

The Use of Apprenticeship and Adoption by the Toronto Protestant Orphans' Home, 1853–1869

CHARLOTTE NEFF*

While the Toronto Protestant Orphans' Home, like other children's homes of mid-to late-nineteenth-century Ontario, was established to make available long-term institutional care for dependent children, it also relied heavily on home placements. It made extensive use of both apprenticeship (binding out), which was a legally recognized and protected relationship, and adoption, which was not. The decisions of the Home's female Managers were thus not driven by a rigid vision of the merits of institutional care or of what childhood should be like for their charges; rather, they dealt with each case individually, an approach that may be partially attributed to the maternal influence but also to pragmatic concerns. Home placement was an important feature of such care well before the implementation of the foster care system in 1893.

Même si la Toronto Protestant Orphans' Home avait été mise sur pied pour fournir des soins institutionnels de longue durée aux enfants à charge, à l'instar d'autres foyers pour enfants de l'Ontario du milieu et de la fin du XIX^e siècle, elle comptait aussi grandement sur l'hébergement familial. Elle recourait de façon exhaustive à l'apprentissage (placement de travail en milieu familial), qui était une relation légalement reconnue et protégée, et à l'adoption, qui ne l'était pas. Les décisions des directrices de la maison n'étaient donc pas motivées par une vision rigide de ce que sont les mérites des soins institutionnelles ou de ce que l'enfance devrait être pour leurs protégés. Elles s'occupaient plutôt des cas un à un, une approche que l'on pourrait attribuer en partie à l'influence maternelle, mais également à des considérations pragmatiques. L'hébergement familial occupait une place importante dans l'approche utilisée pour le soin des enfants à charge bien avant la mise en oeuvre, en 1893, du régime de placement en famille d'accueil.

* Charlotte Neff is an associate professor and Chair of the Department of Law and Justice at Laurentian University. She is a member of the Bar of Ontario and is currently researching pauper apprenticeship in Upper Canada.

LARGE NUMBERS OF CHILDREN'S HOMES were established in Ontario in the latter half of the nineteenth century, 18 of which were receiving government grants by 1880.¹ These homes became the major agencies caring for dependent children prior to the establishment of Children's Aid Societies and the implementation of the foster care system under the Children's Protection Act of 1893.² Their establishment was preceded and accompanied by that of a variety of social institutions, including houses of industry, asylums for the insane, hospitals, juvenile reformatories, and schools. Both contemporary and modern analysis of this rapid development of institutions, which occurred throughout the western world, has tended to focus on the faith nineteenth-century society placed in institutional responses to social problems, and has de-emphasized theories and practices inconsistent with such faith. The resulting models of social policy development in areas like child protection stress marked stages, characterized by sharp changes in philosophy and approach. Common threads which may suggest evolutionary development have thus been neglected.³

In the context of child protection, a detailed study of the practices of children's homes like the Toronto Protestant Orphans' Home (POH) suggests that there was no such abrupt change in provision for dependent children.⁴ Prior to the establishment of such homes, the main way of deal-

1 Ontario, *Sessional Papers*, 1882, no. 45, "Return to an Order of the Legislative Assembly", pp. 2, 3.

2 Ontario, *Statutes*, "An Act for the Prevention of Cruelty to and Better Protection of Children", 1893, 56 Vict., ch. 45; Andrew Jones and Leonard Rutman, *In the Children's Aid: J. J. Kelso and Child Welfare in Ontario* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981).

3 Charlotte Neff, "Pauper Apprenticeship in Pre-Confederation Ontario", *Journal of Family History*, vol. 21, no. 2 (April 1996), pp. 144-171 at 144-145 and n. 4. For a useful review of the literature on institutional development, see Russell C. Smandych and Simon N. Verdun-Jones, "The Emergence of the Asylum in 19th Century Ontario: A Study in the History of Segregative Control" in Neil Boyd, ed., *The Social Dimensions of Law* (Toronto: Prentice-Hall Canada, 1986), pp. 171, 178.

4 The children studied are those recorded in the first admission Register, in which there were 506 entries from 1853 to the end of 1869. The records of the Home are in the Baldwin Room, Metropolitan Toronto Reference Library, L30. The Register for 1853-1869 consists of two parts, one which records the children by date of entry (hereafter Original Register or OR and page reference), and the other — "Children who have left the Home" — by date of departure (hereafter Exit Register or ER and page number). Based on the handwriting and a note about missing information, the first part of this register appears to have been reconstructed in March 1858 by the Secretary of the time from previous records and from memory. The Register for 1853-1902 (hereafter Register Copy or RC and entry number) is, for the early part at least, a copy which compiles information from the various sections of the Original Register and some other sources; the numbers used hereafter to refer to specific children are taken from this Register Copy. The records also include *Minutes of the Board and Annual Meetings* (hereafter *Minutes*), vol. I (June 16, 1851-April 5, 1852) and vol. II (1853 to 1864); a *Visitors' Book* for 1853-1874 in which visitors recorded their names and any comments about the Home, in particular the official weekly Visitors appointed from among the Managers; and the *Annual Report* from 1854 (both original and microfilm copies available). Most annual meetings were also covered in detail in the *Globe* in the first week of June each year. Payments made on behalf of apprenticed children and amounts later paid out to them were recorded in the financial statements in the *Annual Report* — these are not individually referenced in the text.

ing with dependent children was to place them in private homes under indentures of apprenticeship (pauper apprenticeship).⁵ However, even during the first half of the century, male-organized and operated charitable societies provided institutions such as emergency shelters. In Toronto these included the Stranger's Friend Society in the 1820s and 1830s,⁶ temporary asylums to deal with the large numbers of immigrants orphaned and widowed by cholera in 1832⁷ and 1847,⁸ and the House of Industry established in 1837.⁹ All of these organizations normally treated children and their

5 See below. For a detailed discussion of pauper apprenticeship, see Neff, "Pauper Apprenticeship".

6 This Society operated under various names from 1817. National Archives of Canada (hereafter NAC), MG24-A40, vol. 29, file 8591, no. 8392, "Report of a Committee appointed by the Society for the general Relief and benefit of Strangers and the Distressed poor of York" (undated, but after December 1828); Public Archives of Ontario (hereafter AO), MU 2105, misc. ms. no. 7, "Emigrants, Temporary Houses at York", 1831, pp. 50-59; NAC, MG 24-A40, vol. 29, file 8591, "Annual Meeting of the Society, held on Saturday the 14th December 1833".

7 The Committee for the Relief of Widows and Orphans in the City of Toronto was an offshoot of the Stranger's Friend Society. The children and widows may have been housed in the Emigrant Temporary Asylum which existed from about 1828. From August 1832 to August 1834, 535 children were provided for. NAC, MG24-A40, vol. 29, file 8591, "Report of the Committee appointed to Revise the Organization of the Stranger's Friend Society" [1828-9?] and "Report of Annual Meeting of the Strangers Friend Society held 14 December 1833"; *Christian Guardian*, January 30, 1833, and September 17, 1834; British Parliamentary Papers, Irish University Press, Emigration, vol. 19, p. 192, "Report of A. C. Buchanan, Chief Agent for the Superintendence of Emigrants in Upper and Lower Canada, Quebec, 12th December 1832". The minutes of the House of Industry refer to a boy taken from the "Orphan Asylum" in 1834, which seems likely to have been operated by the Stranger's Friend Society. City of Toronto Archives, SC35 A, box 1, vol. II, September 2 and 6, October 22, 1838. The Committee was inter-denominational, Protestant and Roman Catholic, being run by the "Clergy of the different denominations of Christians". *Christian Guardian*, September 17, 1834. This religious cooperation was regarded as "Extraordinary!" by the *Colonial Advocate*, December 11, 1828. One indenture of a child apprenticed by the Committee has survived. See County of Prince Edward Archives, Apprenticeship Indenture re: Sarah Mae Clauerty, October 2, 1832.

8 From its opening in August 1847 to February 2, 1848, 423 widows and children were received in the Widow and Orphan Asylum, and of these 334 were placed in "situations" in or near the city, with the children apparently normally being apprenticed. This Society was run by a group of prominent Toronto men, with "benevolent ladies" taking part in the superintendence of the Asylum. Women also organized an annual bazaar to raise money and supported through subscriptions the Lying-in Charity run by the Society. The subscription list of the Society includes clergy of all denominations, including the Church of England and Roman Catholic bishops. British Parliamentary Papers, Irish University Press, Canada, vol. 17, p. 402; *Globe*, July 17, 1847 (report of organizational meeting); *Globe*, August 11, 1847 (city council meeting at which use of the Barracks for the asylum was discussed); *Globe*, August 21, 1847 ("Appeal to the Citizens of Toronto, on Behalf of the Widows and Orphans of Destitute Immigrants Dying Here"); *Globe*, September 1 and 8, 1847; *Globe*, December 1 and 8, 1847 ("Notice is hereby Given, that Women, Boys and Girls, as Servants and Apprentices, can be procured at the Widows' and Orphans' Asylum. Application to be made at the Institution, corner of Bathurst and Queen Streets, West, Toronto"); *Globe*, May 6, 1848 ("Widows' and Orphans' Asylum: Notice is hereby given that this establishment is to be closed on Monday the 15th inst., and that no Widows or Orphans can be admitted after this date. J. S. Howard. Secretary").

9 City of Toronto Archives, SC 35A, box 1, *House of Industry Board Minutes*, vol. III, April 25, 1848-December 21, 1858, "Rules for the Government of the House of Industry" and "7 Rules for the

mothers as the most deserving of help, and, while providing short-term institutional care, apprenticed the children as soon as possible.

No person or agency was responsible for identifying children in need or facilitating their placement, however. As a consequence, large numbers of children perceived as being in need of care were not getting it. Children's homes were established to meet this perceived need, a development which Patricia T. Rooke and R. L. Schnell have argued reflected a new concept of childhood with four major criteria: dependence, protection, segregation, and delayed responsibilities. This concept led to the creation of total institutions in which to achieve child rescue for those children not properly provided for at home.¹⁰ Rooke and Schnell also note that "the POHs were not merely 'institutions' but were indeed reflections of the world view of a certain group of women and the spatial, physical and moral expressions of a real sense of usefulness, selfworth, identity and autonomy."¹¹ The influence of the lady Managers is evident in the way the Home used apprenticeship and adoption, which suggests both pragmatic and empathetic responses. Although the Managers may have expressed a belief in the value of institutional care and in the desirability of institutional segregation, in practice such

Superintendent"; Canada, *Statutes*, "An Act to Incorporate The House of Industry of Toronto", 1851, 14 and 15 Vict., ch. 35; City of Toronto Archives, SC 35A, box 1, file 15, House of Industry, *Annual Report*, 1870 (summary of the number of children apprenticed from the time it opened); City of Toronto Archives, SC 35 D, box 2, file 2, "Toronto House of Industry Register of Applications for Children 1853–1859" (details about children apprenticed 1853–1859). The House of Industry was not a municipal organization. However, it was intended to be a non-sectarian organization providing for the poor generally, especially widows and orphans. For example, until its incorporation it had as *ex officio* members the Clergy of the City and the Mayor (see report of organizational meeting in *Christian Guardian*, January 11, 1837; report of annual meeting in *Globe*, February 23, 1850). After its incorporation several members of the clergy were still normally named as Trustees and Managers, and the Mayor was still an *ex officio* member. In arguing that early poor relief efforts did not treat children differently, Rooke and Schnell note that the House of Industry began to emphasize placement of children in 1853. Patricia T. Rooke and R. L. Schnell, "Childhood and Charity in Nineteenth-Century British North America", *Histoire sociale/ Social History*, vol. 15, no. 29 (May 1982), pp. 157–179 at p. 164. In fact, from the time of its opening it placed the children in its care in private homes, avoiding long-term institutionalization, although they appear not to have been formally apprenticed until after the House incorporated in 1851. From 1837 to 1852, 318 children were placed.

10 Patricia T. Rooke and R. L. Schnell, *Discarding the Asylum: From Child Rescue to the Welfare State in English-Canada (1800–1950)* (Lanham, Md.: University of America Press, 1983), especially pp. 8, 19, 66–67, 135, 389–396; Rooke and Schnell, "Childhood and Charity". Rooke and Schnell recognize that the homes placed the children, but suggest that this happened between the ages of 12 and 14. They also seek to explain the use of placement in the context of their theory of child rescue by arguing that "binding out made possible a continuation of surveillance and control over the children's lives and confirmed their menial status by the very nature of their occupations" (*Discarding the Asylum*, p. 394). The force of this argument is rather reduced by their acknowledgement that there was minimal follow-up of the children by the homes, and that the same could be said of all children living in families, whether as natural children, apprentices, or foster children.

11 Patricia T. Rooke and R. L. Schnell, "The Rise and Decline of British North American Protestant Orphans' Homes as Woman's Domain, 1850–1930", *Atlantis*, vol. 7 (1982), p. 33.

beliefs were not strongly reflected in their placement decisions about individual children. Their "Rules and Regulations" provided that children should remain in the Home for at least a year and to age 12, emphasizing the merits of segregation and suggesting a belief in delaying responsibilities. In practice, however, the Managers appear to have preferred to place children in private homes as soon as possible, and to have used adoption as well as apprenticeship to achieve this end. This tendency probably stemmed in part from their interest in doing what was best for each individual child and perception that long-term institutional care was undesirable, and in part from a desire to help as many children as possible.

Residential care thus did not displace pauper apprenticeship as a primary mechanism for dealing with dependent children, nor did the foster care system implemented in 1893 represent a major shift in the way such children were accommodated. In effect, the Home could be seen as an agency which made the existing pauper apprenticeship system work. Looked at in this light, the foster care system implemented under the Children's Protection Act substituted Children's Aid Societies for children's homes as the agencies responsible for finding homes for the children.

Establishment of the Home

The Toronto Protestant Orphans' Home was one of the first permanent children's homes established in Ontario. By mid-century many were arguing for permanent residential institutions for children, with three types being identified. First, reformatories were needed for children convicted of serious offences, and, secondly, industrial schools would take care of the criminally inclined not yet involved in serious crime.¹² Admission of children to both types of institution would be ordered by legal authorities. Thirdly, homes like the Toronto POH for destitute orphans admitted voluntarily at the request of friends or family were required. While the image of the pathetic street urchin helped promote philanthropic interest in such homes, they were to be residences for relatively "good" children, not bad characters.¹³

The heightened interest in the plight of dependent children arose in part from problems caused by the rapidly increasing population of Upper Canada,¹⁴ which was doubling about every ten years.¹⁵ These problems were

12 For a discussion of the origins of and motivation for industrial schools, see Charlotte Neff, "The Ontario Industrial Schools Act of 1874", *Canadian Journal of Family Law*, vol. 12, no. 1 (March 1994), pp. 171–208. Much of the discussion about the need for industrial schools came within the context of the debate about compulsory education.

13 Rooke and Schnell, *Discarding the Asylum*, pp. 81, 111–112, 137–180, 394. As to the perceived role to be played by such homes in comparison with that of industrial schools, see "Our Juvenile Vagrants", *Globe*, November 26, 1868; "Compulsory Education" (letter to the editor), *Globe*, April 4, 1868.

14 For all the population figures which follow, see Frederick H. Armstrong, *Handbook of Upper Canadian Chronology*, revised ed. (Hamilton: Dundurn Press, 1985), pp. 265, 275.

15 The population was about 150,000 in 1824, 375,000 when the House of Industry was established in

compounded by the influx of large numbers of poor British immigrants and were particularly acute for the new cities — Toronto, Hamilton, Ottawa, London, and Kingston. Toronto itself, although it became the capital of Upper Canada in 1796, was only established in 1793¹⁶ and had 684 inhabitants in 1811, rising to 30,000 in 1853. During this time it became by far the largest urban centre in the province, surpassing Kingston shortly after 1830.

