

It was pointed out that the Movement had Area Superintendents to check on employment, and there was also the Big Brother. Mr. Hicks said the Area Inspectors were voluntary and in many cases did not do their job; on the other hand some were conscientious and did good work. The "Big Brothers" were in the main nominal.

For the most part it was agreed that the youths had found satisfactory employment, but Messrs. Hicks and Challoner put the view that if the Minister is their legal guardian he should at least know the whereabouts of the lads.

Mr. Hicks said he felt that the Movement should not expand its activities unless it was able to improve its "after-care" or "follow-up" organisation.

Mr. Hicks referred to the difficulty in getting the Movement to do as the Child Welfare Department might suggest. He spoke of political pressure and the standing of the Executive Committee.

Mr. Metcalfe explained that some similar difficulties had arisen in Tasmania with the Movement in that State but had been satisfactorily settled at a round table Conference between the State Immigration, the Minister's delegate under the Guardianship Act and representatives of the Movement.

It was, of course, pointed out that the number of "Little Brothers" was small in Tasmania and there was a less powerful organisation.

#### Fairbridge Farm Schools

Mr. Hicks said that in his opinion the numbers at Fairbridge were now getting to a stage where staff handling was becoming difficult - this primarily due to staff shortages.

He said Fairbridge arrangements at Molong were below the modern standards of child care. They were carrying on in a Kingsley Fairbridge tradition. When he last visited the Home there was not a chair in the establishment, all forms. The eating arrangements were not satisfactory. The cottage mother had crockery and a table cloth, the children did not. Mr. Hicks said it was allegedly a "cottage system" at Molong but this was not so. There were cottages but they were much bigger than is the modern practice. There were no married couples in charge of the cottages, only cottage mothers. Boys, therefore, lacked male supervision which was very necessary.

Mr. Hicks pointed out that more cottages were going up on the same lines as these existing. On the question of Government financial assistance involved Mr. Metcalfe asked, why the Child Welfare Department had not brought their dissatisfaction to notice so that Fairbridge might have been informed that Government monies would not be available unless the project met Child Welfare requirements. Mr. Hicks said the Government monies were not for the actual cottages for the children but for other related work, extra staff quarters, renovations and furnishings. He said he would have felt insecure about telling Fairbridge that they should not build these cottages when the money was their own or had been donated. It was likely, he said, that if the Child Welfare had forced their ideas on the Society, only 1 cottage could have been built for the cost now covering three.