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ABSTRACT

This thesis discusses the establishment and development of the Sydney Day Nursery and Nursery Schools Association and its day care services for the young children of working women in the context of an increasingly dominant social ideology which identified the nuclear family as the ideal location for child-rearing. It analyses the Association and its service provision on six dimensions, namely the administrative structure of the organisation, its definitions of its clients, the availability of its services, funding for and financial management of those services, staff for the services and the care and education programs which were provided for the children.

It is argued that, for all of the period studied, both the Association and the state saw women as the only appropriate childcarers and men as the only appropriate financial providers for families. Day care services were seen as residual welfare supports which were unfortunately necessary when mothers were forced to assume both financial and nurturant responsibilities for their children consequent on men's failures in their socially ascribed roles. The services were legitimated by their functions in preventing infant mortality, in preventing women's financial dependence on either charity or the state, and in maintaining a semblance of family life, imperfect though it was. They were not accepted as legitimate educational institutions either by the state or by kindergarten teachers. They were only viewed that way by a handful of the Association's committee women and by a small band of nursery school teachers which the Association itself began to train in 1931.

It is concluded that, despite continuing disdain by bureaucrats and kindergarteners, by the end of the 1930s the Association provided truly educational programs for two to five year olds in the day care context. These programs were planned and implemented by qualified teachers who were informed by increasingly available scientific knowledge of young children's psychological development. However, the fundamental ideological basis for the service provision and the Association's administrative structure did not change. The Association and its day care services continued on into the second half of the twentieth century tagged with residual welfare labels which prevented them from achieving status as desirable educational institutions.
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CHAPTER ONE

THE FAMILY AND THE STATE IN EARLY TWENTIETH CENTURY NEW SOUTH WALES

In Australia, as in most Western nations, there is a fundamental premise that those who bear children should also rear them. Ideally, children are the product of a legally married male and female couple who, in becoming parents, assume legal, financial and moral responsibility for their offspring and a duty to provide for them. The parents and their children comprise a domestic unit called the nuclear family and this family unit is expected to live in a private domestic space called home. This concept of "the family" is so deeply entrenched, so widely preferred, that, until recently, whenever "the family" was talked about, most people understood the term to mean this conventional form. It has been accepted by almost all strata of society as not only a natural, divinely ordained unit, but also a Positive Good Thing for all its members. Most importantly, it is seen to be the best, if not the only, suitable location in which to bring up children.

The significant features of the traditional nuclear family model and its historical development both as a domestic paradigm and as an economic unit fundamental to the capitalist system have been widely discussed and analysed. Suffice it here to say that this model is like other family models in being patriarchal and based on a sexual division of labour. The male and female partners have different spheres of operation, and different socially ascribed roles. HIS sphere is the external world of paid work and his main role is economic, being charged with responsibility for providing the family's purchasing power. His subsidiary roles are as protector and occasional disciplinarian. HER sphere is the domestic world and her main role is nurturant, being charged with
responsibility for sustaining, succouring, guiding and ministering to the physical and emotional requirements of all members of the family unit. Her subsidiary roles are as consumer and housekeeper.

The implications of this family model for women's role and status in society have been widely explored in recent years.\(^2\) Corresponding work on men in relation to the economy and family life has barely begun.\(^3\) Work on children as players in their own rights has mainly concerned their protection or cases of children in conflict with the law, either through their own transgressions or as subjects in custody disputes. School age children living in families not in dispute with the law are hidden behind the institutional doors of public education and their disturbances are either buried in psychological literature or reflected in state welfare interventions either directly with the children or indirectly with their parents.\(^4\) Children below school age remain essentially invisible, ideologically connected with their mothers and pawns in debates about women's role in society.\(^5\)

Of central relevance here are the two basic and complementary principles of the nuclear family model which defined social expectancies for all women and men regardless of class. One principle identifies women as the only legitimate child carers, particularly of young children. The model argues that, since a woman can be a mother, she not only should be a mother but that she should be nothing but a mother and should find fulfilment only in motherhood. No corresponding argument that, since a man can be a father, he not only should be a father but that he should be nothing but a father and find fulfilment only in fatherhood has ever been seriously promulgated. Feminists such as Badinter proclaim this strategy to be the keystone of women's oppression.\(^6\) Badinter has argued strongly that, from Rousseau to Freud and motivated mostly by state concern, ruling class men have applied strong moral pressure to convince women that the earliest, dirtiest, most constantly demanding years of
human life can only be satisfactorily attended to by the undivided devoted attention of the babies' biological mothers. Women were threatened with dire outcomes including physical disfigurement, the Wrath of God and even Death if they did not fulfil their maternal duties. On the other hand they were promised health, beauty, happiness, esteem and a place in Heaven if they carried out their roles successfully.

Over the generations, and in the twentieth century supported by the technical rational ideology of emerging professional child-care experts and a variety of state legislations and bureaucratic apparatuses, the campaigns have been successful. Women accepted the threats and promises and inexorably the nexus between biological child bearing and social child rearing became complete. Most women came to look forward to marriage and motherhood as their natural destinies in life and their raison d'être. Only harsh fates could condemn women to single and therefore childless lives.

The second principle identifies men as the only legitimate income earners. The model argues that they have an obligation to provide financially for their wives and children and therefore not only must they be satisfactory income earners but also that they should find their fulfilment in their work. Even today, after Equal Employment Opportunity and Anti-Discrimination legislations have been enacted, no corresponding arguments to pressure women into such financial obligations and emotional commitment to work have ever seriously been promulgated.

Men's oppression resulting from application of this principle has not yet been examined as extensively as has women's oppression by the complementary principle. Hence, there is little evidence to show that men were ever subjected to the same kinds of intensive campaigns to convince them of their financial obligations to their families. Doubtless they were subject to considerable moral pressures applied through informal male friendship networks and certainly they
were subject to coercive pressures as their own patriarchy was replaced by the patriarchy of the state. Over time, the great majority of men too came to accept their financial responsibility roles, though bachelorhood remained a more socially desirable state than spinsterhood and more men than women have abandoned their family responsibilities.

Despite both women's and men's acceptance of their prescribed roles, ideals are hardly ever realised in practice and this truism was never more appropriately applied than in relation to the actual generality of the nuclear family model. In the real world, marriages contracted "till death do us part" are not always havens of peace and delight. Women are not always willing or able to rotate their lives around those of their offspring and men are not always willing or able financial providers. Yet the ideal model requires domestic calm and sexual division of labour if children are to be reared satisfactorily. Indeed there is a fundamental incompatibility between the two ascribed roles and in modern society where most paid work takes place outside the home, there are few occupations in which people can successfully combine child caring and income earning simultaneously. If then a woman abrogates her child care role, how can a man perform both functions satisfactorily? Conversely, if a man abrogates his income earning role, how can a woman perform both functions?

It is the latter case of mothers supporting dependent young children without male income earners which is of interest here. The focus is the first half of the twentieth century in urban Sydney. To what extent did such non-ideal family units exist and what options were available to women who were faced with the dual responsibilities of caring for their children and also providing for their sheer physical survival?
1.1 Non-Ideal Families

Prior to the 1970s, the actual extent to which families in New South Wales have not conformed to prescribed nuclear family norms will probably never be known, since Census questions did not always ask for the relevant information. Nevertheless, Census statistics do provide information about broad social conditions and when this information is combined with statistics given in such sources as the Annual Reports of the State Children Relief Department, some indicative though inexact picture can be pieced together.

First, as historians of the Australian family have observed, at the beginning of the twentieth century marriage was not yet a state attained by all or even most people. At the 1901 Census, only 48 percent of New South Wales women in the main childbearing ages 15 to 44 years were married. However, despite ruling class fears about the falling birth-rate, on average each of these women would produce four to six children by the time their families were completed. Moreover, the probability that a woman would become a mother shortly after marriage was high. The Government statistician calculated that, in the twelve year period 1893 to 1904, one-third of all first births were due to "ante-nuptial conception" and 61 percent of all first births occurred before marriages were a year old. Almost all first births (94 percent) occurred within the first two years of marriage.

These families then comprised the apparent stock of ideal units. However, significantly, on the night of the 1901 Census, 15 percent of husbands in New South Wales did not spend the night in the same residences as their wives, a fact which the Government statistician proclaimed to be "the habitual condition throughout Australia". Doubtless some of the absences were for legitimate reasons as men travelled the country looking for work, and probably some proportion of the absent husbands conscientiously sent money home to help support their wives and children. Other absences were occasioned by
hospitalisation or detention at Her Majesty's pleasure. But, as the records of
the State Children Relief Department attest, many of the absences were
effective desertions or permanent separations not legalised by divorce.\textsuperscript{15} Many
men simply disappeared and hence they were able to deny their family responsibili-
ties free from interference by the law. Their women were left literally
carrying the babies.

There were other families in which the husbands were still resident but
they were injured or ill and hence unable to work; had lost their jobs in
seasonal fluctuations and economic recessions; imbibed the proceeds of their
labour or they were in such low paid work that their wages were simply
insufficient to support a wife and several children. How many families of this
kind there were will never be known, since Census statistics do not provide the
information and women in these positions were unlikely to appeal to the State
Children Relief Board, knowing their cases had no chance of success, since an
apparently able-bodied male breadwinner was present in the home.

Second, more certain information exists for those family units which were,
by definition, non-ideal. These were the single supporting mothers who were
either divorced or widowed or who had borne illegitimate children. At the 1901
Census, while only an infinitesimal percentage of women were divorced, almost
nine percent were widowed.\textsuperscript{16} In addition, seven percent of all births in 1904
were illegitimate. Unless these women had been adequately provided for by
their departed spouses and lovers, they too lacked the necessary financial
support to enable them to carry out their child rearing roles. As one Annual
Report of the Infants Home, Ashfield noted of unmarried mothers, they were
commonly in desperate straits:

... the unfortunate woman, in most instances more sinned against
than sinning, who, with an illegitimate child in her arms, weak from
her recent confinement and want of sufficient nourishment, without
home, friends or money, is in despair as to how she shall support
herself and her offspring.\textsuperscript{17}
In total then, given that most married women became mothers soon after marriage, if the widows and wives with absent husbands whether de jure or de facto are added to the mothers of illegitimate children, then at a rough estimate approximately 20 percent of New South Wales women, most of whom would have had dependent children, were living in non-ideal family situations which lacked an adequate male income earner. Some of course were able to rely on family wealth to tide them over troubled times. Working class women were not so happily placed. They could appeal to equally struggling relatives and friends for help and untold numbers were undoubtedly provided with food and shelter for both themselves and their children. But as O'Brien noted, such "Hospitality could provide short-term aid but was often unrealistic as a final answer." Their other choices were to surrender their children completely to charity or the state; to appeal to the State Children Relief Board for cash payments; or to find work and try to be both child carer and income earner.

1.2 State Intervention in Family Life

The ideology of the family holds that it is a private retreat, a world into which the members withdraw for mutual emotional support. Its very privacy leads some to believe that somehow the family is inviolable, more or less free from societal influence. Yet families exist within a wider social context and hence their functioning is necessarily influenced by forces in that larger context, most particularly the state. Connell and Irving have argued that, by the simple reality of its establishment as a penal settlement, New South Wales has a long tradition of state intervention into the social condition of its citizens and that, from the earliest days, the state has actively promoted social and economic organisations founded in the relations of capitalism. Moreover, since capitalism requires a particular form of domestic life, namely the nuclear family with its sexual division of labour, the state in promoting capitalism has
also actively promoted the nuclear family as the basic social and economic unit in Australian society. This is not to say that the state was always directly involved nor that state policies and programs were necessarily consistent, since, as Graycar pointed out, different groups within government espouse different social visions and policy development is necessarily a political activity. Also, a range of factors relating to inter- and intra-governmental constitutional responsibilities, bureaucratic machinery and economic conditions affect outcomes. Hence actions and non-actions depend upon complex relationships between ideology and structural constraints, tempered by expediency, and dominant ideologies may or may not triumph. Nevertheless, for all of the time period of interest here, state policies and legislative programs which were designed to control and monitor family life reflected the ideology of the approved family model. Hence, men were protected and encouraged in their income earning roles; women were deterred from participating in the workforce, thereby ensuring their income dependence; women were educated in their domestic, nurturant roles; and both male and female children were educated for their respective future roles. In addition, if either men or women failed in their assigned roles, the state acted to assume substitute responsibility or, in less benevolent mood, instituted punitive measures to enforce required behaviours on its erring citizens. Only in recent years has the state finally introduced family support services which are actually designed to assist men and women together in their child rearing tasks.

It is the policies and programs which affected the lives of working class women who were responsible for rearing young children without the support of adequate male income earners which are pertinent here. There were two distinct, though interrelated, lines. The first, which is discussed in this chapter, was the state's social legislation for child and infant welfare. The second, which is discussed in the next chapter, was the state's industrial legislation for family income maintenance.
1.3 **State Provision for Child Welfare**

The State in New South Wales began its intervention with children deemed to be in need of care and protection as early as February, 1789, when Governor Phillip sent a four year old girl and a three year old boy to King at Norfolk Island "to be brought up as children of the State". In 1805, Lord Castlereagh legitimated the first administrator's intervention on behalf of neglected and abandoned children and set the pattern for the future. He instructed Governor King that

> In a Settlement where the irregular and immoral habits of the Parents are likely to leave their children in a state peculiarly exposed to suffer under vices, you will feel the peculiar necessity that the Government should interfere on behalf of the rising generation, and by the assertion of authority as well as encouragement, endeavour to educate them in religious as well as industrious habits ... you are authorised to make such advances (from the Public Funds) as you may deem requisite to afford the means of education of the children of the Colony.

There are three significant features of this policy decision. First, the State was authorised to stand in loco parentis when children were judged to be in moral danger. Second, the children were to be trained to fit state plans for their proper station in life. Third, the state was to be financially responsible for such training. Two main lines for implementing this policy were then pursued, each of which already existed in rudimentary form when Castlereagh sanctioned state intervention officially. One was the complete separation of children from their parents and their placement in residential orphanages. The second was state provision of schooling for children still under their parents' primary care. Both of these lines of action were based in the Lockean belief that, since children were considered to be malleable, values could be inculcated in childhood which would carry over into adult life. The corollary was that the earlier the process began the better.

Others have described the development and operation of orphanages and training schools for children who were either deemed by the state to be in need
of care and protection or who were placed in those institutions by parents unwilling or unable to continue to care for their children. They have observed the strong social control functions of these institutions and their heavily regimented, semi-penal nature.

What is important here to note are the definitions of conditions under which the state could appropriate child rearing responsibilities and parents consequently forfeited theirs. These definitions still form the basis for much current law governing child protection. They most commonly related to parents' habitual drunkenness, "notorious and scandalous misbehaviour", and abuse which affected the health and morality of the children. They were wide open to interpretation by lawyers and judges and almost never did these people consider that the situations they judged might be a function of the capitalist system under which the families were trying to survive. Decisions in individual cases regularly reflected ruling class values. By these means, gradual imposition of the bourgeois model of proper family life was strengthened in the name of saving children from the unholy alliance of ignorance, vice and poverty. And the very poor parents, particularly the mothers, who were caught up in the desperate daily struggle for survival, had no surplus energy to resist the imposition which they must have recognised. Mothers in particular must henceforth toe the bourgeois line or risk losing their children to the state.

It is important to note here that during the nineteenth century an administrative model of state and charity co-operation evolved which had three important consequences into the twentieth century.

First, as Horsburgh described, voluntary organisations such as the Benevolent Society became firmly established as government welfare

* Bourgeois is not a readily definable concept. It is used here to refer to a mode of life related to economic and cultural conditions of existence which epitomise values of material wealth and financial stability and which has the nuclear family as described in Chapter 1 as its ideal societal unit.
instrumentalities through state subsidisation of the services. While ruling class philanthropists administered the daily operation of the services and determined their policies and programs, the state made significant contributions to both capital and recurrent costs. This was a pragmatic government response to providing residual welfare services since it was cheaper to supply some funds for agencies using voluntary workers than it was to provide the services totally. It has since developed into a conservative government creed, supported by the Keynesian doctrine that government should not do those things which individuals can do. Hence, voluntary welfare organisations have proliferated, there being some 37,000 in Australia in 1981, and most of these received government financial support to a greater or lesser degree.

Second, the policies and programs were founded in the principles of charity developed by C.S. Loch for the British Charity Organisation Society. These principles were based on three assumptions about human nature and society: first, that economic independence is possible for all, and therefore if anyone fails it is because of individual character faults; second, that the "deserving" can readily be distinguished from the "undeserving"; and third, that it is both necessary and desirable that state intervention be an absolute minimum and limited to chronic cases. On the basis of these assumptions, the principles of charity then were: first, that all charitable actions must assist and indeed pressure individuals towards independence; second, that the family, in its widest sense which includes cousins, must be considered as a unit and the first source of assistance; third, that a thorough knowledge of potential recipients' circumstances is necessary; and fourth, that assistance when given should be sufficient in kind and quantity to effect a cure. Woodrooife noted that these principles were widely accepted and they carried through into professional social work preparation when the Charity Organisation Society's School of Sociology amalgamated with the London School of Economics in
1912. They were also widely accepted in Australia and influenced bourgeois assessments of lower and working class children's needs, their families' obligations and the state's financial responsibilities.

Third, since the administrative model depended on an unpaid voluntary moral army to police and enforce the approved ideology, charitable Good Works became the accepted occupations for bourgeois women. Their activities were directed at orphaned, neglected or destitute children; sick, poor and destitute women; women at childbirth; female prostitutes; and respectable but impoverished immigrant women. Their menfolk encouraged them in their endeavours since, first, social control was the women's explicit aim; second, the women's minds, hearts and energies were occupied, thereby containing their dissatisfactions with their private lives; and third, the women's public show of untainted charity indirectly assisted the men's careers. For bourgeois women themselves, there were three important outcomes. First, they had opportunities to display their considerable organisational, managerial and entrepreneurial talents. They dealt with staff, decided on policies and budgets and organised a host of ingenious fund raising events designed to squeeze money out of tight bourgeois pockets. Second, they refined definitions of class and status distinctions through precise use of the words lady, woman and female and they enforced what they saw as appropriate relations between members of the different social strata. Third, whether they were aware of it or not, they became inextricably enmeshed in the web of family ideology under the capitalist system and consequently were controlled and restricted by that ideology. It was from this platform that bourgeois women, whether married or single, launched their campaigns for women's suffrage, improved legal status for women, domestic science education for girls in schools and higher educational opportunities. The basis of the campaigns was the equation of motherhood with womanhood, an idea which gathered momentum in the twentieth century.
1.3.1 State Children Relief Act, 1881

The visit of the crusading Davenport Hill sisters to Australia in 1873 ushered in a new era of child welfare policy and administration in New South Wales. The Hill sisters argued that the objectives of imbuing children with proper values so that they could dutifully serve the state and ultimately establish well-modulated families could only be achieved if the children themselves were reared by families which exemplified the right lifestyle. The "barracks system" of orphanages and reformatories was attacked and the new child protection imperative was to save the children from institutional upbringing. The virtues of family life particularly in the country away from the corrupting evils of the city, were loudly proclaimed. The benefits for children to be derived from placement with solid, respectable working families who would integrate the children into school, church and community life did not require much explanation to those who already believed in these values. The solution to the child rearing problem was self-evident: if the biological parents had failed the children then the next best thing was a substitute family which although not blood-related, satisfied the criteria of the nuclear family ideal. It was all so simple and, prompted by the press and agitation by church leaders, the idea was accepted with little resistance.\(^\text{37}\)

The State Children Relief Act was passed in 1881. This Act, rumoured to have been drafted by Lady Windeyer on Premier Sir Henry Parkes' invitation, became "the pace-setting model of child welfare administration in Australia over the next generation".\(^\text{38}\) It gave the state power to remove children, who had already been committed to institutions supported wholly or in part by the state, from those institutions and to place them with selected foster families who would be paid for their efforts from consolidated revenue. The object was clearly to empty the heavily state-financed and much criticised institutions and, using the family ideology rhetoric, to institute a cheaper form of child rearing.
Foster care was "in" and placing children whom the state decided were in need of care and protection either directly with intact families or in "cottage homes", where a number of unrelated children lived with a worthy couple who may or may not have had children of their own, remains the preferred way of handling children when natural parents have failed the family model test.

The provisions of the 1881 Act were directly descended from Castlereagh's 1805 policy decision. First, the state continued its power to override parental authority for children whom the state deemed to be in danger. Second, the state pursued its policy of ensuring that the children were properly trained to fit into the society it planned. Third, the state assumed financial responsibility for the children's rearing. In addition, the Act continued existing state policy of using the resources of unpaid volunteers to police its provisions. It established the State Children Relief Board which comprised nine members appointed by the Governor from among the ruling elite. The first two Presidents, Sir Arthur Renwick (1881-1901) and Sir Charles Mackellar (1902-1914) were both medical practitioners, politicians and philanthropists. Renwick was also President of the Sydney Hospital, the New South Wales Institution for the Deaf, Dumb and Blind and the prestigious Benevolent Society. Mackellar was a more active politician, being Chairman of two Royal Commissions of Inquiry, one in 1903 into the birthrate and the other in 1912-13 into provisions for adolescent children. He was also instrumental in introducing legislation controlling illegitimate children and their mothers. The other Board members represented various religious territorial interests.

The Board was supported by a band of voluntary "lady inspectors" who numbered 230 by 1900 and 400 in 1920. These "lady inspectors" and the Board members performed the inquisitorial, investigatory function advocated by the British Charity Organisation Society, in ascertaining whether children were in physical or moral danger and in monitoring the quality of potential and existing
foster families. Their class and religious values informed their recommendations about placement of children, their assessments of the children's behaviour and their decisions when arbitrating disputes between children and families. Their powers were even further enhanced by an amendment to the Act in 1896 which enabled them to remove children directly from their own families to foster families without the need to place them first within an institution.

A second amendment to the Act in 1896 provided for payment of a cash allowance to widowed or deserted mothers to "foster" their own children. This amendment brought both hope and fear to these single supporting mothers. On the one hand, it seemed that the state had at last recognised their desperate financial situations but on the other, assistance could only be achieved after subjection to rigorous scrutiny by the Board and its "lady inspectors". Now, in addition to other class and moral values, the ideologies of "pauperism" and "imposition" came into play. The Board and the "lady inspectors" were motivated by two fears - first, that unscrupulous people would misrepresent their circumstances and thus mislead authorities to grant assistance where none was due and second that individual self-respect would be undermined if hand outs were given without all avenues of self-help having been exploited. The lady inspectors sniffed out signs that able bodied men might be in residence and checked on the circumstances of older children not now resident at home. The similarities between their tasks and those of today's child protection officers and the activities of social security officers administrating supporting parents' benefits in the 1970s are all too apparent.

Between 1897 and 1920, over 21,000 widows and deserted wives applied to the Board for assistance but only 15,000 of them were successful. The annual refusal rate averaged 25 percent, ranging from a low 13 percent in 1907 to a high 41 percent in 1899. Of those who were accepted, 60 percent were
widows, 18 percent were deserted wives in fact and 22 percent had been "technically deserted", 17 percent by husbands hospitalised for mental or physical illness and 5 percent by husbands in prison. In no assisted case was an able bodied male income earner present in the family and no assisted case was an acknowledged unmarried mother. On average over the 24 year period, almost 1700 mothers were assisted each year and each was responsible for an average of three dependent children. The amounts paid varied from 2/- to 5/- per week per child up to 1918. However, as Kewley noted, the allowance was set at about half the already marginally adequate rate paid to foster parents since, as the Board, argued, if a mother received a sufficient amount for a child's upkeep she might be placed in a better position than she was before her husband's death or desertion, and industry and thrift on her part and that of her older children would thereby be stifled.\(^47\)

In summary, the payments were hard won even by those who were desperate enough to apply and submit themselves to investigation; they were subject to regular review; they were never intended to be sufficient to cover the full cost of children's upkeep; and they were not at all related to the women's needs to support themselves. Hence, until the State Widows' Pension Act in 1926, there was no state financial support for thousands of women left responsible for both the child caring and income earning roles.\(^48\) These women were expected either to have older children who would willingly contribute some of their own meagre earnings to support their mothers and younger siblings or to find whatever work they could to pay for food, shelter and clothing. What would happen to their babies and young children below school age remained problematic.

One other outcome of the 1881 Act that should also be noted here was the establishment of an embryonic state welfare bureaucracy which ultimately led to the elimination of the volunteer charity brigades from any directive role
in child welfare services. There were many steps along the way. First, in 1881, the Act established the senior public servant position of Boarding-Out Officer to work with the Board. It also provided for assistants to work with this officer. By 1900 the salaried staff numbered 69 and there were 153 by 1920. Second, at the beginning of 1906, ministerial responsibility for the Board, the Department and the Acts they administered was transferred from the Colonial Secretary to the Minister for Public Instruction. Third, in 1914 when Labor was in office, the public servant Boarding-Out officer Alfred Green replaced Sir Charles Mackellar as President of the Board. Both Carmichael, the Minister for Public Instruction and the Director General of Education Peter Board wished to abolish the Board and place all its functions directly under Alfred Green. Green himself was concerned about the chaotic and unco-ordinated condition of child welfare services in the state, and the growing ineffectiveness of the Board. He advocated

... the co-ordination of all the Acts and agencies dealing with dependent children of the State and the laws applicable in this regard to the general population. They should be placed under direct Ministerial control, with the Head of the Department as permanent head, responsible to, and only to the Minister, as obtains now in the Health, Lunacy and Prisons Departments, which are surely not of greater importance to the State than the Children's Department. It should be the first aim of any Government desirous of doing its duty as such to appoint a Ministry or Bureau of Child Welfare to direct and control all private and public activities for the protection and care of children.

Finally, in October, 1919, the Premier, W.A. Holman ordered a Public Service Royal Commission inquiry to

... deal with matters of policy as distinct from, and in addition to, matters of administration, to which I understand you have previously confined yourself; also whether any modification in the present policy of the Department is necessary; and, if so, what amendments of the law will be required to give effect to such modifications.

The outcome of this inquiry was the Child Welfare Act, 1923, of which W.E. Bethel, the first Under Secretary of the new Department of Child Welfare proudly claimed
In no part of the world is there a single Act so comprehensive in its character, with so many social purposes embodied in its aims and spread over so large a territory as that represented by New South Wales.\textsuperscript{54}

The 1923 Act consolidated all existing Acts and its administration was made the responsibility of a single Department. There was however no Ministry of Children nor of Families. Instead the new Department remained located under the Minister for Education until 1956 when it joined other social services under one welfare portfolio. The Act did abolish the State Children Relief Board and the volunteer services of the "lady inspectors" were dispensed with. Henceforth, social control of inadequate families would be fully a bureaucratic function. Philanthropy could continue to operate welfare services but it would do so subject to state control by regulations attached to legislation. Nevertheless, there was no essential change in the ideology which underpinned state intervention into family life. The 1923 Act continued the policy principles enunciated by Castlereagh over a century earlier and the concept of welfare remained essentially one based on the idea that it is a mopping-up service for families which, for whatever reason, fail to match the idealised bourgeois concept of family life. Hence, the same families continued to be the targets of state attention and poor women continued to live in fear of being judged undeserving and of losing their children to the State. Moreover, state welfare was to prove just as difficult to obtain and just as miserly as voluntary charity had been.

1.3.2 Public Instruction Act, 1880

The other significant nineteenth century child welfare legislation which is relevant here was Parkes' Public Instruction Act, 1880. This Act, which introduced free, compulsory, secular education for children aged six to fourteen years, established the basic framework for education in New South Wales which has endured ever since. Developments leading up to and following this Act
have been well described elsewhere and do not need repetition here. Suffice it to note that as Barcan observed, the Act served effectively as a Factory Act, prohibiting employment of children in factories, shops and on farms by default. In addition, the Act was based on a universalist principle and education remains one of the few welfare provisions to which all children are entitled as of right.

The important issue here is that the state selected chronological age six as the beginning point for schooling yet, from the very beginning as the statistics given in the Minister's Report for 1881 show, 62 percent of all children in the state aged four to six years were enrolled in State schools as well as some 4 percent of children under four years. Doubtless other children in these age brackets were enrolled in the Catholic system. The high proportion of young children attending schools is all the more startling since on the one hand there was no compulsion for these children to attend school and on the other school attendance was not yet at this stage free and parents had to pay a fee for their children's attendance unless they were the fifth children in their families attending the schools. This discrepancy between state requirements and parents' responses demands some explanation.

Why did the state choose age six? Examination of the arguments produced in debates preceding the 1880 legislation provides little enlightenment but it can be speculated that the answer relates to the primary purpose of public instruction which was to produce proficiency in the 3Rs as quickly and as cost effectively as possible. Hence, if the legislators can be credited with taking advice from those who may have had some observational knowledge of child development and if they seriously believed the legislation's main object "to afford the best primary education to all children without sectarian or class distinction", they may have determined that six was the earliest age at which children could be expected to respond to the instructional content and teaching
methods of the time - large classes with monitors to assist the teacher, rigid discipline to keep order in those classes and rote learning to produce the product.

Why did the parents send their four and five year olds and occasionally their two and three year olds to school? The answer here is more certain. The mothers were all too willing to take advantage of any form of outside help to help ease the load of child rearing. As the Sydney Morning Herald observed in 1882, the children were "not sent to school at all for the purpose of being taught, but merely to be out of the way, so that the school [became] to the parents a sort of cheap, convenient nursery".60 Indeed, there was a long tradition of "parents" (which undoubtedly means mothers) using schools as child care services. The Infant School movement arrived in Sydney in 1824 and a school for 60 children aged eighteen months to four years opened in St James Hall in June that year.61 Others followed and until mid-century, when both church and state became distracted by the religious controversy, they enjoyed some prominence. In the second half of the century, children aged two to six years regularly attended both National and denominational schools, the youngest either being left to themselves to make what sense they could of the lessons given to older children or else, if there was a sufficient number of them, being herded together in some out-of-the-way spot to be taught by the schoolmaster's wife as best she could. While school inspectors on some occasions complained that these very young children were subjected to a pressure-cooker approach to satisfy rigid standards and on others that cots should be installed so that toddlers could sleep comfortably, few efforts were made to eliminate their presence. Hence, mothers grew accustomed to being able to send their very young children along to school with older siblings.62

Why did the state accept children below the statutory beginning age, especially if it was concerned to produce literate and numerate workers with
the approved habits as quickly and as efficiently as possible? The answer here probably depends in part on ideological lag, on continuation of beliefs held strongly in the earlier part of the century in the malleability of the mind which underpinned the Infant School movement. There would have been some at least who still believed that, if the children were to be trained properly, the earlier a start is made the better. A second factor is pure expediency. Early Ministerial Reports acknowledged that, if four and five year olds were excluded "the very existence of small, struggling schools was jeopardised". Hence, if the state was to reach older children it was forced to accept responsibility for younger ones as well. To the extent that it did, the state succumbed to women's child care needs and hence supported women in their child caring roles.

The state has never officially lowered its statutory beginning age and this has allowed it a valuable flexibility to operate in a free enterprise capitalist economy. Thus, while education policy for children aged six to fourteen (later fifteen) has since 1880 been based on the principle of universal right, educational policy for children under six has been in a sense based on a residualist principle, that is, that any provision is conditional on the availability of surplus resources in times of prosperity. Hence, in the flourishing 1880s when the state wished to expand its coverage of children, the under sixes continued to be accepted in the system. Indeed the state even experimented with techniques to provide more suitable educational programs for them and introduced Froebelian Kindergarten methods. However, as the 1890s depression deepened and the Department's income was reduced by parents' inability to pay fees, in 1894 the Minister ordered children under six excluded. Similarly, in the revitalising of State education which followed the Knibbs-Turner report in 1903 and the conference of Teachers and Departmental officers in 1904, it was extension of secondary education and upgrading of teacher training which attracted state resources rather than implementation of
Kindergarten recommendations for children below statutory school age. Efforts were made again at that time to reduce the numbers of under sixes and by 1906 only 13 percent of the state's four and five year olds were in schools. State interest in under sixes has continued to wax and wane dependent on available resources and prevailing ideologies. Although all five year olds eventually have been accepted, the state has not yet made universal provision for younger children.

1.3.3 The Kindergarten Union of New South Wales

It was in the contractionary years of the mid-1890s that circumstances combined to create a favourable atmosphere for the establishment of an educational philanthropy for children below statutory school age. A small group headed by Professor Anderson and his future wife Maybanke Wolstenholme, supported by Professors MacCallum and Scott, and members of the newly formed Teachers' Association who were already operating kindergartens in private girls' schools, became convinced of the need for educational reform. With ruling class fears of social unrest rampant "it was comparatively easy to arouse interest in the conditions of neglected children and the imminent danger of larrkinism". So, in July, 1895, they formed the Kindergarten Union of New South Wales with three objects

- To set forth Kindergarten principles.
- To endeavour to get these principles introduced into every school in New South Wales.
- To open Free Kindergartens wherever possible in poor neighbourhoods.

The main appeal of this movement was to the philanthropic hearts of Sydney's social elite, to unloose their purse strings and assist in the social reform of working-class children and their parents. Maybanke Anderson subsequently remarked that there were few people active in the movement who were well-versed in the educational theory of the work. Indeed publicly expressed lack of knowledge of the kindergarten system by its supposed supporters was
something of an embarrassment. Nevertheless, it was the educational nature of the kindergarten which legitimated the endeavour and attracted state financial support. And the fact that the children for whom the programs were provided were below compulsory school age did not prevent the state from making grants in aid to the Kindergarten Union under the Public Instruction vote, along with the University of Sydney, the Royal Australian Historical Society and the Royal Art Society of New South Wales. The first grant was made in 1899 and it has continued ever since.

The Kindergarten Union went on from its tiny beginning in the All-Night Shelter in Sussex Street to develop an influential network of preschool services which still continues. Its training college for kindergarten teachers became the lode star from which graduates ranged out to begin similar kindergarten movements in other states. Until the 1970s and the entry of the Commonwealth government into direct funding of early childhood teacher preparation programs, the provision of such teachers remained the responsibility of a voluntary organisation dependent on its own fee paying students, its fundraising activities and an annual state grant. Similarly, until the Commonwealth Child Care Act, 1972, the provision of educational services for children under five years was in the same position.

The important point here is that the Kindergarten Union as a voluntary organisation provided residual welfare services. Although it focused on Froebellian and later other educational and child development theorists, it has essentially been a mopping-up operation for the state in providing education along approved lines for children whom the state placed outside its sphere of universal entitlement. In addition, to the extent that, for at least its first thirty years, it ignored glaring evidence of children's mal- and under-nourishment, physical abuse, disease and inadequate or inappropriate clothing, and placed its faith indomitably and implicitly in the belief that enough "right
habits" could be soaked up in a few hours each day in the kindergarten atmosphere to combat the evil of disordered home conditions, it betrayed its own welfare objectives. Moreover, its services have never been a solution to the problems which women faced if they needed to assume both child care and income earning roles, since the hours of operation have not matched the hours during which women worked.

1.4 Education for Motherhood

It was through its involvement with the infant welfare movement that the state significantly advanced its aim to spread the bourgeois nuclear family ideal to all strata of society. Chief protagonists in this movement were the medical men (and sometimes women) and nurses employed by the Departments of Public Health and Public Instruction. They were supported by the many politicians who were also doctors, by the medical staff of leading hospitals and by philanthropists. Although these people may have had ideological differences on other matters, they were united in their pro-natalist views and in their efforts to improve both the infant survival rate and the physical condition of older children. Lewis has provided a comprehensive and analytic account of this movement which Thame justifiably claimed to be "the most far-reaching and successful of positive health programmes at that time". The years between 1904 and 1926 saw the growth of a state-wide system of free baby health centres, funded entirely by the state and staffed by trained mothercraft nurses, as well as the growth of school medical services and the introduction of domestic science classes in both primary and secondary schools. It is not the place here to describe all these developments in detail but, since they inevitably affected the lives of all women in the state, some discussion of the events and their outcomes is necessary.

In 1903, the Government Statistician, Timothy A. Coghlan, provided
scientific confirmation of the ruling elite's worst fears that the population was not increasing at a desirable rate. His publication The Decline of the Birth-Rate in New South Wales supplied incontrovertible evidence that between 1886 and 1901 there had been an almost one-third reduction in births to married women under 45 years (from 339 per 1000 to 235 per 1000). He found the facts to be "novel and astonishing" in a young developing country and he spoke for his class when he wrote that

The problem of the fall of the birth-rate is ... a national one of overwhelming importance to the Australian people, ... and on its satisfactory solution will depend whether this country is ever to take a place amongst the great nations of the world. The matter was considered so serious that a Royal Commission was constituted in August, 1903, to investigate the causes of the decline and "the Effects of the Restriction of Child-Bearing upon the well being of the community". The evidence obtained by the Commission and the conclusions it drew have been well analysed by Hicks and Pringle. Here it is sufficient to note that the Commission's Report represented "the high-water mark of the pro-natalist conservatism, national chauvinism and state endorsed sexist ideology". The Report was coloured by a severe moralism born out of the Commissioners' patriarchal ideology of family. It condemned the people (and by implication women particularly) for being unpatriotic, selfish, even vicious in engaging in contraceptive practices to limit their child-bearing. The Commissioners were convinced that "deliberate curtailment of reproduction" led to the weakening of social structure, dissolution of the family, and lessening of moral fibre. Clearly, with such decay, the very fabric of British superiority was at risk, and the nation was in grave danger of occupation by the yellow hordes to the North, particularly the Japanese.

Of significance here was the decision in October, 1903, to extend the Commission's investigations to include the causes of infant mortality and its preventability. This extension was considered necessary since it seemed likely
that the already diminished birthrate would go on diminishing and it was therefore "of paramount importance to the future welfare of the State that the lives of the children that are born shall be preserved, as far as this is possible". 85 Statistics gathered by the Commission had shown that in the decade 1892 to 1901 the death rate of babies in New South Wales in their first year was 111 per 1000 live births. This rate compared unfavourably with Tasmania where it was 95 per 1000 and New Zealand with what was then an enviably low 81 per 1000. It was shown that half the infant deaths in New South Wales occurred within three months of birth and also that there was an enormous difference in the mortality rates of legitimate (99 per 1000) and illegitimate (277 per 1000) babies. 86

The Commissioners published an extensive list of factors considered to be causal in producing infant deaths. These included prematurity, defective care by midwives, illhealth of mothers, lack of public hospital accommodation, deliberate infanticide, and defective management of institutions for illegitimate children. However, by far the greatest cause of infant deaths was "summer diarrhoea" or "acute gastro-intestinal catarrh" which the medical witnesses attributed to reduction in breastfeeding and consequent increase in artificial feeding. 87 In these Dark Ages of infant dietetics, the mixtures fed to infants were frequently nutritionally inappropriate, dangerously laced with chemicals and/or bacterially impure. 88 The results of such feeding were just as frequently disastrous.

The remedy for the problem seemed quite simple to the male politicians, bureaucrats and medical fraternity. If babies were to survive, they had to be breastfed by their mothers and women's ignorance of proper infant health care and domestic hygiene had to be overcome. There were to be two prongs in the attack.

First, spearheaded by Dr W.G. Armstrong, at this time Sydney's
Metropolitan Officer of Health and later Director General of Health, a campaign was launched based on the slogan "There is no feeding like breast-feeding". It was implemented by women home health visitors and it was remarkably successful. In the years 1904 to 1914 the percentage of babies in the Sydney Metropolitan area who were entirely breastfed to at least seven months rose from 72 to 94. There was a concurrent reduction in infant mortality from 106 to 73 per 1000 live births. Encouraged by this evidence and spurred on by heightened public concern about infant mortality as citizens at all social levels reeled in shock and horror at the slaughter of the flower of the nation's manhood in World War I, maternal and baby health care clinics were established under the Baby Clinics, Pre-Maternity and Home Nursing Board. These were supported by local governments and the Country Women's Association. Training for baby health care clinic nurses was begun by the Royal Society for the Welfare of Mothers and Babies in 1921 and finally the whole operation was made the responsibility of a new state Department of Maternal and Baby Welfare in 1926. Thus, in some twenty years, the unco-ordinated efforts of a handful of enthusiasts in inner Sydney were transformed into a co-ordinated, state-wide system of infant health care advice and support, universally available, free, to women of all social levels and untainted by any odour of charity.

The process by which this desirable outcome was achieved represents a classic case study of state-philanthropy relations within the context of medical politics and state power struggles. As Lewis pointed out, the achievement was assisted by the unity of all parties in the desire to reduce infant mortality in the interests of national prosperity and security; by the fact that the baby clinics were advisory and referral services only and hence did not trespass on doctors' rights to private practice; and, from the state's point of view, by the low cost of the services which were staffed by low-paid female nurses and
located in non-costly premises. It was also achieved because women themselves wanted the advice and support. In a changing ideological climate, women were increasingly prepared to seek and use expert scientific rationality in preference to traditional homespun advice; the advice was simple to follow and, given the monopolistic control over training baby health sisters by the Royal Society for the Welfare of Mothers and Babies, the advice was consistent from clinic to clinic; and most importantly, by the 1920s the clinics were advertised as services for all women and babies regardless of social class. In addition, as Lewis did not observe, despite see-sawing changes in government from Labor to Nationalist and back five times during this period, ideological continuity was maintained by senior bureaucrats and medical officers within the Public Health Department.

