The success of these societies is unquestioned.\(^1\)

**Introduction**

Dr Paul Cullen replaced Daniel Murray as Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin in 1852, which was followed by a new phase of extensive church building and parish reorganisation. During Archbishop Cullen’s episcopate (1852–79; cardinal from 1866), criticisms of, and opposition to, the Church of Ireland and its associated charities, including PO Societies, escalated in the lead up to disestablishment. Concurrently, social reformers dealt with vital issues such as public health, workhouse children, juvenile delinquency and cruelty to children which eventually led to the introduction of crucial reforms. This chapter examines the two directly opposing views of PO Societies which emerged in the second half of the nineteenth century. At one end of the spectrum of opinion were Archbishop Cullen and Margaret Aylward who investigated the charity on the grounds of suspected proselytism while at the other were social reformers who regarded the POS boarding-out scheme as an ideal child welfare model worthy of imitation.

**Missionary work in Ireland**

In 1850, after the influx of Irish Catholics during the Great Famine, the full Roman Catholic hierarchy was restored in England in line with Roman Catholic countries, and known as the ‘Papal aggression’,\(^2\) which provoked anti-Catholic sentiment throughout England. The presence of ‘continental religious orders’, and reports of Protestant persecution in Europe\(^3\) alerted Protestants to the potential threat. The missions of the Fathers of Charity in Dublin unsettled the ‘Protestant party’, which was ‘annoyed at these missions and the city was often placarded all over with the announcements of controversial sermons’.\(^4\) Reportedly,
one-hundred Protestants had been converted. In 1851 the Redemptorist Mission in Dublin was allegedly ‘attended by many Protestants’ and ‘some few of them were received into the church’. According to the priests, the mission attracted such attention when it came to light that Fr Lockhart was an Oxford convert.

Archbishop Cullen called for unity among Catholic bishops against ICM missionary progress in the west of Ireland. Growing Catholic strength in Europe and the ‘invasion of popery’ sparked extensive English Protestant enthusiasm for the ICM as a means of defence from ‘the Romish priesthood who seek the subversion of the Protestant Established Church of Ireland’. Reports from Prussia claimed that Jesuit priests were ‘among the Protestant population’. In 1852 Archbishop MacHale, Tuam diocese, assisted by Frs Lockhart and Rinolfi, endeavoured to thwart the progress made by the ICM. In Lyons, France, in the 1850s, there were reports that two English Jesuit priests had been drafted in to seek out English residents ‘with a view to their conversion to the Romish faith’. The Protestant poor were thought particularly vulnerable. In the 1840s the DPOS referred to a school in Lille founded for the purpose of ‘preserving the children of Protestant parents from the destructive precepts of Romish instructors’. Redemptorist and Jesuit missions were set up in County Wicklow, Londonderry, Fermoy and Antrim in the 1850s and 1860s which were countered by the ICM. By the mid-1850s the ICM had established 125 mission stations primarily in the west and south west of Ireland. As well as its activity in the west, the ICM also had a strong presence in Dublin.

Ellen Smyly, née Franks, had been dedicated to her church and to philanthropy from a young age. Mrs Smyly was a close affiliate of Alexander Dallas, the ICM, and married to Josiah Smyly, medical officer to the DPOS. Archbishop Whately’s wife and daughters assisted Mrs Smyly in her work which included the management of a network of schools; however, the archbishop is said not to have supported the mission. Other Protestants linked to both the ICM and the DPOS included, for example, Revd John Gregg, the Earl of Roden, and Joseph Napier Esq. M.P.

A number of Irish Protestants disapproved of providing aid in conjunction with scriptural education and publicly criticised the methodologies used by the ICM. Miriam Moffitt argues that after the 1861 census which exposed the weak Protestant position and the failure of the ICM, and in the lead up to disestablishment, Irish Protestants who had previously backed the ICM turned their attention away from the conversion of Catholics to concentrate instead on defending the faith of
Protestants; however, the preservation of Protestantism had been of major concern since before Catholic emancipation was granted.

**PO Societies and religious rivalry**

Following Archbishop Cullen’s 1856 pastoral on proselytism, which denounced the ICM in particular, there were a number of altercations between the Ladies of Charity (Margaret Aylward founded a branch of the Ladies’ Association of Charity of St Vincent de Paul for Spiritual and Temporal Relief of the Sick Poor in St Mary’s parish Dublin in 1851), and the ICM in Dublin. In addition, Margaret Aylward, with the assistance of Fr John Gowan, founded St Brigid’s boarding-out orphanage in 1856 to defend the faith of Roman Catholic children under threat of Protestant proselytism. (The first child was received in January 1857.) St Brigid’s boarded out children to small farmers in north Dublin, and counties Wicklow and Kildare who had been recommended by parochial clergy and worked in direct competition with the ICM, and the CPOU.

PO Societies also came under close scrutiny in the same year. Revd David Moriarty, who Cullen appointed coadjutor to Cornelius Egan, Ardfert, Kerry, in 1854, and who counteracted much of the Dingle peninsula missionary activity, wrote to the Kerry POS on 18 July 1856, enclosing £1:

As I perceive that a meeting is called this day, in aid of your Orphan Society, may I trouble you to hand in this very small offering of mine. Allow me to express a regret that in advocating the claims of these dear little innocents, sentiments are expressed which cast on the institution a suspicion of proselytism, and prevent a more extensive co-operation of the charitable of all classes on its behalf. Under your direction I feel the fullest security it seeks only, as its name implies, to protect and educate the orphan children of Protestant parents. – With great respect, I am, sir, yours very faithfully, David Moriarty.

In reply, Revd A. Denny, Rector, Tralee, thanked Bishop Moriarty for his contribution, claiming that there had never been any grounds for suspicion. Moriarty’s public display of support for the Kerry POS did not go unnoticed by Archbishop Cullen. (Religiously indiscriminate charitable donations were not particularly unusual – Protestants also donated to Catholic charities.) A year later Dr Cullen stated that while allegations of this kind against Protestant institutions had caused offence they would encourage Catholics ‘to take care of their children’. There were also outcries that Catholic children were at risk of proselytism in workhouses. (Cullen presented these grievances to the Select
Committee on the Irish Poor Law in 1861.) It has been suggested that the Catholic church seized upon the flaws in the Poor Law and the issue of boarding out as it vied for political power in Ireland.28

In 1860 the Catholic Telegraph featured a report from the Ladies of St Vincent de Paul on the alleged proselytising activity of the DPOS. Henry H. Joy Esq. responded on 14 April 1860:

Why was it that especially the Catholic brethren had so much representation within the present year not only from the dignitaries and priests of that church but from the laity of the Church and gentlewomen. What had they [the DPOS] done to call down this storm of misrepresentation. The Protestant Orphan Society was not a proselytising agency one of its cardinal rules being to admit no children no matter how poor, however destitute that were not the orphans of Protestant parents.29

