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Leave thy fatherless children, I will preserve them alive; and let thy widows trust in me.\textsuperscript{1}

Jeremiah xlix. ii.

The large number of children frequently taken by friends shows how extensive is the benefit often conferred by affording even a temporary shelter to the orphans; by this means, the widow, or the elder member of the family, is often given the opportunity to make successful efforts for obtaining a livelihood and may be enabled to take back with gratitude a charge. If left with them at first, it must have paralysed these efforts and kept the whole family in abject pauperism.\textsuperscript{2}

**Introduction**

The Dublin POS (DPOS) was the ‘parent body’ and thus directly responsible for the design and implementation of the boarding-out and apprenticeship schemes which became a blueprint for later PO Societies. Boarding out was by no means a widely accepted child welfare model in the first half of the nineteenth century; for the most part, orphans were placed in institutions such as orphanages, Houses of Industry, Charter Schools, goals and workhouses. Few, if any, contemporary charities aimed to assist the family as a whole. Moreover, orphanages tended to be gender specific which meant siblings were separated. A flexible approach to the provision of short and long-term care was also not characteristic of early nineteenth-century charities. This chapter examines the development of the DPOS ethos, governing rules and policies with respect to eligibility, benefits for widows, boarding out, children’s health, and apprenticeship to determine the extent to which the system could be deemed child and family oriented. References are also made to the policies of early local PO Societies such as Limerick and Tipperary.
Access to PO Societies

The DPOS served respectable Protestant families and imposed rigid application procedures to deter ‘undeserving’ applicants. The admission criteria were clear: legitimacy of birth; one or both parents deceased; father alive but incapacitated, due to mental or physical ill health, and unable to support his family. Children of widows who remarried were inadmissible and if widows remarried while their children were already in the Society’s care, they were considered no longer in need of assistance; only children of Protestant parentage, which included Methodist and Presbyterians and other ‘dissenting churches’ were admitted to the DPOS up until 1898 when the DPOS and CPOU amalgamated and children of intermarriages were admissible (county PO Societies accepted children from mixed marriage families).

Originally, only children under eight were accepted; the limit was raised to nine in the 1830s (the limit was raised again in later years). Children of subscribers bereft of both parents were prioritised. During the period under review here, 95 per cent of the applications received by the DPOS were from widows. Before admitting any child every effort was made to identify any ‘suitable’ Protestant relatives in comfortable circumstances prepared to care for the children. The ‘lower orders’, tradesmen on the committee, were enlisted to verify applicants’ circumstances, for ‘they are by their circumstances in life most likely to be made acquainted with cases of distress, and best fitted to detect and guard against imposition’. In Limerick applications were investigated for two months to prove the validity of the claims. Marriage, baptismal and burial certificates were required, without which applications were postponed or refused.

The DPOS committee did not officially admit children until the quarterly meetings. However, it was resolved in 1831 that to effectively deal with urgent cases between quarterly meetings, ‘a small sum may be drawn from the treasurer until such time as the helpless and perishing child shall be brought before quarterly meetings’, which was a form of out-relief. Children were ‘elected’ to the Society roll; that is a list of names was presented to the committee and they were required to ‘elect’ the candidates deemed most ‘deserving’.

Applicants

Applicants to PO Societies were from a range of backgrounds. For example, the Tipperary POS (TPOS) reported that 20 per cent of the children admitted in 1836 were police orphans and 10 per cent soldiers’ children. In 1836 the TPOS sent a circular with a copy of its rules to the...
commanding officer of each regiment in Clonmel and Caher. In reply Captain Griffiths of the Royal Artillery, ‘enclosed £1 from the officers and £1 from the non commissioners, Gunners and Drivers of that corps as donations’. In 1839 just under 30 per cent of admissions to the TPOS were police orphans; by 1840, two years after the Tithe War had ended, the number had fallen to 18 per cent. (The Peace Preservation Police was formed in 1814, a ‘national police’ in 1822, and the Irish Constabulary and the Dublin Metropolitan Police in 1836. Catholics entered the constabulary from 1836 onwards.)

Labourers’ children represented on average 30 per cent of the total annual applications to the TPOS during this period. Tradesmen’s children – tailors, saddlers, butchers, weavers, and shoemakers – were also admitted, albeit in fewer numbers. Jewellers, accountants, shopkeepers, farmers and teachers were also nominally represented. Labourer and police orphans were the most well-represented among those admitted to the Kilkenny POS. The Kilkenny POS reported in 1849 that 78 per cent of its applicants were widows and 10 per cent widowers; in

**Table 3.1 Kilkenny POS applicants, 1837–48**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bailiff</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacksmith</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrier</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutler</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gatekeeper</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourer</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nailor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organist</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish clerk</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police constable</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servant</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoemaker</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soldier</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tallow chandler</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to labour</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weaver</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing clerk</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 42

*Source: Kilkenny POS annual report, 1849.*
per cent of cases, both parents had died. In Limerick the orphans of doctors, soldiers, the police, clergymen and tradesmen, among others, were received.

DPOS registers contain occupational data relating to deceased fathers which is illustrated in figure 3.1. The following occupations are listed in order of decreasing frequency: servants, shoemakers, clerks, labourers, police, carpenters, farmers, tailors and weavers. The Association for the Relief of Distressed Protestants (ARDP) reported in 1841 that over a three year period 1,260 Protestant servants, ‘the most valuable members of the social system’, sought assistance.

