see the consideration of the mental condition of the child does come into the schedule?—Yes, I believe it does.

5558. I understand from Dr. Warner's evidence that he thought it was rather the *rôle* of the doctors to look at the child from the physical side, and get information as to the mental side from the parent or teacher; but I think in his conclusion on this schedule he does take into account defects in mental power?—Yes, he does, but he does not do that necessarily or solely from his own examination.

5559. He confirms the information given him by others, I suppose?—Quite so.

5560. The objection has been taken that those examinations are sometimes made too much from the physical side, and that the visual signs are too much relied upon, but I am glad to see that this form contains particulars also as to mental power?—Yes.

5561. Do you happen to know about how long the examination of a child takes at one of these consultations that you have referred to?—About a quarter of an hour.

5562. The whole thing is gone through in that time?—Generally. We arrange to have no more children there than will occupy the afternoon taking a quarter of an hour to be given to a child.

5563. At present Dr. Warner is the only medical man who advises you?—Yes, that is so at present. Of course, as you see this has not gone on very long at present. We have had 21 of these consultations. It has gone on for about 18 months, I suppose.

5564. Do you happen to know how many children have been examined in all?—I could let you know precisely, but I think it is about 300 or 350. I do not suppose it is more than that, and probably it may be rather less.

5565. What conclusions have been arrived at as to the cases?—We have not worked those out. All these forms are being kept and we hope eventually to use them. Dr. Warner has them in his hands, but we have not yet made any analysis. I think that must be the next step.

5566. I suppose, speaking generally, some would be recommended to be sent to special classes for education?—Certainly.

Mr. C. S. Loch. 19 Mar. 1897

5567. Some to an idiot asylum?—Certainly. That case which is mentioned there is from a note which I received; it was not taken from the forms.

5568. This is the result of one afternoon's examination?—Yes, it was simply a note I had written to me about it.

5569. (*The Chairman.*) We have been told as regards cripples that it is better not to put them in a special class if possible—that they should go to a school for ordinary children. Would you give the parents the choice as to which they should send them to, whether to the special school or to a school for ordinary children? No, but I should have thought the doctor being consulted, it should be settled by his opinion. Of course there may be cripples with considerable mental defect of some kind, and then I think certainly the child should be sent to a special class.

5570. But do you think it is a good thing for cripples who have a good degree of mental ability, and who would generally rise to the top of the special class, to be classified with the feeble-minded children?—No, I should think not. I should send the cripple into the ordinary school unless he is mentally defective.

5571. Would it be wise to give a local authority the power to set up an institution for more than 20 or 25?—I would rather that the local authorities were not empowered to set up institutions but to utilize them.

5572. But if they had power to set up such institutions you would limit them to that number?—I should—at any rate with one's present knowledge.

5573. You spoke of the value of the contributions of parents; but we had it in evidence that in the case of the blind and deaf it amounted to 1s. a head. Is it worth while to exact any contribution at all? I know it is contrary to the principles of your society; but if we can by any means bring the children out of their homes more easily without contribution, would it not be better to have no contributions from the parents in these cases?—I do not suppose that the contribution which they are asked to pay is any check at the present moment, and I think it is rather a farce to have a law like that and not enforce it. As long as the collecting authority is so entirely unable to cope with the work of collecting from the parents, I think no progress can be made in that direction at all, and that observation refers to reformatories, industrial schools, and other places.

5574. Of course the responsibility of the parent ought to be maintained, if possible; but does not the attempt to do so militate against the children being properly treated?—No, I do not think so. I think this could be done and done well, if the work was localised sufficiently. It is really local work. You cannot get payments made unless they are paid weekly. I think that the call for the money by a person who cared for the child would be good all round; but, on the scale on which things are managed at the present, it is out of the question. This work can only be done satisfactorily as local work.

5575. The expense of collection is more than the value of the contribution?—It is, as at present managed, more than the value of the contribution, but a collection properly done would be, educationally, I think worth a very great deal. The difficulty of the position is this, that we neglect a great deal of useful detail in order to get a point carried, such as the general education of children in London, but I think we suffer terribly for it in the end.

5576. You mean for not driving home parental responsibility?—Quite so; since, if we lose that element in our life our education is to a great extent working in the air.

5577. You spoke, I think, of boarding out for these children; but you know how unsafe boarding out may be for even ordinary workhouse children; would it not be still more unsafe for this class of children who require special care?—I said, I think, that boarding out should be permitted, but at the same time I think your boarding out committee ought to be extremely careful in cases of this kind. We do not quite know what we are dealing with in these cases, but at the same time one does not like to say that there are no instances in which the child would not be dealt with most suitably by boarding out.

5578. The boarding out committee should in those cases be a very special one?—I think so, yes. The people who take charge of it should care particularly for this work, and should be definitely organised for it, and the connection between them and the people who are interested in the child should be very strong.

5579. Should not the committee include a medical officer among their members?—I think so. I think it would be good to have a medical opinion. At any rate that ought to be always available. But what I really think is most useful is such a knowledge of the child as will enable the visitor to know how it is developing. If, for instance, it was boarded out, it would be very important that the child should be visited every week or every fortnight, so that there should be a thoroughly good understanding between the visitor and the person who has charge of the child, and any little thing that occurs may be told the visitor at once.

5580. Does it not practically come to this that there are only two classes of children to be dealt with—those who come from bad homes who ought to be removed from their homes to institutions, and perhaps also a few feeble-minded who come from really good homes. But those who live in good homes, should attend special classes if possible, within reach of their homes?—Yes, subject to periodical supervision and a constant consideration of whether something else should not be done. I take it that the position should be that of a parent of the middle class who has a child that she has to consider carefully. Whether in a home or in a colony the teachers should take the place of the parent, or should co-operate with the parent. With regard to the class of cases that are in bad homes, I really do not think we know enough about them. We do not know what their proportion is. Of the few cases dealt with on the afternoon I have referred to, there was one out of 12 in which we clearly could not trust the mother, but the difficulty even there might be met, I think, possibly in a different way.

5581. Of course in a bad home the child is liable to danger?—It may be.

5582. Where it is not properly looked after it may be, and that would be another reason for removing it from the home if possible?—Yes.

5583. (*Mr. Pooley.*) I want to ask you one question about Darenth. When you said you did not see any objection to the school authority being empowered to send London children direct to Darenth, I think you were thinking of the idiots and imbeciles who go there now?—I was.

5584. You do not mean to suggest that the class of children taken in at Darenth should be extended at all?—Not by any means.

5585. Of course the question of idiocy and imbecility is not immediately before our Committee?—No, only such cases are found in the examination of defective children.

5586. Do you think it is desirable that the school authority should have anything to do with idiots and imbeciles?—The London position, it seems to me, is entirely anomalous. I have always thought that. The Lunacy Commission is in charge of idiots and imbeciles, and if we had no asylums board here, not a poor law authority, but the borough or county would naturally provide these asylums, subject to inspection by the Commission. Now it seems to me it would be quite right for the school authorities as well as for the poor law authorities to make reports to whatever might be the proper body (the county council, possibly, as it would be elsewhere) with a view to their taking that class of child; and that is all I urge.

5587. That they should make representations to other authorities?—Yes.

5588. But you would scarcely go so far as to suggest that they should deal directly with imbeciles and idiots not educable?—No, not at all, but in London (and that is what I understood you referred to) we have the anomaly by which the Metropolitan Asylums Board is itself a poor law institution, and therefore the power of making a direct representation from a school authority to it seems to be absent here.

The witness withdrew.

Mr. VAN PRAAGH called in and examined.

Mr. Van Praagh. 19 Mar. 1897.

5589. (*Chairman.*) You are Principal of the Training College for Teachers of the Deaf and Dumb in Fitzroy Square?—Yes.

5590. How many years have you held that position?—Since the founding of the institution in 1870.

5591. And you are consulted almost daily by parents who bring their children to you to ascertain what the cause of their deficiencies is?—Yes. During the whole course of my professional life I have been constantly consulted by parents with a view of determining what really is the matter with children, whether they are deaf or idiotic, or backward, and therefore I may say that my daily experience has given me considerable knowledge in regard to this matter.

5592. It is, I suppose, more difficult in the case of deaf children to ascertain feeble-mindedness than in the case of ordinary children?—In congenital cases there is the same proportion of backward children that there is among hearing children. It is among those who suffer from acquired deafness that you get more feeble-minded children. Fits in early age, accidents, blows on the head, meningitis, &c., cause deafness and also feeble-mindedness.

5593. Is it your experience that as a rule deaf children do not develop until they are seven or eight years of age?—I would not go so far as that. The congenitally deaf child at the age of three or four is, as a rule, very bright, but it is naturally unfit for being taught. A deaf child is not fit to be taught before it is six or seven years of age, because the early stages of physical and intellectual development take a longer time with deaf children than with hearing children.

5594. Whereas a blind child exercises his hearing from the very first, the deaf do not exercise their sight in the same way?—Yes, they do, and they also exercise their sense of touch in the same way. A deaf child is much more sensitive to touch than a normal child. I am not in favour of teaching deaf children by means of gestures, but the infant deaf child develops a language by gestures entirely on its own account. A baby deaf child learns without being taught how to express its wants. If it is thirsty it will make a natural sign—a sign that nobody teaches it, but every deaf child has the same sign in common.

5595. Of course the sense of touch does not assist in developing the intelligence so much as the sense of sight?—No. The sense of touch is chiefly used as an aid to the acquisition of proper articulation.

5596. Have you in your own school had many cases of feeble-minded deaf children?—My school I regard simply as a practising school for the use of ladies and gentlemen who come there to be trained as teachers. It is simply my hospital to show all cases of deafness, and during the whole of my professional career, since the school has been opened, I have never refused a single case on account of its defects. I have children almost idiots—in fact I can show you one or two now if you like to come.

5597. I found it difficult to find any in your institution when I have been there?—I have one or two who have developed very well, but they were idiotic when we started with them. I think it my duty to show teachers who come there to receive their training all classes of deaf mutes. There is another reason why I admit all cases. When I first introduced the pure oral system it was said by people who did not believe in it that teachers who teach deaf children to speak simply pick their children—pick children with brilliant intelligence and with a small amount of hearing. I wanted to show that was a fallacy. It is not true. We take all kinds of cases. Of course the deaf child who is an absolute idiot ought not, in my opinion, to go to a school for the deaf, but it ought to go to a school for idiots.

5598. But you keep a few?—We keep a few, and we can do a great deal for them. In my opinion you can train a child weak in its intellect far better on the oral system than on any other system by using to its extreme the intuitive system of teaching language.

5599. What is the size of your classes, about 10 or 12, are they not?—No, I do not want as many as 12, 8 to 10.

5600. And for the more backward deaf children you would require smaller classes?—Yes. I should like to explain that a backward child in a class is a great drawback not only to the teacher, but also to the progress of the other pupils, and that I therefore should advise every teacher of the deaf who has a school of 80 or 100 children to separate all the backward ones into one special class, and give that special class a special teacher on the pure oral system. In Germany there has been some idea of having schools for special backward deaf children.

5601. Do you know of any institution of the kind that has been established?—I do not at the moment. I remember reading about one, but the idea, I think, has never been put into practice. But in the various journals and publications it has often been mooted by teachers of the deaf how very difficult it is to teach backward deaf children in the ordinary schools.

5602. In every institution for the deaf in England there is always a class of that sort which is generally taught upon the sign system, and not upon the oral system?—If my advice were asked, I should say those classes should be put on the oral system. Of course you cannot lay down hard and fast rules, and there might, perhaps, be a little writing in the case of a backward child, or a freer use of action—I do not call them signs.

5603. There are cases in which the children have neither sense of sight nor of hearing, and who have to be taught by the sense of touch entirely?—Yes.

5604. Have you had a case of that sort in your institution?—I have had two cases, but not quite blind; they belonged to poor people who could not afford to leave them sufficiently long, and we were obliged to send them home before they were perfectly trained.

5605. I have seen three cases where there was neither the sense of sight nor hearing, and the children could only be communicated with by the sense of touch, and in one case there were only 30 signs or means of communication possible between the child and other people. But, if children are not fairly forward as regards intelligence, you do not keep them in your school?—Yes, I keep them, unless they show by physical signs they are unfit to come to school.

5606. What physical signs do you mean—the shape of the head, for instance?—I have not expressed myself rightly. As long as the child is normal in its habits, has no objectionable features about it, is clean, and does not want nursing, we keep it.

5607. You would rather advocate that feeble-minded deaf children should be kept at home if you could have them taught in deaf schools. Some of your children are boarded out?—They all are.

5608. And would you advocate that feeble-minded deaf children should be kept at home and taught in deaf schools?—Yes, if they are able to go about and do not want nurses or special care.

5609. Are any of your children sent by the poor law authorities?—Yes, we have a few sent by the parish and school authorities. But you would not recognise them; you could not pick them out from those who come from good homes. We board them out under the auspices of a boarding-out committee of which I am the honorary secretary.

5610. Do you know anything about teaching feeble-minded children at their homes by means of missionaries or circulating teachers?—No.

5611. There are such societies in the north of England; I thought, perhaps, you might have heard of them in the south?—No, I have not. There are various schools on the continent for feeble-minded hearing children of which I will give you some particulars by-and-by, if you wish it.

5612. What is the utmost point of intellectual progress that feeble-minded children reach with you compared with the standards in ordinary schools?—I am afraid that is a very difficult question to answer with certainty. You see, it depends upon the child's intelligence. The process is a very slow one; one is obliged to be very careful. I am afraid you could not arrange them in standards at all.

(*Chairman.*) You endeavour to develop the senses chiefly.

5613. (*Mr. Pooley.*) I believe all your children attend as day scholars, and are boarded out?—Yes.

5614. Some of these children are not only deaf, but are somewhat feeble-minded?—It occurs occasionally that we have deaf children who are also feeble-minded.

Mr. Van Praagh.

19 Mar. 1897.

5615. Do you think it is easy to secure foster parents who will give sufficient attention and sufficient sympathy to these deaf children?—I may tell you that during the time that my college has been established I have never had the slightest difficulty as regards foster parents. Certainly I have been signally fortunate. I have had the assistance of many kind ladies in the neighbourhood who have always ferreted out for me, if I may use the expression, very nice homes where the children have always been treated with the greatest kindness, and I may tell you that the foster parents, as a rule, become quite as fond of the children as actual parents, and I have witnessed scenes of the greatest distress when the time has come when the children and their foster parents must part.

5616. Do you think it would be easy to find the same sort of foster parents for feeble-minded children—not, of course, absolutely idiots?—I was going to say it would not be difficult if the feeble-minded child is of cleanly habits, and does not want a great deal of special attention. But if a child requires special nursing, special doctor's care night and day, or is subject to fits and so on, then I should say it ought certainly to be retained in a home.

5617. But feeble-minded children, who are healthy and clean, should be boarded out as well as hearing children?—Yes.

5618. Do you think it is necessary that the foster parent should be very often visited by the boarding-out committee, or some members of it, to see that everything is going on right?—Before we had our boarding-out committee appointed by the department the teachers on the staff of my practising school used to make it a habit to go and see the parents occasionally. Now of course we have a committee of ladies and gentlemen and they visit the homes once a month. I think that is the regulation prescribed by the department.

5619. Do you think that is sufficient?—Quite so.

5620. Some of your boarding-out homes are at Highgate?—Yes, some distance off. I prefer that.

5621. How do they manage to get backwards and forwards?—Some of the children walk one way every day. A little physical exercise is very good for them.

5622. Do they walk alone?—No, they are always accompanied by some responsible person. On the other hand, if it is raining it is an easy and cheap journey by train, by tram, or bus. When old enough they are allowed to go by themselves.

5623. Who pays for the guides and for the railway expenses in the case of children sent by guardians?—Up to now I have always been able with little management to arrange for one of my teachers living in the neighbourhood to take charge of some of these young children. They do that of their own free will and from love of the work. In the case of feeble-minded children, as well as in the case of deaf children, every teacher acquires a certain amount of enthusiasm and love for his work, and a great deal of work is done for which no pay is asked. Some of the children are sent by servants of the house, but it is always easy to arrange it in some way. It is perhaps more difficult to explain to you how it is done than to do it.

5624. From your experience can you say whether in a country town there is likely to be a difficulty in finding fit foster parents for defective children?—As regards the question of finding foster parents for defective children in the country, I should be very sorry to give you an opinion on a matter where I have had no experience; but I should think that in a country town it would be almost easier to find homes for the children than in London.

5625. Have you any strong objection to sending deaf children to large institutions?—I should certainly have the strongest objection possible to sending deaf children to institutions where more than 100 were taken.

5626. You put 100 as a limit?—I do.

5627. Have you any information with regard to institutions for feeble-minded children who are not deaf?—I have not any information as to schools for feeble-minded children except of those I have visited under the guidance of my own friends. Some years ago I had experience of a school at the Hague—a school specially opened and intended for feeble-minded children. I have not visited that school for a good many years, and I wrote to the authorities to send me the last reports for the benefit of this Committee, and if you desire that I could give you any information about the school at the Hague I can do so. In connection with the institution there is a day school under the management of both medical and educational authorities. As far as I can see from this report the medical officer is in residence or lives very near the school. There is a matron, and there is a department for education only. Feeble-minded hearing children who are not subject to any fits or epilepsy, or who are able to walk about like ordinary children, are received.

5628. Are the inmates of the institution adults as well as children?—No, they do not admit pupils over 18 years old. Then children who are suffering from various illnesses, such as are here mentioned in the report, are retained as boarders. You see, therefore, it is a semi-boarding school and a semi-day school. Children who are received in the Hague either live with their parents, or are boarded out in families living in the town—the same plan which I have adopted for deaf children in England. It would, perhaps, be too tedious to go through the whole of this report with a Committee as large as yours, but I will with pleasure do so with one of you, and give a verbatim translation of the rules of the establishment, and so on.

5629. That will be scarcely necessary. This is essentially an institution for feeble-minded——?—It is headed "Report of the medical institution for idiots of minor "age at the Hague." There is a resident director and his wife, who acts as matron. There is a doctor on the premises. Then there is a school, with a proper staff of teachers, teachers of gymnastics, and a teacher of manual instruction. On the 1st of January 1895, there were 85 pupils: 43 of these children were boarded in the institution, and 42 attended the day school. In the course of the year, 24 pupils have been placed. That means they have left the school and gone to some place for employment. 21 have left the school. On the 31st December 1895 the school had 43 boarders and 45 day pupils. Then it proceeds, "six boys and "five girls have left us," and then it gives particulars about the children who have left. A. A. came into the institution in 1885, seven years old. Two years afterwards, when no boarding expenses could be found, his boarding out was continued at the expense of the province or district in which he lived. When he was 16 years old he was very fairly developed, and it was not necessary that he should remain in the institution. Thanks to the assistance of the correspondent at Rotterdam, he was placed with a man who taught him bookbinding. He lived with his parents, who were too poor to provide for the boy. It was very necessary that the boy should receive some pay for his labours, and bring it home. In order to get that aid he endeavoured to find another master, and he succeeded.

5630. (*Chairman.*) Have you other cases?—Let me give you the next case. It is rather interesting, I think. W. F. H. came here on the 21st November 1887. Although very scrofulous is otherwise healthy, and very fairly developed. He takes walks daily, and during the summer he spends as much time as he possibly can at Scheveningen, a seaside place near the Hague. When he was 18 years old he left, and was taken care of by private individuals, where he had the opportunity of making himself acquainted with gardening and the cultivation of flowers. It was very difficult for this poor parentless boy to be entirely self-supporting. We, however, were obliged to send him away, assuring him that he was certain to find a home with other people where he would get very good accommodation.

5631. Were the assurances fulfilled?—I do not know. The account does not proceed.

5632. Can you find a case of a girl?—Yes. One of our girls, extremely poor, came to the institution from an orphan asylum at Utrecht in order to undergo surgical treatment. After a long stay they were obliged to give up the idea of the suggested operation, and the poor girl went back to her parents' home not much better. Two girls, L. K. and M. S., were only a short time with us. On account of the very critical state in which they were they could not follow the instruction. The doctor could not hold out any hope of improvement, and the parents wisely resolved to take them home.

5633. (*Mr. Pooley.*) Does the report given an account of the sort of education given to those who are educable?—There is a report of the educational part here; but I should strongly advise you, if you would like to see a very good school (for it is really thoroughly well managed) to go and pay a visit to that school; I cannot pretend that I know much about the working of it.

5634. It is some years since your visit?—A good many years.

5635. Is it 10 years?—More than that. Here are the particulars. In this school, at which they can remain until they are 18 years, are admitted those cases that through the abnormal conditions of their brain require a special home and special education, also those who are suffering from confusion of thought or vacancy. Then they give particulars as regards cost. The first class have to pay 600 guilders a year, that is equal to 50*l*. The second class have to pay 300 guilders, and the third 250. Then they say what the children have to bring with them who come as inmates, and it gives particulars which are really more of a local character than anything else. But this is the main thing: they admit children who are not able to be taught in ordinary schools with ordinary children, and when those children have the power to be developed, they are developed to such an extent that they are almost equal to children of normal brain power.

5636. (*Chairman.*) They reject a large number?—I think that if after repeated trials they find the case only fit they refer it for medical treatment to an institution for idiots. But in any case, as far as I can see, they do not retain pupils who are older than 18 years.

5637. There are 43 in the institution and 42 boarded out. Is it the better class who are boarded out?—That I could not tell you.

5638. (*Miss Townsend.*) You tell us with regard to your own experience that you have children of well-to-do parents, and children of poor parents, and children of all ranks?—Yes.

5639. Have you observed whether feeble-mindedness is more common among the deaf children of poorer parents?—I have not a sufficiently large number of feeble-minded children in my own school to give you anything like a proper answer to that question, but I should think the proportion is about the same.

5640. Do you ever find it difficult to discern at once if a child is deaf?—No.

5641. I knew a case of a girl who was three or four years in a deaf and dumb asylum, and was supposed to be deaf and was not deaf?—I may say such a case could not happen with me. May I ask whether there was an aural surgeon attending the children at the school you refer to, and were any certificates required before the children were admitted?

5642. That I cannot tell you. I can only tell you that it was a little girl who came for education to a home for feeble-minded girls that I had to do with. She had been supposed to be deaf and dumb, but we found she was neither deaf nor dumb. She now both hears and speaks, though it is still very difficult for her to make an effort to speak. I wanted to ask you whether feeble-mindedness ever took that particular form in your experience?—I have seen feeble-minded children where it was extremely difficult to know whether there was any amount of hearing or not.

5643. In such a case as that you treat the child from the feeble-minded point of view entirely?—I should start by treating the child as we start teaching a deaf child, in the first instance calling its attention to things and trying to make it articulate, and calling into greater action its powers of observation. Then gradually you find out whether the child hears or not.

5644. It is a very common condition of feeble-minded children that they have great difficulty in speaking?—Yes.

5645. And that fact and their backwardness makes them very often appear to be deaf; they take no notice?—Yes.

5646. And in such cases do you think the same kind of treatment is good for them as for a deaf mute?—Exactly the same, I should think.

5647. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) To what age do you keep pupils in your college?—We can only keep the children sent to us by school authorities till they are 16 years of age. But parents who can afford to pay for their own children can keep them there as long as they like.

5648. You do not attempt to classify your children by age, I suppose?—It is impossible in a school for the deaf, and I think it is impossible in a school for the feeble-minded.

5649. You mean the children vary very much in their attainments?—Yes, and there is this difficulty that we have to contend with—I am not now speaking about feeble-minded children. You can send a child to a school any day you like: I mean there are no special dates for admission and no regulations with regard to age. If you were to admit pupils twice a year, and admit only children of a specified age, it would be different; then you might keep children of the same ages in a class. But you cannot do that because you are obliged to take them as they come. That was particularly so before we had compulsory education. I had a case sent to me the other day of a poor girl of 21. The mother would not part with her before, and the doctor in the village did not know anything about oral instruction, and the mother was very anxious that the child should speak, but kept her at home until she was 21. I could not out of humanity's sake refuse to try to do my best for the girl, but I do not know what the result will be. She is perfectly intelligent.

Mr. Van Praagh.

19 Mar. 1897.

5650. Primarily, your college is for the training of teachers, is it not?—Yes.

5651. Can you tell us very briefly how you select your teachers, or would you accept any woman who offers herself?—We accept any women or any men who offer themselves if they can pass the qualifications of our college as regards a pass examination.

5652. Will you tell me what you mean by your pass examination?—I prefer taking a teacher who has already gone through the ordinary course of instruction at an ordinary training college, and who knows what teaching means. At the present moment, I am sorry to say, I have not been able to do so; but we select ladies and gentlemen who have received a high-class education, and they have to pass an examination before entering our college. At the present moment I have a very small number of students, because I have rejected some who, in my opinion, were not fit to be teachers of the deaf.

5653. Do you think that those who have been associated with deaf and dumb children, but who have not taught them generally, make good teachers or not?—I do not think there is much difference. It may make some difference when they teach by fingers or signs, because they get accustomed to the ways and manners of deaf children, but that is just the kind of thing that I should like to avoid. Very often a candidate says, "I can speak with my fingers very well," and thinks that is a certain kind of recommendation; but it is just the reverse.

5654. How long are the teachers trained?—The teachers ought to have not less than 18 months.

5655. What is the teaching they receive?—Firstly, they receive instruction in the physiology of sound—how to produce sound properly; how to teach deaf children to develop their voices—and then they get instruction in the intuitive methods of teaching language.

5656. They really, apart from this technical training, require to be good teachers?—First class teachers. In my opinion, teachers who devote themselves to the education of the feeble-minded want precisely the same training as teachers for the deaf.

5657. Could you give me an idea what training you would give to teachers for the feeble-minded—what would be the special subjects you would teach them?—In the first instance, I should teach them the most correct laws of pedagogy, and how to develop the child's powers, of sight and touch; calling forth the most minute observation of anything that they see, and carrying out the intuitive system of teaching in its most minute particulars.

5658. All that you have now stated the trained teacher already has?—It is not, of course, for me to ask questions, but perhaps I might ask, do you think that your ordinary trained teacher who comes out of a training college is fit, when he is going into a school for feeble-minded and deaf children, to exercise that patience and perseverance which is so required in the training of abnormal children? They surely do not acquire these qualifications in ordinary training colleges.

5659. But take the case of a specially selected woman, already trained as a teacher, do not they answer the purpose?—That may be the exception, but, unfortunately, I have not found it the rule. There are, of course, born teachers—for teachers are born, not made—but I am afraid it is most difficult to find suitable teachers for the deaf or for the feeble-minded.

Mr. Van Praagh.
19 Mar. 1897.

5660. (*Mr. Newton.*) I am right, am I not, in concluding from this report that in the Dutch school of which you spoke the staff consists of four men and four mistresses?—There is the head of the school; there are three masters besides and four ladies.

5661. That is very nearly one to every 10 scholars?—If the head works, but that is perhaps not the case.

5662. It would be one to twelve if he does not work?—One to twelve if he does not work.

5663. Can you say if that is generally supposed on the continent to be the right proportion for the teaching of feeble-minded children?—I should think so. I cannot give you an answer because I do not know.

5664. (*Dr. Smith.*) What do you rely upon with a deaf child as a sign of feeble-mindedness?—I was once asked by a physician "How is it that when one brings "a child to you, you say at once that child is an idiot"? I was obliged to tell that gentleman "I am very sorry "I cannot tell you," and I am very much afraid that I am obliged to give you the same answer. I look at a child and I know what is the matter. It is simply a question of experience. I remember once a gentleman who is a very great authority on the question of feeble-mindedness coming to the institution, and I asked him to go into one of the classes and pick out the feeble-minded from the clever children, but he invariably picked out the clever children as feeble-minded, and the feeble-minded as clever.

5665. You wish to convey that in many cases it is impossible to give an explanation of the reasons for one's opinion that a child is feeble-minded, but there is an impression made upon the skilled mind?—There are certain signs which one may observe. You notice that a child is fidgety, cannot sit still, or there is a rolling about of the eyeballs. I frequently give a child something to eat—and notice whether it dribbles. Then another sign is the position of the teeth—the teeth not being perfectly straight. Another thing I find is the Mongol-shaped eye. I do not say the people who have Mongol-shaped eyes are all idiots, but it is one of the indications that there is a certain amount of abnormality of mind. There are hundreds and thousands of little indications which I may observe when I have cases before me but which I do not remember at the present moment.

5666. Any one of those things in itself would not be sufficient to brand a child as feeble-minded, but the impression produced by an examination of the whole of the features of a child is often sufficient to enable a person of experience to judge?—Then there are other indications. We can ask the parents whether the child is restless in its sleep or cleanly in its habits. I am generally extremely cautious before passing a verdict, because it is a very easy matter to pass a deaf child, or a hearing child, as feeble-minded, without having had sufficient experience. I very often adopt this course. I ask the parent to watch the child in various ways and to come back to me in three months' time and report again. I have sometimes waited six months before I gave a verdict.

5667. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) From what you have said to Dr. Smith I imagine you do place some reliance on physical signs. The shape of the head would be one, I suppose you would say, if the head were extremely small and ill-formed?—Yes. But I would not accept that as a special sign unless corroborated by other signs.

5668. That would be one of the signs?—Yes.

5669. You make an examination of the child mentally and physically. Is it not the fact that deaf children who have been neglected from birth very often resemble in their characteristics, feeble-minded children, even if they do not actually become feeble-minded?—Yes, that is certainly the case.

5670. Do you know what proportion of children in deaf and dumb institutions are feeble-minded?—No, I could not possibly tell you, because I am afraid that no statistics of that kind have been kept in schools or institutions.

5671. But there are a pretty good number, I think, are there not?—There are a fair amount.

5672. Take the London School Board Deaf Centres, for instance?—It is some years ago since I examined the London School Board Centres for the London School Board, and I have not seen them lately. But the London School Board might easily separate all their backward cases and have special classes for them.

5673. As you have said, the same causes contribute to feeble-mindedness and to deafness, especially in non-congenital cases?—Particularly so.

5674. So that you would not be surprised if there were a certain amount of feeble-mindedness as well as deafness in these non-congenital cases in a larger proportion than among hearing children?—Feeble-mindedness does appear to a much larger extent amongst non-congenital cases than amongst congenital. If you go to a school for the deaf you may hear a child speaking beautifully who yet is idiotic. It is not at all a rule that the good speaking deaf child is a good thinker. We very often find that the best thinkers are the worst speakers, and the best speakers the worst thinkers, because there is a small amount of hearing left which gives the articulation a better intonation, but there is no brain power, whereas with a congenitally deaf child the brain power is intact. They think better, and you can teach them language better.

5675. What I was wanting to get at is whether there are a sufficient number of these mentally defective deaf children to make it worth while to group them into separate classes for instruction?—If you have, for example, a school of 100 children you might draft 10 children who are backward into one class.

5676. And teach them separately?—Teach them separately, or in a separate class in the school.

5677. Is there any manual training given in your school?—Yes, a great deal. We have a carpenter's room; we have dress, cutting, &c.

5678. Do not you think manual training is very important for the feeble-minded?—As regards the deaf I should not like to devote too much time to it, because our great aim is to make them speak and use language. But with feeble-minded children I should put manual instruction in the foreground.

5679. Even, I suppose, if they were deaf?—I think so.

5680. With regard to the institution at the Hague which you were kind enough to give us information about, does that institution, as a rule, keep children to the end of their educational period?—I have been looking over the report, and I find that if children get on sufficiently well they are transferred to the ordinary day school.

5681. Can you tell me whether there is in Holland any residential institution for idiots similar to Darenth to which the worst cases can be sent?—I should think so, but I know almost as little about the country at present as you do, but I will with pleasure make the necessary inquiries for the benefit of your Committee. I will receive any set of questions from this Committee and forward them to the secretary or to the president of this school, who will send me detailed answers which I will translate for you.

5682. There is a printed set of questions, and those might perhaps be supplemented by a few more?—I am entirely in the hands of the Committee; I do not want to give you information that is not correct, and I have not seen the place for many years. It would, I think, be more satisfactory for the sake of the cause if you were to draft these questions, and I should forward them and get replies.

5683. Do you think it is important that teachers of defectives should be specially trained to notice the peculiarities of these children so that they might be able to know what they are to expect in the way of defects?—Do you mean in the way of curing defects of articulation?

5684. No, I rather meant mental defects. Speaking with regard to mentally defective children, as well as deaf children, is it not an advantage that the teachers of such children should have some physiology taught them in the way of preparation?—As I said before, I should be disposed to give the teacher for feeble-minded the same training as a teacher for the deaf. To a certain extent, a school for the feeble-minded would always require the direct attention of the doctor as well as of the educator, more so than in a school for the deaf. In a school for the deaf, we do not want a doctor unless the child is suffering from some other defect. But a school for feeble-minded would certainly require two heads—the medical head and the educational head. There is one thing which, perhaps, I might be allowed to call your attention to. Would you want to include any questions about the teaching of articulation to backward children, because I am connected with a hospital where I see a good many cases of bad speaking.

5685. Have you prepared some notes on this point?—I have. Perhaps it would be wise if your Committee could also express some desire that greater attention should be paid by teachers in the development of articulation of their hearing scholars; I do not mean simply with regard to backward children, but to all children. If you go to a school for hearing children, and open a book and let a boy read, and then turn your back to the boy, you will often not hear a word he says. I have found the children very frequently do not articulate properly, they do not know how to use their breath, and they do not know how to speak. A few weeks ago I gave a lecture at the Central Throat Hospital on defective articulation, and I laid particular stress on the point that there is no special attention paid in our ordinary schools to the proper teaching of reading aloud, and the proper use of the vocal organs.

5686. The training colleges of England are now having their attention called to the necessity of teaching distinct articulation?—I am delighted to hear that.

Mr. Van Praagh
19 Mar. 1897.

5687. In France and Germany all teachers are trained in voice production, but, except as regards singing, in scarcely any training college in England has there been an attempt to teach boys voice production for ordinary reading?—I think in every large school more care should be given to the proper instruction of articulation, and stress should be laid on the necessity for giving careful instruction in perfect enunciation.

5688. And that is also important as regards feeble-minded children?—Of course, as regards feeble-minded children our greatest difficulty is to make them speak carefully, and to use their vocal organs properly. I have noticed that sometimes nervousness or anxiety to speak too rapidly results in stammering, and other defects. I do not know how far that is applicable to feeble-minded children, but I know this, that a good many men and women suffer from defective speaking, and this proceeds either from want of brain power or from excess of brain power. One class does not possess the power to speak well; the other class thinks too quickly, and wants to say everything before it is put into proper form.

5689. That is a very essential point for all teachers to bear in mind?—Yes.

Adjourned to Wednesday next at 10.30.

ELEVENTH DAY.

Wednesday, 24th March 1897.

PRESENT:

The REV. T. W. SHARPE, C.B., in the Chair.

Mr. H. F. POOLEY.
Mr. A. W. NEWTON.
Dr. G. E. SHUTTLEWORTH.
Dr. W. S. SMITH.
Mrs. BURGWIN.
Miss TOWNSEND.

MR. H. W. ORANGE, *Secretary.*

Mr. THOMAS DUNCOMBE MANN called in and examined.

Mr. T. D. Mann.
24 Mar. 1897.

5690. (*Chairman.*) You are a barrister-at-law and clerk to the Metropolitan Asylums Board, I believe?—Yes.

5691. And you have been clerk to the Board for how many years?—Six years and two months.

5692. And you can give us the history of the first provision of accommodation for pauper imbeciles?—Yes.

5693. By the Metropolitan Poor Act, 1867 (30 Vict. Chap. 6, sec. 6) the Poor Law Board (now the Local Government Board) were empowered to combine into districts, the several unions and parishes in the metropolis as they should think fit for the purpose of the establishment of asylums for the reception and relief of the sick, insane, and infirm of the metropolis, and to control the action of any such combined body by the issue of orders from time to time. The word "insane" was very loosely used, was it not?—I do not think I must admit that, it being used in an Act of Parliament.

5694. At all events it is very wide?—Such classes of the insane as the Poor Law Board might determine.

5695. In pursuance of this power the Poor Law Board, by Order, dated 15th May 1867, formed the Metropolitan Asylums Board, consisting of representatives elected by each parish and union in the metropolis, and certain representatives nominated by themselves; and issued various subsequent orders for the managers' direction and guidance. It is not necessary for us to have any of those orders, I suppose?—No, I think not.

5696. Towards the end of 1870 the managers opened two asylums for "harmless persons of the chronic or imbecile class"—one at Caterham, Surrey, and the other at Leavesden, Herts. Where did they get those terms, "harmless persons of the chronic or imbecile class"?—Out of the Local Government Board order.

5697. It would be well for us perhaps to have that order?—It is printed on pages 138-196 of a volume of Orders of the Local Government Board relating to the Metropolitan Asylums Board, of which I will forward a copy to the Committee.

5698. Can you explain the phrase chronic or imbecile?—As I understand, it means those persons who are permanently deficient in mental capacity and are harmless.

5699. In fact it is another name for "idiots"?—They include idiots. Idiots I understand to be those who are so from their birth.

5700. So that they are below the level of the feeble-minded who can exercise some small control over their actions and have some moral sense?—I am afraid the line of division between the two is one which only a medical man can properly define.

5701. In 1872 the small-pox hospital at Hampstead was converted into an asylum and temporarily used for the reception of imbecile patients?—Yes.

5702. The first actual step towards the separation of the children was in the year 1873, when the Leavesden Committee, having at that time the management of both the Leavesden and Hampstead Asylums, determined to transfer the children who, to the number of about 100, were then spread over the wards of the former asylum, to Hampstead, with a view to their being kept separate from the adults and educated under the care of a schoolmistress, whose appointment was sanctioned by the managers and the Local Government Board?—Yes.

5703. A schoolmistress was required?—Yes, a headmistress.

5704. She had a staff under her?—I suppose she had, but I cannot say at this date.

5705. In July 1874 the management of the Hampstead Asylum was transferred to a separate and special committee, who at once appointed the said schoolmistress?—Yes.

Mr. T. D. Mann.

24 Mar. 1897.

5706. Or rather she was re-appointed, I suppose?—Yes.

5707. The Caterham Committee had also been endeavouring for some time to separate and educate as far as possible the children in their asylum, and in furtherance of this purpose transferred them (100 in number) to Hampstead in December 1874. The Caterham Committee and the Leavesden Committee were two sub-committees of the Metropolitan Asylums Board?—Yes, two committees of the Metropolitan Asylums Board, managing two groups of institutions.

5708. At the end of 1874, therefore, there were about 250 imbecile children under the manager's care, all at Hampstead, undergoing a regular course of training and education?—Yes.

5709. Can you give us any sketch of the scheme pursued there in 1874?—I am afraid I cannot; the records do not enable me to do that.

5710. It is all past history?—Yes, long before my time.

5711. A scheme to rebuild the Hampstead Asylum and provide "suitable separate accommodation for 320 "children with all requisite schoolrooms, workshops, "&c." was not adopted, but a further scheme to erect a distinct school elsewhere was agreed upon, the Hampstead Committee being authorised to look for a site, and in the meantime to obtain temporary accommodation elsewhere for the patients. The latter (temporary) accommodation was provided at Clapton, whilst a site at Darenth was decided on for the permanent building and sanctioned in February 1875?—Yes.

5712. So far the provision was for children up to the age of 16, was it not?—Yes, that is the dividing line between children and adults.

5713. Then a further step forward was taken. Towards the end of 1877 it was deemed by the managers to be so expedient to watch the future of the children proposed to be admitted into the schools, *i.e.*, after the age of 16, that the managers decided with the assent of the Local Government Board to build two blocks and workshops on the land adjacent to the school for patients over 16. The Local Government Board, however, assented only on the understanding that such blocks should form part of a complete asylum to be ultimately erected. Was this for patients over 16?—Yes, by "asylum" there I mean an adult asylum.

5714. In November 1878 the new Darenth schools were opened, and 345 imbecile children transferred thereto from Clapton. They were not called "imbeciles" before, were they?—Yes, they could be nothing else. We have no power to admit any but imbeciles.

5715. That is the form of the Act, is it?—Yes, we have no power to admit any others.

5716. Have you got the order?—There was an order on the 15th May 1887 constituting the district. The Poor Law Board formed one district of the whole of London. You see they had power to form one or more districts. The Poor Law Board formed one district called the Metropolitan Asylum District. Its area is practically the same as that of the present County of London with the exception of Penge.

5717. The order speaks of "imbecile" children, does it?—No. Article 1 provides that the Metropolitan Asylum district shall be formed "for the reception and "relief of the classes of poor persons chargeable to "some union or parish in the said district respectively, "who may be infected with or suffering from fever, or "the disease of small-pox, or may be insane." Then a subsequent order dealt with the insane part of it—the order at present in existence being dated the 10th of February 1875.

5718. Does that define the word "insane" or explain it?—It does. By Article 2 it provides that "the "insane paupers to be admitted into the asylum shall "be such harmless persons of the chronic or imbecile "class as could be lawfully retained in a workhouse; "but no dangerous or curable persons, such as would "under the statutes in that behalf require to be sent "to a lunatic asylum shall be admitted."

5719. Then the real distinction was between dangerous or curable persons on the one hand, and harmless and chronic on the other?—Yes.

5720. Were the "curable" included with the "dangerous"?—Yes. A curable insane person is deemed to be a "lunatic," and is not covered by the word "chronic" or "harmless." He may be harmless, but if his case is not regarded as chronic, he is a proper subject for a county lunatic asylum.

5721. What do you say as to an incurable insane person?—Such a person is technically a lunatic for the purposes of the Lunacy Acts. He is included within the generic term "lunatic," but he is within the narrower specific description of "imbecile."

5722. In November 1878, the new Darenth schools were opened, and 345 imbecile children transferred thereto from Clapton. The imbecile accommodation generally, however, was still found to be insufficient, and the managers therefore decided to build a complete asylum adjacent to the schools in February 1878. That was for children under 16?—The existing asylum was for adults.

5723. Are not the new buildings for children?—That was subsequent.

5724. The Local Government Board assented, and the asylum was opened in May 1880?—Yes.

5725. Subsequently other blocks (termed pavilions) were erected and utilised for patients under 16 years?—Yes. Those were by way of additions to the schools.

5726. Children are not admitted below the age of five, are they?—No.

5727. Is there a rule to that effect?—It appears that, generally speaking, throughout the kingdom seven is the lowest age at which persons are admitted to asylums. The Local Government Board in a circular letter, dated 24th July 1882, to boards of guardians and others, said "their attention had been drawn to the "fact that several children between two and three "years of age had been admitted into the Metropolitan "District Asylum for children at Darenth, and that it "must be evident that no trustworthy judgment could "be formed as to the intellectual condition of children "of such tender age. In similar institutions the earliest "age of admission had been fixed at seven years. "Bearing in mind, however, the inconvenience that "might result from the detention in a workhouse of "children mentally afflicted, the board considered that "children of five years old, if their condition required "it, might properly be sent to Darenth; but prior to "that age they should be retained in the workhouse."

5728. From the year 1880 the class of patients admitted to the Darenth schools has been deteriorating, owing to the large proportion of the cases sent by the various parishes and unions being of the helpless and epileptic class; so that of the 1,000 patients (speaking roughly) now in the schools so called, only 300 are thought by the medical superintendent to be capable of deriving any benefit from school teaching. Of the remaining 700, 500 are absolutely helpless and unimprovable, whilst 200 improve to a slight degree under the discipline and control to which they are subjected?—Yes.

5729. Prior to 1880 the children were curable?—No, not curable, I do not admit that any of the inmates are ever curable.

5730. Shall I say educable?—Capable of receiving some education, yes.

5731. Before 1880, then, they were all improvable?—As far as we can make out, yes. They were a selection of the cases as it were prior to 1880, in the limited accommodation that was available.

5732. That, I think, concludes the history of the case?—Yes, I think it does.

5733. How many inmates are there at the present time?—About 1,000.

5734. Do you consider that the Darenth schools are in a state of transition?—To this extent, that it has been the subject of inquiry on the part of the managers and is so at the present moment; it has been for the past 12 months or so.

5735. What questions have they chiefly been raising?—Questions of classification of the inmates, and a question of what advantage is to be taken of any improvement they may have derived during the time they have spent in Darenth, when they arrive at the age of 16, and must be fully certified as adult imbeciles.

5736. Are the managers willing to continue the care of improvable imbeciles?—They are bound to continue the care of those who are lawfully in their charge. The question for them to discuss is, how they can keep them, and, at the same time, not entirely destroy any advantages which these children may have obtained during their youth.

Mr. T. D. Mann.

24 Mar. 1897.

5737. You had in the schools on the 31st of December 1896, 634 males and 354 females, or a total of 988?—Yes.

5738. During the year, 140 patients were admitted?—Yes.

5739. Will you be good enough to classify them?—Of the 104 admitted during the year, 26 were in a condition of "idiocy"; 28 of "idiocy and epilepsy"; 53 of "imbecility"; 25 of "imbecility and epilepsy"; 8 of "weak-mindedness." Of the 988 who were in the schools on the 31st of December, 174 were in a condition of "idiocy," 260 of idiocy and epilepsy," 432 of "imbecility," 108 of "imbecility and epilepsy," 14 of "weak-mindedness."

5740. It would appear, then, that very much the same proportions hold good for the total number of inmates as for the 140 admitted during the year?—Yes, except that you will see the proportion of weak-minded, so-called, is much lower in the 988 than in 140. Again, of the 140 admitted during the year, 57 were of the fair grade class, 51 were of a lower class but yet capable of some improvement, 32 were helpless and crippled. Those are simply the medical superintendents' descriptions, however. The same patients may be classified in regard to age in this way:—78 were from 5 to 10 years of age, 55 from 10 to 15 years of age, 7 from 15 to 16 years of age.

5741. Then what do you say as to the discharges, &c.?—37 died, 56 were transferred to the adult asylum, 14 were discharged as recovered, 25 as improved, 10 as not improved.

5742. Those last three classes being discharged in the course of the year returned to their friends, I suppose?—Yes.

5743. How many patients have been discharged since the opening of the institution 22 years ago as recovered and how many as improved?—101 patients have been discharged as recovered, and 242 patients have been discharged as improved.

5744. Can you tell us how the 988 patients were employed?—154 out of 634 males, or about 25 per cent., were employed in various trades and other industrial occupations, whilst 67 out of 354 females, or about 19 per cent. were employed in a similar manner. If it be for the benefit of the child, it is kept in the school classes or school workshops after the age of 16, but these cases are rare.

5745. What have you to tell us as to the manual and industrial occupations?—Manual trainers, appointed with the requisite qualifications, superintend the trade classes, and much of the asylum work (*e.g.*, repairs in tailoring and bootmaking shops, and needlework by the girls) is done by the patients. Eighty of the former schoolchildren are retained as scrubbers and other workers. Admission to the adult asylum is now exclusively confined to patients from the schools.

5746. There are other adult asylums for other patients?—For direct admission, yes—Leavesden and Caterham.

5747. Are lectures in nursing, &c. given to the staff?—Yes, a series of lectures is given to the staff by the matron and assistant medical officers on general and mental nursing.

5748. These lectures are designed to qualify them for service in the asylum, but not, I suppose, for outside service?—I suppose the lectures would fit them for service in any other asylum, but it is not training which entitles them to any certification as trained nurses.

5749. You have also given us, I think, a table showing the progress which the children made in the year 1896?—Yes, that is supplied to me by the schoolmistress.

5750. Can you give me the total number of children?—There are about 320, I believe, in the school classes altogether.

5751. Of these 320, 67 could speak well, 11 could read well, 13 could spell words of one, two, and three syllables, 29 could write well (dictation or transcription), and 12 could do simple and compound rules?—Yes.

5752. The rest were in various stages below that standard?—Yes.

5753. What does the school staff, that is the teaching staff, consist of for the 320 children?—It consists of two assistant mistresses, three monitors (paid 8*l.* a year —formerly patients); and six school attendants who are pupil-teachers. There are three classes in all with a total average attendance of about 265 scholars.

5754. I suppose that some of the 320 are at manual work when the rest are in school?—They are all supposed to be in attendance at school, but from various causes they cannot all attend every day. But this is a matter of internal administration, upon which I am not, perhaps a very competent witness.

5755. Now as to the procedure before admission, what have you to say?—By the Lunacy Act of 1890 every constable, relieving officer, or overseer who knows, either from the medical officer of the union or otherwise that any person in his district who is not a pauper and not wandering at large, is deemed to be a lunatic, and is either (1) not under proper care and control, or (2) cruelly treated or neglected, must within three days inform a justice, who must cause the patient to be examined by two medical practitioners. If he is then satisfied that the said person (though not already in receipt of relief) requires relief for his proper care, he may make an order for his reception as a pauper lunatic in an institution for lunatics, and the constable, &c. must convey the lunatic to the institution named in the order. If the lunatic is wandering at large the constable, &c. may immediately take him before a justice, when similar procedure can be taken.

5756. It rests upon the constable's opinion, does it?—No, that is only one class of persons who can be taken from the street. He gets his information either from the medical officer of the union or otherwise. He may go and take them under those circumstances if he is satisfied that they are "not under proper care and con-"trol, or are cruelly treated or neglected."

5757. But he need not have any medical opinion beforehand?—That is so, but it only entitles him to take them before a justice; they cannot be locked-up without being medically examined and certified by a justice.

5758. When does the medical man come in if a person is taken before a justice?—If the justice says, "Take "him to a workhouse," then the medical officer of the workhouse has to certify that he is a proper subject for detention, before he can detain him at all, except for three days. No one can be detained for more than three days without being certified by a medical officer of the workhouse.

5759. What does the medical officer of the workhouse certify?—He certifies him under Form 10 of the Lunacy Act: "Certificate as to pauper lunatic in a "workhouse. I, the undersigned medical officer of "Workhouse of the Union, hereby certify "that I have carefully examined into the state of health "and mental condition of A.B., a pauper in the said "workhouse, and that he is in my opinion a lunatic, "and that the accommodation in the workhouse is "sufficient for his proper care and treatment separate "from the inmates of the workhouse not lunatics [or "that his condition is such that it is not necessary for "the convenience of the lunatic, or of the other "inmates that he should be kept separate]. The "grounds for my opinion that the said A.B. is a "lunatic are as follows: Dated . (Signed "Medical Officer of the Workhouse." I ought to say that any two Lunacy Commissioners also may visit a pauper lunatic not in an institution, and call in a medical practitioner, and may then, if satisfied, direct him to be received in a lunatic institution, and direct a relieving officer to forthwith convey him thereto. By section 24 of the Lunacy Act, 1890, no lunatic is allowed to remain in a workhouse, unless the medical officer of the workhouse certifies in writing that he is a lunatic, that there is proper accommodation for him, and that he ought to remain. This certificate avails for 14 days, and the Lunacy Act, 1891, section 4, subsection 2, provides that the lunatic may, without more, be removed to a Metropolitan Asylums Board asylum on this certificate within that period; but, in order to detain the patient more than 14 days altogether the certificates (*a*) of an independent medical practitioner, and (*b*) of a justice of the peace, must be obtained in Form A.* The Lunacy Commissioners, however, have notified to the managers that they will not insist on this form with regard to children under 16. In these cases, therefore, the orders of the Local Government Board apply by which the child is admitted on Form B.* On arriving at the age of 16,

* See reprints of these forms subjoined to the evidence of this witness.

Mr. T. D. Mann.

24 Mar. 1897.

however, the child has to be recertified, by a justice, &c., just as an adult ordinarily is.

5760. I see there is an important note with reference to the definition of a lunatic?—Yes. By section 341 of the Lunacy Act a lunatic is an idiot or person of unsound mind.

5761. Therefore, the term includes imbeciles?—Clearly.

5762. Is it quite clear that a lunatic includes every person of unsound mind?—Yes.

5763. Therefore, you think that the people in Darenth who are admitted as lunatics may be persons of unsound mind, but not what are popularly called "lunatics"?—They may not be proper subjects for a lunatic asylum, but they are "lunatics" within the meaning of the Act.

5764. They are technically "lunatics"?—They are covered by the generic term "lunatic"; but they belong to the species "imbecile."

5765. And also those suffering from the utmost degree of violent insanity?—No, they do not include those of violent insanity. We are expressly prohibited from admitting those by the order I have read to you.

5766. It excludes dangerous lunatics?—Yes.

5767. But it includes every child below the condition of a normal child?—It depends upon what you mean by a normal child.

5768. I mean a child who shows no signs of imbecility?—It includes those who show definite signs of mental incapacity.

5769. However slight they may be?—The dividing line is a very fine one, and I cannot pretend to define it.

5770. We are very anxious, if we can, to arrive at a line which can be drawn?—I am afraid I cannot define it.

5771. You think the Act, in its technical terms, includes all children who show any degree of imbecility, however slight?—I think it includes all those who, in the opinion of the persons appointed by law to determine it, are held to be proper subjects of physical restraint.

5772. It rests altogether with the medical officer?—And a justice in the case of adults.

5773. It must be the medical officer who certifies that the person is a lunatic, although he may show only a slight degree of imbecility?—It rests with the medical officer, and in the case of the adults also a justice of the peace. That is the safeguard which is provided by the Lunacy Act.

5774. So that we might find children in Darenth who have a very slight degree of imbecility?—Yes, if they are imbecile. I suppose there are degrees of imbecility, but you will understand I am not a doctor versed in imbecility. But they must all, for the purposes of legal detention, be over the border line; there is no question about that.

5775. Over the border line of perfect sanity?—They must be persons whom the law has contemplated, when it attempts to define what is and what is not a lunatic.

5775*a*. Do not you think it would be well to separate these children into two classes, first, those who are extremely imbecile, who might be sent to an institution like Darenth, and secondly those who are but slightly imbecile, for whom special classes might be provided, where they could be handled carefully and be fitted for some future work in life?—I do not think I am a competent judge of that. I have not come sufficiently in contact with the children, but I should rather doubt whether there are many, who could be properly dealt with other than in an asylum of the kind, and I think you will find from the table I have laid before you the number of children who are improvable is extremely limited. You will observe that the number of those who could even read or write or count is extremely small.

5776. Yes, I see that the number of those who can do anything is very small out of the total number?—Quite so, and those numbers include, of course, some who have been in the school many years, and have been under perpetual training.

5777. Then as to discharge. A patient may be discharged either at the request of the guardians, or relatives, and friends, or by order of any two Lunacy Commissioners?—Yes.

5778. They are then generally removed either to a home or to a workhouse, as the case may be?—Yes.

5779. Have you any statistics of the total number of people whom you technically call "lunatic," in the area of the Metropolitan Asylums Board, and what the relative number is to the population?—No, I have not, but it is about 16,000.

5780. How do you arrive at that?—I know that the asylums of the London County Council for lunatics usually so-called contain accommodation for about 10,000. I am only speaking from memory, and I know that we possess accommodation for about 6,000 of those who are not "lunatic" but imbecile. I am, for the purpose of this answer using the term "lunatic" in the narrow sense of lunatic as distinct from imbecile.

5781. What is the accommodation for children up to the age of 16?—It is just about a thousand. You are asking me now with reference to the imbecile children?

5782. Yes?—I may say that we do not admit to our three adult asylums any children under 16.

5783. With regard to the total cost per head that is I believe very low as compared with most institutions?—No, on the contrary, it is rather high compared with other institutions.

5784. Which are you comparing with?—The Darenth adult asylum and the two other adult asylums at Leavesden and Caterham.

5785. What is the cost?—The total average cost per head of patients at the Darenth asylum and schools for the half year ended 3rd October 1896 was 1*s*. $5\frac{13}{32}$*d*. per day.

5786. That is for adults and children together?—Yes.

5787. That is how much per week?—10*s*. 2*d*. per week, 3*s*. $2\frac{1}{2}$*d*. of which represents the cost of maintenance—maintenance only including in our use of the word provisions, stimulants, and clothing.

5788. How is the cost defrayed?—The cost is defrayed by the metropolitan parishes and unions in two parts—maintenance account being based on the number of patients from, and the remainder proportionately on the total rateable value, of each parish or union.

5789. Do you say that is a low cost?—I say, on the contrary, it is slightly higher than the cost at Leavesden and Caterham. This works out at nearly 1*s*. $5\frac{1}{2}$*d*. per day whereas Leavesden and Caterham work out at only 1*s*. 1*d*. per day, and almost the whole of that difference is due to the larger number of officers and their maintenance.

5790. As to the payment by relatives, of course that is generally very slight?—In certain cases where the patients or relatives can afford anything, I believe they repay to the guardians so much per week according to their means. But so far as we are concerned, we get nothing from the relatives.

5791. The guardians get an average of about 1*s*. a week?—I cannot tell you what the guardians may get, I have no knowledge of it at all, but I believe they get something sometimes; of course all the patients who come to us are technically paupers. They come from the guardians.

5792. The parents may not be paupers, but the patients are?—The admission of the children pauperises the parents. Even if they pay the guardians it is regarded as being relief, and they are disqualified from voting at any parliamentary or other election.

5793. If the parents pay either the whole or any portion of the cost it is still pauper relief, and that pauperises the parents?—Yes; even if they pay the full cost it is still pauper relief.

5794. But you say the managers do not take in any paying patients?—No, we have no paying patients; that is, the managers do not take any payment.

5795. Any payment that may be made goes to the guardians?—Yes. We take no payment direct. We simply take the patients without any knowledge of any arrangement between the guardians and the relatives or friends.

5796. (*Mr. Pooley.*) I understand you to say that for practical purposes, and if you consider individual cases, you can make a distinction between defective children and idiots or imbeciles?—I think I said that I, personally, am quite unable to do so.

5797. Do you think that Darenth is a suitable place for idiots and imbeciles, that is to say, for the lower grades of defective children?—Distinctly. It is a place provided on purpose.

Mr. T. D. Mann.

24 Mar. 1897.

5798. Do you think that by considering each individual case it is practicable to say whether a particular child is an imbecile fit for Darenth, or is merely defective?—That is a medical matter upon which only a medical man can give you a satisfactory opinion. I am afraid I cannot.

5799. Suppose any examination is made of a particular child, and he is thought to be educable by special methods, and not an imbecile, do you think it would be satisfactory to remove such child from the guardians, and put him under the school authority?—I do not quite understand what school authority you refer to.

5800. It would be the existing school authority, the school board or other school authority, as is done under the Blind and Deaf Act in the case of blind and deaf children?—I do not know that my opinion is worth anything on the point. It is merely that of the of the man in the street. Does it not involve the whole question of relief? The relief, I take it, is necessary from the fact that a patient is in the care of the guardians already; and it depends on how that relief is to be administered.

5801. I am not proposing to apply it to children who are already in workhouses, or under the power of the guardians, but to children who are out in the street?—And who are not persons for whom the guardians ought to provide financially?

5802. I refer to persons who might or might not be dealt with so far as regards finance by the guardians?—I think I may say, for what my opinion is worth, that I should never let a child go into the workhouse if I could help it; but that is merely the opinion, as I say, of the man in the street. I have no special knowledge on the subject.

5803. You said that all your patients are practically sent by guardians?—Yes.

5804. When a child is rejected from an ordinary school as too defective, or too imbecile, and goes home to its parents, can you tell me what is the procedure in order to get such a child into an institution like Darenth?—Yes, the procedure which was read out by the Chairman. Of course, a child may be lost though in the care of its parents. If they take care to conceal it, and no one else takes an interest in it, I suppose it may remain at home; but if any "constable, relieving "officer, or overseer who knows"—that is to say, who gets to hear—"either from the medical officer of the "union, or from others, that any person in his district "who is not a pauper, and not wandering at large," that would be the case that you put, "is deemed to be a "lunatic, and is either not under proper care and "control, or cruelly treated or neglected," that child can then be taken before a justice, or may be committed to the workhouse for three days. The result of that would be, that if the child were the imbecile you are supposing, he would soon find his way to Darenth.

5805. In the case of imbecile children under 16, as a matter of fact, are such children taken before the magistrate?—Not if there is anything to bring them to the guardians otherwise. That is only the procedure in the case of a person who is being concealed, as it were; but if the parents, or the relatives, or whoever has the child in charge, find they can do nothing with him, and take him to the guardians, and say they cannot maintain him, and ask the guardians to take charge of him, he would at once drift into the workhouse, and from there he would be sent to Darenth with a medical officer's admission order, such as I will put in. That order has to be signed by the clerk to the guardians, they having got charge of him in the way I have just suggested.

5806. Then if a parent were to take a child to the guardians, and say, "I am unable to keep this child; "I must ask you to take charge of him," it makes him a pauper?—Yes. If the medical officer of the workhouse on seeing the child came to the conclusion that he was an imbecile, and a fit subject for Darenth, he would at once sign a medical certificate to the effect shown on that admission order. That is a statutory form prescribed by the Local Government Board. The clerk to the guardians would make out this admission order, simply saying, "Admit the person named and described as follows," and sign it. The medical officer would fill up the form and sign it after examination of the patient, and it would have to be reported to the guardians themselves, whose chairman would sign this statement at this end, "to be signed by the chairman, vice-"chairman, or a member of the visiting committee." That is signed, and the child is sent to Darenth, and he is detained without anything more.

5807. Is a child ever taken direct from its home to Darenth. The relieving officer has to take the child: but do these proceedings ever take place without the child being taken into the workhouses?—I believe, in fact, they are sometimes; but I believe it is more often that, they go through the workhouse.

5808. (*Miss Townsend.*) Do you think it is fair that parents should be pauperised in order that their children may go to Darenth?—That is a question of general policy with regard to the Poor Law, is it not?

5809. People who are not otherwise paupers, but who are unable to bring up an idiotic child, are forced to remove it?—The question is, I think, hardly separable from the wider question of how far persons should be pauperised if they cannot maintain their children who are in health.

5810. But this seems an exceptionally strong case of pauperisation, that the parents are actually made paupers as soon as they apply for an imbecile child to be placed in an institution, although they may be perfectly willing to pay, and do pay?—I quite admit that there may be cases, in fact there are many cases no doubt, where families, otherwise capable of maintaining themselves independent of Poor Law relief, cannot maintain or provide the means of looking after a child who is imbecile or idiotic.

5811. Would you be in favour of the pauperisation being removed?—Generally speaking, I think I might say yes.

5812. That was done many years ago with regard to fever and infectious diseases?—Yes.

5813. Do you think it is fair to class all these children as "lunatic" in order to retain them at Darenth?—I see no objection to that at all.

5814. Even although they are not lunatics?—But they are all lunatics.

5815. Are all the epileptic children lunatics?—Undoubtedly, a lunatic being a person who is of "unsound mind."

5816. It seems rather an arbitrary term?—For the purpose of legislation one has to have convenient and commodious expressions, and I do not know that you could find a better.

5817. Have the children at Darenth always been considered as lunatics, or has there been a recent order that they should be so considered?—They have always been classified as lunatics.

5818. We understood from one of the witnesses that there was a recent order to that effect?—No. They are not called lunatics down there, but we never use the word "lunatic" in any offensive fashion with regard to them.

5819. But their parents know that they are classed as lunatics. The parents are made paupers, and the children are made lunatics?—They know within the wording of the Act, of the Act of Parliament which governs the institutions, they are lunatics, no doubt; but that has always been the case.

5820. You consider that it really is a question of terms?—It appears to me it is very much a question of terms, yes.

5821. And it is on account of the difficulty of drawing the border line between what are called "lunatics," and what are not, that the larger term "lunatic" is used?—I do not know that the question has ever arisen in that way, quite. I have never heard any objection to the use of the word "lunatic" as comprising all classes of persons of unsound mind.

5822. Has the visiting committee any power with respect to the admission and discharge of the children at Darenth?—Not with regard to the admission; with regard to the discharge, yes. Article 11 of Order of the Local Government Board, 10th February 1875, provides: "The Asylum Committee, acting under the "advice of the medical superintendent, may discharge "from the asylum any pauper, when for reasons which "they shall deem sufficient it is not expedient that he "should continue therein."

5823. Do you know whether, as a matter of fact, they often exercise that power?—If you speak only of children, I should say very seldom indeed. A very small

Mr. T. D. Mann.

24 Mar. 1897.

number of children are discharged from Darenth as being cured; a very small number. You will remember the terms of the Order which I read to you at first, Article 2: "The insane paupers to be admitted into the asylum "shall be such harmless persons of the chronic or "imbecile class as could be lawfully retained in a "workhouse; but no dangerous or curable person, such "as would, under the statutes in that behalf, require to "be sent to a lunatic asylum, shall be admitted," so that it must be necessarily a very limited number.

5824. A large number are taken out by their friends as being fit to remain with them?—I should say that of the small number that do go out at all, far more go out at the request of their friends, or the guardians (which is the same thing nearly) than because they are in any sense recovered; unquestionably.

5825. But in the opinion of the friends, or of the guardians, they are sufficiently recovered to live outside?—It is difficult to say what forms the opinions of friends.

5826. Was Darenth originally for children only, and an adult asylum added in order to provide for the children who had become adults?—Yes. As I explained before, the provision of an adult asylum was required while the whole scheme for which the land was purchased was under consideration.

5827. Do the adults consist of children who have passed through the schools?—That is becoming more and more the case. There have been many adults admitted direct from the parishes and unions; but during the last two or three years it has become necessary to stop direct admissions to the adult asylum, because of the necessity for keeping the vacancies which do occur for the children who mature in the juvenile establishment.

5828. Even so there is hardly sufficient space, and there are a good many adults on the children's side at Darenth?—Yes; but they are retained, not because of want of space, but because they have undergone some amount of improvement, and they are helpful and useful, and their improvement can be turned to some account.

5829. We were told they were retained for want of space, and that a good many of them would be better away from the school?—Of course, that may occur at any given moment; but, speaking generally, it is, I believe, not so.

5830. Speaking generally, is there always room for admission to the adult asylum for the child who needs it?—For the child who matures at 16, and who needs it, yes.

5831. For an adult at 16, or whatever age it is?—The accommodation is generally quite crowded, as it is, of course, everywhere, with regard to lunatics.

5832. How do you account for the increase since the schools were opened with 325, not 20 years ago, and there are now 1,000?—That, as you see, was only a year or two after the commencement of separate provision for the children, and that was simply the number that had accumulated in the other adult asylums. It was the nucleus of a new arrangement. The numbers have grown because there is the accommodation for them, and previously, I imagine, many of these cases were detained in the workhouses.

5833. Are the 80 children, who are retained as scrubbers, considered fit to earn their own living in the institution: in other words is the work considered an equivalent to their cost?—I should think possibly it is, but I am not sure.

5834. Are they paid any wages?—No, they are not.

5835. They get no reward for their services?—No, they get no wages at all.

5836. So that as far as their knowledge goes they are still patients in the asylum?—Yes.

5837. They are not aware that they are earning their own living?—Quite so; they are not fit to be discharged, or else they could not be retained. It may help you if I add that all those cases who arrive at the age of 16 have to go through the certification required by the Lunacy Acts; that is, they have to be taken before magistrates, and all these scrubbers and other persons are so certified.

