

**Western Australian Family and Children's Services Submission to
SENATE COMMUNITY AFFAIRS REFERENCES COMMITTEE
INQUIRY INTO CHILD MIGRATION**

TERMS OF REFERENCE

(a) In relation to government and non-government institutions responsible for the care of child migrants:

(i) whether any unsafe, improper, or unlawful care or treatment of children occurred in such institutions.

None of the child migrants who arrived in Western Australia between 1913 and 1968 were accommodated in government institutions. As explained in the attached Report on Former Child Migrants, these children were received by one of ten non-government agencies, viz Nazareth House, St Josephs, St Vincents, Tardun, Bindoon, Castledare, Clontarf, Mofflyn, Swanleigh and Fairbridge.

The records of Family and Children's Services contain no information on unsafe, improper or unlawful care or treatment of individual former child migrants from the time the department assumed guardianship in 1952. Previous Retention and Disposal policies have meant that the records held by the department are limited, incomplete or non-existent. While the department is aware that allegations of such treatment of child migrants exist in the public domain, no evidence has been found in the extant child migrant records accessed within the time constraints of this submission.

There is however limited documentation in existence indicating contemporary concerns about the child migration schemes. These relate to operational and procedural matters such as: the methods used in selecting child migrants; the lack of information provided by the sending agencies; inadequate education and after-care; the standard of accommodation and physical care; poor administration; lack of staff training; excessive punishment and harsh treatment of children; faulty provision of pocket money and wages; ineffective employment procurement and follow-up; and the use of child migrants as unpaid labour. (Appendices 1 & 2)

Letters written by successive Secretaries of the Child Welfare Department from 1945 to 1949 express concerns that child migrants were not afforded the same protection as wards of the State. There is reference to the reluctance of some of the organisations caring for child migrants to accept the role of the State Guardian in enforcing the Commonwealth Immigration (Guardianship of Children) Act. It was recommended that the Department's right of inspection be extended to 'a right of oversight and supervision' (Appendices 3 & 4). From 1946 to 1952 the Guardian for child migrants was the Under Secretary for Lands and Immigration, pursuant to a delegation by the Commonwealth Government (Appendix 5).

During the 1950s when Guardianship had been assumed by the Child Welfare Department it was alleged that the lack of emotional support in the care of child migrants disadvantaged their later 'assimilation..into society'. Concerns were expressed about after-care of child migrants (Appendix 6). Records show evidence of the Department's attempts to clearly address with the receiving agencies the delineation between the duties of Guardian and Custodian. Developments in child care practices were beginning to highlight the effects of institutionalisation on children in care.

(ii) whether any serious breach of any relevant statutory obligation occurred during the course of the care of former child migrants.

The relevant statutory obligations of the British, Commonwealth and State governments and the voluntary organisations are prescribed in:

- ❑ British *Custody of Children Act 1891* which permitted the voluntary organisations to 'dispose of' the children in their care by emigration.
- ❑ The *Empire Settlement Act 1922* which permitted the British government to channel funds to non-government organisations in support of their migration work (Appendix 7).
- ❑ Australia's *Immigration (Guardianship of Children) Act 1946* which gave the Federal Minister for Immigration legal control over unaccompanied minors until they came of age (Appendix 8).
- ❑ the Western Australian *State Children's Act 1907* and the subsequent *Child Welfare Act 1947* which set out the responsibilities of the Child Welfare Department for the care and protection of children in the state (Appendix 9).
- ❑ British *Children Act 1948* which gave the UK Secretary of State the legal power to control the emigration arrangements made by the voluntary organisations.

Inaugural Agreements made under the Empire Settlement Act between the UK Secretary of State and the organisations nominating child migrants outlined the financial and administrative responsibilities of the respective parties. These agreements specified government subsidies and the responsibility of the organisations to select children and provide information about them to the Secretary for his approval to send these children to Australia (Appendix 10).

When the Federal Minister for Immigration delegated his powers to the WA Under Secretary for Lands and Immigration in 1947, indentures were drawn up between the Custodians (the receiving agencies) and the Guardian, detailing respective responsibilities for the care of migrant children (Appendices 11 &12). Each Custodian agreed to:

1. *bear all responsibility for the care and welfare of the children*
2. *not move them from the place specified without consent, and*
3. *in all things comply with the provisions on its part relating to such children and contained in the Immigration (Guardianship of Children) Act 1946, and in the Child Welfare Act 1907-41.*

At the same time the Child Welfare Department agreed to assume an inspectorial role over child migrants, to assist the Lands and Immigration Department in fulfilling its responsibilities (Appendix 13).

The Department's Annual Report lists this function as: *Apart from the Child Welfare Act...co-operation with the Lands and Immigration Department in supervising migrant children brought to this State by private societies* (ref Appendix 9).

The process is described in an internal Lands and Immigration memo of August 1947:

When the accommodation of several of the institutions was inspected recently, Mr McMinn (Secretary, Child Welfare Dept) accompanied officers of this department and the welfare of immigrant children was discussed. That Department has a staff of efficient Inspectors, and the Secretary agreed that his officers would make inspections and report upon such children as and when required.

Our responsibility under the Commonwealth State Agreement, not only to the children themselves but also to the United Kingdom and Commonwealth Governments as well, demands that we watch the position very closely and periodical visits by an Officer of this Department should, I think, be made. However it is recommended that Mr McMinn's offer of assistance and cooperation be accepted with grateful thanks.

I feel sure that under the arrangements mentioned herein and with the close cooperation of the two departments, the interests of the children will be adequately protected. (Appendices 14 & 15)

Following concerns expressed by British welfare associations about the welfare of child migrants sent to Australia in 1948, the State Under Secretary for Lands and Immigration responded:

..the welfare of the children ... is under constant supervision..(they) are visited every three months by the Child Welfare Department's inspectors...have been medically and dentally examined and remedial action taken where necessary..in addition this Department is taking action through the Education Department towards constant and particular supervision of the education of the children. I can assure you that every possible action is being taken by this department and the Child Welfare Department to ensure that the children's interests are protected. (Appendix 16)

When the guardianship of migrant children was transferred from the Under Secretary of Lands and Immigration to the Secretary, Child Welfare Department in 1952, the department's responsibilities were described as:

- a) *In accordance with the delegation of authority by the Federal Minister for Immigration, accept guardianship of all persons under the age of 21 years who come to Western Australia as immigrants otherwise than in the charge, or for the purpose of living in WA under the care of, any parent or relative of that person.*
- b) *Recommend or approve of the release of such persons from the provisions of the Act.*
- c) *Supervise all migrant children in institutions and in private homes with foster parents.*
- d) *Arrange employment, accommodation and execute service agreements in relation to their wages and working conditions, as in the case of wards of the Department.*
- e) *Generally assist all such migrants to become assimilated into the community. (Appendix 17)*

In 1955 the Department developed a policy to 'standardise the method of handling migrant children and to set out a clear basis of operation with the various custodian authorities' (Appendix18). The policy stated:

1. *Migrant children upon arrival be met by the custodian authorities and taken to their respective homes as at present.*
2. *As soon as practicable thereafter, the new arrivals to be checked by doctors, dentists and psychologists of this department.*
3. *All necessary attention as a result of the checking be given to the children forthwith.*
4. *The custodian then takes full responsibility for the care and upbringing of each child in accordance with the provisions of the Child Welfare Act and Regulations.*
5. *That offices of this Department continue to visit the Institutions at regular intervals to ensure that the standards of accommodation, food and amenities are maintained.*
6. *That Review Committees consisting of officers of this Department and representatives of the custodian authority continue to meet annually to review those children who have attained the age of 14 years and upwards, to plan out their future vocations.*
7. *That 16 years be the maximum age that a child should be kept in an institution, unless there are exceptional circumstances indicating a longer term in the interests of the child concerned.*
8. *That the custodian will continue to place these children in employment and accommodation in the event of failure in either earlier employment or accommodation.*
9. *This Department will assist the child financially as and when required as heretofore with medical, dental and optical accounts, providing subsidy to augment insufficient wages and by providing an amount of 30 pounds for additional clothing when a child takes up his first employment.*
10. *Officers of the Department to check from time to time on the progress of children who have left the institutions and copies of their reports to the*

department be made available to the custodian authorities for their information etc.

- 11. This Department to continue to arrange service agreements with the employers of migrant children whose employment includes board lodging and to bank their wage deductions in Trust Accounts in the Commonwealth Savings Bank.*
- 12. All movement, accidents, absconding, illnesses, hospitalisations and serious misdemeanours etc to be promptly reported to the Department by the custodian authorities and the Department will advise the custodian authorities in the event that it receives such information in the first instance.*
- 13. In matters touching the fostering and/or adoption of migrant children, the custodian authority should indicate its attitude towards the proposition and in cases wherein both the custodian and the guardian agree the child will be placed accordingly.*
- 14. In the event of disagreement, custodian and guardian shall confer with a view to arriving at a mutually satisfactory decision. If this is not achieved and the guardian is satisfied that the child's best interests will be promoted by placement in a private home, he takes full responsibility for the decision to so place the child.*
- 15. In all matters touching the disposition of any child, the child's future well-being will be the paramount consideration in arriving at a decision respecting such child.*
- 16. Regular conferences to be held between officers of this Department and the separate custodian authorities for the purpose of solving minor problems which may arise from time to time.*

Extant records indicate that the Child Welfare Department maintained regular inspections of the institutions, and there are examples of comprehensive inspections providing positive reports on institutions (Appendix 19).

(b) the extent and operation of measures undertaken or required to assist former child migrants to reunite with their families and obtain independent advice and counselling services:

(i) measures undertaken

The positive approach taken by the Western Australian Government was acknowledged in the House of Commons 1997 Inquiry *The Welfare of Former British Child Migrants*. The measures undertaken are listed below.