After the foundation of auxiliaries in the north of the country, Protestant children from Belfast, Fermanagh and Armagh were admitted to the DPOS and boarded out in Wicklow. In all but a few cases, the fathers had been tradesmen. Children of a police sergeant, a surgeon and a foreman were also admitted. The Society for the Relief of Sick and Indigent Roomkeepers also contains references to the destitution experienced by tradesmen. Prior to his work with the DPOS, which is examined in more detail later in the chapter, Revd Thomas R. Shore, curate of St Michan’s parish, was honorary secretary of the Roomkeeper’s Society. In 1834 he reported:

The third class, who are in occasional distress, these are principally poor tradesmen, who would not get an employment in a shop, and are below the rank of journeyman (they might be about 16,000 or 18,000 in Dublin, reduced to distress by sickness). Of the classes above mentioned, I think that the second and third are most rapidly increasing in number. Vast numbers of persons – women – have been reduced from the third class to the second.

The annual reports of the ARDP also referred to the ‘many cases of great distress where the parties had been respectable: widows of clergymen, doctors, attorneys and merchants, and of gentlemen who had been officers’. There is evidence that the better off succumbed to fever in relatively large numbers. Reports from the Parochial Visitors’ Society, which was founded in 1840, also refer to the Protestant poor. William Clementson, divinity student, visitor of St Anne’s parish, reported on 3 January 1844 that he had ‘called upon 110 families and have paid upwards of 500 visits, confining myself almost exclusively to poor Protestant room keepers’. Henry Hutchings, visitor of St Mary’s, stated that ‘nothing can be more encouraging than the reception which the poor Protestants have given their parochial visitor, they are very happy at being sought after, and if in distress, pour out all their woes in one long message to their minister’.
Evidence drawn from DPOS registers and case files suggests that men who had once worked as skilled tradesmen resorted to labouring because of declines in their trades and unemployment. In certain cases, applicants recorded their husbands’ occupations as ‘labourer’ and their husbands’ former trade, for example, as ‘weaver’.

**Widowhood**

Joseph Williams, co-founder of the DPOS, could not have known in 1828 that only six short years later his own family would come to depend on the charity for assistance. Before his untimely death, Joseph had been appointed assistant secretary to the DPOS. The Williams family lived in Mullinahack, St Catherine’s parish, Dublin. In her application to the DPOS Mrs Williams recorded her occupation as a hat trimmer and sought the admission of her three sons Charles (two), John (four) and Joseph junior (nine). All three boys were elected to the Society roll in April 1834 and sent to a nurse in Carnew, County Wicklow. Mrs Williams was heavily pregnant with her fifth child at the time and her daughter was born less than one month after her sons’ admissions to the Society.

A number of women experienced a gradual deterioration in their circumstances due to their husbands’ ill health, unemployment and under-employment. A young man, a smith, ‘had not long been doing business for himself when paralysis of the right side and limbs consequently obliged him to give up his forge ... from that time gradually he grew worse’. His wife was ‘with child’ during his illness. She died during childbirth three days after her husband’s death. Until her admission to
the DPOS, their little girl was cared for by her grandmother who was described as ‘very old and poor’.  

Mental illness and ‘immorality’ also led once comfortable families to live in reduced circumstances. Two girls were admitted to the DPOS after their father died. He had ‘very excellent means’ until shortly before his death, ‘when mental disability came out’ and ‘would have left a very handsome property in benefices to his children’. His fortune was reduced considerably and his daughters were left without any means of support. In another case an aunt admitted her nephew to the DPOS because his mother was dead and his father was ‘unsound in body and mind’.

A widow was left destitute with a four and a half year old child when her husband, who had been a ‘gentleman and held a commission in the Royal Service’ was ‘reduced to the greatest distress through drunkenness’. His wife was ‘lying in the Adelaide Hospital at the time of the election in a very bad state and not expected to recover’. In a number of cases, widows died shortly after their children’s admission.

The Dublin POS: services for widows

The DPOS provided children with long or short-term care as required by widows who could reclaim their children when they so wished, as long as the committee was satisfied that it was in the children’s best interests. Widows themselves, the clergymen dealing with their applications and the subscribers who supported the applications, repeatedly requested the admission of the youngest dependents so that widows could seek employment. A widow returned to Ireland from New York in 1838. The local clergyman reported that she had three children, her last born only months before her husband’s death. The widow attempted to ‘carry on in small jobs to pay for the children’s support but expended the greater part of her wages on paying a nurse to care for her youngest child while she attended work’. She requested that the DPOS care for her infant child, ‘for as it takes all her wages to pay for the nursing of two she has no means to pay for the third or to clothe herself or them, consequently the children are almost naked’. The placement of children with private unregulated nurses was precarious, as brought to light in later baby farming scandals, particularly given that these women were not subject to any form of vetting or inspections, or accountable to any higher authority. As discussed later in the chapter, PO Societies provided widows with the assurance that their children’s placement would be regulated, and though not always effective it accounted for widespread support of its system.
In April 1841 a widow stated, ‘I have no trade or way of earning support for my three children, were they settled I would look out for a situation as it is now my whole dependence’. The clergyman who recommended the case stated, ‘she is obliged to watch a child of two and a half, too young to be left in the care of its sister’. He suggested that if the DPOS elected the younger child, the widow could work and her daughter could attend school, which had dual benefits for the family. It was common for widows to depend on elder siblings, extended kin, friends and neighbours for child care; however, while an invaluable source of temporary support, it was not a long-term solution.

