

# TRAINING COLLEGES.

SPECIAL JOINT COMMITTEE OF THE  
ASSOCIATION OF MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS, COUNTY COUNCILS ASSOCIATION,  
AND ASSOCIATION OF EDUCATION COMMITTEES.

## MEMORANDUM

ON

### Training Colleges for Teachers Provided by Local Education Authorities.

IMPOSSIBLE FINANCIAL POSITION IN WHICH THESE  
COLLEGES HAVE BEEN PLACED.

#### Training Colleges are National Institutions.

1. Training colleges for teachers are national institutions meeting a national need. Students come to the colleges from all parts of the country and on the completion of their training they leave to take up appointments as teachers in schools in all parts of the country. Apart from its impracticability, any attempt to make training colleges local institutions would be unsound educationally; it would take from prospective teachers the opportunity of widening their outlook while in training by contact with students from other areas. The effect of such a policy would be that candidates for the teaching profession would receive their preliminary training in the local schools, be sent to the local training college and then look for appointments in the local schools. The outlook of the teacher would run the risk of becoming parochial and the consequent narrowing of vision would have an undesirable effect in the elementary schools.

2. For many years the Government recognised the national character of all training colleges and made grants to such colleges on a national scale. The grants, with the fees charged to the students, were sufficient to meet the maintenance costs.

#### Offer of Government Assistance to Local Education Authorities to establish Training Colleges.

3. Under the Education Act of 1902, local education authorities were given the power to supply or aid the supply of higher education facilities in their areas. For some years after the passing of this Act, the training college accommodation throughout the country was

inadequate and many candidates, on satisfactorily completing their apprenticeship, found it impossible to obtain entrance to a college for training. To encourage local authorities to make good the deficiency, the Government in 1906 offered to provide 75 per cent. of the capital cost of establishing training colleges. Liberal maintenance grants on a capitation basis were also made in respect to the students in attendance.

Responding to this invitation, a number of local authorities considered it their duty to establish training colleges and to assist the Board of Education to meet the national need for further training college accommodation. Under the Government scale of grants, the financial responsibility for each college rested mainly with the central authority, while the organisation, control, and management rested with the local authority concerned.

In several instances, the establishment of a training college was agreed to by the local authority only after repeated assurances to its members that the Government grants were and would remain on a national basis which would leave little, if any, charge upon the local rates. In practice, it was usually found that the Government grants, together with the fees charged to students, enabled each provided college to meet the whole of the maintenance costs, except the charge upon the local rates necessary to meet the sinking fund payments on the buildings which ultimately would become the property of the local authority.

The national character of the colleges was thus fully recognised and local authorities never

imagined that the Government would not continue to make grants on the same national scale to all colleges.

In 1906 the Government grants to residential colleges were £53 a year for a man and £38 for a woman.

#### **Continuance of Government Grants on National basis.**

4. During the war special supplementary grants were made to training colleges to meet the increased cost due to war causes. With this exception, no change was made until 1918 when, in view of the increased cost of living, the Government grants were increased to £55 a year for a man and £48 for a woman.

In 1919 the Government grants were again increased to £71 13s. 4d. a year for a man and £62 6s. 8d. for a woman.

5. In 1922-23, the maximum grants payable to denominational training colleges are £76 13s. 4d. a year for a man and £65 6s. 8d. for a woman.

#### **Breach of faith: Training colleges provided by local education authorities converted into local institutions and made a charge upon local rates. Denominational colleges not affected.**

6. Under the Education Act of 1918 (section 44 (2)) it is laid down that the total Government grants paid to a local education authority "shall not be less than one-half of the net expenditure of the authority recognised by the Board of Education as expenditure in aid of which parliamentary grants should be made to the authority, and if the total grants to an authority in any year fall short of one half of that expenditure, there shall be paid by the Board of Education to that authority a deficiency grant equal to the amount of the deficiency."