5838. They are still certified as lunatics?—Yes.

5839. And their detention is authorised?—Their detention is authorised when they arrive at the age of 16 in a much more formal manner than it was before.

5840. As a matter of fact when they are so taken before the justices very few are excepted?—Very few are excepted.

5841. Do you know what is the relative cost as between Darenth and district schools?—No, I have no evidence on the subject of the cost of district schools.

5842. I think it is a good deal lower in Darenth than in district schools?—That, I suppose, would be accounted for by the much larger percentage of teaching staff required at the district schools.

5843. Do you think that they have a much larger teaching staff in the district schools in proportion to the number of children?—I should think they must have, because the children are capable of so much more instruction.

5844. Your cost of 10*s.* per week includes the buildings?—It includes everything.

5845. We had an estimate given of 8*s.* 2*d.* as the weekly cost; but I suppose that did not include the buildings?—If you deduct what is called "Building Account," which includes a lot of expenditure on repairs and so on, rates, taxes, and insurance, it would bring it down to something over 8*s.* It would be rather more than 8*s.* 2*d.*, I think it would be 8*s.* 6*d.* then.

5846. I have no doubt the figures of 8*s.* 2*d.* per week and 10*s.* 2*d.* per week are reconcileable in some way?—Perhaps they are.

5847. Are the children always removed from the workhouses at five years of age, or have any children to remain longer in the workhouse waiting admission to Darenth?—I am sorry to say there are many instances in which we have to refuse admission for want of room; but the refusals are chiefly in regard to epileptics or for very bad cases for which we are especially pressed for accommodation.

5848. What becomes of those children for whom you have to refuse admission?—They have to wait for their turn.

5849. In the workhouse infirmary?—In the workhouse infirmary.

5850. No special provision is made for them there; they have to take their chance with the other patients?—Yes, they have to take their chance with the other patients.

5851. Does that prevail to any considerable extent?—No, I do not think it prevails to an extent which is serious. I may add, in explanation of my last answer, that I understand the last time we made inquiries on the subject there were only a few who were actually waiting for admission. We are building a new asylum for aged and infirm people, and we have made several inquiries, and the last time we inquired we found there were a very small number of children waiting for admission.

5852. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) Do I understand you to say that the line drawn for the admission of a candidate to Darenth is governed by whether it is harmless or dangerous?—The harmless and chronic are on the one side of the line and the dangerous or curable on the other.

5853. So that a person is admitted to a lunatic asylum, if he is dangerous?—Yes, or if he is a lunatic but considered to be curable. There are lunatics who are not absolutely dangerous, who are distinctly insane, but are deemed to be quite curable. I mean to say that is within everybody's knowledge.

5854. When Darenth was opened was it primarily for the education of children of weak mind?—No, it was for the separation of children from adults with a view to giving them such education and manual training, and so on, as they were competent to receive.

5855. And now your chronic incurables have crowded out that primary class; have they not?—No, not at all. That primary class are there, and I am not aware that there are any crowded out who could properly be in, except a few, and a very few of the absolutely unimprovable—those who require the most looking after—epileptics, and so on; I know that when pressure does come it is in those particular wards.

5856. You stated that there were very few in Darenth who might be termed educable?—Yes. "Educable," of course, is a relative term; but I say there are very few indeed who are educable to the point of being able to be discharged, with any hope that they would be able to make their own way in life.

5857. The cases admitted to Darenth are stated, by the medical officer, on admission, to be incurable—do I understand you aright?—I do not think it says so.

5858. I thought the form you read out so stated. The medical certificate says, "He is, in my opinion, "chronic and harmless"; and he must be incurable?—They must be persons who are not dangerous or curable.

5859. And yet the medical officer does discharge people because they are cured. What causes that change of opinion?—I am not sure that the medical officer ever discharged anybody because he considered him absolutely cured; but if he does—and I will not deny that he does—it is because patients have got in there who were not thought to be curable at the time they were sent in, but who, by reason of the very excellent education and training they received there, have improved beyond all expectation.

5860. After a child is admitted to Darenth, can you tell me how often it is examined?—What kind of examination do you refer to.

5861. An examination with a view of ascertaining its progress?—It is under constant examination by the medical superintendent and his assistants; under constant observation.

5862. And the medical officer alone would recommend that such and such a case is in a fit state to be discharged?—He would so recommend in any case where he thought so, yes. It is his duty.

5863. Have you any knowledge of children being refused admission to Darenth who yet might be described as imbecile?—Only on the ground that I have mentioned.

5864. And what is that?—Want of accommodation for the moment.

5865. What power has the relieving officer in the matter?—One of the powers is that which I have read out already, that he can take any person whom he comes to hear of, and is believed to be lunatic, and is not under proper care and control, or is being cruelly treated or neglected, before the justice and get him remanded to the workhouse.

5866. And then he can exercise his discretion as to whether or not he receives the application of a parent for the admission of a child to Darenth?—No, that is another matter. I was speaking of his discretion to act on any information that comes to him anyhow. On the application of a parent, I think he is probably bound either to act upon it or to report it to his guardians. But I have not sufficient knowledge of that point. It is a matter which does not come within my special sphere.

5867. It is important to us because I have been told of cases where the relieving officer would not entertain or take any notice of the application, and it is difficult to get to the guardians?—I suggest that the only person who could give you satisfactory evidence on that point is a clerk to a board of guardians.

5868. (*Mr. Newton.*) What is the exact authority for saying that admission to Darenth pauperises the parents?—It is provided by 4 & 5 Will. IV. c. 76. s. 56, that all relief given to or on account of any child or children under the age of 16, not being blind, or deaf, or dumb, shall be considered as given to the father of such child, or children; or, if the child have a mother only, a widow, as given to the widow. It is clear then that the admission of a child to a Poor Law institution constitutes relief to the father of the child, entailing, of course, the disqualifications which the receipt of relief does entail.

5869. What are these disqualifications?—The chief is, I believe, disfranchisement; and, as regards this particular effect, it appears to have been settled in Gray's case (reported in Wolferstan and Bristow's Election Reports, 1859-65, p. 174), that repayment by the person receiving relief does not avoid the disqualification.

5870. Practically, do relieving officers and constables bring idiots before the justices of the peace?—Do you mean independent of any proper application to them from relatives and friends?

5871. Yes?—I am not aware of it.

5872. When a child is once in Darenth what form has the parent to go through to get the child out again?—He can apply to the guardians or he can apply direct to us.

5873. Can he demand it out as a matter of right?—Article 14 of the Order of the Local Government Board of the 10th of February 1875 provides: "In no case "shall any pauper be prevented from leaving the "asylum after the parent or next of kin of such pauper "shall have given to the board of management, the "asylum committee, or the guardians of the union or "parish to which he was chargeable in the asylum, "such an undertaking as they shall respectively deem "satisfactory to provide for the removal, charge, and "maintenance of such pauper with due care and "attention while the malady continues." I may say I only, in my time, know of one instance of an application on the part of friends which we have had to refuse.

Mr. T. D. Mann.

24 Mar. 1897.

5874. What is the educational staff?—I do not know much about that except the numbers.

5875. Can you tell us about their qualifications?—I think you will get this better from the officers.

5876. Will you tell us what the salaries are?—I am afraid I cannot do so. I have not them here.

5877. You say that the number of lunatics under the care of the county council is 10,000?—Roughly, I believe, it is.

5878. And the number of imbeciles under the care of your board is about 6,000?—Yes.

5879. Have you any idea as to the number in private institutions?—No, I have not. You would find that at once in the Lunacy Commissioners Annual Report. You will find the whole statement.

5880. Can you say what proportion of the imbeciles are of school age?—What is the school age?

5881. The school age in an ordinary sense is from 3 to 13; but probably it would be better if in this case we said from 7 to 16?—We take them at 5.

5882. Cannot you give us the number of imbeciles between 5 and 16?—The number at this moment is 671

5883. Can you explain why there are not more than 1,000 imbecile children: for, apparently, with you, only one-sixth of the total number of imbeciles are children of school age?—Yes.

5884. Whilst amongst ordinary people we find the number of children of school age is about one-fourth to one-fifth of the whole population (it varies in different districts), amongst imbeciles you only find that the number of children is about one-sixth?—I am afraid I cannot explain it.

5885. I should have expected the result of the figures to be the other way—that you would have had a greater number of children among imbeciles than among ordinary people?—You mean because of the earlier mortality among people of the imbecile class?

5886. Yes?—I am afraid I cannot explain it.

5887. (*Dr. Smith.*) In that clause which you have read as to the compulsory power for removing imbeciles, I think these words are included "not under proper care or "control"?—Yes, I read those words.

5888. And that would practically exclude a large number of children if it could be shown that they were under proper care or control?—Yes, that is so. It would exclude those who were under proper care or control, if they are not being cruelly neglected or treated.

5889. The instance which was put to you of a child being refused admission to the special schools of the School Board because of its imbecility would not naturally come under the clause which you have read?—He could not be compulsorily taken from his parents or guardians.

5890. Because the parent would immediately say that the child was under "proper care"?—There is no power that I know of compulsorily to take him from his parents.

5891. Then, as regards these children, do you see any difficulty in the way of removing the Poor Law machinery as to admission; and letting such child be admitted direct on the order of some official of the School Board?—You mean without the intervention of the parish or union?

5892. Yes, without the intervention of the parish authority at all?—Yes, I see difficulties. It would require legislative enactment.

5893. It might require that, but is that the only difficulty which you see?—If it were thought desirable, the Act would have certainly to be surrounded with some safeguards in order to secure that the guardians

Mr. T. D. Mann.

21 Mar. 1897.

should not be saddled with the chargeability in respect of persons about whom they had no voice.

5894. I may remind you of the power of admitting patients to the fever hospitals of the Asylum's Board. In the old days that was done entirely through the Poor Law authority?—Yes.

5895. But that has been altered?—Yes.

5896. Do you see any difficulty in making a like alteration as that as regards imbecile children?—I think there is this difference. In the one case it may be said that the good of the community is served by sending a patient suffering from an infectious disease to a hospital, and that, therefore, it is equitable that the charge should be thrown upon the community. But in the case of a person who is of unsound mind, there is no such public consideration as should of necessity and as a matter of course, throw the cost of maintenance of the imbecile upon the Poor Law.

5897. But is not there a public consideration from a moral point of view, in reference to these children being left on the streets—being left at large?—It may be difficult that they should be left in the control of their parents, but I know of no moral consideration which, offhand, would make me say that it is equitable that the cost of providing for such children should be thrown upon the Poor Law without sufficient enquiry and sufficient discretion in the Poor Law authorities.

5898. I may remind you again that in reference to fever patients, a payment was exacted by the board of guardians, even after the alterations I have alluded to were made. Could not a similar arrangement be carried out here?—You mean a provision enabling guardians to exercise the power which they now exercise of recovering from parents or guardians?

5899. Yes?—That would be possible, of course. But then that would not be a case parallel with the fever cases.

5900. I think it is a parallel case, is it not? Those cases were admitted into the fever hospitals through the local sanitary authority?—Yes.

5901. And then I take it the Asylums Board sent notice of that to the board of guardians, and they, where they could, exacted some charge from the friends of the persons so admitted into the fever hospital?—They had power to do so. They did in some cases, but not in others. They did, I believe, in some cases—or tried to do it.

5902. Could not a similar condition of things exist here as regards the children, the advantage being that you would dispense with all this cumbersome machinery of passing the child through the Poor Law officials?—I think there would be no objection if you provided proper safeguards—that is to say, as to certification and so on, and if you gave the guardians power to recover from persons whom they thought ought not to take advantage of the Poor Law, the costs which they were put to for those patients. Then I see no difficulty.

5903. That would be exactly on the lines they made with regard to the fever cases?—Yes; that would meet the point which I raised. But I would first say this, that I know that under the fever arrangements the guardians did experience a great deal of difficulty in recovering the amount.

5904. Probably they experience that difficulty now in reference to imbecile children under their present arrangement?—No, they have power to recover it.

5905. They have power to recover?—Not with regard to fever patients.

5906. I mean as regards imbeciles?—But then they have the initiative there. They have the power of saying in the first instance whether they will accept the chargeability of the patient or not, and it is a different thing rather to throw the chargeability upon them, and then leave them to their own resources whether they can recover it or not.

5907. I asked you that question in view of our knowledge that there are a large number of imbecile cases in London at present not provided for?—Yes.

5908. And in view also of our knowledge as to difficulties in relation to this machinery of the Poor Law?—Quite so.

5909. Have the Asylums Board any power to erect any institution besides that at Darenth for children who have benefited greatly by the education there, and whom it is thought should be retained under some supervision?—Ample power to erect, I believe, any number of institutions for the proper housing and custody of persons who are legitimately under their charge.

5910. Beyond the age of 16?—Yes.

5911. Such children as have greatly improved?—Yes, full power.

5912. Have they ever considered the advisability of doing that?—Yes, they have. They have had the whole question of the custody of children who are maturing into adults, under their consideration for some time past, and, as you are aware, they are now considering the question afresh.

5913. The managers have shown no reluctance in any way to put the Darenth schools in a thoroughly efficient condition to carry out the primary objects of the place?—I should say they have always been in a thoroughly efficient condition, and that it is the manager's earnest desire that they should always remain so.

5914. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) Can you tell us whether any serious attempt has been made to apply the Idiots Act of 1886 to the government of Darenth?—Will you refresh my memory with it?

5915. (*Handing a copy of Act to witness.*) It contains provisions relating to licensed houses, hospitals, and institutions, and my impression is that under the word "institution" we were told that an attempt had been made to include Darenth?—I do not know of any such attempt. I believe it is not included within this description at all.

5916. You will see in the interpretation clause at the end, clause 17, it is said: "Idiots or imbeciles do not "include lunatics. 'Lunatic' does not mean or "include 'idiot or imbecile'"?—Yes.

5917. I am only quoting that to show how diverse both the law as well as general opinion is on the subject?—Yes, it is the Lunacy Act of 1890 that I was referring to when I said that the term "lunatic" covers all classes of insane persons. You will observe that these hospitals, institutions, and licensed houses are those which are registered under this Act, and Darenth, of course, is not registered under it.

5918. I think it was said that Darenth could not be registered under this Act?—Quite so.

5919. What is the class of patients in the adult asylum at Darenth?—They are ordinary adult imbeciles.

5920. Are they improvable cases, or not improvable?—Only a per-centage of them have passed through the schools, and I should say very little improved indeed.

5921. As a rule they are cases which have not been successfully trained?—I believe a very small portion of them are capable of being successfully trained.

5922. Are they employed in the asylum?—Yes, those who are capable of employment are.

5923. Very simple employment, I suppose?—Very simple mechanical employment. One will turn a mangle all day long if you set him to it, and another will fetch and carry all day long if you set him to it.

5924. Are any of them employed at outdoor labour?—Some of them dig and do other agricultural work, some carry coals, and all kinds of things.

5925. With regard to the expense of Darenth as compared with that of Caterham and Leavesden, is the excess owing to the higher staff charges at Darenth?—Practically, exclusively so.

5926. That would include, I suppose, the educational staff?—Yes.

5927. I have been asked to inquire who inspects the educational side of Darenth?—I am not aware of any educational examination.

5928. There is no special educational inspection?—No. I do not think we get even the Poor Law educational examiners.

5929. (*Chairman.*) We are chiefly concerned with a very large class with whom you have comparatively little to do, or ought to have very little to do?—Nothing, as far as I can see.

5930. Those we have to deal with number about 10,000 as far as we can tell. One in every 100 of children of school age and one-sixth of the population is of school age, so that it is about 1/600th part of the whole of the population. Now they are very varying

Mr. T. D. Mann.

21 Mar. 1897.

in their capacity, and they may be divided into higher imbeciles or lower imbeciles, or if you prefer the expression "higher feeble-minded" and "lower feeble-minded." We have about 10,000 children who are not fit for the ordinary schools. Might not the first sifting of these children be done by some medical officer with a teacher and superintendent of the classes, and then might not the residue go to Darenth?—Yes.

5931. On the other hand, the medical officer of Darenth might say that these children were not fit to become inmates of Darenth?—Yes.

5932. Would it not be a good thing to combine the two authorities, so as to be able to have a friendly opinion as to what was the best place for these poor children to go to?—Do you mean would I suggest that the powers of the Asylums Board should be enlarged so as to enable it to deal with persons who are not included within the present technical description of "imbecile"?

5933. Either to do that or to co-operate with the School Board for London in some way or another, so that some of the children should be allowed to go to special classes under the control of the School Board for London?—Yes; but there is another point which of course would have to be borne in mind in connexion with that, and that is the poverty or otherwise of the parents of the children.

5934. We find no repugnance on the part of the parents to sending their children to these special classes?—Quite so.

5935. And the parents are not made paupers by it, and you would agree, I suppose, that it is advisable to keep such children out of Darenth if possible?—Clearly.

5936. And to send them to special classes?—Clearly.

5937. And the parent might possibly have a choice between the two as to whether he would have his child in a special school or in an asylum?—You are aware of course, that the Local Government Board is contemplating dealing with a certain class of feeble-minded children. They did propose to constitute an additional asylums board. The matter is now under the consideration of the Local Government Board with regard to several classes of pauper children. One of these classes is feeble-minded children.

5938. And they would take the feeble-minded children of persons who are not paupers and make both the parents and children paupers?—I am not prepared to say that. So far as their proposals are concerned, they were only to deal, I believe, with pauper children from the Poor Law schools and so on. That rather enters into the question you were suggesting just now. There was a proposal to constitute an additional asylums board of exactly the same dimensions as this; but there is a counter proposal to utilise our board for the purpose, and not to create a second board. What the Local Government Board will finally decide, I am not prepared to say, but it is under consideration.

5939. The machinery seems very simple. The school board attendance officer knows every feeble-minded child in London, they are all scheduled, so that it would be very easy to produce them all if the parents would part with them. It is only in the case of children who are in bad homes that we would wish to separate them and send them to an institution?—Quite so.

5940. The other course is, as I understand, that the school board officer would tell the policeman?—I do not gather that there is any provision to forcibly take from a parent who takes proper care and control of his child, a child whom he wants to keep at home unless the child is badly used or badly looked after.

5941. Or is a danger to the neighbourhood, because he might set the house on fire?—Then he is not under proper care and control.

5942. But you see there are a great number of children who are in such a mental condition, that they are neither fit for ordinary schools on the one hand or for Darenth on the other?—Quite so.

5943. And the children with whom we are specially concerned, you would refuse at Darenth, saying they were not fit cases for that asylum?—You mean children who could not be properly certified for detention at the present time?

5944. Yes?—Yes, I daresay that is so.

The witness withdrew.

Form referred to as Form A. in Mr. T. D. Mann's Evidence. See *Answer to Question* 5759.

LUNACY ACT, 1890.

Second Schedule—*Form* 8.

CERTIFICATE OF MEDICAL PRACTITIONER.

In the matter of_____

of_____

in the_____ of_____

_____ an alleged Lunatic,

I, the undersigned,_____

do hereby certify as follows:—

1. I am a person registered under the Medical Act, 1858, and I am in the actual practice of the Medical profession.

2. I visited and personally examined the said_____

at_____

in the_____ of_____

[separately from any othe practitioner] I personally examined the said_____

and came to the conclusion that he is a Lunatic (an Idiot, or a person of unsound mind) and a proper person to be taken charge of and detained under care and treatment.

3. I formed this conclusion on the following grounds, viz.:—

(a.) *Facts indicating insanity observed by myself at the time of examination, viz.:—*

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

(b.) *Facts communicated by others, viz.:—*

_____

_____

_____

_____

4. The said_____ appeared to me to be [*or* not to be] in a fit condition of bodily health to be removed to an Asylum, Hospital, or Licensed House.

5. I give this certificate having first read the section of the Act of Parliament printed below.

*Dated this*_____ *day of*_____ 189____

(Signed)_____

of_____

Extract from section of the Lunacy Act, 1890.

LUNACY ACT, 1890.

Second Schedule—*Form* 11.

ORDER FOR DETENTION OF LUNATIC IN WORKHOUSE.

*To the Master of the*_____ *Workhouse of the*_____ *Union.*

I, the undersigned,_____

a Justice of the Peace for the_____

being satisfied that_____

a pauper in the_____ Workhouse of the_____ Union

is a Lunatic [*or* Idiot, *or* person of unsound mind], and a proper person to be taken charge of under care and treatment in the Workhouse; and being satisfied that the accommodation in the Workhouse is sufficient for the proper care and treatment separate from the inmates of the Workhouse not Lunatics [*or* that h condition is such that it is not necessary for the convenience of the Lunatic or of the other inmates that he should be kept separate] hereby authorise you to take charge of and, if the Workhouse Medical Officer shall certify it to be necessary, to detain the said_____ as a patient in your Workhouse.

Mr. T. D. Mann. 24 Mar. 1897.

Subjoined is a statement of particulars respecting the said _____

Signed. _____

A Justice of the Peace for the _____

Dated _____ day of _____ 189__.

Form referred to as Form B. in Mr. D. Mann's Evidence. See *Answer to Question* 5759.

ADMISSION ORDER.

Dated _____ *day of* _____ 189__.

To the Medical Superintendent of the Metropolitan District Asylum at Darenth.

Admit the Person named and described as below, from the _____ in the Metropolitan Asylum District.

Name.	Date of Birth.	Calling, if any.	History of Case. Duration of Disease.	Religious Persuasion.	Name and Address of nearest known Relative.

_____ *Clerk to the Board of Guardians.*

MEDICAL CERTIFICATE.

I, the undersigned, do hereby certify that I have this day personally examined _____ a person chargeable to the _____ and that the said _____ is, in my opinion, a chronic and harmless _____ such as might be lawfully retained in a Workhouse, and a fit person for admission into the Metropolitan District Asylum at Darenth, and that I have formed this opinion upon the following grounds, viz.:—

(*a.*) Here state the facts.

1. Facts observed by myself (*a*) _____

(*b.*) Here state the information, and from whom obtained.

2. Facts (if any) communicated to me by others (*b*) _____

I hereby also certify that the said _____ is not at the present time, to the best of my belief, suffering from any contagious or infectious disease, and that, in my judgment, after examination duly made for that purpose, the journey to the Asylum is not likely to prove detrimental to _____, either by reason of advanced age, or in consequence of _____ being affected by disease of the heart, lungs, or other organ.

_____ Medical Officer of the _____ of the _____

Dated this _____ day of _____ 189__.

REPORT TO GUARDIANS.

To be signed by the Chairman, Vice-Chairman, or a Member of the Visiting Committee of the Board of Guardians of the Union or Parish from which the Pauper is to be sent to the Asylum.

I, the undersigned, being _____ of the _____ having, on the _____ day of _____, 189__ personally seen _____, a Pauper chargeable to the said _____, proposed to be sent to the Metropolitan District Asylum at Darenth, do hereby declare that I am satisfied that the said _____ is a proper person to be sent to that Asylum.

Signature _____

Date _____

Sir D. Galton

Sir DOUGLAS GALTON called in and examined.

5945. (*Chairman.*) You know what the nature of our inquiry is?—Yes.

5946. You are chiefly concerned to speak as to results that have been obtained by the International Congress of Hygiene and Demography?—Yes, a committee was appointed by that Congress, and I was appointed chairman of that committee. The results of that committee have practically been all obtained by Dr. Warner, I may say entirely so. The committee was appointed to inquire into the mental and physical condition of children; and funds towards the investigation were furnished by the British Medical Association, by the British Association, and by some few private subscriptions.

5947. Did Dr. Warner undertake this entirely without fee or reward of any kind?—I think the money which we raised may be said to have been given to Dr. Warner simply to cover his time and expenses in making this examination.

5948. Was any other medical man associated with him in the course of the inquiry?—No, I do not think that Dr. Shuttleworth, who was on the committee, made any observations himself.

5949. I believe I also was a member of the committee, but I did not make any attendances?—I think I may say, generally, that no one was associated with him. I may add that I brought the matter before the British Association, and they have given a small grant every year for the last two or three years towards it. I brought it also before the Royal Society, and endeavoured to obtain a grant from that society, but the Royal Society said that they wished to have a much more definite idea of Dr. Warner's processes, and that they should be corroborated by some other medical man, who should make observations, perhaps, upon the same children, in order to corroborate the observations made by Dr. Warner. They did not seem to think that his conclusions were of such a definite nature as to enable them to give a grant.

5950. Dr. Warner, I believe, has examined about 100,000 children?—He has examined 100,000 children, chiefly in schools of the elementary type, and we have published this result in a report.

5951. And you have now founded the "Childhood Society"?—Yes, we founded the Childhood Society as an outcome of that.

5952. That society was founded for the scientific study of the mental and physical conditions of children?—Yes, that is the title of the society. Its objects are first to promote the study of educational methods and environment of children during school life, best suited to ensure the mental and physical development of normal children as well as those whose conditions are abnormal or who are feebly gifted mentally; in the second place, to supply information and diffuse knowledge on points connected with the mental and physical status of children by means of publication, lectures, and otherwise, and to form a library; and thirdly, to promote the training of teachers specially qualified to deal with such children, and assist, by legislation and philanthropic efforts or otherwise, the provision necessary for them.

5953. There have been efforts made in America and on the Continent of Europe in the same direction?—Yes, there have.

5954. For the purpose of testing Dr. Warner's conclusions?—I do not know whether they were made for the purpose of testing Dr. Warner's conclusions, but at all events they are made on parallel lines. Dr. Wundt has written on physiological psychology, and has, I think, got a laboratory of physiological psychology in Germany, and Professor Griesbach has published researches on school hygiene and has made measurements of the nerve fatigue caused in children in school by study. I have shown Dr. Shuttleworth a copy of that book. I may say the ultimate object of Dr. Warner's tests is to discover and discriminate between children who are naturally, and therefore more or less irremediably, incapable, and those who are naturally capable, but incapable probably through faulty nurture or environment.

5955. You know Dr. Warner intimately?—I know him very well.

5956. And you know the system of signs that he follows?—Yes.

5957. And the classification that he makes upon them?—Yes. What I wanted to say about this clause was that the "nerve signs" appear in either or both of the categories which I have mentioned. They appear amongst children who are naturally incapable, and amongst children who are incapable through faulty nurture. But a slouching slovenly child of the latter kind may be made smart and tidy by drill, food, and care, for he has it in him to be so, just as loutish recruits are soon turned into smart soldiers. But the child who is naturally incapable is an almost hopeless subject. It would therefore appear to be a good subject of enquiry as to how far the physical stigmata do really connote the first class of case, and how far the nerve signs do the same.

5958. You wish to have an enquiry made to determine the ambiguity of the nerve signs as between the two classes?—What, I think, ought to be done, is to have such an enquiry as would eventually test Dr. Warner's conclusions. But whoever conducts the enquiry would have to begin by thoroughly mastering Dr. Warner's plan to Dr. Warner's satisfaction, and thenceforward should work independently of him.

5959. You are speaking of the nerve signs now specially?—Yes, the nerve signs.

5960. As to the stigmata or physical signs, any medical man would be quite as well able to judge as Dr. Warner?—Yes. Physical signs sometimes seem to include movements of the hands, or wrinkles in the forehead or face, and these may be called either physical signs or nerve signs, but no doubt they are the result of nervous action.

5961. And they would show in some physical defect?—They would show in some physical manner, I think.

5962. You would not wish to have an enquiry made into the physical malformation or bad development, but simply into the value of the nerve signs, and how far they were signs of incapability?—The best way to put it would be this, I think—to discover whether another person following that line of research would come to exactly the same conclusions as to the children that Dr. Warner does.

5963. His conclusions are that they are applicable to children who are irremediably incapable, and also to children who are so through faulty nurture?—They cover both, because both may show somewhat similar signs.

5964. And they may be misleading as regards feeble-mindedness by being attributed solely to faulty nurture, perhaps?—That is the conclusion that I want rather to suggest for your consideration.

5965. You wish to have the value of his system of signs as showing mental feeble-mindedness tested?—Yes, so as to reduce it to a system. Now it is the work of one man, and there is, therefore, the personal equation of that one man. What I want is to see if you can arrive at some system which would enable any skilled physiologist to come to exactly the same conclusions.

5966. I believe Dr. Warner only uses the sign as a previous test of feeble-mindedness—as a sign leading in that direction?—No doubt.

5967. And when he has selected these children who show the nerve signs, he then examines them for malformations, does he not?—He examines the physical malformations, no doubt.

Sir D. Galton. 24 Mar. 1897.

5968. It is only a preliminary test?—It is a preliminary test, undoubtedly.

5969. Undoubtedly you would not remove a child from a class, or say it was a feeble-minded child, simply on account of nerve signs alone?—No, you would not certainly: you would take the teacher's recommendations also, and of course the teacher must be the person who can best ascertain what a child can do. Still, their observations may want checking sometimes, and I think the teachers might very well desire to free themselves from backward children, and hand them over as feeble-minded children in order to relieve themselves of the trouble of educating them.

5970. Would it be possible for Dr. Warner to give some simple rules which the inspectors in different schools might follow?—I should think he might, but I think what he would say, and what he has said sometimes would be this, "I must show some one what my system is," and then that person might pursue the enquiry.

5971. Could he not issue some rules which might be sent to all inspectors throughout the country, and then ask them to test the value of these signs, without instructing such inspectors personally?—I think in that case there would be liability to mistakes. It would not be fair to Dr. Warner's method of judging of the value of these signs, nor would it, I think, lead to a very reliable conclusion; because in this book Dr. Warner suggests the way in which the signs are made and judged of, and, no doubt, this book would afford a basis, but, I think, there is the personal equation in a matter of this kind which would have to be brought into operation.

5972. Suppose that a preliminary examination were made by the inspectors of London, for instance, of a certain number of schools, and Dr. Warner were called in afterwards to verify the result, would not that be as valuable as employing a single person to go round a much smaller number of schools?—If you could get Dr. Warner to explain to each of the inspectors what his methods were, to begin with, and then let them go and examine the child, I think it would lead to useful results.

5973. You think it must be done verbally, that it could not be done by a written paper of instructions?—You have a written paper of instructions in a sense in this book.

5974. Would it be well to circulate that amongst the inspectors?—I think the simpler way would be for Dr. Warner, in the first place, to explain to certain persons who were to make the inspection what his system exactly is, and then to let them make an independent inspection and see what the results were.

5975. We had a similar investigation with regard to blindness in the schools, which was conducted by Mr. Brudenel Carter?—Is not blindness a very different thing?

5976. Mr. Brudenell Carter was good enough to give us a certain number of rough tests by which we were enabled to examine about 80 or 90 per cent. of the children, and reject them as not being fit subjects for him to examine; and then he himself personally examined the residue of the 20 per cent. whom we laymen were not capable of pronouncing upon. Could not we have a simple series of tests of the same sort which inspectors and teachers could apply, and then Dr. Warner look at the residue?—Are not tests for blindness simple practical tests? As, for instance, reading a book at a certain distance, or seeing things under certain conditions—tests of a kind which Mr. Brudenel Carter put me through the other day when I went to him to ask him whether I had something the matter with my eye. Those are practical tests which anybody could carry out, because there is no personal equation involved in them, I think. However, you could try the experiment of sending this book to the inspectors and asking them to examine a school upon the basis of what is suggested here, and then ask Dr. Warner to see whether he produces the same results. That would, no doubt, be a useful test, but I think you would do it more advantageously if you get them taught beforehand.

5977. And you think probably they might come to the same conclusion as to the proportion of those that showed nerve signs?—I think it ought to be so, and probably it would. I do not doubt that Dr. Warner is

Sir D. Galton.

24 Mar. 1897.

accurate. The only point is that one wishes it reduced to an absolute system.

5978. It is proposed, is it not, to open a laboratory at University College for the teaching of physiological psychology?—Professor Sully proposes to open a laboratory there for the study of physiological psychology or psychological physiology. They have not quite determined on the name yet, I think, but it has been pretty well arranged that it is to be started, and Professor Munsterberg, a German who is now at Freiburg, but who has been at Harvard College in America, and elsewhere, has promised to come over and assist us in opening this laboratory.

5979. Professor Sully, I think, is not a physiologist, but a psychologist pure and simple?—He is professor at University College. He wrote to me and asked me to attend a meeting on this subject, and we had a meeting, and Professor Schäfer and Professor Carey-Foster have arranged, I believe, to put their laboratories at Professor Sully's disposal.

5980. Professor Carey Foster would take the physiological side?—Professor Carey Foster would take the physical and Professor Schäfer the physiological side.

5981. And Professor Sully would take the psychological?—Yes. Professor Sully, I believe, is the person who is to conduct the laboratory, and the use of the two laboratories are, I believe, to be at his disposal. But we attach much more importance to the presence of Professor Munsterberg who said he would come over to explain the necessary arrangements. Professor Munsterberg was a pupil of Professor Wundt's and has been over in America a good deal. This has absolutely nothing to do with spiritualism. We should not countenance that at all at University College.

5982. Do you think that teachers could be trained at such a laboratory?—I think if the laboratory was started it would afford a means of training teachers. That was the main reason why I was anxious to give it some countenance and support at the University College.

5983. In the case of legislation for the benefit of feeble-minded children, it would, I suppose, be necessary to have some medical persons who are specially competent to deal with such cases on behalf of the Government?—It would I think be very desirable, at first (because after all this is a perfectly new matter) to have at headquarters in the Education Department some person who would collate all the reports from the inspectors and advise upon any point which seemed by those reports to require to be put into a proper shape, or as to which it appeared desirable that further experiments should be made. In fact he would gradually work out a proper and a useful and an efficient system. I do not see how you are to do it unless you have some qualified medical officer who is a good physiologist, and who would therefore be capable of looking into all those points. He ought occasionally perhaps to run down to the spot and see and talk to an inspector or have him up; but he would be generally referred to in the matter of reports which came from all parts of the country of feeble-minded children.

5984. Do you happen to know whether there are many such specially qualified medical men in England? I daresay I could mention two or three.

5985. (*Mr. Pooley.*) Would you agree that there are children who can be better taught in special classes and by special methods than in ordinary schools by ordinary methods, because they are defective to some extent in mind?—I should agree with that, but there is always this qualification which I should like to add. Of course the child who is defective will be improved most probably by contact with normal children, whereas on the other hand the normal child is possibly rather injured by too much contact with the defective children. Therefore I think judicious care is required in making the selection of those who are to be separated entirely from the normal children. I think you must look at the matter from this point of view that you do not want to injure the chances of the defective child improving himself.

5986. You think a defective child in a class of ordinary children might be benefited by being associated with children more intelligent than himself?—Yes.

5987. On the other hand, in our existing schools such a defective child is liable to be neglected and left behind in the race?—No doubt.

5988. You must set those considerations against one another?—Yes, both considerations ought to be very carefully taken into account.

5989. Do you agree that in deciding as to whether a particular child shall be put into a special class or not for practical purposes three factors must be considered; the life history of the child as far as you can get it from the parents or other sources, the opinion of the teacher who has actually taught the child, and the evidence of a medical expert?—Yes, I quite think you require all those factors.

5990. Would you put any one of those three factors above the rest as being the most important?—I think I should put the opinion of the teacher almost at the front, because teachers ought to know the children thoroughly. But I would like to say I think environment has a very great influence on a child. I mean the circumstances of its life outside the school. I think you cannot get rid of the question of environment.

5991. You consider that Dr. Warner's system has not yet been completed, and that it would be interesting from a scientific point of view that there should be further independent inquiry?—Yes, I do. I have always felt that, but I never saw my way to getting it, because of course it involves a certain amount of expenditure. First of all we could not expect Dr. Warner to give his time to teaching someone else, and then we could not expect to get the other person to give his time to be taught unless we could remunerate them in some way. I do not know what the Government may possibly be able to arrange with regard to that, but as a private society and a private organisation we could not very well arrange for it. Then there is a difficulty of getting the schools to be examined.

5992. For practical purposes would it be sufficient if the medical experts and teachers in some cases were given the means of studying Dr. Warner's system?—I think so. I think it would be very advantageous for the teachers.

5993. It is not desirable that they should accept it as complete or established?—No, I would not have it accepted as complete until it had been thoroughly endorsed by the Education Department having made an independent enquiry into it.

5994. Do you agree that many of the defects mentioned by Dr. Warner—the nerve signs and other physical signs—are to be found singly and sometimes even in combination in ordinary children—that is in children of ordinary mental capacity?—I think so. I think that there will be no doubt about that. But though I cannot particularise, I have not the slighest doubt that children of ordinary capacity, and who profit very much by being with their fellows may show at one time or another nerve signs which would fall under one or other of Dr. Warner's categories.

5995. In the present state of our knowledge, if we seek to discriminate between ordinary children and defective children by the use of Dr. Warner's system, must it not be applied with some care?—It must be applied with great care I think. That is what I came here to emphasise.

5996. (*Miss Townsend.*) If the nerve signs are in some cases capable of being got rid of by drill or special treatment, would it not be advisable, when the nerve signs are observed in children, to subject them to some special form of drill or treatment in order to determine whether the children are physically or mentally defective?—That is a very difficult question for me, who am not a physiologist, to answer; but I think that there is no doubt that physical exercises would have a great influence in removing many of these nerve signs which are observed.

5997. So that it might be well, in the case of children who show them, to emphasise physical exercises before finally consigning the child to a feeble-minded class on the one hand or to an ordinary school on the other?—I think it would be.

5998. In order to see whether the defects could be got over?—I think it would be very desirable; and I think almost all school systems now include a certain amount of physical exercises or training of some sort or other, which, to a great extent, would produce what I gather your question leads to.

5999. These physical signs, which are elicited by Dr. Warner's inquiry, may be more physical than mental in some cases, and may be got over by physical

rather than by mental training?—Undoubtedly, physical training would assist in removing those which are removable.

6000-1. In that case, it is not very possible, is it, to test Dr. Warner's results until they have been so followed up. You said, I think, that you would like his results to be tested by other examiners?—If the two tests could be made consecutively, then, at all events, you would see what was the value of his theories. If the examination of a school by Dr. Warner, and the examination of the same school by another inspector were made, the one immediately after the other, there would scarcely have been time for anything to have taken place to alter the conditions.

6002. That would assist in testing, no doubt, Dr. Warner's judgment, but would it test the actual state of the children?—What I want to see is, whether Dr. Warner's system is on such a basis that it will bring certain results, however it is applied.

6003. But what I meant was, that the results take time?—If you examine the school to-day, we will say, and you then employ a certain amount of training of some sort, physical training or otherwise, and examine the same children three months or six months hence, I have no doubt you would obtain very different results, and therefore, I say, if you are to test those results, they should be tested almost simultaneously or consecutively. I quite agree with you that the physical training produces immense changes, and you would not find the same condition in a school to-day that you would find in a school three months hence.

6004. If you think the environment of a child is so important, would it be well in cases of a very bad environment to take charge of the children altogether, and to remove them from it; would not they then stand a better chance?—No doubt the children would stand a better chance, but are you to relieve parents of the duties which they have assumed?

6005. I suppose that is a matter for everyone's judgment, but what is your opinion?—So far as the child is concerned, no doubt if you put it in a proper home it would be a great deal of advantage to the child to be removed from a bad environment, and, perhaps, it is a thing which we ought to do.

6006. What do you mean by "a proper home"?—I would not put the child in a barrack.

6007. You would put him in a small home?—I should prefer seeing him in a small home.

6008. Or would you put him in a family?—It depends on the family.

6009. But suppose you chose the family?—If I knew the family well I might do so.

6010. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) Would you tell me what was the object of getting Dr. Warner to examine all these children?—I came into it after a certain time; the thing had begun a long time before the International Congress of Hygiene, by the action of the Charity Organisation Society, and a vote of 100*l.*, I believe from the British Medical Association. Then Dr. Warner brought the results which he had acquired before the International Congress of Hygiene, in which I was Chairman of the Executive Committee. Then the subject was brought before one of their sections, and the recommendation which they made was, that a committee should be formed to continue those investigations, and I was pressed to become chairman of this committee, with the result that I came in in the middle of it. Dr. Warner had made from 50,000 to 70,000 examinations of children, and the committee was to undertake to get 100,000 examinations of children; we met and arranged with the British Medical Association to give us some further money, and we got money elsewhere to some extent at least, sufficient to enable these 100,000 children to be examined. Then we produced this volume as the result of our labours. Therefore, I cannot tell you what was the origin of it, except that Dr. Warner, I suppose, suggested this to the British Medical Association. Probably Dr. Shuttleworth would be able to give you more information about the origin of it than I can.

6011. What I wanted really to know was why it had been thought necessary to undertake this examination?—I cannot tell you in the first instance why. I only tell you how it arose and how I came to be mixed up with it. But it seems to be an absolutely necessary thing to have some standard by which you are to judge of whether a child is feeble-minded or otherwise.

6012. Would you think that a child who was feeble-minded would continue to make effort if it was constantly associated with its superiors?—I should. I always think that to surround children with people who have other aspirations gradually tends to bring them into line with those aspirations, and the tendency is to produce eventually an average.

Sir D. Galton.

24 Mar. 1897.

6013. I think experience shows that a child continues to lag behind and ceases to make effort, feeling its inferiority?—Then in such case I should say that the child ought certainly to be removed to another environment.

6014. In the case of a very nervous child, would you think it well that it should be in a class of, say, 60 children?—I have no doubt there are many instances in which it is of immense advantage to remove the children to another place for education, but that is the reason I lay so very much stress on the teacher having advice in the selection, because unless teachers have a voice in the selection, I do not know how any person coming to examine a class could obtain sufficient knowledge to say that the child ought to go or ought not to go. Still, I think that all the three conditions which were mentioned by Mr. Pooley are very desirable to consult.

6015. It may be most unfair, may it not, to judge a child by five or ten minutes' examination?—I do not think you could make such an examination final. It may be a mode of discriminating, in the first instance, a preliminary discrimination.

6016. (*Dr. Smith.*) A great deal is said about Dr. Warner's system, but does it not really consist of a number of signs which were known before?—Then they were not collated together.

6017. There is no new discovery in the details, is there?—No; there is, I apprehend, no new discovery, but it is the collating together of information from observing the children.

6018. It is merely the reduction to a system of a number of signs which those engaged in this sort of work were conversant with before?—Probably.

6019. This collation or systematising of these signs was brought before the International Congress, and a resolution was passed as to the desirability of a committee being formed in connection with the subject?—Yes, to carry on this inquiry.

6020. So as to find out the precise value to attach to the system as a system?—Yes.

6021. That was ten years ago, was it not?—It is about six years ago.

6022. Was not this first brought forward at a meeting of the British Medical Association in Glasgow in 1888?—Yes, I had nothing to do with it at that time. I had only to do with it at the International Congress of Hygiene. That was in 1891.

6023. But the system was brought practically before the medical profession in 1888 at a meeting in Glasgow?—Yes certainly, and they contributed 100*l.* to it at that time, or very soon afterwards.

6024. In 1891 this system was again brought forward at the International Congress of Hygiene?—Yes.

6025. So that this matter has been very prominently known to the medical profession for all these years?—Yes, certainly it has been largely supported financially by the British Medical Association. They have given three if not four grants to it of 100*l.* each.

6026. I think you said that there was no other medical practitioner prominently connected with the system, other than Dr. Warner?—Dr. Shuttleworth knows about it.

6027. Dr. Shuttleworth was on the committee, probably, but he was not engaged in any active way with it?—I do not think anyone besides Dr. Warner has undertaken the detailed examination of children. I know of no one else.

6028. You say that no other medical man has been associated with Dr. Warner in this work?—That is so.

6029. And your opinion, after this number of years has elapsed since the matter was brought forward, is that some systematic inquiry should be made into its value?—I think it is desirable that that should be done.

6030. And you further are of opinion that it would not be prudent to attach too much value to this system until it has been confirmed by some independent skilled investigation?—Yes.

Sir D. Galton.
24 Mar. 1897.

6031. And I think you wish to imply that this skilled investigation could not be secured by simply giving a list of signs to anybody. Those who investigate the matter must have a physiological training before they could properly apply the signs?—I do not suppose that I, for instance, could go into a school and do it properly. You would require, I think, a medical man, or a man certainly who has had a physiological training. No doubt it would be a medical man.

6032. So that he can properly appreciate the signs?—Yes.

6033. And attach the proper value to them?—Yes. I do not know that you might not train persons who are not medical men to make an examination after you had thoroughly agreed upon the signs.

6034. You think a preliminary selection could be made of suitable children for such classes as the Committee have under consideration, by untrained persons?—I should not like to say that, but I think it is quite possible that it might be done, not by untrained persons, but by persons who are not medical men.

6035. Not trained in a medical sense?—Yes.

6036. You mentioned that it was most desirable that the evidence of teachers should always be forthcoming?—I think that the evidence of teachers is always important.

6037. Supposing that you have got all this evidence, of the teacher, of the family history and so on, with whom would you leave the ultimate decision as to the advisability or otherwise of admitting a child to a special class?—Suppose they all agree, then there would be no difficulty, but you ask what should be done in case there was a difference of opinion?

6038. Yes?—I do not know that I have thought out that question. It would be difficult to refer every case of doubtful opinion to the Education Department itself. I think that the inspector must have a very strong voice in the matter. I should like to have at the Education Department a man who would be able to advise the inspectors and the Department itself upon a question arising as to this, and he should be a skilled medical man.

6039. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) With regard to the application of Dr. Warner's tests, do you think that anyone who had not had a medical education would be thoroughly able to appreciate such developmental defects as we have in the catalogue in this "Report on the Scientific "Study of the Mental and Physical Conditions of "Childhood"?—I have strong doubts about that.

6040. With regard to postures and movements teachers might appreciate them, but what you say as to hydrocephalic, microcephalic, and dolichocephalic children?—I do not think that a man who had not had medical training would be qualified to make such observations.

6041. I have been connected with Dr. Warner as a member of his committee, and in that capacity I have had the opportunity of seeing several of his examinations, am I right in saying that Dr. Warner does not, as a rule, ask any questions of the children?—As a rule he does not, I believe.

6042. He obtains his information as to the mental condition of the children from the teachers?—Yes. I think he invariably takes the teachers' opinion as to the mental condition and examines the nerve signs and other signs.

6043. Then he forms an opinion as to the whole case from the physical signs which he observes himself, and from the mental signs which he obtains information of from the teachers?—I believe so.

6044. Are you aware whether he has had any experience among large groups of professedly abnormal children such as those to be found in institutions for imbeciles?—I think he has been down to our imbecile asylum at Darenth. He went there, I think, especially to visit it for his own satisfaction.

6045. Do you you know how the tests that he has formulated came out when they were applied to a large body of imbeciles?—No. I do not know to what extent he applied them there. But he went down to Darenth I know, and he told me that he had had a very interesting day there; I do not know anything further.

6046. And I think he decides upon the condition of the child by a combination of signs, does he not—the co-relation of signs as he calls it?—Yes.

6047. He would not judge by one sign?—No, he takes a large number of the signs together. That is what I meant to say in answering Dr. Smith—that the signs are not new signs, but that by collating them together Dr. Warner has certainly devised a system—that is the novelty which I understand he claims.

6048. Are you aware that physical criteria similar to those of Dr. Warner (similar to those that we have in this Report), together with the mental conditions, had been noted years before in the books of imbecile asylums?—I believe that is so.

6049. Supposing that it is desirable for these children to be separated from ordinary school children into boarding establishments, from your experience would you say that they should be boarded in small groups, or in large groups?—I should like them to be in small groups—I think that is most essential.

6050. You think if they boarded out there should be only a small number together rather than that they should be put in a large "barrack-like" institution?—Yes, I think a barrack institution is undesirable, even when children arrive at a greater age than you are perhaps speaking of. We have the Gordon Boys Home under us, and the Gordon Boys Home is practically a barrack institution, and we have very often had great difficulties in certain parts of the management, and I am certain that we should do far better with these boys if we had followed Gordon's own idea, which was that they should all be treated in small groups, and with some person to look after each group who would be practically like a mother to them. That, I think, is the only way in which you can produce the best results. And these children are older than yours a great deal; we do not take them under 14.

6051. (*Chairman.*) I think the whole world is coming round to that conclusion, Sir Douglas?—I am glad to hear it.

The witness withdrew.

Dr. Colman.

Dr. COLMAN called in and examined.

6052. (*Mr. Pooley.*) You are Assistant Physician to the National Hospital for Epilepsy, Queen's Square, and to the Sick Children's Hospital, Great Ormond Street, and you are also on the medical staff of the Epileptic Colony at Chalfont?—Yes.

6053. I think you are also lecturer at the Training College for Secondary Teachers in connexion with the College of Preceptors?—Yes, I am.

6054. What special subject have you devoted yourself to?—The observation of normal and defective children.

6055. Is it your opinion that mentally defective children shade off insensibly into the ordinary children on the one hand, and imbeciles on the other?—Yes, and I think it is extremely difficult to arrive at a definition by which children could be included or excluded from the class.

6056. Have you formed an opinion as to the education of defective children, as to whether they do best in ordinary schools or in special classes?—I think it is quite certain that a very large number of them cannot be educated alongside of normal children, and for several reasons. One is, that the health of these defective children is usually indifferent and variable. Their mental capacity is also very variable from time to time, and in addition to that, there is such a marked inequality as to the way in which they are affected in regard to different parts of their work. Many children who can learn extremely easily by rote, and so on, are, to take an example, very deficient with regard to arithmetic. I can say that of children who have come under my own notice.

6057. So that they want special treatment?—I do not see how they can be taught alongside others with advantage.

6058. What do you say with regard to children who are below the standard of the ordinary child, but who are not idiots or imbeciles, as to putting them with other children of defective minds? Do you think there is any disadvantage in that?—I think not. Of course it is very difficult to know what one means by "children of unsound mind." I suppose you do not mean absolutely mindless idiots?

6059. No; I meant was there any objection to putting them with other children of a similar kind in these special classes?—No, I think it is greatly to their advantage. From what I have seen of my own patients who have gone to the special classes—and I have seen their condition before and after—I should say it is to their very great advantage to be in such classes.

6060. Do you think, if a proper selection is made, they do not lose by ceasing to be associated with intelligent and ordinary children?—I have never seen anything indicating that in the least—quite the other way.

6061. Would you say that if they should lose something in that respect, they would gain on the other hand by individual attention?—I cannot say from my own observation that I have seen any case in which there has been any deterioration from their contact with the others.

6062. Can you give us an opinion about the proper number to place in a special class under one teacher?—I am afraid I cannot; that is a matter for the teacher.

6063. Have you an opinion as to the relative merits of day classes and institutions for these children?—I have an opinion, but I am afraid it is not worth very much, because I have not seen much of the institutional style of treatment. I should have said, from the point of view of the children, that classes where the children had a considerable amount of individual attention were very much better for them than that they should be in insititutions which usually contain a large number of children and where the classes are consequently large. I think it is a matter of large *v.* small classes rather than institution *v.* special schools.

6064. Are the children likely to do better where they have home life and mix with ordinary people out of school hours?—I think distinctly so.

6065. You think there is a disadvantage in herding together large numbers in institutions?—I think there is a disadvantage.

6066. What do you say about the possibility of these children attending regularly. Could they usually regularly attend at school?—Very frequently they cannot. I should say that it is the rule that in a couple of years some of these defective children will be away for a longer or a shorter period, perhaps for several periods; but I should not like to say more than that.

6067. What can you say about cases of temporary breakdown. Do they occur largely among children?—Very largely. They are certainly children of more feeble health, and they are more liable to the ordinary diseases of childhood quite apart from any mental breakdown.

6068. You would not expect very regular attendance?—Not so regular as among the other children certainly.

6069. Have you reason to think that in many cases defective children in London are not at school—children I mean who might be at school with benefit to themselves?—I have no doubt of it. For example, I saw 120 odd patients this morning, and there were three of them who were unable to attend school because they were defective, and there was no special class in their neighbourhood, and they could have attended if there had been a suitable school.

6070. Did they give you to understand that they could not get admission?—I should not like to speak of these particular three. I am sorry I did not make the inquiry with a view to my evidence this afternoon, but very often that is the statement—that they are refused.

6071. Were those three children children that you think might have been at school with advantage?—With advantage, but they could not attend regularly, and they would not be able to go at the same pace as other children.

6072. Have you met with instances of the same complaint with regard to epileptic children?—It is almost the rule to get it in the case of epileptic children either from the teacher complaining or, as in one or two cases that have come to my knowledge, because the parents of other children complained that their children were upset by the children having fits.

Dr. Colman.
24 Mar. 1897.

6073. Can you tell us shortly what are the factors to be considered in deciding whether a particular child should be sent to a special class, or kept in an ordinary school?—I think that is a most difficult question to answer shortly. I think there must be a co-operation of the medical examiner with the teacher. The question cannot be decided solely from the medical report. I think one must have the observations of those who see the child constantly, not as we do for a short time, and are able to go into the physical condition, and any indications of mental trouble; one must have the evidence of people who have seen them from day to day, and in varying moods, because it may be that they are brought to the medical examiner a day when they are above the average, or, it may be on the other hand, that they are brought when they are a great deal below the average.

6074. You would have the observation of the teacher if possible?—Of the teacher if possible, and if the parent were a reliable observer, I would have the observations of the parent as well.

6075. Would you have the evidence of the parent as to the family history?—I think it is a very important thing to have that, but I should not like to commit myself as to the amount of weight I should attach to it in every case.

6076. In the case of a child who has not been at school at all, do you think it is advisable that the child should attend an ordinary school for a time in order to be observed by a teacher where there is any doubt?—In cases where there is any doubt, yes, but other cases a medical man could certainly put on one side. There are, however, cases where it is a matter of the very greatest difficulty, and where the teacher's report would be of the greatest assistance.

6077. As to the training of the teachers of these special classes do you think it is important that the teacher should have some physiological training?—I think it is of very great advantage to make them understand the reason for the particular ways in which they have to train these exceptional children.

6078. So that they may sympathise with them and know something about their mental condition?—Yes.

6079. And as to the way in which they ought to be treated?—Yes, I think it is of advantage; I do not think it is essential.

6080. I should like to ask you whether you have any feeble-minded children at the Children's Hospital?—I should think I see seven or eight every morning. We have 100 to 159 out-patients, but that is not a number that you can take as indicating the frequency of such cases, because my colleagues know that I am interested in this question and are good enough to transfer many of their cases to me.

6081. What number of children have you in the hospital?—We have 175, I think.

6082. Do you think it would be practicable to give the school authority any power as regards the instruction of children in hospitals such as yours?—No, because the rules of the hospital are, that no child is to be retained for more than two months, except under very special circumstances.

6083. That is the case in your hospital?—Yes.

6084. It is not an hospital where the children are retained very long?—It is not a home, it is an hospital. Two months is the limit, except under particular circumstances, and usually it is from two to six weeks.

6085. Of course, education does not come in then?—It does not come in at all.

6086. Then as to epileptics, you divide them into three classes?—For convenience, yes.

6087. (1.) Where there is no mental impairment; (2) where their condition is very variable, having periods of mental dulness, but being fairly bright in between; and (3) a large class in which there is great mental impairment?—Yes.

6088. Then as regards their elementary education, do you agree that if the fits occur very seldom and are very slight there is no necessary reason why epileptic children should not be taught with ordinary children?—None whatever.

Dr. Colman.

24 Mar. 1897.

6089. Is it usually good for them that they should have plenty of mental occupation and also physical exercise?—It is of very great advantage to them in almost all cases.

6090. To keep them from brooding over their condition?—Yes. Of course it must be remembered that a large number of epileptic children are at the same time paralysed, and so almost verge into the group of crippled children, and so are debarred from active exercise.

6091. Then for children whose fits are more frequent is it likely, do you think, to do injury to the ordinary children to have them attending school?—Medically speaking, not. If it can be arranged that they should not attend the school regularly. If a child has frequent fits, there is nearly always a great deal of exhaustion after the fit—often a condition of irritability lasting for a day or two, which renders it unwise to send the child to school and renders the child unsuitable to put in the class.

6092. If the child has a fit in the school is that likely to be injurious to the other children?—From what I have seen I should say not. The children very seldom seem to mind it. Perhaps the first time they are startled, but when it is an every-day affair it is hardly noticed at all.

6093. We have had it in evidence that if an epileptic child has a fit it does not produce any injurious effects upon the epileptic children?—Not the least.

6094. The witnesses have not agreed as to the effects in the case of an epileptic child having a fit when among ordinary children?—With regard to epileptic children in a ward I can say certainly they are not affected one way or the other. With regard to schools, it is simply a matter of hearsay; I am really hardly qualified to speak about it.

6095. You think it might be injurious to nervous children?—I think it might upset nervous children; but I know in many cases it is almost a matter of amusement to them as to when a particular child is going to have another fit.

6096. What is the best way of dealing with epileptic children in your opinion?—I think that those who can go to school should go to the ordinary elementary schools. The others I think should be by themselves, under special circumstances where they can get combined hospital treatment (I am speaking of an ideal arrangement) with education, in consequence of their health so frequently breaking down after a severe bout of fits. It ought to be an institution where they can be removed for a time from the educational part and placed under medical care.

6097. At Chalfont you have at present very few children?—We have no childen yet.

6098. But you propose to take them?—Small homes are being built now. They are simply two cottages. Nothing in the nature of a school is arranged at present.

6099. Would you recommend collecting children from the homes into a day school or day schools at Chalfont?—I think that would be very much to the advantage of the children.

6100. Would you give them similar hours and similar instruction to ordinary children?—The children vary so very much in their condition that, though some of them could do that, others would be able to attend very irregularly, I am afraid. The disability from the epileptic fits does not correspond with the disability arising from their mental impairment. A child may have a great deal of mental impairment and not have many fits, and another child may have a great many fits and yet be very little impaired mentally, and so the interruptions to that child would be much greater than in the case of a dull child.

6101. In the case of those who are very much impaired mentally, do you think an institution such as Chalfont or an institution for imbecile children is to be preferred?—I should regard such children as epileptic imbeciles and treat them with the other imbeciles. I do not think they come under the description of "defective children."

6102. You would not propose to keep such children at Chalfont?—No. I am speaking, of course, for myself; the question has never been before the medical committee.

6103. Can you tell the Committee anything about the success of epileptic colonies in Germany?—Children have been colonised at Bielefeld in Germany. In Sweden and I think in Belgium. there have also been successful colonies in which children have been admitted. I can only speak from the reports of the institutions, but the results appear to have been extremely favourable.

6104. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) I think you said that in your opinion, the discrimination of cases should be effected by a combination of teacher, parent, and medical examiner?—Certainly, by the teacher and a medical examiner.

6105. Do you mean by that that the information given by the teacher or parent would be of use to the medical examiner in forming his opinion?—Yes.

6106. Do you think that he or the teacher should have the final voice?—I think the final voice must rest with the medical examiner, but I think he should be specially selected with that fact in view.

6107. I was going to ask you whether you think that any ordinary medical man might be appointed to discriminate in such cases or should he be a man of special experience?—I should expect you would have as great a difficulty in getting a suitable medical man for the purpose, as you would in getting a suitable teacher to superintend the special schools. It would require particular qualifications, knowledge of children, and knowledge of defective children in particular.

6108. You are cognisant, no doubt, of the methods adopted by Dr. Warner in examining children?—To some extent.

6109. You have, I daresay, read his reports?—Yes.

6110. Have you had any personal experience of his methods?—Not a very extensive one. I have made a good many attempts to confirm his observations, but only with partial success.

6111. You have followed the special methods indicated by him?—Yes. The difficulty which I experience in using them for drawing certain conclusions is, that I find that many of the signs are not constant, being often present in a child without the mental impairment; and that they are also inconstant in the same individual, so that when the child is in feeble health, the nerve signs may be very prominent, and a little time after, when he is in better health or is perhaps less nervous in coming to see one, and the signs have disappeared.

6112. Do you think from your experience that nerve signs and developmental signs are not alone to be relied upon in discriminating feeble-minded children?—That would certainly be my own opinion, but I cannot profess to have sufficiently observed as to that.

6113. Would you supplement your own observations by information obtained from the teachers?—I should expect to make very great mistakes unless I did.

6114. Have you any ideas with regard to the training of teachers specially for this work, I mean for the charge of feeble-minded classes?—I do not see that any efficient training can take place unless they have children of this kind under their observation at the time they are being trained. I do not think you can satisfactorily train teachers for defective children simply by giving them healthy ones to observe.

6115. You mean that the teachers should have training in theory and also its practical applications?—They must see the children, or lectures or any form of book instruction is wasted.

6116. Do you think it is possible to train teachers in the recognition of the physical signs of mental defect sufficiently for them to form a trustworthy opinion about defective children?—If you give them a scientific training almost as elaborate as that given to an ordinary medical man then, I think, you might expect it.

6117. But with regard to those who are trained as teachers and not trained as medical students?—You might get a few exceptional men and women who would learn it very well, but I do not think you could hope to train a class in that way.

6118. I just wanted to ask you a question about crippled children. I think you said that epileptic children were often paralysed and crippled, but one sometimes meets with partially paralysed children who are more or less crippled, but are very bright in their intellect?—Frequently.

6119. Have you ever found any cases that are prevented from school attendance?—I do not think they are attending school, but I cannot say that I have known of their being refused admission.

6120. (*Miss Townsend.*) You said it was difficult to frame a definition of "a feeble-minded child." I suppose you do not think it is very difficult to form a judgment as to each individual child after a certain amount of practice?—With regard to 80 per cent. of the cases one can be quite sure without much difficulty, but as to the ten per cent. at the top and the ten at the bottom it is extremely difficult to determine. I should not like to commit myself to a definition of "a feeble-minded child" any more than a definition of insanity.

6121. But it is not so difficult to form a judgment with regard to any particular child?—No, but I should not like to pin myself to any form of words to describe a feeble-minded child.

6122. You said also that you were not able to judge whether small or large classes would be best; but I suppose, theoretically, you would be in favour of small classes?—Very much.

6123. And more individualised teaching?—I think I did say that. I certainly meant to say so. From every point of view, I am very much in favour of it.

6124. And also of small numbers in institutions?—From the medical point of view, yes.

6125. Of course, both the teaching and the medical training can be more easily accomplished with a small class?—It can be more easily done with a small class.

6126. You are forming groups of epileptic children at Chalfont; do you propose to have a school in which to teach them?—Yes.

6127. But if they are very varied in mental power, would not that present a difficulty?—I think that that will be a great difficulty. I think we should do it much more easily if we had a larger population of epileptic children, so that we could have a number of classes suitable for the mental capacity of each, rather than classify them according to their ages.

6128. You would find it very difficult to put the 24 boys or girls who may be living in a particular home all into one class?—Extremely difficult. I think that is where the difficulty will arise.

6129. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) You know the London School Board special classes?—Yes.

6130. Can you give us an idea of the proportion of time you would devote, we will say, to the three R.'s and manual instruction?—I am afraid I hardly know how much the children have under ordinary circumstances.

6131. Do you think the lessons should be of short duration?—Lessons should not exceed 20 minutes for feeble-minded children. I mean with those where there is a marked defect, and there should be, if possible, always an alternation of abstract work and manual work.

6132. You think a good part of their time could be devoted to varied occupations?—Yes.

6133. You would admit that some children need only stay in the special class perhaps one or two years and then could return to the normal school?—That is so certainly, because there are many children who have got behind owing to the teachers not recognising that they had a particular defect, they have been kept back and perhaps rather sternly treated and have been regarded as dull. On the other hand, when they come to the special schools and get more personal and individual attention, they improve very much, and can go back and take their places with the others. I think that one may look forward to the milder forms of mental deficiency being recognised much earlier and to an intimation of that fact being given to the teacher and their being retained in the board schools.

6134. Will you tell us at what age you think their mental deficiency can well be detected?—You mean in the case of children who are quite short of imbecility?

6135. Yes?—I could produce to the Committee several children of three or four years of age whom I have no doubt it will be very difficult to educate in ordinary schools, and yet are children who would pass for being quite bright.

6136. At what age would you like to send such children, of whom I know you have several, to school?—As soon after five as possible.

6137. We find great difficulties in regard to the speech of these children?—Yes.

Dr. Colman.

24 Mar. 1897.

6138. Will you tell us if there is any particular way in which we can overcome that defect?—It is a matter of the very greatest difficulty. It is a matter in which I take a great deal of interest, and I now have practically given up trying to do anything for them till they are 7 or 8 and able to take an intelligent interest in it themselves. I find it extremely difficult with younger children.

6139. I remember gratefully the lecture you gave my staff and have been following out your instructions, certainly with benefit to the children, but I am still dissatisfied with the number of failures that we have. What I wanted to ask you was, do you think that we must expect imperfect speech as the condition of a low mental state?—It is very common in the case of defective children. It partly arises from those deformities of the palate that are so particularly common in these children, although occurring in others.

6140. One would not be able to detect that difficulty by Dr. Warner's "nerve signs"?—No. It is tolerably obvious without any special method.

6141. (*Mr. Newton.*) Have you had any experience of children who have been refused admission to ordinary schools?—Yes, I have a good many.

6142. Can you tell us on what ground they were refused?—A very large number on account of their being epileptics. Others on the ground of their being feeble-minded. I have, however, no documentary evidence on that point—I have simply the parents' words.

6143. Do you think that the epileptics of whom you speak are, as a rule, rightly or wrongly refused?—Most of them wrongly refused, speaking from the child's point of view; they were capable of education.

6144. Do you think they were cases that could have been taught in the ordinary school without risk to the other children, or without damage to the teaching?—I do.

6145. As to the feeble-minded children, do you think that, as a rule, they were rightly or wrongly refused?—Rightly, I think.

6146. You cannot think of any cases that were refused as feeble-minded which might have been admitted?—You mean which might have been admitted into the ordinary elementary school?

6147. Yes?—I do not recall any at this moment.

6148. In the district where you practise, are there special classes for the children who need them?—I cannot speak as to any district. My patients come from every district. There are three defective children at Leyton, and three at Nunhead. There is another at Hammersmith, and two more at New Cross and Brockley. Then there are others spread over London.

6149. Have you any experience of delicate children who have suffered from over-pressure in the ordinary elementary schools?—I see a great many children who are not, perhaps, exorbitantly worked, but exorbitantly worked for their state of health. I think that the variations in the health of such children are not sufficiently recognised by the teachers, and they often attempt to make them go along at what might be a jog trot, perhaps, for healthy children, but which yet means over-pressure for such children at that time. Otherwise, over-pressure in education in the schools, as far as my experience goes, has, I think, to a large extent, disappeared.

6150. You would say that ordinary schools have in them many scholars who are not strong enough for the work, and who ought to be in special schools?—I should not like to say without seeing the schools. I have children whom I keep away because it would be injurious to them, and whom there is the greatest difficulty in keeping at home, owing to the difficulties raised on the part of the school boards, even if certificates have been given. In one case, where a child has been in the hospital for two months suffering from a severe form of chorea, the inspector refused to take the statement that the child is in the hospital and has summoned the mother in default of a certificate.

