



Durham E-Theses

An Alternative Approach to Child Rescue: child emigration societies in Birmingham and Manchester, 1870-1914

WARD, REBECCA,ROSE

How to cite:

WARD, REBECCA,ROSE (2010) *An Alternative Approach to Child Rescue: child emigration societies in Birmingham and Manchester, 1870-1914*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online: <http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/611/>

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

Academic Support Office, Durham University, University Office, Old Elvet, Durham DH1 3HP
e-mail: e-theses.admin@dur.ac.uk Tel: +44 0191 334 6107
<http://etheses.dur.ac.uk>

Rebecca Ward, 'An Alternative Approach to Child Rescue: child emigration societies in Birmingham and Manchester, 1870-1914'

Abstract

This study analyses the operations and activities of two child emigration societies based in Birmingham and Manchester between 1870 and 1914. It argues that both societies marketed and promoted their work as an alternative approach to 'child rescue'. Doing so places them in the wider context of a child emigration movement and a child rescue movement, both of which flourished between the end of the nineteenth century and start of the twentieth century. It also suggests that the founders and staff at these child emigration societies reflected and exploited contemporary ideals, beliefs and fears, particularly about the role of the child and the family within society, the expense of poor law relief, social problems in urban cities and the need for empire strengthening. To persuade people that transplanting children overseas was an alternative form of child rescue, the two societies in Birmingham and Manchester presented a self-created image of their work, which they could change, manipulate and re-adjust to suit their purposes.

Chapter One analyses the motivating factors for child emigration societies to begin their work in Birmingham and Manchester, as well as the subsequent justifications they used to explain their work. Chapter Two assesses the communication and co-operation between the regional child emigration organisations and others involved in child rescue, their relations with government agencies and the ways in which external influences shaped their activities. Chapter Three analyses how the two societies generated and maintained support for their activities through interaction with local people, in both England and Canada. Chapter Four examines how they responded to contemporary challenges and criticisms regarding the welfare of children under their guardianship. This includes an analysis of the ways in which they explained their methods of caring for, training and protecting the children as an alternative approach to child rescue.

**An Alternative Approach to Child Rescue: child
emigration societies in Birmingham and Manchester,
1870-1914**

A thesis submitted by Rebecca Ward for the degree of MA by Research.

One volume

History Department, Durham University

September 2010

Contents Page

<i>List of Tables and Images</i>	p. 2
<i>Abbreviations</i>	p. 3
Introduction	p. 4
Chapter 1: Motivations and Justifications	p. 19
Chapter 2: Networks and Connections	p. 40
Chapter 3: Support and Finances	p. 61
Chapter 4: Protection, Training and Preparation	p. 84
Conclusion	p. 105
Appendices	p. 114
Bibliography	p. 118

List of Tables and Images

Tables

Table 1: Children in an urbanising population in England and Wales p. 22

Table 2: Proportion of poor law children from government institutions
in CEH emigration parties p. 54

Table 3: CEH Sources of Income p. 63

Images

Image 1: Emaciated child p. 68

Image 2: MRH annual meeting, 1910 p. 72

Abbreviations

BCL	Birmingham Central Library
CEH	Children's Emigration Homes, Birmingham
HCPP	House of Commons Parliamentary Papers
HL	House of Lords Parliamentary Papers
MCL	Manchester Central Library
MRH	Manchester and Salford Boys' and Girls' Refuges and Homes
NSPCC	National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children
PO	Records of the Parliament Office
PU	Records of the Public Bill Office

Introduction

On 24 February 2010, British Prime Minister Gordon Brown formally apologised for Britain's role in sending thousands of children overseas, particularly to Australia in the first half of the twentieth century. He stated

To all those former child migrants and their families we are truly sorry. They were let down. We are truly sorry they were allowed to be sent away at the time when they were most vulnerable. We are sorry that instead of caring for them, this country turned its back.¹

As early as the seventeenth century, unaccompanied children left Britain's shores to begin new lives in various locations across the world, but it was not until the mid-nineteenth century that the systematic and widespread emigration of British children began.² The process of transplanting children overseas continued in various guises until 1967 and though exact records are not available, estimates suggest that around 150,000 children were distributed without their parents throughout the British empire over four centuries.³

Modern charities, such as the Child Migrants Trust, have been campaigning during the last three decades for recognition of the 'lost childhoods' of Australian child migrants in the twentieth century. The recent apologies by the Australian and British prime ministers in 2009 and 2010, respectively, have prompted fervent media attention on the history and legacy of child emigration. Journalists for the BBC declared child emigration was 'a history of lies, deceit, cruelty and official disinterest and neglect', whilst Baroness Amos (Britain's High Commissioner in Canberra) stated in the press that the transplantation of children to Australia was 'an absolutely shocking period in our history'.⁴

Despite the recent interest in child emigration to Australia during the first half of the twentieth century, there is only limited research into those children taken to Canada from the middle of the nineteenth century through to the 1920s. In particular, regional

¹ 'Gordon Brown apologises to child migrants sent abroad' (24.02.2010)
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/8531664.stm> (16.10.2010).

² For a more comprehensive discussion of early child migration see G. Wagner, *Children of the Empire* (London, 1982), chapter 1.

³ P. Bean and J. Melville, *Lost Children of the Empire: the untold story of Britain's child migrants* (London, 1989), p.1; S. Constantine, 'Child Migration, Philanthropy, the State and the Empire', Institute of Historical Research, *History in Focus*, 14 (October 2008), no pagination
<http://www.history.ac.uk/ihr/Focus/welfare/articles/constantines.html> (13.12.09).

⁴ 'UK child migrants apology planned' (15.11.2009)
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/8361025.stm> (16.10.2010).

emigration societies operating in provincial cities throughout England are under-researched. Therefore, rather than comparing a range of child emigration schemes to various destinations, such as Canada, South Africa and Australia, this study focuses on two specific organisations that operated during the first forty years of sustained, organised child emigration and sent their children to the same destination. Firstly, in 1872 John T. Middlemore established the Children's Emigration Home in Birmingham.⁵ In May 1873, he accompanied his first contingent of children to Canada, landing in Quebec City. Within two years of starting his emigration work, Middlemore acquired a building in London, Ontario where children from the CEH could be housed upon arrival in Canada and then distributed to their new homes. Over four decades, Middlemore steadily extended the scale and geographical parameters of his emigration work in Canada. By 1891, the CEH distributed children as far afield as Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island.⁶ According to the society's records, by 1914 the CEH had taken 4,773 children overseas to Canada.⁷

Secondly, the Manchester and Salford Boys' and Girls' Refuges and Homes was the collective title for a range of institutions that operated under the guidance of founder, and prominent local businessman, Leonard K. Shaw.⁸ Unlike the CEH in Birmingham, which began operating solely as a child emigration society, the MRH in Manchester had many other branches to their work, including a seaside convalescent home, day nursery and training workshops. Small numbers of children transplanted from the MRH between 1870 and 1883 initially went to a training farm and school in Northfield, Massachusetts. However, from 1883 onwards, the MRH predominately used the emigration services and facilities of other individuals involved in emigrating children overseas in order to send their children to Canada. In particular, they relied heavily on Annie Macpherson and Louisa Birt, two sisters operating child emigration schemes in London and Liverpool respectively.⁹

⁵ For an overview of the CEH see Anon., *One Hundred Years of Child Care: the story of the Middlemore Homes, 1872-1972* (Birmingham, 1972).

⁶ BCL, CEH, MS 517/19, Annual Report 1892, p. 3.

⁷ BCL, CEH, MS 517/23, Annual Report 1915, p. 10.

⁸ A short history of MRH up to 1920 was written by a committee member to mark the 50th year of the organisation's work see W. Edmondson, *Making Rough Places Plain: fifty years' work of the Manchester and Salford Boys' and Girls' Refuges and Homes, 1870-1920* (Manchester, 1921). For specific reference to child emigration see chapter 4.

⁹ See Chapter 2: Networks and Connections for the links between the MRH, Annie Macpherson and Louisa Birt. For an overview of Macpherson and Birt's work, see M. Kohli, *The Golden Bridge: young immigrants to Canada, 1833-1939* (Toronto, 2003), chapters 4 and 5.

Though these two regional societies in Birmingham and Manchester form the major focus of this study, other child emigration schemes are also referred to throughout the analysis to provide context. These include the early work of Annie Macpherson and Maria Rye at the end of the 1860s, Thomas Barnardo's emigration scheme, and the Fairbridge Society who began operating during the first decade of the twentieth century. These emigration schemes were predominately based in London, whereas Louisa Birt's regional emigration work in Liverpool and the Clifton Home for Little Girls in Bristol were more localised societies that operated on a smaller scale. The role and significance of key advocates for child emigration, such as Samuel Smith MP, are also examined because, though they were not directly linked to the CEH or MRH, they affected these societies' ability to conduct their regional emigration activities.

Assessing the intricate, detailed administration and organisation of these child emigration societies reveals how those involved in transplanting children from Birmingham and Manchester marketed their respective schemes as an alternative approach to child rescue. As a concept, child rescue rested on the idea that by removing a child from a life of deprivation and depravity within their existing surroundings, the child could be 'saved' from becoming impoverished, a drain on resources and a 'threat' to society.¹⁰ Therefore, the CEH and MRH's emigration schemes were distinct from previous schemes in the early and mid nineteenth century, which had transported children overseas as a form of punishment.¹¹ Rather, as voluntary organisations, both the CEH and MRH flourished at a time of increased contemporary awareness and interest in the plight of children living in the poorest districts of their respective cities. However, the CEH and MRH were not alone in their quest to work with such children as a range of child rescue organisations began operating in the late Victorian and Edwardian *era*. These included orphanages, children's missions, night refuges, together with well-known organisations, such as the National

¹⁰ J. Grier, 'Voluntary Rights and Statutory Wrongs: the case of child emigration, 1948-1967', *History of Education*, 31, 3 (2002), p. 264.

¹¹ I. Pinchbeck and M. Hewitt, *Children in English Society*, vol. 2 *from the eighteenth century to the Children Act 1948* (London, 1973), chapter 18; K. Gorton and J. Ramsland, 'Prison Playground? Child convict labour and vocational training in New South Wales, 1788-1840', *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 34, 1 (2002), pp. 51-62.

Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children.¹² Therefore, the CEH and MRH had to persuade people that emigration was a viable alternative to other methods of child rescue in order to gain support for their respective schemes.

Producing a detailed analysis of two different societies in Birmingham and Manchester provides a more specific and precise evaluation of child emigration than general survey texts on the topic and does not aim to cover all the schemes that operated during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Survey texts, such as Marjorie Kohli's *The Golden Bridge: Young Immigrants to Canada* and Roy Parker's *Uprooted*, provide a chronological overview of child emigration by describing key events and individuals, including Maria Rye, Annie Macpherson and Thomas Barnardo.¹³ However, these books survey such a vast topic that they can only include a limited discussion of those aspects of child emigration deemed most significant by the author. Thus, Parker's discussion of the CEH only just exceeds two pages, whilst Kohli uses one and a half pages of her book to detail the work of Leonard K. Shaw in Manchester and Salford.¹⁴ Admittedly, these were only intended to be introductory texts but there is much room to expand upon these general surveys and analyse both individual societies in more detail. How did they operate on a day-to-day basis? Did they work in isolation or did they try to form networks with other organisations involved in child rescue? Rather than trying to add to the general overviews of child emigration, this study looks specifically at the CEH and MRH to gain a deeper understanding of their operations in Birmingham and Manchester respectively.

Analysing the intricate operations of two societies in English cities provides a new perspective on child emigration. Several studies have examined the ways in which transplantation affected children and the legacy that it left behind, but there has been

¹² Grier, 'Voluntary Rights and Statutory Wrong', p. 264. A new book by S. Swain and M. Hillel will provide an inter-disciplinary insight into the child rescue ideology by analysing the work of four key individuals, namely Thomas Barnardo, Thomas Bowman Stephenson, Benjamin Waugh and Edward de Montjoie Rudolf see S. Swain and M. Hillel, *Child, Nation, Race and Empire: child rescue discourse, England, Canada, Australia, 1850-1915* (Manchester, forthcoming 2010).

¹³ Kohli, *Golden Bridge*; R. A. Parker, *Uprooted: the shipment of poor children to Canada, 1867-1917* (Bristol, 2008).

¹⁴ Parker, *Uprooted*, pp. 31-33; Kohli, *Golden Bridge*, pp. 213-215.

little interest in the way that individual societies worked on a day-to-day basis.¹⁵ Some of the works exploring the effects and legacy of child emigration are popular histories written in a sensationalist style by journalists or children's rights campaigners, who focus on shocking contemporary news stories about neglected and abused children. Based on memoirs and oral history, P. Bean and J. Melville describe how one boy expectantly hung up his stocking by the fireplace ready for his first Christmas in Canada only to find the next morning that 'Santa' had left him nothing more than a rotten potato.¹⁶ However, these vignettes are important because they show the lived experiences of some children and have brought cases of child abuse to the attention of the modern public. If these accounts are used to critically assess the way in which emigration societies, such as the CEH and MRH, sought to market and explain their work, a different perspective on child emigration is revealed. It is not sufficient to take the promotional material produced by child emigration societies at face value; by comparing the idealised accounts of the CEH and MRH with some of the excerpts in popular histories, a more critical analysis of child emigration emerges. What steps did the CEH and MRH take to alleviate parental fears about child safety in Canada? Did regional emigration societies actually put the needs of the child first or was this an image that they created in order to market their work as 'child rescue'?

Though this analysis focuses predominately on the CEH and MRH, it takes a thematic approach to locate and evaluate their activities within the wider sphere of child rescue. This sets it apart from existing institutional histories or biographies, which chart the singular operations of other individuals and organisations involved in child emigration.¹⁷ Thomas Barnardo's child emigration efforts have undoubtedly generated the most historical interest, aided in part by the survival of a vast archive of sources, such as photograph collections, sermon notes and case histories on individual children.¹⁸ Even before

¹⁵ K. Bagnell, *The Little Immigrants: the orphans who came to Canada* (Toronto, 1980); Bean and Melville, *Lost Children of the Empire*; M. Humphreys, *Empty Cradles: one woman's fight to uncover Britain's most shameful secret* (London, 1994); G. H. Corbett, *Nation Builders: Barnardo children in Canada* (Toronto, 2002).

¹⁶ Bean and Melville, *Lost Children of the Empire*, p. 50.

¹⁷ A. Magnusson, *The Village: a history of Quarrier's* (Glasgow, 1984); J. Stroud, *Thirteen Penny Stamps: the story of the Church of England Children's Society (Waifs and Strays) from 1881 to the 1970s* (London, 1971); M. Diamond, *Emigration and Empire: the life of Maria S. Rye* (London, 1999).

¹⁸ A. E. Williams, *Barnardo of Stepney: the father of nobody's children* (London, 1943); A. E. Williams, *The Adventures of Thomas Barnardo* (London, 1949); D. Ford, *Dr Barnardo* (London, 1958); N. Wymer, *Dr Barnardo* (London, 1962); G. Williams, *Barnardo: the extraordinary doctor* (London, 1966); G. Wagner, *Barnardo* (London, 1979); Corbett, *Nation Builders*; L. Sheehan, *Dr Barnardo* (Bangor, 2001).

Barnardo's death, commentators of his work praised his efforts amongst poor children and placed Barnardo on a pedestal to be respected and eulogised. In 1904, the Duke of Argyll provided the foreword to a book about Barnardo, in which he commented

These pages tell a marvellous tale. They show how a man equipped only with a clear brain and stout heart may do more in his own lifetime in practical benevolence than has been accomplished before in many generations.¹⁹

Though there are no comprehensive biographies on either John T. Middlemore or Leonard K. Shaw, this study does not seek to fill that gap. Rather, it analyses how regional emigration societies relied upon other contemporaries involved in transplanting children overseas, rather than assessing charismatic leaders of child rescue organisations. Though Middlemore and Shaw were the founders of their respective emigration societies, they were clearly not the only ones involved in the process of transplanting children overseas. This included the staff and volunteers at the emigration homes in England, the agents in Canada who placed children in new homes and reported upon their progress, as well as other child emigration societies, such as Barnardo's.²⁰ Therefore, this study places the work of the CEH and MRH in a much wider context and provides an in depth assessment of the process and concept of child emigration, instead of a chronological overview of Middlemore and Shaw's involvement. Did these regional societies operate together as one united child emigration movement, or were there variations in their approach to taking children overseas? How did regional societies communicate with others involved in child rescue and how did this help them to promote child emigration as an alternative approach to rescuing children? How does this shape the idea of a 'child emigration movement' and should historians use this term more carefully?

Examining the operations and workings of two English organisations in Birmingham and Manchester is a different approach to the study of child emigration to that taken in other studies. Both Joy Parr and Myra Rutherdale have examined the experience of English children in Canada by using case histories or history sheets as the predominant source

¹⁹ J. H. Batt, *Dr Barnardo: the foster-father of nobody's children, a record and an interpretation* (London, 1904), p. v.

²⁰ Throughout this study, the term 'emigration home' refers to the institution that children stayed in under the care of emigration societies in England before embarkation.

material for their research.²¹ These are institutional documents produced by individual organisations to chart the progress of their children overseas. However, these sources have a number of limitations, particularly regarding representation. The sheer volume of surviving case histories resulted in Parr and Rutherfordale having to use a sample; Parr only used one in every twenty Barnardo case histories, which means that her study was based on the experiences of just nine hundred and ninety seven children, leaving another nineteen thousand children unaccounted for.²² She then converted qualitative *data* from the case histories into quantitative categories for computer-assisted analysis.²³ Converting primary evidence into a new format that removes it from its original context and tries to create a generalised pattern can never truly reflect the real experiences of the children. A secondary collection of letters from previous child emigrants, edited by Phyllis Harrison, shows the extent of diversity amongst children's new lives in Canada, which can be lost when trying to formulate tables, graphs and algebraic calculations to show children's experiences.²⁴ In contrast to using case histories to study the lives of CEH and MRH children in Canada and the effects of emigration upon their future lives overseas, this study focuses on the activities of regional emigration societies in England. Instead of relying on one type of source, this analysis uses a variety of archival material, including annual reports, magazines, pamphlets and newspaper articles, so that sources can be cross-referenced to gain a deeper insight into the work of the CEH and MRH. Utilising governmental investigations, such as the *Doyle Report*, also shows other people's opinions of child emigration, rather than just using institutional documents that only portray the views of child emigrationists.²⁵

This approach clearly differs from existing interpretations of child emigration, yet it also responds to the research of other historians. Most notably, the academic work of historian Stephen Constantine has laid the foundations for the study of child emigration in Britain.²⁶ Whilst his research has largely focused on more recent, twentieth century emigration

²¹ J. Parr, *Labouring Children: British immigrant apprentices to Canada, 1869-1924* (London, 1980); M. Rutherfordale, "'Canada is no dumping ground': public discourse and the Salvation Army, immigrant women and children, 1900-1930", *Histoire Sociale/Social History*, 79 (2007), pp. 75-115.

²² Parr, *Labouring Children*, pp. 158-161.

²³ Parr, *Labouring Children*, p. 160.

²⁴ P. Harrison (ed.), *The Home Children: their personal stories* (Winnipeg, Canada, 1979).

²⁵ Report to the President of the Local Government Board by Andrew Doyle...as to the emigration of pauper children to Canada, HCPP, lxiii, HC 9 (1875). Throughout this study, the term 'child emigrationist' refers to individuals involved in the organisation and operations of transplanting English children overseas.

²⁶ S. Constantine, 'The British Government, Child Welfare and Child Migration to Australia after 1945', *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 30, 1 (2002), pp. 99-132; S. Constantine, 'Children As

schemes and policies, as well as the legacy of child emigration, Constantine's call for more attention to be paid to the ways in which charities worked in place of, or in conjunction with, the state is addressed in this study.²⁷ What connections did the CEH and MRH form with governmental agencies in order to emigrate children in state care? How did they liaise with other state institutions, such as courts and schools, in order to legitimise their emigration activities and show that it was an alternative approach to child rescue? Constantine also notes that the Reformatory and Industrial Schools Act (1891) and the Children's Act (1908) allowed for the assisted emigration of children but how did other legislation and government regulation affect regional child emigration societies?²⁸ How were the CEH and MRH able to utilise greater state intervention into child welfare to further their emigration activities? Constantine's assertion that it is better to think of a partnership, rather than a boundary, between social services provided by the state and the voluntary sector contributes to a long-running historical debate about the deliverance of welfare in the late Victorian and Edwardian *era*.²⁹ Was there constant liaison between government agencies and regional child emigration societies? Or does evidence from the CEH and MRH provide an additional insight into Constantine's statement that it was a relationship 'repeatedly renegotiated'?³⁰

Evaluating how two emigration societies operated in Birmingham and Manchester naturally focuses on provincial English cities and the people who lived there. Therefore, how do the relations between the CEH and MRH and the local community challenge existing interpretations of class in the late Victorian and Edwardian period?³¹ In this study, 'class'

Ancestors: child migrants and identity in Canada', *British Journal of Canadian Studies*, 16, 1 (2003), pp. 150-159; Constantine, 'Child Migration, Philanthropy, the State and the Empire', no pagination; M. Harper and S. Constantine, *Migration and Empire* (Oxford, forthcoming 2010).

²⁷ S. Constantine, 'Empire migration and social reform, 1880-1950', in C. G. Pooley and I. D. Whyte (eds.), *Migrants, Emigrants and Immigrants: a social history of migration* (London, 1991), p. 62; Constantine, 'Child Migration, Philanthropy, the State and the Empire', no pagination.

²⁸ Constantine, 'Empire migration and social reform, 1880-1950', p. 72.

²⁹ Constantine, 'Child Migration, Philanthropy, the State and the Empire', no pagination; S. Kamerman, 'The New Mixed Economy of Welfare: public and private', *Social Work* (1983), pp. 5-10; G. Finlayson, 'A Moving Frontier: voluntarism and the state in British social welfare, 1911-1949', *Twentieth Century British History*, 1, 2 (1990), p. 185; M. Brenton, *The Voluntary Sector in British Social Services* (London, 1985); G. Finlayson, *Citizen, State and Social Welfare in Britain, 1830-1990* (Oxford, 1994), p. 6.

³⁰ Constantine, 'Child Migration, Philanthropy, the State and the Empire', no pagination.

³¹ R. Lawton and C. G. Pooley, *The Social Geography of nineteenth century Merseyside* (Liverpool, 1973); J. Harris, *Private Lives, Public Spirit: a social history of Britain, 1870-1914* (Oxford, 1993); B. Porter, *The Absent-Minded Imperialists: empire, society and culture in Britain* (Oxford, 2004); P. Johnson, 'Class Law in Victorian England', *Past and Present*, 141 (1993), pp. 147-169; R. J. Morris, 'Structure, Culture and

denotes different sections of society broadly defined in terms of wealth, social standing and occupation. Predominately, the founders, staff and supporters of the CEH and MRH were in the middle class, whilst the children they worked with were largely at the bottom of the social spectrum, what some contemporaries described as the ‘dangerous class’, or the ‘submerged tenth’.³² Through their everyday operations in the poorest districts of Birmingham and Manchester, staff at these two charities interacted with some of the most impoverished people in their respective cities, which disputes claims that different classes ‘were virtual foreigners to each other’.³³ As the CEH and MRH relied upon voluntary contributions to carry out their work, this also provides an insight into the role of charity within Victorian and Edwardian society. Did people donate to charitable organisations, including child emigration societies, purely out of benevolence or were there ulterior motives?³⁴ What role did urban middle-class women play in the running and staffing of charities and what benefits did they receive by supporting the CEH and MRH?³⁵ Assessing the ways in which these two regional societies interacted and communicated with the local community provides new insights into the way that charity was administered in Birmingham and Manchester, as well as the extent to which the CEH and MRH relied upon local people to accept their activities.

As this analysis focuses on the actions of regional child emigration societies towards younger members of the community, it is concerned with the history of childhood, rather than the history of children. The two are distinct concepts, with the former focusing on the

Society in British towns’, in M. Daunton (ed.), *The Cambridge Urban History of Britain*, vol. 3 1840-1950 (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 395-426.

³² For more information about ‘class’ and how it can be defined see W. Booth, *In Darkest England and the way out* (London, 1890); R. I. McKibbin, ‘Social Class and Social Observation in Edwardian England’, *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 28 (1978), pp. 175-199; S. Gunn, ‘Class Identity and the Urban Elite: the middle class in England, c. 1790-1950’, *Urban History*, 31, 1 (2004), pp. 29-47; K. C. Phillipp, *Language and Class in Victorian England* (London, 1984); R. McKibbin, *The Ideologies of Class: social relations in Britain, 1880-1950* (Oxford, 1994).

³³ Porter, *Absent-Minded Imperialists*, p. 20.

³⁴ M. Mauss, *The Gift: form and reason for exchange in archaic societies* (Paris, 1925), translated by W. D. Halls (London, 1990); G. C. Homans, *Social Behaviour: its elementary forms* (London, 1961); P. M. Blau, *Exchange and Power in Social Life* (New York, 1967); C. Levi-Strauss, ‘The principle of reciprocity’, in L. Coser and B. Rosenberg (eds.), *Sociological Theory: a book of readings* (New York, 1965), pp. 84-94; B. Schwartz, ‘The Social Psychology of the Gift’, *American Journal of Sociology*, 73, 1 (1967), pp. 1-11; A. J. Kidd, ‘Philanthropy and the social history paradigm’, *Social History*, 21, 2 (1996), pp. 180-192.

³⁵ K. J. Heasman, *Evangelicals in Action: an appraisal of their social work in the Victorian era* (London, 1962); M. Vicinus (ed.), *Suffer and Be Still: women in the Victorian Age* (London, 1973); F. K. Prochaska, *Women and Philanthropy in nineteenth century England* (Oxford, 1980); J. Lewis, *Women in England, 1870-1950: sexual divisions and social change* (Brighton, 1984); J. Lewis, *Women and Social Action in Victorian and Edwardian England* (Aldershot, 1991).

way adults regarded children and the latter discussing the lived experiences of children themselves.³⁶ Therefore, by analysing the emigration activities of these two regional societies, historians' interpretations of the child and the family in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries can also be redefined.³⁷ Were children seen as victims or threats, or does H. Hendrick's dual dichotomy thesis apply to the views and opinions of child emigrationists?³⁸ Was child emigration 'out of step with its time' because it broke up children and parents in an *era* when the family was regarded by some people as 'a social institution'?³⁹ Or did child emigrationists shape existing contemporary ideas about the child and the family in order to justify their work? The ways in which the CEH and MRH conceptualised the child, as well as the surroundings from which they were 'rescued', enabled these regional child emigrationists to rationalise their work.⁴⁰ However, did regional emigration societies' ideas about children conform to the opinions of other contemporaries working in different institutions, such as schools and workhouses? Evidently, this is not simply a case study of two emigration societies. Rather, it examines how the ideas promoted by CEH and MRH could either conform, challenge or shape contemporary ideas and values about children.

Given that the CEH and MRH operated schemes to transplant children overseas, analysing their work also contributes to historical interpretations of emigration as a means of dealing with population pressure, social problems in England and empire strengthening overseas.⁴¹ Was emigration simply a method of 'shovelling out pauper children' to another country or was it a more complex process that took into account the perceived needs of the child, the

³⁶ A. Levene, 'Family Breakdown and the 'Welfare Child' in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries', *The History of the Family*, 11 (2006), no pagination.

³⁷ L. Rose, *The Erosion of Childhood: child oppression in Britain, 1860-1918* (London, 1991), p. 215; L. C. Berry, *The Child, the State and the Victorian Novel* (London, 1999), p. 16; Pinchbeck and Hewitt, *Children in English Society*; Parr, *Labouring Children*; P. Horn, *The Victorian Town Child* (Stroud, 1997).

³⁸ H. Hendrick, *Child Welfare: England, 1872-1989* (London, 1994).

³⁹ Parr, *Labouring Children*, p. 11; F. K. Prochaska, *The Voluntary Impulse: philanthropy in modern Britain* (London, 1988), p. 23.

⁴⁰ See Chapter 1: Motivations and Justifications.

⁴¹ W. A. Carrothers, *Emigration from the British Isles* (London, 1965); R. B. Madgwick, *Immigration into Eastern Australia, 1788-1851* (Sydney, Australia, 1969); H. M. Johnston, *British Emigration Policy, 1815-1830: 'shovelling out paupers'* (Oxford, 1972); R. C. Mills, *The Colonisation of Australia, 1829-1842: the Wakefield Experiment in empire building* (Sydney, Australia, reprint 1974); R. F. Haines, *Emigration and the Labouring Poor: Australian recruitment in Britain and Ireland, 1831-1860* (Basingstoke, 1997); R. F. Haines, "'The Idle and the Drunken Won't Do There": poverty, the new poor law and nineteenth century government-assisted emigration to Australia from the United Kingdom', *Australian Historical Studies*, 108 (1997), pp. 1-21; G. Howells, "'On Account of their Disreputable Characters": parish-assisted emigration from rural England, 1834-1860', *History*, 88, 292 (2003), pp. 587-605.

community, the nation and the empire? Did child emigrationists subscribe to the idea that emigration provided a ‘safety valve’ to relieve pressures on resources at home in England? To what extent did the CEH and MRH embrace Thomas Malthus’s theory about population pressure and how did they adapt his theory to justify their child emigration activities?⁴² When these regional societies transplanted their children to Canada, they also argued that emigration fortified the empire at a time when other European powers sought to extend their political and military influence.⁴³ Operating at a time of ‘new imperialism’, the CEH and MRH’s attitudes towards empire strengthening can be compared to those of other advocates of child emigration to show how they contributed towards the idea of an ‘imperial mission’ – what historian C. C. Eldridge defined as an obligation to spread Western civilisation, European technology and the Christian gospel overseas.⁴⁴ Were regional societies in Birmingham and Manchester adopting an aggressive imperial policy or were they promoting child emigration to Canada as a way of strengthening existing ties with established colonies?

Qualitative research underpins this study and a wide range of sources is used throughout. These sources focus on the intricate workings of the CEH and MRH, the wider reception of their activities within the local community, as well as the official rulings from central government departments and local authorities that affected their work. The archive collections of the CEH and MRH contain the most useful and most frequently used sources throughout this investigation, namely the reports, journals and magazines that each society produced, either on a monthly or annual basis. These documents outline the work of the respective organisations and were either sold for a small price or distributed freely amongst the societies’ supporters. Consequently, they contain detailed information about the everyday activities of the homes, selected profiles on the ‘type’ of children helped by the organisation and often information about how to donate or subscribe to the society.⁴⁵ As the societies produced these reports for the public, they offer an overly positive, self-created representation of the organisation. The reports commonly contain letters from

⁴² T. Malthus, *An Essay on the Principle of Population* (London, reprint 1973).

⁴³ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* April 1886, p. 63; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children’s Haven* March 1898, p.7; ‘Girls for Canada’, *The Bristol Mercury and Daily Post*, 18 May 1894; ‘British Waifs in Canada’, *Liverpool Mercury*, 17 May 1887; ‘Middlemore Emigration Homes’, *Birmingham Daily Post*, 5 June 1884; J. Samson (ed.), *The British Empire* (Oxford, 2001).

⁴⁴ C. C. Eldridge, *Victorian Imperialism* (London, 1978), p. 2.

⁴⁵ Due to policies on *data* protection enforced by respective archives, where individual children are referred to in this study, only their Christian name will be used in order to protect and maintain confidentiality.

‘grateful’ children settled in Canada, as well as ‘before and after’ photographs of children taken into their care. A true representation of children’s mixed experiences is unlikely to be shown in the reports, as it would not be in the organisations’ interest to draw upon negative evidence in publicity material. Despite this, the reports show the ways in which the societies sought to present themselves to the wider community, together with the evidence they published to justify their work.

Whilst photographs of individual children in the care of the CEH and MRH are not used because this study does not trace the histories of specific children, both societies purposefully reproduced a number of other images showing various aspects of their work. These were printed within their reports and journals, as well as in the local press. Such images are useful for this study because they provide evidence of how the CEH and MRH tried to reach the wider community by bringing their work ‘to life’. A particularly powerful image reproduced by the MRH is analysed in Chapter 3 as it shows the ways in which regional emigration societies could sensationalise their work to emphasise the ‘rescue’ element of their schemes.⁴⁶ However, rather than being random snapshots, those involved in child emigration deliberately staged these photographs to maximise the impact of their child rescue work upon supporters and observers of their schemes. Therefore, they cannot be used indiscriminately simply to show ‘how things were’ but instead, they provide evidence when analysing the ways in which the CEH and MRH sought to portray themselves and their work. Child emigration societies were not the only organisations to use photographs in this manner, indeed, other child rescue organisations, such as the NSPCC, also made use of sensational images in their fundraising and publicity efforts.⁴⁷

As a whole, child emigration was well publicised, which makes journal articles and newspapers a vital source for this study. Extracts from journals, such as *Review of Reviews*, often contain detailed discussion and debate about child emigration, including comments from ‘experts’, such as Sir John Taverner (Agent General for Victoria).⁴⁸ Whilst the agenda of the author will have influenced the article, these journal extracts suggest the ways in which influential people viewed child emigration work and either supported or

⁴⁶ See Chapter 3: Support and Finances, p. 69.

⁴⁷ For a detailed analysis of child photography by such organisations see H. Paris, ‘The Pictured Child in Victorian Philanthropy’ (Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Central Lancaster, 2001).

⁴⁸ ‘Expert Views on Emigration’, *Review of Reviews*, 46, 272 (August 1912), pp. 177-183.

challenged it within the public forum. Information about child emigration was widely available, as London and national newspapers, such as the *Penny Illustrated Paper* and the *Times*, contained information about different organisations and their emigration activities.⁴⁹ On a more local scale, regional publications, such as the *Manchester Times* and the *Birmingham Daily Post*, reported upon child emigration, which is useful when investigating the ways the CEH and MRH appealed to those who were beyond the immediate remit of their work.⁵⁰ Crucially, using these sources shows the extent to which societies were able to communicate information about their work to a wider audience via the popular press and whether this enabled them to become more integrated within the community. This is especially so considering the fact that most articles were penned by the founders and committee members of the organisations, which gave them the opportunity to promote their work in a positive light. Therefore, the descriptions of child emigration work in newspapers may not reflect reality and these articles in local newspapers only portray information carefully selected by the organisations themselves. However, these sources offer much evidence when investigating the self-created image of these societies and how it enabled them to justify their work.

Finally, official government papers relating to child emigration, as well as poor law relief and child welfare legislation that affected the work of the CEH, MRH and other child emigration societies are used. The most influential official report regarding child emigration in the nineteenth century came from former poor law inspector and civil servant Andrew Doyle in 1875.⁵¹ His report is rather narrow in the sense that it only represents the opinions of one man who held strong views on the administration of poor relief and who was working on behalf of the government.⁵² Similarly, Doyle only investigated the work of two people involved in emigrating children to Canada, namely Maria Rye and Annie Macpherson, who began their work in the late 1860s. Nevertheless, his recommendations

⁴⁹ 'Child Emigration', *Penny Illustrated Paper*, 22 June 1872; 'Child Emigration to Canada', *The Times*, 23 July 1885; 'Emigration of Children', *The Times*, 14 December 1886; 'Emigration of Destitute Children', *The Times*, 21 November 1898; 'Emigration of Children', *The Times*, 27 July 1899.

⁵⁰ 'The Boys' and Girls' Refuges and Homes', *Manchester Times*, 25 January 1879; 'Boys and Girls Refuge, Strangeways', *Manchester Times*, 6 December 1884; 'The Boys and Girls Refuges in Manchester', *Manchester Times*, 5 February 1892; 'Gathered from the Gutter', *Birmingham Daily Post*, 9 November 1872; 'Birmingham Children's Emigration Homes', *Birmingham Daily Post*, 3 July 1897; 'The Middlemore Emigration Homes', *Birmingham Daily Post*, 4 January 1900; 'Birmingham Police Courts', *Birmingham Daily Post*, 30 March 1900.

⁵¹ Report to the President of the Local Government Board by Andrew Doyle...as to the emigration of pauper children to Canada, HCPP, lxiii, HC 9 (1875).

⁵² M. E. Chamberlain, 'Andrew Doyle', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* <http://www.oxforddnb.com.ezphost.dur.ac.uk/view/article/66722?docPos=1> (13.12.09).

had an immediate effect on the emigration of poor law children and affected all child emigration societies working with boards of guardians to take children predominantly from workhouses to Canada.⁵³ Therefore, this makes his report an important source when analysing the operations of the CEH and MRH. This also applies to legislation on child welfare and protection, such as the Prevention of Cruelty to Children Act (1889), which inadvertently fuelled child emigration.⁵⁴ Both legislation and government investigations, such as the *Doyle Report*, demonstrate how political decisions affected grassroots organisations working in parts of the country beyond the immediate locality of the central government in London.