7. In the administration of section 44 (2) of the Education Act of 1918, the Board of Education issued Regulations in the year 1919-20 requiring the accounts of training colleges maintained by local education authorities to be included in the calculations for the deficiency grant for their local higher education work. These colleges were to be treated as local institutions, and the local ratepayers were to be asked to find 50 per cent. of the college

expenditure, after the deduction of students' fees, notwithstanding the fact that the large majority of the students in training (sometimes as many as 90 per cent.) came from other areas and had no claim whatever upon the ratepayers of the area of the authority in which the college was situated.

8. The denominational training colleges carried on by the Church of England, the Roman Catholic Church, the Wesleyan Church, or other bodies were to continue to be treated as *national institutions*, meeting a national need, and receiving capitation grants on a national basis as heretofore.

Thus the principle of preferential financial treatment to denominational colleges was set up, and a position created which constituted a breach of faith with the local education authorities who, relying upon the continuance of the Government grants on a *national* basis for all colleges, had assisted the central authority to remedy the insufficiency of training college accommodation.

#### **Repeated representations as to the injustice of the position created.**

9. Since 1919-20, local education authorities have made repeated representations to the Board of Education as to the gross injustice of the position. Invariably the Board have replied that they had *no power* to exclude training college accounts from the calculations for the ascertainment of the amount of deficiency grant payable in respect of local educational work, without rectifying legislation.

The amazing suggestion in fact has been put forward that when the 50 per cent. Deficiency Grant Regulation was adopted, training college finance, in common with the finance of other branches of education, was taken into consideration, and, that as each local authority benefited financially by the change, there was no reason for complaint. Such an argument might be advanced if training colleges were *local* institutions or if each local authority had a training college meeting its own needs only, and denominational training colleges receiving *Government grants on a national basis* did not exist. But when it is remembered that 16 local authorities only have training colleges and that the great majority of the students in these colleges come from other areas and have no

claim whatever upon the local authority providing the college, such a suggestion only accentuates the feeling of injustice, and the only conclusion which can be drawn is that the Board of Education, so far, have refused to consider the position seriously.

#### Increased demands on local rates.

10. In April, 1920, on the completion of the first year of the operation of the "Deficiency Grant Regulations," each local authority maintaining a training college had to make demands on its local ratepayers which could not be justified having regard to the small number of students attending the college from their own area; the ratepayers were thus heavily penalised because the local authority had provided a training college. The increased demands, however, were met as it was anticipated that the false position in which the local authorities had been placed would be recognised and would be rectified forthwith by the Board of Education, even if an amending Act of Parliament were necessary.

#### Impossible position in which local authorities providing training colleges have been placed.

11. The unfairness of the financial position thus created for local authorities maintaining training colleges is exemplified by the case of the Leeds training college.

Prior to the operation of the Education Act of 1918, the charge upon the local rates in respect of the city of Leeds training college was always less than the amount necessary to meet the sinking fund charges on the college buildings. (See Appendix A.)

For the financial year ended 31st March, 1920 (the first year of the operation of the deficiency grant regulations), the net cost of the college amounted to £36,906, 50 per cent. of which had to be provided from local rates.

The local rates for the previous year had provided £4,103 9s. 4d. (*i.e.*, less than the amount required to meet the sinking fund charges on the college buildings), while the Board of Education provided £22,654. For 1919, 15 per cent. of the net cost, therefore, had been met by local rates and 85 per cent. by Government grants.

For the five years preceding 1920, the percentages of the cost met by Government grants and local rates respectively were as follows:—

(1) Year	(2) Government Grants		(3) Local Rates			
	£	(%)	£	£ s. d.	per student	
1915	20,421	(91%)	2,121	(9%)	or 4 10 10	
1916	19,185	(86%)	3,145	(14%)	or 7 10 6	"
1917	18,413	(83%)	3,898	(17%)	or 11 2 2	"
1918	19,900	(84%)	3,867	(16%)	or 11 19 5	"
1919	22,654	(85%)	4,103	(15%)	or 12 2 1	"
1920	18,453	(50%)	18,453	(50%)	or 53 12 10	"
1921	24,504	(50%)	24,504	(50%)	or 59 15 4	"
1922	26,231	(50%)	26,231	(50%)	or 54 19 10	"

The above percentages are illustrative of the financial position in which most of the colleges belonging to local education authorities have been placed.