Mr Joy referred to the report and stated that Protestants believed Archbishop Cullen was ‘responsible for such misrepresentation’.30

The Ladies’ Association of St Brigid’s carried out intensive surveillance of Protestant activities31 and its ‘obviously partisan’32 annual reports regularly featured the DPOS among many other Protestant institutions:

Undoubtedly, many of them are the children of Protestant parents, but strangely enough we find one third of them bearing names that are in Ireland eminently Catholic such as Kelly, McCann, O’Flaherty, Geraghty. The truth is that several adults who live as hypocrites upon the bribes of the proselytisers are sometimes taken away in their sins and then the orphans become the prey of the society.33

DPOS case files record the applicants’ religion and, at least in the cases examined by the author, applicants were from traditional Protestant backgrounds – Church of Ireland and England, Methodist and Presbyterian (Presbyterians and Methodists founded separate boarding-out schemes in 1866 and 1870 respectively) – and converts of long-standing. Protestants also converted to Roman Catholicism, some of whom were received into the church when they intermarried. A convert to Roman Catholicism of sixteen years was assisted by St Brigid’s in the 1860s.34 Moreover, one of St Brigid’s most ardent supporters was a German convert.35 DPOS inspectors recorded the parents’ religion and, in many cases, provided a brief description of their family histories. The DPOS required marriage certificates, birth certificates and burial certificates from every applicant. The committee had asserted in 1830:

As the sole object of the society is the relief of the most wretched and deserving objects of our fellow Protestants, in order to guard against any imposition being practised upon them, they have agreed that the petition
of each child for admission into this society shall be accompanied by certificates of marriage of the parents and baptisms of the children, or, if this cannot be conveniently procured, such other documents as shall appear satisfactory.\textsuperscript{36}

This rule was adhered to until 1898 when the Protestant Orphan Refuge Society (PORS) and DPOS amalgamated, after which the Protestant orphans of Protestant parentage and of mixed marriages were admitted. If these certificates were not lodged with the committee, cases could be deferred for months or refused altogether. Applications were also refused and postponed due to limited funds and age restrictions, and if applicants were judged ‘undeserving’. Managers of the DPOS continued to exert caution with the outlay of funds, which led to fewer admissions, even in more prosperous times. The DPOS provided orphans with long-term care, if required, which was extremely costly: in many cases children were cared for from infancy to adulthood.

In 1862, the Belfast auxiliary stated, ‘be it remembered that it is a defence association, not in any way connected with the controversies now agitating the church, its object being that the orphans of our Protestant brethren should be educated in the faith of their fathers, and trained up in habits of industry’.\textsuperscript{37} The Westmeath POS refused admission of orphans from mixed marriages, declaring that it received only the orphans of Protestant parentage.\textsuperscript{38} In 1863 the DPOS reiterated that ‘it was called the Protestant Orphan Society merely to show that it was Protestant orphans who were assisted by it and surely the first duty incumbent on Protestants was to assist those belonging to that class’.\textsuperscript{39} In response to further allegations, the DPOS stated in 1890, ‘the charges of proselytism which had been brought against them were all nonsense, because they never accepted any child except from the legal guardian or the surviving parent’.\textsuperscript{40} St Brigid’s also publicly condemned the work carried out by the Charitable Protestant Orphan Union (CPOU).

The CPOU

The CPOU, later known as the Protestant Orphan Refuge Society, had a clear purpose, ‘to preserve the Protestantism of the orphans of mixed marriages’.\textsuperscript{41} At the Synod of Thurles, 1850, described as a ‘display of ecclesiastical triumphalism’,\textsuperscript{42} it was announced that papal dispensations had to be granted before mixed marriages could take place; marriage partners were required to pledge in writing that all children would be raised in the Roman Catholic church.\textsuperscript{43} In 1855 there were 103 children under the CPOU’s charge. From a sample of two-hundred
application files, dating from 1850 to 1860, in 62 per cent of cases, Protestant women had married outside their church; Protestant men had intermarried in 38 per cent of cases.44

The CPOU claimed that to provide for the orphans of mixed marriages was not proselytising for surely if that were so, orphans of mixed marriages raised in Catholic institutions were also victims of the same religious interference; ‘unless, therefore, you bring these children up as heathens, it is impossible to bring them up by any means unless what will be liable to the charge of being a proselytising society’.45 The CPOU also acknowledged that the Protestant public favoured the DPOS: ‘I have heard and no doubt you have heard people speak very favourably of the Protestant Orphan Society, and very depreciatory of ours, although they are the same in principle. People say, “I do not like your society, it is a proselytising society”’.46 Owing to its strict admission criteria, the DPOS was not involved in disputes over orphans’ religious upbringing to the same extent as the CPOU.47 DPOS and CPOU application files and associated correspondence differ considerably: while CPOU files refer to priests’ or Catholic relatives’ interference in the children’s placements, references of this kind are not typically found in DPOS files.

In 1859 the CPOU committee requested an amalgamation with the DPOS48 as it could not ‘obtain a hearing’ among those who already supported the DPOS.49 However, the DPOS opposed amalgamation as, ‘it would imperil the interests of the Society, prove unsatisfactory to its best friends, and involve a departure from the principle on which the Society was formed, namely to provide for destitute orphans of Protestant parents’.50 It also confirmed that the CPOU was entirely separate from the DPOS, ‘the two Societies, which have had a separate and independent action for twenty-nine years, each occupying a totally distinct sphere of usefulness’.51

It was stated in St Brigid’s annual reports that Catholics who intermarried would not allow their children to be raised Protestant: ‘A Catholic parent cannot under pains of eternal separation from God give his children to be reared in heresy. Besides we must charitably believe, what in fact almost always happens, that the Catholic parent has had his children baptised in the Catholic Church’.52 In March 1864, a Protestant widower wrote to the CPOU to apply for the admission of his four children. In his letter he informed the committee that he was a convert to Protestantism. He explained that almost ten years earlier, he had had misgivings with the Roman Catholic church for some time and that he had attended no place of worship until after his marriage to a Protestant woman. He attended church regularly with his wife and became a Protestant in 1854, greatly against his parents’ wishes. His wife died in
November 1863\textsuperscript{53} and the parish priest had encouraged the widower’s mother to place her grandchildren with St Brigid’s: ‘Revd Mr. Murphy called to hear her confession and took the names and ages of the four children and they were to be taken in on the following board day’. \textsuperscript{54} The widower explained that ‘his wife’s mother having heard of it went to the Revd Mr. Jordan and that gentleman got them sent to Haddington Road’. \textsuperscript{55} The widower informed the CPOU of the situation as he had applied to the CPOU not St Brigid’s. In this case both father and mother and children were Protestant. The father was alive and expressly wished his children to be raised Protestant.