Almost all of the sources used in this study were primarily written by members of the middle class, including journal and newspaper articles, governmental reports or legislation and reports or magazines edited by staff at the CEH and MRH. As a result, they reflect limited views and opinions, which do not make them representative of the whole of society. Little primary evidence exists from the working-class and ‘pauper’ perspective, but by using sources that reflect middle-class opinions, this study analyses the way in which individuals with the time, money and authority to embark upon child emigration work could promote their activities as an alternative approach to child rescue. Crucially, this is not a history of the child emigrants themselves, nor an examination of the legacies of child emigration. This analysis of the CEH and MRH assesses how some members of the middle class in Birmingham and Manchester could convert their opinions about children, the family, perceived social problems and the role of charity into action. In what ways were they able to persuade their contemporaries that transplanting children overseas was a viable form of child rescue? How did this rely upon the CEH and MRH moving beyond the immediate remit of their supporters and engaging with people in the local community and government agencies?

Chapter One analyses the factors that motivated the CEH and MRH to embark upon child emigration and the subsequent explanations both societies used to justify their work. Chapter Two assesses the networks and links between the CEH, MRH and others involved in child rescue. It also explores the communication they generated with government

⁵³ See Chapter 2: Networks and Connections.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

agencies and the way in which their external influence shaped child emigration activities. Chapter Three analyses how the CEH and MRH tried to generate and maintain support for their work through engagement and interaction with people beyond the immediate remit of their schemes. As charitable organisations, regional child emigration societies relied upon voluntary contributions, which meant that they had to persuade various members of society in both England and Canada to endorse their activities. Chapter Four examines how the CEH and MRH responded to contemporary challenges and criticisms regarding the welfare of children under their guardianship. This includes the ways in which they attempted to care for and train the children before embarkation, together with the alleged methods for protecting them in Canada. Throughout this analysis, it is hoped that a more detailed understanding of regional child emigration societies and their efforts to pursue an alternative approach to child rescue will emerge.

Chapter 1: Motivations and Justifications

To justify and market their activities as an alternative approach to child rescue, the CEH and MRH stated that emigration offered solutions to a number of pressing contemporary concerns. Both of these regional societies promoted their work as a way of addressing social problems, making economic savings and strengthening the empire. Historians have already identified some of these reasons when commenting on the concept of child emigration.¹ Specific studies on individual societies have also highlighted other explanations as to why emigrationists transplanted English children overseas, which include religious conviction, particularly amongst evangelicals such as Annie Macpherson; moral reasoning that life in Canada offered children more opportunities than were available in England; and the idealistic belief in the purity of agricultural life.² However, simply listing the variety of reasons for child emigration suggests that they were all of equal importance and remained constant over a period of forty four years. Whilst all the reasons were undoubtedly interconnected, what two factors initially motivated the CEH and MRH to begin their child emigration operations? How did these societies then continue to justify and explain the need for their schemes as a means of economic saving and empire strengthening until 1914? To what extent were they able to utilise changing contemporary concerns and ideas about the role of the ‘child’ to appeal to as wide an audience as possible? The motivations, justifications and explanations for child emigration help to clarify existing interpretations about middle-class attitudes towards the family and child, as well as the ways in which the CEH and MRH could rationalise the separation of children from their home surroundings.³ They also challenge certain historical interpretations of the ways in which social classes interacted in the cities of late Victorian and Edwardian England.⁴

¹ Carrothers, *Emigration from the British Isles*, p. 272; Hendrick, *Child Welfare*, pp. 81-82; Constantine, ‘Children as Ancestors’, p. 150; Constantine, ‘Child Migration, Philanthropy, the State and the Empire’, no pagination; Parker, *Uprooted*, pp. 273-274; E. Hadley, ‘Natives in a Strange Land: the philanthropic discourse of juvenile emigration in mid-nineteenth century England’, *Victorian Studies*, 33, 3 (1990), pp. 414-417.

² Rutherford, “‘Canada is no dumping ground’”; P. Horn, ‘The Emigration of Catholic Pauper Children to Canada 1870-1904’, *History of Education Society Bulletin*, 59 (1997), pp. 12-13.

³ Pinchbeck and Hewitt, *Children in English Society*; Parr, *Labouring Children*; Prochaska, *The Voluntary Impulse*.

⁴ Harris, *Private Lives, Public Spirit*; Porter, *Absent-Minded Imperialists*; Lawton and Pooley, *The Social Geography of Merseyside*; Johnson, ‘Class Law in Victorian England’; Morris, ‘Structure, Culture and Society in British towns’, pp. 395-426.

Motivation I: problems within society

Though L. Rose argued that children were still regarded as ‘little adults’ into the Edwardian period, there is general consensus within the existing historiography that during the nineteenth century, children gained a separate identity, both biologically and socially, with recognisably different needs from adults.⁵ However, on initial examination, emigrationists’ desire to remove children from their family and home surroundings does not seem to fit within some historical interpretations of the period, which argue that society placed a premium on the promotion of family life.⁶ Renowned Victorian social reformer Lord Shaftsbury exemplified this juxtaposition. He initially opposed legislation for the prevention of cruelty to children on the basis that it interfered with the privacy of the home and a father’s authority over his family, yet Shaftsbury championed child emigration at the start of the 1870s.⁷ Based on these contradictions, J. Parr expressed her conviction that leading figures connected with child emigration ‘appear out of character’, whilst commenting that child emigration ‘seems out of step with its time’.⁸ However, such interpretations may be anachronistic because they do not take into account the overlap of contemporary middle-class desires to improve perceived social problems, their disapproval of seemingly inadequate parents at the bottom of the social scale and their attitudes towards children within a stable family unit.

For the middle class, childhood was largely a time of innocence in which children needed protection and shelter.⁹ However, this contrasted sharply with what emigrationists believed to be occurring in certain urban city districts in London, Manchester, Liverpool and Birmingham, where they claimed that rapid urbanisation had made childhood a period of ‘chaos’ for those at the bottom of the social scale.¹⁰ Schemes to transplant children overseas flourished in slum areas characterised by poor sanitation, overcrowding and

⁵ Rose, *The Erosion of Childhood*, p. 215; Berry, *The Child, the State and the Victorian Novel*, p. 16; Levene, ‘Family Breakdown and the ‘Welfare Child’ in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries’, no pagination.

⁶ Prochaska, *The Voluntary Impulse*, p. 23, 37; Pinchbeck and Hewitt, *Children in English Society*, p. 358.

⁷ ‘Ragged School Emigration’, *Ragged School Union Quarterly Record* (July 1870), pp. 150-152; ‘Colonies and Emigration’, *Examiner*, 7 May 1870; Pinchbeck and Hewitt, *Children in English Society*, p. 557, p. 623.

⁸ Parr, *Labouring Children*, p. 11.

⁹ A. Davin, ‘Waif Stories in late nineteenth century England’, *History Workshop Journal*, 52 (2001), pp. 67-70.

¹⁰ W. B. Paton, ‘Work and Workers VIII: emigration’, *Time*, 19, 44 (August 1888), p. 136; ‘The Liverpool Sheltering Home’, *Sunday at Home*, 1529 (August 1883), p. 523; H. A. Page, ‘Philanthropic work in Birmingham’, *Good Words*, 17 (December 1876), p. 359; ‘British Waifs in Canada’, *Liverpool Mercury*, 17 May 1887.

extreme poverty.¹¹ Descriptions of children entering the CEH from notorious slum districts, such as John Street in Birmingham, include vocabulary like ‘wild’, ‘untamed’, ‘undisciplined’, ‘independent’ and ‘rough’, all of which conflicted with middle-class notions of childhood as a time of innocence.¹² Mortality figures show the extent to which living conditions in these slum areas were below the standards experienced in other parts of a city. When the national death rate was approximately twenty-two per thousand between 1856 and 1860, the borough of Liverpool averaged thirty per thousand.¹³ In the worst areas of Liverpool, the death rate averaged nearly forty per thousand between 1866 and 1877, which some historians have described as ‘stratospheric’.¹⁴ It was these so-called ‘Black Areas’ of high mortality and urban degradation that emigrationists at the CEH and MRH targeted within their respective cities of Birmingham and Manchester.

Underpinning the outpouring of concern about slum districts in the late Victorian and Edwardian *eras* was the problem of population pressure, something M. E. Chamberlain described as ‘one of the oldest revolutionary forces in human history’.¹⁵ Following the publication of Thomas Malthus’s first *Essay on the Principle of Population* in 1789, poverty, death and environmental dilapidation were increasingly linked to views on population growth and the subsequent pressure on resources.¹⁶ Published at the end of the eighteenth century, Malthus’s work initially ran counter to prevailing mercantilist theories that viewed a growing population as an economic benefit; however, his work increasingly

¹¹ Though ‘slum’ is now an evocative and sometimes misconstrued term, contemporaries did use the word themselves to describe certain districts within cities. See S. Smith, ‘Social Reform’, *Nineteenth Century: A Monthly Review*, 13, 75 (May 1883); MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* June 1884, p. 95; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* April 1889, p.72; BCL, CEH, MS 517/463, Annual Report 1873, p. 2; BCL, CEH, MS 517/21, Annual Report 1905, p. 3; ‘British Waifs in Canada’, *Liverpool Mercury*, 17 May 1887; ‘New Sheltering Home for destitute children’, *Liverpool Mercury*, 18 October 1888; ‘Middlemore Emigration Homes’, *Birmingham Daily Post*, 5 June 1894; A. Gleig, ‘Some Account of a Slum’, *Monthly Review*, 22, 66 (March 1906), pp. 111-120; A. G. Symonds, ‘An Unfashionable Slum in Manchester’, *Quiver*, 29, 361 (January 1894); D. Ward, ‘The Victorian Slum: an enduring myth?’, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 66, 2 (1976), p. 323; G. Stedman Jones, *Outcast London: a study in the relationship between the classes in Victorian society* (Oxford, 1984), p. 14.

¹² BCL, CEH, MS 517/ 463, Annual Report 1876, p. 5; Levene, ‘Family Breakdown and the ‘Welfare Child’ in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries’, no pagination; E. Hopkins, *Childhood Transformed: working-class children in nineteenth century England* (Manchester, 1994), pp. 192-194.

¹³ J. K. Walton and A. Wilcox (eds.), *Low Life and Moral Improvement in mid-Victorian England: Liverpool through the journalism of H. Shimmin* (Leicester, 1991), p. 13.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ M. E. Chamberlain, ‘Imperialism and Social Reform’ in C. C. Eldridge (ed.), *British Imperialism in the Nineteenth Century* (London, 1984), p. 148.

¹⁶ Malthus, *An Essay on the Principle of Population*; E. B. Ross, *The Malthus Factor: population, poverty and politics in capitalist development* (London, 1998), pp. 1-3.

gained favour amongst the British social elite throughout the nineteenth century.¹⁷ In line with Malthusian thinking, child emigrationists in Birmingham and Manchester, along with their peers in other cities, identified a growing population and overcrowding in slum districts as damaging to home life and a cause of immorality and crime.¹⁸ Statistics show that the urban populations of both Manchester and Birmingham doubled over a period of fifty years from 1851 to 1901; Manchester grew from 303,000 to 645,000, whilst Birmingham expanded from 247,000 to 522,000.¹⁹ Table 1 also shows that children constituted a large proportion of the growing national, urban population, which may have influenced the CEH and MRH's decision to work predominately with those under fifteen years of age.

Table 1: Children in an Urbanising Population: England and Wales

Year	Percentage of total population
1841	36.1
1851	35.5
1861	35.7
1871	36.1
1881	36.4
1891	35.0
1901	32.4

Source: Horn, *The Victorian Town Child*, p. 211; Morris and Rodgers (eds.), *The Victorian City*; calculated from Census Records.

Though emigrationists focused on overcrowding and the growing population in their respective industrialised cities, they largely did not concur with Malthus's 'positive checks' of starvation, death and disease as the chief routes through which that pressure should be

¹⁷ J. P. Huzel, *The Popularisation of Malthus in early nineteenth century England: Martineau, Cobbet and the pauper press* (Aldershot, 2006), p. 2; A. Murdoch, *British Emigration 1603-1914* (Basingstoke, 2004), p. 4.

¹⁸ U. A. Forbes, 'Overcrowding and Emigration', *London Quarterly Review*, 8, 2 (October 1902), p. 243; 'Miscellaneous', *Manchester Times*, 5 June 1886; BCL, CEH, MS 517/19, Annual Report 1893, p. 10; Ross, *The Malthus Factor*, p. 3

¹⁹ S. Gunn, *The Public Culture of the Victorian Middle Class: ritual and authority and the English industrial city, 1840-1914* (Manchester, 2000), p. 11; B. R. Mitchell and P. Deane, *Abstract of British Historical Statistics* (London, 1962).

alleviated.²⁰ Rather, their focus on removing children from England to Canada directly conflicted with Malthus's claims in 1803 that 'no plans of emigration...can prevent the continued action of a great check to population in some form or another' and that 'emigration is perfectly inadequate' for the purpose of making room for an unrestricted increase of population.²¹ Some historians have recognised and debated this contemporary rebuttal of Malthus's reservations about emigration, instead, seeing the transplantation of people overseas as a 'safety valve' to relieve the pressures of a growing population.²² The CEH and MRH used the term 'safety valve' when echoing prevailing middle-class ideas and actions about the need for people to move away from their homeland. The editor of the MRH magazine commented in 1884 that

the Anglo-Saxon race has increased and multiplied so that the land is not able to bear them; and for years emigration has been a grand *safety valve* for our congested cities; a *divine remedy* for the terrible evil of overcrowding which prevails so largely amongst us.²³

As just one among many different types of organisations involved in promoting emigration, the CEH and MRH's idea of transplanting children overseas conformed to existing contemporary notions about how to relieve population pressure.²⁴ Between 100,000 and 300,000 passengers departed annually from British ports for overseas destinations from the 1850s to the turn of the twentieth century in an exodus of 'prime importance'.²⁵ Therefore, emigration was far from a new phenomenon; by focusing on the transplantation of children, rather than adults, emigrationists at the CEH and MRH were simply able to add a new dimension to an existing process.

²⁰ Forbes, 'Overcrowding and Emigration', p. 243; 'Miscellaneous', *Manchester Times*, 5 June 1886; BCL, CEH, MS 517/19, Annual Report 1893, p. 10; Ross, *The Malthus Factor*, p. 3

²¹ Quoted in Huzel, *The Popularisation of Malthus in early nineteenth century England*, p. 34.

²² H. I. Cowan, *British Emigration to British North America: the first hundred years* (Toronto, 1961), p. 203; C. Erickson, *Invisible Immigrants: the adaptation of English and Scottish immigrants in nineteenth century America* (London, 1972), p. 1; H. M. Johnston, *British Emigration Policy, 1815-1830: 'shovelling out paupers'* (Oxford, 1972); M. Harper, *Emigration from north-east Scotland*, vol. 1 (Aberdeen, 1988), p. 8; Constantine, 'Empire migration and social reform, 1880-1950', pp. 62-63; Haines, "'The Idle and the Drunken Won't Do There'", pp. 1-21; Howells, "'On Account of their Disreputable Characters'", pp. 587-605.

²³ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* June 1884, p. 85.

²⁴ Paton, 'Work and Workers VIII', p. 129.

²⁵ R. D. Grant, *Representations of British Emigration, Colonisation and Settlement: imagining empire, 1800-1860* (Basingstoke, 2005), p. 62; O. MacDonagh, *Emigration in the Victorian Age: debates on the issue from nineteenth century journals* (Farnborough, 1973), p. 1; T. J. Hatton and J. G. Williamson, *The Age of Mass Migration: an economic analysis* (Oxford, 1998), p. 3.

However, these regional societies were not just concerned about population growth. The CEH and MRH identified a number of social problems connected with over-crowded slums, particularly the effects of alcohol after the turn of the twentieth century. This concern was not exclusive to regional emigrationists; the temperance movement continued to be active in the late nineteenth century, expanding its work and influence from the 1870s onwards.²⁶ Emigrationists at the CEH and MRH made clear connections between the effects of alcohol and other social problems; admission records for the CEH between 1902 and 1914 show that ‘drunken and criminal parents’ consistently constituted one of the top two reasons why children gained entry to the home.²⁷ The classification of parents as ‘drunken *and* criminal’ suggests that emigrationists assumed the two categories were inherently linked, something later historians have established, and reflects the strong contemporary middle-class view that slum districts signified a dangerous mixture of intemperance, improvidence and immorality.²⁸ However, emigrationists’ concerns about alcohol also rested on the influence it had upon children. A four-year-old boy admitted to the MRH in 1889 in a state of total intoxication ‘startled’ middle-class staff at the home

The boy reeled on the floor and had to be assisted to a seat. We thought it advisable to have him examined by a doctor who pronounced the poor little baby-boy to be drunk and ordered an emetic to be administered and the child to be put to bed, as otherwise it might prove fatal. It may not generally be known that making children drunk is at present *no offence under the English law*.²⁹

This supports the victim/threat dichotomy that permeates the existing historiography, expanded most notably in an influential thesis by H. Hendrick.³⁰ Whilst a drunken child threatened middle-class notions of childhood innocence, he or she was simultaneously the

²⁶ L. L. Shiman, ‘The Band of Hope Movement: respectable recreation for working-class children’, *Victorian Studies*, 17, 1 (1973), p. 49; A. E. Dingle, ‘Drink and Working-Class Living Standards in Britain, 1870-1914’, *Economic History Review*, 25, 4 (1972), pp. 608-622; A. E. Dingle, *The Campaign for Prohibition in Victorian England: the United Kingdom Alliance, 1872-1895* (London, 1980).

²⁷ CEH Annual Reports contain summaries of admission records. See particularly BCL, CEH, MS 517/21 and BCL, CEH, MS 517/22, Annual Reports 1902-14 for statistics on ‘drunken and criminal parents’.

²⁸ G. Stedman Jones, ‘Working-Class Culture and Working-Class Politics in London, 1870-1900: notes on the remaking of the working class’, *Journal of Social History*, 7, 4 (1974), p. 463; B. H. Harrison, *Drink and the Victorians: the temperance question in England, 1815-1872* (London, 1971); C. Emsley, *Crime and Society in England, 1750-1900* (London, 1987).

²⁹ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* April 1889, p.72.

³⁰ Hendrick, *Child Welfare*; Piper, ‘Moral Campaigns’; Levene, ‘Family Breakdown and the ‘Welfare Child’ in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries’, no pagination; L. A. Jackson, *Child Sexual Abuse in Victorian England* (London, 2000); J. R. Gillis, *Youth and History: tradition and change in European age relations 1770-present* (London, 1981).

passive victim of social problems ‘embedded’ in the slum way of life. As a subversive victim, the child faced being exposed to irresponsible ‘drunken and criminal parents’ or being ‘made’ to get drunk by his associates.

Emigrationists also witnessed the side effects of excessive alcohol consumption when entering the slums as part of their daily work. Especially during the 1870s and 1880s, staff at the CEH, MRH, and more well-known emigration homes run by Annie Macpherson and Thomas Barnardo in London, visited common lodging houses, public houses, known street haunts and the homes of the very poor to locate children suitable for emigration.³¹ Their approach was not to wait for people to come to them for help, but rather to investigate the conditions of slum districts and seek out for themselves those children deemed eligible for their help. This active middle-class intrusion into the lives of those at the bottom of the social spectrum challenges B. Porter’s assertion that different members of society ‘were virtual foreigners to each other’.³² Likewise, emigrationists’ actions within the slums also suggests that they did not conform to what some modern historians have identified as rigid zoning of cities split strictly along class lines.³³ This is not to suggest that late nineteenth and early twentieth century cities had not developed along class lines, so clearly and evocatively described in Benjamin Disraeli’s work, *Sybil: or The Two Nations*, nor that emigrationists’ work when entering the slums was representative of the actions of the middle class as a whole.³⁴ As stated by Samuel Smith, Member of Parliament, social reformer and supporter of child emigration

Large tracts of English cities [are] given over entirely to the reign of squalor where scarcely one well-dressed or respectable-looking person was to be seen – the only visitors to these slum districts being those on religious or philanthropic missions.³⁵

³¹ BCL, CEH, MS 517/463, Annual Report 1873, p. 2; BCL, CEH, MS 517/463, Annual Report 1874, p. 6; BCL, CEH, MS 517/464 Annual Report 1879; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* February 1883, p. 15; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* September 1886, p. 47; ‘The Boys’ and Girls’ Refuges and Homes’, *Manchester Times*, 25 January 1879; ‘Local and District’, *Manchester Times*, 6 May 1882; J. Rose, *For the Sake of the Children: inside Dr Barnardo’s, 120 years of caring for children* (London 1987), pp. 28-45.

³² Porter, *Absent-Minded Imperialists*, p. 20.

³³ Johnson, ‘Class Law in Victorian England’; Harris, *Private Lives, Public Spirit*; Morris, ‘Structure, Culture and Society in British towns’, pp. 395-426; Lawton and Pooley, *The Social Geography of Merseyside*.

³⁴ B. Disraeli, *Sybil: or The Two Nations* (London, 1845).

³⁵ Smith, ‘Social Reform’, p. 897.

By entering areas of the city that were segregated as slums, emigrationists saw first-hand the social conditions and standards of living that prevailed there, which most of their contemporaries in the middle class only read about in the press and pamphlets.³⁶ That emigrationists pursued interaction and contact with those lower down the social scale in a way that many of their contemporaries did not, in some senses, could have given an added sense of authority to their identification of certain social ills. In return, this fuelled their own conviction that by working with children from these slum districts, emigration could alleviate some of the identified problems in Birmingham and Manchester.

Motivation II: the need for separation

When child emigrationists visited slum districts, they largely pinpointed the ‘chaos’ of childhood in these areas onto parents. According to S. Swain, child rescue in the late nineteenth century ‘revolutionised’ concerns about child welfare by positing the parent as the enemy of the child.³⁷ During the 1870s, the CEH, in particular, had aimed to work solely with ‘street arabs’ or ‘gutter children’ – terms used by the press and social commentators to refer to those children broadly defined within Victorian society as ‘poor, ragged, miserable creatures’ that roamed about the streets seemingly ‘uncouth, unwanted and uncared for’.³⁸ However, from the 1880s onwards, the CEH and MRH turned their attention to those children living with parents, rather than those on the streets. Increasingly, they began to criticise parental inadequacy and irresponsibility by examining the living conditions, lifestyle and working habits of children in the slums.³⁹ They typically drew upon reports of violence, starvation and abuse inflicted by parents upon their children. One particular case in Birmingham included Thomas and Sarah whose father was dead and whose mother cohabited with another man. Both guardians were reported as drunkards who had twice been sent to prison for neglecting the children and sending them into the

³⁶ Stedman Jones, ‘Working-Class Culture’, p. 466.

³⁷ S. Swain, ‘Child Rescue: the emigration of an idea’, in J. Lawrence and P. Starkey (eds.), *Child Welfare and Social Action: from the nineteenth century to the present* (Liverpool, 2001), p. 101.

³⁸ BCL, CEH, MS 517/463, Annual Report 1873, p.3; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* January 1883, pp. 4-5; ‘The Liverpool Sheltering Home Annual Meeting’, *Liverpool Mercury*, 2 December 1887; ‘Juvenile Emigration’, *Liverpool Mercury*, 12 February 1887; ‘Sunday in Liverpool’, *Sunday at Home* (January 1896), p. 307; ‘Emigration’, *Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science and Art*, 61, 1585 (13 March 1886), p. 367.

³⁹ BCL, CEH, MS 517/19, Annual Report 1893, p. 3; BCL, CEH, MS 517/19, Annual Report 1894, p. 5; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* April 1885, p. 61; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* March 1889, p. 48; ‘Correspondence’, *Liverpool Mercury*, 12 October 1880.

streets to beg.⁴⁰ Likewise in Manchester, Annie gained admittance to the MRH's emigration home on account of being 'terribly handicapped by a bad mother' who sent her to be a ballet girl, 'anything to make money [out] of her'.⁴¹ Along with sensationalist accounts of abuse, middle-class child rescuers, including emigrationists at the CEH and MRH, regularly denounced lower class standards of child rearing.⁴² An article in the MRH's magazine exemplifies the type of judgemental, value-loaded vocabulary and style of writing used by emigrationists to condemn the upbringing of children in slum conditions

Children [are] in the low, infamous streets, growing up in the haunts of crime and misery amid the reek of gin and the sounds of blasphemy, dirty, dissolute, diseased with always at least one prosperous place close by – the public house – flourishing like some bloated fungus in a region of decay and death.⁴³

As emigrationists at the CEH and MRH believed 'drink, bad feeding, under-feeding, overcrowding, vermin, foul air, dirt and disorder' dominated this environment, they questioned the likelihood of children becoming anything more than their parents or associates.⁴⁴ Whilst these comments and stories may have been exaggerated and embellished to increase support for child emigration, charging allegedly idle, drunken or criminal parents with the 'heinous crime of bringing up their children in squalor and vice' demonstrates a clear imposition of middle-class judgements upon those at the bottom of the social scale.⁴⁵ Evidently, the 'social evils' and 'corrupting surroundings' of the slum sharply conflicted with the stable, domestic, civilised family ideal as understood by the middle class, which many saw as 'the foundation of everything that is valued...our whole structure of society rests on it'.⁴⁶

However, unsuitable living conditions and inadequate parenting were not the only motivations for child emigration. Had this been the case, societies such as the MRH (who

⁴⁰ BCL, CEH, MS 517/20, Annual Report 1900, p. 11.

⁴¹ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* June 1896, p. 122.

⁴² M. May, 'Innocence and Experience: the evolution of the concept of juvenile delinquency in the mid-nineteenth century', *Victorian Studies*, 17, 1 (1973), p. 19.

⁴³ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* January 1883, p. 5.

⁴⁴ 'Birmingham Children's Emigration Homes', *Ragged School Union Quarterly Record* (December 1875), p. 276; 'Emigration', *Saturday Review of Politics*, p. 367; 'Girls for Canada', *The Bristol Mercury and Daily Post*, 18 May 1894; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* November 1884, p. 171; BCL, CEH, MS 517/21, Annual Report 1908, p. 4.

⁴⁵ 'The Boys and Girls Refuges in Manchester', *Manchester Times*, 5 February 1892.

⁴⁶ W. Chambers, 'The Boarding-out System', *Chambers's Journal of Popular Literature, Science and Art*, 4, 19 (9 June 1877), p. 353; Hadley, 'Natives in a Strange Land', pp. 418-420.

offered a variety of options to their children, including training in their workshops) would not have needed to use emigration as a method of child rescue. The crucial difference between the work of child emigrationists and others involved in child rescue work was that transplanting children to Canada enabled complete separation between the child and their previous life in England. Almost *en masse* child emigrationists and their supporters argued that ‘children went with the stream and were what their associates made them’, which therefore meant that they would always be susceptible to falling back in to their ‘old ways’.⁴⁷ This was exemplified in a case from the CEH when eight runaways left the Birmingham home in 1875; two of the boys subsequently faced gaol for larceny, one for burglary, another for manslaughter, whilst the other two committed crimes but evaded the law.⁴⁸ Whilst the precise details of this case may have been exaggerated in the press to give weight to the story, other emigrationists also drew upon examples of parents intruding upon child rescue institutions demanding to see their child or wanting to reclaim them once fully trained in order to send them back out to work.⁴⁹ Not only did this disturb operations at the home, it also meant that emigration societies faced the risk of having their ‘reforming’ work undone once the child returned to their parents or friends.

Through the permanent and complete separation of child and family surroundings, emigration was a distinct alternative, rather than merely a substitute for governmental initiatives, poor relief or individual thrift. Perhaps because of their beliefs in the need for total separation, during the first two decades of the MRH’s child emigration operations, they insisted that they took ‘boys and girls from a class and from surroundings lower than we believe is reached by any similar institution’.⁵⁰ Similarly, the CEH commented in the 1870s and 1880s that only those considered ‘beyond the reach of existing government

⁴⁷ BCL, CEH, MS 517/463, Annual Report 1873, p. 3; BCL, CEH, MS 517/463, Annual Report 1875, p. 1; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* January 1886, p. 6; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* April 1888, p. 74; Rev. J. O. Bevan, *The upbringing of necessitous and pauper children* (Hereford, 1892), p. 18; Rawson, ‘The Life-Blood of the Empire’, p. 542; ‘Girls for Canada’ *Bristol Mercury and Daily Post*, 18 May 1894; ‘Expert Views on Emigration’, p. 181.

⁴⁸ ‘Birmingham Children’s Emigration Homes’, *Ragged School Union Quarterly Record* (December 1875), p. 276.

⁴⁹ ‘Sunday in Liverpool’, *Sunday at Home* (January 1891), p.309, 313; ‘Girls for Canada’, *The Bristol Mercury and Daily Post*, 18 May 1894.

⁵⁰ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* April 1886, p. 63; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children’s Haven* May 1896, p. 100.

institutions' in England were eligible for emigration.⁵¹ As stated by John T. Middlemore in an annual report from 1882

a poor woman calls at the homes...her husband is dead and she is invalided and out of work; she has not broken her fast that day and the bonnet and shawl she has on were borrowed from a neighbour for the occasion...“It is hard” she adds bursting into tears “to see my children clammed and have no bread to give them”. Her application is *rejected*; she must go to the workhouse.⁵²

Thus, the CEH and MRH initially refused to help those cases where other English institutions could provide relief because they argued that emigration was a ‘*dernier ressort*’ only to be used for children who were beyond help and aid at home.⁵³

Whilst other institutions, such as industrial schools, worked on the same principle that a child’s associates and living conditions would cause them to sink into habitual crime and pauperism, emigrationists refuted their attempts to work with these children in England.⁵⁴ Through their magazines and literature, the MRH in Manchester rejected government efforts to educate and reform children of the lowest classes through industrial and reformatory schools by denouncing the expansion of such institutions as a waste of public money

Children whose associations and environment in the mother country are only such as will hinder, if not ruin them, are given by our Emigration Department AN ENTIRELY FRESH START. For this reason we deeply regret the building of great establishments by the board of guardians, for the training at home of pauper children.⁵⁵

Despite an inquiry declaring that the majority of children could overcome adverse circumstances and become self-supporting if left at home in England, this did not change

⁵¹ BCL, CEH, MS 517/463, Annual Report 1873, p. 4; BCL, CEH, MS 517/464, Annual Report 1882, p. 5.

⁵² BCL, CEH, MS 517/464, Annual Report 1882, p.5.

⁵³ ‘The Emigration of Birmingham Children’, *Birmingham Daily Mail*, 26 July 1875. For more information about the ‘type’ of child actually accepted into the CEH and MRH see BCL, CEH, MS 517/174-202, Application Books 1870-1914; BCL, CEH, MS 517/245-427, Admission Papers, 1870-1914; MCL, MRH, M 189/5/1/1-20, Admission and History Books 1881-1914; MCL, MRH, M 189/5/1/3/1-11, Application Books 1874-1913.

⁵⁴ BCL, CEH, MS 517/463, Annual Report 1873, p. 3; BCL, CEH, MS 517/463, Annual Report 1875, p. 1; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* January 1886, p. 6; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* April 1888, p. 74; Bevan, *The up-bringing of necessitous and pauper children*, p. 18; Rawson, ‘The Life-blood of the Empire’, p. 542; ‘Girls for Canada’, *The Bristol Mercury and Daily Post*, 18 May 1894; ‘Expert Views on Empire Emigration’, p. 199; Piper, ‘Moral Campaigns’, p. 22.

⁵⁵ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* March 1895, p. 76.

emigrationists' convictions about the necessity of complete separation.⁵⁶ Evidently, late nineteenth and early twentieth century middle-class contemporaries involved in child emigration saw the lack of moral authority and control within the urban environment as a direct cause of a child's depravity.⁵⁷ As the family unit was essential to the 'moral health of society' and because the attitudes and lifestyles pervading in the slums were consequently deemed a danger to society, this enabled child emigrationists to rationalise the break-up of children and parents.⁵⁸

Justification I: Economic Savings

Though social improvement was a major motivation for the CEH and MRH, these emigrationists in Birmingham and Manchester offered a different justification for their activities, namely the economic savings to the ratepayer and the community. By suggesting that children in the slums were the potential criminals and paupers of the future, the CEH and MRH argued that they would consequently be a 'drain on resources, cost to ratepayers and threat to society' once in a workhouse, gaol or correctional institution.⁵⁹ To demonstrate this point, one child emigrationist in Liverpool argued that his work had saved the ratepayers £565,200 because he had removed nearly two thousand children who would otherwise have cost society approximately £300 each by joining the criminal classes.⁶⁰ Similar estimates in 1882 suggested that a thief who lived twenty years would cost the nation approximately £4,000, therefore if two hundred potential criminals were removed, the community saved £1,200,000.⁶¹ Emigrationists rarely offered evidence as to where these figures came from and the *data* they used is difficult to quantify. However, when contemporaries read such accounts, the relatively small sum of £10 to £16 per head for emigration may have appeared good value in comparison to the potentially large costs incurred if such children remained at home.

⁵⁶ A. McDougall, *Further Inquiries into the causes of pauperism in the township of Manchester* (Manchester, 1885), pp. 6-7.

⁵⁷ Piper, 'Moral Campaigns', p. 18.

⁵⁸ Piper, 'Moral Campaigns', p. 21; Swain, 'Child Rescue: emigration of idea', p. 103.

⁵⁹ 'Birmingham Children's Emigration Homes: farewell meeting of the emigrants', *Morning News*, 27 April 1875; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* April 1896, p.83; 'Emigration', *Saturday Review of Politics, Literature and Art*, 61, 1585 (13 March 1886), p. 367.

⁶⁰ 'Juvenile Emigration', *Liverpool Mercury*, 12 February 1887.

⁶¹ 'The Middlemore Emigration Homes', *Birmingham Daily Post*, 26 May 1882.

As a justification for child emigration, this line of argument was increasingly used once schemes became more established and began taking larger numbers of children to Canada in the late 1880s and 1890s. This particularly applied to regional child emigration societies because they only took small numbers of children overseas during the early years of their work; the CEH in Birmingham, for example, only took twenty-nine children in their first emigration party to Canada in 1872, which would not initially have provided immediate nor large economic savings.⁶² However, as the number of child emigrants increased year-on-year and regional societies expanded their work in England's major cities, emigrationists in Birmingham and Manchester attempted to argue that their activities were helping to reduce the number of young dependents who had the potential to be an economic burden to the community through crime and pauperism.⁶³ As commented in the MRH magazine in 1886

People might take their choice...whether they would assist Mrs Birt to look after these poor children, to rescue them and send them across the seas, giving them a new start in life, or whether they would pay for these children by-and-by in heavy taxes and rates for the support of the police and other agencies the law had provided for repressing sin and crime and immorality.⁶⁴

Thus, child emigrationists argued that they provided a dual service to society by allegedly lowering the rates of crime and pauperism, whilst simultaneously reducing the amount of public money needed to tackle such issues. However, the comment in the MRH magazine also highlights the victim/threat dichotomy because the editor used vocabulary, such as 'rescue' and 'new life' to suggest that children needed, and deserved, their help, yet at the same time they vilified the child by suggesting that he or she would inevitably become a drain on society if left in England. This exemplifies the complex nature of middle-class beliefs about children's place within society and demonstrates how emigrationists were able to use contemporary views and opinions in order to justify their work.

However, the CEH and MRH were not alone in their quest to work with children from the slum districts of Birmingham and Manchester; therefore, the economic arguments in favour of their work were only effective if they could show that transplanting children overseas

⁶² BCL, CEH, MS 517/463, Annual Report 1873, p. 5.

⁶³ 'District News', *Birmingham Daily Post*, 30 December 1890; 'Miscellaneous', *Manchester Times*, 11 March 1882; 'The Treatment of Juvenile Offenders', *Liverpool Mercury*, 6 October 1880.

⁶⁴ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1 *Christian Worker* December 1886, p. 183.

was more cost effective than other methods of child rescue. Regional emigration societies drew comparisons between the costs incurred at different institutions to demonstrate the benefits of their method, which, at face value, did seem to give emigrationists a strong advantage.⁶⁵ The MRH and CEH both used figures that stated pauper children requiring poor law relief cost from £15 to £30 per child per annum when housed with boards of guardians.⁶⁶ This cost was incurred every year and calculated on the premise that, on average, children stayed between four to six years in government institutions, whereas for a one off payment of between £10 and £16, the MRH or CEH could train, emigrate and re-home a child in Canada. Regional emigrationists in Liverpool were even more optimistic, claiming in 1883 that they could provide for ten children at the same cost as just one inmate of a governmental orphanage, reformatory or industrial school.⁶⁷ According to these figures, emigration appeared to be the cheapest method of dealing with the lowest class of urban children and as such, cost-effectiveness was a strong line of argument to pursue when explaining and justifying child emigration. That emigrationists compared the costs of their methods with publicly funded government institutions with such vigour suggests that efficiency and value for money mattered to those members of the public financing child welfare efforts, whether through private donations to charities or through paying rates. It also shows that child emigration societies did not operate in a vacuum, but rather were acutely aware of the methods, operations and costs involved with other schemes and initiatives all providing assistance to children of the lower classes.

