The Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park

A History 1898-1941

Anthony Michael Keenan B.A. B.Ed.

Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the second part of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education

Department of Education

University of Adelaide

June 1988

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT

This study examines the history of the Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park. The Reformatory was run by the Catholic Church and derived its funds from three sources: a State subsidy paid on the basis of a fixed sum per child committed, funds raised from the local Catholic community and bequests and legacies.

The thesis includes both a narrative account of the institution and an analysis of the inmates. Central to the thesis, is the examination of the Reformatory as an institution of social control, seeking to impose an ideology of respectability upon its clients. To establish the argument, the thesis examines how the regime operated, the composition of the staff and investigates how the boys reacted to being under control.

Chapter One examines the founding of the Reformatory and discusses the origins of the Brothers of Saint John the Baptist, an order founded in South Australia, from which the staff were derived. Particular attention is given to the aspirations of the Catholic community and their sense of place in South Australian society.

Chapters Two, Three and Four deal with the administration of the Reformatory and place considerable emphasis on the examination of the boys who made up the Reformatory's population. The experience of these children was a narrow and cloistered one, in direct contrast to their rich, if somewhat chaotic lifestyle, prior to committal.

The final chapter provides a narrative account of the Reformatory's demise: in the final decades, the Reformatory and the religious order were found to be less and less effective. Eventually, both collapsed, as they were not supported with the necessary funds, staff and clients.

STATEMENT

This thesis contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any tertiary institution. To the best of the author's knowledge, this thesis contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference is made.

Anthony Michael Keenan.

April, 1988

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank Dr. Ian Davey for his support and critical guidance.

I wish also to thank Pat and John who did the typing, Sr. Marie of the Adelaide Catholic Archives, the staff of the State Archives of South Australia and Susan MacIntosh for their time and assistance.

Finally, I extend my gratitude to my wife Denise, for her dedicated encouragement.

INTRODUCTION

This study deals with the Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park between the years 1898 and 1943. The Reformatory was founded by Fr. Healy and was staffed by an order of Brothers, the Brothers of Saint John the Baptist. In its peak decade, 1900 to 1910, the Reformatory had a staff of nine men and population of boys which fluctuated between 35 and 40. For most of its life however, the number rarely exceeded 20 boys, dwindling to a mere handful in its last decade. The Report of the Committee appointed by the Government to inquire into Delinquent and other Children in the Care of the State, tabled in 1939, gives a clear picture of these last years of the Reformatory:

> This Reformatory is under the supervision of a Roman Catholic brotherhood, and was founded 40 years ago. There are no women on the staff. The property consists of 25 acres and has permanent water for irrigation purposes. Boys are taught the handling of horses, ploughing, gardening, tinsmithing and woodwork. There were only nine boys in the institution when the Committee visited it, and one boy of school-going age. He received instruction alone in a large empty schoolroom. All boys slept in one dormitory. The outside garden was well cared for, but the institution lacked any homelike appearance, the kitchen being dark, and lacked modern facilities. The woodwork and tinsmithing were carried on in small outside rooms. With so few boys it would appear difficult to plan for work of a more constructive nature. (1)

The boys were placed into the Reformatory for a variety of offences, usually petty theft, or the "crime" of being uncontrollable. This thesis examines the backgrounds of these boys and concludes that the boys were sentenced more because they offended the sensibilities of the respectable, than for any substantial law breaking.

These sensibilities had become enshrined in the rules and regulations of the State Children's Council (S.C.C.), which had the task of sweeping up the truants, waifs, strays and minor law breakers and then relocating them in respectable institutions or homes. It was the task of these places to ensure that the children were properly cared for and appropriately educated. Legislators gave a monopoly of care to the S.C.C. and in the regulations of 1887 (2) strictly forbade contact between the state children and their natural parents. As a result of these powers, the S.C.C. was seen as the natural authority on matters concerning child care and control. The committee of the S.C.C. took its task seriously, even zealously, and made constant public comment upon the parenting of children in South Australia. They concentrated upon the offspring of the poor working classes of Adelaide, because the parents in this section of South Australian society were obvious in their failure to bring up their offspring in a respectable manner. The evidence of this neglect which was constantly quoted by the S.C.C., was the large numbers of street children, which were said to contain "vicious" boys who corrupted and exploited the younger members of the gangs and led them into lives of crime and depravity. (3) After 1895 the S.C.C. became convinced that this group of children was expanding in scope and activity, claiming that there was a rising tide of juvenile crime that needed to be addressed immediately. (4) The problem was seen to be a result of child neglect by the parents who allowed their children to roam the streets and failed to discipline them adequately. To address this issue, the S.C.C. argued, and won, during the revision of the State Children's Bill (1895), greater powers to control and establish more reformatory institutions.

One of the aims of this thesis is to establish why the S.C.C. used these powers to endorse and subsidise the existence of a boys' reformatory run by a religious order; a problem made more complex, as South Australia was renowned for its commitment to secular forms of child care and education. Chapter One discusses the confluence between the views held by the S.C.C. about acceptable child rearing, aspects of the Catholic Church's moral mission and the Catholic community's desire for acceptance in South Australian society. It suggests that the link between them was the concept of respectability - the Catholics wanted to have their community seen as respectable and the S.C.C. worked to have all children raised to become respectable adults. The common ideal made the funding arrangements acceptable to all parties and dominated the purpose of the Reformatory. The implementation of this purpose is discussed in Chapters Two, Three and Four.

In investigating the establishment of the Reformatory, the thesis attempts to extend further the scope of the debate on the growth of educational institutions, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, as Reformatory education is one specialised aspect of this debate. Those who did much to establish the institutional path to adulthood at the turn of the century, considered themselves and indeed, called themselves, reformers. Motivated by liberalism, they sought to save the children and to introduce them to civilised values. The work they did was interpreted by themselves and their chroniclers within the whig progressive concept of history. The reformers and their institutionalised children were seen to contribute to the inevitable advancement of society and thereby to Australia's reputation as a social laboratory for the world. (5)

Studies by Wimshurst, Davey, Vick, Cook and Cashen (6) have examined the interaction between the new institutions and the pre-existing forms of family life and work habits. Their revision of the whig "progressive" model has thrown up a picture in

which the reformers found themselves disappointed in their objectives when confronted with the less than passive and receptive working class culture. Davey, in particular, in his "Growing up in South Australia", argues that the nineteenth century reformers were not seeking to create a better life for the working classes, nor even a more equitable society but rather:

> our forbears developed a particular form of schooling as an instrument of social regulation: a form designed to serve the interests of the social order more than the democratic needs of children. (7)

Brian Dickey also considers that the whiggish view is in need of critical review, arguing that many of the initial developments and subsequent reforms of social institutions were:

> in fact reaction - pragmatic, limited and conservative - designed to regain a status quo in the light of immediate difficulties. (8)

and the history of such institutions:

> tends to be the history of social control of the socially dependent by the socially powerful (9)

None of those who take the revisionist stance argue that this control was a premeditated plot, but rather that it was an almost evolutionary dialectic (10) in which the rejection or exploitation of aspects of an institution led to "reform". Ramsland develops this idea in his examination of the changes to the care of orphaned and neglected children in New South Wales. He presents this as a process in which imported concepts

and institutions of child saving were introduced and established in New South Wales and were then subject to progressive modification in response to the changing composition and activity of the working class. (11) This alteration did not, however, change the underlying fundamental function of social control. (12) Ramsland, in his perception of reform and reformers, is very much in sympathy with the judgement of Margaret Barbalet:

> Reform on a pedestal, the South Australian example would seem to show, soon acquires verdigris. The only statues that have enough patina are those accessible enough to be polished by the touch of children's hands. (13)

Australian Catholics in the nineteenth century considered themselves a besieged minority, underprivileged and oppressed. It was a well-founded opinion, as Catholics made up the largest section of the poor working class of Australia's cities. Catholics were also viewed with suspicion by the rest of society. Campion and other Catholic historiographers (14), along with Hamilton (15), in seeking to analyse the impact of the state upon the Catholic minority, concur that Catholics were observed to be a threat to the Protestant social order. (16) They were popularly characterised as "indulgent, no thrift, no foresight, as uncivilised and illiterate, with habits and customs far inferior to progressive English standards." (17) The Catholics responded with an aggrieved insularity that led them to create institutions that would ensure their children would be Catholic. These institutions can be seen, as Hamilton argues, to be working -class responses to a state that sought to control what was considered to be an unruly section of society. Campion places more emphasis on the role of the traditions and organisation of the church. In his argument, it was the church which responded by organising institutional structures such as schools, into which it coaxed the essentially Irish Catholic working class, so as to resist the controls of the Protestant state. The two

approaches, however, reach a consensus in that they see the function of these institutions as being to produce successful and respectable Catholics.

Chapter Two examines why the boys were in the Reformatory and concentrates upon their failure to live respectably as the factor they all have in common. To Peter Bailey, the issue of respectability involves questions of "social control and cultural hegemony", in which the working class can be seen to be incorporated into "the social consensus that assured mid-Victorian society in particular its overall cohesion and stability." (18) This approach revises the view that the working class was a powerless mass, moved into action by pressure from above. Instead, this view argues that the working class should be seen to be "a complex and autonomous social actor" interpreting and creating its social world. Respectability, with its ideals of moral achievement and economic self-sufficiency, gave the member of the working class a means of interpreting the world and of judging his or her peers. A consequence of this working class interpretation of the prevailing hegemony was that many boys were placed into the Reformatory by their parents because the boys would not conform to the parents attempt to train them to respectability. The official description for such boys was "uncontrollable" and they made up the second largest group within the Reformatory.

Chapter Three argues that once the boys were in the Reformatory, they were subject to a narrow and highly structured programme of instruction designed to make them accept a form of respectability which was impregnated by a concept of Catholic manliness. The chapter considers the methods used by the Brothers to establish respectable behaviour as a lifestyle for the boys. The most important aspect of their programme was the Brothers' own example of deserving, decent and exemplary activity. This link between respectable behaviour and Catholic religion had the effect of allowing

the Brothers to use respectability as a cypher to make their particular religious code of reform comprehensible to the boys.

Chapter Four, with its discussion of recidivism and other forms of delayed resistence to attempts at reformation, illustrates only too well, the ability of the boys to comprehend respectability. Many easily put on the mantle of respectability in order to obtain the favour of release and then, just as readily, removed the assumed covering. In doing so, the boys were illustrating the working class ability to create their own culture and to shape their own world. Respectability used in such a manner indicates how "working people could extract practical benefits, often unobtainable from the resources of their own culture." (19) They could use the cloak of a respectable suit, membership of a respectable working man's club or institute, to obtain patronage, promotion or some other material gain. Equally, they could also leave the guise of respectability with reasonable ease. "For many working class, respectability was a prescriptive rather than a descriptive exercise". (20) In short, respectability was a mode of social behaviour, powerful, manipulative and double edged; it could be employed to admonish and thus control as well as to ape and mock to gain favour and acceptance.

Chapter Five discusses the implications of the failure by the Brothers to obtain recruits for their Order and acceptance of their brand of child reform, which resulted in the demise of both their institution and their Order.

The sources for this study were both primary and secondary and included extensive use of the Adelaide Catholic Archives and several interviews. An important source held in the Catholic Archives was the Morrison Index. This document gives a brief resume of the history of the Brothers and brief pencil sketches of members of the Order. The tendency of such sketches was to centre upon the positive aspects of the men

in question. Occasionally, one obtains a glimpse of the more human characteristics of the men in correspondence, yet even these are brief.

An important insight into the nature of Brothers" regime were the interviews with Brother Schutz, who trained to become a member of the Brothers' of Saint John the Baptist, but left and joined the Salesians, when they took over the Reformatory. The interviews covered some of the experiences of the boys and provided useful material on the layout of the Reformatory and the nature of the administration.

Equally as important, were the mandates of committal that give brief statements of the boys' characters and their reasons for sentencing. The assessments are often only one line, but they do concentrate on the moral character of the boys and thus illuminate tha attitude of the authorities to such boys. More material is found in the petitions for release. These documents cover the investigations of officers, in response to parental request for the release of the child and contain many judgements of the boys, their families and often go as far as to include comments on their service homes. A problem exists in that there are few of these petitions remaining.

Tables of costs incurred and income received by the Reformatory, as well as averages of boys' attendance represent the major official statistics tabled by the S.C.C. in annual reports. They were designed to give the most flattering picture possible and, thus, are not always accurate. Similarly, the annual reports of the S.C.C. to Parliament also gloss over problems. The sets of tables in the appendices give a breakdown of the material derived from the mandates and petitions and presents a considered and effective picture of the Reformatory's activity.

Through a study of these records it has been possible to reconstruct the history of the establishment and the life of the Reformatory and its inmates. It is a chronicle of how the Brothers struggled for 45 years, trying to control the problem of juvenile delinquency. To effect this control, the Brothers used the medium of a reformatory and taught the values of respectability. They were supported with a subsidy from the state, which was also seeking, through the S.C.C., to control the social problems arising from disrespectful juvenile behaviour. The Brothers were also well supported by their Catholic community, which made up the largest section of the poor working class of Adelaide and contributed the largest proportion of juvenile boys in need of reform to the S.C.C.

NOTES

1. Report of the Committee appointed by the Government to Inquire into Delinquent and other Children in the Care of the State. South Australian Parliamentary Papers, (S.A.P.P.) 1939, Vol. 2 No. 75, p.18.

2. Regulations of the State Children's Council, (S.C.C.), 1887, S.A.P.P., 1887, Vol. 3, No. 38.

3. S.C.C., Annual Report, S.A.P.P., 1888, Vol. 3, No. 39.

4. S.C.C. Annual Report, S.A.P.P., 1895, vol. 3, No. 81.
See also 1897, Vol. 2, No. 81.

5. State Children's Convention, (Adelaide, 1907). South Australian Archives (SAA) Government Record Group (GRG) 27/27. Also C.H. Spence, State Children in Australia. Vardon and Sons, Adelaide, 1910 passim.

6. K. Wimshurst, Street Children and School Attendance in South Australia 1886-1915. Master of Education thesis. University of Adelaide, 1979. Also by the same author "Control and Resistance: Reformatory School Girls in Late Nineteenth Century South Australia." in Journal of Social History Vol. 18, 1984 - 1985 pp. 278-285.
I. Davey, "Growing up in South Australia in E. Richards (Ed.) Flinders History of South Australia: Social History. (Wakefield Press, 1986) pp. 371-400.
Also "Growing up in a working class community" in P. Grimshaw, C. McConville, E. McEwen. (Ed.)

Families in Colonial Australia. pp. 50-58.

P. Cook, I. Davey, M. Vick, "Capitalism and Working Class Schooling in late Nineteenth Century South Australia." in Journal of Australian and New Zealand History of Education Society. (ANZHES Journal). Vol. 8, No. 2. 1979.

P. Cashen, "No you don't Wilke, I know your game. The work of School Attendance Officers in South Australian Schools in the 1920's and 1930's." ANZHES Journal. Vol. 11, No. 2, 1982.

7. Davey, "Growing up in South Australia". p. 375.

8. B. Dickey, Rations, Residence, Resources. A History of Social Welfare in South Australia since 1836. (Wakefield Press, 1986) p. xiv.

9. ibid. p. 324.

10. Wimshurst, "Street Children". p. 6.

11. J. Ramsland, Children of the Back Lanes. Destitute and Neglected Children in Colonial New South Wales. (New South Wales University Press, 1986) See chpt. 7.

12. ibid. pp. 232-233.

13. M. Barbalet, Far from a Low Gutter Girl. p. 229.

14. E. Campion, Rockchoppers, (Penguin Books, 1982) J.G. Murtagh, Australia: The Catholic Chapter. (The Polding Press, 1969). R. Fogarty, Catholic Education in Australia 1806-1950.

Vol. 1. (Melbourne University Press, 1959). R.B. Healy, Christian Brothers of Wakefield Street. 1878-1978. (Lutheran Printing House, 1978).

15. P. Hamilton, "Tipperarifying the Moral Atmosphere" : Irish Catholic Immigration and the state 1840-1860, in Sydney Labour History Group, What Rough Beast? (George Allen and Unwin, 1982) pp. 13-30.

16. ibid. p. 13.

17. ibid. p. 13.

18. P. Bailey, "Will the Real Bill Banks Please Stand Up? Towards a Role Analysis of Mid-Victorian Working Class Respectability." in Journal of Social History. Vol. 12, No. 3, Spring 1979. p. 334.

19. ibid. p. 343.

20. ibid. p. 347.

CHAPTER 1

THE GENESIS OF THE REFORMATORY

> March 7, 1898, the Roman Catholic Boys in the Magill Reformatory were transferred to premises at Brooklyn Park ... Archbishop O'Reilly ... on ... 14 September 1898 ... officially opened the Reformatory.
>
> ... the Chief Secretary, the Hon. J.V. O'Loughlin, publically announced his pleasure and the Government sanction in handing over to Fr. Healy's care, Catholic boys who had been [formerly] detained at the Government Reformatory Magill. (1)

This brief account of the origins of the Reformatory reveals one of the facets that was to dominate its existence - the fact that power and responsibility were granted by the state to those who were to run the Reformatory. The institution was thus never really an autonomous structure. It was reliant upon the state for its clientele and its purpose. In all cases the terms used by the Chief Secretary were well chosen and were potent with meaning; he had given "sanction and he had "handed over care" and he could withdraw both. Thus the Reformatory had an underlying relationship of dependence that would ensure that it maintained the objectives of the government reformatory system. The most important of these aims was the fostering of respectable behaviour and attitudes within the boys. According to Pike respectability was a paramount concern in Adelaide because:

> The accepted social measure was respectability and, although some assumed it naturally, others could acquire it. It was seldom accorded to unenterprising wage earners, but it was not monopolised by men of wealth and property. Aspirations judged sound by local and subtle tests meant more, provided that the aspirations were pursued with diligence and energy. A man was

> judged respectable not by the destination he had arrived at, but according to the road he had travelled; and the five roads to respectability in Adelaide were early arrival, thrift, temperance and its illegitimate offspring abstinence, piety and the ownership of land. (2)

"Respectability", Pike concluded, used as a carrot and a whip for the wage earners, dulled the edge of class consciousness" (3) and thus made for a well ordered and well behaved society.

As the sign posts were there to enable a diligent citizen to find and travel the right road, the main question that presented itself before the citizens of Adelaide was, what was to be done about the person who chose not to travel the path of respectability? Even more vexing was what was to be done about the offspring of such disreputable persons? How could they achieve respectability if their parents were providing inadequate moral maps and guidance? The citizens addressed the problem by removing the children and providing institutions that would act remedially to correct past instructions and positively to provide an adequate moral map for future travels. These institutions were the state Reformatory and the Industrial Schools. They were run by the State Children's Council (S.C.C.) which, in 1887, was given monopoly control over deviant children through its wide brief:

> to receive and undertake the control of "children of the State" and to train them to become virtuous and useful citizens. (4)

This statement of purpose was tied to the concept that the boys were not properly trained and compliant citizens and as a result they needed to have this instilled in them

by a special programme of education. As the boys were children of the state they were no longer in their parents' care and their education was to take place in a totally constructed and artificial environment. This process implied an idealism and moral motivation; it encapsulated a great belief that the clientele were malleable and with the right environment and care they could be taught to acquire respectability. This outlook also had a negative side, as this faith was tempered by a belief in the concept that the task of the "less enterprising" was to be useful citizens who accepted their lot and showed respect for their "betters." Thus the clients were seen as the "wilder and less charming children who had to be broken in for the labour market." (5)

Such obedience training, much in the mould of changing a wild colt into a useful work horse, was an attempt to ensure that society obtained its necessary quota of accepting and cheerful subordinates who could be trusted to carry out the dictates of their betters. This:

> amounted to the old story of the powerful stigmatizing the powerless .. and the poor were most unlikely to be deserving. (6)

To ensure this aspect of respectability, the S.C.C. was supervised by a governing board that was made up of some of the most successful individuals in Adelaide society. That is, those that had acquired the title of respectable, or those that had earnt the respect of the respectable; such as Catherine Spence. It is noticable that whenever the S.C.C. was questioned about its efficacy, it was this board and its composition, that the S.C.C. used as its ultimate defence.(7)

Yet whilst this defence worked well enough in times of stress to validate the S.C.C., it was not enough to grant the institutions themselves respectability.

Reformatories and Industrial Schools were perceived as instruments of coercion and were resented (8) as being a little too close to the convict heritage of New South Wales.

South Australians considered themselves superior to N.S.W. as they had no convict past and considered that their colony was founded as a great and noble experiment with, by and for free men. Institutions such as reformatories reminded South Australians that respectability, whilst difficult to obtain, was easily lost. The issue thus arose of how were the institutions of the S.C.C. to be made more respectable? The S.C.C. answered this by examining the paths to respectability. It could provide two of the paths, thrift and temperance, it could hold up the example of land ownership and its board was composed of some of the first settlers but it had considerable problems in addressing the fifth path – piety. As a government instrumentality working within the political framework in which religion was not an affair of the state, the problem of inculcating piety became a difficult issue to address. Clerics who visited after hours were one solution but for many sections of society this was a poor compromise. The Catholics for example demanded their own institutions and placed constant pressure on the state to allow them to do so. In 1893, these issues were addressed by the stratagem of granting the S.C.C. the power to sanction the establishment of private reformatories and to subsidise them. (9) In obtaining this financial and regulatory power, the S.C.C. ensured that these subsidised private institutions were dependent upon the S.C.C. for their existence; thus they were obliged to fulfil the charter of the S.C.C., especially in providing training in respectability. The Catholic Orders in particular catered to the thus far neglected fifth path to respectability – piety.

The first Catholics to obtain a sanction to set up an institution under the new powers of the S.C.C. were the Josephite nuns. They obtained "10/– per week, per girl ... to cover expenses for the maintenance and training of the girls" .(10) With this subsidy

and money obtained from the Catholic community the Josephites set up a Reformatory far removed from Adelaide at Kapunda. The success of their attempt was an important factor in the Boys' Reformatory at Brooklyn Park obtaining funds and support. The practices of the Girls' Reformatory also helped to define those of the Reformatory at Brooklyn Park.

The Girls' Reformatory at Kapunda sought to teach the girls the "domestic ideology of wider society." (11) so as to replace the working class attitudes to work, sex, marriage and play, with those of the more restrictive and respectable middle class. The technique used was to remove the girls from their family and to place them within a rural environment. This they were allowed to do by the power the state had invested in the S.C.C. and through them, the Reformatory. As the girls were urban in origin such an environment must have been both forbidding and artificial (12) and would have enabled the Reformatory staff to have exercised greater control over the girls.

The girls were selected by the state and referred to the Reformatory for their transgressions against propriety rather than against property. (13). This reflects the nature of the Reformatory's task as being to induce correct behaviour rather than to punish for any major crime. To achieve this, the girls were retrained to skills and habits befitting the servants of the middle class: cooking, cleaning and caring. (14) They were educated in these tasks by Josephite nuns whose vows and practice of poverty (15) enabled them to set effective moral examples, thereby winning the girls' confidence and achieving a fair degree of success.

Two precedents were established in the operation of this Reformatory; the first was the concept of a religious order co-operating with the state to establish and run a reformatory for an exclusive denominational group. This was something of a radical move as the state in South Australia had since 1851 been determined not to fund any

form of denominational endeavour, (16) especially any that sought to teach exclusively within one particular religious framework.

The second precedent was the success of the nuns in obtaining compliance from the Catholic Irish working class to the ideology of domestic respectability. The Irish were generally seen as:

> a minority circumscribed by religion, ethnicity and class ... a challenge to the authority of the State ... a vocal and aggressive minority demanding recognition. (17)

and the belief was current that:

> Irish Catholics did not know their place and there was a generalised fear that they were incapable of learning it. (18)

So any success was worthy of funding and any scheme that was modelled on such success was to be viewed most favourably.

The key to this success, as we have seen, lay in the concept of removing the clients from their homes. The approach encapsulated the simplistic belief that the home environment was to blame and, hence, a properly constructed environment would rectify any deviancy.

A further lesson Kapunda held for the state authorities was that as an Order the staff were ideal role models as they were celibate and segregated. They particularly exemplified the role model needed to run a single sex Reformatory as there could be no

confusion of the image of the nuns as they, like the girls, were in an institution dedicated to the negation of temptation. The nuns were chaste, just as the girls in their developing years were expected to be (19). They were also humble, obedient and pure, the epitome of respectability. To this they could add the virtue of piety and thus the nuns offered all paths to respectability. As the Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park was to be staffed by an order, then the lesson of Kapunda would not be lost on the State authorities. Here would be the ideal staff to teach the boys self control. Thus the success of the Girls' Reformatory at Kapunda and its practices ensured that the state would be willing to "sanction" the foundation of a Catholic boys' reformatory at Brooklyn Park.

Perhaps a final inducement for the state to facilitate the establishment of this denominational educational institution, was the matter of money. In a debate held concerning the failure of the state to fund orphanages during the 1897 Parliamentary sitting, Mr. Woods, a champion of the Catholic cause argued that the:

> average cost of the boys in the Industrial School was 8s. per head and 8s. 7 1/4d. in the Reformatory, the total cost was £14,831.19.s, (20).

and that such expense was an inefficient and ineffective manner in which to fund such care.

His argument had great appeal as the replacement of direct costs with a cheaper subsidy system would have been most appealing to State Treasury, especially as the S.C.C would not lose any substantial control over the boys. It even kept the ultimate power of selecting and releasing the boys it handed over to the Catholic Reformatory. As well there was the added appeal of making the Catholics at least contribute towards the costs of

controlling their offsprings' disproportionate transgressions against accepted behaviour. (21)

Yet despite such inducements coupled to the example of the Girls' Reformatory at Kapunda and the expanded powers of the S.C.C., there was no reason to expect a Boys' Reformatory to spring into existence; let alone one that would be fully staffed, motivated and endowed. The catalyst that brought all these elements together and gave the Reformatory form and purpose was the figure of Fr. Healy, the man to whom the Chief Secretary gave his "sanction".

Fr. Healy was one of the leading figures in South Australian Catholic history. He was judged by his peers to be a man of considerable charm and intelligence, possessing drive and a great capacity for work. He was noted for his stubborness, his astuteness and his strength of will which was enhanced by an acute business sense. (22) Healy was farsighted and purchased land, obtained funds and supporters long before the S.C.C. had its powers expanded and could give him the right to establish and run his own Reformatory.

Healy was well prepared for the task that was his life's work, he was part of the great migrations of Catholic clerics from Ireland in the 1880's. He was not part of an Order and thus differed from the general practice (23). He was also different from many others as he was personally invited to Australia by the Bishop of Adelaide in 1881. (24) Apart from his personal qualities, it was the fact that he was educated at St. Johns' Waterford, a centre for Temperance, that led to the Bishop's invitation.

Alcohol was perceived as one of the major causes of Catholic distress in South Australia. The Plenary Council of Bishops in Australia, which defined dogma and Catholic

action in Australia, made the observation in 1885 that:

> intoxicating drink even if taken only in the same quantity, has a worse effect on the Irish Catholic than on any of his fellow Colonists (25).

This in turn helped explain to the contemporary mind the reason for the apparent poverty of the Irish. For it was part of the:

> prevalent suspicion that the sickness of paupers, like their poverty was self inflicted by drunkenness and dissipation. (26)

Healy was thus invited out as "knowledgeable" in the field of Temperance. As part of his brief he would have had the task of converting the locals into the respectable habit of sobriety. This, again, reveals the value system that later would come to inform the Reformatory; that of middle class thrift, hard work and sober industry.

Yet the task of fighting alcohol abuse was only an aspect of his work. For the first 18 years of his life in South Australia, Healy was charged with the task of helping amend the poor contribution the local Irish Catholics had made to their church.

There was a desperate lack of priests to fulfill even the basic parish tasks (27). Thus Healy was given the task of ministering to the needs of a parish that covered most of the western suburbs of Adelaide. He had to build a church from which to operate and to establish a school for the local parishioners of Thebarton. (28) He was also made prison chaplain and found time, as well, to work with homeless men. (29)

These tasks fully occupied Healy's time, and most importantly they informed him. His task as prison chaplain enabled him to observe the effects of gaoling youth and to ponder their treatment by the court system. (30) He learnt about the nature of the Irish Catholic community in his parish and, as it was one of the poorest areas, he came to reflect upon the judgements of the Plenary Council. Healy also came to know of the work of Tenison Woods and Mary MacKillop which had effectively broken down the view held by the Catholic Bishops that the working class and poor Catholics were not worthy of their attention (31). Prior to the work of Woods and MacKillop the tenor of Catholic Education had been that the working class Catholics could survive with only the rudiments of education which was gained at either the local "board" run school or at the local "Dame" school(32). Their unique work resulted in the establishment of the Catholic parish school system in South Australia, the Josephite Order and a willingness by the local Catholic population to support the work of the religious in educating the poor. (33)

Woods and MacKillop convinced the church hierarchy to attempt to set up schools that would bring respectable middle class values to the workers (34). In such schools the Catholics could match the state system and also deny the state their monopoly of education. Like the state school the parish Catholic school rested upon the idea that:

> the poor were supposedly to improve through contact with the loftier tone of the classroom. (35)

This in turn reflected the belief that the working class had accepted that they had to work at " improving their lot" and sought for their children ... " an entry to the coveted white collar positions". (36)

Yet not all the working class accepted this respectable training for their task in life and, as revealed by truanting statistics, many contradicted this path completely. Healy's work with prisoners and the homeless would have brought him face to face with such issues every day. His response was to try and "save" such non-conformists by use of religious charity. (37)

The problem he faced however was that he was one of very few members of the Catholic Church involved in doing such work. Others were involved in staffing the growing numbers of schools and orphanages. He needed more personnel which, ironically, had been one of the major reasons behind his emigration to Australia. Healy's solution was to found a religious order. This was obviously a long and difficult task; one that was made more difficult by the apparant wariness of new orders by the Bishops stimulated by the struggles between Bishop Sheil and Mary MacKillop over the control of her order. (38) Characteristically Healy's response was to establish the order without permission, beyond a reported verbal agreement with the Adelaide Bishop in 1892. This "illegality" was not rectified until 1923, when his order received the "blessing of Rome".(39)

To house this Order, Fr. Healy purchased property. He used parish income, legacies and his own money to buy the land (40). With such purchases Healy sought to support his new order and ensure independence. This issue of independence again reflected the struggle between MacKillop and Sheil and also reflected Healy's stubborn self-will. Whenever he wrote of the Reformatory, for example, he always called it "my institution". (41)

However, it was not just for the cause of personal control that Healy purchased land, he needed land for his order to survive. Healy would have had little or no access to his parish properties. The church Healy had helped build at Thebarton was a diocesan

property and under the control of the Archbishop. It was unsuitable then because of Healy's desire for independence and because a building in frequent use for parish masses was an unacceptable residence for monks. Similarly, the parish school was unsuitable for Healy's purposes. Thus, he had to obtain land to be able to achieve the ideal of establishing a local religious order.