The well-documented Mary Mathews case was another example of the tug of war between St Brigid’s and a Protestant family over children’s religious upbringing. In 1860 Margaret Aylward was found innocent of kidnapping but imprisoned for six months for contempt of court.\textsuperscript{56} St Brigid’s dismissed allegations of proselytism and reaffirmed its defensive stance.\textsuperscript{57} PO Societies, such as the Longford POS, which accepted the Protestant orphans of mixed marriages, also reported similar cases. In 1857, for example, a Protestant father requested that after his death his wife, a Roman Catholic, would raise his son a Protestant. His widow, who was ‘afflicted with paralysis and in very poor circumstances’\textsuperscript{58} admitted the child to the Longford POS where he remained for six years. Press reports state that in 1863 the child was ‘seized by a carman’,\textsuperscript{59} that his mother was present during her son’s removal, and that the Longford POS sought the child’s return. The case was settled in court when it was decided that, as in the Mary Mathews case, the mother’s guardianship rights should be upheld.\textsuperscript{60}

**PO Societies: further development**

In the 1850s, the Vicar of Mullingar stated that Protestant workhouse children lived under ‘perpetual insult and petty persecution’, and had ‘apostatised from their religion in order that their lot would be easier’.\textsuperscript{61} Archbishop Richard Whately founded the Society for the Protection of the Rights of Conscience for the Benefit of Poor Protestants and Converts in 1850.\textsuperscript{62} The Society for the Protection of Converts was formed to protect ‘in the exercise of Christian liberty, those converts from Romanism who had been deprived of all former means of earning a livelihood on account of their change of religion’.\textsuperscript{63} The Society assisted converts to secure employment though it stated that, ‘no money shall be given except as wages for work actually done (and at the lowest rate in the neighbourhood for similar)’.\textsuperscript{64} Whately shared the Vicar of Mullingar’s concerns in 1858 when he claimed that a Protestant housed
with Roman Catholics in workhouses was akin to a ‘slave in South Carolina’. By 1851 there were 106,000 children in workhouses of whom 40 per cent were orphans. The DPOS also drew attention to the perceived dangers of placing Protestant orphans in workhouses:

It was a principle of philosophy that when two bodies, one large and the other small are floating on any fluid, the large body always attracts the smaller; and so they should take care that the relative numbers of the Roman Catholics in workhouses, which are the larger body, do not absorb the Protestant portion, which is the smallest.

Persistent reports that Protestant children were under threat as well as the mounting influence of the Roman Catholic church in Ireland prompted the further development of PO Societies. Cholera reappeared in Cork city, Belfast and Newry, and Dublin from 1853 to 1855 when 2,606 deaths were reported. A DPOS auxiliary meeting at Ballymena, County Antrim, in September 1854 was poorly attended as were meetings in Belfast due to the ‘cholera being very bad in this place’. The outbreak resulted in higher POS admission rates, particularly in Dublin, and was likely to have encouraged the foundation of additional local PO Societies.

The Donegal POS was founded in 1857 by a clergymen in the Gweedore district. Initially, due to limited funds the committee elected the most destitute applicants only; however, Mr John Boyd, of Ballymacool, objected and ‘carried a resolution that no destitute orphan who was Protestant should be refused and the society increased and strengthened, and became equal to the support of them all’. The Donegal POS was referred to as ‘purely defensive’ and a ‘lifeboat for Protestant orphans’. It had also always maintained that ‘it was not a proselytising society’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PO Societies</th>
<th>Year founded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donegal</td>
<td>1857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galway</td>
<td>1857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fermanagh</td>
<td>1859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayo</td>
<td>1861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterford</td>
<td>1862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Londonderry</td>
<td>1865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antrim and Down</td>
<td>1866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armagh</td>
<td>1867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monaghan</td>
<td>1870</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DPOS annual reports.
but rather a mechanism to ensure that Protestant orphans were raised by Protestant families.\(^{73}\)

The inaugural meeting of the County Mayo POS was held in the school-house of the Church Education Society, Castlebar in November 1861. Although not directly responsible for its establishment, the Bishop of Tuam, Thomas Plunket, hoped the Society would prove an important symbol of the Church of Ireland’s worth as disestablishment loomed: ‘as a Protestant institution, it deserves the support of all Protestants, especially when there are parties at the present day, who are loudly calling out for the spoliation of the church in this land, who think it is a lifeless corpse which it is time to bury’.\(^{74}\) While the 1859 Ulster Revival had reinvigorated the Protestant churches, leading to a rise in church and Sunday school attendance, the Bishop of Tuam’s words attest to the Church of Ireland’s attempts to justify its place in Ireland: ‘He thought that this meeting having for its object the formation of a Protestant Orphan Society, spoke volumes for the vitality of the church, as well as that it afforded them an opportunity of preserving that vitality’.\(^{75}\) Robert McDowell identifies the various attacks made against the pre-disestablished Church of Ireland and the motivations for doing so while also noting its ‘virtues’.\(^{76}\)

In 1864 and 1865 Jesuit and Redemptorist missioners were active in Antrim and Londonderry.\(^{77}\) In 1866, there was a reoccurrence of cholera with 2,308 deaths in Wexford, Donegal, Wicklow, Roscommon and Queen’s County with Dublin most affected reporting close to 1,000 deaths within six months.\(^{78}\) The Londonderry POS was founded in 1865 and the Antrim and Down POS on the 28 June 1866. Formerly an auxiliary to the DPOS, it separated from the parent society as, ‘widowed mothers were often unwilling and refused to give up their children to be sent so far away from them as Wicklow and Wexford, where the greater number of the children under the care of the parent society were located’.\(^{79}\) The newly formed Society aimed to serve Belfast and ‘such parts of the counties of Antrim and Down, and the county of the town of Carrickfergus, as shall connect themselves with the Society’.\(^{80}\)

In the same year, the DPOS reaffirmed its position as a defensive society: ‘Let it not be imagined that the faith of Protestant orphan children in Ireland is in less danger of being tampered with now than it was eight and thirty years ago, when this society first started upon its mission of mercy’.\(^{81}\) Founded in 1867, the Armagh POS opening ceremony was held in the Tontine Rooms in Belfast. The Lord Primate and Mrs Beresford, Sir Capel Molyneux, John Vance Esq. and a number of ladies were present. The Lord Primate called attention to the serious neglect of Protestant orphans in the area; the need to protect them from the ‘cold
mercies of the workhouse”; and ‘putting them in such a position as they might have occupied had their parents lived’. The Armagh POS also promoted education in order to ensure the orphans ‘go through future life with respectability’. Moreover, it was said that the ‘generations yet to come’ would be grateful for the legacy of charity left behind as, ‘the orphans and the widows of this county were not forgotten’. Revd Thomas Ellis, honorary secretary, claimed, ‘They do not believe in the workhouse system as a nursery for their children, and they made a laudable effort to carry the better system in which they do believe’. In line with other PO Societies, the Armagh POS aimed to limit the number of Protestant children dependent on workhouses. The Monaghan POS was founded in 1870.