- In 1996 the Select Committee into Child Migration reported to the WA Parliament. The Committee was established to investigate and report on child migration to Western Australia and received 110 submissions. This inquiry was effective in highlighting the history of child migration and the situation of child migrants, and its report was made available to the British Government inquiry.

- Family and Children's Services worked with the nine former receiving agencies to develop the WA Former Child Migrant Referral Index. This single comprehensive index identifies all former child migrants who came to WA from the UK and Malta from 1913 to 1968. There are 2,941 former child migrants listed on the index, which acts as a signposting service containing: name; alias; date of arrival; ship; placement; location of records. (Appendix 20)
- Following protracted discussions with representatives of the British Government, 'front end' information providing the name of the sending agency and the location of records currently held in the UK, is being added to the index. This will greatly facilitate the tracing of the families of former child migrants. (Appendix 21)
- The department works with International Social Services - the organisation that administers the Support Fund established by the UK Government to provide financial assistance to former child migrants to reunite with families - to assist former child migrants to access this travel aid.
- Family and Children's Services supports the Child Migrant Trust with an annual allocation of \$64,000. This allocation is made in recognition of the tremendous work which is being undertaken by the Trust on behalf of former child migrants. In addition the Lotteries Commission of Western Australia has provided grants totalling approximately \$51,000 to assist the Child Migrants Trust in the provision of office furniture and equipment, a computer and facsimile machine and the lease of a motor vehicle.
- The offer of counselling services to former child migrants has been given by the WA Government.
- Family and Children's Services have enhanced the preservation, security and sharing of child migrant records through the development of a database and protocols.
- A special unit has been established in Family and Children's Services to assist former child migrants to access information and trace families, and to provide support and referral to other services for independent advice, practical assistance and counselling. This unit makes all its records available to former child migrants, including the release of original copies of birth certificates.

The receiving agencies have undertaken measures to assist former child migrants, and this information will be provided to the Senate inquiry in their submissions. In summary, these measures include:

- The PHIND information database developed by the Christian Brothers to assist former child migrants who were received into their care to access information and trace families.

- CBER'S, a counselling and support service established by the Christian Brothers for former residents of institutions operated by this Order.

- ❑ A Trust Fund set up by the Christian Brothers to provide financial support to former child migrants who wish to trace and re-unite with families.
- ❑ A grant/loan fund established by Fairbridge to provide former child migrants with financial assistance for educational, medical and domestic needs.
- ❑ The lodging of all Fairbridge records in the State Library and the establishment of protocols for accessing these records.
- ❑ Archivist support, access to records and information provision to former child migrants who arrived in the care of Swanleigh Church of England Home.

(ii) measures required

In 1990 a report prepared by the department's then Principal Psychologist listed the needs of former child migrants:

- ❑ Access to all available information about their personal history,
- ❑ Assistance to trace information about themselves that is not readily available,
- ❑ Assistance to trace their family, and counselling in relation to establishing contact with family members,
- ❑ Access to professional support and counselling to assist them to deal with issues which arise from obtaining information about their personal history and their families,
- ❑ Access to a service that can make contact with a family in the UK,
- ❑ Access to information about citizenship,
- ❑ Access to self-help and voluntary groups to provide ongoing support,
- ❑ Access to services to help in dealing with long term emotional problems arising from their experiences, and
- ❑ Ready means of finding out about services and organisations that are able to provide assistance to them in relation to the above issues.

These needs are being addressed by the WA Government, former receiving agencies and Family and Children's Services.

(c) the effectiveness of efforts made during the operation of the child migration schemes or since by Australian governments and by any other bodies which were then responsible for child migration to:

(i) inform the children of the existence and whereabouts of their parents and/or siblings.

With the passing of time and the disposal of records it is difficult to determine with any accuracy what occurred in relation to providing children with information about the existence and whereabouts of their parents and/or siblings. Family background information on children arriving under the schemes was scant and in many cases non-existent.

Much has been written and stated in the public domain and there appears to be a consensus of opinion that the practice of voluntary organisations and church bodies was to cut children off from their previous lives, in order to make it easier for them to adjust to their new country, and to protect them from the 'evils' of their backgrounds. There is no information in extant records about this practice

Between 1939 and 1940 correspondence from the department repeatedly sought birth certificates from one of the receiving agencies for a group of children under the Roman Catholic migration scheme. The agency did not have them and it took a year to receive the birth certificates from England (Appendix 20). This illustrates the gaps in information and the inadequate immigration processes that existed.

Documented efforts to provide information about child migrants to their parents are extant. For example, a letter written in 1943 by a custodian to the Secretary, Child Welfare Department was in response to the latter's inquiry on behalf of the Premier, on behalf of the Agent General, London who wished to reply to a British parent:

I beg to inform you that the (3) boys are in excellent health and their behaviour is excellent. They write to their mother periodically. Apparently the letters have not reached her. (Appendix 21)

The *Home Office Report on Child Migration to Australia 1952* stated that correspondence between child migrants and relatives was expected and encouraged, and if there was any doubt about the desirability of this, the UK nominating organisation was consulted (Appendix 22). The report continues:

The degree to which children wish to write to their parents naturally varies..children are sometimes upset because their parents do not reply. The whole question of correspondence between children and their parents requires careful treatment and is a matter on which there must often be consultation between the organisation in Australia and the organisation in Britain.

The 1956 *Report of a Fact Finding Mission* emphasised the dearth of background information received from the sending agencies:

We consider it to be of utmost importance that full information should be available, in the first instance to those in the United Kingdom considering children for emigration and secondly, to the persons in charge of establishments in Australia, who should be able to see from the records the reasons that led to a child's emigration...it seemed to us from talks with children that some of those who had parents in the United Kingdom (and there were many of those) were disturbed by reason of separation from their parents. Some did not understand the reasons for the separation and others had parents who failed to write or wrote unwisely. We heard criticisms of parents who misled their children by giving them to believe that they (the parents)

intended to join them, and also of parents who sent..irresponsible references to the possibility of the children's returning to the United Kingdom. (Appendix 23)

Australian organisations complained to the Mission about many instances of unsatisfactory selection of children by the sending agencies and of their failure to furnish information about behaviour difficulties, 'backwardness' and in some cases physical defects.

The UK Catholic Children's Society provided the following information to the WA Select Committee on Child Migration about children emigrated by the Catholic Child Welfare Council: consent by birth parent(s) to the migration of Catholic children (1,147 to Australia) was given in 216 instances (19%). In 913 (80%) instances it is unknown whether or not consent was given as the documentary evidence remains unfound. Attempts, often unsuccessful, were made to locate relatives prior to migration, with searches for families also undertaken by parish priests.

Following migration, there were a small number of inquiries to the CCWC both from families of child migrants and child migrants themselves. Details were passed on or provided, but given the lack of information prior to migration on families, there was apparently little that could be given to people who made inquiries (Appendix 24).

Conversely, Sherington and Jeffery in their book *Fairbridge, Empire and Child Migration* wrote that post-war child migration changed in the wake of the British Children's Act, which emphasised the importance of finding solutions for children in care within Britain, and the Australian Immigration (Guardianship of Children) Act, in which the Australian government required all voluntary societies to obtain the formal consent of a parent or guardian of a child before it would accept the child as an immigrant. This meant that most of the sending agencies were very particular in seeking parental approval and consent for the migration of children. It also meant that because most local government authorities abandoned the strategy of child migration as part of their policy of child welfare, many parents directly approached sending agencies, thus becoming a major source of child migrants.

In the case of Fairbridge the majority of parents not only gave their consent but had actually approached the Society to enrol their children in the Fairbridge migration scheme. A recent study of the National Children's Homes suggests that out of 91 children sent to Australia between 1950 to 1954, 67 consent forms were signed by a parent or guardian (Appendix 25).

Documentation on departmental files refers to the custodian's role in informing families of children's health and progress. The extent to which the department worked to help children maintain or re-establish contact with family is not clear from extant records.

A 1989 report by Margaret Humphries of the Child Migrants Trust to the UK Social Services Committee talks of the 'calculated deception' undertaken by

Australian and United Kingdom organisations in withholding and/or giving incorrect information to child migrants about their antecedents and to families abroad about their children (Appendix 26). The only documentation found on departmental records referring to the withholding of information is a letter from the Commonwealth Immigration Department referring to 'long' and 'short' birth certificates, the latter giving the child's name and date of birth only. If the 'long' certificate showed that the child was adopted or had only one parent's name, the issue of the certificate was to be deferred and the matter referred to that office (Appendix 27).

Contemporary personal testimony from former child migrants and their relatives indicates that false or misleading information was given to them by authorities at the time of emigration, and thereafter.

(ii) reunite or assist in the reunification of the child migrants with any of their relatives.

There is scant historical information available to determine efforts made during the operation of the child migration schemes to reunite or assist in the reunification of child migrants with any of their relatives.

The Catholic Children's Society reported that during the operation of the scheme a small number of children were reunited with their parents as a result of:

- parents going out to Australia to join them.
- the child not settling in Australia and the Australian authorities felt it appropriate to send the child back.
- parents requesting the child back if their circumstances changed e.g. remarriage.

The Society further states:

Re-unification was rare and records suggest it would, quite reasonably, not have been encouraged unless circumstances in the parental home, leading to the original need for the child to come into our care, had changed. Re-unification may not have been facilitated by the fact that parents were expected to pay the child's fare back to the UK (Ref Appendix 24).

Departmental records show that in some cases parents followed their children out to Australia as immigrants themselves, wishing to resume care or contact on arrival. Records show there was considerable debate in Australia about the maintenance of such children, parental rights and responsibilities, the welfare of the children, and the appropriateness of including these children in the migration schemes in the first instance.

Departmental Annual Reports show that from 1952 onwards many child migrants under departmental guardianship were released to parents following assessment of their circumstances. Guardianship was relinquished if deemed appropriate after a given minimum period of time.