6151. By the inspector you mean, do you not, the attendance officer?—Yes, the attendance officer.

6152. Do you think teachers might receive such physiological training that they would be able to

Dr. Colman.

24 Mar. 1897.

recognise the delicate children or those who require special lightening of their work?—I think they certainly ought to have information about that; and they should be able to single out without difficulty a great number of them. I think such teaching would be of the greatest help to the teachers. But I think it ought to be carefully organised, and that there ought to be definite instruction given to them from those cases that you now have in the special schools, so that they might be able to recognise even the milder forms and report them.

6153. Have you ever been present at one of the "admissions" of children to the special classes?—I have not.

6154. You know how they are conducted, do you not?—No, I do not know.

6155. Then I will tell you what the way is, and afterwards I will ask you if you think it is a good one. The board's medical officer, Dr. Smith, and Mrs. Burgwin, the superintendent of the classes, meet to decide—the Education Department's Inspector for the district being present, but having no voice in the verdict (which is really agreed upon by Dr. Smith and Mrs. Burgwin): do you think that a satisfactory plan?—I think it is unsatisfactory in this way. I do not say that it does not in the present circumstances work perfectly; but I think that the medical officer who has to do with the detection of these children be specially fitted for that work; or, at any rate, he should have had special opportunities during his course of acquiring information with regard to it. As a rule, I believe, when the appointments are made, not only in London but school boards elsewhere, no question of that kind comes in at all.

6156. The medical officer was appointed before this matter arose?—Yes.

6157. But I have no doubt that if ever there were a new medical officer that point would be considered?—I imagine there is much more than the medical officer could do. He has other very heavy duties, and I think it is a matter in which there would be an advantage in his having a skilled assistant to perform that kind of work, and I should suggest that that special officer should also have to take part in the instruction of the teachers generally in regard to this matter.

6158. At what age would you admit children to the special classes. I was not quite clear on that point?—As soon as possible after five years.

6159. Do not you think that for children of five years the work of an infant school is diversified enough?—I daresay that there would be no object in their being admitted to the special class at the age of five. Many of them would do quite well probably, in the infant school.

6160. Would you be content that they should be in a good infant school, which is the same as a special class except that the age of the scholars is different?—But the classes are larger, and children tend to drop out of sight in a large class. I think the very great advantage of a small class is that there is much less danger of that.

6161. Up to what age would you keep defective children at school?—I should not like to say. Until it has got big enough to be troublesome. Many of them are physically backward, and, though 13 or 14 years of age, may correspond to children of 9 or 10 in an ordinary school, and I should not propose to send him away then.

6162. At present children of the defective class are bound to stop at school until the age of 14; and some people want to raise the age to 16; would you be in favour of that?—I should be in favour of allowing it, but in some cases it would be unsuitable. So many of them are physically backward that I should think it should be allowable for them to remain till 16.

6163. It is allowable at present. That is to say, there is nothing to prevent any school authority for providing for them up to the age of 16, and there is nothing to prevent the parent from sending them?—I do not think I should be inclined to favour a hard and fast regulation about it.

6164. You would, then, make no innovation in that respect at present?—Not unless there is some fresh evidence brought up.

6165. Have you any experience of children who are not quite deaf, but who are partly so?—I see a considerable number of those, and a considerable number of those whose defective vision has led to their being classed as imbeciles; but who as soon as that difficulty was remedied were able to take their place with others.

6166. What is the right treatment in school for those children who are very hard of hearing?—I think the right thing is to try and get their defects remedied; and in a large number of cases they are remediable.

6167. I have never, so far as I can remember, seen an ear-trumpet in a school; is the absence of such instruments right or wrong?—I do not think that the ear-trumpet is really of very much use for the ordinary forms of deafness that one meets with in children. It is more in the case of old people that ear-trumpets are found to be of advantage.

6168. Then the real thing to do in the case of these somewhat deaf children is to have them thoroughly overhauled by the aurist?—The great bulk of those cases of defective hearing depend upon throat trouble and can be remedied—and the sooner the better. But in order that the throat trouble may be remedied, it is important that it should be recognised and dealt with at an early stage.

6169. And what do you say as to children with defective sight?—Children often suffer from errors of refraction sometimes so severe, that what looks to us a figure looks to them more like a corkscrew.

6170. I see a great many instances of children whose eyes are obviously wrong, but who never seem to have had their eyes examined by any medical man; is that your experience?—Oh, that is the case with a great many. In the case of one boy, supposed to be weak-minded, it was simply a matter of the refractive arrangements of the eyes, although nothing appeared from the outside. The boy was dull; he had been thoroughly thrashed at home, and, according to his own account, at school, and he was a dull cowed boy. He was not a subject for a special class; he was sent to the hospital fitted with suitable glasses, and soon became quite bright.

6171. Then at the examination when the candidates for the special class are admitted, all those cases of semi-blind and semi-deaf children ought to be detected, ought they not?—They ought to be detected. But, unfortunately, you see the defects ought to have been discovered long before; and those defects might then have been remediable.

6172. You do not think a parent is doing his duty in sending his child to school without attending to its eyes and ears?—I am afraid one cannot say that the parent is neglecting his duty. Very often parents are entirely ignorant about it, and not only the parents of the poor, but the well-to-do are just as guilty.

6173. Do you think that the school board could, to a certain extent, be empowered to make parents attend to their children's eyes and ears?—Yes I do. My idea is that you should have a medical officer, and I think he would have a great deal of work. Any of these children who are detected as dull, should, if there is any suspicion that it is not wilfulness be referred to him, and he should make periodical visits to your board schools and any of these cases should be referred to him.

6174. Do you think that the school board should be by law empowered to exclude a scholar who is not properly supplied with glasses and then summon the parent for his non-attendance. Would not that be the only way of dealing with such cases?—I should not be prepared to suggest quite so harsh a measure with regard to the parents, because many of them might not be able to afford the amount they would have to pay for the glasses even at the hospital.

6175. (*Mr. Pooley.*) Might not the state of a child's eyes and ears be put on much the same footing as cleanliness as regards the duty of the school board. The school board, as you are aware, requires a child to be sent to school in a reasonably clean state?—Yes.

6176. And is it not advisable that the school board should have power to require that the parents or, at all events somebody, should see to the eyes and ears of the children?—There is a little difference, however, between the two cases. You object to the child's want of cleanliness on the ground that he is a nuisance to the small community at school. With regard to the eyes and ears it might be regarded as an interference with the liberty of the subject.

6177. You think that would make the difference?—That would make a difference with regard to the view the parents would take of it if it were compulsory.

6178. Eyes and ears, you think, stand more on the same footing as ordinary health?—Yes, I think so, it is rather a matter of health.

6179. Do you agree generally with Dr. Warner's classification of defects into "developmental," "nerve defects," and "low nutrition." I think he makes those three divisions?—I cannot follow him entirely. I think those divisions are much too arbitrary, and those characteristics are usually combined.

6180. Then you do not altogether agree with the classification into those three main classes?—It is very difficult to define. You can call almost anything "developmental," if you like, and can make your tables accordingly. In the same way the children are divided into "delicate," "dull," and "backward," but no two observers mean the same thing by those adjectives. It is difficult to follow the observations, because the terms are so vague.

6181. I think you said that in order to distinguish defects of that sort it was necessary to have a trained eye, some physiological knowledge?—It is in many cases an extremely difficult matter, even for a person who is trained. One does not rely on a single observation such as the shape of the hand, or anything of the kind, but it is by a combination of a very large number of quite trifling observations that one forms any conclusion at all.

6182. Do you think that for observations of that sort it is necessary to have a medical man?—I do, or at any rate, as I say, for him to have had as extensive a scientific basis to his training as a medical man.

6183. You could not expect that amount of scientific knowledge and experience to be acquired by an ordinary school teacher?—I should not. You might get it in exceptional cases, but they would be very exceptional.

6184. Do I understand you to say that this physiological training which you think teachers should have would be mainly for the purpose of teaching them how to deal with children in their classes—how to adapt their methods to them, and sympathise with their mental condition, rather than for the purpose of teaching them to distinguish defective from ordinary children?—It would assist in both directions, but I should not expect that by any course of physiological teaching you could make them trained observers. That is a much longer business.

6185. This physiological training they want mainly for teaching purposes?—It would have the effect of making them suspicious that a case of backwardness was not a case of mere wilfulness, but was possibly due to some deficiency, and then it should be their duty to report it, and the report should go on to the medical officer.

6186. But would not this training be very valuable for the teachers of defective children in the special classes?—If I had anything to do with the appointing of teachers I should not like to appoint them unless they had had some training of that kind.

6187. You would make it essential in the case of these teachers?—I think so. It would be desirable. One cannot always get it, but one must make a beginning. I should think that now they ought all to have it.

6188. Such teaching is wanted for the teachers of special classes rather than for the teachers of ordinary schools?—The teachers in the special schools would want a more advanced training, but I think the ordinary teachers ought to have an acquaintance with the normal development of children and with these more erratic forms, and with the indications of them. I am speaking of what is the best thing; I do not know whether it is feasible; I do not want to overload them.

6189. If you have the opinion of an expert medical officer as to these physical signs before you send a child into the special class, then it is not so important to have also the teacher's opinion upon these signs. The teacher's opinion is important rather upon the ability of the child, and as to whether it can be taught?—Yes. Personally, if I were reporting, the ordinary physical signs one sees would be the least thing I should rely upon. What I should act upon would be my general impression as to the way the child did things and so on, not signs which one would observe on the mere physical examination of the child as it stood in front of me; and one would get very much more valuable information on those points from those who had watched the child constantly during different days, and at different times in the day.

Dr. Colman.

24 Mar. 1897.

6190. You would agree that there should be a medical officer under all large school authorities for the purpose of examining the children of this class?—I think it would be to the great advantage of the community if it were so; that we should have fewer weak adults if that were done, fewer useless ones, and, probably, fewer criminals.

6191. This medical officer would be the supreme authority in the locality on these questions?—I think he should be.

6192. Would it be desirable to have a medical expert connected with the Education Department who should advise in doubtful cases, and should decide where there was difference of opinion?—Yes, I think that would certainly be an advantage.

6193. Almost essential?—You would be sure to have friction unless you had some central authority to which the appeal could be made.

6194. I think you said that you believed there were many defective children who did not succeed in gaining admission to schools?—To my knowledge there are, because they live at too great a distance.

6195. Living at too great a distance would be one reason, and, also, the school might be full?—The school might be full. There are two cases, where I certainly should have passed the children as mentally deficient children, who required special education, in which admission was refused by the medical officer on the ground that they were not deficient, and the parents refused to send them to the ordinary school, and I think the parents were quite right.

6196. We have had it in evidence that the teachers of ordinary board schools are not allowed to refuse admission to defective children?—You mean that they are not allowed by the rules of the board; I believe that is so, butI believe it is done.

6197. One word about epileptic children, I think you agree that epileptic children as a rule are capable of being taught?—Yes.

6198. Except in these extreme cases?—Except in the extreme cases. They form a rather large proportion among children.

6199. In dealing with them, education is really the principal thing rather than medical treatment; you can distinguish them I mean from ordinary invalid children?—No. I think that epileptic children require medical treatment more than the others, and that is why I say that I think the best thing is to have them in an institution where they can have both. They require medical treatment constantly; and, as a rule, there is very little trouble if those who are attending school are allowed to come up to the hospital when it is necessary; and, as a rule, they require treatment for years.

6200. They do not stand on the same footing as ordinary invalid children; there is a reason for making special provision under the Education Acts for epileptic children more than in the case of ordinary invalid children?—Oh, yes, distinctly.

The witness withdrew.

Adjourned to Friday next at 2.30.

TWELFTH DAY.

Friday, 26th March 1897.

PRESENT:

The Rev. T. W. SHARPE, C.B., in the Chair.

Mr. H. F. Pooley.
Mr. A. W. Newton.
Dr. G. E. Shuttleworth.
Dr. W. R. Smith.
Mrs. Burgwin.
Mr. H. W. Orange, *Secretary*.

Mr. H. F. Pooley called in and examined.

Mr. H. F. Pooley. 26 Mar. 1897.

6201. (*Chairman.*) You are a senior examiner of the Education Department?—Yes.

6202. And you have had to do with the working of the Act for the elementary education of blind and deaf children for the last three years?—Yes, I have had to do with the draft of the Bill, and also with the working of the Act since it was passed.

6203. The Royal Commissioners estimated that the number of blind children of school age (5 to 15) in England and Wales was 1,710, and the number of deaf children 4,000 to 4,500?—Yes.

6204. This gives about 6,000 blind and deaf children, or one in 5,000 of the whole population (30,000,000) or one in 1,000 of the number of children of school age?—Yes. I may say upon that that I find that roughly, in some cases, four children of every 10,000 of the population has been estimated as the number of blind and deaf. That was adopted in the Hanley case. But this calculation of about two in 10,000 I take from the Report of the Royal Commissioners.

6205. The certified schools for blind or deaf children have accommodation for 4,480 children, 1476 for blind, and 3,004 for deaf?—Yes, that is so.

6206. The number of children in attendance is, in blind schools, 1,164 (676 boys and 489 girls), in deaf schools, 2,584 (1,480 boys and 1,104 girls)s making a total of 3,748?—Yes.

6207. The total number of children taking manual instruction was 3,611, and the number of children taking elementary instruction was 3,742?—Yes.

6208. The average grant per head for manual instruction was 1*l.* 13*s.* 8*d.*, and for elementary instruction 2*l.* 10*s.* 11*d.*?—Yes.

6209. There was paid as grants to blind schools 2,827*l.* 18*s.* 3*d.* for elementary instruction, and 1,847*l.* 13*s.* for manual instruction, making 4,675*l.* 11*s.* 3*d.*?—Yes.

6210. And to deaf schools 6,711*l.* 17*s.* 3*d.* for elementary instruction, and 4,242*l.* 3*s.* 6*d.* for manual instruction, making 10,954*l.* 0*s.* 9*d.*?—Yes.

6211. Or 15,629*l.* 12*s.* 0*d.* in all?—Yes.

6212. The number of blind children present at inspection, or whose work was submitted to Her Majesty's inspector being 1,164, the average grant for each blind child was 4*l.* 0*s.* 4*d.*?—Yes.

6213. And the deaf children numbering 2,584, the average grant for each deaf child was 4*l.* 4*s.* 9¼*d.*?—Yes, those are the figures for 1896.

6214. The number of blind children present at inspection equals four fifths of the accommodation (namely, 1,476), and the number of deaf children present at inspection equals six sevenths (namely, 3,004). So that the Act has been very successful in providing for the the wants of the children for whom it was passed?—Yes, the numbers present at inspection amounted to four fifths of the accommodation in the blind schools, and in the deaf schools to six sevenths of the accommodation.

6215. So that if a similar Act were passed for feeble-minded children it might be worked without compulsion, very much in the same way as the Act for the blind and the deaf?—I think it would probably work very much in the same way.

6216. The grants allowed by the Education Department are three guineas for elementary and two guineas for manual instruction for every child under efficient instruction who has attended with due regularity?—Yes.

6217. Then you make a statement with regard to defective children—"that if 1 per cent. of children "over seven attended special classes for defectives, "and were paid for at the same rate, the Government "grant would be about six times as much." Do you recommend the same amount of grant?—May I explain that that is merely a statistical calculation. I was assuming that 1 per cent. of the total number of children are defective, and that would give 10 in 1,000 children; or, if you exclude infants, it would give you about 6 in 1,000 children, so that would be six times as many as we find in the blind and deaf schools.

6218. So that if paid for at the same rate, the grant would be about six times as much?—Yes.

6219. If the classes are twice as large—20 for defective children, and only 10 or 12 for blind children—it would not be fair to pay more than half that grant would it?—Probably.

6220. So that the grant would not be six times as large, but three times as large?—On the assumption that there is that difference between the size of the classes.

6221. On that assumption the grant would be about 50,000*l.* to 60,000*l.*?—I do not think it should be reduced in proportion to the size of the classes, because there are, of course, other expenses besides the salaries of teachers.

6222. The cost of maintenance, which is really the cost of staff, is five sixths of the whole?—I should doubt whether the expenses would be reduced in proportion to the increase of the size of the class, because there are other expenses besides the salaries of teachers.

6223. They are only one sixth of the whole. Five sixths of the total cost of maintaining a school is the the salaries of teachers; so that the grant would be about 50,000*l.* or 60,000*l.* on that basis?—Yes, if that calculation were correct.

6224. It appears from an examination of statistics that the average number of deaf children for each teacher is 11 in day schools and 10 in institutions, and the average number of blind children per teacher is 9, both in day schools and in institutions?—I should like to say upon that that the number of children per teacher is rather smaller, I think, than it will be, because there are so many certified schools which have a very much smaller number of children in attendance in the day schools; so that you find a few cases of only six or seven children attending the school, and they necessarily have a certified teacher.

6225. But I think they have pretty well secured all the blind children, have they not?—I should think so.

6226. Therefore the calculation as to the average number per teacher, is not likely to be much above 10 for blind children?—Probably not.

6227. Or above 11 or 12 for deaf children?—That may be so.

6228. In day schools for the deaf and blind, the salaries of teachers average about 8*l.* per scholar?—Yes.

6229. And you think that one fourth or one third might be added for other expenses?—Yes.

6230. But is it not nearer one sixth?—The calculation I have made is from the examination of some 12 or 15 schools; but it is only a rough one.

6231. Schools, you mean, of that class?—Yes, of that class.

6232. But the figure of one sixth is taken from the whole of the schools of the country?—I think the other expenditure in these small certified classes would be a larger proportion than in the larger schools.

6233. In institutions you think the salaries of teachers average about 14*l.*; but is not that an over statement?—It is rather difficult to average. At the Edgbaston Royal Institution for Deaf and Dumb, the salaries average 13*l.* 14*s.* 9*d.* per scholar.

6234. Do you happen to know what "teacher" there includes?—I was going to say there is some difficulty about that. We have taken the total salaries of teachers in the institutions from our forms, but the returns do not show what the duties of the teachers are, and therefore it is possible that some are included who are not merely teachers.

6235. There are two classes of teachers in most of these institutions, those who teach in school hours, and those who superintend them in play hours, and, perhaps there they are both classed together?—For another reason I think that amount is rather too high, because in these institutions the salary of the principal is occasionally high, and that would probably be put in as the salary of a teacher.

6236. Boarding out with foster parents has been adopted only in four places—London, Hull, Leeds, and Leicester. At present only 29 deaf and 2 blind children in all are boarded out?—That is so. But that does not include the number in Leicester which is new, and two new boarding-out committees which are being formed in London.

6237. In fact you would find more difficulty in boarding out feeble minded children than blind and deaf children, probably?—I should think it would require more care in choosing foster parents.

6238. So that we must not look to boarding out very much in future as a way of providing for the education of children of feeble mind?—Of course that is very much a question for the Committee.

6239. But if there has been so little done for the deaf and the blind, there is pretty sure to be still less for feeble-minded children?—It occurs to me that the difficulty will arise if we find feeble-minded children in rural districts. Supposing the Committee think it undesirable that they should be sent to institutions, there will be no alternative but to leave them in their own school, or to board them out.

6240. You find the school authorities co-operate readily in putting the Act in force. For example, five boards in Staffordshire have combined, and are building an institution for 140. That is Mr. Wedgwood's?—Mr. Wedgwood's.

6241. The small school boards sometimes complain of the cost, and they have tried various devices for making it as cheap as possible?—So far as I can tell from the correspondence (of course the inspectors know more about it than we do in the office), the school authorities are willing to put the Act in force. We have had several complaints from small school boards of the cost of sending a child; but their objections have generally been overcome, as far as I can judge from the correspondence, and ultimately something has been done for any blind or deaf child.

6242. In fact, as a rule, it does not pay to keep a school under a school board for less than six or seven children?—No doubt.

6243. If they have only four or five children of this class, it is cheaper to send them to an institution than to teach them at home?—Yes.

6244. North Bierley Urban District Council (Yorkshire), is the only school authority not a school board which has provided a school (in a hired room), and four blind children were taught at a cost of 68*l.*?—Yes.

6245. Wellington, in Somersetshire, has three blind children at a cost of about 40*l.*?—Yes, I mentioned North Bierley, because that is the only case of a school authority not a school board providing and maintaining a child.

6246. No certified day school has been provided by voluntary managers?—No.

Mr. H. F. Pooley. 26 Mar. 1897.

6247. And is not likely to be provided?—That is quite my opinion, because of the expense. They are obliged under section 7, sub-section 1(*b.*) of the Act, to find one third of the cost.

6248. The Department has not received much information yet as to the use of compulsory powers by school authorities?—No.

6249. In fact they have used them very sparingly indeed. At Nottingham, for instance, as you are aware, they have allowed children to go out of school at the age of 13 or 14, though they ought to have enforced compulsion up to the age of 16?—Yes, I am aware that you have reported that from Nottingham.

6250. In the case of deaf children it is very difficult to enforce compulsion, because their wages are of assistance to the parents. In the case of blind children compulsion has not been so necessary, because such children are not useful to their parents. In the same way, with regard to the more feeble-minded children, they would probably be kept at school; but the less feeble-minded would very likely be taken out of a school at the very earliest opportunity, just as the deaf are, because their services are of use to their parents?—I suppose the reason generally is that they can earn wages.

6251. The Education Department has not yet exercised any compulsory powers, but has threatened to do so?—Exactly.

6252. Can you give us any information as to what has been the result of such threats?—I think in almost all cases the threat has resulted in the child being sent to some school. There have been several cases reported of children who are not in a blind or deaf school, and very often the reason has been the state of their health. In some cases the child has been attending a hospital for an operation, and we have had some cases where a private person has said: "These children do not go to "school, and have not been sent to school for two years;" but we have inquired, and have found that they have been sent periodically, every two or three months, to a hospital for some operation, and have been told by doctors that they should run about and play for a time.

6253. We may be met also with the religious difficulty, as in the case of the blind and deaf?—Yes.

6254. The case of parents who are Jews, and Roman Catholics?—That will be so if it is a question of sending them to institutions.

6255. If the same clause is inserted as in the Blind and Deaf Act?—Yes. Perhaps I should say upon the religious question that the difficulty arises from the provisions in the Act about reasonable choice of school by a parent. In some cases a Roman Catholic parent has wished his child to be sent to Boston Spa, in Yorkshire, and the School Board have said, "We have a "school which the child can go to," and then the question is whether it is reasonable for the parent to select this school at Boston Spa.

6256. The Leeds School Board provide a Roman Catholic teacher specially for one deaf child?—Yes.

6257. She has to give religious instruction to the deaf child for the first hour every morning?—Yes. I think the London School Board have made some concessions also in that direction. There is one suggestion I should like to make, that supposing special assistance is to be given to classes for defective children, I imagine it would be more convenient that the grant should be paid on the average attendance, instead of on the system which they are paid to the blind and deaf schools.

6258-9. It is found very convenient to keep that phrase "attended with due regularity" rather in the hands of the Educational Department, than to adopt the view of the London School Board, namely, that if a child has attended for two thirds of the year very irregularly—that is to say, has been absent one time out of every three—they should be paid an eight months' grant for that child?—Quite so. On the other hand, the three and five guinea payments were, I think, originally meant for institutions; they were taken from the Scotch Act. It gives a great deal of trouble, both to the school authority, which has to fill up the forms, and also the Department, to see how much irregularity may be excused, and how many months should be paid for; whereas if we paid for these scholars on the

Mr. H. F. Pooley.

26 Mar. 1897.

average attendance, we could very easily apply the same principle that is applied in ordinary schools as to inspection.

6260. It would be easier from the official point of view?—It would.

6261. And from the child's point of view?—That is a question to be considered. The present system prevents the introduction of that plan of inspection which prevails in the ordinary schools, of doing away with the annual visit, and having one or two visits in the course of the year instead. The present system of payment obliges an examination of all the children, or a visit to the school, at all events, at the end of the school year for that purpose.

6262. I will now read your memorandum upon the effect of extending the Blind and Deaf Act to defective children, and then ask you some questions on it:—

MEMORANDUM UPON THE EFFECT OF EXTENDING THE BLIND AND DEAF CHILDREN ACT TO DEFECTIVE CHILDREN.

The London School Board have suggested that the powers of school boards should be extended to enable them to provide for the instruction and maintenance of defective children on the same lines as the provision for blind and deaf children made by the Elementary Education (Blind and Deaf Children) Act, 1893. A similar recommendation has been made as regards epileptic children.

I propose to consider what would be the exact effect produced if the provisions of the Act of 1893 were extended in their entirety to the afflicted children falling within the scope of our Committee's inquiry, who for brevity's sake, may be called "defective children."

Sect. 1 (1). (1.) There would be a legal obligation on every parent of a defective child to cause the child to receive instruction suitable to it. Instruction in an ordinary public elementary school would not necessarily be accepted.

Sect. 1 (2). The fact of a child being defective would not of itself be a reasonable excuse for non-attendance at school or non-receipt of instruction. Nor would the distance of the defective child's home from a school be a reasonable excuse.

(2.) The Education Department would be charged with the duty of certifying schools as suitable for providing education for defective children, and of making regulations for boarding-out defective children in homes near certified schools.

It would be the duty of every school authority to obtain suitable education (including industrial training) for defective children, either by establishing a certified school, or by sending the children to some certified school, whether board or voluntary, and contributing to the necessary expenses (including clothing). This contribution might be limited to annual maintenance (including the travelling expenses and conveyance of the children), or might extend to purchase and acquisition of the school

For the purpose of securing suitable education the school authoritiy would have power to board out defective children in homes near the certified school.

Sect. 2 (2). Under subsection (2) (*a*) of section 2 the duty of the school authority would not extend to defective children who were idiots or imbeciles, and by section 13 (1) the powers of guardians to send defective children not idiots or imbeciles to school would be repealed, except as to children resident in a workhouse, &c., or boarded out by guardians.

(3.) Section 2 (3) and section 3 relate to the questions of security to be given to a school authority which contributes to the establishment of a certified school, and to the representation (when expedient) of a school authority so contributing on the governing body of the certified school.

(4.) The school authorities would be—

(*a.*) School boards.

(*b.*) For areas not under school boards the district council (urban or rural) acting through a committee appointed for educational purposes.

This provision creates an anomaly, inasmuch as in rural districts and in some urban districts the school authority for the area not under school boards is the district council, instead of the school attendance committee of the board of guardians, which is the school authority under the ordinary Elementary Education Acts.

When the Blind and Deaf Act was passed it was expected that the powers of school attendance committees would be transferred to the new district councils when they were set up, but this expectation has not been fulfilled.

It appears to be very doubtful whether school attendance committees of boards of guardians ought to be empowered to provide and maintain schools.

(5.) The school authority (whether a school board or other school authority) would have power, either alone or in combination with other school authorities, to provide certified schools (including boarding schools) and to raise loans for building or enlargement.

(6.) The Education Department would have power in case of any school authority failing to perform its duty to declare that authority in default or to order it to pay a fixed sum to a certified school towards the expenses of a particular child.

(7.) The Department would be forbidden to certify any school conducted for private profit, or, if a voluntary school, not raising at least one-third of its annual expenses of maintenance out of voluntary contributions and sources other than local rates (including parents' payments) or Government grants.

[This provision makes it unlikely that a voluntary day school would be certified.]

(8.) A certified school for defective children, if and so far as it was not a public elementary school, would have to comply with certain requirements as to religious instruction based on the provisions of the Industrial Schools Act, 1866.

(9.) A payment from the parent of a defective child could be enforced by the school authority.

[Probably this payment could not be enforced in the case of a defective child attending a day school. *See* section 9 (1).]

(10.) The parent of a defective child sent to a certified school would not thereby be pauperised or placed under any disability.

(11.) The parent could exercise a reasonable selection as regards a school for his children.

(12.) A defective child would be deemed a child up to the age of 16 for the purposes of the Elementary Education Acts, and his compulsory education would extend to 16, and he would be debarred from total or partial exemption up to that age, the school authority having no option or discretion in the matter. Sect. 11.

(13.) The Department would be free to aid a certified school in respect of education given to defective children to such amount and on such conditions as might be directed by Minutes. Sect. 12.

(14.) A definition of defective children would have to be framed which would distinguish them, on the one hand, from ordinary children, and, on the other, from idiots and imbeciles. Sect. 15.

12th March 1897. H. F. POOLEY.

Now, taking the Blind and Deaf Children Act by sections, do I understand you think that section 1 (1) would apply?—Yes, I think so.

6263. Section 1 (2) would also apply?—These are, I think, questions for the Committee to consider, and therefore I do not like to commit myself to a decided opinion.

6264. I am asking your opinion as to whether, if this were carried out, a similar clause in the new Act might be drawn up only altering the words "blind and deaf" to "defective"?—Of course such a clause might be drawn; but I should doubt whether it would be desirable, because under section 1 (2) of the Act, it is provided that distance of the residence of the child from the school shall not be a reasonable excuse for neglecting to provide suitable education.

6265. Why should not that provision be applicable to an Act for a defective child as well as a blind or deaf child?—I am not sure that it would be advisable to say that every defective child must be provided for in a special school, or special class, however far off its residence might be, and that the distance should be no excuse. That, however, is rather a question for the Committee to consider.

6266. If a child was, by medical authority, declared defective and a subject for a special class, there would be no hardship in putting it in, would there?—Not if the Committee thought it desirable that a defective child of that sort should be sent away a distance from its home rather than retained in its own school.

6267. You mean that there might be two classes of defective children—one who would go to an institution, and the other to a special class?—Yes. You see a blind and deaf child must, according to the Act, be sent to a certified school, even if there is no such school within 100 miles of its home. I doubt whether the Committee would go as far as that with regard to defective children; it is a serious question.

6268. Do you think that special classes would not be so readily set up for defective children as for the deaf and dumb, though they are six times as numerous?—I think the Committee has to consider the whole question of defective children in rural districts, and if the Committee think that there are classes of defective children who cannot be taught in an ordinary school, then the Committee would probably extend this section to such children, and provide for their being sent compulsorily to some certified school.

6269. Will you draft some clauses similar to these which you think might apply to all cases of defective children certified by a medical authority?—I should be glad to make some suggestion as to a particular clause; but it seems to me to depend very much upon the view taken by the Committee of what it is wise to do with defective children in rural districts who may be at a distance from any certified school or special class.

6270. In your memorandum, paragraph 4, you say that "the school authorities would be:—(*a.*) School "Boards. (*b.*) For areas not under School Boards, the "District Council (Urban or Rural), acting through a "committee appointed for educational purposes." And you add:—"This provision creates an anomaly, "inasmuch as in rural districts, and in some urban "districts, the School Authority for the area not under "School Boards is the District Council instead of the "School Attendance Committee of the Board of Guar"dians, which is the School Authority under the "ordinary Elementary Education Acts." The anomaly exists already, does it not, in the case of the deaf and blind?—The anomaly exists already, because you have one School Authority for deaf and blind children, namely the District Council, and you have another School Authority for ordinary children, namely, the School Attendance Committee of the Board of Guardians.

6271. But the Authority set up for the blind and deaf has acted well, has it not?—It seems to me that the District Council, and not the School Attendance Committee of Boards of Guardians, is the proper School Authority in rural districts, because the District Council is the local authority which has general jurisdiction, whereas the Board of Guardians are the authority for poor law purposes only; and, if it were my business to suggest legislation, I should suggest that the powers of the School Attendance Committee should be transferred to the District Council. In fact, I believe that such legislation has been contemplated.

6272. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) In sub-paragraph 4 of paragraph 2 of your memorandum you draw a distinction between the defective child and a child that is termed an idiot or imbecile?—Yes, that distinction is already made, of course, in the Blind and Deaf Act, and also in the reference to our committee. We have to deal with defective children who are not idiots or imbeciles.

6273. Then in the case of children in rural districts where would you purpose sending those children, or providing school teaching for them?—You mean defective children, not idiots or imbeciles.

6274. Yes. Do you mean that there would have to be new institutions provided?—What is in my mind is this: that if we find a certain number of defective children in rural districts, it is a question for our committee whether we should recommend that they should be compulsorily sent to some school which must necessarily be at a distance, or whether such children should be allowed to remain in their own school, and the best arrangements that are possible made for them there.

6275. Have you made up your mind as to whether the Act should be compulsory?—Of course I could give my opinion, but as it seems to me that is really a question for the Committee.

Mr. H. F. Pooley.

26 Mar. 1897.

6276. (*Mr. Newton.*) Supposing the Act was extended to defective children, would the Education Department have to certify every school in which defective children were kept?—It would, no doubt.

6277. That is to say, our inspectors from the Education Department would have to go to every charitable institution in which defective children who are not actual idiots were maintained?—Yes, no doubt.

6278. Then are not the words in paragraph 12 of your memorandum, "The school authority having no option "or discretion in the matter" too strong; because the words "reasonable excuse" come into all the byelaws, and there is an option or discretion in every case of school attendance, is there not?—Yes, I did not intend to exclude "reasonable excuses." I meant that the school authority is bound to require their attendance at some certified school, unless there is a reasonable excuse.

6279. But there is no hard and fast rule, is there, for attendance, reasonable excuses may always come in?—Exactly, and of course ultimately it is for the magistrate to decide what is a reasonable excuse.

6280. I suppose the whole extension of the Act (Blind and Deaf) to defective children would fall through unless a satisfactory definition could be framed?—I think so.

6281. Unless, therefore, we can get such a definition, all this extension of the Act must be given up?—I think you must have a clear definition, or else it would be impossible to say what classes of children or what particular children come under the Act, and what do not.

6282. (*Dr. Smith.*) In a note to your paragraph No. 7 you say, "This provision makes it unlikely that a "voluntary day school would be certified." May I ask exactly what is meant by "a voluntary day school"?—I mean a day school under voluntary management, and not under a school board or school authority. The reason for that is that if voluntary managers started a day school they would probably not be allowed to charge any fees, because of the Free Education Act; (that is a little doubtful); and they must find one third of the cost from voluntary contributions or sources other than rates.

6283. Of course all those provisions apply to children of the elementary school class, they do not apply to children going to institutions for the higher classes?—They apply to all children dealt with by school authorities, and there is no reason that I know of why the school authorities should not send the child of any parent to a certified school. They have the power to recover the whole cost from the parent.

6284. Could they compel a parent of the better classes to send his child to one of these certified institutions?—They could, unless the parent could show that the child was under efficient instruction in some other manner. So I think it is for the Committee to consider whether that clause as to one third of the expenses being found by voluntary subscriptions should be retained, with reference at all events to day schools set up under this Act. It would discourage the establishment of day schools by voluntary managers.

6285. (*Chairman.*) Perhaps you will read the definition of the blind and deaf from the Blind and Deaf Act, and see if you can form a similar one?—"The expres"sion 'blind,' means too blind to be able to read the "ordinary school books used by children; the expres"sion 'deaf,' means too deaf to be taught in a class of "hearing children in an elementary school."

6286. Why should not you have a definition for defective "not capable of profiting by the ordinary "teaching of a public elementary school"?—I think a suggestion of that sort was made by the London School Board.

6287. The definition supplied by the London School Board is "children who by reason of physical or mental "defects cannot be properly taught in the ordinary "standards or by ordinary methods"?—Yes.

Miss SEWELL called in and examined.

Miss Sewell.

6288. (*Chairman.*) I believe you are warden of the Women's University Settlement in Southwark, and a manager of the London School Board special classes at Pocock Street, Blackfriars?—I am.

6289. How many years have you been acting in that capacity?—I have been warden in the Women's University Settlement since 1891, and I have been manager since managers were appointed to the special

Miss Sewell.

26 Mar. 1897.

classes, which I think is about two years ago, but I forget exactly how long.

6290. The object of the University Settlement is to throw a little light into the homes of the poor?—Yes, to benefit the people of the poorer parts of London, socially, educationally, and in any way we can. We take a special interest in educational matters.

5291. And especially with regard to the more afflicted?—I would not say more especially, but we do take a great interest in them.

6292. You have been kind enough to obtain some statistics for us from certain neighbourhoods?—Yes. I was asked to take statistics over a small area where we have visitors, and I have done so, and have brought the results here; they are very small indeed.

6293. You are prepared to give us your impressions as to the proportion of mentally and physically defective children unfit for ordinary school in nine parishes of Southwark, with a population of 71,365?—Yes.

6294. You have in the special class at Pocock Street 44 known as unfit for school?—Yes.

6295. And on your list of invalid children who are exempt from attending school, owing, I suppose, to some physical defect, you have 35?—Yes.

6296. And there are known to the School Board officers, and not included in the above figures, four more?—Yes.

6297. Making a total of 83 in a child population which you estimate at nearly 16,000?—Yes, I estimate it at nearly 16,000. But that is my own estimate, and I do not know how far it may be trustworthy.

6298. I notice that your child population of 15,858 is of children between the ages of 5 and 15?—Yes. I took 15 because in the general census for the metropolis you get the figures divided off in that way. You get the child population up to 15, and I thought perhaps it was near enough for the purposes of the inquiry.

6299. We are specially concerned with children between 7 and 13, but if we take two fifths off your number—taking four years out of 10, it will perhaps be approximately right?—I should think it might be.

6300. And that would make the child population between the ages of 7 and 13 about 10,000?—Yes.

6301. Then what percentage of those 10,000 children are defective?—I made it upon my figures about 5·68 per thousand. But of course that is on the estimate of the child population between 5 and 15, which I thought would be a useful period.

6302. Have you the names and ages of these 83 children?—There are seven under 7 years of age and 13 over 13 years of age, making 20 altogether. There remain 63 between 7 and 13.

6303. Then that shows a percentage of ·63 defective, taken on 10,000 children between 7 and 13?—Yes.

6304. You say that your figures are not absolutely accurate, but you think they are approximately true?—Yes, but they must not be taken for more than they are worth.

6305. From the parish in which you are best known you get the highest per-centage of physically defective children?—Yes, and that would lead me to suppose that if the other parishes were equally well known, we might have more than we already have. We are working in nine parishes, and from the parish in which we are best known we get the highest per-centage of children. On the other hand, it is only fair to state that there is one parish in which we are very little known, where we do have a high per-centage: not so high, but still high.

6306. The per-centage very largely depends upon the character of the parish, I suppose?—We think it does, in a great measure.

6307. Such children are especially found in the very poorest parishes, where the mothers go out to work, and leave the children to a large extent uncared for?—Yes, they are left uncared for, or left in the charge of older children, who perhaps let them fall downstairs, and so on.

6308. You mention one curious fact, that the number of "special" children is larger from the immediate neighbourhood of the school than from more distant parts. Thus the parish in which the class is situated supplies 18 out of the 44; yet this class is the nearest "special class" for a large part of the district. On the other hand the parish is a very low class one (the population largely costermongers) which may account for the numbers?—I do not understand why it is that that parish does supply the largest number.

6309. The special class would be most known in its own neighbourhood?—Yes.

6310. It may be accounted for in that way, may it not?—Yes, except that they are not admitted on the ground that they are near. I think at the opening of the special class, the teachers in the school under the same roof naturally knew about it better than the teachers of other schools, and probably sent in their own children. I expect this class filled up in that way. It is an odd thing that the same fact holds true of the deaf and dumb class. The larger number of deaf and dumb children come from that parish in which the centre is placed.

6311. It is evidently because the classes are better known to the parents?—It must be so, and that implies that there are a good many children not found.

6312. What is your definition of an imbecile?—I have never attempted to define an imbecile, and I should be sorry to do so here.

6313. You say it is difficult to determine an imbecile, but you seem to come to some conclusion?—Yes. By the imbeciles we mean in our classification, I think, the children who, (without any medical knowledge of our own), we believe are unfit to be taught—at least are not capable of being taught.

6314. Not capable of being taught where?—In the special class. They can be taught perhaps one thing. One child I have in my mind has been there a long time. She can be taught to knit, but she was adding small sums of three figures the other day when I went in, and she had the wildest results, and she had been years in the class.

6315. You can determine the inferior limit for excluding them from the special class; can you determine the superior limit for excluding them from the ordinary school?—I think I might, perhaps, determine a limit which satisfied myself as to their not being in need of any very special education, but I should not personally like to draw the limit for excluding them from the special class, for I hold, however it may be from the point of view of the School Board or of the Education Department, that it is very advantageous to defective children to have some other children mixed up with them.

6316. Do you mean for the purposes of instruction, or at play?—For both.

6317. But suppose they cannot keep pace with the other children's instruction, what advantage would they derive from attending the class?—I am speaking of those children who would be so backward that they could be classed for some time with the deficient children.

6318. You are speaking of backward children—not of defective children?—I understood that your question was how would one distinguish between children who are deficient and children who are only backward. We did attempt a rough classification, which was fairly satisfactory to ourselves, of the children present in that special class who, in our opinion (I do not think it is worth very much), were only backward and not mentally deficient. If you talk to them about ordinary matters you will find them as bright as many children, but they have been very much neglected by their parents, and they have received very little education, chiefly, I might almost say entirely, owing to their irregular attendance. But, personally, I think that the presence of these children is of advantage to the defective children, and I do not think that it is very much harm to themselves, because if the teacher does her duty by them, as I am sure she would, they are pushed on and are pretty soon sent into the ordinary schools, and their places taken by other backward children. They are passed through the special class in a short time, and they get a little more individual attention than they would get in a large class at an ordinary school, and I think on their way they tend to stimulate defective children.

6319. Directly they are developed to some degree you remove them from the class, and pass them on to the ordinary school?—Yes.

6320. You agree that it takes a considerable time before you can determine whether a child is imbecile or not?—Yes, I hold the strongest views on that point.

Miss Sewell.

26 Mar. 1897.

It seems to me a very great misfortune that anything so important should be treated in any way hastily.

6321. And I suppose it would take still longer to convince a parent?—It takes much longer to convince a parent.

6322. Have you ever known a parent convinced that his child was imbecile?—Yes, we have. We have known several cases of parents who were convinced after a good deal of talk, and a good deal of visiting on our part.

6323. They were at last convinced that the children were not capable of profiting by ordinary instruction, or that of a special class?—Yes, and they have now gone to Darenth. We have been instrumental in removing several of these children into Darenth.

6324. Is it a difficult process to get them into Darenth?—Yes, it is, it usually takes a long time.

6325. Can you describe the process you have employed?—If we believe a child should go into Darenth, we never take any action without first getting special medical opinion about the child. We do that rather frequently. We take them up to Dr. Rayner at St. Thomas' Hospital, who is very kind in looking at children for us, and we take no steps in the matter at all till we have an opinion as to whether the child is absolutely unfit for school. Then, having decided that point, we go to the parent, and we say, "We believe your child ought to be in Darenth," and we explain to them what Darenth is. Those who have seen Darenth describe it to the parents. Then we tell them to apply to the relieving officer, which is the ordinary way. They generally refuse at first, but finally, after they are convinced, they apply to the relieving officer, and then, if it is a very clear case, the child goes very quickly; if it is a difficult case it goes very slowly. Sometimes there is a hitch. In one case I think it took us nearly a year, because the father was living in Lambeth and the mother in Southwark, and when the relieving officer was applied to by the mother, he said it was the father's duty to apply, and when the father applied he was told that the child was not living in the same place as he was, and that it was the duty of the other set of guardians to see to it. This went on for months and months, but the child is finally lodged in Darenth.

6326. Have you failed altogether in inducing some parents to have their children removed to Darenth?—Yes.

6327. I presume these children, when they are at home, are a great trouble to their parents, and a great source of danger?—Not all of them. Some are very troublesome, and are a source of danger. Of course we give our attention chiefly to these. Others are well under the control of their parents, and I do not think are a source of danger—at any rate whilst they are young.

6328. And, if they have a good home, you would not be inclined to remove them?—Personally, I should not.

6329. But if they have a bad home, would you be inclined to exercise compulsory powers if necessary?—I think I should in some cases. I certainly should when they became older—when they reach about 14, 15, or 16.

6330. Because of the moral danger?—Because of the moral danger.

6331. Have you found that teachers of ordinary schools are anxious to get rid of many of these cases?—I think they are naturally anxious to get rid of these absolutely defective cases. We have thought that they were a little anxious to get rid of their irregular attenders also, who naturally were backward.

6332. But of course it is impossible for them to do that with with the severe sifting that takes place before they are sent to a special class?—It is much more difficult now than it was.

6333. Do you think that there are some in the Pocock Street special class who are not proper inmates for it now?—I should not like to say that.

6334. Are they in the upper or lower class?—I could not say. I do not remember them clearly in that way. I think there have been children in the Pocock Street class who certainly should not have been there.

6335. Do you mean that they should have been in Darenth, or that they should have been in an ordinary school?—Some of them, I think, should have been in an ordinary school. But again, I think it is very difficult to know from what point of view exactly one should regard the matter. If one regards it from the point of view of the child himself, then I think he might, perhaps, have been in an ordinary school; but, if from the point of view of the more defective ones, then I think he is, perhaps, fairly well placed in the special class.

6336. But you think that he personally would have benefited more by the ordinary school than the special class?—You are referring to any particular child who ought not to have been in the class.

6337. Yes. You think such children might have profited more by an ordinary school?—I think each child must be judged separately; there have been a few of whom that would be true; I can recall one or two special cases.

6338. But that is a question more to be determined by the teacher?—Yes, I think so. A child is now in my mind who was not really, I think, at all defective, but she had extremely bad sight. I think that child ought never to have been in the special class; she should have been in a class for the blind. She is an exceptionally bright child. She was at last moved, I believe through our influence, into one of the board's special classes for the blind, and she is so bright there that they expect her to get a scholarship and do very well. She, I consider, wasted some years by being in that class, and I think the same might be said of one or two deaf children.

6339. It is very difficult to determine, of course, the amount of blindness or deafness that would disqualify for the ordinary school, or would qualify for a school for the deaf or blind?—This class forms a very difficult set of children to judge about.

6340. You have said a good deal about the work of these special classes. Would you consider they have been conducted on thoroughly good lines?—I do not think I know enough to answer that question.

6341. Do you think that the physical training of the children is sufficiently considered?—No; that point has struck me, considering how much has always been said to us by doctors when we have taken the children up for examination. They have always dwelt very much upon the need of physical exercise, and upon how much good it might do the children, and, without knowing very much about it, I have often wondered whether there was enough time given to physical exercise. Personally I do not think that quite enough attention is given to it.

6342. When they have been once admitted, do not you think there should be a second examination after a certain period of probation?—I do.

6343. Similar to the one at admission?—Yes. I think that there should be a very careful re-examination of the child periodically.

6344. After a short interval?—Yes.

6345. To allow the history of the child to be well known?—Yes, but of course not directly after its admission; then it would not be of much use.

6346. After 6 or 12 months?—Probably after six months, I should think, if the child has attended regularly

6347. Your experience with regard to the management of these schools is that voluntary managers are absolutely essential?—I think that they are very essential.

6348. In what ways?—I think they are essential in several ways. It is often difficult to secure the co-operation of the parents in this kind of work, and in doing the things that should be done for the children, and I think volunteers can do more than anybody else.

6349. Cannot a sympathetic board visitor do a good deal, cannot he influence the parents?—I do not know him. He may exist, but the school board officer is a very busy person.

6350. He is a man of facts and figures, not of sympathy?—I should not like to say that. I think he is very busy, and I do not think you can expect from him the immense patience that is wanted for that kind of work. I do not think he looks upon it as part of his business at all.

6351. And so few of them are women?—Yes.

6352. Do you think that women visitors might perhaps exercise the same influence that voluntary

Miss Sewell.

26 Mar. 1897.

managers might do?—I think they might if they were well chosen.

6353. Then of course the voluntary managers should continue their care of the children after they leave school?—That I think is a very important point, and the fact of having been managers, and having had a certain amount of official connexion with the class and the child while at school, gives the manager a good deal of influence when the child is over school age. You know the child, you have followed its history, and you can do things for it which you could not possibly do otherwise.

6354. Are you desirous of extending the school age of these children?—I am not prepared to say that—I think some children would be all the better for a change of treatment at 14.

6355. Do you think that they should go to actual work?—No, I think, perhaps, they would do better in a training home, or something of that sort. Girls might be trained for domestic duties, and so on. I do not say that, of course, of all, and I should be extremely sorry if they were not allowed to stay in the special class.

6356. You have a very interesting analysis here of physically defective children; is that of children in your immediate neighbourhood?—Yes, it is of children in exactly the same area as the others.

6357. You had on the books on the 31st December 1896, 157?—Yes, we had. We had 200 who passed through our books in the course of last year.

6358. Are any of them duplicate entries, that is to say, of children re-admitted;—No, they are not any of them duplicate entries.

6359. There are 157 of various kinds?—Yes.

6360. In these you include two as mentally deficient?—Yes.

6361. One of those mentally deficient children had fits also?—Yes, she had fits.

6362. So that there are practically 155 physically defective children?—Yes.

6363. Are they attending school?—Some of them are attending school, and some are not attending school. If you look at the next analysis you will see there are 36 of those 157 children who are over school age; 15 under school age; 66 we consider fit for the ordinary school; and we do all we can to urge them to attend the ordinary school, which leaves a balance of 41 children, 11 of whom are very delicate indeed, and who are certainly only fit to be taught at home, for many of them are lying on their backs perpetually, and could not go out at all; 24 who we think are fit for being taught in a class, though they are not fit for an ordinary school, and 5 who are attending "special classes."

6364. The school board gives you a room?—The school board used to, as long as they had a room for us, but they have ceased to do so now. We had a room in the deaf and dumb centre, but when the centre grew, and wanted a second room for its own children, the board naturally turned us out.

6365. Do not they consider these children under their care?—I do not know what they consider. I have often wondered what they consider about these children. We have had children of 9 and 10 and older entirely unable to read and write, exempted under medical certificates, and not being educated at all, and if you will notice the school board officers return was 15 children exempt, but we had in our list 35, so that the school board were not aware of them, but all the same they were there.

6366. Where did you find that 35?—It is on the first page of my proof.

6367. That does not agree with your other analysis on page 7, does it?—Yes, I think so. I analyse these 157 who are physically defective. Of these 51 (36 and 15) are over or under school age, 66 are well enough to attend the ordinary school as a rule, 5 are attending a school board special class, leaving a remainder of 35 children of school age unprovided for, 24 of whom we consider fit for class teaching.

6368. There are 24 crippled and delicate children who ought to have been formed into a special class by the board?—I think they ought to have been taught.

6369. You think they are all capable of being taught?—Yes: they are certainly capable of being taught; we find them very intelligent, in fact.

6370. Does the particular inspector of that neighbourhood know about them?—Yes, he does, he is very sympathetic indeed. Mr. Graves has looked into the class more than once.

6371. He is Her Majesty's inspector?—Yes.

6372. What do you say as to the board inspector?—I do not think he knows anything about us. He has never come to us.

6373. Might you not put yourself in communication with him?—The board knows about our existence quite well, because they lent us the room. Her Majesty's inspector looks in upon us occasionally and sees what we are doing and so on, and he has a great deal of interest, I believe, in the classes. I do not know that we require more encouragement.

6374. I paid a visit once, and I thought that few of the children would live?—They are mostly alive still.

6375. Do you think that they will grow up to be men and women?—A good many who have been taught by us, we have started in life, and they are working and earning a living.

9376. You wish to give some notes of an experiment in the education of physically defective children?—Yes, at your request.

6377. There are two means of teaching them (*a*) by means of a class, (*b*) by individual teaching in the home. Would you give us your account of the class. How long has it been in operation?—The class was opened some three years ago. We found that education was very much needed, as so many of the children could not read or write. They were very dull, they could not amuse themselves, and we tried teaching them in their homes. Then we found a good many who probably could be managed in a small class, and would do much better, and would have the stimulus of each others' society, and that we could do more with them in associated work and so on. Then we gathered this class together, and we have had it taught entirely by volunteers. The number of children who are in attendance has varied during the three years from about 6 to 20. It has usually been open four mornings in the week and two afternoons. I should have been quite willing that it should have been open longer, only the difficulty has been to find the teachers. They are entirely volunteers, and it has been difficult to find teachers who have the training and knowledge necessary for such teaching.

6378. And another difficulty has been getting children to and from the class?—Yes, that has been another difficulty. We consider that there are 23 children who could go to the class at this moment, but we only get 10, and we think that, in nearly all these cases, it is because the children cannot manage the distance.

6379. A similar experiment to yours has been tried elsewhere?—Yes, Mr. and Mrs. Pilcher have tried an experiment down in the East End, and they have had, I think, better success than we have. They have managed to set up a little waggonette, or some vehicle which goes round and takes up these children, and brings them to school. Mr. Graves, Her Majesty's inspector, was very anxious we should start a carriage too. We have not seen our way to finding the money yet, but we should like to do so very much. Then, I think, we should work two or three districts together. At present we keep it strictly for our own children, but if we had a little carriage, we might take the children of other districts, and make a better school of it.

6380. Classification is almost impossible, because the children are of different ages and attainments, and it is, therefore, almost altogether individual teaching?—Yes. For instance, we have only 10 children, and we have nearly always two teachers, and some mornings we have three. A lady comes in for the purpose of teaching one or two children who are particularly backward, and who need a good deal of attention.

6381. As regards home teaching, how many visits per week are paid?—One always, and two very often. That is all we can manage, but it is not ideal.

6382. What progress do they make?—I cannot say that they make a great deal of progress, but they do learn enough to brighten them up.

6383. It cheers their lives?—It cheers their lives. I do not think we can honestly say it does a great deal more than that in the case of home teaching, though I think we might do more if there was anyone who could

Miss Sewell.

26 Mar. 1897.

give all her time to it. There are, of course, great difficulties in teaching at home; the room is very full, the baby cries, and it is not easy to teach under these circumstances. Still, we have been fairly successful in that way.

6384. You think that a combination of physical and mental defects is very rare in the same child?—We find it is very rare among these children. I had been led to expect from what I had read that it was very general, but we do not find it so. In this analysis of children which I gave, you will have observed that in our 157, we only had two whom we considered mentally defective; you may also notice that five children are in a special class, but we think that the other three who are there need not be there, so far as mental deficiency goes

6385. You have only one case of serious heart disease; is that common with children?—We have more than one case, I am afraid, of serious heart disease. I think, amongst those 36 "generally delicate," there would be a good many cases of heart disease. That case was specially mentioned because eyes were the real trouble, but she had heart disease as well.

6386. Would you separate the physically defective entirely, from the mentally defective?—Yes, I should. I should very much regret to see physically defective children put in with the mentally defective children, because the physically defective seem to me to require a great deal of attention, and they are not mentally defective, and it would handicap them very much to put them with mentally defective children.

6387. Therefore the class would have to be very small?—We think we could get 23 children if we had a conveyance. And perhaps if we had a conveyance we could get the Lambeth children, and make a school of 30 to 40.

6388. Divided into how many classes?—I should think four.

6389. Very much like a village school in fact?—Yes.

6390. You think it should rather be a voluntary school than a board school?—Personally we think there is a great deal yet to learn, and that we should be very sorry to have any system imposed upon us until we had tried a little more as to what it is possible to do, and what really is the kind of teaching that these children need most, and how far it is possible to manage the attendance, and so on.

6391. There is no voluntary school in your neighbourhood that can supply you with a room?—No, I think not. The voluntary schools in our neighbourhood are St. George-the-Martyr, Christ's Church, and St. Peter's, but they have not room for us. At present we hire a little room on the ground floor in one of the streets near us, and have our children in there. You see it is essential it should be on the ground floor because these crippled children cannot get upstairs. That is one of the great drawbacks to the board schools.

6392. You leave the mentally defective children to the board?—We leave them entirely to the board. They have their classes, and we throw all our strength into helping the board there. But physically defective children are overlooked by the board, except one or two cases, and for no other reason that we can make out, except that they are physically defective. But that is not consistently carried out, and I do not think for a moment they would admit these physically defective children that we have, and I do not think it would be advisable at all that they should be admitted.

6393. Have you been able to assist these children after they have left you?—Yes, our experiment is very young, and the children very few, but we generally aim at apprenticing them. We have just started a little workshop for training some of the boys in surgical boot making. The secret of getting these boys started is to give them a highly skilled trade. It will give them an advantage if they have a highly skilled trade, and they will earn their living in less time and with less exertion than at a less skilled trade.

6394. Does not boot making require a considerable amount of strength?—It requires, no doubt, a certain amount, but we have admitted no boy except under the doctor's advice. We have explained exactly what the work was, and we have got his permission. The experiment is a very small one, we have only three boys there at present.

6395. Are they boots which are made by nailing or sewing?—They are hand-sewn. It is all hand-made work, but the experiment is too young for me to do more than just mention it.

6396. (*Mr. Pooley.*) You think that very few of these crippled or delicate children in that class could reasonably be expected to attend a board school?—No. We have 66 out of 157 who do attend.

6397. You mean who are already attending?—Who are already attending.

6398. I mean in the special class for physically unfit children which you told us about?—We do not think that any of those children can. Our first business is to sort out all those children who we think can attend the board schools. We do this in connexion with the superintendent of visitors.

6399. You have told us about this interesting experiment, but you do not suggest that any special reform is needed; you do not suggest that any further power should be given to the school board to teach that class of children, do you?—I think that the school board ought to do this work finally, but I am not prepared to say the moment has come when it would be to the advantage of the children's education that the board should take over this work entirely. I think that if any new thing can be left in the experimental stage for some time you are apt to get a better thing when you do crystallize it.

6400. You think this small fringe of neglected children should be dealt with by charitable people?—Yes, I do, with the encouragement of the authorities and, if necessary, their help—such help as the lending of a room possibly, and so on.

6401. You have, I see, 48 in the special class at Pocock Street, and you have 38 on your list of invalid children exempt; are those last figures your scheduling?—Yes, our own scheduling. They come to us in various ways The doctors send, the hospitals send, the clergy send, we pick them up in the streets.

6402. Did you come to the conclusion that all the children fit for special classes were already there?—No.

6403. You said the 35 were "physically unfit"; did you mean they were not mentally unfit?—I mean not mentally unfit at all—I mean physically unfit; they have hip disease, spine disease, heart disease, and so on.

6404. Have not the ladies scheduled any mentally unfit or defective besides those 48 already attending the special class?—I expect that we have sent a good many of those in to the special classes. If we come across any mentally defective children we do not deal with them ourselves, we refer them to the board school class. I do not know how many, but probably a certain number of those 48 have been referred by us.

6405. The figures you gave us represent the scheduling which has been done by the ladies of your settlement over a considerable period of time?—It ought not to be called scheduling. In the course of our work in that district we have come across this number of children; or rather we have come across a much larger number of children, but on the 31st December last we had that number of children on our books.

6406. Then it is quite likely that there are in the area a certain number of defective children not now attending special classes, but who are fit for them?—It is probable, but I do not think we shall find a great many.

6407. (*Dr. Smith.*) I gather from what you say that you think children should be kept in the elementary schools if possible?—I do.

6408. In other words, that they should not be too easily admitted into these special classes?—Are you speaking of mentally defective children?

6409. Yes?—It depends so much upon the child. I think a child should be very readily admitted if he is really defective, but if he is only irregular I do not think he should be.

6410. Is it your experience that children are put into these classes because of irregular attendance?—We think so a good deal. But the two things run so much into each other. If a child is very irregular he is naturally very backward, and if he is very backward and has not been much educated he seems very dull. So that I quite realise that it is very difficult to decide whether a child is simply backward from irregularity or really backward from mental deficiency.

6411. But as a rule children are not admitted into these classes who are backward merely because of their irregularity?—I expect in the organisation of the class

Miss Sewell.

26 Mar. 1897.

at the first it was extremely difficult, and I daresay many children have drifted in that were merely irregular.

6412. I do not think they are admitted now?—I do not think they are.

6413. When you speak of physical defects you are talking of physical defects without any mental defect at all?—Yes.

6414. Of purely physical defects such as heart disease or hip disease?—You mean when we are speaking of "physically defective" children?

6415. Yes?—When I use that expression I do not mean mentally defective at all.

6416. But of course you do get physical defects and mental defects associated sometimes?—Very rarely, we think.

6417. Perhaps, but when you speak of physical defects, you have in your mind something very marked, such as blindness?—Or hip disease, and many of these children are cripples. I mean either a distinct physical defect or extreme delicacy. We do find children who are very nervous and delicate without any mental defect.

6418. And in your judgment those children should not be admitted into these special classes?—No, they should not.

6419. You think it desirable to have, in connexion with these special classes, some voluntary agency?—Yes, I do.

6420. Will you give any special reason you have for that opinion?—I think a volunteer can do a great deal in visiting homes and in watching children, and in helping teachers in reference to things which they have not time to do. I think the teachers of the "special class" which we are connected with would tell you that they would be sorry to lose us.

6421. You have probably found in connexion with these classes that very frequently local aid is of great use in a large number of cases?—Yes, we have.

6422. And for reasons of that kind you think it is desirable to have associated with the teachers some voluntary agency?—Yes; there was one child I remember who was very deaf, and we took it to a specialist, and an operation was performed, and that child's deafness was almost entirely removed, and I believe that child has since been able to leave the special class.

6423. And I think there was a blind case?—There was a blind case in Pocock Street. I should like to say another word or two, if I might, on the importance of the preliminary examination, and to suggest if it were possible that on the first examination the child should not be definitely passed, but there should be a time of probation for the child. I do not know whether it would be a possible thing, but if it were possible it would seem to me a very advantageous thing if the children who were alleged to be suitable cases for the special class should be put into a class under a skilled person really trained to observe these children.

6424. Is not that what is done?—They are not put into a probation class for a short time, they are drafted into the class.

6425. Do they not generally enter into the lowest class at the special centre?—Yes, but they cannot be said to be under any particular observation any more than any other child in the centre.

6426. What number would you have in the class?—Suppose there are 15 children for admission, and that of the 15, 12 are admitted, I would have those 12, if it were possible, put under observation for at any rate a week before they were admitted at all into the big class—by a skilled person trained to observe children. If a person trained, for instance, as Mrs. Burgwin is, could watch these children for even a week, I believe that many of the decisions would be reversed. I would take in, on probation, children who seemed apparently to be too bad, as well as children who perhaps at first are thought not to be bad enough, and watch them.

6427. Then, so far as your experience at Pocock Street is concerned, do you think that the admissions are rather too liberal?—I have thought that the admissions were not always quite satisfactory. I do not know enough to say, that I think they have been too liberal. At a recent examination there were two children excluded. Now, what happens to the excluded children? If the parents are not instantly convinced that they are imbecile, where are you to send them? I have in view these two children who interested me. I heard they were refused admission, and I thought I should like to see what happened to them, because I believe legally they drop out of the cognisance of the educational authorities. The school board officer is allowed to remove them from his list, and I believe at the same time an ordinary school has no business to re-admit these children.

6428. Quite so?—What happened was that both these children got back into an ordinary school again. One child was refused admission to the special class. I think it was marked "imbecile" on the sheet; but the parent was not present at the examination, and there is nobody to explain to the parent what happened. I know that in a medical examination such as we arrange for at a hospital the parent is asked to come up, and is asked all sorts of questions—whether the child had fits in infancy, and so on, but in this examination the parent often does not understand what is happening when the child is sent up. One child, as I say, has gone back to a board school—I do not think it is the same board school—and is attending. I sent to see the child a few days ago—I did not go personally—and I found it was in a class, and the teacher did not in the least know what had happened, and was proposing to send the child up again for examination. Now that seems to me very unsatisfactory for the child.

6429. That is owing to want of proper organisation?—You will find it is done, especially if the parents are not convinced. With regard to the other child, I found the parents were extremely respectable people, and we should not have dared to mention the word "imbecile" to them in speaking of the child. They were devoted to it, and I do not think that they for a moment thought that it was an imbecile. It is an extremely delicate and nervous child. I am not a doctor, and I do not venture to say for a moment whether it is imbecile or not. I only know that all its friends, who are unusually intelligent people, do not believe to this day that the child is an imbecile. That child went back to the school and remained there some time until it got bronchitis. It is now at home ill with bronchitis. The position of such children is very difficult.

6430. There must be finality somewhere?—No doubt.

6431. In this particular case the medical officer stated that it was imbecile?—Yes.

6432. You have told us about the cumbersome machinery of the Poor Law and the difficulty of giving effect to it?—Yes.

6433. What would you suggest should be the procedure with a child who is pronounced to be imbecile?—I think you want voluntary managers—people who are interested—to go and explain the matter to the parent. That would be the first step towards clearing up the position. As it is, the parents do not know what has happened, but get a roundabout message from the teacher that the child is pronounced imbecile; they do not know how or where; and, I think, your voluntary visitor could do a great deal by a visit to the parents and saying, "I saw your child examined to-day, and the "doctor thinks it is not fit to go to any school," and then by considering with them what there was to be done.

6434. Is there any possibility of getting an agency in connexion with each special centre of the School Board in London of a voluntary character?—I think it ought to be done, and I do not think it would be at all difficult.

6435. And you would extend your agency in that direction?—We cannot extend it beyond the particular area where we work, but I think we could suggest similar agencies in various parts of London. But, speaking frankly, I do not think we are very much encournged. Through the courtesy of Mrs. Burgwin, whom we know very well, we are able to go in and out of the class, and we see a great deal of the children in that particular class, and we are very much interested in them and in the teachers, but when I and my fellow-manager asked the board to give us certain facilities and information, such as is accorded to ordinary school managers, we got the answer back that they did not see their way to grant the request.

6436. You do not receive encouragement from the board?—No, I do not think we do.

6437. But in a matter of this kind it is really encouragement from the officials that you require in the matter of dealing with these children?—Yes.

6438. It is not so much the board?—It is both. For instance, we have no notice of change of teachers, and that kind of thing. We cannot as managers take any active part in the choice of them, and so on. It is both; the whole thing works in together.

6439. I was thinking more particularly of the children, and your efforts in connexion with them, and also I had in my mind the necessity of medical attention to a very large majority?—Yes, a good many of them require it.

6440. In what ways have you seen the necessity of voluntary agency in that connexion?—I think volunteers could do a great deal in that connexion.

6441. I think it is the experience of the officials of the London School Board that there is a difficulty in finding suitable volunteers?—There are educated people all over London, and if you chose your people sufficiently carefully, and then showed them that they were really wanted, I believe you would get them. Managers are elected, not often, or not always for their particular qualification or interest in education, and there is a difficulty in getting rid of them. I believe there are many board regulations about it; that they all go off at a certain time, but practically you get on most boards a great many managers who really do not know anything about schools or care much, and this is a pity. I know the renewal of the managers is very much of a dead letter, at least I believe so. I have noticed it in several places, but I cannot but think if proper means were taken to secure the help of educated people for these children and encouragement given to them, they would be forthcoming.