In addition to increasing the absolute numbers of dependent children and making them more obvious, these demographic changes created a class of women with much free time. In the country women tended to be fully occupied with domestic and farm chores, but upper-middle-class urban women were not needed to help with their husbands' and fathers' enterprises. Many of these women occupied themselves with charitable work, as it was not considered proper that they undertake paid employment or business enterprises of their own.¹⁷ The establishment and running of children's homes was one of their more notable contributions, as they undertook virtually full responsibility for both the business and day-to-day operations of the institutions. Both the men and women involved assumed that homes providing long-term institutional care exclusively for children should be run by women, such work being seen as a suitable extension of their maternal responsibilities within the family. That such volunteer work offered a productive outlet for competent women may even help explain the popularity of institutions as a way of providing aid to dependent children.

The first children's home to be established in the province was the Hamilton Orphan Asylum, which was opened by the Ladies' Benevolent Society of Hamilton in 1848 and incorporated in 1852,¹⁸ and at least two Roman Catholic asylums were in operation by 1851 or 1852, one in Hamilton and

1837, 725,000 in 1848 when the Hamilton Orphan Asylum was opened, and nearly one million when the Toronto POH was opened in 1853.

16 Edith G. Firth, *The Town of York 1793–1815* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1962), pp. xxxi–xl, 3–56.

17 For a picture of rural middle-class life, see, for example, Susanna Moodie, *Roughing it in the Bush* (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1962); Anne Langton, *A Gentlewoman in Upper Canada*, ed. H. H. Langton (Toronto: Clarke Irwin, 1964). For discussions of the role of women in nineteenth-century children's homes and philanthropy more generally, see Rooke and Schnell, "The Rise and Decline of British North American Protestant Orphans' Homes", pp. 21–35, and *Discarding the Asylum*, pp. 102–103, 130–136; T. R. Morrison, "'Their Proper Sphere': Feminism, the Family, and Child-Centered Social Reform in Ontario, 1875–1900", *Ontario History*, vol. 68 (1976), pp. 45–79. The wife of a prominent member of the legal profession in Upper Canada felt very strongly that it was improper for respectable women to work. See Katherine Mary Jean McKenna, *A Life of Propriety: Anne Murray Powell and her Family, 1755–1849* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1994).

18 Canada, *Statutes*, "An Act to incorporate the Trustees of *The Hamilton Orphan Asylum*", 1852, 16 Vict., ch. 67, s. 9; Hamilton Public Library, *Aged Women's Home Minutes*, vols. I and II.

one in Toronto.¹⁹ Early in 1851 Dr. Rees, founder of the Lunatic Asylum and an advocate for social reform,²⁰ suggested to the Reverend Dr. Stephen Lett that he spearhead the establishment of a non-denominational orphans' home in Toronto. Dr. Lett immediately proceeded to do so, although, because of the existence of the Roman Catholic Asylum, the Home was from the start designated as Protestant. Dr. Lett was also involved with the House of Industry, but was otherwise a relatively obscure minister of the Church of England (incumbent of St. George's Church) and a recent immigrant from England.²¹ The establishment of the Home was thus initiated by men, and they tended to dominate public meetings.²² On an ongoing basis they also advised the lady Managers concerning "Fiscal and other important matters, which could not be so efficiently managed by ladies",²³ and in July 1855 a "Committee of Council" of three men was formally constituted for this purpose. However, from the first concrete proposals it was made clear that the Home was to be run by "the ladies of the City".²⁴

The list of female incorporators and early Managers²⁵ of the Home reads

- 19 *Globe*, March 2, 1855. The *Globe*, January 22, 1853, refers to a Roman Catholic Asylum in the context of a dispute about how R.C. children were treated by the House of Industry. A legislative return in 1865 indicates that this asylum and another in Hamilton were established in 1852, but its dates are not very accurate as it shows the Toronto POH as established in 1849 and incorporated in 1850 and the Hamilton Orphan Asylum as established in 1845. This R.C. asylum was to grow into the largest in the province, with 240 children at the beginning of 1865, compared with 87 in the Toronto POH, the second largest children's home receiving government aid that year. Canada, *Sessional Papers*, 1866, 29 Vict., no. 10, pp. 31–33. A total of six children's homes were in receipt of aid in 1865, five receiving \$640 each and the sixth, the Toronto Girls' Home, \$320. Discrepancies in the founding date for the R.C. asylum may be a consequence of a gradual evolution of institutions, starting informally with nuns providing refuge in convents to individual children in need, and evolving into separate institutions. There may thus not always be a precise date for the founding of Catholic institutions as there is for the Protestant ones. Bettina Bradbury has studied the use of one Montreal orphanage by families in crisis but does not discuss its origins or management in detail other than to state that it was "officially founded in 1853". Bettina Bradbury, "Fragmented Families: Family Strategies in the Face of Death, Illness, and Poverty, Montreal, 1860–1885" in Joy Parr, ed., *Childhood and Family in Canadian History* (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1982), pp. 109–128.
- 20 Anna Brownell Jameson, *Winter Studies and Summer Rambles in Canada* (1838; Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, New Canadian Library no. 46, 1965), p.74; *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 10 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972), pp. 610–611.
- 21 Letter from Dr. Lett, *Globe*, March 2, 1855. The *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 13 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994), p. 596, indicates that his son Stephen was born in Ireland in April 1847.
- 22 At the 1853 annual meeting there were 20 or 30 ladies present and about eight men (*Globe*, June 21, 1853). At the 1859 meeting the "greater portion" of those present were women (*Globe*, June 8, 1859). The men present did appear to dominate, however, both in disputes and in the conduct of routine business, with husbands often even reading formal reports on behalf of the women officers.
- 23 *Minutes*, July 4 and 31, 1855; June 28 1858; *Annual Report*, especially 1856, p. 5.
- 24 *Prospectus*, June 9, 1851, inserted at the front of vol. I of the *Minutes*; minutes of the public organizing meeting, *Minutes*, June 16, 1851.
- 25 The officers are listed at the beginning of the *Annual Report* each year, but normally only last names were given. First names or husbands' initials have in some cases been gleaned from other sources,

like a *Who's Who* of early York/Toronto elite families — Baby, Baldwin, Boulton, Cayley, Denison, Duggan, Gurnett, Heward, Jarvis, Ridout, Robinson, Sherwood, Small, Vankoughnet.²⁶ Mrs. Henry Sherwood was an incorporator and Manager from 1853 to 1855 and 1860 to 1861, and Second Directress in 1853. Mrs. Boulton Sr. of the Grange was an incorporator and Manager from 1851 to 1862 and Second Directress in 1854. Mrs. William (Emma) Cayley was a Manager from 1854 to 1859.²⁷ Mrs. George (Catherine) Gurnett (Manager 1851–1861, First Directress 1855–1857) was the wife of the sometime mayor of Toronto; he was also very active in the organization and a member of the Committee of Council for a time. Although not Church of England, he was a Tory and a strong supporter of the Family Compact.²⁸ However, the most active Managers tended to be wives of less notable members of these families or were not connected with them at all, although their husbands were normally relatively affluent professionals. Mrs. Matthew R. Vankoughnet was a Manager throughout the period considered here, Secretary from 1862 to 1864, and Second Directress for the remainder of the period 1857 to 1879, when she replaced Mrs. Murray as First Directress. Her husband was a lawyer in association with his much better-known brother, Philip.²⁹ Mrs. Frederick (Elizabeth Jane) Widder, the first First Directress, came to Canada in 1839 with her husband, a commissioner of

including the *Minutes* and newspaper accounts of meetings. In many cases more than one member of the same family was involved over the years, making identification uncertain in particular years. The years in which individual women served in all cases refer to the years of appointment at the annual meeting held in June.

- 26 See the *Dictionary of Canadian Biography* for accounts of the various individuals. For accounts of some less honourable activities of some of these families in the first quarter of the nineteenth century, see Chris Raible, *Muddy York Mud: Scandal and Scurrility in Upper Canada* (Toronto: Curiosity House and Dundurn Press, 1992).
- 27 Mrs. Boulton was identified as Mrs. Boulton Sr. of the Grange, and hence Sarah Ann Robinson, wife of D'Arcy Boulton Jr. (son of chief Justice D'Arcy Boulton) and sister of Sir John Beverley Robinson. Her daughter-in-law Harriet, wife of William Henry Boulton, who among other things was mayor from 1845 to 1847 and again in 1858, was also an incorporator and Manager from 1859 to 1861. Mrs. Cayley was the sister of D'Arcy Boulton Jr. William Cayley was a prominent lawyer and politician, member of the Legislative Assembly for many years. *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 6, p. 80; vol. 10, pp. 79–81; vol. 11, p. 165; Victor Loring Russell, *Mayors of Toronto, 1834–1899* (Erin, Ont.: Boston Mills Press, 1982), p. 41.
- 28 *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 9, p. 345; Russell, *Mayors of Toronto, 1834–1899*, p. 25. George Gurnett began his career as a journalist and ended it as a police magistrate. As to his involvement in the Toronto POH, see, for example, *Globe*, June 6, 1855.
- 29 Mr. Vankoughnet was a member of the Committee of Council for much of the time that she was a Manager and sometimes provided legal advice. Philip Vankoughnet (1790–1873, *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 10, p. 693), a Cornwall merchant and politician, attended Strachan's school and was said to be a friend of Archibald McLean. He had several children, Philip Michael Matthew Scott Vankoughnet (1822–1869), a lawyer and politician who ended his career as Chancellor of the Court of Chancery (1862) and of Ontario (1867), being the most distinguished. *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 9 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976), p. 803. See also City of Toronto Archives, *Toronto Directory 1856*.

the Canada Company.³⁰ Mrs. Davidson Munro (Mary A.) Murray, First Directress from 1857 until 1878, came to Toronto from Barbados in 1835 with her husband, who does not appear to have been particularly prominent.³¹ Others who were Managers for some years and who held executive positions included: Mrs. Frederick W. Coate (Annie M., Manager from 1855 throughout the period and Treasurer 1859–1861), wife of an auctioneer; Mrs. John Crickmore (Anne Mary, an incorporator, Manager 1855–1866, and Secretary 1859–1861), wife of a lawyer; Mrs. Peter Diehl (Anne, Manager 1858–1866 and Treasurer 1862–1863), wife of a doctor; Mrs. Charles Heath (Sarah, an incorporator, Manager 1851–1865, and Treasurer 1861), wife of a lawyer who became paymaster for public works; Mrs. Frederick Perkins (Sophia, a Manager 1853–1864 and Second Directress 1862–1864), wife of a merchant; and Mrs. Thomas P. Robarts (an incorporator, Manager until 1859, and Second Directress 1855–1856).³² Other mayors' wives who served as Managers for brief periods were Mrs. Bowes, a Methodist,³³ and Mrs. John Beverley Robinson.³⁴ Rev. Lett's wife, Harriette, was also an incorporator, Manager, and Treasurer, while Rev. Lett himself continued to be very actively involved as Chaplain to the Home and member of the Committee of Council. Mrs. Lett died in 1855, but his second wife became a Manager in 1857 and continued until 1862, when Rev. Lett moved out of town.

The women who incorporated the Home were not a group who had experience with needy children or had worked together in their aid or that of the poor more generally, as had the women in Hamilton, but rather individuals who responded to a public appeal. Few were to become actively involved, and rapid turnover took place among the Managers for the first three years until a group coalesced who had some firm commitment to the venture and the ability to work together. Of the 47 women who were named as incorporators in 1851, only five were Managers in 1853 when the Home opened, and seven in 1854. A cynical interpretation is that those initially involved were far more interested in being seen to be doing their Christian duty and in having something worthwhile with which to occupy their time than they were in the children. At least one "Friend to the Orphan" thought that ignorance of the true state of orphans might have been one of the reasons the founders delayed so long in opening the Home, another being

30 *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 9, pp. 836–838.

31 *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 12 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991), p. 409; *Globe*, June 3, 1868; *Annual Report*, 1879, list of Ordinary Members.

32 City of Toronto Archives, *Toronto City Directory*, 1856, 1859–60, 1861. John Crickmore was a member of the Committee of Council for many years; T. P. Robarts was auditor for the Home until 1859 and a member of the Committee of Council 1855–1858.

33 John George Bowes was mayor 1852–1853 and 1861–1863. Russell, *Mayors of Toronto*, p. 45; *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 9, pp. 76–77.

34 Robinson, son of the eminent jurist, was mayor in 1856. Russell, *Mayors of Toronto*, pp. 57–59.

that they were primarily from the Church of England elite.³⁵ Both the 1851 *Prospectus* and the minutes highlight the religious motivations of both the founders and later Managers, as do successive annual reports, and tend to confirm that the founders lacked personal knowledge about the number of children in need.

An almost constant bickering about organizational issues among the founders reinforces the view that they lacked commitment to the cause of homeless children. As chronicled in the minutes, the organizers proceeded relatively quickly with the appointment of a Board of Managers and officers, the incorporation of the Orphans' Home and Female Aid Society,³⁶ adoption of "Rules and Regulations" for the Home,³⁷ fundraising including a public appeal, and the search for a suitable location. However, the Home did not open until two years after the public appeal, a period characterized by unseemly squabbling among the women involved. The major consequence was an inability to agree whether the Home should be opened forthwith in rented accommodation, or the opening delayed until "an ornament to the City" could be built and paid for, and operating funds secured.³⁸ In early April 1853 the Managers finally resolved their differences in the interests of the objects of the institution, "to honor God by doing good to the poor and destitute orphans He may place in our way". The Home opened in rented accommodation in May 1853³⁹ and moved to its own building in December 1854. It was located on Sullivan Street, north of Queen, between Beverley Street and Spadina Avenue, a short distance from St. George's Church. Most of the active Managers and men were to live in this area, which helps explain their involvement.

Another dispute erupted in 1854 and dominated the affairs of the Society until the summer of 1855. On the surface it was a sectarian dispute, al-

35 Letter to the Editor, *Globe*, April 14, 1853. See also letter to the editor from "A Subscriber", April 9, 1853, which also cited personal advancement as a motivation.

36 Canada, *Statutes*, "An Act to incorporate The Orphans' Home and Female Aid Society", 1851, 14 and 15 Vict., ch. 34. Married women were specifically granted legal capacity to conduct the affairs of the Home by the act. While commonly referred to as the Protestant Orphans' Home, the word Protestant was omitted from the Act of Incorporation despite a last-ditch resolution to include it (*Minutes*, July 15, 1851).

37 "Rules and Regulations of the Orphans' Home & Female Aid Society, Toronto" (hereafter "Rules"), 1st *Annual Report*, 1852. These were approved by the Managers on July 29, 1851, amended on March 18 and 30, 1852, and approved with the addition of one rule at the 1852 annual meeting (see *Minutes*). In 1856 details about the contents of indentures were removed from the rules, and forms of indenture adopted; the following year the rules were amended to add set prayers for meetings and to change the membership rules; and at a special meeting on July 4, 1859, a clause about land transactions was added. The rules thus revised were published with the 1859 *Annual Report*. The wording of the other provisions given below did not change although the rule numbers did. In references to the "Rules" in the text the first number is the rule number in the 1852 version; the number in square brackets is that for the 1859 rules.

38 *Minutes*, 1851–1853; *Globe*, June 10, 1852; June 21, 1853; February 21, 1855.

39 *Minutes*, September 14, 27, and 28, 1852; March 29, 1853; April 9 and 26, 1853; May 17, 1853.

though membership issues were a significant concern and, as with the earlier disagreements, personality clashes may have played a role.⁴⁰ The *Globe* painted the Rev. Dr. Lett as primarily responsible, characterizing him as “a violent bigoted Episcopalian”, but the lady Managers appear to have been as much or more at fault, although the division did not fall along the same lines as in the earlier bickering.⁴¹ The fundamental question was whether the Home was to be a Church of England institution or have a more broadly based Protestant appeal. The Secretary, Miss Isabella McLean, a Presbyterian, and her brother Archibald⁴² were prominent in opposing the Church of England designation, but members of the Church of England supported both sides of the issue. The problem arose because the promoters had professed an intention to establish a non-sectarian Protestant institution and had extended an open invitation to the organizing meeting, although those involved were from the start primarily Church of England.⁴³ In the end, a formal resolution remained on the books declaring the Home to be Church of England, although the Bishop of the Church of England (John Strachan) refused to open the Home officially because of the disagreements about its status.⁴⁴

40 *Minutes*, December 12, 1854.