A comprehensive specialist service is now available through the Family and Children's Services Family Information Records Bureau to assist former child migrants in tracing and re-unifying with their families. The Bureau conducts ongoing evaluation of the services provided to former child migrants to ensure customer needs are addressed. The number of enquires received by the Bureau is increasing (see Table 1). Ongoing communication with the Child Migrant's Trust has provided the Bureau with positive reinforcement of the work being undertaken in this area.

Table 1 Former Child Migrants - total number of inquiries received per year.

YEAR	TOTAL
1992 – 1993	73
1993 – 1994	77
1994 – 1995	37
1995 – 1996	45
1996 – 1997	56
1997 – 1998	116
1998 – 1999	98
1999 – 2000	192
July - December 2000	83
TOTAL	777

The West Australian Government is the only government in Australia to have established a comprehensive index to assist former child migrants to access information about themselves and their families. Since the launch of the WA Former Child Migrant Index in October 1999 there have been 240 requests for assistance.

The commitment and goodwill of the nine former receiving agencies in working together with Family and Children's Services has been effective in recognising and supporting the needs of former child migrants. This cooperative enterprise has resulted in quality service to former child migrants which includes: user-friendly accessibility of records and information; the provision of counselling and personal support; practical recognition and resourcing of the need for independent advice and support; financial assistance to travel to the UK; and setting up the index in less than 3 months of collaborative work.

- (iii) provide counselling or any other services that were designed to reduce or limit trauma caused by the removal of these children from their country of birth and 'deportation' to Australia.**

The welfare of child migrants was receiving attention in 1945, as reported by a welfare officer:

It is not merely a matter of dumping large numbers of children, but of making sure there is a progressive education system to mould them into useful citizens of their country of adoption, and not to become anti-social, anti-Australian members of the community of the future, which would result from promiscuous housing and crowded institutional life, contrary to all ethics in the dominant factor of child welfare interests. (Appendix 28)

An internal memo dated October 1947 to the staff of the Child Welfare Department states that the children were to be visited: *every two months and particular attention must be paid, when the visits are made, to the condition of the children, their accommodation, and their attendance at school.*

The memo went on to stipulate that every child was to be seen and that reports were to be informative in every way: *It is essential that this department sees that the terms of the indentures entered into by the.... authorities in respect to the welfare of the children are rigidly adhered to. (Appendix 29)*

From its earliest involvement the department held the view that child migrants should be treated as state wards regarding their well-being and the levels of subsidy paid for their maintenance: *these new arrivals are treated exactly the same as departmental wards....The future well-being of these children depends to a great extent on their early training in character building, and their freedom from want and fear. Only those with a knowledge of the activities of the Department can realise and appreciate what is being done to make State wards and migrant children useful citizens of the State (Appendices 30 & 31).*

The 'baby boom' which followed WWII and Australia's post-war immigration policies caused large and increasing numbers of children to enter permanent care, making the task of planning and reviewing the needs of these children difficult. Concern was expressed about the large numbers of children becoming institutionalised. A review committee was established for children in institutions, but within a year it was found that the committee could review only a portion of the total children in care. It was therefore decided to ask institutions to submit written half yearly reports on children in their care.

In 1953/4 new procedures were introduced in the Child Welfare Department which incorporated an ongoing case history recording system and compulsory quarterly reporting for children in care. Despite these improvements however, planning focussed on the child in his/her placement rather than the child, plans were always for the immediate future and planning was of an erratic standard.

Welfare officers were under-resourced, over loaded with cases, poorly trained and generally ill equipped to undertake the sole responsibility for planning for the needs and future lives of children (Appendix 32).

The 1954 Annual Report of the Child Welfare Department stated; *The problems of migrant children are many and varied, with the result that considerable time has to be devoted by the senior officers of the Department in giving advice and guidance to them.* At this time, a total of 1,165 migrant children had arrived in WA, 1,057 of this number still under the guardianship of the Department (Appendix 33).

The years between 1959 to 1965 saw the evolution of the case conference system that required comprehensive, long term, diagnosis and treatment planning based on consultation and teamwork. The purpose of the case conference was to plan for the life of the child by bringing together information and opinions needed to this end, within the agreed philosophy and procedures of the department.

There was ongoing debate about the institutionalised care of child migrants compared to cottage style living, and the reluctance of institutions to place migrants in private homes:

The Child Welfare Department favours..placing out in foster homes as a desirable form of child care..our primary objective is to rear children in a sound emotional climate..institutions nominating children are not anxious to pursue the boarding out policy, although it is felt that practically all children could be adequately fostered if the institutions were not rather loath to part with them. (Appendix 34)

A search of extant records indicate that approximately 16 child migrants were adopted, 13 repatriated to the UK and an unknown number were placed in foster homes or boarded out.

A Departmental psychologist reported in 1959 that some custodians had failed in carrying out their responsibilities with regard to the proper selection of child migrants, the provision of after-care and follow-up for child migrants who were initially unsuccessful in employment and/or accommodation and the support required by socially maladjusted child migrants (Appendix 35).

By this time the questionable selection processes, paucity of personal history supplied by the sending agencies, unsuitability of staff, lack of after-care, failure of child migrants to assimilate upon departure from the institutions, and the behavioural and emotional disturbances exhibited by child migrants, were all matters that the department had addressed with the custodians (Appendices 36 &37):

While the standard of institutions receiving children, as far as material needs are concerned, cannot be questioned, there is a deep emotional factor lacking..the officers of this department have had to play a big part in the after-care of migrant children, also considerable psychological testing and counselling have been carried out by departmental psychologists. (Appendix 38)

Records indicate that during the operation of the child migrant schemes, institutions were visited regularly to 'watch the progress and interests' of child migrants. Migrant children boarded out and in employment were visited by departmental officers at quarterly intervals 'and their various problems discussed with them'. Employment and accommodation were arranged for school leavers and a special subsidy was approved where wages needed supplementing. Service agreements were entered into between the employer and the department whereby a portion of the wages were deducted and paid into a trust fund (Appendix 39).

The quality and nature of services to child migrants in the decades between 1940 and 1970 must be seen against the level of expertise of officers and the resources of the department in those years.

In 1959 the department's field staff comprised:

- 2 psychologists
- 5 welfare officers
- 5 district officers
- 13 probation officers.

(d) the need for a formal acknowledgment and apology by Australian governments for the human suffering arising from the child migration schemes

Following the findings of the Select Committee into Child Migration, the Western Australian Legislative Assembly passed a motion in August 1998 apologising to former child migrants 'on behalf of all Western Australians for the past policies that led to their forced migration and the subsequent maltreatment so many experienced, and (to) express deep regret at the hurt and distress that this caused.' (Appendix 40)

In July 1993, the Christian Brothers acknowledged that abuse took place in their institutions and made a public apology to former child migrants who had been in their care.

(e) Measures of reparation including, but not limited to, compensation and rehabilitation by the perpetrators

Reparation measures undertaken by the Government of Western Australia with respect to former child migrants include the apology made by the Legislative Assembly on 13 October 1998 (see Appendix 4) and the initiatives outlined in section b(i) and b(ii) of this submission.

(f) whether statutory or administrative limitations or barriers adversely affect those former child migrants who wish to pursue claims against individual perpetrators of abuse previously involved in their care.

Western Australia has an absolute Statute of Limitations of six years for civil cases. There are currently no plans to change the *Limitation Act* 1935. It would appear that any retrospective change to the Act would need to be treated with considerable caution both because of its effect on the general principle against retrospective legislation and its effect on the general principle of limitation periods in relation to individual cases. Any such legislation would also have to be carefully considered as it could lead to unfair results for those who have proceeded on the basis of the current provisions.

There is no limitation on the time for commencing prosecutions for criminal cases. As in all cases this is a matter for the Director of Public Prosecutions after reviewing the available evidence.

The WA Select Committee into Child Migration addressed issues of abuse in institutions and individuals involved have been encouraged to lodge complaints with the Police.

In some cases legal constraints may inhibit the supply of information. The Western Australian *Freedom of Information Act* 1922 facilitates access by individuals to their personal information held by government departments but provides an exemption to access in respect of third party information, thus respecting the individual's privacy.

The *Western Australian Public Sector Act* 1994 and subsidiary legislation refers to the protection of personal, business and official records. It is unlikely that this legislation would adversely affect former child migrants wishing to pursue claims against individual perpetrators of abuse.