The second prong in the attack was domestic science education for girls in schools. This had been advocated by the National Council of Women since 1898, perhaps not disinterestedly since these bourgeois women were undoubtedly motivated to some extent by their desires to obtain decent domestic servants for themselves and others of their class. Their campaign was basically predicated on the ideology of education for motherhood as Maybanke Anderson, a leading feminist and instigator of the Kindergarten Union, made clear:

In an ideal State, every prospective mother should be so educated that she may not only have a healthy child, but may also know how to train her family in virtue and the duties of citizenship. Without such an education a woman is only partially qualified for the duties and pleasures of life.

In 1905, pressed by both the influential women and the recommendations of the Birth-Rate Commission, the Department of Public Instruction acted and introduced domestic science training into primary schools. After the superior public schools were reorganised in 1911, some of these became domestic science schools for girls, and the curriculum included infant care with other domestic management subjects. There was however never to be the University
Chair of Domestic Science so much desired by bourgeois women activists. Despite some apparent blurring of ideological lines, the state's rationale for introducing education of girls for domestic life was clearly stated by J.W. Turner, Superintendent of Technical Education, in a 1907 report to the Premier on the establishment of a Domestic College for Women. He explained that:

"Domestic science was originally introduced into the school curriculum to raise the prestige of household work. Every home was to become an official and healthy unit within a state working towards national efficiency, and maintaining its racial superiority. At the same time it was believed that it would be easier to attract girls into domestic service if the status of the work was raised. The girl was destined to spend most of her life as housewife and mother and therefore it was just as necessary for her to be efficiently trained as it was for the boy to be competent at his trade or profession."  

Hamilton has pointed out that Turner's statements made no distinction between women's paid and unpaid work. She argues further that the state was not only not interested in providing a vocational training for girls as domestic servants but was actively interested in ensuring that girls were fitted for their proper future roles as housekeepers and mothers. Turner indeed made that idea explicit. In the same Report he said

"Home is essentially a woman's sphere. There is nothing better calculated to develop a woman morally, mentally and physically, than the conscientious performance of all household arts."

There can be little doubt that the New South Wales Department, like its Western Australian counterpart analysed by Porter, assumed the task of training girls, as well as boys, for their respective roles in family life as part of their future contributions to national prosperity. To the extent that the Department was successful, it supported ruling class interests. To the extent that it was uninterested in domestic science as vocational training for girls to be employed as paid servants, it was at odds with those interests. In any case, by the 1920s the Department had replaced bourgeois women's individualistic training of domestic servants with the new god Science served by Technical
Rationality, thereby undermining ruling class women's hegemony in the domestic sphere.

In summary, as the state progressively acquired the male patriarchal role, its policies and programs relating to family life were consistent across its education, health and welfare departments in reinforcing the ideology that child rearing and domestic maintenance were women's proper roles in life. It placed these responsibilities outside its own legitimate sphere of activity except when improper maternal behaviours endangered children's safety and well-being. It assumed that families were financially supported by men and it only intervened when no man was present. Moreover, as is discussed in the next chapter, the assumption of men's financial responsibility influenced state industrial and wages decisions and reinforced women's workforce status as marginal and expendable. In all these policies and programs, as Cox observed, the state represented a coalition of male interests across class which has ensured that child care responsibilities maintained women's domesticity and hence men's own domestic comfort. The state has also avoided confrontation with an economic and social structure which perpetuates poverty chiefly in female-headed households.
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CHAPTER TWO

FOUNDING THE SYDNEY DAY NURSERY ASSOCIATION

It was estimated in the previous chapter that, at the turn of the twentieth century, up to 20 percent of New South Wales married and unmarried women with dependent children lacked a male income earning partner because of death or effective desertion. A further unknown additional percentage still had resident husbands but these men were inadequate income earners for a variety of reasons including injury, illness, drunkenness, job loss, or simply the low wages they were paid. A small percentage of the widowed and deserted obtained cash allowances from the state to help support their children but the payment did not cover the total cost of the children's upkeep and there was no state financial support at all for themselves. The great majority of these families were therefore desperately poor and if they were going to be fed, clothed and sheltered then the women must find paid work either to supplement the family income or to provide it totally. This necessity raised two questions. First, what employment was available and second, what would the women do with their young children while they were working?

2.1 Women's Paid Work

In her study of the Australian family, Grimshaw observed that, while men have always been considered to be their families' economic mainstays, from earliest colonial days married women have also always worked to contribute productively to their families' material welfare. While men laboured on farms and dairies, in mines and construction, as tradesmen and small-businessmen, either as wage-earners or self-employed, their wives also laboured, keeping hens
and selling eggs, rearing calves, growing fruit and vegetables and processing them, helping with fencing, tree-felling and water-carrying, serving in the shop, taking in boarders, sewing, cooking, cleaning and doing the laundry for boarding houses, hotels and the affluent. The problem with married women's paid labour was not so much that it existed but that, when it was removed from the obscurity and privacy of the home into the public workforce, it confronted the bourgeois family ideal squarely. Moreover, that ideal and the demands of capitalism were in a profound state of tension, since on the one hand industrialisation not only accepted but also demanded vast supplies of cheap female labour to satisfy the profit motive and on the other bourgeois domestic life demanded female domestic servants (cooks, maids, laundresses, governesses and nursemaids) to sustain its ideology of womanhood. These ambivalences between capitalism and the approved form of family life have never been satisfactorily resolved.

At the time of the 1901 Census, 29 percent of women in the main childbearing period 15 to 44 years were in paid employment but this figure underestimates the actual extent of women's paid labour to some unknown degree. Much of women's paid work was casual and part-time and hence the ways in which Census questions were framed have, until relatively recently, obscured the real extent of women's participation in the workforce. At the 1901 Census, there were two chief causes of underestimation of women's work. First, only those domestic servants known to be living-in at their places of work were included. Therefore, daily domestics who worked periodically, charring and washing in hotels, boarding houses and for bourgeois families were excluded from the count. Second, out-work and sweated home labour had by no means disappeared in New South Wales and there is no certainty that women earning money this way were counted as breadwinners.

However, for those who were counted in the Census, occupations were
generally consistent with traditional female roles of nurturer, housekeeper and manufacturer of domestic products. Almost half (47 percent) were engaged in domestic work, 14 percent in running hotels and boarding houses and 33 percent engaged as domestic servants, housemaids, nursemaids, washerwomen or cooks. The lowest paid of all domestic workers were the nursemaids engaged to assist in rearing bourgeois children. They were paid 7/- per week and keep, a rate which in relation to the unskilled male labourer's rate of almost 7/- a day says a great deal about the relative commercial value the ruling class accorded to childrearing. General servants and housemaids were paid 14/- and 12/6 a week respectively, laundresses 17/6 while cooks commanded 22/6 per week, also all with keep. The next largest avenue of employment was in manufacture which absorbed 21 percent of the female workforce. Most worked in the manufacture of textiles. A proportion of these workers were female tailors and coat machinists who in 1904 became the first women workers in New South Wales to be covered by an industrial award. This set their wages at 20/- and 25/- per 48 hour week and paid them overtime rates. However, the wages of the great majority of non-unionised factory workers can only be guessed at.

Another important employment category, accounting for 13 percent of the female workforce, was termed "professional". Almost two-thirds of these women were teachers while the remaining third were nurses, or classified as "religion" or "charity" (public service figures were obscured by the statistical classifications used). At this time, women comprised 59 percent of the total teaching force in the state, over half of them (55 percent) in private colleges and schools. In the state schools, 44 percent of the teachers were women. While salaries for female and unmarried male teachers employed by the Department of Public Instruction were equivalent at the lowest classifications (£72 per annum) there were as might be expected considerable differences at all other levels. Nursing was a less well paid occupation, although direct comparison
is hazardous since board and lodging was also provided. At the lowest level, nurses in public hospitals received £40 per annum and nursing sisters £50 to £80 per annum. However the few women who became Matrons in charge of large public hospitals commanded £274 per annum, a salary equivalent to that of the Third Medical Officer and one which compared favourably with the maximum female teacher salary of £280 per annum for a mistress in charge of a girls' department.12

In the following forty years, although the same qualifications about the validity of Census statistics apply, there were changes in both women's occupations and in their workforce participation rates. Table 1 shows that, between 1901 and 1947, the relative percentages of women employed in domestic work fell steadily over the years while employment in commercial and professional occupations increased. Manufacturing employment peaked in 1911 then fell to the 1901 level in 1933, rising again to the 1911 level at the post war 1947 Census.

The second column of Table 2 shows that, in the same period, the percentage of women at work was at its lowest level in 1921 when the motherhood campaign was at its peak. The third and fourth columns of the table show that the percentages of married women at work, and the percentages of married women in the total female workforce, were also at their lowest levels in 1921, even though the marriage rate had begun to rise (column 1). These percentages were still low at the 1933 Census and did not begin to rise rapidly until after the Second World War. Unfortunately, the 1901 Census does not enable married women's workforce participation to be calculated, but since all other percentages are higher for this Census than for the 1911 Census, it is tempting to speculate that this percentage was also higher in 1911. In any case, bearing in mind that the Census figures did not include part-time and casual work, and acknowledging Grimshaw's argument, it is likely that the Census figures even today do not tell the whole story of married
Table 1. Percentages of Women in Major Employment Categories, 1901-1947

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1901</th>
<th>1911</th>
<th>1921</th>
<th>1933</th>
<th>1947</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic service</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commerce and Finance</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary production</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport and Comm.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment, recre.</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 2. Married Women in the Workforce, 1901-1954

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% Married Women</th>
<th>% Women at Work</th>
<th>% Married Women at Work</th>
<th>Married Women at Work as % of Female Workforce</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

women's paid work since in addition to those women who identify themselves as being in jobs outside the home there is an unknown number of housewives who still sell eggs, jams and knitwear and mind the neighbours' children for a fee.

Also unfortunately, there is no way of knowing exactly how many employed women, whether married or single, were responsible for dependent young children. It was not until a special survey was made by the Commonwealth Bureau of Census and Statistics in 1969 that such information became available.\textsuperscript{13} Given that marriage and birthrates changed dramatically in the intervening years, extrapolation is not legitimate. What is known however, is that, early in the century there was strong ruling class resistance to married women's employment because of their actual or potential motherhood status. Perhaps the clearest and most unselfconscious expressions of that resistance were contained in A.B. Piddington's Report of the 1910-11 Inquiry into the Employment of Female and Juvenile Labour in Factories and Shops. Kingston remarked this report "as a high-water mark of masculine, liberal concern with the true and natural role of women in Australian society."\textsuperscript{14}

The outcome of this Inquiry was really a foregone conclusion, even though Kate Dwyer representing the Women Workers' Union was one of the three assistants to Commissioner Piddington and five employed women were included among the witnesses. Piddington dominated the gathering of evidence, selecting questions to be asked of different witnesses and leading them to the answers he sought. For example, all the male doctor witnesses who were in private practice or working in hospitals were asked to comment on the effects of married women's employment in factories on their health, the birthrate and infant mortality. These men were unanimous in their rejection of such employment, variously professing the views that it led to such evils as contraception, neglect of homes and husbands, abandonment of breastfeeding, farming out of babies and increased infant death.\textsuperscript{16} The doctors were also asked to comment
on the Factory Act provision that women were not allowed to return to work until four weeks after confinement. Again, the men were unanimous that this was not long enough, several suggesting that women needed at least eight weeks recovery time, one that return should not be until the baby was weaned at nine months and three that married women living with their husbands should not be allowed to work outside the home at all. None of the women witnesses was asked these questions nor did Kate Dwyer question them to ascertain their views on any of these matters. There was no minority report from this inquiry so it must be assumed that all participants, including Kate Dwyer, accepted Piddington's summary conclusion that

It is obviously inconsistent with the normal duties of a married woman's life that she should give up the whole of the working week to factory employment, and the sole case in which married women not separated from their husbands should be allowed to enter factories ought to be when, through the illness or misfortune or worthlessness of the husband, the married woman is the only chief support of the family. This determining fact ought to be established on the finding of a magistrate who would have the power to call for full evidence in order to prevent evasion and chicanery, and only upon such finding ought permits to be given.

The Piddington inquiry occurred within the context of an increasingly strongly held ideological belief in the concept of a family wage. This concept was popular among both ruling and working classes and its growing acceptance probably explains why there was no public outcry or negative press comment following release of Piddington's report. Beginning late in the nineteenth century, stimulated by the Labor party and male dominated trade unions, the state had begun to legislate to control hours and conditions of work and minimum wages. Its industrial policies as they developed in the twentieth century were clearly based on the bourgeois family ideology. The history of these legislations from a feminist perspective has been well told by Ryan and Conlon. The most far-reaching of the decisions, from women's point of view, was as Ryan and Conlon termed it, "Justice Higgin's albatross" in 1907.
The significant feature of the well-known Harvester judgement was Higgins' determination that a living wage should be paid to every working man (and the gender is carefully chosen) on the basis of his needs rather than on the value of services rendered. Higgins considered "that the normal needs of the average [male] employee in a civilised community" included a wife and several children whom the working man was "under an obligation - even a legal obligation - to maintain".\textsuperscript{21} The standard Higgins determined was one "sufficient to ensure the workman food, shelter, clothing, frugal comforts, provision for evil days, etc."\textsuperscript{22} and presumably similar benefits for his dependants. Yet the standard of 7/- a day which Higgins set as the wage for an unskilled male adult could hardly have represented an adequate income for a family of five. As McCarthy has demonstrated, the eleven weekly family budgets submitted by unionists for Higgins' consideration could not "have done more than demonstrate the difficult living conditions experienced by families of some unskilled workers having only a single income".\textsuperscript{23}

Ryan and Conlon noted five reasons why, despite its obvious deficiencies in providing a decent living standard, the concept of the living or family wage became widely accepted.\textsuperscript{24} Three of these reasons concern humanitarian desires to reduce poverty and redistribute wealth through state industrial intervention based on statistics provided by the new science of sociology. The other two reasons are pertinent here. First was acceptance of the legal obligation men had to support their wives and children, though as many women discovered to their bitter cost, the legislations and the will of the male law enforcers did not often manage to extract that obligation from defaulters.\textsuperscript{25} Second were the notions accepted by men of all classes as well as by bourgeois women and women aspiring to that status, that women did not need to work, that they were supported by men and that they had no dependants. These notions were to have devastating consequences for women especially when
allied with existing conditions of lack of female unionisation, employer intimida-
tion of women union activists, deliberate (male) union discrimination against
women in apprenticeships, exclusion of women from certain occupations and the
dominance of men on industrial boards and conciliation committees, even when
disputes being discussed concerned female-dominated occupations. 26

The most far-reaching consequence for women, one which has only slowly
been addressed in the second half of the twentieth century, has been the low
wage rates determined for women's occupations. Using the false arguments
that women were at least partially supported by men, whether fathers, husbands
or other male relatives, and that they had no dependants, women's wages were
set at 50 to 54 percent of the basic male wage for most of the first half of the
century. Even Justice Heydon, who in 1918 set himself the weighty task of
determining a living wage for women and who himself cited a case where a
daughter was supporting her widowed mother, was able to argue that

We have no doubt that in fact [a woman] does often help her parents
and her brothers and sisters; indeed it sometimes happens that a
widowed mother or an invalid husband has to be kept by the daughter
or wife, or a widow has to keep her young children. Should these
cases be taken into consideration? We do not think they can. They
are exceptional. The normal life and career are what we have to
consider. We do not lower the male living wage for bachelors or
raise it for men with large families. Similarly we cannot lower it
for the woman who lives at home, or raise it for the one who has to
keep a husband. 27

On this basis, Heydon handed down a decision that women should be paid the
prevailing market rate of 30s per week, exactly half the newly awarded male
minimum wage of £3. Thus it was fixed by law that no matter what her
circumstances or responsibilities, a woman was worth only half a man. As
such, she might appeal to employers as cheap labour but the male unions
reacted to this swiftly, ensuring that restrictions and rejections of women in
certain occupations deemed to be male preserves be written into awards and
legal documents. Women were only to achieve equal pay for equal work when
men wished to safeguard their own wages, as for example during the national emergency in World War II. The sorry consequences of these two industrial decisions were ably summarised by T.C. Winter, a long-time Executive Member of the Australian Council of Trade Unions and a Commonwealth Conciliation and Arbitration Commissioner in his Foreword to Ryan and Conlon's book:

By means of the family wage concept, the basic wage, Australian wage and salary earners were cheated for many years. The deceptive basic wage was never what it purported to be, a wage to enable a male wage and salary earner to provide for a wife and family. Further, for many years it was the national basic wage that resulted in cheap female labour. Acceptance of the concept adroitly concealed from the community the patent fact that there were thousands of females working for a living who were called upon to support children, invalids and relations.\textsuperscript{28}

2.2 Origins of Day Care Services

Women with dependent children who needed to work to keep themselves and their families together were multiply disadvantaged in the employment stakes. Not only were they only able to earn half of the male basic wage but they were virtually excluded from the major source of women's employment, live-in domestic service, by the very tangible facts of their dependent children. Even the most poorly paid factory jobs and day-labour domestic work could only be obtained if substitute care for those children could be arranged. The state public schools assisted with children aged six years and over, at least for the greater part of the working day, and in some years the schools could be persuaded to accept five year olds. The problem was to find safe, free or low cost care for babies and under five year olds for whom the state made no provision.\textsuperscript{29}

There were few available options, as two 1906 commentators observed, and those that did exist were either expensive or hazardous to life and limb:

... mothers are forced to leave early in the morning to pursue their work in shop, factory or steam-laundry, and their babies, often two or three in number, ranging from a few weeks to a very few years,
are left in the care of a child, little more than a babe herself, and failing her, to any one of the neighbours who will undertake the charge. Sometimes the children are locked up in a room with food placed within reach, and left to amuse themselves as best they can during the long hours of their mothers’ absence. The results of this are shown only too pathetically in the fagged and anxious faces of the women, the fretful, half-starved babies, and in the cheerless and neglected homes.30

... even if a neighbor [sic] takes care of baby, there is always the risk of sour milk, a dirty feeding bottle, or an accident from falling from the arms of the obliging one’s little daughter. Now and then a working woman may get her child minded free, but if the service is needed often, a charge of sixpence is usually demanded. This is a sore tax on the pocket of the day worker, or factory hand, to say nothing of the uncertainty that her child will be properly tended.31

There were five free kindergartens operated by the Kindergarten Union, one each in Woolloomooloo, Millers’ Point, Surry Hills, Newtown and North Sydney, but these were of limited usefulness since they were only open for three hours in the morning and their Froebelian programs were designed for three to five year old children.32 In special circumstances two year olds might be accepted if they were toilet trained but neither the kindergarten premises nor the programs were designed to cater for babies.33

What were needed were creches or day nurseries, which would care for babies and children under school age and stay open for the long hours that women worked. It is not as if the idea was unheard of, since exactly this kind of service had existed in Europe since at least 1800. The available literature is somewhat contradictory and unclear, but it would seem that what came to be known as the creche was first established in Paris around 1800 by Madame de Pastoret under Josephine Bonaparte’s patronage. Several journalists of the time described this asile or refuge for babies and toddlers under three years of age and Maria Edgeworth wrote a fictional account of it in her novel Madame de Fleury.34 The idea was taken up by Princess Pauline, Regent of Lippe, who, at harvest time in 1802, began a “Nursery Institution” (Pflegerstalt) for the young children of women agricultural workers at Detmold in Westphalia.35 Then, in the early 1840s, the creche for babies under two years was actively promoted
by M. Firmin Marbeau, Mayoral Assistant in the First Arrondissment of Paris, as a necessary institution in the campaign to reduce the mortality rate of working women's babies. He convinced the poor relief officers that the institution was practicable provided that expenses were kept as low as possible; the mothers paid for the service; and any medical expenses were financed by charity. The first of Marbeau's creches was opened in the Chaillot Quarter in 1844 in a house provided by the Superior of a religious order. The experiment was successful and the number of creches grew. By 1867, there were 18 in Paris, 10 in the banlieu, and some 400 in the departments. In addition, strict regulations for operating the creches were developed, and in 1862 the French government officially recognised those creches which satisfied the regulations by granting operational subsidies.

Britain entered the war on high infant mortality rates in the 1840s and the British campaigns to reduce infant loss, like earlier French attacks and later Australian efforts, were led by medical men. Ruling class concern was expressed in two Reports of Commissions Inquiring into the State of Large Towns and Populous Districts (1844 and 1845), in parliamentary debates (1843-45) and in Reports presented by the Children's Employment Commission (1843) and the Poor Law Commissioners (1843). Hewitt attributed this interest to the contradiction which married women's employment outside the home posed for bourgeois family ideology. Concern was focused on the arrangements which working women made for the care of their children, particularly breastfed young babies, during their daily absences at work. Statistics produced in the Reports, while of doubtful accuracy, nevertheless made a clear case for the connection between substitute care, of the kinds described by the two 1906 commentators in Sydney, and high infant mortality rates. The connection was made whether mothers' employment was in industry, agriculture or domestic service. However, there was much subsequent disagreement about who should
be responsible for remediating infant mortality attributable to women's employment outside the home. There were those who maintained the peculiar sanctity of the family unit and its inviolability to outside interference. If mothers were going to work outside the home and their infants were to die, then that was a family matter and not one to concern anyone else, including employers, the state or charity. Then there were those who argued that if manufacturers required women's labour and if women needed such work for survival, then creches should be provided to ensure that babies and young children were safe and well. The problematic question was who should establish and control the services and who should pay for them.

One faction pressed the factory owners, arguing that since they profited from the women's labour, they should "establish within their factories under well-advised regulations, nursery rooms, where working mothers might leave their children in some proper and kindly charge." But the manufacturers were then, as they still are today, singularly disinterested in providing such services for their women workers. Richard Stanway, Newcastle under Lyme, who in 1883 provided a play-room and a cot-room equipped with cradles that were gently rocked by steam-powered machinery, all under the supervision of a Matron, was a rare exception.

Other factions pressed the state to provide public nurseries in both urban industrial areas and rural villages where there were large numbers of women agricultural workers. But the state was as reluctant as the factory owners. It wiped its hands of responsibility by arguing that those who employed the women should bear the moral and financial obligations. Moreover, the state was influenced by arguments from yet other factions who were vigorous in their hostile opposition to creches. These people objected that

(1) It [the creche] is an additional incentive for the mothers to go out to work. Those who otherwise would remain at home, might be inclined to undertake outside work, knowing that the creche would take care of their children ...
(2) It relieves the parents of a responsibility which they should bear, and, to an extent, undermines the mother's sense of duty to the child.\textsuperscript{45}

Clearly, these objections were based on the ideology that first, women had no right to paid work and second, that child care was women's moral obligation. The first basis appealed to male trade unionists who wished to exclude women from factories and skilled trades because they considered women's lower wages to be unfair competition. The second basis appealed to both male and female bourgeois moralists. So the state, instead of providing creches to support working mothers, opted for introducing legislations which restricted mothers' employment. These legislations were sublimely oblivious to the fact that mothers' need to work (at this time there was no question of mothers' right to work) was occasioned by breakdown in men's familial role. The consequences of the legislations were that mothers either lied and continued to work or obeyed and starved.\textsuperscript{46}

The only significant positive response came from bourgeois charity women. Marbeau's creche seemed to them to be a logical resolution to the crisis in familial child rearing caused by women's paid work outside the home. The argument was actually quite straightforward. The basic premise was that child rearing is properly biological mothers' function. However, economic need is primary, since without money the family cannot exist at all. Therefore, if men have failed in their part of the contract, then it was women's obligation to support the family, imperfect as it was. Hence, if mothers must work, then someone else must care for the children. The creche was obviously a better form of substitute care than traditional alternatives, since the children were under medical supervision and the centre could be used for educating women in mothercraft. Provided that, and for British charity workers the caveat was crucial, the mothers were honestly trying to do a proper child rearing job, then here was a new outlet for the energies of stifled bourgeois women. Imbued
with the ideology of motherhood, yet denied much practical involvement with their own children beyond the evening Children's Hour, since their own nurseries were staffed by an array of nursemaids, nannies and governesses, the women grasped the creche as a platform on which to enter public life. To borrow Steinfels' phrase, the creche was "motherhood writ large" and women who were already mothers felt qualified as experts on the subject. Who else but a mother could understand another mother's needs? Second best was a woman with potential to be a mother and who had been appropriately socialised to fulfil that potential.

The first three British day nurseries (the French word does not appear to have been used) were opened in 1850 but their numbers grew only slowly. In 1905, Sennett reported a mere 50 responses from a survey he conducted, 21 from nurseries in London and 29 from provincial cities. Pamphlets published by the Nassau St, London and Ancoats Crescent, Manchester nurseries in 1850 and 1851 show that the rules under which these establishments functioned were closely modelled on those of Marbeau's creches. These rules established the ages of children catered for (one month to three years); set the charge to mothers for the service; stated the hours of opening (5.30 or 6.30 a.m. to 7 p.m. Monday to Friday; 5.30 or 6.30 a.m. to 4 p.m. Saturday); provided for mothers' access during the day to breastfeed their infants; required that the children be presented clean and adequately clothed; and most significantly, required that all children be vaccinated prior to admission and that they not be carrying any contagious disease. These last three rules clearly indicate the perceived importance of the creche in the war on infant mortality and the significant role which medical men and nurses were to play in that attack.

There was one additional rule for the British nurseries which the French creches did not require. This was a moral requirement that, at Nassau St, "Every mother applying for admission for her child must obtain a
recommendation from the clergyman of the parish or a respectable householder of the district" and at Ancoats Crescent that "The Committee of Management shall in all cases satisfy themselves that the parties applying for admission of the children are married and suitable persons to receive the benefits of the institution." The purpose of these rules was clearly to weed out the deserving from the undeserving cases and to determine whether the mothers really did need to work. Only those cases in desperate financial need but who were of a suitable standard of moral propriety were admitted. Moreover, as Sennett pointed out, social control was the explicit objective and hence the investigatory committees were alert for situations in which

If the mother could remain at home and tend the child herself, she is urged to do so. In many cases nurses are sent to the mothers, and instruction given to them in regard to the rearing of children.\textsuperscript{51}

2.3 A Creche Movement Begins in Sydney

At the beginning of the twentieth century in Sydney, the plight of single supporting mothers and mothers who needed to supplement the family income was not one that had called forth much public or private response. A creche had been opened in July, 1890 in Macquarie Street South by the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children.\textsuperscript{52} It was probably still functioning in 1894 but the Society was short-lived and both it and its creche had disappeared by 1900.\textsuperscript{53} Other creches were claimed to have been opened in the city from time to time but no evidence of their sponsoring bodies or lengths and places of operation has been located.\textsuperscript{54} This lack of the very facility which would enable women to work reasonably certain that their children were safe, well and happy contrasts with the situation in Melbourne where the first creche established in 1885 continued to flourish and by 1903 there were seven such institutions, all established by various church groups.\textsuperscript{55}

Why had the Sydney efforts faltered and ceased to function while the
Melbourne services prospered? One can only conjecture at this time space but perhaps one reason was Melbourne's earlier industrial development, particularly the manufacture of textiles and clothing, and its consequent employment of large numbers of women workers.\textsuperscript{56} Perhaps another reason was, as Hewitt described in industrial Britain, that it was not so much that there were not enough mothers in need of the services but rather that the working women were reluctant to use them. Part of this reluctance may have been simple suspicion of something new, but mostly there were two serious objections. First, there were traditional neighbourhood networks of women who provided "day-nursing" for a fee, and, in the ethics of the poor hammered out of adversity, the women felt that if they withdrew their custom they would be literally taking the bread out of the mouths of those too old, frail or unskilled to earn an income in any other occupation. Second, many women were unwilling to submit to searching inquiries into their financial condition, marital status and moral qualities. Hence they either would not, or could not, meet the stringent tests that would give them access to the services.\textsuperscript{57}

Why did factory owners themselves not provide creches for the babies and young children of their women workers? This was the view held by Dr Charles Clubbe, President of the Royal Alexandra Hospital for Children, and he suggested to the 1903 Birth-Rate Commission that, in order to help reduce mortality rates among working women's babies, "It would be well to establish a crèche in connection with all large factories."\textsuperscript{58} But Australian manufacturers were just as reluctant as their British counterparts and have remained so.

The state was disinterested also. Despite its high concern about infant mortality rates, the 1903 Birth-Rate Commissioners did not respond to Dr Clubbe's suggestion and the Report of the inquiry made no recommendations that creches should be established. Neither did Piddington's 1910-11 Inquiry into women's factory work. No indication that the issue was even canvassed
has been located in the Minutes of Evidence of that inquiry. Instead, the state in New South Wales emulated the British example. It intensified its motherhood campaigns and embarked on a legislative program which clearly told women that paid work was men's preserve.

Hence, as in Britain, it was bourgeois charity women who responded to working women's needs. In 1905 another creche was begun, this time one which would not fail but which grew into a substantial empire. The policies and practices which its founding organisation developed continue to influence day care service provision in the state today. There were at least two forces which combined to produce this creche. First, the 1903 Birth-Rate Inquiry had attracted considerable public interest in the infant mortality problem and there were more medical men than Dr Clubbe who believed that the creche would be a valuable adjunct to the mothercraft education campaign. Second, in 1903, the Directors of the Kindergarten Union, one of the major groups of philanthropic women already working with young working class children and their families, decided to exclude children under three years from the Kindergartens. The rationale given for this decision was that "the Kindergarten students attended to be trained as teachers not as nurses (italics added)". The new policy could only have affected toddlers aged perhaps eighteen months and two years who might previously have found their way to the Kindergartens and in any case as noted previously the value of the Kindergartens for working mothers is doubtful given that the program at this time was for the morning only. But nevertheless the decision was a catalyst for some members of the Kindergarten Union who were already familiar with the living circumstances of families in the inner city areas where the Kindergartens were located. They accepted the fact that many working class mothers needed to work to supplement the family income, if not to provide it totally, and they were concerned about the dangerous alternative care arrangements so often made.
They therefore responded immediately to the Kindergarten Union's Directors' decision and announced that

This [decision] will necessitate the opening in the near future of a day nursery or creche in connection with each kindergarten, at which women who have to earn their living may for a small sum daily have their children cared for and attended to during the day.60

However, the projected creches attached to each Kindergarten never eventuated. Instead, a separate group was formed, spearheaded by Kindergarten Union members who were perhaps motivated more by humanitarian interest in infant welfare than in promulgating Kindergarten principles. This group was initially called "The Sydney Creche Association" but within two months it became known as "The Sydney Day Nursery Association", more or less by default.

In the afternoon of August 3, 1905, a meeting of thirteen interested women was held at the Kindergarten Training College, Roslyn Gardens, "for the purpose of organising a movement to establish a Creche". Many of those present were members of the Kindergarten Union. They included Executive Committee members Mrs J.G. Dane, Mrs E. Bennett and Mrs W. Whiting and the Secretary Miss Ellen De Sailly. Miss Frances Newton, Miss Elizabeth Jenkins and Miss Margaret Wells-Arnold, three American kindergarteners who had been imported to train kindergarten teachers, were also present. Two others, Mrs Wilfred Fairfax and Mrs Macdonald Gill, were wives of medical doctors.61 Mrs Fairfax later commented that two of the single women present, Miss Julie Cohen and Miss Linda Teece, were not yet twenty years old and she herself was an inexperienced and nervous twenty-three year old.62

Miss Newton was elected to chair the meeting. The first resolution, moved by Mrs Bennett and seconded by Mrs Whiting "That a movement be organised for the purpose of opening a Creche in Woolloomooloo" was carried unanimously. In a business-like manner, the meeting then proceeded to elect
office-bearers and to establish an advisory committee. Evidently none of those present felt they had either sufficient experience or social prestige to fill the Presidential role since, in her absence but doubtless with her consent, they elected Mrs Ethel Davenport, Honorary Secretary of the Kindergarten Union, as President. Her husband, Frank Davenport of the firm of Davenport and Mant, was the Kindergarten Union's Honorary Solicitor. Mrs Davenport was reputedly "a beautiful gracious lady in her early thirties" so her personal qualities combined with her social position and demonstrated charitable interest in young children to make her an ideal choice. Miss Sylvia Whiting, who had arranged the meeting, and Mrs Fairfax were elected Vice-Presidents, Mrs Dane Honorary Secretary and Miss Cohen Honorary Treasurer. An advisory committee was formed comprising the three American Kindergarteners and four medical men, Drs Wilfred Fairfax, J. Macdonald Gill, R. Phippe Waugh and C. (later Sir Charles) Blackburn. It was decided that committee meetings would be held on the first Thursday of each month at the Kindergarten Training College.

Thus the fledgling organisation was born under the auspices of Kindergarten Union members. It was a philanthropic endeavour to improve the lot of the children of poor working women in inner Sydney and it was to be buttressed by expert advice from medical and educational specialists. In later years it was claimed that the primary stimulus for establishing the first creche was these bourgeois women's concern about the welfare of their own domestic servants' babies. This may well be true but undoubtedly such awareness was part of a wider stirring of public conscience about high infant mortality rates. It was a logical step for charity women already engaged in rescue work with young children to take. The new thrust was to save the babies, both from death and from becoming state wards. Moreover, the creche could clearly be seen as part of the campaign for educating mothers and for preserving family life. Mrs Dane summarised the motivations neatly:
It is not to relieve these mothers of their responsibility, but to ease their overwhelming burden of care and anxiety, to enable them to keep their home and family together, and to supply to their little ones the wholesome and loving care of which they are deprived, and which is so necessary to their well-being that the 'Sydney Day Nursery Association' has been formed.\(^{66}\)

These were undertakings for which bourgeois women who were actual or potential mothers considered themselves well qualified. Had they not been well-prepared for the nurturing role? Were they not already experienced in charity organisation work and in managing domestic households with servants? And perhaps most importantly, was not the time now ripe for action with such agitation among the medical profession? This was an exciting new proposal, a positive humanitarian Good Work, and the women set to enthusiastically.

2.4 Establishing the Venture

As soon as the organisational structure of the group was established, the serious business of planning the venture began. Five important matters required attention. First, it was necessary to arouse public interest and financial support. Second, suitable staff had to be engaged. Third, premises had to be located and furnished. Fourth, rules for operating the services had to be determined. And finally, the idea had to be sold to the client women themselves.

2.4.1 Arousing public interest and fund raising

This was perhaps the aspect of the venture in which the Committee women were most skilled. The first meeting immediately planned two social and fund-raising functions. The first of these was an afternoon "Drawing Room" meeting held at "Cahors", Macleay Street, Potts Point, the residence of Mrs L.V. Levy, on 24 August, 1905. Selected people received personal invitation cards which advertised that "Miss Newton and Miss Arnold will give short
addresses on the benefits which have resulted from the work of the 'Day Nurseries' in America" (Plate la). Mrs Davenport presided over the function and it was reported that "about 50 ladies [attended] the gathering being a most representative one". Each of the three American kindergarteners addressed the meeting and also Mrs Dane. Sir Philip Sydney-Jones, Vice Chancellor of the University of Sydney and knighted for his efforts in combatting consumption, spoke favourably of the creche at Dr Barnardo's Home. Approximately half of those present were sufficiently aroused to immediately subscribe £14 to the good work. A further £4 in donations and offers to sew clothes and fittings were also received. It was agreed that £150 would have to be collected before the creche could be opened.

After this promising start, which was reported in the social columns of several newspapers, the second event was a fund-raising handkerchief sale and garden fete, held at Mrs W.G. Whiting's residence "Astolat", Avoca Street, Randwick, on Thursday, 5 October, 1903. Again, personal invitation cards were printed (Plate 1b). The event was also advertised publicly, but since admission was by silver coin selected attendance was ensured. The afternoon was opened by Lady Fairfax and the social page of one of Sydney's newspapers reported that

The weather was perfect, and the grounds with the stalls dotted here and there, and presided over by daintily dressed ladies, presented a charming scene ... Afternoon tea was served on small tables under the trees, a number of young ladies acting as waitresses. On the lawn a string band played selections of popular music.

Handkerchiefs, cakes, sweets and toys were sold and the enterprising young Misses Cohen, Teece and Whiting ran a novelty stall. Mrs Dane addressed the gathering, explaining the nature of the work, and the practical help the 'Creche' will be to so many poor hardworking mothers ... more funds were needed so as to open the Creche at once, and so allow tiny children to be taken care of whilst the mothers were working instead of as at present being locked up in charge of children, perhaps only five or six years old, all day.
Mrs. L. W. Levy

Requests your presence at a Drawing-room Meeting, to be held at "Cahors," on Thursday, August 24th, at 3 p.m., in connection with the opening of a Crèche in Woolloomooloo.

Miss Newton and Miss Arnold will give short addresses on the benefits which have resulted from the work of the "Day Nurseries" in America.

"CAHORS."  MACLEAY STREET.  POTTS POINT.

Plate 1a  Invitation Card, Drawing Room Meeting, 24 August, 1905

Handkerchief Sale & Garden Fete

IN AID OF THE CRÈCHE,

TO BE OPENED AT WOOLLOOMOOLOO.

WILL BE HELD AT "Astolat," Avoca St. Thursday, Randwick, October 5th, 1905.

FROM 2 TO 6 O'CLOCK.

ADMISSION A SILVER COIN.

Your attendance is cordially invited.

By Permission of Mrs. W. G. Whiting.

Plate 1b  Invitation Card, Handkerchief Sale and Garden Fete, 5 October, 1905
As far as can be ascertained, the proposed creche did not meet with any publicly expressed objections or hostility of the kind encountered by creches in Britain. Perhaps Mrs Dane and the American Kindergarteners were powerful and convincing orators. Certainly they were careful to present the proposal as an institution which would encourage self-help and they obviated criticisms that it would lead to pauperism by announcing that there would be a fee for service. The idea was presented positively as one which would enable women to be self-supporting and hence not become a drain on the public purse. Perhaps the known educational and moral respectability of the sponsoring Kindergarten Union legitimated the proposal. Perhaps it was simply that the timing was perfect and the proposal capitalised on prevailing public concerns about high infant mortality rates in the poorer parts of the city. Had it been floated even six years later in the context of the Inquiry into the Employment of Women and Juveniles, there can be little doubt that considerable opposition would have been mounted by conservative medical men who wished to exclude women from factory work. Whatever the factors were, just two months after the initial meeting to organise "a movement" the organisation was already in a healthy social and financial state. Altogether, when the £59 raised at the garden fete was added to the funds already in hand, a little more than £100 had been collected.\footnote{73} Also, groups of young ladies were forming themselves into "circles of helpers" who undertook to supply a cot and its bedding and to provide for the child who would occupy the cot. In addition, there were numerous donations in kind: kitchen equipment, infant weighing machines, furniture, household linen, clothing and foodstuffs.\footnote{74}

Encouraged by their success, the Committee held a special meeting on 23 October to consider the advisability of opening the Creche immediately. Of course, this could not be done until they had engaged staff and found premises. They resolved to pursue these objectives more vigorously and to open the creche as soon as possible.\footnote{75}
2.4.2 Staffing the creche

From the beginning, it was intended to provide long day care for babies and toddlers under three years of age. Caring for such young children, as the Kindergarten Union had pointed out so clearly, was considered a nursing task rather than a teaching task. Hence, at the first meeting in August, it was automatically assumed that the appropriate person to operate the creche would be a nurse. The "older" married women, Mesdames Dane, Fairfax and Maitland, were appointed to find a suitable person.\(^7\) This presented a problem, since there was no special nurse training in infant care at this time. Six years were yet to elapse before the Sydney Norland Institute was established and began its training in infant nursing and sixteen years until the beginning of Tresillian mothercraft training.\(^7\) In 1898 the Kindergarten Union had begun a course to prepare kindergarten nurses but examination of the syllabus for this course indicates that it was a kind of watered-down version of the kindergarten teacher syllabus, designed to prepare nannies for older children. It would not have produced a competent infant nurse acceptable to the medical profession. In any case, although two kindergarten nurses graduated in 1903, the course lapsed in 1904, not to be revived again until 1911, with the new title of nursery kindergarten course.\(^7\)

Of necessity then, suitable staff had to be located from the ranks of the existing hospital trained general nurses. Midwifery qualifications were of no particular advantage since midwives had no special knowledge or experience in post-natal care. However, two guidelines for selecting suitable nursing staff could be used. First, membership of the Australian Trained Nurses Association (ATNA) did signify that a nurse possessed the medical profession's seal of approval.\(^7\) Second, the District Nurses had demonstrated their Christian and charitable commitments. Moreover, the District Nurses, by the very nature of their work in home visiting which had come to include post-natal care of
mothers and babies, had acquired some practical knowledge of both the living conditions of working people in the inner city areas and the problems these families faced.\(^80\) Mesdames Dane, Fairfax and Maitland began their search by informal inquiry among their medical connections and in September, 1905, the Executive Committee noted that two nurses had applied for the position.\(^81\) But it would seem that neither of these unnamed applicants was considered suitable, because immediately after the special meeting in October an advertisement for a Matron was published in the Daily Telegraph:

**WANTED, MATRON FOR CRECHE, IN WOOLLOOMOOLOO**
Salary for first six months, £30 a year, Quarters and Keep.
Afterwards, £50.