41 *Globe*, February 21, 1855. A letter to the *Globe* from an Irish Protestant reader (July 17, 1851) suggests that the *Globe* was not alone in these views. However, there is nothing in the records of the House of Industry with which he was also involved to suggest that he made a habit of trying to convert such institutions to the Church of England.

42 McLean's role in this affair is noteworthy given that he was a judge and a friend of Anglican Bishop John Strachan. However, he was also a strong advocate of the rights of the Presbyterian Church and was through marriage related to prominent Roman Catholics. *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 10, p. 512.

43 *Globe*, April 14, 1853; March 2, 1855. As to the original non-sectarian aim, it was specifically noted by the Mayor at the first general meeting after incorporation that “the charity was not sectarian, and therefore it was to be hoped it would receive general support” (*Globe*, June 10, 1852). The institution was always called the Protestant Orphan's Home but not officially so designated in the Act of Incorporation. The Managers resolved to add this prior to incorporation, but found they were too late (*Minutes*, July 15, 1851), and the main purpose of emphasizing that it was Protestant was to distinguish it from the Roman Catholic asylum and make clear Roman Catholics were not welcome (see the *Prospectus*).

44 The disputes were extensively covered in the *Minutes*, especially August 29, November 14, and December 12, 1854; January 31, February 12 and 27, March 27, April 11 and 24, May 10 and 29, and June 5, 12, and 21, 1855; and in the *Globe*, February 21 and 23, 1855; March 2, 1855; June 6, 7, and 25, 1855. At the 1855 annual meeting there were also disputes about the mode of electing the Managers for the year, who was entitled to vote, and a sum of money paid to Dr. Lett. It was resolved that Dr. Lett be reimbursed for his expenses in going to Quebec to deal with a legal dispute over a piece of land granted by the government. The opponents of declaring the Home a Church of England institution fixed on this to discredit Dr. Lett, but the Managers had stated at the time they asked him to go that he would be reimbursed. *Minutes*, October 25 and November 16, 1853; March 27 and May 29, 1855. It is not clear why he was not paid sooner. He had been reimbursed for an earlier trip relating to the same grant of land by being made a life member of the institution. *Minutes*, November 30, 1852.

In practice, too, the Home continued to be dominated by the Church of England, with Dr. Lett remaining highly influential. When he moved to the country in 1862 he ceased to be Chaplain, but was replaced by his successor at St. George's, Rev. F. Fuller, who also soon joined the Committee of Council, while his wife became a Manager. Rev. Lett remained a member of the Committee of Council until his death in 1879 and continued to recommend children for admission and potential masters. The Home was strongly supported by other church officials, including Bishop Strachan, despite his refusal to officiate at the opening.⁴⁵ In 1860 he laid the cornerstone for the West Wing and agreed to be appointed official Visitor to the Home.⁴⁶ Upon his death, his successor was likewise appointed as Visitor at the 1868 annual meeting.

Until April 1868 the vast majority of children admitted to the Home were recorded as Church of England, with a handful being Presbyterian, an even smaller number being Methodist, and one being Church of Scotland. From that date forward, the Register normally indicated only that the children were Protestant, there being no explicit explanation in the surviving records of the change.⁴⁷ In the 1869 *Annual Report* it was stated that "Children of all Protestant denominations are received into this Home, and all, except Roman Catholics, can obtain children for apprenticeship or adoption; therefore this Institution cannot be considered sectarian in its views of management." The children while in the Home were to be "brought up in the faith of the Church of England", but when they left the Managers normally placed them with masters whose religion was that of their parents.⁴⁸

Aside from these disputes, the Home had other teething problems. The arguments themselves were in part responsible for a rapid turnover among the Managers, as well as the resignation of the First Directress, Mrs. Widder, in the spring of 1855. In early 1855 the Treasurer, Mrs. Lett, died. In addition, the first Matron resigned after only four months and was replaced

45 Regarding Bishop John Strachan, see *Dictionary of Canadian Biography*, vol. 9, pp. 751–766. His wife was a subscriber and life member from the start. In November 1856 he personally presented a cheque for £151, part of the 1833 fund for cholera widows and orphans, at which time he expressed "his unqualified approbation of the mode in which the entire affairs of the establishment were conducted". *Annual Report*, 1857, p. 8; *Minutes*, November 31, 1856.

46 *Minutes*, July 3, 1860; see also list of officers in the *Annual Report*, 1860 onwards.

47 The Home had been in receipt of a government grant since 1852 (see annual financial accounts), and there was nothing in 1868 which apparently should have caused the Managers to change their procedures for this purpose. The grant was £200 (\$800) in 1855, falling to \$640 in 1864, which they received until 1875 when the government began calculating grants on a *per capita* basis pursuant to "The Charity Aid Act, 1874" (Ontario, *Statutes*, 1874, 38 Vict., ch. 33). It could have been connected with obtaining municipal grants, however, as, aside from an allotment by the city in 1851 of £200 from funds raised by a Jenny Lind concert, none are noted in the accounts until 1869 when \$400 was paid by Toronto, \$40 by Port Dalhousie, and \$25 by Clifton.

48 *Minutes*, July 15, 1851; "Rules", VII [IX]; *Minutes*, September 25 and October 30, 1855; March 26, 1856; February 22, 1859; June 26 and August 28, 1860; April 27, 1869.

by Mrs. Holmes. She in turn resigned in March 1855 because of the heavy workload and low pay, but returned without comment within two months and remained until 1866.⁴⁹

By the fall of 1855, however, these various problems appear to have been resolved and the public bickering to have ceased. Thereafter the Home enjoyed reasonable stability in its management and was professionally administered. Mrs. Murray and Mrs. Vankoughnet remained as Managers and, from 1857, First and Second Directress respectively throughout the period, with the exception of the three years that Mrs. Vankoughnet served as Secretary. Turnover among the 20 Managers was normally only two or three per year, with seven women serving continuously from 1855 or earlier to 1864 or later (Coate, Crickmore, Heath, Monro, Murray, Perkins, Vankoughnet).

Motivations, Mandate, and Admission Rules

The founders of the Toronto POH sought to “rescue their unfortunate fellow creatures from penury and misery”, including children who would otherwise “have been a prey to ignorance, destitution, and vice”. In this they were, as already noted, motivated not by personal experience with these “creatures”, but rather by a sense of religious duty. There is little evidence that much thought was given to the value of institutional care, but they did focus on “the necessity of a separate institution [for children] ... wherein undivided care can be bestowed on the physical, moral, and religious training of its helpless inmates, in most cases admitted in tender years, when just deprived of a parent’s watchful care and instruction”. The promoters cited the examples of long-standing Protestant homes in Montreal and Quebec City, no doubt in the hope that this would be a further incitement to the ladies of Toronto to become involved.⁵⁰

In practice, this meant that care was to be provided “to friendless orphans” including, in order of priority, children with no parents, children with no father, and children with no mother. Applications for admission of children with two parents were normally declined, with exceptions being made only reluctantly.⁵¹ Admission was also normally declined to children

49 That Mrs. Holmes’s interpretation of the problem was accepted is suggested by increases in her wages and the hiring of a third servant. *Annual Report* and *Minutes*, April 26 and August 30, 1853; March 27 and May 10, 1855; September 30, 1856.

50 *Prospectus; Annual Report*, 1854.

51 “Act of Incorporation”; “Rules”, VIII [X]; Rooke and Schnell, *Discarding the Asylum*, p. 139. Practice at Roman Catholic homes may have differed, as at least one Catholic home in Montreal commonly took children with two parents. Bradbury, “Fragmented Families”, p. 118; *Minutes*, March 28, 1854; July 31, 1858; April 1 and 26, 1864; October 27, 1869 (mother and stepfather); *Visitors’ Book*, July 27, 1855; *Minutes*, December 1, 1863; RC 261–265; *Annual Report*, 1867 (four sisters admitted in “peculiar” circumstances who had both a mother and a stepfather, but only after a long discussion and a split vote).

with a parent able to support them.⁵² As a result, although parents sometimes promised to contribute monthly to the support of their children, a practice approved in 1853 as being common in other similar institutions, it was unusual at the Toronto POH.⁵³ After the first two years children under two were rarely admitted.⁵⁴ There were no formal rules about the character of parents, but in fact the Managers refused admission to foundlings and illegitimate children, presumably on the grounds that to admit them would be to support immorality.⁵⁵ Children suffering from mental illness were sent to the Asylum.⁵⁶

The Home was originally intended to serve the City of Toronto and the County of York, but it accepted children from across the province, a point emphasized at the 1864 annual meeting. This was consistent with its funding, as it received a significant annual provincial grant from 1852, as well as a provincial land endowment, but no municipal grants before 1869. However, municipalities from which the children came were expected to contribute to the cost of their children or make a donation to the Home.⁵⁷ Children with a parent in prison were normally refused admission unless their municipality did so, a rule supported by formal resolution in 1862.⁵⁸

52 *Minutes*, September 25, 1855. Rule applied May 31, 1853 (mother), January 27, 1857 (mother), August 25, 1857 (father), October 30, 1860 (father), January 31, 1862 (father), August 29, 1865.

53 *Minutes*, May 31, 1853 (a mother and an aunt to pay \$1 per month); *Minutes*, April 30, 1861 (father in England, a minister, to pay £5 sterling, \$25, quarterly until he could pay for passage of his children); *Minutes*, March 25, 1862 (mother of one pays \$1); *Minutes*, June 24, 1862 (mother of six pays ten shillings); RC 220 (father to pay \$4 per month for son whom he took out three months later, 1862); *Minutes*, July 26, 1864 (widow to pay \$2 for daughter); September 26, 1865 (\$60 half yearly for five children admitted under "peculiar circumstances"); December 26, 1865 (\$12.40 half yearly for children, mother in England). "Contributions by Orphans' relatives" shown on the financial statements were \$11.50 in 1854, \$40 in 1856, \$80 in 1857, \$28.06 in 1858, \$27.60 in 1859, \$11 in 1860, \$15.50 in 1861, \$85.16 in 1862 (\$75 of this from the father, *Minutes*, August 27, 1861; January 31 and April 29, 1862), \$45.50 in 1863, \$38 in 1864, \$210.66 in 1865, \$246.05 in 1866 (at least half the amounts paid in 1865 and 1866 were for the five children noted above, as well as some for the two boys in 1867 and 1868), \$192.57 in 1867, \$99.88 in 1868, \$118 in 1869, \$145 in 1870, \$165.50 in 1871, \$432.84 in 1874, and \$215 in 1879. Excluding capital costs, in 1856 it cost about \$38 to keep a child, in 1862 \$28, and in 1868 \$40, and thus the amounts collected were rarely significant, never more than 7% of the total budget, generally 4% or less.

54 RC 9, 15, 46; *Minutes*, June 27, August 29, and November 28, 1865; January 30 and May 29, 1866; January 31, 1870 (against rules to admit child under two).

55 *Minutes*, June 28, 1853; February 28 and March 25, 1854; *Visitors' Book*, February 16, 1861 (foundlings), December 29, 1868 (parents not married). Rooke and Schnell note this as a common charge against children's homes which did admit foundlings in "The Rise and Decline of British North American Protestant Orphans' Homes", p. 28.

56 RC 17, 26, 237, 284, 386, 88, 239. A boy of "weak intellect" remained in the Home from his admission at age six in 1853 until his death in 1859, despite efforts to have him admitted to the Lunatic Asylum (ER 211, *Minutes*, June 30, 1857, and June 25, 1858).

57 *Prospectus*; Act of Incorporation; *Globe*, June 9, 1864; *Visitors' Book*, October 4, 1856; *Minutes*, December 1, 1863; February 23, 1864; April 1 and 26, 1864; July 25, 1865; January 26, 1869.

58 *Minutes*, October 25, 1859; January 31, 1862. In 1858 a nine-month-old girl was admitted whose

The mandate of the organization, according to the *Prospectus* and the Act of Incorporation, included not only the care of orphan children but also “relief and support ... for destitute females”. In practice they limited their efforts to children due to lack of funds, a limitation formally endorsed in the “Rules and Regulations” and at general meetings.⁵⁹

Operation of the Home

The Home was to be run by 20 lady Managers elected at the annual meeting, from whom would be elected a First and Second Directress, a Treasurer, and a Secretary. The Managers were to hold monthly meetings at which they would approve all admissions, potential masters, and placements. Rooke and Schnell suggest that “It was precisely in these areas that women through their ladies’ committees exercised maximum control.”⁶⁰ Although the First Directress and others often approved placements and admissions between meetings, as evidenced in the *Visitors’ Book*, these were confirmed at the monthly meetings. However, they were normally recorded relatively informally, with even children’s names not always being given. By comparison, the Managers of the Toronto Boys’ Home were very diligent about approving every apprenticeship by formal resolution properly recorded in the minutes.⁶¹ The Managers were to take turns monthly as Visitors to oversee the operation of the Home. They were to visit the Home at least three times per week and record their observations in the *Visitors’ Book*. Entries usually included a statement of satisfaction with what they saw, but often mentioned specific minor or major matters requiring attention, as well as decisions about and activities of children, both individuals and groups. In general, the *Visitors’ Book* suggests that the women had a keen interest in the functioning of the Home and well-being of the children, despite the ignorance, and perhaps indifference, of the founders.⁶²

The Treasurer was to keep a register of subscribers and donors, receive money, keep accounts, inspect and certify the Matron’s account monthly, and report monthly to the Managers, who were to approve all disbursements. The Secretary, in addition to normal responsibilities at meetings, was to keep a Register of the children in the Home. She was also to inquire at least once per year about children apprenticed, conduct the correspondence in

father had been killed in an accident and whose mother was in penitentiary (RC 126 — the girl was taken by her mother two years later). In 1864 a brother and sister whose father was in jail awaiting trial were admitted (RC 309 and 310; OR 34). In 1869 a boy from Niagara whose mother was dead and father in jail was admitted (*Minutes*, October 27, 1869).

59 “Rules”, II [IV]; *Annual Report*, 1859, 1863; *Minutes*, August 26, 1862.

60 Rooke and Schnell, “The Rise and Decline of British North American Orphans’ Homes”, p. 26.

61 AO, Toronto Boys’ Home Papers, F831, Series E, MU 4928 to MU 4933, *Minute Books of Weekly Meetings* from 1865 to 1901, *Minute Books of Special and Monthly Meetings* from 1859 to 1897, and *Annual Report* from 1860 to 1883.

62 Act of Incorporation; “Rules”; *Visitors’ Book*; *Minutes*, January 31, 1855.

general, and prepare the annual report. The records suggest that these responsibilities were discharged reasonably well, with a few brief lapses, although turnover in both offices was high.

Responsibility for the day-to-day running of the Home — management of the domestic affairs and care of the children — was in the hands of a resident Matron elected by the Managers at a monthly meeting. Mrs. Holmes served as Matron until 1866 when she resigned due to her age or ill health, “after twelve and a half years of most faithful service”. She was replaced by Mrs. E. M. Large, who resigned in March 1869 due to ill health, “much to the regret of all connected with the Home”, and was replaced by Miss Wheelwright, who remained for 28 years.⁶³ After the initial disagreement, Mrs. Holmes’s salary, \$200 per year on her retirement, was reasonably good for women, for those in service, and in comparison with that paid at some other children’s homes. This suggests that the Managers came to recognize her work as of fairly high value. She was frequently commended, both in annual reports and in the minutes, for her work in managing the business of the Home and in caring for the children. She was assisted by two servants initially, then three, and as of February 1868 four. One of these was a nurse for the children under four, who were kept in a separate nursery room.⁶⁴ They earned about \$4 per month, which was on the low side.⁶⁵

From 1855 to 1863 these people cared for 55 to 60 children. Despite the building of two new wings in 1861, there was no increase in the number for two years, but in 1864 and 1865 the Home housed between 86 and 94

63 *Annual Report*, 1866, 1869; *Robertson’s Landmarks of Toronto*, vol. 3 (Toronto, 1898; Belleville: Mika Publishing, 1974), p. 296.