In 1849 Josiah Smyly, an eminent doctor with links to the DPOS as discussed later in the chapter, was requested by the committee to enquire into the circumstances of a widow whose husband had died after a ‘lingering disease’, leaving her three children ‘in great destitution’. Smyly reported that ‘when in health her husband was able to keep her in comfortable circumstances, she is now so reduced as to be happy to get into humble service’. He also informed the committee that the widow had placed her children with a nurse in the country (unregulated) while she worked which had cost more than her wages. Finally, he stated that without the assistance of the DPOS, the widow would be forced to give up her employment. Smyly recommended the children’s admission as they would otherwise become dependent on what he described as, ‘the repulsive aid of the poor house’. Analysis of applicant case histories suggests that despite their straitened circumstances, many widows struggled on independently for long periods before they sought assistance from PO Societies in order to keep their children ‘out of the workhouse’, which is considered in more detail in chapter 5.

**Boarding out**

The DPOS developed a boarding-out system, the rules of which county PO Societies adapted to meet local needs. Given that the old method of boarding out involved little or no supervision or focus on the orphans’ educational progress, the DPOS was innovative in a number of respects not least its implementation of effective safeguards to ensure the children’s continued well-being. The first safeguard was the careful selection of respectable nurses. Parish clergymen were required to recommend nurses and verify their claims. Moreover, as an additional precaution the DPOS resolved in 1830 that, ‘inspectors will be occasionally sent down by the Society to see if the nurses are in comfortable circumstances according to the statements contained in certificates’. Generally, chil-
The ‘family system’, 1830–50

Children were placed with respectable Protestant farming families, ‘That in the house of a decent farmer recommended and constantly visited by the local clergyman, a child is not in a more favourable position for health, morals and religion’.  

Once approved, nurses were presented with certificates which confirmed their religion; acreage of farm; and the number of cows in their possession. The ages of the applicants’ youngest children were also documented as, generally, women with infants were not selected as wet nurses. The nursing certificates also detailed the nurses’ personal appearance – her hair, eyes, demeanour and height. These certificates were a means of identification to prevent abuses of the system and were also used in foundlings hospitals. The nurses were paid annually to cover the children’s food, lodging, washing and education and were made accountable to the authority of the clergymen in their own parish and to the DPOS committee.

In order to help children settle in to their new homes, they were generally boarded out with their siblings, a child-oriented measure which recognised and met the specific needs of young children. Children were sent to houses of strangers and had to adjust to their new surroundings which was likely to have been an overwhelming change. The presence of siblings when first placed at nurse gave children, particularly younger children, a sense of security and comfort during the difficult transition. Elder children were encouraged to care for their younger siblings and often took the place of a parent after parental death, with girls becoming ‘little mothers’, a responsibility that few took lightly and in many cases extended throughout their lives. In large families elder siblings ‘acted as an intermediate generation between parents and younger children’.

The DPOS endeavoured to place siblings together. On 4 December 1835, the committee resolved, ‘that a letter be written to Reverend J. Webber stating that the two children allocated to Nurse –, one brother and sister, … it is most desirable not to separate’.

In the case of the Limerick POS, the children referred to the nurses as their ‘aunts’ which helped the children to settle and indicated the often temporary nature of their stay.

Inspections

Regular inspection was the second and most important safeguard. Children were placed with families who lived in close vicinity of the glebe or parsonage house. Local clergymen, who were also referred to as ‘Local Superintendents’, worked for the DPOS on a voluntary basis, and were expected to monitor the children’s attendance at day and Sunday school and to report any problems to the Dublin committee. (Prior to the
establishment of PO Societies, clergymen, their wives and daughters had always contributed to the care of the ‘children of the church’ – ‘orphans who became reliant on its bounty’).

Most local superintendents took their role as the children’s guardians very seriously. They corresponded regularly with the committee regarding the children’s placements and, if necessary, admonished nurses on its behalf.

In addition, while the committee was thankful for the ‘watchful eye of the parochial clergymen’, in order to ensure the children’s continued well-being, it was resolved in 1835 that ‘all of the orphans be in future inspected twice in each year once in winter and once in summer’. The appointed committee members carried out unannounced inspections and reported on the children’s educational progress and physical and moral health, and the nurses’ homes. Moreover, nurses were obligated to attend annual meetings and church with the children which broadened the Society’s supervisory scope in the best interests of the orphans.

The Tipperary POS (TPOS) also made unannounced visits to its nurses and it is likely that all subsequent PO Societies followed suit. Children were inspected ‘two or three times within the year’ and ‘the uncertainty of the period at which the inspector may present himself, and the conviction that no symptoms of neglect will be lightly passed over, have proved wholesome stimulants to the due discharge of the duties which the Society has imposed, and which the Nurses have voluntarily undertaken’. TPOS committee members carried out the duties which were described as ‘by no means pleasant and attended with much trouble and inconvenience’. The TPOS appointed two inspectors from the parish to undertake the supervision of children while boarded out and while apprenticed.

Minutes of DPOS committee meetings and annual reports reveal that it was the resident laity as well as clergymen and ‘official inspectors’ – committee members – who watched over the children; the whole parish, from clergymen and their wives, to neighbours and other parishioners, became overseers who were encouraged to report changes in the children’s appearance or absences from church or school. The DPOS reported in 1843 that ‘the parental care taken of them [the orphans] by the Reverend and his lady who live close to them’ had greatly improved the children’s ‘wretched health’. However, the DPOS did not formally introduce ‘ladies’ committees’ at this time. (The founders of the DPOS clearly outlined their intention to appoint laywomen to undertake these duties in 1829.) The Limerick POS (LPOS) appears to have been the first PO Society to arrange local ‘ladies’ committees’ from 1837, if not earlier.
The ‘family system’, 1830–50

by the ‘Visiting Ladies’ who were mainly the wives of the LPOS committee members. 53

To distinguish the orphans from other children and therefore make them more visible to parish overseers, children were dressed in distinctive clothing. Members of auxiliaries, members of the church, and neighbours were therefore able to detect marked changes in the children’s appearance more easily. It was also important that the children were respectably dressed in order to present a positive public image of the charity. The Charitable Repository in Bandon dressed its female pupils in uniforms ‘to make them more amenable to discipline’. 54 The TPOS girls were described as ‘the little girls in blue’. 55 In Dublin the girls were dressed in gingham uniforms.