Letters, including Testimonials, sent to
SECRETARY OF CRECHE COMMITTEE,
"Frankfort", Victoria road, Marrickville
BEFORE NOVEMBER 8. \(^82\)

The advertisement prompted a large number of applications from among which a selection could be made. The minutes are silent about the actual criteria which were used in making this selection but it is evident that the Committee's choice, Sarah A. Breden, was superbly qualified to become the pioneering first Matron. She had completed three years training at the respected Prince Alfred Hospital and had become a registered ATNA nurse on 1 January, 1901. After further work at Prince Alfred, she was a private nurse between May, 1902 and March, 1904. At the time of her selection, she had been a District Nurse in the Surry Hills, Darling Harbour and Millers' Point areas since mid-1904.\(^83\) Mrs Fairfax reported that she was "a sweet kindly woman who loved children"\(^84\) and the District Nursing Association that "Nurse Breden was always skilful, painstaking and sympathetic with her patients".\(^85\) She must also have been courageous since she was willing to venture into the relatively uncharted waters of day care service provision in Sydney. Her own
words speak eloquently of the motivations which sustained her in her new work:

Many of the little ones who came to us have been the victims of ignorant and improper feeding, and it is encouraging to note the marked improvement which follows their admission to the cleanliness and comfort, and the wholesome living of the Nursery ... The cry of the little ones is rising daily in our midst, and it remains for a generous public to respond to the call, and to help the work of saving infantile life which the Day Nursery Association has begun, for "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto the least of these, ye have done it unto Me" (original italics).86

2.4.3 Locating premises

With a suitable Matron for the establishment engaged, the next task was to locate premises. At the first meeting in August, the young single women, Misses Cohen, Teece and Whiting, had been charged with this latter responsibility. What would they look for? Their guideline was provided by earlier British experience and even if they had never actually seen these creches, full plans and descriptions for two different models were available in such publications as Sennett's *Garden Cities in Theory and Practice*.87 One was a two-storied version for 50 infants and 50 children and the other a three-storied version which included residential accommodation for the creche staff. However, given the perceived urgency to open the projected centre as quickly as possible, it was plain that there was no time available for the erection of a specially designed building so this creche would have to begin in an already existing structure. It was equally plain that an ordinary domestic residence was required, one which was already fully equipped with facilities for cooking, storing food and fuel, washing clothes, children and adults and which contained sufficient space to accommodate cradles and cots, as well as the Matron and maid (since such positions were live-in ones). Play space for the children, both indoor and outdoor, appears to have been a desirable but expendable requirement in the circumstances.

Early in December, a two-storey, single-fronted terrace house at 126
Dowling Street, Woolloomooloo was located and the owner Miss McMahon agreed to reduce the weekly rent from £1 to 19/- to assist this worthy cause.\(^8\) The house was one of the more substantial terraces in the area, although it was only approximately 4.5 metres wide (Plate 2).\(^9\) It was of standard design, with four rooms in the front and wider part, two upstairs and two downstairs, each opening from the hallway. Kitchen, laundry and toilet facilities were on the ground floor, in the narrow back part of the house, with two small bedrooms above. The front door opened almost directly onto the footpath and at the back there was a very small brick-paved yard. The main front bedroom on the top storey opened onto a narrow balcony and perhaps this room was occupied by the Matron. The second large bedroom on this floor housed the babies' cradles and cots.\(^90\) The domestic staff occupied smaller bedrooms at the back of the house. The two front rooms on the ground floor accommodated the children. Mrs Fairfax commented that as soon as the lease was agreed, the interior was kalsomined but

the colours were dark, the hall brown and other rooms dark blue or green so as not to show the dirt! but it was all clean and fresh.\(^91\)

Furniture, fittings, linen, domestic equipment and a limited supply of children's toys were on the whole donated by well-wishers.

2.4.4 **Operating the service**

By 4 December, 1905 the Nursery was ready to receive applicants. Nurse Breden moved into residence on 7 December. She was paid £1 per week and was given £1 initially for provisions. A maid was engaged at 10/- per week.\(^92\) But now that all was apparently ready, the Committee realised the necessity to determine some operating rules. The decisions that were made indicate quite clearly that this creche, like its British antecedents, was a direct descendant of Marbeau's 1844 Chaillot creche with the same important qualifications about
Plate 2  The first nursery, Dowling Street, Woolloomooloo
the moral worthiness of the mothers. Regulations governing the admission of children were determined at an Executive Committee meeting on 7 December and promulgated by way of notice (Plate 3).

First, mothers were required to produce a character reference from "a responsible person, known to the Committee" to demonstrate that they would indeed use their time freed from mothering in gainful (and not immoral) employment and to guarantee that they would not abandon their babies at the creche. As an additional check on these references, applicants had to undergo an interview by a group of three or four bourgeois women who comprised the House Committee and who decided whether or not the case was a deserving one. These requirements were clearly designed to prevent the few available places being abused by undeserving women wishing to evade their child care responsibilities. Second, mothers had to deliver and collect their babies themselves. Substitute people were only acceptable if the Matron had been advised in advance. This rule served several functions. It made quite plain that the service did not offer full-time residential care. It reinforced the principle that prime responsibility for the babies lay firmly with their biological mothers. Also, most importantly, it safeguarded the Association in cases where custody of the babies may be disputed. Third, a daily fee was set for the service which, while comparatively lower than the rate charged by local day nurses, was sufficient to indicate that the mothers should bear at least part of the financial burden of their offspring. Fourth, the daily hours of operation were clearly stated, reinforcing further that the service was not intended to be a residential repository for unwanted babies.

The remaining rules highlighted the significant role which the creche was perceived to be about to play in the attack on infant mortality rates. First, the service accepted only babies and toddlers up to three years of age. In addition, the Committee agreed that preference would be given to babies.
Day Nursery for Babies of Working Mothers,
126 Dowling Street, Woolloomooloo.

Babies taken Charge of for 3d. a Day. Open from 7 a.m. to 6.30 p.m.

REGULATIONS FOR PARENTS.

No child will be received in the Day Nursery until satisfactory proof has been given to the Committee that, by taking charge of the child, the mother will be enabled and intends to use her time in earning her living. It shall also be necessary for the parent to bring a letter from a responsible person, known to the Committee, showing that the case is a genuine one, and giving a reasonable guarantee that the child will be removed at the close of the day.

When possible the mother should bring the child herself. The Matron must be informed if it is proposed that anyone other than the person leaving the child in her care has arranged to remove the child in the evening, otherwise the Matron will not entrust the child to anyone but the person who left it in her care in the morning.

During the hours spent by the child in the Day Nursery it will be given suitable food at proper intervals. Parents or Guardians will be instructed by the Matron with regard to the proper food to be given during the time spent at home, and it is particularly requested that no other food than that specified by the Matron shall be given.

In the case of mothers nursing their infants, arrangements may be made for the mother to attend at convenient intervals for the purpose of feeding her child.

Parents or Guardians must at once report to the Matron the existence and nature of any infectious disease that may occur in the child’s home. Should it be proved that this rule has been broken in any instance, the attendance of the child must forthwith cease.

Children will be received up to the age of three years.

The House Committee meets on Monday mornings at 11, and will receive any applications from Parents or Guardians wishing to leave children at the Day Nursery.

MRS. F. DAVENPORT,
President Sydney Day Nursery Association.

The first three years of life were known to be the most hazardous and therefore it was to these years that the protective umbrella of the creche would be extended. Second, provision was made for mothers to call during the day to breastfeed their infants. However, while this provision was admirable in intent, how many women could actually avail themselves of the opportunity is problematic. It could only have been possible if the mothers' workplaces were within walking distance from the nursery and employers were sympathetic to the women's absence. Third, mothers or guardians were required to accept dietary instructions from the Matron and to implement those instructions at home. Fourth, it was mandatory that mothers or guardians informed the Matron about infectious diseases at home. Failure to do so was punishable by total exclusion from the service. This rule was clearly designed to prevent the spread of infections to others at the nursery, particularly the dreaded gastro-enteritis. But its application was also problematic, since if the baby was not permitted to attend the nursery then the mother would be prevented from working.

2.4.5 Establishing the clientele

Contemporary newspaper articles and the early Annual Reports of the Association, particularly the Matrons' Reports which were published from 1906 to 1917, graphically described the living circumstances of some of the families which came to be served by the Day Nursery. The case histories cited may have been extreme ones, reported in the desire to arouse public sympathy for the cause, but nevertheless they paint horrendous pictures of poverty. Typically, the women had more than one child under the age of three years. They rented their accommodation which frequently comprised only single ill-lit and ill-ventilated rooms. There was usually a single gas ring for cooking and one cold water tap outside, shared by all the families in the house. Such work
as the women could find in jam and clothing factories, steam laundries, charing and other domestic labour in the houses of the wealthy, was physically strenuous. Work availability was variable and hence income problematic. Disposable incomes after paying rent were sometimes as low as three shillings a week while twelve shillings was considered handsome. This amount had to feed and clothe up to six or even eight people when bread cost 2 3/4d a 2 pound loaf, eggs 1/- a dozen, meat 5½d a pound, sugar 2½d a pound and tea 1/6 a pound. It is not surprising then that the women were, as Jeanie Graham Dane described them, tired, anxious and dispirited.

One wonders what these working women of Woolloomooloo thought about the activity in their midst at 126 Dowling Street. Here were well-dressed society women to-ing and fro-ing, the terrace house being painted, furniture, cots, weighing scales, kitchen paraphernalia and a starched white nurse moving in. It is unlikely that anyone would have read the social pages of the newspapers where what was being planned was reported. No evidence has been found to indicate that the Committee members or the nurse actively canvassed the neighbourhood for clients and whether any of the Committee women stopped to chat with passersby and explain what was going on is a matter of conjecture. The only certainly known advertising effort was the erection of a shingle outside 126 Dowling Street. This apparently used the word creche and since "many people were puzzled by the word ... it was decided to have another board made for the front of the house and substitute the term 'Day Nursery'." The new sign read simply

DAY NURSERY
For
WORKING MOTHERS
CHILDREN LOOKED AFTER
For 3d PER DAY
FROM 7 A.M. TO 6.30 P.M.

This pragmatic response to local unfamiliarity with the French word and its
Christian connotations permanently influenced the name of the Association itself. Although Committee members had been invited in September, 1905 to propose "a distinctive name, preferably an Australian one" there had been no creative ideas and the name "Sydney Creche Association" had been adopted in November. After the new sign was displayed in January, 1906, the name "Sydney Day Nursery Association" appears to have been adopted by default.

It must have been self-evident to the people of Woolloomooloo that whatever was happening was being sponsored by a charitable organisation, and there would have been many among the local population who had previously been exposed to the ministrations of such groups. Some may have applied for outdoor relief from such organisations as the Benevolent Society of New South Wales or the St Vincent de Paul Society. Some may have approached the State Children Relief Board for the boarding-out allowance payable to deserted and widowed mothers. Some may have previously been forced by the State Children Relief Board to submit their children as wards of the State or may even have been State wards themselves. In any case, they would have all been familiar with the prevailing model of charity dispensation which was, as Townsend has described it, conditional welfare for the few which those with the authority and power judged to be of individual moral worth. Without any direct contact yet with the Association, the local people probably guessed that, whatever was happening, access to it might be difficult and certainly it would require some personal investigations. Thus some fear and suspicion of this new operation may well have been inherent at the outset.

What then would motivate the working women of Woolloomooloo to approach the well-cared-for premises, to be interviewed by both, the spruce matron and a group of ruling class women, to give intimate details of their financial and family circumstances, to produce letters attesting to their personal merit from both employers and other "responsible" people, to accept
such instruction in diet, health and hygiene as the matron chose to give AND to pay for the privilege? The answer was probably the same then as it is now - the desperate needs created by grinding poverty. What was being offered right in the midst of the working people's houses and for the relatively low price of 3d a day, was a child care service which provided both food and safe-keeping for the babies for the long hours the women worked. It could be seen to be an attractive option with positive features to be balanced against the negative ones related to intrusion into domestic privacy which the women suspected would probably apply. But even so it took a few months for buyer resistance to be overcome. One month after the nursery opened only two children, ages unspecified, were attending and by February, 1906, there were still only nine children.\textsuperscript{102} It was not until March, 1906 that a full complement of fifteen children was achieved.\textsuperscript{103} Since this was the maximum number the Committee decided could be accommodated in the limited premises, thereafter there were more applicants than there were places available at the nursery.

There are numerous reports which assert that the women whose children did have a place quickly came to rely on and value the service being offered. For example, Sarah Breden claimed that, when the nursery was full, some mothers even tried a form of bribery to get a place, by offering more than the normal fee.\textsuperscript{104} In 1908, after the Nursery had been forced to relocate at 27 Rose Street, Darlington, several miles from Dowling Street, the new Matron, Nurse Ryrie, claimed that many of the Woolloomooloo mothers followed the nursery to its new location, thereby adding either the cost of tram fares to their daily expenses or the effort of walking the distance to and fro carrying their babies.\textsuperscript{105} Similar stories were reported in the local press.\textsuperscript{106} An impressed male journalist who apparently visited the nursery by chance, claimed in his article "A Day with the Babies" that "the mothers will make any sacrifice to keep up their payments, so gratified are they for the help afforded". He
reproduced in its entirety a supportive letter from the Secretary of the Woolloomooloo Free Kindergarten's Mothers' Club which described how the mothers had worked to raise £6 for the nursery since they "realised what a great benefit it will be to us here in Woolloomooloo". Other mothers were reported to have said "If you could only realise what it means to us, you would try to put these services in every poor district in Sydney".  

There is no reason to doubt the truth of all these claims. Rather, they demonstrate how sorely the service was needed and that, once their initial reluctance was overcome, the mothers did indeed, as Nurse Breden claimed, "appreciate to the full the benefits which the children receive, and are deeply grateful for the care bestowed on them." Certainly it was the Association's aim to present the Nursery as

... no cold remote charity, but an institution started by fellow women, who fully realise the difficulties that beset the paths of working mothers, who are striving to bring up their children decently and healthily.  

But without the Matron's ability to establish rapport with the working women, the nursery could not have succeeded. The Matron was the first point of contact by the mothers so her sympathy and tact in interviewing and in collecting personal details were vital. And quite clearly the successful early Matrons were warm and compassionate people. They remarked the women's resignation and fortitude in "perform[ing] a week's drudgery for a mere pittance" and could "not help feeling a sincere admiration for the brave way in which they shoulder their heavy burdens, and make the hard, ceaseless, unselfish struggle to try and keep home and family together". They were appalled by the hardships created by seasonal labour when factories and laundries closed down in the winter and by such poverty which created "homes where there is not enough money to buy the necessary comforts and food ... and the sleeping quarters crowded, and the ventilation poor." Their concern
found expression in many tangible ways beyond caring for the children all day. Jennie Hassard, the fourth Matron, acted as an employment agency, being "pleased if anyone needing a woman for day work would ring up the Institution and [she] could send someone at very short notice". Matron O'Keefe offered a listening ear. She commented that "Volumes could be written of the histories poured out in search of sympathy, and the thankfulness shown when timely assistance has been given is very encouraging". Nurse Ryrie was willing to extend her own day, which began at 7am, to 8.30pm to help out a mother who visited her husband in hospital after her day's work. These efforts on the women's behalf were appreciated and formed the foundation for the trust which the women developed even to the point of admitting the matrons into their own homes.

2.5 **Into the Future**

Thus, at the end of the first year of operation, the Association had addressed all of the six major dimensions of day care service provision which were as fundamental then as they are today. These dimensions concern the nature of administrative authority, the kinds of clients to be served, the availability of services, the sources and allocation of funds, staff for the services and the kinds of services to be provided. Then as now, solutions to the problems of service provision related to each of these dimensions were necessarily found within the context of prevailing political and social ideologies about women, childrearing and paid work.

The Association's model of day care service provision was to be something outside state responsibility and something which bourgeois charity women could usefully do in the interests of the state. The administrative structure comprised a Committee of voluntary "ladies" in whom all power and authority was vested. These "ladies" were responsible for employing the nursing "women" who for the
most part were to be drawn from the petit bourgeoisie. These "women" would deliver the service to working class "women" to assist them to keep home and family together. The working "women" would pay a fee for the service but the fee would be relatively nominal and the greater part of the service cost would be raised by the voluntary "ladies". No disreputable "females" were to have access to the benefits of the service. The service was to be provided for infants and toddlers in the interest of reducing their mortality rates. It was to be monitored by medical and educational experts. No one quite knew exactly what the children would do all day but it was assumed that the nursing staff, who were all women, would instinctively be able to cope.

The Association looked forward into the future enthusiastically, and indeed its confidence was not misplaced. The Association was to grow into a powerful organisation which, at the peak of its power in the 1970s, would control seven day nurseries for babies up to two years of age, 17 nursery schools for children aged two to five years, and a teacher training college for over 200 students. The entire story of the Association's growth and development to the present day cannot be satisfactorily told here within the limits of this thesis. Post Second World War social, economic and welfare conditions were so different from those in the pre-war years that an analysis of the Association's operations in that period requires a separate study in its own right.

This thesis focuses on the first 40 years of the Association's history, since by the end of that time the Association had achieved its forms and functions which would continue into the future. The following chapters successively examine events and outcomes in each of the six major dimensions of the service provision which were defined in the first year of operation. There were to be many social changes during these first forty years of the Association's existence and there were consequently many changes in the Association's operations. But the fundamental ideological tensions between women, child-rearing and paid work remained constant throughout and the Association remained just as strongly committed to the principles on which it was founded.
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CHAPTER THREE

THE ADMINISTRATION MODEL

In her first Annual Report, Mrs Dane justifiably claimed that "This first year has been filled with such a measure of success and prosperity that the Association feels it can go forward with hope and confidence to the special work which lies before it in the coming one". At the end of that year the Association was in a healthy financial position, having £132 in its bank accounts. It had raised almost £300 through subscriptions, direct giving and fund raising entertainments. Its Objects had clearly been accepted in Sydney's social circles as worthy of philanthropic endeavour. There does not appear to have been any public outcry that the provision of this service would either encourage women out of their homes and into the workforce or stimulate them into abandoning their motherly obligations. Rather, the Association had succeeded in bringing the plight of working women and their children to public attention and had obtained at least some measure of sympathetic regard for them. One reporter enthused that these children were "loved as dearly as any rich mother loves her pampered darlings" and that "the mothers will make any sacrifice to keep up their payments and to fulfil the simple conditions, so grateful are they for the help afforded".

Why was the opening of this day nursery successful in 1905, when earlier efforts in the 1890s were short lived? There are a number of possible explanations, none of which can be proved but each of which is suggestive and together these factors may have promoted the positive outcome. First among these must be the current climate of concern about the high infant mortality rate. Here was a service, supervised by eminent medical men, operated on a daily basis by qualified nurses and providing nourishing food in hygienic surroundings
which would ensure the healthy survival of the precious infant resource. Second, the service was tightly controlled to ensure that there would be no abuse. Close enquiry guaranteed that only genuine cases of real need would be assisted and that no baby would be abandoned at the nursery. Third was the perception of the Association as operating within prevailing concepts which attributed poverty to individual failure rather than to social and economic structural causes. Thus, the Association was publicly applauded as an "institution which helps a woman to help herself" and that "the best feature of the work [is] that it encourages women to independence instead of pauperism".

There is a fourth explanation, which, while not a sufficient factor on its own, became a powerful force for success when buttressed by the other three factors. This explanation lies in the nature of the operation itself as a women's charitable organisation. Nineteenth century constraints on women's lives, the exclusion of women from productive employment outside the home and women's perhaps consequent enthusiastic embrace of charity work have been discussed earlier. By the early twentieth century, social mores not only permitted elite women to participate in charitable activities but actively expected them to do so. Indeed, participation in Good Works was by then not confined to ruling class women but had spread to those of lesser social standing. In 1913, Jessie Ackermann, the redoubtable American traveller and temperance evangelist observed that Australian women and young girls showed

A deep interest ... centre[d] around all sorts of movements which have for their objects the idea of 'help for others' ... Girls have developed a marvellous genius of organisation. This is not a gift which belongs to a given class: it is general, pronounced even among small children. In both public and private schools, the scholars plan and carry out all sorts of entertainments, get up sales of work, and manage the details entirely alone. In this respect they have displayed marked executive ability, with results which reflect great credit upon their splendid spirit of service. They are not selfish ... and most of all, they fully realise that it is girls' day - girls have 'come into their own'.

The perceptive Ackermann here highlighted two of the key features of
women's involvement in charity. First, such participation reinforced traditional ideas about women's role in the service of others and provided opportunities for women to gain merit in the exercise of that service. This was no startling revelation but the second feature identified by Ackermann was. She noted the considerable executive ability girls displayed in conducting their fund-raising enterprises and this aspect of women's charity work had largely gone unacknowledged and unvalued. If Ackermann's observations are accurate, then clearly the development of young girls' entrepreneurial skills was reasonably widespread, providing a significant pool of young women who not only were imbued with notions of social service but who were also talented and experienced money-makers and managers. Given that many of them would be prevented from paid employment after finishing school, it is reasonable to assume that they would seek personal satisfaction in charity organisations.

The Day Nursery Association, like other women's organisations, was an ideal charity to attract them. From its inception, it has been a women's organisation, initiated and run by women for women. The only men who have played any important roles have been legally, medically and financially qualified people and architects. Recourse to the professional services of these men has, on the whole, only been made because women were either actively prevented from entering some of these professions or were effectively prevented from practising their professions after marriage. For the most part, though, this voluntary organisation provided a medium for bourgeois women to exercise their not inconsequential talents in managing a business operation and in negotiating with political power structures. It therefore possessed considerable appeal "for the independent girl or woman who wishes to do something with her life, outside the trivialities of the social round ... [since] every detail of the management and expenditure is decided by [the committee]". That women responded positively to this appeal in considerable numbers is confirmed by a
contemporary commentator who observed in 1906 "of ladies engaged in this and other philanthropic work of a like nature Sydney has no dearth". It is of some interest then to examine the administrative structure of the Association and the controls that were exercised over the service operations.

3.1 Objects of the Association

The need for rules and regulations was recognised early and indeed such a set of statements was required by legislation after a state inquiry into charitable organisations in 1898. The first Rules were formulated in 1907 and, as required by law, were published thereafter in the Annual Reports until 1924. In this year the Association was incorporated as a limited liability company under the 1899 Companies Act and its formal statements of its objects, its structure and its governance system were then published in its Memorandum and Articles of Association. These were changed in relatively minor ways in 1937, 1938, 1944 and 1964 consequent on changes to the Companies Act in 1936 and 1961, and also on changes in the scope of the Association's enterprise and its responses to changing social factors. However, the principles which underpinned the first statement of objects, structure and governance system have remained unchanged to the present day. Such adjustments as were made did not represent radical redirections of either the Association's stated purpose or the ways in which it set about achieving its goals. Hence an examination of the provisions made under the early Rules and Regulations at this point helps to enlighten later discussion of subsequent developments in the Association's operations.

From 1907 to 1924 when the Association became incorporated, the Objects were

1. To properly care for the babies of poor working women of Sydney during the hours when the mothers are forced to be at work.
(2) The establishment of Day Nurseries in the needy sections of the city.\textsuperscript{10}

The wording was changed slightly in 1924, but the intent did not alter. Hence, until the Memorandum and Articles of Association were amended in 1938 consequent on the Association's added responsibility for nursery schools and teacher training, the Objects were

(a) To promote the establishment of day nurseries in the needy sections of the city of Sydney for the proper care of babies of the needy working women of Sydney during the hours that their mothers are compelled to be at work ...

(b) To establish day nurseries in other parts of New South Wales ...\textsuperscript{11}

These Objects defined the purpose of the services, where they were to be located and who the clients were to be. They acknowledged three important facts: first, that mothers who were not adequately supported financially by male income earners did exist; second, that since government financial support for such mothers was both meagre and difficult to obtain, then these women must work to support themselves and their families; and third, since most paid work was only available outside the home and children were not welcome at the workface, then alternative care must be provided. In theory then, it seemed that the Day Nursery Association's task was quite straightforward but, in practice, as is discussed in the next chapter, definition of "mothers ... compelled to be at work" was at times problematic and suitable premises "in the needy sections of the city" proved difficult to find.

What needs noting here are two fundamental principles on which the day nursery service was to be based. First, even though the day nursery was conceptualised as a residual welfare service, mopping up families which did not fit the ideal stereotype, the Association was continuously alert to ensure that the only cases it assisted were independent and worthy women "who are trying to bring up their children decently and healthily".\textsuperscript{12} The fear of deception was ever present and hence "Every care is exercised that the benefit of the Nursery
is not abused, and in all cases before admission a letter from the mother's employer is obtained.\textsuperscript{13} The Committee women were always impressed when "those of our mothers whose children have been taken free while they were out of work, have been very grateful and willingly pay as soon as they are employed again."\textsuperscript{14} Indeed willingness to pay a fee for service was seen to be critical evidence of the women's self-help motivations. Also, from the Committee women's perspective,

The principle behind [the fee] was the dignity of the people. We never wanted people to feel we were handing out charity to them. We always had a philosophy to give people their status in life. By paying a fee they had rights.\textsuperscript{15}

Second, since the day nursery was intended to produce good future citizens for the state, the Association aimed to care for the children's physical health and moral training. The Committee women believed that

The children ... are our biggest asset. These are the children who will be our workforce. These are the children who will fight for our country. These are the children of the future in everything and the fact that they are fit and well children makes them doubly important to the prosperity of the country. We are only as good as the whole of our community is good. The children need our support to make them part of our community and the things they get before they are seven are important. So we just had to do it for the children.\textsuperscript{16}

Their objectives were "to ensure that any child who has attended the Day Nursery regularly should, on leaving at the age of six years, commence his school life free of any preventable physical defect" and that the children were "educated in the formation of right habits".\textsuperscript{17} The day nurseries could achieve these objectives because "the children are in their care for the entire day, and usually over a period of many months"\textsuperscript{18} and, during this time, they could receive the "right care and training [for] physical and mental health".\textsuperscript{19} Hence

Many little children are given the opportunity of happy and healthy childhood and the beginnings of character are laid that make for good citizenship.\textsuperscript{20}
3.2 The Office Bearers

In 1907 Rules and Regulations provided for a Patroness (the term was changed to Patron in 1937), Office Bearers, an Executive Committee of not less than twelve members and two sub-committees, one a House Committee of four members elected from among the Executive who supervised the daily operations of the nursery, and the other an Advisory Committee of medical, educational and financial experts. All of the Office Bearers and Executive Committee were required to be financial members of the Association and they were elected annually at a general meeting. In practice, likely candidates for the various positions were invited to fill the roles prior to the annual meeting and very rarely in the forty years of operation being discussed here was any election actually held. On the few occasions when one was needed, it took place privately at an Executive Committee meeting prior to the public event.

The critical element in the success or failure of the organisation was the Executive Committee in whom all authority to manage the Association's affairs was vested. This central group controlled all policy development and forward planning, as well as financial and staff management. Such centralised power structure highlighted the importance of the selection of the right people as incumbents particularly of the Office Bearer positions. These comprised a President, four Vice Presidents, an Honorary Secretary and an Honorary Treasurer. Some description of who these people were is therefore important, since their interests and personalities influenced the directions which the Association took.

3.2.1 Vice Regal patronage

The first step towards ensuring the social legitimacy of any women's charity organisation was to obtain the patronage of the Colony's most elite woman, the Governor's wife. This had been the pattern since the days of Anna
King, Elizabeth Macquarie and Eliza Darling.²³ Moreover, Vice-Regal patronage was important for two further related reasons. First, the possibility of being publicly associated with such a high status woman, even to the extent of being invited to Government House, attracted lesser lights anxious to move up the social ladder. Second, because of the strong connection between social status and wealth, the more elite the membership was the greater was the likelihood of substantial donations to the organisation.

Therefore, in 1905, the attentions of the then Governor's wife, Lady Northcote, were actively solicited. The first significant step towards achieving the ultimate seal of approval was taken on 1 June 1906 when Her Excellency accompanied by her aide visited the nursery and presented each child with a toy. She expressed "a deep and sympathetic interest in the efforts of the Association, and pleasure at the bright and happy faces of the children."²⁴ Her interest was indeed genuine. On the following day she sent a cheque for £10 and she accepted the invitation to be Patroness. On 15 August, Lady Northcote's daughter Alice Rawson after whom the first mothercraft schools were named, also visited the nursery and expressed her sympathy for the cause. Two days later, Alice Rawson deputised for her mother at the first Annual General Meeting in St. James's Hall.²⁵ Wives of successive State Governors continued to consent to being Patronesses of the Association in subsequent years.

3.2.2 Presidents

The selection of a President who possessed the requisite social standing to attract attention and the ability to negotiate in appropriate quarters was also important. The first President, Mrs Ethel Davenport (1905-1921), was at the time of her appointment Honorary Secretary of the Kindergarten Union and known both for her interest in young children and her philanthropic work. She was reportedly a graceful and charming person.²⁶ Moreover, as the wife of a
successful solicitor, she not only possessed the appropriate social attributes, but also had personal contacts within government circles. Over the years she organised many meetings with key parliamentary and bureaucratic men and led these deputations. During her Presidency she was instrumental in bringing the work of the Association to the attention of, for example, Fitzgerald, Minister for Public Health; Paton, Director-General of Public Health; and Green, President of the State Children Relief Board.\textsuperscript{27} She mixed in the same circles as Innes-Noad and sought and obtained his influence to expand the work of the Association.\textsuperscript{28} However, in early 1920, Mrs Davenport moved out of the city and found it difficult to attend committee meetings regularly. She felt it necessary to resign from the Presidency and her resignation was accepted with regret as she had "carried on the work with a love for the cause which it will be hard to equal ... the gratitude due to her for her unfailing energy is too deep to be expressed in words."\textsuperscript{29} She did however continue her involvement intermittently during the remainder of 1920 and into 1921 but the situation proved unworkable and she ultimately resigned completely in August of that year.\textsuperscript{30}

The obvious possible successor was one of the two Vice Presidents and at this time the Committee selected Mrs Helene Phillips, wife of a leading Sydney businessman, Orwell Phillips. She was "one of the old school, had a chauffeur, and was very much bound by the etiquette of things. She was very sincere but didn't have the business head for it."\textsuperscript{31} Mrs Phillips was a foundation Vice President of the second Woolloomooloo Nursery which began in 1908 and she had been a Vice President of the Association since 1917.\textsuperscript{32} She therefore possessed sufficient experience to fill the role. However, while she was always willing to serve the cause, she was a retiring person who did not seek the limelight. She did fill the President's position for two years from 1921 to 1923 but she was happier in less demanding roles in Branch Committees.\textsuperscript{33} For
example, in 1935 after the Northern Suburbs Committee resigned en masse, she stepped in as Acting President, withdrawing in 1938 when a new Committee was functioning well. Similarly, in September, 1943, when Mrs C.P. Johnson withdrew her support from the Redfern Nursery, Mrs Phillips became Acting President until 1948 by which time the nursery was flourishing. She was again Redfern's President from 1958 to 1968 after Mrs Sam Jones and her Committee resigned. She had remained a Vice President of the Association almost continuously for 40 years until 1957 and in 1969 when she was well into her eighties she was made a Life Member.

In June, 1923, the other Vice President, Mrs Doretta MacCallum, wife of Professor (later Sir) Mungo MacCallum was unanimously elected President. In 1921, Mrs MacCallum had been a relatively new member of the Association, having joined the Executive Committee in June, 1919 and been elected a Vice President two months later. However, she had already been actively involved in infant and child welfare for more than 20 years. She had been a subscriber to the Infants Home, Ashfield since 1890, becoming a Committee member in 1897. In 1905, when the Day Nursery Association was formed, she had just become President of the Infants Home, a position which she held until ill health forced her resignation in 1945. In addition, the first Drawing-Room meeting of the Kindergarten Union had been held at the MacCallum residence in 1895 and both Mrs and Professor MacCallum worked actively for that organisation in its early years. She had also been a member of the State Children Relief Board since 1910. She was therefore well qualified for the position on both social status and personal experience grounds.

Most importantly Mrs (later Lady) MacCallum was a forceful personality. She was very tall, very handsome and very Germanic. Already aged 60 when she began in the position, she became even more active in her efforts to improve infant and child welfare services than she had already been. During
her presidency, she initiated the systematisation of medical supervision of both babies and older children and supported by her son, Walter MacCallum, she spearheaded replacement of older Honorary Doctors by younger ones with more modern knowledge of child health and nutrition.\textsuperscript{44} It was Mrs MacCallum's vision and driving force which introduced nursery school teachers into the day nurseries and expanded the Association's responsibilities to include teacher training.\textsuperscript{45} By the time Lady MacCallum retired from the Presidency in 1937, the Association had been transformed through the desperate Depression years from an organisation struggling to save infant life and to train older children into acceptable behaviours using a mixture of three hour daily doses of Froebellian Kindergarten supplemented by the ministrations of inappropriately prepared general trained nurses, into an organisation with its own health care and education programs delivered by qualified nursery school teachers.

At the end of 1937 as she approached her eightieth birthday, Lady MacCallum felt that she could no longer continue and she resigned.\textsuperscript{46} For the previous two years she had suffered poor health and progressively more of the executive work had been undertaken by Vice President Mrs Donalda McElhone.\textsuperscript{47} The Committee realised that it could pressure Lady MacCallum no longer and in February 1938 it regretfully accepted her resignation and unanimously elected Mrs McElhone President, a position which she filled until 1963.\textsuperscript{48}

Mrs McElhone was the wife of solicitor William P. McElhone who was active in local government affairs and President of the Cricket Association.\textsuperscript{49} She had joined the Surry Hills Committee in 1920 and had been President of that Branch from 1922 to 1927.\textsuperscript{50} She was elected a Vice President of the Association in 1927, a position which she filled until her election as President in 1938, punctuated by long absences overseas in the early 1930s, following her husband's death.\textsuperscript{51} She was a short, stout woman who could be radiantly
charming when she smiled. She was also a shrewd, astute businesswoman, even a "politicking wheeler dealer".\textsuperscript{52} She actively supported Lady MacCallum in introducing nursery schools and nursery school teacher training and in 1934 she was instrumental in selecting Miss Elizabeth Town as Superintendent of these activities.\textsuperscript{53} She formed a lifetime friendship with Sir William and Lady McKell after McKell, when New South Wales Premier, sought the Association's assistance with evacuated children.\textsuperscript{54} This friendship underpinned McKell's political and financial support for the Association, both during the late Second World War years and subsequently in the establishment of a day nursery in Goulburn.\textsuperscript{55} Mrs McElhone's work for children's welfare was acknowledged by the award MBE in the New Year Honours, 1941.\textsuperscript{56}

\subsection*{3.2.3 Other office bearers}

Until 1917, all secretarial and accounting work was undertaken by voluntary committee members who served for a number of years as Honorary Secretaries and Treasurers. Unfortunately, there are few details of the work they performed since the minutes from January 1908 to October 1917 could not be located. It can be assumed however, that these office bearers diligently carried out their allotted tasks of summoning meetings, recording proceedings and keeping accounts of all financial transactions. Between 1912 and 1917, there was just one nursery at Forest Lodge to operate, since the Committee which had established a second nursery at Woolloomooloo had "seceded" from the Association.\textsuperscript{57} Thus the affairs of the Association were relatively uncomplicated even after the purchase of 24 Arundel Street in 1913, and were well within the secretarial and accounting skills of intelligent, bourgeois women with time on their hands.

But as the war to end all wars continued, there were competing demands for these women's time and energy. They were needed to knit socks and
balaclavas, roll bandages and do other essential voluntary work to support the war effort. Moreover, as more men volunteered and left for the Front, more women were drawn into the workforce. In 1915-16 attendances at Forest Lodge doubled stretching facilities to their absolute limit. A new committee was formed which succeeded in opening another nursery in two terrace houses in Louis Street, Chippendale in October 1916. This was soon full and having to refuse applicants. Towards the end of 1917, Woolloomooloo committee was approached and, considering the somewhat parlous state of its finances and the dilapidated condition of its rented building, it agreed to rejoin the Association. Also, in March, 1918, Mrs Hugh Dixson, wealthy philanthropist and founder of the Sydney Medical Mission, offered the Mission's building on the corner of Riley and Cooper Streets, Surry Hills rent free, as premises for a fourth nursery. It opened on 8 April, organised by the Chippendale Committee.

As well, government was becoming increasingly interested in day nurseries. In the 1915-16 vote, the grant was doubled to £500 and in the 1916-17 vote, a special allocation of £200 was made to open the Chippendale nursery. J.D. Fitzgerald, the Minister of Public Health, Dr Paton, the President of the Board of Health, and Mr A. Green, the President of the State Children Relief Board, all visited Forest Lodge nursery in 1917 and were reportedly "greatly pleased with all they saw". There was pressure from the State Children Relief Board for the Association to open more nurseries, particularly in Alexandria and Mascot. The reconstituted Baby Clinics, Pre-Maternity and Home-Nursing Board, of which Fitzgerald was ex-officio President, was establishing baby health clinics rapidly and the idea of Welfare Centres combining baby clinics, milk depot, day nursery and kindergarten under the one roof was in the wind.

The matters which both the Honorary Secretary and the Honorary Treasurer had to oversee were thus becoming increasingly complex and time
consuming, prompting change to both roles within the organisational structure. The first step was the establishment of a Finance Committee late in 1917, comprising the President Mrs Davenport, Vice President Mrs Orwell Phillips, Honorary Treasurer Rosalie Goldsmith, Committee member Mrs J. Goldsmith, and Miss Ethel Ranken, Honorary Secretary of the Woolloomooloo Committee. In January 1918, this committee recommended to the Executive that an accountant be employed to assist the Honorary Treasurer, at an "Honorarium" of £12 per annum. This person was to be advisory only and not to handle any actual money. In June, the Executive decided that a subcommittee should be set up to examine the situation and "readjust the finances of the Association". Also a special meeting was held later that month to appoint Miss Dulcie Fry "Honorary" Secretary at an "Honorarium" of £2.2.0 per month for three months.

The changes recommended by the Accountant Mr Cullen Ward and Mr Phillips who advised the Finance Committee resulted in a complete revamp of the Association's Rules and Regulations. Many of these changes were occasioned by tensions between the Branches and the Executive which are discussed in the next section of this chapter. The immediate change of relevance here was the appointment of Miss Fry in August as General Secretary and Treasurer at a salary of £72 per annum. Her value to the Association was placed at somewhat less than that of a longstanding Matron who received £100 per annum, about equivalent to a new Matron on probation who received £75 on commencement and was advanced to £84 per annum after six months satisfactory service, and a little more than the kindergarten nurse-teacher Miss Battley who was receiving £65 per annum. The position of Honorary Secretary thus disappeared and henceforth there was to be a paid secretary. The Honorary Treasurer's position was retained, with authority to sign cheques, but this authority was also given to the paid Treasurer, with the safeguard that cheques
must also be signed by a member of the Finance Committee. The paid Treasurer was also authorised to disburse such moneys to Branch Committees as they requested.\textsuperscript{73} In 1921, the term Treasurer was deleted from the General Secretary's title and in 1922, the signatories for cheques were specified to be the General Secretary and the Honorary Treasurer.\textsuperscript{74} When the Association was incorporated in 1924, the General Secretary's duties included keeping accounts as well as the more customary secretarial services.\textsuperscript{75}

The General Secretary's position within the organisation presents a number of anomalies. The position was specified in the Rules and Regulations up to 1923 and also in the Articles of Association between 1924 and 1964 as one of the Office Bearers to be elected annually but whether the incumbent was accorded the status and voting rights of other Office Bearers as an Executive Committee member is problematic. It seems unlikely, since the General Secretary was a paid employee and at least after incorporation it was specified that members of the Executive should all act without remuneration. However, the personal qualities of the officer were clearly very important since she (all the General Secretaries have been women) was entrusted with oversight of the Association's finances and was authorised to disburse money from the beginning. The incumbent's social background was relevant since she arranged meetings with government ministers and senior bureaucrats and often attended deputations with other Executive Committee members. The position was not advertised but was filled by invitation.