12. For the year ended 31st March, 1922, the deficit of the Leeds college had increased to £52,462, of which £26,231 was provided by the local rates (the equivalent of a rate of 2 5 4d. in the £).

494 students were in attendance during the academic year 1921-22, but 28 (or only 5.6 per cent.) were Leeds students, while the remaining 466 (or 94.4 per cent.) came from other areas.

The local ratepayers were required for the financial year ended 31st March, 1922, to put a sum of £55 behind each student whether the student came from Leeds, the South, the Midlands, the North of England, or from Wales or Ireland. Looked at from another point of view, the Leeds ratepayers were required to find a sum of nearly £1,000 for each of the 28 Leeds students, who alone had any claim upon them.

Such an injustice calls for immediate remedy.

13. In view of the impossible financial position, and in order to lighten the burden, the Leeds local authority have been compelled to increase the fee to students admitted to the college as from September, 1923, as follows:—

To Leeds students—from £30 to £40 a year.

To students from other areas—from £30 to £80 a year.

The fee to students from other areas is heavy, but it is felt that the local authority have no alternative; and even when the full effect of

the increased fee is felt, the city rates will still have to provide a sum of £30 per student in attendance or between £14,000 and £15,000 a year (the equivalent of a rate of nearly 1½d. in the £) on an institution which cannot possibly be termed a local institution.

Other local authorities maintaining training colleges are raising their fees to students from outside areas to £80, £85, £90, £105, and even to £120 a year to reduce their burden.

### Bewildered Parents.

Parents cannot understand why students in denominational training colleges can get all the necessary training, together with board and residence, for a payment of £20 or £30 a year, while at a training college provided by a local education authority, the fee is £80, £85, £90, £105, or even £120 a year.

As a matter of fact, it is quite impossible for many of the parents to pay such fees.

14. The following table shows the number of students attending the City of Leeds Training College in recent years from (a) the Leeds area, and (b) outside areas:—

(1)	(2) Total number of students	(3) Number from Leeds area	(4) Per- centage of whole	(5) Number from areas of other authorities	(6) Per- centage of whole
1913-14	480	56	11·67	424	88·33
1914-15	461	61	13·23	400	86·77
1915-16	396	52	13·13	344	86·87
1916-17	329	46	13·98	283	86·02
1917-18	320	50	15·62	270	84·38
1918-19	349	35	10·03	314	89·97
1919-20	341	18	5·28	323	94·72
1920-21	444	22	4·9	422	95·1
1921-22	494	28	5·6	466	94·4
1922-23	459	47	10·24	412	89·76

It will be seen that usually about 90 per cent. of the students come from other parts of the country and have no claim whatever on the local ratepayers.

### Attempts to remedy the position.

15. From 1920 onwards, a number of discussions and meetings have taken place between representatives of local education authorities and the Board of Education with the object of remedying the injustice. Several suggestions have been examined with a view to avoid amending legislation, but each has presented difficulties regarded as insuperable and no solution has been reached. The 16 local education authorities maintaining training colleges still continue to bear the brunt of the expenditure on the colleges which, though situated in

their areas, are rendering a distinctly national service.

### Palliative measures.

16. Local authorities maintaining training colleges are proposing to increase the fees charged to outside students. Such action, however, will not remedy the financial situation of the colleges or fully relieve the local rate-payers unless the fee is fixed at a figure which will cover the entire cost of training.