APPENDICES

- Appendix 1 Extract referring to child migration schemes 1945
- Appendix 2 Extract of Mr Hitchin's (Probation Officer) report to Principal, Tardun from Secretary, Child Welfare Department
- Appendix 3 Memo to the Minister for Child Welfare from Secretary, Child Welfare Department 1946
- Appendix 4 Memo to the Minister for Child Welfare from Secretary, Child Welfare Department 1949
- Appendix 5 Correspondence regarding guardianship and accompanying Instrument of Delegation 1946
- Appendix 6 Letter from Acting Acting Assistant Director, Child Welfare Department to Mr Justice Dovey of Supreme Court 1959
- Appendix 7 Outline of Empire Settlement Act 1922
- Appendix 8 Outline of Immigration (Guardianship of Children) Act 1948
- Appendix 9 Extract form Child Welfare Department Annual Report 1951 outlining responsibilities of the Child Welfare Department according to the Child Welfare Act
- Appendix 10 Example of Agreement between Catholic Migration Association and the Government of WA 1938
- Appendix 11 Example of Indenture
- Appendix 12 Memo to Under Secretary for Lands and Immigration from Assistant Under Secretary regarding responsibilities of Custodian of immigrant children 1947
- Appendix 13 Letter form Under Secretary for Lands and Immigration to Minister for Lands regarding government arrangements for the care of child migrants 1947
- Appendix 14 Memo to Under Secretary for Lands and Immigration from Assistant Under Secretary setting out responsibilities of Custodians and Department of Lands and Immigration 1947
- Appendix 15 Letter from Under Secretary for Lands and Immigration to Secretary, Child Welfare Department regarding conference of State Premiers to discuss child migration 1944

- Appendix 16 Letter from Under Secretary for Lands and Immigration to Department of Information Canberra regarding welfare of child migrants 1948
- Appendix 17 Extract from 1957 Child Welfare Department Annual Report outlining the department's responsibilities according to the Immigration (Guardianship of Children) Act
- Appendix 18 Child Welfare Department Policy re Migrant Children 1955
- Appendix 19 Examples of Child Welfare Department inspection reports
- Appendix 20 Ministerial Statement to Parliament 19 August 1999.
- Appendix 21 Exchange of correspondence between the governments of Western Australia and the United Kingdom (1999 and 2000).
- Appendix 22 Correspondence between Secretary, Child Welfare Department and Tardun regarding birth details of child migrants 1939 - 1940
- Appendix 23 Correspondence regarding information about child migrants for parents 1943
- Appendix 24 Extract from Home Office Report on Child Migration by Moss 1952
- Appendix 25 Copy of Home Office Report *Child Migration to Australia Report of a Fact-Finding Mission* by Ross 1956
- Appendix 26 Extract from submission by Catholic Children's Society (Westminster) 1996
- Appendix 27 Extract from *Fairbridge: Empire and Child Migration* by Sherington, G., and Jeffery, C. 1988, University of Western Australia Press, Perth
- Appendix 28 Report for Social Services Committee prepared by Margaret Humphreys 1989
- Appendix 29 Letter from Commonwealth Immigration Department to Secretary Child Welfare Department regarding birth certificates for immigrant children
- Appendix 30 Extract from Child Welfare Department memorandum regarding welfare of child migrants 1945

- Appendix 31 Memo from Secretary, Child Welfare Department to Welfare Officers outlining duties concerning child migrants 1947
- Appendix 32 Extract from Child Welfare Department Annual Report 1947
- Appendix 33 Extract from Child Welfare Department Annual Report 1953
- Appendix 34 Extract from *The Case Conference System: An Evaluation Report*, Volume 2, Dufty, B.J. and Matthews, R.P., Department for Community Welfare 1980
- Appendix 35 Extract from Child Welfare Department Annual Report 1954
- Appendix 36 Extract of letter from Acting Assistant Director Child Welfare Department regarding placement of child migrants 1959
- Appendix 37 Letter from Assistant Director Child Welfare Department to the Secretary, Department of Immigration regarding the care of a child migrant 1959
- Appendix 38 Letter from Assistant Director Child Welfare Department to Commonwealth Immigration Department regarding after-care 1959
- Appendix 39 Letter from Director, Child Welfare Department to Catholic Archbishop of Perth regarding after-care 1957
- Appendix 40 Extract from letter to Mr Justice Dovey, Supreme Court from Acting Assistant Director Child Welfare Department regarding care of child migrants 1959
- Appendix 41 Extract of report from Secretary, Child Welfare Department to Minister for Child Welfare 1952
- Appendix 42 WA Legislative Assembly debate on motion for apology to former child migrants 1998

DEFINITION

‘Child Migrants’ are defined as: children from the United Kingdom and Malta who were sent to Western Australia between 1913 and 1968, unaccompanied by parents and under the guardianship of the Federal Minister for Immigration (in 1946), the State Under Secretary for Lands and Immigration (1947 to 1952) and the predecessor of the Director General of Family and Children’s Services (after 1952), where a British, Australian Commonwealth and State Government subsidy was paid.

Excluded from this definition are children and young people who emigrated under other programs such as the One Parent Scheme, Big Brother Movement and the YMCA. These migrants were either accompanied by a parent or near relative, received on arrival by a parent or near relative, or emigrated under requisition or nomination systems.

HISTORY AND CONTEXT OF IMMIGRATION

With the granting of self-government in the 1850’s, each colony administered its own immigration policies, and while Federation in 1901 gave the Commonwealth ultimate responsibility, each state jealously guarded its de facto control of this area of government for many years.

In the euphoria of the migration boom beginning in 1901 and ending with WWI the Dreadnought and Fairbridge juvenile and child migration schemes were initiated. While unaccompanied child migrants had been coming to Western Australia under various schemes since the 1830’s, the Fairbridge Society was the first government-assisted scheme.

Kingsley Fairbridge popularised the farm school movement, initially supported by a land grant from the Western Australian government and sponsorship from the Child Emigration Society of Oxford. He was a leading philanthropist of the times who worked to ‘rescue’ destitute children from the slums of Britain and ‘build the Empire’ by bringing such children to Australia where they were provided with a ‘homely’ farm life. Girls were trained for domestic service and boys for farm work. The first group of **13** child migrants arrived in WA in 1913.

During the 1920’s there were new immigration agreements between State and Commonwealth governments within Australia, between the British and Australian governments and between government and non-government organisations.

The first agreements were formalised as the Joint Commonwealth and States Scheme of 1921 and allowed for new cooperation in the field of immigration between federal and state governments in Australia. The Commonwealth assumed the selection, medical examination and transport of prospective immigrants; the states requisitioned the numbers and categories they wanted, and arranged settlement and after-care. Directors of Immigration were appointed both in Australia and in London.

The Empire Settlement Act 1922 followed, assigning special importance to the emigration of juveniles and children and permitting the British government to channel funds to non-government organisations in support of their migration work.

The Depression brought a halt to government assistance to immigration, apart from a small number of Fairbridge children.

Assisted immigration resumed in 1938 on a small scale. The Christian Brothers began their child migration scheme and in 1938 and 1939 some three groups of boys, **116** in all, sailed for WA to be educated and trained by the Christian Brothers.

Immigration ceased with the outbreak of WWII. By this time **1,290** child migrants had been sent to Western Australia, **1,174** of these to Fairbridge.

Following the war immigration took on a different flavour. The Commonwealth government placed a major emphasis on child migration: the 'populate or perish' slogan characterised a mass immigration policy that had bipartisan support in parliament and wide community acceptance.

Juvenile migration, involving young men and women, had been an important part of immigration, because of the shortage of farming and domestic service labour. After WWII juvenile migration flourished for a further 24 years (see separate section). However, the post-war program of child migration (50,000 orphans in the first three years of peace) envisaged by the Commonwealth government was not to materialise.

Child migration was considered a major part of the new immigration policy. The Federal Minister actively encouraged religious and charitable bodies to bring children to Australia under various approved schemes. Representatives of these bodies (referred to as the sending agencies) in the UK began negotiating child migration schemes with their Australian counterparts (referred to as the receiving agencies), the Australian immigration officials in London and the British Government.

The Fairbridge Society, the Catholic Church, the Church of England and the Methodist Church, played major roles in post-war child migration to WA.

In 1947 the Federal Catholic Migration Committee was launched and Catholic Migration offices were opened in the capital cities, with the Catholic Child Welfare Council (CCWC) as its counterpart in Britain. While the majority of children were sent under the auspices of CCWC, it is believed that other children were sent by religious orders working directly to the Christian Brothers. These offices administered the Catholic child migrant schemes until 1956 when changing child care practices meant child migration was no longer a favoured option.

In 1947, the first post war child migrants (nearly 500) were sent to Australia, most of them (over 300) received by the Christian Brothers in WA. The Christian Brothers cared for children sent by UK Catholic agencies together with **300** Maltese child migrants. This Order operated four institutions that received child migrants, viz Tardun, Bindoon, Clontarf and Castledare. Throughout the years of Catholic child migration, the Christian Brothers received approximately **1140** children.

The Church of England Society (and Advisory Council) for Empire Settlement began its work with Swanleigh and in total arranged for the emigration of some **273** children to Swanleigh.

Fairbridge continued its work through the Child Emigration Society (Oxford) and the Children's Farm School Society of WA and received **346** post war child migrants. Fairbridge also received child migrants sent by Barnardo's. During the operation of its child migrant

scheme Fairbridge received a total of **1520** children (1,174 pre-war and 346 post-war) - the highest number of children of all the child migrant schemes.

The United Kingdom National Children's Homes (Methodist Church) arranged for the emigration of only **8** children to Mofflyn.

In the period 1947 to 1950 a number of Catholic women's religious Orders - notably the Sisters of Mercy and the Sisters of Nazareth - entered the field of child migration.

These child migration schemes, while supported by governments in principle, were managed and administered by charitable and church bodies. Essentially governments provided the ground rules, a financial subsidy and monitored their activities. It was the voluntary associations that did most of the day-to day work with child migrants.

Voluntary agencies had direct charge of the migrant children either at the recruitment stage, during their passage or after their arrival in the receiving countries. In this work the voluntary agencies received the encouragement and financial backing of successive British and Australian governments.

Child migrants were initially sent to one of ten receiving agencies, viz Nazareth House (96), St Joseph's Leederville (110), St Vincent's (30), Tardun (220), Bindoon (244), Castledare (250), Clontarf (190), Mofflyn (8), Swanleigh (273) and Fairbridge (1,520).

In total, **1,651** children emigrated under the post-war child migrant schemes. This was much less than originally proposed at the 1946 Conference. The numbers of 'orphans' were not of the scale imagined, and in many respects child migration lagged behind both public opinion and enlightened child care policies. Child and juvenile migration to the Australian states came towards the end of a long experience with the policy elsewhere, especially in Canada, where in the 1920's and 1930's it was strongly opposed and discontinued.

New social realities emerging after WWII did not correspond with the migration policy: family of origin was beginning to be recognised as a vital part of children's psycho-social development; social services of the welfare state were being extended; the social slur of the single parent was waning; poverty was diminishing. In the 1950's and 1960's and the social conditions and attitudes in the UK which had led to many children being sent abroad were changing.