Little is known about the first General Secretary Dulcie Fry (1918-1923) except that she lived at "Ingalar" Turramurra which perhaps is indicative of her social background and explains why she was able to accept the position initially on a small Honorarium. In 1923, she did not actually resign from the position but rather requested twelve months leave of absence.\textsuperscript{76} For most of her period of employment she had no office in which to work so in between
Executive Committee meetings contact must have been informal, at social events and by telephone. However, early in 1922, with the organisation achieving a higher public profile, the need for a permanent office was felt by the Executive and in June rooms at the London Bank Chambers in Martin Place were rented. Office hours were then 10.30 am to 1.00 pm on Tuesdays, Thursdays and Fridays, extending to two and a half hours Monday to Friday by 1927. There were four changes of central office location between 1925 and 1942 until the office was established at 39 Park Street in 1943, where it remained for the next 30 years.

The second incumbent, Miss Stella Davies (1923-1931) began then with an established office. Miss Davies was evidently no ordinary secretary. She was known to Mrs MacCallum and the announcement of her appointment at the May 1923 meeting coincided with the unanimous selection of Mrs MacCallum as President. These two began office together in August and immediately a more "professional" business-like approach is apparent both in organisation and, after the end of the year, in such a small matter as the introduction of a typewriter! Stella Davies' Annual Reports are packed with statistics, social comment on the living conditions of the families the nurseries assisted, statements of the Association's purpose and commentary on the children's needs. She became one of the first students in the Board of Social Study and Training's social work course when it began in 1929, combining the Association's work with her studies. While this must have taken no small organisation it was possible considering that office work was part-time and the Association agreed to employ additional secretarial assistance. Mrs MacCallum supported Miss Davies strongly in her endeavour, persuading the more timorous members of the Executive to grant her leave of absence since "educational experiences of this sort should prove of advantage to the Day Nurseries". Stella Davies completed her course work at the end of 1930 and
then undertook her field work with the Child Welfare Department and the Children's Courts, in Baby Health Centres and with the Benevolent Society, finishing by March 1931. In November of that year she resigned from the Association to go with Kate Ogilvie from the Rachel Forster Hospital to England where both trained as almoners. Miss Davies' resignation was received with great regret. The esteem in which she was held may be gauged by the farewell presentation of a handbag containing a "roll of notes from the members of the Association all wishing her every success in her training for her new work".

3.3 The Committee System

From the beginning all powers to conduct the Association's business have been vested in a central Executive Committee, comprising the Office Bearers and a number of other members, all of whom were elected annually and were required to subscribe at least five shillings a year. Meetings were held monthly, except for January when most members took holidays outside the city. Until the establishment of a central office, meetings were held at the Nurseries. Members who were absent from three consecutive meetings without reasonable excuse or obtaining leave of absence were considered ipso facto to have resigned from the Committee. Four members comprised a quorum until the Association was incorporated in 1924 when it became five.

The Executive Committee was the policy and planning group for the Association, holding the ultimate decision making power on any matter relating to the six main areas of service provision - the nature of administrative authority, sources and allocation of funds, availability of services, the kinds of clients to be served, staff for the service and the nature of the service to be provided. After the first four years, the Executive Committee was not itself involved directly in day-to-day service provision. This was entrusted to Branch
Committees, subject to policy control and direction by the Executive Committee. Branch Committees were appointed by the Executive Committee which could also disband them. At no time has the Executive accepted as a Branch a group of people who were not members of the Association or who were not prepared to accept the Executive's authority. This control and direction particularly in the early years, was a source of confusion and conflict between Branches and the Executive chiefly in two major areas - allocation of funds and supervision of the services. However, the solutions arrived at at various times have never changed the essential nature of administrative authority but have been primarily adjustments to improve Branches' democratic representation on the Executive.

3.3.1 Allocation of funds

There were, and still are, three main sources of funds to finance the nurseries: governments, whether directly through grants or indirectly through relief from taxes and rates; fees paid by parents; and fund raising either through direct giving (subscriptions, donations in money or kind) or through entertainments and lotteries. The Executive Committee and Office Bearers took responsibility for negotiations with government and also determined the fee structure. These do not appear to have been contentious issues at any time. Disharmony did arise however over funds raised by Branch Committees. Next to their supervision of the day-to-day operations of their nurseries, fund raising was Branches' chief function and they were understandably jealous of the hard-won fruits of their labours.

From 1907 to 1917, the Executive appropriated any money raised by Branch Committees, requiring such funds to be paid immediately into the Association's central bank account. Branch Committees then had to apply to the Honorary Treasurer for money to pay even daily expenses incurred in
running their nurseries. Some concession was made in 1912 when Branch Committees were empowered to spend up to £10 on household requirements and furniture if urgently needed but this was too late for the Woolloomooloo Branch which had found the Executive Committee's control restrictive. This committee was committed to the growth and development of its own nursery. It had worked hard in raising money and expected to have more autonomy in determining how this money should be spent. In January, 1912, its frustration resulted in its decision to "secede from the parent body ... feeling it could do better work if it were not joined to the Association".

There were no new Branches until the Chippendale Committee was formed in 1916, so the Rules lay in abeyance for some years. But evidently this new group also found the Rules restrictive and pressed for change. With the Woolloomooloo Committee rejoining at the beginning of 1918, there were now three Branch Committees and discussion led to a change in the Rules such that bank accounts were opened for each Branch Nursery and moneys collected by the Branches were paid into these. This permitted the itemisation of funds raised by the different Committees and the publication of receipts and expenditure for each nursery separately in the Annual Reports. However, the Executive Committee did not relinquish its general control over expenditure and Branches were still required to apply to the Association Treasurer to obtain the necessary funds for daily operation. In 1922, the Rule was changed again reverting to the original single general banking account but accounting procedures established in the meantime which facilitated identification of contributions to and expenditure by the separate Branches were retained. Centralised control over all financial matters was continued after the Association was incorporated in 1924.
3.3.2 Supervision of the services

The second area of tension was in the appointment of Matrons and management of the day-to-day operations of the services. Initially Matrons were required to be ATNA members but this evidently proved a restrictive requirement and in any case as was found with the second Matron, such membership did not guarantee a successful appointment. The Rule was relaxed in 1911 and was not re-introduced until 1922. In the intervening years the basis for decision making about the suitability of applicants was somewhat more arbitrary but throughout this period the Executive Committee retained its right to final approval. Branch Committees were able to locate prospective Matrons but between 1911 and 1922 they were only empowered to bring their recommendations to the Executive Committee for discussion. A majority of both the Executive and the Branch Committee had to agree to the appointment of the recommended applicant. Between 1922 and 1924 the Executive reverted to requiring ATNA membership or an equivalent certificate and with this assurance it was prepared to allow Branches to make their own appointments subject to its confirmation. The matter of Matron's qualifications was finally resolved by the Nurses Registration Act in 1924. After that date all Matrons were required to be State Registered nurses.

A further tension arose over the accountability of the Matron once she was employed. In December, 1905, when the first nursery was opened, the Executive appointed a House Committee, to meet each Monday at the Creche so that it could interview prospective clients and generally oversee the functioning of the establishment. Perhaps these and other Committee women were overly intrusive in areas which the Matron considered to be subject to her particular professional expertise, since in April, 1906, Matron Breden requested clarification of her role. The Executive discussed the situation and to solve the problem it set up a Committee of Inspection in addition to the House
Committee. It was agreed that the Inspection Committee should comprise four members of the Executive, each appointed on rotation for two months and each to visit the nursery once a month at any time. In addition, the role and function of the House Committee was defined. This Committee was to "meet on every Monday morning to consider applications for admission and conduct the general business of the house, to examine the Matron's diary etc. and [to] have the power to summon a Special Meeting [of the Executive] by a requisition of the Hon. Secretary, should same be expedient."

After the original nursery moved to Darlington and a second nursery was established in new premises in Woolloomooloo, members of the House Committee for each nursery were drawn from the Branch Committees rather than from the Executive. It is not known whether an Executive appointed Inspection Committee continued at this time, but perhaps it did and perhaps this added to the Woolloomooloo Branch Committee's discontent. In any case, after the Woolloomooloo Branch seceded in 1912, and there was only one nursery until Chippendale was established in 1916, the relationship between an Inspection and a Branch Committee was irrelevant. However, after Woolloomooloo rejoined the Association at the end of 1917, the new Chippendale and Surry Hills nurseries were also functioning making four nurseries to administer. Each nursery had its own Branch and House Committee so new Branch Rules were imperative. The Executive agreed to give each House Committee some degree of autonomy, for example in the purchase of provisions, but it reinstated an inspectorial Visiting Committee comprising women from among its own members. The function of this Committee was quality control and it reported directly to the Executive Committee.

Over the years, the number of women who comprised the Visiting Committee, the length of time they performed their overseeing function and the method of their selection has varied to some extent, but the existence of a
Visiting Committee and its role and function did not change until the appointment of a professional officer. Some women performed their duties diligently, often reporting what they observed in great detail, while others appeared to lack enthusiasm, defaulting on their obligations and then apologising to the Executive. The House Committees of each nursery continued to be responsible for the day-to-day operation of the nurseries and in general it was to them that the Matrons of the establishments were answerable. The Matrons were given authority over other staff employed by the nursery, for example, the assistant nurses and maids, but they were accountable to the House Committee for keeping account of supplies received and money paid out for these supplies; the children's fees; visitors to the nursery; daily occurrences at the nursery and inventories of household linen and children's clothes. In addition, the Matrons had to "be exact in having all the rules for the management of the Nurseries, and all the directions issued by the committee observed". However, the conditions under which all staff were employed and their salary determinations remained the preserve of the central Executive Committee. This control, combined with the regular quality inspections by the Visiting Committee, worked to ensure a uniform set of operations at all the nurseries, despite their varying physical conditions and the individual personalities of both the Matrons and the separate Branch Committees.

3.3.3 Relationship between the Executive and Branch Committees

Branch representation on the Executive Committee was a third source of tension between Branches and the Executive. Initially, when the Rules were first formulated in 1907, there was only one nursery so although provision was made for the Executive to appoint Branch Committees the question of Branch representation on the Executive was academic. Hence the Rules simply specified that the Executive should comprise not less than twelve financial
members. With the advent of the Woolloomooloo Committee in November, 1908 some adjustment was needed and the Rules were revised in 1911 to allow for the inclusion of three members elected annually by each Branch. This clearly was not a satisfactory solution for the Woolloomooloo Committee as noted previously and it withdrew. In 1918, with three Branch Committees, the rules were changed reducing Branch representation to two members from each Branch, their number to be included in the total of not less than twelve members. They were to be elected annually at the General Meeting of all members, of whom only financial members were entitled to vote. In 1922, Branch representation was raised again to three by the inclusion of the Honorary Secretaries of each Branch. Presumably, during this period, Branches nominated representatives from among their own Committees to ensure their views were heard, but it seems that nomination was to some extent a haphazard affair. The rules were tightened on incorporation in 1924 by requiring written nominations to be received by the Secretary in the month prior to the Annual Meeting. This permitted scrutiny of the nominees to ensure that the rules were being satisfied. Since 1924 the rules have specified three representatives from each Branch, although the proportionate value of these votes have altered. From 1924 to 1944 a maximum of twelve other members were allowed for but in 1944 this number was raised to 18. By that date there were 12 Branch Committees so the possible maximum size of the Executive had grown to 54, although there were never more than 40 who actually attended any one monthly meeting. Even so, the Executive was an impossibly large group, which created considerable difficulties in finding a room large enough to accommodate meetings.

Thus, since 1911, there have been some Executive Committee members who never worked actively in any Branch Committees and hence had no particular partisan affiliations. Others, who may have been elected directly to
the Executive or who were elected as Branch representatives were deeply involved in their particular Branch affairs and understandably tried to obtain the best outcomes possible for their nurseries. It was inevitable perhaps that there would be factional differences and these surfaced at various times particularly when funds were short or new directions were called for. In principle, Branches had equal representation on the Executive, a point that was brought home firmly to the Eastern Suburbs Branch in 1923, when it demanded six representatives. In practice, because some members were elected directly to the Executive, it meant that some Branches had more than their allotted three voices on the Committee. There were various attempts to solve this dilemma. For example in December, 1917 it was decided that Executive Committee members could work on Branch Committees as well as the Executive but they could not hold office in both. Also Branch members often resigned from their Branches if elected to the Executive Committee. But there was no real resolution until the extensive revision of the Memorandum and Articles in 1964 when a carefully worded complex Article limited the total votes of both elected and Branch Committee members to three.

There were other tensions between Branches and Executive members which probably had more to do with clashes of strong personalities than actual structural features of the organisation. But the final word always lay with the Executive as it had the authority to create or disband Branch Committees. One special case in the early years which required maximum diplomacy was the Executive's relationship with the Chippendale/Surry Hills Committee between 1918 and 1922. This was occasioned by Mrs Hugh Dixson's generous offer to the Association early in 1918 of two terrace houses in a row of six which also accommodated the Sydney Medical Mission which she had founded. The offer of rent free premises for 12 months during which Mrs Dixson also agreed to pay rates and taxes came at a time when the Chippendale Committee was
struggling to keep its nursery running in an unsuitable rented building which was costly to run.\textsuperscript{113} It seemed logical to move this nursery into the newly offered building and this occurred on 8 April, 1918.\textsuperscript{114}

There was no essential reason for Mrs (later Lady) Dixson to actually become a member of the Association following this offer, but she had already been a Vice President of the Association between 1909 and 1914 so it was perhaps merely a courtesy to invite her to join again.\textsuperscript{115} As a mark of honour she was offered a Vice Presidency of the Chippendale Committee, a position she accepted and held until her death aged 78 in 1922.\textsuperscript{116} The Association would undoubtedly have been most interested in retaining Mrs Dixson's continued patronage as suitable buildings in which to run a nursery were very difficult to find. But there is evidence which indicates that she was a person with strongly-held views who liked things done her way and it is probable that she created some internal difficulties with the Chippendale Committee, which was in any case under considerable pressure throughout 1918 to keep two nurseries in operation. At the end of the year this Committee "found [it] impossible to carry on the work and ... reluctantly decided to hand in their resignations as a body".\textsuperscript{117} Mrs Davenport was called in to negotiate, to smooth troubled waters and to try "to form a more satisfactory committee".\textsuperscript{118} This she succeeded in doing and with the closure of the Chippendale Nursery also at this time, a compatible Surry Hills Committee was able to continue the work.

Relationships between the Executive and Mrs Dixson were however somewhat tenuous. It would seem that the initial twelve months occupancy was extended and in May, 1919, Mrs Davenport wrote to Mrs Dixson to finalise the detailed arrangements.\textsuperscript{119} Apparently, the Association believed at this time that Mrs Dixson was about to present it with the two terrace houses and on 2 June it was unanimously decided to write to the Medical Mission Trustees to ask them "to hand the building over" to the Association.\textsuperscript{120} However, at this
time the Royal Society for the Welfare of Mothers and Babies was newly established and Innes-Noad's idea of Welfare Centres incorporating baby health clinic, day nursery and kindergarten was being discussed. On 11 June the Association met with the Kindergarten Union to discuss the Welfare Society's idea and at its next meeting the Executive changed its tactics. It unanimously decided to ask Mrs Dixson to hand over the whole row of six terraces to the Welfare Society with the stipulation that the Day Nursery remain in its present position. Mrs Dixson did so agree and the General Secretary was pleased to report in August, 1919 that

... Mrs. Hugh Dixson and the Medical Mission Trustees have made us a wonderfully generous offer. The terrace of houses in Riley Street, in the corner two of which our Nursery is now situated, has been handed over to the Welfare Society, and the Day Nursery is for all time to have its home in its present position.

Much credit is probably due to Mrs Davenport's charm and interpersonal skills in achieving such a satisfactory outcome. The nursery was subsequently called the Emma Elizabeth Dixson Nursery to commemorate Mrs Dixson's handsome gift.

3.4 External Advisers

At the inaugural meeting which formed the Association in 1905, the need for medical and educational advisers for the nursery had been recognised. These were obvious requirements for a service legitimated by its concerns to save infant life and develop worthy citizens. But as the Association developed, other professional services related to the business activities and property acquisitions of the operation were required. There were books to be audited, accounting systems to be devised, investments to be made, buildings to be inspected and altered and legal documents to be drawn up. In the early years, few women were professionally qualified to perform these services. However, between them the Committee women were well placed as the daughters, sisters,
wives, mothers, aunts and cousins of suitable business and professional men and could command ready access to such advice. As this was a philanthropic enterprise, the Committee was loathe to spend any of its hard-won funds in paying for these services so inevitably the women pressured their respective menfolk to contribute their advice free. Many of these men were genuinely interested in the work and some like Mr Davenport, the Association's Honorary Solicitor, continued to contribute their services long after their female relatives' connections with the Association had been discontinued. Their collective assistance has doubtless been of great benefit to the success of the Association over the years, for which grateful acknowledgement has duly been made in successive Annual Reports.

The initial Advisory Committee of medical and educational experts was shortlived. The Rules and Regulations in 1908-09 called for not less than twelve members but this was apparently unnecessarily large and the number was reduced to six in 1911. However, there is no evidence that the Committee ever existed as such nor that it ever met. It ceased to be mentioned after 1912. There were two main reasons for its demise. First, although the three American Kindergarteners did occasionally attend Executive meetings in the early years, by early 1912 the last of them had departed either back to America or to other interests. Subsequent events indicate that the incoming Kindergarten College Principal in 1912, Miss Harriet Dumolo, did not have the same interest in day nursery work and after she took up the position connections with the Kindergarten College appear to have lapsed for many years. Second, the Honorary Medical Officers do not appear to have been much interested in co-ordinating their efforts through committee meetings. None of them ever attended an Executive meeting nor, until 1923, were any efforts to get them together recorded. A number of doctors shared the monthly visiting of each nursery, to examine children, check on the matron, set up diet charts
and inspect the sanitation. Since medical training provided no systematic instruction in children's diseases until the Royal Alexandra Hospital for Children was fully established as a teaching hospital in 1924, the doctors perforce knew only what they had picked up as they went along in practice. Consequently, there was no accepted body of knowledge which they all shared, so their efforts were individualistic and unco-ordinated. Doubtless there were many discontinuities in the advice given.

Medical supervision did become systematic however after 1922, under the direction of Dr (later Sir) Charles Clubbe, President of the Board of Management, Royal Alexandra Hospital for Children. By this time, the Association operated three nurseries catering for almost 150 children daily and three more nurseries were being planned. In July, 1922 Dr Clubbe and Dr J.S. Purdy, Medical Officer of Health with Sydney Council, visited the nurseries and reported to the Association on what they found. Nothing happened immediately but one of the first changes occurred a year later in September, 1923, one month after the new President Mrs MacCallum began her term of office. The Honorary Medical Officers were requested to examine all children attending the nurseries. In October, at Mrs MacCallum's suggestion, a conference of doctors interested in the nurseries was held, presided over by Dr Clubbe. This conference decided that the Honorary doctors should visit the nurseries weekly, advise on the children's diets and inspect adenoids and teeth. The children were to be weighed weekly and charts kept for each child. In December, the Executive adopted the rules devised at this conference and decided to ask Dr Clubbe if he would become the Chief Medical Adviser to the Association. This he agreed to and continued to co-ordinate the activities of the Honorary doctors of the various nurseries until his death in 1932. His role was then taken up by Dr R.B. Wade, lecturer in surgical and medical diseases of children at the Children's Hospital who was equally enthusiastic in
his supervision. None of the older breed of medical men continued in this new regime. The new set of Honorary medical officers after 1923 comprised a fresh and vital wave of interest, supported by albeit rudimentary knowledge but it was addressed specifically to the particular health problems of young children. An Honorary Medical Officer continued to be attached to each nursery until 1946, visiting regularly and advising "as to diet and general treatment". Then, the Department of Health, through its Division of Maternal and Child Welfare, began a systematic health service for the centres run by both the Association and the Kindergarten Union.

There was another offshoot of Drs Clubbe and Purdy's inspection of the children in 1922. As noted previously, the Honorary Medical Officers were instructed to examine the children's teeth. Interest in tooth decay was burgeoning after the First World War when it was discovered that over a quarter of young men were rejected for service because they did not possess "two pairs of biting teeth in apposition". As far as young children were concerned, most medical people did not believe in any treatment of dental caries, preferring to wait until first teeth were sufficiently rotten to be removed. The beginning of children's dentistry is outside the scope of this study but it is of interest that in October, 1923 following Drs Clubbe and Purdy's study of the children's health, the Executive Committee noted that the children's teeth in all nurseries needed attention. The comment was made again in March of the following year in relation to the children at Woolloomooloo. Solutions for the dental problems of the children were hard to come by but the Eastern Suburbs nursery was a trailblazer. When it first opened in November 1924 Mrs W. Cherry volunteered to be the Honorary Dentist. She continued to provide dental services for this nursery's children in her rooms, seeing those who needed treatment for the next thirteen years until it was reported that she had "relinquished her profession".
mooloo Nursery obtained the services of Miss Ogilvie in 1931 and after her marriage she continued to attend this nursery's children visiting once a month for twelve years until 1943. The other nurseries would very much have liked the services of Honorary Dentists but for the time being, children in need of treatment were referred to the Dental Hospital, a somewhat difficult operation for working mothers to arrange. However, in 1939 thanks to fund-raising efforts by the Association's Younger Set, a dental clinic was established at the new Redfern Nursery School. Finally, in 1943, when state interest in supporting day nurseries was at an all time high because of the national need to encourage women into the workforce during wartime, the Minister of Health, Mr G.A. Kelly, arranged for the Dental Hospital to install clinics at each nursery since the "mothers, being at work, are unable to give the time necessary to have [the children] attended to." By 1945 there were clinics in four of the six day nurseries which had been established by 1930 and in three of the six nursery schools which had been opened since 1937. Children from the remaining nurseries and nursery schools were taken to the closest nursery clinic for examination and treatment.
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CHAPTER FOUR

THE AVAILABILITY OF SERVICES

The Objects of the Association defined those who were to be clients of the services and where the services were to be located. In theory then it seemed that the way forward was clear. The clients were to be the babies of women who needed to work and the services were to be located in poor and depressed parts of the city. However, in practice, definition of both the children and the women with access to the service was to be problematic and finding suitable premises on inner city sites proved to be a difficult task.

4.1 Redefining the Clients

4.1.1 Children

The Day Nursery was begun with the intention of providing long day care for babies and toddlers up to three years of age. Yet even at the outset the restrictive nature of the rule was patently clear. What would happen to the children on their third birthdays? The Committee women were well aware that the public schools were not welcoming three and four year olds. They also knew that the few Free Kindergartens which were available were only open for three hours in the morning and hence, even if places for older children were available, the kindergartens did not provide the necessary number of hours of care which children with working mothers required. In 1906, Mrs Dane proposed that

When the children reach the age limit of three years, and are sent on to a Free Kindergarten [the nursery] still hopes to provide for them for a small charge during the afternoon hours and to keep them off the streets until they pass on to public school life and are better able to take care of themselves.
However, such a proposal seemed to create more problems than it solved, since it was evident to all that the facilities available at 126 Dowling Street could scarcely cater for the fifteen to eighteen babies and toddlers who were being cared for each day. Quite clearly older children were more vigorous than the under-threes and they required more play space, both indoors and outdoors, than 126 Dowling Street could provide. Hence, while the nursery was located there, the possibility of extending the service to encompass older children was severely limited. Nevertheless, the contradiction inherent in the three year old rule continued to bedevil the Committee women. Many agreed with Mrs Dane. They saw how futile it was to ensure that the babies reached their third birthdays in a satisfactory condition only to find that the children were then left to the hazards of the streets and neighbours again in the two or three year gap before beginning school. So, in July, 1906, despite the unsatisfactory conditions, the Committee was no longer able to resist its own humanitarian impulses and it agreed to allow already enrolled children to remain at the nursery after their third birthdays. But it could not extend the service to new enrolments and for another year the Committee continued to reject applications for the enrolment of over three year olds, despite the mothers' entreaties.

Ultimately, it was a case of child abuse which provided the precedent for a permanent change in the nature of the service. In November, 1907, Miss Light, Director of the Woolloomooloo Free Kindergarten, appealed to the nursery to take a five year old boy in the afternoons "because he was not well treated at home". In these circumstances, the Committee could not refuse and the child was enrolled. Shortly after this, the nursery was moved to more spacious premises at 27 Rose Street, Darlington and the way was clear for the service to expand without any restrictions on the children's ages. It became, and continued to be, a long day care service for babies and children from a few weeks old up to school entry age. The problem then became a programming
one for the staff rather than an eligibility one for the children (Plates 4a and 4b).

Curiously though, this change in practices was not reflected in the wording of the formal statement of the Objects of the Association for thirty years, even though other wording changes were made at various times. At an informal level the phrase "infants and children under school age" was used in the Annual Reports from 1921 but "children" were not included in the formal Memorandum of the Association until 1938 and then it was in connection with recognition of the Association's new involvement with teacher training.\(^5\)

This lag in formal and official recognition of the expanded focus of the service can perhaps be explained by the Association's continuing primary concern with infant welfare. Unfortunately, it is not possible to obtain an exact picture of the composition of enrolments across the age ranges at this time, since individual enrolment records do not survive and the attendance figures which are cited in Annual Reports and Executive Committee minutes are not broken down by ages of the children.\(^6\) However, there are a few clues which indicate that it was their concern to save infant life which continued to motivate the Committee women up to the Second World War. First, it is noticeable that each of the six nurseries operating by 1930 was established to provide care for babies and toddlers. Between 1937 and 1947 eight new services were established (see Table 5) but these were all nursery schools for children aged at least eighteen months to six years. Redfern Nursery School, opened in June, 1938, did begin to accommodate babies under eighteen months in 1941, but this occurred because of the closure of the nursery section of the Newtown nursery to make way for teacher trainees.\(^7\) Second, and it is admittedly slender evidence, the few photographs of children and staff which were published in Annual Reports up to 1921 indicate that a high proportion of the children were aged up to three years. Third, the Executive Committee minutes throughout this period regularly expressed concern about long waiting
Plate 4a  Children at play, Woolloomooloo Nursery, 1906

Plate 4b  Children in the Darlington Nursery, 1908
lists for babies and the need for more cots. In addition, at times when adjustments were made to the admissions policy, Committee women regularly demanded that priority should be given to babies. Moreover, from the late 1930s when the Association's energies and resources were being directed into opening nursery schools, there were many of the older Committee women who felt that the original purpose of the day nursery service was being lost and they consequently also lost interest in the Association.

4.1.2 Mothers

Deciding the basis for determining who were the mothers "forced to be at work" proved to be more difficult than was initially imagined. As described previously, mothers who applied for places were interviewed by the Matrons and their applications were scrutinised by the members of the House Committee. The women's family circumstances presented an array of non-ideal situations and the merits or demerits of these as causes for the women's working had to be assessed. Situations such as those of widows and deserted wives where there were no male spouses in evidence as breadwinners were relatively clearcut. Also, it seems reasonably certain that neither the Matrons nor the House Committee members were morally judgemental of never married mothers. Illegitimate children were accepted as readily as the legitimate children of other supporting mothers and indeed, it was specifically stated in the Annual Reports from 1924-25 to 1941-42 that "the unmarried mother who is trying to keep her child with her" was one of the "cases which the Nurseries are most anxious to help". More problematic were circumstances where the husbands were still in evidence at home but they either were not working at all or were not earning sufficient income to support their families. There were then, as there are now, a number of reasons why these circumstances existed. For example, men may
have been willing enough but unable to work because of illness; able and willing but they were either in very low paid work or were genuinely out of work; able enough but unwilling especially through intemperance. In the earliest years, it seems that all of these grounds except for men's low paid work were sufficient to make a family eligible for the Day Nursery's support. For example, in 1909 Matron Ryrie at Darlington included in her account of "sad, worthy cases" a family with an invalid husband who ultimately ended up "incurable in one of the Government asylums"; Matron O'Keeffe in the same year, at Woolloomooloo reported being "glad when we know that the absence of old friends means that 'father' is in work again, and 'mother' is once more able to give her time to the children"; in 1913, Matron Gratton at Forest Lodge noted that "Daddie is invariably a mere nonentity where the kiddies are concerned, he is either 'dunck' or has 'don away', and mother goes to work".

But it is evident that as time went by, greater concern was expressed about erring fathers and the possibility that mothers might be defrauding the Association. In the first half of 1918, questions were raised about the eligibility of children with invalid or unemployed fathers and it was decided to apply the scrutiny rules more closely, subjecting the mothers initially to close questioning by the Matrons to collect "the facts" to put before the House Committee and subsequently "the mother[s] of such child or children should come before the House Committee and state [their] case[s]". If it was found that a father had been ill for more than a week, the case "should be looked into further". Late in 1921, concern was again expressed about the veracity of applicants and "It was unanimously agreed that in future a more careful supervision be kept on the mothers who left their children at the Nursery in order to be quite certain that the Association was only dealing with deserving cases". In 1925, the concern about who was eligible for admission found expression in a set of rules which were printed and made available for distribution. Unfortunately, no
copy of these Rules could be located, but it seems that children from intact families with fathers who were able to work were at this time excluded from the Nursery.\textsuperscript{18}

This decision flew in the face of the economic realities of the 1920s. As the decade advanced, if the nursery attendance figures are any indication, more and more women were seeking employment. Throughout 1923 there were repeated comments that each of three nurseries had long waiting lists and each was having to refuse deserving cases.\textsuperscript{19} The average daily attendances in the year to May, 1924 were 46 at Forest Lodge, 47 at Surry Hills and 51 at Woolloomooloo. On one memorable day 65 children were crowded in at the Woolloomooloo nursery.\textsuperscript{20} It seems unlikely that the numbers of deserted, widowed and unmarried mothers in the population were rising dramatically. It is much more likely that the increasing demand for nursery places resulted from the needs of more women with ablebodied but low paid or unemployed husbands to seek work. In any case, by May 1927, the economic situation was sufficiently obvious for the Association to agree to change its admission rules and it was resolved "that in the case where the father is out of work and the mother is compelled to work, the children may be admitted to the nursery temporarily; admittances in such cases to be at the discretion of the Matron, all such cases to be reviewed by the House Committee from week to week".\textsuperscript{21} But evidently, acceptance of these children was undertaken unwillingly and probably on a very temporary basis, since the matter was raised again for discussion early in 1930. By this time, the social evidence was overwhelming and "an abnormally high percentage of applicants for admission due to [this] cause was reported from most branches". It was decided this time that the Matron should interview both parents, that cases admitted on these conditions should be reviewed fortnightly and that babies should have first claim on the available places.\textsuperscript{22}
The General Secretary, Stella Davies, observed in the Annual Report of 1929-30 that the Association "has been compelled to waive temporarily its ruling that children with fathers who are able to work are not eligible cases for a Day Nursery" and that "Many of these are not the typical Nursery case and have never been in such straits before". What is perhaps most revealing is her comment of reassurance that "In every case the mother states that she wishes to work outside the home until her husband can procure employment again" (italics added). In other words, these children were acceptable because their mothers had expressed no intention of permanently entering the workforce. The women's paid employment and inability to be full-time mothers was seen to be occasioned by extraordinary economic circumstances outside their control and as soon as all was well again, they would return home. The view was still the same as that expressed by Matron O'Keeffe in 1909 and it reflected the Association's philosophy that the service it provided was a residual welfare operation and that it was not intended to encourage women into the paid workforce.

In 1926 and 1927, the Lang government pushed through two pieces of social legislation which might be expected to have impacted strongly on the Day Nursery Association's clientele and to have affected their needs for the service. First, the Widows' Pension Act, passed in 1926, provided a pension of £1 per week for widows and 10s per week for each child under the age of fourteen years. If a widow had three children under fourteen years, her annual pension entitlement would have been £130 per annum. However, since at the same time Industrial Commissioner A.B. Piddington had determined that £4.4.0 per week (£228.8.0) was the minimum to provide a reasonable standard of living for a man, his wife and one child, it is clear that no widow could possibly have supported herself and her children on the pension alone to any standard other than that of extreme poverty. Indeed, it was not the State's intention to
provide a totally adequate income for widows and their children. Notions that people have a primary obligation to provide for themselves and those dependent on them were still uppermost among the ruling elite of all political persuasions. Hence the Widows' Pension Act allowed the widow an income of up to £78 per annum before her eligibility for the pension ceased. This meant that if the widow with three dependent children could earn this amount, her family had £208 per annum to live on, or approximately the amount Piddington had set as the minimum living wage for a man, his wife and one child. Of course, it was counterproductive for the widow to earn more than £78 per annum, since if she did so, her pension entitlement ceased.

Some working class widows may have had private incomes from deceased spouses' estates and provided that these incomes did not exceed £78 their circumstances were significantly improved by this legislation. But for the great majority of working class women, the Widows' Pension did not remove their needs to find some kind of employment. Hence those with children under school age were as much in need of the day nursery service after the passage of the Act as they were before it. Consequently, as is reflected in the Association's records, this enlightened legislation had almost no effect on the nurseries' enrolment figures. It was later claimed that "the passing of the Widow's Pension Act practically eliminated this particular class as a Day Nursery case" but the event itself was unremarked in the Association's Annual Reports of 1926-27 and 1927-28.

The second Lang legislation was the Family Endowment Act passed in March, 1927 after bitter debate and protracted legislative difficulty. The Act provided 5s per week for each child under fourteen years living in families receiving the basic wage or less, an amount which Commissioner Piddington now determined to be £4.5.0 per week for a man and his wife, exclusive of children. It was clear that the scheme was conceptualised as an integral part
of industrial policy and wage fixation and it was evident to politicians and wage
earners alike that its real purpose was wage restraint. The scheme was in no
sense a payment for motherhood nor a recognition of the real cost of providing
for children, which at the time of introduction of the payment was probably 11s
per week. Also, despite Lang's loud claims that the Act represented the first
legislation in the world aimed towards the economic independence of mothers,
the provisions of the Act only applied to a small number of people and by 30
June, 1928, only 28,000 claims had actually been granted out of a possible
712,000.28

The Family Endowment Act also went relatively unremarked by the Day
Nursery Association and its provisions also had little impact on the nursery
clientele. Stella Davies remarked in her Annual Report of 1927-28 that

of the 232 mothers on the Nursery rolls for the past 12 months, only
15 were in receipt of State Aid; and but three received payment
under the Child Endowment Act. The Matrons at the Day Nurseries
find that many of the cases eligible for Child Endowment are too
independent to apply; they are usually cases with one child. Others
give as a reason for non-application dislike of filling in the necessary
forms.29

Quite clearly, the 5s per week offered by the state was not sufficient induce-
ment for women to overcome their reluctance to subject their financial affairs
to the searching scrutiny of inquisitorial bureaucrats.

In summary then, up to the end of the Second World War, the cases which
the Association deemed to be mothers "forced to be at work" were widows,
deserted wives, those whose husbands were invalids or alcoholics, and unmarried
mothers who wanted to keep their children with them. Fathers' inability to
earn sufficient income to support their families was only really acceptable
during the extraordinary conditions of the Depression years. The only other
truly acceptable "force" was fathers' absence necessitated by service of King
and Country. During the First World War, the Association noted that "In these
times ... so many more women have to work whilst their menfolk are away
fighting" and similarly during the Second World War that there were "increasing demands made upon the Association". But the Association never really expected that women would voluntarily want to be employed and it assumed that once the crisis, whether of domestic or national origin, was over, the women would happily return to their rightful places at home. The Association never expressed any positive support for women's work in war industries, even though it gratefully accepted additional state subsidies during both world wars. Instead, as is discussed in the next section of this chapter, it saw the additional finance as a hard-won prize to be used to expand its services for those to whom it had always given first priority.

For all of the years under discussion here, the women's work options scarcely changed. In 1927, the General Secretary Stella Davies summarised these as being

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>domestic work</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>factories</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>restaurants</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>machinists, dressmakers etc.</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>charwomen</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hairdressers, office work,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shop assistants, canvassers</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>husbands in hospital</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nor did the women's economic circumstances change. In 1928, Stella Davies observed that

... [Most] of the mothers are employed in domestic work, for which they receive 10/- a day and fares. Of the remainder, the greater number work in factories, or are employed as waitresses, £2 to £2/5/- per week being the average income earned in this manner. From this amount, 17/6 to 25/- is paid for the rent of a room.

Child care expenses claimed another 3/9d per week per child so a waitress with two under school age children earning the maximum income and paying the minimum rent had a disposable income of less than £1 per week. Hence the kinds of extreme poverty observed by the early Matrons of the nurseries did not disappear. As Joan Fry recalled of her student days in the early 1940s
One of the houses where we went there was a dirt floor, no glass in the windows and when we knocked on the door the chooks flew out the window. One child I visited had a very white skin. He lived in a basement flat, under the street level, in one room. The grating was the only light there was. One mother, her husband was in jail, also lived in a basement. She had three children under three, a tin dish to wash the children in, nappies strung all around the basement. She had to cook, sleep, wash all in this one room.33

4.2 Establishing the Nurseries

The factual dates when ideas for new nurseries first appeared, Branch Committees were established, fund raising began and new nurseries were opened are readily obtainable from the Executive Committee Minutes and Annual Reports. Details of the first six nurseries opened by 1930 are given in Table 3. It is clear that, while the first two nurseries opened before 1910 were up and running quickly, later nurseries took much longer to become a reality. The explanations for this lie in practical realities relating to the Association's policy decisions about the location of services and the standards considered necessary for premises. Planning new services always depended on the policy of locating the services as close as possible to working women's homes. Therefore, the first step was to identify a geographical area of need. The next step was to locate either land on which to build a purpose designed centre or an existing structure with adequate yard space which could be converted into a centre. There was always a contradiction between these two steps, since high concentrations of working women with young children were usually found in inner city suburbs. Hence, first, either no land was available or if it was it was prohibitively expensive and second, substantial houses on reasonably large allotments were few and far between. As the city had developed, housing in inner city areas had become predominantly of the terrace or row kind, with virtually no front yard and back yards no wider than five metres. Therefore, if no building site was procurable, the only hope was to find gentlemen's
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of nursery</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date first Committee established</th>
<th>Date nursery opened</th>
<th>Date nursery closed</th>
<th>Lead-up time to opening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Day Nursery</td>
<td>126 Dowling St Woolloomooloo</td>
<td>3 Aug. 1905</td>
<td>4 Dec. 1905</td>
<td>Dec. 1907</td>
<td>4 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27 Rose St, Darlington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forest Lodge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24 Arundel St, Forest Lodge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Woolloomooloo</td>
<td>6 Brougham St, Woolloomooloo</td>
<td>Nov. 1908</td>
<td>21 Jan. 1909</td>
<td>Feb. 1920</td>
<td>2 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anzac Bouffet Domain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dowling St, Woolloomooloo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Chippendale</td>
<td>Louis St, Chippendale</td>
<td>Aug. 1911</td>
<td>Oct. 1916</td>
<td>9 Dec. 1918</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surry Hills</td>
<td>Cnr Riley and Cooper Sts, Surry Hills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Eastern Suburbs</td>
<td>33 Healey St, Paddington</td>
<td>Aug. 1922</td>
<td>29 Nov. 1924</td>
<td>continues</td>
<td>2 years 3 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Paddington from 1955)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Northern Suburbs</td>
<td>8 Rodborough Ave, North Sydney</td>
<td>Nov. 1923</td>
<td>8 Nov. 1926</td>
<td>continues</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Newtown</td>
<td>3 Linthorpe St, Newtown</td>
<td>March 1925</td>
<td>19 Nov. 1930</td>
<td>continues</td>
<td>5 years 8 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
residences which were left over from times when the areas were first settled and which had not yet succumbed to property developers and demolishers. The final step of course, when a suitable prospect had been located, was to ensure that adequate funds were to hand.

4.2.1 The first neighbourhood centres

Woolloomooloo to Forest Lodge

In her first Annual Report in 1906, Mrs Dane noted that the chief problem for the future was

the securing of a proper home for the Nursery. The present quarters in Dowling Street are unsuitable, and far too small for the numbers of children who apply for admission. It is hard to turn them away. A larger number than that at present enrolled could be maintained for the same cost, and it therefore seems unwise to delay in making the necessary change... It has been suggested that perhaps someone might be found who would be willing to erect a Nursery Building as an investment, with the Association as a permanent tenant. The building need not be a costly one, but it should be a large, bright, roomy place, with sufficient ground to enable the little ones to enjoy a life of fresh air and freedom.36

One supporter thought it would be even better still if some generous-minded person would build the building and donate it to the Association.37 However, no such generous person was forthcoming so during 1906 and 1907, the Association explored every other available option in the Woolloomooloo area. A vacant block of land on the corner of Dowling and William Streets was investigated but no purchase eventuated. The City Council was approached with a request for a land grant but this too was unsuccessful. Simultaneously, the search for a suitable house continued. One property in Glenmore Road, Paddington seemed promising but ultimately the Association did not proceed with the purchase as the building required too many alterations and repairs and in any case the Committee was unable to find a guarantor.38 Moreover, the location was not within comfortable walking distance of the women's homes and
places of employment and hence the women might be burdened with the extra expense of tram fares. 39

By mid 1907, it was quite evident that no solution to the accommodation problem could be found in the Woolloomooloo area. After considerable thought, it was realised regretfully that another locality would have to be selected. Sydney was, after all, not short of needy working women in its densely populated inner city areas. Towards the end of 1907, a free-standing stone house was located at 27 Rose Street, Darlington, near the University of Sydney. The house was available on a long lease for a weekly rental of 25/-. 40 One contemporary report described it as "a fairly roomy, old-fashioned place, evidently a relic of old days, when the locality was a desirable residential suburb, not a thickly-populated part of the city as it now is". 41 It was two-storied, with a front verandah on the ground level and a small front garden with "large fig trees for shade and privacy" (Plate 5a). Another contemporary report described the facilities:

A central hall has from it a fair-sized reception and committee room, a dining-room for the officials, a waiting-room for mothers, and the large day nursery. Here, as seen in the picture, are rocking-horses, go-carts, swinging chairs, and kindergarten chairs and tables, also toys and pictures. Most of the furnishings, had begun life in well-to-do Sydney families, and when Reggie had outgrown his Noah's ark, and Mabel had tired of her dolls, they had gone on pursuing careers of usefulness by making the babies of the creche happy ...