The fee which has been fixed at a number of colleges provided by local authorities will, it is feared, be prohibitive, and result in some of the up-to-date colleges being left half empty.

It will certainly have the effect of inducing students to seek admission to denominational colleges where the fees are lower because the Government grants are continued on the old national basis: Colleges provided by local education authorities will only get the students who cannot secure admission to denominational colleges, *i.e.*, the best qualified students will go to the latter colleges.

Denominational colleges are in most cases able to make ends meet with the Government capitation grants received and the fees charged to the students—it is not unusual for a denominational college to have a credit balance.

### A contrast.

17. In one denominational college of 320 students the donations towards the year's maintenance amounted to £88 and a grant of £1,400 was made by the voluntary Board of Supervision. This college spent £1,950 on repairs, £500 on furniture, met the interest on a bank overdraft of £7,121, and finished financially nearly £900 better off than at the commencement of the year.

Were the above a training college provided by a local education authority the local rate-payers would have had to provide at least £10,000 to meet the maintenance charges for the year.

This illustrates the absurdity of the two Government systems of financing the same national work.

The two types of college are doing work similar in character, of equal national importance, and any differentiation in the scale of Government grants is illogical and cannot be justified.

It is, moreover, suggested that the framers of section 44 (2) of the Education Act of 1918 could never have intended this section to apply to institutions serving a national need and drawing students from all parts of the country.

The unexpected application of the wording of this section to colleges provided by local education authorities has had disastrous results.

### Suggested remedy.

18. It is submitted that the Government should no longer delay the reinstatement of the substantive (per capita) grants made prior to 1919 to training colleges belonging to local authorities; if necessary, immediate steps should be taken to promote a Bill in Parliament to end this impossible position of the provided training colleges.

Any other solution would leave the denominational training colleges in a strong preferential position for the recruitment of students for training: equality of treatment is the only fair solution.

With the reinstatement of the capitation grants it should be left to each college to fix the fee charged to the students at such an amount as would leave the local rates to find a sum approximating to the sinking fund charges on the college buildings. There could and would

be no objection on the part of local ratepayers to meet that charge.

### Cost to the Government of reinstating the substantive (per capita) grants to training colleges provided by local education authorities.

19. In England and Wales there are some 91 training colleges of which 20 are provided by local education authorities.

It is estimated that the cost to the Government of reinstating the capitation grants to training colleges provided by local education authorities would amount to a sum of approximately £65,000 a year.

NOTE.—A list of training colleges provided by local education authorities is attached. (*See Appendix B.*) A memorandum indicating the action taken to secure redress of the impossible position created for local authorities providing training colleges is also attached. (*See Appendix C.*)