The proliferation of details and *data* generated by child emigrationists about the economic savings of their work and the public nature of its dissemination demonstrates how emigrationists adapted their justifications to appeal to as wide an audience as possible. Whilst the accuracy of figures relating to the cost of child rescue, as well as the

⁶⁵ BCL, CEH, MS 517/465, Annual Report 1888, p. 14; BCL, CEH, MS 517/20, Annual Report 1902, p. 36; BCL, CEH, MS 517/22, Annual Report 1911, p. 5; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* February 1883, p. 31; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* March 1895, p. 76; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* April 1902, p. 11.

⁶⁶ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* October 1904, p. 5; BCL, CEH, MS 517/465, Annual Report 1888, pp. 14-15. For more information about the provision of poor law relief see M. E. Rose, *The English Poor Law, 1780-1930* (Newton Abbot, 1971); M. E. Rose, *The Relief of Poverty, 1834-1914* (London, 1972); D. Fraser (ed.), *The New Poor Law in the nineteenth century* (London, 1976); M. A. Crowther, *The Workhouse System, 1834-1929: the history of an English social institution* (London, 1981); M. E. Rose (ed.) *The Poor and the City: the English poor law in its urban context, 1834-1914* (Leicester, 1985); D. Englander, *Poverty and Poor Law Reform in Britain: from Chadwick to Booth, 1834-1914* (London, 1998).

⁶⁷ 'The Liverpool Sheltering Home', *Sunday at Home*, 1529 (August 1883), p. 524.

proportionate saving made by ratepayers is difficult to quantify, none the less, emigrationists openly quoted them in the public domain through newspaper reports or pamphlets throughout the period 1870 to 1914.⁶⁸ Whilst this enabled the CEH and MRH to access large numbers of predominately middle-class readers, they also targeted people personally to explain their work and describe the economic advantages to their emigration schemes. Within just one year, the CEH issued hundreds of personal letters to members of the local community emphasising that ‘through no other method can a child be so cheaply and so *well* provided for’.⁶⁹ The process of spreading information about the cost of their work to as wide an audience as possible was important because child emigration relied on voluntary subscriptions and donations.⁷⁰ This posed a challenge because ratepayers already contributed to the cost of governmental child welfare institutions; therefore, emigrationists had to persuade the rate paying public that their work also deserved financial backing. To do so, they emphasised the permanent separation of children from their surroundings, which made their work unique from other child rescue or child saving activities being conducted by English authorities or agencies. Asking for a one-off expense that ‘provided for each child for life’, meant that emigrationists at the CEH and MRH could claim their children ceased to be an economic and social burden to English society.⁷¹ Thus, by vilifying the children they worked with and alleging that they were the paupers and criminals of the future, emigrationists in Birmingham and Manchester promoted themselves as offering a cost-effective alternative approach to child rescue that contributed to the gradual purification of society.

Justification II: Empire Strengthening

Though emigrationists presented certain children as a threat to society when promoting the economic ‘benefits’ of their work, this was not the only way in which they interpreted the role of the child when justifying child emigration. From the turn of the century, they also recognised that significant change for the benefit of the community and wider nation could

⁶⁸ ‘The Birmingham Emigration Home for Outcast Children’, *Weekly News*, date unknown; ‘Birmingham Children’s Emigration Home’, *Birmingham Daily Gazette*, 26 May 1882; ‘The Liverpool Sheltering Home Annual Meeting’, *Liverpool Mercury*, 2 December 1887; ‘Sheltering Home for Destitute Children’, *Liverpool Mercury*, 22 January 1879; ‘The Middlemore Emigration Homes’, *Birmingham Daily Post*, 26 May 1882.

⁶⁹ BCL, CEH, MS 517/93, Scrapbook, p. 65.

⁷⁰ See Chapter 3: Support and Finances for more information about methods of fundraising.

⁷¹ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children’s Haven* January 1907, p. 4; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children’s Haven* June 1898, p.3; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children’s Haven* April 1911, p. 6.

only happen by working with the younger generation. Emigrationists generally considered youngsters aged over fifteen to be beyond help, there being too much to unlearn as ‘thoughts and deeds of sin have [already] been burned into the blood’.⁷² This reflected the general call for social improvement to rest upon the youngest members of the population, especially those at the bottom of the social scale. Some historians have identified this as a sign of contemporary recognition that the health, welfare and rearing of children was directly linked to the destiny of the nation.⁷³ The contemporary term ‘children of the nation’, borrowed from a work by J. E. Gorst, attached new importance to those who would form the next generation and reflected the belief that ‘large masses of our adults are past helping...[but] much may be done with the children’.⁷⁴ Child emigrationists in Birmingham and Manchester, in particular, embraced this concept; in 1905 the MRH emphatically declared

Our children are our greatest national asset...and all responsibilities that now attach to us, the present generation, in private and national affairs, will then attach to them.⁷⁵

No longer were children of the lowest classes merely seen as a social hindrance, these children were now viewed as the future of the country. By working with them, emigrationists could argue that their emigration activities improved life in the immediate present, as well as benefiting the next generation.

One of the strongest ways that the CEH and MRH utilised the idea of the child as a precious resource was in their references to empire strengthening. Whilst historians find it difficult to agree on much of the vocabulary used in connection with studying the British empire, the term ‘new imperialism’ has become attached to the end of the nineteenth

⁷² BCL, CEH, MS 517/463, Annual Report 1877, p. 3; BCL, CEH, MS 517/464, Annual Report 1880, pp. 5-6.

⁷³ N. Rose, *Governing the Soul: the shaping of the private self* (London, 1990), p. 121; A. Wooldridge, *Measuring the Mind: education and psychology in England, c.1860-c.1990* (Cambridge, 1994); R. Cooter (ed.), *In the Name of the Child: health and welfare, 1880-1940* (London, 1992).

⁷⁴ J. E. Gorst, *Children of the Nation: how their health and vigour should be promoted by the state* (London, 1906); W. B Paton, *State-aided emigration* (London, 1885), p. 23; Hendrick, *Child Welfare*, p. 84; Berry, *The Child, the State and the Victorian Novel*, p. 164.

⁷⁵ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children’s Haven* May 1905, p. 34.

century.⁷⁶ With the advent of newly emerging political powers, such as Germany, questioning Britain's international position towards the end of the Victorian *era*, the CEH and MRH increasingly focused on notions of empire as a way to justify their work.⁷⁷ As expressed in the MRH's magazine

the more we regard our colonies as part of the greater English family,
the more likely they are to consider England as the real mother country...
England is only as great as her sons and daughters whether at home or
across the seas, which [serve to] bind rather than separate.⁷⁸

The perceived benefits of child emigration were no longer limited to England; rather, the CEH and MRH now had an imperial element to their activities, which clearly differentiated their work from other child rescue methods.⁷⁹ Drawing upon the changing political landscapes in both England and Europe therefore enabled regional emigration societies in Birmingham and Manchester to modify and adapt the justifications for their work to reflect contemporary opinion and concerns.

Whilst the CEH and MRH used empire-related arguments to justify their work, these child emigrationists in Birmingham and Manchester never considered their schemes to be part of an aggressive imperial policy. Rather, it was always explained as a process that enabled children to act as agents by peacefully linking the mother country to the empire.⁸⁰ This sharply contrasted with other supporters and advocates of similar child emigration schemes, most notably the Marquis of Lorne. At a time of political conflict and war in South Africa,

⁷⁶ Grant, *Representations of British Emigration*, p. xv; Porter, *Absent-Minded Imperialists*, p. xii, 8; R. Koebner, *Empire: a study of the changing concepts of empire and imperialism* (Cambridge, 1961); R. Koebner and H. D. Schmidt, *Imperialism: the story and significance of a political word, 1840-1960* (Cambridge, 1964); T. Pakenham, *The Scramble for Africa* (London, 1991); N. Tarling, *Imperialism in Southeast Asia: 'a fleeting, passing phase'* (London, 2001); Samson (ed.), *The British Empire*.

⁷⁷ Eldridge (ed.), *British Imperialism*, p. 38; Eldridge, *Victorian Imperialism*, p. 126; R. Johnson, *British Imperialism* (Basingstoke, 2003), p. 39; P. J. Marshall, '1870-1918: the empire under threat', in P. J. Marshall (ed.), *Cambridge Illustrated History of the British Empire* (Cambridge, 1996), p. 54.

⁷⁸ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* December 1886, p. 183; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* March 1905, p. 6.

⁷⁹ As used in this study, imperial denotes a habit of mind that gained prominence in the *era* of European world supremacy, whereby a country extended its rule or control, whether direct or indirect through political, economic or cultural control over another country or people. Adapted from definitions provided by Eldridge (ed.), *British Imperialism*, p. 11; J. A. Mangan (ed.), *Benefits Bestowed? Education and British Imperialism* (Manchester, 1988), p. ix.

⁸⁰ BCL, CEH, MS 517/19, Annual Report 1892, p. 10; BCL, CEH, MS 517/22, Annual Report 1912, p. 5; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* May 1893, p. 124; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* January 1905, p. 5; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* May and June 1914, p. 3; A. J. Christopher, *The British Empire at its Zenith* (London, 1988), p. 27.

he suggested that child emigrants be diverted from Canada and sent to the Transvaal and Orange Free State republics.⁸¹

May we not organise little settlements in carefully chosen places
where clergy and schoolmasters and others necessary for the training
of children sent from England may bring up healthy little colonists?
These children would never wish to leave the country they would regard
as their own ...that they must keep their political and social character strong
and healthy and pure must be our desire.⁸²

In contrast to this jingoistic perspective on the purposes and benefits of child emigration, both the CEH and MRH consistently focused their attention on the white dominion of Canada. They argued that doing so would allegedly strengthen the ties of the mother country with one of the most established parts of the empire.⁸³ The MRH, in particular, consistently stated from the 1880s onwards that Canada was part of a 'Greater England' and therefore children lived, not amongst foreigners, but with people of their own race, who held similar values, in a country where the British flag still covered them.⁸⁴ Historian Johnson has stated that terms such as 'Greater Britain' conveyed the special status of white settler colonies, including Canada, in which migrants became agents of British civilisation and took British tastes and values with them to the New World.⁸⁵ Consequently, child emigration societies in Birmingham and Manchester emphasised the opportunity of 'lengthening the cords and strengthening the stakes' of the empire by sending English children to Canada.⁸⁶ Thus, transplanting children who would retain an element of Britishness, even when settled into a new life in Canada, was supposed to fortify the mother country's hold over her oldest colonies and continue to nurture the relationship between the two countries.

⁸¹ For more information about the Boer War see R. Price, *An Imperial War and the British Working Class: working-class attitudes and reactions to the Boer War, 1899-1902* (London, 1972); T. Pakenham, *The Boer War* (London, 1979); J. Gooch (ed.), *The Boer War: direction, experience and image* (London, 2000); F. R. Van Hartesveldt, *The Boer War: historiography and annotated bibliography* (London, 2000).

⁸² Marquis of Lorne, 'Planting out state children in South Africa', *Nineteenth Century: a monthly review*, 47, 278 (April 1900), p. 611.

⁸³ BCL, CEH, MS 517/464, Annual Report 1894, p. 16; BCL, CEH, MS 517/22, Annual Report 1914, p. 5; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* May and June 1914, p. 3.

⁸⁴ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* April 1886, p. 63; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* March 1898, p.7; 'Girls for Canada', *The Bristol Mercury and Daily Post*, 18 May 1894; 'British Waifs in Canada', *Liverpool Mercury*, 17 May 1887; 'Middlemore Emigration Homes', *Birmingham Daily Post*, 5 June 1884.

⁸⁵ Johnson, *British Imperialism*, p. 59.

⁸⁶ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* June 1884, p. 85.

However, some commentators of child emigration also argued that because children retained their loyalty and ties to the mother country, transplanting British children overseas in the colonies encouraged and promoted the ‘continual imperial ascendancy of our race’.⁸⁷ This attitude reflects what C. C. Eldridge has identified as a contemporary notion of ‘imperial mission’ – an obligation to spread Western civilisation, European technology and the Christian gospel overseas.⁸⁸ When coupled with a belief in the superiority of the white, Anglo-Saxon race (which had been used to justify intervention in Africa, continuing British rule in India and the repression of the Jamaica revolt in 1865), for some individuals child emigration took on greater importance as a means of extending British influence overseas.⁸⁹ The need to use child emigration as a method of filling colonial lands with ‘British, not cosmopolitan, stock’, was particularly strong after the turn of the twentieth century, as promoted by individuals such as Colonel H. E. Rawson, B. Dunlop and W. B. Paton.⁹⁰ Perhaps most indicative of such sentiments were the Marquis of Lorne’s comments about the placement of British children in South Africa

They would in time help to keep the balance of power in making the whites ‘show up’ in comparison to the blacks...they would, in short, be bred up to usefully fill places in that South African Union of Provinces which shall keep for the races who have to live there together, the benefits of the best characteristics of the European races.⁹¹

However, these strong ideas of racial superiority and need for racial dominance beyond the British Isles did not tend to percolate into the justifications of child emigration offered by the founders of either the CEH or MRH. Though they did refer to national pride and identity in their justifications for child emigration, these two regional societies only went as far as to say that their children did not ‘cease to be Englishmen when they settled in Canada; they merely move from one part of the empire to another’.⁹² Therefore, unlike some of their middle and upper class contemporaries, imperial dominance was never the overall aim of either the CEH or MRH. Rather, they drew upon selective notions of empire

⁸⁷ B. Dunlop, ‘Child Emigration’, *The British Medical Journal*, 1, 2573 (23 April 1910), p. 1023.

⁸⁸ Eldridge, *Victorian Imperialism*, p. 2.

⁸⁹ C. Bolt, *Victorian Attitudes to Race* (London, 1971), p. ix.

⁹⁰ Rawson, ‘The Life Blood of the Empire’, p. 542; Dunlop, ‘Child Emigration’, p. 1023; Paton, *State-aided Emigration*, pp. 35-36.

⁹¹ Lorne, ‘Planting out state children in South Africa’, p. 611.

⁹² BCL, CEH, MS 517/23, Annual Report 1915, p. 4; BCL, CEH, MS 517/19, Annual Report 1892, p. 10; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* July 1886, p. 183; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* April 1888, p. 74.

and imperialism to adapt their justifications for this alternative method of child rescue to fit with the current political and social landscapes.

Perhaps nothing demonstrates this more acutely than the way in which emigrationists at the CEH and MRH argued that expatriating children would increase demand for British goods in the empire

New markets will be opened up, and the old markets strengthened, so that the mother country finds prosperity come back to herself by reason of the demand among her sons and daughters in the new country for her manufactures and productions.⁹³

In line with their largely non-aggressive imperial attitudes, the CEH and MRH strongly argued that their schemes exploited existing and predominately stable trade relations between the mother country and her white settler colonies.⁹⁴ As later confirmed by historians, more established British colonies provided a relatively secure export market compared with some foreign countries and markets, with few financial or political problems.⁹⁵ The CEH and MRH's conviction that Canada offered some scope for expanded markets is supported by figures that show British colonial investment between 1865 and 1914 was twenty-five per cent of her whole portfolio and that trade with the empire constituted only one third of British overseas commerce at the turn of the twentieth century.⁹⁶

Whether child emigrants really did bring about economic gains through increased demands for British goods is questionable but the fact that emigrationists in Birmingham and Manchester identified such a potential is important. Other child welfare or child rescue institutions operating solely in England could not generally claim that their activities had

⁹³ 'Mr J. T. Middlemore's Emigration Homes', *Birmingham Daily Post*, 5 June 1883; 'Emigration', *Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science and Art*, 61, 1585 (13 March 1886), p. 366; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* November 1884, p. 174; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* June 1890, p. 142.

⁹⁴ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* March 1899, p. 8; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* May and June 1914, p. 3; 'What will he become? Rescuing the Slum Child: imperialism and philanthropy', *Birmingham Daily Post*, 5 May 1902; 'Minority Report of Commission Depression of trade and industry', 1885, quoted in Chamberlain, 'Imperialism and social reform', p. 150.

⁹⁵ Christopher, *The British Empire at its zenith*, p. 36; Eldridge, *Victorian Imperialism*, p. 234; P. J. Cain and A. G. Hopkins, *British Imperialism: innovation and expansion, 1688-1914* (London, 1993), p. 205.

⁹⁶ Porter, *The Absent-Minded Imperialists*, p. 31; L. E. Davis and R. A. Huttenback, *Mammon and the Pursuit of Empire: the political economy of British Imperialism, 1860-1912* (Cambridge, 1986), p. 42; P. Deane and W. A. Cole, *British Economic Growth, 1688-1959: trends and structure* (London, 1969), p. 187; Eldridge, *Victorian Imperialism*, p. 234.

these added 'benefits', thereby making emigration distinctive. In the light of apprehensions and fears that Britain was being overshadowed economically, militarily and territorially, the CEH and MRH's focus on trade opportunities within the empire broadened the justifications for child emigration from both a financial and imperial perspective.⁹⁷ This demonstrates that they successfully recognised and exploited pressing contemporary issues that centred on the stability and future of the empire and found a way to make their scheme supportive of British overseas objectives. For as J. Samson comments, 'whatever else the British [e]mpire was about, it was always about trade... economics were a vital part of imperial identity and growth and the empire was a source of wealth and a field of investment'.⁹⁸ As the young emigrants from Birmingham and Manchester were said to play a major role as consumers for British goods abroad, the CEH and MRH once again shaped their justifications for child emigration around their interpretation of the child. Thus, to explain their work as an alternative form of rescue, regional child emigrationists utilised the changing concept of the child's role as either a victim, threat, agent or customer, which enabled the CEH and MRH to reflect the social, economic, and imperial concerns of the time.

⁹⁷ Eldridge, *British Imperialism*, p. 33; R. Shannon, *The Crisis of Imperialism, 1865-1915* (London, 1974); B. Porter, *The Lion's Share: a short history of British Imperialism, 1850-1970* (London, 1975); R. Hyam, *Britain's Imperial Century, 1815-1914: a study of empire and expansion* (London, 1976).

⁹⁸ Samson (ed.), *The British Empire*, p. 107.

Chapter 2: Networks and Connections

To transform their middle-class ideas about the child, family and society into an acceptable form of child rescue, the CEH and MRH needed to develop and utilise networks or connections with a variety of organisations and individuals. These included other child rescue organisations, different child emigration societies and local government authorities, which locates the work of the CEH and MRH within three wider movements or spheres. Firstly, the transplantation of children flourished at a time of increased contemporary interest in child welfare. Therefore, how did the CEH and MRH's emigration activities benefit from legislative reforms designed to protect children in England? In what ways did they interact with other organisations working with children, namely the NSPCC, and how did this enhance emigrationists' claims to be conducting child rescue work? Secondly, the CEH and MRH were not alone in emigrating children to Canada. Roy Parker has already identified a series of connections between early child emigrationists, such as Annie Macpherson and Maria Rye, but what networks did smaller, regional societies create with other emigrationists?¹ Did these networks enable child emigration societies to form a unified movement or did they operate individual, competing schemes? Thirdly, to expand their activities and work with poor law children, emigrationists needed to show government officials that transplanting children overseas was a viable method of dealing with children in state care. To what extent did child emigration societies liaise with boards of guardians? Who were the 'intermediary' individuals or organisations acting between child emigrationists and government agencies to encourage the increased transplantation of pauper children to Canada? Some historians have suggested that in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century there was an overlap between the services provided by the voluntary sector and the state; did relations between regional child emigration societies and government authorities conform to this interpretation?²

Child protection and welfare

Despite historians being divided as to the starting date of general state intervention, there were clear contemporary calls for state involvement in the welfare of children from the

¹ Parker, *Uprooted*, pp. 33-35.

² Kamerman, 'The New Mixed Economy of Welfare', pp. 5-10; Brenton, *The Voluntary Sector in British Social Services*; Finlayson, 'A Moving Frontier', p. 185; Finlayson, *Citizen, State and Social Welfare*, p. 6.

1880s onwards.³ Orphanages, ragged schools, campaigns against child labour and exploitation, penal reform, the expansion of education and schemes for the emigration of children all flourished in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, aided in part by reforms to protect children.⁴ As A. J. Kidd has argued, children's charities in the 1880s and 1890s looked to the state for a legal framework of child protection in order to carry out their activities.⁵ Perhaps the most important piece of legislation that reflected increased state intervention for improved child welfare was the Prevention of Cruelty to Children Act (1889). Also known as the Children's Charter, this Act covered issues, such as begging and the sale of intoxicating liquor to children, as well as making it a punishable offence 'to treat, neglect or expose a child under fourteen years of age in a manner calculated to cause it unnecessary suffering or to be injurious to its health'.⁶ The Act was of prime importance for child emigration societies as it gave any petty sessional court the authority to remove a child whose parents were convicted of cruelty or neglect from their home environment and place the child into the care of a relation or any guardian the court chose to appoint.⁷ From the 1890s onwards, child emigration societies regularly acquired guardianship of children in this way and were able to include suitable candidates in their forthcoming emigration party. A case from the CEH's annual report in 1908 reads

Charles, 5 years and Ellen, 7 years: Parents were charged with keeping a disorderly house and were convicted...They were further charged with allowing their children to live and reside in the [disorderly] house, contrary to the Industrial Schools Act. The magistrates gave the custody of the children to the Middlemore Homes under the Cruelty to Children Act, remarking that they must be detached from their pernicious surroundings.⁸

³ A. V. Dicey, *Lectures on the relation between Law and Public Opinion in England during the nineteenth century* (London, 1905); J. S. Heywood, *Children in Care: the development of the service for the deprived child* (London, 1959); Heasman, *Evangelicals in Action*, p. 14; E. C. Midwinter, *Victorian Social Reform* (London, 1968); W. C. Lubenow, *The Politics of Government Growth: early Victorian attitudes towards state intervention 1833-1848* (Newton Abbot, 1971); A. J. Taylor, *Laissez-Faire and State Intervention in nineteenth century Britain* (London, 1972); V. Cromwell, *Revolution or Evolution? British Government in the nineteenth century* (London, 1977); P. W. J. Bartrip, 'State Intervention in mid-nineteenth century Britain: fact or fiction?', *Journal of British Studies*, 23, 1 (1983), pp. 63-83.

⁴ A. Davin, 'What is a child?', in A. Fletcher and S. Hussey (eds.), *Childhood in Question: children, parents and the state* (Manchester, 1999), p. 29.

⁵ A. J. Kidd, *State, Society and the Poor in nineteenth century England* (Basingstoke, 1999), p. 107.

⁶ Prevention of Cruelty to Children Act (1889), Public General Act, 52 & 53 Victoria c. 44 HL/PO/PU/1/1889/52&53V1n221.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ BCL, CEH, MS 517/21, Annual Report 1908, p. 16.

The very fact that the court chose to place these children in the CEH suggests that child emigration gained a degree of acceptance amongst some governmental authorities. As the newly appointed guardian of the children, emigrationists such as Middlemore or Shaw were at the end of a long chain of investigations and actions that involved many other people and agencies. The fact that police constables arrested parents, that civil servants were responsible for securing the protection of the child through the courts and placed them in emigration homes, that members of parliament in Westminster passed the original legislation permitting such action locates the work of individual regional child emigrationists within much wider governmental and regulatory networks.⁹

To persuade government officials and agencies, together with the general public, that transplanting children overseas was a form of ‘child rescue’, some advocates of child emigration embraced and promoted reforms for child welfare in England, which helped to combat criticisms that they simply ‘dumped’ unwanted children in Canada.¹⁰ As commented in the MRH’s magazine in 1908

Thirty years ago, in the earliest days of our work, we pleaded in season and out of season for a recognition of the children’s rights against cruel circumstances of abject poverty, against their exploitation by so-called guardians, against the bogey of parental rights and against the degrading habits which were induced by the children’s surroundings.¹¹

The MRH had a strong involvement in campaigning for greater state regulation and intervention in the lives of children and young adults, particularly those with the potential to become hardened criminals in later life. Having visited New York and observed separate children’s courts in America, Thomas Ackroyd, honorary secretary of the MRH, campaigned for a similar system to be introduced in England.¹² Not only were juvenile courts subsequently one of the key components of the 1908 Children and Young Person’s Act, these courts were also a regular source from which regional child emigration societies

⁹ ‘A Brutal Mother Sent to Gaol’, *Birmingham Daily Mail*, 9 February 1897; ‘Cruelty to an Adopted Child’, *Birmingham Daily Mail*, 10 February 1897; ‘Birmingham Police Courts’, *Birmingham Daily Post*, 30 March 1900; ‘Cruelty to Children in Dudley and District’, *Birmingham Daily Post*, 29 May 1900.

¹⁰ See Chapter 4: Protection, Training and Preparation for further discussion on the criticisms levied against child emigrationists.

¹¹ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children’s Haven* March 1908, p. 3.

¹² MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children’s Haven* November, pp. 4-6; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children’s Haven* May and June, pp. 5; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children’s Haven* November 1912, pp. 3-7.

in Birmingham and Manchester recruited potential emigrants.¹³ Though both regional societies had long records of sending representatives to court to offer children convicted of minor offences a non-compulsory alternative to imprisonment in England, upon the establishment of children's courts, there were increased numbers of children who had been accused of criminal offences entering the MRH and CEH.¹⁴ Thus, the MRH's campaign for juvenile courts and the subsequent inclusion of these establishments in legislation demonstrates how one regional child emigration society could demonstrate supposed wider concern for child welfare, whilst at the same time securing a new source from which they could recruit child emigrants.

In addition to benefiting from legislative changes, child emigration societies also formed allegiances with other organisations working with children to show that their activities were an alternative approach to child rescue. One of the most prominent and influential societies that the CEH and MRH connected with was the NSPCC, a society that had spent seven years prior to the passage of the Children's Charter establishing regional groups and voluntarily carrying out duties to protect children in the local community.¹⁵ The NSPCC's doctrine was based on the conviction that

when parents unduly neglect their natural duties or abuse their natural rights, it is the duty of the state to call them to account for their misdeeds and, if necessary, deprive them of the care of their children and place itself in *loco parentis* towards them.¹⁶

Their belief in separating the child from 'inadequate' parents matched child emigrationists' views that removing children from their home surroundings was the only way to get a permanent result from their child rescue activities.¹⁷ The first society for the prevention of child cruelty was established in 1883 when politician Samuel Smith joined with a local merchant and banker in Liverpool, Thomas Agnew. They issued their first appeal for the

¹³ Children and Young Person Act (1908), Public Act 8 Edward VII, c. 67 HL/PO/PU/1/1908/8E7c67; Heywood, *Children in Care*, p. 108.

¹⁴ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker March* 1883, p. 37; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* November 1895, p. 9; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* August and September 1908, pp. 3-6; BCL, CEH, MS 517/19, Annual Report 1894, p. 7; BCL, CEH, MS 517/19, Annual Report 1896, pp. 12-13; BCL, CEH, MS 517/20, Annual Report 1898, p. 11; BCL, CEH, MS 517/21, Annual Report 1908, p. 5; Gorton and Ramsland, 'Prison Playground? Child Convict Labour and Vocational Training in New South Wales, 1788-1840', pp. 51-6; J. Carlebach, *Caring for Children in Trouble* (London, 1970), pp. 25-39.

¹⁵ B. Waugh, 'Street Children', *Contemporary Review*, 53 (June 1888), pp. 825-832.

¹⁶ 'The state in *loco parentis*', *London Quarterly Review*, 15, 50 (January 1891), p. 257.

¹⁷ See Chapter 1: Motivations and Justifications.

new children's society at a meeting hosted by the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.¹⁸ Samuel Smith was also heavily involved in the establishment and augmentation of the Liverpool Sheltering Homes, whose main activity was child emigration.¹⁹ For Smith, supporting both organisations was clearly not a conflict of interest, but rather can be used to illustrate an element of compatibility between these two child rescue societies, which operated within very close geographical proximity.

Though Smith played a key role in establishing regional child emigration and prevention of cruelty to children societies in Liverpool, the two were separate organisations. However, this was not the case in Manchester; in April 1885, the MRH formed a new branch to its organisation specifically to 'combat cruelty to children'. Within four months, they had already dealt with over one hundred cases of suspected cruelty or neglect at their Children's Shelter in the centre of the city.²⁰ As Manchester's Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, this new branch of the MRH network continued to gather strength, as evidenced by increasing numbers of child welfare cases investigated by the branch. In February 1886 alone – less than one year after such work began – the MRH dealt with eighty-seven cruelty cases ranging from desertion by parents, general neglect, begging and selling after prohibited hours.²¹ Whilst dealing with cases of cruelty was only one aspect of the MRH's network of homes and refuges, as an organisation they actively pursued this work and kept themselves informed of similar societies operating in other cities both in Britain and overseas. Individuals involved in inspecting cases of cruelty at the MRH knew of parallel societies operating in London, Liverpool, Glasgow and New York and reported on such organisations in the institution's magazine. Quoting from the thirteenth annual report of the New York Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children, the editors of MRH magazine reported that the American society had investigated 5,822 cases, prosecuted 1,900 adults and placed 2,755 children into homes and institutions.²² Reporting on other societies located the MRH's work within a larger national and international movement of child rescue; evidently, being based in a provincial city did not stop the MRH from contributing to wider child welfare campaigns.

¹⁸ Pinchbeck and Hewitt, *Children in English Society*, pp. 621-622.

¹⁹ 'Sunday in Liverpool', *Sunday at Home* (January 1896), p. 309.

²⁰ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* April 1885, p. 61; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* August 1885, p. 128.

²¹ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* April 1886, p. 64.

²² MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* April 1888, p. 78.

In contrast to the MRH's early involvement in such work, the CEH in Birmingham did not immediately forge connections with the NSPCC, despite a branch of the NSPCC being established in the city as early as 1883.²³ Also unlike the MRH, the two organisations in Birmingham retained autonomy and were two separate organisations within the community.²⁴ As the MRH network of homes and refuges in Manchester offered a wider range of child rescue services than the CEH, who were simply an emigration society, this might explain why the former took a more active role in work to prevent cruelty to children. However, despite the CEH's early reluctance, from the late 1890s onwards they took increasing interest in the efforts of the local Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children and contributed towards their work by taking rescued children into the Birmingham emigration home. Without giving any explicit justification for their change in stance, from 1895 to 1914 the CEH annually sourced a number of its child emigrants through the NSPCC and for five consecutive years between 1898 and 1902, these children formed the largest group in the homes.²⁵ During these five years alone, inspectors of the NSPCC recommended two hundred and nine admissions into the CEH.²⁶ The CEH's developing interest in the work of the NSPCC can also be seen in a scrapbook compiled by the organisation's committee, in which increasing numbers of newspaper articles about the NSPCC's work appeared from 1897 onwards, some of which did not even include specific reference to the CEH.²⁷ Links forged by the MRH and CEH with respective Societies for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children in Manchester and Birmingham demonstrate the extent to which general child rescue efforts generated interaction between those working with children at ground level. Whilst the MRH and CEH largely dealt with the consequences of cruelty and neglect towards children, the NSPCC sought to deal with its causes; therefore, these organisations tackled different aspects of the same problem.

²³ Pinchbeck and Hewitt, *Children in English Society*, p. 622.

²⁴ BCL, CEH, MS 517/20, Annual Report 1900, p.13.

²⁵ CEH Annual Reports contain a breakdown of where the society sourced their children from, including statistics on their age and the reasons for admittance into the home. Common categories include the NSPCC, the police, religious ministers, school board officers and personal applications.

²⁶ BCL, CEH, MS 517/20, Annual Report 1899, p. 4; BCL, CEH, MS 517/20, Annual Report 1900, p. 5; BCL, CEH, MS 517/20, Annual Report 1901, p. 8; BCL, CEH, MS 517/20; Annual Report 1902, p. 7; BCL, CEH, MS 517/21, Annual Report 1903, p. 8.

²⁷ 'An Idle Father and Topsy Baby', *Birmingham Daily Gazette*, 8 January 1897; 'Worcester: A Heartless Mother', *Birmingham Daily Post*, 19 January 1897; 'Cruelty to Children at Smethwick', *Birmingham Daily Mail*, 27 January 1897; 'Shocking Case of Neglect of Children', *Birmingham Daily Post*, 30 January 1897; 'A Cruel Mother Sent to Gaol', *Birmingham Daily Mail*, 6 October 1897; 'Tramp's Cruelty to her Children', *Birmingham Daily Argus*, 13 October 1897; 'Birmingham Parents Imprisoned for Cruelty', *Birmingham Daily Gazette*, 21 January 1898; 'Neglected by Nomadic Father', *Birmingham Daily Gazette*, 29 January 1898. Newspaper clippings collected within BCL, CEH, MS 517/93, Scrapbook, pp. 78-88.

Consequently, by fitting their activities within contemporary moves to improve child welfare, the CEH and MRH could promote their work as an alternative approach to child rescue that was deserving of support.

One movement or several schemes?

Whilst the MRH and CEH forged links with the NSPCC, these regional child emigration societies also created networks with other societies involved in transplanting children overseas, which enabled them to become part of a wider movement that promoted the emigration of children. Roy Parker identified communications, meetings, personal correspondence and travel as the main ways in which early child emigrationists interconnected with one another.²⁸ Though Parker's analysis included John T. Middlemore, it did not discuss the MRH, yet out of the two regional societies in this study the Manchester society pursued far more interaction with other emigrationists than the CEH. In particular, the MRH drew upon the services and expertise of three experienced individuals: Annie Macpherson, her sister Louisa Birt (who was superintendent at the Liverpool Sheltering Homes) and Thomas Barnardo. The work of Macpherson and Birt was of paramount importance to the MRH as this Manchester institution operated a number of child rescue services for children, including a night shelter and seaside convalescence home, but was not an expert in child emigration.²⁹ Therefore, Louisa Birt – though based in Liverpool – acted as emigration agent for the MRH, taking numerous parties of Manchester emigrants to Canada between 1883 and 1890.³⁰ Not only did this save time and effort on the part of MRH staff, who did not have to accompany their children overseas, it also placed the time-consuming work and responsibility for checking the conditions of children once in Canada with Birt. Even when the MRH later sent emigration parties under the supervision of their own staff, they still made use of Annie Macpherson's Canadian distributing home, Marchmont Home at Belleville, Ontario.³¹ By 1874, Macpherson already had three distributing homes in Canada, allowing her to house large numbers of children not only from her own society but also from other child rescue organisations across Britain, including Thomas Barnardo (London), Leonard K. Shaw (Manchester), Mrs

²⁸ Parker, *Uprooted*, pp. 33-35.

²⁹ For an overview of the MRH's work see Edmondson, *Making Rough Places Plain*.

³⁰ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* February 1883, p. 31; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* November 1883, p. 165; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* July 1886, pp. 100-101.

³¹ Upon arrival in Canada, children were taken to a distributing home owned by a child emigration society where they stayed until emigration agents in Canada sent them to new homes and places of work.

Smyly (Dublin), Mrs Blaikie (Edinburgh) and Dr Thomas Guthrie (Edinburgh).³² Almost every young Manchester emigrant from the MRH was sent to the Marchmont Home until the start of World War One, which enabled a strong connection to develop between the two establishments.³³ As commented by the superintendent of the Canadian distributing home

Marchmont Home is not in any sense the property of the MRH but they have for so long made use of us...that we [the Marchmont Home] feel almost as if we were a branch of the MRH.³⁴

Being able to use Macpherson's distributing home, rather than the MRH having to establish one of their own, had the obvious advantage of saving additional overhead expenditures and time-consuming work in Canada. As Macpherson's experienced emigration agents staffed the Marchmont Home in Ontario, this also allowed the MRH to benefit from the expertise of those who were used to conducting child emigration.³⁵

The Manchester institution also forged links with additional individuals to shape their child rescue work in England, most notably Thomas Barnardo. Well-known philanthropist Thomas Barnardo began his child rescue enterprise in 1870 after setting up a home in Stepney, London. Like the MRH, he later incorporated child emigration into his work.³⁶ The bond between Leonard K. Shaw, founder of the MRH, and Barnardo was long lasting and warm, the two once being described as the 'closest and best of friends and allies' whose common work served to 'knit their two noble souls together'.³⁷ Referred to as the 'Barnardo of Manchester', Shaw's homes and refuges implemented a number of the same policies and procedures as Barnardo in London, including the idea of an 'Ever Open Door' policy, by which all children seeking help would be welcomed into the institution day or night, regardless of their situation.³⁸ Whilst Barnardo remained in contact with Shaw and his staff at the MRH through personal correspondence, the connection between these two

³² Heasman, *Evangelicals in Action*, pp. 104-105; Kohli, *Golden Bridge*, p. 96.