Upstairs are the sleeping rooms, with their furnishings of cots, bassinettes, and cradles and also little cane chairs. The matron's bedroom and rooms for the assistants make up the main apartments, whilst the kitchen pantry, bathrooms, a playroom outside for wet days, and a square outside yard for fine weather, provide ample accommodation. There is to be a sandbed where, with spades and buckets, the children can amuse themselves; and the matron has improvised, by means of lime-wash, a hammer and nails, and such like, a second play-house for a change for those who get weary of monotony. 42

Not only were the house and grounds suitable, but the location itself was doubly desirable. First, the relatively grand house survived in an area surrounded by large factories, laundries and clothing manufacturing workrooms
as well as the ordinary working people's terrace houses. Hence, the premises satisfied the criterion of being within walking distance of both the women's homes and their places of employment. Second, in June, 1907, the Kindergarten Union had opened the Golden Fleece Kindergarten at 60 Pine Street, Chippendale. This location was within easy walking distance for young children from 27 Rose Street and there must have been some Committee members who saw the close proximity as the solution to the over-three-years-old problem. Perhaps discussions were initiated by Mrs Dane, who was an Executive Committee member of both the Day Nursery Association and the Kindergarten Union, and who was most interested in the fate of three to five year olds. Whatever did actually transpire, it is evident that the Kindergarten Union agreed to accept older day nursery children, thereby relieving the day nursery nursing staff of responsibility for these children for three hours in the morning. This co-operation, combined with the acquisition of more adequate outdoor play space, allowed the Day Nursery Association to abolish forever its under-three-years-old rule. One contemporary newspaper report noted this desirable outcome with some satisfaction:

A feature of the new building was that it was sufficiently roomy to permit of children being retained after they had reached the age of 3 years. Instead of being discharged, these children were sent to the Golden Fleece Kindergarten in the morning, coming back to the nursery in the afternoon. In this way they were kept off the streets, and were surrounded by a wholesome influence until they were old enough to be admitted to the Public Schools.

The exact date of the removal of the nursery to 27 Rose Street is uncertain but the new nursery was certainly in operation by early February, 1908. Evidently, there was no problem in filling the extra capacity made possible by the new location, since by the following year the Association again had difficulty in accommodating the increasing number of children.

Early in 1909, the Association renewed its approaches to the City Council and began negotiations "to build a model Crèche in Athlone Place." It was
proposed that the Council would finance and build the premises according to plans drawn up by Mr Donald Esplin, an architect engaged by the Association for the purpose and who offered his services free. The Council would then lease the building to the Association charging five per cent of the capital cost of the building as rent. Mr Richard Binnie, husband of one of the Association's Vice Presidents, offered £10 per year for five years towards the rent, provided that five others did also. Three other husbands did come forward to match Mr Binnie's offer - Mr Gilbert Lodge, legal and financial adviser to the Association and married to the Association's Honorary Secretary; Dr E.W. Fairfax, a foundation medical adviser to the Association and married to another of the Association's Vice Presidents; and Dr C. Blackburn, another foundation medical adviser to the Association. However, despite these men's generosity, the proposal fell through, because, as Mrs Lodge commented, "after going into the matter most carefully with the Lord Mayor, it was found that the Council had no power to build a Crèche". The time was evidently not yet ripe for local government willingness and capacity to be involved in day care service provision. It was to be a further thirteen years until Council interest actually assisted in establishing a nursery, and even then the assistance was to be much more modest than that proposed in 1909.

In 1911, the Association received its first state subsidy of £250. This injection of welcome funds enabled the Committee women to consider expanding and improving their service provision. First, given that 27 Rose Street at least continued to be available, and no other options seemed likely, a new five year lease was agreed to and extensive interior and exterior renovations were carried out, necessitating the closure of the nursery for four weeks in March. A separate pantry for infant food preparation was added and another playhouse for older children was built in the back yard. Nevertheless, despite this expenditure, the search for a property to purchase did not cease.
Towards the end of 1913, a house at 24 Arundel Street, Forest Lodge, became available for purchase. The property was of similar dimensions to 27 Rose Street and the house was of a similar substantial kind (Plate 5b). It was situated in "a desirable locality" rather than being closely integrated into the working class community and there was no Free Kindergarten close by. However, the press for ownership was very strong and moreover the Association had amassed a considerable bank balance and hence was in a confident financial position. In these circumstances, policy principles must necessarily be bent when security interests outweighed them. Purchase of the property was justified by the argument that, since the house was located close to a major tramway junction, it was "so central for the mothers". The purchase was made and in October, 1913, the transition to "the fresh, bright, sunny house" took place. The property was completely paid for in seven years and, as there were very few complaints about its adequacy in subsequent years, it proved to be a satisfactory acquisition. With many alterations, it continues today as a day care service.

The second nursery - Woolloomooloo

The removal of the nursery from Woolloomooloo to Darlington at the end of 1907 was a considerable blow to the working women of Woolloomooloo who had learnt to rely on the service. A number were reported to have "followed the nursery to the new house ... preferring to travel the long distance or to move into the vicinity rather than deprive the babies and themselves of the benefits they had been receiving" but the others were left without the safe and relatively inexpensive service to which they had become accustomed. A number of the Committee women, concerned by the loss of the service in the Woolloomooloo area, formed a separate Committee in November, 1908 and pressed on with the hard task of finding suitable premises in Woolloomooloo. In
January, 1908 they succeeded in renting 6 Brougham Street for 25/- per week and within a week they had engaged a Matron, furnished and equipped the building and enrolled their first baby, "a tiny fair mite of sixteen months, and only weighing fifteen pounds". By mid 1909, there were 43 children enrolled and an average daily attendance of sixteen. This grew to an average daily attendance of 25 by 1911. Little is known about 6 Brougham Street or the functioning of this nursery between 1912 and 1917 since, in January, 1912, its independently minded Committee "feeling it could do better work if it were not joined to the Association, decided to secede from the parent body". However, when the Woollahroo Branch agreed to rejoin the Association at the end of 1917, the nursery was still accommodated at 6 Brougham Street, although by this time the premises were in a "very dilapidated condition". The situation was finally relieved by the development of the Welfare Centre at Woollahroo, discussed in the next section of this chapter.

The third nursery - Chippendale to Surry Hills

The second outcome of the increase in available funds which followed the granting of state subsidy in 1911 was the immediate announcement of plans to open a new nursery in Surry Hills. However, by 1911, a suitable property did not appear to exist in this area, neither for purchase nor for rent. In 1912, Mrs Lodge commented gloomily that "Although the matter has been diligently followed up by a specially appointed sub-committee the difficulty has always been - a house - Agents and advertisements have failed to remove this stumbling block". In desperation, the Committee extended its search to the neighbouring suburbs of Camperdown, Alexandria and St Peters but also to no avail. Finally, despite the optimism of another new Committee, the idea was abandoned in 1915.

By 1916 however, there were additional pressures to open a new nursery.
Plate 5a  The second nursery, 27 Rose Street, Darlington, 1908

Plate 5b  24 Arundel Street, Forest Lodge, 1914
Another Committee was formed, strongly motivated by the concern that
during times like the present, when the vigorous young manhood of
the nation is being so sadly depleted, it is almost more incumbent on
us to protect our child life, and help the children through their early
years, thus giving them every chance of growing into healthy men
and women, such as this country so badly needs.64

The following year, encouraged by a promise of an increased government subsidy,
the Association was prepared to settle for less desirable accommodation in the
interests of providing another service.65 It rented two adjacent terrace houses
in Louis Street, Chippendale, which, though "humble" had an airy cot room for
babies and a sunny back yard for older children to play in. The terraces were
located in the heart of a working people's community and in addition they were
sufficiently close to Pine Street to allow the older children to attend the
Golden Fleece Kindergarten.66 The nursery opened in October, 1916 and was
soon operating to its maximum capacity of twenty children a day.67

However, despite an initial state grant of £200 in 1917 to open the
nursery, and a further £200 in 1918 to keep it running, the Association was
discontented with this service.68 The premises were not ideal and concerns
were expressed about the "unhealthy building" and the "trying conditions" for
staff.69 Moreover, the size of the terraces militated against increasing
enrolments hence the cost per child of providing the service was higher than
the Association considered acceptable.70 In this climate of discontent, Mrs
(later Lady) Hugh Dixson's offer rent-free of two adjacent terrace houses on
the corner of Riley and Cooper Streets, Surry Hills, came as a welcome relief.
Under pressure from the Minister of Health to keep Louis Street functioning,
the Association acceded but only until the war finished. Significantly, Louis
Street was closed at the beginning of December, 1918, three weeks after
Armistice Day.71 In the meantime, furniture and effects from Louis Street
were removed to Surry Hills and the new nursery was opened on 8 April, 1918
in an atmosphere of enthusiasm about the concept of Welfare Centres.72
4.2.2 Welfare centres

The idea of Welfare Centres was publicly aired at a widely advertised large meeting held in the Town Hall on 4 November, 1918 for the purpose of establishing the Society for the Welfare of Mothers and Babies. Sidney Innes-Noad, an independent Liberal and recently nominated Member of the Legislative Council, was elected President of this new organisation which was intended to co-ordinate the activities of the various voluntary organisations concerned with health, welfare and education services for women and babies. It has been said of Innes-Noad that he was "not only the best looking man in the House, but a man with the most motherly nature". He believed strongly that the way to build a successful Australia was through ensuring healthy children and that this could be achieved through legislative and moral guidance from the state. However unlike Fred Flowers, a Labor member of the Legislative Council and the state's first Minister for Health, Innes-Noad did not believe that the state should be the major provider of public health services. He believed in the co-operative philanthropy-state model whereby philanthropy undertook service provision with the state's approval and some subsidy. Hence, inside the House he would use his not inconsiderable charm and persuasive powers to argue for government support for the Society and outside the House he was prepared to work in a voluntary capacity to further the Society's aims.

The proposal for a network of Welfare Centres around the state, each under the control of an ATNA nurse who was also a midwife was modelled on the Maternity and Infant Welfare Centres established by the Ministry of Health in England. A copy of its 1919 Memorandum was reprinted by the Welfare Society in 1920 and widely distributed to interested parties. It was envisaged that these centres would provide a comprehensive range of maternal and baby health care services, from home-visiting and advice prior to the baby's birth, to mid-wife delivery of the baby, post-natal home-visiting by trained aides and
subsequently centre-based advisory services to care for the baby's health and nutrition. Pure milk should also be dispensed by these baby clinics. But Innes-Noad's vision was broader. He wanted to extend the service both beyond early infancy and also to the children of working mothers who would find attendance at the clinic difficult to arrange. He proposed airy, attractive buildings "clean and pleasing to the eye" which would contain under the one roof, but each with its separate entrance, a comfortably furnished reception room leading to a bright cheerful clinic, plus a day nursery and a kindergarten, on separate sides of the building. The buildings would be financed by the state but the services would be operated by the respective specialist organisations, namely the Welfare Society, the Day Nursery Association and the Kindergarten Union.

Welfare centre, Woolloomooloo

Innes-Noad's vision was understandably welcomed by the Day Nursery Association which agreed with the fundamental philosophy and which also saw the Welfare Centre idea as a way of overcoming its perennial problems with buildings. Early in 1918, while Forest Lodge Nursery was satisfactorily accommodated, the newly reunited Woolloomooloo Nursery had severe problems "owing to the very dilapidated condition of their premises". Chippendale was threatened with closure and Mrs Dixson's Sydney Medical Mission's terraces had only been made available for one year. In February, 1918, a deputation of nine Association members interviewed J.D. Fitzgerald, then the Minister of Health and a Labor Member of the Legislative Council. Fitzgerald's response was encouraging and it was evident that Innes-Noad's idea of Welfare Centres was being seriously considered by the state. Indeed, there was even a possibility that the state was considering opening its own day nurseries. The Committee responded positively to this idea by immediately suggesting to Fitzgerald that
the Association was willing to open as many nurseries as were required provided that it was given a subsidy of £300 per annum per nursery. However, apart from the grants of £200 to keep Chippendale open and £100 for the new Surry Hills nursery, nothing further came of the suggestion.

Nevertheless, state and public interest in the preservation of child life and the welfare of young children was running at an all-time high in the last year of war carnage and in the immediate post-war years. This interest did ultimately result in permanent homes for the Woolloomooloo and Surry Hills nurseries, though each took some time to achieve. The Woolloomooloo Welfare Centre was the most urgent need, from the perspectives of both the state and the Association. Even before the Royal Society for the Welfare of Mothers and Babies was formally incorporated by a parliamentary Act in 1919, the search began for suitable crown land on which to erect a purpose-designed model Welfare Centre. However, neither the Lord Mayor of Sydney nor the Mayor of Woollahra Council was able to assist. The accommodation problem at Woolloomooloo nursery worsened and in March, 1919, the Association advised the government that it would close the nursery unless some immediate financial assistance was forthcoming. In May, during the worst of the influenza epidemic, the nursery did close but the building was used as a soup and milk depot and "no child belonging to the nursery was being neglected". The Association then threatened the government that unless something was done about the building forthwith, the nursery would be closed within the month and "it would be compelled to advertise closing and reason for so doing in the Press".

Whether as a result of this threat or not, in June, 1919, the government resumed land between Dowling Street, Duke Street and Reid Avenue that had been associated with the proposed Eastern Suburbs Railway. The Public Works Department drew up plans for the Welfare Centre but evidently without
The Association was outraged by both the inadequate size of the block of land and the building plans. It could not see the proposal as being anywhere near adequate to house the three services. Also, it was quite evident that the Public Works Architect knew nothing about day care provision. Ethel Ranken, Woolloomooloo's Honorary Secretary, prepared a statement of what was required for a nursery and submitted it to the Public Works Department. Meanwhile, the Woolloomooloo nursery building continued to deteriorate to the point where, in September, 1919, "one of the ceilings came down, narrowly escaping a child, and the Government's new centre not being ready, it was felt that it would be impossible to hold out any longer". The children were packed off for a month to stay at a cottage at Cronulla kindly loaned by an interested supporter while Ethel Ranken stormed in to interview Innes-Noad. He agreed to use his influence to persuade the state Public Works Department to repair the ceiling and make the building useable again. This was done but in November the owners sold 6 Brougham Street. The nursery was allowed to stay into the new year but with no new centre yet in sight it was finally closed early in March, 1920.

There was no nursery then at Woolloomooloo for four months. Finally, thanks to Innes-Noad, space was found for a nursery in the Red Cross Section of the government owned Anzac Bouffet in the Domain and the nursery re-opened there in July, 1920. The Bouffet was a "big open-air pavilion [which] proved a great success, and one visit to the children shows what a healthy little community is gathered there". It was not however so salubrious for the Matron and staff who lived in, as "The quarters ... were necessarily small" and in fact they were sufficiently unsafe at night that a room elsewhere was rented for them "just for sleeping purposes". The staff however struggled on through 1921 as the new Welfare Centre began to take shape and finally they received their due reward in October when their brand new premises were
ready for occupation. The building was opened on 13 October 1921 by J.J. McGirr, then the Minister for Public Health and Motherhood. The vision had taken over three and a half years to realise yet even when it was ultimately achieved it was flawed. It is not known whether the Public Works Department simply ignored Ethel Ranken's statement of requirements or whether her proposals were themselves inadequate but in any case the staff immediately found the building unworkable and the process of alteration to rectify the design faults began within two months of the opening.

Welfare centre, Surry Hills

The vision of a combined Welfare Centre found a different expression in the row of six terrace houses in Riley Street, Surry Hills, which Mrs Dixson had given to the Welfare Society in August, 1919. Whereas the Woolloomooloo Centre was built by the state on state owned land, the terraces were in the hands of a voluntary society which had only indirect access to state Architect services and the Public Works Department. In November of 1919, Innes-Noad wrote to the Association saying that the development of the terraces as a "model centre seemed a vague proposal" which indeed it did prove to be for quite a while. For the following two and a half years the nursery continued to operate as best it could in the building which

as it stands today, is very trying for those who so ably endeavour to continue the work there. There is no playground at all for the children, and some of the rooms are very dull and cold, and it means continued supervision to keep the babies well and comfortable - the staircase is very steep, and as the cot rooms are upstairs, the running up and down at meal times must be a great tax on the nurses.

However, at last in April, 1921, work on remodelling the terraces began. The Kindergarten section was at the other end of the terrace away from the nursery, and that was remodelled first. The Kindergarten Union agreed to allow the Association to use its remodelled premises until the nursery end was
finished. The nursery then moved twice in seven months, first into the remodelled kindergarten section in October, 1921 and then back into its own end of the terrace in May 1922. Finally, almost four and a half years after Mrs Dixson first offered the terraces to the Association the remodelled Welfare Centre was officially opened by Mrs Thornett, Mrs Dixson's daughter, in June, 1922. Again, the vision was flawed, even at the time of opening, and the General Secretary was instructed to write to the Welfare Society Council "putting before them all the grave faults of the Surry Hills Centre".

By the time the Surry Hills Welfare Centre was opened, there was a new set of National Party Ministers in power and the short-lived innovation of a Ministry of Motherhood disappeared forever. It had in any case been merely a title attached to the Ministry of Public Health for exactly two years while J.J. McGirr was Minister in both the Storey and Dooley Labor governments, between April, 1920 and April, 1922. J.D. Fitzgerald's idea that "it might be necessary to create a separate Mothers' and Children's Department ... under one Minister, either the Minister for Education or the Minister for Health" never eventuated. Indeed the old guard, Flowers, Fitzgerald and Innes-Noad were themselves coming to the ends of their own roads. Fitzgerald died in 1922, Flowers in 1928 and Innes-Noad in 1931. Their powers were diminished and government interest in saving babies waned in the face of the more pressing economic problems of the 1920s. There were not to be any more combined Welfare Centres and in any case, as subsequent events showed, the combined arrangement turned out to be fraught with difficulties when it required co-ordination between three voluntary organisations each interested in its own territorial rights. As simple a matter as a single gas meter for the whole building proved to be a continuous irritation.
4.2.3 More neighbourhood centres

Given the experiences with rented premises, combined endeavours with other voluntary organisations and dealings with government departments to build or develop new buildings, it is perhaps understandable that in its next efforts for expansion the Association looked to its own resources to purchase suitable premises. After all, the relatively tranquil operation of the Forest Lodge nursery provided a clear guiding star. An extra push in this direction was provided by the Department of Public Health, which, after the state's involvement in developing the Welfare Centres, had established plumbing and sanitation regulations for such public institutions as the nurseries. If the Association was to be required to install certain costly features, then it was preferable to do this on its own premises rather than someone else's. Hence, although Stella Davies asserted that "the purchase of a property was forced on the Association", ownership beckoned as the desirable way to proceed. Three more nurseries were achieved during the 1920s which, together with the earlier three, comprised all but one of the total number of nurseries established to care for babies.

Eastern Suburbs (Paddington)

Eastern Suburbs nursery (the name was changed to Paddington in 1955) was quickest off the ground, taking just over two years from idea to reality. This achievement was undoubtedly assisted by municipal government support which both initiated the idea and financially helped to make it possible. In 1922, a singularly active and energetic committee was formed which mostly comprised women from Paddington Municipality but also included others from Woollahra, Waverley and Sydney City. Professional interest was present from the outset - Mrs W. Cherry, a practising dentist, endowed the first cot and became the Association's Honorary Dentist; Miss Smythe, a double certificated
ATNA nurse worked hard in fundraising and became the nursery's first Matron; and Dr Bowman volunteered to be the Honorary Doctor, a position he maintained for over twenty years. Three months after the Committee was formed it met with the Executive of the Association to see what help the Association could give it in opening a nursery. The Committee had already raised £100 and had promises of £100 each from Paddington, Woollahra and Waverley Municipal Councils. But, as usual, premises presented a problem. The Committee's ambitions were high - it would have liked to buy Ormond House from the Government. This was out of the question so the search began for a suitable property to purchase. Some months elapsed as various solutions were attempted. One property was located in Oxford Street in July, 1923, which although it was in disrepair the Association was prepared to lease. However, negotiations fell through in August and despite efforts to persuade the government to make accommodation available in the Army's Victoria Barracks, nothing eventuated. In October "The Grange" at 33 Heeley Street, Paddington came to notice. Inspection indicated that it was suitably located and satisfied the indoor and outdoor space criteria. It was however expensive and the Eastern Suburbs Committee demurred, feeling it could not afford the cost. The Executive Committee agreed to back the Eastern Suburbs Committee if it did proceed with the purchase and there the matter rested over the Christmas period. In February, 1924, the decision to purchase was taken. Although the vendor, the Permanent Trustee Co, raised the price the following month, the purchase proceeded, £700 being paid as deposit with the balance to be paid over three years at 6½ per cent interest. Renovations and alterations cost a further £1250 and the nursery was officially opened by E.B. Harkness, Secretary, Department of Public Health on 29 November, 1924. One year later, only £800 remained of the debt, which means that in something less than four years the Eastern Suburbs Committee
had raised almost £2500. However, that remaining £800 was not reduced for the next 30 years. Presumably the Permanent Trustees were prepared to accept the change in purchase conditions and collect interest over these years rather than repayment of the principal. From the Association's point of view of course it was a shrewd financial move, since the value of £800 when repaid in 1955 and 1956 was considerably less than it was in the mid 1920s.

Northern Suburbs

The need for a nursery on the north side of the harbour was suggested by the discovery that mothers who lived there but worked on the south side found "the distance to be travelled too great, and they had discontinued calling at the Nursery". In the middle of 1922, Executive Committee member Mrs McElhone, newly installed as Sydney City's Lady Mayoress, was asked to correspond with her counterpart in North Sydney "with a view to ascertaining the feeling of the North Sydney residents as regards a day nursery in the locality". Nothing eventuated however until after the Association's Annual Meeting in 1923 when a committee was formed to begin fundraising. North Sydney Council was approached again for support as were Mosman and Willoughby Councils but there was no response. Despite repeated appeals to these Councils, no interest in supporting a day care centre could be generated and in October 1925, both North Sydney and Mosman Councils were reported to have actively rejected the idea. Thus, the task for the Northern Suburbs Committee was to be a longer and harder one than that of the Eastern Suburbs Committee.

Throughout 1924 and 1925, the Northern Suburbs Committee laboured to raise funds and find a suitable property to purchase. In this case the problem was not so much unavailability as selectivity on the Association's part. In all, six properties were inspected and rejected in 1924 and 1925 and the Committee
became desperate.\textsuperscript{119} It investigated the costs involved in buying land and erecting its own building but an expenditure of £3500 to £4000 seemed well beyond what could be afforded.\textsuperscript{120} At last, in June, 1926 "Tramore" in Rodborough Ave, North Sydney was found. It was available at the reasonable price of £2600, was suitably located and as the building was "of one storey, facing east, with a small sunny garden on either side" and it needed only an added verandah extension to provide adequate space, it was purchased on £1100 deposit, the balance to be paid over three years at 6½ per cent.\textsuperscript{121} The nursery was ready to receive children five months after the decision to purchase was taken and it was officially opened by Sir Clifton Love on 11 December, 1926, three years after its committee began work.\textsuperscript{122} The debt was substantially reduced to £750 in 1933 and after 1936 there were regular annual repayments of £30 until the remaining £360 was paid out as a lump sum in 1950.\textsuperscript{123}

**Newtown**

The third nursery initiated in the 1920s was eventually opened at 3 Linthorpe Street, Newtown on 19 November, 1930 by Lady Game, the Governor's wife and Patroness of the Association. It was to be the last nursery which, from the very beginning, included babies under two years as well as older children in its care, until Hillsdale was opened in 1976.\textsuperscript{125} It brought the total number of nurseries to six. It had taken six years from the time Stella Davies reported that "Representations have ... been made from the Erskineville-Alexandria district of the urgent need there is for a nursery in that densely populated locality, and it is hoped that the Association will be enabled to render the help asked for in the near future".\textsuperscript{126} However, despite constant pressure from the local Child Welfare Officer, a Department of Labour and Industry Inspector and members of the Sydney City Mission, the University
Women's Settlement and the Church of England Deaconesses, for four years the Association took no action. It assiduously made "enquiries and expeditions into this neighbourhood and surrounding localities. Every possible source of information has been examined". The evidence of need for a nursery was overwhelming in this area of dense concentration of factories. Moreover, the Association found that Sunbeam Kindergarten at Alexandria was taking children aged eighteen months "because there seem[s] to be no other place for them to go". In addition, local support was strong since even "The men employed at the Eveleigh Workshops have promised to contribute regularly when a nursery is established". Yet, despite all this, nothing happened.

The reasons for the delay are unclear but three main factors can be identified. First, the Association wanted financial support from the factory owners and the local councils. But, as so often was the case, appeals to these worthy citizens fell on deaf ears. Second, the evidence of need in all suburbs from Alexandria through Erskineville and Newtown to Chippendale was so great that it created indecision about where to look for premises. Third, and probably most importantly, Lady MacCallum wanted a well-built property "so constructed as to entail but a minimum of expenditure for repairs". Newtown was the only area in which such properties existed or where there was the possibility of land on which to build such premises. So finally, at the end of 1928, under Lady MacCallum's pressure for action and with her offer to finance the purchase, Newtown was selected. It was, after all, serviced by two tram routes, a railway station and a bus service linking Erskineville and Alexandria.

Once the decision was made, there were then the usual problems in finding a suitable property, either for purchase or for rent. No building sites were available either. Eventually, after much hard bargaining, Dr McClelland accepted Lady MacCallum's offer of £3500 for his Linthorpe Street property on
£1500 deposit with the balance of £2000 to be paid over three years at 6½ percent interest. He vacated the premises in May, 1930 and the nursery was opened six months later. Again, the pattern of non-repayment of the mortgage was repeated but this time there were two major reductions in 1939 and 1940 and the debt was entirely paid off by 1944. None of the records actually say whether Lady MacCallum was the mortgagor so it is but a speculation to suggest that the relatively rapid repayment of debt on this nursery was a function of her close involvement with its purchase. But it is tempting to connect the two facts together.

4.3 Nursery Schools

The experimental nursery school begun at Woolloomooloo Day Nursery in October, 1931, marked a permanent change in the focus of the Association's service provision. The development of nursery schools and nursery school teacher training is discussed in Chapter 8. Here it is important to note that, after the Newtown nursery was finally opened, no more day nurseries which catered for the whole age range six weeks to six years were established until 1976. Instead, the Association's entire energies and resources were concentrated on introducing a system of Nursery Schools for two to five year olds.

During the 1930s, as Table 4 shows, attention was first directed to the six existing day nurseries, and by 1938 a nursery school, staffed by qualified nursery school teachers, had been established at each of these centres. This was not without some difficulty, since, not only did the Association have to set up its own teacher training program, but also its few committed Committee women had to convince many very doubtful other Committee women and also resistant nursing staff that, for example "swings, sandboxes, slides, toys and play material, are necessities, not luxuries for the development and training of the children" and that small tables and individual chairs must replace "the long
Table 4: The Establishment of Nursery Schools at Existing Nurseries, 1931-1938

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day nursery</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date nursery opened</th>
<th>Date nursery school opened</th>
<th>Lead-up time to opening</th>
<th>Financial assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Woolloomooloo</td>
<td>Welfare Centre Dowling St, Woolloomooloo</td>
<td>October, 1921</td>
<td>October, 1931</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1931-1933 £521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carnegie Corp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Surry Hills</td>
<td>cnr Riley &amp; Cooper Sts, Surry Hills</td>
<td>December, 1918</td>
<td>January, 1936</td>
<td>4 yrs</td>
<td>Carnegie Corp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Eastern Suburbs</td>
<td>33 Heeley St, Paddington</td>
<td>November, 1924</td>
<td>October, 1937</td>
<td>6 yrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Forest Lodge</td>
<td>24 Arundel St, Forest Lodge</td>
<td>October, 1913</td>
<td>January, 1938</td>
<td>7 yrs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The introduction of nursery schools was first proposed by Lady MacCallum in February, 1921 but ten years elapsed before the first nursery school was opened.
cumbersome tables and stools. These changes cost money and so too did the reconstruction of existing facilities, such as those which were undertaken at the trail-blazing Woolloomooloo nursery:

Bathroom and lavatory accommodation has been enlarged and improved as the teaching of personal cleanliness plays an important part in the training of Nursery School children. Low basins and taps have been installed in the bathrooms, so that the children may learn to wash themselves. A foot bath and drinking fountain were also installed. Towel rails with a special place for each child’s towel and fixtures for their tooth brushes were supplied ... A new sand box, the cover of which can be used as a slide, has been made. New lockers have been put in for the children’s clothes, so that each child may put away his or her own belongings, self-help being taught in every way to the children. New crockery and cutlery have been purchased also ... new stretchers and chairs.

The great majority of the Committee women were eventually converted to the new approach and in any case, those whose primary interest was in the services for babies could still work for the six older nurseries. The new future was in nursery schools and, as Table 5 shows, by the time the Second World War ended, six of these had been established between 1936 and 1944 and four more that were being planned would eventually begin operation. Five others which were proposed never eventuated. Those that did proceed to completion did so in a variety of ways.

It is beyond the scope of this thesis to detail the establishment of the nursery schools which resulted from vigorous state and public interest in under school age children in the late Second World War years. Suffice it here to say that, in 1944, the New South Wales government almost doubled its subsidy to the Association and that after the war this subsidy continued at an equivalent level. In addition, in 1942 local government authorities at Marrickville and Waverley became directly involved in service provision, establishing a pattern for the future. The Commonwealth also became a sponsor of day care services in 1943, instigating nursery schools at Kingsford, Katoomba, Lithgow, St Marys, Forbes and Lidcombe but only assisting with
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nursery school</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date first proposed</th>
<th>Date nursery school opened</th>
<th>Lead-up time to opening</th>
<th>Date nursery school closed</th>
<th>Funding assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Erskineville</td>
<td>88 Swanson St, Erskineville</td>
<td>June, 1936</td>
<td>July, 1937</td>
<td>1 yr</td>
<td>Continues</td>
<td>1943 War-time extensions Commonwealth Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Redfern</td>
<td>143 Pitt St, Redfern</td>
<td>May, 1937</td>
<td>June, 1938</td>
<td>1 yr</td>
<td>Continues</td>
<td>1938-40 gift from J.P. Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Balmain</td>
<td>Beatty St, Balmain</td>
<td>June, 1939</td>
<td>Never opened</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Land sold, 1952</td>
<td>1940-42 gift from C.P. Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Lithgow</td>
<td>Bayonet St, Lithgow</td>
<td>February, 1943</td>
<td>Never opened</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Abandoned, May, 1944</td>
<td>1944 Commonwealth Treasurer refused assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. St Marys</td>
<td></td>
<td>February, 1943</td>
<td>Never opened</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Abandoned, 1944</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Mosman</td>
<td>33 Brierley St, Cremorne</td>
<td>May, 1943</td>
<td>May, 1944</td>
<td>1 yr</td>
<td>Continues</td>
<td>1945 Mosman Municipal Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery school</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Date first proposed</td>
<td>Date nursery school opened</td>
<td>Lead-up time to opening</td>
<td>Date nursery school closed</td>
<td>Funding assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Herne Bay</td>
<td>Community Settlement, rear 142 Belmore Rd, Riverwood</td>
<td>May, 1946</td>
<td>January, 1947</td>
<td>½ yr</td>
<td>Continues</td>
<td>1947 onwards NSW Housing Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Forbes</td>
<td></td>
<td>September, 1944</td>
<td>Never opened</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Abandoned, 1946</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Goulburn</td>
<td>McKell Place, Goulburn</td>
<td>March, 1944</td>
<td>January, 1956</td>
<td>10 yrs</td>
<td>Continues</td>
<td>1947 McKell friends gifts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Melanie</td>
<td>134 Burren St, Newtown</td>
<td>June, 1947</td>
<td>September, 1957</td>
<td>10 yrs</td>
<td>Continues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
centres at Kingstord, Katoomba and Erskineville and withdrawing as soon as the war was over. Some comment however is relevant about the two nursery schools which were established by the Association before the war began.

**Erskineville**

The idea for a nursery at Erskineville was first proposed in June, 1936 and the decision that the nursery would not take babies was made two months later. The property at 88 Swanson Street was quickly found and it was purchased outright for £1300. It opened in July, 1937 without ceremony, completely overshadowed by the exciting Redfern development. Erskineville was however a true McMillan nursery school, since Mr H.H. McNall, husband of the Erskineville Committee President was a dedicated gardener. Hence a feature of this centre was that very few of our activities take place within doors. As well as play (both free and organised) the children take all their meals, and their sleep in the garden; in very hot or wet weather, they are still able to be out a great deal because of ... an open air shelter.

Erskineville remained a much overshadowed centre until it was completely rebuilt in 1946-47 and it became the second most valuable property owned by the Association.

**Redfern**

In May, 1937, Mr and Mrs James P. Johnson made "the most magnificent gift ever ... [in] bestowing a block of land, with residence for staff, buildings for children and playground, all completely equipped, with the purpose of establishing a Model Nursery Centre." The gift was valued at £10,000 in 1939. Miss Mary Bird, the newly arrived Superintendent of the Nursery School Training Centre supervised the planning and equipment of the centre. Redfern was opened by the Premier, B.S. Stevens in June, 1938. It
accommodated 80 children aged from 18 months.\textsuperscript{151} Just before his death at the end of 1939, Mr Johnson made a further gift of a terrace of five houses in Douglas Street. These adjoined the Pitt Street property. This gift provided the solution to the Association's problem of housing its growing Teacher Training Centre. In a sequential set of moves at the end of 1940, two of the Douglas Street houses were altered to accommodate babies, thereby allowing "Nurse, Babies and equipment [to be] taken over by Redfern".\textsuperscript{152} This released space at the Newtown nursery for Miss Bird and the students to be removed from the Woolloomooloo nursery. Thus, by February, 1941, Redfern became a nursery with babies, Newtown nursery was a nursery school only, and the Training College became permanently located at Newtown.
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CHAPTER FIVE

FINANCING THE ENTERPRISE

The Association has always been a registered charity and since 1924 also a limited liability non-profit company. As such it has therefore been subject to whatever Charitable Collections and Companies Acts were current and these legislations defined organisation and management structures and allowable activities. It may be thought that, as a charity, the Association would be wholly dependent on charitable acts of giving and that, as a non-profit company, it did not make any profit. Each of these notions is misleading and neither reflects the true nature of the income sources and business operations of the enterprise. Like most other charitable organisations in Australia, while donations comprise some proportion of income, funds are also derived from fees for services and government grants.¹ The origins of the latter lie in the country's foundation as a convict colony for which the British Government was wholly responsible. Initially all services perforce were provided by the local authorities and in 1818 the pattern of government subsidy for charitable welfare organisations was set when the Benevolent Society of New South Wales attracted Governor Macquarie’s support and achieved a land grant, a government financed building and a financial subsidy which by 1837 was £1 for each £1 raised by private donors.² Since that time most if not all major charities have sought and usually received some form of government financial support.

The conception of the Association as a non-profit company similarly obscures the real business activities which were necessary if the Association was to survive. Like any commercial enterprise, it had in the first place at least to balance its expenditure with its income or it would have ceased to exist. Therefore, its fundraising activities had to be sufficiently productive to
cover the expenses incurred. In the second place, if the enterprise was to expand so that it could serve a larger proportion of the community, the Association had either to make a surplus from its existing services or increase its fundraising activities or decrease its expenditure or implement some combination of these. As is known, the Association not only survived but grew into a significant empire which still continues. The techniques used to achieve this satisfactory outcome are then of particular interest and are the subject of this chapter.

In day care service provision generally, there are three possible primary sources of income - families' payments of fees for services; charitable donations of money, services or in kind; and government subsidy where government includes all three levels (local, state and Commonwealth) and subsidy includes direct money grants and indirect subsidy through relief from rates and taxes. In addition, surplus capital may accumulate and secondary sources of income may be derived from investments, bank loans and overdrafts. On the other side of the coin, expenditure directly related to the day-to-day operation of day care centres primarily originates from three sources - staff salaries, wages and associated on-costs such as workers' compensation and long service leave provision; the purchase or renting of buildings and their equipment and maintenance; and costs directly related to the children in terms of food, clothing, medical supplies and play equipment. There are also administrative costs, for example office supplies, postal and telephone charges and if an organisation is relatively large, office staff may also be employed whose functions are purely administrative and not directly involved in face-to-face care of children. As in any business, income and expenditure must at least balance for a service to survive. If there is a profit in a given year then the service has the luxury of deciding how to spend the surplus money - whether on staff, premises, children or administration. If there is a loss, then efforts must
be made to restore the balance - whether by seeking more income from any or all of the income sources, reducing expenditure in any or all of the four areas of cost or by some combination of the two.

While the preceding summary sounds simple, deciding the relative weightings to be given to each aspect of what is in fact a complex operation is not so easy. In an ideal world with no financial restrictions, difficult choices do not have to be made. But in the real world where money is a finite commodity, decisions have to be made which necessarily favour one aspect of an operation often at the expense of another. When the "business" is a human service, the choices to be made are often invidious and at every turn there are emotional undertones. When the service is entirely operated by women for women and their children, it is particularly vulnerable to subtle pressures exerted by the "compassion trap". In the present case, the Executive Committee women, whose comfortable lives were on the whole made possible by their husbands, fathers or other male relatives, held absolute power over decisions which dramatically affected the lives of other women and their children. For example, they determined the numbers, salaries, wages and working conditions of their staff. If staff numbers were low, salaries and wages a mere pittance and working hours long, then the life circumstances of the women employed by the Association were correspondingly depressed. One way to improve these conditions was by increasing income. The Executive could achieve this by pressing governments harder, by increasing charitable fundraising efforts or by increasing the fees for service. If governments were not responsive and fundraising was ineffective then the only remaining avenue was to increase fees. In this case, an extra charge pressed heavily on low-earning working women and reduced their life circumstances and the quality of their children's lives. On the other hand, another way to improve staff conditions would be to reduce expenditure on one or all three of the other cost
components, namely the quality of premises, the nature and quality of the services for children and administrative demands. In this case, the staff might be better paid or work shorter hours or there might be more staff for the task, but the buildings would deteriorate, they might not be heated, the children might lack food or equipment or the staff might have additional clerical duties. Balancing these factors is a continuing tension in day care provision, and it is particularly stressful when income is insufficient to cover the costs of all aspects of service provision adequately.

Given that the Association annually published detailed statements of income and expenditure, it has been possible to analyse both the relative proportions of income derived from the three major sources and the relative proportion of expenditure on the four major components of service provision. The analyses reported here examine first, trends in community attitudes to responsibility for childrearing and second, trends in the costs of day care service provision. There were a number of assumptions. First, it was assumed that the amounts of income derived from a given source reflected the degree of responsibility or service provision accorded to that source. In addition, it was assumed that, at any given time, the total amount of income and the relative proportions of income derived from various sources would indicate prevailing community attitudes towards the service and also, that an examination of both total and proportionate incomes over time would indicate changes, if any, in those prevailing attitudes. Second, it was assumed that the amounts of income expended on different components of service provision reflected the degree of importance accorded to those components by the Association. Therefore, in a similar manner, it was assumed that at any given time, the total expenditure and the relative proportions expended on different components of service provision would reflect priorities given to those aspects of the service and/or requirements forced on the Association by external factors,
particularly government legislation and also, that an examination of both total and proportionate expenditures over time would indicate changes, if any, in those attitudes and requirements. Third, it was assumed that the relationship between income and expenditure would indicate the viability of the Association as a business enterprise. Therefore, examination of this relationship at a given time would reflect the match between the Association's ambitions and the degree of community support it received and also, that an examination of the relationship over time would reflect adjustments to that match as either the Association changed its ambitions or community ideas influenced the Association initiatives. Over the years the Association's accounting procedures changed somewhat as did the ways in which income and expenditure were reported. From 1905-06 to 1917-18 the Annual Reports published detailed statements of Revenue and Expenditure for each financial year (1 July to 30 June). In the 1918-19 report, after the Association had revised its accounting procedures and established its central office, a balance sheet stating the Association's liabilities and assets was introduced. This balance sheet has been published for all years thereafter. Also in 1918-19, two different statements of annual income and expenditure were reported - first, an account of receipts and payments for each nursery separately and also for the Association as a whole and second, a statement of revenue. This method of reporting continued to 1940-41 after which date reporting for the Association as a whole was reduced to the balance sheet statement of liabilities and assets and an income and expenditure account which used broad descriptive categories rather than the previously detailed itemisation. However, separate listings of receipts and payments for individual nurseries continued until 1963-64.