The Church of Ireland was disestablished by the Irish Church Act, 26 July 1869, which came into effect on 1 January 1871. The Meath POS expressed trepidation in its annual report:

> Our society, in common with other charitable institutions must bear its part in contending against the waves of the sea of troubles on which we have been launched. The ancient Irish Church has been disestablished and disendowed by the act of legislature. This momentous crisis, fraught, we believe, with danger to the whole kingdom, now hangs like a storm on our horizon.

In 1870 the DPOS committee stated that, ‘the altered position of the Irish Church renders it more imperative than ever upon its members to make full provision for the maintenance and education of the destitute orphans of our communion’. Despite the embrace of evangelicalism by the lower clergy and the laity of the Church of Ireland, and its growth in the mid-nineteenth century, the church did not become fully committed to evangelicalism until after disestablishment. The DPOS upheld the same defensive stance post-disestablishment as it had done since its foundation:

> The Protestant Orphan Society still maintains its ground, the prosperity of the institution is intimately connected with that of the entire church in our land. Every agency, which tends to unite the members of our church in close fellowship with one another, is most valuable at the present time. Every effort to keep the young of our communion and to educate them in the fear and love of god, is now specially required, and the committee venture to claim for the Protestant Orphan Society a foremost place in promoting these great objects.

PO Societies continued to serve the Protestant population in counties throughout Ireland, see figure 4.1.
Following disestablishment, Church of Ireland clergy eventually accepted the church’s independence, with some viewing it as freedom from ‘political trammels’. William Conyngham Plunket, who has been described as a ‘natural diplomat and a seeker of peace’ wrote in the early 1870s of the moderate character of the ‘great majority of Irish Churchmen, including the ablest and most influential of our clergy and laity’. Disestablishment also resulted in the empowerment of the laity.

One way in which the laity contributed to the church and its affiliated charities including PO Societies was through legacies and donations. In 1872 Joseph Kinsey Esq., Balcorris House, County Dublin, ‘an old subscriber of the Society’, bequeathed part of his estate to the DPOS. The money was donated to finance The Kinsey Marriage Portion Fund Charity. The scheme, which was devised by Kinsey, offered marriage portions to POS orphans. He also bequeathed an additional sum for the establishment of a Protestant Orphan Society in Auckland, New Zealand and ‘for the support of clergymen of the English Episcopal Church in Auckland. The Newry POS, Westmeath POS and the Belfast

---

**Figure 4.1** Percentage of Protestant population served by PO Societies, 1861–91.  
*Source: DPOS annual reports, 1861–91, NAI, POS papers, 1045/1/1/29-65.*
POS also received bequests’. It perhaps illustrates the extent to which lay members of the church influenced the management of PO Societies while also showing their commitment to the preservation of the Church of Ireland and Protestant posterity.

‘I shall work away in the shade’: women and PO Societies

Church of Ireland women, who were heavily involved in bible societies, Sunday schools, the Mothers’ Union, the Young Women’s Christian Association and the Girls’ Friendly Societies, also played an important role in ensuring the longevity of PO Societies and were among its most stalwart supporters. In the second half of the nineteenth century women continued to organise bazaars, which were often grand two day events requiring extensive and effective planning. A lady who organised the Limerick bazaar in the early 1850s stated the following in the weeks leading up to the event:

I proceeded to Limerick to canvass Mrs – for our benevolent object. However I was replied by such a tirade against the vanity, frivolity, and dishonesty of Bazaars in general, that I was afraid it would extend to the poor Protestant Orphan Bazaar in particular … The receipt for making a good stall-holder comprises a certain proportion of energy, ditto gracefulness, ditto popularity, ditto steadiness … Perhaps I may be wrong in wishing to keep our list aristocratic … But I am so afraid of affronts and jealousies amongst the Mrs-s. No one can say a word to my Lady Dunraven, or to my Lady Clarina, but I dread a murmur of, ‘Well! I think I am as good as Mrs. D. or Mrs. Any-one-else. I don’t see why I am not made a Patroness’, and that would be endless … We must have a preparatory meeting, without it all the pens, ink, and paper extant would not suffice for the knotty point of tables, tickets, and so forth.

On its first day 700 people attended the bazaar. Embroidery and other ‘fancy works’ were typically displayed at bazaars. PO Societies and convent schools continued to support domestic industry after the manufacture revival of the early 1850s. Crochet pieces were also sold to raise funds for the DPOS and in the 1860s pieces of ‘ornamental needlework’ were sold in ‘orphan baskets’. In 1867 the Armagh POS noted that ladies had raised two-thirds of the funds for all Protestant orphans in Ireland through ‘cards, concerts, bazaars and orphan baskets’. In 1888 the ladies of the Armagh POS held a bazaar in Lurgan from which close to half of the annual income was derived. At the 1890 Armagh POS annual bazaar, Indian embroidery, Indian brass work and hand painted items were sold. Indian embroidery had been
displayed for many years in Ireland, for example, in 1853 at the Irish Industrial Exhibition.

Women also used poetry, music and art to generate interest in the Society’s work. The Limerick POS reported that its lady supporters produced poetry ‘in aid of the bazaar’. In 1854, Mrs William Crofton published *Eight Views, for the Benefit of the Leitrim Protestant Orphan Society*. The book contained pictorial works from Mrs Crofton’s original drawings. Music, particularly hymns, was another important fundraising strategy. Generally, individual PO Societies featured distinct ‘orphan hymns’ in their respective annual reports. A few lines from the Cavan POS orphans’ hymn gives a sense of the sympathy expressed for the orphans and the spirit behind ‘good deeds’:

*Evangelical clergy introduced hymn-singing in favour of metrical psalms.*

Cecil Frances Humphreys (1818–95) who married Revd Alexander, also an acclaimed poet, and later Archbishop of Armagh, was one of the most famous composers of children’s hymns. While the writers of the ‘orphan hymns’ are not documented, it is likely that clergymen and their wives were perhaps inspired by Mrs Alexander’s *Hymns for Children* (published in 1848).

In Galway Henry D. Stanistreet Esq. led the Ballinasloe Choral Society, of which many members were women, and arranged ‘very successful Concerts in aid of the Galway Protestant Orphan Society in 1865 and 1866’. Amateur concerts were held in aid of the Fermanagh POS in the 1860s. In 1863 an amateur concert was held on behalf of the Cavan POS. Mrs Whyte Venables composed one piece of music played on the ‘pianoforte’ on the night; a piece that was shortly due for publication. The Cavan Choral Society also contributed to the night. ‘The quality of Mrs. Wolfe’s singing, there can be no second opinion. The kindness that induced her to lend her service is only equalled by the excellence of her performance. Her management of her voice we have seldom, if ever, heard equalled by an amateur’.