## APPENDIX A.

### COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF COST OF THE CITY OF LEEDS TRAINING COLLEGE YEARS 1908-1922.

(1) Financial years ended 31st March	(2) PAYMENTS.			(3) Total.	(4) Receipts.	(5) Net cost to be met by Government Grant and Rates.	(6) Government Grant.	(7) Cost to Local Rates.	
	Maintenance.	Loans.						Total Amount.	Per Student in attendance.
		Principal.	Interest.						
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	
1908	2,334 8 0	—	—	2,334 8 0	1,464 10 4	869 17 8	2,854 0 0	Credit— 1,984 2 4	Credit— 14 1 5
1909	9,769 13 1	—	—	9,769 13 1	4,256 1 4	5,513 11 9	5,934 0 0	Credit— 420 8 3	Credit— 1 19 1
1910	14,340 17 4	320 0 5	528 8 7	15,189 6 4	5,099 9 2	10,089 17 2	9,807 6 8	282 10 6	1 2 6
1911	11,867 15 5	454 14 9	598 13 5	12,921 3 7	4,311 12 4	8,609 11 3	9,038 10 0	Credit— 428 18 9	Credit— 1 10 6
1912	16 385 16 2	627 5 9	2,481 11 11	19,494 13 10	6,572 2 6	12,922 11 4	10,335 13 7	2,586 17 9	7 12 2
1913	22,591 17 6	768 17 1	2,652 14 9	26,013 9 4	11,366 6 0	14,647 3 4	13,581 4 7	1,065 16 9	2 11 10
1914	25,950 14 9	912 14 9	3,825 3 6	30,688 13 0	9,696 17 1	20,991 15 11	19,993 6 8	998 9 3	2 2 11
1915	25,433 6 4	2,238 6 3	4,514 4 2	32,185 16 9	9,643 9 8	22,542 7 1	20,421 0 0	2,121 7 1	4 10 10
1916	25,211 1 4	2,350 2 8	3,917 17 4	31,479 1 4	9,149 1 3	22,330 0 1	19,185 0 0	3,145 0 1	7 10 6
1917	23,093 5 4	2,420 12 8	3,758 5 3	29,272 3 3	6,960 7 7	22,311 15 8	18,413 0 0	3,898 15 8	11 2 2
1918	24,102 0 8	2,493 4 9	3,673 10 9	30,268 16 2	6,501 14 1	23,767 2 1	19,900 0 0	3,867 2 1	11 19 5
1919	26,943 19 9	2,568 0 9	3,842 8 9	33,354 9 3	6,596 19 11	26,757 9 4	22,654 0 0	4,103 9 4	12 2 1
1920	37,791 16 5	2,645 1 9	4,994 17 0	45,431 15 2	8,525 12 6	36,906 2 8	18,453 1 4	18,453 1 4	53 12 10
1921	49,874 5 3	2,724 8 10	4,862 11 11	57,461 6 0	8,452 12 10	49,008 13 2	24,504 6 7	24,504 6 7	59 15 4
1922	57,723 5 1	2,806 3 3	4,726 7 6	65,255 15 10	12,793 5 4	52,462 10 6	26,231 5 3	26,231 5 3	54 19 10

## APPENDIX B.

## TRAINING COLLEGES PROVIDED BY LOCAL EDUCATION AUTHORITIES.

(1) College and responsible Local Education Authority	(2) Number of students at present attending the college.				(3) Deficiency Grant, payable by Board of Education in respect of the college for the year ended 31st March, 1922.			(4) Estimated sum payable to college by Board of Education for year ended 31st March, 1922, had the substan- tive (per capita) grants continued to operate.			(5) Additional amount to be provided by Board of Education if substantive (per capita) grants were re-instated.			(6) Charge upon local rates in respect of college for year ended 31st March, 1922.			(7) Amount provided per residential student from local rates, irrespec- tive of area from which student is drawn.		
	From own area.		From other areas.		£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
	Resi- dent.	Non- Resident.	Resi- dent.	Non- Resident.															
<b>RESIDENTIAL COLLEGES.</b>																			
Bingley (West Riding of Yorks.)	101	—	99	—	10,310	1	4	13,066	13	4	2,756	12	0	10,310	1	4	51	11	0
Brighton .. ..	1	27	87	9	3,979	4	0	7,264	0	0	3,284	16	0	3,979	4	0	*		
Caerleon (Monmth.)	34	—	71	—	6,261	17	11	8,050	0	0	1,788	2	1	6,261	17	11	59	12	8
Barry (Glamorgan)	80	20	50	—	6,913	0	0	9,865	0	0	2,952	0	0	6,913	0	0	46	0	0
Bangor Normal ..	210	—	75	—	12,896	10	0	25,793	0	0	12,896	10	0	12,896	10	0	44	9	5
Crewe (Cheshire) ..	30	44	22	14	5,491	0	0	7,950	0	0	2,459	0	0	5,491	0	0	*		
Dudley .. ..	—	7	78	79	3,785	12	3	9,741	6	8	5,955	14	5	3,785	12	3	—		
Hereford County ..				See	Note†						Nil.								
Hull Municipal ..	28	—	124	—	6,520	13	9	9,930	13	4	3,409	19	7	6,520	13	9	42	18	0
Leeds City .. ..	47	—	413	—	26,231	5	3	33,400	0	0	7,168	14	9	26,231	5	3	54	19	10
Avery Hill (London)	105	20	146	2	17,480	0	0	21,196	0	0	3,716	0	0	17,480	0	0	57	8	1
Furzedown ..	101	84	57	22	13,730	0	0	13,860	0	0	130	0	0	13,730	0	0	66	0	1
Manchester Mather	5	6	35	13	3,645	14	0	3,113	6	8	Nil.			3,850	9	0	46	5	6
Portsmouth .. ..	2	57	131	6	5,712	0	0	11,074	0	0	5,362	0	0	5,712	0	0	35	7	4
Sheffield City ..	20	13	191	—	10,761	0	0	15,868	0	0	5,107	0	0	11,288	0	0	50	10	11
Swansea .. ..	24	41	96	25	7,276	0	0	13,066	0	0	5,790	0	0	7,276	0	0	*		
<b>DAY COLLEGES.</b>																			
Graystoke Place (London)	—	107	—	36	4,487	0	0	4,004	0	0	Nil.			4,487	0	0	—		
Shoreditch (London)	—	45	—	2	1,011	0	0	1,260	0	0	249	0	0	1,011	0	0	—		
Manchester Mncpl.	—	58	—	129	4,698	1	0	4,650	0	0	Nil.			4,698	1	0	—		
Sunderland .. ..	—	21	—	125	1,989	4	0	4,088	0	0	2,098	16	0	1,989	4	1	—		
											£ 65,124 4 10								