³³ Edmonson, *Making Rough Places Plain*, p. 89.

³⁴ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* February 1894, p. 52.

³⁵ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* August 1886, p. 144; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* April 1888, p. 74.

³⁶ For more detailed information about Barnardo and his work see Wagner, *Barnardo and Rose, For the Sake of the Children*.

³⁷ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* October 1905, p. 3.

³⁸ 'A Manchester Barnardo', *Review of Reviews*, volume unrecorded (16 July 1897), p. 62; F. W. Newland, 'The City of Manchester', *Sunday at Home* (January 1900), p. 370; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* June 1888, p. 106; Williams, *Barnardo of Stepney*; C. Scott, *Ever Open Door: the story of Dr Barnardo* (London, 1972); Wagner, *Barnardo*.

child rescuers also came to fruition on a number of occasions.³⁹ Barnardo addressed audiences at the MRH annual meetings in 1883 and 1903 whilst also attending a ceremony in Manchester to celebrate the completion of an enlargement to the MRH homes in 1884.⁴⁰ Securing connections with key figures, such as Barnardo, enabled the MRH to extend their network of contacts to include those operating much larger organisations that were at the forefront of child rescue work. This demonstrates that, for this Manchester-based organisation at least, working in a provincial city did not result in isolation from larger child rescue societies or child emigrationists.

Given the experiences of the MRH in connecting, communicating and working with Macpherson, Birt and Barnardo, in some senses there appears to have been a distinct child emigration movement. Indeed, several historians use the direct term ‘child emigration movement’ throughout their work.⁴¹ As defined by the *Oxford English Dictionary*, a ‘movement’ denotes

a course or series of actions and endeavours on the part of a group of people working towards a shared goal; or an organisation, coalition or alliance of people working to advance a shared political, social or artistic objective.⁴²

On the surface, this definition seems to apply to child emigration, especially as estimates suggest that approximately fifty individual organisations operated in a range of British locations from 1833 to 1939, all working towards the same goal of rescuing children from urban cities and transplanting them to new homes overseas.⁴³

However, the term ‘movement’ needs further analysis because there was a strong sense of diversity, rather than uniformity, amongst individual child emigration schemes. Unlike

³⁹ MCL, MRH, M 189/7/7, Papers relating to the Marchmont Home and Barnardo’s, 1894-1925; MCL, MRH, M 189/7/7/1, Letters from Barnardo, 1894; MCL, MRH, M 189/7/7/2, Boarding Out of Children, correspondence between the MRH and Dr Barnardo regarding emigration, 1902.

⁴⁰ ‘Boys and Girls Refuge, Strangeways’, *Manchester Times*, 6 December 1884; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* April 1883, p. 59; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children’s Haven* March 1903, p. 2; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children’s Haven* April 1903, p. 4.

⁴¹ Parker, *Uprooted*, p. xiii; Wagner, *Children of the Empire*, p. xii; Parr, *Labouring Children*, p. 11; Harrison (ed.), *The Home Children*, p. 16; P. T. Rooke and R. L. Schnell, ‘Imperial Philanthropy and Colonial Response: British juvenile emigration to Canada, 1896-1930’, *Historian*, 46, 1 (1983), pp. 56-77.

⁴² *Oxford English Dictionary Online* <http://dictionary.oed.com> (22.07.10).

⁴³ Constantine, ‘Child Migration, Philanthropy, the State and the Empire’, no pagination; N. Sutherland, *Children in English-Canadian Society: framing the twentieth century consensus* (Toronto, 1976), pp. 28-29.

other child rescue causes, such as the prevention of cruelty to children, which was the main concern of the NSPCC, there was not one, united, national child emigration society advocating the removal of children to Canada.⁴⁴ As independent organisations, emigration societies in cities like Birmingham and Manchester operated autonomously within their local and regional communities, uninhibited by the restraint of any central body. One key factor differentiating each society involved in child emigration was their regulation governing the selection of children suitable for emigration. Some, like the Clifton Home in Bristol only admitted girls, others like Father Nugent in Liverpool only accepted Catholic children, whereas the MRH and CEH made it their policy from the 1880s onwards that ‘every class of destitute child in our city is cared for and no deserving case is ever refused’.⁴⁵ These differing perspectives on the selection of children gave societies control over those admitted to their care and enabled some to target certain children over others. Therefore, this sense of individuality suggests that the movement contained variety and independence, as opposed to homogeneity and regularity.

Consequently, it is hard to conceptualise a ‘typical’ child emigration society because, though organisations all promoted the idea of transplanting children overseas, they worked in increasingly different ways to bring this to fruition. Later schemes, like that operated by Kingsley Fairbridge in the 1910s, contrasted sharply with the early efforts of Maria Rye in the 1870s.⁴⁶ Unlike Rye, who predominately transported untrained children from workhouses and found employment for them with local Canadians, Fairbridge developed a system whereby children spent time in one of his Australian farm schools before embarking on the search for employment.⁴⁷ When gaining prominence in the 1880s and 1890s, the schemes operated by the CEH and MRH sat halfway between these two ends of the spectrum. Like Rye, they sent their children predominately as young labour to Canada but, like Fairbridge there was greater emphasis on training and rehabilitation before such

⁴⁴ C. A. Sherrington, ‘The NSPCC in transition, 1884-1983: a study of organisational survival’ (Unpublished PhD thesis, London School of Economics, 1985).

⁴⁵ ‘Manchester and Salford Boys’ and Girls’ Refuges and Homes’, *Ragged School Union Quarterly Record*, 9, 34 (April 1884), p. 74; ‘The Boy’s Refuge: Welcome to the Rev. Father Nugent’, *Liverpool Mercury*, 23 May 1871; ‘The Rev. Father Nugent on “nobody’s children”’, *Liverpool Mercury*, 13 June 1871; ‘Girls for Canada’, *The Bristol Mercury and Daily Post*, 18 May 1894; Children’s Emigration Homes’, *Birmingham Daily Post*, 30 June 1896.

⁴⁶ See survey texts such as Kohli, *Golden Bridge* for overview of how different organisations worked.

⁴⁷ Diamond, *Emigration and Empire*; Parr, *Labouring Children*, pp. 30-31, 151; G. Sherrington and C. Jeffery, *Fairbridge: empire and child migration* (Nedlands, Australia, 1998); R. Fairbridge, *Pinjarra: the building of a farm school* (London, 1931).

children left the institutions.⁴⁸ Distinct from both Rye and Fairbridge's schemes was the fact that the CEH and MRH emerged and operated in designated provincial localities. The variety of schemes and the extended period over which child emigrants embarked for Canada means that the 'child emigration movement' was not one fixed process, but rather the amalgamation of several ideas and methods that developed and changed throughout the period 1870 to 1914.

The development of child emigration activities arguably stems from the contact that existed between different societies and the ways in which they became aware of each others' child rescue work. Whilst Parker identifies that networks developed through attendance at conferences where child emigrationists could meet face-to-face, information about individual schemes received publicity in a number of localities across the country through the press.⁴⁹ This allowed child emigrationists and those interested in their work to see how other schemes operated in different cities throughout England. Middlemore's emigration scheme in Birmingham gained exposure in the *Sheffield and Rotherham Independent*, information about child emigrants from Manchester appeared in the *Liverpool Mercury* and news about Barnardo's work was announced in the *Birmingham Daily Post*

It is understood in Canada that Dr Barnardo, who has taken up juvenile emigration in connection with his Boys' Home here with so much success, has now on a foot a plan to 'provide for' some of the young men who haunt the common lodging-houses of the metropolis rather from necessity than inclination. The present intention is to find them permanent employment as farm labourers in Canada.⁵⁰

As information about individual societies' work entered the public domain through the press, this served as an inadvertent method of exchanging ideas, as well as giving indications about the scale of individual organisations and their scope for branching out beyond their initial localities.⁵¹

⁴⁸ See Chapter 4: Protection, Training and Preparation for more information about the training of young emigrants at the CEH and MRH.

⁴⁹ Parker, *Uprooted*, pp. 33-35.

⁵⁰ 'Imperial Parliament', *Sheffield and Rotherham Independent*, 16 May 1899; 'The emigration of children to Canada', *Liverpool Mercury*, 20 September 1890; 'Gleanings', *Birmingham Daily Post*, 26 September 1884.

⁵¹ Parker, *Uprooted*, pp. 33-35.

For some regional organisations, sharing and receiving information about others involved in child emigration sparked concerns that larger, expanding societies would displace them and prevent the continuation of their existing work within the local community. Upon hearing news in 1895 that Thomas Barnardo intended to open a new institution in Birmingham, the CEH reacted publicly through an article in the press to condemn his plans

Dr Barnardo already receives an almost national support; surely he can suffer our local institutions to continue their labours without let or hindrance.⁵²

Here is a clear example of a local charity resenting the dominance and power of a larger organisation that threatened to move into their locality. Middlemore's apprehension about the new Barnardo home was underpinned by concerns about the potential loss of supporters and funding, as well as existing competition from other institutions in Birmingham, such as the Gordon's Boys' Home and the Church of England Homes for Waifs and Strays.⁵³ The CEH also objected that Barnardo had not consulted with local charities and societies before planning and starting construction for his new institution in Birmingham

Signs are not wanting of a rival in the field of well-doing...[Barnardo] has stolen a march upon Birmingham, for little or nothing has been known of his intentions and it would have been a gratuitous act of courtesy to have acquainted the various committees of local charities with the objects he had in view.⁵⁴

Middlemore and Barnardo had not previously had a negative relationship, in fact they had joined forces at a conference in 1885 regarding the prospect of government intervention in child emigration work.⁵⁵ However, Middlemore's attitude in 1895 shows that self-preservation was of the utmost importance for the CEH, who relied on originality and independence to gain support within the local and regional area.

However, these rivalries between different societies did not necessarily mean that the work of the CEH fell outside the concept of a child emigration movement, rather their reaction to Barnardo suggests that increased competition made the CEH more determined to maintain their existing position within it. In some respects, the CEH and MRH both displayed this

⁵² 'Miscellaneous', *Birmingham Daily Gazette*, 9 May 1895.

⁵³ Ibid.

⁵⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁵ Paton, *State-aided emigration*, p. 32.

concern for self-preservation, but expressed it in different ways. With regard to the expansion of Louisa Birt's Liverpool Sheltering Home in 1895, the MRH did not seem to show the same signs of rivalry that Middlemore had demonstrated against Barnardo, despite operating in the same field of child rescue and working within relatively close geographical proximity. In fact, the MRH emphatically declared in their society magazine, 'we are heartily glad to see [Louisa Birt] is enlarging her borders'.⁵⁶ This may have been because the MRH used Birt's services extensively to complement their own work and regarded Birt and her sister Annie Macpherson as allies rather than rivals.⁵⁷ Therefore, it may not have been in their best interests to condemn expansion plans in Liverpool, but rather by embracing it the MRH may have been able to access improved or new services. In comparison, the CEH clearly saw Barnardo's new home in Birmingham as a direct threat against their independent work within the local community and as a matter of self-preservation, it was in their best interests to condemn the proposals and attempt to maintain dominance in the local region. The contrast between the attitude of the CEH and MRH serves to demonstrate that through the interactions and connections between different societies, the child emigration movement was complex and multifaceted. It comprised a variety of societies that used a range of methods, drew upon different resources and took contrasting actions with regard to their fellow contemporaries involved in child emigration. However, underpinning all of their schemes was the notion that transplanting children overseas was an alternative way to deal with those children rescued from the slum districts of English cities.

Emigrationists, campaigners and government authorities

The diversity of approaches and methods used by child emigrationists is also reflected in their individual relations with local government authorities. An amendment to the poor law in 1850 enabled guardians of any union or parish to 'expend money in and about the emigration of any poor orphan or deserted child under the age of sixteen', thus allowing child emigrationists to offer their services to assist with the emigration of pauper children.⁵⁸ Some emigrationists, such as Maria Rye, relied heavily on forging a workable relationship

⁵⁶ 'Emigrant Children' in MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* April 1886, p. 63; 'Mrs Birt's Sheltering Homes Liverpool' in MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* December 1886, pp. 182-183; 'Mrs Birt's Sheltering Homes Liverpool' in MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* January 1890, p. 48.

⁵⁷ Ibid.

⁵⁸ Poor Law Amendment Act 1850, s. 4. Quoted in J. Eekelaar, "'The Chief Glory': the export of children from the United Kingdom", *Journal of Law and Society*, 21, 4 (1994), p. 489.

with boards of guardians in order to transplant children from English workhouses to Canada. During the first five years of her scheme, she sourced over 1,000 children directly through boards of guardians.⁵⁹ Key to her success was communication with local authorities.⁶⁰ Writing to one of her contacts in Colchester in 1874, Rye stated

I send you by book post some papers relating to my work and which I shall be obliged by your setting before your board of guardians...Those I now send will, no doubt, be sufficient, especially if you will tell the chairman that the local government board at Whitehall are strongly in my favour and that there will be no difficulty in getting their consent. I hope I shall have a large party from the Colchester Union.⁶¹

Explaining her methods and previous successes in this way gave boards of guardians a carefully constructed insight into Rye's work, written in her own words, which presented the most positive image of her scheme. By mentioning contacts already forged with other officials, Rye gave an impression of credibility, as well as experience, that sought to allay potential resistance to sending pauper children overseas.

However, not all child emigration societies initially focused on working with pauper children under the care of boards of guardians, which again highlights the individuality of organisations involved in transplanting children to Canada. For the CEH in Birmingham, emigrating pauper children from local workhouses was a move away from their original rigid aim to 'work with children of the street arab class only'.⁶² Though John T. Middlemore largely maintained this creed between 1873 and 1894, the statistics in Table 2 overleaf outline how transplanting children from government institutions became an increasingly significant part of the CEH's work.

⁵⁹ Kohli, *Golden Bridge*, p. 28.

⁶⁰ Parker, *Uprooted*, pp. 33-34.

⁶¹ Reprinted in 'Colchester Board of Guardians', *The Essex Standard, West Suffolk Gazette and Eastern Counties Advertiser*, 23 January 1874.

⁶² BCL, CEH, MS 517/463, Annual Report 1875, insert of statement of purpose.

Table 2: Proportion of poor law children from government institutions in CEH emigration parties

Year	Number of children from board of guardians	Total number of children emigrated
1895	7	148
1900	0	151
1905	52	175
1910	54	191

Source: BCL, CEH, MS 517/174-203, CEH Admission Papers, 1895-1910.

Taken at five-year intervals, these statistics show that in 1895 children recommended by boards of guardians constituted approximately five per cent of the total number in Middlemore's emigration parties, whereas by the first decade of the twentieth century this had risen to approximately thirty per cent. From 1905 onwards, poor law children regularly constituted one of the largest categories of children at the CEH home, overtaking those removed from cruel or neglectful parents and those found homeless on the street.⁶³ For the CEH as an organisation, this had a number of consequences, most prominent being that when they took children to Canada from government institutions, such as the workhouse, they received direct payment from the respective board of guardians to cover the cost of each child now under the CEH's care. Therefore, in 1905, when such children constituted thirty per cent of the CEH's emigration parties, the Birmingham organisation received £570 from boards of guardians that equalled approximately £11 per child.⁶⁴ That boards of guardians allowed their children to join emigration parties and funded their journey to Canada suggests a degree of acceptance amongst some local authorities that transplantation was an alternative way of dealing with pauper children.

However, the process of removing children from state institutions and taking them to Canada was also subject to policies stipulated by central government departments, who did not always look favourably upon child emigration. In 1874, senior inspector for the local government board, Andrew Doyle investigated the emigration schemes of Maria Rye and

⁶³ BCL, CEH, MS 517/21, Annual Report 1906, p. 9; BCL, CEH, MS 517/21, Annual Report 1907, p. 9; BCL, CEH, MS 517/21, Annual Report 1908, p. 10; BCL, CEH, MS 517/22, Annual Report 1909, p. 11; BCL, CEH, MS 517/22, Annual Report 1910, p. 11; BCL, CEH, MS 517/22, Annual Report 1911, p. 9; BCL, CEH, MS 517/22, Annual Report 1912, p. 11; BCL, CEH, MS 517/22, Annual Report 1913, p. 11; BCL, CEH, MS 517/22, Annual Report 1914, p. 12; BCL, CEH, MS 517/23, Annual Report 1915, p. 11.

⁶⁴ BCL, CEH, MS 517/21, Annual Report 1906, p. 55.

Annie Macpherson, presenting his findings to the House of Commons in February 1875.⁶⁵ He made a series of criticisms, including the selection methods used by Rye and Macpherson, the lack of aftercare and supervision of children once in Canada, lack of training prior to embarkation, as well as the alleged financial gains made by Rye and Macpherson during the emigration process, stating

[Canadian complaints] will continue to be repeated until the whole system is brought into discredit, unless much greater care and discrimination are exercised...[there] is a very strong ground indeed of dissatisfaction with the whole system of emigration as it has been heretofore conducted.⁶⁶

Within just one month of the report's release, the local government board ended the large-scale emigration of pauper children, which was a ban that lasted until 1883.⁶⁷

M. Kohli described the *Doyle Report* as having a 'considerable' effect on child emigration.⁶⁸ She based this assertion upon statistics showing that child emigrant numbers halved between 1874 and 1875 and then further decreased the following year.⁶⁹ The report specifically referred to the emigration of children by Maria Rye and Annie Macpherson, but evidence from regional societies challenges Kohli's assertions about its effects. The CEH in Birmingham actually gathered strength from the 1870s onwards, expanding its operations with street children rapidly during the same period as the freeze on the emigration of poor law children. The total number of CEH emigrants rose from 164 in 1875 to 752 in 1883.⁷⁰ Thus, there was substantial growth in the CEH's work, despite not being able to establish links with local boards of guardians to include poor law children in their emigration parties between 1875 and 1883. This early expansion at the Birmingham society clearly challenges Kohli's general assertion about the damaging effects of the *Doyle Report*.⁷¹ Instead, it concurs with R. Parker's suggestion that emigrationists focused their attention on other children, particularly those on the streets or with 'inadequate' parents,

⁶⁵ Report to the President of the Local Government Board by Andrew Doyle...as to the emigration of pauper children to Canada, HCPP, lxiii, HC 9 (1875); Parker, *Uprooted*, pp. 49-50.

⁶⁶ Report to the President of the Local Government Board by Andrew Doyle...as to the emigration of pauper children to Canada, HCPP, lxiii, HC 9 (1875), p. 15, 19.

⁶⁷ Parr, *Labouring Children*, p. 32.

⁶⁸ Kohli, *Golden Bridge*, p. 23.

⁶⁹ Despite providing these figures, Kohli does not stipulate whether they correspond to England or the United Kingdom. Kohli, *Golden Bridge*, p. 23.

⁷⁰ BCL, CEH, MS 517/463, Annual Report 1876, p. 4; BCL, CEH, MS 517/464, Annual Report 1884, p. 4.

⁷¹ Kohli, *Golden Bridge*, p. 23.

precisely because they could not send poor law children abroad.⁷² This is not to deny that the breakdown of relations between the local government board and emigrationists curbed the number of potential children available for emigration. However, as the CEH figures highlight, individual regional societies could still thrive by adapting and adjusting their methods in response to external influences upon their work.

Though Doyle's report suspended the emigration of pauper children for eight years and allowed emigration societies to target other types of children, it did not permanently prevent child emigrationists from taking children who were in state care overseas. Following the lifting of the ban in 1883, proposals to transplant poor law children increasingly formed the basis of political discussion. Whilst the emigration of pauper children has attracted historical interest, the individuals and organisations who advocated the increased use of emigration for pauper children are under-researched.⁷³ These were influential people who, though not operating child emigration schemes themselves, promoted the extension of this work to include larger numbers of pauper children in emigration parties. One such advocate was Samuel Smith of Liverpool. As City Councillor, chairman of the local Chamber of Commerce and Member of Parliament, Smith was powerfully connected and a committed proponent of social reform, especially with regard to the effects of alcohol, housing improvements and education.⁷⁴ As an aide to child emigration, he worked with renowned local businessman and philanthropist Alexander Balfour to establish the Liverpool Sheltering Homes in 1873; after persuading Louisa Birt (sister to Annie Macpherson) to superintend the home, Smith remained an ardent supporter of their child emigration work.⁷⁵ Given that Smith was not personally involved in the everyday operations of emigrating children to Canada, his connections with regional societies provided much of the evidence he used when arguing in favour of the increased

⁷² Parker, *Uprooted*, p. 52.

⁷³ Eekelaar, "'The Chief Glory'", pp. 487-504; Horn, 'The Emigration of Pauper Catholic Children to Canada', pp. 12-20; M. Martin, "'A future not of riches but of comfort": the emigration of pauper children from Bristol to Canada, 1870-1915', *Immigrants and Minorities*, 19 1 (2000), pp. 25-52; Wagner, *Children of the Empire*; Kohli, *Golden Bridge*, chapters 8 and 9; Pinchbeck and Hewitt, *Children in English Society*, chapter 18.

⁷⁴ 'Miscellaneous', *Northern Echo*, 8 December 1882; 'Reformatory Conference', *York Herald*, 28 April 1888; 'Poor Law Children', *The Standard*, 27 July 1899; Smith, 'Social Reform', pp. 896-912; 'Liverpool Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children', *Ragged School Union Quarterly Record*, 9, 33 (January 1884), pp. 13-15; S. Smith, *My Life Work* (London, 1903), P. J. Waller, *Democracy and Sectarianism: a political and social history of Liverpool, 1868-1939* (Liverpool, 1981).

⁷⁵ 'Sunday in Liverpool', *Sunday at Home* (January 1896), p. 309.

emigration of pauper children. As a regular attendee and speaker at the Liverpool Sheltering Homes' annual meeting, he commented in 1883

We hope our experience [of child emigration] in Liverpool and similar experiences in Glasgow, London, Birmingham and other large cities is gradually preparing the way for a far wider system of dealing with these children, which the state can only inaugurate.⁷⁶

Smith's comment that the state could 'only inaugurate' the increased use of child emigration suggests that he was not asking for the government to begin its own child emigration work, rather he wanted state officials and agencies to authorise greater use of existing societies who specialised in child emigration. It does seem that Smith's calls were gradually recognised because the *data* from the CEH in Table 2, see above, shows increasing numbers of pauper children joining emigration parties towards the turn of the twentieth century. This supports E. Macadam's interpretation of the last quarter of the nineteenth century, which she identified as a period of co-operation between statutory and voluntary social work, and termed as 'new philanthropy'.⁷⁷ Later historians have used the term 'mixed economy of welfare' to define this period in which there was an overlap between the services provided by voluntary agencies and the state.⁷⁸

Smith's reference to a variety of schemes operating in different cities also shows that he had an awareness of other regional child emigration work. In particular, he was no stranger to Leonard K. Shaw's institution in Manchester. On 6 December 1884, Smith gave an evening lecture at the Manchester institution entitled 'Juvenile Emigration: its relation to pauperism and crime' following a public ceremony to celebrate the opening of an enlargement to the MRH.⁷⁹ Chairing the session was the Mayor of Manchester who also welcomed well-known philanthropist and emigrationist Thomas Barnardo onto the stage to discuss his child rescue work in London. Twelve years later Smith again appeared with a local dignitary to deliver an address at the MRH's annual meeting.⁸⁰ The MRH's ability to

⁷⁶ 'Liverpool Sheltering Home', *Liverpool Mercury*, 2 February 1883.

⁷⁷ E. Macadam, *The New Philanthropy: a study of the relations between the statutory and voluntary social services* (London, 1943), p. 33.

⁷⁸ Kamerman, 'The New Mixed Economy of Welfare: public and private', pp. 5-10; Brenton, *The Voluntary Sector in British Social Services*; Finlayson, 'A Moving Frontier', p. 185; Finlayson, *Citizen, State and Social Welfare*, p. 6.

⁷⁹ 'Boys' and Girls' Refuge, Strangeways', *Manchester Times*, 6 December 1884; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* January 1885, p. 7.

⁸⁰ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* March 1896, p. 77.

secure Smith as a speaker may have been linked to their aforementioned close connections with Louisa Birt's Liverpool Sheltering Home, a society that Smith helped to form in 1873. These gatherings of influential public figures at the Manchester institution show that hosting such events provided an opportunity for MRH staff and supporters to network with people beyond the immediate remit of their institution. The connections between Smith, the Liverpool Sheltering Home and the MRH also demonstrates how people working outside of individual societies showed an active interest in provincial child emigration schemes and the role that it could play as an alternative approach to child rescue.

Smith was not alone in promoting child emigration as a suitable method of dealing with pauper children. The extent to which other individuals helped him to campaign suggests that in some political circles there was a growing acceptance of child emigration as an alternative method of tackling social problems and the expense of poor relief. This is particularly evident in the two deputations that Smith joined to meet with the Home Secretary during the 1880s. Seeking government funds to prepare more poor law children for emigration, Smith stated

for some years past the local government board had placed the greatest hindrances in the way of this good work. State grants for the emigration of destitute children would in the end be a really economical mode of dealing with a pressing question, subject, of course to all reasonable restrictions and safeguards to prevent abuses, without crippling the efficiency of the work.⁸¹

A number of other MPs from different political parties appeared alongside Smith at the deputations to second his assertions, including Sir E. Wilmot, Sir F. Milner, Mr Tomlinson, Mr Vincent and Mr Houldsworth.⁸² However, individuals directly involved in small, regional emigration societies, such as Leonard K. Shaw, did not seem to be involved in these political campaigns. Rather, people like Smith and his peers became advocates of child emigration and used their connections to draw increased attention to such work. For smaller regional societies, such as the MRH and Liverpool Sheltering Home, this enabled information about their provincial activities to reach new circles in London.

⁸¹ 'Mr S. Smith MP on Child Emigration', *Liverpool Mercury*, 15 July 1885.

⁸² 'Mr S. Smith MP on Child Emigration', *Liverpool Mercury*, 15 July 1885; 'Child Emigration', *Leeds Mercury*, 12 February 1887; 'Juvenile Emigration', *Liverpool Mercury*, 12 February 1887.

Political campaigns to increase the use of emigration for poor law children show that the concept of transplanting children overseas was not confined simply to child emigrationists. Rather, the operations of societies like the CEH, MRH and Liverpool Sheltering Home attracted attention, support and promotion from a variety of people with wider concerns and objectives. For some general emigration societies, such as the Central Emigration Society, the concept of child emigration fitted with their existing ideas and methods of tackling middle-class fears about social problems and population. The Central Emigration Society's aims included the promotion of emigration amongst unemployed people, campaigning for increased state aid for emigration and disseminating more information about the various emigration options available.⁸³ Organisations that promoted general emigration increasingly took an interest in the transplanting of children overseas because as a process, it conformed to existing ideas and practices that they already advocated. As the honorary secretary of the Central Emigration Society commented in 1888

The more I learn upon the subject [of child emigration] the firmer I am convinced that the emigration of suitable persons, and above all of suitable *young* persons, is one of the least demoralising, the least expensive and the most successful of the multitudinous remedies for alleviating distress.⁸⁴

Only by understanding the methods and approaches of child emigration societies could organisations such as the Central Emigration Society advocate the expatriation of children overseas with such conviction. This understanding largely stemmed from direct connections and interaction with individual child emigrationists. In 1885, the Central Emigration Society organised a conference for managers and owners of children's homes in Exeter Hall, London where they heard emigrationists such as Dr Barnardo, Mr Middlemore, Mr Shaw, Captain Brooks, Mr Williams and others express their varied opinions about increased government involvement in child emigration.⁸⁵ That the Central Emigration Society facilitated the 1885 conference; that their representatives gave speeches at other events in favour of child emigration, such as the Reformatory Conference in London in 1888; that they distributed a list of organisations involved in child emigration to boards of guardians across the country all serve as evidence of the Central Emigration

⁸³ Paton, *State-aided Emigration*, p. 40.

⁸⁴ Paton, 'Work and Workers VIII', p. 142.

⁸⁵ 'Miscellaneous', *Morning Post*, 23 March 1885; Paton, *State-aided Emigration*, pp. 31-32.

Society's commitment to the expansion of child emigration.⁸⁶ This suggests that individuals and organisations campaigning for more poor law children to be sent to Canada embraced a shared sense of commitment to the expansion of child emigration. Encouraging government officials and agencies to make increased use of this alternative approach to child rescue drew attention to individual child emigration societies, even those based in the provincial cities of Birmingham, Manchester and Liverpool.

⁸⁶ Paton, 'Work and Workers VIII', p. 140; 'Miscellaneous', *Morning Post*, 23 March 1885; 'Reformatory Conference', *York Herald*, 28 April 1888; Paton, *State-aided Emigration*, pp. 31-32.

Chapter 3: Support and Finances

Child emigration was only one method of child rescue and the CEH and MRH were just two amongst an abundance of charities operating between 1870 and 1914.¹ As these regional societies operated within the voluntary sector, they had to work hard to persuade people that their emigration activities offered a viable alternative approach to dealing with street, criminal and pauper children that was worthy of support. As charitable organisations, how did regional child emigration societies in Birmingham and Manchester generate enough funds to carry out their work and avoid ‘philanthropic insufficiency’ – the potential shortfall of cash and commitment?² How did they make use of marketing tools, such as annual reports, to disseminate information about their schemes? Only by engaging with a variety of people could the CEH and MRH generate enough backing for their work. Therefore, what methods did these societies employ to immerse themselves within the local community? Did they take a targeted approach in order to reach certain sections of society? How did the CEH and MRH benefit when advocates of child emigration voiced their support at a national, rather than regional, level? The ways in which the CEH and MRH generated support for their work demonstrates how they tried to persuade people to accept that their work was a suitable way of working with certain children. Evidence from these organisations also contributes to existing interpretations of charitable-giving in the late Victorian and Edwardian period, as well as the role of women engaged in philanthropic work.³

Means of Support

Though modern popular histories and media productions often vilify child emigrationists and criticise their schemes as inhumane, in contrast Leonard K. Shaw, John T. Middlemore,

¹ M. Simey, *Charitable Effort in Liverpool in the nineteenth century* (Liverpool, 1951); D. E. Owen, *English Philanthropy, 1660-1960* (London, 1965); B. Harrison, ‘Philanthropy and the Victorians’, *Victorian Studies*, 9, 4 (1966), pp. 353-374; K. Laybourn, *The Guild of Help and the Changing Face of Edwardian Philanthropy: the Guild of Help, voluntary work and the state, 1904-1919* (Lampeter, 1994); P. Shapely, *Charity and Power in Victorian Manchester* (Manchester, 2000).

² M. Gorsky, *Patterns of Philanthropy: charity and society in nineteenth century Bristol* (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 1999), p. 11; Finlayson, *Citizen, State and Social Welfare*, p. 146.

³ Mauss, *The Gift*; Homans, *Social Behaviour*; Levi-Strauss, ‘The principle of reciprocity’; Schwartz, ‘The social psychology of the gift’, pp. 1-11; Blau, *Exchange and Power in Social Life*; Kidd, ‘Philanthropy and the social history paradigm’, pp. 180-192; Heasman, *Evangelicals in Action*; Vicinus (ed.), *Suffer and Be Still*; Prochaska, *Women and Philanthropy*; Lewis, *Women in England*; Lewis, *Women and Social Action*.

Louisa Birt and others involved in transplanting children overseas almost always portrayed their work as an act of charity or philanthropy.⁴ Though defining ‘charity’ or ‘philanthropy’ is problematic due to the varying historical meanings of the words, both terms remain loosely interchangeable and are used in this study to denote the act of giving help to those in need.⁵ Thus, whilst child emigrationists in the late Victorian and Edwardian *eras* offered many justifications and explanations for their activities, they also promoted the removal, training and expatriating of children as charitable rescue work in the most exact sense of the word – children literally being taken from perceived lives of misery and vice to be transplanted to new homes overseas.⁶ Like any other contemporary charity, the establishment, stability and permanence of regional child emigration organisations relied heavily on the continued financial backing of supporters.⁷ The CEH records can be used as a case study to analyse the income generated by the society. Out of the CEH and MRH, the Birmingham society’s accounts present the most complete set of accessible *data*, though they naturally only show the income of this one organisation. Akin to other contemporary charitable organisations, vital funds entered the CEH in various ways.⁸ Supporters could pay a set annual fee to ‘subscribe’ to the society to receive publications outlining their work and tickets to organised events. Supporters could also give *ad hoc* donations, which enabled them to choose the value of their monetary gift, rather than subscribe a set amount stipulated by the charity. Similarly, individuals could bequeath money to the CEH as a legacy, which the charity received upon the death of the supporter and subsequently invested.⁹ The CEH also organised numerous collections throughout the

⁴ A. Gill, *Orphans of the Empire: the shocking story of child migration to Australia* (Alexandria, Australia, 1997); Bagnell, *The Little Immigrants*; Bean and Melville, *Lost Children of the Empire*; Humphreys, *Empty Cradles*; ‘Reluctant Pioneers’, *The Times Educational Supplement*, 21 April 1989; ‘Lost Children of the Empire’, *The Observer Review*, 19 and 26 July 1987; ‘The Forgotten Children they fed to the Empire’, *The Guardian*, 6 May 1989; *Lost Children of the Empire* (ITV production, 1989); *The Leaving of Liverpool* (BBC-ABC production, 1992).

⁵ Owen, *English Philanthropy*; R. H. Bremner, *Giving: charity and philanthropy in history* (London, 1996); Finlayson, *Citizen, State and Social Welfare*, pp. 6-8.

⁶ BCL, CEH, MS 517/21, Annual Report 1908 p. 4; BCL, CEH, MS 517/19, Annual Report 1892, p. 4; BCL, CEH, MS 517/19, Annual Report 1896, p. 8; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children’s Haven* February 1896, p. 57; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children’s Haven* November 1907, p. 3; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children’s Haven* September 1899, p. 7; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children’s Haven* May and June 1909, p. 3; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children’s Haven* January 1883, p. 16; ‘Gathered from the Gutter’, *Birmingham Daily Post*, 9 November 1872; ‘Child Emigration’, *Penny Illustrated Paper*, 22 June 1872; ‘Mr Middlemore’s Emigration Home’ *Birmingham Daily Gazette*, 27 April 1875; ‘Juvenile Emigration’, *Liverpool Mercury*, 12 February 1887; ‘The Liverpool Sheltering Homes’, *Liverpool Mercury*, 2 December 1887.

⁷ Kidd, *State, Society and the Poor*, p. 68.

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ BCL, CEH, MS 517/20, Annual Report 1901, p. 18. The MRH records in Manchester Central Library also contain information about legacies see MCL, MRH, M189/3/5/1.

year held in churches, conducted by door-to-door canvassing and at events organised by the charity.¹⁰ Taking accounts figures from the middle of each decade as a sample, the following table shows the amount of money raised from these various forms of income.

Table 3: CEH Sources of Income

	1875	1885	1895	1905	1915	Total
Subscriptions	£672	£1092	£1212	£1325	£1136	£5437
Donations	£953	£1315	£618	£739	£1546	£5171
Legacies	-	-	£50	£516	£844	£1410
Collections	-	£129	£58	£59	£41	£287
Interest on bank accounts	£25	£13	£14	£10	£21	£83

Source: BCL, CEH, MS 517/463-465, Annual Reports 1873-1890; BCL, CEH, MS 517/19-23, Annual Reports 1891-1915

As the table demonstrates, subscriptions and donations consistently formed the two largest types of income for the society; indeed, there were only seven years throughout the period 1870 to 1914 when this was not the case.¹¹ Based on figures from the statement of accounts, on average there was a difference of £1,286 between the highest form of income (either subscriptions or donations) and the lowest form of income.¹² Especially during the establishment of the CEH, founders, honorary secretaries and their families invested substantial amounts of their own private funds into the child emigration scheme in Birmingham. In 1872, members of the Middlemore family provided almost £800 in subscriptions, donations and legacies, which amounted to nearly half of the total income generated during that year. Likewise, in 1874 the Middlemore family collectively provided £590, which in itself was £100 more than the income generated by their first public fundraising event.¹³ This shows that the CEH depended heavily on both subscriptions and

¹⁰ BCL, CEH, MS 517/463, Annual Report 1877, p. 8, 11; BCL, CEH, MS 517/464, Annual Report 1880, pp. 9-10; BCL, CEH, MS 517/464, Annual Report 1881, p. 8; BCL, CEH, MS 517/19, Annual Report 1898, p. 15; BCL, CEH, MS 517/22, Annual Report 1911, p. 30.

¹¹ CEH statement of accounts in Annual Reports for years 1904-1905, 1907-1912. See BCL, CEH, MS 517/21, Annual Reports 1904-1905; BCL, CEH, MS 517/21, Annual Reports 1907-1908; BCL, CEH, MS 517/22, Annual Reports 1909-1912.