In dealing with the problems of money and land, Healy revealed his sympathy for an abiding interest of his church, that of accumulating property. The Christian Brothers for example were constantly acquiring land and title deeds in their early years in South Australia. (42) This acquisitive spirit was part of Healy's approach to his faith. When he arrived in the 1880's his first task was the purchase and development of land in Thebarton for a church and a school. Thereafter through thrift and hard work he accumulated enough capital to eventually purchase the site at Brooklyn Park and later to increase his holdings. In this Healy was personifying the paths to respectability and, as he practiced such values throughout his life in South Australia, we can assume he not only believed in their worth and practice, but also that he would have expected his charges to do the same. Hence, when Healy came to found and administer the Reformatory at Brooklyn Park he made sure that such values were instilled into the boys who were referred to him and that the personnel he obtained to run the Reformatory, the Brothers, were also of like mind.

Healy's original acquisitions, which were to house these Brothers, were a moderately sized villa and 25 acres at Brooklyn Park. (43) The site was in a dairying area that had the potential to allow intensive farming that might support Healy's order. The order called itself the Brothers of St. John the Baptist. In 1895 they became the

staff of the local parish school, founded a decade early by Healy and then in 1898, they became the staff of the Boys Reformatory, Brooklyn Park.

The Brothers of St. John the Baptist were vital to Healy's work and they were his creation. Yet, their antecedents had a pedigree that went back to South Australia's foundation. The Brothers were derived from the Temperance Guild of St. John the Baptist.

This Guild began in 1847 when:

> Bishop Murphy ... organised a St. Patrick's Temperance Society at West Terrace which had a membership of 400. (44)

This level of participation was quite high as there were only some 1,649 Catholics in South Australia at the time (45). Not all of them would have been members of the Bishop's immediate flock; yet the Bishop's word was law (46) and the faithful were eager to obey. The Guild, however, withered, but just before its complete collapse, Fr. Julian Tenison Woods, in his position as extra-ordinary agent of the Archbishop of Adelaide, revived the membership in 1867. He established a..."Juvenile Branch known as the Guild of St. John the Baptist" with its own fife and drum band and he dedicated the guild to the task of temperance and thrift. (47)

Woods' addition of the juvenile branch sheds further light upon his aims for, while he linked the adults' activities with those of the juvenile, he kept the juvenile branch structurally separate. Thus, Woods saw the juvenile years as being especially important and that juveniles warranted special training and care. In this, Woods can be

seen to be a forerunner of the later preoccupation with the juvenile and obviously, the work of the Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park. (48)

An important aspect of the juvenile branch was that it had a band. The band was saturated with military discipline and appearance and thus required time and money to organise. As funds and money were short, any decision to commit such outlays needed solid justification; Woods saw the inculcation of discipline, order and military efficiency as important achievements. They were, of course, part of the wider agenda of thrift, hard work and deference – the agenda of respectability.

In this sense then, it can be seen that the Guild was founded to ensure that the juvenile members of the Church sought respectability and that activities of the Guild would see these values expanded and promoted. An example of this is the local meeting held at the girls' classroom of the parish school Thebarton, in which ... "a good programme of songs and recitations were carried out ..." (49). This usual Friday meeting (50) revealed that the members were preoccupied with the participation in the parlour activities of good songs and edifying quotations rather than with joining in the entertainment of the working class "pub" or "vaudeville" (51).

Given Healy's character these aspects of the Guild appealed to him and it is not surprising to note in 1884, when the Guild began to founder, that Healy took up its overall command. As a consequence of Healy's reconstruction of the Guild, it took on the name of its juvenile section and became the Guild of St. John the Baptist. This ensured that the links of temperance and education were maintained, if not emphasised. In doing so, Healy was able to forge a strong link between himself and the Guild members, so much so, that quite often Guild members attributed the founding of the Guild to Healy alone (52).

The Brothers of St. John the Baptist emerged from this era of the Guild's reconstruction. They were the creation of Healy; particularly as it was Healy who "induced" the younger members of the Guild to leave and set up the Brotherhood. (53) Yet the Brothers were also inevitably imbued with the values and purposes of the Guild they had belonged to before. This intermingling of Guild and Order was symbolised by the choice of St. John the Baptist for the patron of the Brothers. For, by this choice, the link of Guild and Order was firmly stated and the work of Healy, in reconstructing the Guild and facilitating the Brothers' ambitions, was acknowledged. Further, the choice of a saint who was patron of those who practiced abstinence and atonement, (he was in fact accredited with having never tasted alcohol and for practicing the rites of purification and cleansing) (54), made sure that the aims of the Guild and the Brothers, were complementary and continuous.

Such a choice of patron was further overlaid with significance, as it implied an attitude that saw alcohol as unclean and those who were victims of its effects, were similarly seen as tainted. This obvious legacy of the Guild was complemented by the Brothers' desire to help or "correct" those who had fallen under the influence of alcohol. Again the choice of patron revealed a link between the Guild and the Order, in that it helped to shape the approach the Brothers followed in helping the "fallen". St. John the Baptist had resisted the allure of alcohol and had practiced rites of ritual purification by virtue of individual, if divinely inspired, will power (55). The Brothers sought to emulate this and, at the same time, instill it into any unfortunates who came to be in their charge. What made the Brothers distinct from the Guild, was the fact that they sought to be totally dedicated to the task. In their words, they were acting in "atonement for such sins" (56) and sought to form an Order of Brothers to practice that atonement.

This atonement sought to fix the responsibility for alcoholism and poverty upon the weak, individual wills of those who fell into such vices. (57) The individuals had failed to develop adequate moral fibre to resist temptation and it was thus up to the Brothers to suffer and atone on their behalf. Further, the Brothers were set the task of teaching the fallen the ways of atonement. These were the paths of respectability - cleanliness, thrift, hard work and deference. Once these lessons were taught and absorbed, the Brothers expected their charges to develop enterprise and desire to succeed and thus achieve respectability.

Reflecting these lessons, the Brothers were living examples of the paths to respectability. They were similar to a type of Australian described by contemporary observers as:

> lower class gentlemen ... (who) ... continued to amaze strangers with their constant striving for respectability, their workaday tidiness and kindly manners, who at meetings were neatly groomed and respectful in their behaviour, who on Sundays and grand occasions took out their best suits and became almost indistinguishable from the middle class. (58)

Reinforcing such attempts was the example provided by the first Superior of the Brothers of St. John the Baptist, Jerome Luddy. His parents, Michael and Julia Luddy, were prominent Guild members and pillars of the Catholic Community. The family had migrated to South Australia from Cork (Ireland) in the 1860's, with neither of the couple receiving any assistance, or causing any bounty to be paid on them. They arrived on different ships, Julia arriving later in 1865, bringing two children with her. Once re-united, they settled down to produce a large and long lived Catholic family. Two

members of the family joined the clergy. A daughter became a Dominican Nun; Sr. Xaveria, who lived to 74 years of age, dying in 1936. However, for the purposes of this work, the most important was a son, Jerome Luddy. He was the person upon whom Healy laid his charge of forming and running the Brothers of St. John the Baptist. It was he who also ran and administered the school at Thebarton and the Reformatory itself (59).

Jerome Luddy was born in South Australia in 1866. He was educated by the Dominicans and left school to join the firm of "Shuttleworth and Letchford", described in the South Australian Directory as a real estate agency located in the Waterhouse Chambers, King William Street, Adelaide. At the age of 25 years, Luddy left the firm to join Healy and form the Brothers. He was described as a cultured singer, a man of great gentleness of manner and something of a natural teacher (60). In partnership with Healy, he controlled the Brothers and the Reformatory for some 40 years, dying on the 8th July 1931, aged 65 years. A testament to his personal self-discipline and will, was the fact that for the last 15 years of his life he ran the Reformatory despite being badly incapacitated from a major accident that he suffered at age 50.

Apart from his personal qualities, Jerome Luddy was noted for his business sense, as could be expected from a member of a real estate firm, who had managed to work his way up to the level of an associate before he resigned. Such qualities held the Reformatory in good stead, as there were many land purchases, subsidies and donations .

Luddy was thus a natural leader of those "amazing young gentlemen", noted for their appearance and manner. He had all the salient qualities of the respectable including a fine singing voice which enabled him to have greater claim to cultural achievement and respectability. He was also very much part of the history of the Guild. His father was a member for 25 years (61) and other members of the family were also

very active in its deeds. It is possible that he was a product of Woods' juvenile branch as he was, after all, only 25 years when he joined Healy at Brooklyn Park. He would then have epitomised the aim of such sodalities, in displaying the ultimate "christian morality" (62) in his personal history and in his choice to help found a religious order and in turn a Reformatory.

One of the reasons why Jerome Luddy was able to be such a leader of men, seeking the attributes of the respectable, was that he was evidently one of very few Brothers who was educated to any degree. The parliamentary papers recorded, in report after report, that only one teacher was available amongst the Brothers at the Reformatory (63). The majority of the Order it would appear, were men such as Tom Supple, or Brother Ignatius as he became known, who had been a letter sorter at the Norwood Post Office before he joined the Order and became their cook (64).

That men of the calibre of Brother Ignatius dominated, is given further credence in that only one of the Order became a priest. This was Fr. Smyth, who succeeded Fr. Healy as supervisor of the Reformatory. Fr. Smyth was something of a prize recruit, as his uncle had been the Papal Legate in Adelaide. Fr. Smyth was thus part of the class of well educated administrators who had originally founded the Guild Movement in South Australia. Yet, given that he was the only one to be seen as having the potential to be adequately trained and educated, despite Healy's aim to have the order as well stocked as possible with priests (65), tends to indicate that the personnel available was ill-equipped to cope with the demands of education.

This lack of potential did not deter the Order from establishing an institution dedicated to the promotion of respectability. Hence in 1896, with the combination of the various elements, which included the S.C.C.,the work of the Catholics in the Kapunda

Girls' Reformatory, the personality and commitment of Healy and Luddy and the existence of the Guild and its offshoot, the Brothers of St. John the Baptist, the Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park came into existence. It was a red letter day for Catholics attempting to achieve a respectable place in society, as shown by the raising of £177.1.0 in donations on the day and the following statement in the Southern Cross:

> The State Childrens' Council were to be highly commended for calling in the aid of religion to help them in reforming boys and girls. It was a good sign of the times, this acknowledgement of the power that is in religion, especially Catholic Religion, for this work of reformation. Poor little uncontrollables. (66).

NOTES

1. Catholic Archives: (C.A.)
   Morrison Index: (M.I.) p.123.
   (N.B. this will be identified with the initials C.A.M.I.).

2. D.Pike, Paradise of Dissent. (Melbourne University Press, 1968 2nd Ed) p.510.

3. ibid p.510.

4. South Australian Archives: (S.A.A.)
   State Childrens Council (SCC) Annual Reports, 1887.
   Government Record Group (GRG): 27/31.

5. R. Kennedy, "Charity and Ideology in Colonial Victoria"
   R. Kennedy (Ed.), Australian Welfare History. Critical Essays. (McMillan, 1982) p.54

6. ibid p.54

7. See chapter 5.

8. Pike, p.510.

9. S.A.A. S.C.C. GRG. 27/31/1893.

10. ibid 1897.

11. K. Wimshurst, "Control and Resistance: Reformatory Girls in Late Nineteenth Century South Australia." Journal of Social History. Vol.18. 1984 - 1985 p. 278.

12. ibid p. 279.

13. ibid p.277.

14. ibid p.277.

15. R. Fogarty, Catholic Education in Australia 1806-1950. (Melbourne University Press, 1959) Vol. 2. p.476.

16. B.K. Hyams and B. Bessant, Schools for the People? (Longman, 1972) p.49.

17. P. Hamilton , " Tipperarifying the moral atmosphere" in Sydney Labour History Group, What Rough Beast, (George Allen and Unwin, 1982) p. 13.

18. ibid p. 21.

19. M. Barbalet, Far from a Low Gutter Girl. (Oxford University Press, 1983) Chpt. 4: passim.

20. C.A. Southern Cross (S.C.): July 1897.

21. Barbalet, p. XV.

22. C.A.M.I. p.123.

23. Fogarty, p.273.

24. C.A.M.I. p.123.

25. E. Campion, Rockchoppers. (Penguin Books,1982) p.61.

26. R. Evans, " The Hidden Colonists: Deviance and Social Control in Colonial Queensland." in J. Roe (Ed.) Social Policy in Australia. (Cassell Australia, 1976) p. 79.

27. Fogarty, p. 259.

28. C.A.M.I. p. 119.

29. C.A.S.C. Nov. 1936.

30. C.A.M.I. p.123.

31. Fogarty, p.476.

32. ibid. p.292.

33. ibid. p.476.

34. ibid p.476.

35. K. Wimshurst, "Child Saving and Urban School Reform in S.A." Melbourne Studies in Education. 1983. p. 210.

36. Fogarty, p.339.

37. C.A.M.I. p.123.

38. Campion, p.72.

39. C.A. Correspondences (C) letter dated 1895 from Mgs. Byrnes. See also a letter dated 14/5/23 to Rome.

40. See C.A. (C) Folio 2, file 22 for legacies, donations and like financial dealings.

41. C.A. (C). See numerous letters that were written in such terms.

42. R. B.Healy , Christian Brothers of Wakefield Street 1878-1978. (Lutheran Printing House, 1978) p.16.

43. C.A. (C). Folio 1.
Letter: W.G. Gunn to Archbishop Spence 6/8/1931 incorporating a table of purchases. See also letter: 21/2/1893.

44. C.A.M.I. p.121.

45. W. Vamplew et al (Ed.), South Australian Historical Statistics. (History Project Incorporated, 1986) p.139.

46. Campion, p.60.

47. C.A.M.I. p.121.

48. Barbalet, p.196.

49. C.A.S.C.: Aug: 1898.

50. ibid : The meetings were held monthly.

51. M. Cannon, Life in the Cities. Australia in the Victorian Age: 3. (Currey O'Neil, 1975) pp. 232-233.

52. C.A.S.C. Dec: 1898. and Dec: 1899.

53. C.A. (C) 15/3/1898.

54. C.A. Fr. Smyth. Sermons: (F.S.S.) Sermon on St. John the Baptist. 1919.

55. ibid 1919.

56. C.A.: lecture notes on the Brothers of St. John the Baptist. Fr. W.L. Cornell.

57. C.A. F.S.S. 1917.

58. Cannon, p.263.

59. C.A.S.C. Death Notice 17/7/1931.

60. C.A.S.C. 17/7/1931.

61. C.A.S.C. 22/10/1916.

62. Fogarty, p.413.

63. SAA: South Australian Parliamentary Papers (SAPP) paper no.2 Table 30, 1913.

64. Salesian Provincial Office, Profiles of Salesians. 1923 - 78. p.104-105.

65. C.A.M.I. p.139.

66. C.A.S.C. 9 Sept. 1898.

CHAPTER TWO

THE CLIENTS AND THEIR COMMITTAL

Amongst those who would have attended the opening ceremony of the Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park when the Chief Secretary charged the Brothers of St. John the Baptist, and Fr. Healy in particular, with the care of the Catholic boys transferring across from the Magill Reformatory, was the first official entrant, Phillips O'Connor. What he thought of this ceremony initiating his proposed reform is not recorded and this is indicative of much of the reform process; the child was rendered an item, one of a group to be processed to a given end, by those very people that Phillips was watching. Phillips task was readily to obey and passively to serve his sentence, thereby proving his reformation. An ironic education for a child on the eve of adulthood as he would be poorly prepared to take on the role of the adult's self directed decision making.

Phillips was only 13 years of age when he was transferred from Magill Reformatory. The mandate that sentenced him, itemised him as number 7/95, indicating that he was the 7th boy sentenced in 1895. This firmly fixed him in his statistical place. All boys sentenced received such a depersonalised numeral identity.

Phillips's family was large. His mother Julia had ten children. Phillips was in the middle and when sentenced was aged 11 years. He had 4 brothers older than himself, the eldest being 16 years of age and one younger, the baby of the family, at 1 1/2 years of age. He had four sisters ranging in age from 14 years to 4 years (1). The family was supported by his father, Edward O'Connor, who was described as "labourer of Shipsters Rd., Kensington", earning 36/- a week. (2)

Phillips was sentenced because he "stole from William Shannon of Kensington Park 10/-" (3). For this he was sentenced "till 16 years" and was admitted to the Magill Boys' Reformatory on the 19th March, 1895.

It was noted upon his committal form that he had been a:

> good boy until the last 12 months. Since when he has not been good but goes out nightly and got with bad boys. (4)

It was also noted that his family were "sober and industrious." (5) Phillips stayed a year in the Brooklyn Park Reformatory leaving in October 1899. (6).

Phillips sums up much of the experience of the boys sentenced to the Reformatory. The poverty of his family was quite typical. When he was sentenced his father earnt less than the estimated minimum wage for South Australia for that year of 41s. 8d. a week. (7). One can assume then that the family lived in cheap and probably cramped conditions, especially given that 12 people shared the home. Admittedly four of the ten children were over 12 years of age and were thus able to have left school, if they followed its path of progression from age 6 to age 12. This did not however mean that the children would have left home. The parents would not have wished to lose a share of the income from their children. Also youth wages were low and made it unattractive to leave the family and its obligations.

It may well have been the poverty that led to Phillips stealing the 10/-, almost a third of his father's income. However the authorities sentencing Phillips would have most likely ascribed it to the "laxity of parental control and parental indifference".(8) They would have seen that he would become one of those children:

> committed to ... reformatory school ... to exercise a beneficial influence upon ... (his) conduct ... that (he) might receive a fair start in life. (9)

The courts, also saw Phillips as one of a special class of boys who:

> mix with other and vicious boys who instruct them in many vices ... they sleep out at night and eventually become criminals. (10).

Yet Phillips' view of life on the streets was that it was part of the way in which he would become self-supporting and adult; preferring it to living with a warren of siblings, whose diets and comforts, due to their father's wage, would have been both poor and few and far between.

Phillips' case reveals the process by which the Reformatory justified its aim of enforcing the contemporary respectable values upon its clients' behaviour and lifestyle.(11) It used the evidence of "laxity of parental control" as justification in committing Phillips to the Reformatory for retraining. It is of interest to reflect that the family was none the less considered "sober and industrious". This denial of the evidence of the investigators about the family and propensity to make unilateral judgements on the needs of the child revealed the extent of the S.C.C.'s power and the lengths to which it was willing to go to see "proper" habits and values inculcated.

The boy Phillips is also of interest, as he is one of the last to be sentenced to the care of the S.C.C. until the age of 16 years. William Castle who is the next to enter the Reformatory after Phillips, was sentenced until 18 years of age. He, however, was originally sentenced a year later than Phillips, although he was also at the age of 11 years at the time of sentencing and he was also originally sent to Magill Reformatory before being transferred to the Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park. Like Phillips, William was from a working class background as his father was a painter.

Unlike Phillips, William was sentenced as "a neglected child whose father charges him as uncontrollable." (12).

This introduces some new perspectives about the tasks of the Reformatory. The change in the age of release indicates that the state was redefining the length of childhood. As of 1896, a person was considered to be a child until 18 years, subject to the care of the "child saving" institutions of the day (13), while Phillips ceased to be treated as a child, at the age of 16 years. At this age, his childhood years legally concluded and he was open to sentencing to gaol and other punitive actions taken by the State against adult transgressors if he committed further crimes. The change of release age had the effect, therefore, of extending the period of grace in which the child could be allowed to make mistakes and be retrained. It also had the effect of diminishing the income offspring could earn for themselves and for their parents, and reflected the attempts to keep children longer at school and out of the workforce. The introduction of class 5 by the Education Department of South Australia was part of this trend. This class, however, was resisted by many parents, as the students had to pay for the privilege of being educated to this level (14). In participating in the extension of the age limits of childhood, the Reformatory was very much part of the prevailing concepts promoted by the State about the child and its upbringing. (15) It is important to consider that William's father committed his son to the Reformatory, thereby revealing an implicit acceptance of the role of the Reformatory and the validity of its values in structuring the maturation process of the child. Mr. Castle was not alone in this, as many children were committed as being "uncontrollable".

The use of the term "uncontrollable" is instructive as it indicates that the child had at least partial responsibility for his situation. Such perception diverted the attention away from the situation of William's family background and saved the state

from addressing the problems of poverty and destitution. William's case is also of interest in that whilst his father had him committed as uncontrollable, the committal process adjudged the boy neglected. This then placed some moral blame upon the parents for the boy's uncontrolled nature and thus further justified the incarceration of William at state expense.

William did not serve out his sentence in the Reformatory, but was put out to service at the age of 14 years. Like others in this situation, he became a servant of some "deserving" person. In William's case he was put out to a farm at Meadows, in the service of a widow, Elizabeth J. O'Loughlin. (16). At Meadows it was assumed that he would experience the "cleansing" effects of the country air and that he would be free from the temptation of the theatre and the bicycle. (17). In service he could learn to put into practice the new values passed on to him by the Reformatory. Such "putting out" was very much part of the accepted ideology in the S.C.C. for controlling and reforming the child. (18).

Having the child learn farming skills, was also part of the ideology. At the Brooklyn Park site, the boys were taught to grow lucerne and how to irrigate. One of the later members of the Reformatory's novitiate, Brother Schutz, remembered ...

> "they used to grow lucerne there (pointing to the west), where there are houses now .... they used to irrigate ... flood from the old salt well ... salty water ... used to flood the lucerne." "They (the inmates) - in the earlier times - they used to do gardening, look after the cows." (19) "All this area was wide open spaces in those days ... You could walk for all afternoon and you wouldn't see anyone ..."(20)

In the case of William, Mrs. O'Loughlin would thus have considered herself to have obtained a trained servant who was cheap and docile, as he was only 14 years old and had been recommended to her by the Brothers.

William appears to have been docile enough for a few years, but in 1902 at age 17 1/2 years he:

> absconded from the service of Mrs. O'Loughlin of Meadows and was arrested for larceny after serving a sentence in Naracoorte gaol. (21).

He was resentenced to the Reformatory and was eventually released to his father on the 26th May 1903 having reached the age at which his sentence expired.

William's case is of further importance as it questions the efficacy of the process. It appears that despite the confinement in the Reformatory and the placement in the country, he still managed to slip into his old ways. His experience is an ironic comment upon the attempt by the state to lengthen the years of childhood, as at 14 years of age, William was placed out as a hired hand and paid an exploitive minimum wage which was set and policed by the S.C.C. (22) Further he was made to live in an alien environment, devoid of any of the emotional, family and peer support he would have received upon the streets of Adelaide. The ultimate irony was his release to the man who had originally committed him to state care.

Adding to the picture is the case of Leo James Byrnes, who was committed in 1923 at age 14 years and one month. When he was sentenced at Peterborough he was described as having :

> no previous convictions but a wayward boy. Some time ago he ran away to Sydney drawing money banked for him by parents, put away for a fortnight (23).

Leo's parents were separated. His mother lived at Torrensville while his father ran a blacksmith business at Yanine. Leo had three siblings, two brothers and a sister, all married. This family was described as:

> Respectable, but mother said to be too lenient and not to exercise proper control over the boy – good home, every comfort (24).

Leo had less mitigating circumstances than both Phillips and William, yet in his sentence he is accorded the same treatment. He was:

> sent to the B.R.B.P. until 18 years old for theft of 3 cheques to the value of £39.7.2. and moneys to the value of £17.10.2. (25).

He had stolen the money from:

> the firm of Parsons and Robertson. Boy went to Melbourne but was arrested at Murray Bridge and brought back. (26).

The three cases are illuminating when they are compared. They show similarities in that all were perceived as products of inadequate parenting and investigations were undertaken by the S.C.C. to prove this and in turn led to the statements about their parents upon the files. Note, however, that Leo Byrnes was not

indicated to be neglected, rather he was seen just as "uncontrollable". This distinguished him from the other two. He was also far more extravagent in his offences. This possibly reflected his age as he was three years older than the other two examples and that he was sentenced 25 years later when a more tolerant stance was taken. He was also from a more affluent and thus acceptable background. Yet despite the differences between the boys and their offences the function of the Reformatory as an instrument of punishment and control remained unchanged for all three and this is well illustrated by their experiences.

The unchanging nature of the Reformatory's approach is further verified with the case of Robert Threadgold. For, while it might be considered justified to incarcerate a thief like Leo in the Reformatory and thereby punish him with a loss of freedom for four years, a different impression of such justice is created by considering Robert's case.

Robert was sentenced in 1920, after pleading guilty to having stolen "one Onoto fountain pen value 15/-" (27). He too was sentenced to the Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park until the age of 18 years. He was described as mischievous with the family being considered to be "Temperate, industrious and orderly" (28). Yet he received a sentence equivalent to that of Leo Byrnes. In fact Robert was a resident in the Reformatory when Leo arrived.

The mandate committal for Robert stated that his family was made up of 10 children, six over the age of 13 years and 4 under that age (29). It was seen that Roberts' problem was caused or, at least, exacerbated by his membership of a large family. This led the S.C.C. to see a need to have him removed and put into an institution where Robert would receive the adequate attention and training needed to develop him

into a respectable adult. Furthermore his deviant tendencies, revealed by his act of theft, would not be passed on to his siblings.

What sort of influence did the experience of attending the Reformatory have upon such boys as Robert? The facts are telling. After Robert had served three years, he was placed out on probation to his father Robert's father was seen as respectable and it could be expected that he would continue to exert a positive influence upon his reformed son and would have little trouble with him. But this was not so. The next entry in official records said of him that he..."seems to have gone wild, leaves his place and stays out late etc." (30).

Consequent to this he was sentenced for breaking and entering a shop and stealing £2.0.0. of goods (31). In 1923 he was returned to the care of the Reformatory.

In this sense he repeated William's pattern as he was put out on licence and returned to his "old ways". In fact these "old ways" appear worse for the experience of his reform. The family also did not seem to have improved by the S.C.C.'s standards, as another son had been born during Roberts' absence and his father was out of work (32). As in the original sentencing, Robert's crime appears to be judged as more serious by the authorities consideration of his family background.

The previous case studies clearly illustrate the two paths by which the boys were expected to be reformed; incarceration for the entire period of the sentence or incarceration followed by either licencing out to acceptable families as servants, or probation to parents. They also show the two major reasons why children were sent to the Reformatory - for the crime of theft and for being uncontrollable.

The assessment by the S.C.C. of the family environment was also important. If this background was considered to be sufficiently inadequate, the state of the family itself appeared to become a major cause of sentencing and putting the child in the care of the state.

This was particularly so for the child who came from a family in which there was a deserted, widowed or separated parent. Checking the records shows that 50 of 300 children who had their parental situation documented were from single parent families, and of these only 9 had the male as the sole parent. It can be inferred from these factors that such families were considered to be inadequate environments in which to enable the already errant child to learn society's values.

Other factors also played a part in the committal decisions. For example, if the parent had remarried, this was seen as worthy of comment in the mandate of sentencing. An instance of this is George Corsey, who was sentenced at Snowtown, at age 14 years. Comment was made that his mother, Annie Sorensen, had remarried and lived with Oscar Sorensen at Port Adelaide (33). George was put into Magill Reformatory and then was transferred to the Brooklyn Park Reformatory at its opening. He served his total sentence at Brooklyn Park, failing to be licenced out or to be the subject of any petition of release. As his peers were either licenced out or released before their sentence was completed it may well be that George was considered both inadequately socialised and lacking any alternative environment to that of the Reformatory, in which to learn the necessary skills for adulthood.

The example of George and his treatment helps to clarify that the function of the Reformatory was to correct parental inadequacies. This was particularly its intention when dealing with boys from families with the mother as the sole breadwinner. In the

mandates in which the female was the head of the household, note was always made of her occupation and often of her income; indicating thereby her poverty in both time and money to dedicate adequately to "controlling" her son. Hence when Edward Lemon was sentenced, under the heading of "family character" it is recorded that his mother was a Charwoman of Owen Street, off Gilbert Street. Edward, in fact, was sentenced "until 18 years as a boy convicted of larceny of 7 lbs. of butter". (34)

Edward was 12 years old at the time of sentencing. Eventually he was put out to service with Mr. R. Honner of Maitland in 1901 when he was aged 15 years. When sentenced, note was made of the fact that his mother was the only responsible adult in the family, and obviously the crime of theft was taken as proof of her inadequacy to parent the boy.

Some mothers openly acknowledged that their boy was beyond their control and sought to use the Reformatory as a means of disciplining their child. This was seen as a final step and signalled an acceptance by the mother of the role of the Reformatory in effectively conveying the necessary social values to allow the boy to achieve respectability. As many parents went to the extreme of committing their child as uncontrollable it can be concluded that the role of the Reformatory was generally acknowledged and accepted in society and that the Reformatory's fundamental values of respectability were widely shared.

In 1900, for example, William Gardner was "charged by his mother as uncontrollable" and "sentenced to the age of 18" (35). In 1901 he went to service, with Mr. Wm. Mager of Tarcowie. He was 15 years old when sentenced and his mother was recorded as living at Fifth Street, Bowden. The same was also the case with 11 years old Francis Davis who, was uncontrollable, and was sent to the Reformatory in 1899 to

serve his sentence until 18 years old. His mother, Eliza Davis of Peel Street, Yatala, was recorded as deserted by her husband. Francis seemed to live up to his description, or at least initially, as he was put out to the service of Mr. J.W. Wilson in 1900 but was returned after six months as unsuitable. He then spent the rest of his sentence in the Reformatory until 1905, serving out the total of his sentence. (36)

The habit of returning unsuitable children was even practiced by the parents. Margaret McMahon sentenced her son in 1903 as uncontrollable. He was 9 years old. She took him back on probation in 1904 but later in the year returned him "for misconduct" (37). Such use of the Reformatory did not always appear successful. Rebecca Bertram of Wright Street had her son committed for larceny of "two Yale locks, two railway tickets and 20/-". Donald, her son, was recorded as being "not too good" (38) in character and further, was a member of a family whose father was dead. The family was made up of seven children over the age of 13 years and 3 under that age . Rebecca thus was perceived as being unable to provide proper care and attention, yet the Reformatory seems to have had little more success than Rebecca, as the boy was recorded as being detained in the Industrial School in 1912, some five years later, aged almost 17 years (39).

The above patterns were repeated for the situation in which the male was the sole parent. Roy Forrestal, sentenced at age 11 years for being uncontrollable, is a good example of such boys. His father was a clerk, working at the "Adelaide Goods Sheds" . The boy stayed one year, until 1905, when he was released to the care of his father.(40) Note, however, a significant difference between single parent families in which there was a male at the head of the household, as compared with a female head. Roy was released to the care of his father, while boys such as Donald Bertram were not generally

released to the care of their mothers. In fact the records reveal that the mother did not often attain probation of their son.