\* Not possible to separate cost as between residential students and day students.

† Up to the present the operation of the deficiency grant regulations has not affected adversely the finances of the Hereford local authority. The authority received last year from the Government practically 65 per cent. of the net expenditure on higher education.

## APPENDIX C.

## FINANCING OF TRAINING COLLEGES.

## ACTION TAKEN TO SECURE REDRESS OF THE IMPOSSIBLE FINANCIAL SITUATION CREATED FOR TRAINING COLLEGES PROVIDED BY LOCAL EDUCATION AUTHORITIES.

1918.—The Education Act, 1918, laid down that total Government grants paid to local education authorities should be not less than half the net expenditure recognised by the Board of Education, and if grants paid

were less than one half, Board would make up the deficiency.

January, 1920.—Board of Education issued Regulations which required the accounts of a training college provided by a local

education authority to be included with local educational services in the local authority's calculations for the ascertainment of the deficiency grant payable. This decision indicated that while grants on the national scale were to be continued to denominational colleges, the grants to colleges provided by local education authorities were to be reduced and 50 per cent. of the cost of such colleges, after deductions of the fees charged to students, was to be met by the *local ratepayers*.

February, 1920.—Representations made to the Board of Education as to the injustice of the decision.

April, 1920.—The Board of Education stated that they had no power to exclude training college accounts from deficiency grant calculations.

Meeting at Leeds Education Offices on 20th April, 1920, of representatives of local education authorities responsible for training colleges, and deputation appointed to interview Board of Education.

May, 1920.—Statement prepared and forwarded to Board of Education on behalf of education authorities responsible for training colleges.

June, 1920.—Deputation of representatives of local education authorities interviewed the Board of Education, and Board promised to give consideration to the representations put forward.

January, 1921.—No action had been taken by the Board of Education and further meeting of representatives of local education authorities managing training colleges arranged to consider matter.

Decided to communicate again with the Board of Education and to ask the local authorities' educational associations to take matter up.

May, 1921.—Circular issued by the Board of Education to local authorities putting forward a scheme for financing training colleges maintained by local authorities. Scheme suggested sharing cost between Board and local authorities sending students to the colleges. Memorandum prepared showing the proposal impracticable as it

would mean that many local authorities would make no contribution to the cost of training of teachers. Representatives of Association of Municipal Corporations, County Councils Association, Association of Education Committees and local authorities maintaining training colleges had interview with Board of Education to discuss the circular.