¹² Calculated by deducting the lowest income from the highest income for each year, totalling up the amounts and dividing by the number of years that *data* was available for (forty two). For complete *data*, see accounts section at the back of each relevant CEH Annual Report. BCL, CEH, MS 517/463-465, Annual Reports 1873-1890; BCL, CEH, MS 517/19-23, Annual Reports 1891-1915.

¹³ BCL, CEH, MS 517/463, Annual Report 1873, pp. 15-16, 19; BCL, CEH, MS 517/463, Annual Report 1875, p. 13, 17.

donations to provide the bulk of their funds. It also highlights the importance of maintaining continued support from donors and benefactors year on year to secure the required income needed to conduct child emigration schemes.

Whilst Table 3, above, shows some of the main forms of income, the CEH also developed other methods of generating funds. Most notably, members of the committee in Birmingham delivered private, fee-paying lectures on their work to specific audiences at external venues, such as the St George's Ward Liberal Association, Cambridge House School and Edgbaston Young Ladies College, which generated small amounts of revenue for the society.¹⁴ Providing lectures, concerts and entertainment began in 1878 and continued to be a sporadic source of income until the turn of the twentieth century when these events became a regular feature in the organisation's statement of accounts.¹⁵ The largest single amount collected by CEH lectures and concerts actually occurred in their introductory year (1878) when such events generated £100 19s 5d.¹⁶ Though this form of income was infrequent over the next twenty years, from 1898 onwards there were regular entries in the CEH accounts ranging from £7 to £79 generated from entertainment delivered by their committee and staff at external venues. For the period 1898 to 1914, this form of income generated a total of £604 for the CEH, giving an average annual income of £36 from lectures, entertainment and concerts.¹⁷ As well as providing a steady source of income in the early decades of the twentieth century, organising such events allowed regional societies to move beyond their immediate circle of supporters and explain child emigration to specific audiences. By providing information about their work to select members of the public, these small-scale events gave audiences a greater insight into the charity, the opportunity to ask questions and the chance to meet some of the staff involved in the everyday running of the homes.

Though child emigrationists in Birmingham and Manchester relied upon a regular financial income, some individuals offered tangible support and backing to such institutions in a

¹⁴ 'The Middlemore Emigration Homes', *Birmingham Daily Post*, 4 January 1900; BCL, CEH, MS 517/463, Annual Report 1878, p. 14; BCL, CEH, MS 517/21, Annual Report 1904, p. 32.

¹⁵ BCL, CEH, MS 517/463, Annual Report 1878, p. 15; BCL, CEH, MS 517/464, Annual Report 1879, p. 14; BCL, CEH, MS 517/20, Annual Report 1900, p. 6; BCL, CEH, MS 517/20, Annual Report 1901, p. 18.

¹⁶ BCL, CEH, MS 517/463, CEH Annual Report 1879, insert.

¹⁷ See relevant statements of accounts at the back of CEH Annual Reports from 1878 to 1915 for more details. BCL, CEH, MS 517/463-465, Annual Reports 1878-1890; BCL, CEH, MS 517/19-23, Annual Reports 1891-1915.

variety of ways, particularly those who volunteered during their spare time. The CEH in Birmingham received complimentary legal and accountancy services from 1875 onwards, which defrayed costs and provided a high standard of service.¹⁸ They were also particularly fortunate in procuring gratuitous professional services from doctors and surgeons. Medical professionals performed routine checks on the children and on occasion carried out more extensive duties; in 1877, doctors performed surgery on a child who had joined the society with a diseased foot that needed immediate attention.¹⁹ Whilst it is impossible to place a price on these voluntary services, they demonstrate a level of commitment amongst some members of the local community to the child emigration cause. Individuals' unpaid work – especially those offering professional services – may have been more valuable to charities than a donation because it provided targeted, direct and necessary assistance in specific areas relating to the everyday operations of the homes. In the case of the MRH in Manchester, volunteers completed a range of tasks and activities at the homes, including caring for the charity's horses, which enabled children to deliver goods from the institution's workshop across the city, through to providing concerts and evening entertainment for children in the home.²⁰ A lengthy note in their monthly magazine from 1896 reads

we are much indebted to friends who week by week give an evening's entertainment or lecture to our boys at Strangeways. On [14] November, Mr Goodwin and friends provided a good concert, on 21 [November] a capital Temperance Lecture with lantern views was given by Mr Taylor. A week later, a concert by Mr Stirling and friends was much enjoyed and on [12] December Mr Thompson and friends also gave a most interesting concert. [19] December was a very special evening as we had the pleasure of a most interesting and instructive lecture by Oliver Brockbank on his journeys in the East with magnificent lantern views. We tender warmest thanks to all our friends.²¹

¹⁸ The CEH issued an annual note of appreciation to those who provided gratuitous services throughout the year. This can be found towards the end of the annual reports, before the statement of accounts.

¹⁹ BCL, CEH, MS 517/463, Annual Report 1878, p. 9.

²⁰ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* March 1896, p. 72, 76; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* April 1902, p. 11; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* October, 1903, p. 3; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* December 1903, p. 14; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* January 1913, p. 10.

²¹ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* March 1896, p. 75.

Not only does this show the frequency of voluntary support that the MRH secured, it also suggests that because external individuals came into the homes to give talks to the children, these people must therefore have accepted the concept of child emigration.

Whilst the CEH and MRH clearly received monetary contributions and voluntary assistance, they were, however, in constant competition with other worthy causes who all vied for the attention of potential supporters. As expressed in one local Birmingham newspaper in 1875

At the present day there is an almost endless variety of institutions, societies and private enterprises for the relief of the troubles and difficulties encountered by unfortunate human beings, and *paterfamilias* – as he sits down to breakfast after the arrival of the postman – is bewildered in endeavouring to decide upon the most deserving of the many charities whose claims are urged so strongly and so repeatedly upon him.²²

This draws attention to the vast choice that benefactors faced when trying to decide which charities to support, as well as the difficulties that individual organisations faced when trying to market themselves as a cause worthy of support. With the ‘social fabric of Victorian England [being] permeated by charity’, this suggests that the idea of giving money to charitable organisations was part of everyday life for those in a financial and social position to do so.²³ Out of the myriad of charities competing for supporters’ attention and support, child emigrationists faced particularly strong competition from medical organisations operating in the same local area. P. Shapely’s research on Manchester shows that in the mid- to late- nineteenth century, medical organisations enjoyed the largest patronage of key notables in the city.²⁴ ‘Charity leaders’ in Manchester (defined as individuals involved in a proportionally large number of local charities and characterised by their capital, affluence and social standing) held 299 posts within medical charities compared with only 72 posts in children’s charities.²⁵ Primary evidence from the MRH archive seems to confirm Shapely’s research; in 1912, the MRH was second behind Manchester’s Royal Infirmary in terms of the number of supporters financially backing

²² ‘The Emigration of Birmingham Children’, *Birmingham Daily Mail*, 26 July 1875.

²³ Kidd, ‘Philanthropy and the social history paradigm’, p. 180.

²⁴ P. Shapely, ‘Charity, status and leadership: charitable image and the Manchester man’, *Journal of Social History*, 32, 1 (1998), p. 162.

²⁵ Shapely, ‘Charity, status and leadership’, p. 157, 162.

their work.²⁶ Clearly then, there were many good works that people could choose to support in England's major cities, with societies such as the CEH and MRH far from being the only organisations searching and appealing for backing to carry out their work.²⁷

Therefore, making child emigration charities known to a wider audience using specific marketing tools was an important way of generating support and revenue. This was especially so with regard to the annual report or monthly magazine, which outlined the aims, scale and results of the CEH and MRH's emigration schemes. Described by R. S. Tompson explicitly as 'publicity', charities designed these documents to canvas for, and maximise upon, support for a respective organisation.²⁸ The founder or honorary secretary of both the MRH and CEH took prime responsibility for writing and editing these documents, giving them the freedom to choose what to exclude or include for their readers' attention. As a result, they were able to portray their respective charities in the most positive light by taking direct control over the way in which they presented their work. To evoke sympathy and compassion amongst their readers, both annual reports and monthly magazines contained emotive descriptions of the society's children, heroic stories of rescue and horrific tales of parental neglect and abuse. The more dramatic the narrative, the more interest it generated amongst supporters and onlookers of child rescue work.²⁹ A particularly potent example can be seen in the 1894 December edition of the MRH's magazine, the *Christian Worker*, in which a photograph of an emaciated child – barely recognisable as a living human being – lying in the lap of a member of their staff occupies the centre of an A4 page, see image 1 overleaf. Similar images of neglected, orphaned or destitute children were commonplace in the Victorian *era* to depict a sense of neediness or poverty, with art historian S. Casteras identifying a range of such paintings and pictures even entering the Royal Academy in London between 1840 and 1900.³⁰

²⁶ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* November 1912, p. 5.

²⁷ Kidd, 'Philanthropy and the social history paradigm', pp. 180-181.

²⁸ R. S. Tompson, *The Charity Commission and the Age of Reform* (London, 1979), p. 70.

²⁹ Rooke and Schnell, 'Imperial Philanthropy and Colonial Response', p. 74.

³⁰ Paris, 'The Pictured Child in Victorian Philanthropy'; S. P. Casteras, "'The gulf of destitution on whose brink they hang": images of life on the streets in Victorian art', in J. Treuherz, *Hard Times: social realism in Victorian Art* (London, 1987), pp. 131-139.

Image 1: Emaciated child



Source: MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* December 1894, p. 29

The title of image 1 read, 'A Shocking Sight' and throughout the accompanying article in the *Christian Worker*, the narrator provides the story of the child's rescue. Using poignant descriptions and sensationalist language, the MRH was able to maximise the impact of the article to gain empathy and support from readers

Untended and unfed, it was left alone for whole days, making its feeble wail in vain. The process of slow murder was stopped just in time and the child *may* recover. The mother is in prison for two months.³¹

Far from providing a factual account of the child's rescue, the writer and editor of the MRH's magazine deliberately chose evocative phrases like 'feeble wail' and 'slow murder' to embellish the details of the case and emphasise to readers the type of children and circumstances the society dealt with. Thus, readers of the MRH's magazine received an edited version of the case specifically retold for publicity purposes.

However, moving stories and carefully written narratives were only effective if child emigrationists could secure as wide a readership as possible to disseminate these details about their work. Whilst both the CEH and MRH utilised annual reports and magazines

³¹ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* December 1894, p. 29.

extensively to describe their work to supporters, there were key differences in their approach to the logistics of getting such documents disseminated. The CEH used a printing company to produce their publicity material whereas the MRH used their own printing workshops and trainees to avoid the cost of paying an external company.³² As commented in the MRH magazine in 1905

we hope our friends will be pleased with the new form of the annual report, which we have endeavoured to make as attractive as possible by illustration and good type. It does credit, we think, to our boys' printing department and serves as a sample of the kind of work we can execute. We should be glad to send a copy to addresses where our friends thought it would be read with interest.³³

Whilst saving money, this method also gave valuable experience to the MRH apprentices and provided readers with a sample of the quality and range of work the institution's printing workshop was able to deliver. The MRH hoped that this would, in turn, encourage orders from the public for their services and therefore generate extra revenue for the institution.³⁴

The distribution of charity publications influenced both financial income and the dissemination of information about child emigrationists' work. All subscribers to both the MRH and the CEH received a complimentary copy of the institutions' annual reports, whilst the MRH also sold their monthly magazine individually at the price of one penny, which served to provide an extra source of income.³⁵ By supplying their annual report to current subscribers, the CEH in Birmingham helped to maintain interest in their work and kept supporters updated on developments within the institution, but in some respects they were in fact 'preaching to the converted'. Instead, the MRH's approach of selling their magazine for a small sum to the general public allowed them to expand the readership of their magazine beyond the immediate circle of subscribers, which enabled them to appeal to people previously unaware of their work. By doing so, the MRH extended their support

³² See CEH statements of accounts for respective years, 1873-1914. Statements of accounts can be found at the back of each Annual Report. BCL, CEH, MS 517/463-465, Annual Reports 1873-1890; BCL, CEH, MS 517/19-23, Annual Reports 1891-1915.

³³ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* May and June 1905, p. 12; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* November 1895, pp. 4-5; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* August 1896, p. 151.

³⁴ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* November 1895, pp. 4-5; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* May 1896, p. 103.

³⁵ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* September 1888, p. 164; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* November 1888, p. 204.

network on a far wider geographical scale than the CEH, with agents in twenty seven English towns and cities selling the charity's magazine as early as 1883.³⁶ By 1892, the institution was prepared to send their publications to international locations, including Europe, Syria, Egypt, North Africa, Australia, India, Natal, New Zealand, Canada, the USA, Central and South America, West India Islands, Tasmania, West and South Africa.³⁷ There is little accessible evidence showing the precise international distribution of the *Christian Worker* (later *Children's Haven*), however the organisation estimated that they distributed thirty thousand publications in 1884.³⁸ Evidently, the MRH placed a high value on being able to communicate with a range of people in a variety of destinations.

Engaging with the local community

Both the CEH and MRH clearly sought to connect with potential and existing supporters using a variety of methods. By engaging with the local community, the CEH and MRH tried to generate more interest in their respective schemes at a regional level. Consequently, events hosted in England's major industrial cities enabled child emigrationists to introduce their schemes to a targeted audience who were perhaps unaware of the scope and aims of their work and therefore less likely to have given previous support. To increase attendance figures, societies actively advertised these events in local newspapers, as in the case of an evening lecture delivered in 1883 at the Young Men's Christian Association in Liverpool.³⁹ Rev. R. H. Lundie (Moderator Elect of the Presbyterian Synod of England) delivered the talk on child emigration with Mr Samuel Smith presiding at the meeting. These talks and lectures were particularly popular in Liverpool and the fact that clergymen and well-known local figures, such as Samuel Smith, spoke publicly about the perceived benefits of child emigration confirmed their own support for such work.⁴⁰ By publicly endorsing the activities of regional societies, it can be suggested that these key public figures from within the local community also gave child emigration schemes added credibility amongst the local community.

³⁶ In 1883 the MRH had agents supplying their magazine in places such as London, Manchester, Liverpool, Leeds, Bowden, Bolton, Bury, Blackburn, Buxton, Blackpool, Chorlton-cum-Hardy, Eccles, Gorton, Hulme, Lytham, Middleton, Pendleton, Southport, Sale, Salford, Ulverston, Weaste, Whaley Bridge and Wilmslow. MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* January 1883, p. 16.

³⁷ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* June 1892, p. 150.

³⁸ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* January 1884, Preface.

³⁹ 'Advertisements and Notices', *Liverpool Mercury*, 7 December 1883.

⁴⁰ 'Local News', *Liverpool Mercury*, 12 June 1871; 'The Liverpool Sheltering Homes', *Liverpool Mercury*, 2 December 1887; 'Mrs Birt's Juvenile Emigration Scheme', *Liverpool Mercury*, 18 December 1877.

Whilst talks and lectures may have had an intimate and personal atmosphere, some larger-scale fundraising and promotional events were successful at generating interest in individual charities across a wider range of people within the local community. In particular, the charity bazaar – a public sale of goods often accompanied by entertainment – enabled organisations to interact with the local community whilst also raising substantial sums of money directly for their cause.⁴¹ Many different charities used bazaars as a method of raising money and increasing awareness of their work, therefore child emigrationists had to provide a unique experience to single out their event from those hosted by other charities throughout the year.⁴² The CEH bazaar held in Birmingham’s town hall in June 1886 was especially successful in creating a crowd by combining the sale of useful goods with entertainment based on an unusual Japanese theme.⁴³ The hall itself was decorated to resemble a Japanese village, whilst the CEH also managed to engage a team of native painters willing to display their artwork. Besides the Japanese-themed attractions, the bazaar also offered cookery lectures, music from a live orchestra, a dress exhibition, an illusion artist and shows by a ventriloquist, not to mention numerous stalls selling goods as varied as needlework, china, books, umbrellas and fresh flowers. By analysing a range of charities that hosted such events, F. K. Prochaska stated that people from all social classes found bazaars, fancy fairs and ladies’ sales a fashionable way of making money for their chosen charity.⁴⁴ Bazaars offered an opportunity for people to show their support either by attending as a consumer or by helping to man stalls or supply goods to sell, which made bazaars accessible events for many people in the local community. An unusual bazaar may also have generated greater interest in the event and encouraged people to talk about their experiences at the bazaar, thereby spreading the name of a respective charity through word of mouth.

Regular events hosted in prominent civic buildings meant that promoters of child emigration actively entered the public domain and became involved in the social fabric of the city, providing these charities with a valuable forum in which to spread information about their work. A case in point is the annual meeting – again often held in the town hall

⁴¹ F. K. Prochaska, ‘Charity Bazaars in nineteenth century England’, *The Journal of British Studies*, 16, 2 (1977), pp. 62-84.

⁴² Prochaska, ‘Charity Bazaars in nineteenth century England’, p. 62.

⁴³ A full report of the bazaar was published in the local newspapers see particularly ‘The Emigration Homes Bazaar’, *Birmingham Daily Post*, 2 June 1886.

⁴⁴ Prochaska, ‘Charity Bazaars in nineteenth century England’, p. 62.

– which gave many charitable organisations, not just the CEH and MRH, the opportunity to communicate directly with those interested in their work, as well as explain the year’s operations and canvas for increased support.⁴⁵ Though small monetary collections were usually made at the annual meeting, these events should be seen as an occasion that brought to life the information issued in annual reports and monthly magazines, which allowed charities to promote child emigration in a positive way. For child emigrationists in Birmingham and Manchester, the annual meeting was one of the most important social events in the calendar that attracted large numbers of supporters.⁴⁶ The CEH’s issuing of admission tickets for annual meetings demonstrates the popularity of such events, particularly when there were many occasions when non-ticket holders were turned away due to full capacity in the venue.⁴⁷ Similarly, the number of people attending the MRH’s annual meeting in Manchester in 1910, as illustrated in the packed galleries in image 2, below, gives some indication of the scale of interest that annual meetings generated and suggests the importance of such occasions to individual charities when trying to garner support for their work.

Image 2: MRH Annual Meeting, 1910



Source: MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children’s Haven May and June 1910*, p. 9.

⁴⁵ ‘MRH’, *Manchester Times*, 21 February 1885; ‘The Boys’ and Girls’ Refuges and Homes’, *Manchester Times*, 25 January 1897; ‘The Liverpool Sheltering Home’, *Liverpool Mercury*, 2 December 1887.

⁴⁶ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children’s Haven May 1897*, p. 282.

⁴⁷ BCL, CEH, MS 517/93, Scrapbook, p. 34, 78, 81, 102.

Annual meetings also served as important networking events for child emigrationists and their supporters because prominent public figures were often in attendance.⁴⁸ Public dignitaries – usually the mayor and mayoress – presided over the meeting whilst other notables, including bishops, MPs and councillors, also made regular appearances on the platform.⁴⁹ Comparing the guests at regional child emigration societies’ meetings with those who held invitations to larger organisations’ meetings shows some differences in the type of public figure targeted for attendance. Whilst regional societies like the MRH and CEH usually secured local dignitaries and notables, in 1884 the Central Emigration Society’s list of members who could attend annual meetings and gatherings included, the Archbishop of York, Earl of Bessborough, Lord Colin Campbell MP, Lady Frances Balfour, the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, Bishop of Hereford, Bishop of Liverpool, Bishop of Newcastle, Bishop of Ripon, the Dean of Westminster, Archdeacon Farrar, J. A. Campbell MP, Dr Kinnear MP, Mr Macnaughten MP and Mr Tomlinson MP.⁵⁰ Though regional emigration societies rarely had such an extensive list of guests, they did try to utilise connections with influential individuals who had a connection to the local area. The Liverpool Sheltering Homes regularly invited local Member of Parliament Samuel Smith to their annual meetings, the CEH in Birmingham frequently asked local politician, later colonial secretary, Joseph Chamberlain to attend, whilst the Bishop of Manchester often presided at MRH meetings.⁵¹ This was extremely beneficial to child emigration societies as it spread their message amongst the elite of local society who, by endorsing the work of the charity, had the potential to attract wider public attention and therefore increase support for individual charities.

Whilst events like annual meetings and bazaars enabled CEH and MRH staff to go out into the community, child emigration societies also encouraged people from the local area to

⁴⁸ See also Chapter 2: Networks and Connections.

⁴⁹ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* March 1883, p. 46; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* March 1889, p. 52; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* May 1890, p. 122; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children’s Haven* March 1896, p. 77; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children’s Haven* April 1901, p. 9; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children’s Haven* April 1911, p. 4; ‘Children’s Emigration Home’, *Birmingham Gazette*, 22 November 1876; ‘Birmingham Children’s Emigration Homes’, *Birmingham Gazette*, 26 May 1882; ‘Birmingham Children’s Emigration Homes’, *Birmingham Daily Post*, 3 July 1897; ‘Children’s Emigration Homes’, *Birmingham Daily Post*, 2 June 1899.

⁵⁰ Paton, *State-aided emigration*, p. vi.

⁵¹ ‘The Liverpool Sheltering Homes’, *Liverpool Mercury*, 2 December 1887; ‘The Children’s Emigration Homes’, *Birmingham Daily Post*, 18 June 1890; ‘Middlemore Emigration Homes’, *Birmingham Daily Post*, 13 May 1893; ‘Boys and Girls’ Refuges and Homes’, *Manchester Times*, 25 January 1897.

meet their children at the homes and see first-hand the work being carried out there. Conducted by a member of staff, organised tours of the homes, workshops and accommodation occurred on a regular basis and were open to the public, as well as newspaper reporters or social commentators.⁵² This offered visitors a valuable insight into the lifestyle and routine of such institutions, as well as the chance to see the ethos of the charity in action by getting beyond the official publications and appeal advertisements issued by charities. As stated by the editor of the MRH's monthly magazine, *Children's Haven*, in 1903

Friends are invited to call and see the various branches [of the MRH] and to take their children with them that they may for their own sake be led to sympathise with and help those so less fortunate than themselves.⁵³

This invitation clearly indicates that by seeing the children in the homes, hearing about their previous experiences and seeing the ways in which the MRH was now helping them, visitors would feel moved enough to sympathise with the children and contribute to the MRH's work. Thus by allowing visitors into the homes, such societies sought to integrate their work within the local community and co-operate with local people to persuade them that their activities offered a viable alternative approach to child rescue.

Another method of drawing members of the local community into emigration homes was by inviting supporters to attend farewell parties. These gatherings were usually scheduled a day or two before the embarkation of a batch of children to Canada. John T. Middlemore of the CEH in Birmingham announced farewell parties in local newspapers, as well as by sending individually written and personally signed letters of invitation to regular supporters and their families.⁵⁴ The fact that the CEH began issuing tickets for those wishing to attend farewell parties in the 1880s suggests the increasing popularity of such events.⁵⁵ The content of these farewell meetings varied between institutions but gradually became more elaborate as child emigration gathered pace from the late 1870s onwards. Early farewell gatherings at the CEH consisted simply of a special tea for the emigrants with a few invited

⁵² MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* May 1890, p. 122; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* February 1914, p. 11; 'Birmingham Emigration Home for Gutter Children', *Morning News*, 9 November 1872; 'Certain Gutter Children', *Birmingham Daily Gazette*, 9 September 1875; 'Correspondence', *Weekly News*, 4 December 1879.

⁵³ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* December 1903, p. 3.

⁵⁴ 'Birmingham Children's Emigration Homes', *Birmingham Daily Post*, 28 April 1875; BCL, CEH, MS 517/93, Scrapbook, p. 9, 39, 57, 87.

⁵⁵ BCL, CEH, MS 517/93, Scrapbook, p. 9, 59, 73, 101.

guests, whereas London-based philanthropist and child emigrationist Thomas Barnardo used the occasion to demonstrate the ‘transformation’ of his children from unruly street children to fully trained young emigrants.⁵⁶ Barnardo’s children put on regular performances for supporters, in which children would parade in their emigration outfits, demonstrate their drill routines, as well as any particular individual talents, such as singing or playing a musical instrument.⁵⁷ Thus, inviting supporters to see the children fully trained and equipped for their new life in Canada was a relatively common way of drawing the public into an institution, whilst also enabling the charity to parade the ‘finished article’ in front of those who had helped to finance the perceived transformation in the children.

As supporters attended charity bazaars and farewell parties, this shows that charitable involvement and contributing to worthy causes was in many cases a very public act. Those in the local community were, therefore, fully aware of who was supporting and helping specific causes. According to A. J. Kidd, possession of wealth or professional standing was rarely enough to secure wider social legitimacy and advancement, whereas giving to charity ‘transfer[ed] the status accruing from wealth acquisition to an altogether higher moral plain’.⁵⁸ Consequently, those giving regular or large donations to charities received recognition within the public domain, which placed individuals from the middle and upper classes on a pedestal within society, particularly when eulogised in the local press.⁵⁹ This is clearly evidenced in the list of benefactors’ names and contributions printed by charities in their annual reports, monthly magazines and local newspapers, as well as through the announcement of particularly generous donations at public meetings.⁶⁰ The CEH consistently included a regular section in their annual reports detailing the names of all contributors and the amount given.⁶¹ In contrast, the MRH’s monthly magazine had a dedicated section outlining specific donations deemed to be of particular interest, either for their monetary value or because they were from a notable public figure.⁶² Some donors

⁵⁶ BCL, CEH, MS 517/463, Annual Report 1875, Preface; Rose, *For the sake of the children*.

⁵⁷ Wagner, *Barnardo*, p. 70.

⁵⁸ Kidd, ‘Philanthropy and the social history paradigm’, p. 189.

⁵⁹ Shapely, ‘Charity, status and leadership’, pp. 158-160; Simey, *Charitable Effort in Liverpool in the nineteenth century*, p. 56; Harrison, ‘Philanthropy and the Victorians’, p. 364.

⁶⁰ Kidd, ‘Philanthropy and the social history paradigm’, p. 189.

⁶¹ See respective Annual Reports for a list of contributions, usually printed before the statement of accounts at the back of each report.

⁶² MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children’s Haven* April and May 1889, p. 4; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children’s Haven* February 1896, insert; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children’s Haven* September 1902, p. 2; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children’s Haven* January 1902, insert.

also experienced double exposure, as it was relatively common for press releases to cover the proceedings of annual meetings, meaning that contributions initially announced live at the meeting were then later printed in the local newspapers.⁶³ As some historians have identified, through the public exposure received by giving to regional child emigration societies, wealthy individuals could announce their membership of the social elite and increase their influence, reputation, as well as social and cultural standing within the community.⁶⁴

In much the same way as their contemporaries who supported other charitable organisations, it seems that local patrons of child emigration societies received clear benefits. Akin to shareholders in a business, subscribers and donors to most charities usually had the right to exercise their influence over the respective charity in a number of ways.⁶⁵ The CEH's constitution stated that all subscribers were entitled to be present and vote at the annual meeting and had the power to call special intermediate meetings on the requisition of 20 subscribers. At such meetings, all decisions were made on the outcome of a majority vote of those present. Likewise, those present at the annual meeting elected the committee responsible for the general management of the CEH, whilst the institution's accounts had to be presented annually to subscribers for scrutiny. Though committees held responsibility for the management of such organisations, this democratic process actively involved subscribers in the running of the charity and transferred decision-making powers from the minority (the committee) to the majority (the subscribers).⁶⁶

This had an important impact on women living in an *era* where they were prohibited from voting in political elections and predominately expected to succumb to male dominance in the fields of business, management and politics.⁶⁷ As subscribers to charities, women had the opportunity to express their own point of view and in exercising their opinions, they had the potential to have a direct effect upon the way in which their chosen charity

⁶³ 'The Liverpool Sheltering Home', *Liverpool Mercury*, 2 December 1887; 'The Boys' and Girls' Refuges in Manchester', *Manchester Times*, 5 April 1895; 'Mr Middlemore's Emigration Homes', *Birmingham Daily Post*, 5 January 1876.

⁶⁴ Gorsky, *Patterns of Philanthropy*, p. 6; R. J. Morris, 'Voluntary Societies and British Urban Elites, 1780-1970: an analysis', *Historical Journal*, 26, 1 (1983), pp. 95-118; Harrison, 'Philanthropy and the Victorians', p. 363.

⁶⁵ Kidd, *State, Society and the Poor*, p. 68.

⁶⁶ BCL, CEH, MS 517/23, Annual Report 1915, Preface.

⁶⁷ Prochaska, *Women and Philanthropy*; Lewis, *Women in England*, p. 75.

operated. Admittedly, ladies with sufficient money to subscribe to charities in their own right and with enough time to attend annual meetings were generally those in the higher social circles, but this should not detract from the significance of their role within the voluntary sector. F. K. Prochaska made links between female involvement in philanthropy and the early suffragette movement in Britain, arguing that charitable work empowered women to campaign for enfranchisement.⁶⁸ Though other historians are not in agreement with such claims, the fact remains that women, in particular, had much to gain by becoming involved in charitable work and showing their outward support for child emigration within the local community.⁶⁹

For over half a century, academics from different disciplines have recognised that the formation of relationships between charities and individual supporters is complex and multifaceted, whilst the reasons for undertaking charitable work are many.⁷⁰ Ideas about the various motives behind the act of charitable-giving stemmed from previous discussions of the ‘social exchange theory’ by sociological theorist G. C. Homans in the 1950s.⁷¹ Based on the idea that human relationships are formulated on the notion of ‘give and take’, whereby each party seeks to negotiate a favourable outcome, psychologists J. Thibaut and H. Kelley argued that the four things prompting people to engage in social exchange are anticipated reciprocity, expected gain in reputation and influence, altruism and direct reward.⁷² By using these existing theses in conjunction with evidence from regional child emigration societies, it is possible to challenge the opinion of historians B. Harrison, N. McCord and F. K. Prochaska who claim that philanthropic tendencies in the nineteenth century were predominantly synonymous with altruism.⁷³ Though benefactors of child emigration societies had to ‘give’ their money to fund child emigration work, they were

⁶⁸ Prochaska, *Women and Philanthropy*.

⁶⁹ K. J. Heasman, ‘Review of Prochaska, *Women and Philanthropy*’, *Victorian Studies*, 25, 2 (1982), pp. 251-252; Lewis, *Women in England*, p. 92; Heasman, *Evangelicals in Action*.

⁷⁰ Mauss, *The Gift*; Homans, *Social Behaviour*; Levi-Strauss, ‘The principle of reciprocity’; Schwartz, ‘The social psychology of the gift’, pp. 1-11; Blau, *Exchange and Power in Social Life*.

⁷¹ Kidd, ‘Philanthropy and the social history paradigm’; G. C. Homans, ‘Social Behaviour as Exchange’, *American Journal of Sociology*, 63, 6 (1958), pp. 597-606.

⁷² J. W. Thibaut and H. H. Kelley, *The social psychology of groups* (New York, 1959).

⁷³ B. H. Harrison, *Peaceable Kingdom: stability and change in modern Britain* (Oxford, 1982); N. McCord, ‘Aspects of the relief of the poverty in early nineteenth century Britain’, in R. M. Hartwell et al, *The Long Debate on Poverty: eight essays on industrialisation and the “condition of England”* (London, 1972), pp. 91-108; F. K. Prochaska, ‘Philanthropy’ in F. M. L. Thompson (ed.), *Cambridge Social History of Britain, 1750-1950*, vol. 3 *Social Agencies and Institutions* (Cambridge, 1999), pp. 357-398.

clearly able to ‘take’ certain personal rewards through increased influence and recognition within both the respective charity and the local area.

Targeting and utilising support

Whilst child emigration societies actively sought engagement and communication with the local community, neither the CEH nor MRH left their fund-raising and publicity activities simply to chance. Rather, when appealing for funds and voluntary assistance, regional emigration societies focused on certain sections of society, in order to encourage acceptance of their work and maximise proceeds and support. This was particularly the case with female supporters, most prominently those in the upper middle class. By appealing to these ladies and encouraging them to partake in suitable activities, the CEH and MRH were able to utilise female support in a variety of ways. Through the establishment of sewing circles and working parties, the production of clothing for charity became a social activity and regular event for these ladies. Particularly popular amongst female supporters of the CEH in Birmingham, their first sewing circle began in 1879, later superseded by the first working party in 1884.⁷⁴ This initial meeting in Edgbaston consisted of twenty-eight ladies who collectively made the entire underclothing, hoods, scarves and cuffs for the CEH girls emigrating that year.⁷⁵ Over the next thirty years, female supporters of the CEH established an additional eleven working parties both in Birmingham city centre and in its suburbs. Locations included Handsworth, Solihull, Sutton Coldfield, Selly Oak, Sheldon and Moseley, with numbers increasing from 28 ladies in 1884 to a peak of 152 in 1908. The average number of ladies attending working parties in aid of the CEH throughout the period 1884 to 1914 rested at 102.⁷⁶ These figures give an indication of the importance of such gatherings; they produced useful goods for the children whilst the process of ladies meeting together for a common cause also ensured the work of regional emigration societies was inadvertently taken directly into the local community.

When analysing the ways that emigration societies sought to appeal to different people, particularly women, the CEH and MRH effectively split their supporters into separate

⁷⁴ BCL, CEH, MS 517/464, Annual Report 1879, p. 10; BCL, CEH, MS 517/464, Annual Report 1884, p. 17.

⁷⁵ BCL, CEH, MS 517/464, Annual Report 1884, p. 17.

⁷⁶ BCL, CEH, MS 517/464, Annual Report 1884, p. 17; BCL, CEH, MS 517/21, Annual Report 1908, pp. 22-23.

groups, often along class lines. This enabled societies to respond to the needs and expectations of their benefactors, as well as the means by which individuals could help the charities. Evidently, the demands of time and money required for charitable involvement meant that it fell largely to those who already held or enjoyed wealth and these were the people that charities naturally targeted because they were a good source of charitable assistance.⁷⁷ Thus, there was little chance of women lower down the social scale receiving an invitation to attend a private sale for the CEH hosted in the drawing room of a middle-class family in the wealthy suburb of Edgbaston, but they may have been able to make a small contribution to a church or school collection.⁷⁸ Not only were 'leisured' ladies able to join sewing circles or host sales, regional emigration societies also requested their presence at garden parties and afternoon teas in order to advance their charitable cause of child emigration.⁷⁹ Some historians argue that as ladies of the leisured class, philanthropy was their most obvious outlet for self-expression as it was free from the restraints and prejudices associated with women in paid employment.⁸⁰ Therefore, by organising these types of events, regional emigration societies, such as the CEH and MRH, deliberately appealed to these ladies and made a conscious effort to provide them with an outlet that they would enjoy, which would also be of material benefit to the charity.

Though appealing to local people was vital if child emigrationists were to generate sufficient support for their activities, their schemes also depended upon attracting national attention. This gave smaller, regional emigration societies greater exposure because individuals who were not connected to specific emigration schemes often discussed the transplantation of children overseas within a wider context. Articles in publications, such as the *British Medical Journal*, suggest that some of those discussing and disseminating information about child emigration were in academic or professional careers and therefore their support may have given added credibility to such schemes.⁸¹ These authors examined child emigration from different perspectives and their 'expert' opinions served to enhance the argument that an expansion in emigration schemes was one way to solve existing social

⁷⁷ Gorsky, *Pattern of Philanthropy*, p. 11.

⁷⁸ BCL, CEH, MS 517/93, Scrapbook, p. 104.

⁷⁹ BCL, CEH, MS 517/465, Annual Report 1900, p. 6; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* July 1896, p. 135.

⁸⁰ Prochaska, *Women and Philanthropy*, pp. 5-6; Lewis, *Women in England*, p. x, 92; Vicinus (ed.), *Suffer and Be Still*, p. x; Lewis, *Women and Social Action*, p. 2; Kidd, *State, Society and the Poor*, p. 69.

⁸¹ B. Dunlop, 'Child Emigration', *The British Medical Journal*, 1, 2573 (23 April 1910), p. 1023; 'Child Emigration', *The British Medical Journal*, 1, 2581 (18 June 1910), p. 1504.

problems caused by over-population, industrialisation and urban migration.⁸² These articles and publications could stem from previous talks or lectures, in which child emigration featured as only part of a wider discussion. This was the case with a pamphlet written in 1892 by Rev. Bevan based on a paper he had originally delivered at the Cardiff meeting of the economic branch of the British Association for the Advancement of Science. Though his pamphlet dealt with numerous options that could be implemented to deal with poor or criminal children, he dedicated two pages to child emigration and directly referred to emigration schemes run by Thomas Barnardo and John T. Middlemore.⁸³ Not only did this introduce the concept of child emigration to wider circles, whose interests lay in broader economic and social issues, it also demonstrates that child emigration societies did not always have to be actively advertising their work because, in some cases, their advocates did it for them.

