

unfortunate that these figures, incapable of proof and based upon vague assertion, should be quoted by public men of position, with no warning as to their unreliability, and made use of to induce the public to call for exceptional legislation to relieve the distress they are thus led to believe exists to so vast an extent.

The experience of the Joint Committee on Underfed Children, established by the London School Board, and continued by the London County Council,<sup>1</sup> has shown conclusively that there is no ground, so far as the Metropolis is concerned, for the assertion that private charity is unable to meet the demand, even when it is swelled by the inclusion of large numbers of children not really in want of the relief given. Nor is there any reason to think that the case is different outside the Metropolis.

Mr. Barrow himself seems to have found no difficulty in relieving the distress in his own schools, and the description he gives of his own work is a convincing proof that even in so poor a district as that to which he refers, and when so large a proportion of the children are considered by him to require meals, private charity is quite able to meet the demand.

It is clear, therefore, that those that say that legislation is necessary, owing to the vast number of school children suffering from want of food, have entirely failed to make out their case, whilst on the other hand there is abundant evidence to show that the numerical statements on which they rely are grossly exaggerated, and that private charity properly organised is fully capable of dealing satisfactorily with the distress arising from under-feeding.

Secondly.—Would the scheme have the desired effect?

Shortly stated, Mr. Barrow's scheme appears to be that a list of underfed children should be compiled by the Managers' Attendance Committee, assisted by the School Visitors; that

<sup>1</sup> See an interesting article by Sir Charles Elliot on "The Gratuitous Feeding of School Children," *Empire Review*, May 1905.