6442. Of course all my remarks are in the direction of the children, not in connexion with the teachers at all, and, so far as I know, agencies such as you mention would be very welcome?—I think it would be a great advantage that they should be welcomed.

6443. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) There are one or two questions I should like to ask you with regard to the examinations that you say take place at St. Thomas's Hospital. Are those of children who are mentally defective?—We take our children to St. Thomas's Hospital with all sorts of diseases, and amongst others the mentally defective.

6444. Do they ever go to the Charity Organisation Consultations, of which we heard the other day?—We have not used there consultations. I know all about them. Dr. Rayner is very good to us, and we take our children to him, and we like it better. It is a matter of choice.

6445. With regard to the girls you mentioned, I understood you that after 14 years you think it desirable that some of them should go to training homes?—Yes.

6446. That is to say, that might be an alternative to their remaining longer at school?—Yes.

6447. Then with regard to the teachers in your settlement; may I ask, who are the teachers; are they ladies of university education?—They have varied, of course, as we have been able to get them. The lady who is in charge of the class just now is a Miss Sparks, whose home is at Wimbledon. She came to help us when we had a Miss Buckton, who was a very able woman indeed. Miss Sparks came as a volunteer assistant. She was so much interested in the teaching and the work done, that she withdrew from us and had herself trained in kindergarten work, quite voluntarily, and she has come back now. We have lost Miss Buckton; she is doing other work, and Miss Sparks has taken her place.

Miss Sewell.

26 Mar. 1897.

6448. Evidently this lady has had the best sort of training?—She has had very good training; but I quite realise there may be a serious difficulty in these classes if through any misfortune we were not successful in getting properly trained teachers. In fact we have ourselves suffered. There was an interregnum between two of our teachers in which we did very badly. There is, of course, a want of permanence about these purely voluntary efforts which is an element of weakness.

6449. I was a little surprised to hear that you did not often find a combination of physical and mental defects; do you think that may be because children who are both physically and mentally defective are apt to be sent away from home to asylums, so that you would not meet with them so much?—I do not know. I have found that mentally defective children were also physically defective, but we have not found that the physically defective are frequently mentally defective. There is one point about the irregularity of the "special" children, you did not ask me a question upon which is mentioned in my proof, and is, I think, important. We have observed that there is a very large number of children who are extremely irregular, and more so, perhaps, than in the ordinary schools (we are managers of the ordinary schools also). In that schedule of mentally defective children, on page 4, I have, you will observe, 18 marked as "backward and very irregular." With the exception of three the attendance is very bad, and some are hardly to be seen at school at all, and we do not know whether there is unusual slackness on the part of the school officers in not securing the attendance of those special children.

6450. You are now speaking of backward children, not mentally deficient children?—No, the children in the special class. I think they are mostly the backward ones who are irregular. I believe they are simply in that class because of their irregularity.

6451. Some of that class are very regular?—Some of them. There is a section of children in that class, who have been irregular, and we do not think that the officers are quite strict enough in enforcing the attendance of these special children.

6452. These are children of better intellect, although they are more backward?—Yes, we also have thought if a case of this kind comes up before the magistrates (and probably that is the secret of the school board officers' slackness) he is not so ready to enforce attendance in the case of children who are in a special class as in the case of children in the ordinary schools.

6453. That is the experience of school board officers?—I do not know whether it is their experience. We notice it. One of our members is on the notice committee and issues summonses and so on, and we think that the magistrates are even more slack in sentencing the parents of the special children than they are in other cases. They are certainly very slack, and we have great difficulties about getting the non-attenders punished adequately.

6454. As a rule the mentally deficient are regular?—Yes, the really mentally deficient, I believe, are regular.

6455. It is probably the truant class who are very backward?—Yes, it is a very great misfortune.

Mr. ARTHUR R. PRICE called and examined.

Mr. A. R. Price.

6456. (*Chairman.*) I believe you are very much interested in special classes for mentally defective children?—Yes.

6457. Which group of schools are you specially interested in?—The Broad Street School and the Highway group.

6458. That is in the East end of London?—In Ratcliff parish.

6459. You are manager of that group?—Yes.

6460. You frequently visit the school yourself?—Yes.

6461. With what object do you pay these visits?—Very largely, I think, to encourage the teacher and to help her in her work.

6462. And to obtain personal knowledge of the children?—Yes.

6463. And through them to influence the parents?—Not so much as manager of the special classes, but as manager of the board school. That is to say, I have had to do with the parents of these children who are now in the special classes previously when they were in a neighbouring board school.

6464. It is the transferring them from the board schools to the special classes with which you have most to do?—Yes.

6465. In fact, when they are in the special classes you consider they are out of your reach and special care?—No, I should treat them in just the same way. If there is any account to give to their parents, or if they are to be sent into the country, or hospital orders are necessary, I should do just the same as I do with children in the ordinary board school.

Mr. A. R. Price.

26 Mar. 1897.

6466. You have considerable knowledge of the lowest class, both of boys and girls in ordinary schools?—Yes.

6467. As a rule they are large classes with a great mixture of children, some are well up in Standard I. work and others are almost totally ignorant?—Yes.

6468. Do you generally find that much attention is paid to the totally ignorant children, or are they allowed to take their chance?—Do you mean in an ordinary infant school?

6469. In an older school, in the lowest class of boys and girls?—Some of them are so absolutely stupid that the teacher has not time to devote special attention to them, but those with whom anything can be done, I think, get a very fair share of attention.

6470. But do you think, when a teacher despairs of a boy, that then the boy is left very much to take his chance and gets very little care?—I think that is necessarily so. The teacher cannot neglect all the other boys.

6471. Special classes or special teachers of some sort are necessary for the very dull and backward children, who cannot keep pace with the others?—Yes.

6472. Excluding for one moment mentally deficient children, would you give this care to the backward and dull children in the ordinary school with a special teacher, or would you put such children in a special class?—As the teachers are at present appointed, I do not think that matters very much, but I should like to see some changes with regard to the appointment and education of the teachers.

6473. You would have specially trained teachers for those dull and backward children?—Yes.

6474. It really comes to this: that you would desire a special class for the dull and backward children as well as for the mentally deficient?—A special teacher, yes.

6475. But do not you find such teachers now in board schools?—I think you do; but I do not think you can rely on every teacher being adapted to deal with dull and backward children.

6476. It depends upon the amount of sympathy in his nature?—Yes.

6477. Are these lowest classes generally under the care of one teacher, or does he have some assistance with the backward children?—That would depend upon the size of the school. If the school is large enough to have two Standard I.'s, I should think the headmaster in the ordinary course would draft all the dull and backward children into one of these standards.

6478. You do not advocate that, do you?—No, but I think that is what would be done.

6479. You advocate the mixing the less forward ones with the others in two divisions, and that each division should have some of the more forward and some of the more backward; it is not a wholesome thing to put a great number of dull children together in one class, you think?—No, I do not think it is, but then, with classes of the present size, it is very hard for the teacher. He must do justice to those children who can do their work, and he can with great difficulty find time to look after three or four dull children out of a class of 60 or 70.

6480. You think in order to do justice to some he must do injustice to others?—Yes.

6481. A large body of managers is not wanted for a board school if they distribute the different duties among themselves?—No. My own view would be that there should be one gentleman and one lady to each school.

6482. The great evil with most managers seems to be that each manager considers that he is to look after the whole management of the school, and the school in every particular?—We do divide the work in our group. I do not think it is common.

6483. How do you divide labours?—We have three schools in the group, and we divide our whole body of managers into three sub-committees, and each sub-committee has a correspondent, who calls the sub-committee together when they are required, or acts himself. I, as correspondent for the Collingwood Street School, for instance, should not take any active steps with regard to anything that went on at Broad Street School; but, if anything occurred to me, I should write to the correspondent of that sub-committee, and suggest to him that he ought to look into it, or take steps.

6484. Has each member of the sub-committee special duties with regard to his own school?—No, not formally, but more or less it drifts into that.

6485. If anything goes wrong, either in the boys' school or infant department, any member of the committee will consider himself responsible for looking after it?—Yes.

6486. Would it not be better to divide the duties among yourselves in some way?—They are divided in this way. For instance, the Children's Country Holiday Fund work is divided, and we are lucky in having a Mr. Mills, who looks a great deal after children who are leaving school, getting them employment and so on. If a case of a child leaving school was brought to my notice, I should probably send it on to Mr. Mills, not as a matter of duty, but because he has specially devoted himself to that work.

6487. No one of your managers knows how many children in the school are suffering from weak eyes at this moment?—No.

6488. Nor would they be able to say how many children in the school were suffering from any particular defect?—No.

6489. What class of teachers do you advocate for the special classes; you would, I suppose, advocate a good education as a teacher with some physiological training?—Yes. I have talked it over with some of the other managers, and I think that the plan that occured to us as being the best was to take the ordinary teachers who had been properly trained, and who had been five years in an ordinary board school, and let him or her go through a course of six months at a hospital receiving a salary and giving a bond, or undertaking to the board that they would stay in the special class for three years; and that, at the conclusion of the hospital training, they should be drafted into the special class.

6490. They should be paid a rather higher salary to make up for the deferred salary which they had lost?—No, I think they ought to receive a salary while at the hospital.

6491. Do you think the board have the power to pay it, or would be willing to pay it?—That I do not know.

6492. I doubt whether they would have power to pay that salary?—They do at present give the teachers in the special classes 10*l.* extra a year.

6493. Does not that tempt the right kind of teacher to come forward?—I do not think so. The teacher I have to do with is certainly extremely satisfactory; but you see if teachers get appointed to these schools it makes it almost impossible for them to get a headship in the ordinary way. Therefore you are likely to get an unambitious teacher, and, I think, considering the great difficulty and hardship of the work, there ought to be some inducement to them as teachers. Their scale of rising salary ought to be different to that of the ordinary teacher, who can always look forward to getting a headship sooner or later.

6494. We are told they are not out of the groove, but they are called up for reconsideration every five years, and that they are as likely to be appointed as head teachers as anybody else?—That has been stated, I know, but I think you will find teachers do not think so themselves, and I must say as manager that I should not be so inclined to nominate a teacher, who had been out of the run of the school for five years teaching special children, to go back and have the control of other teachers.

6495. You think it would disqualify them to some extent?—Yes. That is to say, if two teachers were equal, and I had a doubt about them, I should certainly choose the one who had been working in the ordinary school.

6496. The appointment of head teacher rests with the board, and not with the managers?—But managers go up now and have a good deal of voice in the matter of the final selection.

6497. These teachers are appointed with Mrs. Burgwin's sanction in the first instance?—Yes.

6498. So that you may have some reliance that suitable teachers will be appointed, so far as certain qualities are concerned, such as sympathy with the children, and knowledge of the special class?—I suppose Mrs. Burgwin can only appoint those who apply. If you have a very suitable teacher in the school she may not be willing to go to the special class under present conditions. My point rather was that I do not think you get the most suitable teachers, though I should like to say that the teacher at Broad Street is, I think, exceptionally well qualified for her work.

Mr. A. R Price.

26 Mar. 1897.

6499. The board are proposing to distribute a number of small centres all over London?—Yes, so I understand.

6500. Do you think the schools should be built for a larger number, so as to enable a better classification to be made of the children?—It is so difficult for these special children to cross the main roads, especially in a rough neighbourhood like ours; where they are not known they get ill-treated by boys, and they are too far away from their parents, or anyone, to give them help. I have had difficulty with one or two children going to a school on the other side of the Commercial Road. I think I wrote to Mrs. Burgwin about it.

6501. You think a small centre, with its difficulty of classification, is better than a large centre, because of the difficulty of children going far from home?—I think it would be better if each small centre had two classes instead of one. I do not think it is desirable to have a teacher all alone by herself; she gets very lonely. Another great difficulty that comes in is that a teacher is sometimes ill and cannot go, and there are all the children in the school together with no one to look after them.

6502. What happens in that case?—What I had to do was to arrange with the head mistress of an infant school to look in every morning. One morning I sent the children home, but luckily, just as they were going, the teacher that Mrs. Burgwin sent down came in; but I went down and found these children alone. The teacher of the class had been taken very seriously ill. That might happen again. It is a difficulty which may arise at any time.

6503. Do you think that in the special classes at Broad Street you have the right class of children?—Not altogether. It is so difficult to choose the right school.

6504. It is very carefully done at present by the co-operation of the superintendent of the special class and the medical officer of the board, and all the previous history of the child is known, either from the teacher or the parent, so that there ought to be no difficulty in discriminating?—It is very difficult, I think, with the short time at disposal, in view of the number of children who are coming in to see new people in a strange place. I think Mrs. McDermott, in her answer to the question, dealt with that very fully.

6505. From ten minutes to a quarter of an hour is devoted to the examination of each child?—Yes.

6506. And I have seen a child under examination for longer than that in doubtful cases?—Yes.

6507. In some cases there can be no doubt for a moment?—In some cases there is no doubt at all.

6508. And if there is a doubtful case, the medical officer is, I think, very careful?—There is no doubt about it.

6509. And then there should be a period of probation, and they should be called up again, should they not, after five or six months?—I think so; yes, or even within a shorter time. I should have thought that after they had been first passed, if the teachers had them for a month, they could then give a report on any children whom, for any reason, they thought were not satisfactory, and the doctor might reconsider it.

6510. Do you happen to know what becomes of the rejected children who are not fit either for the ordinary or special classes? Are they generally to be found in the street?—I should think so.

6511. Unless there is a voluntary agency which interests itself in the children, and gets them taken to some idiot or imbecile asylum. There is no other agency that you know of for sending them from their homes?—I know of none.

6512. Even although they may be dangerous, or loathsome to live with?—I do not know of any.

6513. At present the board has no power to detain them at school after 13 or 14, but there is no reason why they should not keep them at school to any age; they have legal power to do that?—They have no legal power to keep them at school.

6514. They cannot get the fee grant beyond the age of 15; but every other grant they can get up to any age, even up to 21?—I should think it would be very desirable to keep them as long as possible—some of them at all events.

6515. But you were not aware that the board had that power?—No, I was not.

6516. (*Mr. Pooley.*) Were you aware that a child's attendances can be counted until it is over 14, and has passed the Seventh Standard according to the Code?—Yes, I knew that.

6517. There is nothing, as far as I know, to prevent one of these defective children being retained in the schools?—Beyond the age of 14?

6518. Yes?—There is nothing to prevent such a child from being retained, but he cannot be compulsorily retained.

6519. Do you agree that after a sufficiently careful examination, and after getting the opinion of the teachers, there is not much practical difficulty in deciding whether a child is mentally defective he should be taught in a special class, or retained in the ordinary class?—Oh, no; I should not think so.

6520. Do you think that for practical purposes, and after careful examination, the discrimination can be made?—Yes.

6521. You have in all schools, of course, a certain number of very dull and backward children?—Yes.

6522. There is not much difficulty in their treatment until they get into the school for older children, is there?—No.

6523. Then, under the organisation in London, do you find these children apt to collect in the lowest class of the school below Standard I.?—Yes.

6524. Do you call them Standards 0's?—No, it is Class I. in the infant school.

6525. Is it not desirable that some arrangement should be made for giving special attention to these backward children who are below Standard I.?—Yes, I think it is. I think with a good many of them, it is very hard to decide whether they are only backward, or whether they are really mentally deficient.

6526. Would you advocate some assistance being given to the teacher of Standard I. by the addition of a teacher who can give most of her time to the dull children, taking them by themselves in some subjects, and allowing them to be taught with the Standard I. children in other subjects?—Do you mean a specially qualified or trained teacher?

6527. I meant by preference a specially qualified teacher, but that would rather depend upon the number of these dull children?—I was going to say I think there would be hardly enough in one school to justify having one teacher.

6528. We find, for instance, that in Bradford and Birmingham they have in some schools a small class of from 4 to 15 of what they call Standard 0 children, and that they give them a teacher of their own—usually an assistant teacher—who gives a good deal of personal attention to them, do you think that is a good plan?—Yes, it would simplify the work of the school a great deal, and enable the rest of the children in the standard to get on with their work quicker and better if those children were eliminated.

6529. You think it is a good plan, but it involves the question of expense?—Yes.

6530. If you had teachers with special physiological training, where would you put them; would you put them in charge of the special classes?—Yes.

6531. You would not employ them in the ordinary schools for ordinary children?—No, I would not.

6532. You want them mostly for the special class?—I think so. There is one question upon which I think they should be specially trained; the question of punishment which is a very difficult question with these children. With the class I have to do with—Mrs. McDermott's—she has never punished a child all the time she has been there; but it is quite clear that in dealing with these children, the boys especially, severe punishment must occasionally be necessary, and I think that the teachers ought to receive some special instruction as to the danger of punishing these children in a careless or haphazard way.

6533. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) Among the children in the district where you are manager, are the children often suffering from want of food?—A great many of them.

Mr. A. R. Price.

26 Mar. 1897.

6534. Will you tell us what is done for the special children in that way?—They have a glass of milk in the middle of the morning.

6535. And do you think that has been very good for them?—Yes, I do.

6536. With regard to the country holidays fund, have you been able to arrange for most of these children to get away into the country during the summer?—Well, a great many of the parents of these children are so very poor that few of the children can go; I think I only sent away two last summer out of that class.

6537. That would be because of the poverty of the parent, not that the child did not need the change?—Quite so.

6538. So that if some help could be given them these children would benefit?—My experience with them is this: I can always help them with clothes, boots, and things; but my experience is that when the parents are so poor that they will not pay anything it means that they will not take sufficient trouble to keep the children clean enough to go. I do not think the chief difficulty in sending the very poor children is the money, because that can always be got; it is the difficulty of getting the parents to cut their hair or to do anything at all for them; because I do not approve of taking all the care of children off the parents.

6539. Have you any ideas as to the occupations which it would be well to introduce into the classes?—Well, I think, for some of them a great deal might be done somewhat on the lines of what is done in the blind classes—teaching them to use their fingers more. I had a curious case the other day of a boy who had got into trouble, and whom I wrote to you about. He was transferred from Collingwood Street School to Trafalgar Square. The child's mother was very concerned, and spoke to me in the street about him. I went and saw the mother and the father. They kept a small sweet-stuff shop. She was very angry about it, and said that that boy could sell much better in the shop than any of them; and I found that was the fact; he was very sharp in the shop, though, apparently, he cannot learn anything.

6540. (*Mr. Newton.*) Have you any reason to think that the board has got hold of any unsuitable teachers for these special classes?—No.

6541. Then you have only what I may call *a priori* reasons for thinking that the present system of appointing teachers in the special classes is unsatisfactory?—Yes, and also what I have learned from the teachers. They tell me the reasons why they would not go into the special classes.

6542. But, as far as you know, the teachers in the East of London are satisfactory?—Yes.

6543. What, exactly, would you expect a teacher to learn in her six months at the hospital?—That would be rather for a doctor to say. There are symptoms of epilepsy and St. Vitus' dance, and various things of that sort, as to which experience would, I should think, be very useful to a teacher of this special class of children.

6544. You would not, then, suggest a general hospital; you would suggest an asylum, or institution, rather?—Yes.

6545. Have you ever considered whether as good a training might not be given by sending the teachers for six months to one of the best centres of the board, to there watch the teaching and watch the children?—Yes, I think that might be a good thing; but I should not think it was so good as having some physiological training. I think, too, it would be a very good thing if the teachers of this special class were allowed so many holidays in the year on which they might go and see the other centres, and see what was done; because it is terrible work for the teachers with their class alone—vastly more lonely than the work of other teachers—and they fear that they will be apt, ultimately, to get into a groove by being in one class alone.

6546. As to the size of the class; how many children are there in the Broad Street school at present?—32, I think.

6547. Are there any boys among them?—No.

6548. Then the presumption is that there would be 60, if boys were admitted?—I should think more. My impression would be that there are more defective boys than girls. I do not know if that is the case; but that would be my impression.

6549. The situation of Broad Street is rather cramped; you have the docks round you, and the railway?—Yes.

6550. And yet you could get 60 children in that position?—Yes.

6551. That would rather point to a centre for three classes, would it not?—Yes, I think so. But I think the boys and girls should certainly not be taught in the same classes.

6552. What are your reasons for thinking that?—A great many. Some of them have certainly got vicious tendencies, even when they are young.

6553. Tendencies which cannot be overcome by watchfulness?—It would be very difficult.

6554. Then would you have special centres for boys and special centres for girls?—I think that would be best.

6555. Of what size would you make them?—I should think a class of 30 is a practicable size.

6556. My meaning is, would you rather have two centres with 30 in each, or one centre with 60?—I think one centre of 60 divided into two classes would be best.

6557. Do you think a teacher could deal with as many as 30 properly?—I am thinking of 30 on the books, not of 30 in average attendance.

6558. Do you think a teacher could deal with even as many as that?—The smaller the class the better, no doubt. But the teachers, I think, do fairly well with them.

6559. Have you ever been present at the reading lessons in one of these classes which have been conducted by one teacher only?—Yes, I must have done; but I cannot remember it distinctly.

6560. Have you ever noticed how extremely difficult the teacher found it to teach the reading effectively when there were several groups to deal with?—No, I should not like to say. I do not specially remember being at their reading; perhaps I had better say I have not been there.

6561. (*Mr. Pooley.*) Have you any objection to mixed schools for ordinary children?—I have, where you get poor children. It is perfectly shocking the things we come across in ordinary children from poor neighbourhoods. From better neighbourhoods it is different.

6562. These mentally defective children are often backward, physically, are they not?—Yes.

6563. So long as the class was rather small, and the teacher able to give a good deal of attention to them and watch them, there would be less danger, perhaps, in a class for defective children being mixed than an ordinary class, would not there?—Yes, there might be; but of course, on the other hand, you are dealing with the worst of a poor class of children—children very often with hardly any moral sense.

6564. At all events you would not allow the boys to remain in a mixed class up to 14?—Oh, certainly not—not till 14: not in a mixed class.

6565. Then you must look at the practical question of having a sufficient number of children for a class: you think that is an important element, do you not?—Yes. I may say that when I took a party of children down into the country, and I asked Mrs. McDermott if she would like to bring her class down with them, she said she would rather not—that some of them were so spiteful that she would not like to trust them in a country place, where they would not be under her eyes.

6566. Mere spitefulness can be looked after by the teacher to a great extent, can it not?—Yes, in a room.

6567. It might be worse organisation, might it not, to have a single teacher in a small boys' school and a single teacher in a small girls' school. Would it be worse to have boys and girls together in a class sufficiently large for two teachers?—I should not like the girls and boys to be together. I feel strongly on that; I think almost anything would be better than that. I am talking of deficient children, or children in a poor neighbourhood.

6568. At the same time you admit that very often they are physically backward, and that that reduces the objection to some extent?—Some are physically backward; others, I think, are not.

6569. It would depend very much upon the particular children you got in the class?—Yes.

6570. (*Mr. Newton.*) Nobody proposes that the boys and girls should play together. They would invariably, in all these cases, have separate playgrounds and offices; it would simply be that they would sit in the same room in the presence of a teacher. Do you consider that objectionable?—No, if they had separate playgrounds and offices, and there were two teachers, one to look after the boys and the other to look after the girls. That would get rid of a great part of the difficulty.

6571. You know that is demanded by the department, wherever there are boys over eight years of age, all over the country?—Yes, some of the teachers could answer this better than I. My own impression would be, from what the teachers tell me, that they think the boys and girls ought not to be together.

6572. Even to sit together in the same room under the eyes of the teachers you think objectionable?—Yes I have been told by teachers it is more difficult to manage these mentally deficient children when they are sitting together; but that would be much more a matter for teachers than for myself.

Mr. A. R. Price.

26 Mar. 1897.

6573. (*Mr. Pooley.*) Would it be satisfactory physiological training, do you think, for the teacher to attend a good special class for a time, and at the same time to attend lectures on physiology given by some properly qualified medical man?—Yes, I think it might be. I think it would be a very desirable thing that all teachers, for instance, should know what the preliminary symptoms of things like St. Vitus' dance are—that very often you get children who look very delicate, and the teacher does not know whether anything ought to be done or not. I suppose that could be taught in lectures quite easily.

Adjourned.

The SCHOOL BOARD for NOTTINGHAM were unable to send a witness to appear before the Committee, but wrote as follows:—

School Board Offices, Victoria Street,
Nottingham, 15th April 1897.

DEAR SIR,

6573*a*. Adverting to your letter of the 23rd ult., stating that the Committee upon Epileptic Children will be glad to receive further views of my board upon the subject under inquiry, I beg to inform you that my board very largely concur with the recommendation made by the council of the Charity Organisation Society on the 24th December 1893, and with the views expressed by the London School Board in their letter of the 20th October 1896.

6573*b*. My board's experience of the methods of instructing defective children in special centres—which they first established on the 1st April 1893—has caused them to view with considerable satisfaction the present special centre development in Nottingham, the details concerning which have already been supplied to your Committee upon the forms which have been filled in by our special teachers.

6573*c*. My board consider that centres for defective children should be conducted strictly in accordance with Kindergarten principles—that the instruction should be given as largely as possible in the form of directed play; and that no detailed syllabus of instruction in various subjects should be insisted upon; but that the teachers (who should be specially selected for their skill as kindergartners), should be given fullest liberty to develop whatever aptitudes (mental or manual) their scholars from time to time evince.

6573*d*. My board's experience leads them to conclude that the children for these centres can be satisfactorily selected by requiring the various teachers to submit names of children they consider suitable for such centres, and requiring the board's inspectors to report individually upon the cases submitted; though of course periodical examination by medical experts would doubtless materially assist.

6573*e*. My board's experience further leads them to conclude that epileptic children (unless their fits are very rare, and of mild form), and imbeciles, cannot be admitted to special centres without very materially interfering with their successful work; but that children who cannot be described as really defective, but only as extremely dull, may not infrequently benefit from undergoing a course of instruction in a special centre.

6573*f*. My board have hitherto found no reason for departing from their original plan of confining admission to special centres to children over 8 years old, inasmuch as defective children below this age appear to be adequately provided for in infants' schools, which are organised and taught in accordance with enlightened kindergarten principles.

I am, &c.
W. J. AUEL,
Clerk.

H. W. Orange, Esq.,
Secretary to the Committee
upon Defective and Epileptic Children

THIRTEENTH DAY.

Wednesday, 28th April, 1897.

PRESENT:

The REV. T. W. SHARPE, C.B., IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. H. F. POOLEY.
Mr. A. W. NEWTON.
Dr. G. E. SHUTTLEWORTH.
Dr. W. R. SMITH.
Mrs. BURGWIN.
Miss TOWNSEND.

Mr. H. W. ORANGE, *Secretary.*

Mr. JOHN CHAIGNEAU COLVILL, Mr. HARRY FRANK DIBBEN, and Mr. JOHN ARMINE WILLIS called in and examined.

Mr. J. C. Colvill
Mr. H. F. Dibben, and Mr. J. A. Willis,

28 April 1897.

6574. (*Chairman to Mr. Colvill.*) You are Her Majesty's Inspector for the Guildford district?—Yes.

6575. You are accompanied at this inquiry by Mr. Willis, Inspector for the Brentford district, and Mr. Dibben, Inspector for the Croydon district?—Yes.

6576. You have acted upon a circular letter which was sent out to the chief inspectors, dated the 15th February, 1897?—Yes.

6577. Would you read that circular letter to the Committee if you please?—"Education Department, Whitehall.—15th February, 1897.—Sir, the replies received to Circular 370 have been referred to a committee appointed by the Lord President to report on the education of defective and epileptic children. I am directed by Mr. Sharpe, Her Majesty's Senior Chief Inspector, the Chairman of this Committee, to ask you to be good enough to assist the Committee by furnishing further information as to the provision made for these children in rural districts. It is suggested that particulars to be entered upon the enclosed forms should be obtained

Mr J. C. Colvill, Mr. H. F. Dibben, and Mr J. A. Willis.

28 April 1897.

" by personal inquiries from three rural parishes in " your district, each with a population of not less than " 600, to be selected by you with a view to the infor- " mation being as far as possible accurate and typical. " Your further observations are also invited as to any " points which you may have observed since your reply " to Circular 370, especially the following.—Do the " teachers and the school authorities endeavour to " secure the attendance of (*a*) defective, and (*b*) " epileptic children at school; and, if so, what are the " best arrangements which you have observed for their " instruction? In cases where they do not attend " school, what degree of defectiveness is held sufficient " to exempt them from attendance, and what tests are " applied before they are exempted or excluded? Is " it desirable to empower school authorities to provide " institutions for the maintenance and instruction of " such (*a*) defective, or (*b*) epileptic children as are " likely to become wholly or partly self-supporting? " Do you recommend that the provisions of the Blind " and Deaf Act, 1893 (copy enclosed), or any of them, " should be extended to defective children? If so, " please specify the particular provisions to which you " refer, and say (1) what modifications you recommend; " (2) how you would define the class of children to " whom the Act would be extended; (3) whether " school authorities and parents would readily co- " operate in carrying into effect such proposed legis- " lation. Do you recommend any alteration in the " code, and, if so, what in order to make special " provision for the education of these children?—You " will oblige by sending your reply, together with the " forms duly filled up, addressed to me, as Secretary " of the Committee on Defective and Epileptic " Children, not later than the middle of March. I " have the honour to be, Sir, Your obedient servant, " H. W. Orange."

6578. Are you aware what steps were taken to carry out this circular and put it into effect?—This circular was addressed to the chief inspectors, three copies of it were sent to the chief inspectors of divisions, who then allotted them to the three inspectors in their division.

6579. In rural districts?—Yes, in rural districts. Each inspector sent out three forms of inquiry; some appear to have sent out four or five to parishes in their districts, and in some cases the inspector seems to have verified the return in connexion with the managers, but in the greater proportion the return is simply made out by the manager or teacher or clerk of the School Board, and signed by him.

6580. And you have made an abstract return of these 88 parishes returns, coming in from 28 inspectors, and extending over 26 counties?—Yes, it is as follows:—

ABSTRACT RETURN OF DEFECTIVE AND EPILEPTIC CHILDREN IN RURAL PARISHES.

Enclosure to Circular dated 15th February 1897.

H. M.'s Inspectors: 28. Counties: 26. Parishes: 88 (*a*.) Population: 166,303. (*b*.) Number of children (of P. E. S. class apparently) aged 3 to 13: 29,446. (*c*.) Number of children aged 3 to 13 who are absent from school owing to *mental* or *physical* defect: 119 (·4). (*d*.) Number of children aged 3 to 13 who, being in attendance at school, are defective to a degree which prevents them from receiving proper benefit from the instruction: 278 (·94). (*e*.) Number of children under heads (*c*) and (*d*) together who may be ranked as imbecile, *i.e.*, incapable of becoming wholly or partially self-supporting: 104 (·35). (*f*.) Number of children under heads (*c*) and (*d*) who are defective but not imbecile: 281 (·95). (*g*.) Defective children absent from school who might with advantage be in attendance: 3. (*h*.) Defective children taught (*a*) with infants or (*b*) older scholars, or (*c*) by themselves: (*a*), (*b*.) These facts cannot be gathered from the answers. (*c*.) None. (*i*.) Does the presence of the defective children in school interfere with the instruction of the other children? Yes, 8; no, 52; "no experience," 28. (*j*.) Notes as to the instruction of the defective children; methods, subjects, and results: Classified, as far as possible, according to age: Given as much individual attention as possible ("not much"), and often at the hands of a monitor; are kindly treated: The same subjects as other children, but with a lower standard in R., W., A., and with little expectation of success in class subjects: They "pick up what they can," "take their chance," "mark time," generally taking an extra time in the infant class, and two years to a standard: They are easily amenable to discipline, and do not appear to be considered as much trouble; of their subsequent fate there is no evidence. (*k*.) Any remarks as to numbers and treatment of epileptic children, not defective: Only 27 epileptic children are specified, mostly slight cases; the return, however, says "they are mainly kept away." No account of their treatment is given except in two returns, 1, "on recovery from a fit " they are sent home with a monitor"; 2, "carefully " screened from excitement." (*l*.) Any remarks as to numbers and treatment of children, both defective and epileptic: There are no answers. (*m*.) Name of teacher (or manager) giving the above information: In only one instance is the information given checked by a medical man (Fazeley, Staffs., H.M.I., Mr. Colt). In some parishes the return of defective (*d*) is obviously exaggerated, notably in Starry, Kent, H.M.I., Mr. Routledge.

6581. The population of these parishes was 166,303?—Yes.

6582. And the number of children of public elementary school age, that is from 3 to 13, is 29,446?—Yes. That number, I may mention, is not absolutely trustworthy; in a great many cases the number given as the number in the parish is simply the number in attendance at the school; apparently it is assumed that that represents all the children.

6583. That accounts for one-fifth or one-sixth of the population?—It is a little more than one-sixth; it is about half-way between one-fifth and one-sixth.

6584. And of these 29,446 children, 119 are found to be absent from school owing to mental or physical defect?—Yes.

6585. There is no discrimination between mental and physical defect, but it is chiefly mental?—Chiefly. There are certain cases of physical defect, notably the first on my list here. There is a school returning three children as absent: one girl dumb, one epileptic, one, vicious and dangerous. In another case there is one girl returned as absent with skin disease, which is, presumably, temporary.

6586. And there are actually attending at school 278 out of these 29,000 or 0·94 per cent., who, although in attendance at school, are defective to a degree which prevents their receiving proper benefit from the instruction?—Yes.

6587. Putting those two classes together, you have 397 or 1·34 per cent. of the 29,000 children classed as defective?—Yes.

6588. Then, I have 104 here, or 35, as the number of children under heads (*c*) and (*d*), who may be ranked as imbecile, that is entirely incapable of becoming wholly or partially self-supporting?—Yes.

6589. Two hundred and eighty-one, or 0·95 per cent. who are defective but not imbecile?—Yes.

6590. And there are only three defective children returned as absent from school who might with advantage be in attendance?—So the returns say. I conclude that that means only three children absent from being defective; there must be a much larger number absent; it cannot mean all the children absent from school; that must only be the children absent from school under heading (*c*).

6591. Owing to some mental or physical defect?—Yes.

6592. As to the way these children attend at school, you find it difficult to gather any information from the returns?—Very. That is under heading (*h*)?

6593. Yes. None are taught by themselves with special care; but, whether they are mixed with infants or taught with older scholars, there are no returns to show?—No; it is specified in some cases, but even then it is impossible to tell whether the children are taught with infants or older children, or with imbecile children.

6594. As to the question whether they interfere with the instruction of the other children there are only eight affirmative answers, 52 in the negative, and 28 decline to say anything about it?—28 say that they have no such children in the school, and so they have no experience; but even as regards the eight the answers are more or less qualified, though there are two teachers who say that their presence does very seriously interfere with the instruction of the other children.

6595. But, as a rule, they seem to say they may be taught with other children?—Yes, most of them say so.

6596. Then, with regard to the way they are taught, as to classification, they are classified as far as possible according to age; but you do not approve of that, do you?—No. Age should not be the only basis.

6597. And they are given as much individual attention as possible, which in most cases, of course, is very little?—Yes.

6598. And often at the hands of a monitor; but they are kindly treated?—Yes, that is so.

6599. They are taught the same subjects as the other children, but with a lower standard in reading, writing, and arithmetic, and with very little expectation of their doing much in class subjects?—Yes.

6600. The general thing is that they "pick up what they can," or "take their chance," or "mark-time," generally taking two years to a standard, and an extra time in the infant school?—That is so.

6601. But there is no difficulty about the discipline, and they do not appear to be considered as any sort of trouble in the school?—That is so.

6602. But no effort is made to trace their subsequent life at all?—That is so, to judge from these returns.

6603. So the conclusion is that they receive scarcely any instruction which is likely to be of any benefit to them in their future life?—Yes. (*Mr. Willis.*) So far as my experience goes some little special trouble is taken with them. I have noticed that at all the schools an attempt has been made to give them a little special individual instruction.

6604. At a time different from the other scholars, or with them?—Generally they take the opportunity to tell off a teacher to look after the two or three whilst the others are at some work that they can be left to; but it is distinctly in the view of the teachers that they require some special instruction.

6605. But, of course, they can give very little attention to them?—Just so; but they give that individual attention.

6606. Some slight individual attention?—Yes, they are not simply left in the class; that is my point.

6607. But it cannot be called any great amount of individual attention?—No.

6608. (*To Mr. Colvill.*) As to epileptic children, only 27 are specified, and mostly slight cases; but they would not be likely to hear of the worst cases, would they?—There seem from the returns to be almost no bad cases in the schools.

6609. You would not be likely to hear of the worst cases?—There must be bad cases.

6610. There are cases where, when they have recovered from fits, they are then sent home with a monitor?—Yes.

6611. Do you know how they are treated then?—I think they are left pretty much to the parents. Some teachers said that for a day or two after the fit they do not expect them to do much; but the fits seem to be of rare occurrence in the schools. (*Mr. Willis.*) That has been a very marked feature.

6612. (*To Mr. Colvill.*) One return says: "They are mainly kept away." What return is that?—I think that is in Mr. Dibben's returns. (*Mr. Dibben.*) I have found cases in which the parents say they are subject to fits, and they are kept away at the time that they show any signs of having them. I have only found one teacher who has had any children who had fits in school; that was a teacher who had two children.

6613. And the fits were not of a serious nature, I suppose?—No, but they appeared to be epileptic.

6614. (*To Mr. Colvill.*) All this information comes entirely from laymen; there is no medical expert in any case?—In one case the return is signed by the local medical man, that is in the return from Fazeley parish in Staffordshire, in Mr. Coit's district. That return is signed by the rector, the doctor, and the teacher, and they say "no epileptics at all;" and they return two children only under (*c*) as absent owing to defect; and four children as attending school but not capable of getting full benefit from the instruction.

6615. Under head (*m*) this abstract says: "In some " parishes the return of defective (*d*) is obviously " exaggerated." You have given us ·95 per cent. under head (*f*), children who are defective, but not imbecile. Would you wish to withdraw some of that in consequence of the belief that the number is exaggerated?—A small number possibly; but it is possible, of course, that there may have been exaggeration on the other side in certain other cases.

Mr. J. C. Colvill, Mr. H. F. Dibben, and Mr. J. A. Willis.

28 April 1897.

6616. Some may have been more lenient?—Yes.

6617. So you think that the two may balance each other?—Yes.

6618. And the number, ·94 per cent., under head (*d*) is not seriously affected by that last remark?—No, I think not. There is one parish in Mr. Routledge's district in Kent where, in a school population of 291, they have returned 32 children in the school as defective to an extent which renders them unable to benefit by the instruction.

6619. Are those included in the ·94 per cent.?—Yes, those are included in the ·94 per cent.; but that is balanced by the large proportion of parishes on the other side.

6620. We should like as full information about that parish as you can give us?—It is the parish of Sturry, near Canterbury in Kent. The population is 1,789; the number of school children 291. Under heading (*c*) there are 3 children returned, and under heading (*d*) 32.

6621. What percentage is that?—Between 10 and 11 per cent. Then under heading (*e*) 2, and under heading (*f*) 33.

6622. How many under heading (*e*)?—Under heading (*e*) 3.

6623. Under (*e*)?—2 under (*e*); that leaves only one of the 3 not attending; and the answer under heading (*g*), as to whether they might attend with advantage, is, "No; they would get no advantage under present conditions."

6624. It seems to be some rather lenient idea. That is the number that would fall under (*f*)?—Yes. I should say the return was a slack one altogether.

6625. Did you tabulate them all to show the percentage in each case?—No, I have not done that.

6626. I think it would be well to do that, to see how far the percentages agree in each case under each head?—Yes, I can easily do that. This school is one in which the attendance is bad; there are only 291 attending out of nearly 1,800 children.

6627. Then the general conclusion you draw is as follows: that, as regards epileptic children in rural districts, they are very few?—Yes.

6628. Out of a population of 166,303 there are only 27 such children?—Actually named.

6629. Though there is an indication that some small additional number may exist?—Yes.

6630. And that these epileptic cases are generally slight cases?—Yes.

6631. And no objection is taken to their presence in the school?—No.

6632. Their treatment by the local authorities seems to vary according to the wish of the parents, I presume; but no special arrangements are made for their instruction, each child going on in the ordinary class?—Yes.

6633. But you think that on the whole they are carefully protected from over pressure?—Yes, certainly.

6634. And, according to their different degrees of defectiveness, they gain advantages more or less approximate to the other scholars in school attendance?—Yes.

6635. And you think it is desirable to leave them, so long as they are not distressing cases, in ordinary schools?—I should say certainly.

6636. You have not much information about those who are severely defective, but you say they do not attend school at all, as a rule?—Those severely affected do not appear to do so.

6637. Do you happen to know whether many are sent to institutions?—The only opportunity I have had of inquiring at all was at Godalming, as to the number of applications they had had from children of school age there. I know there they have only two there do not appear to be many, and I cannot hear about the country of many being sent away.

6638. Is that a home at Godalming?—Lady Meath's Home of Comfort.

Mr. J. C. Colvill, Mr. H. F. Dibben, and Mr. J. A. Willis.

28 April 1897.

6639. What area does she draw from?—I think from anywhere really. I do not think there is any limit. I have their report here.

6640. And there were only two applications in the course of a year?—They have only two children of school age there, and the chaplain told me they were not particularly encouraged, but they have not many applications of the sort. (*Mr. Dibben.*) I found one who was said to be purely imbecile at Epsom, a girl of 12.

6641. Epileptic and imbecile?—I think there was no epilepsy.

6642. We are on the question of epileptics just now. (*To Mr. Colvill.*) Then, passing on to defective children in rural districts, is any pressure put upon them to attend school, do the local authorities vary very much in that matter?—I should say the local authorities would put no pressure on, for two reasons. In the first place I think they do not put very much pressure on anybody; and, secondly, in the case of a child of that kind, they feel that they probably would not be supported by the magistrates if they did.

6643. Does that apply to very dull children as well as to children with some physical or mental defect?—No, I should say not.

6644. Very dull children are treated by the attendance officer in the same way as other scholars?—Yes, I think so; because a dull child is not discovered till he goes to school. The attendance officer in most country districts deals only with the child who is in school; so that when once the child is got into school he is under the same pressure as any other child.

6645. We have been told that in some voluntary schools, in Bradford, I think, they were found to be encouraged rather as a means of bringing a grant to the school, when the board schools excluded them. Is that your opinion of the treatment of them in voluntary schools, generally?—I could not make it out very positively from the returns, but there seem to be some indications that they were more readily admitted in voluntary schools, which I should account for by the fact that the financial pressure is greater, and also that the managers have more personal knowledge of the families; that the rector of a parish very often is aware of the existence of a child of that kind who is a trouble at home, and wants to do anything he can for it, and perhaps takes a little more pains than a merely official visitor would.

6646. It is a kindly interest in the child rather than a wish to get an increased grant?—I should think so. I should be sorry to say that it was a mere desire to make money; but there is also the matter of the 17*s.* 6*d.*, and there is nothing very special to be spent, so there is no object in not having them.

6647. But some of the inspectors have found that there are special arrangements for teaching them; you say they give them as much personal attention as circumstances permit?—Yes.

6648. How would you treat them yourself; as children two years younger than themselves, as a rule?—I think the great thing is to try and keep the child as much among children of its own age as you can, because it helps to keep up the child's self-respect and confidence.

6649. Even though the lessons it is receiving are of less value, and the lessons of a class two years junior might be of some value?—I would not go so far as to say that age should be the absolute criterion, but I think it ought to affect the question more or less. I should like to see a great deal of reading, writing, and arithmetic in a case of that kind dispensed with, and the child given some manual occupation while the class is engaged at things beyond its reach. I do not see why they should not do netting or knitting, for instance.

6650. There are so few cases actually absent from school owing to mental or physical defect, that we might almost take it for granted that they do not exist, and that there are none?—Very few, I should say.

6651. Then the attendance officer himself seems to decide a great deal upon the question whether a child is defective or not?—Yes, I should say so.

6652. And in no case is a medical officer employed?—Unless there is a difference of opinion. If the attendance officer and the mother fall out, then I think it is possible they may insist upon a medical certificate; but I have not found many cases.

6653. You do not know of many cases brought before a magistrate where a medical certificate was cited as the reason?—I have not seen such a case myself.

6654. It is not likely to get as far as that?—I do not think so.

6655. Now it is desirable to provide for all these children, the 104 who are defective to a degree that prevents their receiving proper benefit from instruction under head (*e*), who are incapable of being wholly or partially self-supporting. Have you any opinion as to the desirability of empowering school authorities to deal with those cases?—I thought that the children coming under heading (*e*) were outside the scope of your inquiry.

6656. I think all defective children come within the scope of our inquiry, and I think we should like to make some recommendation as to how to make provision for children who are not capable of receiving instruction in school?—Children who are not capable of being wholly or partially self-supporting, you mean?

6657. Did you find any opinion in the country as to how they should be provided for?—The imbecile children?

6658. Yes; instead of the present rather defective process of sending them to an institution, and pauperising the parent by so doing, is it thought desirable that some means should be found empowering school authorities to deal with them?—I should think it would be a great advantage to have some authority so empowered; whether such children could be dealt with by the same authority as under the other Act seems to me doubtful.

6659. But there must be very many on the border line, though they rank as imbecile, who might come under head (*f*), "Children who are defective, but not imbecile." Would it not be well if the same authority had to deal with both?—Yes, I think so, certainly.

6660. Therefore, it would be a good thing for the school authorities to have power to deal with imbeciles as well as defectives?—Yes, it should be the same authority.

6661. And a simpler process to enable them to send them to an institution, as in the case of the deaf and blind?—Yes.

6662. Then, as to the 281 children defective but not imbecile, how would you propose to deal with them?—If there are only one or two not very distressing cases, I gather you would leave them in the village school where they are?—I think so. I think the balance of advantages would be in that direction, though there would be disadvantages.

6663. And the inspector might be required to see that they had some special training, chiefly in the direction of manual training?—Yes, I think so.

6664. Of course, if they were specially defective, it would be better perhaps to draft them into some special classes provided for them in the towns, and so enable the school authorities to pay for the maintenance of such children, board and lodging, and for their being taught in special classes where they would receive instruction suitable for their greater defect?—There should be a power of doing so, I think. I should not like it to be compulsory.

6665. It would be difficult, of course, to exercise compulsion in those cases?—Yes.

6666. On the whole, are you satisfied that the larger proportion are better fitted for their future by living at home in family life, and seeing all the circumstances of rural life and labour among their own people, than by being drafted away to an institution necessarily very different in its arrangements from the ordinary rural home, where all the manual work is of a more specialised type, and under constant supervision, only to be returned after a few years to conditions which have become unfamiliar, and among people who have ceased to be friends, and who know the returner only as having come from a "silly" school, where work has to be done without immediate supervision, and in the way traditional in the neighbourhood, if it is not to be despised or at best suspected?—Yes.

6667. In your opinion, it would only be the small residuum that ought to go to institutions?—Yes, very small.

6668. Who should be trained for some special work, and not for the work of their own neighbourhood?—Yes, quite so. Often in schools cases are pointed out

Mr. J. C. Colvill, Mr. H. F. Dibben, and Mr. J. A. Willis.

28 April 1897.

of children exceedingly dull or backward, with the remark, "what that boy likes is to get away with the horses," or on the farm, or the garden, or something of that kind.

6669. And then they are among their own friends?—Yes, then they are among their own friends, who look after them; they are recognised institutions in their village, and everybody has, I think, a kind word for them, and is glad to help them if they can.

6670. There has been a great change in country places as regards the treatment of these children, and the kindness shown to them in the last 20 or 30 years, has there not?—I should say very great.

6671. And more so in villages than in towns?—I should think so, on account of the greater intimacy between families.

6672. Then, if it was suggested that a larger number of these children were to go to institutions, there would be great opposition on all sides from the parents, from the neighbourhood, and probably from the local authorities?—Yes, I think so.

6673. And, unless a strong case were made out showing that they could benefit by the institution, and would be prepared for some life that they could not be prepared for in their own neighbourhood, probably it would be resented?—I should say so.

6674. What authority would you recommend for dealing with these children, you have considerable experience of boards of guardians?—Yes.

6675. And not a very high opinion, I am afraid, of them?—I cannot say it is a very high one; it may be founded on insufficient evidence; but, *primâ facie*, I have not a very high opinion of them.

6676. I am told the attendance officers are improving very much in the country districts. I speak from my own experience?—I think they are better than they were, and in the more populous smaller areas in the country they certainly take the trouble now to get a more effective man; but I know some that I think might be improved upon with advantage.

6677. Is it desirable to have a large body like the county council dealing with cases like this, who would have no personal knowledge of the children, or a district council (which would be practically a Board of Guardians) who would have some local knowledge of their circumstances?—I should myself be more inclined for the larger body.

6678. They could afford a better medical officer?—They could have a better staff altogether—a better medical officer, and better industrial superintendents in any homes they established.

6679. Power might be given, then, to the county councils to establish such institutions, you think?—Yes, I think so; I prefer the county council myself to the district council.

6680. You would not leave it to voluntary effort to establish institutions to which payments might be made out of the rates in each case, with a certain contribution from the institution?—The great drawback about that is that you have no security for their establishment tolerably evenly over the country.

6681. You would not trust to voluntary effort to provide the number of institutions required?—I do not think you could.

6682. The school boards would provide them?—The larger ones would; I do not think the country boards would be very zealous in the matter, but the larger ones would, no doubt.

6683. Comparing these children with the blind and deaf children, are you familiar with the Blind and Deaf Act?—Yes, I have a copy of it here.

6684. Under section (1) you say that the parent already seems to recognise the obligation to have his child educated, except in the case of such seriously defective children as are beyond the scope of the Committee's inquiry; but, as regards the great majority of the others, you think that the advantages and disadvantages of the special institutions are too nearly balanced to justify compulsion. What do you mean by "the great majority"; it is 104 who are imbeciles, and 281 who are defective?—I should say, as regards the 281, the great majority would be more fit for country life after passing through the ordinary school. Supposing you were not going to add them to the great urban industrial populations, if they are to stay in the country, I believe they would get very nearly as great advantages in the country school as they would anywhere else.

6685. You are prepared to say that, as regards the great majority of the others, you think the advantages and disadvantages of the special institutions are too nearly balanced to justify comparison; but, on the other side, I thought you would say that, as regards the large majority, the 281, you prefer their staying at home?—Yes, but I bring in the 104, you see.

6686. You bring in the imbecile as well as the defective?—Yes.

6687. As regards the 281, you still agree that you would leave them at home—the majority of them?—Yes, the majority, I think.

6688. You say that boarding out does not seem to meet with much success in the case of blind and deaf children, and would probably be more difficult for defectives. That is, no doubt, true; but have you any reason to think that it is not used for blind and deaf children?—I gathered that from Mr. Pooley's evidence; I thought that the number of children boarded out under that Act is not a very large percentage. (*Mr. Willis.*) I made some inquiries at Hillingdon where 92 were boarded out, and they, none of them, came under that Act.

6689. (*To Mr. Colvill.*) But it is only the beginning of the system?—Yes; but many people who might be willing to take a blind or deaf child would be unwilling, perhaps, to take a defective child.

6690. Then you do not agree with the provision in the Blind and Deaf Act which extends the school age to 16?—Looking at it exclusively from a rural point of view, I am not sure that I do. I think not.

6691. Would you not desire that they should have a fairly good education; and if it was found that at the age of 13 they were a long way behind an ordinary boy of 13, that is to say, in the Second Standard when he was in the Sixth or Seventh, would you not then advise that they should stay longer in school?—I am not sure that I should; I do not attach a high importance to the mere academic standard obtained generally by those children.

6692. But, taking the instrumental subject of reading, would you be content with the Second Standard for these defective children?—I think I should. I doubt whether their reading would ever be such as would be very great help to their guidance in life or to their obtaining information about anything.

6693. But, if it is found in institutions that they can rise to the Third or Fourth Standard if they stay longer in the school, would that modify your opinion?—I do not attach very high importance to the Third or Fourth Standard; it depends upon what the standard is, and the standard is necessarily very much a mechanical matter.

6694. But the reading in Standard II. gives you no command of a book, whereas the reading in Standard III. and IV. does?—I wish one found it so more often. I think the thing that strikes one most, with an ordinary child, is that though he reaches a high standard of reading, the one thing that he has not learned is how to make use of a book.

6695. At what age do you think they are capable of profiting by an ordinary reading book?—That is rather a difficult question to answer.

6696. It would help us to know whether they should be educated up to a certain standard?—I should say it depends less upon the actual standard of technical proficiency attained in reading than upon the extent to which the child had been accustomed to use reading as a means of obtaining information for itself; and that seems to me to be the weak point of schools generally.

6697. But Standard II. leaves him without the possibility of obtaining information for himself, whereas Standard IV. would enable him to find that knowledge for himself if he was disposed to use it?—I should not feel hopeful about it.

6698. But it would be better that he should be brought up to a higher standard than Standard III. if it could be done, would it not?—Yes; but I should not think the advantage would be sufficient to outweigh the disadvantage of withholding for a further two years the instruction in practical life.

Mr. J. C. Colvill, Mr. H. F. Dibben, and Mr. J. A. Willis.

28 April 1897.

6699. You think that an expert medical opinion is necessary in all cases as to whether any steps should be taken either for sending them to an institution or detaining them longer at school?—I should say so, certainly.

6700. And as to any alteration in the Code, in order to make special provision for the education of these children, what is your opinion. Under present circumstances, of course, they obtain the same grant as other children whether they have been possibly slightly neglected or carefully trained?—Yes.

6701. That is not a desirable state of things. How would you make special provision in ordinary schools for such children; take the case of only one or two children in a school, in the first place?—I think I should encourage the substitution of a larger amount of manual employment instead of a great deal of the academic work that they do at present, or that they can hardly be said to do, but which they are listening to at present, while others are learning.

6702. It would be possible to allot a desk or table where they might sit under the eye of the teacher while the rest of the class is doing something else?—That seems to me the only thing to suggest.

6703. Would you make it a condition of the Code that they should have some special attention of that sort before the payment was made?—Yes, something of that kind might be inserted.

6704. And you think that teachers would fall in with it very readily?—I should say so; I think that a number of teachers are dissatisfied at present; they feel that these children are not benefiting to the extent which they would like.

6705. And it would be a valuable suggestion to allow them to devote themselves to manual work for at least one-third of each day?—Yes, I think so. (*Mr. Willis.*) There is a little danger, I think, in that, very similar to the danger in cottage gardening; that is to say, that for manual work you must take away somebody from the work of the school to do it; and that, in these small schools where the staff is small, would be a difficulty.

6706. (*To Mr. Colvill.*) I was contemplating a desk or table where the child, under the eye of the teacher, might be doing some manual work like macramé work?—Yes, or netting, or even basket-making.

6707. Under the eye of the teacher, not requiring a separate teacher. (*To Mr. Willis.*) Would you have any other substitute for such treatment of a child?—I quite allow that these children want cultivating in that particular line. The curious point is that each child has its own peculiarity, and you cannot, so far as I know, make any general rule as to the sort of work they do. We must all, I think, be familiar with the fact that some of these imbecile children show extraordinary talent in summing, mechanical summing, and will add up packs of figures correctly; some show signs of power in drawing, and some in colour work; but, as to making any general rule, that would be impossible. I should simply point out that, in these country schools, you could scarcely expect teachers to be all skilled in macrame work, basket work, and so on. You are asking a great deal there I think that the suggestion, if made, should be made in a very tentative form, otherwise the teachers would feel that the burden cast upon them was very much greater than hitherto had been the case.

6708. The notion is that they would feel relieved if they were allowed to set the children to work for which they had shown some proclivity, not to set them to distasteful tasks, but to find out first in what direction the child's natural inclination led it, and then to give it work of that sort to do under supervision?—It is astonishing how much these children take in the general atmosphere of school work, both in the matter of discipline and of really learning something or other, some effect is produced upon their brains, and I think that one of the greatest proofs of that is the fact that so few fits occur in school among the epileptics. That I attribute almost entirely to the disciplinary influence of the atmosphere in school life.

6709. I was only contemplating the case where the teacher preferred the manual instruction. If she preferred to keep them in the class that would be another matter. The general notion is that they would like the manual instruction, and that they would benefit by it; but if the teacher preferred to keep them in the class she would be at full liberty to do so. (*To Mr. Colvill.*) I think I have taken you through most of your proof?—Yes, I think so.

6710. Do you want to add anything to your evidence in chief?—No, I do not think so.

6711. (*Mr. Pooley.*) As regards epileptics who are severely affected, you think they are so few as to form no nucleus for merely local institutions; but do you see any objection to their being sent to some central institution, not a local one, but at a distance, in thoroughly bad cases?—I suppose those children would go to an institution with a view of their remaining there.

6712. Yes?—I see no objection to that.

6713. Then you think the best practical plan would be to empower school authorities to send severe epileptic cases to an institution at a distance, if necessary?—Yes, I should say so.

6714. Have you any reason to suppose they would not be willing to exercise those powers in proper cases?—We may be confident, I think, that they would not go out of their way to use their powers, but I should be sorry to think that they would not use them where sufficient reason were shown.

6715. Yes; there is naturally a good deal of sympathy with that kind of case?—Yes, I think so.

6716. Unless there happened to be a large number of such cases in one district, there is no reason to suppose the children would not be dealt with?—No.

6717. You say you think the local authorities should have the power of creating or contributing to institutions for defective children. As regards the mentally defective, is it your view that that class should be extended to all who are capable of being educated, to however small an extent?—That the class for which they should make provision should be thus extended, do you mean?

6718. Yes, I mean as regards the empowering of school authorities and guardians, you would like liberal powers to be given to school authorities, not limited to those children who are merely dull or defective to a slight extent, but to all who are capable of education?—Yes, I think so; I suppose that the greater degrees of defect are those in which the sending away to an institution is most justifiable, is it not.

6719. But the point in my mind is this: according to our terms of reference we do not deal with idiots or imbeciles, but in deciding what classes of children might be dealt with by school authorities in distinction from those children, idiots and imbeciles, who are dealt with by the guardians, do you think it is desirable that the school authority should embrace all except those that can clearly and decidedly be pronounced to be idiots?—Yes, I think so.

6720. Then, as to special classes for defective children in rural districts; supposing the district council were the school authority, would it be desirable and would it be practicable that the district council should start special classes where they were wanted in connexion with a particular school?—I suppose that they would be at liberty to start them in whatever the most convenient situations in their area might be. My doubt would only be whether their area would supply a sufficient number of children for the class.

6721. But would it be desirable to empower district councils to establish defective classes? They have not the power now; do you think it desirable that they should have that power?—I should rather that they had the power than nobody; but I should rather that the county council had it than that they had it.

6722. But is it not a great objection to your proposal as things are, that the county council have not experience in elementary educational matters, that they also have not any inspectors or officers for that purpose?—So far as experience goes, I should say that they have as much experience as the average district council, have they not? And so far as regards the staff that they would maintain, the staff would have to be created anew, and the county council would be more likely to obtain a really efficient staff for superintendence than a small organisation like the district council. It would be just like the case, I take it, of the medical officers of health, who were first of all appointed by smaller areas, and whom every county is now trying to bring under the county council more. They are county officers now. It is found that you can give work to occupy a man's whole time, and secure a better man in that way.

Mr. J. C. Colvill, Mr. H. F. Dibben, and Mr. J. A. Willis.

28 April 1897.

6723. Would not the advisability of empowering county councils to do this work rather depend upon whether county councils are to have similar powers in other branches of elementary education. As the law is at present, when you have the school attendance committees as the authority for ordinary elementary education, and the district councils as the school authority for blind and deaf children, would it not produce complication and confusion if you gave the county council the power in a small branch such as this of defective children?—No doubt it would add to the existing confusion. I should be inclined to meet that by giving all those powers to the one body—the county council.

6724. And if you could not do that, would it not be wiser to have the same authority we have under the Blind and Deaf Act, namely, the school board and the district council?—As to the practical difficulty of having the two authorities, of course you are in a better position to judge than I am, a great deal, and I quite agree that it is exceedingly unadvisable to have so many authorities of various kinds; but whether the addition of one more authority to the existing numerous ones would make the difference between effectiveness and ineffectiveness I am hardly prepared to say.

6725. You do not advocate the extension of age of compulsion to 16, you say?—No.

6726. But do you agree that there are some cases in which it would be desirable that defective children should be educated up to 16 years of age?—I am certainly not prepared to say there are not. Certainly there may be cases of that sort.

6727. Then, if special grants are to be made for these defective children by Government, would it not be desirable that those grants should be extended up to the age of 16?—Yes, I think there I should quite agree with you.

6728. And also grants, of course, for manual instruction?—Yes.

6729. Do you think it desirable that school authorities should have the power at their option of enforcing the attendance of defective children up to 16 years of age?—It is hard to say. I think if they had the power it would be very rarely used. There may be a case here and there where they might consider it would be worth using, but I doubt whether there would be much practical outcome of such power being given to them.

6730. In the case of an enterprising school authority, it is possible they might pick out a particular child and say "That child must stay till 16 years of age," is it not?—The question is whether that would not tend to greater effort on the part of parents to conceal the defects of such children and keep them away from school altogether. We have to remember that the ascertaining of the defective children that exist is not a very complete process at present; the average rural officer depends very much more upon looking at the books and seeing who are the children actually attending, and coming down upon those who are a little bit irregular, than on finding out who are not attending school at all.

6731. You think it would not be advisable to have compulsion to that limited extent?—I should think not.

6732. Supposing special grants were given for defective children, would it be desirable that they should be paid on the average attendance, do you think, rather than at so much per head as for blind and deaf children?—I suppose it is easier to pay on the average attendance, is it not, than so much per head?

6733. If they are in day schools, I should say so?—Yes.

6734. Do you see any reason, I mean, for altering the present practice in ordinary public elementary schools of paying on the average attendance?—I do not see any.

6735. Then you would advocate making the grant at so much on average attendance rather than a fixed sum per head?—I think so. The comparative convenience of different modes of paying grant is not a matter that comes within my personal knowledge in any way.

6736. (*Miss Townsend.*) In considering the question as to which authority the defective children should be under, it might be the case that some of the defective children were also blind or deaf, might it not?—Yes.

6737. And in that case the conflict of authorities would make it more difficult to deal with them; it would be difficult to know whether to tabulate them as blind or deaf or defective. Would not that also point to their being all under one authority?—I suppose that blindness or deafness are so absolutely easily ascertained that it is a question of fact in that case so much more that there ought not to be any distinction; a blind or deaf child, I suppose, would go to the blind and deaf school. The question of imbecility might lead to disputes, but I suppose you would send a blind child to a blind school, whatever his state of mind was. (*Mr. Willis.*) No, the Act forbids idiots to be sent.

6738. (*To Mr. Colvill.*) It might be difficult to decide which was the more prominent defect, the blindness or the defectiveness; and that might be an additional reason for putting them all under one authority?—That is so.

6739. And that possibly the school authority rather than any other?—Yes.

6740. In your experience, have you found that the defective children in rural districts excite any interest outside their school teachers; for instance, that some amount of voluntary teaching might be given them. The manual teaching that Mr. Sharpe suggested just now might come from outside, and relieve the teacher in that way, might it not?—I am afraid the tendency has been for outside help of that kind rather to fade out of schools; the process of conducting a school and teaching has become so much more technical that a great many outsiders who used to help have dropped off probably.

6741. But it might be the best kind of teaching for defective children?—I think very likely.

6742. And it might well be encouraged in rural schools?—Yes, I think it might be of very great value.

6743. And, as to the extension of age to 16, do you think that would be more likely to be useful in the case of girls than of boys. You would often be glad to put a defective boy to such work as he could do at 14, but in the larger number of cases the girls would profit by a longer school life; is not that so?—Yes, that is possible.

6744. They could be better trained for service or whatever life was fitted for them, and they would be less liable to become a danger to the community?—Yes, I think that is possible.

6745. Then, if the special grant were to be used for placing a child in an institution rather than keeping it in a day school, would not the dependence of the grant upon the average attendance make it more difficult; would it not be better to make it an absolute grant? Supposing it was thought well to send a child to an institution, the same grant would be used for that purpose, and could not, of course, depend upon the average attendance?—That is a point which really I can hardly answer. I am not sufficiently familiar with the details of grant payment to know how it works.

6746. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) Can you tell me whether there are more boys or girls that are defective out of these numbers?—I have tried to find it out, but I cannot find it out from the returns. Here and there it is specified, but the larger proportion of the returns simply give outside numbers.

6747. You cannot, from your own experience of children incapable of coming up to standard according to their age, give us an idea as to the proportion?—I have been looking in the schools in the last month or so, since I was aware of this first, and there, I think, I have just checked them off one against another; and so far they are identical.

6748. About the same proportion?—Yes; here and there there are certain differences. There are three parishes that mention two girls and a boy. The next parish does not discriminate; the next does not discriminate, nor the next, nor the next. But there are some, again, that do. Here is one boy and no girl; but it is impossible to tell from these returns in any way.

6749. Our experience in London is that there are more boys who are defective than girls?—So I see.

6750. I notice that you seem inclined to leave the 278 under their present conditions?—The very great majority of them I am inclined to think so.

6751. Although they are returned as just "mark-time," and they "take their chance," and so on?—

Mr. J. C. Colvill, Mr. H. F. Dibben, and Mr. J. A. Willis.

28 April 1897.

Yes, they are picking up something, perhaps. What they pick up is very little academically, certainly; but they are learning to associate with their fellows and to observe a certain amount of decency and order in their relations of life, and they are among friends, and in the playground a great many of them seem very happy; and then they get away and go out with their fathers on the land, and they get a certain amount of perhaps rather unintelligent familiarity with the circumstances under which we hope they are going to live.

6752. But what we want to get at is this, that all the school training is to enable the child to live a happier, better, and more useful life?—Yes.

6753. But these children are not prepared in any way to do that. After the school age comes in the difficulty, I think. You can conceive that they are really a source of danger in the parish after school age?—Yes.

6754. I grant that if you look at the child as it stands in the schools, unless you think of its future, I do not think it matters, it is as you say, picking up something and taking its chance; but it is for its future life that we have to prepare it, and these children are often not only mentally but physically weak; you cannot turn the girls into ordinary service even if anyone would take them. So that what one feels is that this is no training for the future?—What I feel is, that the training that they get in an institution is not practically fitting them for their probable future even then. A child that is trained in a large institution with children of the same sort——

6755. I was not at all thinking of a large institution in any way?—But still a great deal of the employment must be more organised and specialised than it can be in an ordinary cottage home or anything of that kind. When they come home they are strange to everybody about them—strange to the whole method and manner of life. I am afraid it would end in a great many of them remaining in the large centres and not coming back into country life at all; because country life seems to me only tolerable—I do not speak disparagingly of it, for I love it, but it seems to me only tolerable to people who have been brought up in it. People who have been in bigger societies or in populous places resent the loneliness and monotony of it.