This can be seen as a reflection of the general approach of society to the role and function of women, in which they were expected to provide for the nurturing and care for the young, rather than to discipline and support them. In many ways this is exemplified in the famous Harvester Judgement which defined the male as the breadwinner and allocated to women the role of dependant and the task of care giver (41). This in turn meant lower wages for females as the judgement gave the female only half the wage of the males. It also gave these females a greater responsibility without the means to fulfil these tasks. That is:

> women were now expected to be more conscientious mothers and attend to the child's social as well as physical formation. This increase in maternal responsibilities enabled the State to exert a greater degree of control over the entire population. Women's economic dependance was ... enshrined in the wage structure ... (42).

Yet such enshrinement of dependency left the female without the means to fulfil the responsibilities that society had allocated. Hence, the Reformatory operated to maintain the prevalent code of the value and use of females in the family and the economy. At the same time it ignored the major cause of the problems the female, single parent family's lack of income.

What of the boys with no family, the orphans who offended and were sent to the Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park?

Patrick Dunn is such a case. His family was victim of death and desertion. In his case the state acted as the parent, taking up the task in the absence of suitable relatives . Patrick's father was "address unknown" and his mother had died. The state split the family up, the boys going to one institution the girls to another. Ironically the action caused the family to cease to exist. It also had the effect of ensuring the complete dependency of the children upon the state for their identity and very survival. The state, reflecting its belief that boys and girls needed to be raised differently and separately, placed Patrick Dunn into an all boy's Reformatory, expecting him thereby to develop to be an upright honest citizen (43).

Yet Patrick's path was anything but ideal. He was put into Magill Reformatory when his widower father was sick in hospital. Patrick was deemed to have .."no sufficient means of subsistence". This situation was confirmed by the disappearance of his father from Adelaide Hospital, which for all intents and purposes, orphaned Patrick. He was at this stage 10 years old. (44).

From Magill, Patrick was sent to service with "Mary Luce, Roman Catholic Widow" (45). There he caused problems and was returned to Magill, only then to be given to "N.H. Humphrey of Mitcham" (46). Again he was returned as unsuitable, but this time he was sent to the Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park and stayed there until his sentence expired. He then was collected by his sister Rose, who had been licenced to "Mr. M.J. McGrath, R.C. Postmaster Redhill" (47) and they apparently attempted to set up again as a family.

In the case of Patrick, the state could not claim to have wrought any great changes. He proved difficult as a servant and was constantly rejected, thereby negating the process by which he was supposed to develop to adulthood. His eventual referral to

Brooklyn Park revealed the state to have recognised that Patrick needed constant surveillance and control as a total dependent, if he was to become the adult they envisioned.

Patrick's case is emulated by the story of David Cruse. He was described when sentenced at the age of 12 years as ... "a truant, stole money from Mr. Cowling Chemist at North Adelaide: 7/-". His widowed mother was a ... "charwoman who cannot afford maintenance." David lived with his mother in the "workingmans' cottages at Stanley Street, North Adelaide" (48). She was caring for a family of five on what would have been less than the minimum wage for females of 27/6d, far below the male rate of 62/1d. (49). Such social inequities didn't concern the authorities as they acted to break up the family, with David being sentenced to the Industrial School Magill in 1917 . He absconded two years later for a month, and when recaptured was sent to the Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park at age 16 years. Here he remained until his sentence expired. (50)

These case studies illustrate the process and path by which the boys became involved with the Reformatory. They were chosen because they illustrate some of the salient characteristics of the boys and the issues that surround their presence at the Reformatory.

Reviewing the boys it is seen that a definite cycle is followed by those sentenced to the Reformatory. The pattern is set in the opening year of 1898, when of the 13 who were transferred from Magill, the majority were between the ages of 13 and 15 years . Seven of these boys left by the end of their first year at Brooklyn Park. Only one remained for some time but he left in 1902 by absconding. Hence, apart from this one long term case, the boys left either by serving out their time or because they were put

out to service. The age at which this occurred was about 15 years, despite the fact that their sentence was not to expire before they turned 18 years old. These ages represented crucial stages in the development of the boys. The age of committal, 13 years, for example, concurred with a time when the boys were only just starting to learn the techniques of surviving in the adult world of work and responsibility for the boys were no longer bound by the compulsory clauses of the Education Act. The boys were able to leave school and enter work. Thus clients of the Reformatory were experiencing a new and sanitised environment at a crucial stage in their development. Such disorientation and dependency would have made the boys a little more tractable than if they were older or more experienced in the world, and would have seen them lose a lot of the "street education" they had already received.

The pattern of few boys remaining to serve out their sentence until 18 years was maintained throughout the life of the Reformatory. In 1899 the average age of leaving was 15.5 years old. In 1900 the age was 15 years and the same in 1905. Some boys did leave the Reformatory later than others and some, in fact, stayed until almost 20 years of age. Yet these were fairly rare. Generally the length of stay was some two years, from the ages of 13 to 15 years. Despite the age for release being raised from 16 to 18 years in the opening years of the Reformatory, in practice the age of 16 remained the age by which the boys could expect to obtain release. (51)

Equally, the reasons for committal remain constant. Of these, a majority were for the crime of theft; 98 out of the 207 boys who attended in the first decade were committed for some crime against property. This was three times greater than any other reason for committal. The thefts as such were petty enough, yet the sentencing was not. Boys received up to eight years in some cases. Generally the amount taken was less than £5.0.0. with some as low as 6/-. (52) The money was often spent upon pleasure

items and trips, which often led to their detection and arrest (53). Yet such theft was usually from other poor people and would have represented a substantial amount to both the thief and the victim, often a week's rent or food. Hence the "flashing around" and conspicuous spending by some of the boys.

Such theft represented an attempt to obtain privileges and goods that the parents' poverty or the work situation would not allow. It also acted as a statement of defiance or rebellion against the very situation that had led to the child being in such dire poverty and destitution. This was unconscious, in the form of trying to impress one's peers by undertaking a dramatic theft or was just an act of almost aimless pleasure seeking. Whatever the full reasons for the theft, a link of poverty and theft is clear in the examples that have been examined.

This link occurs even in some of the more unusual cases of boys committed to the Reformatory. Leonard Hickey stole:

> 1 camera, 1 kitbag, 1 thermos flask, 1 clock, 2 clothes brushes, 1 looking glass, 1 tobacco pouch, 1 comb, 2 pocket knives, 1 nail brush, 1 revolver, 1 glove, 1 strop, 5 tins tobacco, 3 boxes cigarettes, 1 pair scissors, 2 fountain pens, 2 pipes, a quantity of fireworks ... £5.10.0 ... all from a shop in St. Peters in 1917 (54).

Then, on the next day, 4th August, he stole at Norwood "1 riding saddle of the value of £2.0.0.", and on the 12th August, at Gawler "2 double barrel shotguns and 7 boxes of gun cartridges ... £16.3.9." (55)

There was no statement in the sentencing mandate which outlined what motivated him to take such an odd assortment of goods. He was arrested and sentenced until he turned 18 years. He was desribed as being of :

> fairly good character up until 5 weeks ago. Since then has been playing truant from school (56).

It is interesting to note that he was not sentenced for truanting, nor was any action taken against him for this truanting.

Leonard's family provides a clue to his socio-economic position. His mother lived at 14 Rundle Street, Kent Town and paid 14/- a week rent. She was:

> not in good circumstances and was obliged to go out working for a living - bears a good character and is of sober habits and a very respectful person (57).

This, in line with cases previously described, indicates the authorities' major concern was that the mother was not providing adequate parenting and that Leonard needed retraining. They were not interested in addressing her financial situation which was at the root of the family's problems. Yet they were impressed enough to record that she was a very respectful person. This entry illustrates the values the Reformatory expected to inculcate into the boys - the sober habits of respectability. The mother was considered too weak to control and educate her son and as a consequence another model had to replace her - the Reformatory.

Harold aged 10 years, stole 5/6d worth of wheat in 1914. He was sentenced until the age of 18 years. His father was adjudged ... "very indifferent. He had been convicted of drunkedness on various occasions" (58). Helping the authorities condemn Harold was the admission of his mother that ... "we cannot control him at all. I think it would be better to put him away" (59). This was reported in that major shaper of public opinion, the press, and this press report was included in Harold's S.C.C. file. (60)

We see the same sentence, regardless of how bizarre the crime or the nature of the circumstances that led to it. From this it can be established that the S.C.C. saw the families' failure to control their offspring, as the reason to step in and undertake the role of parenting. The major control that operated over the S.C.C., it would appear, was that the sentence had to end by the child's 18th year. Hence, an orphan, a petty criminal, a miscreant and a perpetrator of a major crime were all one in their sentence and in their treatment.

Another major group of children to end up in the Reformatory whose cases have not yet been described, are those who were defaulters. Boys from this group came in larger numbers in the later years of the reformatory. These boys, who had been sentenced for having failed or refused to pay a fine set by the courts for minor misdemeanors, were generally sentenced for a week at most. This must have been very unsettling for the inmates who were in the Reformatory on a long term basis, especially as the boys who were defaulting were usually older than the average age. There appears to have been no rationale for putting these boys in the Reformatory and this seems to deny the logic behind the practice of Reformation. How could boys be reformed in a week? What could the Reformatory do with them? The very idea of a Reformatory was to separate the child from its family and negative influences so as to train them in a sanitised atmosphere whereas these boys were gone within a week, hardly any time to

achieve the desired effects of isolation. In 1902 for example, out of the 33 boys interned, 9 were there for default of payment of fines. The majority of these had been originally fined for use of indecent language in a public place (61). Were the authorities attempting to scare or warn such boys of their future by placing them in the Reformatory or were they there simply because of a lack of space elsewhere? Whatever the reason, all that is known of these boys is a name, a number, a sentence and age.

The sentencing of defaulters to limited confinement at the Reformatory confirms that the Reformatory was perceived fundamentally as a means of enforcing the morality of the day. It corrected the transgressions of any family, which had failed to educate its child to proper "public behaviour" as revealed, literally, through bad language. The State's confidence in the Reformatory to make miraculous transformations upon such defaulters must have been at a peak in 1902, to have such a large number of defaulters sentenced to a period at Brooklyn Park. Such confidence is confirmed by the S.C.C. annual reports, containing as they did glowing comments upon the work and effectiveness of the Reformatory (62).

The criteria that denoted successful reformation are revealed when one examines the boys who were considered "reformed" and thus released earlier than their sentence demanded. The means by which such boys were brought to notice, assessed and judged was by petition. Such petitions are interesting in their structure alone. They asked questions about where the parents went to church, how often, asked for references and demanded why the child was to be given such grace as to obtain a petitioned release. It even asked what employment the child was to have. Personal issues such as the state of the family, the size of the house, the place where the child was to sleep were also investigated. Once this form was filled out, the whole process was followed up by extensive interviews (63). The parents had to prove themselves worthy of having their

child back by assuring the authorities that they could promote and conform to a correct moral and physical environment. If not, the petition would be refused.

Sometimes petitions were granted readily, allowing the child to stay less than a year at Brooklyn Park. In the opening days of the Reformatory, John Burke of Parkside was released to his parents who were described as being "sober, industrious but poor" (64). In his case the sobriety of the parents and their industry, sufficiently outweighed the negative aspects of their poverty to allow the home environment to be considered adequate in its example.

Another boy, John Shephard, was 16 years old when he was sentenced. John had been found to be a "neglected boy" , yet he was to stay for only six months. His father however was a stone mason, which was a fairly skilled and stable occupation (65). Interestingly, a brother of John Shephard, Ernest, sentenced in 1903 at the age of 12 1/4 years, for theft of a watch and chain, did not obtain release until he was 17 years old (66). At this time the father was recorded as having difficulty in obtaining work.

The timing of the petition also seemed to affect the chances of its success, as much as did the home situation of the boy's family. It appears to have been easier to obtain release as the Reformatory entered the 1920's. Yet even in these cases, the proof of an appropriate home was still demanded if the petitioner was to earn the release of the child.

David Collarton for example, was placed in the care of the Reformatory by his father on 3 April 1919. On 2 February 1920 aged only 16 years, he was released to his father following a very short period of internment. Supporting the case for his release

was a reference from Fr. Healy. The memo that gave David release, made comment upon both the family and the home:

> I would respectfully recommend this lad be given a trial at home. His father thinks he has learned a lesson and will be more amenable to discipline. The home is a good one and Mr. Collarton is quite capable of looking after his son (67).

Mr. Collarton also had the other positive attributes of being married, in regular work and being a regular church goer. David was also an only child, thus enabling his father to give him his full attention. The case was easily and rapidly dealt with. The date of the memo recommending his release being the same as the day he was released and it was composed only a few days after the petition was lodged. David was thus released readily into what the S.C.C. considered a "normal" or "apt" environment. If however this environment varied from the married, working, respectable parents then problems would have ensued.

George Clifford is an example of a boy whose petition for release was not granted readily, even though the timing of the petition coincided with a period of increasing readiness to release the child. George's petition is an example of the S.C.C. considering information about relatives, rather than merely focussing upon the situation of the parents. George was born on 26 September 1905 and he was aged 14 years 5 months when he was committed to the Reformatory in 1920. In the mandate for committal it was stated that he was of "good character, attends C.B.C. regularly" (68). He was a member of a family consisting of three girls aged 23 years, 22 years and 15 years, and three boys aged 27 years, 21 years and 18 years, with George being the youngest. At a later point in the mandate, the statement of his character was contradicted by the

investigating officer ... "Character: very bad, will not work, steals money, tells lies". He had been before the court on the 26th November as being ... "unlawfully on premises with five other boys ... whipped " (69).

George was unusual in that his petition for release came from his brother Daniel. The petition offered to the authorities as proof of Daniel's suitability as a surrogate parent, a seven room house and a job for George as a cleaner at a picture theatre that Daniel owned. Daniel himself was a sober respectable businessman, aged 32 but unmarried.

A report, that the S.C.C. considered in determining whether or not to release George to his brother's care, claimed that George:

> is now in second class, has improved very much and promised, if released, and given another chance that he will try and make good. Feeling that he has had sufficient discipline and on account of the serious ill health of his mother (heart trouble) they are very desirous of having him released as soon as possible (70).

The S.C.C. obviously wary of releasing George to the care of his brother, commissioned a further more detailed report. Ironically, this report noted George's record as being:

> four abscondings, one placing out with Daniel Clifford on probation. After six weeks absconded. Inspectors reports, one fair, one indifferent (71).

Yet the S.C.C. released George. The crucial factor was the fact that George was to have a job and a solid home run by a businessman who obviously fitted the ideal young successful man.

In contrast to the success of the brother obtaining the release of George, is the case of a boy merely recorded as "Toweaker". He was petitioned for release by his sister. She was married, 19 years old and working as a house keeper. She offered to the authorities a position for her brother as an apprentice cabinet maker at De Youngs of Gilbert Street. In these pieces of information we see a parallel to the case of Daniel Clifford; the sister was as respectable as Daniel, though much younger and she offered as good a position as Daniel's offer of making his brother a cleaner at his picture theatre. Furthermore, "Toweaker" had no past history of absconding or failed probation. Yet the boy was not released. The reason lay in the S.C.C's opinion of the powers of the girl to provide an adequate role model and control over her brother:

> I fear this girl would not be able to control her brother. He is very hard to manage and was such a naughty boy prior to his committal and released, will go back to his former companions (72).

Behind this we can infer that there was a definite opinion regarding the ability and role of women in the upbringing of children. Daniel, a male, was seen as a far better role model than a married woman.

To be fair the judgements were not all so hard to make nor the decisions so unjustifiable. William Boswell, for example, was refused permission to visit his aunt's place, Mrs. Crawford, despite the fact that William was progressing very well and was

exhibiting all the necessary cues for reformation. The officer investigating the request informed the S.C.C. that:

> The home is most undesirable for a boy. From a reliable source I am informed that these people indulge in sly grog selling and drinking goes on in the home late at night (73).

Such examples reveal that the work of the Reformatory was at least partially based upon the authorities' fear of the influence of a corrupt environment upon juveniles. The Reformatory was thus there to replace the family which was at fault and not to be trusted, with a sanitised environment and suitable role models. These in turn reflected the dominant sexual stereotypes and values of society and obviously, the opinions of the S.C.C.

As previously mentioned, no outreach work was done by the Brothers of the Reformatory in an attempt to address the major reasons behind such poor family situations. In adopting such a limited approach, it can be seen that the Brothers' reform work could only be continued in the "outside world" when the child could be released to a special environment that matched the Reformatory. The irony of this process was that the boy was reduced to a dependent. If he suited the model and was able to exhibit the acceptable behaviour then he could be trusted to leave the Reformatory. If, however, the boy rejected, or exhibited independent behaviour, then he remained within the Reformatory for his entire sentence. He might be released if, and when, the rare circumstances occurred in which a matching environment of control and surveillance was found. The search for this like environment required extensive research into the family background and testing of the boy's and the family's character - all of which was recorded on the mandates and petitions. Hence, when a boy was considered reformed and

the family did not match the desired type then he was not released. Thus, by such actions the Reformatory recognised that the boys it moulded were not up to the task of facing temptation; they were too dependent upon the Reformatory environment to maintain their reformed state.

A last aspect revealed by the petitions is the relationship between the parents and the authorities. In this interaction the parent was cast in the role of defendant seeking to explain why the child was to be released and why the child was inadequately trained. To maintain this relationship the parents were kept ignorant and distant from the work of the Reformatory. This is best illustrated by the almost pathetic reasons given for asking for the release of the child. One mother claimed she wished to give her son "a mother's love" and for this she required his release. Needless to say she had to go on living unrequited. Another argued that they wished to give their son the "better influence of the home". (74) This bald statement apparently offended the S.C.C. and led to copious investigations of the family, the upshot of which was a round condemnation of the family as soaks and drunkards and a recommendation that extended the sentence of the boy until his age forced the Reformatory to release him. (75)

Such statements reveal the almost secretive nature of the Reformatory's work. Parents were not privy to the affairs of their sons and this maintained the assumed infallibility implied in the Reformatory's carte blanche control of their charges' lives. This confirms the arguments made earlier that boys were sentenced for committing acts that indicated their failure to adhere to social mores and that such failures were considered to have originated in the family environment, especially if that environment did not match the respectables' view of child education and upbringing.

The preceding case studies reveal the types of boys sent to the Reformatory in its years of operation. They have been selected as being typical of the total sample available. A synopsis of the type of boy committed is that they were working class in origin, in the sense that their parents were in poorly paid manual occupations. This poverty was intensified by the large sizes of the families and the fact that a significant proportion had only a single adult as head of the family and main income provider. Of these, the most disadvantaged were the families headed by a single female, for her employment was often the most menial and least well paid.

These conditions go some way to explaining why the majority of the boys were sentenced for theft, although the children would not necessarily have stolen to supplement the family income. They may have wanted to possess what they had no chance of attaining in the normal course of events. This, in turn, may also explain the bravado and independence shown by the boys to their peers which often led to their arrest.

The remaining numbers of committals came from the child transgressing against the rule of propriety. This includes the charges of being uncontrollable and using indecent language. A small number also had committed the wrong of truancy; the failure to fulfil the minimum attendance requirements. This was 35 days a quarter prior to 1905 and four days of a five day school week after 1905. The compulsory clause applied only to children between 6 and 13 years of age, with the upper age lifted to 14 years in 1915. As the Reformatory took boys from 13 years old, the truant client numbers were low, and although it is interesting to note that whilst the Reformatory was not overrun by truants they represented a discreet part of the Reformatory population. Such boys were not originally sentenced to the Reformatory for truanting but rather for other transgressions. The truancy officers obviously did not often use the Reformatory as a

place of correction, despite the clients of the Reformatory being "poor characters", "poorly educated." (76) This is itself is a noteworthy fact, as the act of truanting was of great concern to the educational authorities at the turn of the century and a considerable amount of time and effort was spent enforcing the compulsory clause of the Education Acts. (77)

Given that truancy was of great concern to the authorities, it begs the question as to why the Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park was rarely used to correct such transgressions. The answer may lie in the fact the contemporary Catholic schools were noted for being "less strict in the enforcement of the regulations and that they objected to, and in some cases even undermined, the efforts of attendance officers." (78) Several boys who were sentenced to the Reformatory were even recorded as truants of a number of months standing, from local Catholic schools. The Catholic schools had thus failed to report or have action taken against the boys for fear that they might be taken away to non-Catholic schools or institutions. (79) It is not surprising, then, that the inspectors recorded such information with disapproval.

It is also not surprising that parents who wished to keep their children available for work sent their children to Catholic schools, even if they were not Catholic themselves. Such is the case with the Quinn family in the 1920's, who were entered into the Reformatory on the strength of their attendance at a Catholic Parish School and who were expelled from the Reformatory when their true non-Catholic situation was discovered. (80) It was interesting that these boys were truants, and were finally caught by the authorities through petty acts of larceny or for disturbing the peace, during school hours.

An example of active truanting is provided by the case of Cornelius Kirby. He was admitted to the Boys' Reformatory in 1902 at age 17 years and 9 months, for unlawfully disturbing the public peace. He was kept in the Reformatory until he turned 18 years in September. Cornelius had been in the Reformatory system before. He had been sentenced as an uncontrollable child in 1898 to the Boys' Reformatory, Magill and when convicted he was described as a "very untruthful and disruptive truant". In contrast, his mother was described as "sober and industrious". (81)

Cornelius had been the subject of correspondence prior to conviction in 1898, with regard to his truanting. His mother wrote to the State Childrens Council in 1897 that:

> Cornelius will not attend school and is quite uncontrollable, the schoolmaster told me to write to you to see what can be done about it. (82)

She added that she wished the matter of her writing to be kept secret as she was frightened her son would become very bitter towards her. She wrote again, a month after an inspector had visited, that "my son has not been to school since you were up last to see me ... he is quite uncontrollable." (83) This she followed up by getting the head teacher of the local school to write to the local police, to obtain a reference to enable the boy to be committed. She didn't want to be involved and said so in his letter, but urged the police to act as:

> the boy's example is a menace to the good conduct of other better disposed boys and for the sake of the other boys and the lads own future welfare, I think it is extremely advisable that the

> necessary steps be taken immediately for having the boy placed in the Reformatory School. (84)

James Willis is another example of a truant at the school. He was sentenced in 1898 as "a boy convicted of theft of Tasma Tonic Ale". He was 12 years and 9 months old. The value of the Tonic was a petty 8d. James' father earnt £1 per week with which he supported 4 children in the family beside James ranging in age from 17 to 4 years of age. The family thus lived in considerable poverty which would have precluded the purchase of luxuries such as tonic ale. It also would have meant that the family would have found it hard to maintain a home and a reliable diet, forcing the children to go to work as soon as possible to make ends meet. This included the practice of going to work on days when school was operating and the children, such as James, were required by law to attend. Consequently the report on James stated:

> the boy is in the habit of playing truant and running away from home, for the last 12 or 15 months and his mother states she was unable to control him and his step father is usually away at work (85)

James remained at the Reformatory until November 1901 when he was released for service to Mr. J. Grunike of Stirling North. He remained at service until 1902 when he absconded and committed larceny. He was resentenced to the Reformatory and remained there until May 1903 when he went out again to service, this time to Mr. Willis of Balaklava. He was then 7 months short of finishing his sentence. (86)

These cases illustrate the fact that truanting had little direct role in putting the boy into the Reformatory. Rather, such behaviour was seen as part of a package of errors that made the boy uncontrollable and thus eligible for the Reformatory which

acted more to restrain the boy than to educate him. If the Reformatory's primary task was to educate, then its clients would have included more truants and a greater emphasis would have been placed on correcting truancy. As it was, truancy, the deliberate avoidance of formal education, was not a vital aspect of the clients' committal.

The paths to committal reveal that the boys were there more for reasons beyond their control, than for any act of genuine and deliberate challenging of the social order. In many ways they posed very little threat to the immediate status quo. Ironically, many boys were even placed into the Reformatory by their parents as a method of minimising their outgoings in both money and energy.

When these paths are considered along with the background of the majority of the boys, poor working class, then we can conclude that the Reformatory was there as an instrument of effecting early and punitive control of the children. When this is added to the pre-occupation of the officers and the courts with the family background then it can be inferred that the task of the Reformatories was to ensure the child was correctly brought up, as the respectable had come to define such upbringing. In other words the Reformatory was in existence as an instrument to replace the family for the child, so that the inadequate parenting, as revealed by the child's deviancy, could be efficiently and effectively corrected, thereby enabling the juvenile to eventually become a respectable adult.

NOTES

1. South Australian Archives (SAA) Government Record Group (GRG)
   i.e. S.A.A: G.R.G. 27/12/1895 -1908. "Phillips"
   "Brooklyn Park Reformatory Admissions 1895-1908".

2. ibid 1895 "Phillips"

3. G.R.G. 29/121/1895. "Phillips"
   "Mandates for Committal".

4. G.R.G. 27/21/1895 "Phillips"

5. G.R.G. 29/121/1895 "Phillips"

6. ibid.

7. W. Vamplew et al(Ed.) South Australian Historical Statistics. (S.A.H.S.)
   (History Project Incorporated, 1986) p. 92.

8. G.R.G. 27/31/1887.
   S.C.C. Annual Report.

9. ibid 1887.

10. ibid 1897.

11. See Catholic Archives (C.A.) Southern Cross (S.C.). 9-9-1898: It dealt with the question of defining the qualities of respectable adulthood as...
"... to earn an honest living ... behave like honest men and good citizens."

12. G.R.G. 27/12/1897. "Castle".

13. G.R.G. 27/31/1896.

14. D. Grundy, "Free Schooling and the State in South Australia" Melbourne Studies in Education. 1983. p. 196.

15. S. Tiffin, "In Pursuit of Reluctant Parents". in Sydney Labour History Group, What Rough Beast (George Allen and Unwin, 1982) Chpt. 6.

16. G.R.G. 27/12/1896. "O'Loughlin"

17. G.R.G. 27/31/1897.

18. ibid 1897.

19. Bro. Schutz ... Interview No. 2.

20. Bro. Schutz ... Interview No. 1.

21. G.R.G. 27/12/1902. "O'Loughlin"

22. In a later reference (GRG 27/31/1919) Wages for children reached 10/- a week. Wages for adult males was 70s. 5d. and adult females 33s. 3d. (S.A.H.S. p. 292).

23. G.R.G. 29/121/1923. "Byrnes".

24. ibid.

25. ibid.

26. ibid.

27. G.R.G. 29/121/1920 S.C.C. 47/20 C. 650 C. 730. "Threadgold" Mandate (Two mandates exist in this file).

28. ibid.

29. G.R.G. 29/121/1920 (Mandate 'B'). "Threadgold"

30. G.R.G. 29/121/1923. "Threadgold"

31. ibid.

32. Mandate 'A' dated 20/10/20 indicates the father in work as a store keeper's assistant. Mandate 'B' 5/4/1923 indicates he was unemployed.

33. G.R.G. 27/12/1896. "Corsey"

34. G.R.G. 27/12/1898. "Lemon"

35. G.R.G. 27/12/1900. "Gardner".

36. G.R.G. 27/12/1900. "Davis"

37. G.R.G. 27/12/1904. "McMahon"

38. G.R.G. 27/12/1907. "Bertram"

39. G.R.G. 29/121/1912. "Bertram"

40. G.R.G. 27/12/1904. "Forrestal"

41. A. Summers, Damned Whores and God's Police. (Penguin Books, 1975) p. 337.

42. ibid p. 341.

43. G.R.G. 27/12/1897. "Dunn"

44. ibid.

45. G.R.G. 29/121/1892. "Dunn"

46. G.R.G. 29/121/1894. "Dunn"

47. G.R.G. 27/12/1897. "Dunn"

48. G.R.G. 29/12/1917. "Cruse"

49. S.A.H.S. p. 292.

50. G.R.G. 29/121/1917. "Cruse"

51. Appendix 1 (e).

52. Appendix 1 (a).

53. G.R.G. 29/4/1921. "Petitions for release" - Reginald Magill is an example of such "flashy behaviour". He is discussed in Chapter Four.

54. G.R.G. 29/12/1917. "Hickey"

55. G.R.G. 29/121/1919. "Hickey"

56. G.R.G. 29/121/1917.

57. ibid.

58. G.R.G. 29/121/1914. "Healey"

59. ibid.

60. The clipping was titled "Pathetic Cases in Court" .

An equally unusual case was Joseph Stiegleman who stole a cigar and a duck and was committed until 18 years old.

(G.R.G. 27/12/1901.) He was released to Mr. Morris M.P. 12 days after sentencing.

61. Appendix 1 (a).

62. G.R.G. 27/31/1887 - 1916. All S.C.C. Annual Reports.

See also discussion in Chapter One.

63. See examples contained within the following:

G.R.G. 27/4/1920 and G.R.G. 27/4/1921.

64. G.R.G. 27/4/1920. "Burke"

65. G.R.G. 27/12/1899. "Shephard"

66. G.R.G. 27/12/1903. "Shephard"

67. G.R.G. 27/4/1920. "Collarton"

68. G.R.G. 29/121/1920. "Clifford"

69. ibid.

70. ibid.

71. ibid.

72. G.R.G. 29/121/1920. "Toweaker"

73. G.R.G. 29/121/1920. "Boswell"

74. G.R.G. 27/4/1920. "McCarthy"

75. G.R.G. 29/121/1921. "McCarthy"

76. South Australian Parliament Debates (SAPD) Legislative Council. December 1915 - 3097; 3098.

77. P. Cashen, "No you don't Wilke, I know your game. The work of School Attendance Officers in South Australian Schools in the 1920's and 1930's". Journal of Australian and New Zealand History of Education Society. (ANZHES Journal) Vol. 11. No. 2, 1982. passim.

78. ibid p. 18.

79. E. Campion, Rockchoppers (Penguin Books, 1982) p. 61.

80. Chapter Two

81. G.R.G. 29/121/1902 "Kirby"

82. G.R.G. 29/121/1898 "Kirby"

83. G.R.G. 29/121/1902 "Kirby"

84. ibid.

85. G.R.G. 29/121/1898 "Willis"

86. G.R.G. 29/121/1902 "Willis"

CHAPTER THREE

INSTRUCTING THE CLIENTS

> The mind of the child is soft and pliable ... it is easily impressionable ... the young heart is easily moulded into the right shape ... the early lessons are the ones that remain ... The all important part is of exacting obedience and respect ... parents must ... insist upon their commands being obeyed ... their companions are to be Catholic children of good moral character. Parental authority must be upheld - parents ruin children by allowing them too much of their own way - those parents are acting contrary to the order established by Almighty God. (1)

These words spoken by Father Smyth in a sermon in 1911 sum up the approach to education taken by the Brothers of St. John the Baptist at their Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park. Father Smyth at the time was second in command of the Reformatory to Father Healy and was marked out to be his successor. He was a foundation member of the order and had been chosen by Father Healy to study for the priesthood so that he would be a suitably qualified successor as superintendent. At this stage Father Smyth had been associated with the Brothers of St. John the Baptist and its Founder, Father Healy, for over two decades and thus was well qualified to outline the educational approach used by the Brothers at their Reformatory.