Uniforms were also a way of telling apart DPOS orphans from foundlings:

A letter be written to the managers of St Peter’s Repository expressing the mortification we feel at finding that the same peculiar pattern of frock worn by the female orphans has been furnished to some of the foundling girls belonging to St Peter’s parish who are at nurse in the County of Wicklow whereby the distinctive character of the dress is rendered useless,
and we incur the liability of having these children mistaken for Protestant orphans which may, in many ways, lead to a very great inconvenience.\textsuperscript{56}

Children were not placed in any home in which nurses also cared for foundlings – abandoned children, generally, though not always of illegitimate birth. The DPOS was a respectable charity which aimed to maintain the respectability of widows and orphans. If its subscribers had discovered that DPOS orphans were associated with ‘immorality’, it would have tarnished the Society’s good reputation.

### Unsuitable homes

For many nurses, caring for the orphans was an act of benevolence, a favour or good turn which they hoped would be reciprocated. There is evidence that former DPOS nurses applied to the Society for assistance in widowhood.\textsuperscript{57} At the first DPOS annual meeting parents were implored to consider their own children’s futures: ‘fathers and mothers then, you may leave your children orphans, I address you in behalf of those orphans yonder; the mercy you bestow upon them, may cause mercy to be bestowed upon your children’.\textsuperscript{58} The DPOS supplemented nurses’ wages with bonuses during hard times, gratuities for the care of sick children, who required extra attention and nourishment, and annual supplies of clothing. Influential doctors’, gentlemen’s and clergymen’s names featured in the DPOS reports as committee members, patrons and vice-patrons; it was a highly reputable charity, one which elevated the nurses’ status. The same families carried out the work over generations.

However, despite the best efforts of many of the DPOS local superintendents to select good homes and the generally high standard of nursing, some of the placements, particularly in the early years, were entirely unsuitable. The committee sent two inspectors to investigate the case of a young orphan boy who had left his nurse’s home and was reportedly missing. The nurse had not informed the committee and had received four months’ allowance despite the child’s disappearance. In response the committee resolved on 4 December 1835, ‘That we conceive the clergymen into whose charge the orphan was entrusted to have been neglectful of the interest of the Protestant Orphan Society in not reporting the absence of the child from the nurse that to be forthwith written to on this subject to ascertain how long the child has been absent from the parish’.\textsuperscript{59} These cases shaped future DPOS policies and improved the lot of other children. It is interesting to reflect on the founders’ original rules dated 1828, ‘every proper investigation shall then take place and such remedy be adopted for the prevention of any
further neglect of duty’. For every case of neglect there was a corresponding reform measure.

In 1836 the DPOS committee introduced stricter nurse selection guidelines: ‘Five members with secretaries shall be appointed to a standing sub-committee to whom shall be confided the selection of nurses’. Dublin, and later county PO Societies such as Tipperary, supplied nurses with a set of rules for the care of the orphans. ‘N.B. It is requested that a copy of these rules be kept in the Dwellings of the nurses in some conspicuous place, so as to be seen by all who may visit them’. Nurses became conduits for moral reform and ‘good nurses’ became models for expected standards of parental care.

Revd Thomas Shore was thirty-four when he began his work with the DPOS and became a key figure in the DPOS committee:

During his tenure as ‘General Superintendent of Orphans’, Shore detected a number of cases of neglect; for example, in 1836, he discovered that a nurse had sent a twelve-year-old boy in her care to work as a servant for her son. Shore reported that he had ascertained by personal investigation that the orphan ‘had been in Dublin at intervals since the last annual meeting for several weeks together acting as servant to his nurse’s son, who keeps a dairy in Wood Street’. The nurse was dismissed and the orphan transferred to another location. In 1841 the committee reiterated its commitment to the children’s welfare: ‘the utmost care is taken (founded on the personal inspection of a member of the committee), to have the several localities where orphans are placed, suited to the age and sex of the children’. Revd Shore appears to have been the driving force behind such progress.

While most nurses adhered to the rules set by the DPOS, others proved less cooperative:

The subcommittee having carefully considered the peculiar circumstances in which they are placed respecting the management of orphans located in the parishes of Tullow and Ardoyne, circumstances which are so peculiar that they cannot carry out their operations respecting orphans in either of those parishes in the same manner and on the same terms as they do
in all other parishes in which orphans are located without running the risk of giving offence when they have not the least intention of doing so. Circumstances so peculiar as to have prevented the managing committee from carrying into execution the order after which they felt it their duty to issue, respecting some nurses in those parishes in August last ... This subcommittee will not henceforward undertake or be responsible for the inspection, superintendence or care of any orphans located in the parishes of Ardoyne or Tullow, neither will we locate any orphans in either of those parishes or transfer or remove to the apprentice class or otherwise any orphan there from without having previously received the directions in each case from the managing committee.66

The minutes of earlier meetings suggest that there had been difficulties with two specific nurses who had been warned on two separate occasions that if the children’s standard of hygiene did not improve, the children would be removed. The labour intensiveness of cleaning for women who also had their own children to care for and their own duties on the farm meant that the committee’s expectations were often unachievable. The children were eventually transferred to other nurses.67