6756. In many of the returns you have given in there will be just the one teacher for the boys, girls, and infants. Will that be so in some of these 28 parishes?—I should say not in any of these. These are all supposed to be parishes of over 600 population, so that so far as I can gather there are no single-handed schools among these.

6757. But still it would be so throughout the country; we know there are many with a single teacher?—Yes, there are, I know.

6758. It would be impossible, then, for a teacher single-handed to give any special attention to this class of children, do you not think so?—One would certainly say so beforehand, but one has seen such wonderful instances of a teacher with all the standards and infants doing these things that one can hardly say it would be impossible. I admit they must be exceptional people.

6759. But I gathered from your remark that you would think it far better that these children should be taught occupations, and their senses trained in that way as much as possible?—Yes. Do you not think it would be possible for a child to have a table to itself, and have its little occupation, whatever it was? It need not work at it continuously; certain lessons it could take with the rest of the school, when it came to singing, drill, or reading; but wherever a teacher found either that the lesson was beyond it, or that its interest was flagging, it could simply turn to and go on with its little work, whatever it might be.

6760. Then, in order to give the child this extra help, you would think it right that there should be extra money?—I am afraid nothing can be done without money; but I believe you might possibly, in many of these small schools in small parishes, find the special extra help that Miss Townsend has already mentioned coming in to supplement the school staff, especially in matters of that kind, which are not technical matters of training college teaching and examination.

6761. (*Mr. Newton.*) At what age ought a boy to go to work who means to work on the land?—Of course the farmer complains that he goes too late now. I do not agree with him; but there are certain points with which a boy never acquires the same familiarity later, such as dealing with animals, and the sooner he goes the better, in that view.

6762. Would a boy, then, who went to work at 16, be at a disadvantage?—I have no doubt about it, as regards obtaining employment.

6763. And as regards growing into a good labourer in the long run?—I should say the average rural opinion would be that he would suffer.

6764. Then you think it better that a boy should go to work at 13 or 14, with a little less reading, than that he should go at 16, with rather more reading?—Yes, where it is a boy, on the hypothesis that you are proceeding upon, who is never likely to carry his reading to any very highly profitable point.

6765. That is to say, assuming those three years represent the difference between the Standards II. and IV., you would prefer 13 years of age with the Second Standard, rather than 16 years of age with the Fourth?—I think I should in these cases.

6766. Have you ever seen any manual instruction given to defective children in village schools?—Specially given on that account? No, I do not think I have.

6767. Would the premises of most of the country schools that you know admit of that?—For the one or two cases, yes, I should say so.

6768. And do you think that a grant of 2*l.* or 3*l.* a head would be sufficient to encourage the managers to provide that?—I am a little bit doubtful about the effect of that grant; it might be largely to increase the number of children who were engaged in this manual employment.

6769. That could be checked by the inspector, I presume, and effectually checked, could it not?—What is the inspector to do if he is assured by the managers and teacher: "This is a boy that nothing can be done with in any other way?"

6770. He can examine and question the child; and I think myself, in the last resort, there ought to be an official medical officer whom he could appeal to?—Yes, that is what I should say. I should be sorry to let the inspector be the final judge. Let him report upon the matter, if you like; but I think the onus of settling the case ought to be thrown on expert opinion.

6771. Then you think, if there is an extra grant given, there must be an official medical officer?—I should say so.

6772. Would it be a good thing to have a paragraph in the Instructions something to this effect: "The "teacher should study the idiosyncrasies of defective "children, and cultivate them." Is that the way you would put it?—I should say that largely the teachers do so already. The question is whether their training, like the training of inspectors, is such as qualifies them to do so effectively.

6773. That, of course, points to the view, does it not, that the teachers' science training should be a training in physiology rather than some of the extraordinary things that they are taught?—I think that is very possible.

6774. Then you said you would leave the 278 under existing conditions?—Yes.

6775. You do not mean that you would leave them under existing conditions, but that you would leave them in the existing schools?—Yes.

6776. With proper apparatus and more care?—Yes, quite so.

6777. (*Dr. Smith.*) Your experience is confined altogether to rural districts, I think?—Yes, altogether; including small country towns, of course.

6778. Therefore, in your judgment, whatever views we may have as to the course to be adopted in urban districts must be modified for proper application in rural districts?—Yes, I think so.

6779. There is one point notably you have drawn attention to; that is, the age and also the necessity for manual training. You think in any case manual training is most essential in the case of these children?—I should say so.

6780. And that the manual training in rural districts can be better got in their own homes than in connexion with any school?—The manual training for the sort of occupation we are endeavouring to fit them for.

Mr. J. C. Colvill, Mr. H. F. Dibben, and Mr. J. A. Willis.

28 April 1897.

6781. And that would apply also, more or less, to girls, would it not?—More or less.

6782. Girls would get domestic training in their own homes?—Yes, and of course very often there may be somebody living in the village who will take a girl of that kind and be willing to give her a little help. On the question of girls, one is naturally not quite so confident as with regard to boys.

6783. But what would the future of such a girl as this be in a rural district?—They drift out to service in farmhouses, and that sort of thing. It is not a very good look-out, perhaps, in many ways.

6784. That is what you mean, they will drift out to service in farmhouses?—Yes.

6785. Therefore the training that would make them effective servants could be better got in farmhouses?—Yes; if they come to a farmhouse with the training acquired in an institution there would probably be immediate conflict with the mistress of the farm.

6786. I am not thinking of an institution, but of an ordinary girl going to a school up to the age of 13; she must have a future, and the training she wants to fill any position for such a child would be a domestic training?—Yes.

6787. And you think the earlier she gets that in some home (her own home probably) the better?—Yes, I think so.

6788. And therefore, in that respect you think the extension of the age is not desirable in rural districts?—I think that would be my opinion.

6789. You mentioned about the classification of children in school according to age. Would it not meet your point if these children were associated with healthy children, is not that the point you wish to make rather?—Yes, and also that there are many nervous children, that seem to have lost confidence, from being treated as something inferior to most children of their size; it helps them a little to raise them from among infants.

6790. You see these children are two or three years behindhand?—Yes.

6791. What would you call their age then—their real age—16, or what they physiologically reach?—You have got to read all the things together, I take it. You find a teacher says, "I kept that boy in Standard I., "but he was getting too big for it altogether"; he becomes a little bit of a bully perhaps, as Mr. Newton and I heard yesterday about a boy who was rather violent, but when some other big boys came it rather tended to restrain his violence.

6792. You think the number of these children is not so large as that in many cases a class could be formed?—I say in the country to form a class you would need a group of some 10 to 15 children.

6793. I was going to ask you what number you would put in a class, say 15 to 20 children?—You would have to cover a largish area to get that class.

6794. And, therefore, there would be difficulties in getting them to attend?—Yes, in fact they could not attend daily.

6795. Therefore, it would be practically impossible to have a class, from the distance alone?—Yes. Here and there you might find a school that was favourably situated, but very few, I think.

6796. As regards the question of placing power in the hands of the district council and the county council, you drew a distinction between what is now being done about the medical officer of health. I did not quite follow you?—I believe I am right in saying that the medical officers of health in the first instance were all appointed by the local sanitary authority, and that you had over the country a large number of independent medical officers of health for small areas. The consequence was that no one area was enabled to afford a man occupation for his whole time, or to pay him properly. The result was that the work was badly done. That has been felt in the country, and at last there was a marked tendency for different areas to combine together and employ one medical officer; and now the county councils, in the last three years, have done a great deal to appoint a medical officer of health for the county, getting the other local authorities to contribute.

6797. As a matter of fact that is not quite the case. Of course every sanitary authority is compelled to appoint a medical officer of health?—Yes.

6798. And a combination may be effected by different sanitary authorities?—Yes.

6799. But the objection has been urged to that, that the distance sometimes is so great that the medical officer cannot reach these remote districts, and does not do so more than once or twice a year sometimes?—Yes.

6800. But the county medical officer is an official with no executive duties really?—No; but he acts as a sort of chairman, or whatever it may be, of all the others.

6801. Presumably that would be the case; but, as a matter of fact, it is not so. He has no power over the district medical officers of health, no authoritative position over them at all. Of course, the county council might make arrangements with the local authority that their officer should be used; but that is a separate thing?—That is perhaps the thing I had in my mind at the moment.

6802. But it has been put to you whether, seeing that the blind and deaf are in the hands of the district council, it would not be well to have these children, too, under the same authority. You do not modify your expression on that point?—As to the difficulties of the two, I am not in a position to form an accurate opinion, not being acquainted with the actual administrative difficulties at the department.

6803. Do you think you would want a very expensive staff for these children?—Do not you think you would want a medical officer who had made a special study of the matter?

6804. What have you in your mind as an institution?—I had in my mind rather a group of institutions; that the county council should create half a dozen, or more, according to its area, in the most favourable positions in the county, each dealing with its own section of the county.

6805. Then you would have a medical officer to visit the whole of them?—Yes; who should be the general adviser on the whole of that question. He should pass the children into the institution, and exercise such medical supervision, not over their ordinary health, but over their mental progress, as must be necessary.

6806. And possibly the medical officer of health for the county, if such existed, could do that work?—Quite so.

6807. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) Did I rightly understand that these returns are returns of children actually attending school, and that you think it possible that there may be other defective children that are not tabulated?—The defective children not attending school are supposed to be tabulated, 119 of them; of course we cannot say that those are all. These are probably all taken from the class using public elementary schools; there is nothing quite to show, but I expect they do not take into account children of higher social position.

6808. You think this covers the whole number of the ordinary elementary school class?—Yes; allowing for a few instances of carelessness where a person fills in "nil" all down the column as being the readiest way to get the return sent off by post.

6809. Then with regard to the question of age, is it within your experience that some of these defective children mentally, are also very backward physically in growth, and so on?—Some are.

6810. So that there would not be the same objection to their being in classes with children of a less age than themselves; the disparity would not be so great?—No.

6811. Then, if in rural schools the ordinary teachers have the training of the few defective children that attend, would it not be well that some instruction on the mode of training defective children and their peculiarities should form part of the training of the teachers?—That is very desirable indeed, I think.

6812. (*Chairman.*) Those inquiries are exhaustive really by personal inquiry from the houses of the children in most cases?—Yes, I should say so.

6813. We may take it for granted that we have really all the children who have any mental defect tabulated, with very few exceptions. That is the chief point in

Mr. J. C. Colvill, Mr. H. F. Dibben, and Mr. J. A. Willis.

28 April 1897.

your statistics?—I do not think you can rest too much upon the absolute completeness of the returns. I think there is a good deal of evidence that they represent quite as much the view of the teacher as his actual counting of heads or anything of that kind. That is rather the impression that the returns give one.

6814. The statistics might be modified by the teacher's particular view, but we have all the children of any defect tabulated?—So far as the teachers are aware.

6815. And they must be aware of all children of school age in the parish?—I do not think that.

6816. In small country parishes?—They probably are, but I do not think you can be perfectly certain of it.

6817. (*To Mr. Willis.*) Would you tell us how you arrived at your statistics?—The parishes that I inquired into are: Hillingdon, one of these newly formed parishes, I cannot speak positively about the population, but I think it is about 2,500, very scattered; Ruislip (and that, again, is a new parish) about 1,200; and Sunbury, a parish of about 4,000. Those are the parishes I have tabulated and returned. With regard to Ruislip, after sending the inquiries and not being satisfied with the return made, I asked my assistant to call and to explain matters. I was unable to do more myself in that matter.

6818. Can you say what your assistant did?—I gave him all the papers, and I went through with him the criticism of the answers that he made, and I had occasion to point out there that his return of the children under the heads (*c*) and (*d*) "defective but not imbecile," was obviously wrong, inasmuch as he returned a great many children who were simply backward, not defective.

6819. Then he corrected that return, did he?—My assistant verified that fact.

6820. So you have no doubt as to the result as to Ruislip?—I have no doubt as to the result. My assistant further saw Mr. Everitt, the vicar, who gave complete assistance in the matter, and who, being very well acquainted with the population, could verify the figures.

6821. He knew the houses of the children?—Yes.

6822. So that we may be sure, in the case of Ruislip, that we have a full and exhaustive inquiry?—Yes.

6823. Now, as to the other two parishes?—As to Sunbury, my inquiry was conducted through the teachers, who are very old-established teachers there, and know the inhabitants very well; and I am bound to say that I have been unable to do more to verify it than to compare it with my own general knowledge of Sunbury, which is very fair.

6824. How many schools are there in Sunbury?—There are three separate institutions.

6825. Is this gathered from all the three schools?—Yes.

6826. You have got information from all the teachers in Sunbury?—I did not get it directly from the Roman Catholics, but from the other two it came directly, and they cover three-quarters of the numbers.

6827. Have you any doubt as to the return from Sunbury?—None. With respect to Hillingdon, I went into the matter very fully myself. I first forwarded my inquiries and got replies; then I got Mr. Harvey, the vicar of the parish, to take a great interest in the matter, and after making the return I had a meeting between him and the teachers. I requested the attendance officer to attend, but he did not attend. But the teachers are intimately acquainted with the children, and I had also considerable knowledge of the parish, and I can state positively that we had there a very exhaustive return.

6828. You speak of the teachers of all the schools?—Yes, I saw all the teachers of all the schools myself, and verified the returns that they made. I had in every case to correct the return made to me by the attendance officer.

6829. Did any point strike you in going through the inquiry as to the treatment of these children, or the sympathy shown towards them, or any other points that must be of interest?—As to the sympathy shown for them there was every evidence throughout amongst all the teachers that they did the best they could for these imbeciles.

6830. Were they found more in the infant schools or the others?—Rather more in the other schools.

6831. (*To Mr. Dibben.*) How did you get your information?—I went myself, after giving due notice and asking the managers to meet me, to Leatherhead, to Epsom, and to Hampton-on-Thames. At Leatherhead, at which the number appeared to be rather large, the population of last census was 4,395, it has not much increased since then, I think. The number of children on the books was 774, and present 653. I saw every child except one. In two cases they came from the same family; they were cases of brothers or sisters from the same family. In one the father drank, was very rarely sober; and in another pair the mother was said to be almost imbecile and the father very little better. In the boys' school the teacher appeared to be making great efforts to give them individual attention. They were not all kept by themselves, two of them were in Standard I., one was in Standard II., and this boy was only eight years of age and apparently belonged rather to those who occasionally have fits; his parents said he had fits at home, but he never had them at school, as he was occasionally sent away for a time. The one in Standard III. was rather a case of defective sight, a boy of the age of nine. In one case in which a girl was said not to attend, the mother said she was always ill, and it was a case I specially asked them to make inquiries about. The girl had been in attendance in the infant school, and although the mother said she could not learn anything and also was never well, she did not say she had fits; the child was bright enough in the infant school, and the teacher had no difficulty whatever with her, but looked upon her rather as a bright child.

6832. As to Leatherhead, are you quite satisfied as to your conclusions?—As to Leatherhead I am, and I can give the numbers Mrs. Burgwin asked about—the number of boys and girls: I think the numbers were almost evenly divided. (*Mr. Willis.*) I forgot to mention that they were about the same in my district. (*Mr. Dibben.*) They are within one of each other.

6833. What number is that about?—Four boys in the senior boys' school; four girls in the senior girls' school; one girl in the British; two infant boys; three infant girls; two infant boys who were said to have fits; and it was the teacher here who had actually seen fits in school. One of the boys had a brother with a head very much of the same shape who had died about two years after leaving the infant school.

6834. Speaking of the infant boys and girls, at what age were they; were they over eight years?—They were under eight years of age.

6835. Now, as regards Epsom?—As regards Epsom I did the same thing. As to the numbers there, I have four boys and seven girls, and, of the infants, three were boys and one was a girl.

6836. What is the total for Epsom, and what is the population of Epsom?—The population is 8,417.

6837. The total number of cases?—15. On the books there were 1,011, and present on the occasion that I visited it, 824. That was where one child was imbecile and never had been to school, but had simply been kept at home by the parents.

6838. How did you discover that?—My correspondent told me. It was a child, I believe, belonging to one of the gardeners or coachman of some resident there. Of the boys, two came from the union, one 10½ and the other 12 years old.

6839. What standard were they in?—They were, I think, both in Standard I.; and one also in Standard I. who was physically weak, and one boy who showed particular talent for drawing was either in Standard II. or III. with the other children, but was unable to do anything hardly except draw, and his drawing was really very nicely done. Then, in the girls' department several of those were from the union, and a good many of them had only been there a short time, had apparently come into Epsom with their parents; they were being taught with Standard I., and were, as a rule, taken either by the teachers or by a monitor for reading and various other things, drawing, copying, and so forth. Then the next case was Hampton. The population is 3,449; 545 on the books and 479 present. There was only one boy absent from physical defect, he was partly paralysed, and was unable to come in damp weather. There were three boys and four girls. In one of these cases the parents, both mother and father, drank, and at that moment they were both in hospital on account

Mr. J. C. Colvill, Mr. H. F. Dibben and Mr. J. A. Willis.

28 April 1897

of—I do not know whether it was some little difficulty with each other, but, at any rate, for some reason they had been taken to the hospital. There were in all three boys and four girls, and two boys and two girl infants. Of the four girls, one had been doing pretty well, was dull, but not specially dull until she had fever, and had not been able to do much since; and in another case the elder children were particularly bright; just this one child, nearly 10, was specially dull.

6840. So you have every reason to suppose that your returns are trustworthy as regards the number of children for those three parishes which you have examined?—Yes, I think so.

6841. (*Mr. Newton.*) (*To Mr. Willis.*) What machinery would you suggest for bringing country children within the view of the local authority?—We must assume, of course, that every child is tendered for admission at some school, whatever its mental condition; we must assume that the attendance officer sees that that is done. I would then suggest that every teacher should make a return of such children as appear to him to be defective from any cause whatever; that the attendance officer should report these to the school authority, by whom they should be entered on a register; that the school authority should appoint a representative sub-committee who need not be necessarily of their own body but formed, say, of a teacher, a medical man, and a guardian or other layman, to report upon all these cases; that their report, and the action of the school authority upon that report, should be entered on that register, and that it should be part of the duty of the inspector from time to time to inspect and report upon that register with the light of such information as he may have received independently. It would be very easy to deal with cases of default by empowering the Local Government Board, on application by the Department, to appoint a sub-committee, with power to act for those purposes. The school authority would then be seized of all the cases, and having a report of an expert sub-committee would be able to classify them, and to report to whomsoever it be, the district council or the county council, as to the numbers that would come under the various heads. I apprehend the school authority, being informed by the guardians, would not be very anxious to report more under the head of absolutely defective than they must, inasmuch as the absolute defective would clearly require a special school, and more particularly a boarding-school.

6842. (*Chairman.*) You describe the process which is followed very closely in London to begin with; but then you introduce the Local Government Board, and thereby introduce the pauperising element. Would you not rather exclude the pauperising element?—My only reason for introducing the Local Government Board is that it is the only authority we have in the country that I know of to deal with these matters; byelaws and so on all come under the Local Government Board. That the dual authority that exists is a good plan I take leave to doubt, but at present it is the authority.

6843. It would be better to give the authority to the School Attendance Committee rather than the Local Government Board?—Probably the authority should be given more to the county council, I should say.

6844. You are wrong in your facts as to the Local Government Board, it is the Education Department that has power to declare a school authority in default?—Yes, to declare a school authority in default, but in dealing with byelaws, apparently, the first application goes to the Local Government Board.

6845. The school attendance byelaws come to the Education Department?—For sanction, but not, surely, for the purpose of enforcement?

6846. (*Mr. Pooley.*) Yes, the Education Department is the authority over the School Attendance Committee. The education byelaws of the School Attendance Committee do not go to the Local Government Board at all?—It is not for the Local Government Board to enforce them?

6847. No, they do not touch school byelaws?—It is purely academic question in my district, I may say.

6848. (*Mr. Newton.*) You would not say they were enforced by any Government Department?—No.

6849. (*Chairman.*) (*To Mr. Colvill.*) I want to call your attention to an answer given us by the medical officers of three of the largest institutions for dealing with defective children. The passage that I want to call your attention to is this: "A knowledge of reading and writing is of great importance as opening up sources of information and recreation, and affording means of keeping up communication with friends." You seem to look at one side of the question only, namely, putting the child in the very essential position of earning its own living. But there is also another side of the question; a child has an intellect and a soul—it requires some degree of happiness and comfort. Would you not agree that a knowledge of reading and writing is of great importance as opening up sources of information and recreation, and would you not retain these children at school until they had acquired the means of obtaining such?—No, I have the greatest respect for the opinion that you have quoted——

6850. But you would leave that side of their life blank?—No, but I do not think you can carry it to such a point as to open up sources of information and recreation.

6851. But these three people say that it is possible?—Then I bow to their superior information.

6852. And, therefore, you would say it would be a wise thing to retain them at the institution?—No, I should not say that; I should bow to their superior opinion, but should not change my own.

6853. But it is a question of what is best for the children. You would leave out one side of the life altogether?—Not altogether, I think. I should carry it on so far as it is possible to do it within that age; but I do not think that you are going to carry it to the point where it contributes very materially to their happiness and enjoyment.

6854. On the other side, these three experienced officers are speaking of imbeciles, a class below the class that we are speaking of, when they say that a knowledge of reading and writing is of great importance; therefore, *a fortiori*, it must be of much greater importance with regard to these others?—I am afraid they are constitutionally incapable of deriving so much enjoyment from reading and writing; but that is my opinion.

6855. (*Mr. Newton.*) It is your view, is it not, that you should make an honest attempt to develop their souls and intelligences?—Yes.

6856. And if by the age of 13 or 14 you find that you have not done so, you would give it up?—I think so.

6857. (*Chairman.*) Would it be of any use for the Education Department to send out some sort of guidance to the teachers in all schools, drawn up by medical experts, as to how these children should be treated. They want guidance, no doubt. They do their best from sympathy, but it is often misdirected sympathy. Would it not be desirable that certain instructions should be sent out from experts to recommend the teachers to do certain things, if it were possible, with the limits of the school work, and also with such opportunities as they should have?—It might be a very great help indeed, and it might be a very great help to us also.

6858. It might be a very great help to inspectors as well as to teachers?—Yes.

6859. Then the sum of it all is that you would leave the children at their homes attending the ordinary school; but in the case of a dangerous child would you have no compulsion at all—a child that was dangerous at home, that set fire to the house, or anything of that kind; would you not give compulsory powers in that case?—There probably would be no need for them then; would not the parents be only too happy to let the child go?

6860. We find there is no machinery, and the parents are reluctant to part with the children. It would be well, perhaps, that the parents should know what facilities there were for taking children away from their homes rather than compulsion. You would try persuasion and spreading information; but, in the last resort, should there not be some compulsion?—I suppose, in a case of absolute danger, that compulsion exists already?

6861. (*Dr. Smith.*) Yes, if it can be shown that the children are not under proper control; but it is a difficult thing to show that?—That is so.

6862. (*Chairman.*) It is difficult to prove the case, of course. There are cases in London, even at this moment, where children are in the habit of setting fire to everything, but the parent maintains them under their control; and I think that is a case where

Mr. J. C. Colvill, Mr. H. F. Dibben, and Mr. J. A. Willis.

23 April 1897.

Mrs. Burgwin breaks down altogether? — (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) Yes.

6863. (*Miss Townsend to Mr. Dibben.*) In speaking of what had been done in inquiring into these schools there was mention made of children sent from the workhouse to day schools. Is that done in all rural parishes, or only partially?—Very partially.

6864. Consequently that would affect the statistics; in some cases they would report the children and in other cases they do not?—Yes. (*Mr. Colvill.*) Of course the tendency to send pauper children to the ordinary school is growing.

6865. So that the numbers you have given include a certain number of pauper children as well?—Probably, but the returns do not show how many. They are naturally sent in most cases to schools near the union. (*Mr. Willis.*) None of my returns include union children, but they do include incidentally a certain number of boarded-out children, waifs and strays I think mostly.

6866. (*Chairman to Mr. Colvill.*) I believe some inquiries have been made of one of Dr. Barnardo's Homes?—Yes.

6867. Can you give us any statistics that would be interesting to the Committee from the report?—The inquiry was made by Mr. Dugard at Ilford. The number of children in the school between the ages of three and 13 was 508; the number of children between the same ages absent from school owing to mental or physical defect—I suppose that is children exempted from part of the ordinary curriculum—was only two; but the numbers who, being in attendance at school, were defective to a degree to prevent their receiving proper benefit were 23.

6868. Are these proposed to be retained in the institution, do you know?—There is no statement about them here at all. The two who are not attending school were apparently imbecile and come under head (*c*). Of those attending school who were defective but not imbecile there were 21; physically defective, 9; and mentally defective, 12. Mr. Dugard asked "are "the defective children taught with the infants or "other children?" and the answer was "with others "in classes suitable."

6869. So there seems to be about the same proportion?—Yes; and there the presence of defective children is not found, it appears, to interfere with the instruction of other children. They are not so defective, he says, but that they can take a share in the ordinary class lessons; and among them there are three cases of epileptics not otherwise defective.

6870. Does that return state what it is proposed to do with those in after life?—Nothing. It is signed by the governor, but Mr. Dugard does not say anything about it himself; he appears to have got his request for a return rather late.

The witness withdrew.

After a short adjournment, Mr. POOLEY took the chair.

The Rev. CHARLES DURELL DU PORT, M.A., called in and examined.

Rev. C. Durell du Port, M.A.

6871. (*Chairman.*) You are Chief Inspector, I believe, for the East Lambeth Division?—East Central Chief Inspector; district inspector for East Lambeth.

6872. And will you tell us what special board schools you have in your division?—In my district of East Lambeth there are at present—I had better say there were three weeks ago, because it is possible that one more may have come into existence in the last 10 days—there were three weeks ago but two centres at work in my district of East Lambeth, Sayer Street centre and Choumert Road centre.

6873. Can you tell us shortly as to the class of children that have been admitted to these special classes?—Yes; I think that for the last few months under these co-operative admission committees we have been admitting the right children to those classes—that is to say, children whom, perhaps, one might describe as semi-imbecile as a rule; not children who take two or three years to go through the ordinary standards against an ordinary child's one year, but children distinctly different in type from slow dullards in the ordinary schools; I think we have been admitting such.

6874. You think it is very valuable, before children are admitted, to have the opinion of the teacher who has actually taught them, supposing they have been in some school before?—Oh, essential, amongst other opinions.

6875. You think the three factors in deciding are, the opinion of the teacher, some knowledge of the home circumstances, and the opinion of a medical expert?—And of an observant inspector?

6876. Yes?—Those four, I should think, would be a good guarantee: because, you see, without an observant inspector a teacher might mislead the admission committee, because a head teacher might surely possibly be induced by his class teacher's influence to mistake a very stubborn, difficult, and rather exceptionally dull boy for a suitable case for a special school; and if such boy or girl is getting on reasonably at an ordinary school I would be the last to recommend its removal. The teacher, therefore, must prove to someone's satisfaction that that child is not getting on at the ordinary school, and is giving undue trouble. The presence of the inspector would be a check upon that. The presence of the inspector might even be a check upon the medical opinion. A medical officer, doubtless, is absolutely certain, and cannot possibly err, but might from sheer lack of time be very glad indeed to ask whether the inspector might not conceivably have come across that case in his inspection of the school, and have seen that it was giving very much more trouble than he might have expected; or, on the other hand, the medical man, looking on one single morning, with many admissions to carry out rapidly, into a very shy, dull case, might, if left to himself, think it almost more idiotic than perhaps, had he more time and a few weeks to watch the child in, he might be disposed to think it at the end of that period. Therefore, highly as I value the opinion of the medical expert in the matter (and we cannot do anything without it), I think the medical officer, like the teacher, like the inspector, or like the chief inspector, is none the worse for being checked.

6877. You think, in checking the admissions, it is desirable, if possible, that the inspector should have a voice?—I do; because I think the more of us there are present, the more likely we are not to make a mistake.

6878. Do you think it desirable that children of this class should be admitted into an ordinary school first for probation?—Not if the cases are manifest without that probation. If a case is not manifest without some kind of probation I would let it have probation either at an ordinary school or a special school; but in many cases I should think that when a child comes straight for admission into a special school, in the teeth of the great prejudice that had to be overcome on the part of parents and others, the proper place for his probation would be the special school. I am very much in favour of the probationary admission of the child into some school. It is very difficult to estimate accurately and finally on a short and final interview on the admission day.

6879. Is it not often difficult to get sufficient evidence as to the capacity of a child until the child has had some probation in a school?—Yes, I think that, in a school.

6880. Would not the ordinary school in most places be the best place for probation?—Not necessarily by admitting the child there in the first place; but, if the child has been in an ordinary school, the evidence is already worked out, and the child has been under the eyes of the doctor, who then would have almost paramount authority. But in the case of a child not having been to school at all, if, in the eyes of the doctor, with others observing the child with him, the child seemed to be a case for a special school, I should say give it probation in a special school at once on the doctor's direction.

6881. But, in the ordinary way, would not the ordinary school be the best place for probation; because in the first interview it would not be possible to get sufficient evidence of the special fitness of the child for a special school?—I should not like to go so far as to answer your question in the way you evidently wish me to do,

in the affirmative. I suppose, before a child is offered for a special school there must be strong *a priori* evidence that that is where it must go, because the parents' prejudices are all the other way.

6882. Will you tell us your views about the training and teaching of the children admitted into these special schools?—That is a large question.

6883. Would you take them through the ordinary standards?—No. Put briefly, my answer to your question would be that I think the principles governing the general training in special schools ought to be very different from the principles that govern those schools now. I think that now they are too like ordinary schools, and that the special kind of training that these special children need is not made sufficiently the keystone of the whole education. I have here in my envelope the time-tables of the two schools in the East Lambeth district. I will give them to you if you would like to have them; but, of course, you can get them from other sources. I do not think an expert would know, if I put those time-tables into his hands, that they were not the time-tables of an infant school, or of a combination school, partly junior mixed and partly infants. I think an expert would not know they were the time-tables for schools for children of an almost semi-imbecile type. I consider that manual instruction ought to be the key of the whole training and education, and that the education that we call the education of the standards, the ordinary literary education of our ordinary schools, ought to come in rather as a side light than as the main end. I think we err there. The work done is beyond praise for pains and earnestness and zeal, but they are trying to make scholars a little too much upon the ordinary lines, supplemented by a great deal of kindergarten training, as in an infant school. I would turn them to one or other or more than one of the various kinds of manual instruction, adding in the ordinary scholastic lines of an ordinary school as an extra, but not as a foundation line. In that way I think our schools would be aiming much more than they do now at making these children self-supporting in after life. Hardly any of them will be able to use their scholastic training and teaching in after life to any great profit; and the manual training that I am pleading for would, I think, go far towards preparing a good many of them to earn their bread in after life. Why should they not cook, or learn to cook? Why should not the boys from the very first be made to carpenter—to learn wood work? An immense amount of mental training can be combined with the teaching of dressmaking, laundry work, cookery work, and English slojd or woodwork. You would not be sacrificing the mental side of the child's development, and you would, I think, be increasing by a very large percentage the chance of training that child to, if not self support, partial self-support in after life. I am exceedingly anxious about the after life of those children; that is the fact of the matter.

6884. Then, to put it shortly, you would put the standard work into the background?—Very much so.

6885. And give more attention to manual training?—As the basis of the whole thing.

6886. But the kindergarten work. Do you consider that is part of the manual instruction?—Certainly.

6887. For the younger children?—Yes. I do not know whether it would be right for me to throw out another idea; it is like asking you questions which I have no right to do. But that last remark of mine suggests the thought. I am exceedingly anxious about the after-life of those children. I do not think you are sufficiently protecting society in their far-off future.

6888. We shall be glad if you will tell us how you think the instruction can be amended with a view to their being more successful in after life?—That was what I was speaking to then.

6889. Perhaps you will tell the Committee how you think the system can be improved in the London special classes with that object?—What I have been saying tends directly in that direction, because the training in this manual side of their instruction would possibly give them an opening for, at any rate, partial self-support in after life. At present, of course, there is nothing of the kind; you are not training for the after life.

6890. But it is the case now, is it not, that there is manual instruction in some of the classes?—Not in mine.

6891. Cookery for girls?—We do not teach cookery, as per the time-tables of my special schools.

Rev. C. Durell du Port, M.A.

28 April 1897.

6892. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) Yes?—That is a great point for the special schools that do teach it then; but not for boys yet, unfortunately.

6893. (*Chairman.*) Is that a suggestion you would make, that the boys should be taught cookery?—Yes; I do not see why boys should not learn to cook just as boys learn to do wood work. Anything that begins with their hands, and occupies them, will be a right start and a valuable training.

6894. You would teach both boys and girls cookery?—Yes.

6895. And you would teach laundry work to girls?—Yes. I think I would to girls; perhaps the boys would resent it.

6896. And carpentry?—I do not see why girls should not learn carpentry too, but they have already two subjects in laundry and cookery, and the boys would have two subjects—not carpentry, but wood work and cookery.

6897. Have you any other suggestions as to manual training?—No, I think that covers the most important part of it. If you will allow me to put another answer to your question: You asked me to review what I thought of the methods of teaching now observable in these special schools. There will always have, of course, to be the more scholastic side of teaching—the teaching of subjects more like our standards—even I admit that, as a side issue; but it ought to be essentially concrete from begining to end—long abstract figures should be unknown. Reading lessons should be as concrete as possible; the blackboard in constant use with pictures and illustrations. The last reading lesson I saw in those schools was conducted by one of the ablest teachers in them. And yet the children were gathered round her knee seven strong, each with a book reading round mostly simultaneously, as with the dame of an old village school; there was no blackboard, there was no concrete element at work—they are not capable of taking the thing in so. Everything ought to be made, if possible, objective and concrete in every side of the teaching.

6898. Have you spent much time in the special classes?—Very much time, relatively speaking; not as much time as in the other schools, for there are but two, whereas there are more than a hundred of the others.

6899. Is it not the case, when you speak of clay modelling, cardboard work and colour work, that much attention is given to that now?—Yes, as in an infant school. I think I have said that my time-tables would hardly be known, if looked at by an expert, not to be the time-tables of a very well arranged infant or junior school.

6900. And you suggest that that kind of teaching should be carried to a greater extent for older children?—Expanded into new subjects, into what I would call technical or manual subjects as early as possible.

6901. Have you any practical suggestion as regards holidays?—Do you think children fall back during holidays?—I think they fall back immensely.

6902. What practical improvement could you suggest in that respect?—It is very difficult to make a practical suggestion on a point like that; but I cannot help thinking that the country holiday fund or some other similar altruistic agency would, if they could, gladly lend themselves to help in that particular matter.

6903. You think that it would be more useful for these defective children, that is to say, if necessary in these cases?—Yes, I think so. I think for them the question is a question of training rather than mere teaching, and that an immense amount of acquired habit is lost in the longer holiday.

6904. Will you tell us what you think should be the limit of the size of classes for these children?—I may perhaps put it negatively first—not 30. I do not think that they ought to be more than 15 strong if the children are to be of the type that are, during the last few months, being admitted into the schools. If the children have been rightly described by me as what most persons would think semi-imbeciles, I do not think there ought to be more than 15 in a class.

6905. And should the newly admitted children be taught in smaller numbers than the children who have been some time in the school?—I suppose very often it would end in that.

Rev. C. Durell du Port, M.A.

28 April 1897.

6906. Do you think it is the younger children whom it is more important to have in smaller classes?—No, I would not say that. I think that none of the classes, as long as the children involved are of the type now coming to the schools, should be more than 15 strong. They sub-divide even now at the best of the schools. At Sayer Street the first class is sub-divided into divisions, and these seven children who were doing their reading round the knee of the teacher left the other perhaps 12 or 13 at work, practically uncontrolled, at literary matters at the desks—Those children should not be taught so. I think 15 would be enough as a rule in any classes.

6907. Then, as to the situation of these classes—which is the more important, that you should have the classes near the homes of the children, or that you should have a sufficient number of children in a special class to admit of their being organised into two or three divisions?—To have the classes near the homes of the children, because you are not so dependent on organisation for this work as you are for the work of children who are not in any way specially defective. An immense amount of this work has to be done individually. We suffer now, largely because our centres are too far from one another and from the homes sometimes of those that need them.

6908. If arrangements could be made for conveying children from their homes to the central schools, would that modify your objection?—That would help very much; but I think the real way to organise for the needs of London in this matter would be to organise a great many very small centres in connection with ordinary schools.

6909. Would it not be a serious objection to that that in each of these classes there would be a comparatively small number of children of different capacities and different degrees of instruction?—You will have that at best. You have it now more or less in the organised centres. I do not know that you would have it more. I am disposed to think the work would be best done if frequently a special class were organised under the title "special class," no other word about "defective" to be used—special class—it would be the 8th class of an ordinary school, or the 7th or the 6th as the case might be. It would be handy then to all the children coming to the school. It would be a small class, because in connection with one small neighbourhood there would not be more at most than 10 or 12 of these children, which would be workable by one teacher. They could then take some of their subjects, such as singing and drill, with some of the children of the ordinary school; which I think would do a great deal of good to the specially defective children, and (which is a very important point), if we had a large number of small centres, forming as it were a special class of ordinary schools, the parents would not have the excuse for setting up their backs against sending their children to these schools as they now do under the sobriquet of "silly school." That keeps a great many children away. The parents do not like to send their children to the "silly school."

6910. Do you agree with the evidence that we have had that the objections of the parents are being removed now that these special classes are gaining ground?—No; I think they may be removed a little, but I think they are not being removed wholesale; but I think they would break down rapidly under that system of special classes connected with an ordinary school. The distinction would not then be so marked; it is very marked now if a child goes to what the parent is pleased to talk of as a "silly school." If it was my child I would send it there. But they are much more sensitive than those of what are called higher social ranks. And the question of distance, again, is an immense difficulty. I have come across a great many cases of suitable children for the special class in ordinary schools who are too far away. Of course, as you rightly said, the question of guides might often meet that difficulty.

6911. May we take it, then, that you think that a class of some dozen defective children of different ages could be suitably taught by a single teacher?—By a single very carefully selected and trained teacher, yes.

6912. What sort of special training do you think teachers of these classes should have?—Well, that is a question hard to answer in a few words. There are no training colleges existing that are capable of giving a special training. I should think, therefore, that for the present no teacher ought to be permanently connected with that particular work, which is immensely difficult and which requires very special natural aptitude, without having first spent some months under the supervision and guidance of an experienced teacher in a school of the kind. I hope I am imagining a difficulty; but if it is at all possible to conceive that any of our teachers get appointed to these schools (for, remember, the salaries are higher, and we all like higher salaries) on what the school board call "Form 40," then I think it is a deplorable mistake. We do not want teachers with a brilliant Form 40.

6913. Will you tell us what "Form 40" means?—Scholastic distinctions achieved during early life.

6914. Then you think that the first essential is that the teachers for these special classes should be chosen with care?—Yes, if you please, with extreme care.

6915. And then, do you think that they should be always women?—Always women.

6916. And that then they should have experience under a good teacher of a special class for a certain time?—Yes.

6917. Do you think they should have some physiological training?—Certainly I think that.

6918. I understood that. Might it be gained by attending physiological lectures?—Yes; very practical lectures.

6919. By doctors and medical experts?—Yes, but they must not be all theory.

6920. Is there any other training you would suggest?—Yes, but I have already suggested it. These teachers ought, of course, if possible (it will not matter in London so much, but it will in some places) to be qualified in some measure in English slojd, laundry, cookery, and dress cutting and making; but in London, I suppose, we should not feel that so much as elsewhere, because there are always, in London, special schools and special teachers to be obtained for these special purposes.

6921. In London, I take it, as a rule the children would be drafted off to classes in cookery, laundry-work, and slojd?—Yes, often they would; therefore, in London, that special training would not be so necessary.

6922. Have you seen many cases or heard of many cases of epilepsy in your schools?—No, not many. I am speaking now of East Lambeth, with a little slice of West Lambeth. I believe there is a school population of about 92,000 to 93,000 children, and there are, I believe, about 40 or 50 epileptic cases known in my district—some 18 to 20 of them serious cases—too serious, I imagine, to allow of attending school, and the rest more or less serious epileptic cases, but probably some of them attending school more or less regularly. I look upon that as a very small proportion of epileptic cases as compared with my recollections of epilepsy in earlier days, as an inspector, 20 and 30 years ago, in country towns and villages.

6923. Do you think that children who have slight epileptic fits are best taught in the ordinary schools, and are no hindrance to the other children?—That would be rather a sweeping answer to give; I would hardly say that. I hold, first of all, may I say, please, that in many cases—children who are said to have slight epileptic fits have never, from a scientific point of view, that is to say, have never under proper proof—been shown to have had epileptic fits at all. I think that very often parents who know that their children had fits when teething answer questions when the children are 8, 9, 10, and 11 years old, saying "Oh, my child had fits," and very often so answer the question as to imply to a listener that the parent means epileptic fits; but in many cases no medical man has seen those children with a view to those fits, and, without a medical man's word, I doubt whether an ordinary layman could fix the epileptic character of fits; it would be very difficult to fix.

6924. In the case of a child who has slight fits in school, whatever they may be, whether epileptic or not, is there any objection to such a child being taught in an ordinary school?—If they are very slight fits, and only occur very rarely, the objection is not very grave, and I ought to say, perhaps, in answer to that question, and at that point, that I have repeatedly had it pointed out to me that epileptic fits do not come on frequently during the school lessons of a child, but happen much more frequently at home. If, on the other hand, you contemplate serious epileptic fits, not necessarily very frequent, but very severe, then I say that child ought not to be in the large class of an ordinary school. I shall be thought by many a heretic upon the point, I know. I know some people would say, let that child, subject to severe epileptic fits, terrifying as they are to those that witness them, be left in the ordinary school where the children are all well; do not send it to a special school where the whole of the children are already possessed of half a constitution, it will shock them so. At the risk of being thought a heretic, I would say that I do not think that an epileptic fit would shock the children in one of our special schools anything like as much as it would shock the ordinary children in an ordinary class. I have been told by more than one experienced and able teacher of those special classes that, as a rule, the members of our special classes are exceedingly dull and unsensitive.

Rev. C. Durell du Port, M.A.

28 April 1897.

6925. Yes, we have had some evidence to that effect, that an epileptic fit is not so terrifying in special classes to defective children as it is in an ordinary school?—I feel it strongly, a serious epileptic fit. And one other point I feel, bearing upon that side of the question, is this; that a serious epileptic fit occurring in an ordinary class may occur in one child at the back of a class of 70, and the teacher of that class would have no opportunity of watching any of the premonitory symptoms, and, in fact, not even of being useful promptly at the very first set in of a fit. But in a corresponding set in of a fit on the part of one out of a class of 15, why, the teacher herself of the special class, being continually on the *qui vive*, would see the first premonitory symptoms, and would do the best she could to provide against accident or horror, and would call in the help, probably, of the caretakers before matters had got to their worst.

6926. And you agree with the opinion, I believe, which the committee have formed that severe epileptic cases ought not to be taught in ordinary schools?—Yes.

6927. As to teaching them in special classes, if the fits are severe is there not also an objection?—Yes, there is; but I would be disposed (mainly basing my idea upon the ground that fits appear not to come so frequently during the occupied school hours, and assuming the fits are not so severe as practically to make it impossible for a child to go to school at all) until, if ever, the time comes for providing special schools for epileptics, to let them have a probationary experimental trial at a special school, keeping it distinctly probationary and experimental, so that the child might not be compromised there so as not to be able to be removed without long notice. Then, if one or two fits occurred, the mistress would take upon herself at once to say: "You were sent here conditionally; the conditions "have broken down; you must not attend any more." I would make it very experimental and probationary.

6928. Have you made up your mind what should be done with extreme cases of epileptics not fit to be taught in these classes?—No, I think that is a doctor's question.

6929. You have not considered the question of sending them to an epileptic colony?—No, I have not had the opportunity of practically considering that. There are in the whole of my 92,000 children in East Lambeth but 17 such cases, which are so few that I have almost neglected to give my mind to that point educationally.

6930. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) About that probationary period, you say that the children should have a chance in the special classes. You mean those who might be on the border line of an idiot. Were you thinking of those?—Do you mean early in my evidence?

6931. You said that they should have a period of probation, some in the special classes and some in the ordinary schools, and you seemed to lean to special classes?—When they had not been to school before.

6932. Then the child should be obviously imbecile?—Obviously semi-imbecile.

6933. Before being introduced to a special class altogether?—I think so, unless it secures admission into an institution for positive imbeciles and idiots; for the alternative to that I understand to be that the child would have to go to an ordinary school.

6934. Or would go to no school at all?—Yes, or to none at all. I would have it in experimentally.

6935. With regard to the time table used in the special classes, the afternoon is devoted to object lessons, as you know?—Entirely, or almost entirely, to object lessons and kindergarten occupation. But the object lessons—twice a week in one of our schools—are being conducted for the two classes combinedly.

6936. That would be contrary to rule, then?—Would it?

6937. Yes, it would be breaking the time-table?—In a sense, no doubt; I am glad you feel that.

6938. It would be breaking the instructions to teachers, to put it that way?—I am glad of that, because these children can, of course, follow no object lessons 40 strong. I do not think there ought to be more than 12 or 15 in a class for object lessons

6939. And, with regard to the training, are you aware that the boys and girls who are considered fit do attend cookery, laundry, and carpentry?—No, I was not aware. I thought there had only been one experiment of boy-teaching in cookery made yet in London.

6940. Yes; I beg your pardon, that is so?—I was not aware that any defective children in my district had been taught cookery.

6941. You are quite right; but the board have it now under consideration that some of the boys might be taught cookery; but with regard to going to the carpenter's shop, although the boys may be old and big, I have not felt in several cases that it was safe to let them go and handle any tool that was sharp; and there comes the great difficulty. Can you suggest any other occupation that they could go to?—Not of equal value. I am not, of course, surprised that you, feeling personally and practically responsible, are anxious about that difficulty; but if the boy in question is such as you feel, and the teacher of the special class feels, ought not to be risked amongst sharp tools, that is a dangerous member of society. Is the special school the place for that boy?

6942. —Yes, I think so?—You do. May I ask if you meant that the boy would hurt himself or someone else?

6943. Someone else in his temper; especially as he very often objects to correction?—Very often indeed; and is he never to have it?

6944. Well, it is hardly safe to trust them. We have found, in some instances, after a great deal of training, at Edmund Street, that some boys attend there and do well in the carpenter's shop; but one boy we have had three years, and have not felt we ought to send him out there to handle sharp tools?—Of course one must answer you sympathetically upon the point. As long as the boy you describe is a member of the school, and you and the head teacher entertain that anxiety, you must make an exception in that individual case; but I am not sure that a case such as you describe is a proper case for a special school for defective children. It is for a medical man to say what ought to be done, but something more drastic as a remedy, surely, is required for cases like that, is it not?

6945. We do not want to incur any unnecessary risk?—I might, in answer to your question, put in an additional parenthetical answer. Emphatically in one of the classes in my district the average discipline to my mind is nothing like strong enough, and if not very much strengthened might tend to develop the boy you have been describing to me; for I think in these special schools, whilst love and sympathy and watchful kindliness should be at work in a superlative degree, there should be a corresponding element exercised of firm constraint and subordinating discipline. I feel that more and more, the more I watch the working of the schools, if the children are to turn out when they leave school fit to be left free to go into society. I know the difficulty that I am insisting upon there; for, if I am not out of order, I might tell the Committee that there was one occasion when you were present with me in the school, and I saw wilful wickedness proceeding on the part of a particular boy who certainly might develop into one of the difficult and dangerous cases described by you. I said to you: "Now, that wants sharp punishment, it is not dulness "or defectiveness, but positive wickedness; would "you dare use the cane?" And you said: "I "would be afraid it might die under the passion "caused by it." That is an important point as an anecdote; it throws great light upon the difficulty. I thought I owed it to you and to the Committee to tell you that, since I have put down as one of my cardinal principles that discipline must be maintained, and not

Rev. C. Durell du Port, M.A.

28 April 1897.

only love, and that the children must not be allowed to do what they please at school, move as they like, and be as inattentive as they like.

6946. (*Chairman.*) What is the practical lesson you want the Committee to learn from that?—That there is a phase of defectiveness that might sometimes, in the eyes of a very skilful and experienced expert (namely, Mrs. Burgwin), make corporal punishment impossible, but that some other punishment should be replaced for it, some other punishment should be devised, that by sheer force of penalty should control wickedness. I am firm on that. You should not send out those semi-imbeciles into society uncontrolled. I am firm on that. If not you will be turning out into society, to breed, a most fearfully difficult race, very dangerous to their own society and to other ranks.

6947. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) You spoke about the children's holidays?—Yes, I hope I am not wrong in imagining that they do lose very much.

6948. You are quite right, it is the experience of us all that after the summer vacation they are very troublesome to manage for some time?—I have seen it.

6949. But I have been in communication with the Country Holidays Agency, and you can readily imagine that very few homes will take one of these children; but you will be glad to know that I am hoping this year, if the board will agree to the children going before the ordinary holiday times, that we shall get the homes reserved for our children, say, in the month of July. In that way I am hoping that they will get the holiday under some sort of supervision of people understanding the difficulties?—That is very hopeful.

6950. Then, I think we shall not suffer on their return as we have done in the past?—I am glad to hear it.

6951. (*Mr. Newton.*) Do you think that the buildings used for special classes are satisfactory?—Not the building at Choumert Road, Peckham, which, either as an experiment or to please the fantastic idea of some architect, was planned three stories high. But the buildings, as I have them at Sayer Street, all on the ground floor, are to my mind perfectly suitable.

6952. How many square feet of floor space would you give to each scholar in a special school?—I have not thought out in square feet the school space; but there is ample space in the Sayer Street buildings as they stand.

6953. Yes; but if the department is to pay a special grant for classes for defective children, should not some extra amount of space beyond what is required in the ordinary school limit be demanded?—Yes, because the 10 square feet limit, if applied to the small classes that I am pleading for, would, no doubt, be quite insufficient.

6954. I was rather wanting to know what you thought about it. Could you give us any idea in square feet?—I have not thought it out in square feet. I would rather not burst an idea upon you; I would rather answer you generally, and say that space must be liberally provided and that the 10 square feet is insufficient when applied to these small special classes, and there should be a hall, a small hall.

6955. Or, I suppose, a broad passage may be considered equivalent to a small hall?—Yes, certainly; there is that at Sayer Street.

6956. As to the furniture, have you thought about that?—No; except that I am perfectly satisfied with Sayer Street furniture.

6957. In Sayer Street there are some single desks and some dual desks?—Yes, I think there are. I am not sorry for that. I should wish that there were parallel desks and some dual desks in all the board schools in London. I am not a devoted admirer of dual desks.

6958. Most teachers of special classes think that there ought to be single desks; do you agree with them?—Yes, I rather do; but still I would not lay down a rule as a *sine quâ non*; I would keep the whole of the organisation element as elastic as possible.

6959. I think you said you were strongly in favour of small classes, with 12, 15 or 18 children in each?—Yes, because you can multiply them, and so cover a very large district area.

6960. Should a teacher of a class of that description try and take scholars individually in reading, or in little classes?—I could conceive that some of them would not be able to read at all. There are cases of children whom it would be perfectly useless to attempt to teach to read.

6961. My question only refers to those that can be taught to read?—We often come across children that can calculate, and constantly children that can write, well, and sometimes those children will never learn to read.

6962. What I meant was, should a teacher try and divide the 15 or 18 children into little classes for elementary subjects?—Only when they fall into them naturally.

6963. Then a great deal of the teaching would be individual?—Yes, a great deal of the teaching would be individual and a great deal would grow out of the manual instruction work I began with. In cookery you can learn an immense amount of arithmetic, for instance, in weighing and buying and mixing, an immense amount of weights and measures, calculation of cost, and sums in £ *s. d.* can be done through cookery. You can do object lessons through cookery, by having a talk over the actual things they are holding in their hands and making into palatable dishes.

6964. As to drill, do you think that they have enough of that?—I hope so; it does them a great deal of good. But in drilling I would, if possible, let them sometimes, as in singing, take their place with a class of the children of an ordinary school, because there they can combine without hurting the others, with no risk whatever to themselves, and with much more chance of profit, for many of these children have no initiative power whatever.

6965. We have about 20 hours a week available for secular instruction. What proportion of that would you give to drill and manual work?—I would make the manual work and the manual instruction the key to the whole of my (I will not say instruction at all, but) training. Therefore I would make the other subjects fit themselves in to the convenience of a training for these manual and kindergarten occupations, with very objectively taught object lessons.

6966. Do you think that the teachers are cramped by their time-tables, that is to say, by a sort of superstitious notion that they are bound when the hands of the clock get to a particular point to stop what they are doing?—They are bound by that, but I think they are sometimes (especially on the time-tables as they now exist, in the forenoon) exceedingly glad when the clock does strike, to stop their rather futile endeavour to train some of their children into fair standard arithmeticians. I think that the stroke of the clock is a justifiable delight to the teacher when so occupied in that it does stop that to the moment.

6967. But my question would cut equally the other way. Does the time-table bind them to go on up till the clock gets to a certain point when they feel that they ought to have stopped before?—Yes, but the teachers are so earnest that if they felt that the children show signs of weariness and fatigue they would break the time-table, and sing a song or exercise the children at drill.

6968. But the point is, have they the courage to break away from the time-table when they see need to do so?—Oh yes.

6969. (*Dr. Smith.*) You think that it is very necessary that there should be a proper guarantee that proper children are admitted to these classes?—I do.

6970. You think it is essential from a variety of points of view?—I think from all points of view, and from yours as much as from any, if we can get from you the amount of attention necessary on the part of medical men to really rule these cases. I presume they are very difficult to rule.

6971. Then, as regards the admission to these classes, there must be finality somewhere?—Yes.

6972. With whom would you leave the final decision?—Do you mean where grave discrepancy of opinion has occurred?

6973. No, I mean this, you are dealing with abnormal children?—Yes.

6974. These children are children not normal?—No.

6975. You think it is necessary that they should go into the infant department first?—No, not if they are proved abnormal.

6976. But where is there the proof of abnormality you must get that from somewhere?—You must.

6977. Can we get it from the experience in the infant school?—If the child has attended one.

6978. Therefore the evidence of the teacher under whose care the child has been in the infant school is very essential to a right conclusion as to a child?—The evidence of the teacher in any school that the child has attended previously is a most essential factor.

6979. In fact it gives a history of the case?—You cannot get it in any other way except through the parents, and I fear that the parents' history is not always very dependable.

6980. And you think (I am assuming that a medical officer would have to determine this case) that he cannot determine it without such evidence?—No, he must have the evidence of the teacher of the school in which the child has been.

6981. What other evidence do you think he ought to have other than what he can obtain for himself?—I did, of course, before, say that I thought the teacher of any school in which the child had been should be part of the evidence, and I did assume, of course, that some such expert, as we always have present at those admission committees in Mrs. Burgwin, would be present, not necessarily herself, but some expert in the training and teaching of these children, used to them; and, of course, I did say I thought, by way of having a little extra light

. . . .

6982. Yes, we will come to that, but the main point now is the admission of these children, whether the case is a right one or not for admission?—That is it.

6983. And the question turns entirely upon the extent of the abnormality of the child?—Entirely, evidence being given as to that by the teachers of any department in which it had previously been taught.

6984. As essential to a right conclusion being arrived at?—Yes, I think so.

6985. Then, assuming that other methods are adopted at the time of examination, you think a proper decision can be arrived at?—I do not quite follow your question.

6986. Having this history of the case——?—The parents' history, do you mean?

6987. Not always; it is not available?—I would try to get the history from the parent and from the teacher.

6988. And, having this evidence of the case, and from the evidence that can be obtained from the child directly by examination, then you think a right conclusion can be arrived at?—For probationary admission, I should be afraid whether one might not been then make a mistake.

6989. Quite so. You think a wholesome check is afforded by the presence of Her Majesty's inspector?—Might be. I think it might be, if he has given his mind to the subject, and visited the schools very much; and I think he could sometimes give you corroborative evidence, or the opposite, as to what the teacher's experience of that child who is a candidate for admission was in the school it had attended before. I have known several instances in which, when children came up to the admission committees, I recognise them at once as children that I have inquired into when inspecting an ordinary school as cases giving trouble or gaining no benefit.

6990. Then you think that the inspector could afford additional evidence to that provided by the teacher?—Sometimes, not always; and we will hope that he would be quiet and say nothing then.

6991. And, as regards the training, it should be more in the direction of manual work than academic work, as the term has been used?—I think so, for many of the reasons that have already been reviewed; and also because, as I suppose I have implied already, the manual powers of these children are in many cases their strongest powers. Not in all, for there are cases where either paralysis or some element of crippledom makes that not true. But in a great number of cases of semi-imbeciles it has occurred to me that if you are to educate these children at all your best chance is through their hands, seeing that their hands are their most intelligent organs.

Rev. C. Durell du Port, M.A.

28 April 1897.

6992. And as regards the special training of teachers apart from their personal qualifications and gentleness and adaptability, and so forth?—And unwavering firmness and disciplinary power and will.

6993. You think a knowledge of physiology necessary?—I did not say that; but I think that a knowledge of physiology, intelligently taken in and practically learnt, would be a great advantage.

6994. Yes, more advantage than it is generally to anybody?—Yes, I think so; the children are so peculiar.

6995. But physiology does not point out peculiarities does it?—No; but if you have learnt physiology you recognise the peculiarities as being something lying outside of what you have learned as the ordinary condition of things. Is not that so?

6996. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) Following that question of Dr. Smith's, may I ask you: Do you think it would be an advantage to these teachers to have some theoretical instruction as to the peculiarities that they may expect to meet with in these children; I mean bodily as well as mental?—Yes, but I would like it to be as little theoretical as possible. I would like it to be as practical as possible.

6997. With illustrations, of course; but they should know principles as well as actual facts?—Yes, but all shown scientifically and actually; in actual operation, objectively; not learned, I mean, for examination; not acquired as theory.

6998. Illustrative; if possible, with examples?—It would be absolutely useless otherwise; and, if possible, examples of a corresponding age and size.

6999. We have had before us this morning a memorandum furnished to us by the authorities of the idiot asylums of the country, and they place some stress on the subject of teaching in a knowledge of reading and writing. They quite agree with you as to the necessity, the paramount necessity, one may say, of manual training; but they speak of a knowledge of reading and writing as affording children capable of acquiring it a certain interest in life. Do you agree with that? Do you think it is important that people should learn to write and read if it is at all possible to teach them?—Oh, yes.

7000. I mean defective children?—Yes; I endeavoured to limit that. I would have those subjects of reading, writing, and arithmetic brought in as, not the main primary aim, but distinctly a secondary aim, to be carried out so far as possible, and only so far as seems reasonably possible.

7001. (*Chairman.*) I should like to ask you one question with regard to what you said about discipline. Do I rightly understand that what was in your mind was that this class of children are less amenable to discipline, and therefore they want a better disciplinarian put over them?—Yes, they are far more difficult to manage.

7002. A teacher of strong will?—An attractive gentleness of manner combined with a determined will.

7003. You do not suggest that they require corporal punishment?—No, distinctly otherwise. I should be afraid, as a rule, of the use of corporal punishment; but I feel that some kind of corresponding penalty must be devised in certain cases. Many will yield, you know, to the strong-willed influence of a fascinating teacher. It is only for a few; it is for the lawless and profane that we have to make laws. It is for a certain few that there must be, I think, probably not by corporal punishment, but if not by that, then by some other invented punishment, a means whereby every one of them should be brought under control, and made to subject themselves and to obey; else it is not safe to float them on to society afterwards.

7004. You agree with Mrs. Burgwin that there would be risk in corporal punishment in some of these cases?—Yes, I do.

The witness withdrew.

Mr. W. E. Currey. 28 April 1897.

Mr. William Edmund Currey called in and examined.

7005. (*Chairman.*) You are Her Majesty's Inspector for West Lambeth?—Yes.

7006. Your division is West Lambeth?—Yes.

7007. Will you tell us what special classes there are in your district?—None. That is my difficulty.

7008. Then what you have to tell us is rather the knowledge that you have acquired from meeting with defective or feeble-minded children in the ordinary schools?—Yes, that is all.

7009. And you have not even visited one of these special classes of late years?—Yes, I have, but not for four years. In Southwark there was one in my district at Pocock Street, but I left that district four years ago almost, it being then only recently begun—I think two years, perhaps hardly that. I have been there two or three times, but I could not form any very clear ideas as to the results.

7010. Could you tell us, either generally or with reference to particular cases, what you have to say about the existence in ordinary schools of children who would more suitably be taught in these special classes?—Opinion is divided upon the subject, but there appears to be amongst the teachers with whom I have spoken rather a general agreement that the children, where they are tractable, are as well, if not better, in the ordinary schools under ordinary environments than they would be if drafted into special classes. But then that opinion is only *a priori*, and requires correction from experience of the working of the special classes, which we have hardly had an opportunity of observing.

7011. You say children who are tractable; but must you not add to that children who are capable of deriving benefit from instruction in large classes with other children?—That is a matter of course, children who are educable as well, I should say; I was assuming that they could be taught something. It may take a longer or shorter time; sometimes it takes a long time before the intelligence or interest is awakened at all. That is a point on which one feels, of course, that one wants farther guidance, farther knowledge, as to whether that interest would be awakened more early under special tuition than it can be in the ordinary class.

7012. Have you observed yourself cases of children not merely backward but to some extent defective in ordinary schools?—I have. For example, I took particular notice of an infant school at Battersea Park Road, a board school. There are rather a large number in that school whom the mistress considers to come under that heading; perhaps something like 10. I speak a little vaguely about it, but something like that. I noticed a good many of them. The mistress said they had all been slow in starting, but all had been taught something; they were all getting on in a fairly satisfactory way, with one exception. There was one little girl that could not be said to have been taught anything as yet; but she had had her interests awakened, and looked up when addressed and smiled, and that was considered a step in advance which would probably lead on to something more.

7013. What age was that child?—About five years.

7014. Then all these children are young?—Yes.

7015. Then you see no objection to these particular children being taught with the infants?—I think no harm is coming of it at present. I will not undertake to say that nothing better could be done.

7016. When they grow older than that and get into schools for older children, would not children of this class be almost certain to be neglected if taught in large classes with ordinary children?—I should not like to say that; I think they would never reach the higher classes of the upper schools probably, but I think they would receive a fair share of attention in the junior classes. I do not see any disposition on the part of teachers to push them on one side.

7017. Perhaps you have not had under your notice any very marked cases of defective children taught with the older children in the senior schools?—Yes, I have; but they were not probably very bad cases, most of them; they were all teachable to a reasonable extent, but slowly. They would take two or three years to learn what a sharp child would learn, and learn better, in one.

7018. You have not been able to compare the same child that you have seen in the senior school and afterwards passed into a special class, so as to form an opinion as to the rate of progress?—No, I have not; I could not give any direct evidence as to that. I have seen, I may say perhaps, children whose age would, *primâ facie*, lead me to suppose they would be in the senior school, who were still in the infant school, and to whose instruction there I should take no objection because they were quiet. I saw, on the other hand, a case of a little boy who was not quiet, who was mischievous and rather wicked, and delighted in frightening the children in the infant school. He was a difficult case.

7019. What age was he?—He was only seven, I think; he was not old, but he was very mischievous and troublesome. That is the only case of those that have come under my notice lately in which I found a child of that sort. He would be, I should say, better in a special class, not for the sake of instruction, but of more discipline.

7020. What we should really like to know from you, is your experience of children of some degree of defect of intellect who cannot be properly taught with the other children in ordinary schools, but who might be much benefited by instruction in special classes and instruction of a special kind?—I am in a difficulty about that; I have not been able to see children of precisely the same type under the two systems for a sufficient length of time.

7021. Could you say whether you agree with Mr. Du Port that older children of weak intellect would benefit by more manual instruction and kindergarten work and object lessons, rather than by the routine of the standards?—Yes, I should entirely agree with that. If I might make a suggestion, I think there is another kind of work in which boys who could not be trusted with sharp tools might be employed; it is a kind of work which is rather in favour for rougher boys in Germany, what they call Pappwerk, that is to say, cardboard work. I have visited evening schools where it was done on a small scale by voluntary agency among the teachers at Dresden, and there was also a carpentry school at the same place. The director of the schools who took me there said that in his opinion this Pappwerk was of more value to the rougher boys than the wood work, the value being, in his opinion, not that it made them brighter scholars, but that it made them more tractable; they somehow take to it more kindly. And his opinion was based upon the evidence of the parents of these lads, who said that since they had been doing this work they found them quieter and better behaved at home. They were not children exactly of defective intellect, but rather children whose early life had been neglected.

7022. That would be useful as kindergarten work, but I take it it would not have the same bearing upon their future life with a view to their earning something?—Not immediately, it would not be of any value of course as a trade, but it might be of considerable value as a training. I am only suggesting it in the case of those who could not be trusted with tools that might be used as weapons.

7023. Do you think it likely that these older children of weak intellect would do better in the special class with a time-table specially suited to their instruction than with older children where the time-table must be adapted for the good of the majority?—I do think so; I think a special time-table would be an advantage to them. But at the same time it is not impossible that by a little elasticity in the working of an ordinary school they might be allowed to occupy themselves in a different way from the majority, from the bulk of the class, they might be doing some hand work whilst the others were doing some head work.

7024. Have you observed in your schools any special arrangements for defective children, such as small classes or modifications of the time-table to suit two or three or a small number?—No. I have no experience of that, the numbers are not sufficient to justify it; two in a class is about what you find, often there is not one in the school. It is merely a question of a little care and sympathetic treatment upon the part of the class teacher, and I must say on the part of the children of the class as well, for they are often very kind and considerate to those afflicted children, and that I regard as rather a valuable influence upon them so far.

7025. Then, if such children are found in a large senior school, do you think it would be better for the children to remain low down or to be moved up to be with children of their own age as much as possible?—I think something between the two. I should treat them as I would ordinary children who are merely making slow progress. I should always move them after a certain time up to the classes where children were something of their own age; I mean, I consider that the social surroundings are, on the whole, of more value to them in a school than actual attainment.

7026. Have you come across many physically defective children, cripples or paralysed?—I am happy to say not a very great number.

7027. Have you noticed any cases where special furniture was introduced, special chairs for such children?—Yes, where the children have been seated apart as comfortably as circumstances would permit.

7028. Do you see any reason why those children, if they are of normal brain power, should not be taught in ordinary schools?—No, except that in some cases the difficulty of getting them upstairs is insuperable; that is the only thing.

7029. So that it is necessary to have them in a room on the ground floor?—Yes.

Mr. W. E. Currey. 28 April 1897.

7030. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) There is only one question that I wish to ask you. Are you aware whether there are cases in your division not in attendance at school at the present time for want of a special class?—I am not aware of any. I cannot undertake to say there are not any.