It was a view of education that saw the child as passive and a receiver of impressions and instructions. The child was like a blank slate upon which was to be written the lessons for future life and once impressed thereon they would be extremely difficult to remove. These indelible marks were made not so much by the content of the lessons but rather by their hidden curriculum, their moral message. The key to these moral lessons were the twin values of obedience and respect. The learning of these values would, Father Smyth argued, see the child achieve the proper moral life, the life

of the successful, respectable Catholic person. The sermon also isolated some other factors necessary to enable the child to be successfully educated. The first of these was the presence of good examples. In Father Smyth's terms, these were the primary educators the parents as well as Catholic children of good moral character. The absence of these would see the child follow its natural inclinations.

These inclinations reflect another aspect of Father Smyth's beliefs as to the factors involved in sucessfully educating a child. The child had to be controlled. The child's natural inclinations showed the weakness of human nature. In his sermon Father Smyth argued that the child had to be controlled and be made to respect commands and orders of those in authority. The children could not be left to themselves as their natures were weak and they would tend to bend towards corrupt or evil activities, not the least being the wilful ignoring of the Catholic Church and its teachings. Consequently Father Smyth argued for a strict educational process. He wanted the child to learn law and order and to know the proper respect for power and the moral values of the Catholic religion. He wanted children to become respectable adults and thus be a credit to the Church.

In putting these values into practice at the Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park, Father Smyth and Father Healy, with the other members of the Order of St. John the Baptist, set up an essentially conservative educational regime. Central to its educational practices was the use of religion as a means of education for moral respectability as well as a means for ensuring discipline and obedience. In this the Reformatory was not substantially at odds with other Catholic educational institutions of the time, whose basic perception of Catholic education and life was made up of a:

> rigid puritanism 'expressed by' its tough rules, strict laws, its stress on obedience, duty and a black and white morality. (2)

These views were prevalent in the era in which Father Smyth and Father Healy grew up and were themselves educated. In the state schools of the time, the ideals of Hartley, the founder of the state education system were being rigidly put into practice. Hartley argued that "religious and moral training was more important than the learning of fact." (3) He however stopped short of introducing religion as a part of the curriculum and instead in his regulations of 1892, he instructed that:

> moral lessons ... to ... enforce ... the necessity for cleanliness, punctuality, industry, obedience, truthfulness, honesty, respect and the consideration of others and the performance of the duties of a citizen (4)

were to be taught once a week.

The two systems then had points in common, the most important of which was the desire to mould the child by a system of strict discipline into being a respectable and responsible citizen. The Catholics differed from the state system by demanding that religion was the key to such a moral education and that the whole of the educative process should be informed by religion. Naturally, they also argued that the only acceptable form of religion was Catholicism. Such a conflict however did not preclude the two systems from seeing that they had areas of common interest and could co-operate. Hence the state funded the Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park whilst the Reformatory in turn would emphasise in their education the importance of being a respectable citizen.

The compromise of educational practices worked well and the state often congratulated the Reformatory upon the value and success of its work. Notable amongst these comments was praise for the hard working, honest and useful boys produced by the Reformatory. (5)

Upon this basic area of agreement the Reformatory placed its own value structures. These values reflected the lives of the Brothers and the vows they had taken. They sum up a perspective of Catholic manhood that was essentially puritan and authoritarian. The Brothers themselves had taken vows of "chastity, poverty and obedience." (6) with a special brief to devote their lives to the care and education of the poor. As such they put these values into their Reformatory process. The boys were correspondingly watched and controlled to ensure they abstained from temptation be it drink, smoking, sex or any other form of frivolous pleasure. Their methods included the use of authoritarian control, enforced deferential obedience to the Brothers' commands and occupying the boys with hard and constant work. The model cited for these values was the patron of the Order, St. John the Baptist. He was recorded as never having tasted alcohol , as living in extreme poverty, being in constant gainful activity and taking the tasks of life seriously, whilst maintaining suitable deference to authority. (7) He was regarded by the Brothers as being the simple, pure, hard working man and the boys were expected and extolled to emulate his example. Thus, they were to become respectable working men - and specifically Catholic respectable working men.

These added valued were condoned, as the Brothers were after all, dealing with Catholics and were only taking care of their own. This ideal was often emphasised by successive Archbishops when they reviewed the role of the Reformatory, or when they were moved to comment in a public forum in support of extra funding or in praise of some particular achievement, such as the building of additional dormitories. (8) It was

certainly an area Father Smyth emphasised in his sermons. Such an approach indicated the sense of responsibility the Brothers were attempting to instil in their charges, as well as the Catholic Church's striving for respectability by ensuring its own were adequately and safely re-educated.

Part of this desire for respectability was derived from the Catholics' belief that they were the drunkards of South Australian Society. The Brothers were themselves the product of a Temperance Society. They held as a value and as a principle to be adopted in teaching that drinking to excess was the great weakness of the Irish Catholics. They sought to instil in their charges the shame that drunkedness brought with it and the fact that drinkers were not respectable, nor acceptable members of society, especially of Catholic Society.

The Brothers educated so that "their constant purpose shall be that their pupils grow up to be God fearing, well instructed Catholics." (9) This meant that the Brothers were charged to "instil in their pupils the principles of voluntary total abstinence from intoxicating liquor." (10) They did this by impressing "upon them the gravity of drunkenness [sic]." (11) arguing as they did so in the language of Father Smyth, that "Drunkenness [sic] is a sin ... is a disturber of the peace, it is a robber, it is a murderer ... drunkeds (sic) shall not possess the Kingdom of Heaven." (12)

In adopting this mode and purpose of education it was obvious that the Brothers were more interested in the moral education of their charges rather than their academic skills. The whole thrust of the educational process was the maintenance of the child's religion rather than his educational achievement. This was tied very closely to the concept that such moral education and standards facilitated respectability and thus in some way would ensure that the adult would be a a good Catholic if nothing else.

This approach had its echoes in contemporary society and more particularly in the intellectual currents of late 19th and early 20th Century Australia. There was a general agreement that the working class had a considerable element within it that had a propensity to "consume alcohol ... pawn their possessions and to gamble at race tracks." (13) This element threatened the moral well being of their more respectable peers and brought them all into disrepute. The reasons for this behaviour lay in either moral inadequacy as Father Smyth would argue, or as with the emerging fashion of Eugenics and other purported scientific theories, some genetic fault. (14)

Yet Father Smyth and the scientists had points in common which would have influenced the method and content of the teaching at the Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park. Father Smyth claimed:

> that some people even search out evils out of a sinful curiosity. That's certainly done by persons who go to picture shows where bad pictures are frequently shown ... evils of the worst kind enter the soul ... of a person who looks upon bad pictures. (15)

and that such evil tendencies were derived from the family. The instructions to the Brothers reminded them that:

> they must not lose sight of the fact that the children given to their care have inherited from their parents different dispositions and also that the family environment has had its influence upon their characters. (16)

Whilst the Eugenic movement claimed that "defectiveness was hereditary and that the defective classes need sterilisation or segregation" (17), it also suggested that:

> dangerous lunatics who required treatment for the protection of society ... were deemed to come from the pauperised sections of the working classes. (18)

In short, the Brothers at the Reformatory, like society at large, were looking to isolate the children from their parents and to contain them in some way so that they would cease to be a threat to society. The Reformatory had the extra task of reforming the boys to an acceptable image, reflecting a faith that something could be done for these boys. This was in marked contrast to the Eugenists who would have had the boys dealt with permanently. Nevertheless the process of reforming the boys was a difficult and long term process and required the Brothers to practice great restraint. It also demanded that they emphasise to the boys that the poor and the pauper were, despite Christian admiration of the ideals of poverty, "a pariah - a sinful failure ... a moral liability," (18) and as such the Brothers shared the prevalent outlook that:

> a working class child, orphan, vagrant, thief ... the assumption was made that he or she was the offspring of a degenerate and deprived class, requiring intensive disciplinary treatment in a Reformatory. (19)

The aim of this discipline was to produce "habits and thought appropriate for the respectable working class such as obedience, discipline, honesty, cleanliness and sobriety." (20)

In this process concepts of individual privacy and freedom as the private property of the child was negated by the communal organisation of the Reformatory. Paradoxically, the purpose of this denial was to attempt to instil in the child some form of individual respectability. This paradox of a communal lifestyle inculcating a private and individual moral respect was never addressed by the Brothers. Part of the reason for this lay in the fact that the Brothers, being part of a religious Order, had no concept of the individual or the private as being delineated by property. They had taken vows to live a communal life in which all property was shared and all wishes of individual action were subordinate to the group and its needs. (21) Hence, the Brothers applied their own experiences to their charges and expected the same effects. The boys however were not members of an Order and did not choose to be in the Reformatory, meaning that problems of control and discipline were very much part of the curriculum of the institution.

This control was enforced by use of the same communal habits the Brothers practiced. The boys all washed in communal wet areas situated in a large shed about 100 metres from the main living areas but immediately and casually inspected from the residential quarters of the Brothers. Hence, when practicing the all important habits of cleanliness the boys were easily and rapidly supervised. They had no chance of escaping from the Brothers into individual cubicles and separate shower recesses and their behaviour was minutely inspected by their peers and the Brothers. This helped to negate any individual acts of rebellion and thus subsumed the individual boy into the collective image of being a member of the Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park therefore facilitating control and obedience. When sleeping and eating the boys were also kept in a communal situation and constantly supervised. The boys' sleeping quarters were a large hall that later became the Parish Church. This barrack like area was overseen easily from any vantage point and this made control almost absolute. Eating took place in a

large Refectory which led off the common kitchen. The Brothers maintained control by eating at different times to the boys and in a separate room. (22) Thus, when eating, the boys were subject to constant supervision and their eating habits and manners were able to be constantly corrected. Equally, by eating in a separate area, at a separate time, the Brothers made sure that the boys did not get to have too intimate a view of them and undermine their authority or the Brothers respectability and propriety.

Such techniques of herding the offenders together and maintaining them at a distance was quite a common ploy used to enforce discipline and control in reformatories in the late 19th Century. (23) By placing the child on constant inspection, pressure was placed upon him to conform and enabled lessons and instructions to be given by use of drill techniques. The system as such was efficient, as a large mass of children could be dealt with at one time and the standards of control and discipline were reinforced by the use of humiliation and peer pressure. On the other hand, however, the chances of mass rebellion were present, as the peer group could form to oppose the instructions. Yet the very openness and constant inspection prevented any substantial attempts at rebellion.

This process of supervision was aided greatly by the layout of the buildings of the Reformatory. The impact of the dormitory and washing arrangements has already been discussed and the visual control afforded by such a design was further enhanced by the architecture and physical situation of the Reformatory buildings. They were constructed around a small central court yard. All exits and gaps were sealed off with fences and even the poles of the verandahs were treated to prevent the boys climbing up and escaping via the roof. (24) The central courtyard was flat and lacked any shade tree. Again, this restricted the chances the boys had of hiding, or abusing anything. The area

was suitable for closely supervised games and easily supervised from the residential areas of the Brothers.

The church and the chapel were the two major buildings in the complex. The courtyard was dominated by the size of the church whilst the major doors of the chapel opened on to the playing area. Hence if the Brothers were not watching the boys the message was imparted that someone else was checking on them.

In 1905 the Reformatory was described "as a total area of 12 a (acres). 3r (roods). 38 p (perches)." and at its heart were:

> improvements consisting of a main building composed of sandstone and brick containing 7 rooms ... viz:
>
> Dormitory 35' x 17'
>
> Oratory 22' x 17'
>
> 4 rooms 14' x 13'
>
> 1 room 12' x 12'
>
> together with detached wings on the East and West sides containing:
>
> Dormitory 45' x 20'
>
> Dining Rooms 24' x 14'
>
> Kitchen 20' x 14'
>
> also 6 workshops and a store-room constructed of galvanised iron, a stable and coach house with bails to accommodate 10 cows, fowl houses and a block of land 2 ac. 1r. 7p. which is fenced with 6ft. pailings and 10 ac. 2r. 31p. is substantially fenced with

posts and 9 wires and planted around with almonds and olive seedlings. (25)

The Reformatory was thus a small collection of buildings surrounded by a mixed farm of sorts, that was operated by the boys as part of their path to reform. The appearance was of a small fortress, fenced and patrolled, set in a large open area substantially removed from the urban area of Adelaide. It was basically self sufficient so that little was needed from the nearby business areas and there was little need to leave the farm area itself. This further reduced the chances of escape as well as eliminated potential temptations. Furthermore, the surrounding land was flat with the buildings of the Reformatory being built on a small rise within a marshy expanse of floodplain of the River Torrens. (26) Consequently, the land was easily overseen by residents of the Reformatory and the work of boys on the farm was also easily inspected and reviewed. This work was of a menial and labour intensive nature, facilitating the control of the boys by exhausting them and at the same time giving them proof of the value of their labour. This reinforced the prevalent values of the Reformatory; the values of the respectable labouring classes which were useful hard work, thrift and righteous moral activity.

The open communal plan of the Reformatory and the surrounding lands, whilst being in tune with the architectural practices of many of the Borstals and Reformatories of Europe was in marked contrast to the "separate system" practiced in early Victorian England, especially for its prisons. (27) In this form of architecture, the inmates were rigorously separated from each other to avoid the temptations of contact and to prevent the possibility of contamination. This concept of control was available to the Brothers when they began their work in the 1890's and had been practiced in the prisons of Australia and more particularly in the Yatala Prison to the north east of Adelaide. Yet

when the Brothers came to develop their reformatory they adopted the open communal plan. This placed them well within the accepted practices of the day as other reformatory buildings in Adelaide were communal – even the Reformatory ship that had housed the boys prior to the Magill institution had been a communal institution. The Brothers also had another constraint which would have made any form of control and education other than communal living almost impossible and that was cost. The Brothers obtained their site at Brooklyn Park by use of Parish and personal funds. The cost of producing a cellular system (28) would have been prohibitive. Further, the Brothers as communal dwellers themselves, would have found the ideological shift too much to have been able to accommodate the system of such individual isolation.

The impact of the buildings was reinforced by a strict regime of discipline. This was summed up in the Institutes of the Order and in many ways is a typical document of reformatory institutions. (29) The main thrust of this regime was to ensure the boys had little and, if possible, no time when they were left to their own amusement, to preclude the possibility of them resorting to uncontrolled behaviour. The paradox of this situation was that such a programme enforced a dependency that made sure the boys would take longer, or even ultimately fail, to develop the necessary personal skills to fulfil the aims of the Reformatory in making them useful and respectable citizens.

This constant activity prevented the boys from dwelling adversely and negatively upon their lot and thereby developing resentment towards the Reformatory authorities. Instead, their thoughts and actions were guided towards an acceptable end. This goal was tied closely to the concepts of hard and constant work. Consequently, the time table for the day centred upon a great deal of prayer and strict codes of behaviour and regimented activities.

The day began at 5.15 a.m. when the Brothers awoke and began their first prayer activities. From this point the day continued by programmed activities until 9 p.m. when the Brothers went to bed. During this time, masses were held and breaks were marked by the saying of prayers. School itself began at 8 a.m. It ran until 12.00, when a prayer session was held. The boys then had half an hour for lunch which was followed by school activities until 5 p.m. (30)

Boys working upon the farm followed the same time table and had the same prayer programme. This was very much in accord with general Reformatory and Borstal practices and reflected the desire to inculcate worthy and moral activities. (31) The Catholic Church had other motives as well, they were seeking to maintain the adherence to their faith or possibly more correctly, to re-establish the adherence to the Catholic Church by the boys.

In keeping with the use of prayer, was the maintenance of the practice of silence. This was a powerful tool in developing discipline and ensuring the boys were not able to develop any form of resistance to the Reformatory's authority. At all times the boys were expected to practice "silence but not strained in the classroom." (32) They were to make sure that they never left their place and instructions on punishment for this transgression were emphasised in the rules.

Along with other Reformatory practices, the Brothers were given instructions about how to control the deportment of the boys:

> the pupils ... shall always sit or stand as the case may be in a becoming posture. Their hands when not occupied at their lessons

> should be up on the desks in front of them or behind their backs when standing. (33)

Furthermore the boys had to be watched wherever they went. The Brothers were told not to turn their backs upon the pupils and:

> a Brother ... must be ... most vigilant over any group not playing. He shall insist that they play or occupy themselves in some useful way. (34)

When not at play the boys were expected to work. This work was either school work, farm work, or the work of an indentured servant. Overall the aim of such activity was to train the boys into some form of trade. The problem with this approach was that the Brothers were neither sufficiently trained, nor effectively informed, to enable the boys to enter a trade. Men who joined the Order who were sufficiently trained, failed to remain in the Order. An example of this is John Hynds who joined on 20 August 1926. He was described as a fitter and turner by trade and on entering had resigned his position as inspector of turners at McKay's famous implement works. However, on the 10th October 1927 the superintendent of the Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park wrote to the Archbishop:

> John Joseph Hynds ... left the Institute of his own free choice this afternoon. (35)

Another example of a man who left early was "John Williams of Bold Hills, Brisbane who was admitted recently, proved unsuitable and untrainable." (36) As a result the Reformatory paid for his return to Brisbane. In a community which failed to exceed ten

in number, such failures to find and maintain suitable members meant that the process of education was always suspect and the hopes of educating boys to join a trade were doubtful in the extreme.

As the Reformatory failed to provide an apprenticeship for trade skills when the boys emerged at 18 years of age they found themselves too old to become apprenticed. The Brothers were condemning any boy sufficiently interested in a trade to being unable to obtain one, despite purporting to fit the boys for future respectable and useful occupations. This inadequate attempt at practical trade training was common amongst reformatories. (37)

Such futility was recognised by outsiders. The Mayor of Hindmarsh's criticism was not alone in the condemnation of the education offered as irrelevant and failing in its aim in that it failed to "qualify him (the student) for his necessary certificate as a competent tradesman." (38)

Whilst these charges were true, they nevertheless failed to recognise an important aspect of reformatory education. Such education had the intention of both keeping the boy busy as well as training the boy to habits considered vital for obtaining respectable occupations. The Brothers needed the boys to recognise that they were to gain something from the curriculum. Given that the boys were not well educated, nor could they be expected to be high achievers, these gains had to be concrete in the form of an occupation. If the boys had no sense of worth in their education, then rebellious reactions might occur and the hidden curriculum might fail. The child in turn would fail to learn habits of industry and respectable behaviour and thus the Reformatory would fail in its purpose. Hence, the letter of the Mayor was ignored and the practices maintained.

It can be concluded that the very process of reformatory education was, therefore, more an adjunct to the training of the boys in controlled and disciplined behaviour. Inadequate trade education was merely a way of altering the child to accept the rhythms of trade, rather than the skills in the hope that the child would become a useful hand to the machine age world: an unskilled, but disciplined worker - a trade assistant.

The process of control and the ignorance of the inapt nature of the educational process was facilitated by the isolation from general society practiced by the Brothers themselves. This was part of the nature of reformatory activity, as the boys were separated deliberately to prevent them becoming corrupted by deviant peers, inadequate parents or temptation. Such isolation was the Reformatory's main purpose. Yet the Brothers' deliberate segregation from the world compounded the impact of the inadequate knowledge of Trade training and practices. The Brothers continued to practice their curriculum and to prepare their charges for life removed from contemporary changes and ideas.

This isolation was adopted by the Brothers, as much to increase their control over the boys, as to develop within the boys the Brothers' concepts of Catholic male sexuality. This was done by the use of censorship and strict sexual segregation as emphasised by the regulations used by the Brothers. In such a view females were seen as a source of temptation and corruption of the morals of boys which meant that "Persons of the opposite sex are excluded at all times from the school." (39) Moreover, the "sin of scandal" was constantly before the Order. This sin varied from:

> the person seen working on Sunday, the Catholic parent who sends a Catholic child to the State School, and the sorts of individuals of

> a certain sex who disregard common rules of Christian propriety in matters of attire. This is an evil which has done great harm as there is the weakness of human nature... to be considered. (40)

In adopting and promoting such views the Brothers were fostering within their charges a sense of the celibate and a fear, if not a positive dislike of females.

Such Catholic manliness and respectability went further as the Brothers themselves were constantly warned that "vigilance to prevent immoral conduct is never to be relaxed. Boys regarded as undesirable associates are to be separated." and "all obscene literature was to be destroyed." Brothers were instructed that "they shall not have familiarity with anyone and are forbidden to fondle or take hold of any boy." (41) This even extended as far as punishment, as Brothers were warned of the need to be dispassionate over their meting out of blame and in inflicting the sentence, which usually involved some form of beating or labour overseen or administered by them. The danger of taking pleasure in revenge was obviously a source of worry to the founders of the Reformatory, as it had the potential to corrupt the austerity of the Brothers and might even help develop some physical or psychological bond. Similarly, the Brothers were instructed that "things that tend to hurt the sensitive feelings of the pupils are ... forbidden." (42) Again, this led the Brothers and the boys away from the sensual and thus into the world of the straight-forward Catholic male of strong moral qualities.

Thus, the Brothers, as well as the boys, were expected to practice a strongly puritanical moral standard, the essence of which was a strong distrust of sexuality and sensuality. The latter was particularly proscribed and access to overt stimulation, as far as the Brothers defined such a thing, was circumscribed by removing all forms of

stimuli. Even text books were to be carefully excised to ensure that only a minimum and proper stimulation was experienced by a select and particularly strong few. This extended as far as company was concerned and the pleasures of "sightseeing, appearing abroad, hearing news" were all avoided as activities and "desires unbecoming religious men." Consequently, the Brothers and their charges were expected to "sedulously avoid the company of seculars." and that in speech "wordly, political or frivolous topics and all such beneath the dignity of one concentrated to the will of God shall not be discussed." (43)

The Brothers and their charges were, therefore, extremely limited in their activities and in their interests. The sober image of Catholic manliness was given greater form by the visual impact of the clothing worn by both the inmates and the Brothers themselves. The Brothers wore "a plain black Soutane ... or a suit of Black Serge of the Chesterfield make ... with the hat of black felt, clerical in shape." (44) This enabled the Brothers to be noticeable in their austerity and presence as well as enabling them to show their disregard for the colours and activities associated with the frivolous and sensuous. To match this the boys were of uniform dress and appearance. They wore a plain black suit and had their heads shaved. (45) When in public, such as when going to church, they were matched in rows and marched in silence to their destination, even if it was several miles away. Avoiding buses and other means of public transport eliminated any temptations and acted to maintain the boys' sense of separation from the "worldly" that surrounded them.

The practices and ideology of the Brothers thus acted to develop a moral order within the boys. It was a type of education that developed a form of masculinity based upon a contempt for the female and made sure that the boy believed in hard work and the values of the Catholic Church. All efforts were made to suppress or eliminate any

alternative influences upon the boys and the Brothers themselves. No other role models were allowed and the boys were brought up in an isolated and exclusive environment, a situation reinforced by the boys appearance, which set them apart from others and acted to reduce the chances of contact with peers and any sources of corruption.

This environment was maintained at all costs. Even when giving reports the Brothers were warned that:

> whilst being candid ... they ... will endeavour to give as optimistic a report as they can, to prevent the possibility of the boys removal ... perhaps to a non-Catholic school. (46)

Hence every reasonable effort was made "to save the reputation of a pupil who has ... committed some fault damaging to his character." (47) In short, at all times the Brothers, regardless of the academic or educational results obtained by the child, had to bear in mind that the primary purpose of the institution was the education in values of Christian Catholic manliness and behaviour. The process of education was subservient to this goal, as were the Brothers themselves.

Not surprisingly, the Brothers found that the previous experiences of the boys had fostered in them attitudes and values which were in direct contrast to those of the Reformatory. These the Brothers sought to eliminate by regimenting the day activities of the boys, so that they practiced a lifestyle of the respectable Catholic man. This brought with it the inevitable consequences of rebellion and resistance. Even boys whose experiences had led them to develop attitudes in accord with most of those of the Reformatory, found that the dreary inculcation of habits "conforming to the monotonous daily routine of the respectable poor" (48) was irksome. This meant that the staff had to

be resolute in their authority. In many of the state institutions the habit was to employ ex-military members whose training and familiarity with strict discipline was seen as an advantage. (49) The Brothers were not unlike their state counterparts in their dedication to a set of ideals and in following a regular and enforced routine of absolute obedience. They had an absolute "commander" and a set of enforcable rules. As such, the Brothers were also very much part of the movement of muscular Christianity which sought to save the poor and dissolute by use of team sports (50) and the appeal of the regimentation of music bands with their uniforms and army style training. (51) With such habits and displays the Brothers sought to inculcate values of obedience and discipline. They were developing habits of regular activity and attitudes of deference to authority, the qualities of the respectable working man.

The Brothers tempered their discipline by practicing "compassion". (52) and in practicing compassion, the Brothers were able to rely upon religion to carry the psychological impact of the discipline past the stage of mere physical restraint. Examination of Father Smyth's sermons reveals the link the Brothers were able to make between the Catholic concepts of sin as transgression against divine law and the boys' transgression against society and its laws. The boys were constantly reminded that their disobedience in failing to be exemplary Catholics in society was a sin equivalent to any in the church and that the two aspects of religion and proper behaviour were inseparable. This extended to the parents, who were equally chastised for their sin of failing to ensure their children were properly brought up Catholics in their secular activities. We see this in Father Smyth's sermons, where he constantly links the need for family discipline with the condemnation of parents who failed to send their children to Catholic schools and with the damnation of drunks and vice ridden members of society. The link was expressed in the phrase "no system of education is complete unless it has religion ... incomplete religion produces disorder and sin." (53)

The state institutions shared this fear of disorder and vice, but lacked the direct link between irreligious attitudes and social deviancy. Instead, they placed great stress upon the lack of moral fibre and moral development, yet the State Reformatory failed to develop the cogent ideology explicit in the dogma of religion. The Brothers recognised this and saw themselves as offering a superior model to the boys under their care. The two sets of organisations may have had many points in common concerning the need for discipline, its form and function but none-the-less the Brothers and their Church considered the state inadequate in its instruction and criticised those members of the Catholic faith who turned to the state rather than the Church. Father Smyth particularly criticised the practice of liberal philanthropists who individually or actively supported the state intervening with the "devotion of money or time to the alleviation of the miseries of the poor or oppressed" (54) as being inadequate and ill-directed because of its "godlessness" (55), arguing as he did , that this lack of religion would only further "corrupt" the boys in habits of vice and sin. That is, the boys would be tempted away from the path of respectable behaviour demanded by Father Smyth's version of Catholic manliness.

To ensure the purity of the Catholic experience, boys who were found not to be Catholic were immediately removed from the Reformatory regardless of the circumstances. The Quinn brothers illustrate this process. The eldest boy, Cyril, was sentenced in 1912 when he was 11 years and 4 months for stealing a quantity of gas fittings worth £4.0.0. He was sentenced until 18 years of age but was released in 1912 at the age of 14 years. His home life was described as "poor". (56)

Cyril was followed into the Reformatory by his brother Frank, who in 1912 had committed larceny and was whipped, but not sentenced. In 1914, he was put into the

Reformatory for three months for trespassing at the South Australian Gas Company. In 1916 he was caught stealing jewellery worth 2/6d., and was again sentenced to the Reformatory until 18 years of age. The parents at this time were described as "careless and indifferent" and their attitude was seen to be reflected in Frank's poor behaviour. The committal mandate noted that "this boy requires discipline. He does what he likes at home." (57)

Whilst Frank had been in and out of the Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park the youngest brother, Stanley, was sent there in January, 1915. Stanley was aged 7 years and 11 months at the time of sentencing for having stolen 6/6d. Thus in a family of boys and 6 girls, a pair of brothers were in the Reformatory together at most times between 1914 and 1920.

As with previous examples, the authorities highlighted the parents' failure to control their children and to set adequate standards of respectable behaviour as the reason for this occurring. In one mandate of committal, Mrs. Quinn was described as being of "weak character". In another Mr. Quinn was chastised as being:

> not of sober habits. At present he is not working full time. His wife goes out working. The children are left to run the streets and consequently get into mischief. (58)

The fact that they were Protestants was not brought to light until 1920, four years after the last two brothers were united in the Reformatory. The circumstances of the revelation are of interest. In 1920 Maria Quinn, the mother and William Graham her son-in-law, petitioned to have Stanley released. The State Children's Council investigated the family and found Mrs. Quinn to be widowed and the three boys baptised as

Anglicans. As a result the boys were immediately released from the Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park to the State Children's Council and Stanley himself was recalled from service to Mr. Barry of Pt. Germein, where he had been since 1917, to be released to Mr. Graham. The memo indicating the religion of the brothers arrived on 17 May, 1920, the boys were released on 13 June, 1920. (59)

This challenge to the "faith" of the Reformatory was repeated in 1922 when a boy committed to the Reformatory claimed on affidavit to be Catholic as he had attended Catholic day schools. The father who made the declaration, however, reversed his statement three days later; the boy was finally removed from the Reformatory after two months.

It is of interest that this boy came up again for resentencing in 1925 for "theft at Wayville ... 6 bags of Hay Chaff". The mother stated the boy to be Catholic. In the light of their previous experience, the Brothers of the Reformatory left the boy in the hands of the state. (69)

In the case studies presented it is noteworthy that when the boys were non-Catholic the effort at removing or altering undesirable traits was not even attempted. In such a case the ideal of producing a respectable Catholic was not a possibility and thus not addressed. It was also a dangerous situation to have persons of such non-Catholic attitudes within the Reformatory as their faith, or lack of faith, challenged the very ethos of the Reformatory and its staff. It also provided a source of temptation awayfrom the Catholic images of manhood and respectability being promoted by the Brothers and this, after all, was the function of the Reformatory: to isolate the child from temptation so that he could be formed to the ideal image.

This dogged sense of mission was recognised by the S.C.C. not just by funding the Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park but also by the practice of referring to the Reformatory, boys who had failed to be successfully dealt with by the state Reformatories. Naturally, however the boys had to be Catholic before they were admitted otherwise the impact of the Catholic religion and its ideals of celibate Catholic manhood would be lost. In 1902 for example, William James Harris, aged 13 years was sent to a state reformatory as his mother was in "indigent circumstances and unable to support him." (61) A close inspection of his case reveals that the boy provided the institution with many problems. He came from a family situation which was in complete disarray. He had been sentenced originally in November 1899 to the Industrial School at Edwardstown along with his "elder brother Edward (12 years old), younger brother Alfred (8 years and 9 months) and sister Mary, 3 years and 3 months." (62) From here, he was sent out to the home of Mrs McGrath almost immediately. He was returned by her on November 27, 1901 for misconduct. On January 2, 1902 he absconded from the Industrial School. He was captured on January 8, 1902 with a John Cole at Macclesfield. Then on April 5, 1902 he again absconded with Eleazer Herewane and was recaptured the same day. Finding him hard to handle the Industrial School sent him to Mr. Honner of Maitland on April 17, 1902. Whilst in Mr. Honner's service he committed larceny and was consequently re-committed to the Industrial School on June 21, 1902 and transferred immediately to the Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park. There he settled down and remained in the Brothers' care until February 9, 1907 when he was again sent to service, this time to a Mr. L.M. Williams of Carrington. (63) William was then 16 years and 8 months old. He had been in and out of service and the Industrial School four times in 3 years, before being sent to the Brooklyn Park Reformatory. The sentencing was thus an act of trust or desperation, that paid off.