Shore, whose work with the Society was unpaid until the late 1840s, remained a central figure in the DPOS until the early 1850s. The committee trusted him emphatically and praised his tireless efforts on behalf of the orphans:

One of its members, who had devoted himself to the regulations of the internal affairs of the Society; and who for several years, had relieved the Committee from all anxiety as to the care of the Orphans while at nurse, by voluntarily and gratuitously undertaking the entire charge of the regulation, inspection, and superintendence of the nurses.68

In August 1851, the committee again referred to Shore’s ‘zeal and efficiency’.69 Entries in the subcommittee minute book detail the hours he spent ‘in the office’, preparing for ‘the dispatch of new orphans’, ‘the transferral of orphans’ and ‘foregoing inspections’, which took weeks to complete.70

Medical care

Medical care in Ireland comprised voluntary hospitals, county infirmaries and dispensaries, originally supported entirely by charity and subsequently organised under the Dispensary Act, 1805. After 1840 the number of dispensaries gradually increased in number. By 1846, there were 204 dispensaries in Leinster, each one serving an average
population of 9,675. Legislation introduced during the famine to improve public health included the Nuisances Removal Act, 1848, and the Disease Prevention Act, 1849. In County Wicklow, where DPOS orphans were boarded out, there were sixteen dispensaries, each of which served an average population of 7,887, six fever hospitals and two infirmaries, which suggests that the children had relatively sufficient access to medical care. Conversely, in Leitrim there were eight dispensaries to serve an average population of 19,412, one fever hospital and only one infirmary.

**DPOS medical officers**

Dr Samuel Litton became one of the first doctors on the DPOS committee. He was a governor and consulting physician of the Hospital for Incurables, Donnybrook Road. (Robert J. Graves was among the other renowned names associated with the hospital.) Dr James Pope was a member of the first DPOS committee and also a member of the Hibernian Temperance Society of which Philip Cecil Crampton Esq. was president.

Another committee member, Dr Maurice Collis, was an attending surgeon at the Meath Hospital and lived at 113 Merrion Square, Dublin. His nephew and namesake was appointed as surgeon to the Meath Hospital in 1851 following his uncle’s resignation, later appointed Examiner in Surgery in the Queen’s University, and an Examiner in the Royal College of Surgeons. His work on cancer has been described as a ‘medical classic’. Howard Cooke, MD and surgeon with an address at 73 Blessington Street, Dublin, was also listed as a medical adviser for the DPOS.

Dr John Ringland had spent time on the DPOS committee before his departure in 1846. The committee ‘wished for his success and assured him of the sense they entertain of the ability and attention with which he has devoted his talents and his time to care of those among our orphans who required medical treatment as well as the kindness and sympathy he has always evinced towards those suffering little ones’. Ringland had studied at Sir Patrick Dun’s, and the Meath and the Rotunda hospitals; he delivered George Bernard Shaw in 1856. He was also listed as a committee member of the ARDP in 1847.

Dr Josiah Smyly was appointed surgeon to the Meath Hospital in 1832. He was an esteemed and highly respected surgeon. He was described in later years as ‘the unobtrusive Christian man, the genial philanthropist, ever ready to assist the poor with his professional advice and his purse’. Smyly was Vice-President of the RCSI.
Dr Alfred Henry McClintock was elected a member of the DPOS committee in October 1847 in place of the late Doctor Litton. As part of his duties, he inspected applicants’ claims on the north side of the city. Another esteemed doctor, McClintock introduced hugely beneficial sanitary reforms to the Rotunda Lying in Hospital, of which he was master in the 1850s, among many other achievements. Described as a ‘quiet, deeply religious man’, he was also a member of the Benevolent Fund Society of Dublin.

**Children’s health**

The DPOS recommended that infants remain with their mothers, where possible, until they had finished teething as convulsions during dentition was a common cause of infant mortality. For example, in 1843 the DPOS committee ordered that ‘orphan – be not taken from his mother until after the next election as his health is at present delicate owing to his getting his teeth’. Revd Shore drew attention to the dangers associated with the early removal of infants from their mothers again in 1850 when he reported that while young dependents were the ‘greatest impediment to the mothers’ exertions’, if removed too early they would ‘suffer exceedingly by the change’ and ‘some have died during the progress of dentition’. Despite already following a general policy of leaving infants with their mothers until after dentition, it resolved formally that all newly elected orphans under eighteen months (though in numerous cases children remained with their mothers for far longer) were to remain with their mother or relatives with a paid allowance from the Society until they were physically strong enough to be transferred to their nurses.

The DPOS sent children to healthy country districts because fresh air, a change of air, was medically recommended for the maintenance of good health and for recuperating after bouts of illness. Sea bathing and sea air were also recommended. (Sea bathing became a popular leisure pursuit in the eighteenth century. Sir John Floyer, Dr Richard Russell and Dr William Buchan were all well-known advocates and in Scotland, the benefits for delicate children were stressed.) Children were placed in homes which were ‘convenient to a dispensary and sea-bathing’. The availability of pure milk was another extremely significant reason for children’s placement in the country. Children were only sent to homes where there was a plentiful supply of ‘good milk’. In urban areas milk was often watered down thereby reducing its nutritional value. The city dairy yards were unsanitary and contaminated water was used to adulterate the milk.
The DPOS application form required information as to whether or not the orphan in question had received the small pox vaccination. In some cases DPOS medical officers recorded that they had inoculated the children when they were admitted.\textsuperscript{93} The Cow Pock Institution was founded in 1804 to collect and administer small pox vaccinations mainly in the city. The Vaccination Extension Act, 1853\textsuperscript{94} gave powers to boards of guardians to vaccinate.\textsuperscript{95} There is evidence that the aforementioned medical men were instrumental in greatly improving DPOS orphans’ health. The minutes of committee meetings state that Mr Jepps, the DPOS secretary, ‘had waited upon Doctors Smyly and Collis relative to the proposed consultations respecting the health of the orphans – both gentlemen most readily agreed to these wishes and arranged to meet at Mr Smyly’s house at two o’clock. Accordingly, notices have been sent to the other medical gentlemen and the sub-committee requesting their attendance’.\textsuperscript{96} Following the discovery of health problems among the children, the subcommittee of medical officers compiled a report and forwarded ‘special instructions’ to the nurses ‘embodying the recommendations contained in the report’.\textsuperscript{97} In February 1846, against the background of the famine, the committee again convened to discuss the children’s health.