Mrs Beresford arranged a concert on behalf of the Armagh POS in 1876, which was held at the Tontine Rooms, Belfast. The programme for
the concert included: Duet, Rondo in F, clarinet and piano (Beethoven), Mr Strangways and Dr Marks; part song, ‘The Fairest Flower’ (Sir R. B. Stewart), ‘Wake, my love’ (Loder), ‘Hark, the curfew’ (Attwood), ‘The Mill Wheel’ (Kreutzer), ‘Zampa’ (Laberre), the Irish ballad, *Norah, the Pride of Kildare*, among many others. The harp featured in some of the arrangements.112 In 1890, a concert was held in the evening after the first day of the annual bazaar in the Town Hall, Lurgan, and ladies performed ‘pianoforte’ and violin solos.113

Women were also involved in more practical aspects of the Society’s management; for example, they assisted the clothing subcommittees. The Antrim and Down POS reported in 1868 that, ‘during the past year the sub-committee, aided by the ladies has spared no exertion in providing not only a suitable but a comfortable outfit for all the orphans elected by our society, as well as for the apprentices’.114 The Tyrone POS committee recorded its appreciation for a recently deceased lady subscriber and collector in 1877:

> The mention of the latter name can only awaken feelings of the greatest regret for her loss in all who wish well to the Protestant orphans of the county. Indefatigable in her exertions on behalf of the Society she persevered to the last as the Orphan’s friend in the task of gathering contributions, and by her very successful efforts she added materially to the Society’s yearly finances.115

Tributes of this kind feature in the annual reports of the DPOS and local PO Societies throughout the second half of the nineteenth century and bear testament to the commendable work of so many Church of Ireland women who had fundraised on the Society’s behalf for much of their adult lives.

**Additional fundraising strategies: the language and visual expression of transformation**

Revd John Gregg, renowned for his oratory abilities, delivered annual sermons on behalf of the DPOS. In 1850 he preached a sermon entitled ‘Misery and Mercy’ which emphasised the stark difference between the children’s lives before and after they had received assistance.116 Known as ‘good John Gregg’ (Archdeacon of Kildare 1857), he was extremely well liked, and had a special affinity with the orphans as his own father had died when he was nine; he referred to himself as ‘the orphan child of the only Protestant family in one of the obscurest parishes in the most neglected county in Ireland’.117 Gregg also wrote a number of sermons
for children which he preached ‘on an early Thursday in the month of January’, such as ‘Plain teaching for little children’, ‘Wisdom unto salvation: a sermon to children’, and ‘The way to be good’. Gregg was thanked for his ‘untiring interest’ in the DPOS and for the ‘steady increase in the contributions so liberally supplied by the congregation in Trinity Church’.  

Other clergymen also expressed a sense of empathy for the orphans; for example, in a sermon preached on behalf of the County Leitrim POS in 1864, Revd C. Adams stated that ‘he [Adams] had a solemn and peculiar feeling attached to it which reminded him of friends whom he had lost. In the year 1839, he understood the society was formed, and in that year he lost his mother, being then only two and a half years old. He could speak in some measure from experience that that was an incalculable loss’. Moreover, after his mother’s death, Revd Godfrey Massy, Limerick POS, became responsible for his younger brothers and identified well with parental loss.

As discussed in chapter 3, children were put on display at annual meetings, a practice which continued into the second half of the nineteenth century. Nurses were responsible for escorting the children to Dublin while clergymen’s wives, daughters and other supporters of the Societies dressed them in their best clothes and prepared the children’s ‘tea’ after the event. In 1865, the Fermanagh POS committee commented on ‘the appearance of the children on the platform’ as ‘abundant proof of the good effected by the Society’. The language of transformation was utilised by other charities and missionary societies. The ICM, for example, produced hymns that told of converts’ transition from the darkness of ‘popery’ into the light. In the 1850s the Limerick POS referred to the children’s appearance at its annual meeting: ‘They display before us vividly the fact that there is an intimate connection between ours and the other state’. The orphans acted as a reminder of the uncertainty of life.

Born in 1845 in Upper Gardiner Street, Dublin, and christened in St Andrew’s Church, Thomas Barnardo was deeply inspired by the late 1850s evangelical revival and became an active member of the Young Men’s Christian Association. In the 1860s he attended meetings at the home of Mr and Mrs Henry Grattan Guinness in Dublin and opened his first refuge in London in 1870. Lydia Murdoch identifies Barnardo’s use of song, dance and dramatic scenes to emphasise the ‘before and after’. He stated in 1890 that, ‘people believe in what they see’. PO Societies and Thomas Barnardo used language and visual proof to stress the transformative power of their respective work which evoked an emotive response from subscribers.
Family support

Workhouses continued to represent often the only source of relief for destitute widows and their dependents. In a north Antrim town, for example, it has been observed that ‘up until the late 1860s, the main role of the Ballymoney workhouse seems to have been as a longer-term shelter for the most vulnerable in society: the elderly, deserted or widowed women and their children, and the vast majority of them were to remain in the workhouse for a significant length of time’. In 1861 William Neilson Hancock, credited with the foundation of the Dublin Statistical Society in 1847, identified the negative impact of workhouse dependency for artisans in reduced circumstances: ‘how much greater must it be in the poor labourer’s or artisan’s family, where a husband’s and a father’s death means not only the withdrawal of comfort, care, protection, and guidance, but also the stoppage of the means of support’. Despite widows’ (with two or more legitimate dependents) eligibility for outdoor relief, Hancock claimed, ‘whether these classes get out-door or in-door relief is a matter left entirely to the discretion of the guardians’. Hancock pointed out the vast difference between the provision of outdoor relief in England and that in Ireland: ‘on the 25th of April, 1857, there were only 957 persons receiving out-door relief or less than a fiftieth part of the number receiving indoor relief’.

Thus, the DPOS and local PO Societies retained an appeal among respectable but reduced widows who welcomed an alternative to indoor relief provided in workhouses in the north and south of the country. Isabella Tod, the renowned social reformer, emphasised the ill-considered policy of offering respectable people in reduced circumstances only the option of workhouse relief. In workhouses ‘respectable’ and ‘unrespectable’ women tended to be separated to ‘prevent moral contamination’. PO Societies, which continued to support ‘the family system’ as opposed to the placement of orphans in workhouses, therefore met a specific demand for relief from the lower middle class who invested in their children’s futures by subscribing to the charity.