GUARDIANSHIP

The relevant statutory obligations of the British, Commonwealth and State governments and the voluntary organisations are prescribed in:

- ❑ British *Custody of Children Act 1891* which permitted the voluntary organisations to 'dispose of' the children in their care by emigration.
- ❑ The *Empire Settlement Act 1922* which permitted the British government to channel funds to non-government organisations in support of their migration work.
- ❑ Australia's *Immigration (Guardianship of Children) Act, 1946* that gave the Federal Minister for Immigration legal control over unaccompanied minors until they came of age.

- the Western Australian *State Children's Act 1907* and the subsequent *Child Welfare Act 1947* which set out the responsibilities of the Child Welfare Department for the care and protection of children in the state.
- The British *Children Act 1948* that gave the UK Secretary of State the legal power to control the emigration arrangements made by the voluntary organisations.

Under the *Immigration (Guardianship of Children) Act* the Federal Minister for Immigration became the Guardian of immigrant children to the age of 21 years. In 1947 guardianship was delegated to the WA Under Secretary for Lands and Immigration.

In 1952, guardianship for immigrant children in WA was transferred from the Under Secretary of Lands and Immigration to the Secretary, Child Welfare Department.

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

It is difficult to clearly determine the roles and responsibilities of the British, Australian and State governments, together with the sending and receiving agencies. The lack of records and the passing of time has led to various interpretations of the enabling legislation and its historical precedents and the policies related to child migration.

Legislation and Policies

In 1850 the British *Poor Law Act* made provision for the emigration overseas of the children of the poor who were under 16 years of age. Every application was supposed to be submitted to the Poor Law Board for approval and the children themselves were required by law to agree to the arrangement. There was already a long history of children being sent overseas, usually as cheap labour. The Parkhurst boys who came to Western Australia in the 1840s were one example.

The passage of the *Custody of Children Act* in 1891 seems to be an indication that the British Government was increasingly prepared to intervene in the interest of the children.

In Australia there was no formal mechanism in place to manage the affairs of immigrant children apart from voluntary committees. This changed in 1839 when an Ordinance came into force appointing guardians to child migrants. This was later repealed and a more general ordinance providing for the guardianship of child and juvenile migrants was passed in 1842.

The *Industrial Schools Act 1874* introduced for the first time the notion of government control over private institutions caring for children, while the managers of the institutions were given the power of guardians over these children. In 1893 the government introduced another Act to provide for the establishment of Industrial and Reformatory Schools which were to be inspected and licensed.

The *State Children Act* of 1907 repealed all the above nineteenth century legislation to make better provision for the protection, control, maintenance, and reformation of neglected and destitute children. The Act legislated for the establishment of a State Children's Department, with a Secretary having power over the care, management and control of the persons and property of all State children.

The *Empire Settlement Act 1922* was a particular milestone in the history of child migration. In dealing with the administrative processes required for emigration to the Dominions, the British Government proposed to rely on existing Government and private organisations:

It shall be lawful for the Secretary of State, in association with the Government of any part of His Majesty's Dominions, or with public authorities or public or private organisations either in the U.K. or in any part of such Dominions, to formulate and cooperate in carrying out agreed schemes for affording joint assistance to suitable persons in the U.K. who intend to settle in any part of His Majesty's Oversea Dominions. The Secretary of State shall have all such powers as may be necessary for carrying out his obligations under any scheme made in pursuance of this Act.

Agreements made under the Empire Settlement Act between the UK Secretary of State and the organisations nominating child migrants outlined the financial and administrative responsibilities of the respective parties. These agreements specified government subsidies (including Commonwealth and State) and the responsibility of the organisations to select children and provide information about them to the Secretary for his approval.

The Western Australian Child Welfare Act of 1947 further consolidated the law relating to the making of better provision for the protection, control, maintenance and reformation of neglected and destitute children. It made no mention of immigrant children, in spite of the fact that the Commonwealth Government had just passed the *Immigration (Guardianship of Children) Act 1946* which gave the Commonwealth Minister the power to delegate the work of caring for these immigrant children to the separate State bodies.

The new post-war immigration policy resulted in the introduction of the *Immigration (Guardianship of Children) Act*, and creation of the post of Federal Minister for Immigration. It was argued that the Commonwealth had over-riding responsibility for child migrants which did not end with their arrival, but extended to ensuring their proper accommodation and care until 21 years of age.

Clause 6 of this Act stated: *The Minister shall be the guardian of the person, and of the estate in Australia of-*

(a) Every evacuee child; and

(b) every immigrant child who arrives in Australia after the commencement of this Act, to the exclusion of the father and mother and every other guardian of the child, and shall have, as guardian, the same rights, powers, duties, obligations and liabilities as a natural guardian of the child would have, until the child reaches the age of twenty one years or leaves Australia permanently, or until the provisions of this Act cease to apply to and in relation to the child, whichever first happens.

The Act made further provision for the delegation of these powers: *It is proposed to utilise the services of the State authorities..(who) under delegation from the Minister, exercise control and supervision of the children until 21 years of age. They will be cared for under the auspices of voluntary migration organisations introducing them, such as the Fairbridge Farm Schools, Dr Barnardo Homes, Northcote Children's Farm School, and Church bodies.*

In 1946 at their conference to discuss child migration, State Premiers resolved that 'the Commonwealth should continue to be the sole authority in respect of migration activities overseas, and should accept financial responsibility for the recruitment, medical examination and transportation of assisted migrants'. It was agreed in principle that the States should carry out the function of reception upon arrival in Australia, also that of looking after the newcomers accommodation needs, but in practice, this was passed to the voluntary organisations.

At this conference a cautionary note was delivered about 'past exploitation of child migrants' citing lack of education and labour exploitation as examples, and 'special protection' of child migrants was suggested.

When the Federal Minister for Immigration delegated his powers to the WA Under Secretary for Lands and Immigration in 1947, Indentures were drawn up between the Custodians (the receiving agencies) and the Guardian, detailing respective responsibilities for the care of migrant children.

Each Custodian agreed to:

4. *bear all responsibility for the care and welfare of the children*
5. *not move them from the place specified without consent, and*
6. *in all things comply with the provisions on its part relating to such children and contained in the Immigration (Guardianship of Children) Act 1946, and in the Child Welfare Act 1907-41 and the regulations made thereunder and amendments thereto.*

At the same time the Child Welfare Department agreed to assume an inspectorial role over child migrants, to assist the Lands and Immigration Department in fulfilling its responsibilities. The Department's Annual Report lists this function as: *Apart from the Child Welfare Act....co-operation with the Lands and Immigration Department in supervising migrant children brought to this State by private societies.*

The process is described in an internal Lands and Immigration memo of August 1947:

When the accommodation of several of the institutions was inspected recently, Mr McMinn (Secretary, Child Welfare Dept) accompanied officers of this department and the welfare of immigrant children was discussed. That Department has a staff of efficient Inspectors, and the Secretary agreed that his officers would make inspections and report upon such children as and when required.

Our responsibility under the Commonwealth State Agreement, not only to the children themselves but also to the United Kingdom and Commonwealth Governments as well, demands that we watch the position very closely and periodical visits by an Officer of this Department should, I think, be made. However it is recommended that Mr McMinn's offer of assistance and cooperation be accepted with grateful thanks.

I feel sure that under the arrangements mentioned herein and with the close cooperation of the two departments, the interests of the children will be adequately protected.

Subsidy agreements were negotiated between the British Government and the Australian Commonwealth and state governments, and the sending and receiving agencies. A separate section deals with these responsibilities.

The actual selection of migrants remained a grey area. This was technically a Federal Government responsibility, though in practice, the choice was made by the sending agencies. Teams from the Child Welfare and Immigration departments were responsible for the inspection and approval of institutions proposing to receive child migrants.

Meanwhile in Britain, the British *Children Act 1948* gave the UK Secretary of State the legal power to control the emigration arrangements made by the voluntary organisations. The Act contained two clauses on child migration. Clause 17 dealt with children in local authority care: these would only be allowed to emigrate with the Secretary of State's consent, and if it benefited them. Clause 32 concerned children cared for by voluntary organisations. This stated that the Secretary of State 'may by regulations' control emigration arrangements. Debate on this clause concerned the following statement:

It would be a great satisfaction to the Societies who do this work best if they knew that some of the bodies who do not do it so well could be brought up to the mark, so that children are not sent out without any regard to whether they are likely to go to decent homes when they get there, whether they are themselves in a fit condition and are the kind of children who ought to be sent abroad.

The Lord Chancellor gave an assurance that children would not be emigrated 'unless there is absolute satisfaction that proper arrangements have been made for the care and upbringing of each child'.