A letter be written to the several superintendents of our orphans requesting that they would have the kindness to give directions to the respective nurses to apply in every case of sickness for a ticket of recommendation to the Dispensary so that our children may have, without delay, the benefit of the local medical assistance, as we conceive that orphans wholly dependent on the bounty of others, and actually resident in the district, are fairly to be classed among the numbers of those whose relief and assistance dispensaries are established.\textsuperscript{98} Local doctors were also directly involved in the maintenance of the children’s health. They regularly wrote to the Dublin committee with recommendations for the treatment of sick orphans whom they had recently attended.\textsuperscript{99} Local superintendents (clergymen and their wives), school teachers and nurses also informed the committee when children were ill.\textsuperscript{100} Carefully chosen nurses gave children with persistent illnesses specialist care. ‘Invalid children to be located with Mrs – and Mrs – residing at Balbriggan as occasion offers at the rate of ten pounds per annum’.\textsuperscript{101} These women played an integral role in the low mortality rates among DPOS orphans. In 1846 a gratuity was given to a nurse in Dunganstown ‘in consideration of the great trouble she was subjected to by ill health of newly elected orphans, one of whom was inoculated with small pox secretly by her mother just previous to their being sent
to nurse’. Ringworm was detected among some of the children and ‘Beatson’s Lotion’ was the recommended cure. Three boys were sent to a nurse in Delgany, County Wicklow, ‘who were placed in her care for the cure of ringworm’. The doctor certified their recovery but the committee advised that the boys remain there for an additional month. In October 1846, a teacher at the Cronroe School, Glanely, County Wicklow, reported a young girl ‘has a sore head – a woman is curing it for 5/c’. In a separate case, in 1847 a doctor prescribed sea bathing for a girl with ‘sore eyes’.

In the same year there were a minor number of cases in which nurses gave children up because of the ‘dearness of provisions’ and in one case because of a death in the nurse’s family. The committee provided each nurse with an additional grant because of the ‘increased price of provisions this season, in consequence of the failure of the potato crop’. Masters, too, reported their inability to keep their apprentices: ‘in consequence of the loss of the potato crop, he fears he will not be able to support his apprentice, begs advice’. Throughout Black ’47 reports of sick children continued to rise. In some cases children were in extremely poor health and admitted to hospital. Four children could not attend the 1847 annual meeting because their nurses were ill with fever. It was thought advisable that they did not attend to prevent its spread. Five other children had whooping cough and for the same reason were directed not to attend. Those who did attend were inspected and noted as being free from cutaneous disease. Despite a number of disease outbreaks, the DPOS recorded consistently low mortality rates which are illustrated in figure 3.3

Burial societies were commonplace during the first half of the nineteenth century because the ‘lower orders’ were unable to pay funeral...
expenses. Charitable lay people set up burial societies to raise funds to assist bereaved families. The Protestant Benevolent Burial Society was founded in 1834, ‘some benevolent persons having witnessed the hardships endured by many of their Protestant brethren for want of suitable means of internment for their friends’.113 It was customary for nurses, DPOS committee members and the other boarded-out children to attend the funerals of any orphans who died while under the Society’s care. Forty-two children and fourteen nurses and their families attended the funeral of – who died in June 1847. He was considered a ‘very delicate child when first received from Belfast in April last’.114 The boy was interred in Kiltegan churchyard.

Local superintendents were frequently praised for their dedication to the orphans’ care115 and objected to practices that appeared to compromise the children’s health. Revd William Smyth Guinness, rector of Rathdrum, and as discussed in chapter 2 a member of the Irish Homœopathic Society, among other superintendents in County Wicklow, disapproved of sending orphans to Dublin to attend the Society’s annual meetings. Smyth Guinness informed the DPOS committee in 1850 that ‘the younger children have suffered severely in many instances from being obliged to take so long a journey and recommended that some change should be made’.116 Women, most probably the nurses or clergymen’s wives, were also likely to have raised the issue. Despite the justified concerns of the superintendents, the committee chose to retain the practice, ‘of the past eighteen years’.117 The committee reminded the superintendents that the children’s presence induced people to donate to the Society and recommended that in future all children attend, ‘except in cases of delicacy of health’.118 Moreover, the annual meetings provided an additional opportunity for committee members, lay subscribers and the children’s mothers, who were known to attend, to inspect the children. Attendance at the meetings also encouraged nurses to maintain the children’s clothing and general health.

Families reunited

If widows’ circumstances improved through remarriage, emigration, or other means, they generally applied to the DPOS for ‘repossession’ of their children. (In the broader context, it was common for pauper families to leave their children in workhouses before they went abroad to seek employment. These children were essentially ‘temporary orphans’ who were later reclaimed by their parents.)119 The DPOS thoroughly investigated applications from widows, siblings and other members of the family who wished to reclaim their children. ‘The committee
always make the strictest inquiries for their relatives and never give them but where they are convinced it is for the benefit of the orphan’. inspectors visited the applicants’ residences and judged the suitability of the surroundings. Another important consideration was whether the children were being reclaimed purely as a source of labour.