The success was so marked that in 1905 Alfred, William's brother was also committed to the Boys Reformatory Brooklyn Park. He, too, had been sent to service to Mr. McGrath on November 21, 1899. From there he was returned to the State Industrial school on the July 19, 1905. He was now aged 14 years 5 months. Upon his return he was immediately transferred to the Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park. He remained there until October 23, 1908 when he was put out to service with Mr. Francis Burns Jnr. of Snowtown. (64) His records cease at that point and it is likely that he was released upon turning 18 years in February 1909.

Another example of referral to the Reformatory at Brooklyn Park after the state institution had failed to reform the boy was the case of Christopher Smith. He was transferred at age 14 years and 8 months from the Brighton Deaf and Dumb asylum in 1905. He had committed misconduct and was transferred to allow the Brothers to handle him as a difficult case. Christopher stayed at the Reformatory until May 1907 when at age 16 years he was put out to service with Mr. Willis of Balaklava. (65)

Later, in 1908, Walter Lawrence O'Hare alias Curtis, arrived aged 10 years and one month. Walter was illegitimate and was sentenced originally in 1900 to the Industrial School as "an illegitimate child whose parents cannot be found." He was aged 2 years and 7 months at the time. From there he was sent to Mrs. Shanks of Aldgate. He remained there until the age of 6 and one-half years when he was returned as "unsuitable". On March 31, 1904 he was sent to Mrs. O'Donoghue of Kapunda. She kept him until 1906, returning Walter as she no longer wished to keep him. Later in 1906 Walter was again sent out, to a Mrs. M. Nelson of Woodville Park, who returned him within a few months for misconduct. (66) Again, he was put out to service, to Mrs. Hoare, who again, returned him for misconduct. Upon his return Walter was found to be

suffering from the measles and was sent to the Adelaide Hospital. He was then 9 years old. Once more he was sent out to service, this time to a Mrs. Howard of Gladstone in 1908. Again, Walter was returned for misconduct. The Industrial School responded to his record by sending him to the Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park on March 28, 1908. (67) Subsequent checks of the admission mandates reveal no further records and it can be concluded that Walter was to be controlled effectively by the Brothers until he reached the release age of 18 years.

Such cases continued throughout the life of the Reformatory. Robert Wallace was convicted in 1919 for unlawful possession at the age of 12 years. His father, a driver by trade, was recorded as being a member of the Church of England although his mother was a Catholic. He was placed in the Industrial School, Edwardstown, and from there he was put out to service from which he then absconded. He also absconded from the Industrial School three times. Eventually in 1920, only one year after sentencing, he was sent to the Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park. In 1921 he was put out on service and again absconded, but returned voluntarily to the Reformatory. (68) In 1925 he was subject to a petition for release. He was then 17 and one-half years and near the end of his sentence. He had done nothing wrong since 1921 and thus had a very good record. His family, however, were not equal to his record – they had been described in 1920 as "not suitable persons to have custody" with "both parents addicted to drink." (69) In 1925 the parents were still recorded as living in a "locality in which ... drunken brawls are frequently indulged in and Mrs. Wallace is often mixed up in them "the poverty of the home is no doubt attributable to their drinking habits." (70) The application was not granted and the Reformatory remained the boy's principal residence until he turned 19 years of age as his sentence was extended to punish him for earlier absconding attempts.

These boys all represent "hard cases". The Reformatory and its process of instruction was seen as the place in which the boys could gain what the state institution failed to offer. The history of the Boys' Reformatory is studded with such transfers and it represents a comment upon its perceived success rate. Interestingly, very few boys moved from the Reformatory to a state institution.

The use of the Reformatory as a repository for such troublesome cases indicates the nature of the Reformatory's educative system. The boys, such as the illegitimate Walter, failed to obtain adequate role models or sympathy from those to whom he had been sent. Some didn't want him, others couldn't handle a sick child. In Walter's case we see the Reformatory's ability to respond and control difficult boys by use of compassion and care. In other cases, the Reformatory and its mode of absolute control, coupled with its smaller number of clientele, (approximately 20 boys at a time) made the Reformatory a more effective institution for transferring adequate role models and forms of discipline. This in turn reveals a tailoring of the instruction of the Reformatory to such clients. Its care and curriculum were structured to cater for the boy whom even peer institutions found difficult.

This targetting of the process of education and care can be seen in the level of educational achievement of such boys. The main aim of the Reformatory was not necessarily to produce high academic standards, but rather, as a last resort, to control the boys and to develop them to the end of being respectable, efficient and effective Catholic male workers. Consequently there were very few academic successes at the Reformatory. Few boys reached class four and this was in keeping with findings derived from investigations into the late nineteenth century operation of the Hindmarsh Public School, where less than 13% of boys passed the compulsory standard. (71) If anything, the Hindmarsh statistics are an enviable record when compared to the success rates at

the Reformatory. George Clifford was 15 years and 2 months in 1920 and was recorded as being in second class, well short of any level of academic achievement. George was also recorded as being in "the first conduct class" indicating a merit system operating in the Reformatory based purely upon the boys' behaviour. (72)

Progress through schooling was not rapid and this sometimes acted to disadvantage the boys. John Chesterfield aged 17 years and 8 months was released after six years in the Reformatory to the custody of his father, and John went to work as an unskilled labourer in a factory. The reason for him taking this occupation was the lack of adequate trade training he had received in his three years in the Reformatory as well as the fact, that despite this time spent in the Reformatory, he was still only in second class.

In many ways the Brothers recognised the difficulties in educating their clients and tended to try and place them into work as soon as possible. Ernest Gould was released in 1920 to pursue work so that he "could have a chance in life." (72)

Another such boy released to work to give him a chance in life was Thomas McCarthy. He illustrates the interaction of the family and the educative process offered at the Reformatory. Thomas was first sentenced in 1918 when aged 16 years and 10 months. He was the youngest in the family, with six sisters, all married, and a brother at the front. He was sentenced as an uncontrollable child. The committal mandate recorded that the "boy admits taking drink with parents in the home" and that "Bowden police have seen him knocking about with the woman Moody, now in gaol." (73)

In 1920 the parents petitioned for Thomas' release. Thomas' mother signed the petition with an "X" and gave the information that Thomas was born in Kenwall County

Tipperary, Ireland. The petition claimed that Thomas' father was suffering from cancer and had worked at an Engineering works in Hindmarsh. The petition was investigated and the parents were described as:

> addicted to drink; they are what would be called soakers. Have not been convicted but are habitually heavy drinkers. The Bowden Police have seen Mrs. McCarthy drunk. When brought to the department Tom says he ran away because his mother was always drunk and did not get his meals. He now has gone back on this statement since seeing his parents. (74)

The petition was declined. Two matters are of interest in this decision. The first is that Thomas conformed to the standard pattern of the boys in the Reformatory in being poorly educated and a poor achiever. He was recorded as being in second class when 17 years and 10 months old. The second is that the parents were described in the petition by police as "not fit and proper persons." That is they were not respectable enough to take care of their son and it was thus recommended instead that he be "placed out in a government service home to give him a chance in life. There is just a chance that he may remain there and do well. " (75)

Thomas illustrates how the Reformatory had to take into account the parental environment when considering the process of education and release. The Reformatory having worked to try and produce a particular type of boy could not afford to release him back to the environment considered to be the original cause of his deviancy. Had the boy's parents been respectable he would have been released to them and the home situation would have played a lesser part in the decision.

It was rare for a boy to spend all his time in the Reformatory itself as such containment was for children who were particularly difficult (76). Instead, as the above cases alone have illustrated, most boys were put out to service. This was a form of indentured labour rendered to some respectable citizen for the remainder of the child's sentence. As such, "putting out" was part of the ideology in which the family was supplanted by strangers who were paid, or received some reward for performing the role of parents. (77) The justification for using such a method was that the child's own family was inadequate, as they could not provide the right conditions and training to enable the boy to learn to be respectable and thus some other more able family should be entrusted with their care and development.

The technique of placing out in service, which was also practiced by all state care institutions, reveals a facet about the Brooklyn Park's educational thrust. It confirms the Reformatory's attempt to provide the boys with the skills and training necessary to be respectable hard workers. As with the doctrine of education espoused by Father Smyth, the need for worthy Catholic models was a high priority and the boys from Brooklyn Park were always sent to Catholic homes for their training. Interestingly, some of these establishments came to be constantly used and one suspects that the boys were a handy source of labour, for these 'reforming families'! This situation however may also reflect the statement of the S.C.C. that indicated that "good Catholic homes were hard to find" (78), as much as a case of child exploitation.

When in such a home the boys were as dependent as they had been in the Reformatory, although they were trusted more, as they spent more time on their own and their privacy was restored to them to a large extent. However, the boys were still undergoing the same type of training and curriculum and thus were still learning the same basic values and lessons, albeit in a different setting.

In adopting putting out as a technique of training, the Reformatory was fitting into a method of adolescent education that was in operation in peer institutions in South Australia. The process itself was policed and promoted by the State Children's Council which provided the officers who investigated the service homes to which the boys were sent. The Reformatory had the role of developing a network of families which were then assessed for their suitability by the Council. The Reformatory also had the responsibility of nominating appropriately prepared boys for putting out, as well as recommending a particular service home for each boy. The S.C.C. maintained its control over the whole process by reserving to itself the sole authority to undertake inspections. These inspections assessed the boy's progress and the care offered by the service home, making appropriate recommendations about the future of the child and the home. (79) This enabled the Council to effectively monitor the service experience of all children committed to reformatories and industrial schools.

At the same time the Reformatory was participating in the common practice of putting out, it was also partaking of the latest trends in education. The Eugenics movement and the New Education Movement in the 1900's both argued that practical education was in the national interest. (80) Out on the farms and in the newly developing factories the boys were able to become obedient and efficient workers. (81) As the century progressed the Reformatory began to send the boys more to factories than to farms reflecting the growth of industry in South Australia. In 1908 the boys were sent almost exclusively to the wheat farms of the North and the dairy farms in the South East of South Australia. By 1920 the boys were almost exclusively in urban, industrial pursuits such as Holdens' Motor Body Works and De Youngs in Hindley Street. (82)

Many boys were "put out". Arthur Albert Jolly was an example of such a boy and his case provides an insight into putting out activity, revealing much about the motivation and the effects of such indenturing. Albert was put out to Mr. Sexton to do farm work in 1921, at the age of 17 years, after a petition for his release was rejected. At the time of the petition he had been in the Reformatory for three years, after having originally been convicted in 1918 for larceny when he was 14 years 5 months old. (83) In 1921 Arthur's mother petitioned for his release. However she lacked the necessary respectability to allow the boy to be released to her. The description of the family revealed his mother and siblings to be anything but respectable. The mother was:

> of drunken habits and her husband is addicted to drink ... They reside in a two roomed galvanised iron house, scantily and porrly furnished ... Mr. Jolly is in constant work and earns on average 12/6d a day ... the eldest daughter ... at the age of 17 years gave birth to an illegitimate child ... suffering from a sexual disease (84)

Rather than have the child released to her, the Council sought to have the boy put out to a responsible, respectable person who would bring the boy up properly. However in a variation to the norm, instead of the Reformatory finding a person for the boy to be indentured to, Mrs. Jolly provided some one who could be trusted to accomplish the tasks of controlling the boy by setting an adequate role model and giving appropriate employment. This was a Mr. Sexton. In doing so Mrs. Jolly indicated her compliance with the process of reformation and gave tacit agreement to her family's unsuitability. Mr. Sexton was investigated and was subsequently described as "a farmer and good Catholic." In June Mr. Sexton was contacted by phone and Arthur was released to him for 15/- a week and from this point on, a money order arrived for Arthur Jolly's account

every few months, a portion of which was for his own savings and another for his mother. In return, the S.C.C. supplied the boy with a new suit for his future life. (85)

Albert Jolly differed from his peers in that he was sent to farm work rather than industrial work. His peers in the 1920's were increasingly being sent to the factories as apprentices or labourers in the obvious recognition that this was the growth area of the economy and, thus, more likely to absorb boys with low skills and poor education. The reason Albert was sent to a farm far from the city, lay in the fact that he was a particularly difficult case and had to be put into service at a place where he could not contact, nor be contacted, by his dissolute family. As the Josephite nuns had noted in respect to their female charges, the "expense and difficulties of travel would prevent undesirable relatives from visiting ... and ... also abscondings would cease." (86) Further, there was a hope that the countryside, untainted by the street culture and the depressing atmosphere of the slums, would provide Albert with a form of physical and mental activity appropriate to the development of the necessary moral virtues to become a man.

Boys from the Reformatory who were considered less difficult than Albert, such as Reginald Magill, became piece workers in factories and workers on production lines. (87) This was not just a recognition that such boys had less need of the isolation of the bush but it was also an acknowledgement that mechanisation of agriculture had dampened the demand for unskilled labour. As Mennel noted when considering the contemporary process of industrialisation in America:

> the economic and social problems of the reform schools did not evaporate in the country air ... and ... few schools could stay abreast of agricultural technology. (88)

The Brothers at the Reformatory were even less able than their American peers to cope with this industrialisation as few of the Brothers were familiar with the demands or practices of the industrial system and the few men who joined the Reformatory and possessed the necessary skills did not stay. (89) As a consequence, the Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park fell behind each year with the changes in work practices and needs of the boys. It ended up producing unskilled workers who were condemned to the bottom of the working class by their lack of skill and the age at which they began work. Yet, they were expected to conform to the ideals of the skilled working class, the artisans, with their hunger for middle class respectability and achievement.

The Reformatory offered a moral education. It trained the boys to express this primarily through their standards of dress, manners and application to work. To achieve this transfer of values the Brothers stressed the need for the right environment. This had to be isolated from previous influences, such as the inadequate family, and to be as structured as possible. Temptation of all kinds was to be excluded as much as possible and religion as a form of thought and behaviour was rigorously practiced. Again the outward signs of attending church, acting modestly and correctly were seen as achieving success.

If the process failed there were many excuses. The boy's corrupt nature, the guardians the boy had been put out to were inadequate, the moral education incomplete. Hence the Brothers offered as a solution to such failure more incarceration, more rote training and more dependency until the boy achieved the correct forms of respectable Catholic manly behaviour.

Regardless of the reasons for failure or success, the primary aim remained, that of turning the boys into respectable Catholic males. These males would prove their

worth by working hard, abstaining from drink and by controlling their sexual desires. They would come to associate only with Catholics and seek to place their children in Catholic schools. They would achieve this by hard work, religion, education in trades and useful activities and by being put into the right environment. In short, the process of education was more important than what was taught.

NOTES

1. Catholic Archives (C.A.)
   Fr. Smyths Sermons. 1909-1921. (F.S.S.). 1911.

2. E. Campion, Rockchoppers. (Penguin Books, 1982) p. 63.

3. G. Saunders, "J.A. Hartley and the founding of the Public Education system in South Australia" in C. Turney (Ed.), Pioneers of Australian Education. (Sydney University Press, 1972) Vol.2, p.173.

4. ibid p.174.

5. South Australian Archives (SAA) Government Record Group (GRG) State Children's Council (SCC) annual reports: 1898-1925: Virtually all reports praise the B.R.B.P. GRG. 27/31.

6. C.A. File 3 Directory and Rules of the Institute of the Brothers of St. John the Baptist. (rules) 3: (1) The rules are split as in this case into Chapters (3) and Section (1).

7. C.A. F.S.S. 1918.

8. See particularly C.A. Correspondence. (C) Folio 1. Letters for 1923; the year of the Institutes declaration by the Pope.

9. C.A. (rules) (1). p.11.

10. ibid pg. 11.

11. ibid pg. 11.

12. C.A. F.S.S. 1917.

13. J. Roe, "Leading the World 1901-1914" in J. Roe (Ed.), Social Policy in Australia (Cassell Australia, 1976) p. 14.

14. Eugenic theory basically resolved the Nature/Nurture debate in favour of Nature by considering human character to be determined by genetic inheritance. See D. Macallum: "Eugenics, Psychology and Education in Australia." Melbourne Working Papers , Volume 4, 1982/83.

15. C.A. F.S.S. 1921.

16. C.A. (Rules) 2 (6).

17. S. Garton, "The Melancholy years: Psychiatry in N.S.W. 1900-1940" in R. Kennedy (Ed.), Australian Welfare History. (Macmillan, 1982) p. 157.

18. R. Evans, "The Hidden Colonists. Deviance and Social Control in Colonial Queensland". in Roe, p. 188.

19. Stephen Humphries, Hooligans or Rebels: An Oral History of the Working Class Childhood and Youth 1889-1939. (Oxford University Press, 1981) p. 211.

20. ibid p. 214.

21. C.A. Rules. 2. (1) p. 16

22. Bro. Schutz ... Interview No. 2.

23. S. Humphries. Chpt. 8. passim.

24. Bro. Schutz ... Interview No. 2.

25. C.A.C. Folio. 1.

26. Bro. Schutz ... Interview No. 1.

27. H. Tomlinson, " Design and Reform: The Separate System in the Nineteenth-Century English Prison." A. D. King (Ed.) Buildings and Society. (Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1980) Chpt. 3 passim.

28. ibid p. 114.

29. See Humphries, Chpt 8.

30. C.A.C. Folio 2. dated 1926, composed in 1923. This document was prepared for the Brothers' submission to be recognised by the Church. It reflects an earlier time table composed at the Brothers' foundation. There were no less than 7 periods of prayer mentioned in the document.

31. Humphries, p. 211.

32. C.A. (rules) "School Rules." 77. (2).

33. ibid 87. (1).

34. ibid 85. (38), 88 (47).

35. C.A.C. Folio 1. 20 August. 1926. No. 41, and 10 October 1927.

36. ibid 1 November 1929.

37. Humphries, Chpt. 8. passim.

38. Applications for release 1921: S.A.A. GRG: 27/4/1921.

39. C.A. (rules) 61 (1).

40. C.A. F.S.S. 1921.

41. C.A. (rules) 101 (10); 89 (52); 18 (17); 95 (1).

42. ibid 98 (14).

43. ibid 17 (13); 4 (9); 16 (10); 59 (7).

44. ibid 32 (1).

45. Bro. Schutz ... Interview No. 1.

46. C.A. (rules) 81 (19).

47. ibid 99 (18).

48. Humphries, p. 219.

49. ibid 224.

50. Humphries. p. 223.

51. R. M. Mennel, Thorns and Thistles.
(University of New England Press, 1973) p. 74.

52. C.A. (rules.) 98 (1).

53. C.A.F.S.S. 1912.

54. J. Godden, 'The work for them and the glory for us!' Sydney female Philanthropy 1810-1900." in Kennedy. p. 85.

55. C.A. F.S.S.S. 1912.

56. GRG 29/121/1912 "Quinn".

57. GRG 29/121/1920 "Quinn".

58. GRG 29/121/1915 "Quinn".

59. GRG 27/4/1920.

60. GRG 29/121/1921 see also Riley 29/121/1915.

61. GRG 27/12/1875-1908; Harris - 1902.

62. ibid. 1905 - Harris.

63. ibid 1907 - Harris.

64. ibid 1905 - Harris.

65. ibid 1905 - Smith.

66. S.A.A. Mandates for Committal. GRG 29/121/1906 - O'Hare.

67. ibid 29/121/1908 - O'Hare.

68. S.A.A. GRG 27/4/1920. Wallace.

69. ibid

70. ibid

71. P.Cook, I.Davey, M. Vick, "Capitalism and Working Class Schooling in late Nineteenth Century South Australia". In Journal of Australian and New Zealand History of Education Society. (ANZHES Journal) Vol. 8, No.2 1979.

72. GRG 29/121/1920. "Clifford".

73. S.A.A. Petitions GRG 27/4/1920.
Two petitions exist - one in the name of Wallace, the other McCarthy - they are attached to each other.

74. GRG 27/4/1920 "McCarthy".

75. ibid "McCarthy".

76. See the examples of such boys in Chapter Four of this thesis.

77. M. Barbalet, Far from a Low Gutter Girl (Oxford University Press, 1983) p. 198.

78. S.A.A. Annual Reports. 1906.

79. See Barbalet for a comprehensive examination of the process by which female state wards were "put out" and their response to this experience.

80. B.K. Hyams and B. Bessant, Schools for the People? (Longman, 1972) p. 66; pp 87-88;

81. S.A.A. S.C.C. annual reports often argued the value of country life. Occasionally it presented long arguments as to the need to extend the experience. See 1897: appendix and 1926 as examples.

82. See GRG 27/4/1920.

83. GRG 29/121/1921. "Jolly".

84. GRG 27/4/1921. " Jolly".

85. GRG 29/121/1921. "Jolly".

86. K. Wimshurst, " Control & Resistance : Reformatory School Girls in Late Nineteenth Century South Australia.". Journal of Social History Vol. 18, 1984 - 1985 p. 284.

87. See Chpt. 4; SAA GRG 29/121/1921 Magill.

88. Mennel. p. 105.

89. See the earlier discussion of John Hynds and membership of the Order.

CHAPTER FOUR

RECALCITRANT CLIENTS

Recalcitrance means obstinate disobedience and as a word it is derived from the Latin meaning to "kick out". It is thus an apt word when used in the context of the Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park, as the boys who rebelled, kicked out against the respectability offered by the Brothers of Saint John the Baptist. Similarly the Brothers' response to recalcitrance from their charges, was to control the boys and continue to train them as one would a disobedient or wayward animal that had in some way lashed out in the midst of a training programme. Recalcitrance displayed by the boys was in the form of recidivism, acts of solidarity and absconding.

The genesis of these acts of rebellion lay in the tension created by the Brothers' desire to impose a regimen which was in sharp contrast to the habitual lifestyles of the boys. Their attempts to induce respectability by use of strict timetables, cleanliness and religion clashed with the boys previous existence in which they were key members of the family economy, obtaining part time work and perceived more as young adults, rather than as dependant children. Davey has described this transitional period in such a boy's life as:

> almost entirely unregulated. It was achieved with little or no guidance or restriction, either familial or institutional. Even at school he had one foot in the classroom and one in the workplace. The final step would have passed unremarked. He never really had an adolescence as we understand it. (1)

This unregulated existence clashed violently with the ordered dependency administered by the Brothers at Reformatory. It is interesting that the tension rarely exploded into rioting or violence, as it did in similar institutions for girls. The boys did not act in concert to resist the authorities. (2) Instead they tended to act individually

by absconding, or by misbehaving when out on probation or service, so that they were returned as unsuitable or uncontrollable.

Recidivists were numerous and this was the main expression of recalcitrance amongst the boys. It was a delayed defiance whereby they abandoned all moral lessons of the Reformatory, seeking instead to treat the Reformatory experience as an interruption to a lifestyle, rather than recognising it as an attempt at correction. Often the boys were returned by their parents, sometimes after the parents had regularly petitioned for their son's release. Michael Fahey was an early example of such recidivism. Michael, aged 16 years, was sentenced in July 1901 for using indecent language in a public place. (3) He was fined, failed to meet the cost and was put into the Reformatory for a week. Unaffected by his short stay Michael stole a saddle worth £1.10.0 from his father and was resentenced to the Reformatory on 29 November 1901, only four months after being first released. Still defiant, Michael absconded on 16 December with William Clark and remained free, until recaptured, on 13 January 1902 - 29 days later. He was resentenced, but this time remained in the Reformatory until his father petitioned for his release, which was granted on 20 August 1902. Michael was then aged 17 years 10 months - 2 months short of the completion of his sentence. (4)

William Carroll, a contemporary of Michael's, was admitted to the Reformatory at the age of 10 years. William's parents were separated, his mother lived at Wallaroo and his father at Grote Street in the City. He was charged as uncontrollable by his father, who himself was described as "sober and respectable" and who "acted as agent and collected rents." (5) William was sentenced in 1900 and was well behaved enough to be released on petition to his father in 1902. The father's occupation and respectable status had a large part to play in both the boy's original sentencing and in his early

release, as his father's respectability was emphasised in both the mandate for committal and the petition for release.

Yet, despite the apparent respectability of the parent and his obvious value as a role model for William, the boy was soon resentenced. This occurred after a year in his father's care in 1903. William was convicted of larceny. He had "stolen birds: to wit 3 pigeons of the value of 5/-; property of Cornelius Crowley" (6). William at this stage was 12 years and 10 months old. In committing such a crime, despite having been in the Reformatory and having learnt the lessons of adequate and respectful behaviour, especially due regard for property, William was in need of special treatment. Hence, he was not released again to his father, despite his father petitioning in 1904, twice in 1905 and twice in 1907. There is no evidence to show that William was anything but a properly behaved boy in the Reformatory. On June 25 1907, at age 15 years and 10 months, William was put out to service to Mr. F. Ryan of Hamley Bridge, indicating thus that he was seen as mature and responsible enough to learn the tasks of a servant and that he had proved himself respectful enough of others to be trusted outside the control of the Reformatory. (7)

In August, 1908, at the age of 17 years and 10 months, William was returned to the Reformatory for misconduct. This time William had to serve out the rest of his sentence in the Reformatory. William, thus, reveals the means by which the Reformatory dealt with those that betrayed its trust. He had twice failed the Reformatory and as a consequence, found himself kept there for long periods of time. While William did not abscond, he did rebel in a most obvious and effective way by refusing obstinately to conform to the moral behaviour promoted by the Reformatory.

Another factor that led to rebellious activity and that of the ultimate act of rebellion of absconding, occurred when the Reformatory sponsored an experience of full time employment. This employment can be distinguished from the placing out on service, as such "service" entailed being given to members of the community as an indentured servant. The boy's task was to be of service to someone whilst they were serving their sentence. In contrast to this, the Reformatory also facilitated boys obtaining full-time work as part of their service time. When so engaged the boys were treated to the same wages and conditions as their peers, but were checked by inspectors. Cases which illustrate this aspect of the Reformatory's work belong to later periods in the Reformatory's history and apply to older boys. Boys placed in full time work were often successful, yet there were some boys who absconded from the workplace and others who refused to fulfil work expectations and were sent back to the Reformatory. These failures were ironic as the whole thrust of the Reformatory was to enable boys to achieve a respectable lifestyle, of which full time employment was the most crucial aspect.

Reginald Magill was one who absconded from full time work. He had stolen £6 in November 1919 and was caught and placed on probation in his mother's care. Had Reginald been convicted of such a theft a decade earlier, he would have almost certainly been committed to the Reformatory until 18 years old. Despite the court's leniency in giving him such a chance, Reginald proved too difficult for his mother and was put into the Reformatory in February 1920. In May 1921 Reginald was again released from Brooklyn Park to his mother on probation. On 27 of July, 1921 he was subject to a report that read as follows:

> Reginald was a failure ... his was absolutely lazy and impudent. He had three situations in three months and was dismissed from each.

> He was then transferred to the Boys Reformatory Brooklyn Park ... he was released a little over 2 months ago. He has already had three situations... Carrols Wicker Works ... he was dismissed as useless ... Waltons ... he left because they wished him to go on piece work ... he likes to get his wage with the minimum amount of work ... I then get him on at Simpsons at 18/- per week I can clearly see we are going to have a lot of trouble with the boy ... (8)

The report predicting trouble with Reginald at Simpsons was proved correct, on 13 August, 1921, the inspector reported: "He (Reginald) has been warned that if he leaves his present position he will be returned to Boys Reformatory Brooklyn Park". (9) It is clear that Reginald's attitude and approach to work was not seen as consistent with that of a member of the respectable working class. This was an obvious worry to the State Children's Council and the Reformatory, as the behaviour of Reginald struck at the root of their endeavours. They closely monitored him and were alternately urging him on and threatening him with return to the Reformatory. The essence of their threat was that Reginald would lose his new found adult status and income and would be reduced again to that of a dependent, if returned to the Reformatory. Reginald failed to heed advice and warnings. He took his freedom and sense of independence to its limits and left his place of work. The report noted that:

> Simpsons rang ... they had been obliged to reprimand Reginald sharply for carelessly knocking over a pile of enamel signs. Reginald gave impudence, put his coat on and left. The other boys noted he was parading £9 or £10 in notes. Saw mother at once about 6 p.m. She said the boy had returned home at 4 p.m. dressed in his best and gone out. She had given him £10 to bank.

> The boy it has since transpired absconded to Melbourne, returning apparently yesterday. I was informed by some-one ringing up for his mother, but fearing the boy would not come with me I rang police as there was a warrant out for him. Boy sent to Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park while a country situation is being found for him. (10)

Reginald was returned to the Reformatory on 25 November, 1921, at the age of 17 years. Within two months, Reginald's mother applied for his release by petition. The petition was not granted, despite the fact that the petition's report noted "Mrs Magill has since married and has a comfortable home and had obtained work for her son." (11)

Reginald was a boy who had been given the chance to become a respectable worker. However, he was found wanting. He failed to follow instructions and was careless at his tasks. When given money he betrayed the trust put in him and went to Melbourne to spend it. Overall Reginald was a failure for the Reformatory system. He was, however, over the average age when he entered the Reformatory, as he was 16 years old. This gave him experiences of life and attitudes that the Brothers would have found hard to eradicate or even modify. To some extent the Brothers recognised this and had Reginald passed on as soon as they could. Yet, even in this attempt, they failed. Consequently, the Reformatory became a form of prison in which Reginald was incarcerated until his term expired. Thus Reginald sums up many of the functions and directions taken by the Reformatory when faced with total rebellion. It reverted to being a gaol of the most naked kind, holding the child away from society as long as it was legally able to. In this case the Reformatory no longer acted to reform but rather to punish by attacking the independence and self esteem of the child.

In Reginald's case the situation was made more intense because he was well past 15 years of age and he was well versed in life on the outside of the Reformatory. For Reginald the Reformatory and its lessons were irrelevant. The only function the Reformatory could provide was to be a place of containment.

Another boy who had a similar experience of the Reformatory as a holding institution was Albert H. He was put into the Industrial School, Edwardstown, in 1919 as an uncontrollable child. Whilst in the school he was reported three times for misconduct and once for absconding. In response to this absconding attempt he was transferred to the Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park in1921 at the age of 11 years. His mother immediately sought to have him released but the petition was refused. The main reason for the refusal which appeared upon the file, was that the boy's home life was less than desirable. The investigating officer reported:

> Mrs M. is living in a miserable locality. She has 3 little children by her second marriage, one boy is 8 by her first marriage ... and she has Margorie aged 16 ... for all the children, her husband and herself there is only one bedroom and the use of a balcony. (12)

Undaunted, Mrs. M reapplied in February 1926. She was recorded at this time to be 39 years of age and as living at Bacon Street, Hindmarsh with five children. This was to be the second of four applications that continued until 1927. In response to this petition the boy and his family were again investigated. The inspector noted that:

> this lad ... has been most unsatisfactory ... his parents frequently move from suburb to suburb to avoid their creditors ... the other

> children in the home ... are being supervised by the education department for truancy. (13)

The report made further comment upon Mrs. M:

> before her marriage to Mr. M. she was living with him as his wife, but was later divorced and married him ... she is a rough coarse woman ... who is always getting into debt. Mr. M. appears to have degenerated since his marriage ... she shouted at them (the children) and pushed them around in rough fashion. (14)

Mrs. M. was not to be denied and produced a reference from a Rev. W.H. Cann who claimed that the boy needed a mother's care. Needless to say, Albert was not released as:

> the applicant has a bad reputation but we have no evidence to show that she is living a fast life except that her husband has no confidence in her. (15)

Overall, the family did not fit the image of respectability being fostered by the Reformatory and as a result Albert stood no chance of being released.