Despite the changes in reporting techniques, it is believed that the categories of income and expenditure used in the analyses discussed in this chapter have been consistently identified. Definitions of those categories are
given in Appendix I. It is inevitable that there will be some minor inaccuracies since, when a new direction was begun, it often took a while for income and expenditure related to this initiative to be separated out from the general accounts. These errors mostly concern the Nursery School Training Centre. Also, some difficulty was experienced in determining classification of expenditure on buildings since deposits, mortgage interest and repayments, building repairs, rates, taxes and in later years depreciation were in some years debited to nurseries individually, in some years to the Association as a whole, and in others not itemised sufficiently to determine where they had been attributed. For the purposes of discussion in the present context, it was decided to include all identifiable building costs as nursery costs and hence on occasions the totals reported here differ from those given in the Annual Reports. In addition, financial information up to 1955 is presented here, so that trends which were apparent by 1945 may be placed properly in perspective.

3.1 Sources of Income

As mentioned previously, there were three major sources of income available to the Association, namely its own fundraising, government subsidy and fees for service. Annual incomes from each of these sources are given in Appendix I Table 1. These incomes fluctuated from year to year for a variety of reasons and hence, in order to identify trends over time, incomes from each source were summed for five year periods beginning in 1905-10. The total incomes from all sources in those five year periods up to 1955 are given in Table 6. Since money values changed over time, direct comparisons of the total given in Table 6 are not particularly useful. Therefore, it was decided to calculate the relative percentages of income derived from each source within each five year period. These percentages are shown in Table 7. It is stressed that the percentages shown at each time point are relative to each other and that they give no indication of actual monetary values at that time.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Individual capital donations</th>
<th>Entrepreneurial activities</th>
<th>Organisation capital donations</th>
<th>Commercial services</th>
<th>Business activities</th>
<th>Total Association</th>
<th>Fees for Services</th>
<th>Government subsidy</th>
<th>Total income TOTAL INCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1905-10</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
<td>778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911-15</td>
<td>1201</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>2078</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916-20</td>
<td>2043</td>
<td>1147</td>
<td>1419</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>5228</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>2596</td>
<td>2596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921-25</td>
<td>3365</td>
<td>5222</td>
<td>2275</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1211</td>
<td>12107</td>
<td>4176</td>
<td>4176</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926-30</td>
<td>5333</td>
<td>5793</td>
<td>2670</td>
<td>5281</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>19962</td>
<td>7621</td>
<td>7621</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931-35</td>
<td>2414</td>
<td>4302</td>
<td>2793</td>
<td>5189</td>
<td>1643</td>
<td>16293</td>
<td>5603</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>5742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936-40</td>
<td>9411</td>
<td>8371</td>
<td>2355</td>
<td>8262</td>
<td>1128</td>
<td>2923</td>
<td>10438</td>
<td>1163</td>
<td>11581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941-45</td>
<td>15410</td>
<td>1679</td>
<td>16383</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>33542</td>
<td>21420</td>
<td>1694</td>
<td>23114</td>
<td>1698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946-50</td>
<td>24087</td>
<td>1660</td>
<td>9833</td>
<td>3161</td>
<td>38791</td>
<td>71041</td>
<td>7403</td>
<td>78444</td>
<td>8713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951-55</td>
<td>43687</td>
<td>1174</td>
<td>4305</td>
<td>2275</td>
<td>51441</td>
<td>195323</td>
<td>7017</td>
<td>202340</td>
<td>21513</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: Details were available for 1905-06 and 1908-09 only

Note 2: Excludes 1942-43 since insufficient details were available

Note 3: Entrepreneurial activities were included with individual capital donations after 1941
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Individual Capital donations</th>
<th>Entrepreneurial activities</th>
<th>Organisation capital donations</th>
<th>Commercial services</th>
<th>Business activities</th>
<th>Total Association</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Total fees for services</th>
<th>Government subsidy</th>
<th>Total government subsidy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1905-10</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911-15</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916-20</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921-25</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926-30</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931-35</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936-40</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941-45</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946-50</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951-55</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: Details were available for 1905-06 and 1908-09 only
Note 2: Excludes 1942-43 since insufficient details were available
Note 3: Entrepreneurial activities were included with individual capital donations after 1941
5.1.1 Fundraising

Inspection of Table 7 shows that, until the Second World War, the Association's fundraising was the largest single source of income for the operation. Until 1911 when the first state subsidy was received, the Association supplied almost 90 percent of the total revenue. From 1911 to 1940, the proportion of income provided by fundraising remained relatively stable, comprising between 53 and 61 percent of the total in each five-year period. The lowest point was in the period 1931 to 1935 when the worst effects of the economic depression were biting hardest into the available surplus capital of bourgeois philanthropists. Fundraising recovered as a source of income after 1936 but from 1940 "The many appeals brought about by the War ... made the work of raising funds very difficult." Moreover, after rationing and transport restrictions were introduced "all evening functions were necessarily abandoned." Other fundraising activities were substituted but, as Table 7 shows, the decline in fundraising as an income source, which began during the Second World War, continued after the war was over. By 1951-55, fundraising activities produced only 13 percent of the Association's total income.

Voluntary organisations such as the Association, which are both registered charities and limited liability companies, have two major avenues of fundraising open to them. First, there is direct giving which is essentially of two kinds. One may be called capital donations, where capital comprises both money and property. Money can be given in small or large amounts in the form of subscriptions, gifts for general or specific purposes or legacies in wills. Property can also be given in small or large amounts in the form of foodstuffs, toys, clothes, household equipment, land and buildings. The second kind of direct giving may be called labour donations, by which is meant giving one's time, energy and skills in mending, making, transporting, building, caring for people, organising, selling and so on. Some labour donations do not produce
real money but instead save the recipient organisation from expending its funds on paid services. Such volunteer services are usually of inestimable value and they are not recorded on either side of a financial balance sheet. Other labour donations, particularly where the volunteer services are provided for selling a product of some kind, as in canteens, tuck shops, jumble sales, fetes, street collections or entertainments of various kinds, do produce real money and hence are included in financial statements as income. The second major fund raising avenue is through conventional business activities as an organisation acquires capital as both money and property. Accumulated funds can be invested, properties can be bought and rented or sold for profit.

All of these avenues were open to the Association and it is of some interest to analyse the relative emphases given to each of these different forms of fundraising over time. Of course, actual activities do not always fall neatly into the categories defined above since, for example, an Honorary Solicitor may act without payment to do the conveyancing in property purchases or people volunteering of their services to organise a fete or card party may also contribute goods of different kinds. Given this consideration and the specific categories the Association itself used at different periods, it has not been possible to identify all funds raised according to the spectrum of techniques outlined above. However, for the period 1905 to 1940, five consistently defined sources were identifiable. Two comprised capital donations, on the one hand by individuals and on the other by other charitable organisations. Two more comprised entrepreneurial fundraising activities, one in the form of art unions and a variety of entertainments such as balls, fetes, theatre performances, card parties and the other in the form of commercial services such as canteens and jumble sales. The fifth source is money raised by the Association's business activities and includes rent, interest on investments and profit on sale of properties. From 1941 to 1955, only four distinct sources are identifiable, since
individual capital donations and funds raised through entertainments were combined to form one category. The other three categories remained the same.

The relative percentages of total revenue derived from each of the five fundraising sources are given in Table 7 and are shown graphically in Figure 1. Inspection of the figure indicates that there were significant changes in the nature of the Association's fundraising activities over the years. Up to 1925, capital donations and entrepreneurial activities were the most productive sources of income. Then from the 1926-30 period up to the end of the Second World War, commercial services became a major income earner. Ordinary business activities only ever comprised a small percentage of the total income, at most six to seven percent for the decade 1916 to 1925.

**Capital donations**

Until 1920, direct individual and organisational capital donations comprised approximately 40 percent of total revenue. After 1920, these money gifts, while still being made and indeed increasing in value, progressively accounted for less of the total income until, in the depression period 1931-35, direct giving comprised less than 20 percent of the total. There was a minor recovery in the 1936-40 period but thereafter capital donations ceased to be a major income source. In later years there were some substantial individual money donations, often made anonymously, and also several large property gifts, but, as a general rule, this Association was not the recipient of large sums produced by wealthy philanthropists. In this, of course, the Association has been perhaps little different from most other Australian charities since, on the whole, this country has not produced many Carnegies and Rockefellers. Such endowments as were made over the years were usually very small beer compared with the amounts needed to provide the services. Efforts were made to encourage
FIGURE 1  Income from fundraising sources as percentage of total income, in five year periods, 1905-10 to 1951-55
enthusiasts to endow a cot, that is, for an individual or group to make an annual donation sufficient to cover the cost of keeping one child for a year. This donation could be wholly in money or partly in money and partly in clothing, foodstuffs or household linen. However, while some cots were supported in this way by individuals, for the most part endowed cots were a result of voluntary work groups called Circles, discussed in the next section.

**Entrepreneurial activities**

Until 1940, money raised by entrepreneurial activities was a major income source. It was maximum in the first five years, accounting for 38 percent of the total. It was significant again between 1921 and 1925, raising over one quarter of the total revenue. However, the Second World War severely curtailed these activities and they never recovered to the same vigour in the post war period.

**Entertainments**

Among the best money-makers were theatrical performances, for which the players offered their services free or at a cost sufficient only to cover expenses. Audience tickets were priced high as the proceeds were for charity. A single matinee in November, 1921, netted £800 of which £500 was immediately placed in an interest-bearing deposit "with a view to opening a new nursery which the Association hope to do in the very near future".8 Another matinee performance in October, 1925 raised almost £700.9 Fetes held in the grounds of private houses continued to be profitable, one in 1927 netting £500.10 Balls and dances were always popular, two organised by the Motion Picture Distributors in the 1926 and 1927 seasons netting over £300 and £200 respectively.11 On a smaller scale, individuals held card-parties and afternoon teas for their separate nurseries, the proceeds being pooled in the Association's central account. Income raised from all these sources accounted for some 15
percent of the total income in each five year period up to 1940, after which
time this funding source cannot be separated from capital donations.

Art Unions

In 1917-18 Chippendale Committee organised an Art Union (raffle) for
which the prize was £25 donated by an interested supporter. This too was a
profitable undertaking as it netted £500. In 1924, when all avenues of fund-
raising were being activated in the expansionary drive, another Art Union was
launched in great hope and with a projected closing date in November 1925. No
details of the prizes on this occasion could be located but it is clear that
this was to be a much bigger operation than the previous one. In March, 1925
a male secretary was employed to supervise the project. His importance may
be gauged by his salary which was equivalent to that of the General
Secretary. Members began to sell the 112,000 tickets which had been printed.
But progress was slow and eight months after the launch, the Executive
Committee sounded desperate. With the closing date nearing, almost 80
percent of the tickets were still in circulation. Perhaps the prizes were simply
not attractive. Perhaps the male organiser did not possess the requisite entre-
preneurial skills. Whatever the reason, the Executive decided to move things
along by appointing a second, more experienced organiser, at more than three
times the salary currently being paid. An extension of the closing date was
also necessary and this was sought and granted. In the end, the Art Union
was enormously successful, raising over £1000, the largest single amount yet.
Half of this money was invested in War Loan Bonds at 6 percent interest and
the other half used in the North Sydney property purchase. But it had taken
almost two years from the floating of the idea to the achievement of this
result and the amount raised was not in fact much more than the amount raised
by the single matinee performance in 1921. Moreover, the time, effort and
anxiety expended in the achievement made this avenue of fundraising a poor
cousin indeed. The experience was not one to be repeated.

Circles

The concept of young women in between school and marriage getting together for a semi-social gathering, to share gossip while plying their needles and crochet hooks in a good cause, was a well-entrenched custom by 1905. These work groups became known as Circles and the Association advocated their formation as auxiliary committees for the nurseries. Their chief function, as defined in the Rules for the Formation of Circles (Plate 6) was to maintain a cot at the nursery and the baby who occupied the cot. The first group was formed in January, 1906 by young women living at Beecroft, and by the end of 1906 there were six Circles in various suburbs of the city. Their labours contributed handsomely to the Association's income, producing 30 percent of the total in 1909, tapering to 12 percent in 1932. By this time, as Stella Davies explained, the functioning of the groups had changed though their purposes remained the same:

It is not a difficult matter to start a circle; a group of friends band together with the object of helping the children and their mothers at one of the Nurseries. Visits are paid to that branch, and each member contributes 1/- a month, which is devoted towards some special benefit for the children.

One of the groups formed at this time called itself the Noel Club. It was not so much a work-group as a girls' social club interested in organising entertainments, the proceeds of which went to charity. Mrs Frances Norton later recalled the beginning of this Club:

A group of girls had just left the Grammar School at Petersham. A few said, why don't we meet for something so they started to meet once a month at somebody's home on Monday Nights. Somebody enterprising said why don't we expand and ask a few friends. I was one of the friends. I was doing my accountancy and I became the Honorary Treasurer and when the O'Brien girls came back they had found the Sydney Day Nursery and they decided one of the things we would do would be give the Christmas parties at Woolloomooloo and Paddington and to enable us to do this, every Monday night we would
Rules for the Formation of Circles

In Connection with

The Sydney Day Nursery Association.

1. In order to maintain a cot, each circle shall be responsible for the sum of £10 annually, to be paid in quarterly instalments of £2 10s.

2. If all necessary clothing is supplied, only £8 in money need be provided.

3. Circles will be at liberty to hold their meetings (except on the dates of executive meetings) at the Nursery, provided due notice be given to the Matron.

4. Should the Hon. Secretary, or any other representative of a circle, desire to be present at any of the regular executive meetings, it will be necessary to first notify the Hon. Secretary of the Association.

5. All members of Circles and their friends may visit the Nursery any day of the week after 11 a.m.

President: MRS. T. DAVENPORT.
Hon. Sec.: MRS. DANE.
Hon. Treas.: MISS JULIE COHEN.

meet we'd bring a toy and pay a shilling. The Noel Club became quite big - over 50 members, all young people, a lot of good-looking youngsters ... We used to go to Woolloomooloo on Saturday afternoon for the Christmas party and the mothers would come, Paddington in the evening and have it under the trees that are still there, pay for the food, pay for the toys.22

As the 1930s advanced the Noel Club began to dwindle as original members married and their social and family obligations changed. But the Club continued to attract girls of similar social standing as replacements and it was still providing Christmas parties for the children during the Second World War years.23 It was through contacts such as these that new recruits for the Association's Committees were often found, Mrs Norton herself being one of those recruits.

Commercial services

Early in 1927, a year after completion of the Art Union project, a new avenue of fundraising began which instantly proved successful and which continued to contribute between 15 and 20 percent of the Association's total income for the next twenty years. The idea for this new endeavour had been proposed by Mrs Gunther of the Woolloomooloo Committee at the meeting in April, 1924 when the Art Union idea was floated.24 Mrs Gunther could see an opening for a tuck shop for students at East Sydney Technical College, Darlinghurst. No progress on this idea was made immediately but Lady MacCallum discussed the proposal with Mr Nangle, Superintendent of the College during 1925 and 1926. Finally, in December, 1926, the Department of Education not only gave approval for the proposal but it also agreed to supply a building rent free, carry out necessary renovations, install appliances and supply almost all equipment for the undertaking.25 Mrs Metcalf was employed to manage the service, a job which she continued to do successfully for the next 14 years.26 Throughout those years, the tuck shop annually provided some 15 percent of the Association's total income.
There were at least three crucial factors which helped to determine the tuck shop's profitability. First, as noted above, premises were rent free and almost all plant and equipment were initially supplied by the Department. Hence, the Association had no initial capital outlay and the only recurrent expenditure apart from replacement equipment was for supplies and fuel. Second, a number of Committee women took an active interest in the enterprise and their considerable housekeeping knowledge and experience in catering for large functions were invaluable. They knew about prices and quantities and were comfortable in this domestic operation, balancing the purchase of supplies with the students' demands. As Mrs Norton said of the later wartime canteen

We used to go around and see where we could buy cases of jam and things ... We had to estimate, one pound of tea made 200 cups if you could make them all at a given time but wouldn't if you had to have one for the pot and all that sort of thing so I had to do all this calculating and I was a very good calculator and we were never short of tea.²⁷

The third crucial factor was that, although Mrs Metcalfe was employed as a general manager, no other paid staff were employed. The Executive Committee pressured each of the five Branches into providing teams of voluntary workers to staff the service. Two women were required one day each week to work two shifts (10.30am to 2pm and 3.30pm to 7pm) to cover the busy periods.²⁸ By June, 1927, three volunteers were needed each day and the Branches preferred to take a week's duty in rotation.²⁹ By 1930, the volume of business had grown so much that five volunteers were required daily.³⁰ Thus if different women comprised the team each day, each Branch was required to produce 25 women during its week. As there were six Branches by this time, each volunteer gave one day's labour every sixth week for ten months of the year while the College was in session. Alternatively, if only five women were offering from a Branch, these women worked five days every sixth week for the service. They prepared food, served it, and cleaned up afterwards. They found
the work strenuous but sometimes worked long hours to see it through.\textsuperscript{31} As Mrs Norton said, there were "lots of wonderful people, people who never, ever lifted a teatowel at home [who] would be down there scrubbing the counters and working like mad".\textsuperscript{32}

But there were some who found the work unpleasant. It appears to have been particularly galling for the Northern Suburbs Branch which rebelled on at least one occasion and refused to participate.\textsuperscript{33} It was perhaps more difficult for members of this committee to travel to Darlinghurst in these days before there was a Harbour Bridge, but subsequent events indicate that this kind of fundraising activity was not much to their liking. In 1928, after the rebellion, the Executive Committee applied heavy moral pressure on the Northern Suburbs Branch to do their tour of duty. The worthy Melanie Alexander, then Northern Suburbs Honorary Secretary, was prevailed upon to continue\textsuperscript{34} and for the next two years, probably spearheaded by her efforts, Northern Suburbs did send its share of conscripted volunteers. In 1930 Mrs Alexander resigned from Northern Suburbs and it would appear that, with her pressure gone, this Branch immediately sought release from its undesirable obligation. The arguments used were not reported but the fact that a sixth Branch now existed, making five on the south side of the Harbour, may have contributed. In any case, Northern Suburbs did seem relieved to report in 1931 that it had been released from this onerous duty "other assistants having been available" and that it was able to return to its more compatible social entertainment form of fundraising.\textsuperscript{35}

These "other assistants" were coming from the new Newtown Branch which Melanie Alexander joined immediately after resigning from Northern Suburbs.\textsuperscript{36} The willingness of this new Branch to take up its full share of obligations, particularly after its somewhat unsteady progress earlier, may well reflect the enthusiasm which Melanie Alexander brought with her. Mrs Alexander appears to have had both a talent and an enormous drive for
"catering undertakings" such as the Tuck Shop. From 1942 until it closed at the end of 1946, she successfully organised and managed a very profitable canteen for servicemen at the Showgrounds.37 She died early in 1947 and one cannot help but wonder whether her strenuous labours in tuck shop and canteen were contributory factors. In paying tribute to this remarkable woman, Mrs McElhone, the President in 1947, said:

It is with great regret that we record the death of Mrs George Alexander, President of the Newtown Committee, which administers the Training College as well as the Nursery School. Mrs Alexander had been a sincere and enthusiastic member of the Association ever since her arrival in Australia in 1923 and it was due to her efforts in the war years that over £12,000 was raised, which enabled us to extend our work. We hope in the near future to build a Nursery School in the grounds of the Training College at Burren Street, Newtown, in memory of her and in commemoration of work.38

That dream was not achieved until 1957.

In summary, although by 1930 fundraising activities still produced more than half of the Association's total income, there had been a distinct shift in the manner in which this income was raised. Direct giving of money whether by individuals or organisations was in decline. Entrepreneurial fundraising through entertainments continued but it was only to be a significant income source for one more decade. The new world of the 1930s and 1940s would require Committee women to roll up their sleeves and get their hands dirty. The Branch Committees maintained their sizes during the 1950s and 1960s, so it is evident that there were many who were prepared to do so. Whereas the early founders of the Association were nineteenth century women, who, like Mrs Orwell Phillips "were people of money and standing and they didn't have the pressures of having to earn and also probably not the drive",39 the newer Committee members were twentieth century women. Of course, there were still those who joined because of the social prestige of the Association and whose primary satisfaction was derived from the social activities. As Mrs Norton said "It's easier to attract people if you just enjoy yourself, if you have
the money to pay [rather] than to work hard with all the problems of running something". But for women like Mrs Norton, who was one of only ten women chartered accountants at the 1933 census, the Association provided a useful outlet for their energies and talents. Used to doing things for themselves but denied the opportunity of paid work after marriage, they threw themselves into voluntary work for a good cause. These women, who joined the Association in the 1930s to 1950s, carried on the traditions established in earlier days when charity work was part of one's class obligations. As another committee member observed in 1981, "These days any woman with any potential at all is out earning, for the extra money".

5.1.2 State subsidy

From the beginning the Association was interested in attracting government subsidy consistent with existing state policy. Moreover, eulogistic journal articles, particularly those by an anonymous enthusiast who wrote under the pseudonym M.S., supported such government financial support. In 1906, M.S. wished Sydney to emulate Glasgow which "appears to imbued with the desirability of minding the babies while the mothers work, that it is proposed, if not now carried out, that the municipality shall take over the entire cost of its creches". S/he pressed further and advocated, in the words of Sir Samuel Johnson, that "Seeing that the preserving of the physique of our workers is of paramount importance, it would be well if both Parliament and the municipality made the creche subject their immediate business" (italics added). Given Sydney's contemporary climate of concern about infant mortality and the prevailing model of joint charity - state co-operation in welfare services, it seemed reasonable to expect the New South Wales government to respond positively to these appeals. So, in 1909, the Association approached the government through Mr Hollis, the local Member for Darlington. As a result,
Dr Paton, Director of Charities, inspected the nursery "and offered congratulations on the work done." Eventually the first grant of £250 on a £1 for £1 basis was made in the 1910-11 estimates, and state government subsidy has continued to the present day.

The injection of state money at this time did not lead to the consequent reduction in philanthropic giving so often feared by the ruling elite and used as an argument against state provision of services. Its immediate effects were first to boost the Association's surplus to a peak never to be reached again and second to encourage the Association to expand and plan another nursery in Surry Hills. Its effect on total revenue in relative terms was to reduce the proportion of income raised by the Association from almost 90 percent to between 56 and 60 percent of the total and to introduce the state as a significant funding source. Reference to Table 7 shows that during the First War period, state money comprised some 30 percent of the Association's total income, a figure that was not to be reached again until the Second World War years 1941-45. In this early period, it was between 1918 and 1922 that government interest was maximum, reflecting the universal horror and shock at the massive losses of young men sustained in the First War. Indeed, early in 1918, the Association believed that the government was considering opening state-run nurseries and it responded to this idea by suggesting to the Minister of Public Health that it would be prepared to open as many nurseries as were needed provided that the government guaranteed £300 per annum for each nursery. Some eighteen months later in November, 1919, with the baby health centres and Royal Society for the Welfare of Mothers and Babies model now before them, the then President, Mrs Davenport, supported Mrs Louis Phillips' (the former first Treasurer Julia Cohen) idea that the state should take over the existing three nurseries, on the condition that Association members be appointed to the managing Board. Five of the Executive Committee including
Mrs Davenport, Mrs MacCallum and Miss Ranken discussed the suggestion with Mr Green, President of the State Children Relief Board. Mr Green was not particularly encouraging. He stalled, saying that nothing could be done until after the Christmas vacation. Simultaneously, Innes-Noad's Welfare Centre vision was developing so it was perhaps inevitable, given Innes-Noad's influence, that an idea of completely state-run nurseries would not come to fruition. There is no further mention of the idea after 1919 and all energies were then directed to achieving the best possible outcome from the combined charity-state form of operation.

Although the Association's ambit claim in 1918 estimated £300 per annum as its needs for running a nursery, it would appear that the state set the price somewhat lower. Early in 1918, the government decided that £200 would be sufficient for the Association to operate the short-lived Chippendale nursery and it then fixed on this figure as an appropriate annual grant for each nursery. However, E.B. Harkness, Under Secretary, Department of Health, was a staunch ally. Late in 1924 he contacted the Association and advised it to request an additional £100 for each nursery in the next budget estimates. The Association did so but the application was not successful. Early in 1926, Harkness suggested that the Association try again and this time the application did succeed. Although the Association felt that this achievement was "due, in a great measure to the President's representations on [its] behalf", Harkness must also be given some credit. His position on the question of the relative responsibilities which private philanthropy and the state should bear in this kind of service provision is not altogether clear. Certainly he was in favour of significant state subsidy but it is not known whether he would have preferred completely state-run nurseries, similar to the ultimate outcome for baby health centres, or not. Unfortunately, the departmental correspondence relating to the Baby Clinics/Royal Society for the Welfare of Mothers and Babies dispute
does not illuminate the matter.\textsuperscript{54}

From 1927 until 1939, state subsidy remained at an average £1500 per annum, despite the fact that there were by then six nurseries and two nursery schools to be supported.\textsuperscript{55} There were some additional grants in 1930 and 1931, but these were to help finance other programs related to the welfare of unemployed women and girls in the worst of the depression.\textsuperscript{56} Hence, as Table 7 shows, except for this increase in the 1931-35 period, from 1921 to 1940 state subsidy was reduced to less than 20 percent of the Association's total income. However, from 1940 to 1945, war again prodded state interest in women's employment to replace men called up in the nation's defence. It also produced yet another wave of interest in young children's welfare. Between 1941 and 1944 the state financed remodelling of the nurseries at Woolloomooloo and Surry Hills Welfare Centres so that more children could be enrolled. The Premier, W.J. McKell, opened both remodelled premises.\textsuperscript{57} Moreover, state subsidy for recurrent expenditure increased dramatically, rising to an all-time high of £10,000 in 1944. Hence, as Table 7 shows, in the 1941-45 period, state subsidy increased to comprise almost 30 percent of the Association's income, the same level as in the 1916-20 period. After the war, state subsidy increased even further and, until the Commonwealth Government became significantly involved in funding day care service provision following the Child Care Act in 1972, it continued to supply approximately one third of the Association's total income.

**Commonwealth Government subsidy**

In January, 1943, the Commonwealth Government offered "financial aid to certain extensions of our work where it would facilitate the employment of women in essential services".\textsuperscript{58} This assistance helped to establish nursery schools at Kingsford and Katoomba and to extend facilities at Erskineville so
that more children could be enrolled. However, unlike the State Government which continued its support in the post-war period, as soon as the war was over, the Commonwealth withdrew its involvement. No further grants were received after July, 1946 until the 1970s. Commonwealth subsidy was therefore specifically related to women's war work and it was limited in both amount and time.

Local Government support

As discussed in Chapter 4, Paddington and Woollahra Councils had been instrumental in establishing the Eastern Suburbs Nursery in 1924. Their initial one-off donations continued throughout the 1930s and 1940s as annual grants. Also, during those years, the Association pressed local government authorities in the suburbs where the nurseries were located to provide relief from rates and taxes. Then, as now, achievement of this relief was variably successful, depending on the particular Council's interest in day care services. For example, North Sydney and Newtown Councils responded positively in 1935 but Glebe and Redfern Councils were singularly unwilling. In the late war years, Randwick and Mosman Councils made initial grants for establishing the Kingsford and Mosman Nursery Schools respectively, but otherwise their interests did not extend much beyond occasional assistance with fencing or landscaping. However, Marrickville Council followed the example set by the state government twenty years earlier and built its own welfare centre combining day nursery, kindergarten and baby health clinic in the one building. It was equipped by the Marrickville Day Nursery and Kindergarten Fund and operated by the Association. Waverley Council followed a similar model in 1946. Thus, by the end of the Second World War, local government authorities were directly involved in day care service provision and as Table 7 shows, they provided four to five percent of the Association's total income.
In summary then, since the first grant was made in 1911, state subsidy has always been a significant income source for the Association. Even at its lowest points, subsidy comprised almost 20 percent of annual revenue. There were three peak periods of state financial support, each motivated by somewhat different state concerns. The first, up to the early 1920s, was stimulated by the loss of men during the First World War and it focused on reducing infant mortality and raising a healthy population. The second, in 1931-35, was stimulated by widespread poverty during the economic depression and again it had a health focus. The third, in 1941-45, was stimulated by the next war but this time it was motivated by urgent needs to encourage women into the workforce. It did not involve infants and indeed the services which were established during wartime made no provision for babies.

These changing motivations are reflected in the difficulty which the state experienced in finding a comfortable bureaucratic home for administration of day care services grants. When the first grant was made in 1911, there were no Ministries of Health or Welfare and unlike kindergartens, nursery services did not appear to fit under the Public Instruction portfolio. Hence, the grant was made under the Colonial Secretary's vote in the category "Endowments to Hospitals etc. and other Charitable Services". Between 1911 and 1916 the Association's grant was made on the basis of £1 for each £1 raised by private donations, with the rider between 1913 and 1916 of government control over where the nurseries would be located. In the 1916-17 vote, the basis of the Association's subsidy was changed and it became an untied special grant which, although still under the Colonial Secretary's vote, was administered by the Department of Public Health. There the Association rested, along with the Infants Home Ashfield and the Royal Society for the Welfare of Mothers and Babies, until 1926 when the Association and the Infants Home were again placed directly under the Colonial Secretary while the Royal Society remained
under Health but administered by the new Department of Maternal and Baby Welfare. The Association's grant remained under the Colonial Secretary's Department until 1940, along with a miscellaneous collection of other unique functions including the Burial of Destitute Persons, the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals and the Board of Fire Commissioners. A Ministry for Social Services was created in 1933 to administer Widows Pensions and Family Endowment. From 1939 to 1956 it was connected with the Labour and Industry Portfolio. The Child Welfare Department was created in 1924 but it was placed under the Minister for Public Instruction also until 1956. However, in 1940 under wartime conditions, the Labour and Industry Department and the Social Services Department were amalgamated under one ministry and the Association was placed under this portfolio. There it remained until 1956 when Child Welfare was removed from the Public Instruction portfolio, Social Security was separated from Labour and Industry and Child Welfare, and Social Services were joined to create a new Ministry. Thus, throughout all these changes, at no time was the Association seen to be an education responsibility. It was first of all a health responsibility, then in a curious limbo and finally it was settled as a welfare service. This changing identity meant that the Association necessarily had to deal with three government departments, each of which could, if it chose, off-load responsibility to one or more of the other departments. As the Association was to find to its bitter disappointment, its multiple personality meant that its teacher training institution fell between Departmental cracks.

5.1.3 Children's fees

Table 7 shows the relative proportion of total revenue obtained from fee for service. It is readily apparent that the mothers progressively paid more for the cost of the services for their children as the years advanced and that this
increasing contribution occurred in two major leaps. For the first fifteen years, fees accounted for only some ten percent of the Association's total income. This figure clearly reflects the basis of the service as a charitable one whereby the more affluent gave of their largesse to assist the deserving poor. The service fee was considered token in terms of the actual cost of providing the service but, as noted previously, it was made to obviate the criticism that a free service would have attracted, that is, that a free service would be seen as undermining individual responsibility.

Towards the end of 1919, it was decided to increase the fee for service and the charge for one child was doubled to sixpence a day for one child and more than doubled for additional children in the family by increasing the fee to five pence a day for each child. In 1920, the Association noted with some satisfaction that "this proved a very material help towards the upkeep of the nurseries". Indeed, in real terms, actual income from fees quadrupled while the percentage of total income from this source doubled to 21 percent. Fees were again increased at the beginning of 1924, this time to 9d a day for one, 1/3d for two and 1/6d for three children. However, while this fee increase also increased the actual amount of money raised, it did not alter the relative proportion of income obtained from this source. For the next twenty years, whether consciously or not, the fee was adjusted so that it maintained approximately 20 percent of the Association's total income. Hence, from 1921 to 1940, although the number of services increased from three to eight, and therefore the total number of children catered for increased correspondingly, the additional income derived from fee increases merely compensated for inflation on the one hand and changes in income received from fundraising and the government on the other. The fee was still considered to be token, and indeed in real terms it paid for little more than the children's food during the day, but clearly there had been a shift upwards in the degree of financial
responsibility for their children which the Association believed mothers should, and could, bear for the care of their children.

And yet, after both the 1919 and 1924 fee increases, the Association reported the women's apparent acceptance of this additional drain on their meagre wages. In 1920, Dulcie Fry claimed that "The mothers were only too grateful for the help given to them and their little ones and cheerfully paid the higher donation". In 1924, Miss Massie, Honorary Secretary at Forest Lodge commented that "The new scale of charges came into operation at the beginning of 1924, with very little objection from the mothers, in fact, the number of children is increasing". In the absence of other informants, one cannot tell at this time space how accurately these remarks reflected the mothers' true reactions. It may be that the nurseries' clientele were indeed the very "deserving poor" which charities like the Association sought to assist. Hence, having internalised the values that they had a duty to provide for themselves and their children, they simply accepted the increase as just another of life's crosses to bear. In these days before any form of social security for women, any income was better than none and any child care was better than none, hence they just had to make do.

The Association was however not blind to working women's plight. As the economic recession at the end of the 1920s worsened into depression in the early 1930s, it began to take children free of charge so that their mothers could look for work. Moreover, in October, 1931, it reduced the fee to the 1919 level of sixpence a day. In addition, supported by a grant from the Committee for the Relief of Unemployed Woman and Girls, it provided accommodation for unemployed women and offered them work in the nurseries. However, it was surprised that "For some reason or other, destitute mothers do not seem anxious to avail themselves of the offer of free food and care for their babies" and it was disappointed to find that "it was
difficult to find the right type of women ... to fit ... into the domestic regime of the Nursery". Moreover, it found that mothers were abandoning their five and six week old babies at the nursery, a situation which had never previously occurred. Clearly, the depression had brought the Association into contact with people who had never before darkened its doors, and it was more than happy when the depression receded and its traditional clientele was restored. Nevertheless, once the idea of free places had been introduced, it never completely disappeared. A few children at each nursery continued to be taken either free or on reduced payment when family circumstances were low.

It is beyond the scope of this thesis to examine the second leap in children's fees as a revenue source which began during the Second World War and continued until the Commonwealth Child Care Act in 1972. Suffice it here to say that, by the post war period, both the nature of the Association's service provision and its clientele changed. By then, as is discussed in the next section of this chapter, responsibility for financing day care services had become primarily an argument between parents and the state.

5.1.4 **Relationship between the three major funding sources**

The relationships between the percentages of income derived from the three major funding sources in each five year period are shown graphically in Figure 2. It will be recalled that the percentages shown in the figure are relative to each other within each time point and that the figure gives no indication of actual monetary values. Also it will be recalled that analysis of income sources was undertaken on the assumption that relative proportions of amounts of income derived from a given source reflected the degree of responsibility for day care service provision which society accorded to that source. If that assumption is correct, then Figure 2 clearly shows that there were major shifts in community attitudes over the 40 years examined here.
FIGURE 2  Relative percentages of income from all sources, in five year periods, 1905-10 to 1951-55
The service began as a charity, raising almost all of its income but charging a nominal fee for the service. After it received state subsidy, the Association continued to raise approximately 60 percent of its total income until the Second World War. It also continued to charge a fee for service but fees continued to supply only ten percent of income while state interest was high and its subsidy supplied 30 percent of income. Then in the 1920s as state interest waned, for the next decade, parents and the state contributed approximately 20 percent of income each, except during the economic disaster in the early 1930s when the state increased its relative contribution. The situation reverted to normal once the depression was over. The Second World War permanently changed the relative responsibilities of charity, the state and parents for day care service provision. In the short period between 1936 and 1950, the Association's fundraising capacity dropped from 60 percent to 20 percent of the total income. At the same time, parents were required to pay proportionately more for the services for their children and the state also became a more significant funding source. The crossover point was between 1941 and 1945, when financial responsibility was approximately equally shared by charity, the state and parents. In the post war period, charity's contributions continued to decline while parents and the state bore the major cost of the service provision. The Association became a manager of other people's money instead of its own.

5.2 Expenditure

There are four primary sources of expenditure in day care service provision - staff salaries or wages and associated on-costs; buildings and their equipment and maintenance; costs directly related to the service for children such as food, clothing, medical supplies and play equipment; and administrative costs related to office equipment and maintenance. Costs for each of these
four areas of expenditure were detailed in the Annual Reports from 1905 to 1964, thereby facilitating an analysis of trends in the costs of day care service provision. Definitions of the categories used in the analysis are given in Appendix 1 and annual expenditures in each category are given in Appendix 1 Table 2. In order to examine trends over time, expenditures in each category were summed for five year periods beginning in 1905-10. The total expenditures for all categories in those five year periods up to 1951-55 are given in Table 8. As was the case with analysis of income, since money values changed over time, direct comparisons of the totals given in Table 8 are not particularly useful. Therefore, as was done for analysis of income, it was decided to calculate relative percentages of expenditure in each category within each five year period. These percentages are shown in Table 9. It is stressed again that the percentages shown at each time point are relative to each other and that they give no indication of actual monetary value at that time.

5.2.1 Expenditure on nurseries

Inspection of Table 9 shows that, in the first decade of operation, expenditure related only to the direct nursery service provision. After the appointment of Dulcie Fry as General Secretary in 1918 and the establishment of a central office in 1922, administrative expenses accounted for some ten percent of the total expenditure. From 1926 to 1940, central administration expenses were inflated by charging the costs of salaries and provisions for "catering undertakings" against administration. After 1940, the cost of maintaining a central administration, exclusive of salaries, was held relatively constant at between five and seven percent of the total expenditure. Hence, for most of the first 40 years, expenditure directly on nurseries, including capital and recurrent expenditure on buildings, comprised 80 to 90 percent of the total outlay.
Table 3: Total expenditure on all categories of service provision, 1905-10 to 1951-55, in five year periods

(Sources: Refer Appendix I, Table 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Salaries</th>
<th>Food</th>
<th>Other recurrent</th>
<th>Play equipment</th>
<th>Total nurseries without buildings</th>
<th>Total building costs</th>
<th>Total nurseries with buildings</th>
<th>Nursery School Training College</th>
<th>Total central administration</th>
<th>TOTAL EXPENDITURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1905-10</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>405</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>569</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911-15</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>254</td>
<td></td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>1412</td>
<td>3313</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916-20</td>
<td>2823</td>
<td>1692</td>
<td>1020</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>5602</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>6391</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921-25</td>
<td>7162</td>
<td>3366</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td></td>
<td>12278</td>
<td>5143</td>
<td>17421</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926-30</td>
<td>11971</td>
<td>5418</td>
<td>3237</td>
<td></td>
<td>20626</td>
<td>6677</td>
<td>27303</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931-35</td>
<td>13056</td>
<td>4804</td>
<td>2172</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20447</td>
<td>4126</td>
<td>24373</td>
<td>285</td>
<td></td>
<td>5081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936-40</td>
<td>21153</td>
<td>8148</td>
<td>3489</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>34980</td>
<td>6681</td>
<td>41661</td>
<td>735</td>
<td></td>
<td>9880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941-45</td>
<td>43953</td>
<td>13196</td>
<td>12616</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>70338</td>
<td>14866</td>
<td>85204</td>
<td>5232</td>
<td></td>
<td>90436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946-50</td>
<td>104701</td>
<td>25422</td>
<td>25579</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>156332</td>
<td>41177</td>
<td>197509</td>
<td>11463</td>
<td></td>
<td>14449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951-55</td>
<td>242841</td>
<td>46386</td>
<td>39374</td>
<td>2636</td>
<td>331437</td>
<td>64992</td>
<td>396429</td>
<td>18178</td>
<td></td>
<td>22878</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: Details were available for 1905-06 and 1908-09 only
Note 2: Total Central Administration included tuck shop expenditure, 1927-40
Note 3: Nursery School Training Centre costs were not fully detailed in 1932-37
Note 4: Nursery School Training College costs were not detailed in 1941-45
Table 9: Relative percentages of expenditure on all categories of service provision, 1905-10 to 1951-55, in five year periods  
(Source: Refer Appendix I, Table 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Salaries</th>
<th>Food</th>
<th>Other recurrent</th>
<th>Play equipment</th>
<th>Total nurseries without buildings</th>
<th>Total building costs</th>
<th>Total nurseries with buildings</th>
<th>Nursery School Training College</th>
<th>Total central administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1905-10</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Note 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911-15</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>99.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916-20</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921-25</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926-30</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931-35</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936-40</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941-45</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946-50</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951-55</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: Details were available for 1905-06 and 1908-09 only

Note 2: Total Central Administration included Tuck Shop expenditure, 1927-40

Note 3: Nursery School Training Centre costs were not fully detailed in 1932-37

Note 4: Nursery School Training College costs were not detailed in 1941-45
Salaries

As might be expected, staff salaries were the most costly item of expenditure, even though, as Stella Davies remarked in 1929 "The salaries paid are not high; in certain cases the Committee would gladly pay higher salaries if it were possible to do so". Up to 1930, expenditure on salaries was maintained at approximately 35 percent of the total outlay. There was an apparent reduction of staff costs in the 1911-15 period but this is an artefact of the technique used here of comparing relative percentages. Only one nursery was in operation at that time and the purchase of the Forest Lodge premises in 1913 was a major outlay in comparison with other costs. After 1930, salaries progressively accounted for a greater proportion of the total expenses until by 1951-55 they comprised 56 percent of the total expenditure. The reasons for this continuing increase are discussed in Chapter 6.3. Here it is sufficient to note that there was no union coverage of any day care service staff until 1948 and that, until the 1940s, all staff lived in at the nurseries and hence their salaries were additional to board and lodgings provided by the Association.