For the most part, the DPOS appear to have cooperated as much as possible with widows. In 1841, the committee reported that ‘the child was taken away by the mother who has become rich having married well in London’. The boy had been boarded out for six and a half years. In September 1845 a widow requested the return of her daughter, after which the committee made enquiries and ‘having ascertained that it would be for the advantage of the child’ approved the application. In the same week the committee received another letter from a mother wishing to ‘thank the Society for the kindness shown to her child, stating that she wishes to withdraw her’. Children sometimes had to make extensive journeys abroad to reunite with their mothers. In 1846 a widow, who had remarried in Quebec, approached the Society for her son who had been under its care for a number of years. The committee agreed to send the boy, ‘provided we are satisfied with the character of Mr – the boy’s stepfather’. It was routine practice in these cases for the committee to seek verification of claims and to confirm the widows’ circumstances and step-parents’ character from contacts (clergymen) in the destination country. The Society typically approved these cases and contributed to the children’s travelling expenses.

There is also evidence, particularly during the famine, that in rare cases widows were in position to take back children after their other children had died, leaving them in ‘improved circumstances’.

‘Make the children independent’

The Kildare Place Society (KPS), which used the Lancasterian system, supported the theories of Pestalozzi, who emphasised the necessity for kindness and encouragement of pupils and recommended manual activities in the classroom. The Society was the first in Ireland to do so. In the eighteenth century Pestalozzi had warned against the neglect of destitute children. After 1831, the KPS was no longer state funded and struggled under the weight of financial strain. The Church Education Society (CES), founded in 1839, took over the KPS college in 1855. Alexander Leeper, rector of St Audeon’s parish, principal of the CES College for twenty years, was also secretary to St Mary’s POS auxiliary, a member of the main DPOS committee, and an influential figure in its management. The DPOS and other PO Societies ensured that
children attended schools ‘conducted on such principles as we would approve, which are those of the Church Education Society’. Revds Thomas Kingston and John Nash Griffin were members of both the DPOS and the CES committees.

In the early nineteenth century, many child workers, particularly chimney sweeps in Dublin and Cork, were cruelly treated by their masters and placed in grave danger on a daily basis. In Dublin initially a Protestant Sunday School Society and later a Roman Catholic school offered them assistance after such ‘systematic cruelty’, which included child murder, was publicly condemned. While conditions improved after the use of the ‘sweeping machine’, the ARDP, founded in 1836, reported that a ten-year-old chimney sweep had been forced to scavenge for food and was sold to his master for £1.

Prior to the reduction in parliamentary grants, Charter Schools had once been the principal source of juvenile training. Agriculturally based reformatories were founded in Germany from the 1820s, houses of refuge were established in New York in the 1820s which provided juvenile delinquents with education and apprenticeships, and, in 1839, in France, voluntary run farming colonies were established to help reform young offenders. In the 1830s a Church of Ireland clergyman in Wexford, Revd William Hickey, started a model farm and produced a book on farming methods for the Kildare Place Society. Under the Board of National Education, a model farm was founded to train teachers in 1837 and model agricultural schools were opened from the 1840s. Revd Sillery visited France in the 1840s where a Protestant orphan institution was working under the same principles. ‘A large farm of ground belongs to it in which the boys took turns in learning and practising improved agriculture … they learn trades and many acquire the business of florist and agriculturalists in a large garden adjoining’.

The Limerick POS started a model farm on land donated by Lord Guillamore in 1848; the children learned valuable agricultural methods, and produced crops on the land which were distributed among the poor in Limerick. In 1848 Poor Law Guardians were permitted to buy land to instruct workhouse children in agricultural work.

**DPOS apprenticeships**

The DPOS believed that, ‘manifestly it was doing nothing or worse than nothing for a child to support him in comparative comfort for a few years and then return him to the destitution from which he had been taken’. Apprenticeships were, therefore, considered imperative to the children’s future progress. As discussed in chapter 2, no provisions were
made for the apprenticeship of workhouse children when the Poor Law was extended to Ireland.\textsuperscript{143} DPOS orphans were generally bound out at the age of twelve or over\textsuperscript{144} for three to seven years depending on the trade while Poor Law Guardians in England bound out orphans from the age of seven until the age of twenty-one.\textsuperscript{145}

The DPOS introduced a number of measures to ensure that children were not exploited by their masters; for example, in some cases at least two apprentices were bound out to the same employer and, where possible, children served their time in the same parish or county in which they had spent their childhoods:

Most of the children previously apprenticed having been bound in Dublin, your committee consider that it would be advantageous that they should be apprenticed when practicable in the country where they have been reared, and are known and have formed friendships. Exclusive of the advantage to the apprentices themselves in respect both of health and morals, your committee cannot forbear remarking, as a secondary benefit of this arrangement that thereby a permanent addition will be made to the Protestant population of the country parishes.\textsuperscript{146}

In an annual report dated 1839, the committee resolved that the character and the circumstances of employers necessitated their utmost vigilance. The children also required ‘peculiar watching’ as clergymen claimed that ‘whilst the orphans are young, their management is comparatively easy, but when they grow up and begin to act and think for themselves they occasion increased trouble’.\textsuperscript{147} In numerous cases children ran back to their nurses, which suggests they had formed strong bonds with them during their formative years.\textsuperscript{148} In fact the incidence was so high that the DPOS committee sent a circular to nurses warning them not to permit the orphans to return to their homes, for it would both unsettle them and hinder their progress.