64 *Minutes*, June 26, 1855.

65 As to the Managers’ opinion of Mrs. Holmes, see for example *Minutes*, September 30 and December 30, 1856 (when she was entrusted with full control of the store of the Home). As an example of wages in other homes, in 1869 the total wage bill for the Ottawa POH, for a matron, teacher, and servant, was \$190, and in 1870 the matron’s salary was raised to \$144, the teacher’s to \$108. NAC, RG28 I 37, Ottawa Protestant Orphan’s Home, *Annual Report* Financial Statements and *Minutes*, April 25, 1870, and December 22, 1871. As to the value of the wages of the Matron and other servants by comparison with others, in 1837 it was noted “We give to our man-servant eight dollars a month, to the cook six dollars, and to the housemaid four; but these are lower wages than are usual for good and experienced servants, who might indeed command almost any wages here, where all labor is high priced.” Jameson, *Winter Studies and Summer Rambles in Canada*, pp. 71–72. In 1854 A. C. Buchanan, chief emigration agent at Quebec, reported that farmers could not afford to pay new immigrants more than \$6 to \$8 per month plus board and lodging, while good hands could after one year get \$10 to \$14 per month. Railway workers could get up to \$1 per day, probably excluding board. Helen I. Cowan, *British Emigration to British North America: The First Hundred Years* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1961), p. 285. In Hamilton in 1873 skilled workers could earn from \$1.75 to \$2.50 per day, labourers \$1 to \$1.25, without room and board, while domestic servants could make \$7 per month plus room and board. Michael B. Katz, Michael J. Doucet, and Mark J. Stern, *The Social Organization of Early Industrial Capitalism* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1982), pp. 35, 88.

children. After a disastrous epidemic in January 1866 this dropped back to former levels for two years, but rose again to 87 in 1869. The children slept in dormitories, often, perhaps normally, two to a bed.⁶⁶

The children also assisted in the running of the Home, the boys being “made useful in the house as far as they are capable of doing so” (shovelling coal, gardening, cutting and piling wood), the older girls helping all the servants with their duties. From time to time it was noted in the minutes that there were no children old enough in the Home “who could be spared” as apprentices, suggesting their services were often heavily relied upon.⁶⁷ In 1860 it was agreed that some girls could be more formally “trained up in the Home to assist in the domestic management of the Institution”, four girls being chosen therefore in November 1860. This resolution was overturned three years later, when it was decided that the four girls should be apprenticed.⁶⁸

Discipline was to “be strictly parental in its character, and the order and decorum of a well regulated family shall be carefully observed”.⁶⁹ There is little evidence of strict discipline and some suggestion that it was discouraged. For example, in April 1855 Mrs. Cayley noted in the *Visitors’ Book* that a servant had struck a child, and in 1865 Mrs. Holmes complained to the managers of severe punishment being used by Miss Scott, the teacher. After a special meeting to consider the issue the Managers exonerated the teacher of “all intentional unkindness”, but noted that on two occasions she had “acted rather injudiciously”.⁷⁰ In April 1856 the infliction of corporal punishment by himself and the Matron on a group of boys who had run away was carefully recorded in the *Visitors’ Book* by Rev. Lett as if it were unusual. He also refrained from punishing the oldest boy, who had not been and was unlikely to be admitted to the Home. In June 1860 Rev. Lett recommended in the *Visitors’ Book* that the police be recruited to deal with a runaway as an example and warning. In general, motherly care and attention on the part of the Matron and others were noted and extolled in successive annual reports and the *Visitors’ Book*,⁷¹ although it is difficult to imagine the Matron being a surrogate mother for over 50 children.

According to the rules, the children were to be in school six hours per day, but in practice formal school hours were probably only four.⁷² Girls

66 *Visitors’ Book*, April 7, 1865; July 28, 1865; July 7, 1869; *Annual Report*, 1865, 1870.

67 *Minutes*, June 26, 1855, “Rules for the Orphan’s Home”; *Annual Report*, 1868.

68 *Minutes*, November 27, 1860; March 31, 1863; July 31, 1866; March 31, 1868; *Annual Report*, 1862, 1868; *Visitors’ Book*, September 27, 1856; October 30, 1862.

69 “Rules”, VII [IX].

70 *Minutes*, December 26 and 29, 1865.

71 See, for example, *Annual Report* for 1856, 1860, 1861, 1864, 1865, and 1866. The maternal kindness of Mrs. Lett was also noted in the 1855 *Annual Report* and the kind and attentive care of the nurse in the *Visitors’ Book*, October 20, 1855, and May 8, 1861.

72 “Rules”, VII [IX]; Preamble to the Act of Incorporation; *Minutes*, June 26, 1855; February 26 and

were to learn reading and writing, boys arithmetic as well. In addition, there was practical instruction such as needlework and household work.⁷³ It took some years to establish a school on a regular basis, with instruction first being provided by the Matron. She found she did not have the time, and hence was soon assisted by volunteers, with a paid schoolmistress (Mrs. Holmes's daughter for one year) not being hired until 1860. In 1869, when the number of children in the Home rose to 97, 24 boys were sent to a local Common School to ease the load on the teacher. In 1875 a government inspector noted 56 boys and 25 girls attending school in the Home under one teacher.⁷⁴ A class of this size sounds excessively large and unmanageable to us, but it was the norm for Toronto schools, where the average number of pupils attending per teacher was 70 in 1871 and 67 in 1872,⁷⁵ with the number of children on the rolls being much higher due to low attendance rates.⁷⁶ In 1865 the Managers requested a grant from the school board, but there is no evidence of any support until January 1879, when the board appointed a teacher for the Home.⁷⁷

Religious training was an important part of the upbringing of the children, but the evidence supports Rooke and Schnell's conclusion that "the institutions themselves did not seem to represent oppressive evangelical fervour in religious training and indoctrination."⁷⁸ There was much focus on religion in the management of the Home, with meetings being opened and closed with prayer, the 1859 rules even specifying the prayers to be used. Every annual report included comments about the religious value of the work being undertaken and thanks to God for enabling the Home to do it. Often these comments were relatively *pro forma*, but in 1858, there being

March 26, 1856; *Visitors' Book*, April 24, 1855; September 29, 1857; December 11, 1860; January 29 and April 30, 1861; February 26, 1867; September 1, 1869; December 8, 1870; *Annual Report*, 1856, 1857, 1860, 1861.

73 *Minutes*, March 27, 1866; *Annual Report*, 1868.

74 Ontario, *Sessional Papers*, 1875, no. 4, "8th Annual Report of the Inspector of Asylums, Prisons, &c., Ontario", p. 185.

75 Ontario, *Sessional Papers*, 1874, no. 3, "Annual Report of the Normal, Model, High and Public Schools" for 1872 — Appendix B, p. 105. In 1876 a *Globe* reader lamented that "a very large number [of children] cannot be received, owing to the present buildings being overcrowded. In more than one-half of them, especially in the lower divisions, there are in each room from 100 to 130, and in some cases over 150 under one teacher." "The Defeated School By-Law" (letter to the editor), *Globe*, July 25, 1876.

76 In 1868, for example, 37,052 Ontario children between 5 and 16 were said not to have attended any school, while 44,407 attended fewer than 20 days, 76,961 between 20 and 50 days, and 103,342 between 50 and 100 days. Ontario, *Sessional Papers*, 1869, no. 3, "Annual Report of the Normal, Model, Grammar and Common Schools" for 1868, p. 50.

77 *Annual Report*, 1879; *Minutes*, August 27, September 27, and October 29, 1878; Ontario, *Sessional Papers*, 1879, no. 8, "Twelfth Annual Report of the Inspector of Asylums, Prisons, and Public Charities, 1879", p. 273.

78 Rooke and Schnell, "The Rise and Decline of British North American Protestant Orphans' Homes", p. 27.

little out of the ordinary to discuss, the report constituted virtually a mini-sermon. There is little evidence that religion received excessive emphasis in the daily routines of the Home, however, there being for example nothing in the rules, minutes, or annual reports about daily prayers, chapel, or weekly attendance at church or Sunday school. Nevertheless, it is clear from entries by Rev. Lett in the *Visitors' Book* that the children attended church weekly and were baptized if they had not been previously. Visitors to the schoolroom also frequently commented about the children singing hymns and reciting the catechism, but there were also many comments about their secular knowledge such as reading, writing, singing, and multiplication tables.

The children also had leisure time. The minuted rules provided that they were to go for a daily walk or engage in active play indoors. There were many references in the *Visitors' Book* to the children playing both inside and out and going for walks, as well as some to toys such as marbles, dolls, small wheelbarrows, and cricket equipment.

The Managers paid substantial attention to the health of the children, including the provision of isolated bedrooms for the sick in 1865 and frequent improvements to drainage and ventilation. Visitors often found the children having their bath, referred to once as their daily bath. The rules provided that diet was to be approved by the Managers or Medical Advisor, and one of the steps taken prior to the opening of the Home was to get the medical advisors of the time "to draw up dietary regulations".⁷⁹ By 1854 Dr. Ogden was serving without charge as the Medical Officer, and he did so throughout the period being considered. He was a frequent visitor to the Home, daily when there were sick children, and the care and attention he gave the children were repeatedly commended in the annual reports. He also initiated many physical improvements in drainage, water supply, ventilation, heat, and accommodation for the sick, sometimes even personally supervising the work.⁸⁰ Mass vaccinations of the children were recorded in the *Visitors' Book* on several occasions. These efforts were generally rewarded with good health and a low death rate. Only 12 deaths were recorded from the opening of the Home to June 1869, with the exception of January 1866, when an additional 18 children died in the space of four weeks from the combined effects of three simultaneous epidemics: measles, dysentery, and whooping cough.

On the whole, there is no reason to believe the lives of the children while they remained in the Home were not as pleasant as could be expected in the circumstances. Given the high ratio of children to staff, children could expect little adult nurturing, but they did have the other children to rely on, including in some cases siblings. This is suggested by the death of three pairs of siblings in the January 1866 epidemic: one-third of those who died,

79 "Rules", VII [IX]; *Minutes*, April 26, 1853.

80 *Visitors' Book; Annual Report*, for example 1866.

which is probably higher than might be expected by chance.⁸¹ Their material needs were reasonably well provided for, there was a regularity to their lives, and they received a basic education in accordance with the standards of the time. They also remained in the urban environment familiar to most of them.

There is no independent evidence about the conditions in the Home or the well-being of the children until the inspector of asylums and prisons began reporting on individual homes in 1874, at which time “the house throughout was found in a very clean and orderly state, with evidence of its affairs being well and properly administered.” The following year he did express some concerns about the physical arrangements, but these were promptly addressed.⁸² Few expressions of appreciation (or otherwise) by the children have survived, but in 1864 one girl, on being paid \$27 of apprenticeship money due to her, gave \$10 of it to the Home.⁸³

The Home’s Relationship with Parents

Rooke and Schnell have argued that it was standard for homes to attempt to displace parents by requiring their commitment to leave children in the Home for at least two years and by resisting parental requests for the return of their children.⁸⁴ Limited support for this contention can be found in the practices of the Toronto POH, and there is substantial evidence that the Home tried to work cooperatively with parents to do what seemed appropriate in the long-term interests of the children. The Home does seem to have required that many children be “given up”, apparently through the signing of forms, although there was no provision for this in the rules and no such forms have survived.⁸⁵ The rules simply stated that applications for admission were to be made in writing,⁸⁶ without even requiring that these applications be made by the parent or guardian of the child. In practice, the Register frequently noted the name of an individual recommending a child for admission, often a Manager, and it may have been these people who were the formal applicants.

81 RC 334 & 335, 283 & 285, 327 & 329.

82 Ontario, *Sessional Papers*, 1874, “Annual Report of the Inspector of Asylums, Prisons, &c. for 1874”, 38 Vict., no. 2, p. 150; 1875, 39 Vict., no. 2, pp. 184–185; 1876, 40 Vict., no. 2, pp. 194–195; 1877, 41 Vict., no. 4, pp. 220–221; 1878, 42 Vict., no. 8, pp. 232–233; 1879, 43 Vict., no. 8, pp. 273–274.

83 *Minutes*, November 29, 1864.

84 Rooke and Schnell, *Discarding the Asylum*, pp. 141–142.

85 In 1864 admission of a girl was declined in part on the grounds that the mother was not “willing to give her up” (*Minutes*, February 23, 1864). There are references to papers being signed (or not signed) in RC 363 (1865), RC 401 (1866), and *Minutes*, January 31, 1865 (reference to a printed form). In 1866 there is reference to a boy who “was not given over by the execution of papers as is usual in cases where absolute control of the children is obtained by the Managers” (*Minutes*, January 30, 1866).

86 “Rules”, VIII [X].

The motivation for requiring children be “given up” was to give the Home the authority to place children whose parents were not expected to reclaim them. However, legislative provisions governing apprenticeship,⁸⁷ as well as the only known case in which a parent tried to reclaim an apprenticed child,⁸⁸ suggest that parents who had clearly entrusted their children to children’s homes could not override apprenticeships, regardless of whether there was such written authority. In 1871 legislation limited parental rights, whether or not the child was apprenticed, by providing that parents and guardians could not, without consent, remove their children from an institution or home if they had abandoned them or the children were dependent on charity for support.⁸⁹ If parents were not contributing to their child’s keep, which was normally the case at the Toronto POH, this provision may have applied. However, a case from 1909, interpreting a similar later provision, suggests that courts might have interpreted the clause very strictly had there been a legal challenge. In this case the judge stated that “Leaving the child with those who had contracted to take proper care of it cannot fairly be called abandonment or desertion.”⁹⁰ This provision would have equally applied to adopted children, but the parents of adopted children would otherwise have had much greater rights, since at the time there was no legal provision for adoption. The cases noted are very clear that, even if the parents signed an adoption agreement, they were not thereby constrained from reclaiming their child. The courts were sometimes prepared to override parental rights and order that a child remain with adoptive parents if this was considered in his or her best interests, but whether such an order would have been made in the nineteenth century is dubious.⁹¹

87 Upper Canada, *Statutes*, 1851, “An Act to amend the Law relating to Apprentices and Minors”, 14 and 15 Vict., ch. 11, s. 2. This section provided that a child apprenticed by public authorities would be bound “in the same manner as if such Apprentice had been bound by his or her parent”. Incorporation statutes of private homes which provided for apprenticeship made the provisions of this Act applicable to such apprenticeship, as did the amendment to the Act of Incorporation of the Toronto POH which provided for apprenticeship. The Toronto Girls’ Home also provided in its incorporation statute that it had the powers of a parent or guardian over children placed under its protection.

88 In 1892 a mother sought a writ of *habeas corpus* to have her daughter returned to her after the child had been apprenticed by the Toronto Girls’ Home, but this request was denied by Street J. (*Globe*, November 12, 1895), whose decision was affirmed by the Divisional Court (*Globe*, April 11, 1896) (*Re Robinson*). This case, pursued as a test case by the Girls’ Home, dates from a later period than that under consideration here, after the 1871 legislation referred to in the previous note. However, it does not seem to have relied on this legislation, but rather on the power of the Home to apprentice granted by legislation. Thus a court could have made a similar decision prior to 1871. Rooke and Schnell, in *Discarding the Asylum*, state that this case overrode an Ontario statute which required that parents sign away the rights to their child before he or she could be apprenticed, but it is unclear to what they are referring (p. 149).

89 Ontario, *Statutes*, “An Act to amend the Act respecting Apprentices and Minors”, 1871–1872, 35 Vict., ch. 17.

90 *Re Davis* (1909) 18 O.L.R. 384–387.