Food costs

From the beginning, the day nursery service focused on providing the children with healthy diets as defined by the best medical advice that could be obtained. Hence, as Table 9 shows, in the period 1905-10, food comprised one third of the total expenditure and in the period 1911-20 something more than 20 percent of the total. However, although nutrition remained an important focus of the service, as the years passed, food progressively accounted for smaller relative proportions of the total expenditure. From 1921 to 1945, expenditure on food continued to comprise some fifteen percent of the total outlay but in the post war period it declined until by 1964, the last year for which records were published, it was reduced to seven percent of the total outlay.
Premises

The Association's policy was to purchase premises rather than to rent them and hence, since such purchases were obviously major outlays in relation to other costs of service provision, when they were made is reflected in peaks in the relative percentages of expenditure. As Table 9 shows, there were three such peaks, each of which reflected an expansionary phase in the Association's activities. The first, in 1911-15, was caused by the first property purchase, Forest Lodge in 1913. The second, in 1921-30, marked the growth of the Association from three to six nurseries. The third, in 1941-50, marked the final growth phase at the end of which the Association was operating fourteen day nurseries and nursery schools and a teacher training college for 100 students.

Recurrent expenses

Apart from food supplies, there are numerous recurrent expenses in day care service provision including fuel, replacement of furniture and fittings, laundry and cleaning expenses. As Table 9 shows, from 1916 to 1955 these expenses have comprised some ten percent of the total expenditure with maximum expenditures of thirteen and fourteen percent of the total in the war years 1916-20 and 1941-45. Any explanation of these increases during war years must be tentative since insufficient details are available to provide an exact account of expenditure, but it seems reasonable to assume that the increases were associated with shortages of supplies and increased fuel charges.

Children's play equipment

As Table 9 shows, children's play equipment has never been an expensive expenditure item in relation to other costs of service provision. At no time has it accounted for even one percent of the total expenses involved in running the services.
5.2.2 **Relationship between major categories of expenditure**

The relationship between the four major categories of expenditure (salaries, food, premises and recurrent expenses) are shown graphically in Figure 3. It will be recalled that the percentages shown in the figure are relative to each other within each time point and that the figure gives no indication of actual monetary values. It will also be recalled that analysis of expenditure categories was undertaken on the assumption that relative proportions of amounts expended reflected priorities which the Association accorded to the different categories of expenditure at a given time point. If that assumption is correct, then Figure 3 clearly shows that, over the years, staff salaries steadily accounted for higher proportions of the service cost, while food just as steadily accounted for lower proportions. Other recurrent expenditure averaged ten percent of the total costs over the whole period, while purchase and repair of buildings averaged approximately fifteen percent of the total expenditure, with three major peaks during expansionary phases.

5.3 **The Success of the Business Venture**

From its earliest years the Association was a well-regulated, law-abiding society but it does appear to have achieved its first property purchase in 1913 in a relatively informal way. As no minutes of the Association for this period survive, the legal details of this purchase are not known but it can be assumed that they were somewhat less than desirable for an expanding organisation. So, early in 1924, when additional property purchases were being considered, the need for the Association to be formally incorporated as a limited liability private company became paramount. 80 There were two chief reasons for this. First, it facilitated the technical ease of projected purchases since it enabled registration of purchases in the Association's name rather than in the names of individual Office Bearers who would change with time. The Board of Directors
FIGURE 3  Relative percentages of expenditure on major categories of service provision, in five year periods, 1905-10 to 1951-55
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of the company (in this case the Executive Committee) became the continuing referent entity. Second, it limited the liability of individual members of the Association, in the event of financial disaster or injury to employees.

As the Association was already well provided with operating rules, and the Honorary Solicitor Mr Davenport was very familiar with the Association, it took only two months from the decision to incorporate being taken to the actual signing of the official documents on 9 June, 1924.\textsuperscript{81} Thereafter, the Association has operated under the relevant sections of the Companies Act, initially Sections 52 and 53 of the 1899 Act and later Section 24 of the 1961 Act.

The Memorandum and Articles of the Association enabled it to buy and sell property and raise and invest money, but of course all income and property were required to be used for promoting the Association's objects. No member might profit in any way from the operations of the company, nor might any paid officer be a member of its management council (the Executive Committee). The 1924 Articles provided for a membership not exceeding one thousand and, in the event of the Association being wound up, Members' liability was limited to £1. Also, in the event of the Association being wound up or dissolved, any assets were not to be distributed among the Association's members but must be given to another organisation or institution/s with similar objects. The Memorandum required that accounts of receipts, expenditure, assets and liabilities be kept, be available for inspection by members and be audited annually. The twenty women who signed the original Memorandum in 1924 represented all of the four Branches then in existence and also included the President, Lady MacCallum, one Vice President Mrs Goldsmith and the Honorary Treasurer, Miss Alice Friend. The advice of the existing Trustees, Judge Backhouse, Mr Rodney Dangar, Mr L.J. Davis and Mr O.E. Friend was retained.

Although the Association has reported its financial dealings annually and in reasonable detail for all years of its existence, its status as a non-profit
private company makes it impossible to examine its "profitability" by usual methods. For example, it has no stated paid up share capital and no issue of dividends to shareholders, therefore one cannot examine profitability in terms of dividend yield in relation to the market price of shares. Also, as there is no paid up share capital as such, one cannot look at the value of assets in relation to capital. Therefore, in order to examine the financial success of this enterprise, alternative methods of analysis had to be devised. This was made somewhat complex by changes in reporting systems over the years which reduced the extent to which categories for analysis could be identified which had consistent definitions over the total time span. Also, the separation of income and expenditure from assets and liabilities meant that to some extent annual profit or loss statements were not directly connected with statements of what might be called the Association's net worth (the excess of assets over liabilities). Therefore two separate analyses seemed necessary, first to look at success in balancing income with expenditure and second to look at growth or otherwise in the Association's net worth. It is believed that the techniques used in the analyses which follow resulted in indices which, although crude, fairly reflect the business operations of the Association and also take into account changes in money value over the period.

5.3.1 Balance of income and expenditure

In order to examine the Association's success in balancing its budget in each five year period, total expenditure (E) was subtracted from total income (I) and the difference was converted to a percentage of total income (I) for that period i.e. \( \frac{I - E}{I} \times 100 \). This percentage gave an index of surplus or deficit in terms of income for each five year period. It was assumed that the indexes would indicate whether the Association was accumulating capital or needing to draw on reserves. If capital was accumulating then empire-building dreams
might be encouraged; if it was reducing then the operation would need to contract in some way.

The resulting indexes are shown in Table 10 and are presented graphically in Figure 4.

Table 10: Balance between income and expenditure, 1905-10 to 1951-55, in five year periods.
(Source: Refer Appendix I, Table 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total income (ΣI)</th>
<th>Total expenditure (ΣE)</th>
<th>ΣI-ΣE</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1905-1910</td>
<td>£ 778</td>
<td>£ 569</td>
<td>£ 209</td>
<td>26.9 Note 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911-1915</td>
<td>3668</td>
<td>3324</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916-1920</td>
<td>8824</td>
<td>7617</td>
<td>1207</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921-1925</td>
<td>19883</td>
<td>19382</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926-1930</td>
<td>35083</td>
<td>33765</td>
<td>1318</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931-1935</td>
<td>30883</td>
<td>29939</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936-1940</td>
<td>50695</td>
<td>51896</td>
<td>-1201</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941-1945</td>
<td>99203</td>
<td>90436</td>
<td>8766</td>
<td>8.8 Note 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946-1950</td>
<td>198298</td>
<td>223421</td>
<td>-25023</td>
<td>-12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951-1955</td>
<td>413546</td>
<td>437485</td>
<td>-23939</td>
<td>-5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: Details were available for 1905-06 and 1908-09 only
Note 2: Includes 1942-43 since total income and expenditure were available.

It will be readily observed that, for the most part, in its first 40 years of service provision, the Association maintained healthy surpluses, despite occasional years in deficit (see Appendix I, Table 3) and regularly expressed anxieties about income. If the indexes are interpreted in sequence, then it can be seen first that the large surplus of capital in the first five years to 1910 encouraged the first property purchase in 1913. This purchase then reduced surplus capital but by 1916-20, the surplus recovered to 14 percent of income.
FIGURE 4  Balance between income and expenditure as percentage of income, in five year periods, 1905-10 to 1951-55
Continuing success therefore justified expansionary visions and three property purchases followed in the 1920s. Although the purchases reduced the surpluses and the depression period was a difficult time, the Association still maintained an average three percent surplus until 1936-40. The deficit in this period probably reflected the Association's expansion into providing teacher training for which it received no state subsidy. However the doubling of state subsidy during World War II and the addition of Commonwealth funds helped to restore a surplus balance in 1941-45. Subsequent events are beyond the scope here but it can be said that in the decade after the war, the Association struggled not only to maintain its 12 existing services but also to make concrete five more services that had been planned (see Table 5). It also struggled to maintain its teachers college for which state subsidy of any kind continued to remain unavailable.

5.3.2 Growth in the Association's net worth

A second way of assessing the Association's "profitability" was to assess its "net worth" in terms of the difference between its assets and its liabilities. Before 1918-19, the only indication of the Association's net worth was contained in its bank balances. However, after 1918-19 when balance sheets were published, the total value of assets was listed in two sub-divisions - money (invested and accruing interest) and property (as land, buildings, furniture and fittings). Also, total liabilities in terms of mortgages, loans and overdrafts obtained to provide cashflow were listed. The difference between liabilities and assets was therefore available to provide an index of the Association's net worth. However, because money changed in value over time and a relative percentage conversion was not appropriate in this case, the actual differences between assets and liabilities were converted to a value corrected to the base year 1911. The conversion factor selected was a retail price index for six state
capitals combined (see Appendix 1, Table 4). The final step was to average annual assets, liabilities and "net worth" calculations over each five year period.

These values are shown in Table 11 and the averaged corrected "net worth" for each five year period is presented graphically in Figure 5. It will be readily observed that, after the property purchases in the 1920s, growth in the Association's net worth was exponential until the post-Second World War period. Again it is beyond the scope here to discuss the fall-back after 1950. Suffice it to say that, in some respects, it was an artefact of the Association's failure to revalue its properties, a situation which was rectified in 1959.

Table 11: Average net worth (assets minus liabilities), 1905-10 to 1951-55, in five year periods, corrected to base year 1911.
(Source: Refer Appendix I, Table 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital</th>
<th>Assets Property</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Liabilities</th>
<th>Uncorrected net worth</th>
<th>Corrected net worth (base year = 1911)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1905-10</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>151 Note 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911-15</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>539</td>
<td></td>
<td>539</td>
<td>479 Note 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916-20</td>
<td>956</td>
<td>1316</td>
<td>2272</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>1471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921-25</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>3910</td>
<td>4806</td>
<td>1012</td>
<td>3794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926-30</td>
<td>2738</td>
<td>10265</td>
<td>13003</td>
<td>2714</td>
<td>10289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931-35</td>
<td>3479</td>
<td>14534</td>
<td>18013</td>
<td>4732</td>
<td>13281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936-40</td>
<td>2913</td>
<td>20960</td>
<td>23873</td>
<td>4485</td>
<td>19388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941-45</td>
<td>6485</td>
<td>30832</td>
<td>37317</td>
<td>5251</td>
<td>32066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946-50</td>
<td>5264</td>
<td>55450</td>
<td>60714</td>
<td>20753</td>
<td>39961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951-55</td>
<td>11748</td>
<td>71554</td>
<td>83302</td>
<td>39705</td>
<td>43597</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: Details were available for 1905-06 and 1908-09 only
Note 2: Forest Lodge was purchased in 1913 but assets and liabilities were only listed from 1919.
FIGURE 5  Average net worth (Assets minus Liabilities) to base year 1911, in five year periods, 1905-10 to 1951-55
In summary then, the Association was a remarkably successful business enterprise for all of its first 40 years of operation. The success is all the more noteworthy when it is recalled that the enterprise was entirely managed by an Executive Committee of voluntary women, many of whom in addition to the Presidents were astute and shrewd business managers. Since this Committee was at all times the decision-making authority, it is to them that credit for the success must be given. They made the decisions to invest in property rather than to rent premises and they managed the cash flow which produced more annual surpluses than deficits. However, this is not to say that the achievement took place without outside help. For example, the women regularly consulted political, bureaucratic, legal, financial, real estate and architectural advisers to whom they had access through their husbands, fathers and other male relatives. But the women's lobbying skills were finely tuned and they were experts at exerting moral pressure. Hence for the most part they were able to obtain these men's services either completely free of charge or at minimal cost. Nor is it to say that the success was entirely achieved by the women's skill in fundraising. Of course, it was no mean feat to raise the many thousands of pounds needed to keep the nurseries running and from the late 1920s many women worked hard in the "catering undertakings" which were so profitable. But the Association's fundraising activities only ever produced a little more than half of the total income. The mothers paid for the services provided and their fees comprised one-fifth of the total income for most of this period. In addition, state financial support must not be overlooked, since it too provided at least one-fifth of the income. Moreover, the state government built or remodelled two of the early centres and paid for their repairs, while local government built and maintained two of the later centres and the Commonwealth government paid for major alterations to two other centres, one of which had been a handsome gift from a particularly generous benefactor.
Chapter 5 Financing the Enterprise
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CHAPTER SIX

STAFFING THE SERVICES

The previous three chapters have discussed the Association's administrative structure and organisation, its definitions of who were the clients for whom services were to be provided, the establishment of those services and how they were funded. It is now time to examine the services themselves, since after all service provision was the reason why the Association existed at all and all of its activities were directed towards the maintenance and expansion of the nurseries. This chapter discusses staffing matters and the following chapter looks at the care and education programs which the staff provided for the children.

It will be recalled that the Association modelled its day care services on those already existing overseas. The ethos was that of the French creche which was established to protect and care for babies and toddlers aged up to three years during the time their mothers were earning money to provide for their families. The objects were to assist in reducing high infant mortality rates and to improve young children's health. The guidelines for the Sydney services, as for the services established in Britain, America, and other parts of the Western world, were the French state regulations which after 1862 governed the conduct of creches, particularly those which sought state subsidy. These guidelines, apart from specifying conditions governing eligibility of parents and parents' fee paying and other responsibilities, clearly spelled out the health orientation of the creche and the control measures to be enforced on families using the day care services. Requirements included the necessities that children be vaccinated prior to entry (presumably against smallpox); that children be presented in clean clothes; that no child suffering from a contagious
disease be admitted; and that children be medically examined prior to admission. The creche was expected to provide for each child its own cot, toilet set, and feeding bottle. Mothers breastfeeding their babies were encouraged to have access to their children at any time of the day. It was expected that the children would be cared for by nurses and the regulations required that there should be one nurse for every six children. Nurses in charge of the institutions were given the courtesy title of Matron and they and the institutions were directed and supervised by medical doctors.²

It will also be recalled that the Kindergarten Union had been established in Sydney in 1895 and that by 1905 it provided morning programs of Froebellian education for children aged three years to school age at a few kindergartens located in inner city suburbs. These programs were delivered by teachers which the Kindergarten Union trained itself. Evidently, at this time, while children aged three years and over were considered to be educable and hence were the province of teachers and their educational efforts, children under three years were not considered to be educable and hence they were the province of nurses and their physical care ministrations. This had not always been the case, as early nineteenth century experiments with schools for children as young as eighteen months attest.³ Nor did it remain the case later in the twentieth century, as the development of nursery schools for children aged eighteen months to three years indicates.⁴ However for all of the period under present study, and indeed to the present day, the care of babies and toddlers aged under two years remained supervised by health-oriented nurses. Also, there was no questioning of the principle that not only may children from chronological age three be educated by teachers but also they should be so educated. The problematic areas have been who should care for and educate two to three year olds and how would education for children over three years be provided.
6.1 The Care and Education Dichotomy

In the first two years of operation, when the Day Nursery at Woolloomooloo catered only for children aged up to three years, the service provision was relatively uncomplicated. The first Matron, Sarah Breden, began the task of caring for each baby and toddler for anything up to twelve hours a day in a relatively small terrace house with its upstairs cot room and its tiny outdoor playing space. The children ranged in age from three weeks to three years and by March, 1906, fifteen children were attending regularly and eighteen on emergency days. Sarah Breden and the maid assisting her were busy people indeed.

It had been recognised at the very first meeting that the nursery service required educational as well as medical advice and the three American Kindergarteners working at the Kindergarten Teachers College showed at least passing interest in the nursery. For example, early in 1906 as numbers attending the nursery grew, Miss Jenkins, Principal of the College, began to send two students to the nursery each morning "to give the older children some training". These two extra pairs of hands for a few hours in the morning were undoubtedly a boon to Matron Breden and indeed she and her assistant may well have learnt some skills from the students which would have assisted in coping with the children during the long afternoons when the staffing ratio was one adult to eight or nine children. However, at the end of 1907, two changes occurred which affected the nature of the service provision. First, the nursery moved to 27 Rose St, Darlington, and second, the Association extended its service to include children aged up to school age of five or six years. It would still have been possible for kindergarten students to have visited the Rose St. nursery since the distance from the Kindergarten College at 40 Roslyn Gardens, Darlinghurst was no greater than to kindergartens at North Sydney and Newtown where students went for practical experience. But there were now
children aged three, four and five years attending the nursery. These children clearly needed more experienced direction than students in training could provide. The Day Nursery Association faced a dilemma. It accepted the principle that children aged over three years required "proper" education and it also accepted the principle that this education should be provided by teachers, not nurses. The question was how to provide the service.

It might be expected, given the close links between the Association and the Kindergarten Union created by the membership of many Committee women in both organisations, that the obvious answer was for the Association to employ a kindergarten teacher to work with the older children at least for the usual three hours in the mornings. The idea was after all not unknown. This was the system already adopted in many American philanthropic day nurseries by the end of the nineteenth century. But this was not the solution arrived at. Instead, it was agreed between the two organisations that the older children would attend the morning program at the newly opened Golden Fleece Kindergarten nearby in Pine St. Chippendale.

Unfortunately no minutes of this period for either the Day Nursery Association or the Kindergarten Union survive so it is not possible to determine exactly why this decision was made. However, one can speculate that there were at least three possible explanations. First, as always, was the matter of cost. Since teachers and nurses were expected to perform different duties the employment of a teacher at the day nursery would have meant an additional staff salary thereby increasing the cost of the service provision. Given that the Committee women always kept a watchful eye on expenditure, they may have been concerned that the additional outlay was not warranted. Second, the Kindergarten Union may have seen the Association as encroaching on the three to five year old educational territory over which it had a monopolistic control, and it may have actively discouraged the Association from entering the field.
Third, and this may have been the deciding factor, to provide a kindergarten within the nursery required space for kindergarten activities alone. The "circle room" was a mandatory facility for group work and work with the Gifts and Occupations. It is doubtful whether 27 Rose St. afforded such a luxury.

Whatever the reasons may have been, the decision to send the older children to an already functioning kindergarten rather than to extend the service provided by the nursery had a number of far reaching consequences for the development of early childhood services in New South Wales. First, the regrettable ideological division between early childhood care and education may be dated from this point. The Kindergarten was clearly identified as providing an educational program for children aged three to five years while the day nursery was identified as providing basic physical care and protection for children as young as a few weeks old. Moreover, education was identified as an input to be dealt out in short, measured doses, by specially trained teachers while care was something ongoing, continuous over longer periods of time and provided by women with no particular training relevant to the job.

Second, the decision meant that little if any interaction occurred between the teaching and nursing staffs of the separate institutions. An assistant nurse walked with the children from the nursery to the kindergarten probably at about 8.45am and delivered the children into the hands of the kindergarten teacher. She then returned to the nursery to assist with the babies. At about 11.45am the assistant nurse would again walk to the kindergarten to collect the children and take them back to the nursery for their midday meal. The nursing staff thus knew little about the children's activities while at the kindergarten. Conversely, there is no evidence to suggest that the kindergarten teachers made any significant efforts to inform themselves about the children's activities while they were attending the nursery. The kindergarten teachers' afternoons were filled with visiting mothers at home, conducting mothers'
meetings, running after school clubs for older children and preparing their programs for the following day. They had little time to visit the nursery even if they had been interested.

Third, the decision confirmed the continuing existence of two separate systems of early childhood services, each controlled by its own organisation which was responsible for raising funds to finance its services. At the public level, this meant that in many ways the two organisations competed for scarce philanthropic donations from those who were interested in the welfare of young children. At the state level, the two organisations were seen to be providing quite different services. The Kindergarten Union was always seen as an educational service and until 1950 its annual grant was made under the vote of the Minister of Public Instruction as a "Special grant in aid of Kindergarten Classes". However, the Day Nursery Association was seen by the state to be providing either a health service or a welfare service, even after 1931 when it introduced nursery schools and nursery school teachers to staff the nursery schools. The state never really saw the nurseries as legitimate educational services.

Between 1935 and 1945, there were only two occasions on which any senior people within state education circles appreciated that the nurseries, particularly the nursery schools, provided education for the children as well as health and welfare services. On the first occasion, as is discussed in Chapter 8, Professor Mackie, Principal of Sydney Teachers College, and the Minister for Education, D.H. Drummond, assisted the Association in receiving state financial support for its teacher training centre. However, the assistance was given by default rather than by direct subsidy, since it was achieved by the Association's non-payment of fees due to Sydney Teachers College and the state's tacit acceptance of the Association's recalcitrance.

The second occasion was a brief period between 1942 and 1945 when the
state was becoming directly involved in providing a small number of nursery schools during the Second World War. The Labor Minister for Education, Clive Evatt, became interested in transferring the Association's subsidy to his own portfolio.\textsuperscript{12} Evatt's interest began early in 1942, prompted by Mrs McElhone's request for Department of Education Scholarships for nursery school teacher training students.\textsuperscript{13} Evatt was impressed by Mrs McElhone's arguments. He could see that the nurseries provided education as well as care for young children. Moreover, he observed that the Kindergarten Union, which was doing similar work, was subsidised on his Department's vote and that the Association's students attended the Department's Teachers College. He therefore began negotiations with Hamilton Knight, Minister for Labour and Industry and Social Services, to have the Association's vote made under Education estimates rather than Social Service estimates.\textsuperscript{14} Evatt put forward his proposal to Cabinet in August, 1942 but apparently received no support for it.\textsuperscript{15} Indeed, Hamilton Knight objected vigorously to the proposal, even though the Association was a very small part of his portfolio. He argued that

\begin{quote}
I am definitely of the opinion that the work carried on by the Association is of a social rather than a educational nature, particularly in view of the fact that the children to be cared for are under school age. In view of this the administration is one more appropriate for my department than that of Education and I cannot see that any good purpose would be served by transferring the administration of the vote to the Department of Education.\textsuperscript{16}
\end{quote}

In May, 1943, Evatt tried a direct appeal to the Premier, W.J. McKell but McKell stalled, deferring decision until the 1944 estimates.\textsuperscript{17} In the meantime the Minister for Health, C.A. Kelly, became convinced that his Department should have control over preschool aged children. In March, 1944, he called a conference between himself, Hamilton Knight and Evatt to discuss a resolution to that effect.\textsuperscript{18} But the three men were deadlocked, each believing that his Department was the rightful owner of day care services. Kelly could see only the health aspect, Hamilton Knight the welfare aspect and Evatt the educational
aspect. The impasse was not resolved at this time and indeed, as was discussed in Chapter 2, it has never been satisfactorily solved. The important point here is that there was no change in the administration of the Association's vote during the period under present study. Hence, day care services continued to be tied ideologically with residual welfare, thus preventing any legitimation of them as respectable educational services.

There were two other outcomes of the decision in 1907 to send older children to the Golden Fleece Kindergarten for their daily dose of education. First, kindergarten teachers came into contact with day nursery children who by definition were more severely disadvantaged, both economically and socially, than kindergarten children. Although all the children came from the same depressed, working class suburbs, it is likely that most kindergarten children came from intact homes where there were male wage earners and mothers who were free in the afternoons to be visited at home or to attend mothers' meetings at the kindergarten. However, all day nursery children came from homes where mothers were forced to work by the absence or economic inability of their male partners. Since women's wages were only half those of men, the day nursery children's homes were necessarily poorer than those of the kindergarten children and in addition the day nursery children's mothers were not free in the afternoons either to be visited at home or to attend meetings. It has been suggested that these circumstances, when added to the difficulties which many teachers experienced in managing the somewhat less disciplined and probably overtired and hungry nursery children, may have led to some teacher rejection of nursery children. 19

Second, with one notable exception, until the 1930s when the Day Nursery Association began to train its own nursery school teachers, the only professionally qualified staff employed in day nurseries were nurses. There is some evidence that at various times the Association wished to employ kindergarten
teachers but it was rarely successful in either attracting or holding such staff. The bases for these outcomes probably lie in the experiences of those teachers who did encounter day nursery children in the kindergartens, in their professional expectancies and in the salaries and working conditions provided by the Association. The situation was similar to that which Beer remarked in America. Kindergarten teachers were more interested in their educative roles than in either the children's physical care or the welfare focus of the nurseries. They found routine physical care tasks, such as tooth-brushing, hand-washing, toileting and toilet training, dressing and cleaning up after sick children, beneath their dignity. Moreover, they were embarrassed by association with a welfare agency, and the pay was poor for the longer hours they were expected to work. Hence, Kindergarten teachers were not attracted to day nursery work and ultimately, as is discussed in Chapter 8, the only solution to the problem of educating children in the nursery was for the Association to train its own brand of teachers.

6.2 Day Nursery Staff

Writing in 1906 in the first wave of public enthusiasm about the establishment of the Day Nursery at Woolloomooloo, an author identified only as M.S. proclaimed that the creche provided a new avenue of women's employment, one which

... is as yet only in embryo, but which, as our city passes from slum-land into garden-city land, will increase, until bands upon bands of earnest young women will be required as probationers, and as they are certified, into professional 'tenders of babies'.

There had of course been "professional" baby-tenderers for centuries, in the sense that there were women whose paid occupations involved caring for other people's children. Indeed, the word nurse both as a noun and as a verb takes one of its meanings from nourishing and tending the young. Bourgeois houses
had long contained rooms specifically designated as nurseries to which children and their nurses were assigned. However, whereas nursery governesses usually had at least basic education and often commanded higher status in the household than general domestic servants, nursery nurses and nursemaids possessed neither education nor status.22 The nursemaid was the lowest paid of all domestic servants.

In the first third of the twentieth century, in the contexts of concerns about infant mortality and population growth, and a reducing supply of domestic servants, the professionalism of baby-tenderers was to undergo a transformation chiefly in terms of the education of mothers in the rearing of their own children. As Reiger remarked "The very naturalness of mothering became redefined in the light of discussions about the need for mothercraft and for the application of rational, scientific knowledge to the process of childrearing".23 Of importance here was the development of programs for new child care professional experts. Since the Association was concerned to provide quality services, it might be expected that these new infant and child health professionals would be relevant staff for the nurseries. However, as is discussed in later sections of this chapter, their impact was minimal in the period under study. The problems were systemic and related to the multi-faceted nature of day care service provision.

In 1906, M.S. attempted to define the desirable characteristics and qualifications of the women who would provide group care for other women's children:

The 'tender of babies' may be an amateur, who has time and enthusiasm, or she may be the professional nurse who while she goes into the work wholeheartedly yet has to make her livelihood by what she spends her working hours in doing. There is ample room for each type in this large and as yet ungarnered field of women's work in this country ... While the Matron will always need to be a highly trained nurse, it is not absolutely necessary that all those engaged in the work should have received hospital training, as the duties of the creche under skilful direction will be of a nature to teach the general management of babies. In no work, it is true, is there more need of a 'vocation', yet any kind, cheerful, warm-hearted girl, with a love of children and a readiness to submit to discipline, would be suitable for training.24
M.S. here identified a number of important parameters for selecting staff for
day care services. First it was automatically assumed that the staff would be
women. Second, personal characteristics necessary for the job included
commitment and dedication, kindness, cheerfulness, compliance and love for
children. Third, since the job could be learnt through practical experience,
women without any formal qualifications could perform the task. Fourth, while
the director of the institution should be a professionally qualified nurse,
hospital training was not necessarily the best preparation for the other care-
givers.

It is patently clear that M.S. unquestioningly assumed that women
instinctively possessed tender, protective, nurturant traits which fitted them for
child rearing tasks. M.S. was naively unconscious of the social manipulation
which fostered and developed this single, circumscribed area of the female
psyche through the ideology of family. Nor was M.S. aware that this manipu-
lation of women's socially developed compassionate nature amounted to
exploitation as blatant as other forms of exploitation (sexual and economic) so
widely discussed in recent years by feminist writers. It has ensnared educated
women into the helping professions and caught them in a "compassion trap" for
which the bait was a nagging imperative to protect and rescue the vulnerable.
Hence, whether the profession was nursing, teaching or social work, the
outcomes have depended on the fact that

... Both family and professional commitments incorporate the
insidious notion that the needs, demands, and difficulties of other
people should be woman's major, if not exclusive, concern and that
meeting these must take precedence over all other claims. Implicit
in the role that derives from this conviction is the virtue of
subordinating individual needs to the welfare of others and the
personal value and supposed reward of deriving vicarious satisfaction
from this exercise. This indirect expression of talents and skills and
these rewards reaped secondhand are probably the chief features
distinguishing women from men in their professional lives ... Thus,
although women may appear to have achieved economic freedom by
performing a job that is independent of the practical ties of children
and husband, in terms of psychological commitment they are
generally subject to the same sort of thinking; their modus operandi utilizes identical resources and skills as the homebound wife and mother.\textsuperscript{25}

For all of the period examined here, day care work was a particularly powerful "compassion trap" for well socialised women who were motivated by ideals of service. Its subjects were vulnerable young children and for single women who were not yet blessed with the glorious crown of motherhood, it provided an outlet for what they were convinced was their basic nature. Hence, even for those staff who possessed professional qualifications, whether they were the early matrons or the later nursery school teachers, the driving force behind their work was their commitment and dedication to helping children, even at the expense of their own incomes and health.

6.2.1 General nurses

It is perhaps not an overstatement to say that until relatively recently nursing was an occupation more closely allied to housekeeping and domestic service than to scientific medicine. Through the efforts of the Nightingale disciples, by 1900 nursing had become a ladylike profession with the dedicated overtones of a religious order. Although denied access to the professional legitimation which university-based training would have given, professional status was achieved by setting up highly selective entry requirements and a lengthy, supervised training period in hospitals whose merits were evaluated by a professional society controlled by (mostly male) doctors. The theory content of nurse training courses was minimal and could probably have been learned in a few months. However, the three year training period was filled out by using trainees as low paid staff in the hospitals, mostly engaged in domestic chores and drill in bed-making, floor-cleaning and sink scrubbing. In addition, since it was argued that hospitals operated twenty four hours a day, the staff worked in shifts and that well-bred young ladies could not go about the streets alone and
unchaperoned, hospitals provided accommodation for nurses, sometimes of a horrendous nature. For three years, intelligent, capable young women willingly submitted themselves to working excessively long hours at chores often much worse than housework, to moral supervision unequalled outside a convent, and to spartan food and accommodation for very little reward other than the honour and glory of becoming "the lady with the lamp". 26

However, nurse trainees did have some study content in their courses and examinations to pass. Course work included basic knowledge of physiology and anatomy, current techniques for identifying diseases and injuries and the management of disease and injury cases. They studied principles of hygiene including disinfection, elements of sanitary engineering, ventilation and the law relating to infectious diseases. 27 Their courses were taught by doctors and nurses whose knowledge base was informed by modern germ theory which attributed the causes of disease to microscopic organisms. They knew that certain identified bacteria could be destroyed by a number of sterilising techniques but their understanding of both transmission and destruction of other bacteria and viruses was still rudimentary. Immunology was in its infancy and chemotherapy did not begin until the 1930s. 28 In many ways, health and hygiene practices remained based on the principles enunciated by Dr Phillip Muskett, one-time Senior Resident Medical Officer at the prestigious Sydney Hospital and Surgeon Superintendent to the State government. Muskett, a popular and prolific writer of practical health guides between 1890 and 1910 based his advice on five laws of health care - cleanliness, fresh air, diet, clothing and exercise. 29 Ideas about the importance of cleanliness and fresh air had been popularly promoted during the nineteenth century by such organisations as the Australian Health Society and the movements for sanitary reform. These ideas were based on a miasmatic theory of disease which attributed causes to "toxic affluvia" from drains, cesspools and decomposing material and
to "foul air". Although incorrect, miasmatic theory led to improvements in sewerage, drainage and water supply systems. These developments contributed positively to improvements in public health but could not of course completely control epidemic outbreaks. As Gandevia commented, an elegant and efficient toilet was no cure for unwashed hands and the unhygienic handling of food. Public health could not improve generally until there was widespread acceptance of the dictum that "neither filth nor smell cause fevers until the carrier adds the specific infection and water or flies act as the vector".  

Significant in the achievement of this objective was a confluence of pressure from ruling class women for domestic science education, from state interest in domestic efficiency in support of national productivity and from the medical profession's interests in reducing infant mortality. These pressures impacted most strongly on lower middle class women from whose ranks the great majority of nurses were drawn. An obsession with cleanliness and tidiness was generated which produced an almost fetish attention to household dust and the belief that "neglect of housecleaning is tantamount to child abuse".  

The motto that "Cleanliness is next to Godliness" reigned supreme. Curiously, though, despite the fact that even today no more serious connection between household dust and disease has been identified than the relationship with allergies, the focus on domestic cleanliness and tidiness did have some positive effects on reduction of the spread of some infectious diseases. For example, hands, clothes, cooking and eating utensils were washed more frequently and more thoroughly. Emphasis on ventilation led to both indoor and outdoor airing of bedding and clothes and isolation and quarantine of sick people, thereby reducing the risk of transmission through shared use of eating and sleeping equipment. Also, by the 1920s when a major campaign against flies was mounted, even if they did not yet understand germ theory, middle class women had been sufficiently sensitized that they screened, swatted and sprayed the
unseemly fly with an almost holy fervour.32

Nurses, in addition to being deeply imbued with respect for the virtues of cleanliness, tidiness and fresh air, were competent in invalid cookery. Also, they were trained housekeepers having been instructed in keeping accounts, buying supplies at best prices, superintending servants, repairing linen, keeping inventories of stores and supplies and writing reports for Committees. From the Association's perspective, these additional skills made nurses even more desirable as staff for the nurseries, since it was then not necessary to employ a cook and the staff could be expected to account exactly for household supplies.

6.2.2 Mothercraft nurses

Until 1921 there was no specialised training of nurses in infant care. Whatever ideas general trained nurses had would have been obtained from the public press, their own investigations and personal backgrounds or by reading such compendiums as Muskett's The Feeding and Management of Australian Infants, first published in 1892 and running to numerous editions by 1910. However, by 1918, four years after the establishment of the first Baby Health Clinic, there was considerable interest in Sydney in the work of the New Zealand doctor Truby King, whose 1908 pamphlet The Feeding and Care of Baby had by 1913 become a substantial 162 page book and the bible of the New Zealand Plunket nurses.33 On 4 November, 1918, the Royal Society for the Welfare of Mothers and Babies was formed at a widely advertised and well attended public meeting in the Sydney Town Hall.34 One of the main lines of action proposed for this voluntary organisation was the training of Nursing Aids who would visit pregnant women at home prior to their babies' births, "assist with self-care" during pregnancy and return after the births to advise in baby care.35 Contemporary newspaper reports stressed that "The aids are in no way to be regarded as nurses but simply as assistants, trained to understand how to
correctly carry out the instructions of the clinical trained nurse."\(^{36}\) The aids would not encroach on ATNA nurses' territorial rights to deliver babies and were clearly envisaged as volunteer subordinates under ATNA nurse direction. It was proposed that they should be young women 18 to 25 years of age, drawn from the ranks of middle- and upper-class girls who were VADs, members of the YWCA and GFS who "have been working for the soldiers" and now in the post war years would be looking for something to do "for it is a foregone conclusion that, after having tasted the sweets of service, they will never again go back to the bad old days of idleness and pleasure seeking".\(^{37}\) They were to undertake one month's training in hospitals under ATNA matrons' directions and five months in the field under district or clinic nurses' directions. They would learn simple care of infants including general hygiene, how to bathe, handle and lift babies, food preparation and details of proper clothing. They would attend lectures given by physicians on physiology, anatomy, digestion and respiration and would complete a St John's Ambulance First Aid Certificate (or the Red Cross Certificate would do). At the end of six months they would submit themselves to practical and theoretical examinations and, if successful, they would be awarded the Certificate of the Society. All of this would be undertaken voluntarily and from service ideals related to the trainees' own prospective motherhood and the actual motherhood of other women as the Women's Column of the Sydney Morning Herald made clear:

The object of this training is two-fold but the most important part of it from the girl's point of view is that it trains her so that when the time comes that she marries and has children of her own, she will know how to take care of them ... Secondly she is supplying assistance to suffering womanhood.\(^{38}\)

And finally, having emerged as highly trained Mothers Aids the girls who could not afford to continue in a voluntary capacity would be offered a "nominal weekly salary of about 25/-".\(^{39}\)

However, on the advice of Dr Margaret Harper, who became the medical
Director of the Royal Society's Infant Welfare Training School, "Tresillian" at Petersham, the first infant nurse training program began in 1921 as a three months post-graduate course for general trained and obstetric nurses. The course was basically designed to promote breastfeeding of babies. It included instruction in infant hygiene, breastfeeding techniques and mothercraft. By July, 1924, 130 nurses from all parts of New South Wales and from other states had completed the course. In 1927 the course was extended to four months "as it was considered necessary by the medical authorities to do this in order to make the training more comprehensive". Also on Dr Harper's advice and doubtless with the support of Dr Dick, the Director General of Health, in 1924 completion of the Tresillian Mothercraft course was made an essential qualification for any nurse wishing to be employed by the state Baby Health Centres. In 1927, the state took the further step of paying the tuition and residential fees of "trainees required for appointment to Baby Health Centres" and it also provided trainees with a £1 per week living allowance. Such state support ensured that the Tresillian Mothercraft training program was continuously popular and never short of students. However, since almost all nurses who undertook the program were employed by the growing state system of Baby Health Centres and hence obtained a reasonable salary for a 44 hour working week in relatively non-stressful conditions, there were few if any of these women available for employment by the Day Nursery Association.

The idea of training mothercraft aids to work in private homes became a reality in 1926 when a twelve months course preparing girls with no previous nursing training to be "Mother's Helps" was begun by the Society at its Infant Welfare Training School "Tresillian" at Petersham. Course work constituted one term of the year's work and the remainder of the time was spent in gaining practical experience with both mothers and babies in the Society's residential nursing homes. The term "Mothercraft Nurse" was introduced in 1930 and in
1933 the course was extended to fifteen months "so that these nurses would be capable of taking charge of children up to three years of age". The additional time was mainly spent in practical work in the day nurseries operated by the Day Nursery Association. By the 1930s there were some nine to twelve graduates from each intake and they primarily obtained employment either as staff of the Royal Society's nursing establishments or in private homes. However, although the Association's records do not list staff qualifications, a few references indicate indirectly that these mothercraft nurses were employed to care for babies under two years by 1940 and the practice was standard by the end of the Second World War. 47

6.2.3 Kindergarten and Froebel nurses

The idea of professional training for kindergarten nurses to work in bourgeois homes with children beyond early infancy was brought to Australia by Ridie Lee Buckey, the Chicago trained American kindergartener who arrived in Sydney from Honolulu in 1897 to begin training kindergarten teachers. Miss Buckey planned a one year course which included instruction in hygiene, housework, cooking and needlework as well as study of kindergarten Gifts and Occupations, games, songs, physical exercises and reading aloud. 48 This course did not require the Junior University examination as an entrance qualification as did the two year kindergarten teacher preparation course. Comparison of the syllabuses for the two courses shows that the kindergarten nurse course was practically-oriented while the teacher course was considerably more academic and designed to develop the students' cultural tastes. Although study of the practical aspects of kindergarten work was common to both courses - for example, technical work with the Froebelian Gifts and Occupations, games, songs and "physical culture", the nurse course aimed to develop a practical housekeeper with an understanding of hygiene while the teacher course
examined history, philosophy and psychology. The nurse course clearly would
not have led to the outcome desired by Maybanke Anderson, that "the position
of the teacher-nurse would be elevated to the rank of a profession". Only a
handful of young women ever graduated from this course and in 1905 the
program lapsed. This was not because of lack of demand for kindergarten
nurses but because, as Elizabeth Jenkins, Principal of the Kindergarten
Teachers College explained in 1906

Until ... the position is better paid, there is small inducement for
any young woman to take such a course ... the sum offered is often
less than that paid an untrained housemaid, while the quality of
service exacted is much higher.