7031. May I refresh your memory with regard to one child. I know you sent in a special report on that case, a little boy in Gideon Road?—Yes.

7032. He certainly is not fit to attend an ordinary school, and his father has threatened proceedings against the Education Department for not providing a place for his child. I think he is justified in his complaint?—Did I go the other way?

7033. No, you said you thought he should not attend the boys' department?—Yes.

7034. He is a deficient child, but I should not like to say that he ought to be excluded from a special school. I think there he ought to have the chance?—Yes, I remember the boy. I examined him, and, so that I might not be acting on my own responsibility merely, I got Mr. Bilton to take him with me, and the mother came with him. We both agreed in our opinion.

7035. Yes, I know you did; but still, if you recall that child I think it would be a fit case for a special school?—Yes, I think so; I quite agree.

7036. We acted upon your report?—Yes.

The witness withdrew.

Adjourned to Friday next at a quarter past 2 o'clock.

FOURTEENTH DAY.

Friday, 30th April 1897.

Present:

The Rev. T. W. SHARPE, C.B., in the Chair.

Mr. H. F. Pooley.
Mr. A. W. Newton.
Dr. G. E. Shuttleworth.
Dr. W. R. Smith.
Mrs. Burgwin.

Mr. H. W. Orange, *Secretary.*

Mr. W. E. Knollys. 30 April 1897.

Mr. William Edward Knollys called in and examined.

7037. (*Chairman.*) You are chief inspector and assistant secretary of the Local Government Board?—I am.

7038. And you know the working of the various Acts as affecting the defective and epileptic children?—Yes.

7039. Can you state to the Committee what are the powers under which boards of guardians deal with children of unsound mind?—The guardians' powers of detention of lunatics are those stated in section 24 of the Lunacy Act, 1890, 53 Vict. c. 5, and the term "lunatic" as used in that Act is defined to mean "an idiot or person of unsound mind." By section 13 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1868, 31 & 32 Vict. c. 122, guardians may pay the cost of idiots sent to asylums for idiots. The section is as follows: "The guardians of any "union or parish may, with the consent of the Poor Law "Board, send an idiotic pauper to an asylum or an "establishment for the reception and relief of idiots "maintained at the charge of the county rate or by public "subscription, and they may, with the like consent, send "any idiot, imbecile, or insane pauper, who may lawfully "be detained in the workhouse to the workhouse of any "other union or parish with the consent of the guardians "of such last-mentioned union or parish, and pay the "the cost of the maintenance, clothing, and lodging of "such pauper in the asylum, establishment, or workhouse, "as well as the cost of his conveyance thereto or his "removal therefrom, and the expenses of his burial when "necessary." Special provision is made for the treatment of idiots and imbeciles by the Idiots Act, 1886, 49 & 50 Vict. c. 25, and section 15 of that Act provides that "nothing in this Act shall operate to deprive the "guardians of the poor of any union of the power of "sending pauper idiots or imbeciles to hospitals, institutions, or licensed houses registered under this Act, or "from receiving in respect of such idiots or imbeciles such "sums of money as shall, from time to time, be granted "by Parliament for the maintenance and care of pauper "lunatics, as if the same idiots and imbeciles were "pauper lunatics." As regards children who may be feeble-minded, but have not been certified to be lunatics or idiots as required by the provisions of section 24 of the Lunacy Act, 1890, the board are empowered by the Poor Law (Certified Schools) Act, 1862, 25 & 26 Vict. c. 43, to issue certificates to certain schools and institutions for the education and maintenance of pauper children. Such schools must be supported wholly or partly by voluntary subscriptions, and when the certificate above mentioned has been issued by the board, guardians are empowered to pay from funds derived from rates for any child sent to such schools any sum not exceeding the total sum which would have been charged for the maintenance of such child if relieved in the workhouse, and in the conveyance of such child to and from the same, and in the case of death the expenses of his or her funeral. By the Divided Parishes and Poor Law Amendment Act, 1882, 44 & 45 Vict. c. 58, this power is extended. Section 13 of that Act provides as follows: "The guardians of any union who "send any pauper child to a school certified under the "Act of 25th and 26th years of the reign of Her present "Majesty, chapter 43, may pay the reasonable expenses "incurred in the maintenance, clothing, and education of "such child while in such school to an amount not "exceeding such rate of payment as may be sanctioned by "the Local Government Board for pauper children sent "to such school, anything contained in the said Act to "the contrary notwithstanding." By section 10 of the Poor Law Act, 1879, 42 & 43 Vict. c. 54, the power of guardians to subscribe to the support and maintenance of any public hospital or infirmary under the Poor Law

Mr. W. E. Knollys

30 April 1897.

Amendment Act, 1851, 14 & 15 Vict. c. 105, is extended to authorise guardians, with the board's consent, to subscribe towards any asylum or institution for blind persons, or for deaf and dumb persons, or for persons suffering from any permanent or natural infirmity, or towards any association or society for aiding such persons, or for providing nurses, or for aiding girls or boys in service, or towards any other asylum or institution which appears to the guardians, with such consent as aforesaid, to be calculated to render useful aid in the administration of the relief of the poor. But nothing in this section is to authorise any subscription to any asylum or institution unless the Local Government Board are satisfied that paupers under the guardians have, or could have, assistance therein in case of necessity. This section would apply to institutions for feeble-minded children. It must, of course, be remembered that the duties of guardians, with reference to all the children, are confined to those who are destitute.

7040. You state that the guardians' powers of detention of lunatics are given in the Lunacy Act, the term lunatic being used to define "an idiot or person of unsound mind." Have you any idea how far the practice has been to extend that definition upwards?—The guardians would have no power to deal with a person as a lunatic or an idiot unless he was certified by a medical man to be a person of unsound mind, and also an order of the justices was given, by which he could be dealt with. He would have to be dealt with under the Lunacy Act.

7041. Then they can pay the cost of idiots sent to asylums by another Act?—By section 13 of the Poor Law Amendment Act, 1868, chapter 122, they can.

7042. That was further extended by the Act of 1886 making further provision for the treatment of idiots and imbeciles?—Yes.

7043. But as regards children who may be feeble-minded, but have not been certified as lunatics or idiots, are there powers under the Act of 1862 to issue certificates to certain schools and institutions for the education and maintenance of pauper children only?—Yes, that is so, provided that the schools are supported wholly or partly by voluntary contributions.

7044. Does that extend to children outside workhouses; those receiving out-door relief?—Yes.

7045. And to others who are not receiving out-door relief?—They must be children who are in need of relief. The guardians would not have power to deal with them otherwise.

7046. You have no power to give that sort of out-door relief, as it were, and so pauperise the parents?—The parents would be pauperised.

7047. If they accepted such relief?—Yes.

7048. Is relief ever given in that form alone without any other?—Yes, certainly.

7049. So that there is power to deal with any feeble-minded children at present, but it pauperises the parent?—There is power to deal with any feeble-minded children by sending them to certified homes, or by sending them to other institutions to which we are authorised to empower the guardians to subscribe under the 42 & 43 Vict. c. 54. s. 10.

7050. So that, really, they have the power of assisting all afflicted children, whether deaf, blind, or feeble-minded. In the case of the deaf and blind it does not pauperise the parent, but in the case of the feeble-minded it does?—Yes.

7051. Can you tell us how many schools there are certified under the 25th and 26th Victoria, to which feeble-minded children can be sent by boards of guardians?—There are three at present certified, and we have proposals before us now for certifying three more. There is a home for training girls of the feeble-minded class at Hitchin, a home for feeble-minded girls at Starcross; and we have received proposals to certify homes at Shepherd's Bush, Bristol, and Halifax.

7052. These come from voluntary bodies, of course?—Yes, and the homes are all of them partially supported by voluntary contributions.

7053. Have boards of guardians power to set up homes of their own for feeble-minded, or must they send them to certified voluntary institutions?—They would certainly have power, with our consent, to set up an institution. That would be of the nature of a branch workhouse, more or less. It would be be an institution considered as part of the workhouse.

7054. So that really all the feeble-minded children might be taken up by the guardians and placed in institutions under the care of the guardians, if the Local Government Board consented?—The circumstances would require combinations of unions to do that.

7055. Have any boards of guardians made such a provision. We find that about one per cent. of the children of school age require some sort of care?—I do not know whether you have seen the return.

7056. We shall come to that later on, shall we?—Yes.

7057. But no boards of Guardians have suggested that they would like to set up institutions of that kind?—There are so few feeble-minded children in any one union, that any union that did that would have to deal with the children of a large number of unions besides their own.

7058. But then there are some other institutions available to which feeble-minded children can be sent by boards of guardians besides the three you have already enumerated, and the three proposed?—Of those that are not certified, but to which boards of guardians have power to subscribe with the sanction of the Local Government Board, under the 42nd and 43rd Victoria, chapter 54, section 10, there are six homes to which we sanction subscriptions at present: one at Bristol, one at Darley, one at Barnt Green, near Birmingham, one at Arrowfield Top, at Alvechurch, one at Painswick near Stroud, one at Knotty Ash, Liverpool, and also at the Royal Albert Asylum for idiots.

7059. How do these differ from the other certified schools?—They are not subject to our inspection. If a school is certified, it is subject to the Local Government Board inspection, and the guardians can then send children without our sanction; but to the other schools we sanction subscriptions under a different Act. One is under the 25th and 26th Victoria, and the other is under the 42nd and 43rd Victoria.

7060. You have no supervision over any but the three institutions you mentioned at first?—We have no supervision over those others.

7061. Of course the guardians pay visits from time to time?—Yes.

7062. That is the only supervision, practically?—Yes; we have no authority to visit. Of course if we thought it necessary from anything that we heard to institute an inspection or visit and they refused, we should hesitate to allow the guardians to continue to subscribe.

7063. Have your officers ever paid such visits?—They do from time to time, but only under exceptional circumstances. They regularly inspect the certified homes.

7064. Is there any reason why they should not all be inspected; is it want of staff?—No; it would require legislation.

7065. I thought you said you could insist upon it if you desired?—For the certified homes.

7066. And with regard to the others you could insist upon it?—No, we cannot insist upon it; but if they refused—if we thought it necessary and they refused—we should naturally hesitate to allow subscriptions to be continued. We have no power to visit.

7067. You have the power of withholding a grant?—We have power to refuse to allow boards of guardians to subscribe.

7068. That is equivalent to the same thing?—Well, yes; but I think we consider it very different. With regard to those homes we have not the same responsibility in any way that we have with regard to those that are certified.

7069. You wish to give them a freer hand in fact?—We should prefer, as a rule, their being certified; but the managers in some instances object to having their homes certified, and still we think that under the powers of the Poor Law Act, 1879, we ought to allow subscriptions.

7070. Why do they object to be certified—because they know they would not come within your rules?—I think our requirements may be more than they would be prepared to comply with.

7071. However, you are satisfied with the government of the homes at all events, and the general management?—Yes. We always visit the homes, before we sanction subscriptions in the first instance, through an inspector.

7072. Do you give the same rate of payment to the certified homes as to those you do not certify?—The certified homes have a fixed rate of payment which varies considerably. For instance, at Hitchin, the payment is 13*l.* per annum; at Morpeth I see it is 15*l.* 12*s.*; and at the asylum at Starcross it is 31*l.* 4*s.* Those are the three certified homes.

Mr. W. E. Knollys.

30 April 1897.

7073. How do you account for that great difference, double in one case. Perhaps it is a smaller institution?—Starcross is a large institution, it has accommodation for 230 children.

7074. The cost of an institution is nearly 30*l.*?—It is probably not so much at Hitchin and Morpeth.

7075. And to homes not certified have you the same rate of payment?—The subscriptions vary from 5*s.* to 7*s.* 6*d.* per week per inmate for those that are not certified.

7076. That is higher than the usual rate of payment for pauper children for boarding them out in a home?—5*s.* a week is about the ordinary rate of payment for pauper children in certified homes. For instance, now there are a good many Roman Catholic children in certified homes where they pay about that.

7077. Where two or three are boarded in separate homes in the country, what is the rate of payment?—Under boarding-out, 4*s.*, exclusive of clothing and some other small extras.

7078. How many places are there in these homes for the pauper children?—In the certified homes, in the one at Hitchin, there is accommodation for 20 girls, and there are at present 18 girls sent there by the board of guardians; in the one at Morpeth there is accommodation for 12, and nine have been sent by the board of guardians; and at Starcross, there is accommodation for 230, and 208 have been sent by the boards of guardians.

7079. So that the total accommodation at the certified homes is less than 300 available for pauper children?—Yes.

7080. What is the number contemplated at the others?—I have not got those figures, but they are not large homes.

7081. That bears no proportion, of course, to the number of places that you want?—No.

7082. Are many applications made to the boards of guardians and refused?—Boards of guardians very often wish to find some place to which to send a feeble-minded boy especially, and they are unable to do so.

7083. Then, do they drift into the workhouse infirmary, or what becomes of them?—They stop in the workhouse. It depends upon the degree of feeble-mindedness, of course.

7084. You do not happen to know whether, as a rule, they are placed in the workhouse infirmary?—No, I think they would not be placed in the workhouse infirmary unless there were something physically wrong.

7085. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) I have seen them in the North of England occasionally in the imbecile ward?—It depends upon the degree of feeble-mindedness, very much.

7086. (*Chairman.*) How do you make payments to other institutions; do you make them to the boards of guardians or to the institutions?—The boards of guardians themselves pay; it is by subscription; such subscription as we sanction, and we sanction, as a rule, so much a week for a child or an adult as long as they are maintained in the institution. You will see that the number of children sent to these other homes is considerably greater.

7087. Can you give us the number?—I cannot give you the number; but I can give you the number of the boards of guardians that send them. I see that to the Bristol home 10 boards of guardians subscribe; to the Darley home, 4; to the homes at Barnt Green and Arrowfield Top, 26; to the home at Painswick, 2; and to the home at Knotty Ash, 5. In the Royal Albert Asylum, although there is a total accommodation for 600, five-sixths of these are either elected or paying cases, having only one hundred vacancies for poor law cases.

7088. Then, you authorise the subscriptions by boards of guardians, but you pay no grants directly?—No, we pay no grant directly.

7089. Are no grants paid directly to the workhouse schools by the Local Government Board?—No, the Local Government Board pay no grants direct to the workhouse schools, but grants are paid from the Exchequer Contribution Account in respect of the salaries of the officers of the workhouses.

7090. And, when they go to the outside schools, of course they earn a grant like other children?—Yes, but for the schools, not for the guardians.

7091. About epileptic children, are there any homes to which they can be sent by the boards of guardians?—There are three homes for epileptics to which subscriptions by boards of guardians have been sanctioned, one at Chalfont, in Buckinghamshire, one at Maghull, near Liverpool, and the Lady Meath Home at Godalming; but, at the present time, the home at Chalfont does not make provision for children, they are about to do so.

7092. And the home at Maghull, has that any room for children?—I believe children are sent there.

7093. You do not know the number of epileptic children actually in workhouses at this moment?—No, I do not.

7094. Can we obtain that from any source?—There is the return that was ordered in 1894; have you got that return; if not, I propose to put it in.

7095. Thank you very much?—I will give you the figures. The summary is as follows: it refers to provincial workhouses. The number of children in provincial workhouses who are imbecile only, was 294.

7096. You mean excluding London?—Yes; epileptics only, 93; and both imbecile and epileptic, 98. The number of the above children who were of dirty habits was 229, and the number of the above children who, in the opinion of the medical officers, would be likely to be improved by special training was 178. The above particulars are contained in returns from 175 unions.

7097. Representing what population, do you know?—I cannot say.

7098. Those are all the unions outside London?—The total number of extra metropolitan unions in England and Wales is 618, and the returns received from the remainder of those unions show that there were no such children in the workhouse. So that there were only imbecile and epileptic children in 175 workhouses out of 618. You wish to have that Return put in.

7099. Is that a very reliable return, is it founded upon medical evidence or merely upon the opinion of the authorities of the workhouse?—It was the number who, in the opinion of the medical officers, would be likely to be improved by special training.

7100. So that he must have seen all the children and sifted them?—Yes.

7101. You are speaking of all the epileptic cases?—Imbecile and epileptic (*handing in the Return*).

7102. (*Dr. Smith.*) Do improvable cases refer to epileptics, or the other class, the mentally deficient?—Previous to speaking of this return, I was speaking of the mentally deficient.

7103. (*Chairman.*) Can you give the Committee any information as to the provision made by local authorities of special accommodation for pauper idiot and imbecile children?—That point is dealt with in the 49th Report of the Commissioners in Lunacy; they write as follows:—

"The question of the provision by local authorities of special accommodation for pauper idiot and imbecile children has of late been publicly discussed. In our 45th Report, p. 48, we referred to the subject, and suggested that the larger counties, or two or more of the smaller in union, might well consider the advisability of exercising the power given by Section 241 of the Lunacy Act, 1890, and building separate idiot asylums. We added that, in our opinion, such asylums should be of an inexpensive character. At the Northampton County Asylum, a block, connected with the main asylum, has been built, which accommodates 50 idiots of the two sexes, and is filled partly by home county and partly by out-county patients, and the Middlesex County Council has determined to erect on their asylum estate at Wandsworth, a detached building which is intended to receive 100 idiots of each sex. The plans of this building have been sanctioned, but the work has not yet been begun. No other local authority has yet, under the power quoted, made distinct provision for this class, but the wants of the Metropolis have been fairly met by the Metropolitan Asylums Board's idiot asylum at Darenth. It is very difficult to arrive at anything like an accurate estimate of the number of idiot and imbecile children in the country. The Registrar-General's Report of the Census of 1891 gives the number of persons 'mentally deranged,' and of the ages from birth, up to and including 14 years, as 5,176, and elsewhere states that of the persons returned as suffering from insanity, '7,722 were either still under 10 years of age, or were returned as having been 'mentally deranged from childhood': but the Report characterises the returns as 'most inaccurate,' and we are unable to derive from the Census Returns any useful information on the subject under consideration.

Mr. W. E. Knollys.

30 April 1897.

"The opinion has often been expressed, and it is one in "which we entirely concur, that the association of idiot "children with the adult insane or imbecile inmates of "lunatic asylums and workhouses is extremely undesir- "able, and indeed an undoubted evil. To ascertain as "nearly as possible the extent of this evil in institutions "for lunatics (excluding those exclusively for idiots) we "have obtained returns from all these institutions of the "numbers in them, on 1st September 1894, of 'idiot, "'imbecile, and epileptic children under 16 years of age.' "From these returns, we find that the total number of "such children was 525, of whom 399 were classed as idiot, "and 126 as imbecile, the number who, in the opinion of "the medical officers, might be improved by special train- "ing, being 154. Similar returns of 'imbecile and epileptic "children under 16 years of age' in the workhouses, "separate infirmaries, schools or other similar establish- "ments of the extra-metropolitan unions in England "and Wales at the same date, have been obtained by the "Local Government Board, and they are embodied in "a Parliamentary Paper, printed by order, dated 12th "February 1895, of the House of Commons. The "number of these children, no distinction being drawn "between 'idiot' and 'imbecile' was 485, and they "appear to have been found in 175 only of the 618 extra- "metropolitan unions. The number improvable by "special training was stated to be 178. The term 'idiot' "is found to be very elastic, and to include very various "degrees of mental incapacity. At the top of the scale, "and excluding cases of mere slow and backward "development, will be found children who by appropriate "training may be raised to the position of self-supporting "citizens; but our experience obliges us to conclude that "the proportion of such cases is a small one, and that "as regards the great majority of those who come under "our notice, attempts at mental development and "industrial training are rewarded by very poor results. "Still, on the grounds of humanity of the immense "relief afforded to poor families by the removal of idiot "children from their midst, and of the desirability of "dissociating such children from the adult insane in "institutions, we shall at all times most gladly afford "our support to any proposals for making separate "asylum provision for this class, subject always to the "view as to the character of the provision expressed in "our 45th Report, as quoted above. We fully realise, "however, the difficulty of making such provision under "the Lunacy Acts. The returns we have referred to "afford, of course, no indication of the number of children "of the descriptions mentioned who reside with their "parents or friends. We may safely assume, however, "that it exceeds, and probably largely exceeds the sum "of the numbers given in the returns. From these "returns, we gather that in Lancashire there were in "asylums and workhouses together only 204; in York- "shire 88, in Northamptonshire 53, in Warwickshire 56, "in Staffordshire 43, in Kent 41, in Gloucester 38, in "Essex 35, and in each of the other counties fewer than "30 children of the descriptions in question. A pauper "idiot asylum, to be conducted economically, ought not "to be built, we think, for fewer than 400 or 500 patients, "and it is probably only one of the more populous "counties, such as Lancashire or Yorkshire, that would "feel justified in providing at the cost of the county, "separately from other local authorities, an establishment "of that size. It is not probable that local authorities "would unite (as they are empowered to do) in providing "these asylums, for there appears to be little disposition "to combine for such purposes, and, indeed, the tendency "at present is rather towards the dissolution of unions "already existing for similar objects. We think, however, "that Lancashire and the West Riding of Yorkshire "might each very properly provide an asylum, and if the "supply of idiots from the county itself were not sufficient "at once to fill it, we doubt not that any excess of "accommodation would be eagerly sought after by other "authorities, and be a source of profit. The destination "of idiots attaining to adult age and not rendered capable "of self-support, would have to be considered, and in "the majority of cases it could only be, we suppose, "the lunatic asylum or the workhouse."

7104. What children do you consider would fall within the province of guardians to deal with. You have given us this paper setting out the powers of guardians. Would their powers extend to all children below the normal condition, if they chose to stretch them?—Not if they were not destitute.

7105. But I thought you said they might have this form of relief without being destitute?—Not without being destitute.

7106. It would pauperise the parents. But the parents would not necessarily go into the workhouse?—No, the parents would not necessarily go into the workhouse, but the parents must require relief. They must be unable themselves to deal with the children.

7107. But supposing it was a payment of 30*l.* to an asylum, you would not expect a poor parent to pay that?—No, but the payment by the board of guardians of a subscription of 30*l.* would pauperise the parent.

7108. But would not compel them to go into the workhouse?—Certainly not.

7109. And you would not be obliged to say he was destitute?—The extent of his destitution, of course, would be a question for the guardians to deal with. The guardians are only supposed and only authorised to deal with cases of destitution.

7110. But they might allow a poor artizan to remain outside the workhouse, and yet send the children to an institution, as being a form of parochial relief that would pauperise him?—Yes.

7111. So that by a little stretch of their powers they might send all children unable to pay 30*l.* a year, imbecile or feeble-minded, to an institution, if the parents were willing to accept the taint of pauperism for themselves?—I should hardly like to commit myself to the statement quite in that form. No doubt it would be a matter for their discretion, as to the amount of destitution that there was in any case which would justify them in affording relief in that way to the parents.

7112. You can conceive that a board of guardians, taking great pity upon a child, and also knowing that the parent was unable to provide for it in any other way, would accept some small contribution from the parent and pay by far the larger part of the cost to an institution?—Yes, I think probably they would.

7113. And if homes were found, the guardians might send in a large number. It is the want of homes rather than of will on the part of the guardians that prevents the guardians from sending these children under proper guardianship?—Yes. You mean children not already in the workhouse?

7114. Yes?—I think the extent to which that was carried would require to be very carefully watched.

7115. Do you not think that the Local Government Board would authorise, probably, all such cases, if public opinion went with them?—We should have to consider each particular case as it was brought before us.

7116. Are you aware whether any children are sent to Darenth without pauperising the parent?—Not to Darenth.

7117. What would be the meaning of the term pauperising the parent; it amounts to nothing but a name, does it?—It is every person who is in receipt of relief on his own account, or on account of any member of his family.

7118. Does that deprive him of any civil privileges?—Yes, of the privilege to be registered, or to vote as a Parliamentary voter, or at a municipal election, or as a burgess, or at any election of the officers under the provisions of any statute, or at the election of any guardian of the poor, or any member of any parochial board in Scotland, or any other board acting in the distribution of relief to the poor, under the Poor Law Acts.

7119. In fact, it deprives him of nearly all civil rights?—Yes.

7120. As an elector at all events?—Of all franchise rights.

7121. So that he cannot be said to have any share in the government of the country, so far as himself and family are concerned, in any sense?—No. You are aware, of course, that under the Medical Relief Disqualification Removal Act, medical relief only does not disfranchise.

7122. Would this be called medical relief?—No, it could not be called medical relief.

7123. Are you aware whether they are ever struck off the register in such cases?—In these particular cases? No, I cannot tell you.

7124. I should think it is very unlikely that they are. It would not be known to the registration officers, would it?—I should think the relieving officers would give the names to the registration officers.

7125. Is there any way of sending a child to Darenth without going through the workhouse?—He can be sent direct, provided the requisite certificates and requirements

of the board are complied with. I think you have had this Order put in by Mr. Mann, the Order of the 18th February 1875, as to the Metropolitan Asylums Board asylum at Darenth. I think Mr. Mann told me he put it in.

7126. Perhaps you will read Article 3?—Article 3 of that Order states the requirements that must be complied with. Article 2 is: "The insane paupers to be admitted "into the asylum shall be such harmless persons of the "chronic or imbecile class as could be lawfully retained in "a workhouse; but no dangerous or curable persons, such "as would, under the statutes in that behalf, require to "be sent to a lunatic asylum, shall be admitted." And Article 3 is: "Every pauper, whether upon his first or any "subsequent admission into an asylum, shall be admitted "upon an order, filled up and signed by the clerk to the "board of guardians of the union or parish from which he "is sent to the asylum, according to Form (A.) in the "Schedule to this Order. The order of admission shall "be accompanied by a certificate and report as follows, "that is to say: A certificate in the Form (B.) in the "Schedule to this Order, signed by the medical officer "(either of the workhouse or district, as the case may be) "of the union or parish to which the pauper is chargeable; "which certificate such medical officer is hereby required "to give, upon request from the board of guardians or "relieving officer, in every case in which, after due "examination, he may find that such a certificate ought "to be given as regards the pauper's fitness, both for "admission into the asylum and for removal thereto. A "report in the Form (C.) in the said schedule, signed by "the chairman or vice-chairman of the board of guardians "of the union or parish to which the pauper is chargeable, "or by some member of the visiting committee of such "board of guardians. The order of admission shall be "signed by the clerk, by direction of the board of "guardians; but such direction shall not be given until "the certificate and report above-mentioned have been "laid before the board of guardians."

7127. That makes the course pretty easy?—Yes, and I think it is as well that I should state that I wished to find out how many cases were sent direct to Darenth without passing through the workhouse or district school, and I had some difficulty in arriving at it, but I found that out of 127 cases admitted in one year, 17 were admitted direct, that is to say, 17 were admitted upon a certificate from the district medical officers, and not the workhouse medical officers; and, therefore, it may be assumed that they were admitted direct. It would be rather over 13 per cent. of all the children admitted. That applies to the children. Darenth, as you know, is divided into two parts,

7128. Then comparatively little use has been made of that Order—only 13 cases out of 120?—But the Order applies to every case that is admitted, whether it is admitted through the workhouse or not.

7129. (*Mr. Pooley.*) You told us about the civil disabilities which a parent suffers who accepts relief; are there not other incidental disadvantages, such as forfeiting the right to be benefited by certain charities, and so on; is it not very often a condition of charities that the recipients should not have been in receipt of relief?—I believe there are such conditions; I cannot confidently state to what extent, but I know there are.

7130. Would the fact of having been relieved by the guardians under the provisions of these Acts pauperise the child in after life?—Not in after life. The pauperism ceases so soon as the contribution ceases; and with regard to children sent to these institutions, the pauperisation of the parent ceases so soon as the child is 16, and then the child itself is pauperised. It is under the Act of William IV. that the parent is pauperised as long as the child is under 16. Any relief given to a child under 16 pauperises the parent.

7131. (*Dr. Smith.*) The pauperisation is not removed, it is only shifted?—Yes.

7132. (*Mr. Pooley.*) Then as regards these certified homes, as I think you called them, are some of these homes certified for feeble-minded children, or are they simply certified for the reception of pauper children?—We state the purpose for which the home is to be used, and then we issue a certificate in general terms, but for the admission of so many children to the home, and it would be understood that the home is be used for the particular class of children to which we should refer in our letter which would accompany such certificate.

7133. Then, practically, some of them are certified for this special class of feeble-minded children?—Yes.

7134. I understand that before the guardians send a child to one of these certified institutions it would be their duty to inquire into the circumstances of the parent?—Certainly.

Mr. W. E. Knollys

30 April 1897.

7135. Whether the child was destitute or not?—Certainly.

7136. And they would be within their duty and certainly within their rights if they declined to deal with any child unless they were satisfied that the child was destitute?—Certainly. They would not be justified in dealing with the case of any child unless there was such a degree of destitution on the part of the parent as rendered it necessary. I think it is important that the word "destitution" should not be pressed too hardly. It would not, as a rule, be necessary that there should be absolute destitution.

7137. But under the existing law a feeble-minded child of a parent who is not destitute cannot get education except in the ordinary elementary school?—That would be so.

7138. That is so, is it?—I imagine so.

7139. Darenth is certified simply for lunatics, including idiots?—Yes, imbeciles and idiots.

7140. Can you say whether there would be any objection to its being certified for feeble-minded children as well; for the reception of feeble-minded children, not idiots or imbeciles?—I can only speak personally. It seems to me that it would be objectionable that the same institution should be so certified. I think if you are dealing with children who are feeble-minded only, it would be unwise to mix them up with children who are certified lunatics.

7141. Then, it is not in your opinion, if I may ask you the question, desirable that the school authorities should have the power of sending feeble-minded children, not idiots or imbeciles, to such an institution as Darenth?—It might be desirable that they should send them to an institution, a modified form of the Darenth institution possibly.

7142. But not to Darenth itself?—I do not think it would be desirable to send them to Darenth.

7143. May I ask you this question. When the Blind and Deaf Act was passed, the powers of guardians to send blind and deaf children to schools were repealed, except in certain cases—except in the case of children in a workhouse or sent to an institution from a workhouse?—Yes.

7144. There would not be the same reason, would there, for repealing the powers of guardians in regard to feeble-minded children? Supposing that the school authorities were given special powers in regard to feeble-minded children, not idiots or imbeciles, there would not be the same reason for repealing the powers of the guardians?—There seems to me to be this difficulty, that it would be very difficult to state where the feeble-mindedness really began and where it stopped and where it became imbecility.

7145. This is my point: that in the case of blind and deaf children you had a class of children who were only dealt with as regards their education by the guardians?—Yes.

7146. Therefore there might have been a conflict, if the school authorities had been empowered to deal with those children and the powers of the guardians had not been repealed?—Yes.

7147. But is it not the case that the state of things is different with regard to feeble-minded children—feeble-minded children, not idiots or imbeciles—because, in many cases, they are not dealt with and cannot be dealt with by guardians under the existing law?—You mean, because their parents are not destitute?

7148. Yes?—Then the guardians would have nothing to do with them under the existing law.

7149. No?—Destitution is the fundamental *sine qua non* to the guardians dealing with any cases; it is supposed to be so; and, therefore, the children who are feeble-minded but whose parents are not destitute would not come in any way under the care of the guardians.

7150. So that there would be no need to repeal the powers of the guardians with regard to those children in the event of certain powers being given to the school authorities?—No; the guardians have no power with regard to such children; they have, in fact, nothing to do with them if they are not certified imbeciles.

7151. That is what I was speaking of, not of their powers with regard to certified imbeciles, but their powers with regard to the feeble-minded?—They have no power with regard to the feeble-minded unless they are paupers.

Mr. W. E. Knollys.

20 April 1897.

7152. In the case of the blind and deaf it had come to be considered that they had powers although the children were not paupers?—Yes, I believe that was so; at least they had the power of paying for them in institutions, I believe.

7153. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) In the eyes of the Local Government Board does a child become an adult at the age of 16?—Not necessarily.

7154. In the case of a child in an institution, I think you said that the pauperisation of the parent ceased when the child was 16?—That is under the Act of William IV., but we have allowed guardians to continue to pay for children in institutions until they are 21.

7155. And the parent then remains a pauper until the child is 21?—No; the parent remains a pauper until the child is 16.

7156. And who becomes the pauper then?—The child.

7157. It does become a pauper at 16?—Yes.

7158. At 16 the child is declared a pauper?—I think I can quote you the words of the Act; it is the 4th and 5th of William IV., chapter 76, section 56, which provides: "That from and after the passing of this Act, all relief "given to or on account of the wife or to or on account "of any child or children under the age of 16, not being "blind or deaf and dumb, shall be considered as given to "the husband of such wife or to the father of such child "or children as the case may be, and any relief given to "or on account of any child or children under the age "of 16 of any widow, shall be considered as given to such "widow." Therefore, the parents are only pauperised when relief is given to children, when the children are under the age of 16. That Act of William IV. still remains in force, but in a great many cases they are orphan and deserted children who are sent to the institutions, when I say we raise no objection to their continuing in these institutions till 18, or sometimes till 21.

7159. I was not quite clear about the contribution which you make to Hitchin, Morpeth, and Starcross. In the case of Hitchin you give 13*l.*?—We give nothing.

7160. The guardians?—The board of guardians.

7161. They pay 13*l.*?—Yes.

7162. And to Starcross 31*l.*?—That is so.

7163. Does that mean that at Starcross you pay the total maintenance, and in the other two cases the cost is made up by voluntary subscriptions?—No, it ought not to mean that, because under the Act of the 25th and 26th of Victoria, we are not empowered to certify a home unless it is supported wholly or partially by voluntary subscriptions.

7164. That is what I understood. Then can you explain why you pay double at Starcross?—I cannot explain offhand; it is a very old rate of payment, but Starcross has the medical staff, &c. that would be attached to a lunatic asylum.

7165. With its increased accommodation you would have thought it would have been cheaper rather than dearer, would you not?—I should certainly. In these cases, probably in the other cases where smaller contributions have been allowed, if we were to allow the larger ones the guardians would not avail themselves of their powers. I think that is extremely likely.

7166. Still, someone has to find the cost of that child. It puts the burden upon the community somewhere?—Yes; but part of the cost is supposed to be found.

7167. But I should imagine it was not found at Starcross?—Well, we must hope it is.

7168. A child sent to Darenth becomes a pauper lunatic, does it not, under the Act?—Yes.

7169. I think you said that you do not approve of feeble-minded children going to the same institution as unatic children?—I should not, certainly.

7170. Are you aware that at Darenth a certain proportion of children are sent out from there as being able to partially maintain themselves?—I believe that is so.

7171. Such a child would be a feeble-minded child?—It would be a lunatic in the eye of the law.

7172. That is what I wanted you to say——

7173. (*Chairman.*) Not a lunatic, but a certified lunatic?—A certified lunatic in the eye of the law.

7174. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) So that the certified lunatic leaves the institution able at least partially to maintain itself?—Instead of lunatic if you use the word imbecile, you may hope that it receives such education while it is there, that it is gradually improved to such an extent that it is able when it leaves Darenth at least partially to maintain itself.

7175. But you do not think the arrangement which places a lunatic child and a feeble-minded child in the same building, is advisable?—Certainly not.

7176. (*Dr. Smith.*) You were saying that destitution was a necessity to enable the board of guardians to act?—Yes.

7177. And that pauperisation followed?—Yes.

7178. In those cases where the board of guardians exact a certain payment per week from the parents, does pauperisation follow there?—Yes,

7179. Pauperisation still follows?—If the guardians pay and recover the amount they pay, pauperisation would still follow.

7180. Therefore the payment by the parent of the partial expense of the child would not remove the taint of pauperisation?—No, it would not.

7181. You said 17 cases were admitted direct into the institution at Darenth; by that you simply meant that they did not pass through the workhouse?—Yes.

7182. The district poor law medical officer certified the case rather than the workhouse medical officer?—Yes.

7183. That was the only difference?—That is the only guide that I have. I find that the certificates were signed by the district poor law medical officer instead of by the workhouse medical officer.

7184. But the medical officers being in each case the poor law official?—Yes.

7185. You mention two classes of institution, one certified by the Local Government Board and the other not. What does certification depend upon in those cases?—The managers apply to us for a certificate. We send our inspector to inspect the institution; he answers certain questions with reference to it, and if we are satisfied we issue a certificate.

7186. Accommodation, cubic space, and questions of that character?—Yes; and also as to whether he is satisfied as to the management, the teaching staff, the nursing staff, the attendants, and so on.

7187. The general management, and facilities for teaching?—Yes; and administration.

7188. This return that you have alluded to from different provincial institutions seems to me to apply only to imbeciles and epileptics?—Yes; but you will see that a great number of them are capable of improvement.

7189. I was coming to that. There is no definition of the term imbecile, I think, anywhere in the return?—I do not think so.

7190. Therefore you cannot tell us whether that term imbecile does include feeble-minded?—It means that they have all been certified as imbeciles, therefore it would not include feeble-minded.

7191. Therefore this further statement of improvable cases applies to imbeciles who are certified as such and to epileptics, and has no reference to the class of so-called feeble-minded?—That is so.

7192. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) Is there any power to compel guardians to send away from workhouses children who are imbecile? May they keep them in their workhouses if they choose?—Yes, they may keep them.

7193. With regard to the Parliamentary Return, may I ask you this question; it refers to imbecile children, I think, in workhouses and in infirmary schools. I suppose it does not include any pauper children who are at their own homes, pauper imbecile children for whom out-door relief is allowed?—No, it does not.

7194. But I think that does take place in some parishes?—No doubt, with feeble-minded children.

7195. Living at home with their friends, and an allowance is made on account of the extra trouble that they are to their friends in looking after them?—Yes, probably by the boards of guardians. The amount of relief that shall be given in any case is a matter absolutely for the discretion of the guardians.

7196. But these, I presume, that we have an account of are those children who are actually resident in the workhouses, and certified as imbeciles by the medical officers of the workhouses?—I understand the term to be that.

7197. But I understand that probably the form is sent to the clerk of the union, and then the medical officer would help in its compilation, would he not?—Certainly.

7198. And so, I think, we may take it that those are certified as imbecile, and if they were simply feeble-minded in workhouse schools would not be included in such return?—A child in the workhouse would not be called an imbecile unless he had been certified.

7199. Do you happen to know at all about the number of feeble-minded children in district schools of the metropolis, those considered feeble-minded and not imbecile?—I cannot tell you.

7200. Or in workhouses?—No.

7201. No official list has been made?—No.

7202. (*Chairman.*) I gather from your evidence that the guardians cannot do much in the matter unless voluntary bodies initiate some measure, or institutions?—That is so.

7203. So that really the whole matter is almost at a deadlock for want of voluntary initiative?—Yes.

7204. And legislation is much wanted to deal with this class of children, as the powers, if they exist, are not sufficiently exercised, and probably do not exist?—Whether they might not be dealt with without legislation is another question. I mean that if voluntary agencies were to come forward, and homes were to be increased to which the children could be sent, we should certainly do all we could to encourage and help them forward, I think.

7205. But if legislation can be enacted offering certain grants to such voluntary institutions from the State, no doubt they would spring up as occasion arose?—No doubt that would be an assistance.

7206. But you do not see any hope or any immediate prospect, or ultimate prospect of any great effort being made without?—No; the number of certified homes throughout the country is largely increasing every year, and as the need for these particular homes is brought before the public, I think probably the number would increase. At present, although we have only certified three homes, we have proposals to certify three more.

7207. But if they saw a prospect of aid from the State that would stimulate it?—Yes, no doubt.

Mr. W. E. Knollys.

30 April 1897.

7208. You must have a wealth of definitions at the Local Government Board. Can you give us a definition of feeble-minded, imbecile, idiot, and lunatic, dividing them into four classes. Would any of your great authorities be willing to give us some workable definition to differentiate the four classes?—I am afraid it would be very difficult. But is there not a definition as to "idiot" in the Idiots Act?

7209. We have one or two Acts of Parliament definitions, and a good many popular definitions; we should be very grateful to you if you could furnish us with one. Who is your senior medical officer now?—For poor law purposes, Dr. Downes.

7210. Would you ask Dr. Downes if he could supply us with any working definitions of these terms; they need not be couched necessarily in scientific terms?—I will certainly ask him, but I think it would be a very difficult task.

7211. You see, the only definition is that "idiot" does not include "lunatic," and "lunatic" does not mean "idiot," that is in the Idiots Act the 25th June 1886. I should think it would be possible, would it not, to draw up some sort of workable definition by tests?—I think it would hardly be possible, it would be so very difficult to say where feeble-mindedness ended and where imbecility began.

7212. Of course there is a border line. Then it also really comes to this, that the guardians can do anything they please, provided they can find a medical officer who is willing to call a feeble-minded child a certified lunatic?—They cannot do anything otherwise. With regard to any feeble-minded children, they can send them to any institution for feeble-minded children provided the institutions are first established.

7213. Quite so, but there is no necessity laid upon them to do so?—No.

The witness withdrew.

Mr. H. E. B. Harrison, Mr. O. Airy, and Mr. A. B. Fisher.

Mr. Heneage Egerton Brydges Harrison, Mr. Osmund Airy, Mr. Ambrose Brewin Fisher, called in and examined.

7214. (*Chairman* to *Mr. Harrison.*) You are Chief Inspector for the Liverpool Division, and are accompanied at this Inquiry by Mr. Airy of the Birmingham Division, and Mr. Fisher of the Plymouth Division?—Yes.

7215. You have all seen this circular, which is addressed to certain inspectors asking you to make inquiries in towns upon the subject of the education of defective and epileptic children?*—Yes.

7216. You have received returns from how many inspectors?—I think it is 22 towns completed. There were 24 that I believe I ought to have received returns from; but, as a matter of fact, I have only received from 22, and those I was asked to tabulate.

7217. And you can tell us the percentages which were arrived at in those towns, which seem to show some degree of variation according to the definition the inspector took perhaps, or for some other reasons?—And from the sources from which he obtained his information, no doubt. Here is an abstract of the total returns received.

Aggregate of returns made to the Circular.

(Enclosure to Circular of the 16th February 1897.)

Number of towns: 22. (*a.*) Population: 4,311,400. (*b.*) Number of children aged 3 to 13: 846,600. (*c.*) Number of children aged 3 to 13 who are absent from school owing to mental or physical defect: 1,062, no return from two towns under this head. (*d.*) Number of children aged 3 to 13 who, being in attendance at school, are defective to a degree which prevents them from receiving proper benefit from the instruction: 3,815. (*e.*) Number of children under heads (*c*) and (*d*) together who may be ranked as imbecile, *i.e.*, incapable of becoming wholly or partially self-supporting: 531, no returns from four districts. (*f.*) Number of children under heads (*c*) and (*d*) who are defective but not imbecile: 3,150, no returns from three districts, and in several (*e*) and (*f*) do not equal (*c*) and (*d*). (*g.*) Are any defective children absent from school who might with advantage be in attendance? Only a few districts give returns under this head. (*h.*) Percentage of (*f*) to (*b*): ·37, but with full returns should be higher. (*i.*) Percentage of (*d*) to (*b*): ·45; percentage of (*c*) and (*d*) to (*b*): ·57.

7218. Perhaps you will tell us what the variation ranges upon?—Disregarding one *nil* return from one small town, Gainsborough, which I believe, ought not to have been sent to me, and those which are obviously incomplete, the variation is from 0·06 at Cardiff, and 0·08 at Hull, to 2·4 in Southampton. It stands about 1 per cent. in Bradford, Halifax, Norwich, and also in Birmingham, if I may take Her Majesty's Inspector's figures given in his report though not in the printed form. (*Mr. Airy.*) That is right. (*Mr. Harrison.*) While several of the large towns, such as Liverpool, Newcastle, Plymouth, Aston, Reading, Merthyr Tydvil, and Swansea, work out at about ½ per cent., the variation being from 4 to 7 per 1,000.

7219. In the case of Hull, can you account for the extremely low return?—It appeared to me from the scant remarks that accompanied the return that it was compiled chiefly from the school board returns, and that the clerk was not very much inclined to believe in the existence of feeble-minded children, or at any rate, to a very small extent indeed. I may say that the total under the heads of (*c*) and (*d*) on that form—the percentage of (*c*) and (*d*) to (*b*) is 0·57.

7220. That is including Hull?—That is including all those towns except Gainsborough.

7221. (*Mr. Pooley.*) (*c*) plus (*d*)?—Yes.

7222. (*Chairman* to *Mr. Airy.*) Perhaps you will tell us how you arrived at your conclusion. Was it entirely through the clerk or through personal inquiries?—Both; but the numbers are somewhat vitiated by the extreme reluctance on the part of a good many of the voluntary schools, especially Roman Catholic schools, to give their figures. They seemed to be under the apprehension that there was a desire to withdraw their children from their schools, and I had a considerable amount of difficulty in getting accurate figures. Indeed, in four cases they utterly declined to give the figures to the emissary of the School Board, and I went round myself, and then I got them. I explained the matter to them and assured them there was no intention of hurting them. But most of my information is got through a really very careful census on the part of the School Board, done in good faith, and with every desire to carry it out accurately.

* For copy of the circular, *see* 6577; "the chief town" being substituted for "three rural parishes."

Mr. H. E. B. Harrison, Mr. O. Airy, and Mr. A. B. Fisher.

30 April 1897.

7223. Did you verify any of the results yourself in the schools to see if they corresponded?—Yes, and they corresponded practically almost exactly, so far as I was able to find out.

7224. (To *Mr. Fisher.*) And is your experience also at Plymouth? How did you proceed in Plymouth?—I saw the clerk of the School Board, and hoped to have met the committee of the board that are dealing with the question, but only one member turned up, and I got all my information from that one member and from the clerk; but I was under the impression that there was no conflict of opinion between the members of the committee. I think I should have heard of it; the clerk would have told me. I think I may take what I have given as the conclusions of the committee on the subject.

7225. And did you verify the numbers by inquiry at the schools?—No, I had not time. (*Mr. Airy.*) Perhaps I may add that if my figures were to be modified, it would be rather in the direction of increasing the number than diminishing it.

7226. (To *Mr. Harrison.*) Will you give us the details of your return from Liverpool?—The Liverpool return was, in the first place, drawn up by the attendance officers, and then supplemented by inquiries addressed to the managers, teachers, and medical officers of institutions in the city, such as the dispensaries and children's infirmary. It was made about the middle of 1895, and forwarded to the Education Department. I think it was in answer to a circular that was issued. The industrial schools, of which there are five, were not included in it, and the figures of those now obtained, and of the private adventure schools separately, may perhaps be of some interest. They are as follows:—Industrial schools, number on rolls, 849; defective children, 21, or 2·5 per cent. Private adventure schools, on the rolls, 1,108; defective children, 23, giving 2 per cent.

7227. How were those returns obtained?—I got those the other day through the clerk of the board specially, after this circular. The private schools are all examined by men appointed by the board; in most cases, I think, clergymen who have had some previous experience in education. The private schools, judging from the reports on them by special examiners appointed by the board, are largely a refuge for delicate children, and there is reason to expect the above returns are rather below the mark.

7228. Then what conclusion did you come to as regards the whole of Liverpool, taking industrial and private adventure schools, as regards the public elementary class?—The return of (*c.*) and (*d.*) under that circular works out at ·67, but that is only for the public elementary schools; it does not include either the private adventure schools or industrial schools; they were not included in the return. That would slightly raise it; it would probably raise it to the full seven per 1,000.

7229. As to attendance of defective children at school, have you reason to suppose that many are kept at home, or do you think the whole number of defective children are to be found in public elementary schools?—The general conclusion of the returns sent to me is that the attendance is fairly satisfactory, but that it is not very zealously encouraged; in fact, it amounts to this, that there is a tendency, I think, for children who are what we may call unacceptable either to absent themselves from school, or in many cases to gravitate towards private adventure and industrial schools.

7230. Does your return include those kept at home by reason of some defect rendering them impossible to be educated in public elementary schools?—Yes, it does; and I can give you the figures. The number of children in Liverpool, the estimated population before the extension of the borough boundaries was 100,000, and 325 were said to be absent from defects; that is to say, that the visitors did not press them to come; they were satisfied that they were not fit subjects for inclusion in a public school.

7231. Were the defects chiefly physical or mental?—I am afraid I cannot tell you that, but I fancy about half and half.

7232. And you think these defective children were to be found more in the voluntary schools than the board schools?—Perhaps, inasmuch as in Liverpool the voluntary schools are chiefly in the worst parts of the town, having specially a very large Roman Catholic population.

7233. (To *Mr. Airy.*) What do you think as regards Birmingham? Are there more to be found in the voluntary schools?—No, I think not, because the conditions are almost reversed with Liverpool. The Board has taken on such a much larger proportion of the population than the voluntary schools have, and gone much lower than the voluntary schools on the whole; but the Roman Catholic schools are peopled very largely by Irish, Irish who have been there three or four generations—Irish who came over at the time of the famine of 1848, and have since been degrading very rapidly through drink; and the priests tell me that the effects come out in the third generation, and there is no doubt that among that low-class Irish population there are a considerable number of defective children. But, speaking generally, I should say the greater number were in the board schools.

7234. But if they were Irish they would be found in the Roman Catholic schools?—Yes, but on the whole the greater number of defective children in Birmingham are in the board schools.

7235. (To *Mr. Fisher.*) What do you say as regards Plymouth?—I am rather at a disadvantage, because I am new to the district, and anything I know is known really through this Committee I am at, and the Clerk of the Board. The Clerk sent round inquiries to all the voluntary schools, and a certain number replied; but, so far as I could see from the replies, the proportion was very much larger on the side of the board.

7236. (To *Mr. Harrison.*) I suppose these defective children are mixed up with dull and backward children when found in school in what is commonly called Standard 0?—Yes, that is the case.

(*Mr. Fisher.*) I think so.

(*Mr. Airy.*) That is not universal with me at all. I find the two plans going; they are either kept in Standard I. (the worst of all plans to my mind), or scattered through the school according to age and physical development, which is a better plan, though not so good as special classes, of course.

7237. (To *Mr. Harrison.*) What test is applied to exempt the children in the case of the 300 excluded from schools?—I cannot find either in Liverpool or in any of the answers I have received that any formal tests are attempted. The decision is sometimes left to the teachers, sometimes to the visitors, and in a few cases to the school board inspector in conjunction with the medical officer of the board, if there is one; while in a few towns the board appear to have a special committee to decide in each case. A medical certificate is often required before total exemption is claimed. In Liverpool the decision is practically left in the hands of the four head attendance officers, who make a full and special report on each case to their superintendent. In practice his decision is based upon the opinion he forms as to whether the magistrate will convict if an attendance summons is issued.

7238. In the case of Liverpool there are no special classes for defective children?—No, nothing has been done at present.

7239. Therefore they are all mixed up with Standard I. in school, and called Standard 0?—I am afraid that is very generally the case. Occasionally, when the deficiency is not very bad, I find a child is promoted and allowed to do what he can in a higher standard.

7240. But he receives instruction in certain subjects apart, and in others mixes with the other children?—I think he takes his chance in the standard in which he is taught.

7241. In some of the boards—I was in Bristol yesterday and in Standard I. in every case there was a pupil teacher attached to the class, who took part of the class in such subjects as reading?—That is the case in Liverpool in many cases; but then there will be no special attention paid to a defective child. He will simply rank with a backward child.

7242. (To *Mr. Airy.*) Is that the case in Birmingham? You have certain special classes in Birmingham, but not sufficient for the population?—No.

7243. The majority of defective children are still mixed up with the dull and backward?—Yes.

7244. How are they treated in Birmingham?—As I was saying, either in Standard I. or scattered about the school. In the second case there is no special provision made for them, and I have not noticed that in Standard I. there is any special provision made for them.

7245. Have they no special instruction apart from other children in any subject?—No.

7246. (To *Mr. Fisher.*) Is that the case in Plymouth?—So far as I have seen, I should say that was so; there is no special notice taken of them. I have had one or two cases where I have asked the question, and they say:

Mr. H. E. B. Harrison, Mr. O. Airy, and Mr. A. B. Fisher.

30 April 1897.

"We let them go up standard by standard; it pleases the "child, and he thinks he is passing the standards, although "he is not." That seems to me sensible. The whole thing is tentative.

7247. Would a child not make more progress if he were allowed to stay for two years in one class?—No, I think not.

7248. Have you any scheme for teaching reading to a child of that sort?—No, I never heard of anything of the kind; they are too small in numbers to begin with; the teachers have no time to expend in teaching them.

7249. Then there is nothing for it but to put them into special classes under special teachers?—I think so, and collecting them.

7250. But it is desirable to retain them in the ordinary school unless they are distressing cases of very defective children?—You mean, if a class were formed in an ordinary school.

7251. Yes?—I think if you could collect them there; but in an average school there are so few that I do not think that they would profit much.

7252. (To *Mr. Harrison.*) If any of you three gentlemen can give us a definition of a defective child, we should be greatly indebted to you?—Mr. Fisher has suggested one in the returns I have. (*Mr. Fisher.*) I may say that it is not my own. (*Mr. Harrison.*) I will read it for him: "A child who, unable, by reason of mental or physical "infirmity, to be taught in an ordinary school, is likely, "under special instruction, to become partly or wholly "self-supporting."

7253. We should all, possibly, agree with that?—No doubt. (*Mr. Fisher.*) There is one other point that I thought should be put in, namely, that you have to exclude those already provided for by the Deaf and Blind Act—that definition does not exclude them.

7254. (*To Mr. Harrison.*) Have you any other definition?—No. Mr. Elliott, Her Majesty's Inspector, Bristol, suggests that the definition should have relation to the power of a child to earn his own living, wholly or partly; and Mr. Rooper, Her Majesty's Inspector, Southampton, would leave the decision in every case entirely to a doctor. I need not say I quite disagree with that.

7255. On what ground do you disagree with that?—The doctor will not be a specialist, for you cannot get a specialist to go all round the country and decide in every case. I do not think you would get a better judgment from a doctor than from somebody who has had a good deal of experience in dealing with these children.

7256. If he were not an expert in mental diseases, you mean?—Just so; I fancy anybody who has had a great deal of experience with these children would be a better judge than an ordinary practitioner.

7257. But such an officer, if he went round at the expense of the State, would be most useful, would he not?—Undoubtedly; but to leave it to a chance medical practitioner in every town in the kingdom, would seem to me to be putting a tremendous power in his hands which he would be quite unable to wield. (*Mr. Airy.*) May I add that I do not think a doctor, at one interview, or even two or three, would be capable of saying whether a child was defective or not. Very often the deficiency will not appear until the person who is forming a judgment has been in company of the child for weeks. I have known two or three cases of that, where a child was proved, afterwards, to be obviously deficient; but where for weeks the peculiar circumstances that brought out the deficiency did not occur.

7258. But you would not have a child rejected at first, but approved on trial for six months or so, and then brought up for judgment again?—Yes; I should trust the opinion of a teacher or somebody in that child's company continually, sooner than I should trust the opinion of a doctor.

7259. Even of a doctor who had seen a great deal of mental disease and could recognise at a glance almost the outward signs?—Yes.

7260. (To *Mr. Harrison.*) As to the co-operation of parents with the school authorities, what have you to say?—There is not much evidence on that point in the returns, but it is pointed out that the removal of these children from their homes would be very unpopular, and that many parents regard these afflicted children with peculiar affection.

7261. But suppose the positive advantages to be gained by removing them from home were shown to the mothers (in extreme cases, I mean) do you think they would be likely to be adverse to it?—I do not think three would be any general opposition in the case that you put.

7262. There is no desire to remove a child that can benefit by an ordinary school in the special class?—It is merely a question whether you can persuade the parents that it is for their children's good; I think then they will acquiesce.

7263. Either in a special class or sending them away?—I think that the inspector who answered this had in view the question of central schools as opposed to classes attached to schools.

7264. We do not find much opposition to special classes attached to schools?—I think there would be no opposition as long as great care is taken, as in London, to call it a special class, and not a special school. If you once have separate schools they would undoubtedly be labelled as the idiot schools.

7265. The children would sleep at home at night even if they went to a central part of the town by day?—It was rather contemplated that if you had those central schools you would either have to provide means of locomotion for the children or keep them entirely.

7266. Which should you prefer, small schools dotted about the town with about 20 each or large central schools with about 100, to which they would be conveyed in the morning and return at night?—I should be inclined to prefer the plan of special classes attached to existing schools, because I think in many cases the association with other children on the way to school and in the playground is valuable; and also because in the case of a class attached to a school there is no labelling of the children directly.

7267. On the other hand, it would increase the cost of education, because if you have a small number like 20 you require considerable classification, and probably 20 in a single school could not be taught by a single teacher?—I regard the question rather from the point of view of large towns. In London there seems to be no serious difficulty on the point.

7268. You would suggest, I understand, some alterations in the Code to meet the cases of these children?—These are the suggested alterations: (1.) That general principles of instruction should be laid down in the Code; (2.) That the maximum number in each class should be prescribed; (3.) That the teachers of these children should undergo some special training; (4.) That the age of instruction should be raised to 16, but there is a good deal of hesitation as to whether this should be made compulsory; (5.) That regulations as to mixed classes are necessary when the instruction is prolonged after the age of 14; and (6.) Inspection in some sort by experts is advised. That is a summary of the suggestions given in the returns submitted to me.

7269. Would you have a scheme placed in the Code of Instruction, we do not place the scheme of instruction of the deaf and blind in the Code, with the view of giving greater freedom to the teachers. Would you not advocate giving greater freedom to the teachers of defective children in the same way?—The wording is "general principles only." I think it might be as general as you like, so as not to fetter the teachers but simply to lay down that certain general lines should be followed.

7270. I do not suppose you know the state of the law as regards sending defective children to school at institutions or homes at present; but we may say it is very little used and requires further legislation to get these children to proper classes or schools. Would you suggest transferring the whole power, as in the case of the blind and deaf children, to the school authorities?—The evidence I have on that point is as follows. There is a general consensus of opinion that enlarged powers are required, and also that special grants should be made. That is what it amounts to.

7271. Have you any suggestion to offer as to the details of the way in which that could be carried into effect?—Only as to certain alterations that would be necessary, supposing that the Blind and Deaf Act were re-enacted with regard to these children *mutatis mutandis*.

7272. *Mutatis mutandis* of course; some of the clauses would not apply in this case?—No; and I should say that supposing that were done there are certain modifications of the Act which were specially suggested by Mr. Fisher.

7273. What are they?—That Section I. should be made to include children between 5 and 16 years of age.

7274. You mean feeble-minded children?—Yes.

Mr. H. E. B. Harrison, Mr. O. Airy, and Mr. A. B. Fisher.

30 April 1897.

7275. You are supposing an Act drawn up for feeble-minded children?—Yes. The next suggestion is that these words should be added to Section II. Sub-section (2) (a) "unlikely to become self-supporting after due probation in a special instruction class." That Section X. should be modified so as to guard against disfranchisement of parents in case of a child being sent from a special class to an asylum; and that Section 12 should be modified so as to secure a minimum grant of 5*l.* per child. I may add to those that I have one suggestion from Mr. Green, Her Majesty's Inspector, Aston, that power should be given to magistrates to remove defective children from homes when they are neglected.

7276. They have that power already if the children are not under proper control?—I doubt if it is a power that is applied except in the very worst of cases.

7277. You have some general remarks to offer founded on the evidence that has been given to you, first, as to the general public apathy on the subject?—Out of the 22 towns from which I have had returns only six have yet practically faced the question; a few affect to disbelieve in any serious amount of defect, and the majority either regard it as insufficient to call for immediate action or have shelved the question for a time and are waiting for a lead. It is pretty clear, however, that most will be prepared to act heartily when their responsibility is brought home to them.

7278. In fact, they want guidance? — They want guidance. In talking with the teachers on the subject I found that many of them take a very curious attitude; they seem to think that the elementary school is the best place for these children, and that three or four years in a preparatory class, which is generally under the weakest teacher in the school, is the proper place for feeble-minded children; they think that so long as the children are treated with kindness, everything that is possible has been done for them. That, I think, merely shows that they have never faced the possibility of special instruction and that possibly in certain cases the explanation given by Mr. Airy just now may account for their attitude.

7279. Then there are other difficulties in the way as to the attitude of parents; but I gathered before that they were generally very favourably inclined, if the children were treated kindly, to allow the children to be sent to special classes?—I think I have already answered that question, it came out under another head.

7280. As regards the opinion of an expert, in one part of your evidence you seemed rather to say that it was not necessary, and in another part you seemed to say it was necessary?—I gave the opinion of my colleagues, not my own.

7281. We should like to have your own opinion as to what points the expert would be valuable upon?—Perhaps the question of an expert is rather a delicate one to handle before this Committee, but I think it is generally admitted that experts are apt to take strong views on their own subject, and that it is not wise to leave uncontrolled authority in their hands. I am inclined to think that the arrangements made for the examination of the deaf schools afford the best solution of the problem. I should suggest the employment of a specialist to visit classes from time to time with the district inspector, and if necessary to consult with and advise him, more especially with a view to determining whether the children are rightly placed.

7282. I think the question for us is chiefly this, we are of opinion that a medical expert should be consulted, but the question is, who is to have the ultimate voice; the inspector or the medical expert?—The ultimate voice should remain with the Department or with the Department's representative, most undoubtedly. The expert should be consultative. As a matter of fact I think it would only be in extreme cases that anybody would be inclined to traverse his decision.

7283. Do you think that the Department would have the courage to go behind a medical certificate given by an expert, who pronounced his decision that the child was in such and such a condition, if Her Majesty's Inspector thought otherwise?—I can imagine cases in which I should certainly have the courage to advise the Department to that effect.

7284. Although it is a question for an expert who knew a great deal of mental disorder and the signs of it, which Her Majesty's Inspector would not be acquainted with, do you think that your own opinion would outweigh that?—No, of course no'. What would be done would be that somebody else would be called in to decide between the two.

7285. That is to say, the expert advice would in the end be the ultimate decision? — Yes, the ultimate decision.

7286. It would not be Her Majesty's Inspector's?—No, but it would not rest with any one man who might see in half the community signs of epilepsy or deficiency.

7287. But, still, the ultimate decision would rest with expert medical advice?—I think it would be hard to go behind that if more than one agreed upon the subject.

7288. Not only hard, but would it be right?—Certainly not if there was agreement amongst experts.

7289. As to the question of age, from 5 to 16 has been suggested, I do not know whether because of the similarity of the Blind and Deaf Act or the Poor Law Acts. Have you any information to give us as to the extension of age?—I think that is owing to the very slow development of these children which requires an extension of age; and there is the further reason that homes and institutions to train them to earn a livelihood will be more willing to receive them, as I understand, at 16 than at 14.

7290. They can be transferred from the school authority to the home?—Yes.

7291. In the case of girls is it not, perhaps, advisable to have them transferred before the age of 16. Have you ever had that question considered?—I understood from a lady who is interested in that school for laundry work, at Knottyash near Liverpool, that they preferred them about 16.

7292. If they leave them in the ordinary schools how will they be trained at the age of 16?—They would like to have them trained first, I think, if possible.

7293. What kind of training do you contemplate?—In the special classes of course.

7294. But we have had evidence that these feeble-minded children are exposed to special temptations before that age. Would you be willing to extend the training to the age of 16 or to transfer them to a home before the dangerous age came upon them?—I would in no case make it compulsory to 16, but I think it might be made compulsory so far that they should be obliged to attend these classes unless it could be shown that they were profitably employed, and being in an institution would, of course, count as profitable employment.

7295. Do any of Her Majesty's Inspectors give any light as to the proper mode of treating children in these schools?—No, I have had no evidence on that point at all; I think very few of us have had any experience at present.

7296. Then, as regards the large towns, you think there would be no difficulty in the financial question, the difficulty would arise rather with regard to the rural places. You think the school board would probably in all cases, when once the duty was shown and some guidance given, set up special classes?—Yes, I think so; but I think unless a fairly substantial grant were given there might be a good deal of hesitation to make as much provision as is necessary in many towns.

7297. It would not be necessary to give as large a grant as in the case of the deaf and blind, because the classes would be larger?—I may say that in all cases of inspectors who have addressed themselves to the financial side of the question, the sum of 5*l.* has been suggested as the amount of the Government grant.

7298. Have you any other suggestion to make?—I have had some evidence—I do not know whether it really comes within the purview of the inquiry or not—but some little while ago the Liverpool School Board had all the children in one of the industrial schools examined by a specialist in deafness, with a view to seeing how far dulness could be connected with deafness, and the results were rather remarkable. If it comes within the purview I will give it to you.

7299. Yes, it is a defect in the child?—The teachers were asked to divide the children according to their estimate into three classes, good, fair, and bad. Every child was then tested by the doctor according to its power to hear the tick of a watch held in turn to each ear, 60 inches being taken as the normal limit for that watch and the number of inches below that limit, if less than normal, recorded in each case for each ear. The results of each of these three classes are given in the following table.

7300. The point you want to bring out is that dulness of hearing is very much connected with dulness of intellect?—Yes. There were 203 children in the school. 62 were designated by the teachers as "bad," and the average hearing distance of these 62 was 31½ inches; 52 children were designated as "fair," and the average mean hearing distance in their case was 47⅝ inches, 89 were designated as "good," and in their case the average mean hearing distance was 51 inches. A further examination of 15 selected as the dullest children gave even more striking results. These results indicated a distinct relation between deafness and dulness, and they seem to suggest the advisability of special instruction for very deaf children who are in the ordinary school quite as much at a disadvantage the as feeble-minded, and I think they also suggest the importance of the application of some tests for deafness such as are now being made for defective sight—especially as I understand that a large number of those cases would, if taken in time, be found curable.

Mr. H. E. B. Harrison, Mr. O. Airy, and Mr. A. B. Fisher.

30 April 1897.

7301. You have nothing to say about epileptic children. You have no statistics at all?—Nothing special about them. Of course, like everybody else, I have come across epileptic children occasionally; but I think that in bad cases of epilepsy the board always report to the guardians, and the guardians, as a rule, find a place for those children in some home.

7302. (To *Mr. Airy.*) Have you any suggestions to make before members of the Committee put questions?—No, I think not. The suggestions with regard to what should be laid down in the Code were, I think, mine? (*Mr. Harrison.*) They were common to most. (*Mr. Airy.*) They correspond exactly with what I have got down. And there was another point with regard to contributions which I said I did not think Mr. Harrison need mention, but I think it is important now. I do not think that contributions could be demanded from the parents of defective children.

7303. You mean of all means, of every description of wealth?—No, I refer to the elementary school class, generally speaking.

7304. Which includes the whole population?—Of course it does technically. Contributions are demanded from parents of deaf-and-dumb children; but with defective children, to whom it is difficult to supply satisfactory tests, and who are often useful at home, you would not be able to get contributions unless it was compulsory. I find that the parents not only find these children very useful at home, and also regard them with peculiar affection, but almost invariably they look upon their children as possessing some peculiar gift. It is most curious. I have talked with parents constantly. They say: "Yes, she is very dull about so-and-so, but she has such-and-such a gift." It is remarkable how they fasten on some very often imaginary excellence; and all those things tend to make it difficult to force parents to give the children up.