Whilst securing support for child emigration in England was undoubtedly important, the success of respective schemes also relied on Canadian co-operation. Some historical accounts already refer to the hostility directed at child emigrants as certain Canadians saw these young newcomers as a contaminating threat to their society.⁸⁴ However, the importance of keeping the Canadian population and government onside cannot be overemphasised. The CEH and MRH's methods of gaining Canadian support varied from sending letters and pre-penned articles to Canadian newspapers, touring the provinces to host public assemblies and meeting key government officials, including Hon. J. M. Gibson (member of Ontario government) and Mr Kelso (Chief Secretary of the Children's Department) in order to promote their work.⁸⁵ The vast distances involved in placing out children in Canada's provinces and the unfamiliar lifestyle they encountered once there meant that these charities also relied on local knowledge and assistance in settling their

⁸² See Chapter 1: Motivations and Justifications for more discussion on the way in which the CEH and MRH focused on perceived social problems to justify their emigration work.

⁸³ Bevan, *The upbringing of necessitous and pauper children*, pp. 18-19.

⁸⁴ Bagnell, *Little Immigrants*; Parr, *Labouring Children*; Parker, *Uprooted*, chapters 9 and 10; D. French, *Faith, Sweat and Politics: the early trade union years in Canada* (Toronto, 1962); A. McLaren, *Our Own Master Race: eugenics in Canada, 1885-1945* (Toronto, 1990); P. T. Rooke and R. L. Schnell, 'The King's Children in English Canada: a psychohistorical study of abandonment, rejection and the Canadian response to British juvenile immigrants, 1869-1930', *Journal of Psychohistory*, 8 (1981), pp. 387-420; Rooke and Schnell, 'Imperial Philanthropy and Colonial Response', pp. 56-77.

⁸⁵ '107 Bright Children from Middlemore's Homes', *Halifax Herald*, 17 July 1897; 'Mr John T Middlemore and his emigrant children', *Halifax Acadian Recorder*, 19 July 1897; 'Homes in Canada', *Halifax Daily Echo*, 7 June 1899 (sourced from BCL, CEH, MS 517/93, Scrapbook, pp. 84-86); MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* October 1897, pp. 348-349.

charges. This was particularly the case with the CEH who publicly acknowledged the help offered by their ‘Canadian friends’.⁸⁶ John T. Middlemore had originally sailed to Canada in May 1872 with his first batch of emigrants without any plan as to how or where he would distribute them, relying entirely on the assistance of local Canadians who had heard about his scheme through telegrams before his arrival.⁸⁷ From the mid 1870s onwards, Canadian supporters of the CEH were particularly active in forming local committees to oversee and monitor the progress of Birmingham children placed within their community; key individuals in various Canadian provinces, such as the Rev. Canon Partridge, Messrs Heath and Finnemore, Colonel and Mrs Maunsell remained staunch advocates of the CEH.⁸⁸ By utilising their connections with local people, child emigration societies began to create a network of informal agents who promoted their work and sought to promote the reputation of child emigration amongst communities in Canada who were otherwise remote and hard to access.

However, child emigrationists did not just rely on adults to support, advocate and fund their activities. The CEH and MRH also strategically appealed to English children, which serves to demonstrate the breadth of support that individual charities were able to secure. To communicate with some of their young followers, the MRH had a dedicated children’s section in each monthly magazine, in which the editor regularly explained emigration work in simplified terms and asked young readers to show their support

Dear Young Friends – Another month has come and gone. Oh! How fast they do come. And it finds us busy, very busy, preparing our first party of boys this season for Canada...When our boys reach there, in about ten days, the snow will still be on the ground but ere long the genial sun will melt it up.⁸⁹

Describing child emigration in a story-like manner, whereby MRH children escaped the ‘misery’ of city life in Manchester and went on adventure to new lands in Canada presented the emigration scheme in a specifically child-friendly manner that sought to appeal to

⁸⁶ Every Annual Report includes acknowledgement of help from ‘Canadian friends’, usually situated towards the end of the document. BCL, CEH, MS 517/463-465, Annual Reports 1873-1890; BCL, CEH, MS 517/19-23, Annual Reports 1891-1915.

⁸⁷ BCL, CEH, MS 517/463, Annual Report 1873, p. 5; Anon., *One Hundred Years of Child Care*; Kohli, *Golden Bridge*, pp. 131-136.

⁸⁸ BCL, CEH, MS 517/463, Annual Report 1875, p. 8; BCL, CEH, MS 517/465, Annual Report 1886, p. 15; BCL, CEH, MS 517/19, Annual Report 1895, p. 17; ‘Birmingham Children’s Emigration Homes’, *Weekly Post*, 13 July 1875.

⁸⁹ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* December 1887, p. 185.

younger members of society.⁹⁰ It is possible to suggest that the MRH actively targeted children in the middle- to upper- classes because they would be the ones with the requisite literacy skills to read the magazine and whose parents had enough money to subscribe to it on a monthly basis. Likewise, these children were more likely to have the necessary leisure time in which to host suitable fundraising events, as well as having friends and family who would contribute to its success. Typically, the MRH encouraged its child supporters to host garden parties and doll's bazaars, use collecting-boxes to gather small amounts from friends and family, or make small items of clothing, such as earmuffs.⁹¹ Such appeals generally met with good responses; over a period of 44 years, the MRH recorded 225 contributions in its 'Children's Section' of the monthly magazine. Of these, 399 were from girls and only 126 were from boys, meaning that 76 per cent of the contributions to the MRH came from girls. This predominance of contributions from young females seems to support Prochaska's argument that in terms of general charitable activities, involvement was far more extensive amongst girls than amongst boys.⁹²

Though child emigrationists in Manchester clearly appealed to children who did not need to use their emigration services, most regional emigration societies also relied upon contributions from their current and former children. Out of the two regional child emigration societies in Birmingham and Manchester, the MRH placed far more emphasis on the importance of children contributing towards their maintenance than the CEH, employing their boys in five of the institution's workshops, whilst girls were encouraged to form musical groups that supporters could hire as a means of entertainment.⁹³ At the peak of their contributions in 1903, the children at the Manchester and Salford homes added £3,082 to the general fund, which was one quarter of the whole amount necessary for the year.⁹⁴ In contrast, the CEH only allowed their boys to work during the first decade of the

⁹⁰ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* August 1883, p. 121; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* April 1889, p. 70; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* February 1910, p. 5.

⁹¹ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* November 1903, p. 3; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* April 1904, p. 12; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* March 1908, p. 4.

⁹² Prochaska, *Women and Philanthropy*, p. vii.

⁹³ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* May 1886, 80; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* April 1888, p. 80; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* December 1895, p. 20; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* May 1896, p. 103; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* January 1897, p. 246; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven*, April 1903, p. 3.

⁹⁴ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* April 1903, p. 3.

organisation's operations, which generated an overall small total of £35.⁹⁵ However, both societies insisted that they did not expect their children to fund their own passages to Canada but rather, by encouraging them to contribute towards their general maintenance, emigrationists argued that it motivated children to work hard, develop a self-help mentality and 'appreciate' the services of the homes.⁹⁶ An emphasis on gratitude also featured prominently in later correspondence between societies and their children settled in Canada. In a letter sent by Middlemore in 1882, he invited former children to contribute towards the expenses of one CEH inmate each year to share the 'blessing of emigration with some of the unfortunate children of your native town'

My dear boys and girls...Your emigration to Canada has been a great blessing to you! You will not keep this blessing to yourselves, will you? Would you not rather pass it on to those children who are living in destitution at home? We can feed, clothe, and educate a child in Birmingham, bring it to Canada and settle it in a good home here for seventy five dollars...why should not the older boys and girls in Canada pay the expenses of one or two children every year? Why should not you have some children who will bless you for helping them?⁹⁷

Though neither the CEH nor MRH demanded that former children respond to such appeals, the letter specifically focuses on the alleged benefits and success of former children's new lives in Canada, thereby applying pressure on recipients to respond to the request for money. The fact these societies acknowledged monetary contributions from their former children suggests their appeals had some success, as a number of children were willing to give something back to the charitable societies that had trained, prepared and emigrated them to new homes overseas.⁹⁸

⁹⁵ See CEH Statement of Accounts at the back of Annual Reports, 1873-1883; BCL, CEH, MS 517/463, Annual Reports 1873-1878; BCL, CEH, MS 517/464, Annual Reports 1879-1883.

⁹⁶ BCL, CEH, MS 517/463, Annual Report 1875, p. 5; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* June 1890, p. 142; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* August 1896, p. 151.

⁹⁷ BCL, CEH, MS 517/93, Scrapbook, pp. 60-61.

⁹⁸ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* December 1894, p. 31; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* February 1902, p. 6; BCL, CEH, MS 517/465, Annual Report 1887, p. 17; BCL, CEH, MS 517/20, Annual Report 1900, p. 30.

Chapter 4: Protection, Training and Preparation

Whilst child emigrationists used extensive publicity to promote their respective schemes, it would be misleading to suggest that persuading people to accept their activities was easy. Existing interpretations of child emigration have largely overlooked the challenges raised by parents to schemes such as those operated by the CEH and MRH. What were parents' concerns and how were they expressed to child emigration societies? What steps did emigrationists take to reassure parents and did their newly implemented methods of protecting children when in Canada make a difference? There is also little historiography analysing the training of child emigrants. Why did contemporaries criticise the education given to young emigrants and how did this prompt changes in training provision? How did child emigrationists respond to contemporary ideas about education for the working class and how did they make use of state educational facilities in the training of their children? Whilst educating the young emigrants before embarkation, the CEH and MRH had to accommodate the children in England. By focusing on the alleged ways in which they looked after children in England and on the journey to Canada, the CEH and MRH portrayed a caring image of their work. However, were the emigration homes 'children's havens' or were there ulterior motives behind the lifestyle and living arrangements that emigrationists advertised?¹

Protecting the children

Even though parents and children targeted by emigrationists were at the lower end of the social spectrum and were often vilified by child rescuers, this did not prevent parents from raising concerns about child rescue schemes or organisations.² For regional child emigration societies in particular, the issue of parental rights dominated their work, as the transfer of guardianship from parent to emigration society was crucial to the legitimacy of their schemes. Taking an admission form for the CEH as an example, the document explicitly stated that John T. Middlemore would become the child's guardian and that the

¹ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* January 1905, p. 4.

² See Chapter 1: Motivations and Justifications for more information about the way in which child emigrationists and other child rescuers viewed and portrayed parents living in slum districts. For more information about the complex nature of the relationship between parents, children and childcare agencies or institutions, see L. Murdoch, *Imagined Orphans: poor families, child welfare and contested citizenship in London* (London, 2006).

parent consented to their child leaving England under Middlemore's care.³ However, an MRH admission form was more ambiguous because the clause for emigration was embedded amongst other conditions of admission, including the payment of expenses if the child left, or was removed, from the homes without the MRH's authorisation.⁴ In the final three decades of the nineteenth century, cases where parents felt they had been duped or misled into surrendering their parental rights by signing admission forms at emigration homes were reported in the local press.⁵ Subsequent negative exposure as 'child stealers' conflicted sharply with the images that emigrationists tried to create in their publicity material and showed a darker side to their allegedly charitable child rescue work.⁶

Parental opposition to signing over guardianship for their children and allowing them to be taken to Canada had a marked impact on some regional child emigration societies. L. Murdoch argues that parents often appealed to local guardians, welfare officials and magistrates for assistance in dealing with disputes over their rights, but parents could, and did, take more immediate action against individual charities or organisations.⁷ One of the major ways in which parents could voice their objection to transplantation as a means of child rescue was by refusing to consent to their children being admitted to emigration homes in the first place. In the south-west of England, the committee of the Clifton Home for Little Girls in Bristol found there was a 'great prejudice against emigration' amongst parents. Whilst parents needed to use the childcare services offered by the society, they openly informed staff at the home that they resisted using their services because they did not 'like the thought of [their] child so soon going across the water to a new country'.⁸ In such cases, it is unlikely that a lack of knowledge about the journey or the life awaiting their child in the colonies caused parental resistance. Information about emigration opportunities were extensively publicised and distributed using a variety of mediums, including privately published travel guides, roaming agents, visits or letters home from

³ See Appendix 1 for the full admission form document.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ 'Singular Charge of Child Stealing', *Manchester Times*, 18 December 1886; 'A Complaint against the Children's Emigration Homes', *Birmingham Daily Gazette*, 17 May 1889; 'The Boys' Emigration Homes', *Birmingham Daily Gazette*, 18 May 1889; 'The Children's Emigration Homes', *Birmingham Daily Post*, 20 May 1889; 'Children's Emigration Homes', *Birmingham Daily Gazette*, 21 May 1889.

⁶ See Chapter 3: Support and Finances for more information about how child emigrationists marketed and promoted their work.

⁷ Murdoch, *Imagined Orphans*, pp. 94-95.

⁸ 'Girls for Canada', *Bristol Mercury and Daily Post*, 18 May 1894.

those who had emigrated and publications issued by the Emigrants' Information Office under the supervision of the Colonial Office.⁹ Therefore, even when allowing for lower rates of literacy amongst the poor, it seems that parents who refused to sign the admission form to child emigration societies actually made a conscious and deliberate decision not to allow their child to leave the country. Following parental objection and in order to increase and secure numbers of children in their home, the Clifton Home in Bristol was forced to relax their admission rules in 1894 by deleting the clause that gave them the authority to emigrate children in their care.¹⁰ That parental objection to emigration was sufficient to change the operating policies of this regional society reflects the extent to which some parents challenged child emigration. Notably too, the CEH – a society so committed to emigration that up until the late 1890s this was the only service they offered – also had to admit that they faced opposition to emigration from parents and others within the local community. As a result, they had to adopt a policy of finding homes and employment in England for those children who needed help but could not join an emigration party, either through their own unsuitability or through resistance from parents or guardians.¹¹

Evidently then, child emigrationists, such as John T. Middlemore and Leonard K. Shaw, could not simply ignore the opinions and rights of parents. Rather, as child emigration gathered pace and societies sought to expand their work, they had to persuade parents that emigration offered an alternative form of child welfare. Parental anxieties were particularly fuelled by fervent media focus on isolated cases of neglect and cruelty to children in their new Canadian homes, especially when a disturbing case involving a Barnardo child who died at the hands of a Canadian farmer headlined in both London and regional newspapers in 1895.¹² Through both the press and public meetings, child emigrationists themselves openly acknowledged concerns from parents who felt their offspring 'were not sufficiently

⁹ Paton, 'Work and Workers VIII'; Erickson, *Invisible Immigrants*, see particularly Introduction; D. F. Harris, *The Work of Canadian Emigration Agents in Shropshire, 1896-1914* (Birmingham, 1991); E. Richards, 'How did poor people emigrate from the British Isles to Australia in the nineteenth century?', *Journal of British Studies*, 32, 3 (1993), pp. 250-279; M. Hewitt, 'The itinerant emigration lecturer: James Brown's lecture tour of Britain and Ireland, 1861-1862', *British Journal of Canadian Studies*, 10 (1995), p. 103-119.

¹⁰ 'Girls for Canada', *Bristol Mercury and Daily Post*, 18 May 1894.

¹¹ BCL, CEH, MS 517/19, Annual Report 1896, p. 3.

¹² 'Boy Killed By Ill-Treatment', *Birmingham Daily Mail*, 22 November 1895; 'An Orphan Boy Killed by Cruelty', *North Eastern Daily Gazette*, 23 November 1895; 'Alleged Murder of Boy from Barnardo's Homes', *Glasgow Herald*, 23 November 1895; 'Emigration to Canada', *Morning Post*, 23 November 1895; 'English Boys in Canada', *The Standard*, 23 November 1895; 'Charge of Manslaughter: Dr Barnardo's Boys Sent to Canada', *Yorkshire Herald*, 23 November 1895; 'Emigration to Canada', *The Times*, 23

cared for', 'forsaken or cast adrift' and may face the possibility of being 'badly treated' once in Canada.¹³ One method of publicly combating parental concerns in the early 1870s was the farewell party, used initially by John T. Middlemore of the CEH and later adopted by other societies, including the MRH in Manchester.¹⁴ These events enabled parents to come to the emigration home, say a final goodbye to their children and listen to an address, usually made by one of the committee, in which parents were assured of their child's safety.¹⁵ As published in a local newspaper the day after a CEH farewell party in April 1875

[Middlemore] exhorted parents to have no anxiety about their children, as they would be well cared for in every respect and would send home accounts as to how they were faring...The Rev. J. J. Brown next addressed a few words to the parents, assuring them that their children were not about to be sold as slaves, neither would they be treated as such.¹⁶

As parents had little way of knowing what fate would befall their children, they were reliant upon emigrationists assuring them of their child's future safety in Canada. Thus, in some ways the farewell party can be seen as a publicity event that allowed emigrationists to tell parents what they wanted to hear within a public forum. Several studies have provided insights into the harsh reality of life in Canada for some young emigrants and though contributing to this literature is beyond the remit of this study, it is important to acknowledge that in many cases, children did not receive the safe and secure life overseas that emigrationists promised.¹⁷ Though the reality of life in Canada did not always match the illusion, by addressing parental concerns at a formal meeting, the farewell parties played an important role in actively creating the image that emigration was a suitable option for children of the lower classes.

November 1895; 'Infant Emigration to Canada', *Huddersfield Daily Chronicle*, 25 November 1895; 'The Strange Death of a Boy in Canada', *Birmingham Daily Post*, 19 December 1895; 'The Manslaughter of a Barnardo's Home Boy', *Liverpool Mercury*, 19 December 1895.

¹³ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* June 1884, p. 95; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* October 1904, p. 5; BCL, CEH, MS 517/464, Annual Report 1884, p. 3.

¹⁴ 'A voyage with juvenile emigrants', *Birmingham Daily News*, 19 December 1874; 'Birmingham Children's Emigration Home', *Birmingham Daily Post*, 28 April 1875; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* April 1896, p. 85.

¹⁵ 'Birmingham Children's Emigration Home', *Birmingham Daily Post*, 28 April 1875; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* April 1896, p. 85.

¹⁶ 'Birmingham Children's Emigration Home', *Birmingham Daily Post*, 28 April 1875.

¹⁷ Parr, *Labouring Children*; Harrison (ed.), *The Home Children*; Humphreys, *Empty Cradles*; Bean and Melville, *Lost Children of the Empire*.

In a further bid to overcome suspicion of (or opposition to) emigration, societies and their supporters attempted to explain their respective schemes by comparing their work to the British system of boarding out pauper children from the workhouse into ordinary families. Doing so enabled them to argue that children benefited from being brought back into ordinary family life, which provided them with as natural an upbringing as possible.¹⁸ According to William Chance, honorary secretary of Central Poor Law Conferences in 1897, boarded out children could ‘run about freely’ and because they were ‘not marked out from other children’, they were able to merge with the local population, rather than be contained in segregated and recognisable institutions.¹⁹ By bringing in the use of ‘boarding out’ to describe child emigration, societies and advocates of their work were able to market their activities as a familiar system that most people already understood in England, except that it occurred in the colonies where children supposedly had better opportunities.²⁰ As the reputation of child emigration had been damaged by the *Doyle Report* in 1875, extra effort was therefore required to counteract the argument that boarding out in Canada exposed children to exploitation by ‘haphazard parentage’.²¹ To do so, emigration societies were able to emulate some of the guidelines that regulated the system of boarding out in England and apply them to child emigration to show how they aimed to keep their children safe in Canada. Regulations issued in 1889 to govern boarding out in England stipulated that the local government board retained permanent guardianship of the children and had the authority to withdraw a child from their placement if the local government board saw fit.²² The CEH’s emigration agreements, to be signed by Canadians taking English children into their homes, worked on a parallel principle, stating

I acknowledge Mr John T. Middlemore to be the guardian of the said boy...and acknowledge the right of Mr John T. Middlemore or his agent to remove him from my custody if he shall consider it in the interest of

¹⁸ Bevan, *The up-bringing of necessitous and pauper children*, p. 13-14; W. Chance, *Children under the Poor Law: their education, training and aftercare* (London, 1897), p. 181; BCL, CEH, MS 517/21, Annual Report 1905, p. 3; Rooke and Schnell, ‘Imperial Philanthropy and Colonial Response’, p. 61; Martin, “‘A Future not of Riches but of Comfort’”, p. 30.

¹⁹ Chance, *Children under the Poor*, p. 181.

²⁰ BCL, CEH, MS 517/465, Annual Report 1886, p. 4; BCL, CEH, MS 517/21, Annual Report 1905, p. 3; ‘The problem of the unemployed’, *Review of Reviews*, 32, 192 (December 1905), pp. 616-618; ‘State-assisted emigration of children’, *Review of Reviews*, 33, 194 (February 1906), p. 186; ‘Migration Within the Empire’, *Review of Reviews*, 47, 282 (June 1913), p. 547.

²¹ G. Johnson, ‘Child Emigration’, *British Medical Journal*, 1, 2576 (14 May 1910), p. 1026.

²² See Chance, *Children under the Poor*, chapter 7 for full regulations.

the said boy, of which he or his agent shall be the sole judge.²³

Consequently, by utilising the terminology already in existence, child emigrationists were able to draw comparisons between their work and that which was already being carried out on a local scale in England.

Given the extent of parental concerns and the general increased focus on the welfare of the child during the last quarter of the nineteenth century, emigrationists also marketed the fact that they placed more emphasis on investigating who was trying to adopt or employ their child emigrants once they arrived in Canada. Both the CEH and MRH conducted personal interviews with applicants, who were predominately male, along with their wives, if previously unknown to emigration society staff, to assess whether they would be appropriate foster parents or employers.²⁴ Specific details of the interview process are not available in archival sources, which makes it difficult to assess whether this was a sufficient or successful method of assessing potential applicants. However, from the 1870s onwards, it was also common practice for emigration societies to demand that Canadian families complete an application form and provide character references, preferably from a magistrate or a clergyman, before they could be considered suitable for taking one of the children.²⁵ Recommendations commonly took the following form

I can conscientiously and cordially recommend Mr [insert name] as in every way a suitable person to be entrusted with the care of a boy and thoroughly competent to train him to become a useful member of society.²⁶

The reference was already pre-worded by emigration societies, with applicants only having to secure a signature from their minister or local dignitary, which left no room for referees to add their own comments about the suitability of the applicant to care for a child. It can therefore be suggested that securing a recommendation was a mere formality, rather than a specific tool by which emigrationists could gauge the true personality and compatibility of an applicant. Evidently, whilst emigrationists did take steps to reassure critics that they did

²³ See Appendix 2 for the full Canadian settlement and application form document.

²⁴ BCL, CEH, MS 517/465, Annual Report 1885, p. 8; BCL, CEH, MS 517/465, Annual Report 1888, p. 9; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* December 1912, p. 6.

²⁵ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* June 1886, p. 95; 'The Children's Emigration Homes', *Birmingham Daily Post*, 2 June 1883; 'Girls for Canada', *The Bristol Mercury and Daily Post*, 18 May 1894.

²⁶ See Appendix 2 for the full Canadian settlement and application form document.

protect children, the extent to which emigrationists can truly be said to have ensured the safety and wellbeing of their children in Canada is questionable.

Alongside parental calls for improved child safety, there were also moves within British and Canadian governmental circles for better protection of children sent out to Canada. In the *Doyle Report* (1875), the author highlighted deficiencies in the way Maria Rye and Annie Macpherson monitored and tracked the progress of children once placed out in Canada.²⁷ Doyle reported that in the late 1860s to early 1870s, their charges were ‘lost sight of’ and he produced long lists of children whose current addresses were unrecorded

There are many other [children] of which nothing authentic is known...all trace [of them] seems to have been lost. E. B. lost sight of. C. C. left her second place a year ago. Present address not known. J. C. believed to have left last reported situation. The present address of M .H. is not known.²⁸

Thus, Macpherson and Rye’s lack of correspondence with children and incorrect information regarding their whereabouts rendered the young immigrants vulnerable in a strange country where they had no point of contact beyond their new Canadian family or employer. If Doyle’s concerns are compared with the voluminous records of settlement and progress reports available for the CEH in Birmingham it can be seen that, on the surface at least, later emigration societies made an effort to maintain contact with the children sent out to Canada by charting their progress in their new homes.²⁹ Likewise, when the emigration of pauper children from the workhouse recommenced in 1883, regular reports of their progress had to be submitted to the local government board, which aimed to combat the idea that children were simply dumped in Canada and left to fend for themselves.³⁰

²⁷ Report to the President of the Local Government Board by Andrew Doyle...as to the emigration of pauper children to Canada, HCPP, lxiii, HC 9 (1875), pp. 25-28.

²⁸ Report to the President of the Local Government Board by Andrew Doyle...as to the emigration of pauper children to Canada, HCPP, lxiii, HC 9 (1875), p. 27.

²⁹ The CEH records at Birmingham Central Library and MRH records in Manchester Central Library include vast collections of emigration books, histories, settlement and reports on individual children re-homed in Canada. The amount of detail recorded about each child varies between entries and can sometimes be limited to single phrase comments, such as ‘doing well’. See BCL, CEH, MS 517/249-300, Histories, Settlement and Reports 1870-1914: MCL, MRH, M 189/7/2, Emigration Books, Girls 1897-1914; MCL, MRH, M 189/7/3, Emigration Books 1-14 1883-1913.

³⁰ Kohli, *Golden Bridge*, pp. 274-276.

Canadian authorities also stipulated that child emigrationists take greater responsibility for their children when placed in new homes by requiring each society to have use of a distributing and receiving home.³¹ This facility was designed so that children could use the home as a place of rest after their journey from England before being placed out with new families and to which they could return when sick or in need of re-settlement.³² Usually based at the distributing and receiving home, emigration society agents had the task of embarking upon annual visiting tours to check children placed in Canadian settlements. Sometimes accompanied by members of staff from the English homes, these visits were intended as a method of reporting on each child and re-homing them if either the child or their Canadian host was unsatisfied.³³ However, the efficiency of these safety measures is disputable considering the volume of children in the care of emigration societies, the vast distances involved in placing them out and the subsequent need to visit them regularly, especially when societies became more established and expanded their areas of operation. By 1902, the CEH in Birmingham had transplanted 2,942 children throughout the Canadian provinces of New Brunswick, Ontario, Nova Scotia, as well as on Prince Edward Island.³⁴ Evidently, these measures had their shortcomings but, despite this, their implementation demonstrates that emigration societies were aware of parental and governmental concerns and were prepared to act upon them.

Training and Preparation

Challenges and concerns regarding child emigration were not simply restricted to the way in which various schemes dealt with children's safety and wellbeing once in Canada. Questions regarding the adequacy of training provision for child emigrants also emerged. This was particularly the case with boys, who were predominately engaged in agricultural work in Canada, but who generally received an industrial training prior to embarkation. Some of the many agricultural tasks that boys completed in their new Canadian homes

³¹ Carrothers, *Emigration from the British Isles*, p. 279.

³² MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* April 1889, p. 70; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* May and June 1907, p. 15; BCL, CEH, MS 517/464, Annual Report 1884, p. 3; BCL, CEH, MS 517/20, Annual Report 1902, p. 4.

³³ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* June 1883, p. 87; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* March 1895, pp. 76-77; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* July 1887, p. 112; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* May and June 1905, pp. 11-12; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* July 1910, p. 8; BCL, CEH, MS 517/464, Annual Report 1884, p. 3; BCL, CEH, MS 517/465, Annual Report 1886, p. 4; BCL, CEH, MS 517/465, Annual Report 1890, p. 9; BCL, CEH, MS 517/20, Annual Report 1897, p. 18; BCL, CEH, MS 517/21, Annual Report 1904, p. 3.

³⁴ BCL, CEH, MS 517/20, Annual Report 1903, p. 3.

included making hay, planting and harvesting a crop, tilling the land, milking cows or riding and driving horses.³⁵ Following numerous reports of children struggling to settle during the first three to four months in their new country, commentators directly pinpointed the chief cause of this to their lack of practical training

Failures have been chiefly due to the unfitness for farm life of some of the children sent out, and also from the want of sufficient training...One need in the preparatory training of the children sent out to such homes stands out as paramount, and that is some degree of farm training in connection with the Emigration Branch of our work. This is strongly urged by our Canadian friends.³⁶

Though the *Doyle Report* criticised the poor provision of training and helped to ensure that children received some *ad hoc* instruction before expatriation, it was the type of training that left children largely ill equipped to face the realities of living and working on rural homesteads in the colonies.³⁷ Central to the issue was that boys in England underwent training that prepared them for jobs within ‘artisan trades’.³⁸ The MRH in Manchester had a range of workshops to teach boys the basic requirements for a career in a skilled trade or craft, such as blacksmithing and joinery.³⁹ Other MRH workshops included a firewood shop, printing, shoe-making and tailoring, which all offered specific training that would make a boy employable within a relatively limited, urban job market.⁴⁰ L. Murdoch argues that social reformers promoted these artisan trades because they ‘recalled the English pre-industrial past’, which encouraged ‘self-sufficiency, craftsmanship and social harmony’.⁴¹

³⁵ BCL, CEH, MS 517/463, Annual Report 1877, p. 7; BCL, CEH, MS 517/21, Annual Report 1905, p. 5; BCL, CEH, MS 517/22, Annual Report 1911, p. 6; BCL, CEH, MS 517/22, Annual Report 1913, p. 7; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* July 1883, p.111; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* September 1888, p. 168; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* March 1895, p. 78; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* July 1895, p. 139; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* February 1905, p. 14.

³⁶ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* October 1897, pp. 347-349; BCL, CEH, MS 517/465, Annual Report 1890, p. 9.

³⁷ Report to the President of the Local Government Board by Andrew Doyle...as to the emigration of pauper children to Canada, HCPP, lxiii, HC 9 (1875), p. 16.

³⁸ Murdoch, *Imagined Orphans*, p. 123.

³⁹ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* May 1894, p. 99.

⁴⁰ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* May 1894, p. 99; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* December 1894, p. 20; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* November 1895, p. 4; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* February 1896, p. 53; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* March 1896, pp. 72-73; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* October 1896, p. 181; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* January 1902, p. 6; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* October 1907, p. 5; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/4/3, *Twelve Years Ago: the story of a refuge*, pp. 2-3.

⁴¹ Murdoch, *Imagined Orphans*, pp. 123-124.

Child emigrationists' responses to criticisms about the lack of appropriate training varied between different societies. Along with sending children to Canada with Louisa Birt, the MRH also sent early emigrants to the Northfield training and farm school in Massachusetts. This prompted calls, namely from A. J. McMillan (Manitoba Governor General), for the MRH to establish their own farm in Canada for the training of child emigrants.⁴² The concept of training children once they arrived in their new destination particularly gathered strength during the first decade of the twentieth century. In 1909, Oxford scholar Kingsley Fairbridge established farm schools in the colonies that would equip children with the necessary skills to settle on agricultural land and successfully begin farming.⁴³ Whereas societies like the CEH and MRH had previously placed child emigrants in the homes of local families almost immediately upon their arrival in Canada, Fairbridge kept English children at farm schools for a number of years until they were old enough – and skilled enough – to take up their own land or apply for jobs.⁴⁴ Consequently, Fairbridge did not maintain residential training homes in Britain; rather his society was an empire recruitment agency designed to take children from the workhouse, voluntary organisations and parents directly to farm schools overseas where their training then commenced. Though it gained popularity from the 1910s onwards, Kingsley Fairbridge did not pioneer the farm school method of training. Rather ironically, a Church of England clergyman, Rev. Freeman, had previously occupied the site at Pinjarra before Fairbridge's arrival and operated a very similar scheme but had failed to make his work a success.⁴⁵

Drawing on the idea of farm schools highlights a strong contemporary debate regarding how, and where, child emigrants should undergo their training, which formed a vital component in emigrationists' efforts to persuade people of the viability of this approach to child rescue. When comparing the more traditional method of emigrating children overseas and placing them immediately in new homes with the farm school approach, contemporaries recognised a number of advantages to the latter method. Most obviously, children gained practical experience of living and working in the climate and conditions of their new country, whilst still being under the immediate guidance and protection of the

⁴² MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* May 1883, p. 79; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* March 1894, p. 70; Edmondson, *Making Rough Places Plain*, pp. 96-97.

⁴³ For the most comprehensive study on Fairbridge see Sherington and Jeffery, *Fairbridge*.

⁴⁴ G. Sherington, 'Suffer Little Children: Britain's child migration as a study of journeyings between centre and periphery', *History of Education*, 32, 5 (September 2003), p. 472.

⁴⁵ Fairbridge, *Pinjarra*, p. 47.

emigration society.⁴⁶ Therefore, they were essentially educated and trained ‘on the spot’ and were able to become acclimatised to their new way of life.⁴⁷ It is worth emphasising that most emigration societies operated in industrial cities, hence the children selected for emigration rarely had any comprehension of what rural life would involve. As stated in an MRH magazine in 1912, ‘when our boys go out they have never handled a horse or cow (probably never seen the latter) and they are [therefore] handicapped’.⁴⁸ Whilst there were clear benefits to opening training farms overseas, if this was not possible it became desirable for such establishments to be set up in England so that children would at least have exposure to some form of agricultural training before embarkation.⁴⁹ In 1912, Sir John Taverner (Agent General for Victoria) championed the establishment of a self-supporting farm around fifty miles from London for boys to learn about milking, feeding poultry and pigs, as well as the use of agricultural equipment.⁵⁰ Whilst some societies, such as Barnardo’s, the National Society in London for Homeless and Destitute Boys, and the Children’s Home, already ran similar establishments, they were not available on a large scale and were not used by the smaller, regional societies like the CEH and the MRH.⁵¹

However, boys destined for farm work were not the only ones sent to Canada between 1870 and 1914. Whilst M. Gomersall argues that formal schooling in the nineteenth century ‘took a gendered form’ and children’s broader experiences in the home and society taught them ‘about their respective social positions...and how life “ought” to be’, this can also be applied to the training of young female emigrants at the CEH and MRH.⁵² From the early child emigration schemes run by The Children’s Friend Society in the 1830s through to some of the twentieth century ones organised by Fairbridge, there was an overriding assumption that most girls were destined to work within the home environment once in the colonies.⁵³ More specifically, Jan Gothard suggested that rather than women expecting to

⁴⁶ Paton, *State-aided emigration*.

⁴⁷ Johnson, ‘Child Emigration’, p. 1026.

⁴⁸ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children’s Haven* December 1912, p. 12.

⁴⁹ ‘Manchester and Salford Refuges and Homes for Boys and Girls’, *Manchester Times*, 5 April 1895; BCL, CEH, MS 517/19, Annual Report 1896, p. 3.

⁵⁰ ‘Expert Views on Emigration’, pp. 178-179.

⁵¹ Forbes, ‘Overcrowding and emigration’; Paton, ‘Work and Workers VIII’; ‘Juvenile emigration to Canada’, *Daily News*, 24 October 1874; Carrothers, *Emigration from the British Isles*, p. 284.

⁵² M. Gomersall, *Working-Class Girls in nineteenth century England: life, work and schooling* (Basingstoke, 1997), p. 5.

⁵³ E. Bradlow, ‘The Children’s Friend Society at the Cape of Good Hope’, *Victorian Studies*, 27, 2 (1984), pp. 156-177; Sherington, ‘Suffer Little Children’, p. 468.

take on more prestigious roles, such as that of governess or nurse, there were wide openings in the colonies for those prepared to accept jobs as hired domestic help in established colonial homes.⁵⁴ That emigrants in general were sought for manual labour was emphasised by a telegram from the Minister of Agriculture in Canada in 1883 stating that, ‘farm and general labourers...and domestic servants are urgently wanted in old provinces of Canada as well as Manitoba and British Colombia’.⁵⁵ Arguably, it was easier to provide domestic training for girls – rather than the farm work deemed necessary for boys – as girls could help in the everyday running of emigration homes whilst also learning valuable skills before emigration commenced. Some societies, such as the MRH, operated specific training programmes for girls that incorporated ‘housework, cooking and laundry work’ into their daily routines, as well as providing older girls with the opportunity to spend their evenings in a separate sitting room sewing and knitting clothes to take to Canada.⁵⁶ In comparison to the industrial training received by MRH boys, this training for girls appears to have been a more relevant method of preparing for emigration. Its provision as part of the girls’ daily routine also encouraged them to see the successful running of a home as an all-encompassing vocation that was directly linked to their future lives as domestic servants, wives and mothers in the colonies.

However, provision of such extensive vocational training for girls was not exclusive to emigration homes and its implementation can be seen as part of a more general approach to educating girls of the lower classes in this period. As recognised by some historians, domestic service was one of the largest categories of employment for English working-class girls in this period, with over two million young women working within households in 1891, which equated to one in three of all girls aged fifteen to twenty.⁵⁷ Likewise, the primary occupation of workhouse girls upon reaching the age of thirteen was domestic service, for which ‘the workhouse and district schools ensured they had the basic

⁵⁴ J. Gothard, *Blue China: single female migration to colonial Australia* (Carlton South, Australia, 2001).

⁵⁵ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* May 1883, p. 79.

⁵⁶ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* May 1894, p. 107; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children’s Haven* November 1895, p. 6; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children’s Haven* March 1896, pp. 72-73; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children’s Haven* May 1896, p.104; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children’s Haven* April and May 1899, p. 6.