When the guardianship of migrant children was transferred from the Under Secretary of Lands and Immigration to the Secretary, Child Welfare Department in 1952, the latter department's responsibilities were described as:

- f) In accordance with the delegation of authority by the Federal Minister for Immigration, accept guardianship of all persons under the age of 21 years who come to Western Australia as immigrants otherwise than in the charge, or for the purpose of living in WA under the care of, any parent or relative of that person.*
- g) Recommend or approve of the release of such persons from the provisions of the Act.*
- h) Supervise all migrant children in institutions and in private homes with foster parents.*
- i) Arrange employment, accommodation and execute service agreements in relation to their wages and working conditions, as in the case of wards of the Department.*
- j) Generally assist all such migrants to become assimilated into the community.*

In 1955 the Department developed a policy to 'standardise the method of handling migrant children and to set out a clear basis of operation with the various custodian authorities.' The policy stated:

- 17. Migrant children upon arrival be met by the custodian authorities and taken to their respective homes as at present.*
- 18. As soon as practicable thereafter, the new arrivals to be checked by doctors, dentists and psychologists of this department.*
- 19. All necessary attention as a result of the checking be given to the children forthwith.*
- 20. The custodian then takes full responsibility for the care and upbringing of each child in accordance with the provisions of the Child Welfare Act and Regulations.*
- 21. That officers of this Department continue to visit the Institutions at regular intervals to ensure that the standards of accommodation, food and amenities are maintained.*
- 22. That Review Committees consisting of officers of this Department and representatives of the custodian authority continue to meet annually to review those children who have attained the age of 14 years and upwards, to plan out their future vocations.*

23. *That 16 years be the maximum age that a child should be kept in an institution, unless there are exceptional circumstances indicating a longer term in the interests of the child concerned.*
24. *That the custodian will continue to place these children in employment and accommodation in the event of failure in either earlier employment or accommodation.*
25. *This Department will assist the child financially as and when required as heretofore with medical, dental and optical accounts, providing subsidy to augment insufficient wages and by providing an amount of 30 pounds for additional clothing when a child takes up his first employment.*
26. *Officers of the Department to check from time to time on the progress of children who have left the institutions and copies of their reports to the department be made available to the custodian authorities for their information etc.*
27. *This Department to continue to arrange service agreements with the employers of migrant children whose employment includes board lodging and to bank their wage deductions in Trust Accounts in the Commonwealth Savings Bank.*
28. *All movement, accidents, absconding, illnesses, hospitalisations and serious misdemeanours etc to be promptly reported to the Department by the custodian authorities and the Department will advise the custodian authorities in the event that it receives such information in the first instance.*
29. *In matters touching the fostering and/or adoption of migrant children, the custodian authority should indicate its attitude towards the proposition and in cases wherein both the custodian and the guardian agree the child will be placed accordingly.*
30. *In the event of disagreement, custodian and guardian shall confer with a view to arriving at a mutually satisfactory decision. If this is not achieved and the guardian is satisfied that the child's best interests will be promoted by placement in a private home, he takes full responsibility for the decision to so place the child.*
31. *In all matters touching the disposition of any child, the child's future well-being will be the paramount consideration in arriving at a decision respecting such child.*
32. *Regular conferences to be held between officers of this Department and the separate custodian authorities for the purpose of solving minor problems which may arise from time to time.*

While child migrants were not state wards, the Child Welfare Department from its earliest involvement held the view that they should be provided with the same care and protection. Records indicate that during the operation of the child migrant schemes, institutions were visited regularly to 'watch the progress and interests' of child migrants.

Migrant children boarded out and in employment were visited by departmental officers at quarterly intervals 'and their various problems discussed with them'. Employment and accommodation were arranged for school leavers and a special subsidy was approved where wages needed supplementing. Service agreements were entered into between the employer and the department whereby a portion of the wages were deducted and paid into a trust fund.

Relationships of the Australian government with:

➤ British government

The British government, in partnership with the Australian government, entered into agreements with each of the sending agencies under the Empire Settlement Acts of 1922 and 1956. These prescribe child migrant numbers and financial contributions agreed to by the governments, and the power of the UK Secretary of State to approve all immigration. Records exist of correspondence and meetings between British and Australian Government Ministers and representatives in relation to child migration schemes. The files relating to this area are located in Canberra and are listed by the National Archives.

➤ **State government**

The Commonwealth Government's involvement in child migration did not commence to any significant extent until after WWII. Before this, immigration schemes were largely handled by the individual states, each having its own Immigration Department. The Joint Commonwealth and States Scheme of 1921 outlined the respective duties of the Commonwealth and State governments in relation to migration.

The Commonwealth Government did not legislate for child migration until 1946. However, from the first government-assisted child migration scheme (Fairbridge) the Commonwealth governments contributed a subsidy.

In the years following WWII the role of the Commonwealth Government was mainly that of an overseer, the programs being administered by the states. The Federal Minister for Immigration had guardianship of immigrant children in 1946 and delegated this power to the states in 1947.

➤ **Sending agencies**

As per agreements made under the Empire Settlement Act the sending agencies were responsible for the administration of the schemes and were more accountable to the British government. They were required to provide information to the UK Secretary of State for his authorisation to migrate children. It appears that in practice they dealt with all decision making processes and procedures in relation to the selection of children, consents and migration arrangements.

Representatives of the sending agencies dealt with Australian immigration officials based in London. Children selected for immigration were to be medically examined in Britain to determine their suitability and the Agent-General could reject any child on medical or other grounds.

➤ **Receiving agencies**

The relationship between the Australian government and the receiving agencies in WA appears to be predicated on the Empire Settlement Acts and Immigration (Guardianship of Children) Act. These relate to the numbers of child migrants each agency could receive and the financial subsidy paid by Commonwealth government.

Relationships of the State government with:

➤ **British government**

The report of the Select Committee into Child Migration states that at least since the middle of the last century, child migration has been officially sanctioned by both the UK Government and the WA State Government, through a series of legislative measures and government endorsement of the schemes.

Each of the state governments entered immigration agreements with the British governments according to the Empire Settlement Acts, as described above. It appears this mostly concerned subsidy agreements and numbers of immigrants. The British Government was responsible through the Secretary of State to regulate and oversee the schemes.

➤ **Sending agencies**

As per the Empire Settlement Act records exist of correspondence and meetings between state officials and the sending agencies. It appears that once details such as numbers of child migrants and financial subsidies were finalised between the state government and the sending agencies, the latter mostly dealt with representatives of the receiving agencies. Part of the agreement as per the Act was for the sending agency to find the children and provide for their care in WA, while the state was responsible for the free education of child migrants.

The Child Welfare Department was critical of the sending agencies for their failure to supply accurate and comprehensive information about child migrants, and their selection methods.

➤ **Receiving agencies**

The WA State government held responsibility at all times for the inspection and licensing of receiving agencies. Until 1946 it had a defacto role in the supervision of immigrants, including child migrants. From 1946 onwards when the guardianship of child migrants was delegated to the state, the overseeing of the receiving agencies custodial care of child migrants was undertaken by officers of the State Government. These responsibilities, and the role of the Custodians of the receiving agencies, were clearly delineated in the Indentures and the 1955 policy previously described.

Records indicate that the Child Welfare Department undertook its statutory obligations with the receiving agencies. There are examples of both highly positive and critical inspections and assessments of receiving agencies, and documentation to the State Minister of Child Welfare concerning the performance of receiving agencies and child migration schemes in general.

A 1945 administrative document lists a number of concerns with regard to receiving agencies and their care of child migrants and refers to the fact that the Commonwealth Government had nevertheless decided to encourage the continuation of child migration schemes. It concludes that the role of the state government is: *A closer supervision...of their standards of performance..(to) ensure they should do good work in the post-war years.*

Other Relationships

The relationship between the sending agencies and the UK homes from where the children came is unclear. For example, with regard to the religious orders running the homes and the child care agencies that may have placed the children with them, it appears that it was mostly the agency that was involved with the migration procedures and consents. The Catholic

Children's Society reported that the relationship between the agencies and Orders in the decision making process is unclear from extant records.

This may also apply to the Church of England homes in the UK that sent children via the Church of England Society for Empire Settlement. It has been claimed by some writers that those children's homes in the UK which belonged to local government authorities were significantly more professional in the decision making process, selection and consents, and migration procedures. The local government authorities working with sending agencies were apparently strict in overseeing migration arrangements for children in local government care.

A number of sources state that the policy towards child migration was decided at government and church levels, beyond the managers of receiving agencies and the actual carers.

Other Documentation

The public domain contains diverse statements and opinions about the roles and responsibilities of governments and voluntary organisations in relation to child migration schemes. The following are some examples.

'Lost Children of the Empire' by Bean and Melville addresses the shortcomings of the UK government's participation in child migration schemes: *What is so extraordinary about the child migration schemes is that at no time were any safeguards made governing the welfare of child migrants sent out by the voluntary societies. Under the Children Act 1948 the Secretary of State was given the legal power to control the emigration arrangements made by the voluntary organisations but this was never used.*

Bean and Melville point to the Curtis Committee of Enquiry set up by the UK government in 1947 to report on existing child care methods. The inquiry concluded that emigration was 'not one method we especially wish to see extended' and decided that children who wished to emigrate should only be allowed to do so with 'thorough care and supervision'.

The inquiry formed the basis of the most far-reaching British legislation ever made regarding deprived children: the *Children Act*, 1948, which contained clauses for the regulation of child migration schemes, powers which Bean and Melville believe were never adequately applied.

They also discuss the establishment by the British government in 1953 of the Overseas Migration Board, which enthusiastically supported child migration schemes, but still did not address the lack of overseeing of the welfare of child migrants. Bean and Melville assert there was no official attempt made by the British government to assess the child migration schemes until 1956. Three years before that Moss, a British visitor to WA who toured the institutions caring for child migrants, made an unofficial uncommissioned report for the Home Office, in which there was no awareness of how the children were being treated. His superficial remarks were made at a time when children were already making official complaints about the extent of abuse.

"Orphans of the Empire' by Gill traces the defining of roles and responsibilities to the Empire Settlement Act 1922. When Parliament debated the Act it was proposed that the British Government rely on existing 'Overseas Governments and private organisations, whether of a business or philanthropic character' to work with the Overseas Settlement Committee in dealing with the administrative processes required for emigration.

Gill writes that the 'export' of children was initiated by the British Government in partnership with the Australian federal government. The State Governments were 'junior partners' in the schemes. He states that the Immigration (Guardianship of Children) Act 1946 suggests a legal responsibility on behalf of the 'custodian' actually caring for the children, also that the Federal Minister or delegated authorities had responsibility for removing a child from 'unsuitable' custodians. From his point of view, both custodians and guardians failed in their duties.

The failure of the British Government to use its broad powers under the Children Act 1948 to supervise the emigration procedures of voluntary agencies is again highlighted.