91 Concerning judicial attitudes in custody disputes, see Constance B. Backhouse, “Shifting Patterns

The Managers appear to have respected the wishes of parents who showed a continuing interest in their children. They would, for example, seek the permission of parents before apprenticing children for longer terms than normal, and agree to requests by parents that children remain a little longer in the Home before being apprenticed or be kept in the Home for short periods until the parents could take them out.⁹²

There is some support in the rules for Rooke and Schnell's argument that children's homes restricted visiting hours "to limit the unwelcome intrusion of families and friends":⁹³ "No relative or friend shall interfere in the management of the children, nor visit them except in the presence of the Matron, nor at any time when such visits are disapproved by the Managers." Formal visiting hours were limited to Wednesdays from twelve to two o'clock, and express permission of one of the Visitors was required for a child to visit friends.⁹⁴ There is no evidence in the minutes, *Visitors' Book*, or annual reports that there were any disputes with parents about such visiting.

Nor is there any evidence of the "universal and absolute denunciation of the removal of children by parents or guardians" cited by Rooke and Schnell.⁹⁵ With respect to children placed, this does not in any case appear to have been a problem, as only one child, a girl, was said to have been taken from her placement by her mother.⁹⁶ Others who ran away may have gone to relatives, but there is no evidence for this aside from the high failure rate of placements of boys whose mothers were alive; more likely explanations for this are discussed below. At least six of the children returned to the Home from their placements were ultimately taken by parents or other relatives.⁹⁷ In two cases where placements were not working and the child was in his or her late teens, the Managers suggested that the child be returned to his or her mother.⁹⁸

Furthermore, of the 243 children among the first 506 entries in the Register who were never placed by the Home, 153 were taken by a parent and 18 by another relative. The children taken by relatives spent shorter times in the Home than did children placed: 43 per cent were in the Home less than

in Nineteenth-Century Canadian Custody Law" in David H. Flaherty, ed., *Essays in the History of Canadian Law*, vol. 1 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981), pp. 212–248.

92 *Minutes*, November 27, 1866; August 27, 1867; January 2, 1868.

93 Rooke and Schnell, *Discarding the Asylum*, p. 158.

94 "Rules", VII [IX]; *Minutes*, June 26, 1855, "Rules for the Orphans' Home".

95 Rooke and Schnell, *Discarding the Asylum*, pp. 141–142, 147–155, and "Childhood and Charity", pp. 174–178. Rooke and Schnell themselves note that "ins and outs ... were always in the majority", in "The Rise and Decline of British North American Protestant Orphans' Homes", p. 27.

96 RC 302. Another girl ran away to her sister, who returned her to the Home (RC 217 & 266).

97 RC 250 & 481, 249, 495, 257, 252 & 275 & 395, 341 & 378 & 404 (this girl was later returned to the Home by her mother and placed out again).

98 RC 242, 448.

a year, compared with 29 per cent of those placed; 38 per cent were in the Home two years or longer, compared with 45 per cent of those placed. They also left the Home at a younger age, the median being age eight compared with ten for those placed. Large numbers of parents thus used the Home as a short-term refuge, in particular for very young children, who could not tend to their own needs or be placed in school while the parent was working. This is suggested by the slightly younger median age on entry of children taken by their parents (six compared with seven for those placed), as well as by the tendency for the youngest children, especially boys, to spend longer periods in the Home prior to being claimed. However, relatives also sometimes left their children until they were old enough to work and thus be of economic benefit to the family: 22 of the 30 who were 11 or older on leaving had been in the Home two years or more, as had 10 of the 19 who were 10 years old on leaving.

Girls taken out by their mothers were the youngest on entry (median five years old, six for boys) and on departure (median seven years old, eight for boys). Bettina Bradbury, by comparison, found that three-quarters of the girls admitted to the Roman Catholic St. Alexis girls' home in Montreal returned to parents or relatives, and half likewise stayed less than one year. However, the girls there tended to be older, eight years old on average at entry, although the daughters of widows left sooner than did other girls. She argues that this was because widows needed their daughters' help. The younger age of the girls when taken from the Toronto POH makes it difficult to adopt this explanation for the pattern here, nor is the difference between boys and girls so great as to require major justification. The strength of maternal ties and the desire to take back children as soon as their needs could be met at home seem the best explanations.⁹⁹ The most common change in social or economic circumstances which permitted parents or relatives to take back their children, that the mother had remarried, tends to support this conclusion.¹⁰⁰

Sometimes conditions were placed on the removal of the children, such as that money owing for their keep be paid or that recommendations be provided by the person claiming the child, especially if that person were a relative other than a parent. On the other hand, the Home occasionally asked that children be removed when promised support payments were not made.¹⁰¹ However, since such payments were unusual at the Toronto POH,

99 Bradbury, "The Fragmented Family", pp. 115–119. This refuge function of children's homes may not have been taken into account by Splane, who argued that the homes had a low success rate in finding places for children. Richard B. Splane, *Social Welfare in Ontario 1791–1893* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965), pp. 225–226.

100 RC 97, 144, 148, 151, 155 & 156, 276 & 277; *Annual Report*, 1860. See also RC 225, 226, 383, 384, 155, 156, 157, 158, 188, 189.

101 *Minutes*, May 25, 1858; October 30, 1860; March 31 and December 1, 1863; April 25, 1865; Rooke and Schnell, "Childhood and Charity", pp. 177–178.

they could not normally have been a condition of the right to withdraw children, as Rooke and Schnell argue. Only occasionally was it suggested that the Home in any way disapproved of parents taking their children, and only once were active steps noted to keep parents away, in the case of twin girls adopted by the same family, whose whereabouts were to be kept from their alcoholic father.¹⁰²

Rules and Practices Respecting Apprenticeship and Adoption

The analysis of apprenticeship and adoption is based on a study of the rules and policies of the Home and of the fate of the 447 children admitted to the end of 1869. (The Register records 506 admissions, but some children were admitted more than once.) Of these, 204 were placed: 107 girls and 97 boys. The records show that 31 girls and 13 boys were adopted, 59 girls and 81 boys apprenticed, 10 girls and three boys both apprenticed and adopted, and seven girls placed in service. The information about individual children which could be gleaned from the records, although not complete for all children, includes name, age, date of arrival, circumstances of admission, family background, date of departure, reason for departure, name of person to whom the child was apprenticed or by whom adopted, names of individuals who recommended the family in which the child was placed, and sometimes follow-up details. In addition, detailed information about money sent to the Home to be deposited in accounts for apprentices was recorded in financial statements in the annual reports. The information from these records is summarized in the accompanying tables.

Legalities: Apprenticeship

Apprenticeship of pauper children, part of the English Poor Law from the time of Henry VIII, was extensively used by parish poor law authorities from the sixteenth century to 1834. Despite condemnation of the practice in Britain because of abuse of the children, pauper apprenticeship was formally adopted in Upper Canada by the ‘‘Orphans’ Act’’ in 1799.¹⁰³ This Act provided that the Town Wardens of a township could, with the consent of two justices of the peace and of the child if over 14, apprentice any orphaned or abandoned child, to the age of 18 for girls or 21 for boys, unless relations were able and willing to support the child. A child abandoned by his or her father could likewise be apprenticed by the mother, with the consent of two justices of the peace. It provided no details about the terms of apprenticeship, which were presumably to be governed by the laws of England, as were trade apprenticeships at this time.¹⁰⁴ Later legislation

102 ER 228; RC 51, 75, 421, 422, 238.

103 Neff, ‘‘Pauper Apprenticeship’’; Upper Canada, *Statutes*, ‘‘An Act to provide for the Education and Support of Orphan Children’’, 1799, 39 George III, ch. 3.

104 W. C. Keele, *The Provincial Justice or Magistrate’s Manual* (Toronto, 1835), pp. 19–31, 338; 2nd

defined in greater detail the nature of the legal relationship and extended the power to apprentice to other appropriate officials.¹⁰⁵ Trade apprenticeships, by contrast, could be entered into by anyone having “the care or charge” of the minor. While pauper apprenticeships could be entered into at any age, trade apprenticeships were not to be entered into before the age of 12 for girls (14 under the 1851 Act) and 14 for boys. Both trade and pauper apprentices were said in legislation and indentures to be “bound out” or to “bind themselves”, and the forms used for pauper apprentices were adapted from those used for trade apprentices.¹⁰⁶

The 1851 *Prospectus* for the Toronto POH stated that “the orphans will be fed, clothed and instructed, up to the age of 12 or 14 years, when they will be apprenticed to respectable persons.” The Act of Incorporation made

ed. (Toronto, 1843), pp. 24–36, 468–469; *Dillingham v. Wilson* (1841), 6 Q.B. (Old Series), pp. 85–89.

105 Upper Canada, *Statutes*, “An Act respecting the Appointment of Guardians”, 1827, 8 George IV, ch. 6, s. 2; “An Act to authorize the Apprenticeship of Minors in certain cases, and to regulate the duties of Masters and Apprentices”, passed December 7th, 1846, by the Common Council of the City of Toronto, published in the *Globe*, December 23 and 26, 1846; Upper Canada, *Statutes*, “An Act to amend the Law relating to Apprentices and Minors”, 1851, 14 and 15 Vict., ch. 6; *Consolidated Statutes of Upper Canada*, “An Act Respecting Apprentices and Minors”, 1859, 22 Vict., ch. 76; Ontario, *Statutes*, “An Act to amend the Act respecting Apprentices and Minors”, 1871–1872, 35 Vict., ch. 17; Ontario, *Statutes*, “An Act respecting Apprentices and Minors”, 1874, 38 Vict., ch. 19, s. 4.

106 A standard form for use for trade apprenticeships is provided in Keele, *The Provincial Justice*, 1835, pp. 24–25, and 1843, pp. 30–31. While the apprentice is at the beginning said to “put himself apprentice”, at the end it is stated that “each of the said parties bindeth himself unto the other”. With respect to the form for pauper apprentices, he refers the reader to this form for trade apprentices (1835, p. 338; 1843, pp. 468–469). For examples of trade indentures using the terminology “bind out”, see AO, F-775, Miscellaneous Collection, 1861-14 MV 3273, Indenture between Alexander Ross, Rainham Township, and John Abell, by which Josiah Ross is apprenticed to learn “the art and trade of a machinist”, April 1, 1861; AO, MV 3273, Craik Family Papers, Accession 9850, Indenture of Apprenticeship between Alexander Craik and John McKellan, October 20, 1865. For informal uses of the terms “bound” and “binding out” in relation to trade apprenticeships in letters from immigrant youths, see Royal Philanthropic Society, Surrey Record Office, microfilm 19 (2271/1/1–16), Red Hill Farm School, *Annual Report* for 1857, p. 35; Royal Philanthropic Society, *Emigration Letter Book 1857–1874*, Mormon Church film, reel no. 1471007 (Genealogical Society of Utah, Salt Lake City), 1863, p. 143; Royal Philanthropic Society, Surrey Record Office, Ware Papers, 1487/142/1, “Letters To Martin Ware From Former Ragged School Boys”, 1857; Guildhall Library, London, ms. 5754, “Casebook of London Boys Given Assisted Passage to Canada”, c.1860 (microfilm in Public Archives of Canada) nos. 26, 29. One immigrant youth who went through the Toronto House of Industry in 1862 was said to have “bound himself” to the shoemaking trade. City of Toronto Archives, SC 35 D, box 2, file 3, “Toronto House of Industry Register of Boys arriving at House of Industry from England 1858–1868”, July 13, 1862. Similar terminology was also used in British indentures, for example, “William Phippen hath put placed and bound himself” to the baker’s trade (Lennox and Addington County Museum, Small Collections 32334, Indenture of Apprenticeship between William Phippen and Jacob French, February 1, 1840). See also AO, F-775, Miscellaneous Collection, 1845 no. 8 MV 2109, Indenture of Apprenticeship between Joseph Thomas Rolph (with consent of his father) to Messrs Cole and Henderson, December 13, 1845.

no provision for the placement of children, providing in the preamble only that the purpose of the association was to provide “relief and support to friendless orphans and destitute females”. However, an amendment prior to the opening of the Home provided that it could “put and bind out as an apprentice, any child or minor under the charge, care or protection of the Corporation”, and that the “Apprentices and Minors Act” would apply to such apprenticeships, “so far as may be consistent with the Rules” of the Corporation.¹⁰⁷ This gave the Home the power to apprentice children of any age without reference to public officials or approval of justices of the peace.

More detailed provision was made for apprenticeship in the “Rules and Regulations”. The Managers were to satisfy themselves as to “the respectability and competency” of the masters; character evidence was to include a certificate of a clergyman. The Managers at their monthly meetings were also to “make the necessary order for apprenticing”. In 1856 detailed forms of indenture were adopted, one for boys and one for girls, but still no reference was made to adoption. Although only one actual indenture has survived, frequent references in all sources indicate that these apprenticeship procedures were followed relatively strictly.¹⁰⁸

The indentures were to be signed by the master and by the Home with the consent of the child (although it is not clear the child was to sign; legislation normally required such consent only from age 14). The obligation of the child was to “faithfully serve the said party of the second part, and in all things demean her/himself as a good and faithful [apprentice/servant] ought to do”. The obligation of the master was to feed and clothe the child “in a fit and proper manner, according to the respective station of the parties”, bring the child up in the Church of England,¹⁰⁹ teach the child reading and writing, and instruct the child in a trade (normally farming or domestic service, but occasionally a real trade).¹¹⁰ The master was also required to make five annual payments to the Home on behalf of the child, and at the end of his or her term to provide “a good and new suit of clothes, suitable to the condition of the said child”. The master was to send with the annual payments a written report “of the condition and welfare of

107 Canada, *Statutes*, “An Act to amend the Act, intituled, An Act to incorporate the Orphan’s Home and Female Aid Society, Toronto”, 1852, 16 Vict., ch. 71.

108 “Rules”, IV [VI], IX [XI]; *Minutes*, February 26 and March 26, 1856; *Annual Report*, 1856 and 1857 where the forms were reproduced (hereafter Form of Indenture). Only one signed indenture has survived. Although dating from June 1900, it was in most respects identical to the form of 1857. Oakville Historical Society, Indenture between the Toronto POH, Mrs. A. C. Orr, and Sarah Louise Chilliman, June 16, 1900.

109 As already noted, children were normally placed with families of their own religion, and hence the appropriate church would likely have been cited here.

110 One boy was apprenticed as a tinsmith (*Minutes*, April 9, 1856; OR 85), another as a butcher (*Minutes*, July 26, 1864), and another as a waggonmaker (*Minutes*, July 26, 1864; RC 198, 301).

the child". The form was clearly designed to be signed at the time when payment on the child's behalf was to commence. However, as we shall see, many children were placed and indentures signed years before payments were to begin, and hence the form would have to have been adapted, and presumably would have provided for reports to be made on the children in the years prior to the commencement of the annual payments. Although the "Apprentices and Minors Act" allowed that an indenture could be transferred, there was no provision for this in the Home's indentures. Instead, the Managers reserved "the right of resuming their control over the said minor, or taking such other measures for securing his rights as they may be advised" in the event of the death of the master or mistreatment of the child.¹¹¹ Although transfers were occasionally approved, in 1866 the Managers resolved that apprentices could not be transferred.¹¹²

Under the 1852 rules, boys were to be apprenticed to age 21 and girls to age 18,¹¹³ ages which corresponded to those specified in the 1799 "Orphans' Act", but under the revised rules these age provisions were removed. Unfortunately, with only one surviving indenture from 1900, a systematic analysis of the actual terms of apprenticeship cannot be made. However, from the payment records of those children for whom money was paid, it can be determined that in practice girls were normally apprenticed to age 16 or 17, boys to 17, and only occasionally for a longer term.¹¹⁴ Under the 1900 indenture a girl was apprenticed at age 10 until age 17, with seven annual payments specified.

Responsibility for the children from the time their indenture expired was not defined, although there were normally three to five years between the termination of their indentures and their majority. The "Apprentices and Minors Act" did not clarify legal responsibility during this period, decreeing only that the term of an indenture was not to extend beyond the minority of the apprentice. The Home did not seem to see itself as having any significant responsibility for these children or those who left their positions, other than to pay them the money due to them, and would refuse readmission to children as young as 12. Where there was a surviving parent, the Home seems to have regarded him or her as responsible.¹¹⁵ The Managers were more likely to help out older girls than boys and provide them shelter while

111 Form of Indenture, *Annual Report*, 1857, pp. 32, 33–34.

112 *Minutes*, April 24, 1866; February 26, 1867; November 25 and September 28, 1868. Concerning a boy who was transferred on his own initiative, see *Minutes*, March 27 and December 28, 1866; February 26, 1867; RC 49.