August, 1921.—Alternative scheme suggested to Board of Education whereby deficit on training colleges provided by local education authorities might be met from pool to which all authorities should be required to contribute on basis of child population. Contributions of local authorities to rank for Board of Education deficiency grant.

August, 1921, to July, 1922.—Board considered suggested scheme and possibility of promoting a Bill in Parliament to give effect to it, but came to conclusion that they could not make the Bill a Government measure as it would be too controversial to stand a chance of being passed into law.

Board suggested that local authorities should agree among themselves as regards principles, and that they should promote a Bill which the Government could support.

Several meetings of the various educational associations took place, but although a number of suggestions were examined, no agreement could be reached.

July, 1922, to December, 1922.—Further meetings took place between the various educational associations. In August, 1922, a letter was forwarded to the Board of Education showing that the deficit on the Leeds college had increased to over £26,000 a year and intimating that this burden on a non-local institution could not continue to be placed upon the rates.

13th December, 1922.—Further meeting arranged between the President of the Board of Education (the Right Hon. E. F. L. Wood, M.P.) and representatives of the Association of Municipal Corporations, the County Councils Association, and the Association of Education Committees. The President received the deputation sympathetically and stated that the representations made should have his careful consideration.

[OVER.

### Striking Facts.

1. For some years after the passing of the Education Act of 1902 the training college accommodation throughout the country was inadequate. To encourage local education authorities to make good the deficiency the Government in 1906 offered to provide 75 per cent. of the capital cost of establishing training colleges and to give maintenance grants on a national basis. In response to this invitation 16 local authorities established training colleges on the understanding that the Government grant would remain on a *national* basis, which would leave little or no charge upon the local rates.
2. The grants were continued on a national basis to all colleges until 1919. They are still continued to colleges *not provided by local education authorities*, but, because of an unexpected application of the wording of section 44 (2) of the Education Act of 1918, training colleges provided by local education authorities are now illogically treated as *local* institutions and the finance of these colleges is lumped with that of local educational services. By this means the Government grant to training colleges under local education authorities is reduced from approximately 90 per cent. to 50 per cent. of the net expenditure, and *the ratepayers of the area in which the college is situated are required to find the other 50 per cent. of the net cost.*
3. Training colleges are in no sense provided to meet local needs: only a very small proportion of the students are drawn from the area in which the college is situated, and only about 10 to 20 per cent. of the students on the completion of their training are absorbed or are absorbable in that area.
4. In Leeds in 1919 local rates had to find a sum of £4,103 in respect of the city of Leeds training college, or 15 per cent. of the net cost, the Government finding £22,654 or 85 per cent. of the net cost. Now the local ratepayers have to find 50 per cent. of the net cost. Leeds, in consequence of the change, had to provide in respect of the college a sum of over £26,000 for the financial year ended 31st March, 1922, or a rate of 2½d. in the £. In other words, Leeds rates put a sum of £55 behind each student whether the student came from Leeds, the North of England, the South, the Midlands, Wales, or from Ireland. Looked at from another point of view, of the 494 students in attendance at the college, 28 only were Leeds students, and the Leeds ratepayers were required to find a sum of nearly £1,000 for each of these 28 students *who alone had any claim upon them.*  

The above example is typical of the position in which practically all training colleges provided by local education authorities (see Appendix B, page 6) have been placed by the change in the system of Government grants payable to such colleges.
5. A continuance of the present financial position is impossible. It is manifestly unfair to local ratepayers who entered into a partnership with the Government to carry out a national responsibility.
6. Repeated representations for remedy to the Government have failed. Preferential treatment of one type of training college cannot be justified and should cease. All training colleges are doing work similar in character and of equal national importance, and equivalent grants must be made to all colleges.

February, 1923.