The British House of Commons Inquiry states in its report: *The British government's failure to insist upon more strict controls over the activities of voluntary agencies was reinforced by similar poor performance by the Australian authorities in their inspection and supervision of the quality of care offered to child migrants.*

It points to the Empire Settlement Act 1922 and the Children Act 1948 as being the critical pieces of legislation that in theory provided for the regulated emigration of children. The voluntary agencies had direct charge of the migrant children either at the recruitment stage, during their passage or after their arrival in the receiving countries. However, charitable agencies did not operate under the stricter framework of regulations that controlled the work of local authorities. It was this lack of accountability, according to the inquiry, that allowed the charities to make 'ad hoc decisions.'

The Inquiry was 'appalled' at the apparent lack of proper monitoring and inspection. Mistakenly, the inquiry states: *On arrival in Australia children became the responsibility of the authorities as 'wards of the state'.* In fact, in WA migrant children were not state wards, but were under the guardianship of either the Federal Minister of Immigration, the Under Secretary of Lands and Immigration, or the Secretary, Child Welfare Department.

The inquiry further stated that the prime responsibility for the neglect of checking procedures rests with the state governments concerned. However, the sending agencies might have been expected to have investigated more thoroughly the conditions in which children were living. The post-war schemes appear to have been excessively permissive regarding the monitoring of children's welfare: *It was the charitable and religious organisations who maintained the child migration policy often apparently motivated by the need to keep the institutions overseas financially viable.*

In conclusion, it reported: *We think it incumbent on the British Government to accept additional moral responsibility for what happened since it passed the enabling legislation..(which) also gave the government a contractual responsibility for the welfare of the children.*

Sherington and Jeffery in *Fairbridge, Empire and Child Migration* wrote that post war child migration was more regulated as a result of the 1946 Immigration (Guardianship of Children) Act, and increased public awareness, even opposition to sending British children overseas. Whereas the Australian and British Governments had previously encouraged child migration through financial grants but with minimal supervision, the post-war period saw more state regulation and accountability.

In the wake of the 1948 Children's Act most local government authorities abandoned child migration as part of their policy of child welfare and assistance. Similarly, following the Immigration (Guardianship of Children) Act, the Australian Government required all voluntary societies to obtain the formal consent of a parent or guardian of a child before it would accept the child for migration. This led most of the voluntary societies to be very particular in seeking parental approval and consent for the migration of children. These authors provide data showing that the majority of children at Fairbridge emigrated with consent.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO CHILD MIGRATION SCHEMES

Child migration schemes received financial assistance from the British, Commonwealth and State governments that included land grants, capitation grants and passage costs. Government subsidies varied over time and were made directly to all institutions caring for child migrants, according to the number of child migrants in residence. The UK sponsoring bodies of the schemes also provided financial assistance.

Fairbridge was the first child migration scheme to receive government assistance. In an agreement between the Western Australian Government and the Child Emigration Society, the sponsoring body for Fairbridge, the government provided a grant of land, £6 per child passage money and free education.

In 1915 Fairbridge began receiving a State capitation grant of 4 shillings per migrant child per week. The British Government matched this amount together with monies for the purchase of additional land in 1919. Fairbridge then negotiated a financial package in 1922 with the Commonwealth and State governments jointly agreeing to contribute one-third of the maintenance cost.

From 1937 the WA Lotteries Commission paid a grant of 3/- per child per week to institutions caring for child migrants, this amount gradually increasing to \$1 in 1970.

In 1938 a financial agreement was made under the Empire Settlement Acts 1922 and 1937 between the British Government and the Catholic Emigration Association: the British and Commonwealth Governments provided joint fares assistance; the British, Commonwealth and State Governments contributed towards the cost of the care of migrant children in Catholic institutions; and the Association was to bear the expenses of administering the scheme.

In 1941 the Commonwealth subsidy was replaced by child endowment paid for all child migrants at 5/- per week per child

At a 1948 state conference on *Subsidies and Welfare under the British Child Migration Scheme*, subsidies for child migrants up to 16 years were increased, bringing payments into line with total State ward subsidy levels of £ 1.8.0. weekly. The conference also moved that the State would provide child migrants with a clothing and pocket money allowance, and a wage subsidy upon leaving care, commensurate with the assistance given to wards. Western Australia was the only State where payments for migrant children were equivalent to amounts paid for State wards.

In 1948 payments to child migrants up to 16 years were summarised as:

Commonwealth Child Endowment	10/- per week
State Subsidy	3/6 pw
British Government Subsidy	6/3 pw
Lotteries Commission	<u>3/- pw</u>
Total	£ 1.2.9. per week

In 1963 payments were:

Commonwealth Child Endowment	10/- per week
State Subsidy	15/- pw
British Government Subsidy	£ 1.5.0 pw
Lotteries Commission	<u>10/- pw</u>
Total	£ 3.0.0. per week

ALLEGATIONS OF ABUSE

The records of Family and Children's Services contain no information on unsafe, improper or unlawful care or treatment of individual former child migrants from the time the department assumed guardianship in 1952. Previous Retention and Disposal policies have meant that the records held by the department are limited, incomplete or non-existent. While the department is aware that allegations of such treatment of child migrants exist in the public domain, no evidence has been found in the extant child migrant records accessed within the time constraints of this report.

Documentation is available on concerns about the child migration schemes. The documentation relates to operational and procedural matters such as: the methods used in selecting child migrants; the lack of information provided by the sending agencies; inadequate education and after-care; the standard of accommodation and physical care; poor administration; lack of staff training; excessive punishment and harsh treatment of children; faulty provision of pocket money and wages; ineffective employment procurement and follow-up; the use of child migrants as unpaid labour; and the reluctance of some of the organisations caring for child migrants to accept the role of the State Guardian in enforcing the Commonwealth Immigration (Guardianship of Children) Act.

Letters written by successive Secretaries of the Child Welfare Department from 1945 to 1949 express concerns that child migrants were not afforded the same protection as wards of the State. It was recommended that the department's right of inspection be extended to 'a right of oversight and supervision'. From 1946 to 1952 the Guardian for child migrants was the Under Secretary for Lands and Immigration, appointed by the Commonwealth Government.

During the 1950s when Guardianship had been assumed by the Child Welfare Department a new concern was documented about the lack of emotional support in the care of child migrants, which later disadvantaged their 'assimilation..into society'. The after-care of child migrants was an ongoing concern. Records show evidence of the Department's attempts to clearly address with the receiving agencies the delineation between the duties of Guardian and Custodian. Developments in child care practices were beginning to highlight the effects of institutionalisation on children in care.

During the last decade former child migrants in the UK and Australia have made allegations of abuse against members of former receiving agencies and given accounts of lives of hardship and deprivation. Civil proceedings for compensation by over 250 former residents of Christian brothers institutions in WA led the Brothers to establish a Trust fund to assist those concerned, the majority being former child migrants.

The emerging themes about child migration schemes are: the lack of effective monitoring of the children's welfare; the false or misleading information given to families and children by authorities at the time of emigration; the poor conditions and abuse endured by child migrants; and the denial or withholding of information critical to former child migrants and their families in re-establishing contact. The House of Commons inquiry condemned the policy of child migration, stating it was a 'bad and, in human terms, costly mistake'. It further stated:

There was a misguided view that British children could somehow be given a fresh start many thousands of miles from all that was familiar. The tragic reality for many children was appalling standards of care. Insufficient attention and consideration was given to the long term implications of separating children from their families, friends, social context and their country on a permanent basis. Child migrants were told individually and collectively that their parents were dead, that they were 'war orphans' that they had nobody in the world and that their country did not want them.

In November 2000, former child migrants, filed a lawsuit against the UK before the European Court of Human Rights. The lawsuit alleges violation of Articles relating to the government withholding information from former child migrants and the practice of 'deporting' children without parental knowledge or consent, and giving children false information.

Other Documentation

Throughout its long history child migration has been punctuated by a series of scandals. The lack of educational provision, the overwork, the evidence of ill treatment and abuse, all have featured in official inquiries and literature. Issues of protection and control, and at times exploitation, permeate the records.

The Scheme, by BM Coldrey documents the Christian Brothers highly significant and controversial involvement in child migration. The author reports on:

- Brother Keaney's 'sour' relations with the Child Welfare Department due to his 'casual attitude to rules and regulations...and his excessive punishment of certain inmates which resulted in a long-standing dispute with the department.'
- The Hicks Report of 1953, a 'devastating' critique of the Child Welfare Department and institutions which described WA child care practices as 'primitive and backward'.
- Reports both positive and critical made by Child Welfare inspectors about accommodation, amenities, and the treatment of absconders and bedwetters.

Bean and Melville in *Lost Children of the Empire* refer to the Fact Finding Mission of 1956 which was critical of child migration:

We heard..that widely held view that many children whom life had treated badly would benefit by transfer to a new country where they could be given a new start, away from old scenes and unhappy associations. Few with whom we spoke seemed to realise that it was precisely such children, already rejected and insecure, who might often be ill-equipped to cope with the added strain of migration..We think that the desirability of enabling children deprived of normal home life to be brought up in circumstances approaching as near as possible those of a child living in his own home applies with particular force to migrant children, who in addition to the basic needs of children for the understanding and affection

that lead to security, here experienced disturbance arising from their transfer to new and unfamiliar surroundings.

This book decries the history of child migration in Australia as 'a history of cruelty, lies and deceit.' To evidence this, it provides details of the lives of child migrants and concludes with:

The orphanages and farm schools ...were destructive environments because there was no basic foundation for emotional development... Because records were deliberately withheld from them (former child migrants), they had no sense of identity or self-worth.

Alan Gill's *Orphans of the Empire* contains personal accounts from some thirty former child migrants of the abusive and deprived childhoods that they experienced. The involvement of welfare officers is provided as evidence both of ineffective action against the cruelty of carers, and as strong advocates for the better care of child migrants.

GOVERNMENT INQUIRIES

There have been two major parliamentary inquiries into child migration.

