

£30,624.2s.4d, towards which government subsidies only covered £3,912.18s.11d.<sup>25</sup> A deficit for that year of £20,648.18s.1d had been passed back to the account of the London Head Office.<sup>26</sup> Given that 170 children had been sent from the UK to Dr Barnardo's Homes institutions under UK Government subsidies between 1947 and 1951, the total given for government subsidies in these accounts seems rather low.<sup>27</sup> Nevertheless, even if somehow under-calculated, the combined amount of maintenance funding from the UK Government, Australian Commonwealth Government and New South Wales State Government would not have covered the scale of the deficit presented in these accounts.

3.23 At this point we have not been able to find accounts in the UK or Australian National Archives for receiving institutions run by the Salvation Army, the Anglican Church, the Methodist Church or Catholic religious orders. As we noted in our previous oral evidence (Day 9 transcript, p.53), a significant focus of expenditure for Catholic donors and organisations in Australia for most of the period in which Catholic institutions were accommodating child migrants was the funding of a national private Catholic education system at both primary and secondary level. This may have affected the level of private donations that were made to Catholic institutions specifically accommodating child migrants, but in the absence of any accounts we cannot have a view on this.

3.24 In summary, it is hard to provide a conclusive answer to this question about the adequacy of maintenance funding, but general observations that can reasonably be made are that:

- \* child migrants may well have suffered effects of limited maintenance funding if they were sent overseas before a maintenance agreement had been made with the UK Government;
- \* it would not be true to say, certainly before 1945, that residential institutions accommodating child migrants in Australia consistently ran at a loss and we have provided examples of some institutions running at a profit;
- \* it is not clear that maintenance funding from British and Australian government sources would have been sufficient to meet the running costs of institutions accommodating child migrants in the post-war period, but organisations would have been better placed to meet these costs if they were using largely unpaid staff (e.g. as members of religious orders or the use of children's own labour) or if they were able to raise additional income through private donations or sales of produce.
- \* our difficulty in tracing archived accounts of a number of receiving organisations, despite the maintenance of such accounts being a formal requirement of maintenance agreements with the UK Government, limits our analysis in response to this question.

---

<sup>25</sup> We assume that this account line for 'government subsidies' represents the total income from maintenance contributions from the UK Government, the Australian Commonwealth Government and the State Government of New South Wales, but the accounts do not make this clear.

<sup>26</sup> Dr Barnardo's Homes (New South Wales) Annual Report, 1951, National Archives of Australia, A445, 133/2/4, p.26.

<sup>27</sup> We have not been able to ascertain whether the New South Wales Government maintenance contribution for child migrants in 1951 was A3s.6d per week or whether it had by then been increased to the A4s.8d, as noted in paragraph 11.12 above. Assuming that the State maintenance contribution was A3s.6d in 1951, the combined maintenance subsidies from the UK Government, Australian Commonwealth Government and NSW State Government for child migrants would have been A£1.6s per child per week or A£67.6s per annum. The total of A£3,912.18s.11d for government subsidies stated in these accounts represents a full year of combined maintenance funding for only 65 children.