7305. (To *Mr. Fisher.*) Have you anything to add?—With regard to alterations in the code, my suggestions were merely, at the time, those of the committee of the Plymouth board. On thinking the thing over, and going into it a little myself afterwards, it struck me that it would be better to keep this outside of the code altogether. I, first of all, began to see what articles would want altering, and the more I went on the more articles seemed to me to have some near or remote bearing on the point; and I think it would be much simplified if we were to keep the whole thing out, and simply put into the code such a definition as would exclude such children's attendances from being reckoned in a public elementary school.

7306. The Department would lay down certain recommendations in a circular which should be a general guide?—Yes, you might draw up any conditions you like, but not in the code for public elementary schools.

7307. You would allow great variety of teaching?—Yes, and I think if you allowed a free hand outside the code you would be likely to draw up a better set of instructions.

7308. I think one of you laid less stress upon their happiness in school than upon their progress?—I think that occurred when I was giving evidence.

7309. We have it in evidence from the medical officers of some of the largest institutions that a knowledge of reading and writing is very essential for the future happiness of these children, and I thought you seemed to neglect that side of the life—the future life—that earning wages was the chief consideration?—I was merely giving the idea of teachers on the point; I was not saying it was my own.

7310. What we want to secure is, besides their preparation for life, such progress in the ordinary teaching of an elementary school as to enable them to find pleasure and happiness in life afterwards?—I quite agree with you. (*Mr. Airy.*) There is only one word I should like to add. It appears to me that the children require different machinery for their education in their different classes; as regards the defective children who are likely to become *wholly* self-supporting, in my opinion the day classes meet the needs of those sufficiently.

7311. Day special classes?—Yes, if encouraged and properly superintended, they can maintain themselves in manufacturing centres where many different trades are carried on. If they are likely to become *partially* self-supporting, I think that institutions are needed, first to train them to work, and, secondly, to give them work after school age; and, if they are likely to be neither wholly nor partially self supporting, they of course need institutions—they are a real danger to society; and the girls especially need institutions. Then, with regard to epileptic children, I consider that they would be better dealt with by guardians and private charity.

7312. (*Mr. Pooley* to *Mr. Harrison.*) In adopting the first section of the Elementary Education (Blind and Deaf Children) Act, do you think that the instruction in an ordinary infant school might be considered sufficient and suitable for a defective child under seven, as a rule?—That is to say, that a child under seven should not be sent to a special class, but should be retained in the infant school.

7313. Yes; I mean, would you consider it satisfactory that a defective child should be retained in the infant school up to the age of seven?—I think that that would rather depend upon what opportunities there were for special instruction; but I should be very sorry to offer a definite opinion about that, because my own experience of the actual instruction has been much too limited. If it is necessary to retain the child up to seven in the babies' class, I think that it would be detrimental to the babies' class and for the grown child; otherwise I see no objection to retaining them in the infant school, but there is no question that they would do much better in a special class, provided that there is a special class attached to that school, or to a neighbouring school, which is readily accessible.

7314. Then you would approve of special grants to be paid for the children up to 16, provided suitable arrangements were made for their instruction?—Certainly; on that, I think, all my colleagues seem to be practically unanimous.

7315. And after what age do you think they would recommend that a special grant should be paid—from what lower age?—I have not addressed myself to that question. You mean whether from five?

7316. For the special grants?—That is to say, whether they should be admitted to the special class before the age of seven.

7317. Yes?—That is a point which I would rather leave to somebody who has had more practical experience to decide upon.

7318. And have you considered whether it would be advisable that the special grants in day classes should be upon the average attendance rather than a fixed sum to each child, as they are in the case of blind and deaf children?—My only doubt in answering that is as to whether, if you pay on each child, you ought not to require a certain percentage of the possible attendances. I think that if you pay on the very bad attenders, it is hardly fair to the State—the State is not getting its *quid pro quo*.

7319. That is one difficulty we find in paying for the blind and deaf—they are paid for if they attend with sufficient regularity—and in day classes it is very difficult to say what is sufficient regularity. I was suggesting that it would be simpler in the case of day classes to pay on average attendance for these defective children?—I should be quite inclined to agree with that, and, of course, in most of the blind and deaf schools the children either come to the centres of instruction from a home, or are resident in the place where they are instructed; and there is much less danger of irregularity.

7320. I understood you to say that the age of instruction should be extended, and that they should be instructed up to 16, but that you did not advocate compulsory attendance up to 16?—Every return that I have, I think, in which the matter is treated at all, recommends that there should be instruction up to the age of 16, but it seemed undesirable that that should be compulsory. I should be inclined to introduce a clause that it should be compulsory, if the child could not be shown to be profitably employed.

7321. Then it is necessary in these cases to persuade the parents to send the child to a certified school. The parents are often unwilling to have their children labelled as feeble minded or children that ought to be in special classes?—

Mr. H. E. B. Harrison, Mr. O. Airy, and Mr. A. B. Fisher.

30 April 1897.

But I understand that every possible means are to be taken to prevent that labelling, by giving the name of special classes and by rather attaching classes to schools than by having special schools which might be called "idiot schools."

7322. Even if all that is done the parent would probably be disinclined, and would rather have his child considered an ordinary child than the child of a special class. And would not this difficulty arise if you had compulsory attendance, that inasmuch as it would depend upon whether the particular child was feeble minded or not whether it could be compelled to stay up to 16 or only up to 14, if you had strict compulsion it would be the parents' interest not to have the child allotted as feeble minded?—I do not think that if you can show the parents that during the present school age you are distinctly benefiting that child they would have any objection to keeping it in the class (for which they are not to pay) from 14 to 16; they will then perceive the combined benefit to be derived from the instruction. But I am not at all convinced that the extension of the age to 16 should not be wholly permissive.

7323. (To *Mr. Airy.*) I want to ask you, on that question of contribution, whether the difficulty of getting payment from the parents would only be important in the case of a child being sent to an institution and not in the case of a child being sent to a day school?—Yes; that question would not arise with me at all, because everything is free.

7324. I thought you said there would be a difficulty as regards contributions?—I was referring to sending them to institutions.

7325. In the few cases in which these children might have to be sent to institutions you would not recommend that such children should be exceptionally dealt with, would you, and that there should be no power to get a contribution from the parents?—I think the imposing of a contribution would make it extremely difficult, from reasons I have mentioned—extremely odious, at any rate, I will not say difficult, because if the law insisted upon it it would be done, but it would make the measure an extremely odious one.

7326. Would you be satisfied with the provision of the Blind and Deaf Act upon that point, which is that the school authority and the parent must agree as to the amount of contribution?—I think it could be done. May I say that I disagree with Mr. Harrison, and I think rather with yourself, on the matter of the method of payment to the classes. The attention is so entirely individual, the teaching is so individual, so personal to the defective child, that one can hardly regard the matter of payment in the same light as in an ordinary school. Where there is a teacher to every eight children, for instance, or something like that, and each child has to be treated as a separate entity almost without relation to any other child, for a long time, then it seems natural and fitting that the payment should be a personal payment for that child.

7327. Rather than upon average attendance?—Yes, rather than upon average attendance, and, further than that, I should be inclined to make the demand for regularity not too onerous, of course having proper safeguards, but not to make it too onerous.

7328. Do you think that these defective children are likely to attend regularly?—Yes, I think they are. They do at Birmingham attend extremely regularly; very regularly indeed to what one might expect.

7329. (To *Mr. Harrison.*) You said something about regulations for mixed classes. Do you think in these defective classes the children might properly be taught together up to 14?—I see no objection to that.

7330. You think that after 14 some regulation should be made?—I think some regulations may be necessary.

7331. As you are making suggestions about the application of the Blind and Deaf Act to this sort of children I should like to ask you whether you see any reason for repealing any existing powers of guardians, as was done under the Blind and Deaf Act?—I am afraid I have not considered that point (*Mr. Airy.*) Would the alternative to that be the placing of the whole matter in the hands of the local authority?

7332. No; as I understand under the Blind and Deaf Act the only elementary education that was given to the blind and deaf children practically was given by the guardians?—Yes.

7333. Then, by the Blind and Deaf Act, the powers of the guardians were transferred to the school authorities?—Yes.

7334. Except in the case of children in workhouses or sent to an institution from the workhouse, and in order to prevent a conflict of jurisdiction, the powers of guardians as to such children were repealed?—I should strongly urge that being done in this case.

7335. We heard from the last witness that the guardians only deal with exceptional cases of feeble-minded children; that is to say, with feeble-minded children who are destitute only, they do not deal with ordinary feeble-minded children?—My object would be to put as much power as possible into the hands of the local authority. I do not know how it is to be done. In the big towns the local authority will do the thing best.

7336. In the hands of the school authority?—Yes, where there is a strong board, and their interest is awakened in the matter, they will do it best.

7337. (*Mr. Newton* to *Mr. Harrison.*) You spoke of a grant of 5*l.*; does that include the fee grant?—I imagine certainly not.

7338. Does it mean 5*l.* on average attendance or 5*l.* per child?—Well, that is rather a new point to me. I have endeavoured to answer Mr. Pooley upon that subject. I do not know what the arguments are with regard to regularity.

7339. But let us assume for a moment that the grant is to be paid on the average attendance. Do you think 5*l.* is too high, or the right amount?—I am not prepared to fix the amount, but I think that the contribution from the State should bear the same proportion to the actual cost of education as it now bears in the case of an ordinary child, taking the country as a whole. Perhaps it might be awarded on a slightly more liberal scale, so as directly to encourage proper provision being made for these children.

7340. If the classes were of the size that they are in London, that is to say twenty or more, then 5*l.* a child would more than cover the cost of instruction and leave a profit, would it not? (*Mr. Airy.*) I have a figure on that that might be useful. In day-classes, where part of the premises of an ordinary school is used, the expense in Birmingham is not quite twice that of an ordinary child; it is 4*l.* 3*s.* 8*d.*

7341. Then you would say a grant of 5*l.* is too high per child?—It is higher than the present expense, but I think the expense will rise rather than drop as we understand the matter better.

7342. (To *Mr. Harrison.*) To how many children of this class would you allot a teacher?—My impression is that 20 should be the maximum number, and that it would be desirable in most cases that the number should be considerably under 20.

7343. (To *Mr. Airy.*) What number would you recommend?—I should say eight or ten as the maximum.

7344. (To *Mr. Fisher.*) Have you ever seen any of these classes?—No.

7345. Have you formed an opinion upon that point?—I feel more inclined to agree with 8 or 10 than 20 as the maximum. (*Mr. Airy.*) May I modify that? I would say eight or ten certainly at the beginning of training; but nothing has struck me more than the remarkable rapidity with which the children improve. The way in which they learn to obey orders (whereas when they come in they cannot even obey orders), and obey orders *en masse*, not merely individually, is very great; so that my suggestion must be modified by that consideration.

7346. (To *Mr. Harrison.*) Have you ever considered the policy of paying an extra grant in respect of stray defective children in ordinary schools for whom special provision in the way of special manual work is provided?—No. That seems to me rather a question for small towns and country schools, of which I have none.

7347. But in outlying parts of big towns it applies?—I think we should have no difficulty, as in London, in collecting the children in Liverpool in special classes.

7348. (To *Mr. Fisher.*) Could the children in Plymouth be collected in special classes, it is a long straggling place?—Yes, I think they would be. I do not know quite what the proposals of the board are. At present they are look-about for buildings, but I think they are, at any rate, for the present, intending to begin with one.

7349. You think that would provide for the whole of the town?—Not as conveniently as centres dotted about, undoubtedly.

Mr. H. E. B. Harrison, Mr. O. Airy, and Mr. A. B. Fisher.

30 April 1897.

7350. Are there any stray children, do you anticipate, in the suburbs of Plymouth that could not go into any possible centre, that must either be treated at their schools or else must be sent to institutions?—Do you mean the epileptic or the defective?

7351. I am speaking of the defective class, not the epileptic?—Plymouth has been a good deal extended now, they have just made it larger; and I think, certainly, in the outlying districts it would be difficult for the children to get to one centre.

7352. I ask that because there are places in London where the children are out of reach of any conceivable centre?—I do not think it is impossible. I think at present Plymouth is in a state of transition. I think they propose extending the trams, and that kind of thing, that may perhaps meet the case to a great extent.

7353. If not, what would you suggest for children of those outlying districts that are practically on the same footing as rural districts?—I do not know that I have thought of that.

7354. You have not considered the point whether it would be possible to give them some special manual work in their schools under the care of their teachers?—I do not think it would be very valuable.

7355. (To *Mr. Harrison.*) If a medical expert was appointed to assist the department inspector, how often would you propose that he should visit each class in England, would once a year be sufficient?—He should certainly, I think, visit each district once a year, as the inspector's assessor and adviser; but I do not think it would be necessary that he should visit each class.

7356. If he visited two or three classes in each district, do you think that would be sufficient?—If he visited two or three classes in each district, I think that would be in all probability sufficient for one to make full use of his skill as an expert and specialist.

7357. (To *Mr. Airy.*) I only wanted to ask whether the division of time between manual work and ordinary work at Birmingham is satisfactory?—I think so at present.

7358. What is the division?—It is practically about half and half, practically almost an equal division of time.

7359. And you would recommend that to be followed generally, then?—No, I do not go so far as to say that; I have not had experience enough to lay down any dictum of that kind, but it seems to me at present to fulfil the purposes very fairly; it is only in the initial stages.

7360. So far as it goes it seems to work satisfactorily?—Yes, but it varies very much with the individual child—there comes in the individuality again, which is to my mind the key.

7361. The moral is that the teachers should bother very little about the time-table?—You should give them as much freedom as you can.

7362. (*Dr. Smith* to *Mr. Harrison.*) If the real object in view in establishing these classes is to be maintained, it is necessary, is it not, that the admission of children into them should be safeguarded?—Most certainly.

7363. And you think it is desirable that, except in very obvious cases, all such children should be for a period of, say, six months in the infant department?—No, I am not prepared to say that, for this reason; that supposing the child is eight or nine years old, and of normal growth, it will be a very disturbing element in the infant department, and distinctly unfair to the teacher and children in that department.

7364. Well, the child would have been at school before it is eight or nine, in all probability?—But I thought your supposition was that the child of eight or nine should be kept there.

7365. No?—Then, perhaps I did not quite understand it.

7366. I mean before the child is admitted to such special class there should be a probationary period spent in an elementary school—in the infant department obviously?—I imagine in most cases it will be so, but I am not prepared to say that in every case it must necessarily be so.

7367. In very obvious cases there would be no necessity, of course; but speaking as a rule?—I think in practice you will find it is so.

7368. I put the question because you said that the opinion of the teacher would be much more valuable than that of a medical man as regulating the admission into these classes?—That was Mr. Airy.

7369. I think you said—you quoted from some report that you had and said you disagreed with it?—No, that was Mr. Airy about the teachers most undoubtedly. (*Mr. Airy.*) Yes, I followed that up.

7370. (To *Mr. Harrison.*) You quoted from a report, and there was some one of your correspondents who said that medical opinion was essential?—Oh, yes—Mr. Rooper would leave the decision in every case entirely to the doctor.

7371. And you disagreed with that?—Yes, I disagree with that, for this reason—that it would come to be decided by a general practitioner.

7372. Excuse me one moment. You say you disagree with that?—Yes.

7373. Then if the child has not been in a school how could the teacher give any opinion as to the capabilities of that child? I understood you to say that the opinion of a teacher was to be preferred to that of a medical expert?—That was not exactly it. I said that I disagreed with the decision in every case being left entirely to a doctor—that was all I disagreed with.

7374. But you mentioned about the teachers; I have got a note of what you said?—That was Mr. Airy.

7375. I think Mr. Airy said something about it; but I do not quite follow whether, when you are speaking of a medical man, you are speaking of an ordinary general practitioner?—Yes, certainly; and that is what I understood that Mr. Rooper, who made the suggestion, meant.

7376. You mean any practitioner who might accidentally be called in because he was near the case, or in some such way?—Or a general practitioner, perhaps, who did work for the school authority, the school board, or whatever the local authority might be.

7377. That is rather a difference?—I do not quite see that.

7378. You do mean a general practitioner in that sense—a specially appointed officer to the board?—Well, if you like it, yes.

7379. There is a great difference between such a medical practitioner and a medical practitioner with no connection with educational work?—Oh, you mean to say that a man in that case would devote his special attention to this subject, and would be in the position of a specialist?

7380. No. If you will tell me exactly what you mean when you use the phrase "medical man" in this connection I shall be obliged?—Perhaps I can explain it in this way. I understand Mr. Rooper's suggestion is that he would admit nobody to these classes unless approved by a doctor. I think that is perfectly and entirely unnecessary.

7381. That is what I understood you to say?—Yes.

7382. Then I asked you for the definition of your doctor?—I put it of any doctor, that it is not necessary to call in a doctor.

7383. You do not think a medical opinion in such a case is necessary at all?—Not in every case. This was a sweeping assertion that the decision in every case should be left to a doctor—it seems to me that that is perfectly unnecessary, that there are many cases which are so obviously clear that one does not want to call in a doctor at all.

7384. You mean that the case is obviously too bad?—Too obvious, I will say.

7385. (*Chairman.*) But you have not answered the question. By obviously too bad you mean a lower line?—I would rather say that the case is an obvious one.

7386. (*Dr. Smith.*) By that you mean that anybody can see that the child is defective?—Yes.

7387. Does not, then, the question arise whether the case is properly admissible into a class?—I can only answer that by saying that the way I looked at it would be that there would be specialists to go round.

7388. You are not answering my question?—I do not understand the question.

7389. You say the case would be so obvious as to be admissible. Then I say might not the question arise whether the case is not too bad even to be admitted into such a special class?—I beg your pardon. Yes, I can answer that, I think—that where there was any doubt about a case, then expert opinion must be called in to give a decision on it.

Mr. H. E. B. Harrison, Mr. O. Airy, and Mr. A. B. Fisher.

30 April 1897.

7390. Very well. Then you spoke afterwards of a specialist. It was in a different connexion altogether that you used that phrase, I think?—No, I do not think so.

7391. What is your definition of the word "specialist" in this connexion?—I will say a man who has given his attention almost entirely to the case of, we will say, diseases of the mind in children, or of all these causes that lead to feeble-mindedness.

7392. You mean a lunacy expert—an expert in the department of mental diseases?—Yes, I suppose that would be it. You, probably, know what the definition is, and whether lunacy is included or not, better than I do.

7393. That is a general term which is applicable?—Yes.

7394. Then, is it a gentleman of that class that you think would be desirable as a referee in these cases?—Most certainly.

7395. But you would not leave with that official the ultimate decision relative to a case?—I may say I intended no disrespect whatever to the specialists, but what I feel is this: That I think a specialist should not have uncontrolled authority with practically no appeal against his decision—that that would be a bad thing—and that the general conduct of this business had better go through the ordinary officers of the Education Department who are responsible for it, and I would rather have the specialist in the position of an assessor, much in the same way as nautical assessors sit in the Court of Admiralty.

7396. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) Supposing a "specialist" were to be attached to the Education Department, would you have the same objection to his being the final authority if he became an official, and the matter went through the machinery of the Education Department?—My point is this: That I do not want to see any specialist give a decision from which there is no appeal; that is to say, that any one man should be able to say: This child is a feeble-minded child and must be legally regarded so and treated so.

7397. But may I ask you whether you have in mind that the specialist would form his opinion simply from his own observation, and not from information that he had derived, either from Her Majesty's Inspector or from the teacher from whom Her Majesty's Inspector, I imagine, would derive his information. Do you suppose that a specialist (to use the term) would think that he had a decisive insight without collateral information?—No, certainly not; but in no case would I leave him to decide without a possible appeal—that is all I want to safeguard.

7398. Then, passing to the return we have before us, might I ask amongst these 22 towns is Liverpool included?—Yes.

7399. Is Manchester also one?—Yes. I will give you the list if you would like it.

7400. I was particularly interested in those two towns—cities I ought to call them, I suppose—because, in former times, I used to go to each of them a good deal, and I hoped that by this time they would have had some special classes formed; but they have not, have they?—Well, you know, I think, the reason was this: The return upon which these figures were based was called for in the year 1895. The board have been very particularly busy since that with a great many schemes, and I think there has been a disinclination to face a new one. I think that will explain, to a very large extent, our apparent apathy on the subject.

7401. It is not that they really have made up their minds that it is unnecessary, but that they have not had time to attend to the matter?—They have had other very pressing things to deal with.

7402. (*Chairman* to *Mr. Harrison.*) You said in your evidence that you thought that the school boards would readily co-operate in doing this work of providing for defective children, and we have the case here of a large place—the Borough of Bournemouth, with a population of 37,000, with no school board, the town council of which have had a case brought before them. The case was a child neither deaf nor dumb, but defective, and it was excluded from St. Andrews School in that borough because it was thought not to be a fit inmate for the infant school. The mother appealed to the Education Department and they consulted the correspondent. The correspondent said that the boy required close and individual attention, which they could not give him in the school, and that he was found incapable of receiving instruction, he had a capacity for stupid mischief, and no impression could be made upon him. The correspondent then goes on to detail certain other habits the child had, which shows he was an unfit inmate for the school. Then, after some other correspondence, they were allowed to exclude him from that school. The correspondence was referred to this Committee, and the secretary wrote to the Town Council, who are the education authority for the place, and described the case to them and asked if they would supply us with information as to the number of children in Bournemouth defective, and whether they might not do something for this child in particular. The answer of the Town Council was to this effect: "With reference to your inquiry as to whether the "council think the Blind and Deaf Act, 1893, might "properly be extended to provide for these cases, the "Council direct me to say that it seems desirable that "special means of education should be provided for all "children who are so defective as to require individual "attention. The education in elementary schools is "necessarily carried on in classes, and the discipline and "progress of such classes is interfered with by the presence "of defective children who at the same time derive little "if any benefit from their attendance. If a suitable "school were provided within a reasonable distance of the "town to which defective children could be sent upon "similar terms to children within the scope of the Blind "and Deaf Act, 1893, it would, perhaps, be an advantage "for a few of these children. But if the school is at a "distance the Act is very difficult to work owing to the "opposition of the parents. As a rule parents object very "much to this class of child being taken away from the "fostering care that they receive at home. Most of these "cases, indeed, are rather subjects for medically supervised "homes than for educational establishments." The number of children sent us from Bournemouth is: Imbecile 5, Epileptic 1, Dumb 4, and 12 others may be said to be more or less mentally affected. So it appears that this Town Council (and you may take it as a fairly typical Town Council) were quite willing to set up such a class if legislation enabled them to do so on similar terms to those of the Blind and Deaf Act. They think that these children should be treated rather in their own town, some under medically supervised homes and some in the schools of the borough. That seems to agree with what you said as to the school authorities being willing, if leave was given to them, if an Act were passed enabling them to provide for the education of defective children?—I think so entirely.

The witnesses withdrew.

Adjourned to Wednesday next at 11 o'clock.

FIFTEENTH DAY.

Wednesday, 5th May 1897.

PRESENT:

THE REV. T. W. SHARPE, C.B., IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. H. F. POOLEY.
Mr. A. W. NEWTON.
Dr. G. E. SHUTTLEWORTH.
Dr. W. R. SMITH.
MRS. BURGWIN.
Miss TOWNSEND.

Mr. H. W. ORANGE, *Secretary.*

Miss MARGARET HODGE called in and examined.

Miss M. Hodge.

5 May 1897.

7403. (*Chairman.*) You have made a special study, I understand, of the schools in Germany for feeble-minded children?—I have.

7404. Are you able to offer us any definition of feeble-minded?—In Germany, I think, a feeble-minded child is defined as a child who is incapable of doing the work of an ordinary school.

7405. Both mentally and physically incapable?—Yes, I have no other definition to offer.

7406. And they have in Germany a certain test, that if a child fails to accomplish in two years the work which in ordinary schools should be done in one year, then he has to go through an examination?—If he remains in the lowest class in any school, either the gymnasium, the middle-class school, or the people's school, for more than two years, then he has to go through a special medical examination, and an examination by the director of the school.

7407. What do you call the lowest class of school, the Untere-bürger-schule?—I did not mean the lowest class of school; I meant the lowest class in any school.

7408. The medical officer joined with the director of the school in the examination?—Yes, because they find very often that the director of the school does not really know how to distinguish between laziness and mental incapacity, and so they have to call in the doctor.

7409. Not after two years experience?—No, not after two years experience. The child also goes through an examination afterwards by the director of the backward school.

7410. Then if those two individuals agree to pronounce the child to be incapable of doing the work of the school, he is allowed to be excused from attendance at school, and the parents are advised to send him to the Hilfs-schule?—They are not obliged to send them.

7411. The Hilfs-schule corresponds to our special school?—Yes, the same as your special schools.

7412. It does not differ from them in any way, I think?—Yes, it does differ, because so far as I have seen you have much larger classes in your special schools than they have in Germany in the Hilfs-schule.

7413. Is that the only difference that you have noticed between the two schools?—That is the chief difference.

7414. Then if the child cannot do the work in the special class after two years probation, he is excused from school attendance of any kind?—Yes.

7415. He is not sent to any place where he can learn a trade, and so become able to earn his own living?—No, because he is supposed to be idiotic if he cannot do the work of the special school, and the parents are advised either to send him to an institution for idiots, or else to get special instruction for him at home; but that special instruction at home is never a success, I believe.

7416. Compulsion is not enforced?—No, his education is neglected.

7417. Education is compulsory, of course, in the ordinary schools?—Yes, but not for idiots.

7418. But not in the case of the weak-minded children?—No; it is also not compulsory in the case of weak-minded children; it is left to the choice of the parents whether they will send them to the special school or keep them at home, but the parents are also advised to send them to the special school.

7419. Are there many such children who are kept at home, or are they generally sent to special classes?—Herr Kielhorn tells me that in Brunswick, where the schools have existed for 16 years, there is never any difficulty, when a child is declared incapable of doing the work of an ordinary school, about sending him to his school. The parents are only too eager to do so, but in the towns, where there is not so much known of the schools, and their working has not been seen, and the effects of the schools cannot be so well judged of, then the parents are reluctant sometimes to send their children.

7420. Such a school used to be called a feeble-minded school, I believe?—Yes, the Schwach-sinnige-schule.

7421. Now it is called the Hilfs-schule?—Yes.

7422. Do you think that that change of name has done a great deal to remove the reluctance of the parents to send their children to it?—Yes.

7423. Is our name "special school" inferior to "Hilfs-schule"?—No, I do not think so. I think it is quite as good a name. It does not necessarily mean that the children are mentally deficient.

7424. Do you know what is done with backward children who are not absolutely sent out of the ordinary schools after the two years' probation, or do you go so far as to say that after two years' probation a backward child is sent out of the ordinary schools?—Yes, if on medical examination they are pronounced to be unable to do the work of the ordinary school then they are sent out.

7425. If they are very dull and backward are they allowed to stay there?—No, because no child is allowed to stay more than two years in a class in the ordinary school; they are then sent out of it.

7426. What becomes of them if they are not feeble-minded after that time?—They are all considered feeble-minded if they are unable then to do the ordinary work in the ordinary school.

7427. They seem to be stronger minded in Germany than we are, because I notice that in Brunswick, a town of 120,000 inhabitants, only 160 children have passed through the special school in the 16 years that have elapsed since its establishment?—That is more than 1 per 1,000.

7428. But we are afraid that it may be 1 in 100 that requires special help; but you say in Germany it is about 1 in 1,000?—I think I should like to say with regard to that, that it struck me in Germany that the children were at a lower standard; they have a lower standard in the ordinary school.

7429. I see really it is very much the same in Brunswick as it is in England, about 1 in 100 of the school population?—Quite so; I was speaking of the whole population.

Miss M. Hodge.

5 May 1897.

7430. And they manage in Brunswick to conciliate the parents, so that they are willing to part with their children?—Yes; indeed they are quite eager, and in Hanover when the school was started in 1892 they had 60 applications sent in from the parents before the school was ready; Dr. Wehrhahn, the school inspector, told me that.

7431. In fact, the way is prepared for these special classes; are the parents told beforehand, or is it this regulation of two years' probation that makes the parents aware that their children are not fit for the ordinary school?—It is the two years' probation. The child has always been to an ordinary school first, because six is the earliest age at which a child goes to school in Germany, and the youngest child in a backward school is always eight years of age, because it has been two years in an ordinary school.

7432. Does this apply to the whole of Germany?—I am afraid it only applies to North Germany and Saxony. Those are the only parts of Germany that I know.

7433. We have a long list of towns here, but I think they all come from Saxony or North Germany?—The schools in Saxony are by far the best.

7434. Now you visited some of the special schools abroad?—Yes.

7435. And you have visited some in England?—Yes.

7436. Can you institute any comparison between the two as to the system pursued. Perhaps you will describe the system pursued abroad?—Abroad there is one great defect, I think, in the German schools, that is to say, that they only employ male teachers except in the school at Aix-la-Chapelle, where they have a woman teacher for the lowest class, but, as a rule, in German special schools they have only woman teachers for needlework, and for no other subject at all; but all the classes are taken by men.

7437. Are they so unscientific, then, as to think that the lowest class can have an inferior teacher in the shape of a woman?—I am afraid throughout Germany that is the idea.

7438. We hold in England that the lowest class wants the most skilful teacher; and I think we are wise in putting women there?—I think that men-teachers are not as good as woman-teachers for these children, because they are not so patient. In a great many instances I saw a great deal of kind and loving patience on the part of men-teachers; but it seemed to me that they make the great mistake of overlooking the girls and teaching the boys.

7439. What made you feel that, was it because the girls seemed dull?—The girls were exceedingly dull, and in the upper classes of the schools there never were any girls, the boys always got to the upper classes; there was almost a much larger proportion of boys in the top class; there were only two or three girls in the top class.

7440. Was that accepted in Germany as the natural condition of things?—I am afraid that they have a very much larger proportion of boys in these schools altogether. In all the schools that I visited three-quarters or two-thirds of the children were boys.

7441. How do you account for that?—I asked the directors of the schools to explain it, and they said that they did not expect so much of the girls in the ordinary schools, and they let them remain in the schools when they were feeble-minded; they did not mind whether they went up from class to class. In Leipsic they have special system of classification which I thought very good, and which I have not seen in any other German school, and I do not think it is pursued in England. They classify the children according to subjects, and then the children remain with those who are about on a par with them and emulation is really able to come in.

7442. That would require a certain amount of cross classification, would it not?—It may be rather difficult to carry out, but it seemed to me that it would be a better classification, because, as you know, one child may be good at reading who is very feeble at arithmetic, and will never make any progress when it is put in a class with children who are at all ahead of it.

7443. We have sometimes in England cross classification in arithmetic; does it go beyond that?—Yes, they classify all the different subjects; there is a classification for Scripture, there is a classification for reading, there is a classification for writing, and there is a classification for arithmetic.

7444. So that the same lessons were going on in the same school at the same time always?—Yes; but that school at Leipsic is the only school where I have seen it. I have never seen it in any other school.

7445. The curriculum of the school includes a large amount of manual labour?—Yes.

7446. What is the sort of manual work in which girls are trained?—Needlework only, and a great deal of knitting. The boys have wood-carving and carpentering and bookbinding; they call it papparbeit in Germany; it is all sorts of paper work.

7447. And they give a great deal more time to singing and composition, and the forming of complete sentences, and correct enunciation and pronounciation, and they also cultivate all their senses, speech and hearing, and so forth; and I find that many children suffer from defective senses?—Yes, I think that is more the rule in German schools than in English schools, so far as I know.

7448. Are blind and deaf children mixed up in the same classes with other children?—Not children who are totally blind and deaf, but the partially blind and deaf children, children who cannot see at all well, and children who are very deaf, are.

7449. Do you think that that is wise?—No, I think that is a great mistake in German classification. I think that they should not put the children that are deficient in hearing or deficient in sight with the others.

7450. And they confine a great part of the teaching to the practical work of life, such as taking them out to buy things?—They give lessons in class on that, and they give lessons in stamping letters, stamping parcels, and buying railway tickets, and going imaginary journeys.

7451. And the lessons are shorter in Germany than they are here?—Yes, the lessons are only 20 minutes. The German lesson is generally from 45 to 50 minutes in the ordinary schools, and the lessons of the Hilfsschule are only 20 minutes, and they are frequently diversified by the introduction of a song or drill.

7452. Do they have more lessons in the course of the morning, or the same number as the other children, though shorter?—They have more lessons in the course of the morning, but they have a longer period in the middle of the morning for recreation.

7453. Now these schools are all set up by the municipal authorities?—Yes, they are entirely dependent upon the town, not upon the Government at all.

7454. Do they erect special buildings for these classes?—In some cases, but in some cases they use ordinary houses where, of course, the accommodation is not very good. At Aix-la-Chapelle they have a very poor building.

7455. Then they do build special schools; can you describe the construction for us; how are they arranged?—I am afraid I have never seen any school that was built specially for a special school. I have seen one that was built for an ordinary school and was used for a special school.

7456. They think it is sufficient to hire a house or some other building?—Yes.

7457. And do they allow a larger space in the class-rooms, and more playground accommodation for these children than we do here?—I do not think that I found it so in any instance.

7458. In fact, an ordinary house would have no playground attached to it?—No; I think the only thing was that at Brunswick they have smaller classes, so that they have more space, because Herr Kielhorn always insists upon limiting the classes to under 20; he has never more than 20 in a class.

7459. But the buildings are generally inferior, and the teaching is inferior to that of the ordinary schools?—I do not think the teaching is inferior; that is not at all my experience. The teachers are very enthusiastic, and in most instances I should say that they are superior to the teachers in ordinary schools.

7460. In Brunswick, how many children have they in a class?—There are four classes in the school.

7461. What is the size of the classes?—In Brunswick the largest class that I saw was 20, and Herr Kielhorn says that he does not think that you can teach more than 20 of these children in a class, because they require so much individual attention.

7462. The auxiliary school in Brussels consists, I think, of five classes; the total number of children is 136, and the classes are made up as follows:—27, 31, 26, 28, and 24?—Yes, I saw one class of 24.

7463. And they wish to diminish the number of children in the class?—Yes, Herr Kielhorn says that the ideal state would be to have about 15 in a class.

7464. Would the size of the class be larger as the children got higher up in the school?—Yes, you can have a larger class as the children get higher up in the school. I should think it would be possible to have larger classes there, but I do not know whether that is followed out in all the schools.

7465. Up to what age do the children stay in the classes?—They stay eight years in the school and they come at eight years old, so they stay till 16 years of age. Some stay until they are 17 or 18 years old.

7466. Because they come in later?—Yes, they can stay until they are 17 or 18, but they do not stay later than 16. There was a case of a child at Brunswick, a girl who had come in at 13 years of age because she had remained in the ordinary school till 13 and had made no progress, and it was only then that her parents awoke to the fact that she was a backward child.

7467. Had not the school awoke to the fact before that?—I think they had, but it was a private school, and they wanted to keep her, I suppose.

7468. In Dresden I think there are two special schools?—Yes, one for the Neustadt and the other for the Altstadt.

7469. And one boarding-house for backward children?—Yes; about that I know nothing, because it has only been started lately, but I heard from Herr Keilhorn that there is a boarding-house called Schrötische Anstalt, but it is 1,500 marks a year for each child and that seems a prohibitive price for poor children; it cannot be for poor children if it is 1,500 marks a year—that is 75*l.*

7470. What is your opinion of the system in Germany—that it is working well?—I think it is a good system, but I think it has certain defects. One defect which I have already mentioned is in their having men-teachers instead of women-teachers. A second defect is that I think the classes are in some instances too large; for example, in Aix-la-Chapelle and Leipsic the classes were sometimes too large. But there are certain very good points about the system in Germany: One is the great variety of work that is given; and another is the shortness of the lessons and the short school hours. In Dresden they have only 15 hours for the lowest classes a week, and for the upper classes 30 hours a week.

7471. Have they any trade-teaching?—They teach carpentering, but they have no selected training for special trades, at least I do not think they have; I never saw any. In Dresden they have a great deal of manual training.

7472. About 80 per cent. of the children appear to be able to earn their own living?—Is it so large a percentage as that?

7473. I will read the numbers. In Aachen 68 per cent.; in Düsseldorf, 80 per cent.; in Cologne, 87 per cent.; in Brunswick and Crefeld, 90 per cent.; in Dresden, Halberstadt, and Hanover, 100 per cent. earn their own living?—I did not know it was so high a per-centage as that. I think the girls do not succeed so well as the boys. The girls generally go to domestic service or return and do work at home. If you look through the list of those who are occupied in after life in Brunswick, you will find that the girls generally go to domestic service or return and do work at home.

7474. The fact is that of 71 that left Elberfeld, only four became domestic servants, and 13 went to housework at home. The rest were boys?—Yes.

7475. But we have not any evidence as to the relative numbers of the boys and girls there?—There is probably a rather larger proportion of boys than there is of girls; there always is in the class.

7476. Do these children mix with other children in the streets, and how are they treated by them?—They have a special playground for themselves in those special schools; they do not mix much with the other children; it is supposed to be bad for them to mix with the other children, because they laugh and mock at them.

7477. Then there seems to be a rule that they are not to receive children who are deficient in hearing or in sight?—But they do. I suppose they do not receive children who are absolutely deaf or absolutely blind; but children who have defective sight or defective hearing they certainly do receive.

7478. I suppose it is the only place that is open to these poor children really?—Yes, I suppose so. I think another defect of the German system is that they teach a great deal too much Scripture, and one finds that the children cannot understand it; it takes up a large proportion of the time. That is because they are so anxious to prepare the children for confirmation from the first.

7479. But the number of hours given to religious instruction is four hours and a half; it seems to be the same in all three classes?—I think that in nearly all the schools they have about that proportion given to religious instruction, and it is really as a preparation for confirmation and it is simple word knowledge; the children do not seem to understand what they learn at all.

7480. It is about the same proportion as in our English schools?—I did not know that. Then again, another defect of the system is that there is a great deal too much learning by heart, I think, because you often find that the children do not really understand what they have learnt at all. For example, a child gave a very eloquent discourse upon David and Goliath; but when he was asked afterwards why David went out to meet Goliath, he replied: "I suppose he went to take his father his dinner." He had not the least idea.

7481. Did you examine any of the classes yourself?—Yes, I asked the children some questions, but they were very much overawed at having a stranger to ask them.

7482. You did not get much out of them?—No.

7483. What did you examine them in?—I asked them some questions in arithmetic, and that is a difficult subject always.

7484. How high had they got in arithmetic—as high as fractions?—In the top form at Brunswick I think they were as high as fractions; but I do not think I ever found another form that was doing fractions.

7485. What proportion of the children in these classes were feeble-minded?—There was one little boy who was very quick at arithmetic; but I think he was deficient in other subjects. When he came to write down a sum he could not make his figures properly, and I do not think he would have been able to do up to practice and decimals.

7486. Did you see many cripples among these children?—I saw a good many cripple children, particularly in the girls' department. I saw a good many girls who were partly paralysed in the hand.

7487. Were they not fit to go into other schools in regard to their intellect, or were they slightly imbecile as well?—They were slightly imbecile as well; that is to say, they were backward, certainly.

7488. If they had been ordinary normal children, would they have gone into the ordinary school?—Yes.

7489. As regards epileptics, did you find any of them?—No, I do not think I ever met with any epileptic children in any of the schools. Are the epileptics sent to special schools here?

7490. Unless they are very severe cases they are. Then the German system is that for two years they are tried in the ordinary school, and for two years in a special class, and after that they are disqualified from all school attendance?—Yes, if they are found to be idiotic; but I think it very rarely happens that they are found to be idiotic, because such a careful examination is made of them by the director of the special school before he admits them, and he refuses to take any children on the ground of idiotcy if on the examination he finds them idiotic. A case occurred when I was at Brunswick. A child came in with his father, and Herr Kielhorn examined the child, and said it was a hopeless case—he could not take him. He ought to

Miss M. Hodge.

5 May 1897.

Miss M. Hodge.

5 May 1897.

go to the idiot asylum if he went anywhere, because it would be bad for the other children.

7491. Do you know what proportion of the children are excused on the ground of idiotcy or on the ground of danger to other children?—I do not.

7492. (*Mr. Pooley.*) You said that the size of the classes in the Hilfs-schule was much larger than it is in England?—Much smaller, as a rule, I think.

7493. I understood you to say it was much larger?—No, in England you have quite large classes, have you not?

7494. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) No, ours are smaller than those in Germany?—The only class that I saw was 40 in the Walworth Road School.

(*Mrs. Burgwin.*) There were about 60 children on the roll, but there were three teachers and three classes.

7495. (*Mr. Pooley.*) You spoke about the classes in the school at Brunswick, which you thought were under 20 children?—I know I saw a class of 20, and Herr Kielhorn told me that he liked them to be under 20 children,

7496. By this return that we have before us the classes seem to be between 20 and 30 children in Brunswick; how are they in other places as to size?—I am not absolutely certain of the exact number, but in Aix-la-Chapelle there were 24 in a class, I know in one of the classes.

7497. Do they usually run to larger classes or smaller classes?—Just over 20, I should say, between 20 and 30 generally.

7498. Then, as to the passing out of the class in two years, have you visited many ordinary schools to see the kind of children that are able to pass out in two years?—I visited a good many of the Volks-schulen in Aix-la-Chapelle.

7499. What does it practically amount to—do they practically pass out in two years all the children that are not feeble-minded?—The system in Germany is very different from the system in England, because the children are not supposed to get through a certain amount of work in two years. They are questioned by the inspector, and if they have dealt intelligibly with the work that they have done they are passed on to the next class. The whole system of inspection is different in Germany, it seems to me, from what it is here, because the inspector is very often familiar with the school and is very well known to the children; he is a teacher himself, and questions the children like an ordinary teacher. If he finds that they have really intelligently understood what they have done in the two years then they pass on to the next class; they have not to get through a certain amount of work. Of course, they have a code, but the inspectors are very indulgent as to the amount of work in the code that they have accomplished if they have done that amount intelligently.

7500. So that a merely backward child, if he had ordinary intelligence, would succeed in getting out of the class in two years?—Yes, quite so.

7501. You were telling us about the male teachers. Were you speaking then of the ordinary schools or of the Hilfs-schule?—The Hilfs-schule; but in an ordinary girls' school no women teachers, I think, above the fourth form. I think it is only men that teach the upper forms. Men teach the third, second, and first forms.

7502. Are they mixed schools?—All the Hilfs-schulen are mixed schools, and all the special classes are here, I imagine.

7503. Are the ordinary schools mixed schools?—No, the Germans would be horrified, I think, at the notion of mixed ordinary schools. They only have mixed schools for Hilfs-schulen for economy's sake, because in a small town they could not afford to have one for each sex.

7504. But in the mixed schools the girls' classes are taught by male teachers, you say?—Yes, the three upper classes; that is because women are supposed to be incompetent.

7505. (*Miss Townsend.*) Can the feeble-minded children leave before their time is up in the Hilfs-schule?—I think they generally stay till the end of the course, but there would be no compulsion on them to stay There can be no compulsion because it is entirely at the choice of the parents whether they send their children there or not.

7506. They are not compulsory schools in the sense that the ordinary schools are?—No, I think they cannot be, because the children's health might fail.

7507. Is the two years in the ordinary school the only test? Can a teacher send children at any time from the ordinary school, or only when they pass out of the lowest class?—If they pass out of the lowest class into the next class, the presumption is, I suppose, that they can keep pace with the work of the school.

7508. So that after that they have no choice?—No; but if a child came into a class higher than the lowest; supposing a child came into the fifth class in the school, and it was found after two years that he could not keep pace with the fourth class, then the teachers could send him to the Hilfs-schule.

7509. So that two years in any class is the test?—Yes.

7510. Are the children ever returned to the normal school from the Hilfs-schule?—Yes, I think there have been some instances of it. Sometimes it has been simply a temporary illness that has disabled a child from doing the work.

7511. You said that the school hours were very short, that they very often did only 15 hours a week?—I think not very often. I think it is only in Dresden that the lowest class does 15 hours a week; the highest class does 30 hours.

7512. What do they do with the children during the rest of the hours of the week; do they take any supervision of them except during the 15 hours?—At Brunswick, where there is only one school, the teacher supervises all the play in the afternoon; the teachers stay for the afternoon and supervise all the play.

7513. So that they are at school as long as the other children?—They can be if they live far from the school.

7514. And they are supervised by the teachers?—Yes.

7515. The kinder-garten teaching is not under the Government, you say?—It is entirely private adventure, or started by the town. The town has a kinder-garten for poor children, and pays for it.

7516. Do the teachers of the feeble-minded classes adopt kinder-garten methods or their own methods of teaching?—They do adopt kinder-garten methods in one sense, that is to say, they appeal very much, I think, to the children's love of activity. There is no special kinder-garten method to adopt, but the general principle of the kinder-garten I think they use.

7517. Then it is not carrying on the kinder-garten course for older children?—No, I do not think so. I am afraid in Germany they do not seem to believe so much in the kinder-garten in the schools that I visited.

7518. Yet they adopt the same principles, if not the same system, you think?—Yes, I think they do in these schools.

7519. Do you think that the feeble-minded girls who are kept at home to help their mothers are kept because it is thought that they are useful enough for that, and it is not necessary for them to come to school. Is that one reason why there are fewer girls at school, do you think?—I think that is possibly the reason. The reason given to me was, as I say, that they were overlooked in the ordinary schools, and that it does not matter so much whether a girl is backward or forward.

7520. Did you ever make any inquiry as to whether there were any epileptic children in the ordinary schools or the Hilfs-schule?—No, I do not know about epileptic children.

7521. They did not come within the scope of your enquiry?—No.

7522. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) Did you see the schools in Düsseldorf, Elberfeld and Cologne?—No.

7523. I believe there you would have found women-teachers as well as men-teachers?—I am glad of that.

7524. Can you tell us what the occupations were that the children are engaged in?—Do you mean manual occupations.

7525. Yes?—The girls in the schools that I visited were engaged in knitting and needlework mainly, and

Miss M. Hodge.

5 May 1897.

they had a little drawing too. The boys had wood carving and carpentering, and I think all the pappar-beit, the book-binding and cane-work.

7526. I was going to ask, did you not see chair-caning?—Yes, they do cane-work.

7527. What proportion of the schooltime is devoted to manual work?—It differs very much. In Dresden they give the largest proportion of the time to manual work, because they give all their afternoon school-hours to hard manual work.

7528. What proportion of the time would be given, say to study, could you tell us?—I am not sure; I cannot generalise upon that ground.

7529. Would more than half the time be given to study?—Yes, more than half the time was spent in mental study.

7530. And could you tell us what was the highest point reached by the children in mental study?—In the top form in two or three of the schools in Leipsic, in Dresden, and in Brunswick, I should say that the children were about equal to Standard II. here; I do not think they were much higher, it might be the IIIrd Standard.

7531. I saw in Brunswick, children who could do Standard VI. work in Herr Keilhorn's school?—Do you think so?

7532. They could do fractions?—Yes.

7533. And they could read an ordinary reading book?—Would that be VIth Standard work?

7534. An ordinary reading book and fractions would be VIth Standard work?—But you see they do money sums much more easily than we do, but I think that is owing to the decimal system.

7535. But that is their standard of arithmetic?—You really think they could have got to the VIth Standard. I thought they were about the IIIrd Standard; I should not have said they were higher.

7536. Could you give us any idea of the sort of child admitted to these classes. You say they are only admitted after they have been two years in an ordinary school; but surely some were admitted who had not been two years in a school previously?—I should doubt it. I did not know that there was any instance of it. Herr Keilhorn never mentioned one to me and he gives it as a general statement that it is after two years in an ordinary school.

7537. Did you ascertain at all what these children did when they left school, how far they could support themselves?—Yes. Herr Kielhorn gave me some information with regard to that; he told me that in almost every instance the children were able to do some sort of work when they left school, but very rarely any mental work.

7538. So that after the training that they received in the school, they were able to support themselves?—Yes.

7539. That would lead us to suppose that they have a very high standard for a feeble-minded child. would it not, judging from the results in England?—I do not know whether in England the children can support themselves when they leave school.

7540. Many, I fear, will not be able to do so. What I want to arrive at is this, whether the standard in Germany for admission to the special schools is a higher one than we are adopting?—I do not know, but I should say, judging by the lowest classes (and one can only judge by the lowest classes, because those children are just admitted), you would find that the children are quite as backward as the children in our schools.

7541. (*Mr. Newton.*) How do they furnish their special schools?—They give them plenty of pictures; and I think that is very important, I wish we had more illustrations in our schools for these children, because they so delight in pictures; and they give them a great many lessons on pictures.

7542. But I rather meant as to desks, how are they furnished?—Just the ordinary desks; in Dresden, I fancy they have graduated desks; and they have the higher desks at the back, so that they can keep a watch on the children.

7543. Have they single desks to hold one child, or two children, or more than two?—They are benches generally there, raised benches.

7544. And for writing?—They are benches with desks in front of them; they are not very advanced in school furniture in the elementary schools in Germany.

7545. Did you notice that the children are fidgetty and that their attention wanders very rapidly, as is the case with us?—Yes, that is so; they cannot fix their attention, and that is why the teachers give them these short lessons and so much variety in the lessons, because it is so difficult to concentrate their attention.

7546. I should like to know a little more in detail what they do in arithmetic; could you give me any idea of what they would be doing in the first class?—In the lowest class?

7547. Let us take the first class to begin with?—The top class?

7548. The top class?—I did see fractions in one school, but I do not remember anything more advanced than that.

7549. But then we may treat fractions in so many different ways?—Vulgar fractions, I mean.

7550. But you can make vulgar fractions either very easy or very difficult; could you give us any idea what sort of questions they were doing?—They did mental arithmetic in vulgar fractions, but problems they could not deal with anywhere.

7551. Would they be able to deal with such a question as this: "I share an apple equally among six people, what fraction would each get"?—Certainly.

7552. And would they get a step further: "I divide "it equally into six pieces, then I take three of those "pieces and put them together—what amount of the "apple would that be?" would they get up to that point?—I should say so certainly. I think they understood fractions in that form some of them; I do not think all of them did.

7553. And in reading, what sort of book would they read; would they read such a book as Grimm's Tales in the top class?—I do not remember what they did read. Some of them read very well, but some had defective speech. I should think that would be about the standard that they would read; they would not read a book much more advanced than that.

7554. That would be about a third-standard book in England, would it not?—I should have thought so.

7555. I only want to ask one question about the number of these schools. I see there is no mention of Berlin here?—There is no special school at Berlin, because the head school inspector at Berlin says that backward children can go to the idiot asylum; they have a very good idiot asylum there, and he does not believe in fine distinctions.

7556. So that if you are born in Berlin, you must either be an idiot or go to the ordinary schools?—Yes.

7557. Then I see that from Hamburg, which is a huge place, they only return one class with 20 scholars; does that show that there is anything of the same sort as in Berlin; does it show, I mean, that the authorities are unfavourable to the system?—I should think it must; because in every large town like that there must be a larger proportion of children who are unfit to go to ordinary school work.

7558. But this gentleman at Berlin is an exception, I suppose. He does not represent educated opinion, does he?—I do not know; he seems to have a great deal of power; but then the school inspectors in Germany seem completely to rule.

7559. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) You told us that the medical officer, along with the director of the school, made a careful examination and sent off many children to the idiot asylums. Is not that one reason for there being a better average class of children in the ordinary schools in Germany than we have in England; I mean as shown by their after life?—I must say that I should dispute the statement that they have a better class of children in German schools, judging by the lowest classes. I think it may be that the children succeed better in after life, but I do not think they have a better class of children; because, in the lowest classes in many instances the children seem to me more idiotic.

Miss M. Hodge.

5 May 1897.

7560. The statistics here give a very large percentage of success in after life?—Yes, I think the training is excellent; but I do not think the children are at a higher standard.

7561. But still they are carefully weeded out by the medical officer before they are passed into the special classes?—Yes.

7562. Do you know anything about institutions for feeble-minded boys and girls beyond school age, any industrial institutions, I mean, or working homes?—No, I do not

7563. For those who are not absolutely idiotic, I mean?—I believe there are evening classes in Dresden for boys in handicraft, and I think the boys could carry on their work there in Dresden and Leipzig and in other parts of Saxony at these institutions more than in any other district of Germany.

7564. Do you mean classes for feeble-minded boys and girls or only for ordinary boys and girls?—For ordinary boys and girls; but I think the feeble-minded children might take advantage of them if they chose.

7565. Have you visited any idiot institutions in Germany at all?—No, not in Germany; I have been to Darenth in England.

7566. Do you happen to know whether they have male or female teachers in idiot institutions in Germany?—I could not say.

7567. (*Chairman.*) Were you present at any examination where the medical officer sifted the children?—No.

7568. Do you happen to know what test he applied; does he apply this test, that they were not likely to be able to get their own living in after life?—I am afraid I do not know what test he applies.

7569. I think there must be some test of that sort, because out of 71 who left Elberfeld all are returned as able to get their own living, except 15 who are not at work owing to illness; but they claim for all the children there that they are capable of earning their own living afterwards, except in the case of illness. Do you not think that they must take that as a test?—I do not see how the doctor could judge of that.

7570. By the degree of mental capacity. Does it not enter into his calculation at all?—I should think it may enter into his calculation, but I should think it would be very difficult to judge.

7571. They seem very capable of judging if all that are turned out at the end of the training are able to earn their own living; but is there not some danger that they might shut out some others who might benefit by the classes?—I think it is possible. It is a very serious thing, I think, to send one of these children as an idiot, because if he is pre-disposed to be weak-minded it increases the tendency.

7572. When did you last visit a special class in England?—I think it was in 1894.

7573. Can you carry back your memory so as to picture the two classes, the German and the English, and tell us which you think had the lowest class of children?—It certainly struck me when I was in Germany that the children in the lowest forms that I saw were of a lower type.

7574. And yet they are more successful than we are so far as their after-life is concerned?—They have been working longer.

7575. How long have they been working?—Sixteen years in Brunswick, and since 1867 in Saxony, I think.

The witness withdrew.

Rev. F. Synge, M.A.

The Reverend FRANCIS SYNGE, M.A., called in and examined.

7576. (*Chairman.*) You are Her Majesty's Chief Inspector for the Eastern Division?—Yes.

7577. And Inspector of the Hackney District in the Metropolitan Division?—Yes.

7578. Have you visited most of the schools for defective and epileptic children in your district?—I have visited all the special classes in my district.

7579. Have you tried your hand at applying any test to defective children? Where do you draw the line between a defective and a normal child?—I have not done so personally, but I have been present at several of the "taking in" days, and I have watched the medical officer and the superintendent. I have watched the lines that they went on, and fully agreed with them, I think, in almost every case.

7580. They act upon a combination, of course, of the history of the child at home, and the history of the child at school, and also the signs of physical or mental defect that the medical officer detects?—Yes.

7581. On which of those elements do you place most reliance; the history of the child in school and at home, or upon an examination of a quarter of an hour by the superintendent and the medical officer?—I think I place most reliance upon the examination. The accounts from the school depend so much upon the teacher from whom they come. If I get a report that comes up to me from a teacher whom I know very well that report is very valuable; but a good many of the reports that come from the schools are wanting in accuracy and in value, I think.

7582. It seems that in Germany if a child stays for two years in the same class it is then tested to see whether it is a fit subject for a special class or "hilfs-schule," as it is called in Germany. Would you be inclined to think that that would be a good preliminary test?—That is rather wholesale, I think. I do not think we want it quite so long as that.

7583. At the age of 8 that is; if a child stays in Standard I. from 6 to 8 years of age?—Many children only begin to develop at eight years of age, and a child does not want to be treated abnormally before that.

7584. At what age would you begin to test him?—I think I would begin a little older than that. I think if he is three years in a class, I should be inclined to say then that he must be rather weak.

7585. You have, I suppose, a considerable number of defective and backward children in the lowest class of your schools which is generally called Standard 0?—Yes.

7586. Do you think that they are rather slurred over and neglected?—Yes, sometimes, but I do not think it is necessarily so. I think it is a bit of not very good organisation if there are too many of those children.

7587. The history of school life will not help us, will it, in large classes where these defective and feeble-minded children have been mixed up with other children?—No, it will not; because these children want individual care.

7588. What is your idea about the history that you get from the school?—I should discriminate between different schools; you have to go school by school. In one school the head teacher knows all about it, and any children that are put down as in Standard 0 you may pretty well take at once into the special class; in other schools I should pay very little regard to it.

7589. Will the recent circular help you to discriminate between Standard 0 and Standard I., do you think?—I do not know how far it will particularly. I think it tells one to do what one has been doing to a great extent.

7590. And which you seem to have failed to do in a good many schools?—Yes, I am afraid so; failed to do as fully as one would wish.

7591. Then this pronouncement ought to strengthen your hands?—Yes.

7592. So that we may hope to see Standard 0 more thoroughly sifted than it has been in time past, and a preparatory test applied for the work of the medical officer of the board and the inspectors?—I think you may. It is the whole thing being too big that prevents one doing it in every case; but there is no such effective way of looking into Standard 0 as getting the head teacher to go into the cases individually.

7593. You think that is absolutely necessary?—It makes it disappear the next year to a great extent if they have done that.

7594. You do not think you can give a strict definition yourself of a feeble-minded child?—No; I think that one of the things that I put down is that I do not want it to be too clearly defined. I do not think we are ripe for it yet. The border line is very undefined to my mind, as I see it working out on the "taking in" days; and I think it must be undefined both to the medical officer and to Mrs. Burgwin.

7595. You think that on the upper side the teacher is the best judge, and on the lower side the medical officer must be the absolute authority?—I think on the lower side we must be very gentle at present, and take the children into these classes experimentally, rather than send the child to be secluded for life.

7596. But upon the whole, the medical authority is the only one that can give us a real decision on the lower side?—Yes, and the only decision on the lower side; but I do not imagine that any medical authority can quite say which child may benefit by such classes, and may be able to live in the world instead of being taken out of it.

7597. Not irrespective of the history of the child?—No, not irrespective of the history of the child in some cases; but there is still a border line for the medical officer, as for everyone else, I think.

7598. As you know, in Standard 0 none of these children have been tabulated, or their history kept?—No, that is so; but some head teachers will tell you all about every child of the kind in their school.

7599. Do you think you can trust to their memory as sufficient?—I could take you into schools where you could be told about every child of the kind.

7600. But not sufficiently accurately to be able to give an exact picture of the child's mental state?—Pretty well. I remember being astonished at it in some schools.

7601. But those must be very sympathetic and intelligent teachers?—Yes, they are.

7602. The majority of teachers would hardly be up to that, would they?—Perhaps not; but I think I could point to a good many about whom there would be no doubt.

7603. Then it is in the minority of cases that you would get trustworthy facts from the teacher about the child's mental state?—I think so. That does not apply to big schools; in the large board schools it is lost sight of, but any teacher in a moderate-sized school would know it very well.

7604. In a voluntary school where there are only about 30 or 40 in Standard III., perhaps; but in a board school where there are perhaps 70 children it would be much more difficult?—Yes, it would be much more difficult there, because the thing is changing, it is a floating population.

7605. Then supposing these children were thoroughly sifted and put into special classes for good reasons, how would you train them; would you give them more manual and industrial training?—Yes; I think the object is to teach the child to earn its own living, rather than to read and write.

7606. On the other hand, the authorities of the asylums lay great stress upon reading and writing as a great help in promoting the happiness of these children in after life. I gather that you, like some of the other inspectors who have been before us the other day, seem to look more to the wage-earning side, but there is another side of their life, namely, the happiness of these children, which do you put first?—I think that the wage-earning power and being independent makes the happiness of living for them. I do not think that these children, so far as I know them at all, will ever be developed sufficiently intellectually to promote their happiness, they will never read for their own pleasure, I am afraid.

7607. But that is against the experience of the officers of the asylums?—Then I submit to people of more experience, mine is very small.

7608. I have here a memorandum from the authorities of all the great institutions, and in their answers they give us this information: "A knowledge of reading "and writing is of great importance as opening up "sources of information and recreation, and affording "a means of keeping up communications with friends. "Most imbeciles derive great pleasure from receiving "and sending letters"?—I am rather astonished to hear it. From what I have seen of these cases, the children certainly never arrive at the stage of reading or writing that would be a pleasure to them.

Rev. F. Synge, M.A.

5 May 1897.

7609. Is that so?—I do not think there is a case in my district, Mrs. Burgwin will correct me if I am wrong.

7610. Mrs. Burgwin will put questions to you about that afterwards. What occupations do you suggest are the best for these children. Did you notice which they took most interest in?—That twine work pleases them very much, knotting cords, I forget the name of it.

7611. Macramé work?—Yes.

7612. And anything to do with colour?—Yes, that has got to do with colour, but in the time that they are at manual occupations they seem to me to be happier and better than when they are doing any other kind of work, when they are trying to do mental work. Then as to carpentering, I have seen the boys at Abbey Street, and the teachers of the class seemed to be satisfied that they were developing there, and getting on.

7613. I think the general agreement is that imbeciles should be excluded from these special classes, inasmuch as they are likely to cast a sort of prejudice upon them, and that they would derive but little benefit from them. You would rather be inclined, I gather, to include them out of pity?—I should be inclined to say that the border line is very indistinct, and that some of them are capable certainly of training in manners and in behaviour, such as would fit them in certain occupations, without seclusion. I think that one very strong case of that kind came out at Abbey Street, on one of the "taking-in" days. It was a big boy, who was brought up before the medical officer and Mrs. Burgwin as having finished his time in the school, who was absolutely destitute of intellectual powers, so far as I could judge, and yet he had been civilised in the class, and would have been perfectly capable, I think, if he had been taken on by some patient person, of doing some simple out-of-door work, and of behaving himself, and getting on.

7614. Was he capable of doing any work at all?—I thought so.

7615. Would he not have learnt more at an asylum for imbeciles?—That seemed to me just a case that was very near an imbecile, and yet that class had developed him, and had done a very great good to him. I do not know enough about asylums to say how far they might have been better; but it seems to me that it is a terrible thing to seclude a child for life if you can help it.

7616. I think we are all agreed that they should be brought into society, and kept at home as far as possible; but the question would be whether he would not be better away than in a class, if he was not fit for it?—Probably Mrs. Burgwin and Mr. Newton know the boy that I am referring to.

7617. There is one remark of yours that I think rather requires some explanation. You say that it seems questionable in the case of some children whether any attempt should be made to rouse their dormant intelligence. What do you mean by that exactly?—Before these special classes were well on foot, when the Newcastle Street Centre was set up, which was the earliest in my district, it had got a very enthusiastic teacher, and, as I looked at the class she was trying to deal with, it struck me very strongly whether she was not awakening those children to pain rather than to gain. There was no medical officer called in at that time, and I felt very strongly the want of a medical opinion on those children before you tried to rouse them at all. I was not certain whether in the stimulation of what intellectual powers they had you might not be simply arousing them to pain.

7618. Do you not think that all intellectual effort is in the first instance painful, and that we only acquire a taste for intellectual effort by association?—I do not mean that. The thing was present to my mind then. I may be entirely wrong about it, but it struck me: "I "do not know whether to recommend for those children "trying to rouse them at all."

7619. What should their future life be, in your opinion?—I doubt their future life at all. I mean that the children seemed to me doomed to death. Some of them I looked at had mighty heads.

7620. But as long as their life lasted, would you not try to develop them, so far as any intelligence that they might have went?—I should be sceptical about it. I may be corrected by the medical authorities, but I

Rev. F. Synge, M.A.

5 May 1897.

should have wanted a medical opinion about it before I should have tried.

7621 But in all the schools they try to develop the intelligence, so far as it is capable of it, without exception?—But does it not in some cases simply rouse inflammation or brain disease?

(*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) I think I have known of a case or two, but that is all.

(*Dr. Smith.*) Yes, there are some cases.

(*Witness.*) It would be possible you think. I know it struck me the first time that I should like to have expert authority on that case before I tried to rouse it at all.

7622. (*Chairman.*) What is the evil that you are afraid of—that it might arouse an immoral sense?—No, I thought it might be rousing them to pain, and might bring on inflammation of the brain.

(*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) In hydro-cephalic heads, I believe, have seen that kind of thing arise.

7623. (*Dr. Smith.*) You thought it was rousing them for no good purpose?—I thought it was questionable. I wanted your opinion.

7624. (*Chairman.*) What size of class should you recommend for these defective children?—When I see a class of 30 I feel that that is too big. That is the size at present, I believe.

7625. Would you say that the smallest class should be about 15 and the others 20?—That is about the kind of thing I should recommend.

7626. Is not that the limit under the London School Board in your district at the present time?—Thirty is the limit, and I often see it full.

7627. At present, I think the London School Board fill up all the class-rooms to the same extent as in an ordinary class-room, namely 10 square feet per child?—I do not think I have any class-room in which there is not plenty of space; but what I mean is that there are too many children for one teacher.

7628. Would you say that there was sufficient space for drill and exercises?—There is sufficient, I think; it is tolerable, there is nothing to complain of really, I think, in that respect.

7629. These children require a great deal of movement, do they not?—Yes, it is better if they can have a separate room for drill as they have at Abbey Street.

7630. But it is not advisable to be constantly moving them from room to room; would it not be better if they could have some drill in the same class-room if there were double the space, so as to keep them in their own room?—Yes, I think that would be better.

7631. (*Mr. Pooley.*) I gather that your feeling would be to include the lower grades of feeble-minded children in these classes rather than to let them go into institutions for imbeciles and idiots?—The border line cases, I may say, rather than the lower grades; certainly not the absolutely imbecile cases, but the doubtful cases I should be inclined not to draw the line too strictly about. It is only in those cases when I have been watching the taking in that I have been inclined sometimes to differ a little from the medical officer and the superintendent. I think I should like to see a case of that kind taken in; I think that the special class could do something for it.

7632. That question of rousing the dormant intelligence would furnish a test as to whether the child should be admitted or not. I mean that if a child would be injured if he was excited or if his intelligence was aroused, he would on that account possibly be a fit person for an imbecile institution where he could be secluded?—Quite possibly. One wants an expert opinion very strongly on those cases.

7633. If a child has mental faculties, however weak, as a rule it is desirable, is it not, that they should be exercised if he is likely to derive pleasure from it?—Certainly.

7634. And also he should have an opportunity of education in these special classes, should he not, because he will be more likely to be able to earn his own livelihood wholly or partially?—Quite so.

7635. (*Miss Townsend.*) Would you raise the age of the children attending the classes; would you like them to remain longer in the classes?—I do not think it is possible as long as they are mixed classes. Already there are big boys in the class, and I question whether they ought to be there sometimes.