⁵⁷ J. F. C. Harrison, *Late Victorian Britain, 1870-1901* (London, 1990), p. 81; C. Dyhouse, *Girls Growing Up in late Victorian and Edwardian England* (London, 1981), p. 82; T. McBride, “‘As the Twig Bent’ The Victorian Nanny”, in A. S. Wohl (ed.), *The Victorian Family: structure and stresses* (London, 1978), p. 53.

training'.⁵⁸ Thus, pauper girls under the care of boards of guardians who were housed in segregated accommodation at Shoreditch helped to do the cooking and washing, whilst those attending Board schools often began their long domestic training when first entering infant class.⁵⁹ In such institutions, essential aspects of living and working within the home environment formed the backbone of the curriculum as cookery became a recognised subject in 1882 and laundry lessons first began in 1889.⁶⁰ Girls were introduced to basic needlework and undertook knitting drill before moving on to more specific lessons on 'minding the baby', 'how to light a fire' and 'cleanliness in the home'.⁶¹ As the Education Act of 1880 made attendance at school compulsory for all children between the ages of five and twelve, and as some provincial emigration societies like the CEH were not recognised as certified schools, sending their girls to a local educational institution meant that potential emigrants received a practical education delivered in line with state recommendations.⁶² Providing their female children with a similar education to that which they would have achieved in other institutions may also have helped emigrationists to promote the idea that their work was a viable alternative.

With wider reference to the training of all children, middle-class beliefs about the purpose of education strongly influenced the preparation that child emigrants had to undertake. Middle-class perceptions that children from lower down the social spectrum were unused to discipline and lacked respect for authority meant that reformers called for these children to be 'civilised' in preparation for future work within a clearly stratified society.⁶³ This added an extra dimension to the training that most potential emigrants had to undergo. Evidence from regional emigration societies supports Murdoch's argument that when trying to 'civilise' their children, charities and poor law services influenced each other on numerous issues.⁶⁴ This was partly achieved through an informal connection between some emigration homes and the local educational establishment, in which both institutions

⁵⁸ L. Peters, *Orphan Texts: Victorian orphans, culture and empire* (Manchester, 2000), p. 10; Murdoch, *Imagined Orphans*, p. 125.

⁵⁹ Chance, *Children Under the Poor Law*, p. 146.

⁶⁰ A. Davin, *Growing up Poor: home, school and street, 1870-1914* (London, 1996), p. 148.

⁶¹ Davin, *Growing up Poor*, p. 116; A. Digby and P. Searby, *Children, School and Society in nineteenth century England* (London, 1981), p. 47.

⁶² Education Act (1880), Public General Act 43 & 44 Victoria, c. 23 HL/PO/PU/1/1880/43&44V1n201.

⁶³ Davin, *Growing up Poor*, pp. 133-134; Harrison, *Late Victorian Britain*, p. 203; Dyhouse, *Girls Growing Up*, p. 79; Digby and Searby, *Children, School and Society*, p. 23, 33, 110.

⁶⁴ Murdoch, *Imagined Orphans*, p. 8.

applied complementary approaches to the training of children. Thus, the CEH in Birmingham professed that the first step in any training was to establish 'cleanliness, obedience and truthfulness' amongst the children, which mirrored the approach taken at local Board schools where children were taught the rudiments of cleanliness and behaviour before learning habits of neatness, order and obedience.⁶⁵ With both types of organisation focusing on similar principles to 'transform' children, it can be argued that this work was mutually beneficial in 'civilising' the children, as instruction in manners and attitude at school encouraged children to be more receptive in emigration homes and vice versa. That child emigrationists responded to these calls to 'civilise' their children also demonstrates how they were influenced by middle-class ideas about schooling and education. Evidently, in trying to make their activities appear acceptable to a wide range of people, child emigrationists had to conform to contemporary middle-class standards and ideals about education by ensuring that children at their institutions received comparable levels of training, which served the same purpose, to those children admitted to other local organisations.

As part of the 'civilising' process, the influence of emigration society staff cannot be underestimated. All staff involved in the emigration of children were required to lead by example and through their own actions guide the children placed under their care. This was particularly evident in Fairbridge's empire building project at Pinjarra in Australia where he explicitly wanted to hire 'gentlemen and gentlewomen of refinement and culture' who would present a model example of middle-class Englishness to his children.⁶⁶ Unlike early emigration societies who wanted their children to embrace the new culture into which they were fully immersed, Fairbridge tried to retain a strong sense of national identity and pride amongst his children in Australia.⁶⁷ Therefore, he reasoned that reprimands for incorrect grammar, pronunciation, manners and etiquette could only be successful if the person administering the corrections was exemplary in such areas themselves

[The] pastoral peace was shattered by the prolonged and infelicitous attempts

⁶⁵ BCL, CEH, MS 517/20, Annual Report 1897, p. 4; J. Martin, *Women and the Politics of Schooling in Victorian and Edwardian England* (London, 1999), p. 117; Gomersall, *Working-Class Girls*, p. 121; Dyhouse, *Girls Growing Up*, pp. 82-85.

⁶⁶ Sherington, 'Suffer Little Children', p. 472.

⁶⁷ BCL, CEH, MS 517/463, Annual Report 1875, p. 3; BCL, CEH, MS 517/464, Annual Report 1882, p. 8; BCL, CEH, MS 517/22, Annual Report 1912, p. 4; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* June 1890, p. 150; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* February 1896, p. 57; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* December 1912, p. 12.

of a group of particularly 'H'-less boys to pronounce correctly the following sentence: "H'early ev'ry aft'noon 'e 'ad 'ot 'unks of 'am"...Kingsley had finally to get a looking-glass to show the effect of aspirating an 'h'.⁶⁸

Even those employed in service roles as cooks and laundresses within Fairbridge's establishment had to be of the highest standard, as he thought locals who were considered 'rough' and 'uncultivated' had a damaging effect on children who were apt to pick up their bad habits.⁶⁹ Linking back to one of the major justifications for child emigration, which argued that children were easily led by those who surrounded them, Fairbridge maintained a strong desire to secure competent staff who would be a role model for the children throughout their reformation.⁷⁰

Lifestyles and Living Arrangements

Emigrationists' formal education programmes and varying standards of training at the homes clearly responded in certain respects to criticisms over the lack of suitable preparation for emigrants' working lives in the colonies. However, child emigrationists themselves also promoted the argument that, in line with the philanthropic nature of their work and as part of a child's 'transformation', they sought to 'de-pauperise' children and prevent them from becoming institutionalised whilst in the English emigration homes.⁷¹ During the early decades of child emigration, this therefore set them apart from other institutions, particularly workhouses, and appeared to provide a carefully constructed alternative approach to child rescue and childcare. One of the key differences that child emigration societies tried to create and emphasise between their homes and those of other institutions caring for similar types of children was a homely environment for the children when residing in England before embarkation. Attempting to do so meant that regional emigration societies shied away from the barrack-style approach of workhouses in the mid- to late- nineteenth century where government authorities dealt with paupers 'in the gross' with no element of individualism or distinction between children.⁷² In 1894, Leonard K.

⁶⁸ Fairbridge, *Pinjarra*, p. 106.

⁶⁹ Fairbridge, *Pinjarra*, p. 100.

⁷⁰ See Chapter 1: Motivations and Justifications for more information about the explanations for child emigration.

⁷¹ For more information about the style of accommodation for children 'in care', see L. Murdoch, 'From Barrack Schools to Family Cottages: creating domestic space for late Victorian poor children', in J. Lawrence and P. Starkey (eds.), *Child Welfare and Social Action: from the nineteenth century to the present* (Liverpool, 2001), pp. 147-173.

⁷² Bevan, *The upbringing of necessitous pauper children*, pp. 6-7.

Shaw argued that bestowing personal attention upon individual children rather than treating them *en masse*, through something as simple as referring to each child by its name as opposed to by a number, made children feel valued and part of the home community. He stated, 'it makes a great difference, at 8 years old, to be called "Harry" instead of "Number 451" and to have someone you can call 'Mammy' and run to for sympathy'.⁷³ Both the CEH and MRH grouped children under the care of a matron – known to the children as 'mother' – who lived with them and guided them throughout their stay.⁷⁴ At the turn of the century, for example, the Cheetham Hill complex of the MRH had six homes accommodating fifteen children in each, who all 'shared in the duties and privileges of a common home life'.⁷⁵

Whilst emigrationists used idyllic descriptions to portray their English institutions as a 'haven' in which children flourished in family conditions, more practical, as opposed to altruistic, reasons underpinned the living arrangements at emigration homes.⁷⁶

Contemporary critics of barrack-style institutions argued that when multitudes of children were gathered together in a closely confined space, there was greater possibility of diseases, such as measles and scarlet fever, spreading amongst them.⁷⁷ Therefore, by splitting their children into smaller contained units, organisations like the MRH in Manchester had better control over illnesses spreading amongst their children, thus keeping medical costs and disruption at the homes to a minimum. This was important for those attempting to emigrate children because taking a high number of diseased children to Canada had the potential to damage a society's reputation, as the CEH encountered in 1884. Following an outbreak of measles amongst their children, this Birmingham society witnessed a 30 per cent decrease in the number of Canadian applications for their children the following year, with numbers dropping sharply from 713 applications in 1883 to less than 500 in 1884. As stated explicitly by John T. Middlemore in the annual report

The great diminution in the demand for our children in 1884 is doubtless

⁷³ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* May 1894, p. 106.

⁷⁴ Chance, *Children under the Poor Law*, p. 135; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/4/3, 'The Glory of Manchester: a sermon by Lord Bishop of Peterborough', p. 10; 'Birmingham Emigration Home for Gutter Children', *Morning News*, 9 November 1872.

⁷⁵ 'The Manchester Refuges of Mr Leonard Shaw', *The Christian*, 4 April 1901, p. 17.

⁷⁶ Bevan, *The upbringing of necessitous pauper children*; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* January 1905, p. 4.

⁷⁷ Bevan, *The upbringing of necessitous pauper children*; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* June 1883, p. 87; Murdoch, *Imagined Orphans*, pp. 43-66.

to be explained by our having, unhappily, carried the measles with us in our last journey to Canada.⁷⁸

The reason why measles spread so quickly amongst the CEH children was largely due to the fact that accommodation at their receiving and distributing home in Canada was not large enough to contain such a high volume of children all arriving from England. Nor was there sufficient space available to quarantine infected children.⁷⁹

As emigration societies like the CEH and MRH heavily promoted the idea that they tried to emulate family life, they focused largely on the matron's maternal role within the organisation to create the illusion that children lived 'in a home in reality' rather than merely in an institution.⁸⁰ Contemporary commentators claimed that matrons at such institutions seemed to possess the 'natural gift' of bestowing 'motherly care' upon children

We rely chiefly on a *woman's* influence in the education of our children. It is true that an hour's training a day from the General Manager is of advantage to the boys, especially as its discipline is rather severe, and the boys *enjoy* its severity. But the daily association of the children with noble and unselfish women, whose whole hearts are set on their welfare is beyond doubt, the chief purifying influence of their lives.⁸¹

The image of the kindly, selfless, patient matron who nurtured and purified the children largely conformed to contemporary middle-class beliefs about the importance of a woman's role within the home.⁸² As F. K. Prochaska stated, women could apply their domestic experience and family concerns to the world outside the home.⁸³ The fact that emigrationists incorporated middle-class ideals about the role of women into the daily operations of the homes gives some indication of the extent to which their own personal beliefs influenced their work. Likewise, by drawing on, and emphasising, the supposedly 'loving' nature of their matrons, the CEH and MRH sought to show that their organisations

⁷⁸ BCL, CEH, MS 517/465, Annual Report 1885, pp. 3-4.

⁷⁹ BCL, CEH, MS 517/465, Annual Report 1885, pp. 7-8.

⁸⁰ 'The Liverpool Sheltering Home', *Sunday at Home* (August 1883); BCL, CEH, MS 517/463, Annual Report 1873, p. 9.

⁸¹ BCL, CEH, MS 517/464, Annual Report 1884, p. 8.

⁸² 'Work amongst the orphan and destitute children', *Ragged School Union Quarterly Record* (7 January 1882); Smith, 'Social Reform'; Mrs Meredith, 'Juvenile Emigration', *Sunday at Home* (17 July 1880); MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* March 1902, p. 3; BCL, CEH, MS 517/464, Annual Report 1884, p. 8; Vicinus (ed.), *Suffer and Be Still*; Lewis, *Women in England*, p. 75; Martin, *Women and the Politics of Schooling*, p. 14; Harrison, *Late Victorian Britain*, pp. 157-158.

⁸³ Prochaska, *Women in Philanthropy*, p. 7.

provided for the emotional needs of the children – whether they truly did or not is open to debate.

However, grouping children into smaller numbers under the care of a matron also had its practical benefits for the emigration society staff. L. Murdoch claimed that the cottage homes and model villages were just as factory-like as the barrack homes, with similarly strict daily schedules, but their layout made it easier for staff to assess and influence children's temperaments and characters to determine their suitability for emigration.⁸⁴ As the editor of the MRH monthly magazine commented in 1895, placing untried, untrained, undisciplined and often untruthful girls into new homes generally had one ending, 'early dismissal, or absconding and ruin'.⁸⁵ Therefore, by assessing and reprimanding children whilst they went about their day-to-day activities in the home, emigration society staff could influence a child's life at all times, making training an integral part of their experience in the home. John T. Middlemore stated in 1882 that children's education at the CEH 'extended to every circumstance of their lives – to their meals, their occupations, their companions and their conversation'.⁸⁶ Child emigrationists' desire to exert control over the lifestyles of their children emulated other methods used by institutions across Europe, most notably the colony of cottage homes for juvenile delinquents at Mettray in France and the Rauhe Hause in Germany.⁸⁷ By monitoring and guiding a child's life in its entirety throughout their stay in the English emigration homes, the CEH and MRH could have more influence on the child's training and greater authority over the children in the home.

Building upon the image of family influences and 'motherly love', child emigration societies also sought to persuade people of the emotional bonds that existed between the children and matron. The CEH expressed this supposedly intimate connection between children and staff by claiming that emigration was the 'most painful aspect of their work'

⁸⁴ Murdoch, *Imagined Orphans*, p. 61; J. de Liedfe, *The Charities of Europe* (London, 1872); MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* February 1897, p. 243.

⁸⁵ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* August 1895, p.185.

⁸⁶ BCL, CEH, MS 517/464, Annual Report, 1882, p. 9.

⁸⁷ F. Driver, 'Discipline Without Frontiers? Representations of the Mettray Reformatory Colony in Britain, 1840-1880', *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 3, 3 (1990), pp. 272-293.

because once they had formed bonds with the children and become fond of each other, it was time to find them new homes in Canada.⁸⁸ Likewise, the MRH stated that

these little ones wind themselves strongly round our hearts and to the matrons especially, it is hard work to part with the children whom they have known and loved so long.⁸⁹

These comments are highly subjective and only represent the viewpoint of the emigrationists, not the children. Therefore, it is difficult to assess the extent of true ties between staff and children. It is also possible to question whether the connections between the matron and her charges really did exist at all in the majority of cases, or whether the above comments published by the CEH and MRH were simply publicity, by which emigrationists could claim a compassionate element to their work.

In order for their work to gain acceptance in England, emigrationists arguably put far more effort into creating an image of how the children would be treated under their care and how their life in Canada would develop, rather than ensuring that this was matched in reality. To achieve this, emigration agents placed great emphasis on the idea that their children had as comfortable a journey to the colonies as possible. Liaison with a ship's captain or familiarity with the crew meant that sections of the vessel would often be set apart for the exclusive use of the children so that they had privacy from other passengers when eating, sleeping and washing.⁹⁰ Whilst this undoubtedly should have made a difference to the quality of their journey, it does not detract from the fact that both the CEH and MRH emigrants always had to travel in overcrowded steerage because it was the cheapest option. By focusing on the 'positive' aspects of the journey in their annual reports and magazines, emigrationists generated an image that their children were embarking on an exciting adventure, whilst largely minimising discussions of the hardships that accompanied the voyage

⁸⁸ 'Birmingham Children's Emigration Home', *Morning News*, 27 April 1875; 'Birmingham Children's Emigration Home', *Birmingham Daily Post*, 28 April 1875; 'Presentation at the Middlemore Home', *Birmingham Daily Post*, 1 October 1890; BCL, CEH, MS 517/463, Annual Report 1877, p. 4; BCL, CEH, MS 517/464, Annual Report 1881, p. 5; BCL, CEH, MS 517/20, Annual Report 1897, p. 5.

⁸⁹ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* July 1886, p. 11; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* June 1892, p. 151.

⁹⁰ BCL, CEH, MS 517/463, Annual Report 1877, p. 6; BCL, CEH, MS 517/465, Annual Report 1890, pp. 8-9; BCL, CEH, MS 517/19, Annual Report 1892, p. 6; BCL, CEH, MS 517/19, Annual Report 1893, p. 14; BCL, CEH, MS 517/19, Annual Report 1898, p. 9; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* August 1883, p. 121; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* April 1889, p. 70; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* May and June 1905, p. 10.

We watch the exquisite flight of the seagulls who still pursue us and observe the beautiful circles they describe...vast following waves rise and impend over the stern of the ship but instead of submerging us, carry us bravely on their tops...In the morning we wake in a full view of the Islands of Miquelin and St Pierre and our children watch with rapture a school of porpoises which are playing between us and them.⁹¹

Evidently, image-making formed a major part of emigrationists' strategies to persuade people to accept child emigration. Through their promotional publications, such as annual reports, emigrationists had the ability to manipulate the reality of their work and portray a version of the truth that presented their schemes in the most positive light.

This was particularly so with regard to the descriptions that John T. Middlemore and Leonard K. Shaw used to describe the opportunities available to children once in Canada. Described as the 'land of milk and honey' where opportunities abounded and where there was room for the development of young ambition and talent, emigrationists painted Canada as the perfect new home for young slum children.⁹² Their descriptions of the new country largely focused on the healthy, outdoor lifestyle with its abundance of food, regular employment, good wages, settled homes and strong Christian values. These contrasted sharply with the urban slums from which the children had been 'rescued' and highlighted the sense of perceived opportunity in Canada.⁹³ As commented by the editor of the MRH's monthly magazine in 1886

They nearly all breathe the same spirit of bright contentment and satisfaction in their new homes...The healthy outdoor life of the farm must have a wonderful charm for our poor little city-bred children. Accordingly, we find nearly every letter full of descriptions of the animals they have attended to.⁹⁴

Drawing upon the differences between life in England and Canada highlighted one of the most unique aspects of child emigration. No other type of child rescue could claim to provide such opportunities for children. Thus by reporting on success stories, such as former children who had gone on to become independent farmers in Canada, child

⁹¹ BCL, CEH, MS 517/464, Annual Report 1884, pp. 9-10.

⁹² MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* July 1893, p. 165.

⁹³ 'Juvenile Emigration to Canada', *Liverpool Mercury*, 17 September 1885; 'Mr Middlemore's Emigration Home', *Birmingham Daily Gazette*, 26 April 1876; BCL, CEH, MS 517/22, Annual Report 1909, p. 4; Lawrence and Starkey (eds.) *Child Welfare and Social Action*, p. 8; Horn, 'The Emigration of Catholic Pauper Children to Canada', p. 13.

⁹⁴ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* January 1886, p. 5.

emigrationists tried to demonstrate the perceived opportunities available through their alternative approach to child rescue. As they simultaneously minimised information about cases where children had failed to settle in their new homes, it is clear that the CEH and MRH were able to portray their emigration schemes in the most positive way to answer critics and challenges to their work.⁹⁵

⁹⁵ 'Children's Emigration Homes', *Birmingham Gazette and Express*, 4 May 1906; BCL, CEH, MS 517/93, Scrapbook, p. 17; BCL, CEH, MS 517/93, Scrapbook, p. 103; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* February 1883, p. 31; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* January 1886, p. 5; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* February 1892, p. 66; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* March 1905, p. 8; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* April 1908, p. 8.

Conclusion

Having analysed the administration and organisation of two regional emigration societies, how were their respective schemes shaped as an alternative approach to child rescue? There is strong evidence to suggest that both these regional organisations drew upon contemporary issues, debates and concerns to make their schemes seem relevant and reflective of the changing social and political landscape. In the 1870s and 1880s, the CEH and MRH focuses on perceived social problems, such as overcrowding and urban degradation, and established their schemes as a response to the ‘chaos’ of childhood in slum districts.¹ To justify their work and explain their activities to contemporaries, both societies focused on the economic savings that could benefit ratepayers, as the alleged paupers and criminals of the future would cease to be a drain on English resources once in Canada.² However, after the turn of the twentieth century the CEH and MRH re-focused their justifications to reflect the need for empire strengthening, in what historians have dubbed an *era* of ‘new imperialism’.³ At a time when newly emerging political powers, such as Germany, questioned Britain’s international position, the CEH and MRH increasingly used ideas of empire as a way to justify their work. Their children were to be ‘agents’ of British civilisation and ‘customers’ for British products, which characterised the young emigrants as ‘children of the nation’, rather than a threat to society in urban English cities.⁴

Evidently, the CEH and MRH used changing concepts of the child, including victim, threat, and agent of British civilisation, to explain their work and make emigration an applicable

¹ MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* June 1884, p. 95; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* 1889 April p.72; BCL, CEH, MS 517/463, Annual Report 1873, p. 2; BCL, CEH, MS 517/21, Annual Report 1905, p. 3; ‘British Waifs in Canada’, *Liverpool Mercury*, 17 May 1887; ‘New Sheltering Home for destitute children’, *Liverpool Mercury*, 18 October 1888; ‘Middlemore Emigration Homes’, *Birmingham Daily Post*, 5 June 1894.

² ‘Birmingham Children’s Emigration Homes: Farewell Meeting of the Emigrants’, *Birmingham Morning News*, 27 April 1875; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children’s Haven* April 1896, p. 83; ‘Emigration’, *Saturday Review of Politics, Literature and Art*, 61, 1585 (13 March 1886), p. 367.

³ Grant, *Representations of British Emigration, Colonisation and Settlement*, p. xv; Porter, *Absent-Minded Imperialists*, p. xii, 8; Koebner, *Empire*; Koebner and Schmidt, *Imperialism*; Samson (ed.), *The British Empire*; Pakenham, *The Scramble for Africa*; Tarling, *Imperialism in Southeast Asia*.

⁴ BCL, CEH, MS 517/463, Annual Report 1877, p. 3; BCL, CEH, MS 517/464, Annual Report 1880, pp. 5-6; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker*, December 1886, p. 183; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children’s Haven*, March 1905, p. 6; Gorst, *Children of the Nation*; Rose, *Governing the Soul*; Wooldridge, *Measuring the Mind*; Cooter (ed.), *In the Name of the Child*.

form of child rescue. This challenges Joy Parr's belief that child emigration was 'out of step with its time' and that leading figures involved in such activities were 'out of character'.⁵ On the contrary, these were individuals in the middle class reacting to perceived threats against their ideas and assumptions, which in turn resulted in the imposition of their values, judgements and prejudices upon those at the bottom of the social scale.

However, the CEH and MRH did not convert their ideas and values into action on their own. Through their liaison, co-operation and communication with other agencies interested in their activities, these two societies accessed and exploited a number of networks that enabled them to extend their work beyond their original aim of transplanting only homeless, orphaned or illegitimate 'gutter children'.⁶ By locating themselves within a wider child rescue movement, the CEH and MRH both forged links with the NSPCC, which enabled the two regional emigration societies to receive children who had been removed from cruel or neglectful parents into their emigration homes. Between 1895 and 1915, the NSPCC recommended over six hundred and eighty children to the CEH, most of whom then joined emigration parties departing from the Birmingham home to Canada.⁷ Not only does this suggest that a different type of child rescue society accepted the process of transplanting children overseas at the turn of the twentieth century, it also shows how the CEH and MRH could demonstrate an interest in other contemporary child welfare causes. This helped to combat the idea that they were simply 'dumping' poor children in Canada and gave the impression that those involved in child emigration were improving children's lives, even if later memoirs and oral histories dispute the reality of this image.⁸

⁵ Parr, *Labouring Children*, p. 11.

⁶ BCL, CEH, MS 517/463, Annual Report 1873, p.3; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* January 1883, pp. 4-5

⁷ BCL, CEH, MS 517/20, Annual Report 1897, p. 4; BCL, CEH, MS 517/20, Annual Report 1898, p. 4; BCL, CEH, MS 517/20, Annual Report 1899, p. 4; BCL, CEH, MS 517/20, Annual Report 1900, p. 6; BCL, CEH, MS 517/20, Annual Report 1901, p. 8; BCL, CEH, MS 517/20, Annual Report 1902, p. 7; BCL, CEH, MS 517/21, Annual Report 1903, p. 8; BCL, CEH, MS 517/21, Annual Report 1904, p. 8; BCL, CEH, MS 517/21, Annual Report 1905, p. 7; BCL, CEH, MS 517/21, Annual Report 1906, p. 9; BCL, CEH, MS 517/21, Annual Report 1907, p. 10; BCL, CEH, MS 517/21, Annual Report 1908, p. 11; BCL, CEH, MS 517/22, Annual Report 1909, p. 12; BCL, CEH, MS 517/22, Annual Report 1910, p. 11; BCL, CEH, MS 517/22, Annual Report 1911, p. 9; BCL, CEH, MS 517/22, Annual Report 1912, p. 11; BCL, CEH, MS 517/22, Annual Report 1913, p. 11; BCL, CEH, MS 517/22, Annual Report 1914, p. 12; BCL, CEH, MS 517/23, Annual Report 1915, p. 11.

⁸ Harrison (ed.), *Home Children*; Humphreys, *Empty Cradles*; Bean and Melville, *Lost Children of the Empire*.

As 'child rescue' was the concept of removing children from their existing surroundings in order to save them from the perpetuating cycle of poverty, crime and destitution, this meant that individuals and organisations conducting such work had to enter slum districts to find children to 'rescue'. By doing so, John T. Middlemore, Leonard K. Shaw, Louisa Birt and Thomas Barnardo became 'missionaries' as they sought out potential emigrants from the lodging houses, street haunts and homes in the urban slums.⁹ Emigrationists' work within the poorest districts of English cities suggests that different sections of society were not 'virtual foreigners to each other', as B. Porter claimed, and that by entering such districts, emigrationists did not conform to what some modern historians have identified as rigid zoning of cities split strictly along class lines.¹⁰ Their concerns about social problems in the slums clearly show that there was a difference between living standards in various parts of Birmingham and Manchester, but by choosing to work within the poorest areas, emigrationists and others involved in child rescue, such as the NSPCC, could transform their middle-class values and ideas into action.

However, the CEH and MRH were not the only organisations involved in removing children from their homes in English cities and transplanting them overseas. Some historians use the term 'child emigration movement' to refer to the collective efforts of individuals and organisations operating child emigration schemes.¹¹ This idea of a movement is supported by the networks that existed between the MRH, Louisa Birt, Annie Macpherson and Thomas Barnardo. Not only did the MRH use Macpherson's distributing home in Canada, they also sent their children overseas under the care of Birt and Barnardo during the early years of their emigration work.¹² The fact that over fifty emigration societies were linked by their common use of transplantation as a means of child rescue

⁹ BCL, CEH, MS 517/463, Annual Report 1873, p. 2; BCL, CEH, MS 517/463, Annual Report 1874, p. 6; BCL, CEH, MS 517/464, Annual Report 1879; BCL, CEH, MS 517/93, Scrapbook, p. 75; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* February 1883, p. 15; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* September 1886, p. 47; 'The Boys' and Girls' Refuges and Homes', *Manchester Times*, 25 January 1879; 'Local and District', *Manchester Times*, 6 May 1882; Rose, *For the Sake of the Children*, pp. 28-45.

¹⁰ Porter, *Absent-Minded Imperialists*, p. 20; Johnson, 'Class Law in Victorian England'; Harris, *Private Lives, Public Spirit*; Morris, 'Structure, Culture and Society in British towns', pp. 395-426; Lawton and Pooley, *The Social Geography of Merseyside*.

¹¹ Parker, *Uprooted*, p. xiii; Wagner, *Children of the Empire*, p. xii; Parr, *Labouring Children*, p. 11; Harrison (ed.), *The Home Children*, p. 16; Rooke and Schnell, 'Imperial Philanthropy and Colonial Response', pp. 56-77.

¹² MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* February 1883, p. 31; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* November 1883, p. 165; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/1, *Christian Worker* July 1886, pp. 100-101; MCL, MRH, M 189/8/2, *Children's Haven* October 1905, p. 3.

also shows that the work of the CEH and MRH can be placed within a much wider movement. Despite this, it would be misleading to suggest that the child emigration movement was homogenous; rather it was characterised by variety and diversity, as there was not one, single, overarching society with branches in different parts of the country. Instead, child emigration societies operated independently, which resulted in differences in their admission policies, selection criteria and methodology. Consequently, the regional work of the CEH and MRH benefited from the ideas, approaches, facilities and services of other emigrationists because, though they all worked towards transplanting children overseas, each society shared its own experiences at meetings, conferences, through the press and in personal correspondence.¹³

The discussion and promotion of child emigration extended far beyond those who founded and operated emigration societies. Politicians, professionals and clergymen all commented on the use of child emigration as an alternative approach to child rescue.¹⁴ This was particularly so when societies such as the CEH and MRH worked with children in state care. Not only does this show that the concept of child emigration reached wider political, religious and academic circles, it also demonstrates that advocates of child emigration named and promoted individual societies, as well as the concept that underpinned their work. Thus, Samuel Smith MP drew upon evidence from the Liverpool Sheltering Home, MRH and other regional societies in his discussions of child emigration when declaring that schemes in Liverpool, Glasgow, London and Birmingham were ‘preparing the way for a far wider system of dealing with these [pauper] children’.¹⁵ The very fact that such a range of people promoted child emigration provides evidence that the process of transplanting children overseas became an increasingly acceptable method of child rescue amongst some sections of society. This is not to deny that there were critics of child emigration schemes, but the interest and discussion that expatriating children overseas created shows that societies like the CEH and MRH were not restricted to their respective localities, but rather their work gained attention in much wider circles.

¹³ Parker, *Uprooted*, pp. 33-35.

¹⁴ Smith, ‘Social Reform’, pp. 896-912; ‘Mr S. Smith MP on Child Emigration’, *Liverpool Mercury*, 15 July 1885; Paton, *State-aided emigration*; Paton, ‘Work and Workers VIII’, ‘Reformatory Conference’, *York Herald*, 28 April 1888; Dunlop, ‘Child Emigration’, p. 1023; ‘Child Emigration’, *The British Medical Journal*, 1, 2581(18 June 1910), p. 1504; Bevan, *The upbringing of necessitous and pauper children*.

¹⁵ ‘Liverpool Sheltering Home’, *Liverpool Mercury*, 2 February 1883.

The increased inclusion of poor law children in CEH and MRH emigration parties supports some historians' opinion that there was an overlap between the services provided by the state and voluntary societies during the late Victorian and Edwardian *era*.¹⁶ Though the British government did not set up its own child emigration scheme between 1870 and 1914, it did use the services and facilities of voluntary agencies to emigrate children from government institutions, such as workhouses, to Canada. Individual emigration societies forged relations with local boards of guardians and received payment to cover the costs of emigrating pauper children.¹⁷ However, whilst there was clearly an overlap, the relations between societies and government agencies did not remain constant during the first forty years of sustained child emigration. Andrew Doyle's report on Maria Rye and Annie Macpherson's work in the late 1860s and early 1870s temporarily ended the emigration of pauper children between 1875 and 1883.¹⁸ Likewise, even when transplanting children restarted again after the lifting of the ban, the British government was still reluctant to take on any more responsibility for child emigration than was necessary. At a meeting between advocates of child emigration and the Home Secretary in 1887, the Home Secretary stated that if the government began transplanting children overseas, 'it would degenerate into mere red tape-ism' and therefore 'it must be done by voluntary effort'.¹⁹

As child emigration was to remain within the voluntary sector, securing support from a variety of people in a range of places was vital to the success of child emigration. Crucially, the CEH and MRH relied on monetary and material gifts to carry out their work but, in order to secure these contributions, emigrationists had to ensure that their activities gained approval and support within local, national and international arenas. Doing so required them to promote a positive image of their schemes to as broad an audience as possible. They achieved this by writing annual reports, magazines, journals and newspaper articles – all of which enabled them to show a carefully constructed, often self-penned insight, into their emigration schemes. The CEH and MRH also took their work beyond their respective emigration homes and sought to integrate themselves within the local

¹⁶ Macadam, *The New Philanthropy*; Kamerman, 'The New Mixed Economy of Welfare', pp. 5-10; Brenton, *The Voluntary Sector in British Social Services*; Finlayson, 'A Moving Frontier', p. 185; Finlayson, *Citizen, State and Social Welfare*, p. 6.

¹⁷ BCL, CEH, MS 517/21, Annual Report 1906, p. 55.

¹⁸ Report to the President of the Local Government Board by Andrew Doyle...as to the emigration of pauper children to Canada, *HCPP*, lxiii, 9 (1875).

¹⁹ Quoted in 'Local Echoes', *Derby Mercury*, 25 April 1900.

community through charity bazaars, annual meeting and talks or lectures. The success of fundraising efforts and promotional events relied on appealing to the right audience in the most appropriate manner as societies sought to tailor events to suit the means and expectations of their various supporters. The different methods of generating support not only show regional emigrationists' desire to engage with those beyond the immediate remit of their work, but the fact that they clearly gained monetary, material and voluntary support shows an element of acceptance amongst a wide cross-section of society for their alternative approach to child rescue.

Not only do the fundraising efforts of the CEH and MRH show how they were able to garner support for their own work, it also demonstrates the more general role of charity in late Victorian and Edwardian society. A. J. Kidd has claimed that the 'social fabric of Victorian England [was] permeated by charity', which suggests that the idea of giving money to charitable organisations was part of everyday life for those in a financial and social position to do so.²⁰ Voluntarism put responsibility for welfare on the individual, either by acting for themselves or for others; when an individual or group then offered welfare services to others, this has been termed 'other-regarding' voluntarism.²¹ Therefore, by either conducting child emigration themselves or by supporting schemes for the transplantation of children, people became 'active citizens' and contributed to a charitable cause that was portrayed as child rescue.²² The CEH and MRH relied upon people seeing child emigration as an act of charity in order to compete with other urban child rescue organisations and voluntary institutions that all sought backing from the public.²³ Philanthropy operated in a competitive marketplace and the CEH and MRH needed to make both their emigration work and their fundraising events unique or memorable in order to generate support for their activities.

Fundraising evidence from the CEH and MRH can also be used to challenge interpretations of charitable giving and the motives that underpinned it. Some historians have seen philanthropy and charity as synonymous with benevolence and unselfish generosity.²⁴

²⁰ Kidd, 'Philanthropy and the social history paradigm', p. 180.

²¹ Finlayson, 'A Moving Frontier', p. 183.

²² Ibid.

²³ Shapely, 'Charity, status and leadership', pp. 157-177

²⁴ Harrison, *Peaceable Kingdom*; McCord, 'Aspects of the relief of the poverty in early nineteenth century Britain'; F. K. Prochaska, 'Philanthropy'.

However, the public act of supporting a charity meant that patrons received a number of benefits, including the opportunity to display their wealth, gain influence within a particular organisation and receive recognition within the public domain for their charitable work.²⁵ Therefore, it was a complex symbiotic relationship that enabled both the benefactor and the charity to negotiate a favourable outcome, rather than a relationship based solely on the altruism of the donor or volunteer.²⁶ That the CEH and MRH provided a variety of methods by which people could support their organisation, including donating money, attending social events and volunteering within the homes, suggests that they were able to capitalise on the role of charity and the value that some contemporaries placed upon it.

Though child emigrationists in Birmingham and Manchester clearly generated support for their work, this did not mean that contemporaries did not challenge or criticise the way in which they transplanted children to Canada. By analysing the CEH and MRH's responses to challenges about children's safety, their education and the potential for them to become institutionalised, it is clear that their work extended far beyond the simple gathering of children and the subsequent distribution of them overseas. Their responses to challenges and criticisms regarding the welfare of children in their care show that these regional societies were forced to make numerous concessions and amendments to their schemes in order to gain the approval of a range of people, including parents and government authorities. This shows how emigrationists like John T. Middlemore and Leonard K. Shaw engaged with individuals and organisations beyond the immediate remit of their schemes, as well as the fact people external to an organisation had a strong influence on the way in which the CEH and MRH were able to operate. Thus, even committed emigrationists including John T. Middlemore of the CEH in Birmingham had to provide additional care and training services for those children who were unsuitable for emigration – something that went against the initial aims and objectives of this society.²⁷ Underpinning these changes, there is a clear sense that emigrationists' presented a deliberate picture of their work that seemed to address concerns and criticisms about child welfare, but in reality it is

²⁵ 'The Liverpool Sheltering Home', *Liverpool Mercury*, 2 December 1887; 'The Boys' and Girls' Refuges in Manchester', *Manchester Times*, 5 April 1895; 'Mr Middlemore's Emigration Homes', *Birmingham Daily Post*, 5 January 1876; BCL, CEH, MS 517/23, Annual Report 1915, Preface.