Interestingly, Albert seemed to have behaved himself while living at the Reformatory. Fr. Smyth, the superintendent, wrote in March 1926;" I beg to inform you that this boy is in the first class and his conduct is satisfactory." (15) This is in remarkable contrast to Albert's record elsewhere, for whilst Mrs. M. was making her requests, Albert had been placed out on service. On 31 March 1924 he was placed out but was returned soon after, on 5 May 1925, for being unsuitable and very disobedient.

He was again placed out on 30 July 1925 but was once more returned as unsuitable, on the 22 August of that year. On 24 April 1926 he was put out on service yet again. He absconded this time on 22 December 1926, but returned voluntarily to the Reformatory on the same day.

Fr. Smyth had little problem with the boy and Albert liked being at the Reformatory. He did not like being out at work. At this point, it was obvious to all that Albert could not go out to service, yet he was now almost 15 years old and had spent well over five years in the Reformatory system, four of them being at Brooklyn Park. The solution was to leave Albert at the Reformatory.

On 4 January, 1927 Mrs. M. applied again. This time she had the Mayor of Hindmarsh write on her behalf. He asked that the boy be released to do an apprenticeship. He claimed that the Reformatory was not training the boy to any good end:

> He is being trained at present, still it will be almost useless to him in years to come, as that would not qualify him for his necessary certificate as a competent tradesman. (17)

However, Mrs. M. was still seen in a poor light by the S.C.C. She was seen as "a most unruly woman ... her husband informed me he had reason to believe that she still goes about with other men." (18) Consequently, the petition was refused. However as the earlier letter from Fr. Smyth had indicated, the boy was little trouble at the Reformatory and it was probably because Fr. Smyth was convinced of Albert's good behaviour that when Mrs. M. applied again in April 1927, he was released to her on probation.

Once home again, Albert caused problems. A report stemmed from this which claimed that:

> Mrs. M. says that Albert's conduct in the home is bad. He uses filthy language in the presence of his mother and the younger children. He is also in the habit of flogging the younger children in the home. It appears Albert completely upsets the home and his mother makes no attempt to correct him. (19)

Albert was not what his mother hoped he would be, nor was he a good advertisement for the process of reformation at the Reformatory. The years of training seemed not to have had any effect and his behaviour, if anything, was a negation of what he had been taught about being respectable.

Later in the same year Albert was found work at Orroroo as a farm hand, in much the same way that Reginald was found work at Simpsons. Like Reginald, Albert absconded from the job and returned home. Albert claimed that he had been "twitted on being a state child." The report took no further action and on 6 October, Albert was found fresh work with "Mr. C. Francis of Bugle Ranges at 30/- a week." This did not last long and, again, Albert returned home. He still had not shown much evidence of having learned the lessons of the Reformatory. A minute dated 4 November, 1927, notes:

> he is out of work and makes no effort to find it. Does not get up until late in the morning which is particularly bad seeing the father is in receipt of public relief. (20)

At this point, Albert found work with Mr. Johnson of Kimba and all appeared well. However, on 8 November, 1927, a letter arrived alleging theft from the farm that Albert had worked on at Orroroo. He was accused of stealing a safety razor, soap, brushes, suspenders, combs, handkerchiefs and books. It was also claimed that he had:

> shot up the cowshed, wash house and lavatory with rifle bullets and made a nest in the straw at the bottom of the paddock with books and water instead of working. (21)

The matter was investigated and the family questioned "with no result" except that "Mr. M. had little doubt that he (Albert) took the lot" (22) The family at Orroroo appears to have pressed the department and on 7 February, 1928, Albert was convicted of unlawful possession and was sentenced to the Reformatory for six months.

Incredibly, despite being quite a disappointment to the Reformatory by betraying its trust and failing to abide by any of the precepts of the Brothers, Albert attempted to gain his release from the Reformatory. He wrote in 1928 in a very clear, well formed handwriting to the Children's Services Officer: "... My height is 5' 9" and my weight is over 11 stone and I feel ashamed when I think I am not supporting myself." (23) Fr. Smyth wrote a supporting letter, in which he stated that Albert's behaviour was satisfactory and that he was:

> an exceptionally well grown boy and is over 18 years of age and I am of the opinion it would be advisable to give him an opportunity to earn his own living. (24)

In a letter of 2 May, 1928, Albert and Fr. Smyth were told that the requests would not be granted and Albert remained in the Reformatory until September when his sentence expired.

Ultimately, the Reformatory became a place of confinement rather than a place of reform for Albert. There was nowhere else for him to go and so he was put away in the care of Fr. Smyth and the Brothers and was not to be released until the last possible moment. Albert, like Reginald thus reveals the futility of the reform process for the most recalcitrant offenders.

The letters written by Fr. Smyth and Albert indicate their concern about his increasing maturity and his approach to manhood. Albert was ashamed of his failure to escape the dependent situation of having to learn and rely upon the Reformatory. Fr. Smyth was concerned about the impact of delaying Albert's entry into the adult world. Both were well aware that Albert was too old for the institution and in some way offered a threat to its operation. These letters highlight the contradiction between society's view of the older juvenile as an apprentice adult, practicing responsibility and acquiring respectability and the Reformatory's role of maintaining a child-like dependency to allow the child to obtain these attributes. This contradiction became more acute as the boy became older and showed signs of physical maturity; these frustrations were expressed by absconding, outbursts of rebellion or, unusually, as in Albert's case, by pleas for release.

The foregoing cases present a picture of the recividist as a boy who had been in the Reformatory for some time or, at least, had some prior experience of it. He was over the age of 15 years and had some teenage experience of the "outside world" as well. The recidivist resented the reform process and also made some extravagant gesture, be it

the extreme of "shooting up the cow shed", or merely "flashing money". The most spectacular of the recidivists tended to be those out on service, perhaps because they had more opportunity to rebel, whilst those in the Reformatory may well have found passive resistance enough of an achievement. Interestingly, it was not uncommon for such a boy to return voluntarily to the Reformatory, especially if the boy had been out on service. Recidivists were punished by having their sentence extended and by experiencing delays in being put out to service, which suggests they might have achieved their aim of remaining at Brooklyn Park.

Overall, however, the thrust of the Reformatory was to delay the process of growing up by increasing the period of dependency. This gave the boys longer to learn the values and attitudes of proper respectability that would enable them to succeed in the world. Hence, the extension of the period in which the boys were kept in the Reformatory when they transgressed the law, or betrayed the trust of the Reformatory.

A further challenge to the workings of the Reformatory and its desire to produce the respectable worker was presented when the Brothers were confronted by displays of solidarity. The idea of a special institution such as a Reformatory was essentially to isolate those at risk from their sources of temptation, so that they could effectively develop the moral structures necessary to be responsible, respectable citizens. This isolation meant the boys were brought together at random and were reduced to isolated solitary individuals, easily directed and instructed. Thus, any displays of solidarity provided a rather difficult challenge as the Brothers found themselves confronting a small cell of boys who were united, passed lessons of disobedience and resistance and kept alive those very aspects of life that the Reformatory hoped to remove. Thus, older brothers, gang leaders and strong friends provided role models which were undesirable and difficult to discredit.

One such challenge which the Reformatory failed to control effectively was the membership of brothers in a gang or "push". This provided a dual challenge in that not only was there sibling support and solidarity, but also the peer support from other gang members made the ability to resist the authorities both more effective and more durable. The situation was made far worse when the "push" existed before the boys were sentenced to the Reformatory. Such a challenge occurred very early in the history of the Boys Reformatory Brooklyn Park and the experience seemed to be sufficiently traumatic to ensure that the situation did not occur again.

This challenge occurred when the O'Loughlin brothers were sentenced to the Reformatory along with the Reid boys. The two families were from the town of Kapunda and were part of a gang of boys of different ages. The boys were not all sentenced to the Reformatory at any one time, but arrived over a period of time. Thomas and James O'Loughlin were sentenced to the Boys Reformatory Brooklyn Park in 1897. Thomas was aged 13 years and his brother 9 years. The family was centred on the mother, Mary O'Loughlin, as the father had died some years earlier. The mother was described as living at the Morning Star near Kapunda and that she "receives government rations ... very poor and sober." (25) The eldest O'Loughlin boy, Thomas, was sentenced for "larceny of beef dripping and sausages", while James, the younger brother, was convicted of "unlawfully assaulting Florence Ellis with a stone". They were soon to be joined by John on 19 March 1899, who was aged 12 years and 8 months. He was convicted of the "larceny of one pair of silver plated spurs and two cakes." (26) At this point all the boys of the O'Loughlin family were in the Reformatory, leaving only a sister at home with the mother.

Two years later, the brothers were split up. Thomas went to service with Mr. W.P. Dahf of Eurila, (27) in April 1901, while John was sent out to service in

September 1902. Only three months later on December 9, 1902, at age 14 years, James absconded from the Reformatory. A cryptic memo records him as being "overage and the police informed." (28) He was one of the very few boys not to be caught and be returned to the Reformatory. James, the boy who absconded, had been in the Reformatory for some five years, and his departure so soon after being separated from his brother, reveals that the Reformatory process had little impact upon him. Rather, it seems it had been the presence of his brothers with him in the Reformatory, that had kept him in there and their removal prompted him to abscond.

The case of the O'Loughlins is complicated by their relationship with the Reids, the other family to be sentenced from Kapunda. The two sets of brothers made up a gang or push that operated around Kapunda. The relationship was a complex one and appears to have affected the behaviour of the boys at the Reformatory and thus the efficacy of the training that was given to the boys by the Brothers.

The families of the two sets of siblings were similar. As with the O'Loughlins, Mrs. Reid was the nominal head of the family, as the father was recorded as living at Broken Hill. In fact Mrs. Reid lived at the Morning Star Hotel with Mrs. O'Loughlin. Unlike Mrs. O'Loughlin however, Mrs. Reid was noted for a less savoury image as she was recorded as being addicted to drink. (29) There were five in the Reid family, with the two sons, John and Joseph, being those closest to the O'Loughlin boys.

The Reids' careers parallel those of the O'Loughlin brothers. John Reid was sentenced in 1897, aged 13 years and 3 months. He was recorded as being guilty of the theft of the beef dripping and sausages along with Thomas O'Loughlin. In 1898, he was sent out to service to a Mr. Pat Fitzpatrick, a Roman Catholic farmer.

Joseph Reid was sentenced with John O'Loughlin in March 1899 to the Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park, for the theft of the silver plated spurs and two cakes. (30) John O'Loughlin was 12 years 8 months at the time, Joseph was 10 years 11 months. On the very day that Joseph arrived at the Reformatory, he attempted to escape. Joseph was away for a day and had his sentence extended for one month as a punishment after he was caught and returned to Brooklyn Park. Thus, by 1899 five members of the Kapunda push were in the Reformatory together.

In April 1901 Thomas O'Loughlin was put out to service. Then, in July 1901, John Reid was recommitted after absconding from Mr. Fitzpatrick. He was sentenced to the Reformatory until 18 years of age but remained there for one month only and then absconded again on 9 August, 1901. (31) On August 30, 1901 Joseph Reid absconded. This was his second attempt at absconding. Once more he was recaptured a day later and his sentence was extended until he turned 18 years, 6 months. (32) Again his absconding attempt, after some 3 years of quiet acceptance of Reformatory life, was no accident and reflects the impact of the changes being experienced by the push members as the Brothers manoeuvred to break up the push and minimise its influence.

In September 1902, John O'Loughlin was put out to service with Mr. G. Kerin of Yahl Paddock Mt. Gambier. He was 16 years of age at the time. Of all the boys from the Kapunda push John O'Loughlin appeared to be the least restless and to have had the least offences against his name. This left Joseph Reid and James O'Loughlin still in the Reformatory. On December 9, 1902 James O'Loughlin absconded. He was 14 years, 9 months old at the time. He was not recaptured. (33) Joseph Reid then remained alone in the Reformatory until 1904 when he was licenced on probation to his father, at age 18 years and 6 months. He had by this time spent 7 years and 5 months learning how to be

a respectable and responsible adult but even at this age he was still put on probation to his father.

The history of the push from Kapunda illustrates several facets about the rebellious clients of the Reformatory, specifically those related to each other by some special peer and familial bonding. The boys were very close. Actions by one tended to spark reciprocal actions by another. They obviously had a strong sense of loyalty to each other and some form of need to prove their worthiness to each other by matching actions. It is interesting that Joseph Reid, the earliest rebel, was the one to serve the longest sentence at any one time. His early attempts at absconding tapered off when he had been deserted by his friends and relations. Of all the boys of the push, he was the only one the Brothers of the Reformatory could effectively claim to have had some degree of success with and that was simply by virtue of the fact that he was the one they had kept incarcerated the longest.

In the case of the boys from Kapunda we see an example of how the Reformatory acted to control its charges by use of indentured service and social isolation. Boys were split up to stop potential trouble from occurring. Ironically, this acted to cause more rebellion, as boys absconded more frequently in response to such action. It was when the Reids were broken up and the O'Loughlins were put out to service, that other members of their push tried to escape. It was when one of the boys was successful in absconding, or absent on service, that his peers caused trouble. It also indicates a failure by the Reformatory staff to effectively substitute their values and role models for those inculcated by the push that the boys had formed when younger. The very aim of the Reformatory, except perhaps in the case of Joseph Reid, failed in all respects. The Kapunda push remained incorrigible rejecting the Catholic view of manhood that was inculcated by the Brothers of St. John the Baptist.

There were some examples where peer solidarity was established between boys in the Reformatory. This was to be expected as boys in close contact with each other formed friendships that would be used to support each other in the face of the privations of Reformatory life. One particular group that emerged early in the Reformatory and which showed peer solidarity, was that of three friends, Arthur Davoren, Charles McCarthy and William Carter. The three absconded on 22 December, 1898 and were subsequently returned by Arthur Davoren's father on the following day.

William Patrick Carter was sentenced to the Industrial School, Edwardstown, in July 1896 as a "neglected child whose mother charges him being uncontrollable." He was released in March 1897, but in September 1897, he was recommitted again by his mother as being uncontrollable. He was described on the mandate as being "not a good boy. Sleeps out, won't work." His father was a plasterer, earning £1.16.0 a week and who paid 2/6d a week towards his son's expenses. (34) William was aged 13 years when he absconded in 1898. After absconding William was re-sentenced until he reached the age of 18 years. He remained in the Reformatory until November 16, 1901, when he went out to service with Mr. Lynch of Lochiel. He was then 17 years old. He was no longer the subject of any memos and we can assume he was released whilst on service.

Charles McCarthy was recorded as having no mother and that his father was a lamper of Sutherland Street, Glanville. Charles was sentenced for theft in 1897 and absconded in 1898 with William Carter and Arthur Davoren. Charles was 13 years and 6 months old at the time. (35) When he was returned, Charles had his sentence extended. In June 1898 Charles was put out to service with Mr. Kerin of Yahl Paddocks, where he remained until his sentence expired.

Arthur Davoren was sentenced in 1898 at the age of 15 years, for theft. (36) Two items are of interest in the connection of Arthur, William and Charles. The first is that Arthur had only been in the Reformatory for a month and was not as influenced as William and Charles by the operations of the Reformatory. In contrast, William had been in the Reformatory for two years and Charles for a year and a half, by the time of their escape. William was recorded as being an uncontrollable child, whilst Charles was not noted for anything excessive in his behaviour beyond the one conviction of theft. Neither had any memos and records of absconding before they met Arthur and we can conclude that the friendship between the three boys and Arthur's leadership led to their absconding. It was also to Arthur's family that the three absconded.

The second point of note is that the boys were rapidly split up. The least intractable, Charles, was put out to service in June 1898, immediately after absconding. Arthur was kept at the Reformatory until August 1899, whereupon he was released to his father. William, the boy whose record revealed him to be the most difficult of the three boys, was however kept in the Reformatory for another three years. Interestingly, when Arthur was returned to the Reformatory in 1900 and the friendship was renewed, the two were split up as soon as was practicable. Arthur was put out to service in April 1901 and William, to make the separation permanent, was finally put to service in November 1901. (37)

The case of friendship and resistance being formed within the Reformatory illustrates the difference between a push formed prior to the boy's experience of the Reformatory and that formed after sentencing. Those friendships and relationships formed outside the Reformatory had greater durability and effectiveness. Those formed within the walls had less impact and were more easily dealt with by the Brothers.

It is of significance that in this case study of peer solidarity, the only one to maintain any rebelliousness after the failed absconding was Arthur Davoren. This is of importance as Arthur was the least familiar with the routine of the Reformatory system and the only one of the boys to have any siblings within the Reformatory, suggesting the influence of these factors in determining behaviour.

Arthur's younger brother, Peter had preceded him into the Reformatory. In August 1898, Peter was sentenced to the Reformatory for larceny. A few months later his older brother Arthur, at the age of 15 years, was also sentenced for theft. Arthur took one dozen spoons and forks. As already discussed, Arthur immediately absconded with two others, but was returned on the following day by his father. Arthur was released in 1899 to his father, probably in recognition of the voluntary return. In 1900 he absconded from his father, was recaptured and sentenced and put out to service in 1901 to a Mrs. Gillard of Oladdie. (38) During this period of service, Arthur turned 18 years old and was released from his sentence while at service.

In contrast to his brother, Peter remained apparently passively at the Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park unti 1901. In that year Peter, then aged 14 years, was released to his mother. Peter very soon re-offended after his release. He was resentenced to Brooklyn Park in January 1903 for larceny. In September, 1904, he was sent to service with Mrs. A. Fox of Marybank, Hectorville. In the same year Mrs. Fox returned Peter as she no longer required him. Peter was consequently sent to Mrs. S.M. Sutton of Pleasant Park, Mt. Gambier, on February 17, 1904. He was then aged 18 years and 5 months and had until January 15, 1905 to serve out his sentence. At the completion of his sentence he was 19 years and 4 months. (39)

The Gleeson brothers illustrate another dimension of sibling experience. The Gleesons' mother lived at Bowden and their father was recorded as living at Murray Bridge in 1904 and in 1905, was described as "an indifferent character, at present on the West Coast". Thus the parents were obviously separated and the mother was effectively the head of the home. In 1902, at the age of 14 years and 10 months Edward Gleeson was sentenced to Brooklyn Park until the age of 18 years. Petitions by each parent for his release were declined in the same year. In 1903, Edward was released to service with Mr. F.P. Dempsey at Yatina. Edward absconded on April 9, 1904, whilst en route from the Jamestown Hospital to service. He was captured and resentenced to the Reformatory the next day. Edward remained in the Reformatory until he was released when his sentence expired on April 10, 1906. (40)

Edward's brother, Walter, was sentenced to the Reformatory on October 23, 1905, aged 12 years and 3 months. He was convicted of larceny. As in the case of Edward, petitions were lodged for his release upon sentencing, first by the mother, then by the father. These petitions were declined, but Walter was eventually released to his mother on February 23, 1907. (41)

Considering the Reformatory was attempting to do the educative work of the family, it is ironical that the boys who attended as a family unit posed some of the greatest problems for the Reformatory. In fact, the difficulties were so great that after the initial experience in the first decade of having a combination of brothers of differing ages in the Reformatory at the same time, the practice was rarely repeated. The challenge to the Reformatory offered by such siblings, was their ability to interact to resist the instructions of the Brothers. Again, as with other examples of boys who rebelled against the respectability offered by the Brothers, the recalcitrance was expressed chiefly in the forms of recidivism and absconding.

Not all siblings posed a threat or were failures. There were some early apparent successes with siblings who were at the Reformatory together. The Lawlor brothers are an example of such a success. Their father was a "tailor, off Waymouth Street, City" and earnt some £3.0.0. a week. A family of eight was kept on this sum: boys: 20,17,11,3; Girls: 22,15,8,6." (42) In 1896, David Lawlor was sentenced to the Industrial School, Edwardstown for the theft of dynamite caps from Alfred Short. David was released in the same year to his father. Whilst under the care of his father, in 1897, he was resentenced for the larceny of 79 ploughshares, but this time he was committed to the Brooklyn Park Reformatory. Here he served until 1899 when he was again released to his father, apparently having passively served his time and proved his reformation.

In 1898, David was joined in the Reformatory by his brother, then aged 12 years. He, too, is recorded as being named David and had committed theft. This time the father's address was Market Street, off Gouger St. (43) This was the family's third move in four years and reflected a reasonably typical pattern for many of the Reformatory boys. As with his brother, the boy remained passively at the Reformatory, until he was released to the father on probation.

In contrast to the solidarity shown by siblings, friends and by gang members, the majority of the remaining recalcitrant boys acted individually. They often indulged in acts of passive resistance, such as not paying attention in class, or not participating in the prayer and church services. A more active form of protest was shown when boys absconded. This act revealed little forethought and was undertaken merely for the immediate gratification of temporary freedom, as a considerable number of the boys were recaptured in their homes, or in the streets where they lived and the punishment for absconding was an extension of their sentence. There were 31 absconders from the Reformatory in the first decade of its operation, a good record, considering that over

200 boys were committed to the reformatory during this period. Of those who did abscond in this first decade, most were free only for a day, while four escaped for at least a month and one is not recorded as ever having been recaptured. This last boy was recorded as officially over age and thus no longer the concern of the Reformatory.

Absconders were almost all aged 15 years or over at their time of escape. (44) This was the age when their peers outside the Reformatory were considered to be young adults. Hence, it is likely that the boys absconded to avoid the dependency enforced upon them by the Reformatory which was similar to that of their childhood and which they desired to leave behind in making that final step to manhood.

The case of Patrick Leo Beatty illustrates the impact of this growing maturity upon the boys' acceptance of their dependency in the Reformatory. Patrick was already well advanced in becoming a young adult when sentenced to the Reformatory; he was not under the cotrol of his parents and was versed in street life. His mandate of committal recorded:

> The boy had been under the control of the grandmother Ellen Porter of Wallaroo. She had to go out washing. The child was allowed too much to his own resources and was inclined to thieve and stay out late at night. (45)

The mandate goes on to inform that the boy's father worked at Tumby Bay, but records nothing about his mother.

Patrick's lifestyle was recorded as questionable: "He hangs around the Town Hall at night till very late and on several occassions has not been home at night. The

grandmother cannot control him and is in indigent circumstances." He was supposed to be attending the Roman Catholic school but during the quarter ending October his attendance was nil. Then, in 1911, "Mrs. Porter had £1 sent to her by her son. The child received and opened the letter and spent the money." No conviction is recorded for this deed, but in 1912, he was caught "unlawfully taking the sum of £3.4.1., the property of Harold Conrad." For this, he was tried and sentenced to the Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park. He was 13 years and 3 months old at the time. (46) Two years later, aged 15 years, 2 months, he absconded and was at large for eight months, an unusually long period of time. He was captured and resentenced on June 14, 1915. His total sentence was extended for a month as punishment. (47)

Boys absconded from both the Reformatory and from service. Those who escaped from service were either resentful of their role as servant, or had problems with their masters, or both. As with boys who escaped from the Reformatory, the statistics for those who escaped from service, reveal that the boys typically absconded at the age of 15 years. This, again, reflects the impact of maturity upon the boys, particularly as they were originally put out to service because they had in some way proven themselves worthy of the Reformatory's trust and were old enough, or mature enough, to be in the role of indentured servant.

Far less successful in his attempts to abscond was Charles Diggers. He was a product of the welfare system, such as it was, of the late nineteeenth century and his career path is an illustration of its problems and failures. His story was in many ways an indictment of a system that attempted to replace what it perceived as inadequate parenting, with an institutional model. Diggers was born in the Central Asylum in 1887 and was convicted under the Destitute Relief Act on June10, 1889, as having "no home or settled place of abode". (48) He was two and a half years at the time and he was sent

to the Industrial School, Magill, to be brought up, his mother having forfeited the right to bring him up, by her poverty. Charles was registered at the Industrial School until May 10, 1901, when he absconded from the service of Mrs. Rogers. Cryptically, we are told he was returned by Mr. C. Preece of 222 Gilles Street.

At the time of absconding, Charles was 14 years and 5 months old. He had only a year and one half left before he was due to leave the school and enter the world at large. Upon his recapture, Diggers was sentenced to the Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park. He was, thus, one of many boys who were sent from one institution to another in response to actions which attacked the nature of the institution to which they were originally sentenced. Charles entered Brooklyn Park at a disturbed time. A push was unsettling the boys and naive Charles responded on August 13, 1901, by absconding. He was away for a day before being recaptured. On August 30, of the same year, he repeated the action in the company of a push member, Joseph Reid. Again, he was away for a day. This time he was sentenced to an extra five months and on December 10, he was sent to the home of Mr. M. Kain of Mt. Gambier, where he served out the last six months of his time. (49)

We see in Charles Diggers some of the themes that were common to the experience of absconders; a short time of absconding, the apparent pointless nature of the act and previous experience of the Reformatory or welfare system. Note that Charles may be seen as slightly exceptional, as he was a product of institutionalization.

Recalcitrance had as its source the tensions created by the impact of physical and emotional maturity upon the boys self-esteem and self-image. It is of significance that the boys who rebelled regularly, or successfully, were over the age of 15 years. The Reformatory offered images and values of respectable manhood to the boys, while maintaining the boys in a state of child-like dependency. The contrast between the

Reformatory model and their own experience of the adult world was considerable. In many cases, rejecting the Reformatory was part of the process by which the boys could prove themselves to be adult. The act of absconding alone put an end, even if it was only briefly, to the state of dependency for the boy and thus enabled him to experience adulthood and independence.

NOTES

1. I. Davey, "Growing up in South Australia," in E. Richards (Ed.), Flinders History of South Australia: Social History. (Wakefield Press, 1986) p. 375.

2. K. Wimshurst, "Control and Resistance: Reformatory School Girls in the Late Nineteenth Century South Australia" in Journal of Social History Vol. 18, 1984 - 1985 p. 282.

3. South Australian Archives. (SAA) Government Record Group (GRG). 27/12/1898-1908: Admissions. 1901 "Fahey".

4. ibid. 1902 "Fahey".

5. ibid. 1900 "Carroll".

6. ibid. 1903 "Carroll".

7. ibid. 1908 "Carroll".

8. SAA GRG 27/4/1921 "Magill".

9. ibid.

10. ibid.

11. ibid.

12. SAA GRG 27/4/1921 "Albert H.".

13. ibid. 1927.

14. ibid. 1927.

15. ibid. Letter "Rev. W.H. Cann".

16. ibid. Letter "Fr. Smyth".

17. ibid. Letter "Mayor of Hindmarsh".

18. ibid. 1924.

19. ibid. 1927.

20. ibid. 1927.

21. ibid. Letter 1927.

22. ibid. Memo 1927.

23. ibid. Letter "Albert" 1928.

24. ibid. Letter "Fr. Smyth" 1928.

25. SAA GRG 27/12/1897 "James O'Loughlin".

26. ibid. 1899 "John O'Loughlin".

27. ibid. 1897 "Thomas O'Loughlin".

28. ibid. 1897 "James O'Loughlin".

29. ibid. 1899 "John Reid".

30. ibid. 1899 "Joseph Reid".

31. ibid. 1901 "John Reid".

32. ibid. 1901 "Joseph Reid".

33. ibid. 1899 "John O'Loughlin".

34. ibid. 1897 "Carter".

35. ibid. 1897 "McCarthy".

36. ibid. 1899 "Arthur Davoren".

37. ibid. 1900 "Carter".

38. ibid. 1900 "Arthur Davoren".

39. ibid. 1903 "Peter Davoren".

40. ibid. 1902 "Edward Gleeson".

41. ibid. 1905 "Walter Gleeson".

42. ibid. 1897 "David Lawlor".

43. ibid. 1898 "David Lawlor".

44. Appendix 1 (e) "table of leaving ages".

45. SAA GRG 29/121/1912 "Beatty".

46. ibid.

47. ibid. 1915 "Beatty".

48. SAA GRG 27/12/1901 "Diggers".

49. ibid. 1901 "Diggers".

CHAPTER 5

EPILOGUE: THE END OF AN ORDER

Whilst the Reformatory had periods of internal crisis with its clients and their needs, it generally had very little interference from outside bodies. Overall, it was a well regarded institution that was little questioned and rarely asked to justify itself. The reports of the State Children's Council were always positive and frequently complimentary. On the surface it would appear that for most of the Reformatory's life, its function of turning delinquent boys into good, moral, respectable Catholics, was universally well supported.

Yet problems did exist with the Reformatory and its relations with the "outside world". In the debates around the educational reforms of 1915 the Reformatory was subject to some close and unwelcome scrutiny, whilst in the 1930's the Reformatory like other government funded institutions found itself in great financial difficulty. Finally in 1941 the Reformatory was closed down and it became an orphanage. This cessation of the original function was followed closely by the dissolution of the Brothers of St. John the Baptist by the Archbishop of Adelaide and a new Order of religious, the Salesian Fathers, took over. This order was considerably different to their predecessors as they were trained in different techniques and, though agreeing in general principle with the Brothers of St. John the Baptist, they had different ends in mind. Interestingly this administration also underwent considerable change during its tenure of the Reformatory at Brooklyn Park, which came to an end in 1984.

These developments reveal something of the Reformatory's operation as they indicate how the Reformatory responded to change. Not the least of these changes were the demands of the state, which was the principle funding source for the Reformatory. The state communicated its expectations through the State Children's Council (S.C.C.) and its successor, the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Board (C.W.P.R.B.). These two organisations worked closely with the Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park to achieve their

shared desire to produce useful and respectable citizens out of their mutual charges. It must be remembered that the S.C.C. was the senior partner in the relationship as it held the money and was instructed to investigate the Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park and to report to the Parliament annually. Despite this superior position, the S.C.C. rarely interfered with the operations of the Reformatory other than to set the broadest of parameters for the reform process itself.

The nature of the relationship between the state and the Reformatory is well documented in the annual reports of the S.C.C. to Parliament. These reports concentrated upon assessing the inmates' progress, commenting upon administration and offering some sweeping generalisation regarding a worthy or notable event in the year of the Reformatory. These reports were always very broad, always positive and even offered excuses for problems and failings. An example of this occurred in 1899, a year after the Reformatory was opened, when the S.C.C. noted that:

> the conduct of the inmates has been generally satisfactory and the seven abscondings were mainly confined to boys who were newly committed. (1)

This rather superficial assessment of a problem was typical of the reports and reflected the satisfaction the S.C.C. felt with the activities of the Reformatory. The statement even implied that had these seven boys been longer in the Reformatory they would have happily remained like the other inmates.