113 "Rules", IX.

114 *Minutes*, March 27, 1866 (boy apprenticed to age 19 at request of Managers); December 28, 1866 (boy apprenticed to age 21 at request of master; the financial records show that he was paid until at least age 20); February 28, 1871 (request for two-year extension of boy's term denied as against the rules).

115 RC 12, 242, 448; *Minutes*, May 27, 1862; October 25, 1864; March 29, 1870; January 27, 1874.

they found situations; one girl was readmitted at age 18 and another at 16, although another sent away by her master for bad conduct at age 15 was turned away and sent to a refuge.¹¹⁶

The “Apprentices and Minors Act” added little to the obligations owed by the parties, but did specify procedures for dealing with complaints by both apprentice and master. Such complaints might include failure of the master to provide necessities, ill treatment by the master, refusal of an apprentice to obey commands, or “any other improper conduct” on the part of the apprentice. Masters could be fined up to five pounds, be subject to distress to enforce the debt, or be imprisoned if the debt were not paid. The main penalty against an apprentice was imprisonment. It was also stated that “any person who shall knowingly harbor or employ any absconding Apprentice” would have to pay the master the value of the services lost.

In 1855 the Managers noted that it was “contrary to the rules of the Society to send children out on trial”, but occasionally such a trial was formally arranged.¹¹⁷ In other cases children were informally sent to masters without completion of forms, normally on trust that these would be completed.¹¹⁸ There were also some requests granted to return children to the Home, or even to alter the nature of the placement, because the indentures had never been signed.¹¹⁹

Legalities: Adoption

Adoption, the recognition of someone as the legal equivalent of a legitimate natural child, was never endorsed under English common law. Massachusetts was the first common law jurisdiction to pass an adoption act in 1851, while Ontario did not do so until 1921 and England not until 1926.¹²⁰ Guardianship was a legal mechanism for giving stability to informal adoptions, but until 1874 this would have been an option in Ontario only if the child's father were dead, and a court order was required.¹²¹ There is little

116 *Minutes*, July 30 and October 29, 1867; January 2 and 28, 1868; March 15, 1875; RC 184, 207, 367, 433; ER 215, 216, 218, 230, 424.

117 *Minutes*, March 27, 1855; August 10, 1854; RC 291. In December 1870 an 11-year-old boy was taken on trial, but ran away and was placed again in January 1871 (RC 358). The *Minutes*, May 27, 1856, record a request for a girl on one month's trial, but there is no record of her actually being placed with the woman.

118 See, for example, *Minutes*, April 24, 1855.

119 For example, *Minutes*, October 25, 1859.

120 C. M. A. McCauliff, “The First English Adoption Law and its American Precursors”, *Seton Hall Law Review*, vol. 16 (1986), pp. 656–677; Yasuhide Kawashima, “Adoption in Early America”, *Journal of Family Law*, vol. 20, no. 5 (August 1982), pp. 677–696; Ontario, *Statutes*, “The Adoption Act”, 1921, c. 54; “Adoption of Children Act, 1926”, 16 and 17 George V, ch. 29 [England]; *Re Davis* (1909), 18 O.L.R. 384; *Fidelity Trust Co. v. Buchner* (1912), 26 O.L.R. 367; *Re Hutchinson* (1913), O.L.R. 114 (C.A.).

121 Upper Canada, *Statutes*, “An Act respecting the Appointment of Guardians”, 1827, 8 George IV, ch. 6, s. 1. In 1874 provision was made for the appointment of a guardian by “any charitable

evidence that children's homes made use of this procedure. The incorporation statutes of some homes did provide for adoption, but never defined what it meant, and rarely stipulated any protection of the relationship on behalf of the child or the adoptive parents.¹²² The legal rights and responsibilities of the parties to an adoption thus remained ambiguous. As already noted, the law would likely have favoured a parent seeking to overturn an adoption, even if there were a written adoption agreement. However, under simple rules of contract, any written agreement between a children's home and adoptive parents should have been enforceable between them. Thus, a home could have required that adoptive parents fulfil their obligations under the agreement or could have taken the child away if appropriate. The adoptive parents, on the other hand, could have asserted their authority over the child against anyone but the parents.

Neither the *Prospectus*, the Act of Incorporation, nor the rules of the Toronto POH made provision for adoption.¹²³ In 1854 a bylaw was proposed which would have made the paperwork and procedure virtually the same as for apprenticeship, with different forms of indenture, as well as a contract. A few months later there was reference to the signing of the "necessary papers" for an adoption, but otherwise no evidence exists of any formal adoption agreement being approved at this time. In 1860 concern was expressed that "there is no provision in the Act or bye laws sufficiently protective of the Orphans taken for adoption", but again no evidence indicates that anything was done. In 1866 it was resolved that indentures for adoption and letters to accompany the indentures were to be printed. The only surviving adoption indenture dates from 1879.¹²⁴

There is evidence for only one formal rule concerning adoptions, "that persons who have children of their own should not be given children from the Home for adoption".¹²⁵ In practice, the rule that masters be recommended by a clergyman was followed for adoptions as well, as the minutes and the Register regularly recorded the name of a clergyman recommending the person taking the child, sometimes with reference to a certificate. No forms for such references survive in the Home's records.

society authorized by the Lieutenant Governor to exercise the powers conferred by this Act" without a court order. Ontario, *Statutes*, "An Act respecting Apprentices and Minors", 1874, 38 Vict., ch. 19, s. 2.

122 See, for example, Canada, *Statutes*, "An Act to Incorporate The Girls' Home and Public Nursery of the City of Toronto", 1863, 26 Vict., ch. 63, s. 4; Splane, *Social Welfare in Ontario*, p. 225; Neil Sutherland, *Children in English-Canadian Society: Framing the Twentieth-Century Consensus* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976), p. 10; Rooke and Schnell, *Discarding the Asylum*, pp. 140–150.

123 "An Act to Incorporate The Girls' Home and Public Nursery of the City of Toronto", s. 4.

124 *Minutes*, August 10, 1854; April 24, 1855; January 31, 1860; April 24, 1866. The indenture was found between the pages of the *Visitors' Book* for 1853–1874.

125 *Minutes*, December 27, 1855.

As to what the parties thought adoption meant, in one woman's case the child was to be brought up "as her own child". After this child was returned from her first home "a married man without children" applied to adopt her, it being said he would "give the child a portion", though he did not take her.¹²⁶ In another case the Managers approved an application from a single woman for a five-year-old girl "to adopt and bring her up as a 'companion'".¹²⁷ The 1879 adoption indenture provided that the child was being given to the adoptive parent "to be adopted as his own child" but went on to detail the adult's obligations to "kindly treat, respectably clothe, sufficiently maintain, teach and instruct, or cause to be taught and instructed, the said child; and especially in regard to her moral and religious duties". The adoptive parent was also to provide an annual report to the Home until the child reached 18. One case suggests that, prior to the use of written indentures for adoption, some masters saw adoption as a way of taking a child without commitment. In 1865 a seven-year-old girl was placed with the understanding she would be apprenticed and adopted. The papers were not signed, however, and three months later the master wrote complaining of her conduct and requesting that she therefore be adopted only. The Managers agreed. A year later a complaint was received that the child was being unkindly treated. The Managers made inquiries, but there is no evidence that they pursued the matter.¹²⁸

Payment of Children (Table 7)

One clear legal difference between apprenticeship and adoption was that those taking apprentices agreed to pay the children, but no such arrangements were made for adopted children, although two of the latter were paid in any case. The Home's accounts reproduced in the annual report show sums being held for individual "indentured orphans" from 1856 on, including amounts paid out. The 1880 annual report also recorded payment to the Managers of \$272.51 of "unclaimed deposits with interest to February 27, 1880". Otherwise, however, the money paid went entirely to the children, with none of it being taken by the Home.

Money was recorded as received for 46 (56 per cent) of the apprenticed boys, two of the three boys apprenticed and adopted, one of the ten boys adopted, 42 (71 per cent) of the apprenticed girls, five of the ten girls apprenticed and adopted, and one of the 31 girls adopted. At least three years' worth of payments were made for 27 or more of the apprenticed boys who claimed their money, both of the boys apprenticed and adopted, 30 of the apprenticed girls, three of the girls apprenticed and adopted, and the one adopted girl. For five apprenticed boys and one apprenticed girl, payments

126 *Minutes*, April 14, 1855; May 25, 1858; RC 8, 112.

127 *Minutes*, October 27, 1857; OR 28, 31; ER 220, 222; RC 26, 237, 284, 386.

128 *Minutes*, November 28, 1865; February 26, 1867; RC 326.

were made but the money was not claimed. The two adopted children who were paid may have had a second placement as an apprentice which was not recorded, or perhaps the type of their original placement was incorrectly recorded, as both were eleven years old when placed.¹²⁹

The amounts paid out at the end of an apprenticeship were not massive, but neither were they insignificant, amounting in many cases to at least half a year's wages for a young person. On the other hand, the masters had very cheap labour.¹³⁰ Seventeen children received less than \$10, but 23 were paid between \$20 and \$30 plus interest, and another 24 received \$30 or more, one of these more than \$50 plus interest. For girls apprenticed before the age of 12, the normal payment appears to have been a total of \$25 plus interest, paid in instalments of \$3, \$4, \$5, \$6, and \$7 starting at age 13, sometimes 12. Payments for boys were less regular, but the most typical was a total of \$30 plus interest paid in instalments of \$4, \$5, \$6, \$7, and \$8 starting at age 12.

The ability of boys to earn perhaps ten times as much elsewhere by the age of about 16 could explain why, according to the record of payments, so many of the boys left their places at about the age of 15. On the other hand, if they were so badly paid, why did so many, about 16 boys, actually stay to the age of 17 or 18? Perhaps they were being paid directly more than legally required under the indenture. Some may even have been treated like sons and received a share in the family farm or assistance in establishing farms of their own. Others may not have been working full time for their masters and may have had a second paying job. Still others may have lived in areas where it was difficult to find jobs, or lacked the initiative to look for one until forced to do so.

Follow-up and Enforcement of Indentures by the Home

Follow-up of children placed was minimal. There was no provision for personal inspection of homes (either before or after placement), visits to the children, or correspondence with them. Homes were initially approved on the basis of the recommendation of one person, normally a local minister. After placement, the rules stated that the Secretary was to inquire about apprenticed children at least once per year, and masters were to submit a

129 RC 138, 22.

130 Records of youths emigrating from England in the 1850s and 1860s suggest that the starting salary for a 16- to 18-year-old might be \$48 to \$72 per year, and in 1870 the best might by their early 20s get \$140 per year, plus room and board and sometimes other benefits. Royal Philanthropic Society, Surrey Record Office, 2271, film 19, *Annual Report*, 1855 to 1870, Letters from Emigrants; City of Toronto Archives, SC 35D, box 3, file 3, Toronto House of Industry, "List of Boys Arriving from England 1858-1868". For comparisons with other wages, see note 65 above. Another measure of the value of this money is that it cost in 1862 about \$45 to keep one child in the Toronto POH for a year, as the entire operating budget for the Home in 1862 was \$2,601.37 and there were about 60 children in the Home at the time. *Annual Report*, 1862.

written statement at least once per year.¹³¹ These inquiries included requests for payment of money, and were reasonably diligently made. However, money due was not paid for all the children, and many masters who did ultimately pay did not do so on a yearly basis. Hence reports from masters were likely received only sporadically. Some were mentioned in the minutes, but there is no way of knowing how diligently reports were so recorded.¹³² There was no provision for inquiries to be made about adopted children until the adoption form came into use sometime between 1866 and 1879, and thus the Home may have kept better track of apprenticed children. In addition, when the young people collected their money at the end of their term of apprenticeship, the Home would be likely to get some sort of report from them personally as to their current circumstances. When masters did not pay, the Secretary wrote to them; this normally resulted in the masters paying the money owing.¹³³

Furthermore, whatever arrangements were made at the time children were placed were meant to be permanent. In other words, there were no stages to the relationship (such as a period of informal placement followed by apprenticeship at age 12) which would have required some supervision and a decision made by the Home, as was the case for immigrant British children later in the century.¹³⁴ Children were apprenticed when placed or shortly thereafter, although they were not paid until age 12 or 13, and children who were adopted remained permanently with their new families.

Despite the rather limited provision for checking on the welfare of the children, the Managers were not heartless. If it came to their attention that children were being badly treated they would remove the children from the homes in which they had been placed. They also were very open to accepting the children's versions of events, and would accept them back into the Home if they ran away and returned of their own accord. At least 11 children were so mistreated and left or were removed from their places; most left after a only a few months, but in one case a girl ran away after seven

131 "Rules", VI [VIII], IX [XI].

132 Alphabetical list of children apprenticed with accounts covering the period 1862 to 1870, front of the *Minute Book*, vol. II (1853–1864); notes re inquiries about apprentices and replies, *Minutes* beginning August 28, 1860.

133 *Minutes*, July 29, 1862; October 27, 1863 (a master refused to pay for his apprentice because the apprentice could not work hard due to an injury; the Managers insisted the master pay, and he did); *Minutes*, December 26, 1865; October 30, 1866; RC 95. (A master wrote asking that the money owing to his apprentice, now of age, be sent. The Managers replied, saying that he had not paid all that was due and "threatening him with having the Law enforced if he did not at once pay the remainder". The sum due was paid ten months later.) *Minutes*, March 1869 (woman to be requested to pay \$36 owing, but there is no evidence this was ever paid, RC 227); *Minutes*, December 8 and 29, 1874.

134 Joy Parr, *Labouring Children: British Immigrant Apprentices to Canada, 1869–1924* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980, 1994), chap. 5. Rooke and Schnell, in *Discarding the Asylum*, p. 140, suggest that this was also common for children's homes.

years. Some ran away never to be heard of again, some returned to the Home, and some the Managers removed or asked parents to take.¹³⁵

The procedures followed by the Managers when they received a complaint of ill treatment are illustrated by a case in 1866. A minister wrote advising that a recently apprenticed 11-year-old girl was being unkindly treated. The Managers wrote to the master, who replied that the family had never been unkind. The girl also sent a letter stating that she had a good home and that they were kind to her. However, a few months later the minister wrote again. The Managers then arranged for another minister to check the story, and wrote to the girl's master asking him to send her to Toronto to visit her mother. The account of mistreatment was confirmed, the Managers insisted that the girl be sent at once, and "after hearing the girl's account decided that she could not return" to her master.¹³⁶ On another occasion in 1861, when a 10-year-old girl was reported by her mistress, a widow, to have run away, there was suspicion that the child had been "unkindly and improperly treated". The Managers accordingly instituted an inquiry. It was as a result determined to fine the woman £20 (about \$80), and the Home's solicitor and the clergyman who had recommended the woman were so advised, although there is no evidence that they succeeded in collecting this sum.¹³⁷

Several children ran away from their masters and were accepted back into the Home, although there was no mention of ill treatment, the Managers being apparently willing to allow them to escape from circumstances in which they were unhappy. Some of these children were also placed again by the Home, and money paid by their masters before they ran away was held for them, although not claimed by all of them.¹³⁸ Likewise, although the Home sometimes relied on the existence of an indenture to deny a master's request to return a child,¹³⁹ masters were occasionally permitted to return children without stated cause.¹⁴⁰ Four boys and four girls were

135 Girls: RC 387; RC 364 & 405; *Annual Report*, 1861, RC 40 & 191, OR 24; *Minutes*, November 26, 1861 and January 31, 1862, RC 161; *Minutes*, July 30 and August 27, 1867, and January 2, 1868, RC 172; *Minutes*, July 30 and October 29, 1867, and January 2 and 28, 1868, RC 184, 207, 433, ER 215, 216, 218, 230; *Minutes*, May 25, 1869, RC 505. Boys: *Minutes*, January 27, 1874, RC 448; *Minutes*, May 25, 1869, RC 250, 481, ER 234; RC 211 & 336, *Minutes*, February 28, 1865; *Minutes*, January 31, 1871, RC 358.