In 1879 the Antrim and Down POS reminded its subscribers that it served those children who ‘might otherwise have been degraded amid the associations of the workhouse, or have grown up a nuisance to society ... Under the parental care of this Society the children do well, and come out well in the end’. PO Societies also asserted that widows should be ‘respected and respectable’, which were core artisanal values. The avoidance of the ‘dreaded workhouse stigma’ meant that widows could maintain their respectability which in turn lessened the likelihood of downward social mobility leaving them in better stead.
to remarry: remarriage was used as a strategy by many widows to re-establish themselves and reunite their families.\(^{136}\) Class boundaries\(^ {137}\) and levels of respectability determined women’s suitability for marriage. While there is evidence that women availed themselves of indoor relief or private charity from sources such as PO Societies it was, nevertheless, typically a last resort. Despite an increase in the provision of public outdoor relief in Ireland from 6,263 cases in the 1860s to 56,619 in the 1890s,\(^ {138}\) the number of widows in receipt of outdoor relief remained relatively low due to the stigma associated with the acceptance of any form of poor relief.\(^ {139}\)

### Child welfare reforms

In 1850 there were 119,628 children in Irish workhouses and by 1853 there were 82,434 under the age of fifteen\(^ {140}\) of whom 5,710 were illegitimate and 93 per cent were orphans and deserted children. While there were regular reports of dismal mortality rates among workhouse children, the DPOS boasted consistently low mortality rates, which fell on average below two per cent of the total children on the Society roll in any given year. As discussed in chapter 2, since the passage of the Poor Law, 1838, the DPOS and local PO Societies had endeavoured to draw the public’s attention to its successes particularly in relation to the children’s good health and repeatedly held up its system as a superior alternative to workhouse provision for widows and children. In 1860, for example, the *Christian Examiner* referred to the DPOS recommendation for ‘a family system of rearing orphans rather than workhouses’.\(^ {141}\) St Brigid’s also advocated the ‘family system’, compared its system to workhouses, and objected to children’s placement in workhouses on medical grounds.\(^ {142}\) However, by the mid-1850s, other Catholic lay orphan associations that boarded out children had been taken over by various religious congregations, after which the institutional model was generally used. In the next twenty-five years, for example, the Sisters of Mercy went on to establish thirty orphanages.\(^ {143}\)

Octavia Hill and Mary Carpenter campaigned to improve conditions for destitute children in England. From the 1850s onwards, the Dublin Statistical Society provided a vital platform for debates on child welfare reforms. Ingram, Hancock, O’Hagan and O’Shaughessy all approved of boarding out for workhouse children. In 1856, Mr Norward, a guardian in the North Dublin Union, attempted unsuccessfully to introduce a boarding-out scheme described as an ‘enlightened and benevolent proposal’.\(^ {144}\) The North Dublin Union had refused to admit children ‘at present in the hands of the police’ because ‘it would be nearly certain
death to receive them into this house’. In its 1857 annual report the DPOS referred to the North Dublin Union case and reminded its subscribers that destitute Protestant orphans ‘would have no shelter to fly to but the poorhouse, if the Protestant Orphan Society did not exist!’

In the late 1850s, Mrs Hannah Archer argued that the placement of children under the age of two in workhouses was detrimental to their health and that such an environment was unsuitable for children due to the long-term negative effects of institutionalisation, conclusions which echoed points raised in DPOS reports from the pre-famine years. Following an examination of the work carried out by PO Societies and St Brigid’s, Neilson Hancock concluded that, ‘with such an amount of Irish opinion, both Protestant and Roman Catholic, against the workhouse system, the difficulty is to conceive what is to be said in its defence’. Hancock sought the opinion of Revd Eugene O’Meara, DPOS Secretary, on whether the ‘family system’ implemented by PO Societies would prove useful for workhouse children. O’Meara reported that children’s health would be greatly improved if sent to ‘the salubrious air of the country’, which he considered far more advantageous to bodily health than years spent in union workhouses. He also assured Hancock that many of the children helped by the Society ‘have raised themselves to positions of respectability’. Only 5 per cent ‘turned out badly’ and only ‘very few’ became criminals. While unable to guarantee that the same system could be successfully applied to workhouses, O’Meara believed that ‘the children themselves’ and the ‘community at large’ would benefit.

Sir John Arnott, Mayor of Cork, in an investigation into the condition of the Cork workhouse children a year earlier recommended the Cork POS as a model system on which workhouse reform could be based, particularly in relation to the health benefits for children and in light of ‘shocking’ workhouse child mortality rates. Children were found in deplorable conditions suffering from scrofula and opthalmia.

At the Social Science Congress held in 1861, lady attendees visited the homes of DPOS nurses and orphans. Greatly impressed by the good care taken of the children, they duly praised the Society’s work, which is thought to have ‘considerably influenced the introduction of boarding-out arrangements for workhouse children in Ireland and in Britain’. Reformers were able to present a solid argument in favour of boarding out by referring to the DPOS, a reputable charity with almost fifty years of experience, as a tried and tested model.

When asked in 1861 whether he thought it wise to board out workhouse children, Mr Nicholas Mahony, Cork Poor Law Guardian, replied, ‘Yes; just the same as the Protestant Orphan Society in Cork do,
with very good results; the children all turn out very well’. In 1862 the Poor Law (Ireland) Amendment Act was passed, which introduced boarding out for children under five years of age. Archbishop Cullen and the Royal College of Physicians called for amendments and submitted petitions to appeal. Consequently, guardians were empowered to exceed the age limit from five to eight years if children’s good health depended on such an extension. However, the Board of Guardians were not compelled to board out children; rather the decision to do so was discretionary.

In 1862, the Earl of Roden restated that the DPOS aimed to encourage independence rather than dependence for children.

I need hardly suggest to you that whether the child is reared and educated in the workhouse or in the Protestant Orphan Society, the money that supports it comes equally out of our pockets, and the only option you have to choose is whether you will pay poor rates for the bad education of the workhouse and the perversion of its objects, or give a subscription to the Protestant Orphan Society, for good objects and for beneficial results.

The Earl of Roden went on to say that he had witnessed children who had remained in workhouses for numerous years without any hope of a future as ‘respectable, independent citizens’. Through the DPOS, Protestants laid the groundwork for an alternative to workhouses for Protestant widows and children, one which did not perpetuate stigma but rather promoted respectability, social mobility and independence.

In 1868 Florence Davenport Hill commended the DPOS for its careful supervision of the orphans whilst boarded out and drew attention to the many health benefits of its system. St Brigid’s also received considerable praise:

Confraternities in the City voluntarily collect the subscriptions; and the inspection is performed by the ladies connected with St. Brigid’s. In this latter respect it may even be superior to the Protestant orphanage, for, able and devoted as are the gentleman who visit the little Protestants in their homes, it cannot be disputed that women are, by virtue of their sex, more competent to judge the well-being of children.