In the following year, 1900, the site was described as "commodious and comfortable" (2) with "the boys being taught to be useful and good lads." (3) That is the Reformatory was producing a desirable type of citizen; a useful, respectable adult,

thereby justifying the expenditure of the S.C.C. and the comment of the previous year.

Occasionally the S.C.C. would venture a minor comment upon the methods of the Brothers, as in 1906:

> the singing of the inmates has greatly improved, and as this art is one that tends to the humanising of the boys and gives them entry into society which they would not otherwise share, it is greatly to their benefit. (4)

This comment in itself is instructive of the purpose of the Reformatory. By teaching the "genteel" arts of singing the Reformatory was training the boys to aspire to the position of the upper working class, the respectable artisan. This was the class that "aspired to comfort quite undreamed of by an English tradesman" (5) and possessed furniture equal in quantity to, but all "of a lower grade than their bourgeois equivalents". Very important amongst such furniture was the piano, which made the home respectable and was the epitome of good taste (6). Like the skill of singing, the possession of a piano was an achievement of the respectable artisan ideal of self improvement (7) and the pinnacle of working class aspirations. (8)

Sometimes the annual report attempted to explain aspects of the philosophy of the Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park. One S.C.C. annual report commented that:

> this institution has done well this year, as it usually does. Whether this is entirely because the work is a labour of love it is difficult to say. Perhaps "love taught with common sense" would express the truth. (9)

The absence of a comment upon the all important religious bias of the Reformatory is of note in this report. This indicates the S.C.C.'s outlook that the Reformatory was a success because of its practical approach, rather than because of its strength in providing suitable role models or its power of religious conviction. It is of interest that the religious nature of the training was rarely commented upon by the S.C.C., which chose instead to emphasise constantly how the Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park fulfilled the aims of making the lads good citizens and useful workers. On the grounds of utility and effectiveness, even the reasons for escapes were carefully given so as to indicate that the value of the institution was in its training to the desired goals of the S.C.C. Even as late as 1915, the S.C.C. was offering excuses for failings and compliments of a superficial nature:

> the superintendent is again to be congratulated on another successful year ... there has been a new feature this year in the absconding of 10 boys. Most escaped as a consequence of the alterations, which before their completion left an unguarded spot. (10)

The reasons for such absconding attempts were never delved into by the S.C.C., indicating the state's complete trust in the efficacy of the Reformatory and its efforts. Such abscondings were excused as being physical in their cause, rather than being seen as indicating problems within the Reformatory itself.

In short the S.C.C., until its absorption into a government department, was a staunch ally of the Reformatory. (11) It excused failings and expressed praise for the manner in which the Reformatory fulfilled the aim of training boys to be useful and effective workers within society. In this approach the S.C.C. saw religion as a means to

an end, a tool to be used to inculcate discipline and control. This ignored the perspective of the Brothers who saw the fostering of religion as an end in itself. This difference in attitude, along with other like contradictions, was never addressed and fundamentally never needed addressing as long as the Reformatory completed its end of the contract.

In 1915 the Reformatory's role was the subject of major questioning. This arose from the reports of parliamentary members during the Royal Commission into Education. The remarks caused considerable controversy as they attacked the fundamental function of Reformatory education and especially the issue of the religious nature of the training offered at Brooklyn Park. Tied closely to this examination of the role and the types of training were political issues involving the funding of religious bodies by the state. A considerable political storm erupted which saw the Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park's relationship to the state, its processes of training and its particular aims for the boys under its care thrown into the spotlight.

The controversy began when Mr.Thomas Ryan, Member for Sturt, raised the question of the funding of orphanages. The thrust of his attack was that the Catholic Orphanages, and like religious staffed and funded organisations, were being neglected and their important work overlooked. (12) Specifically he attacked the S.C.C. and its work. The substance of the charges were that the Catholic organisations were superior to those of the state. For his evidence he compared the material obtained by a commission into education about the treatment meted out to the boys at Magill relative to those offered to children at the Catholic Goodwood Orphanage. He claimed that:

> I would sooner put a child of mine into its coffin than into the State Childrens Council ... there is everything in that institution but humanism." (13) and "my experience of the State Childrens

> Council officers is that they do their very best, but are bound down with a lot of regulations. (14)

Ryan was seeking to gain support for his motion that:

> the government should arrange for the payment of a fixed sum to be paid to all Orphanages for each child housed and cared for by such institutions. (15)

He moved this motion on 8 December 1915. To prove his allegations and to gain support for his motion, Ryan compared the finances of the various institutions. He argued forcefully that Catholic Orphanages were disadvantaged, having to cater for their charges on "6s. 6d. per week" whereas if they were kept in the state institution the cost would be £2.6s.6d." (16) He also stated that the state orphanage:

> however well it is kept, cannot give that loving environment and religious faith which comes from the devotion of the women who have given their lives for this work. (17)

He constantly reiterated the claim that the state could not look after the children as well as the private institutions and he followed this up with a statement that "the State institutions have regulations, and they even have leg irons." (18)

Mr. John Pick supported the motion noting that with:

the drought and the war, and the continued appeal for the patriotic funds, the people today are not in the position to support ... as they have in the past. It is really a State work. (19)

This was followed by Mr. Peter Reidy who supported Ryan and added to his statements by repeating three times that:

> before the child is taken under the charge of the State Children's Department it has to be brought before a Court, and it has to be proved that the child is destitute. It has to be declared a pauper. (20)

The debate was adjourned and Ryan's comments were promptly reported in the press. The Advertiser pushed his opinion that the state was not producing adequately trained boys. It also stressed the presence of leg irons and claimed that the State Children's Council was an institution that branded the child a pauper for life. (21)

Several matters are of importance in Ryan and his supporters' arguments. They attacked the respectability of the institutions of the state, claiming that they reduced the child to the status of a pauper, the lowest level of working class life. In contrast they claimed that the private institution spared the child this status and thereby preserved that child's respectability in the eyes of society and for this reason these private institutions deserved to be funded. This attack, and the underlying thrust of the statements, indicate that the aim of institutions such as reformatories was to preserve the respectability of the child and where possible to restore this aspect of their character. Hence, the reaction of the press and the M.P's to the claims that to enter a state institution the child had to be declared a pauper and the serious treatment afforded to Ryan's claim that he would rather see a child in a coffin than charged as a pauper for life.

At the adjournment debate which followed , the attack upon the S.C.C. was broadened and the nature of reformatory education and staffing was introduced into the debate, a step which the Hon. Sir Richard Butler deplored and sought to contain by claiming the earlier statements were "grossly exaggerated." (22) Mr. Thomas Smeaton, (23) a some time member of the S.C.C., supported Ryan in his criticism. He, however, deplored the invective of Ryan's debate, and claimed that he had resigned when he "found out that things were being done about which I did not know". (24) Smeaton argued that although there may be problems with the nature of the management structure, the management was still full of worthy individuals. To support his case he quoted members of the Board of the S.C.C., Lady Holder and Mr. Glynn, and that as a result, whilst the department may not be perfect, Ryan should modify his opinion. (25) He implied that the respectable nature of the management board ensured that the institution they oversaw would be similarly respectable and thus deserving of some support and if criticised it should be done politely. (26)

Not to be denied, Ryan used the opportunity to continue his claims and to press for some action. He attacked Smeaton and his supporters for resenting his action and then proceeded to compare the conditions in the different Reformatories and Industrial Schools. Most distressing for Ryan was the situation at Magill, in which he found boys chained together but more particularly he also:

> found that alongside a European boy of 16 there was a full-blooded aboriginal who could not speak a word of English, and had nothing in common with the white boy. (27)

To Ryan this last act attacked all the expectations of reformatory education in that the exemplary atmosphere and company was not being maintained. Mr. Ryan and his

Education Commission went on to state:

> We have given a great deal of consideration to the question of what the State is doing towards the education of boys committed to the care of the State Children"s Council, particularly those in the Reformatory at Magill, and those in the Roman Catholic institution at Brooklyn Park, and that managed by the Salvation Army at Mount Barker. For the last seven years there has been an average of 32 boys at the Magill Reformatory, and practically nothing is being done to educate them or to fit them to follow a useful occupation when they leave the Reformatory. We found that a few of the boys had left school when they had only reached the second class of the primary school, and while others stated that they had been in the fourth and fifth classes, it cannot be denied that the educational standard of the majority of the boys is very low. The only benefit the boys receive from their detention in the Reformatory is the subjection to the discipline of the institution. In every other respect the years they spend in the Reformatory are wasted. (28)

Ryan after quoting from the report of the Education Commission, went on to claim that "in the whole of the 24 hours not a minute is devoted to education" (29) and that not even adequate evening or Sunday Schooling existed. (30)

Again, Ryan was reflecting the expectations held of reformatory education, in that it was supposed to make the boys God-fearing, good "citizens of South Australia" (31) and that this was to be achieved by the use of education and discipline. These

factors would, when combined, produce boys capable of fulfilling the role of respectable workers.

In contrast to the condition of the Magill Reformatory, Ryan posed the Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park as the ideal. He claimed that the Brooklyn Park establishment had only two men looking after 24 boys, while Magill had nine men looking after 31 boys, (32) thereby illustrating the effectiveness of Brooklyn Park and condemning Magill. Further, Ryan claimed at Brooklyn Park:

> there is no lock on the gate or anywhere else. A quarter of the time each day is spent in schooling, and this was the amazing testimony. It should be written in letters of gold. For 21 years they have been carrying on that work, and the Police Court records have not been able to reveal a single boy who passes through that institution that ever again was brought before a Justice ...

This glowing account was followed by the judgement that "One institution helps the boy lead a full and free life, and the other stamps it out." (33)

Ryan's testimony was coloured by his desire to embarrass the government and to obtain funds for the Catholic schools and welfare institutions. He tended to exaggerate the situation, for as noted in previous chapters (34), boys were often recycled through the Reformatory via the Court and the S.C.C. Yet, in exaggerating, Ryan stated some things about the Reformatory that are of importance not the least of which was the worthy nature of the experience in preparing the boys for their future lives as workers and model citizens.

However,in his exaggeration, he fabricated claims of achievement which were patently wrong. He claimed the Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park, had no lock anywhere but, in fact, the whole place was fenced and sealed off and as the S.C.C. report for 1915 stated many boys escaped when these walls were breached to build extensions. (35) Ryan was thus a little over-enthusiastic in his support for the institution. This stemmed from his political desire to humiliate the government by denigrating the state run Reformatory as less successful than the comparable Catholic Reformatory, the criterion for achievement being the respectability of the Institution. Ryan illustrated this point by use of a case study of a woman who could not control her child. He related how she had to submit to the investigative processes of the S.C.C. which she did with apparent good will but, when she discovered that her son was to be referred to the State Reformatory, she:

> a woman who had seen better days broke down and yelled ... many and many a person today is making sacrifices sooner than see her children committed to that institution. (36)

Further, Ryan made great play of the logical link that a child in the Reformatory was a state child and thus a pauper. (37) He did this to indicate that the state institutions were inferior in that they reduced the child to the status of a pauper whilst the Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park offered no such condemnation but, rather, liberated the child from pauperism's stigma by not being so completely associated with government regulations and staff. (38)

Ryan's statements were taken up by Mr. John Cowan in the Legislative Council, who asked for a report to answer Ryan's allegations. This report was tabled on 14 December 1915. Along with it were letters from the S.C.C. and the Magill Reformatory

which had been sent to the Education Commission explaining the situation of the leg irons seen by Ryan. The report answered each of Ryan's statements. It claimed that:

> Council is always on the side of "sympathy" ... more inclined to leniency than austerity ... and the officers at the central office, are keenly interested ... while those who come closely in contact with the children are beloved by them. Surely there is no lack of "humanism" in this. (39)

This humanism in administration and care was informed by the belief that "young persons may with proper treatment become good citizens." (40)

The report attacked the notion that being declared unable to support or control one's children was a failure that proved pauperism and thus provided entry to the Reformatory. The report argued instead that those who found it necessary to make such admissions were those who would agree that it "was surely neither disgrace nor inconvenient to show the facts" (41) and that not all the children committed were there for pauperism. Some, it suggested, were there because they were:

> neglected or ill treated by their parents and as such these children are not called, or convicted or treated as paupers. (42)

The next section of the report dealt at length with the Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park and compared it to the Magill Reformatory. The report justified Magill's staff numbers, pointing out that:

> The staff of men was ... six, not nine, and when it is remembered that the grounds are extensive, that there is no material obstacle to absconding, that the boy's work lies in every part of the estate, that there is indoor as well as outdoor occupation ... it will be granted that the staff was not too large. In addition, it is to be noted that the men were and are expected to do as much of the work as possible, as long as it does not prevent the proper supervision of the boys. The men are not simply guards, they are fellow workers. (43)

In contrast at Brooklyn Park:

> Reverend John Healy (himself a tower of strength) and three lay brothers, two of whom devote their whole time, and the third a portion of his, to the supervision of the boys. The premises are small, the yard is securely enclosed, and the boys are not at any time free from supervision ... The Brooklyn Park establishment is well managed and there are few escapes. (44)

That is, the report argued that the two Reformatories complemented each other, rather than competed, and thus developed the state's programme for converting the delinquent juvenile into the respectable citizen.

The report also addressed the issue of discipline at the two sites. The chaining or tying together of boys at Magill was justified on the grounds that little else could be done to keep such boys in detention. (45) This function was further confirmed by the claim in the report that:

> The statement that punishment is unknown at Brooklyn Park would at once be repudiated by the superintendant, for no man would more readily disown any attempt to show his position more favourably than the facts. (46)

The issue of the Aborigine boy was dealt with by explaining that he "could do very well in the daily school" (47) and thus was no less acceptable than the other boys as a subject for suitable training to the desired end of becoming a respectable hard working citizen. This was especially so, as he could speak English. (48)

Furthermore the report attacked Ryan for claiming that the boys were in reformatories because of mild crimes or errors such as stealing cigarettes and scaring horses. (49) Rather the S.C.C. report claimed that:

> There are few, if any, there who have not been guilty of theft (several of them many times guilty); vice, and crime of the lowest is practiced by some, and that in spite of every effort to suppress it, and the tendency of most of these lads is towards wrong of various kinds. (50)

Finally, in keeping with the Reformatory as a bastion of moral instruction, the boys at Magill were supposed to attend church every Sunday and Sunday School after that, like the boys at the Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park. (51) Unlike the Reformatory at Brooklyn Park, Magill, it was admitted, did not spend as much time in formal schooling of its charges. A reason was offered to explain this failing; Magill Reformatory had run a school to teach boys subject to the compulsory clauses of the Education Act but the numbers became too small and so the school was scaled down to only

a session in the morning. (52) However it was "recognised that this was not the best plan, and so was not pressed on those who were disinclined." (53) Thus, this school was eventually closed down, as it failed to fill any worthwhile purpose and merely made life difficult for all concerned as the "disinclined" boys resented the attempt to educate them and disrupted the process of reform by rebelling against any such attempts.

In sum, the debate over the administration and financing of the South Australian Reformatories, sparked by Ryan's allegations, raised the political profile of reformatory education, the long term consequence of which was the disbanding of the S.C.C. in 1926. The immediate result was the alteration of the regulations governing the education and treatment of the boys sent to the Magill Reformatory. In contrast, the Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park remained relatively untouched, its work practices substantially unquestioned and unchanged, a matter well reported in the Catholic newspaper, "The Southern Cross" . (54) This paper rejoiced in the fact that a Catholic institution was reported as being superior to its peer, state-run organisation, in producing respectable citizens. (55)

In the light of how well the Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park fared in the debate over Reformatory education, it is ironical that it was the Catholic Church that eventually took action to close it down. The factors that cumulatively led to the decision to close the Reformatory were many and made their impact felt gradually over a twenty year period beginning not long after the 1915 debate. The demise of the Reformatory was accelerated by the disbanding of the S.C.C. and was completed with the dissolution of the Order of St. John the Baptist in 1942.

One factor which had a major effect on the Reformatory's future was the gradual decay in the numbers that made up the membership of the Order which had peaked in

1911 with eight Brothers. In 1914 Brother John McNamara, a founder member, died. His death was followed in 1915 by that of Brother James Donovan, which left a group of six Brothers. (56) Then, in 1921, shortly after he had been made a Monsignor, Father Healy died. His successor was Father Smyth, who had been hand-picked and trained by Monsignor Healy for the task. Father Smyth was ably assisted by Brother Luddy, despite the fact that Luddy was ailing at this stage in the history of the Reformatory. Thus the ability of the Reformatory to cope with its clients was severely reduced. Several new faces appeared in the Order but they also left quickly. Between 1916 and 1929 seven men attempted to join the Order but most of these did not stay. This inability to attract the right men and to maintain the commitment of those that had come to join the Order was very much part of the South Australian Catholic experience. A Catholic cleric commented that:

> as for vocations among the Colonials, angels visits are numerous compared to them. The very best of them think of nothing but of advancing themselves in life. Of course, they want to lead good lives and save their souls, and make money too and become respectable. A very few go in for the Church, but a life like ours never in his wildest dreams enters a colonial's mind. (57)

Thus, a young man could and would make it successfully in society without resort to the church.

The Archbishop was concerned about the declining numbers in the Order and commented in a letter to the Brother Director that he was "glad the younger Brothers were getting on so well, but (that he) would like to see a larger number of suitable subjects entering." (58)

Despite his concern the Archbishop did not intervene and the Order was able to achieve a milestone in 1923 when, after a period of review, the Brothers were given official sanction by the Pope. The priest assigned to investigate the Brothers to assess their validity as an Order, noted the Brothers' rules (Institutes) to be rather restrictive and too regimented and as a result some modifications were requested to them. (59) Yet, the Brothers, guided as they were by the need to achieve and inculcate respectability in their clients and within general society, sought to maintain their austerity. It suited their purposes to project the living proof of a clean and respectable lifestyle and they attempted to have their Institutes varied as little as possible. They lobbied and obtained the support of Archbishop Spence. He wrote a letter to the Vatican in which he noted that:

> the Brothers have charge of a Reformatory which is recognised by the State. All Catholic boys are handed over to the Brothers. Their secular and religious education is attended to by the Brothers and 95% of these boys eventually turn out good Catholics and good citizens. (60)

Not only were the Brothers' numbers declining but their income declined as well. This lack of money compounded the staff reductions and was another factor in the Reformatory's eventual demise. The financial situation reached a crisis in 1925 and stemmed from the Brothers' attempt to expand their operations by increasing the size of their school at Thebarton and by enlarging their holding around the Reformatory at Brooklyn Park. To do this they were forced to borrow heavily from Archbishop Killian and the Catholic Church Endowment Fund, which held the accumulation of donations, legacies and gifts to the Order. (61) This worried the Archbishop who examined the financial position and discovered that they had incurred a debt of £3765. This was accumulated in part by domestic wear and tear of the Reformatory site (62) but more by

the school expansion at George Street. The Brothers had only obtained £350 from subscriptions to meet the building costs and had only £750 in savings. Hence, their need to borrow. In a letter to Archbishop Killian in 1935, Father Smyth promised "to repay the costs within a reasonable time." (63) Yet, despite Prince and Princess competitions which raised over £660 a time , "a portion of which ... was devoted to the upkeep of the men's shelter", (66) and attempts at self sufficiency, which saw the Brothers have all the school furniture made by the boys at the Reformatory, (65) their efforts were insufficient . The Brothers found themselves attempting to survive on ideals of self-sufficiency and self-help assisted by public donations, at a time when the nation was in depression. They stood no chance of successfully repaying their debts as their supporters were as poor as they were. The result was an expanding debt which was a blow to the very ideals practiced by the Brothers.

Intensifying the financial crisis and hastening the Reformatory's close was the Reformatory's reliance for part of its income on a per capita income subsidy in which they were given money by the state for each child in their care. If the numbers fell too low, the site would become unviable, especially if debts were high. This situation occurred after 1934. The state's subsidy, designed to encourage the institutions to raise matching monies, was far too low to cover the costs of running the Reformatory and keeping the Brothers. If anything the institution was becoming a burden to the Church and thus undesirable to maintain. As a consequence, Archbishop Killian wrote a letter to Father Smyth forwarding to him the cheques requested by the Brothers to enable them to service their debts and other maintenance costs. (66) He also outlined his concerns. The Archbishop noted that:

> in view of the fact that the number of boys sent to Brooklyn Park are diminishing, I really think the time has come when we should

> look for a new agreement with the Government authority. No matter what the number of boys, there should be a minimum sum granted for the maintenance of the place. (67)

The Archbishop followed up his idea by writing to the Chairman of the Children's Welfare and Public Relief Board asking for more money. Citing the precedent of the Salvation Army Home he specifically requested that :

> if the number of inmates be less than twelve, your board should still pay the sum of at least £6 per week to the Institution as maintenance. (68)

This letter was written on the 6th August, 1935. On the 10th, the Archbishop wrote to the Board again:

> On enquiry I find the number of boys committed to their care has been gradually decreasing, nor is their any likelihood of any notable increase in the future... It seems to me that this Institution at Brooklyn Park has come to an end of its usefulness... Under the present circumstances, therefore I shall be grateful to the Board if they relieve the Brothers at Brooklyn Park, at your convenience, from any further responsibility and close down the Institution as a Boys' Reformatory. (69)

The Board replied on 17 August:

> the matter was brought before the Board ... and ... bearing in mind the good work carried out at the Institution since 1898, during

> which time so many boys have been guided and helped, it is the boards desire that the Institution should not be closed. (70)

On the 18 September, the Department clarified its offer by giving the Archbishop what he wanted and, ironically, accomplished what Ryan had tried to achieve in 1915 with his attack on the Board's predecessor, the S.C.C:

> I beg to advise you that the government has approved the proposal made with regard to the subsidy at the Boys' Reformatory... the approval of the Chief Secretary ... is for the payment 10/6d. per week per boy ... with a minimum payment of £6 per week. I note with some degree of concern that at the moment there are only three boys in the institution, and realise with you that some further consideration may have to be given of the whole matter, unless the numbers sufficiently increase to warrant you in retaining the services of the Brothers for the inmates. (71)

Archbishop Killian, on 21 September, agreed to allow the Reformatory to stay open. In doing so, he also agreed to meet their debts and loans which continued to accumulate, but were now less vital as they didn't sap the operational budget for the Reformatory and the boys' care. (72)

However, the number of boys in the care of the Reformatory did not increase and only 4 boys were recorded as being in attendance in 1940, considerably lower that its peak of thirty. By this time also, the Brothers themselves were more involved in the running of the Catholic School at Thebarton and in administering to a Novitiate that had been founded with the monies obtained via loans from the Archbishop in 1935. The

government had also kept an eye on the membership and the new Archbishop, Archbishop Beovich, was keen to establish a solid educational administration for his Diocese. To do this he needed the state's support and did not wish to see undue emphasis put on the spending patterns and the activities of a now overstaffed and over capitalised Reformatory at Brooklyn Park.

The Archbishop's response to the situation was to address the question of the Reformatory's relevance to the Catholic community. He decided that if it was no longer a useful organisation, given its low client numbers, it should be closed. Rather than waste a valuable resource, the Archbishop changed the function of the buildings to that of an Orphanage. In recognition of the experience of the Brothers in working with juveniles he made them the orphanage staff and designated the site as the senior Boys' Orphanage - the pinnacle of the recently re-organised welfare structure of the Adelaide region. Similarly the school at Thebarton was made the Diocesan technical school for Catholic boys and the Brothers of St. John the Baptist, their teachers. (73)

As a result, great changes were initiated at the Reformatory:

> a new refectory (was) built; the chapel (was) enlarged and decorated; additional dormitory and bathroom accommodation (was) provided and a new up to date laundry and kitchen equipment (was) installed. (74)

In many ways the educational and training practices of the Reformatory continued, the major difference being a change in the clientele to whom such services were offered. The new boys were, after all, still obliged to stay at the site and were dependent on the Brothers. They were, of course, not tainted with the vices of their predecessors, but

like them, they were to have instilled into them the Catholic view of manhood, practiced by the Brothers on their previous charges.

Father Smyth remarked upon this continuation of the purpose and ideology of the Reformatory in his speech upon the opening of the new Boys Town:

> The Brothers hope with Divine assistance, to educate and instruct the boys in such vocations as they have a liking for - technical work, farming etc. They will receive them from their eleventh year upwards and intend, if the boys wish, to keep them till their sixteenth year when they might be apprenticed or placed in some suitable position. The Brothers hope later to establish a hostel for the apprenticed boys, so that they still may be under the watchful care of the Brothers, until they are of an age to make their way in life. (76)

As a result of these changes to the physical conditions at the site of the Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park "over 30 senior boys from the two Catholic orphanages, Largs Bay and Goodwood, took possession of the fine accommodation." (77) There, as Father Smyth outlined, in his speech at the opening of the Orphanage, they would experience at the hands of the Brothers of St. John the Baptist, ongoing training in technical skills and instruction into the practices of being a good Catholic worker, much in the manner of the preceding Reformatory education.

Yet, despite the similarities, the Brothers administration had changed and this was to be followed by more drastic change for the whole order. To cope with the changes involved in controlling and educating the new clientele, the Brothers were reorganised. For example:

> Brother Leo, who had many years experience with the delinquent and destitute boys at Brooklyn Park, was appointed Brother Director of the new Boys Town Development. Brother Lawrence, who has for the past 6 years been Director of studies at the Juniorate of the Institute, (was made the) Brother in charge of St. Johns Technical School Thebarton. (78)

The Brothers thus had new jobs within the area of juvenile care and these jobs had new demands. Brother Lawrence whilst still a teacher, basing his work around Catholic Theology, and Brother Leo, whilst still in total charge of the boys, were not able to apply the same techniques of control and instruction as used in the Reformatory. The clients were different boys. They were seen as needing greater sympathy and care as they were victims of fate not perpetrators of crime. These changes were enough to undermine the Brothers. Archbishop Beovich worried about the effectiveness of the Brothers, given that he recognised that they had undergone considerable change in their tasks and roles, and he moved to investigate their work and appointed a Secular and an Order priest to review the Order of St. John the Baptist. These priests recommended the dissolution of the Order which the Archbishop acted on in 1943. Three of the Brothers disagreed with the dissolution and obtained permission to set up the Order in another state under another Archbishop. They went to Melbourne where they took over Ozanan House, a refuge for the destitute and homeless, and tried to recreate their Adelaide experience where the Brothers had run the Garfield Shelter for homeless men since 1900. Archbishop Mannix did not impede them and allowed them to take novices and restart the Order. Their attempt failed, however, and on the 20 May 1959 the last remaining member of the Brothers of St. John the Baptist died, leaving two novices a month short of taking their vows. (79)

The remaining Brothers and members of the Juniorate either left the religious life, or joined other Orders. Some joined the Salesians who took over the Orphanage at Brooklyn Park on January 4, 1944, under Father Baloni as Rector. (80) This new Order was a "new broom" and the contrast of their methods with those of the Brothers St. John the Baptist was illustrative of why the Reformatory was closed. One of the most radical changes was that the new Order was international. They were not the products of the local Catholic community, as the previous Brothers had been and, thus, were free from the prevailing attitudes that had become entrenched since the foundation of the Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park. Their view of the child and his education was different and stemmed from a more cosmopolitan outlook. The members of the new Order were well educated - four had matriculated from Melbourne University and one from London, (81) and several had recently completed post graduate studies overseas. They were thus better educated than their predecessors and more able to adapt to the changing problems to be faced in dealing with the new clientele of Orphan boys.

The differences in the training of the two Orders was reflected in the change of discipline and its administration. Brother Schutz, who had been in the Novitiate under the Brothers of St. John the Baptist, noted that discipline became more effective but was practiced with greater compassion and less brutality. The new Order set an example by mixing with the boys and Brother Schutz noted that "they (the Brothers of St. John the Baptist) used to keep separate and do a little bit of corporal punishment, which wasn't the best really. You can't get respect that way." (82) Further, the boys were no longer treated as inmates of a prison, and they were not "locked in ... where the hall is now." (83) The fences were breached by gates and the boys were given more freedom.

The attitude brought to the work by the priests of new Order, was important in these changes. Brother Schutz, who had been in the novitiate of the St. John the Baptist and was on the eve of taking his vows with the Order, left the novitiate and joined the Salesians. He said he moved because "it appears we wouldn't have any future. Thats the reason why I didn't see any future in them ... that's why I left." (84) The new optimism made a great change from the dour puritan days of the Brothers of St. John the Baptist and made life for the boys a little easier. It "became like a home" (85) and the:

> lads came here younger than they did in the Reformatory. They came for a while to do their sentence and then they had to go... That's the early days, it became more stable. They stayed for years, some of the kids before they left. (86)

With the greater stability a less oppressive regime was able to operate and a greater sense of expectation was able to develop. The Salesians thus altered the whole process by which Brooklyn Park had been run for almost 50 years. Their approach and attitudes saw members of the previous order join them and to recognise the faults of the previous regime. The contrast in technique and expectations revealed the Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park to have been a place in which control was the first priority, education a secondary function and a means to an end. It shows the Brothers of St. John the Baptist to have practiced a rigid and dogmatic vision of Catholicism which they had inherited from the late 19th Century and the personal vision of their founder.

NOTES

1. S.A.A. GRG. 27/11/1899. Annual Report of the State Children's Council.

2. ibid 1900.

3. ibid 1900.

4. ibid 1906.

5. M. Cannon, Life in the Cities. (Currey O'Neil, 1975) p.261.

6. H. McQueen, A New Britannia. (Pelican Books, 1975) p. 118.

7. Cannon, p. 261.

8. McQueen, p.118.

9. Annual Report. 1914.

10. ibid 1915.

11. ibid 1926.

12. South Australian Parliament Debates. (SAPD): Legislative Assembly. December 8, 1915. p. 2861.

13. ibid p. 2863.

14. ibid p. 2863.

15. ibid p. 2861.

16. ibid p. 2862.

17. ibid p. 2863.

18. ibid p. 2864.

19. ibid p.2864.

20. SAPD: Legislative Council. December 9, 1915. p. 2928.

21. ibid p. 2928.

22. ibid p. 2928 .

23. ibid p. 2929.

24. ibid p. 2929.

25. ibid p.2932.

26. ibid p. 2931.

27. ibid p. 2930.

28. ibid p. 2930.

29. ibid p. 2930.

30. ibid p. 2931.

31. ibid p.2931.

32. ibid p. 2931.

33. ibid p. 2931.

34. See Chapter Two and note reference 10. of this chapter.

35. SAPD: Assembly p. 2932.

36. ibid p.2864.

37. ibid p.2864.

38. South Australian Parliamentary Papers (SAPP) No. 111. State Children's Department. Report on charges against management. p. 1.

39. ibid p. 1.

40. ibid p. 2.

41. ibid p. 2.

42. ibid p. 2.

43. ibid p. 2.

44. ibid p. 2.