136 *Minutes*, July 31, November 27, and December 28, 1866; RC 364, 405.

137 *Minutes*, November 26, 1861; January 31, 1862. These circumstances are not recorded in RC 161.

138 RC 325 & 355, 258, 31 & 169 (boys). RC 56 & 129 & 179, 66, 367 (girls).

139 For example, *Minutes*, November 29, 1858: A Mrs. Pringle asked to return Margaret Best "the girl being saucy and troublesome". The request was denied because there was an indenture. The girl apparently did stay, as the *Annual Report* records money being paid on her behalf in 1863–1864 and 1866–1867 and being paid out to her in 1868–1869. See also *Minutes*, July 26, 1859; November 25, 1868.

140 RC 6 & 80, 77 & 128, 125 & 289, 135, 145 & 170, 217 & 266, 364 & 405, 382, 100 & 286, 341 & 378, 257, 427 (girls); RC 29 & 76, 177 & 195 & 248 (returned twice), 354, 137 & 168, 416, 198 & 301, 298 & 385, 494 (boys).

returned for bad conduct,¹⁴¹ although it was “against the rules to do so”.¹⁴² It is possible that in some of these cases indentures had not been signed.

Age at Placement (Tables 3 and 4)

Adoption was to be limited to children no older than eight, perhaps younger.¹⁴³ Two girls and one boy were eleven when said to be adopted, but, as money was paid on behalf of two of them, the designation of the placements as adoptions may have been wrong.¹⁴⁴ The median age for adopted boys was five, for girls six.

The rules stated that children were to remain in the Home until age twelve before being apprenticed,¹⁴⁵ but the Managers did not normally strictly adhere to this rule. The median age for apprenticed boys was eleven and for girls ten. Nevertheless, in 1862 the Managers cited the rule in their annual report as justification for the small number of apprenticeships. Even during this year a seven-year-old girl was apprenticed and two of those adopted, one aged six and one eleven, were both apprenticed and adopted, and in subsequent years the policy quickly slipped again.¹⁴⁶

On the other hand, few children were apprenticed before the age of nine and none before the age of six. Thus, the best chance such children had of being placed was adoption. Very young children were seldom even adopted, however, with only seven children being three or younger when adopted (3.4 per cent of all placements), although 20 per cent of all children admitted and 14 per cent of children placed were of this age on admission. This confirms the generally accepted view that, although people adopting in the late twentieth century normally want an infant or very young child, in the nineteenth century people preferred children who were at least old enough to attend to all their personal needs and begin to contribute to household chores.

Time in Home Before Placement (Tables 1 and 4)

The rules provided that children were to remain in the Home for at least one year before being apprenticed.¹⁴⁷ Nevertheless, 36 per cent of apprenticed

141 RC 92 & 247 & 337 & 358, 249, 43 & 120, 93 & 352 (boys); RC 424, 184 & 207 & 433, 331 & 409, 252 & 275 & 395 (girls). One girl was returned insane (RC 88 & 239).

142 *Minutes*, January 2, 1868; RC 213.

143 *Minutes*, October 30, 1860 (RC 149): a nine-year-old was requested for adoption, but the Managers required an apprenticeship. Likewise in 1866 a nine-year-old boy was apprenticed and adopted as he was considered too old for adoption alone. *Minutes*, October 30, 1866 (RC 332).

144 RC 22, 138, 139.

145 “Rules”, IX [XI].

146 RC 147, 185, 67. Regarding children under 12 being apprenticed in 1862–1863, see RC 124, 146, 197, 229. For 1863–1864, see RC 125, 252, 213, 217, 100, 231.

147 “Rules”, VIII [X].

girls and 12 per cent of apprenticed boys were placed earlier.¹⁴⁸ On the other hand, most children spent long periods in the Home prior to being apprenticed, the median time for boys being 40 months and for girls 17 months. The lower median for girls is explained in part by the use of adoption to shorten the stay of younger girls, and in part by their younger median age at apprenticeship.

Because adopted children were younger at placement than those apprenticed, they also tended to stay for shorter periods in the Home before being placed. Most still spent a significant time in the Home, because it was difficult to find homes for very young children. For adopted boys the median time in the Home was 13½ months and for girls 10 months. Four of the boys and seven of the girls adopted spent two years or more in the Home, the longest stay for boys being 72 months and the longest for girls being 69 months.

Family Circumstances of Children Placed

Information about parents is given for about three-quarters of the children placed in Table 5. Of these, 36 were orphans, 37 had a father alive, 78 a mother, and one a stepmother. None were said to have had both parents alive. Boys were somewhat more likely to be full orphans (21 per cent) than girls (14 per cent). Girls were more likely to have a father alive (21 per cent) than boys (14 per cent). Perhaps fathers were more likely to request help in raising a girl than a boy; alternatively, the Home may have been more sympathetic to such requests. Thirty per cent of adopted boys and 52 per cent of adopted girls had a living parent. It would seem, therefore, that families in which the children were placed normally had no objection to their having a surviving parent.¹⁴⁹

Details about the family circumstances are given for about one-third of the children placed. In most cases, the surviving parent was said to be destitute, unable to support the children, without a home, unable to work, or ill. Hence, except to the extent that poverty was a moral fault, their character was not impugned. However, in a few cases the children were admitted because of the bad character of a surviving parent, normally the mother.¹⁵⁰ In no case was the character of the child questioned, suggesting that the Managers tended to judge the children on their own merits, not on the basis of what their parents were or had done.

148 RC 252, 122, 134, 145, 172, 184, 160, 229, 194, 331, 135 (11 girls less than 6 months); RC 85, 127, 137, 130, 30, 136, 279 (7 boys less than 6 months); RC 328, 88, 364, 302, 341, 74, 267, 95 (8 girls who stayed between 6 and 12 months); RC 115, 71, 357, 325 (4 boys who stayed between 6 and 12 months).

149 Rooke and Schnell argue, to the contrary, that families were reluctant to take children with parents. *Discarding the Asylum*, p. 143.

150 RC 17, 18, 27, 42, 43, 44, 122, 123, 124, 159, 160–163, 176, 177, 178, 290, 291, 174, 310, 331–133.

Stability of Placements (Table 6)

Placements were frequently unsuccessful: the children ran away, sometimes back to the Home; were returned to the Home by their masters; were taken by a parent; or were even taken back into the Home by the Managers. Two girls were sent to the asylum¹⁵¹ and one boy to prison.¹⁵² In some cases the master's name was crossed off in the Register with no explanation. Many children were placed two or three times. Despite more limited legal protection, adoptions were more stable and hence, to the extent success of placement can be measured by stability, more successful. Those both apprenticed and adopted had the best success rate, although, given the small numbers involved, any such conclusion can only be very tentative. Boys were slightly more likely to experience unsuccessful placements (38 per cent) than girls (35 per cent), but apprenticed girls were somewhat less successful (47 per cent of apprenticed girls, 40 per cent of apprenticed boys). Median age at placement was the same for all children, as was the time in the Home for boys placed, whether or not their placements were successful; girls whose placements proved unsuccessful had spent significantly less time in the Home beforehand (median 12 months compared to 22 for all girls placed). However, boys 12 or older at placement were more likely to run away from their placements; of the 33 such boys, 10 ran away, whereas only seven of the 59 boys who were 11 or younger on placement and six of the 105 girls placed were said to have run away without cause.

Apprenticed boys with a mother alive were much more likely to have unsuccessful placements, at the rate of 22 out of 30 (73 per cent). However, in only two of these cases was it noted that the boys were taken by their mothers, and only after they had returned to the Home (three years later in one case). The circumstances in many of the remaining cases suggest it was unlikely the mother was an influence.¹⁵³ If being enticed away by their mothers to support their own families does not explain the failure rate of these boys, what does? While many of them were in the Home for a number of years before being placed, some may have lived in a fatherless family long enough to have felt the lack of a father's discipline, or to have developed a sense of independence which made them resent an apprentice-master relationship imposed by others.

Whether children finished most of the term of their last placement can be surmised from the money paid on their behalf. As noted above, at least 40 per cent of apprenticed boys were paid for at least three years of their apprenticeship, as were 52 per cent of apprenticed girls. This may not be a complete picture, since some payments may have been made directly to the children on the termination of their term, some indentures may not have specified payments, and some masters may simply never have paid.

151 RC 26 & 237, 88 & 239.

152 RC 42.

153 RC 42 (prison); RC 98, 291, 416, 143 & 299, 94 & 394, 93 & 352 (second placement completed).

Individual Experiences

The bare statistics suggest that the children can be categorized and certain conclusions reached about the “normal” experience of children placed by the Home, either with respect to decisions made for them by the Managers or with respect to their chances of success in placements. In reality, the experiences of individual children, whether apprenticed or adopted, varied enormously, indicating that individual circumstances and experiences were far more influential than any policies or practices of the Home.

Some children were young when placed, some older. Whatever their age at placement, some had spent a relatively short time in the Home, others many years. Some were orphans; some had one parent alive; some had other close relatives. Some would have been influenced by their family experience before entering the Home, whether good or bad, while some of those who were very young on admission would not even remember their family life and perhaps be more adversely affected by a lack of early nurturing. Girls placed shortly after their arrival at the Home, but quickly returned from their placements, may have looked and behaved well on first meeting, and hence been among the first to be chosen by masters looking over the children themselves, but may have been in fact unmanageable. On the other hand, they may simply have been unlucky in being chosen by someone who treated them poorly or with whom they were incompatible. Some masters, perhaps particularly those from the middle and upper classes, may have had unrealistic expectations about these children and lacked the patience to cultivate them. Even where we do have some limited details about what happened to the children, these are normally insufficient to reach any conclusions as to why placements did or did not succeed. Mistreatment by a master, for example, might have been the result of real incompatibilities between the two parties, while misbehaviour of the child might have been prompted by mistreatment. The interpretation of the situation could even be affected by the status of the master.

Contrast, for example, the experiences of three four-year-old girls, uneventfully adopted after eight months or less in the Home, with that of another adopted at age four after nearly two years in the Home. She was sent back by her adoptive father after two years “in consequence of his wife’s bad conduct”. She was immediately adopted again, and seems to have remained for seven years, when she was returned to the Home by a woman who reported that she had been deserted by her adoptive parents and had fallen into bad company. The girl was then placed in service, but a few months later the same informant reported that she had seen the girl in Yorkville and that she intended returning to her “friends”, they being the adoptive parents who had deserted her. At the same time, her mistress reported that the girl had left her service and returned to Toronto.¹⁵⁴ Two

154 RC 8, 112.

other girls with similarly unsettled lives appear in the end, however, to have done well enough. Both were first placed at the age of nine, one after nearly six years in the Home, the other after only six months. The first returned to the Home from her first adoption after only three months, ‘‘having been treated improperly’’. She was apprenticed and adopted two months later, and money was paid on her behalf. The second girl was returned from her first adoption after only seven months, apprenticed a month later, returned three months later, and apprenticed again one month later; \$25 was paid when she was 16 and claimed by her the following year. The girl with the most negative experience was adopted at age five after three years in the Home. Five years later the woman who had adopted her returned her to the Home, then took her out again three months later, only to return her again after two years. At this point Rev. Lett took the girl as an apprentice, although he too returned her, suffering epileptic fits, after two years. Four years later she was placed in the Insane Asylum in Hamilton.¹⁵⁵

Adopted boys had similarly varying experiences. One boy adopted at age three after only one month in the Home was mistreated in his first placement. He returned to the Home and stayed a further two and one-half years before being again adopted; within the space of a month he was returned and adopted again, this time apparently successfully. Another adopted at age eight after three years in the Home was returned for ‘‘bad conduct’’, then immediately apprenticed; he returned to the Home within three months, whereupon he ran away with two other boys.¹⁵⁶ Three others were apparently successfully adopted at very young ages (one, three, and three) after short periods in the Home (seven, ten, and thirteen months). Two were orphans, and one had a mother alive.¹⁵⁷ Three other boys successfully adopted were older on placement (seven, eight, and eight) and had spent longer periods in the Home (two, four, and six years), with two of them being orphans.¹⁵⁸

Apprenticed girls who were ultimately successfully placed included a nine-year-old placed after one year in the Home, on whose behalf \$26 was paid. Another who was in the Home only six months was paid \$39 when she became 19. Girls with relatively longer stays who were apparently successful included a seven-year-old who had been in the Home nearly three years, for whom \$34 was paid, and a twelve-year-old placed after nearly eight years in the Home, for whom \$18 was paid.¹⁵⁹

One of the less successful girls was admitted to the Home at age two with

155 RC 164, 254, 324; RC 8 & 112, ER 234, *Minutes*, July 30, 1867, and March 31, 1868; RC 40 & 191; RC 37 & 73 & 89; RC 26 & 237 & 284 & 386.

156 RC 177 & 195 & 248, 92 & 247 & 337 & 358; regarding the other two boys, see RC 325 & 355, 228.

157 RC 388, 46, 417.

158 RC 205, 295, 359.

159 RC 91 & ER 209; RC 323, 147, 61.

a mother alive and apprenticed at age eight, but returned after one month. She was apprenticed again ten months later, but returned after two months. She was not apprenticed again until five years later at age 14. Another girl was admitted at age two and apprenticed at age 11, but returned after one month. She was ultimately ‘‘taken by her brother after being nine years in the Home’’.¹⁶⁰

Among apprenticed boys was one, placed at age nine after nine months in the Home, who ran away from his master and had no further contact with the Home. He can be compared to another nine-year-old, placed after five and one-half years in the Home, who had about \$30 paid to the Home on his behalf which he claimed, with interest, at age 21.¹⁶¹ Ten-year-olds placed only once, and who from money paid can be assumed to have completed their apprenticeships, stayed in the Home prior to placement for varying times from two months to four and one-half years; three were orphans, one had a father alive, and one had a mother, a prostitute, alive.¹⁶² Three who were ten when first placed and ultimately ran away likewise had stayed in the Home for from two months to four and one-half years (two had mothers alive).¹⁶³

Boys 12 or older on first placement had on average the longest stays in the Home. One apprenticed at age 14 after 11½ years in the Home had money paid on his behalf four times over a period of five years, and at the age of 18 claimed \$33. Another aged 13 on his first placement spent the same length of time in the Home; although this first placement failed after 10 months, he remained in his second placement and collected \$51.54 at age 17. Both boys had mothers alive.¹⁶⁴ However, a few of these boys spent only very short times in the Home, two who had unsuccessful placements and one whose placement was successful. One 12-year-old boy was apprenticed after only one month in the Home; he ran away from his master within a month. The second, a 13-year-old with a mother alive, was apprenticed after only four months and ran away from his first placement within a few days. The third was a 13-year-old orphan who was placed after only a few days in the Home; his ‘‘apprenticeship expired’’, although no money was recorded as paid on his behalf.¹⁶⁵ The least successful boy in the medium term was probably a 12-year-old apprenticed after the relatively short stay of 15 months. Three years later the widow to whom he had been apprenticed gave him up on the grounds that she could not support him, at which point ‘‘The boy wished to be allowed to hire himself by the month to some

160 RC 382, 100 & 286.

161 RC 357, 273.

162 RC 30 & 75, 87, 294, 234, 121, 130, 290.

163 RC 43 & 120, 24, 137 & 168.

164 RC 142, 94 & 394.

165 RC 127, 136, 85.

other tin smith but refused to be apprenticed again.’’ At some unspecified time he was sent to the penitentiary for burning down a barn.¹⁶⁶

Conclusions

It is thus evident that the Managers of the Toronto Protestant Orphans’ Home were flexible in their approach to the institutionalization of children and did not allow their decisions to be dictated by strict rules or principles. There was not one common experience on the part of the children who went through the Home, but rather an enormous variety of experiences. The Home’s use of both apprenticeship and adoption can be explained in this light; it permitted the Managers to provide for the individual child as seemed most appropriate at the time, given the child’s age, sex, and character, as well as the wishes of those looking for children. The wishes of the children also seem to have been taken into account, especially when they ran away, returned to the Home, and were not summarily sent back to their masters. The use of adoption for younger children suggests that the Managers thought it desirable to remove children from the institution at as young an age as possible, and to try to provide real homes for such children, not just houses in which their material needs were met. On the other hand, the insistence on apprenticeship indentures for older children rather than adoption indicates that the Managers recognized the difficulty families would have in truly “adopting” an older child as their own, and the risk that they would instead use adopted children as free labour. Apprenticed children were probably not usually treated as family — the number of times children were returned, because of ill health or bad behaviour or because of difficulties in the master’s own family, establishes this. However, they were at least paid a small annual wage, and the indentures required that the masters provide a minimum of education and training. An apprentice could also be removed if serious abuse or failure of a master to meet his or her obligations came to light. Furthermore, while the consequences of adoption for the young adult prior to the age of majority were unclear, there was a specified end to the apprenticeship relationship at a relatively young age.