The same year the Society invested in a home located near St Stephen’s Church in Dublin. The Society House, or Percy Place as it was better known, was used for the reception of nurses and orphans prior to annual meetings; as a collection point for the orphans’ clothing and shoes; but, primarily, it served as a training home or ‘boarding school’ for apprentices where potential employers could make arrangements to meet the children.\textsuperscript{149} The children were sent to Percy Place from their nurses for further training and remained there for periods ranging from a few weeks to a year depending on the availability of apprenticeships. Fewer than thirty apprentices resided there during the 1840s. Initially, extended kin could visit freely; however, shortly afterwards the committee required visitors to seek sanction from the office. The relatively flexible system
reflects the efforts made to preserve family ties. The Tipperary POS also founded an apprentice training home in Clonmel in 1841 for ‘the reception of 14 children master and mistress and committee of ladies to regulate its affairs’. Training homes generally came under the management of ladies’ committees. A number of orphans were sent to the Providence Home, founded in Dublin in 1839, which trained respectable homeless girls in domestic skills and was managed by a ladies’ committee. The Home’s motto was ‘prevention is better than cure’.

The DPOS set up an ‘Apprentice Relief Fund’ in 1842 to assist any orphan who ‘shall have served his or her apprenticeship satisfactorily, or who has lost his or her place without fault on the part of such apprentice’. The committee claimed that by helping the orphans in this way, it was ‘acting the parents’ part’. The fund was hugely beneficial: it gave apprentices who were considered in ‘urgent need’ the chance to emigrate or secure another apprenticeship and it gave those who had served their time well the means to purchase the necessary tools for their trade. In the same year, Revd Minchin, secretary to the DPOS, assisted an apprentice boy when his master, a ship’s carpenter, to whom the Society had paid an apprentice fee, neglected to train him:

Mr Minchin proceeded to state that his only object was to see that the boy was done justice to, that the society being supported by subscription, depended on public opinion for its well-being, and it was his duty to see that all masters to whom apprentices were sent from that institution should treat them properly, otherwise all confidence would be withdrawn from the society.

The judge in this case applauded Revd Minchin’s support of the boy: ‘his conduct was praiseworthy in the extreme. It was his duty to look after the children entrusted to the society’. The case was closed in favour of the DPOS.

Revd Dr Joly founded the ‘Premium Fund’ in 1844 which provided the committee with sufficient resources to give children who ‘in addition to general good conduct, exhibit the greatest proficiency at stated examinations’, small rewards, known as ‘good conduct premiums’. The committee allocated a portion of Dr Joly’s fund to encourage ‘improvement in needlework’ and girls who made ‘satisfactory proficiency’ received rewards. Revd Thomas Gregg, former DPOS secretary, left a bequest in 1846 which was added to the fund. In the same year, the DPOS committee arranged a ‘Protestant Orphan Tea’ for the apprentices, held biannually thereafter, in order to keep them in close sight and monitor their progress.
With a decline in applications for apprentices during the famine and its aftermath, it became necessary to seek out apprenticeships in England and elsewhere. For example, a family who intended to emigrate to Canada in 1847 applied to the Society for two orphans. The Society agreed to the arrangement, ‘in consideration of the advantages to the children and the difficulty of providing suitable places in this country at present’. In another case, a Reverend and his wife brought a female orphan with them when they emigrated to Australia in September 1847. The DPOS also sent a small number of children to the Cape of Good Hope. As mentioned in chapter 2, the Children’s Friend Society sent orphans and destitute children to Canada and the Cape of Good Hope as part of an early emigration scheme. Charlotte Neff suggests that the charity organisers introduced measures to prevent, or at the very least reduce, the incidence of child exploitation as cheap labour.

The DPOS also sent children to sea. For example, in March 1848 it was noted that ‘three boys having expressed their wish to go to sea [are to] be sent to Portsmouth with some careful person in order, if possible, to have them apprenticed in the Royal Navy and that Dr M’Clintock [is to] be requested to procure any further information as might be useful’. The committee resolved to do their utmost to ‘get them into the Merchant Service in the event of disappointment’. Seemanship is discussed in more detail in chapter 6.

In September 1849, Revd Shore investigated the Society’s legal position with respect to apprenticeship indentures and discovered, through the gratuitous help of an attorney, that employers could not cancel indentures unless the apprentice had committed a felony. Although apprentices had always been inspected, Shore also recommended the appointment of an inspector to deal specifically with apprentices to ensure their ‘constant and vigilant superintendence’. The committee appointed an ‘Apprentice Superintendent’ who was ‘well acquainted’ with trades and tradesmen and the ‘reciprocal duties’ of masters and apprentices. (Revd Shore, who was chaplain to the Newgate prison and familiar with the causes of criminality, later founded a Protestant reformatory school.)

Conclusion

The DPOS was responsible for the placement of children with ‘suitable’ families, inspections, medical care, and education. Where possible, children were placed with their siblings, and nurses were made accountable to the authority of the clergymen in their own parish and to the DPOS committee in Dublin, which were innovative and child-oriented
policies. Moreover, given the general absence of state provisions, investment in an apprenticeship scheme in the 1830s, hinging on the idea that prevention was better than cure, was both a progressive and ambitious undertaking. The DPOS apprenticeship system was a vital component of its overall commitment to family support, for children who were equipped with skills became useful members of society; but more practically, they became useful members of the families to whom they were likely to return, bringing with them an education and earning power. As discussed in the next chapter, despite the apparent progress made by PO Societies in the area of child and family welfare, there was considerable opposition to its work.
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