In 1996 the Select Committee into Child Migration reported to the WA Parliament. The Committee was established to investigate and report on child migration to Western Australia and received 110 submissions. This inquiry was effective in highlighting the history of child migration and the situation of child migrants, and its report was made available to the British Government inquiry.

Following the findings of the Select Committee into Child Migration, the Western Australian House of Assembly passed a motion in August 1998 apologising to former child migrants 'on behalf of all Western Australians for the past policies that led to their forced migration and the subsequent maltreatment so many experienced, and (to) express deep regret at the hurt and distress that this caused.'

In 1998 the British House of Commons released the report *The Welfare of Former British Child Migrants*. Its recommendations are far-reaching, involving Australia, Canada and New Zealand. This inquiry has resulted in:

- A public apology to former child migrants issued by the House of Commons (July 1998).
- The establishment of the UK Central Information Index.
- The establishment of the Support Fund administered by International Social Services. This fund provides financial assistance to former child migrants to reunite with families.

The Australian Senate Community Affairs References Committee is currently conducting an inquiry into child migration and will report by 14 May 2001.

WA FORMER CHILD MIGRANT REFERRAL INDEX

In response to the British Government's findings and recommendations concerning the welfare of former British child migrants, Family and Children's Services organised a meeting of representatives from the former receiving agencies in Western Australia in 1999. The commitment and goodwill of these people together with the support from officers of the department has resulted in the development of a single comprehensive index to identify all

former child migrants who came to Western Australia from the UK and Malta from 1913 to 1968.

There are 2,941 former child migrants listed on the index, which acts as a signposting service and contains the following information: name; alias; date of birth; date of arrival; ship; placement; and location of records. Since the launch of the index in October 1999 there have been 720 requests for information.

Following protracted discussions with representatives of the British Government, 'front end' information providing the name of the sending information and the location of records currently held in the UK, has been sent to Family and Children's Services.

The Western Australian Government is the only government in Australia to have established a comprehensive index to assist former child migrants to access information about themselves and their families.

SUPPORT TO FORMER CHILD MIGRANTS

In 1990 a report prepared by the department's then Principal Psychologist listed the needs of former child migrants:

- ❑ Access to all available information about their personal history
- ❑ Assistance to trace information about themselves that is not readily available
- ❑ Assistance to trace their family, and counselling in relation to establishing contact with family members
- ❑ Access to professional support and counselling to assist them to deal with issues which arise from obtaining information about their personal history and their families
- ❑ Access to a service that can make contact with a family in the UK
- ❑ Access to information about citizenship
- ❑ Access to self-help and voluntary groups to provide ongoing support
- ❑ Access to services to help in dealing with long term emotional problems arising from their experiences
- ❑ Ready means of finding out about services and organisations that are able to provide assistance to them in relation to the above issues.

These needs are being addressed by the WA Government, former receiving agencies and Family and Children's Services. The positive approach taken by the Western Australian Government was acknowledged in the House of Commons 1997 Inquiry *The Welfare of Former British Child Migrants*. The measures undertaken are listed below.

- ❑ Family and Children's Services worked with the nine former receiving agencies to develop the WA Former Child Migrant Referral Index (see previous section). This will greatly facilitate the provision of information and tracing of the families of former child migrants.
- ❑ The department works with International Social Services - the organisation that administers the Support Fund established by the UK Government to provide financial assistance to former child migrants to reunite with families - to assist former child migrants to access this travel aid.

- The WA Government supports the Child Migrant Trust by the provision of subsidised travel, accommodation and office costs; office equipment; funding grants totalling \$106,100 and an annual funding agreement of \$64,000.
- The offer of counselling services has been given by the WA Government.
- Family and Children's Services have enhanced the preservation, security and sharing of child migrant records through the development of a database and protocols.
- A special unit has been established in Family and Children's Services to assist former child migrants to access information and trace families, and to provide support and referral to other services for independent advice, practical assistance and counselling. This unit makes all its records available to former child migrants, including the release of original copies of birth certificates.

The receiving agencies have undertaken measures to assist former child migrants, and this information will be provided to the Senate inquiry in their submissions.

In summary, these measures include:

- The PHIND information database developed by the Christian Brothers to assist former child migrants who were received into their care to access information and trace families.
- CBER'S, a counselling and support service established by the Christian Brothers for former residents of institutions operated by this Order.
- A Trust Fund set up by the Christian Brothers to provide financial support to former child migrants who wish to trace and re-unite with families.
- A public apology to former child migrants in July 1993 by the Christian Brothers, acknowledging that abuse took place in their institutions.
- A grant/loan fund established by Fairbridge to provide former child migrants with financial assistance for educational, medical and domestic needs.
- The lodging of all Fairbridge records in the State Library and the establishment of protocols for accessing these records.
- Archivist support, access to records and information provision to former child migrants who arrived in the care of Swanleigh Church of England Home.

JUVENILE MIGRATION SCHEMES

These schemes were mainly active prior to WWII, operated by private organisations in conjunction with the London based Commonwealth Immigration Office and the respective State Immigration Offices. They involved the selection and nomination of British juveniles, mostly male and destined for farming, for emigration to Australia, together with the provision of support, training and after-care by voluntary organisations.

Juvenile migration was boosted when collective nomination was extended in 1923, which instead of requisition (migrant selection according to dominion government requirements)

and individual (people in Australia nominating relatives and friends) migration, permitted voluntary agencies to nominate groups of juveniles to emigrate from Britain.

This was a favoured form of immigration, as it was seen as both a humanitarian effort to improve the prospects of young men, and a boost to the labour force. By 1927 a total of 15,964 unaccompanied juveniles aged between 12-18 years had been assisted by juvenile migration schemes to settle in Australia.

The 1954 Annual Report of the Child Welfare Department describes the migrant children under the guardianship of the Department, and goes on to state:

In addition to these children..a total of 434 unaccompanied minors nominated by private persons have arrived to take up employment and are under departmental supervision. The 275 migrant children who are working are employed in the following categories:

<i>Farming and Pastoral</i>	111	
<i>Apprentices, Trades</i>		33
<i>Hospital Employees</i>		13
<i>Clerical Workers</i>	30	
<i>Seamen</i>	2	
<i>Labourers</i>	61	
<i>Domestics</i>	25	
<i>Total</i>	<u>275</u>	

Dreadnought Trust

The Dreadnought Trust was the first scheme, founded in 1908. The Trustees paid ≤8 and the NSW government ≤12 towards the passage costs of juvenile boys aged between 16-19 years. The Trustees provided training for farming, pocket money and after care in conjunction with other 'Settlers' organisations. They dealt entirely with 'selectees' - young men selected by Commonwealth Immigration officers in London from among those offering, recommended by county colonisation societies and unemployment bureaux.

The first 'Dreadnought boys' arrived in 1911 and when the last group arrived in 1939 the total number of Dreadnought boys brought to NSW had reached **5,595**.

The scheme had serious problems, the boys were exploited and had severe adjustment difficulties and many eventually returned to the UK.

Big Brother Movement

In 1924 Richard Linton (businessman/philanthropist) founded the Big Brother Movement, members of which undertook to care for migrant boys aged between 15–18 years arriving from Britain to work on the land (until 1939) or to work in either city or rural areas (after 1947). It was the most successful and enduring of the youth migration organisations, intended to stimulate youth migration by appealing to British 'middle class' families through the offer of reliable contracted 'Big Brothers' to supervise the lives of their young men in Australia.

The movement received financial support from governments at various times over the next half-century and was lauded as the ideal form of migration. Its halcyon years were the 1950's

and 1960's when as many as 400-500 youths a year arrived in NSW, Victoria, South Australia and Tasmania, the states in which the movement mostly operated. Some **12,500** juveniles emigrated with the Big Brother Movement from 1925 to 1983. Departmental records list 151 youths brought to WA by the Big Brother Movement.

WA Young Australia League

This movement was founded in 1905 by J.J. Simons. It was not concerned primarily with child or youth migration, however during the 1920's the League sponsored 192 young British men to WA on similar lines to that of the Big Brother Movement.

Salvation Army

Among the Protestant churches it was the Salvation Army which was most active in promoting youth migration before WWII, mostly from 1920-1930. They mainly trained boys for farming in Queensland and were highly regarded for their migration work (total number not known).

YMCA, Boy Scouts

These organisations sponsored small-scale juvenile immigration, mainly to Queensland and Victoria in the 1920's.

The Church of England

During the 1920's various prominent figures within the Anglican Church in Australia encouraged assisted immigration for young men and women, the former for farms, the latter for domestic service. The schemes were based in Queensland and NSW (total number not known).

ONE PARENT SCHEME

There are varying descriptions of this scheme. Some documentation defines it as a migration scheme where a British single parent, usually an unmarried mother or a widow, permitted her children to immigrate to Australia, intending to follow them to Australia in due course, settle herself and re-establish the family. An alternative definition states that it was a scheme whereby a one parent family migrated and was supported by accommodation in voluntary organisations and a government subsidy until such time as the parent was able to establish an independent lifestyle for the family.

It appears that in WA, the scheme began in the 1950's and Fairbridge was the only organisation to receive these children. Fairbridge records a total of 372 children who immigrated under the scheme. However it is unclear if this is an accurate total number because of the ambiguous documentation in both the Fairbridge and departmental records. Historians of Fairbridge WA believe these children were accompanied by their parents.

The Child Welfare Department's 1963 Annual Report provides the first annual statistics on the One Parent Scheme. It records 91 children arriving that year under the scheme. Yearly numbers are thereafter provided in annual reports, but it is not clear if the figures are for that current year or include children from previous years. In 1966 it was reported that 185 migrant children had come to Fairbridge under the 'One Parent Scheme',

The department's 1967 Annual Report stated that guardianship through the Director of the Child Welfare Department was not involved, but the department paid a special subsidy of 6/- per week for the period of twelve months after arrival and whilst resident in the institution.