²⁶ Mauss, *The Gift*; Homans, *Social Behaviour*; Levi-Strauss, 'The principle of reciprocity'; Schwartz, 'The social psychology of the gift', pp. 1-11; Blau, *Exchange and Power in Social Life*; Kidd, 'Philanthropy and the social history paradigm', pp. 180-192.

²⁷ BCL, CEH, MS 517/19, Annual Report 1896, p. 3.

questionable whether the extent of protection, training and the living arrangements that children experienced really put the needs of the child first. Secondary collections of memories and oral histories testify to the suffering that some children endured, as well as the damaging legacy of child emigration upon former child migrants' perceptions of their identity.²⁸ Whilst the changes and adaptations that emigrationists at the CEH and MRH made to their schemes show that they were aware of challenges and criticisms to their work, they were also able to manipulate the presentation of their activities to persuade people that their societies offered an alternative form of child rescue.

Evidence from the CEH and MRH provides a regional perspective on the history of child emigration and can be used to demonstrate how the transplantation of children from Birmingham and Manchester was marketed as an alternative approach to child rescue. Neither of these provincial organisations operated in a vacuum, but rather relied upon communication and engagement with a range of people and organisations, both within the local community and wider government agencies. This concept of integration and co-operation could be extended to examine how a range of child emigration societies operated in England, Scotland and Ireland in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Examples of suitable case studies include Quarrier's Homes (Glasgow), Mrs Smyly's Homes (Dublin) and the work of Father Nugent in Liverpool. Nugent's emigration activities would be of particular interest because he only worked with Catholic children, which may provide a different insight into the way that his organisation integrated with the local community, together with other child emigration societies and local authorities. Many of Nugent's children had already made the journey from Ireland to Liverpool with their families, before being transplanted again to Canada on their own.²⁹ Therefore, further investigation into his work may enhance understanding of the links between Ireland, England and the wider empire, as well as provide a deeper insight into the role of child emigration in empire strengthening. Child emigration is a rich area of British history that has been under-studied; further research into the process and concept of transplanting

²⁸ Harrison (ed.), *Home Children*; Bagnell, *The Little Immigrants*; Bean and Melville, *Lost Children of the Empire*; Humphreys, *Empty Cradles*; Corbett, *Nation Builders*; Constantine, 'Children As Ancestors', pp. 150-159.

²⁹ There are already some historical interpretations and discussion of Nugent's work including C. Bennett, *Father Nugent of Liverpool* (Liverpool, 1949); P. Runaghan, *Father Nugent's Liverpool, 1849-1905* (Birkenhead, 2003); J. Furnival, *Children of the Second Spring: Father Nugent and the work of childcare in Liverpool* (Leominster, 2005).

children overseas can greatly enhance existing knowledge of British social history, migration history and the history of the empire.

Appendix 1

MRH admission agreement, 1885

I [insert name] hereby declare that [insert name] my son enters the Manchester and Salford Boys' and Girls' Refuges and Homes and Children's Aid Society (herein after styled the said institution) with my full approval and consent; and in consideration of your receiving him into the said institution I agree with the committee for the time being of the said institution that I will not remove him without your consent, or in any way interfere with him so long as he remains therein.

And I also undertake and agree that in case of my removing him contrary to the wishes of the committee for the time being of the said institution, or if he shall leave without your permission, I will, on demand, pay to the committee of the said institution such a sum (in respect of his board) as will be equal to the aggregate amount of 5s per week to be calculated from the time of admission into or to the time of his removal or leaving the said institution, and such further sum as shall have been expended on his clothing or other necessaries as shall be shown by the books kept by the master or other superintendent of the said institution. I promise also and agree to remove the said [insert name] at any time if called upon to do so and I agree to your finding him a home either in England or abroad as you think proper.

Dated this third day of November 1885.

Witness

.....

Signed

.....

(Quoted in 'Singular Charge of Child Stealing', *Manchester Times*, 18 December 1886)

CEH admission form, 1915

I, [insert name], do sanction and approve of my son [insert name], leaving England for Canada, and I consent to him emigrating in the care of John T. Middlemore, his agent or agents and I further constitute John T. Middlemore his Guardian, and I request John T. Middlemore to act as such, in proof thereof I hereby affix my signature. I further agree to pay the sum of 2s per week for two years towards expenses.

Witness

Signed

.....

.....

Appendix 2

Settlement and Application Form for CEH emigrants; employment of child with adjoining Recommendation by Minister, undated.

I herewith apply for a boy of [insert age] years and if successful in my application, I agree to provide him proper food and clothing, so that he shall be as well clothed as at present, also with such Common School Education as is supplied in the District where I reside; and I undertake that he shall attend Sunday School and Divine Worship, and to pay him sufficient wages for the services he may render me, and to retain him in my employ up to the age of eighteen years, and to furnish a report every six months of 1) his health 2) general conduct and 3) education. I acknowledge Mr John T. Middlemore to be the Guardian of the said boy, and I agree to permit him or his agents, at all times to have access to the said boy, and acknowledge the right of Mr John T. Middlemore or his agent to remove him from my custody if he shall consider it in the interest of the said boy, of which he or his agent shall be the sole judge.

Signature Address
Railway Station Date

Recommendation by Minister

I can conscientiously and cordially recommend Mr [insert name] as in every way a suitable person to be entrusted with the care of a boy, and thoroughly competent to train him to become a useful member of society. I will maintain a supervision over any boy Mr John T. Middlemore or his agents may entrust to [insert name] and I will forward a report of his progress and general condition once a year if required.

Signature Rector or Pastor ofChurch
Address
Nearest Railway Station
Date.....

(BCL, CEH, MS 517/93, Scrapbook, no pagination)

Settlement and Application Form for CEH emigrants; adoption of children

I, [insert name], of [insert place], do hereby promise and agree to adopt [insert name], and to treat him in all respects as my own son. I agree that he shall attend school and a place of worship regularly, and that he shall write or that I will write for him, not less than four times a year to his friends in England. I promise to inform the Manager of the Guthrie Home in the event of his suffering from serious illness. Should it be necessary for me to part with him I promise to return him to the Guthrie Home, with his clothes in good condition. I promise and agree to give him \$150 at the end of [insert date] should he remain with me until that time. I acknowledge the right of John Throgmorton Middlemore to remove him from my care if he consider that the above conditions have not been fulfilled.

Signed.....

Witness.....

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Archive collections

Birmingham Central Library, Archives and Heritage: Children's Emigration Society Records

MS 517/19	Annual Reports, 1891-1896
MS 517/20	Annual Reports, 1897-1902
MS 517/21	Annual Reports, 1903-1908
MS 517/22	Annual Reports, 1909-1914
MS 517/23	Annual Reports, 1915-1920
MS 517/93	Newspaper cuttings, correspondence and other papers (referred to throughout as Scrapbook)
MS 517/174-203	Admission Papers, 1871-1915
MS 517/245-247	Application Books, 1877-1914
MS 517/249-299	Histories, settlement and reports of children sent to Canada
MS 517/463	Annual Reports, 1873-1878
MS 517/464	Annual Reports, 1879-1884
MS 517/465	Annual Reports, 1885-1890

Manchester Central Library, Archives and Local Studies: Manchester and Salford Boys' and Girls' Refuges' and Homes' Records

M 189/3/5/1	Legacies, 1891-1914
M 189/5/1/1-20	Admission and History Books, 1881-1914
M 189/5/1/3/1-11	Application Books, 1874-1913
M 189/7/2	Emigration Books, Girls, 1897-1914
M 189/7/3	Emigration Books 1-14, 1883-1913

- M 189/7/7 Papers relating to Marchmont Home and Barnardo's, 1894-1925
- M 189/7/7/1 Letters from Barnardo, 1894
- M 189/7/7/2 Boarding Out of Children, correspondence between the MRH and Dr Barnardo regarding emigration, 1902
- M 189/8/1 *Christian Worker* monthly magazine, January 1883-October 1895
- M 189/8/2 *Children's Haven* monthly magazine, November 1895-December 1914
- M 189/8/4/3 Pamphlets, including L. K. Shaw, *Twelve Years Ago: the story of a refuge* (Manchester, 1881); L. K. Shaw, *Night and Morning* (Manchester, 1883); L. K. Shaw, *The Cry of the Children* (Manchester, 1882); G. R. Kirlew, *At the Prison Gates or: Sandy Lost and Found* (Manchester, 1883); 'The Glory of Manchester: a sermon by Lord Bishop of Peterborough to commemorate the Jubilee of the MRH', 14 March 1920, printed in pamphlet form.

Books and pamphlets

- Bevan Rev. J. O., *Upbringing of necessitous and pauper children* (Hereford, 1892)
- Chance W., *Children under the Poor Law: their education, training and aftercare* (London, 1897)
- Dacey A. V., *Lectures on the relation between Law and Public Opinion in England during the nineteenth century* (London, 1905)
- Disraeli B., *Sybil: or The Two Nations* (London, 1845)
- Gorst J. E., *Children of the Nation* (London, 1906)
- Liedfe J. D., *The Charities of Europe* (London, 1872)
- Malthus T., *An Essay on the Principle of Population* (London, reprint 1973)
- Mearns A., *The Bitter Cry of Outcast London: an inquiry into the condition of the abject poor* (London, 1883)
- Paton W. B., *State-aided emigration* (London, 1885)

Newspapers

Birmingham Daily Argus

Birmingham Daily Gazette

Birmingham Daily Mail

Birmingham Daily Post

Bristol Mercury

Bristol Daily Post

Eastern Counties Advertiser

Essex Standard

Examiner

Glasgow Herald

Huddersfield Daily Chronicle

Liverpool Mercury

Manchester Times

Morning News

Morning Post

North Eastern Daily Gazette

Northern Echo

Penny Illustrated Paper

Sheffield and Rotherham Independent

The Standard

The Times

Weekly News

West Suffolk Gazette

Yorkshire Herald

Journals and magazines

British Medical Journal

Chambers' Journal of Popular Literature, Science and Art

Contemporary Review

Good Words

London Quarterly Review

Monthly Review

Nineteenth Century: A monthly review

Pall Mall Magazine

Quiver

Ragged School Union Quarterly Record

Review of Reviews

Saturday Review of Politics, Literature, Science and Art

Sunday at Home

The Christian

Time

Reports and Legislation

Report to the President of the Local Government Board by Andrew Doyle...as to the emigration of pauper children, HCPP, lxiii, HC 9 (1875)

McDougall A., Further Inquiries into the causes of pauperism in the township of Manchester (Manchester, 1885)

Education Act (1880), Public General Act, 43 & 44 Victoria, c. 23.
Parliamentary Archives, London HL/PO/PU/1/1880/43&44V1n201

Prevention of Cruelty to Children Act (1889), Public General Act, 52 & 53 Victoria, c. 44.
Parliamentary Archives, London HL/PO/PU/1/1889/52&53V1n221

Children and Young Person Act (1908), Public Act, 8 Edward VII, c. 67
Parliamentary Archives, London HL/PO/PU/1/1908/8E7c67

Secondary Sources

Books

- Anon., *One Hundred Years of Child Care: the story of the Middlemore Homes, 1872-1972* (Birmingham, 1972)
- Bagnell K., *The Little Immigrants: the orphans who came to Canada* (Toronto, 1980)
- Batt J. H., *Dr Barnardo: the foster-father of nobody's children, a record and an interpretation* (London, 1904)
- Bean P. and Melville J., *Lost Children of the Empire: the untold story of Britain's child migrants* (London, 1989)
- Bennett C., *Father Nugent of Liverpool* (Liverpool, 1949)
- Berry L. C., *The Child, the State and the Victorian Novel* (London, 1999)
- Blau P. M., *Exchange and Power in Social Life* (New York, 1967)
- Bolt C., *Victorian Attitudes to Race* (London, 1971)
- Bolton J. R. G and Bolton J. (eds.), *Aurora Leigh and Other Poems: Elizabeth Barrett Browning* (London, 1995)
- Bremner R. H., *Giving: charity and philanthropy in history* (London, 1996)
- Brenton M., *The Voluntary Sector in British Social Services* (London, 1985)
- Cain P. J. and Hopkins A. G., *British Imperialism: innovation and expansion, 1688-1914* (London, 1993)
- Carlebach J., *Caring for Children in Trouble* (London, 1970)
- Carrothers W. A., *Emigration from the British Isles* (London, 1965)
- Chesney K., *The Victorian Underworld* (London, 1970)
- Christopher A. J., *The British Empire at its Zenith* (London, 1988)
- Cooter R. (ed.), *In the Name of the Child: health and welfare, 1880-1940* (London, 1992)
- Corbett G. H., *Nation Builders: Barnardo Children in Canada* (Toronto, 2002)
- Cowan H. I., *British Emigration to British North America: the first hundred years* (Toronto, 1961)

- Cromwell V., *Revolution or Evolution: British Government in the nineteenth century* (London, 1977)
- Crowther M. A., *The Workhouse System, 1834-1929: the history of an English social institution* (London, 1981)
- Cunningham H., *Children of the Poor: representations of childhood since the seventeenth century* (Oxford, 1991)
- Davin A., *Growing up Poor: home, school and street, 1870-1914* (London, 1996)
- Davis L. E. and Huttenback R. A., *Mammon and the Pursuit of Empire: the political economy of British Imperialism, 1860-1912* (Cambridge, 1986)
- Deane P. and Cole W. A., *British Economic Growth, 1688-1959: trends and structure* (London, 1969)
- Diamond M., *Emigration and Empire: the life of Maria S. Rye* (London, 1999)
- Digby A. and Searby P., *Children, School and Society in nineteenth century England* (London, 1981)
- Dingle A. E., *The Campaign for Prohibition in Victorian England: the United Kingdom Alliance, 1872-1895* (London, 1980)
- Dyhouse C., *Girls Growing Up in late Victorian and Edwardian England* (London, 1981)
- Edmondson W., *Making Rough Places Plain: fifty years' work of the Manchester and Salford Boys' and Girls' Refuges and Homes, 1870-1920* (Manchester, 1921)
- Eldridge C. C., *Victorian Imperialism* (London, 1978)
- Eldridge C. C. (ed.), *British Imperialism in the Nineteenth Century* (London, 1984)
- Emsley C., *Crime and Society in England, 1750-1900* (London, 1987)
- Englander D., *Poverty and Poor Law Reform in Britain: from Chadwick to Booth, 1834-1914* (London, 1988)
- Erickson C., *Invisible Immigrants: the adaptation of English and Scottish immigrants in nineteenth century America* (London, 1972)
- Fairbridge R., *Pinjarra: the building of a farm school* (London, 1937)
- Finlayson G., *Citizen, State and Social Welfare in Britain, 1830-1990* (Oxford, 1994)
- Ford D., *Dr Barnardo* (London, 1958)
- Fraser D. (ed.), *The New Poor Law in the Nineteenth-Century* (London, 1976)

- French D., *Faith, Sweat and Politics: the early trade union years in Canada* (Toronto, 1962)
- Furnival J., *Children of the Second Spring: Father Nugent and the work of childcare in Liverpool* (Leominster, 2005)
- Gilbert B. B., *The Evolution of National Insurance in Great Britain: the origins of the welfare state* (London, 1966)
- Gill A., *Orphans of the Empire: the shocking story of child migration to Australia* (Alexandria, Australia, 1997)
- Gillis J. R., *Youth and History: tradition and change in European age relations 1770-present* (London, 1981)
- Gomersall M., *Working-Class Girls in nineteenth century England: life, work and schooling* (Basingstoke, 1997)
- Gooch J. (ed.), *The Boer War: direction, experience and image* (London, 2000)
- Gorsky M., *Patterns of Philanthropy: charity and society in nineteenth century Bristol* (Woodbridge, Suffolk, 1999)
- Gothard J., *Blue China: single female migration to colonial Australia* (Carlton South, Australia, 2001)
- Grant R. D., *Representations of British Emigration, Colonisation and Settlement: imagining empire, 1800-1860* (Basingstoke, 2005)
- Gunn S., *The Public Culture of the Victorian Middle Class: ritual and authority and the English industrial city, 1840-1914* (Manchester, 2000)
- Haines R. F., *Emigration and the Labouring Poor: Australian recruitment in Britain and Ireland, 1831-1860* (Basingstoke, 1997)
- Harper M., *Emigration from north-east Scotland*, vol. 1 (Aberdeen, 1988)
- Harper M. and Constantine S., *Migration and Empire* (Oxford, forthcoming 2010)
- Harris D. F., *The Work of Canadian Emigration Agents in Shropshire, 1896-1914* (Birmingham, 1991)
- Harris J., *Private Lives, Public Spirit: a social history of Britain, 1870-1914* (Oxford, 1993)
- Harrison B. H., *Drink and the Victorians: the temperance question in England, 1815-1872* (London, 1971)

- Harrison B. H., *Peaceable Kingdom: stability and change in modern Britain* (Oxford, 1982)
- Harrison J. F. C., *Late Victorian Britain, 1870-1901* (London, 1990)
- Harrison P. (ed.), *The Home Children; their personal stories* (Winnipeg, Canada, 1979)
- Hatton T. J. and Williamson J. G., *The Age of Mass Migration: an economic analysis* (Oxford, 1998)
- Hay J. R., *The Origins of the Liberal Welfare Reforms 1906-1914* (London, 1983)
- Heasman K. J., *Evangelicals in Action: an appraisal of their social work in the Victorian era* (London, 1962)
- Hendrick H., *Child Welfare: England, 1872-1989* (London, 1994)
- Heywood J. S., *Children in Care: the development of the service for the deprived child* (London, 1959)
- Homans G. C., *Social Behaviour: its elementary forms* (London, 1961)
- Hopkins E., *Childhood Transformed: working-class children in nineteenth century England* (Manchester, 1994)
- Horn P., *The Victorian Town Child* (Stroud, 1997)
- Humphreys M., *Empty Cradles: one woman's fight to uncover Britain's most shameful secret* (London, 1994)
- Huzel J. P., *The Popularisation of Malthus in early nineteenth century England: Martineau, Cobbet and the pauper press* (Aldershot, 2006)
- Hyam R., *Britain's Imperial Century, 1815-1914: a study of empire and expansion* (London, 1976)
- Jackson L. A., *Child Sexual Abuse in Victorian England* (London, 2000)
- Johnson R., *British Imperialism* (Basingstoke, 2003)
- Johnston H. M., *British Emigration Policy, 1815-1830: 'shovelling out paupers'* (Oxford, 1972)
- Kidd A. J., *State, Society and the Poor in nineteenth century England* (Basingstoke, 1999)
- Koebner R., *Empire: a study of the changing concepts of empire and imperialism* (Cambridge, 1961)

- Koebner R. and Schmidt H. D., *Imperialism: the story and significance of a political word, 1840-1960* (Cambridge, 1964)
- Kohli M., *The Golden Bridge: young immigrants to Canada, 1833-1939* (Toronto, 2003)
- Lawrence J. and Starkey P. (eds.), *Child Welfare and Social Action: from the nineteenth century to the present* (Liverpool, 2001)
- Lawton R. and Pooley C. G., *The Social Geography of nineteenth century Merseyside* (Liverpool, 1973)
- Laybourn K., *The Guild of Help and the Changing Face of Edwardian Philanthropy: the Guild of Help, voluntary work and the state, 1904-1919* (Lampeter, 1994)
- Lewis J. E., *Women and Social Action in Victorian and Edwardian England* (Aldershot, 1991)
- Lewis J. E., *Women in England, 1870-1950: sexual divisions and social change* (Brighton, 1984)
- Lubenow W.C., *The Politics of Government Growth: early Victorian attitudes towards state intervention, 1833-1848* (Newton Abbot, 1971)
- Macadam E., *The New Philanthropy: a study of the relations between the statutory and voluntary social services* (London, 1943)
- MacDonagh O., *Emigration in the Victorian Age: debates on the issue from nineteenth critical journals* (Farnborough, 1973)
- Madgwick R. B., *Immigration into Eastern Australia, 1788-1851* (Sydney, Australia, 1969)
- Magnusson A., *The Village: a history of Quarrier's* (Glasgow, 1984)
- Mangan J. A. (ed.), *Benefits Bestowed? Education and British Imperialism* (Manchester, 1988)
- Martin J., *Women and the Politics of Schooling in Victorian and Edwardian England* (London, 1999)
- Mauss M., *The Gift: the form and reason for exchange in archaic societies* (Paris, 1925). Translated by W. D. Halls (London, 1990)
- McKibbin R., *The Ideologies of Class: social relations in Britain, 1880-1950* (Oxford, 1994)
- McLaren A., *Our Own Master Race: eugenics in Canada, 1885-1945* (Toronto, 1990)
- Midwinter E. C., *Victorian Social Reform* (London, 1968)

- Mills R. C., *The Colonisation of Australia, 1829-1842: the Wakefield Experiment in empire building* (Sydney, Australia, reprint 1974)
- Mitchell B. R. and Deane P., *Abstract of British Historical Statistics* (London, 1962)
- Murdoch A., *British Emigration, 1603-1914* (London, 2004)
- Murdoch L., *Imagined Orphans: poor families, child welfare and contested citizenship in London* (London, 2006)
- Owen D. E., *English Philanthropy, 1660-1960* (London, 1965)
- Pakenham T., *The Boer War* (London, 1979)
- Parker R. A., *Uprooted: the shipment of poor children to Canada, 1867-1917* (Bristol, 2008)
- Parr J., *Labouring Children: British immigrant apprentices to Canada, 1869-1924* (London 1980)
- Peters L., *Orphan Texts: Victorian orphans, culture and empire* (Manchester, 2000)
- Phillipps K. C., *Language and Class in Victorian England* (London, 1984)
- Pinchbeck I. and Hewitt M., *Children in English Society, vol. 2 from the eighteen century to the Children Act 1948* (London, 1973)
- Platt A., *The Child-Savers: the invention of delinquency* (London, 1969)
- Porter B., *The Absent-Minded Imperialists: empire, society and culture in Britain* (Oxford, 2004)
- Porter B., *The Lion's Share: a short history of British Imperialism, 1850-1970* (London, 1975)
- Price R., *An Imperial War and the British Working Class: working-class attitudes and reactions to the Boer War, 1899-1902* (London, 1972)
- Prochaska F. K., *Women and Philanthropy in nineteenth century England* (Oxford, 1980)
- Prochaska F. K., *The Voluntary Impulse: philanthropy in modern Britain* (London, 1988)
- Rose J., *For the Sake of the Children: inside Dr Barnardo's, 120 years of caring for children* (London 1987)
- Rose L., *The Erosion of Childhood: child oppression in Britain, 1860-1918* (London, 1991)
- Rose M. E., *The English Poor Law, 1870-1930* (Newton Abbot, 1971)

- Rose M. E., *The Relief of Poverty, 1834-1914* (London, 1972)
- Rose M. E. (ed.), *The Poor and the City: the English poor law in its urban context, 1834-1914* (Leicester, 1985)
- Rose N., *Governing the Soul: the shaping of the private self* (London, 1990)
- Ross E. B., *The Malthus Factor: population, poverty and politics in capitalist development* (London, 1998)
- Runaghan P., *Father Nugent's Liverpool, 1849-1905* (Birkenhead, 2003)
- Samson J. (ed.), *The British Empire* (Oxford, 2001)
- Scott C., *Ever Open Door: the story of Dr Barnardo* (London, 1972)
- Shannon R., *The Crisis of Imperialism, 1865-1915* (London, 1974)
- Shapely P., *Charity and Power in Victorian Manchester* (Manchester, 2000)
- Sheehan L., *Dr Barnardo* (Bangor, 2001)
- Sherington G. and Jeffery C., *Fairbridge: empire and child migration* (Nedlands, Australia, 1998)
- Simey M., *Charitable Effort in Liverpool in the nineteenth century* (Liverpool, 1951)
- Stedman Jones G., *Outcast London: a study in the relationship between the classes in Victorian Society* (Harmondsworth, 1984)
- Stroud J., *Thirteen Penny Stamps: the story of the Church of England Children's Society (Waifs and Strays) from 1881 to the 1970s* (London, 1971)
- Sutherland N., *Children in English-Canadian Society: framing the twentieth century consensus* (Toronto, 1976)
- Swain S. and Hillel M., *Child, Nation, Race and Empire: child rescue discourse, England, Canada, Australia, 1850-1915* (Manchester, forthcoming 2010)
- Taylor A. J., *Laissez-Faire and State Intervention in nineteenth century Britain* (London, 1972)
- Thibaut J. W. and Kelley H. H., *The social psychology of groups* (New York, 1959)
- Tompson R. S., *The Charity Commission and the Age of Reform* (London, 1979)
- Van Hartesveldt F. R., *The Boer War: historiography and annotated bibliography* (London, 2000)

- Vicinus M. (ed.), *Suffer and Be Still: women in the Victorian Age* (London, 1973)
- Wagner G., *Children of the Empire* (London, 1982)
- Wagner G., *Barnardo* (London, 1979)
- Waller P. J., *Democracy and Sectarianism: a political and social history of Liverpool, 1868-1939* (Liverpool, 1981)
- Walton J. K. and Wilcox A. (eds.), *Low Life and Moral Improvement in mid-Victorian England: Liverpool through the journalism of H. Shimmin* (Leicester, 1991)
- Williams A. E., *Barnardo of Stepney: the father of nobody's children* (London, 1943)
- Williams A. E., *The Adventures of Dr Barnardo* (London, 1949)
- Williams G., *Barnardo: the extraordinary doctor* (London, 1966)
- Wooldridge A., *Measuring the Mind: education and psychology in England, c.1860-c.1990* (Cambridge, 1994)
- Wymer N., *Dr Barnardo* (London, 1962)

Articles and chapters from books

- Bartrip P. W. J., 'State Intervention in mid-nineteenth century Britain: fact or fiction?', *Journal of British Studies*, 23, 1 (1983), pp. 63-83.
- Bradlow E., 'The Children's Friend Society at the Cape of Good Hope', *Victorian Studies*, 27, 2 (1984), p. 156-177.
- Bramwell B., 'Public space and local communities: the example of Birmingham, 1840-1880', in G. Kearns and C. W. J. Withers (eds.), *Urbanising Britain: essays on class and community in the nineteenth century* (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 31-54.
- Casteras S. P., "'The gulf of destitution on whose brink they hang": images of life on the streets in Victorian art', in J. Treuherz, *Hard Times: social realism in Victorian Art* (London, 1987), pp. 131-139.
- Chamberlain M. E., 'Imperialism and Social Reform' in C. C. Eldridge (ed.), *British Imperialism in the Nineteenth Century* (London, 1984), pp. 148-167.
- Constantine S., 'Empire migration and social reform, 1880-1950', in C. G. Pooley and I. D. Whyte (eds.), *Migrants, Emigrants and Immigrants: a social history of migration* (London, 1991), pp. 62-83.
- Constantine S., 'The British Government, Child Welfare and Child Migration to Australia after 1945', *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History*, 30, 1 (2002), pp. 99-132.

- Constantine S., 'Children as Ancestors: child migrants and identity in Canada', *British Journal of Canadian Studies*, 16, 1 (2003), pp. 150-159.
- Constantine S., 'Child Migration, Philanthropy, the State and the Empire', Institute of Historical Research, *History in Focus*, 14 (October 2008), no pagination
<http://www.history.ac.uk/ihr/Focus/welfare/article/constantines.html> (13.12.09).
- Davin A., 'Waif Stories in late nineteenth century England', *History Workshop Journal*, 52 (2001), pp. 67-98.
- Davin A., 'What is a child?', in A. Fletcher and S. Hussey (eds.), *Childhood in Question: children, parents and the state* (Manchester, 1999), pp. 15-36.
- Dingle A. E., 'Drink and Working-Class Living Standards in Britain, 1870-1914', *Economic History Review*, 25, 4 (1972), pp. 608-622.
- Driver F., 'Discipline Without Frontiers? Representations of the Mettray Reformatory Colony in Britain, 1840-1880', *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 3, 3 (1990), pp. 272-293.
- Eekelaar J., "'The Chief Glory": the export of children from the United Kingdom', *Journal of Law and Society*, 21, 4 (1994), pp. 487-504.
- Finlayson G., 'A Moving Frontier: voluntarism and the state in British social welfare, 1911-1949', *Twentieth Century British History*, 1, 2 (1990), pp. 183-206.
- Gorton K. and Ramsland J., 'Prison Playground? Child convict labour and vocational training in New South Wales, 1788-1840', *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 34, 1 (2002), pp. 51-62.
- Grier J., 'Voluntary Rights and Statutory Wrongs: the case of child emigration, 1948-1967', *History of Education*, 31, 3 (2002), pp. 263-280.
- Gunn S., 'Class Identity and the Urban Elite: the middle class in England, c. 1790-1950', *Urban History*, 31, 1 (2004), pp. 29-47.
- Hadley E., 'Native in a Strange Land: the philanthropic discourse of juvenile in mid-nineteenth century England', *Victorian Studies*, 33, 3 (1990), pp. 411-439.
- Haines R. F., "'The Idle and the Drunken Won't Do There": poverty, the new poor law and nineteenth century government-assisted emigration to Australia from the United Kingdom', *Australian Historical Studies*, 108 (1997), pp. 1-21.
- Harrison B., 'Philanthropy and the Victorians', *Victorian Studies*, 9, 4 (1966), pp. 353-374.
- Heasman K. J., 'Review of Prochaska, *Women and Philanthropy*', *Victorian Studies*, 25, 2 (1982), pp. 251-252.

- Hendrick H., 'Children and Social Policies', in H. Hendrick (ed.), *Child Welfare and Social Policy: an essential reader* (Bristol, 2005), pp. 31-50.
- Hewitt M., 'The itinerant emigration lecturer: James Brown's lecture tour of Britain and Ireland, 1861-1862', *British Journal of Canadian Studies*, 10 (1995), pp. 103-119.
- Homans G. C., 'Social Behaviour as Exchange', *American Journal of Sociology*, 63, 6 (1958), pp. 597-606.
- Horn P., 'The Emigration of Pauper Catholic Children to Canada, 1870-1914', *History of Education Society Bulletin*, 59 (1997), pp. 12-20.
- Howells G., "'On Account of their Disreputable Characters": parish-assisted emigration from rural England, 1834-1860', *History*, 88, 292 (2003), pp. 587-605.
- Johnson P., 'Class Law in Victorian England', *Past and Present*, 141 (1993), pp. 147-169.
- Kamerman S., 'The New Mixed Economy of Welfare: public and private', *Social Work* (1983), pp. 5-10.
- Kidd A. J., 'Philanthropy and the social history paradigm', *Social History*, 21, 2 (1996), pp. 180-192.
- Levene A., 'Family Breakdown and the 'Welfare Child' in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries', *The History of the Family*, 11 (2006), no pagination.
- Levi-Strauss C., 'The principle of reciprocity', in L. Coser and B. Rosenberg (eds.), *Sociological Theory: a book of readings* (New York, 1965), pp. 84-94.
- Marshall P. J., '1870-1918: the empire under threat', in P. J. Marshall (ed.), *Cambridge Illustrated History of the British Empire* (Cambridge, 1996), pp. 52-79.
- Martin M., "'A future not of riches but of comfort": the emigration of pauper children from Bristol to Canada, 1870-1915', *Immigrants and Minorities*, 19, 1 (2000), pp. 25-52.
- May M., 'Innocence and Experience: the evolution of the concept of juvenile delinquency in the mid-nineteenth century', *Victorian Studies*, 17, 1 (1973), pp. 7-29.
- McCord N., 'Aspects of the relief of the poverty in early nineteenth century Britain', in R. M. Hartwell et al, *The Long Debate on Poverty: eight essays on industrialisation and the "condition of England"* (London, 1974), pp. 91-108.
- McBride T., "'As the Twig Bent" The Victorian Nanny', in A. S. Wohl (ed.), *The Victorian Family: structure and stresses* (London, 1978), pp. 44-58.
- McKibbin R., 'Social Class and Social Observation in Edwardian England', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 28 (1978), pp. 175-199.

- Morris R. J., 'Voluntary Societies and British Urban Elites, 1780-1870: an analysis', *Historical Journal*, 26, 1 (1983), pp. 95-118.
- Morris R. J., 'Structure, Culture and Society in British towns', in M. Daunton (ed.), *The Cambridge Urban History of Britain*, vol. 3 1840-1950 (Cambridge, 2000), pp. 395-426.
- Murdoch L., 'From Barrack School to Family Cottages: creating domestic space for late Victorian poor children', in J. Lawrence and P. Starkey (eds.), *Child Welfare and Social Action: from the nineteenth century to the present* (Liverpool, 2001), pp. 147-173.
- Piper C., 'Moral Campaigns for Children's Welfare in the Nineteenth Century', in H. Hendrick (ed.), *Child Welfare and Social Policy: an essential reader* (Bristol, 2005), pp. 13-30.
- Prochaska F. K., 'Charity Bazaars in nineteenth century England', *Journal of British Studies*, 16, 2 (1977), pp. 62-84.
- Prochaska F. K., 'Philanthropy' in F. M. L. Thompson (ed.), *Cambridge Social History of Britain, 1750-1950*, vol. 3 *Social Agencies and Institutions* (Cambridge, 1999), pp. 357-398.
- Richards E., 'How did poor people emigrate from the British Isles to Australia in the nineteenth century?', *Journal of British Studies*, 32, 3 (1993), pp. 250-279.
- Rooke P.T. and Schnell R. L., 'Imperial Philanthropy and Colonial Response: British juvenile emigration to Canada, 1896-1930', *Historian*, 46, 1 (1983), pp. 56-77.
- Rooke P. T. and Schnell R. L., 'The King's Children in English Canada: a psychohistorical study of abandonment, rejection and the Canadian response to British juvenile immigrants, 1869-1930', *Journal of Psychohistory*, 8 (1981), pp. 387-420.
- Ross E., 'Survival Networks: women's neighbourhood sharing in London before World War One', *History Workshop Journal*, 15, 1 (1983), pp. 4-28.
- Rutherford M., "'Canada is no dumping ground": public discourse and the Salvation Army, immigrant women and children, 1900-1930', *Histoire Sociale/Social History*, 79 (2007), pp. 75-115.
- Schwartz B., 'The Social Psychology of the Gift', *American Journal of Sociology*, 73, 1 (1967), pp. 1-11.
- Shapely P., 'Charity, status and leadership: charitable image and the Manchester man', *Journal of Social History*, 32, 1 (1998), pp. 157-177.
- Sherington G., 'Suffer Little Children: British child migration as a study of journeyings between centre and periphery', *History of Education*, 32, 5 (2003), pp. 461-476.
- Shiman L. L., 'The Band of Hope Movement: respectable recreation for working-class children', *Victorian Studies*, 17, 1 (1973), pp. 49-74.

Stedman Jones G., 'Working-Class Culture and Working-Class Politics in London, 1870-1900: notes on the remaking of the working class', *Journal of Social History*, 7, 4 (1974), pp. 460-508.

Swain S., 'Child Rescue: emigration of an idea', in J. Lawrence and P. Starkey (eds.), *Child Welfare and Social Action: from the nineteenth century to the present* (Liverpool, 2001), pp. 101-120.

Ward D., 'The Victorian Slum: an enduring myth?', *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 66, 2 (1976), pp. 323-336.

Newspapers, magazines, media productions and websites

'Lost Children of the Empire', *Observer Review*, 19 and 26 July 1987

'Reluctant Pioneers', *The Times Educational Supplement*, 21 April 1989

'The Forgotten Children they fed to the Empire', *The Guardian*, 6 May 1989

Lost Children of the Empire (ITV production, 1989)

The Leaving of Liverpool (BBC-ABC production, 1992)

www.history.ac.uk/ihr (13.12.09) *Institute of Historical Research*

www.news.bbc.co.uk (16.09.2010) *BBC News*

www.oxforddnb.com (13.12.09) *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*

www.dictionary.oed.com (22.07.10) *Oxford English Dictionary Online*

Unpublished theses

Daniels B., 'Street Children and Philanthropy in the second half of the nineteenth century' (Unpublished PhD thesis, Open University, 2007)

Paris H., 'The Pictured Child in Victorian Philanthropy' (Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Central Lancaster, 2001)

Searle G. M. C., 'Rescue or Bondage? A Case Study of four Voluntary Agencies involved in Child Emigration to Canada, 1870-1925' (Unpublished PhD thesis, Oxford Brookes University, 2004)

Sherrington C. A., 'The NSPCC in transition, 1884-1983: a study of organisational survival' (Unpublished PhD thesis, London School of Economics, 1985)

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without the prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.