We should not assume that the Managers were always driven by considerations of what was best for individual children. Placements of those already in the Home, which resulted in the full cost of their care being assumed by their masters, permitted the Managers to admit other orphans and hence to help more children, without resorting to the expensive alternative of enlarging the Home. The Managers thus achieved greater merit in doing their Christian duty.¹⁶⁷ There is also some suggestion that children were appren-

166 RC 42; *Minutes*, July 27, 1858.

167 That the Managers of children’s homes may have been driven by economic imperatives as much as by principle is consistent with Smandych and Verdun-Jones’s argument that concerns with economy were a major factor in the development of institutions in the nineteenth century (“The

ticed before the stated age of 12 to avoid behaviour problems, including groups of children running away.¹⁶⁸ The Managers' flexibility also provides some support for the argument of Rooke and Schnell that, in the early years of operation, children's homes "are appropriately seen as an extension of the individual women and reflecting their preferences and prejudices" with "individual eccentricities" dominating.¹⁶⁹ A substantial consistency in admission and placement practices does emerge, however, even if they did not always follow the rules, and there are few hints of the favouritism or "patronage" suggested by Rooke and Schnell.

The women did not spend a great deal of time talking about children and their needs, nor seem to perceive that they were invoking any new perceptions about children. To the extent they did discuss the motivations for their work, they focused on doing their Christian duty. A desire to use their own time in a productive and rewarding way was probably also a significant factor. However, their flexible approach belies a rigid belief that institutional care was best, or even good, for these children in comparison to private homes, only that it was better than what the children could otherwise have expected. The women accepted without question that the kind of home care such children had always received under the terms of pauper apprenticeship was suitable, and they made extensive use of it. Indeed, the establishment of institutional care no doubt increased the use of such home placements by providing a means of identifying more children perceived to be in need and organizing their placements. The result, and perhaps even the aim, was that the majority of children who did not return to their parents spent most of their childhood in private homes rather than an institution, as had those apprenticed in the past and as would those placed in foster care after 1893. The nineteenth century hence appears as a period of evolution in provision for dependent children, with heavy reliance on home care throughout the century: whether arranged privately, as was normally the case in the first half of the century; by institutions providing short-term emergency care, as occurred from time to time during that period; by children's institutions like the Toronto POH in the second half of the century; by child immigration organizations; or through the Children's Aid Societies after 1893.

Unfortunately, to a large extent we must rely on quantitative data in making these assessments. While a certain amount of qualitative information can be gleaned from the records, we have no detailed case histories which

Emergence of the Asylum", pp. 171, 178). Rooke and Schnell recognize the economic imperative, but argue it as support only for the apprenticeship of older children (*Discarding the Asylum*, pp. 177-179).

168 *Visitors' Book*, April 24, 1856.

169 Rooke and Schnell, "Childhood and Charity", p. 170. Detailed comparisons with Roman Catholic homes run by nuns rather than married women with children might provide some insight into these issues, but such comparisons must be left for future studies. One such girls' home in Montreal has been studied by Bradbury in "Fragmented Families".

reveal the true feelings of masters, the managers of the Home, parents, or, most importantly, the children, nor is there any long-term information about the children. As a consequence, we will never really know what the women and children thought about long-term institutionalization, adoption, or apprenticeship, or which was more successful; we can only attempt to imagine how the lives of children may have differed as a result of their experiences.

Table 1 Destiny and Time in Home of All Children Admitted

	Total number	Age in (median)	Age out (median)	Months in Home (median)	0 to 11 months	12 to 23 months	24 to 47 months	Over 48 months	Unknown
Children placed	204	7.0	10.0	22.0	60	43	42	51	8
Girls placed	107	7.0	9.0	13.5	44	25	19	18	1
adopted	31	5.0	6.0	10.0	17	7	5	2	0
apprenticed	59	8.0	10.0	17.0	21	14	9	14	1
both	10	7.0	9.0	21.0	3	3	2	2	0
to service	7	11.0	13.0	19.0	3	1	3	0	0
Boys placed	97	6.0	11.0	35.0	16	18	23	33	7
adopted	13	3.0	5.0	13.5	5	3	2	2	1
apprenticed	81	7.0	11.0	40.0	10	13	21	31	6
both	3	7.0	7.0	12.0	1	2	0	0	0
Relatives/friends*	174	6.0	8.0	15.0	76	27	38	29	4
Girls	71	5.0	7.0	13.0	31	15	14	9	2
mother	54	5.0	7.0	14.0	23	11	12	7	1
father	11	6.5	8.5	10.5	5	4	0	1	1
other	6	7.0	10.0	18.0	3	0	2	1	0
Boys	101	6.0	8.0	15.0	43	12	24	20	2
mother	66	6.0	8.0	24.0	24	8	20	13	1
father	23	5.5	8.0	4.0	14	3	2	3	1
other	12	6.0	9.0	22.0	5	1	2	4	0
Unknown	2	–	–	–	2	0	0	0	0
Died in Home**	29	3.0	5.5	12.5	12	9	4	3	1
Girls	7	2.0	4.0	11.0	3	2	0	1	1
Boys	21	3.5	5.5	13.0	9	6	4	2	0
Unknown	1	–	–	–	0	1	0	0	0

Table 1 (Concluded)

	Total number	Age in (median)	Age out (median)	Months in Home (median)	0 to 11 months	12 to 23 months	24 to 47 months	Over 48 months	Unknown
Ran away from Home (boys)	11	10.0	10.0	11.0	6	2	0	1	2
To Boys' Home	2	-	-	-	1	0	0	0	1
Destiny Unknown	30	7.0	-	-	2	1	0	0	27
Girls	10	7.0	-	-	2	1	0	0	7
Boys	19	7.0	-	-	0	0	0	0	19
Unknown	1	6.0	-	-	0	0	0	0	1
All***	447	6.0	9.0	17.5	157	79	84	84	43
Girls	194	6.0	9.0	13.0	80	42	33	28	11
Boys	249	6.0	9.0	22.0	75	36	51	56	31
Unknown	4	-	-	-	2	1	0	0	1

Sources: See note 4 for the sources of these data. Many children were admitted to the Home more than once. This table records their destination only for their first exit, with the exception of two boys who ran away from the Home but returned and were later apprenticed and one girl who left with her father after her first stay and was apprenticed after her second. Brief departures with family during the January 1866 epidemic are ignored. The departure date and age on entry or departure are missing for some children, but children are nevertheless included under any category for which their information is complete. Ages recorded by the Home were also not always accurate, and could vary between admission and exit and between admissions. Where either the admission or exit age is missing, one year was added for a part year of 6 to 11 months.

* Includes two whose sex cannot be identified.

** One more child died in the Home on his second stay, having left with his mother after his first stay, making a total of 30 deaths in the Home during the period under consideration.

*** This is three less than the total of the above, as explained in the note on sources.

Table 2 Age on Entering the Home

	Total number	Age in under 3	3 to 5	6 to 8	9 to 11	12 and older	Age in unknown	Age in (median)
Children placed	204	14	53	75	49	7	6	7.0
Girls placed	107	7	26	39	29	4	2	7.0
adopted	31	6	12	10	3	0	0	5.0
apprenticed	59	1	11	22	22	1	2	8.0
both	10	0	3	6	1	0	0	7.0
to service	7	0	0	1	3	3	0	11.0
Boys placed	97	7	27	36	20	3	4	6.0
adopted	13	4	6	1	1	0	1	3.0
apprenticed	81	3	21	32	19	3	3	7.0
both	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	7.0
Relatives/friends	174	15	63	59	21	2	14	6.0
Girls	71	7	26	24	7	1	6	5.0
mother	54	6	22	19	4	0	3	5.0
father	11	1	3	2	2	0	3	6.5
other	6	0	1	3	1	1	0	7.0
Boys	101	8	37	35	14	1	6	6.0
mother	66	5	24	24	8	1	4	6.0
father	23	2	9	7	4	0	1	5.5
other	12	1	4	4	2	0	1	6.0
Unknown	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	–
Died in Home	29	8	14	4	2	0	1	3.0
Girls	7	4	2	1	0	0	0	2.0
Boys	21	4	12	2	2	0	1	3.5
Unknown	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	–

Table 2 (Concluded)

	Total number	Age in under 3	3 to 5	6 to 8	9 to 11	12 and older	Age in unknown	Age in (median)
Ran away from Home (boys)	11	0	2	3	4	2	0	10.0
To Boys' Home	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	-
Destiny unknown	30	3	6	10	6	2	3	7.0
Girls	10	0	4	4	0	1	1	7.0
Boys	19	3	2	5	6	1	2	7.0
Unknown	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1.0
All	447	40	138	151	81	13	21	6.0
Girls	194	18	58	67	36	6	9	6.0
Boys	249	22	80	82	45	7	13	6.0
Unknown	4	0	0	2	0	0	2	-

Sources: See note 4 and the sources for Table 1.

Table 3 Age on Leaving the Home

	Total number	Age out under 3	3 to 5	6 to 8	9 to 11	12 and older	Age out unknown	Age out (median)
Children placed	204	2	20	41	86	47	8	10.0
Girls placed	107	1	13	25	51	14	3	9.0
adopted	31	1	13	13	4	0	0	6.0
apprenticed	59	0	0	7	40	9	3	10.0
both	10	0	0	4	6	0	0	9.0
to service	7	0	0	1	1	5	0	13.0
Boys placed	97	1	7	16	35	33	5	11.0
adopted	13	1	6	5	1	0	0	5.0
apprenticed	81	0	0	9	34	33	5	11.0
both	3	0	0	2	1	0	0	7.0
Relatives/friends	174	6	39	49	46	17	17	8.0
Girls	71	2	21	16	17	8	7	7.0
mother	54	2	18	13	13	4	4	7.0
father	11	0	3	1	2	2	3	8.5
other	6	0	0	2	2	2	0	10.0
Boys	101	4	18	33	29	9	8	8.0
mother	66	2	9	24	19	7	5	8.0
father	23	1	6	8	6	0	2	8.0
other	12	1	3	1	4	2	1	9.0
Unknown	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	—
Died in Home	29	4	10	10	2	2	1	5.5
Girls	7	3	1	2	1	0	0	4.0
Boys	21	1	9	7	1	2	1	5.5
Unknown	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	—

Table 3 (Concluded)

	Total number	Age out under 3	3 to 5	6 to 8	9 to 11	12 and older	Age out unknown	Age out (median)
Ran away from Home (boys)	11	0	0	2	5	2	2	10.0
To Boys' Home	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	—
Destiny Unknown	30	0	1	0	0	1	28	—
Girls	10	0	1	0	0	1	8	—
Boys	19	0	0	0	0	0	19	—
Unknown	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	—
All	447	12	69	103	136	69	58	9.0
Girls	194	5	36	43	68	23	19	9.0
Boys	249	7	33	59	68	46	36	9.0
Unknown	4	0	0	1	0	0	3	—

Sources: See note 4 and the sources for Table 1.

Table 4 Median Age on Leaving and Median Number of Months in Home According to Age of Admission

	Age in										
	Under 3	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12 and over
Placed											
<i>Girls</i>											
Number	7	5	11	10	13	9	17	10	9	10	4
Age out median	5.0	7.0	6.0	7.0	8.0	9.0	9.0	10.0	10.0	11.0	14.5
Months in Home median	33.0	59.0	22.0	30.0	28.0	18.0	12.0	9.5	3.0	4.5	11.0
<i>Boys</i>											
Number	7	10	8	9	15	15	6	4	10	6	3
Age out median	4.5	10.5	11.0	8.0	10.0	11.0	9.5	10.0	12.0	12.0	13.0
Months in Home median	28.5	86.5	82.5	39.0	53.0	61.0	26.5	15.0	15.0	13.5	1.0
To relatives											
<i>Girls</i>											
Number	7	9	8	9	5	9	10	3	3	1	1
Age out median	3.0	6.0	4.0	6.0	7.0	10.0	9.0	9.0	10.0	12.0	13.0
Months in Home median	15.0	24.0	4.5	8.0	17.0	41.0	17.0	6.0	3.0	22.0	0.0
<i>Boys</i>											
Number	8	15	10	12	14	12	9	8	3	3	1
Age out median	5.0	6.0	5.0	6.0	8.0	8.0	10.0	11.0	10.0	12.0	13.0
Months in Home median	30.0	36.0	18.5	15.5	20.0	9.0	20.0	24.0	3.0	6.0	7.0
All											
<i>Girls</i>											
Number	18	16	19	23	18	20	29	13	12	11	6
Age out median	3.0	6.0	5.0	6.0	7.0	9.5	9.0	10.0	10.0	11.0	13.0
Months in Home median	22.0	29.0	10.0	15.0	24.0	29.5	13.5	7.0	3.0	6.0	3.0
<i>Boys</i>											
Number	22	31	25	24	31	33	18	15	18	12	7
Age out median	3.5	6.0	6.0	7.0	9.0	9.0	10.0	10.0	11.0	12.0	13.0
Months in Home median	18.5	36.0	33.0	22.0	33.5	29.0	20.0	16.0	12.0	11.0	2.0

Sources: See note 4 and sources for Table 1.

Table 5 Status of Parents of Children Placed*

	Boys				Girls					
	Adopted	App.	Both	Total boys	Adopted	App.	Both	Service	Total girls	Total
Orphan	5/1	15/2	1	21/3	5/2	8/4	2	–	15/6	36/9
Father alive	3/2	10/1	1	14/3	8/1	13/6	2	–	23/7	37/10
Mother alive	1	30/22	1	33/22	8	29/12	4/1	4	45/13	78/35
Stepmother	–	–	–	–	–	1/1	–	–	1/1	1/1
Not noted	4/1	26/8	–	29/9	10/4	8/5	2/1	3	23/10	52/19
Totals	13/4	81/33	3	97/37	31/7	59/28	10/2	7	107/37	204/74

* The first number in each case refers to the total placed, the second after the slash to those whose placements were unsuccessful.

Sources: See note 4 and sources for Table 1.

Table 6 Unsuccessful Placements*

Nature of first placement	Total	Placed twice	Placed 3 times	Returned by master	Left place	Left with relative	Mistreated by master	Age in (median)	Age out at first placement (median)	Months in Home before first placement (median)
Girls	37	14	7	17	5	2	7	8	10	12.0
Adopted	7	2	3	—	1	—	2	7	8	23.0
Apprenticed	28	11	4	17	4	2	3	8	10	12.0
Both	2	1	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	—
To service	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Boys	37	13	2	12	17	—	4	6	11	36.0
Adopted	4	1	2	4	—	—	—	4	5	9.5
Apprenticed	33	12	—	8	17	—	4	7	11	38.0
Both	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

* Individual children may be included under more than one heading.

Sources: See note 4 and sources for Table 1.

Table 7 Money Paid

	Boys	Girls
Adopted	1	1
Apprenticed	46*	42**
Both	2	5**
Service	–	4
Total	49	52

* One of these was originally adopted, then returned and apprenticed seven years later.

** Includes one originally adopted.

Sources: See note 4 and sources for Table 1.