As discussed in chapter 3, although DPOS clergymen and committee members acted as local superintendents and official inspectors, clergymen’s wives were also expected to take an interest in the orphans’ welfare. Moreover, the Limerick POS organised parish ladies’ visiting committees from the 1830s. The 1871 DPOS annual report noted the Statistical Society’s acknowledgement and support of its system:
The plan adopted by the Society of locating its orphans in respectable families in the country has received the approval of one of our highest statistical authorities and has by the same authority, been pronounced to be greatly superior to the assembling of children together in one building, under the boarding school system.\textsuperscript{165}

In December 1875, the DPOS welcomed further support. The Vice-President of the Statistical and Social Inquiry Society of Ireland, John Ingram, recommended the DPOS system: ‘The success of these societies is unquestioned, and is to me the standing and conclusive evidence, that in spite of all allegation to the contrary, the boarding-out system, if properly worked, can be carried out effectively, and made to produce the happiest results’.\textsuperscript{166} Ingram recommended an extension of the age limit for boarding out children to thirteen years, which led to legislative reform in 1876.\textsuperscript{167}

Two years later, Isabella Tod presented a paper to the British Association for Advancement of Science in August 1878. The paper referred to the report made by Mrs Senior to the Right Hon. James Stansfield, President of the Local Government Board on the district schools that housed girls from London workhouses.\textsuperscript{168} (Tod had founded the North of Ireland’s Women’s Suffrage Association in 1872 and from 1874 Anna and Thomas Haslam, Quakers, began to draw attention to women’s suffrage using the \textit{Women’s Advocate} as their platform for debate.) Haslam went on to form the Dublin Women’s Suffrage Society in 1876. In 1878 Tod called for reforms in the area of outdoor relief and acknowledged the DPOS in her report:

 Warned by the errors of the old charter schools, which had just been closed, the Protestant Orphan Society from the first eschewed large buildings and mechanical arrangements, and placed the children in families in the country. The success of this institution is beyond dispute, and as it deals with hundreds at a time, the scale is sufficiently large to be an excellent test of efficiency.\textsuperscript{169}

Impartial in her assessment of Catholic and Protestant boarding-out schemes, Tod also praised the work of the Presbyterian Orphan Society, St Brigid’s and St Joseph’s, ‘who have constantly boarded the children in the care among farmers and others in the country, with the best results’.\textsuperscript{170} The Presbyterian Orphan Society was indebted to the DPOS for its assistance and advice when the charity first began its charitable work.

In 1889 Florence Davenport Hill put into perspective the true extent of the DPOS’s social influence.
The careful organisation of this Society, to which its success is doubtless largely owing, has special interest for the advocates of Boarding-out as now pursued for State children. It was accepted as an example by Mr Greig when more than 40 years ago he modelled the system for the city parish of Edinburgh; and its main features are reproduced in the English Boarding-out Orders of 1870 and 1877.\textsuperscript{171}

Mr George Greig, Inspector of the Poor for the city parish of Edinburgh, detailed the ‘family system’ he had implemented, which was ‘chiefly modelled by him upon those devised by the Irish Protestant Orphan Society’.\textsuperscript{172} Greig referred to careful nurse selection, the importance placed on inspections, and the removal of children in cases of neglect.\textsuperscript{173} Florence Davenport Hill noted ‘the success of Scotland in boarding out the children of the state has become proverbial’.\textsuperscript{174} By 1869 almost all Scottish workhouse children were boarded out to respectable families.\textsuperscript{175} The publicity surrounding the Orphans of Glenbirkie raised the Society’s profile outside Ireland and perhaps even reached reformers such as Greig in Scotland. The DPOS and local PO Societies were recognised by the highest authorities as having pioneered an outstanding large-scale boarding-out system which became the blueprint for workhouse reforms in Scotland, Ireland and England.

**Anti-child cruelty legislation and the Dublin Aid Committee**

Dr Curgeven founded the Infant Life Society in 1870 and following a number of ‘baby farming’ scandals the Infant Life Protection Act\textsuperscript{176} was introduced in 1872,\textsuperscript{177} under the terms of which people who accepted money for the care of more than one infant were obliged to register their name with the authorities. The Children’s Dangerous Performances Act, which prevented children under fourteen from participation in dangerous exhibitions, was passed in 1879. Following continued baby farming scandals, the Prevention of Cruelty and Protection of Children Act\textsuperscript{178} was introduced in 1889.\textsuperscript{179} The begging clause empowered the police to transfer children to safety. The act was amended in 1897 following a number of high profile cases of criminal baby farming in England and Wales.

The Dublin Aid Committee, which was founded in 1889 by Rosa Barrett, raised public awareness of anti-cruelty legislation and acted as an authority on child welfare issues. Rosa Barrett, social reformer and founder of the Cottage Home for Little Children and the first crèche in Ireland, also had a working relationship with the DPOS: children elected to the DPOS were occasionally sent to Barrett’s cottage home.\textsuperscript{180}
The Roman Catholic church was initially distrustful of the Dublin Aid Committee, later known as the National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children.

Mrs Elizabeth Leeper, sister of Dr Isabella Mulvany, the renowned long-standing headmistress of Alexandra College, and her husband, Richard Robert Leeper, became prominent members of the NSPCC committee. There was a special fund named the Elizabeth Leeper Clothing Guild, which was still in use in the 1970s. Richard Robert Leeper MD, St Patrick’s Hospital, was a progressive force in the field of mental illness: he greatly improved patients’ quality of life in a multitude of ways, from rebuilding patient accommodation to nurse training.

Richard Leeper was closely related to Revd Canon Alexander Leeper, discussed in the last chapter as being an active member of the Dublin POS and Church Education Society in the 1850s.

In addition, for example, Mrs Black, Blackheath, Clontarf, is listed as a contributor of ‘toys, clothes and fruit’ and was a member of the NSPCC committee in the early 1890s. Better known as Mrs Gibson Black, Mrs Cecilia Black’s husband was the wealthy wine merchant, Mr Gibson Black. His father was Revd Gibson Black, a former secretary of the DPOS, and a highly regarded figure in the 1830s and 1840s. These close connections perhaps provide some insight into the legacy of charitable work which can be traced back to a number of Church of Ireland clergymen, their wives, and to some extent the DPOS.

In a paper presented in 1892, Rosa Barrett raised the issues of parental duties and ‘children’s rights’ in light of the recently carried Prevention of Cruelty to Children bill: ‘by means of this law, a parent or guardian if convicted of cruelty endangering the life or health of a child, may be deprived of its custody until the child is fourteen years of age, if a boy, or sixteen years, if a girl. Previously a parent might beat, starve, ill treat, or neglect his child with impunity, and even by neglect kill it, so long as the murder was committed slowly enough, and no one had the power to interfere’. This statement constitutes a firm basis for advancing the argument that the DPOS and local PO Societies acted as private child protection enforcers in the absence of public anti-cruelty measures. Prior to the 1889 act, as Barrett argues, parents could treat their children as they wished without punishment.

If children were neglected, exploited, beaten by their own parents, to whom could they turn? POS orphans were inspected, clergymen and their families were responsible for their care; they were monitored in school and Sunday school, and more likely to receive medical attention. The committees comprised both religious and lay representatives and all were accountable to the subscribers, and to the children’s relatives.
Conclusion

Local PO Societies were founded in the second half of the nineteenth century because Protestants opposed the placement of Protestant widows and children in workhouses for three main reasons: first, the likelihood that Protestant orphans would change their religion rather than endure persecution; second, widows’ respectability was compromised; and, third, on medical grounds: children’s physical development was stunted, fresh country air was medically recommended to improve health, and workhouses reported high infant and child mortality rates. Archbishop Cullen and Margaret Aylward also publicly objected to the placement of children in workhouses. Social reformers commended the DPOS and St Brigid’s boarding-out orphanage in equal measure, and from a social perspective and in spite of allegations of proselytism and the religious competition which divided them, both charities were convinced of the advantages of boarding out and both undoubtedly contributed to workhouse reforms. The next chapter analyses the DPOS system in practice to determine whether it merited such widespread support.