7636. Would you like their education to be continued elsewhere?—I should think that might be so in some cases, but I do not know enough about it to be really certain.

7637. Then, about the children whose intelligence you think had better not be roused in the class-room?—I do not say that I think it had better not be roused. I said that I wanted an expert opinion on those cases rather than that I had one of my own.

7638. You would not like to see them left unemployed, would you?—They were cases that wanted a medical opinion which at the time it was not open to me to take.

7639. At all events they might be amused, might they not?—I should think so; but even as to that, in those cases of water on the brain, I do not know whether any rousing is right.

7640. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) I think you referred to the Newcastle Street Special School, and I think you referred to the time before it was a special class, and before it came under my supervision?—Yes.

7641. I think it might interest you to know that some of those cases are now at Darenth Asylum. Could you tell me whether you think the time table is satisfactory as it is at present?—I am afraid I have not watched the time-table very often. I watched the classes at work, but not the time-table. I have judged of the time-table by the time I was there.

7642. I was only wondering whether in your opinion we gave sufficient time to manual instruction?—I think it is quite possible that more time should be given to that; it certainly seemed to me to be the most fertile part of the work. But I should not interfere much about the time table considering that the teacher ought to know much better what division of time ought to be given than I should at first.

7643. Have you thought our desks quite suitable as we have them at present?—They are the ordinary desks; there is no special desk provided.

7644. Do you think that a single desk would be better than dual desks?—I am never fond of dual desks, I never think them a good arrangement. Yes, I should imagine that single desks would be distinctly better.

7645. (*Dr. Smith.*) I only want to ask you this question: If it came to be a question of amusing these children merely that would hardly be the duty of the London School Board, would it?—No, I think that was only suggested to me. Which children do you mean?

7646. These bad cases which you though it would be better to do nothing for?—I think I have been a little misunderstood about that; that is not what I thought. I thought that one wanted a proper opinion upon them from an expert before one went further in trying to amuse them. I should think it is quite possible that you could have said at once whether such a child ought to be stimulated and to have his intellect aroused in any way, or whether it was simply cruel to attempt it.

7647. What I mean is that if it is to be simply a question of taking care of these children that would hardly be the duty of the teachers of the school?—No, it would not.

7648. (*Chairman.*) Do you happen to know how many children there are who are not present in school owing to their being too defective?—I can give you no statistics as to that.

7649. You have had experience of rural schools; if there are one or more of these defective children in a rural school, how should they be dealt with in your opinion?—That is a regular puzzle. I have always said that if they are not in the way in the school, and if they are not a trouble to the other children, it is better to keep them there; but if they are so defective as to be troublesome and interfere with the other children I have always said strongly that the teachers have reasonable cause for excluding them, and that they ought to be excluded. I have often rather brought it before the managers that it was unfair to the other children and to the teachers to allow them to come to the school.

7650. Would you give the school authority the power to remove such a child and to board it out near a central class where it could be properly taught?—Yes; I think that would be a useful thing to do.

7651. They are better taken out of the school in a rural district?—Yes, they are certainly in the way there, that kind of imbecile children.

7652. Are the centres in London placed in proper places, do you think, so that the children have not to walk far to come to school?—They are insufficient in number as yet.

7653. But the London School Board is planning a scheme of special centres for the whole of London; they are laying out a map for the purpose?—I remember I met Mrs. Burgwin once and I tried to plan out my own district for the purpose.

7654. What do you think you require to provide for the defective childen in your own district?—I think for the present we want about three or four more centres to complete the necessary accommodation in my district.

7655. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) Yours is the best district; you have five centres?—Mine is the best, and I certainly want some more.

7656. (*Chairman.*) Will you look at the maps which the London School Board has prepared for London, and look at your own district and see if their scheme coincides with your own. How many additional centres did you say you wanted?—I have put down one at Lamb Lane; that is on the map. Then there is one at St. John's Road; I should have put it at this new road, that is practically the same thing, but I should have put it at Gopsall Street instead of St. John's Road. The other one I put down was at Homerton College, and the School Board put it at Berger Road. I think that Homerton College is the only place for it.

7657. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) And that is the place where it is going to be put; it is not going to Berger Road?—Then you have put down the same as I have in my scheme?

(*Mrs. Burgwin.*) Yes.

7658. (*Chairman.*) So that that is exactly the number you think you need?—Yes.

7659. Are you guided in that scheme of yours by the leading thoroughfares?—They would be central. For instance, Hoxton has got none. I put one in the most central part of Hoxton.

7660. Do you put it near a big thoroughfare where the child would have to cross it to get to the centre?—The Great Kingsland Road bounds Hoxton on one side and the City Road bounds it on the other.

Rev. F. Synge, M.A.

5 May 1897.

7661. Would the children have to cross those large thoroughfares to reach the centre?—A few of the children would, but we have a great population in that particular part of Hoxton. Then, with regard to Lamb Lane, it is a school that is going to be deserted for a new board school, and I think there is no provision at all within reach of it; Maidstone Street is the nearest, and that is some way off. The whole of Homerton has no school except the one at Hackney Wick, which is inaccessible for any but this small neighbourhood. I think that other Homerton class is as central as anything can be.

7662. Then you think that your district will be fully supplied when these special centres are set up?—That is about eight centres; that, I think, will do.

7663. In which class is there the highest number of children?—I think at Abbey Street; I suppose there are 40 there now.

7664. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) In Abbey Street there is accommodation for 90; at Cranbrook Road for 30; at the Eton Mission 30; at Mansfield Street 30; and at Newcastle Street 30?—Yes; but only two of those are at all full; Abbey Street is not full up to the 90, it has about 40. Newcastle Street has its 30, and Cranbrook Road, I think, has its 30.

7665. And the others have about 30 each?—Yes.

7666. Is Hackney over supplied with schools, or will it be after those centres are built, if the schools are not full at the present time?—No; Abbey Street is simply an old building, in which they have put three rooms to that purpose.

7667. Would this be the sort of building that you would suggest, a building for 30 for one class, or two classes or three classes; should the 30 be divided?—It is better, I think, to make many centres than to try to mass too many children at one. Of course a centre is better if you can classify there, but the children will not go very far; these children cannot be sent very far.

7668. Do you think that two classes are enough for any centre?—I have no experience with regard to that.

7669. That is to say, two teachers dividing their classes?—Only just now, since the last taking-in day, has any centre grown to two classes, so that I have no experience as to double classes.

The witness withdrew.

Mr. Arthur William Newton (a Member of the Committee) examined.

Mr. A. W. Newton.

7670. (*Chairman.*) I believe you wish to give us some opinion as to the present organisation of the special schools under the London School Board?—I do.

7671. Will you make the statement that you wish to make?—I visited 20 of the classes, and in two or three cases I saw buildings that, I believe, are regarded as permanent buildings, which are very unsuitable indeed. First of all, there is the Park Walk School, near Chelsea, where the centre consists of a room which seems to measure about 16 by 14 feet; it contains 10 dual desks, and no other desks. There were actually more than 20 children present when I visited it, and the children were in far too close quarters for the best work to be done.

7672. The School Board claims to have the right to put 20 children in 10 square feet?—At present; but I am only pointing out that their present arrangements are very far indeed from ideal. Then I went to see Chrisp Street, in Poplar. There there seems to be no playground, and, so far as I could judge by one visit, the lighting is unsatisfactory. Then I saw Choumert Road, near Peckham Rye; there there are three class rooms built in the form of a tower, one above the other, which, of course, is very unsuitable. Then, again, at Bath Street, City Road, the lighting in one room is very unsuitable, and the noise from the traffic outside is very tiresome in one room. Those are the clearly bad ones. There is one more, and that is the one at St. Dunstan's Road, near Hammersmith. That is a room originally intended for a manual training room, at the top of a very high building; there were two teachers there, working in the same room. There is no cloak-room; the cloaks are kept in the class room itself, and there is no lavatory, although the lavatory attached to the manual training room is sometimes used.

7673. And those five, you say, are permanent buildings?—I believe they are; but I do not know whether the Board regards them as permanent buildings or not. Some of them certainly were.

7674. Have you any reason to believe that the Board will not replace them when the defects are pointed out?—The Board has certainly built Bath Street and Choumert Road specially for the purpose.

7675. Now, as to the size of the classes. Do you think that the teachers have too much to do?—I think that the single-handed teachers have distinctly too much to do.

7676. That is to say, in a class of 30 children without any sub-divisions?—Yes. The worst case was the case of Abbey Street, where there was only one teacher when I first visited it. There were 38 children on the roll, and, speaking from memory, there were 31 present. I also saw various cases of single-handed teachers where there were 20 children present, and all those teachers struck me as being overburdened. One was clearly not able to deal with all the children she had, and a great many others found it very hard work, especially in the reading lessons. The reading lessons that they attempted to give in two or three centres—I forget which—quite broke down; they could not keep the two or three groups of children going at once.

7677. The teachers have had no training of any kind, I suppose, as a rule, except from practice in

Mr. A. W. Newton.

5 May 1897.

another similar class. They are selected by the School Board, I understand, as being especially bright teachers, first of all, in other schools; but for this special work they have no special training, except what they get for themselves?—Except that before they are permanently appointed, they attend at some other of these classes established in London, and see what goes on there.

7678. On the whole, are you satisfied with the teachers?—I think that, with, perhaps, one exception, the Board have got hold of quite the right sort of teachers.

7679. What, in your opinion, is the best sort of furniture for these special classes for defective children?—Single desks—one desk for each scholar.

7680. And chairs?—Desk and chair combined. I have noticed, in a great many cases, the children interfering with each other where there were dual desks; in fact, that strikes me as being the great difficulty that the teachers have in keeping order.

7681. Is there any other point that you wish to bring before the Committee?—No, I think those are all the points.

7682. You have, I believe, some statistics about certain areas in your district?—Not about my own district in particular. I took 10 of the centres in London, and I estimated, so far as I could, what was the area of the feeding ground from which each of these centres was fed. I took the number of children between 7 and 13 years of age in the centre, the number of children between 13 and 14 years of age in the centre, the number of children between 7 and 13 years of age in the feeding ground, and I could also estimate roughly—though there are no actual statistics—the number of children between 13 and 14 years of age in the feeding ground. Taking the results of all 10 centres, and adding them up, you get about 68,000 children between 7 and 14 years of age in the 10 feeding grounds, and you find that 71 of those children are actually in attendance at the centres, which corresponds, more or less, with the 1 per cent. that we have been estimating. This table contains the particulars:—

COMPARISON of ATTENDANCE at 10 Centres for DEFECTIVE CHILDREN with the SCHOOL POPULATION of the Areas from which the Centres are Fed.

(1.) Name of Centre.	(2.) Number on Roll, April 1896. (a.) 7–13.	(b.) 13–14.	(c.) 7–14.	(3.) Scheduled Children, April 1896, in Feeding Ground. 7–13.	(4.) Estimated Number of Children. 13–14.	(5.) Total Number of Children, April 1896. 7–14.	Remarks.
Hugh Myddleton - Chequer Alley -	63 22	6 1	69 23	7,610 1,652	—	—	Feeding ground unusually small, but teachers are confident as to boundaries, which are well defined.
British Street -	25	3	28	2,904			Isle of Dogs; seems a poor neighbourhood.
"Brecknock" -	45	3	48	3,908	—	—	
St. Clement's Road	62	3	65	5,304			Part of neighbourhood bad; thieves, &c.
Park Walk - -	16	3	19	5,970			Nearly all children here from board schools. Do voluntary schools, of which there are many about, refuse to let their defectives go.
St. Dunstan's Road	36	6	42	8,355			New neighbourhood; mostly respectable.
Edward Street -	73	11	84	8,717			Part of neighbourhood very poor.
Choumert Road -	39	10	49	6,130	—	—	Well-to-do neighbourhood on the whole.
Sayer Street - -	36	19	55	7,940	—	—	
All 10 Centres -	417	65	482	58,490	9,200	67,690	

NOTE.—The figures in 2(*a*), 2(*b*), 2(*c*) are ascertained from teachers; stray children living outside feeding ground have been deducted. The area of feeding ground has been ascertained by study of map, by study of actual neighbourhood, and by inquiries from teachers. Where there is a doubt as to the proper limits, the area has been taken too large rather than too small. The figures in column (3) are from last school accommodation report of School Accommodation and Attendance Committee. There are no statistics of the Board as to number of children beteween 13 and 14: but the Life Table shows that 9,200 is not far from the truth for the whole 10 feeding grounds. The number for each feeding ground separately could be roughly estimated were it worth while to do so. Of course, however, the smaller the area the less certain is it that deductions made with help of Life Table are correct.

CONCLUSIONS.

So far as these 10 areas are concerned:—

71 per cent. of the children between 7 and 13 are in attendance at the special classes; and

71 per cent. of the children between 13 and 14 are in attendance at the classes.

The coincidence of percentages is remarkable, but of course accidental; but for Sayer Street it would not exist.

Making all allowance for errors in areas of feeding grounds, and for refusals to send children to special classes, it seems hardly possible that in London the defectives, as defined by the Board's medical officer, exceeds 1 per cent. of the school population. The areas may be considered representative, they seem to represent every section of the elementary school classes of society.

It will be seen that the proportion of defectives varies considerably in the different areas; it seems quite possible that, in like manner, it may vary very greatly in different towns.

7683. That scarcely holds for the Hackney District, with its population, does it?—I do not take the whole district; these statistics merely refer to the areas within reach of the 10 centres.

7684. But your contention is, as I understand, that they would apply to each district?—I think probably they would apply to the whole of London.

7685. The attendance at the special classes in Hackney does not come up to 300, I see?—Part of Hackney is not within reach of any centre.

7686. But if in Hackney, on a population of 180,000, 1 per cent. of the school population between 7 and 13 years of age ought to be in attendance, you would scarcely say that we have found all the children yet who ought to be at a special school, would you?—No; that is not quite the point. Probably a large part of Hackney is not within reach of any centre.

7687. Quite so; but when you have supplied the proper number of centres do you think that we shall probably have all the children for whom special classes are needed?—I think it is most likely that when the

centre is supplied you will find the children. I will now hand in a table of statistics compiled upon a somewhat similar basis by Mr. W. J. Purver, superintendent of visitors in Greenwich:—

Mr. A. W. Newton.

5 May 1897.

CENSUS of CHILDREN in BLOCKS A$_3$ and B of GREENWICH (taken by Board's Officers in April 1897).

		(*a.*) 5 to 7.	(*b.*) 7 to 13.	(*c.*) 5 to 13.	(*d.*) over 13.
Children attending school.	(1.) Ordinary children attending the ordinary schools	1,437	3,987	5,424	384
	(2.) Cripples attending ordinary schools - -	1	10	11	2
	(3.) Children attending the special school - - -	—	53	53	3
	(4.) Children attending ordinary school, but probably (*i.e.* in officer's opinion) fit for special school, *i.e.*, defective.	3	5	8	1
Children not attending school.	(5.) Children excused from attendance as idiots or imbeciles.	—	3	3	1
	(6.) Children excused from attendance as cripples -	1	6	7	1
	(7.) Children excused from attendance as epileptics -	—	1	1	—
	(8.) Children excused from attendance as defective but not idiotic.	—	—	—	—
	(9.) Children excused (*permanently*) from attending on other medical grounds.	—	4	4	—
	(10.) Other children not attending: truanting, in country, &c., &c., temporary illness.	20	27	47	7
Total number of children from 5 upwards enumerated -		1,462	4,096	5,558	399

1,386 children between 3 and 5 were also enumerated; of those 806 were in attendance at school, and 580 were not in attendance; but it is, of course, impossible to classify them under the heads given above.

The two blocks to which this census refers constitute the area between the Thames Deptford Creek, the South Eastern Railway (Woolwich Branch) and the Surrey Canal. The population may be considered a representative one, inasmuch as it contains small shopkeepers, artisans, labourers, railway men in regular work, casual labourers, and a certain very rough element.

Certain corners of the area are just over half a mile from the special school at Edward Street, but the great majority of the children are within half a mile from the school.

The five scholars between 7 and 13 who are set down under head (4) may be either children living at the extremity of the area, or children whose parents object to the special classes. One of the classes certainly falls under the latter head.

The valuable part of the results is, of course, that contained in column (*b.*); this agrees pretty closely with Dr. Warner's results. As children who are legally exempt are not enumerated unless they happen to be in attendance, column (*d.*) does not contain all the children over 13, and is therefore of no great value for the present purpose.

The figures for the two blocks could be given separately; but they are much more instructive when taken together, as together the blocks form a more typical district than either block would form when taken alone.

Adjourned.

SIXTEENTH DAY.

Tuesday, 1st June 1897.

PRESENT:

H. F. POOLEY, ESQ., IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. A. W. NEWTON.
Dr. G. E. SHUTTLEWORTH.
Mrs. BURGWIN.
Miss TOWNSEND.

Mr. H. W. ORANGE, *Secretary.*

Mr. JOHN HOLM, F.R.C.S.E., M.R.C.S., called in and examined.

Mr. J. Holm, F.R.C.S.E., M.R.C.S.

1 June 1897.

7688. (*Chairman.*) You are a Fellow of the Royal College of Surgeons, Edinburgh?—Yes.

7689. And Member of the Royal College of Surgeons, England?—Yes.

7690. Fellow of the Medical Society, London?—Yes.

7691. And you have been Examiner in Physical Education for the School Board of London?—Yes.

7692. We want, of course, to get from you something about the system of physical exercises or gymnastic training which would be suitable to mentally defective or physically defective children, who are the subject of our inquiry. You think that for the gymnastic training, the treatment required for defective children must be considerably modified from what can be used with advantage for the normal child?—Precisely so.

7693. And you are of opinion that the Swedish system, which is called after Ling, is the only gymnastic system based on a scientific knowledge of the human body?—Most certainly.

7694. And you think that that system is superior to any other system that you know of?—Not only superior, but—I will not say there is no other form of gymnastics that can be of use—but it is the only system that really has essential value, especially in cases like those you are proposing to deal with.

7695. Are there any other systems to be compared with this that you know of?—There is the German system of gymnastics, which has many movements, but all other systems outside the Swedish system are haphazard systems based on the general very excellent principle, that exercise is good, therefore, let us exercise; but the movements and exercises are not

Mr. J. Holm, F.R.C.S.E., M.R.C.S.

1 June 1897.

elaborated; they are not developed on any system or any regular plan for the harmonious development of the body, and the consequence is, that although they often make strong, and too often stiffen, the body, they deform the body. Now that is bad in the normal man, and to give an illustration of what I mean, if you go to one of the displays of the German Gymnastic Society at the Crystal Palace, you will see there that the men, and they are the very best types of men, because it is those men they put forward there, men, that under a better system would be capable of being developed into a sort of ideal combination of Hercules and Adonis; it is those very men that have the high shoulder and the gymnastic stoop, and a very considerable amount of stiffness. Now in the Swedish system (you can only see it in its full development in Sweden) you will find a total absence of that. The men and the women are well set up, equally developed and supple, and I need hardly say, that taking two human beings of theoretically equal strength, the one who is supple is almost doubly as strong as the one who is not.

7696. Would you say the object of Ling's system is harmonious bodily development?—That is the object.

7697. And it is based on accurate anatomical and physiological knowledge?—Yes. And then there is another point that Ling insisted on, and that is, not over-development. Directly you get over-development you cease to get harmonious development. You must keep within the vital capacity of the individual, which is an ever-varying factor. No system can make every man or woman equally strong.

7698. You say that this Swedish system is applicable to these defective children as well as to normal children, because it may be applied to the restoration of this harmonious bodily development?—Yes.

7699. Can this system be localised and be applied to the special parts of the body that require restoring?—Yes, that is the great peculiarity of the system, but that applies specially to the medical section.

7700. You say you divide it into four sections, educational, military, medical, and æsthetic?—Yes.

7701. With regard to these children it would be the educational and medical sections that are valuable?—Precisely. The medical and educational sections are directed to train large bodies of normal children. Of course, in the initiation, you start with small squads, the same as with recruits, but later on you can exercise the children in scores, or fifties, or hundreds as they reach a higher stage of proficiency, whereas where you have to remedy a defect, you must apply the exercise which must be localised to act on, say a weak set of muscles, you must act directly on that weak set of muscles, and that can only be done by an applied movement by the operator exciting a resisting power, and in their weakened or semi-paralysed set of muscles by making use of and cultivating what little there may be of action there. You must remember that you are not merely exercising the muscles, you are exercising the nerve centres that govern the muscles, and you are reacting back on that nerve centre, and in that way attracting physiological nutrition both to the centre, and to the muscle, which manifests the evolution of the nervous force.

7702. Does this system require much special apparatus as applied to the class of children we are dealing with?—No, very little apparatus, in fact, apparatus can be (but it is not well) always dispensed with; but unfortunately the system requires a skilled teacher, and when I was in Sweden in 1882, the Governing Council, which is a very important body of the Royal Gymnastic Central Institute of Stockholm, had just found that their curriculum, which is a very severe one, and which extended over two years, including instruction in anatomy, physiology, hygiene, the theory of gymnastics, and the teaching of practical gymnastics in its different forms, was insufficient, and that it was insufficient, curiously enough, not with those pupils who were indifferent to their work, but it was too short for those most diligent and enthusiastic, that their very enthusiasm led them into error, hence at that time the curriculum was extended to three years.

7703. Was that the curriculum for teachers?—Yes, for teachers. In Sweden you cannot teach gymnastics, unless you are a diplomat of the Central Institution. In the same way, every officer in the army, who hopes for promotion, must acquit himself well in his gymnastic course at the Central. When I say acquit himself well, I do not mean that it is necessary for him to perform extraordinary gymnastic feats, which I would say is the very curse of scientific gymnastics, the aiming at doing this, that, or the other monstrosities, which at once gets away from what we started with just now, harmonious developments.

7704. While you are upon this point, do you think the teachers in this country can easily acquire a knowledge of this system?—They can, and that is shown in this way, that though the course is all too short, as I pointed out in my report to the London School Board—yet notwithstanding its extreme shortness on the girls' side, having classes originally with a good instructress, that was Madame Bergman-Osterberg.

7705. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) Mademoiselle Löfving was the first?—Mademoiselle Löfving did very little, it was essentially Madame Bergman-Osterberg who did the work, and she has been succeeded in her turn by a very efficient teacher, Miss Eley.

7706. (*Chairman.*) I think we need not go into individual instances. Would you tell us whether teachers can acquire a knowledge of this system in this country?—They can acquire it at Madame Bergman-Osterberg's physical training college at Dartford in Kent.

7707. And what time do you think an ordinary trained teacher ought to devote to acquiring this method?—If you ask me what time they ought to devote, I should say two or three years: but as a practical man I should think an efficient person might acquire a fair knowledge in a year.

7708. Would that be by training the whole time for a year, or going there on certain occasions?—Training at times; but I think she had better spend the whole time there, then she will go through a course of lectures which are part of the whole business.

7709. Do you think that defective children in these classes can almost universally be benefited by exercise of this sort?—Well, of course there are hopeless cases which nothing can benefit; but I should say, that excepting those very hopeless cases, they are all capable of benefit; at the same time that benefit of necessity is a limited quantity.

7710. But they are capable of some benefit?—Yes.

7711. Is one of those benefits an increase in the respiratory power of the patient?—Yes, that is almost invariable. If you have sufficient intelligence in a child to be able to teach him to take long breaths, that is, deep regular inspirations, you can always improve the cubic capacity of the lungs.

7712. Does that lead to an equal and regular distribution of the circulation?—Most emphatically.

7713. And to an improvement of the nerve force?—Yes, it adds essentially to the vitality of the individual.

7714. Do you in this class of children always find a deficiency or perversion of the co-ordinating faculty?—I should say that that was universal, or at any rate all but universal.

7715. And you think it necessary that the exercises should be applied to the individual case; it is necessary to have regard to the individual case?—Yes; of course with defective children their ability would vary according to the amount of their intelligence, and those who were moderately intelligent would be able to take class exercise; but they would all of them be the better for specific exercises in addition. The very worst and most defective mentally of the children would only be a nuisance in the class and would prevent other children benefiting from the lessons.

7716. Have you visited any of the special classes of the London School Board?—Yes.

7717. Could you describe to us any specific exercises which you think would be generally useful for those children?—For the defective children who are moderately intelligent, you mean?

7718. Yes; They must be that to be at these classes, because we do not take the idiots?—I see. On general lines it would be the ordinary system that is practised in the schools of the School Board for London. Now I have here a little book, you will probably be amused at the little engravings, by Mr. Liedbeck, who I may mention is the Government Inspector of Gymnastics for the whole of Sweden, and is also one of the Sub-Directors of the Central Institute at Stockholm, and he is a better gymnast than he is an artist; but anyhow this shows the class of movement.

7719. I do not know whether this book would be too long to go through?—It would be impossible, and I am afraid it would be useless, because, as I say in my notes, you come back to this point, that you must have a skilled teacher—without that you can do nothing. It would be just as useful for me, if I were to tell you that in certain cases of disease a certain surgical operation will be of the greatest use and may save the life of the patient; but it will be of no use for me, at a lay board, to enter into the details of that surgical operation, it would be useless; and so in the same way I do not think that any good end is to be gained by going into a description of the hundreds and thousands of exercises that are comprised in the Swedish system.

7720. You do not think you could usefully put in a written description of a few of the exercises?—No, I can only say generally that you must not be too ambitious; you must be content to proceed slowly, and what you do must be done well. Start with two or three simple exercises and get those mastered, and from that you can go to something better.

7721. The one principle is that you should cultivate the normal movements of the body?—Yes; not any strained or contorted movements.

7722. You have had experience yourself of the benefit of scientific gymnastics in this class of children?—Yes.

7723. Where did you get that from?—Professionally I am a grandson of Ling. Ling, amongst his pupils, had two pupils whom he designated, at the Swedish gymnasium, as the only two men capable of carrying out his idea, those two men were sub-directors under him, one was Professor Braütel, and the other Professor Georgü. I was Professor Georgü's pupil and assistant for over twelve years, and have had exclusive charge of his practice. That is where I have gained my knowledge of Ling's system; therefore, professionally, I am Ling's grandson.

7724. Do I rightly understand that you have private patients coming to you for advice as to gymnastics?—Yes: that is my line of practice—the practice of Ling's system in its medical aspect. I do a little gymnastic educational work, but not very much.

7725. I think we have heard sufficiently what the principles of this system are. Is there any particular apparatus which you think should be provided for these classes?—Apparatus is desirable, but it is not necessary.

7726. Not necessary to have any apparatus at all?—No, that is not an essential, the teacher is the essence of the thing; but there is a simple ladder apparatus that is desirable.

7727. Many of these exercises can be done in the class room?—Yes.

7728. They do not require a special gymnasium?—Really the only gymnasium that is essential is a floor to stand on and the body of the pupil, if you only know how to use that floor and that body.

7729. Do you recommend dumb-bells?—More hateful abominations have never been used even by the strongest.

7730. Do you recommend staves?—No, they are an evil, but they are not so evil as the dumb-bell is, because the dumb-bell contracts the chest, stiffens the shoulder, and makes a person clumsy. There are very few people indeed who can use dumb-bells properly. You have to consider this (which is lost sight of) that you have to multiply the weight of the dumb-bell by the leverage of the arm, and that makes a pound dumb-bell, in its action on the shoulder, a great many pounds; therefore, it overdevelops the scapular muscles and shoulder-joints in the effort to hold the dumb-bell. The great thing that a gymnast has to fight against, is the difficulty of keeping the shoulder-blades in the proper position—well back—and directly you put the dumb-bells in a child's hands (even a very light one) they instantly, to ease themselves, let the shoulder blades go forward. I have here an illustration of an important apparatus, which is a very simple thing. (*Exhibiting the same.*)

7731. What do you call that?—The Swedes call it a *Ribbstol;* I suppose we should call it a fixed ladder. It is put close against the wall—the wall is just a few inches behind it.

7732. Is that for the muscles of the arms and for the body generally?—This man is using the muscles of his legs, the muscles of his back and the muscles of his arms—he is using everything really.

7733. Would you recommend that particular instrument for classes?—Yes, that is a very good one. But unless you have a good teacher you are better without apparatus. If you have not a skilled teacher then let the child have a skipping rope and let the child have a ball; because with apparatus which children can use they always pull themselves out of shape if they use it without direction. I do not object to apparatus, of course.

Mr. J. Holm, F.R.C.S.E., M.R.C.S.

1 June 1897.

7734. But you think it is not necessary?—I think every man, woman, and child, unless there is a medical reason to the contrary, ought to be able to climb a rope and climb a pole; and you cannot teach pole-climbing and rope-climbing unless you have those things; therefore, I should say that a *ribbstol*, a bar, and a few ropes, are all you want—and even they, as I say, are not absolutely necessary. Mr. Liedbeck deals with that question. As you know, Sweden is a poor country and many of the schools cannot have any apparatus, so he uses a form as you see here. (*Exhibiting an illustration.*) That is to represent a boy on a vaulting bar.

7735. Then no special apparatus is necessary. Are there any special forms of drill that you would lay stress on, special movements?—Yes, the movements of the Swedish system as carried out in schools. I may say, for instance, that, if our children were taught the abdominal movements there would be less hernia; and if they were taught the respiratory movements we should have less lung disease than we have. I hope you do not think I am too enthusiastic, but I am speaking within my knowledge, and I am not in the least exaggerating. It stands to reason that if by exercise you can increase, as you can readily, the cubic capacity of the lungs these results must follow.

7736. I think you have given us the general principles, and no doubt Dr. Shuttleworth will like to ask you some questions with regard to the particular forms of mental or physical defect and the application of Ling's system with regard to them.

7737. (*Mr. Burgwin.*) Have you had cases of heart disease under your care?—Yes, many.

7738. What special exercises would you give in such cases?—To begin with, you will always give general exercises, especially the relative movements and general movements, exercising the muscles of the body generally. But, in addition to that, you will give respiratory movements, and in addition to that give special percussions and vibrations of the pneumogastric nerve, in addition to more general treatment. The heart-disease treatment, the Nauheim treatment, merely consists of Ling's treatment of heart-disease plus a system of baths; but at the Central Institution in Professor Georgü's practice, in my practice, and I think I may say in the practice of every skilled medical gymnast, we have been treating heart-disease successfully for years without baths. I do not mean to say that I have any objection to the Nauheim baths—I think they are very good; but in my opinion it is the gymnastic treatment that is the more important portion of the Nauheim treatment, and the Nauheim exercise treatment is properly simply Ling's system, which has been practised at the Central Institution since the year 1813.

7739. Then you would not exclude children either with heart-disease or spinal curvature from exercises?—Certainly not.

7740. You consider that all children should have them?—Yes; but you must not put a child with heart-disease, and in speaking of heart-disease pray do not let me convey a wrong impression, that a gymnast can cure all heart-disease any more than any other member of the profession, but in cases of functional heart-disease you can in a large number of cases cure it, and even where there be organic disease you can very often alleviate it. As regards crooked spines, or weak spines, there is no doubt that the gymnastic treatment is the only rational treatment to adopt. If you do not adopt that you must put the child into a special support, which at once increases the original mischief which had its origin in the weakness of the trunk muscles, and combined with asymmetry of the trunk muscles. By putting a child in a case you at once stop the natural movements of the trunk, therefore the weak trunk muscles are at once deprived of any possibility of being strengthened. Furthermore, you will put pressure on, say, which is the most usual form, the right shoulder, which, as it is called, grows out; it grows out because the spine is crooked. The left hip grows out from the same cause; you put another pad on the left side of the ribs lower down, and so by means of a very skilled

Mr. J. Holm, F.R.C.S.E., M.R.C.S.

1 June 1897.

apparatus you use a key, you put on these pressures to try and squeeze the parts into a more normal condition (which as a rule you do not do), and you prop up the shoulders. The result of these pads is that you at once intertere with the normal movements of respiration, the child cannot breathe, and directly you attack respiration you attack everything, you attack the proper arterialisation of the blood, you at once limit the action of the lungs, and by limiting their action you tend to increase weakness in them, and so you attack the general health.

7741. Would you tell us how much time you would give to gymnastic exercises, and at what hours?—A gymnastic lesson should never be taken immediately after eating; there should be an interval, according to the meal; if it is a heavy meal, an interval of two hours, after dinner say.

7742. Two hours after dinner?—Yes.

7743. After any meal?—After breakfast an hour is sufficient.

7744. Why, the same process is going on?—Yes, but I am assuming the child will eat more at dinner.

7745. That breakfast is a lighter meal?—Yes.

7746. I did not think it was in Stockholm; but, however, how long should the gymnastic lesson last?—That must be a variable factor; I should say from half-an-hour to an hour.

7747. Do you recommend set lessons once or twice a week, or a few exercises each day?—A few exercises each day is infinitely preferable. And then half-an-hour or even less is sufficient.

7748. Half an hour would be a large slice out of a child's school time each day, would it not?—The tendency is to over-cultivate the brain, unfortunately, and let the body take its chance; the consequence is that the brain does not do the work which it would otherwise do if there had been from the first a little more attention given to the body.

7749. Do I understand that you would recommend that half an hour each day should be given to gymnastic exercises?—Yes.

7750. (*Mr. Newton.*) Do you think the exercises ought to be prescribed by the teacher of the child or by a doctor?—If the doctor has gymnastic knowledge, undoubtedly by the doctor; but if the doctor has not gymnastic knowledge he cannot prescribe the exercises, and then you are safer in the hands of a good teacher. But it is a very dangerous thing for an ordinary gymnastic teacher to meddle with disease—whether it be heart-disease or scoliosis, (spinal curvature)—or indeed anything. I found an enthusiastic gymnast on one occasion vigorously at work, and she was very strong; the child was specially weak, but still happily nature was stronger, the teacher was diligently trying to straighten a Pott's curvature of the spine. I explained to the lady that, had she been successful, she would have killed the child and probably have been tried for manslaughter.

7751. In London it would be quite easy, would it not, to have one medical man to supervise the gymnasts of all the classes?—Yes, I think it would.

7752. That would be a great deal safer, would it not, than leaving it in the hands of the teachers of the classes?—Very much better, but, as regards those medical men in this capital of the world, there are three of them, there is Mr. Bernard Broth, there is Mr. Kelligrew, and there is myself.

7753. Then, given such skilled medical supervision, do you still think that the teachers would still want a year's training?—Undoubtedly.

7754. Even if they had the advantage of one of those three experts to supervise them?—Most certainly, because it is they that apply the exercise. You cannot gain the skill, you cannot get the technique under the time. Of course, we know there are teachers who advertise to teach French in 12 lessons—well.

7755. Will you kindly give me your opinion of games *versus* drill?—I think games are necessary and most excellent, but they will not take the place of physical training any more than novel-reading—even of the highest type—will take the place of a proper form of literary education. Games are very good, and if a child is properly prepared by physical training, he will enjoy the game and enter into it very much better than without that training; but I think the training is necessary, I do not say it should necessarily precede, because a child plays a game before he is ripe for training. In fact, there is Nature's training, and if it were not for Nature's training, things would be very different. See how instinctively, when children see a pole they climb up it, and a bar they go over it, and how children never can be still, although foolish people try to keep them still, because there is the natural instinct.

7756. Do not games develop quickness in a way that gymnastics do not do?—The Swedish system develops quickness, develops extreme attention and extreme rapidity: but I do think that a game is most important in developing accuracy of perception and quickness, for instance, if a child has to catch a ball.

7757. Do you think games with a ball ought to be part of the regular training of special classes for defective children?—I think so, but I do not think it should form part of the gymnastic class.

7758. It does not matter what you call it, but do you think it should be taken as part of their training?—Yes. I think that should be left to the playground.

7759. And you think that should be regularly and systematically worked at by the teacher?—I think the danger of our sports is, that we regulate them a little too much, and they become business rather than pleasure.

7760. That was just the point I wanted to bring out?—I think, perhaps, it would be well for children to be taught games and then left to play them themselves. I do not think they want the teacher to be there, unless she enters *con amore* into the game, I think the teacher is better away when the children are playing.

7761. Are there any special games you would recommend for defective children?—No.

7762. You mean that the games of ordinary children are suited for defective children?—Yes; you must remember, of course, that there is this objection to most games; I am not making it an objection to the practice of games, I consider them most excellent, and, in fact, it is well-known that the excellent physique of the English people is based on their games, but nearly all the games are one-sided, they tend to develop what we are bound to develop from babyhood—righthandedness. You very often notice that, for instance, with cricketers, who are especially marked in the development of the right shoulder, and the drawing of the right scapula from the centre.

7763. Then, as regards military drill; is that a good thing or a bad thing?—I think military drill is excellent.

7764. You are in favour of that?—Yes. When I say I am in favour of it, I am not in favour of the system of the free standing exercises that has been devised by Colonel Onslow, a thing that is neither fish, flesh, fowl, nor good red herring; but I am speaking of military drill itself, with a weapon.

7765. Such a thing as bayonet exercise you would approve of?—That is excellent, but you must train up to it. In order to put pupils, with advantage, either to fence with the bayonet, or small-sword or broad-sword fencing, their bodies must be previously prepared, otherwise it degenerates into a thing that is too contemptible to be of any use.

7766. I suppose fencing and single-stick exercise would be out of the question with these children?—Entirely out of the question.

7767. About another point. I notice how badly they walk; is there any class of drill that would be of any use in teaching them to walk properly?—That teaching of proper walking forms the most important portion of Ling's system, and I would say also of any good gymnastic system.

7768. Have you ever noticed the way in which negroes and negresses carry things on their heads, and how excellently they walk?—Yes; and I have also noticed how badly the ordinary negro does walk; there is a sort of splay-footedness; but I have never had the advantage of seeing those people in their own country. I have seen pictures of them, a negro girl poising a vase holding water on her head, and really looking a veritable Venus; but when I see a negress or a negro walking the streets of London, they walk in a peculiar splay-footed manner.

7769. But the negro walks best with no shoes on?—There is something in that. The greatest attention is

given, in Ling's system, to foot exercises; what are called tiptoe raising. I have some illustrations here which I shall be happy to leave with you for a day or two, from which you will see the enormous attention that is given to this class of exercise. The goose-step again, as taught to our recruits, is a most excellent movement, but we think we rather improve upon it. Then you must have the foot-placings; an enormous amount of attention and time is give to foot-placings and to the mountings. If we consider walking to be a word, all those movements form the letters of which that word is composed, and it is just in those things where the superiority of the Ling system comes in.

7770. And then as to skipping-ropes; I suppose they are good?—Yes; very excellent. They may be over used and they may be used badly, but a skipping-rope is not a dangerous thing; for one girl that injures herself with a skipping-rope there are hundreds that do themselves good, and therefore, the one must be sacrificed for the good of the many.

7771. Would you go so far as to say, that well-organised games in the playground are as good in their own way as gymnastics?—In their own way; but they should only be a supplement, not a substitute. Of course, if you cannot have any system of physical education, then by all means have the games.

7772. There is this always to be said; I do not know whether there is anything in it, that gymnastics seem to tire people, while games in moderation seem to rest them?—I do not think we find that in practice.

7773. I often, for instance, see a class, which, after it has had 20 minutes or half-an-hour's Swedish drill in a board school, looks very tired?—But then that is good; that is a training in itself.

7774. There may be advantages in it; people have to learn to be tired, no doubt?—Precisely.

7775. On the other hand, you see boys playing in a game: they play a long time, even little boys, without appearing tired?—There is a good deal of hysteria, shall I say, in that; the same thing that we meet with in a young lady, who cannot stand the most simple exercise, and will assure you that it will be the death of her; but if you happen to go to a ball you will see her dancing till 4 o'clock in the morning with the greatest ease, and she will tell you next day she is as fresh as a daisy. Yet she has been through a sort of coalheaver's exercise, if one may use the term. But if a little of that had had to be done in actual duty she would have died.

7776. But you do get a great deal more out of people when they are doing work they like?—Yes.

7777. And will not you, therefore, improve the cubical capacity of the lungs more by letting a boy run about than by putting him through drill?—No. It is astonishing how those games develop very often spasmodic breathing; that is to say, you actually raise the blood and get a certain limited action of the blood—you erect the blood, but you do not do it in the right way.

7778. I can understand that happening in the case of an athlete running his very hardest to produce a given result, but I cannot understand it in the case of a boy running about simply to amuse himself, and to make his blood circulate?—You do see boys running in a peculiar spasmodic way in the playground.

7779. Even for the sake of playing?—Yes, I think so; but I do not wish to lay any undue stress on this; it is merely that you put the question to me whether I think the cubic capacity of the lungs can be as well developed by games as by systematic exercises. I do not think it can. But a game on the top of systematic exercise will add to the foundation already laid.

7780. I understand that there are three things which exercise may improve. The first is the actions of the nerve-cells and the brain?—Yes, spinal culture.

7781. Secondly, the development of the muscles?—Yes.

7782. And, thirdly, the cubical capacity of the lungs?—Yes.

7783. Which tends the more to the working of the nerve-cells—a game or gymnastics?—It is difficult to say, they tend in different directions. I doubt very much whether you can say that the one does it more than the other; only that they do it in a somewhat slightly different way. I see your point, and there is a great deal in your point, that when children are enjoying themselves and so on there is a greater lightness, and the brain will be likely to benefit more; and it is a point I should like to think over but at the same time I think we are rather mixing two good things up, and that each good thing is good in its own function.

Mr. J. Holm F.R.C.S.E., M.R.C.S.

1 June 1897.

7784. The moral, then, would be that you should have both?—Yes.

7785. What those defective children want is not, so far as I can see, in many cases, muscular development, for their muscular development is very often as good as that of ordinary children; it is the want of the ability to use properly what they have got?—That you can only get by training, and that must be systematic training. In the case of a child who has deficiency of co-ordination, I doubt very much whether games are ever much remedy for that; because the human form adapts itself to circumstances so much that the very inco-ordination will be made to work in such a way as to fit in with and to meet the exigencies of the case; but the other, which tries to remedy the inco-ordination, is more irksome, because it is a far greater strain on the will, and in that case would undoubtedly tend far more to the development of that portion of the nervous system than any game would in that particular instance.

7786. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) Do you happen to know anything about schools for defective children in Sweden?—I cannot say that I do.

7787. There are some in Sweden, I know?—I have been to a school of the deaf and dumb, but I cannot recall that I ever visited any of the idiot asylums.

7788. I have lately received some reports from an American institution in which they had Norwegian instructresses who professed Swedish drill, and they speak very highly of it in connexion with the imbecile children that they have to deal with there; that is what brought it to my mind. Now, may I ask, do you think that Ling's system of drill reacts on the mind as well as the body, that is to say, helps the child to be attentive and prompt?—I would say that any system of drill does that, because you have to develop the habit of attention.

7789. And that is what is deficient in these children?—No doubt, and such a system is an excellent thing if it is not pushed too far by too great enthusiasm on the part of the teacher. You see, in all these cases, and in fact, universally, in the matter of physical culture, what you want to aim at is, to set up the reaction of repair and increased nutrition. If you push it too far and exhaust, you set up the reaction of exhaustion, from which they have to wait to recover. It is true you do get a repair following, but you do not re-actively stimulate repair.

7790. Does not that rather point to the necessity of some skilled supervision or direction—not necessarily medical—of these exercises in the case of deficient children?—I think that skilled direction is most desirable. To give you a similarity, when the Dental Act was passed, a portion of the medical profession held that any surgeon or physician (on the principle that the greater contains the less) should be permitted, without going through the dental curriculum, to practice as dentists. Now, Sir John Somes and Mr. Turner opposed this. They said that, however great the anatomist, however great the physician, however great the surgeon may be, unless he has been through the requisite instruction as a dentist, he is not fit to be a dentist; and they therefore insisted, and they carried their point, that to be on the dental register you must pass through the dental curriculum, and that is the difficulty one meets with at the present stage. I hope in the years to come it will be remedied, and that gymnastic training will form part of our medical curriculum; but until it does a medical man is unhappily, not competent to judge.

7791. That is to say, any general medical practitioner?—Yes. He is, of course, competent to judge if he comes in and sees the children are distressed; then he can say, "This will not do." And I think the supervision will be good, because if they undertake these supervisory duties a conscientious man will feel it his duty to make himself acquainted with the technique of that part of his work, only it takes time.

7792. You have told us that these exercises must be kept within the vital capacity of the individual?—Yes.

7793. These feeble-minded children are (sometimes, not always) feeble-bodied; and that is an additional

Mr. J. Holm, F.R.C.S.E., M.R.C.S.

1 June 1897.

argument, I think, for their being properly directed. Some children are scrofulous, some anæmic, some, as Mrs. Burgwin has told us, suffer from heart-disease. Perhaps, I might say that the heart disease that is most common is the organic form from congenital malformation?—Yes.

7794. Do you know of any limitations of drill in a case of that kind, where, *e.g.*, there is tendency to cyanosis?—Yes; when dealing with a case of that kind you must be very careful and especially with regard to arm exercises and extreme running exercises,—any extreme exercise in fact—but the arm exercises are those that act on the heart, especially the proper arm extension movements, if they have to be given in those cases where the probabilities are that they had better be left alone.

7795. So that a child like that should be taken away from the ordinary drill?—As I explained to Mrs. Burgwin, they should have special exercises, if they have any.

7796. Then one meets sometimes with children whose movement of the joints is imperfect from enlarged ends of bones, rickety children among them. Do you know anything specially good for them?—You must give applied movements.

7797. You get thickenings above the wrist, for instance?—Yes, we will assume that the operator is holding the hand, fixing it; then the patient will offer a resistance in one part or another, according to the specific circumstances of the case. Of course, if you have got an enlarged ricketty joint, you may rub it as long as the person lives, and you will not produce any appreciable absorption, but you can strengthen the part by opposing force, that is, resistant force, to the specific exercise.

7798. Sometimes one meets with children with defective sensation in their fingers, they cannot feel like ordinary children. Do you know of any special exercise for that class?—By means of very sharp percussive movements over the whole course of the spine and nerves, you can tend to wake up the nervous system. I cannot go beyond that. Again massage, of course, is a great help for defective sensation, say, in the hands; there is no doubt that massage, including kneading frictions, is very useful, not superficial frictions which do very little good, but powerful frictions, and the percussive movements. A movement carried right down the spine with extreme rapidity, not a hanging percussion, but a sharp series of percussions following each other rapidly, stimulate the spinal nervous system enormously. You find the patient say: "Oh, I feel so refreshed."

7799. Is that same sort of thing good in the case of over sensibility, hyper-æsthesia?—You have to be very cautious then. If you get a case of hyper-æsthesia as a rule, you must rely upon very quiet, gentle frictions.

7800. Then there are some nervous children we get sometimes who, if you tell them to pick a thing up, pick it up as if it burned them?—But even in hyper-æsthesia, in cases of spinal irritation in girls and young women, occasionally you find that where they cannot bear the slightest touch down the spine, because it sets up some symptom or another, it is astonishing how, in a little while, by proceeding very cautiously and gently they are able to bear a gentle passive friction, and in the course of a few weeks they will bear a very severe percussion, showing that the hyper-æsthesia disappears.

7801. Then in cases of imperfect use of the limbs after paralysis, say, after infantile paralysis, what do you recommend?—There it is purely a question, of course, of what is the extent of the injury to the nervous centre; if the nervous centre is in a very defective condition, you cannot make another nervous centre. My experience is this: that if you have a little power to start with you may very often increase it, but when you have nothing, you can do nothing.

7802. But where you have a little, you would be in favour of using that little and trying to get more?—I should, undoubtedly, be in favour of using it even though no results were gained, because it is the right treatment; but you cannot rely upon any great results following.

7803. And in those cases of involuntary movement that one sometimes sees, such as finger-twitching, what do you recommend?—There is no doubt that there is a cultivation of the regulated movement as an antidote to the involuntary movement; but that again depends upon what is the cause of the sense of irritation; and there comes in undoubtedly the beneficial influence of drugs.

7804. One gets cases ocasionally following birth-palsy, due to some injury at birth, and at school age there is no active disease, but the child has involuntary movements of certain muscles, specially marked in the hand?—I am afraid many of these cases have their origin in the unnecessarily frequent and sometimes reckless use of instruments.

7805. Well, that is a medical question?—Yes, that is a question outside.

7806. But in those cases you say that a regulated movement acts as the natural antidote to the irregular movement?—In some cases you get extraordinary results, in other cases you get none. I am afraid in the majority of cases you get little or none.

7807. I have seen some extraordinarily good results from regulated movements in the cases I have been describing as following birth-palsy?—I have seen excellent results in infantile paralysis, but on the other hand I have met with the most disappointing results.

7808. These cases have very often not much intellectual damage, they have good will power, and will try to do all you tell them to do, and so after a while they overcome this involuntary movement?—Yes.

7809. Then with bent spines, spinal curvature, I suppose you consider that always a matter for medical treatment?—It must absolutely be.

7810. You will not allow a teacher to deal with a case like that as she is accustomed to do with others?—It would be utterly useless; more likely than not they will make them worse. But in regard to spinal curvature, speaking of scoliosis, not speaking of Pott's disease, I go so far as to say that every case of scoliosis is absolutely curable if taken sufficiently early, apart from any extraordinary circumstances, such, for instance, as some terrible break-down from scarlet fever, followed by measles, and that followed by rheumatic fever, when the whole health is completely shattered; but short of that every case of scoliosis is curable if taken sufficiently early.

7811. And lordosis?—In all these cases you must give general exercises, but in cases of lordosis you must give special attention to increasing the strength of the abdominal muscles. Even some members of the profession overlook the fact that abdominal movements are special movements quite as much as those at the back of the body, and so it is in lordosis. Lordosis starts with weakness of the abdominal muscles.

7812. That is a posture one meets with often amongst feeble-minded children?—Yes, and curiously enough it is one of the evidences of the necessity of systematic training. Many children habitually never straighten their knees, they always stand with the knees slightly bent; that throws the centre of gravity of the pelvis out, and to counteract that the lordosis comes. By a very simple process of teaching that child to be knit from top to toe you have got over half the difficulty and half the cause; but the essential cause of lordosis is weakening of the abdominal muscles.

7813. I see you object to dumb-bells. Do you object equally to light wooden dumb-bells and to the more weighty ones?—The dumb-bell becomes less pernicious as it decreases in weight, but when it vanishes altogether then it becomes absolutely harmless.

7814. I had in mind the feeble grasping power which we sometimes meet with in defective children. I have been in the habit of thinking that the grasping of dumb-bells was a good thing in such cases?—Yes, for that reason, but I have in mind what is the ordinary dumb-bell exercise, that arm extension movement or rhythmical slow movement of the arms. The strongest man does not want the dumb-bell to increase; if he puts go into the movement he has quite enough muscular action, if he does the movement properly. In fact the dumb-bell prevents his bringing the muscular contraction up to that last fractional part of an inch which is the important strain to put on.

7815. Then with regard to the respiratory movements, have you any special exercises?—Yes.

7816. Are they movements of the arms?—Respiratory movements are generally combined in practice with either passive or active rotatory movements of the arm. You will start by giving the arm rotation, say, and then, having got the shoulder-blades in good and proper position, you will tell the pupil or patient to take a deep, slow respiration. And mind you, sometimes when you first start they will not know how to do that, so that you must start, perhaps, by laying them flat on their backs on a table and teaching them simply how to breathe; but assuming that they know how to breathe, only they are limited in breathing power, then you teach them to take a deep respiration while you make a slow rotatory movement of the arm, and that is repeated a few times. You will then have a little more rotation, and then you will come down and let them place their hands on their hips; and while you encourage them with your hands on the outside of their ribs to take deep respirations, being very careful that they are using the diaphragm as well as the thoracic respiratory movements. By the way, there is a point that is overlooked, and a very important one, to go back to the dumb-bells. You see that is where the difficulty comes in in arm movements, and it is the same fact that involves the danger of parallel-bars, and the danger of trapeze exercises, as well as the danger of dumb bell exercises, namely, that there is scarcely any articular attachment of the upper extremity to the body—it is only clavicular; hence all the attachments are muscular, and hence it is that the shoulder-blades are so easily dragged out of position; and when you get the attaching muscles and their tendons stretched, which is very readily done, you can get them readily strained to such an extent that you can never get them to become properly contracted again.

Mr. J. Holm F.R.C.S.E., M.R.C.S.

1 June 1897.

7817. There was just one question about military drill. Did I rightly understand that you approve of military drill for feeble-minded children?—Yes.

7818. Military drill, such as a drill-sergeant gives?—No. I want the child worked up by his free standing and other exercises, and then he should have the musket put in his hands and have the military drill. That is what I understand. I consider that the military drill, so-called, is a very poor sort of business—the free standing exercises.

7819. Do you not think it is apt to degenerate often into mere mechanical movement without any exercise of intelligence?—Yes, but you can have nothing better than the ordinary drill that a soldier goes through.

7820. I mean the squad-drill?—It is good for children to get to move in masses with regard to marching; that is a good system.

7821. But you do not think that is good enough alone?—No, I do not think so. Where you are dealing with defective children, I am afraid you are at once met with the difficulty that it is very difficult for them to work in large masses.

7822. They would be apt to get very mechanical and just imitate one another, and do the thing without any thought in an automatic sort of way?—Yes.

7823. (*Chairman.*) The plan you would like best is to have a teacher who has been trained in Ling's system?—Yes.

7824. Supposing you could get that, do you think it would be of any use to send round a teacher who has been trained in the system to the different classes, to give directions or hints to the existing teachers as to what physical exercises to use?—It would be better than nothing at all.

7825. And you think it necessary, supposing you have a trained person to teach the gymnastic exercises, that a doctor should point out the particular physical defects or weaknesses of the children?—It is desirable undoubtedly. Of course you see the trained medical gymnasts (that is the medical gymnasts trained at the Central Institute) have really a very considerable amount of semi-medical training; but even there, with that semi-medical training, it has been found in Sweden that the purely medical gymnast runs into error, and the consequence is now, that the medical gymnast in Sweden cannot practise, that is to say, cannot take undivided control of a patient as distinguished from educational gymnastics, without that case being under the supervision of a doctor of medicine, and that has been found there necessary in the very home of the system.

7826. I suppose that your belief is that these exercises on Ling's system would be less likely to injure a delicate child than the ordinary gymnastics?—Much less; but mind you, children can be injured by Ling's system as by any other, and it was just on account of that, as I mentioned to you, that the curriculum was increased. It was the enthusiastic teachers from whom the danger came, not the lazy ones.

7827. I rather gathered that these physical exercises are often a little dull for children, and uninteresting?—I think that depends very much upon the teacher. You can get a great deal of go out of them if you know how.

7828. And this percussive treatment that you were prescribing, is rather a medical treatment for the individual child, is it not?—Yes.

7829. That is not in the nature of drill?—No, it must be done under medical supervision.

7830. That is not applicable in fact, to these cases?—No.

7831. (*Dr. Shuttleworth.*) There is one question that I omitted to ask. We have heard a great deal about eye movements; that is to say, a witness told us that defective children very often could not move their eyes laterally, that if an object were held a couple of feet in front of their eyes and moved from right to left, they could not follow it with their eyes, they had to move their heads, and he made a good deal of that as a sign of mental weakness. Have you been in the way of noticing these deficient movements of the eyes?—No. It is only on theoretical consideration that it has occurred to me whether it would be worth trying systematic exercises in cases of squints; but I have never really done it, to begin with, I have never been able to get a colleague who would send a patient to me: but my plan would have been to have put a pair of spectacles, that is, absolutely closed spectacles, on the patient, with a central slot, and a little screen with a minute hole in; then, say that the child had an internal squint, to gradually draw that aperture outwards and see if you could train the child to use the eye.

7832. What I refer to is not so much a squint as want of capacity to use any of the muscles for movement of the eye balls, either laterally, or up and down?—Of course, the same plan might be tried there, but as I tell you it is only in theory that it has occurred to me, and if anyone thought it was worth trying I should be only too glad.

7833. (*Chairman.*) Have you formed an opinion as to whether hand balance, the position of the hand when held out naturally is any indication of defective intellect, the position of the hand, the way the fingers drop, whether the thumb drops, and so on?—I have not had any opportunity, but I should say that the more defective they are, the more likely they are to get into abnormality.

7834. And in Ling's system is there any special drill adapted to that kind of irregular action of the hands and arms?—Yes; Ling's movements would tend to remedy that. There are many people who cannot extend the arm thoroughly, the tendency, for some reason, is that the flexor muscles always nearly tend to overpower the extensors. Therefore a gymnast must always pay greater attention to the extensors. We notice, whether it be in old age, in weakness, or illness, we all tend to double up. In paralysis you scarcely ever see the hand turn outwards, it is always internally, because the pronators are the analogues of the flexors.

7835. Are there any books which are useful for teachers for learning this system?—The only good book I know of in English is "Ling's System of Swedish Gymnastics," and that deals only with free standing exercises.

7836. (*Mrs. Burgwin.*) Who is that by?—Captain Haasum.

7837. (*Chairman.*) Would that book be useful to the ordinary teacher?—Not the slightest use. If they have been through a course of instruction it is a most valuable book, and if they have not it is Greek and Hebrew to them.

7838. Its introductory remarks might be useful, perhaps?—Yes.

7839. But the details would be Greek and Hebrew?—Yes.

The witness withdrew.

Dr. WILLIAM ALEXANDER, M.D., F.R.C.S., of the Maghull Home for Epileptics, near Liverpool, was unable to attend, but sent the following Memorandum:

7840. For purposes of education, epileptic children can be divided into three classes:—

Class A.—Pure epileptics with minds almost unimpaired, who are as capable of control as other children, and who can be educated in the same way as, and often with, healthy children, provided that provision be made for repose and isolation should an attack occur during school hours. A great many of these cases are, at present, educated at ordinary schools or private schools.

The great majority of our epileptics at Maghull have been taught reading, writing, and arithmetic in the ordinary way. This can be done generally first, because a child having a fit does not frighten people as an adult in a fit does. Second, the majority of pure epileptics do not become seriously afflicted with the disease until the school days are over. The following statements confirm these views:—

In 116 epileptics under my care, 84 attended school for the full term, 6 left school prematurely on account of the attacks, and their education was carried on at home to its completion. All these were fairly well educated, and most of them well educated.

Sixteen had not much education. They could read and write but nothing more. All these were associated with mental defects, or with congenital epilepsy.

In 10 cases the patients were more or less imbecile. Several of these 10 had advanced fairly well in their education till epilepsy supervened, when the brain disturbance was so great as to sweep away all impression education had made upon them. Some that could read well previous to their illness cannot now recognise the letters of the alphabet.

The whole 26 were incapable of further school education, and efforts to teach them to read or write met with such very small success that the attempt had to be given up. Epileptics are, generally speaking, deficient in mathematical knowledge, if we except one or two cases where the capacity for computation has been phenomenal.

7841. *Class B.*—The second class of epileptics are those where the mind is disturbed but not much impaired. These children can learn, but they require special methods of treatment and control and are as much injured by mental work in their irritable moods as they are relieved by physical work, and they should be educated by themselves under special skilled teaching and under special medical advice.

7842. *Class C.*—The third class of epileptics are those where congenital mental defects are present, or where imbecility or idiocy exist. These cases may be educated with the weak-minded or imbeciles, and their education will consist of a small modicum of literary education and a large amount of physical education. For example, one little girl, who has been under my care for several years, is lamentably deficient in school education, and what intelligence she has is quite shattered by the simplest question. The most wild and random answers are given, yet she is reliable, industrious, and a capable worker.

Reading may be acquired by many of these patients, but only with difficulty, and it is of little use, as many of them do not read for themselves, and those who do seem to be fond of reading do not understand or remember what they have read.

But nearly all of them can find work to interest them on a farm or in a workshop, and each one has her or his vocation in which proficiency may be attained, and the object of educators should be to find the vocation for which each is fitted or inclined.

In order to ascertain the suitable vocation for each epileptic imbecile we must often work below the surface.

For instance, Tommy E., our crack bowler at Maghull, had slack-jointed legs, a slouching gait, and a loose gyrating walk. To see him come up to the wicket with the ball in his hand, a bystander would say that the ball would, probably, fly anywhere but to the appointed wicket. But Tommy had a straight eye, that fixed itself on the point to which to go, and legs and arms rallied to support the eye in a most wonderful manner.

Another youth, who had been educated by all the best methods that easy circumstances could obtain, was worried, restless, fidgety, always "boring" his relatives and attendants about his sensations, his queer feelings, and his general discomfort.

Various occupations were presented to him, such as are considered suitable to his position, but to none would he take. One day, by a whim or accident, he commenced to scrub a floor, and his vocation was found. He now goes about dressed like an ordinary farm labourer, and delights in all sorts of heavy menial work. He does not require any task to be set, but comes out to his work as if the place belonged to him, and everything depended on him.

7843. I would recommend, from what I have seen of these cases:—

1st. That epileptics who have only occasional attacks, and who are progressing satisfactorily at ordinary schools, and under suitable control at home, should not be interfered with.

2nd. That a school should be provided in every county for epileptics, who are likely to be a danger or nuisance in ordinary schools, where they could be either day scholars or boarders, and where appliances and modes of instruction would be adapted to meet the peculiarities, both mental and physical, of these cases. There is every reason to think such a school would be self-supporting.

3rd. That instruction should be more in direction of technical and manual work, than of pure brain work, and should be intended to train the child directly for a trade suitable to her or his infirmity, and by which she or he could earn a living in the future.

(Most of the 90 educated epileptics referred to in my statistics have no means of earning a livelihood, because the vocations to which any of them were apprenticed, or in which they had become proficients, were unsuitable.)

4th. Epileptics who are also weak-minded, idiots, or imbeciles, should be included in the last three classes, and treated with them in schools and workshops.

5th. The number of pure epileptic children amongst the population would probably be sufficient to require a school in every county. I have no statistics bearing on this point, except that derived from my practice, and the applications that are made to us for admission to the home at Maghull.

Adjourned.

APPENDICES.

APPENDIX A.

Appendix A.

Notes on Foreign Systems of Education of Feeble-minded Children.

I.—GERMANY.

(*a.*) NOTES taken from an ARTICLE by Herr ZIEGLER, published in Herr Prof. Dr. W. REIN'S ENCYKLOPÄDISCHES HANDBUCH DER PÄDAGOGIK, on GERMAN SCHOOLS for MENTALLY-DEFICIENT or FEEBLE-MINDED CHILDREN.

Vol. iii. sec. 33, pp. 695–700.

[For these notes the Committee are indebted to Mr. M. E. Sadler, Director of Special Inquiries and Reports to the Education Department.]

Number of schools.

(1.) 1816. The first private establishment of this kind established at Salzburg.

1846. Kingdom of Saxony established first State institution.

1867. The first *Nachhilfeklasse* opened in Dresden. About 1880 the Minister of Education, Von Gossler (Prussia), called upon all towns of over 20,000 inhabitants to provide a school of this description.

The following responded:—

Aix.	Halberstadt.
Altona.	Halle a. S.
Brunswick.	Hamburg.
Bremen.	Hanover.
Breslau.	Karlsruhe.
Chemnitz.	Kassel.
Crefeld.	Cologne.
Dresden.	Königsberg.
Dortmund.	Leipzig.
Düsseldorf.	Magdeburg.
Elberfeld.	Mayence.
Erfurt.	Nordhausen.
Frankfurt a. M.	Stettin.
Gera.	Weimar.
Görlitz.	

There are 30 of these schools in the German Empire.

Fifty establishments altogether of one sort or another. Many more are being built.

In some cases there are special classes for weak-minded. They are mainly founded on the model of Elberfeld.

The present supply of schools is quite insufficient.

Admission.

(2.) Great care is taken to prevent the stigma of "idiocy" from attaching itself to these schools. They are not to receive epileptics nor juvenile criminals; they are not to receive children deficient in hearing or sight; nor children who are backward through illness or irregular attendance.

Admission is limited to children who, after two years at a State elementary school, have proved themselves incapable of doing the work.

Age.

(3.) The age of admission is usually eight years, but exceptions may be made, after thorough investigation by teachers, managers, and doctor.

Object.

(4.) The object of these schools is to ensure primary notions of right and wrong, and of orderly behaviour, and to enable the children to earn their living and hold their own in the world.

Duration of school life.

(5.) The duration of school life is ordinarily six years; but after suitable investigation, and on expressed wish of parents, two years may be added to course.

Division of school.

(6.) The schools are arranged in the three-class system (Dreiklassen system), with two divisions (abteilungen).

Girls and boys are not separated.

Subjects of instruction.

(7.) The subjects of instruction are partly those of the primary school, but a much lower standard is expected, and no compulsion is exercised to get the children up to any particular level.

Teaching is done largely by means of pictures and object lessons.

There are games with balls, &c.

Exercises in distinguishing shape, colour, qualities, materials.

Building or forming patterns with "toys."

Exercises in distinguishing tastes, sounds, &c.

Froebel gifts largely used.

In some schools—lathe, cardboard-work, and cane-chair seating and mat weaving.

In arithmetic, simple operations not going beyond 1,000.

In religion, preparation for confirmation.

Simple teaching of Bible history, and faith and practice of Christianity.

Gymnastics and games.

Time-table.

(8.) Time-tables vary from 15 to 30 hours a week. Where the schools are in the same buildings, or near other schools, the times of opening and closing are 15 minutes later, to prevent possible disturbance.

Elberfeld time-table.

(9.) The actual hours at Elberfeld are:—

Classes I. and II. (27 hours weekly.) 4 days 4¾ hours. 2 days 4 hours.	Hrs.	Class III. (27 hours weekly.) 4 days 4¾ hours. 2 days 4 hours.	Hrs.
Religion	4½	Religion	4½
Arithmetic	5	Arithmetic	6
Reading	5	Reading and writing	6
Writing	2	Drawing	1
Object lessons	1	Varied occupations	2
Drawing	2	Manual instruction (for girls)	3½
Manual instruction	4½	Other object lessons	3
Geography or singing	3	Singing and articulation	1

Hours 8.15 a.m. to 4.15 p.m.
With break from 11.15 (or 12) a.m. to 2.15 p.m.

Cost.

(10.) The cost is borne by the town; in only a few cases are fees charged.

The cost is from 3*l.* to 5*l.* per head.

Teachers.

(11.) Teachers are chiefly men. In consideration of the untiring patience and love needed for the work they receive from 5*l.* to 20*l.* extra yearly.

Results of these schools.

(12.) The results of these schools are universally admitted to be good.

Of the children who left school at Easter, 1893, the following per-centage were capable of earning their living (erwerbsfähig):—

In Aix	68 per cent.
In Düsseldorf	80 ,,
In Cologne	87 ,,
In Brunswick and Crefeld	90 ,,
In Dresden, Halberstadt, and Hanover	100 ,,

Out of 71 who left Elberfeld in 1893:—

17 artizans.
13 house-work at home.
4 domestic servants.
12 factory hands and day labourers.
4 errand boys.
1 clerk.
15 without work owing to illness.
5 unknown.