45. ibid: memo attached dated July 18, 1913.

46. ibid p. 3.

47. ibid p. 2.

48. ibid p. 2.

49. ibid p. 2.

50. ibid p. 2.

51. ibid p. 2.

52. ibid p. 2.

53. ibid p. 2.

54. Catholic Archives: The Southern Cross (C.A.S.C.) December 11, 1915.

55. ibid Dec. 1915.

56. C.A.: Morrison Index (M.I.) B.2 Volume 16, p. 40.

57. Richard B. Healy, Christian Brothers of Wakefield Street. 1878-1978. (Lutheran Printing House, 1978) p. 10.

58. C.A. Correspondence (C.A.C.) 25/9/1929.

59. ibid 30/10/1923.

60. ibid 31/8/1923.

61. ibid "Statement of W.E.G. Gunson" Solicitors. dated 6/8/1931.

62. ibid 19/7/1983.

63. ibid 25/8/1935.

64. C.A.S.C. January 10, 1936.

65. ibid. September 1983.

66. C.A.C. 29/7/1935.

67. ibid 29/7/1935.

68. ibid 6/8/1935.

69. ibid 10/8/1935.

70. ibid 17/8/1935.

71. ibid 18/9/1935.

72. ibid 21/9/1935.

73. C.A.M.I. p. 126.

74. C.A.S.C. May 16, 1941.

75. ibid June 22, 1941.

76. ibid June 27, 1941.

77. ibid June 27, 1941.

78. ibid June 22, 1941.

79. Brother Schutz ... Interview No. 1.

80. C.A.M.I. "Miscellaneous" - one page.

81. ibid.

82. Brother Schutz ... Interview No. 1.

83. ibid No. 2.

84. ibid No. 1.

85. ibid No. 1.

86. ibid. No. 1.

APPENDICES

The appendices are collections of tables. They are grouped according to their content and treatment. Numerical tables make up the first set of appendices and treat the statistics of arrival/departure/ages.

The second appendix is a set of tables which covers the names, dates and methods by which clients left.

Appendix three covers the issue of service by the clients by giving tables of place and date of service.

Table four is the final appendix. This charts the history of the family absconders discussed in Chapter Four.

Appendix 1. (a): Admissions by Sentence

Source: 1895-1908 Admissions book
1909-1925 Mandates for committals

Year	Theft	Default	Uncontrolled	illigitimate	Neglected Destitute	Transfers	Assault	Trespass	Abscond.	Total
1895	1									1
1896	2		1			1				4
1897	9		1			1	1			12
1898	7		2		1			1	3	14
1899	12		1			1			3	17
1900	4		3		1	2			1	11
1901	7	3	5		1	5			6	27
1902	10	8	4		3	1			5	31
1903	15	5	4			1	1	1		27
1904	6	3	4			2	1		4	20
1905	6	1				8			2	17
1906	5		2		1				1	9
1907	5		2			3				10
1908	1		1			2				4
1909	1									1
1910	3									3
1911	2									2
1912	3	2								5
1913	1		1							2
1914	1									1
1915	5							1		6
1916	4									4
1917	2									2
1918			1							1
1919	2									2
1920	1		1	1	1					4
1921	4									4
1922	1					1	1			3
1923	2									2
1924										0
1925	2					1				3
Total	**124**	**22**	**33**	**1**	**8**	**29**	**4**	**3**	**25**	**249**

Appendix 1. (b): Admission Age

Source : 1895-1908 Admissions book
1909-1925 Mandates of admission

Year / Age	8 - 9	9 - 10	10 - 11	11 - 12	12 - 13	13 - 14	14 - 15	15 - 16	16 - 17	17 - 18	18 - 19	N/A
1895				1								
1896				2				2				
1897		1			1	6	2	1		1		
1898					4	3	2	2	1			2
1899			2			3	2	2	2	4		3
1900			1		2	1		4	1			2
1901		1		5	2	2	4	3	1	3		6
1902				2	2	5	2		4	4		14
1903		1	1	2	4		2	3	5	3		5
1904	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	2	3	2	6
1905			1	2	1	2	4	2	3		1	1
1906			1	1		1	1	3	2			
1907			1	2	1		1	2	2	1		
1908			1				1		1	1		
Sub-total	1	4	9	18	17	24	22	25	24	20	3	39
1909										1		
1910								2	1			
1911					1	1						
1912				2				1		1		2
1913						1				1		
1914			1									
1915	1				2	1	1	1				
1916			1				1	1		1		
1917						1		1				
1918									1			
1919							1	2				
1920							2					
1921					1					2		
1922		1	1									1
1923							1		1			
1925			1		1			1				
Sub-total	1	1	4	2	5	4	6	9	3	6	0	3
Total	**2**	**5**	**13**	**20**	**22**	**28**	**28**	**34**	**27**	**26**	**3**	**42**

Appendix 1. (c): Age of Clients at Leaving

Source: 1895 - 1905 Admissions book

Year/Age	10 - 11	11 - 12	12 - 13	13 - 14	14 - 15	15 - 16	16 - 17	17 - 18	18 - 19	Sub-total	Unknown	Undated	Sub-total	Total
1895										0			0	0
1896										0			0	0
1897										0			0	0
1898					4	3	4	1		12			0	12
1899				2	5	3	7	3		20			0	20
1900				1		1	1	1		4			0	4
1901		2		2	1	4	7	4		20	3	1	4	24
1902			1	2	2	2	3	12		22	10		10	32
1903				1	3	3	2	7		16	6	1	7	23
1904	1				3	3	7	7	2	23	3	2	5	28
1905	1	0	1	0	2	1	1	5	2	13	1	2	3	16
1906				1	1	1	5	1	4	13	3		3	16
1907			1				7	4		12		7	7	19
1908						1	3	5		9		3	3	12
Total	2	2	3	9	21	22	47	50	8	164	26	16	42	206

Appendix 1. (d): Student Arrivals and Departures

Source: 1895 - 1908 Admissions book

		Year of Departure															
	Year	?	1895	1896	1897	1898	1899	1900	1901	1902	1903	1904	1905	1906	1907	1908	Totals
Year of Admission	1895						1										1
	1896					2	1										3
	1897					7	2	1	2	1							13
	1898					3	3		6	1		1					14
	1899						13	1	3		1						18
	1900	1						2	6	1	1		1				11
	1901	3							10	8	2	3	2	1			26
	1902	10								17	9	3	1	1	2		33
	1903	7									9	10	2		1	3	25
	1904	5										9	5	4			18
	1905	2											2	5	6	1	14
	1906	3												3	1	3	7
	1907	7													2	1	3
	1908	3														1	1
	Totals	41	0	0	0	12	20	4	27	28	22		13	14	12	9	187

N.B. ? = "Unaccounted For"

Appendix 1. (e): Tables of Students Attending/Ages/Service:1895-1908

Source: 1895 - 1905 Admissions book

Year	1895	1896	1897	1898	1899	1900	1901	1902	1903	1904	1905	1906	1907	1908
Table 1														
Number sentenced-accumulated	1	4	17	31	49	60	87	120	146	166	182	192	202	206
Number leaving-accumulated	0	0	0	12	32	36	60	92	115	143	154	175	194	206
Table 2														
Admissions by year	1	3	13	14	18	11	27	33	26	20	16	10	10	4
Leavers by year	0	0	0	12	20	4	24	32	23	28	16	16	19	12
Table 3														
Max. number in Reformatory by year	1	4	17	31	37	28	51	60	54	51	59	33	27	22
Avg. number in Reformatory by year	1	4	17	19	17	24	27	28	31	23	23	17	18	10
Table 4														
Avg. age of Admittants	11	12	13.3	13.6	14.5	13.9	13.6	14.7	13.9	15.3	14.4	13.6	13.7	14.2
Avg. age of Leavers by year of admission	15	15.3	15	15.7	15.5	15	14.7	16	15.7	16.2	16	15.4	16.3	17
viz. admitted 1895 at age 11, left age 15.														
Table 5														
Avg. age of Leavers by year	0	0	0	15	15.2	15.2	15.1	15.8	15.5	14.2	15.3	15.9	16	16.4
Table 6														
Number sent to Service during year	0	0	1	2	3	2	9	4	5	9	3	7	6	4
Table 7														
Number sent to Service from that year	0	2	4	5	2	4	5	12	11	7	5	2	1	n/a
Table 8														
Avg. age of Service	0	0	15	14	15	15.3	15.8	16	15.8	16.3	15.7	17	16.4	17
Table 9														
Length of stay before Service from that year	0	1.5	3.6	2.6	1.5	0.2	3.4	2.6	1	1.1	1.4	2	1	n/a

Appendix 1.(f): Age at leaving by Year of leaving by year of entry

Source: 1895 - 1908 Admissions book

Year of entry	Year of leaving	Age 10- 11	11- 12	12- 13	13- 14	14- 15	15- 16	16- 17	17- 18	Total
1895	1895									
	1896									
	1897									
	1898									
	1899						1			1
1896	1896									
	1897									
	1898					1		1		2
	1899					1				1
	1900									
1897	1897									
	1898					3	1	2	1	7
	1899					1		1		2
	1900				1					1
	1901								2	2
	1902					1				1
1898	1898						2	1		3
	1899					1		2		3
	1900									
	1901						3	2	1	6
	1902								1	1
	1903									
	1904								1	1
1899	1899				2	2	2	4	3	13
	1900								1	1
	1901				1				2	3
	1902									
	1903						1			1
1900	1900						1	1		2
	1901					1		3	1	5
	1902				1					1
	1903						1			1
	1904									
	1905								1	1
	1906									
	1907									
	1908				Age unknown		1			
1901	1901		2			1	1	2	2	8
	1902				1	1	2	2	2	8
	1903							2		2
	1904					2		1		3
	1905						1		1	2
	1906							1		1
	1907									
	1908				Age unknown		2			

Year of entry	Year of leaving	Age 10- 11	11- 12	12- 13	13- 14	14- 15	15- 16	16- 17	17- 18	Total
1902	1902				1			1	5	7
	1903					3	1		5	9
	1904					1		1	1	3
	1905								1	1
	1906						1			1
	1907							1	1	2
	1908		Age unknown		10					
1903	1903				1				2	3
	1904	1					3	3	3	10
	1905								2	2
	1906									
	1907							1		1
	1908		Age unknown		6		1	1	1	3
1904	1904							2	4	6
	1905	1			1	1		1	2	5
	1906								4	4
	1907									
	1908		Age unknown		3					
1905	1905					1			1	2
	1906							2	1	4
	1907							4	2	6
	1908		Age unknown		1			1		1
1906	1906				1			2		3
	1907			1						1
	1908		Age unknown		3				3	3
1907	1907							1	1	2
	1908		Age unknown		7			1		1
1908	1908		Age unknown		3				1	1

Source : Mandates of admission 1896 - 1905

CATEGORY	Number
Unskilled	48
Labourer	37
Housekeeper	4
Pensioner	2
Lamper	1
Unemployed	1
Gardener	1
Rent Collector	1
Prisoner	1

CATEGORY	Number
Skilled	19
Mason	3
Miner	4
Clerk	4
Printer	2
Piano tuner	1
Carpenter	1
Examiner (railway)	1
Malter	1
Coach builder	1
Drill instructor	1

Semi - skilled	22
Fireman	1
Engineman	2
Agent	3
Platelayer	1
Brickmaker	1
Butcher	2
Salesman	1
Bookmaker	1
Canvasser	1
Driver	1
Warder	1
Seaman	3
Salesman	1
Linesman	1
Painter	1
Sawyer	1

Self-employed	8
Tailor	2
Businessman	2
Blacksmith	1
Pawnbroker	1
Tobacconist	1
Merchant	1

SUMMARY	Number	%
Unskilled	48	49%
Semi - skilled	22	23%
Skilled	19	20%
Self-employed	8	8%
Total	97	100%

Appendix 2. (a): Absconders - First Attempts 1896 - 1908

Source: Mandates of Admission 1895 - 1908

Year	Name	Age sentenced	Reason	Year absconded	Age absconded	Year recaptured
1897	McCarthy	13	Theft	1898	14	1898
	Carter	13	Uncontrollable	1898	14	1898
	O'Loughlin (James)	9.5	Assault	1902	14	Not recaptured
	Cunningham	17	Theft	1898	18	Not recaptured
1898	Dugan	15	Theft	1898	15	Not recaptured
	Smith (Wm)	13	Uncontrollable	1901	16	Not recaptured
	Davoren (A)	15	Theft	1898	15	1898
1899	Reid (John)	10	Theft	1901	12	1901
	Smith (Sam)	13	Theft	1899	13	1899
	Wolfe	17	Theft	1899	17	1899
	Haire	15	Theft	1899	15	1899
1900	Healy	15	Theft	1900	15	1901
1901	Diggers	14	Transfer	1901	14	1901
	Clark	17	Uncontrollable	1901	17	1902
	Fahey	17	Theft	1901	17	1902
1903	Barton	16	Transfer	1904	17	1904
1904	Cull	17	Uncontrollable	1904	17	1904

Appendix 2. (b): Petitions for Release - Summary

Source: Petitions for Release 1920, 1921

Year	Name	Applicant/Occupation	Committal Reason	Committal Age	Petition Age	Release Age	Result of Petition
1920	Clifford George	Brother/Businessman	Uncontrollable	15 2/12	17 8/12	17 8/12	O.P.
	Toweraker	Sister/Home duties	Theft	14	14	-	-
	Kendle	Godparents	Destitute	-	-	-	-
	Boswell Wm.	Great Aunt/Home duties	Referred	-	15	-	-
	Gould	Father/Miner	Theft	15	16	16	O.P.
	McCarthy	Mother/Home duties	Uncontrollable	16	18 7/12	-	-
	Wallace	Father/Driver	Theft	11	12 1/6	-	N.R.
	Wallace	Mother/Home duties	Absconder	-	17 1/2	-	N.R.
	Quinn Stanley	Mother	Theft	9	14 1/2	-	R.
	Collarton David	Father	Uncontrollable	15	16	16	O.P.
1921	Hammond	Mother	Theft	17	17 1/2	-	-
	Ross	Father/S.A.R.	Truant	11	17 4/12	17 4/12	R.
	Magill	Mother/Home duties	Theft	14	17 1/6	-	N.R.
	Jolly	Mother	Theft	14	17	17	O.P.
	Chesterfield	Father	Theft	14	17 8/12	17 8/12	O.P.
	Ryan	Mother	Theft	-	-	-	O.P.
	Haire	Mother	Uncontrollable	8	17 1/6	-	N.R.

\- No action
N.R. Not released
O.P. On probation
R. Released

Appendix 3. (a): Service Provider - Client 1897 - 1908

Source: 1896 - 1908 Admissions book

Service Year	Provider	Town/Suburb	Client	Committal Year	Committal Age	Service Year
1897	H.Humphries	Mitcham	Dunn	1896	14	15
1898	P.Fitzpatrick	Lincolnsfield	Reid	1897	13	14
	E.O'Loughlin	Meadows	Castle	1896	14	14
1899	F.Slattery	Snowtown	Lawlor	1897	14	16
	Mr. Kerin	Mt. Gambier	McCarthy	1897	13	15
	J.Kenny	Arthurton	O'Reilly	1899	16	16
1900	G.Murphy	Hamley Bridge	Malloy	1900	16	16
	Mrs. Willis	Balaklava	Fenner	1900	15	15
1901	R. Houner	Maitland	McNally	1897	13	17
	W.P. Dahf	Eurelia	O'Loughlin	1897	13	17
	M. Maloney	Weetulta	Griffin	1898	13	16
	R. Houner	Maitland	Lemon	1898	12	15
	J. Granike	Stirling North	Willis	1898	12	15
	J. Lynch	Lochiel	Carter	1898	14	17
	Mrs. Gillard	O'laddie	Davoren	1900	17	18
	W.M. Mayer	Larcowie	Gardner	1900	15	16
	D.S. Madigan	Hokina Siding	Cagney	1901	11	11
1902	M. G. Kerin	Mt. Gambier	O'Loughlin	1897	13	18
	M.F. Leahy	Hornsdale	Healy	1900	15	17
	Mr. Hynes	Arthurton	Longbottom	1901	15	16
	Mr. Kerin	Mr. Gambier	Diggers	1901	14	15
1903	J. Falkner	Parnaroo	Hobbs	1902	13	14
	L. Kerin	Mt. Gambier	Rorren	1902	13	14
	F.P. Dempsey	Yatina	Gleeson	1902	14	15
	Wm. Willis	Balaklava	Willis	1902	17	18
	M. Y. Leahy	Hornsdale	Kilmartin	1902	16	17
	Wm. Willis	Balaklava	Fergerson	1903	17	17
1904	J. O'Shauchan	Pt. Lincoln	Elridge	1902	12	14
	M.C. Kerin	Mt. Gambier	Saunders	1902	16	18
	Wm. Willis	Balaklava	Maly	1903	16	17
	P. Manning	Saddleworth	McDonnell	1903	14	15
	Mrs. O'Brien	Tothills Creek	Munro	1903	15	16
	J.C. Sutton	Mt. Gambier	Bevern	1903	16	17
	Rev. Hourigan	Kadina	Oxer	1903	14	15
	S.M. Sutton	Mt. Gambier	Davoren P.	1904	18	18
	F. Kerin	Mt. Gambier	Hollywood	1904	18	18
1905	Wm. Willis	Balaklava	Crowe	1903	15	17
	P.F. Chigwidden	Yongola	Dann	1904	13	14
	M.M. Coffey	Collinsfield	Fersdale	1904	15	16

Service Year	Provider	Town/Suburb	Client	Committal Year	Committal Age	Service Year
1906	T.P. Dempsey	Yatina	Ford	1901	11	17
	R. O'Grady	Maitland	Myman	1902	11	15
	Wm. Willis	Balaklava	Cull	1901	14	19
	D.F. Kerry	Streaky Bay	Barton	1904	17	19
	T. Quin	Franklin Hrbr.	Voege	1904	16	18
	Mrs. J. Hogan	Taylors Gap	Daly	1905	13	14
	M. Maher	Marrabel	Gobain	1905	16	17
1907	J.R. O'Halloran	Uroonda	Heffermen	1902	12	17
	L.M.Williams	Carrieton	Harris (Wm.)	1902	13	18
	W.M. Hawes	Mallala	Souter	1902	11	16
	Mr. F. Ryan	Hamley Bridge	Carroll	1903	12	16
	F.M. Case	Orraroo	Newcombe	1905	13	15
	W.M. Willis	Balaklava	Smith	1905	14	16
1908	L.P. Dempsey	Yatina	McGrath	1906	15	17
	R. O'Grady	Maitland	Dunn	1906	15	17
	Mrs.P.McCarthy	Florieton	Pickett	1907	15	16
	F. Burns (Jnr.)	Snowtown	Harris(Alfred)	1905	14	17

Appendix 3. (b): Service in Committal Sequence

Source: 1895 - 1908 Admissions book

Committal Year	Service Year	Provider	Client	Town
1896	1897	M.H. Humphries	Dunn	Mitcham
	1896	E. O'Loughlin	Castle	Meadows
1897	1899	F. Slattery	Lawlor	Snowtown
	1901	R. Houner	NcNally	Maitland
	1898	P. Fitzgerald	Reid	Lincolnsfield
	1901	W.P. Dahf	O'Loughlin	Eurelia
1898	1901	M. Moloney	Griffin	Weetulta
	1901	R. Houner	Lemon	Maitland
	1901	J. Grunkie	Willis	Stirling North
	1901	J. Lynch	Carter	Lochiel
	1899	Mr. Kerin	McCarthy	Mt. Gambier
1899	1902	Mr. Kerin	O'Loughlin	Mt. Gambier
	1899	J. Kerry	O'Reilly	Arthurton
1900	1901	Mrs. Gillard	Davoren	O'Laddie
	1900	G. Murphy	K. Malloy	Hamley Bridge
	1900	Mrs. Willis	R. Fenner	Balaklava
	1901	Mr. Mayer	Gardner	Larcowie
1901	1906	T.P. Dempsey	Ford	Yatina
	1902	M.F. Leahy	Healy	Hornsdale
	1902	Mr. Hynes	Longbottom	Arthurton
	1902	Mr. Kain	Diggers	Mt. Gambier
	1901	D.S. Madigan	Cagney	Hokina Siding
1902	1904	J. O'Shauchen	Elridge	Pt. Lincoln
	1907	J.R. O"Halloran	Hefferman	Uroonda
	1903	J. Falkner	Hobbs	Parnaroo
	1907	L.M. Williams	Harris	Carrieton
	1903	L. Kerin	Rorren	Mt. Gambier
	1903	F.P. Dempsey	Gleeson	Yatina
	1906	R. O'Grady	Wyman	Maitland
	1901	Jas. Crowley	Flannagan	Saltia
	1903	Wm. Willis	Willis	Balaklava
	1907	Wm. Hawes	Souter	Mallala
	1904	M. Kerin	Saunders	Mt. Gambier
	1903	M.T. Leahy	Kilmartin	Hornsdale
1903	1903	Mrs. A. Fox	Davoren (Peter)	Hectorville
	1903	Mr. P. Manning	Minahane	Saddleworth
	1904	Wm. Willis	Maly	Balaklava
	1904	P. Manning	McDonnell	Saddleworth
	1904	Mrs. O'Brien	Munro	Tothills Creek
	1903	Wm. Willis	Ferguson	Balaklava

Committal Year	Service Year	Provider	Client	Town
1903 (cont'd)	1907	Mr. F. Ryan	Carroll	Hamley Bridge
	1905	Wm. Willis	Crowe	Balaklava
	1904	J.C. Sutton	Bevern	Mr. Gambier
	1903	D. McNarmor	Barton	Mt. Gambier
	1904	Rev. M. Horigan	Oxer	Kadina
1904	1904	Mrs. Scutton	Davoren (Peter)	Mt. Gambier
	1904	F. Kerin	Hollywood	Mt. Gambier
	1906	Wm. Willis	Cull	Balaklava
	1905	P.F.Chidwiggen	Dunn	Youngola
	1906			Franklin Harbour
	1905			Collinsfield
	1906	Mrs Hogan	Daly	Taylors Gap
	1907	F.M. Case	Newcombe	Orraroo
	1908	F. Burns (Jnr.)	Harris	Snowtown
	1907	Wm. Willis	Smith	Balaklava
	1906	M. Maher	Gobain	Marrabel
1906	1908	L.P.Dempsey	McGrath	Yatina
	1908	R. O'Grady	Dunn	Maitland
1907	1908	Mrs McCarthy	Pickett	Florieton

Appendix 4. : Family Absconders

Source: 1895 - 1908 Admissions book

1897	John Reid (Oct) 13*	Thomas O'Loughlin (Oct) 13	James O'Loughlin (June) 9	
1898	Service to 14 P.Fitzpatrick (July)			
1899				John O'Loughlin (March) 12
1900				
1901	Re-admitted (July) Absconds (August) 17	Service to Mr.Dahl (April) 17		
1902			Absconds (Dec) 14	Service to M. Kerin (Sept) 15
1904				
1906				
1907				
1908				

*** Numbers relate to age in years**

1897				
1898		Peter Davoren (Aug) 12*	Arthur Davoren (Dec) Absconds (Dec) 15	
1899	Joseph Reid (March) 10		Probation to Father 16	
1900			Re-admitted (June) 17	
1901	Absconds (Aug) Re-sentenced (Aug) 12	Released to Mother 15	Service to Mrs. Gillard 18	
1902				Edward Gleeson (Oct) 14
1903		Re-sentenced (Jan) Service to Mrs. Fox (Sept) 17		Service to Mr. Dempsey (Sept) 15
1904	Probation to father (Aug) 15	Re-admitted (Feb) Service to Mrs. Sutton (Feb) 18		Absconds (April) 16 Re-sentenced (April)
1905				
1906				Released 18 Term expired
1907				
1908				

*** Numbers relate to age in years**

1897				J. McDonnell To B.R.Magill 13* Licenced to Father	
1898					
1899		Wm. Harris to Industrial School 10 Service to Mrs. McGrath	A.Harris Industrial School 8 Service to Mrs. Daly		
1900				Re-sentenced (Theft) 15	
1901		Re-admitted 12 Service to Mr. Honner		Sent to hospital (Mar) Returned and released on petition 16	
1902		Absconds 13 Transferred to B.R.B.P.			
1903					M.McDonnell 14
1904					Service to P.Manning 15
1905	Walter Gleeson (Oct) 12		Re-admitted 14 Transferred to B.R.B.P.		Re-admitted 15
1906					
1907	Released to Mother (Feb) 14	Service to Mr. Williams 18			released to Father on probation 17
1908			Service to Mrs. Burns 16		

*** Numbers relate to age in years**

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

a. Public Records Office of South Australia

Admissions Register: Boys' Reformatory Brooklyn Park. 1895-1908 GRG 27/12.

Applications for Release of Children from the Council's Control 1920-1921 GRG 27/4.

Correspondence of the State Children's Department 1887-1927. Court Mandates committing Children to the Custody and Control of the Council. 1898-1926 GRG 29/121.

State Children's Convention (Adelaide 1907).

b. Catholic Archives

Archbishop Beovich - Outline of the case - Brothers of Saint John the Baptist.

Bro. Tim Costelloe: A study of the Institute of the Brothers of Saint John the Baptist.

Correspondence Files

Father Carrol: Notes on lectures.

Father Smyth: Sermons and notes.

Institute of the Brothers of Saint John the Baptist.

Morrison Index.

Profiles of Salesians

Southern Cross Newspaper 1893-1943.

c. Other

Interviews:

Brother H. Schutz: 1985-1986.

Brother J. Larkins: 1984.

Reports and Papers

Annual Reports of the State Children's Council 1887-1926.

Report of the Committee appointed by the Government to Inquire into Delinquent Children in the Care of the State, South Australian Parliamentary Papers, Vol. 2, No. 75, 1939

State Children's Council - Correspondence re statement of Mr. Ryan, South Australian Parliamentary Papers, Vol. 3, No. 113, 1915.

State Children's Council Regulations, South Australian Parliamentary Papers, Vol. 3, No. 38, 1887

South Australian Parliamentary Debates.

Secondary Sources

Austin, A.G. Australian Education 1788-1900: Church, State and Public Education in Colonial Australia. Pitman, Melbourne, 1961.

Bailey, P. "Will the Real Bill Banks Please Stand Up? Towards a Role Analysis of Mid-Victorian Working Class Respectability." Journal of Social History. Vol. 12, No. 3, 1979.

Barbalet, M. Far from a Low Gutter Girl The forgotten world of state wards: South Australia 1887-1940. Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 1983.

Campion, E. Rockchoppers

Growing up Catholic in Australia.

Penguin Books, Australia 1982.

Cannon, M. Life in the Cities

Australia in the Victorian Age: 3

Currey O'Neil, Melbourne, 1975.

Cashen, P. "No You Don't Wilke, I Know Your Game. The work of School Attendance Officers in South Australian Schools in the 1920's and 1930's".

Journal of the Australia and New Zealand History of Education Society. (ANZHES Journal), Vol. 11, No. 2, 1982.

Connell, R.W. and Irving, T.H. (Eds.)

Class Structure in Australian History.

Longman Cheshire, Melbourne, 1980.

Cook, P. Davey,I., Vick, M.

"Capitalism and Working Class Schooling in Nineteenth Century South Australia":

ANZHES Journal, Vol. 8, No. 2, 1979.

Davey, I. "Growing Up in South Australia" in E. Richards (Ed.) Flinders History of South Australia: Social History. Wakefield Press, Adelaide, 1986.

"Growing up in a working class community" in P. Grimshaw, C. McConville, E. McEwen. (Eds.) Families in Colonial Australia. George Allen and Unwin, Sydney, 1985.

Dickey, B. Rations, Residence,Resources.
A History of Social Welfare in South Australia since 1836.
Wakefield Press, Adelaide, 1986.

No Charity There: A Short History of Social Welfare in Australia.
Nelson, Melbourne, 1980.

Fogarty, R. Catholic Education in Australia. 1806-1950. Vol. 1.
Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1959.

Grundy, D. "Free Schooling and the State in South Australia."
Melbourne Studies in Education, 1983.

Healy, R.B. Christian Brothers of Wakefield Street. 1878-1978.
Lutheran Printing House, Adelaide, 1978.

Humphries, S. Hooligans or Rebels, An Oral History of the Working Class
Childhood and Youth 1889-1939.
Oxford Press, Oxford 1981.

Hyams, B.K. and Bessant, B.
Schools for the People?
Longman, Melbourne, 1972.

King, A.D. Buildings and Society
Essays on the Social Development of the Built Environment
Routledge and Kegan Paul, Melbourne, 1980.

Kennedy, R. Australian Welfare History
Critical Essays
Macmillan, Melbourne, 1982.

Kett, J.F. Rites of Passage
Adolescence in America 1790 to the present.
Basic Books, New York, 1977.

Macallum, D. "Eugenics, Psychology and Education in Australia".
Melbourne Working Papers Vol. 4, 1982/83.

Mackinolty, J. and Radi, H. (Eds.)
In Pursuit of Justice
Australian Women and the Law 1788-1979.
Hale and Ironmonger, Sydney, 1979.

McQueen, H. A New Britannia
An argument concerning the social origins of Australian radicalism and nationalism
Pelican Books, Australia, 1975.

Mennel, R.M. Thorns and Thistles
Juvenile Delinquents in the United States 1825-1940.
University of New England Press, New Hampshire, 1973.

Murtagh, J.G. Australia: The Catholic Chapter.
The Polding Press, Melbourne, 1969.

Pike, D. Paradise of Dissent.
South Australia 1829-1857.
Melbourne University Press, Melbourne, 1968. 2nd Ed.

Ramsland, J. Children of the Back Lanes
Destitute and Neglected Children in Colonial New South Wales.
New South Wales University Press, Sydney, 1986.

Roe, J. (ed) Social Policy in Australia.
Some Perspectives 1901-1975.
Cassell Australia, Sydney, 1976.

Saunders, G.E. "J.A. Hartley and the Foundation of the Public School System in South Australia. in C. Turney"(Ed.), Pioneers in Australian Education. Vol. 2.
Sydney University Press, Sydney, 1972.

Spence, C. State Children in ~~South~~ Australia.
Vardon and Sons, Adelaide, 1907.

Summers, A. Damned Whores and God's Police
Penguin. 1975.

Sydney Labour History Group.
What Rough Beast?
The State and Social Order in Australian History
George Allen and Unwin, Sydney, 1982.

Vamplew, W. Richards, E. Jaensch, D. and Hancock, J. (Eds.)

South Australian Historical Statistics

History Project Incorporated, Sydney, 1986.

Wimshurst, K. Street Children and School Attendance in South Australia 1886-1915.

M. Ed. Thesis. University of Adelaide. 1979.

"Child Saving and Urban School Reform in South Australia"

Melbourne Studies in Education , 1983.

"Control and Resistance: Reformatory School Girls in the Late Nineteenth Century South Australia"

Journal of Social History Vol. 18., 1984 - 1985