Notes

3 Moffitt, Irish Church Missions, p. 20.
4 Missions in Ireland: Especially with reference to the Proselytising Movement (Dublin: J. Duffy, 1855), p. 34.
5 Ibid., p. 70.
6 Moffitt, Irish Church Missions, p. 20.
8 Belfast News-letter (8 October 1852).
9 Moffitt, Irish Church Missions, p. 98.
10 E. Maguire, Roman Catholic Proselytisers Met and Answered: Recollections of a Visit to Lyons in 1858 (Dublin: Curry, 1858), p. 8.
11 Ibid.
12 See introduction of The Orphans of Glenbirkie, p. 19.
16 Acheson, History of the Church of Ireland, p. 199.
17 Moffitt, *Irish Church Missions*, p. 149.
23 *Freeman’s Journal* (18 July 1856).
33 St Brigid’s Orphanage annual report, 1864, TCD, OLS B3 744 no. 1, p. 18.
35 Prunty, *Margaret Aylward*, p. 75.
36 Minutes, 27 Mar. 1830, NAI, POS papers, 1045/2/1/1.
37 *Irish Times* (5 April 1862).
38 Registered application files, NAI, CPOU papers, 1045/11/2 (284–99).
40 *Irish Times* (6 March 1890).
41 *Irish Times* (27 July 1861).
44 Registered applications, 1850–60, NAI, CPOU papers, 1045/11/2.
45 *Irish Times* (8 April 1863).
48 Minutes, 16 Sept. 1859, NAI, POS papers, 1045/2/1/6, p. 285.
Opposition and support, 1850–98

50 Ibid., p. 287.
51 Ibid.
52 St Brigid’s Orphanage annual report, 1864, TCD, OLS B3 744, no. 1, p. 18.
53 Registered applications, NAI, CPOU papers, 1045/11/2 (423–50).
54 Ibid.
55 Ibid.
56 See for a full account of the case, Prunty, Margaret Aylward, pp. 91–101.
57 St Brigid’s Orphanage annual report, 1863, TCD, OLS B3 744, no. 1, p. 6.
58 Freeman’s Journal (18 April 1863).
59 Ibid.
60 Ibid.
62 Acheson, History of the Church of Ireland, p. 199.
63 Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette (15 Aug. 1860).
64 Ibid.
66 Ibid., p. 193.
67 DPOS report, Irish Times (23 November 1861).
69 Ibid.
70 Minutes, 29 Sept. 1854, NAI, POS papers, 1045/2/1/2, p. 291.
74 Irish Times (23 November 1861).
75 Ibid.
79 Belfast News-letter (7 March 1868).
80 DPOS annual report, 1866, NAI, POS papers, 1045/1/1/37–42, p. 15.
81 Ibid., p. 18.
82 Belfast News-letter (8 November 1867).
83 Ibid.
84 Ibid.
85 ‘Armagh POS’, Belfast News-letter (27 October 1876).
87 Minutes, 1 Apr. 1870, NAI, POS papers, 1045/2/1/8, p. 209.
88 Acheson, History of the Church of Ireland, p. 132.
89 DPOS annual report, 1873, NAI, POS papers, 1045/1/1/43–9, pp. 16–17.
90 R. Clarke, ‘The clergy and disestablishment’, in Bernard and Neely (eds), The Clergy of the Church of Ireland, pp. 169–85, p. 170.
91 Ibid., p. 182.
Ibid.


94 Minutes, 1867–72, NAI, POS papers, 1045/2/1/8, p. 365.

95 Documents relating to the Kinsey Marriage Portion Fund, NAI, POS papers, 1045/4/8/7.


97 This quote refers to a Limerick POS lady subscriber, see Massy, *Footprints of a Faithful Shepherd*, pp. 429–33, p. 430.

98 Ibid., pp. 429–33.

99 Ibid., p. 432.

100 See M. Cronin, “‘You’d be disgraced!’: middle-class women and respectability in post famine Ireland’, in F. Lane (ed.), *Politics, Society and the Middle Class in Modern Ireland* (Basingstoke, New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), pp. 107–29, p. 111; see also, Enright, “‘Take this Child’”.


102 *Belfast News-letter* (12 November 1867).


105 Cavan POS annual report, 1855, NLI.


109 *Tuam Herald* (27 April 1867).


111 Ibid.

112 *Belfast News-letter* (9 March 1876).


114 *Belfast News-letter* (7 March 1868).

115 Tyrone POS annual report, 1877, p. 11, NLI.


120 *Irish Times* (30 July 1864).

121 ‘Fermanagh POS’, *Irish Times* (9 August 1865).
Opposition and support, 1850–98

122 See Moffitt, *Irish Church Missions*, p. 87.
130 W. N. Hancock, ‘On the importance of substituting the family system of rearing orphan children for the system now pursued in our workhouses’, JSSISI, 2:13 (1859), pp. 317–33, p. 329.
134 *Belfast News-letter* (18 October 1879).
142 Prunty, *Margaret Aylward*, p. 64.
144 Hancock, ‘On the importance of substituting the family system’, p. 326.
145 *Ibid*.
146 *Ibid*.
147 George, *Foster Care*, p. 7.
148 Hancock, ‘On the importance of substituting the family system’, p. 328.
149 Ibid., p. 329.
150 Ibid.
154 Report from the Select Committee on Poor Relief (Ireland) 1861, HC 1861 (408), vol. xx.
158 Ingram, ‘Comparison between the English and Irish Poor Laws’, p. 57.
159 Robins, Lost Children, p. 275.
160 Irish Times (5 April 1862).
161 Ibid.
162 Davenport Hill, Children of the State (1st edn 1868), pp. 132–5.
163 Ibid., p. 137.
165 DPOS annual report, 1871, NAI, POS papers, 1045/1/1/37–42.
166 Ingram, ‘The organisation of charity and education’, p. 462.
167 Robins, Lost Children, p. 280.
169 Ibid., p. 295.
170 Ibid.
172 Ibid., p. 156.
173 The Medical Record, 7 (1872), p. 487.
176 35 & 36 Vic., c. 38
177 Luddy, Women and Philanthropy, p. 92.
178 52 & 53 Vic., c. 44.
180 Minutes, 1890s, NAI, POS papers, 1045/2/1/13.
181 NSPCC annual reports, NLI.
Opposition and support, 1850–98


183 *Irish Times* (15 April 1893).

184 ‘Will of Mr. Gibson Black’, *Irish Times* (23 March 1889); parish records; Lunney, ‘Richard McClelland-Leeper, Richard Leech’.