In 1906 the Sydney Norland Institute was established. Based on its English
parent, it offered a twelve month course which included work in a hospital, a
kindergarten and its own nurseries. It aimed to supply educated nursery nurses
care for infants in bourgeois homes. Its object was to "further national
welfare by reducing maternal ignorance widely held responsible for the high
infant death-rate". In 1911 it was reported that over 500 mothers were
seeking a Norland nurse and that "the nurses begin at once with a good
salary". The Kindergarten Union may have been influenced by such a high
level of demand or perhaps by the reported improvement in salary. It may also
have believed that the standard of training program offered by the Norland
Institute was not sufficiently high. Whatever the reasons, in April, 1911, the
Kindergarten Union decided to reinstate its kindergarten nurse course and Ridie
Lee Buckey's program with little alteration was taken out of mothballs. The
course was advertised as an option for girls "who have sense enough to prefer
home life to office work", who liked teaching but who did not have sufficient
education to enter the teacher training program, "and, which is, perhaps, most
important of all ... who have no need to earn their living, but hope some day to
be happy wives and mothers ... the chief object of a woman's life".
The kindergarten nurse course aimed "to get a girl to take complete charge of a child of three years or upwards". The only entrance requirements were personal suitability, English knowledge, and the £12/12/- fee necessary to do the course. The graduate could look forward to a salary of £40 to £50 per annum in addition to board and residence provided by the employer. She could also of course look forward to whatever restrictive condition of employment the employer chose to impose. In 1912, four women graduated from this course but in the 14 years to 1925 when the course lapsed again there were a mere 45 graduates.

Early in 1925, Harriet Dumolo, Principal of the Kindergarten Teacher College, initiated a revision of the kindergarten nurse program. She wrote to Dr Harper, Director of the Tresillian Training Centres suggesting that the two organisations cooperate in training nurses who "will be available as special children's nurses, and will be equipped with knowledge which will enable them to deal with older children as well as babies in arms." The Royal Society thought this to be "a wise policy on the part of the Union and we shall endeavour on our part to see that the training is of the highest order." This new professional was to be called a "Froebel Nurse". Entrance requirements for the course were the same as for the kindergarten nurse course, that is, personal suitability, a certain standard of English and fee paying ability. The twelve months training was evenly divided between Tresillian and the Kindergarten Teachers College. While at Tresillian, students completed the same study course as Baby Health Centre nurses but since Froebel Nurse students had not previously been trained as general or obstetric nurses, their practical work was for six months rather than three. The kindergarten component was also six months.

The first Froebel Nurse graduated in 1925. The event was remarked in the Annual Reports of both voluntary organisations. The Kindergarten Union
noted with pleasure the graduate, Freda Wood, was already employed and that

There is a big demand for trained children's nurses. This course should attract many girls as a happy and congenial means of livelihood, as well as being a fitting preparation for life in the home - their own, or that of others.  

The graduates commanded salaries of £104 per annum plus board and residence. Most of the graduates went into "positions in the country" presumably as nannies and governesses and with hopes that they might catch some wealthy squatter's son. However, despite the Kindergarten Union's proud hopes that the course would be popular, between 1925 and 1932 when the course ceased again, there had been a mere fifteen graduates. The influence of the economic depression in the early 1930s cannot be discounted in the demise of the course. Nor indeed can the influence of Mrs McElhane, who was Chairperson of the Tresillian Petersham Management Committee from 1925. It is probably significant that withdrawal of the Froebel Nurse course coincided with the extension of the Mothercraft Nurse course to fifteen months by the inclusion of a three months' component of lectures and practical work in the Association's nurseries and nursery schools. That development is discussed in Chapter 8. For the present, in the period up to 1932, a total of some 60 Kindergarten and Froebel Nurses were produced and it is plain that they were not programmed to consider day nursery work as one of their options.

There was one exception. This was (Marion) Elsie Battley, a 1913 graduate of the Kindergarten College's revived Kindergarten Nurse course. Miss Battley was employed at the Forest Lodge Day Nursery from 1915 to 1932. When the Rose Street Nursery moved to 24 Arundel St. Forest Lodge in October 1913 there was no kindergarten nearby so throughout 1914 the day nursery staff bore the total load of occupying the children. It is evident that the Matron, Jessie Gratton, was well aware of her own inabilities to provide adequately for the older children. It was she, rather than the Forest Lodge
Committee, who first reported in 1915 that "At the beginning of January we organised a Kindergarten School for the little ones and it has been a huge success". Quite clearly Matron Gratton understood the need to provide "for the mental side of the children's nature ... uniting amusement with instruction and education with play". Unfortunately at this time space nothing could be discovered about Jessie Gratton's origins or previous training but her comment that "Many of the bairns that come to us have to be taught to play" may indicate both a Scots background and some understanding of the Froebellian Kindergarten. Similarly, no information about Elsie Battley's background could be obtained so it is not known whether she knew Jessie Gratton or any of the Committee women personally. However, while she was a student, Elsie Battley had undertaken some of her practical experience at the Golden Fleece Kindergarten in 1913 and so encountered the day nursery children. This experience may have inspired her to want to continue to work with these children. Whatever the circumstances were, Elsie Battley was appointed as a kindergarten teacher at the Forest Lodge Nursery and was apparently a great success, continuing to work for 17 years with a succession of Matrons despite difficult working conditions.

Elsie Battley's course in 1912-13 comprised practical work in the kindergarten in the mornings and classes in the afternoons on singing, voice production, folk dancing, handwork, sewing, "children's playthings", nature study, hygiene, cooking, child study and "method". She was therefore prepared to be a practical helper in the nursery with some skills to provide music, movement, craft and handwork activities for the children. To assist Miss Battley, Jessie Gratton initiated an appeal to buy a piano and achieved her target in 1917. The following year the Forest Lodge Committee provided the funds to rent two extra rooms in a house at the back of the nursery so that Miss Battley had some free space in which to work with the kindergarten age
children. This produced a double benefit in that it also gave "Matron a much-needed extra cot room".\textsuperscript{72} Regretfully, this new space was lost in September, 1919 and hopes to build an extension to replace the space were finally abandoned in 1921.\textsuperscript{73} So, for some thirteen years, Miss Battley continued to operate her kindergarten activities in the children's dining room. Miss Battley's services were dispensed with in 1932 ostensibly because there were too few children of kindergarten age attending the nursery. However, it is probable that Miss Battley's advancing years and the Association's venture into training nursery school teachers were also contributing factors. Whether Miss Battley simply recognised the writing on the wall or not, she was reported to have accepted the decision in good spirit, agreeing with the Association's "desire to keep down expenses" and also that the children could be managed by the junior nurse who "shows great aptitude in teaching the children games and rhymes, and marching to the gramophone; also taking them every day to University Park for exercise".\textsuperscript{74} Remarkable indeed was the selflessness of this product of the Kindergarten Training College. There was no such other ever employed.

In summary then, until the 1930s the nursery staff were predominantly general trained nurses and domestic assistants, none of whom had any special prior training which was directly relevant to caring for babies and young children in group situations. The Matrons of the establishments were primarily administrators whose chief duties were financial and housekeeping management and maintenance of the nurseries' hygiene and nutrition programs. Day-to-day care of the children was primarily the responsibility of less well qualified or partially trained junior nurses and domestic assistants. The care and education programs which these women provided for the children during their long hours at the nurseries are discussed in Chapter 7.
6.2.4 Nursery school teachers

In October, 1931, Lady MacCallum's long cherished dream of employing qualified nursery school teachers to care for the older children in the nurseries began to become a concrete reality. The development of nursery school teacher training from 1931 to 1945 under the Association's auspices is discussed in Chapter 8. Here it is sufficient to note four points.

First, apart from Miss Battley at Forest Lodge, nursery school teachers were the first nursery staff employed by the Association who were specifically professionally qualified to care for and educate groups of young children aged from eighteen months or two years to school age. They had successfully completed one or two year programs based on the English McMillan nursery school diploma. The programs required at least an Intermediate Certificate standard of education for entry. They included study of the theory and practice of education, child psychology and intelligence testing, modern principles of hygiene and nutrition, curriculum content in literature, music, movement, speech training, art, handwork and gardening. Hence at last after 26 years of service provision, the Association was able to provide its own brand of education directly within the nurseries.

Second, this was a new teacher training program and in addition it was one which challenged the Kindergarten Union's 35 year monopoly over the early childhood education field. Moreover, by definition, a nursery school teacher trained by the Association was expected to work in its day care services after graduation. Hence, for the reasons discussed previously, the programs were only attractive to women who were committed to ideals of service, who were prepared to work long hours for little financial reward and who accepted the fact that there were mothers who needed to work. Therefore, the numbers of graduates each year were very small and it was not until 1938 that sufficient nursery school teachers had been trained to staff the six nurseries that had
been established by 1930.

Third, the introduction of nursery school teacher training permanently changed the nature of the Association's future service provision. The nursery school teachers were clearly successful in changing the nurseries from restrictive, noisy and mildly chaotic places into busy, pleasant and harmoniously ordered ones. The changes which were so positively remarked by Committee women were just as positively remarked by prospective client women. Hence, applications for places soared. Moreover, interest in reducing infant mortality had waned since public infant health programs had been so successful. In addition, providing nurseries for babies under two years was much more costly since the staffing ratio needed to be much higher. Therefore, as more teachers were trained, new centres established in the 1930s and 1940s did not plan for babies but were nursery schools only, designed for children aged eighteen months or two years to school age and staffed entirely by nursery school teachers, students in training and domestic helpers.

Fourth, in the older nurseries which continued to cater for babies as well as older children, there were some vigorous demarcation disputes between the older Matrons and the younger nursery school teachers. The nursery school staffing formula assumed that nurses would care for babies under eighteen months but it also assumed that the senior nursery school teacher was the Director of the total establishment. At some nurseries, the existing Matrons were simply summarily dismissed and replaced by nurses who accepted the situation and confined their activities to the babies and the cot room. But at other nurseries, Branch Committees were reluctant to dismiss elderly, long-serving Matrons who had nowhere else to go. Hence there was often confusion about who was in charge of what. In addition, there were age differences between the women and they had different training and attitudes. The problems at those nurseries were not satisfactorily resolved until the Matrons finally retired.
6.3 **Industrial Issues**

For all of the period under discussion here, none of the nursery staff was covered by any industrial award. In the early part of the century, nurses saw themselves as a cut above shop assistants and factory hands and they insisted on exclusion from legislation protecting other women workers from exploitation, preferring to endure rather than complain.\textsuperscript{75} By 1908 the NSW Labor Council was committed to a policy of securing awards for nurses and domestic workers in hospitals but the ATNA remained determinedly aloof from the Council's efforts.\textsuperscript{76} Eventually, Public Service Association Awards for hospital nurses and domestic workers were won in the 1920s and later, awards were made under the respective unions as they were established. However, there was no award for nurses working outside hospitals and large institutions until 1946 and no award for domestic staff working in early childhood services until 1969.\textsuperscript{77} Nursery school teachers only received their award in 1970.\textsuperscript{78} Hence, for all of the period studied here, nursery staff salaries and working conditions were a matter of private negotiation between the staff and the Association unregulated by any trade union or arbitration system. The negotiations were necessarily constrained by the financial resources available. They were also tempered by the ideological and class backgrounds of the participants, their gender, and for the contact staff in particular, by the very nature of their occupations as providers of human services. Dissatisfied by their salaries and working conditions, as many undoubtedly were, there was no question of using the ultimate industrial strike weapon, since the "compassion trap" held them firmly in fear of the adverse consequences this would have on their clients.

6.3.1 **Salaries**

There can be no doubt that the Association wished to provide the highest quality care for the children which it could afford. It was also aware that such
care depended on the quality of its staff. Hence, if the Association was to attract and retain competent, qualified women, the amounts and conditions offered had at least to be comparable with those available in other sections of the health care and education industries. Therefore first, as was customary for nurses, all positions provided residential accommodation at the nursery. Thus staff had no expenses on travel, food, rent, furniture, linen or fuel. Doubtless the worthy Matron of each establishment kept a watchful housekeeper's eye on consumption and possible disappearance of supplies provided by the Association, but there is no indication in any of the records that staff abused the benefits which living-in afforded. It is difficult to calculate the monetary values of such residential accommodation but, given the living costs cited elsewhere, it was probably worth an additional third of the salaries paid. Second, although salaries were never high, they were regularly reviewed and adjusted as far as funds permitted. The records regularly show that, following particularly successful fundraising activities or increases in state subsidy, increasing staff salaries was a high priority. Every effort was made to keep pace with salaries in the wider community and probably the salaries offered to the nursing staff were not hugely different from those which obtained in private hospitals. A hierarchical system was used as was customary in hospitals, however salary differentials between Matrons, senior, junior and probationary nurses varied considerably at different times. For example, in 1918, Jessie Gratton as Head Matron supervising three nurseries, earned a salary of £100 per annum while senior nurses were paid £58/10/-, junior nurses £52 and nurses on six months probation £39.79 However, in 1927, the supervisory position had been abandoned, and Matrons at each of the five nurseries were paid £117 per annum and other nurses £104.80 These salary levels remained more or less stable until the end of the Second World War by which time they had increased to £230 for Matrons in nurseries with babies and £190 for a nurse acting as a Matron in other nurseries.81
Nursery school teachers were however poorly paid compared with other teachers. When the Association began to train and employ them, the Committee women equated the teachers with nurses and treated them accordingly. Hence, since nurses were paid £1/5/- per week, new teacher graduates were paid the same if they were in charge of a nursery school, or even 2/6 per week less if they were assisting. At this time, unclassified teachers working with the Department of Education were paid £3 per week, so even after living-in benefits were taken into account, nursery school teachers were poorly paid indeed. The situation was little different by the end of the Second World War. Nursery school teachers were paid £150 to £180 per annum depending on their years of experience and Directors were paid £230, the same as a Matron in charge of a nursery for babies. At this time the lowest paid Department of Education teachers received £212 per annum with progression possible to £410. As one of the 1935 teacher graduates explained

You see all those old ladies still considered us as nurses and expected us to be happy with hospital conditions. We were regarded as sort of nursery maids and they were very condescending to us ... One of the teachers was saying something about meals or salaries or something and one of the Committee women said, What do you think we're doing? We work like slaves to provide the money to pay you, and I said, Excuse me but don't you work for the money to pay for the children ... It was her attitude, looking down on everyone and we were on a par with the grubby children. It was a charity for us. The fact that we worked for practically nothing so they could afford to pay for the children meant nothing.

Nevertheless, despite the low wages which the teachers were paid, the cost of staff salaries continued to escalate, as was discussed in Chapter 5 (see Figure 3), primarily because, as the years went by, the teachers insisted that child to staff ratios should be reduced.

6.3.2 Working conditions

In return for the living-in conditions and salaries, until 1930 the nursery staff were required to work up to eleven hours a day Monday to Friday and
seven hours on Saturday, a 62 hour week. Unfortunately no information is available about what breaks if any the staff were able to take during those hours, nor is there any complete information about the staffing ratios at the nurseries. What little evidence exists suggests that the normal ratio was ten children to one adult, somewhat higher than would be expected today, but not outrageously so. However, it can be assumed that if the staff did take breaks, their only recreational areas were their own bedrooms on the premises or the public streets. Also, if staff members were absent, there were no substitute staff to replace them, hence child to adult ratios would have been even higher than normal.

Since the days were long, child to adult ratios were high, financial rewards were not great and staff had no particularly relevant preparation for working with young children, one cannot help but wonder how satisfied these women were with their occupations. The Executive Committee Minutes make no record of staff complaints, but this may merely reflect the socialisation of the nursing staff as women working in traditional nurturant occupations, caught in the "compassion trap" and unable to take any form of industrial action. One indicator of job satisfaction used today is rate of staff turnover. Records are too incomplete to give any indication about junior nurses and domestic staff, but credits given to Matrons in the Annual Reports do at least permit an examination of their periods of service and the reasons for their departures. These credits reveal that most Matrons stayed for five to seven years, while a very few lasted ten to fourteen years. Their resignations were attributed to a number of causes. For example, Sarah Breddon left to travel overseas but it may be significant that on return to Sydney she did not seek a day nursery position again. Jennie Hassard "was obliged to resign her position for family reasons." No explanation is available for Matron Ryrie's departure. Jessie Gratton resigned to be married while Matron O'Keeffe appears to have reached
retirement age. These periods of service and the reasons for the Matrons' resignations suggest that at least these women found the positions congenial and they resigned only because of age or external factors in their personal lives.

Throughout all these years the Executive Committee kept a watchful eye on staff appointments and when necessary, they were quick to act if the nurses did not live up to expectations. For example, when Sarah Breden resigned in August, 1906, mothers were being turned away because all places were taken. However, two weeks after the appointment of the new Matron there were five or six vacant places each day and three months later there were no new applicants at all. The Committee concluded that, although the Nursery was being kept in reasonable condition, the Matron was unable to "call forth the sympathy and co-operation of the mothers". They therefore decided that "the Matron did not seem to have the elements necessary to make her a successful head of such an Institution as the Nursery" and she was asked to resign. Similarly, in the difficult conditions at Surry Hills nursery in 1921 and 1922 during the demolition and rebuilding of the terrace row, there was a succession of unsatisfactory Matrons, one being dismissed because the Visiting Committee "was not entirely satisfied with the appearance or attitude of the Matron - also Matron's bedroom has been found to be most untidy" and because the nursery "was both untidy and not altogether too clean [and] the Matron had not been dressed in uniform." Clearly the Committee women were very definite about the personal warmth characteristics, the standards of domestic housekeeping and the level of civility which they required. These values were clearly expressed in their public commendations of those Matrons who did manage to satisfy the Committee's high expectations. These women were praised for making the nursery a bright and happy home for the babies, for winning the love of both the children and their mothers, for filling a difficult position, for arousing the interest and enthusiasm of the neighbourhood, for showing
untiring devotion, for willing co-operation with the Committee, as well as for managing the household accounts with thrift. Their resignations were accompanied by sincere regrets on the Committee's part and expressions of how much the Matron would be missed by the mothers and children.

Relationships between the Committee women and the nursery staff were never quite the same after the nursery schools were introduced. Of course, the Committee was just as happy to commend staff who displayed the values by which the Association measured merit. In particular, the first Superintendent of Nursery School Training, Miss Gillespie, who burnt out before she had completed her one year contract, was praised because

she did not spare herself. It is difficult to see how she could, single-handed, have achieved so much, undertaking as she did to re-organise the Nursery, do the housekeeping, devise an improved way of keeping accounts, as well as conduct the Nursery School, especially as the most rigid economy had to be enjoined upon her. It was a matter of great regret that her threatened blindness made it necessary for her to return to England.

Similarly, the second Superintendent, Miss Town, was congratulated for "her unselfish devotion [which] left ... no time for leisure or pleasure." The Committee hoped "that she will find some recompense in the genuine appreciation of all those who have come personally in contact with her."

But the nursery school teachers whom the Superintendents trained were a different breed of women from the nurses. They were just as strongly socialised as women and they had entered the profession strongly motivated by ideals of service. They had chosen nursery school teaching rather than kindergarten teaching because they rejected the kindergarten's rigidity and its provision "for children of non-necessity." Their focus was on disadvantaged children and their object was to improve the children's intellectual as well as physical development. They objected to seeing small children "all washed and brushed up ... sitting in rows on benches, expected to stay quietly and wait for
a very early lunch". They were free, independent spirits who had not been subjected to repressive, regimented hospital training and they wanted the children to be free and independent too. The Committee women did not understand.

They were nice warm hearted housewives who were there because they loved children but they didn't have any conception of education. They used to think that the children had too many toys, didn't know anything about the psychology of children and they didn't see that there was any need to know.

Hence, the teachers "were up against getting any educational principles across within the organisation as well as outside." They were also "up against" the Committee women in trying to improve their salaries and working conditions. The teachers were less accepting of exploitation than the nurses and they objected strenuously to being "hamstrung around with rules and regulations ... and expected to do what we were told". From 1936 they became progressively more militant in demanding improvements. Initially they accepted living-in conditions since the hours were long and the morning start was so early, that it was preferable not to add hours of travel onto the day. They even accepted the low salaries since any pay was better than no pay and they were doing what they wanted to do. However, they wanted an eight hour day like other workers. The Executive Committee proposed that they could work 9am to 3pm and Saturday mornings, and that the Matrons and nurses would care for the children for the remaining hours. However that was fought by the teachers. They said that would be absolutely wrong, there'd be no contact with parents at all and there'd be no stability for the children. We worked it so that we had overlapping shifts, 7am to 3pm, 9am to 5 or 6pm, so we had continuity. It was a long while before people could see why we did it. We worked it out on the basis of the children's needs. The Committee didn't understand why, didn't understand that children didn't come in just to be minded.

In this battle, the teachers' educational principles prevailed, since their own solution to the problem did not affect the Association's finances. Indeed, the
teachers had the impression that "It didn't matter what we did with the children as long as we didn't exceed the Committee's bank balances." 101

In 1938, the teachers formed a Nursery School Teachers Association to give themselves a forum to discuss both their work and their working conditions. The Executive Committee was stunned to receive correspondence from this group and rejected it out of hand. 102 However, the group persisted and in 1941 it presented the Committee with a log of claims concerning control over staff in the nurseries, recreation leave, sick pay, living-out allowances, salary increases, relief from restrictive rules governing lights and telephone usage and responsibility for interviewing parents. 103 The teachers did win some concessions a year later but it was not until May, 1943 that the greater part of their claims were incorporated into the Branch Rules. 104 In the meantime, the teachers began discussions with the NSW Teachers Federation to try to obtain coverage under their award. 105 They were unsuccessful since the Department of Education did not recognise their nursery school diploma as a qualification for employment in departmental schools. 106 The teachers then informed the Committee that they had formed their own union. 107 The Committee was aghast since

they didn't want us to be a union, or have anything to do with unions. Unions were wrong. An Association was alright, it wasn't a union because it didn't govern our terms of employment. It was just something private among the teachers. 108

The teachers' union never did become a registered union. The fight to obtain shorter working hours, better salaries, and greater recognition of the teachers' work as educationalists continued to be an internal battle between the teachers and the Association for the next 35 years until the teachers finally obtained coverage under the Assistant Masters and Assistant Mistresses Association (now the Independent Teachers Association) in 1970.
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CHAPTER SEVEN

THE CHILDREN'S EXPERIENCE

As was discussed in previous chapters, the Association's day care services have always had a social purpose, aiming to assist disadvantaged women in keeping their babies and young children within their family units when financial circumstances forced the mothers into the paid workforce outside the home. This is not to say that the Association actually encouraged mothers' workforce participation nor that it approved of men who were unable or unwilling financial providers. Rather, the Association provided residual services until such times as families could be restored to "normal" and the mothers could return to their rightful domestic and childrearing roles in their homes. For all of the years under study here, the perception of the nurseries as welfare institutions by most of the Committee women, state politicians and bureaucrats and by professional experts, particularly kindergarten teachers, led to the identification of the services as primarily custodial places which kept children safe from such hazards as physical abuse, inadequate supervision, insufficient or inappropriate food and lack of shelter.

However, to imply as many have done that the nurseries were merely restrictive, custodial places is to do them an injustice. They may have been overcrowded and staffed by women who were ill-prepared for their tasks, but they had clear health care and educational aims for the children who, after all, were the direct recipients of the services. Initially, the aim was to assist in reducing infant mortality rates and later this aim extended to producing children who would enter school medically fit and with healthy teeth. The services also aimed to begin the children's social and moral development into
worthy future citizens. There were then both health care and educational programs at the nurseries, albeit of a sometimes ad hoc and informally structured nature. These programs are the subject of this chapter.

The Association's records show quite clearly that this organisation was aligned with the best British and American organisations in its intentions to provide quality care for the children it served. However, in practice, the efforts of both the Committee women and the staff were constrained by their knowledge, or more frequently their lack of knowledge, for the tasks they undertook; by their moral value systems; and by the availability of funds. All of these factors affected such aspects of service provision as child to staff ratios, the physical facilities of the services; the quality and quantity of children's equipment and play materials, and the nature of the health care and educational programs which were offered. Hence, actual conditions in the nurseries fostered and sometimes justified a community view of the services as physically safe but educationally unsound institutions. By the 1930s when the Association began to train its own nursery school teachers along McMillan lines, that view was well-entrenched. Overcoming it was to be the nursery school teachers' biggest battle, one which even today has not yet been fully won.

7.1 The Care and Protection Program

Given the social purposes of the services, the interest of the medical profession, the health oriented nursing staff, and the non-existence of any scientific body of knowledge about children's psychological development at the beginning of the twentieth century, it is not surprising that from the outset, the services operated by the Association were strongly focused on children's physical welfare. Indeed, this was appropriate for a day care service since management of the nutrition, health and safety aspects of the program was as fundamental to the service provision then as it is today. These aspects
provide the foundation for whatever educational programs are to be implemented and they are the aspects of service provision which are most subject to precise licensing regulations.

7.1.1 Nutrition

Throughout all its years of service provision, the Association has focused strongly on providing adequate and suitable food for the children. It was saddened to find that many of the children at entry to the nursery were the victims of inadequate nourishment and "ignorant and improper feeding". Both Committee women and the nursing staff disapproved of the children's home diets. For example, Sarah Breden was shocked to find that on entry to the nursery many children preferred water or cocoa to milk and treacle to butter. Mrs Dane disparaged diets of corned beef, cabbage and currant buns. They were similarly united in their great pride in seeing

... that even a few weeks of wholesome diet and proper care can change a puny, miserable, sad-faced baby into a jolly, bouncing little youngster such as one may see in any ordinary comfortable circumstance family.

This kind of transformation greatly impressed the public, as the lyrical outpouring of one male journalist in 1906 attests:

... a pretty babe ... had come there a poor wasted atom of humanity, with a frail hold on what had so far proved to it a sad world. The skill of the nurses in charge, and the attention of the honorary medical staff has snatched the little life back from the brink of eternity to become, Mayhap, the strong mother of many future good citizens of Australia, and to be at least now a comfort to her hard-working mother.

He also claimed that "so that there shall be no suffering to the child by wrong diet enough food for the night is sent home when the mother comes for her child in the evening". However no supporting evidence for this extravagant claim has been found so it was probably an over-enthusiastic statement. Whatever nutritional benefits the children received were undoubtedly obtained
from two main thrusts in the nursery program. First, as was stated in the
Regulations for Parents in 1906,

Parents or guardians will be instructed by the Matron with regard to
the proper food to be given during the time spent at home, and it is
particularly requested that no other food than that specified by the
Matron shall be given. (Plate 3)

Diet charts were drawn up by the Honorary Medical officers according to the
principles of their knowledge base, and then it was the Matron's responsibility
to ensure that this diet was implemented both in the nursery and at home. As
Miss Burne, one of Dr Armstrong's Sanitary Inspectors and Health Visitors,
noted at the Forest Lodge nursery in 1914,

a scale of diet is given to each mother by the Matron who urges the
necessity of rigid adherence to it, and also the necessity of cleanli-
ness and ventilation in the home.8

Thus the Matrons, who interacted with the mothers each day at the times of
delivery and collection of the children, were charged with an important
educative function. However, what success they had in changing dietary
practices at home remains problematic. Perhaps the nutrition of some children
was improved by the advice offered by the nursery but there were no sanctions
that the nursery could enforce if mothers simply accepted the diet charts
politely and then proceeded to ignore them. Moreover, given their incomes, the
mothers may not have been able to afford the recommended foodstuffs. Also,
since the Matrons regularly and strongly expressed their sympathies with the
hard lives of the working mothers, it is doubtful that any of them was actually
either as severe or as peremptory in her advice to mothers as the Regulations
might suggest.

The second, and probably the more important thrust in the nutrition
program, was, as stated in the Regulations for Parents

During the hours spent by the child in the Day Nursery it will be
given suitable food at proper intervals. (Plate 3)
The chief ingredient considered to be "suitable food", and which contributed to the reportedly remarkable transformations of the children, was milk. For young infants this was considered to be breastmilk and the Regulations for Parents stated that:

In the case of mothers nursing their infants, arrangements may be made for the mother to attend at convenient intervals for the purpose of feeding her child. (Plate 3)

However, since the mothers' workplaces and work schedules did not necessarily permit the women's attendance at the nursery to feed their infants, this was probably more an ideological commitment statement than a statement of actual conditions. Artificial feeding appears to have been the norm. In the early years, the donations in kind listed in the early Annual Reports show that Mellin's, Nestle's and Allen and Hanbury's Foods, as well as fresh cows' milk, were used. The cows' milk was probably modified, using principles such as those outlined by Dr Muskett in his *The Feeding and Management of Australian Infants*. Muskett recommended the addition of an alkali such as lime water to reduce acidity or a thickener such as barley water which would break up curd formation, the addition of sugar and dilution of the milk. Sterilisation and storage of the formula was probably done using a machine constructed according to a design published in the British Medical Journal and which Muskett had persuaded a local ironmonger to manufacture.

However, there was always concern about the recurrent summer disease, gastro-enteritis. The early Annual Reports regularly commented on whether or not the nursery escaped "the much dreaded disease which is so prevalent in our midst" or "experienced the greatest difficulties in coping with this dreadful scourge." While there was still no refrigeration and milk supplies remained unreliable in their cleanliness, by 1914 it was considered safer to use already processed condensed milk and barley water, "this food agreeing with the babies, and is within reach of the mothers." This mixture was even advocated by
Armstrong's Health Visitors, since it was convenient, comparatively cheap and had reasonable keeping capacity. However, although the babies fed on this mixture looked healthy enough, the diet was deficient in Vitamins A and D. Lewis noted that infants fed in this way were in fact poorly nourished and low in vitality and that rickets was a commonly associated disorder.\textsuperscript{13} It was not until the 1920s that, as Reiger has described, the medicalisation of infant feeding made infant care a highly complex scientific and professional affair.\textsuperscript{14} Books and pamphlets by such infant welfare experts as Dr Margaret Harper in Sydney and Dr Vera Scantlebury-Brown in Melbourne emphasised regular feeding schedules, precision in measurement of formulas and babies, charting age/weight progress and above all, medical supervision of both mothers and babies.\textsuperscript{15} Of course, the development of the ice chest and the ready availability of block ice were also necessary steps for the return of modified cows' milk as a safe formula for infant feeding.\textsuperscript{16}

Toddlers and older children were fed "sundry saucers of bread and milk" and "milk, cream, porridge or whatever is deemed most suitable."\textsuperscript{17} If Muskett's advice was being followed, toddlers up to two years of age received up to two pints of milk a day. From six months, potatoes, gravy, broth, light puddings, eggs and "a bone to suck" were progressively added, followed by rusks and bread at 12 months and the first meat and poultry at 18 months. Minced mutton was considered the most preferable meat. No fruit or vegetables other than potatoes were included in this diet at all. Older children were given bread and milk for breakfast, soup and milk pudding for dinner (the middle of the day meal) and milk, bread and treacle for "early tea", a late afternoon meal.\textsuperscript{18} Modern dietetics would not evaluate the children's milk and high starch diets favourably and would condemn the lack of fibre and vitamin C. But contemporary judgments were all laudatory, agreeing that the nursery's nutritional regime contributed positively to the physical welfare of the babies and children.
in its care.

As discussed in previous chapters, the immediate post First World War period was a time of renewed interest in reducing infant mortality and in child health. There had been scientific advances in knowledge of the composition of food. The existence and function of some vitamins became known in 1912 and subsequently scientific research into the chemical properties of various foods filtered into domestic science teaching programs and cookbooks produced for the ordinary housewife.¹⁹ Throughout the 1920s, growing medical interest in child health, political interest in national fitness and various Royal Commissions particularly those concerned with the Basic Wage, combined to produce heightened awareness of nutritional issues. The science of diatetics was spawned and the training of professional dieticians was begun. Health and other social conditions produced by the economic conditions of the late 1920s and early 1930s were the final catalyst which led to the formation of the Commonwealth Advisory Council on Nutrition in 1936. This body, with the co-operation of State Committees, conducted a national survey of household expenditure on and consumption of foodstuffs and the physical condition of children. The Council's Final Report in 1938 was comforting in that it found that there was no major cause for alarm about Australian nutritional standards.²⁰ However, the work was significant in drawing wide public attention to questions of nutritional and dietary composition.

There can be little doubt that the Committee women and nursery staff were aware of this intellectual ferment in infant and child physical welfare circles. The records of the Association indicate that introduction of changes into the nurseries' nutritional and health programs began in 1923 after Mrs Doretta MacCallum was elected President of the Association and Miss Stella Davies became General Secretary. Early in 1922, perhaps at Mrs MacCallum's prompting, Dr J.S. Purdy, Medical Officer of Health, City of Sydney and the
aging Dr (later Sir) Charles Clubbe, President of the Board of Management, Royal Alexandra Hospital for Children, were asked to examine all 150 children attending the three nurseries which were operating at that time. Their report on the children's health remained in abeyance until October, 1923, two months after the new leadership team had taken office. Mrs MacCallum then wasted no time in reorganising the medical supervision of the nurseries. She was a new broom and she swept the older breed of doctors out, replacing them with a new team of younger men who were more in tune with modern medical knowledge and approaches. Under Dr Clubbe's general direction, this new team visited the nurseries weekly, and instructed the nursery staff in weighing both babies and older children weekly and in keeping age/weight charts. They revised the children's dietary program along new dietetic lines based on knowledge of the main food groups and essential vitamins. They, along with Mrs MacCallum, struggled to convince some of the older Matrons of the value of the new dietary program.

In the new dietetic regime, each child was given three meals a day, carefully planned to provide a balanced diet. Included was one pint of milk a day, fresh fruit and wholemeal bread. Cod liver oil supplement was introduced in March, 1924 and by August the Committee was pleased to note the children's weight gains. In her Annual Report for 1927-28, Stella Davies observed that

The general health and physique of the children has been found to be remarkably good - surprisingly so - if consideration is given to the housing conditions under which most of the children live. Cases of absolute malnutrition are extremely rare; and though many children, on admission, are underweight - if the child attends regularly - this is rectified by the careful nursery diet and regular medical supervision.

However, as always, although it is clear that the Association wished to implement the most up-to-date dietary regime planned according to the most advanced medical knowledge, the new diet was costly and maintaining it was a problem. Stella Davies, ever honest in her reporting and earnest in her efforts
to improve the quality of life for the children, noted in her 1928-29 Annual Report that

It has been computed that 1/- will provide food for one day for a child at the Nursery. Much thought and planning is devoted to the question of food ... and the Committees are satisfied that the diet given to the children is well balanced, except in the amount of fresh fruit supplied. Housekeeping expenses permit of this most necessary item being given two or three times only during the week. Cases of fruit, especially oranges and apples, are always most welcome donations at all of the Nurseries.28

In the following years, the children's diets were regularly reviewed as new knowledge became available, or, as in wartime conditions, foodstuffs changed in their availability. There were continuous efforts to increase amounts of milk, meat, eggs, fruit and vegetables in the diets, to increase the variety of foodstuffs offered and to improve the flavour, texture, and visual appeal of the meals.29 At different times the revisions were initiated by interested Matrons, planned by commissioned consultant dieticians or, on one occasion, designed by Lady MacCallum herself with Dr Wade's approval.30 Throughout, the Executive and Branch Committees maintained continuous watch over the balance between the benefits of improved nutrition and their cost.31 They were always grateful to Matrons who demonstrated skills in both good cooking and thrifty household management.32 Indeed, the success or failure of the nutritional program depended heavily on the Matron's knowledge and understanding of the new principles, since in most of the nurseries they continued to have management responsibility for domestic maintenance.33 In some cases, the Matrons' authority over both the children's and the staff's food was a major dissatisfaction for the young nursery school teachers and a continuing source of conflict and irritation between the teachers and the nursing staff.34

7.1.2 Health

By 1905, scarlet fever, diphtheria, typhoid fever and bubonic plague were legally notifiable diseases and the Coast (now Prince Henry) Hospital had been
established to deal with infected patients. By 1920, tuberculosis, infantile paralysis and meningitis had been added to the list of notifiable diseases. There had been attempts during the early infant mortality campaigns to include gastro-enteritis in the list but none of these efforts was successful. This disease, along with other non-notifiable diseases such as influenza, whooping cough, measles, varicella and rubella, remained subject to periodic epidemic outbreak.

It is important to remember from a perspective in the 1980s that, until sulpha drugs became available in the mid 1930s and penicillin in the 1940s, death from any of these epidemic diseases remained an awful though declining prospect for children and adults alike. Hence, undoubtedly, it was fear of disease transmission in the close confines of the nursery which prompted the Regulation that

Parents or Guardians must at once report to the Matron the existence and nature of any infectious disease that may occur in the child's home. Should it be proved that this rule has been broken in any instance, the attendance of the child must forthwith cease. (Plate 3)

The Regulation is not exactly clear about what procedures would take place if the presence of an infectious disease in the child's home was reported. However, by 1914, in practice it meant that no child suffering from an infectious disease, including gastro-enteritis, was admitted to the nursery. This was a very necessary rule since, although at this time the actual mechanisms of transmission of specific diseases were not fully understood, quite clearly exclusion of infected children completely eliminated any potential risks. But it was unmerciful, since it meant that the children's mothers were forced either to forgo income and stay home to nurse their children or to go to work leaving their sick children in perhaps inadequate care.

Miss Burne was well aware of the repercussions of the exclusion rule. She observed that
While seeing the wisdom of this rule under existing conditions, it is very hard for these working mothers who find it necessary to stay at home and nurse the sick one, thus losing the means of providing not only for the sick child, but also for the others who are dependent on her ... These children are often not sick enough for Hospital treatment, but during convalescence require correct diet and care to prevent a recurrence, which is frequent when left to the care of any irresponsible person while the mother is earning the necessary means to provide food and carry on the treatment begun by the Hospital.38

She therefore recommended that the Association consider setting aside a room at the nursery as an isolation room with an Alice Rawson nurse in attendance, arguing that

... the Alice Rawson nurse would be of great benefit. The nursing and care that is so necessary to the little sick one could be given, and the mother enabled to go on with her work ... children who were suffering or recovering from gastro-enteritis could be kept separate and nursed back to health, and the mother taught and helped to do her part of the work.39

Miss Burne's proposal was both humanitarian and inspired but it was never put into practice. There were three main reasons for this. First, there was simply not enough space in those nurseries, which were converted houses, to allow the luxury of setting aside one room for sick children only. Rooms for sick children were incorporated into new nurseries such as the Woolloomooloo Welfare Centre but these were used simply as isolation areas until such time as mothers could be contacted to come and remove their children. Second, there was the question of who would pay the additional nurse's salary. The Association could not afford to pay for an extra nurse at each nursery whose sole duty would be individualised attention for sick children. Third, there was the question of the Association's legal responsibility should a child die while on the premises. This was not a hypothetical question since, as the Association well knew, the physical condition of even apparently well children could suddenly deteriorate and result in death within hours. It rather shocks the present day reader to encounter cases of children dying either at the nurseries or within hours of their attendance. There were more than a dozen such cases in the
years up to the 1930s, from such causes as measles, whooping cough, pneumonia, enlarged tonsils, diphtheria, congenital heart disorder, and in one case "natural causes". In each case there was an inquest and in each case the Association was exonerated. But the responsibility weighed very heavily indeed on staff and Committee women alike. They knew the nursery was not a hospital and that it did not have immediate access to doctors or surgical intervention should they be needed. Hence it is perhaps understandable that they preferred not to run the risks which accompanied childhood illnesses.

Hence, from the earliest days, the role of nurses employed in the nurseries came to exclude nursing sick children for anything more than a few hours. This was further reinforced by the state which progressively legislated to exclude children suffering specific infectious diseases for defined periods of time from public institutions such as schools and the nurseries. Consequently, the role of the nurseries came also to exclude assisting working women on those occasions when they were most desperately in need of help. Well enough to work themselves, they were forced either to forgo income and stay home to nurse their children or to go to work leaving their sick children perhaps inadequately cared for. This dialectic tension between women, work and childrearing has never been adequately solved. Even today, very few day care centres have the luxury of a room for sick children and most will send sick or injured children home as soon as parents can be contacted. Also, neither state nor voluntary agencies have established readily available health care services to assist working mothers while their children are ill or convalescing. Today's working mothers face exactly the same dilemmas when their children are sick as working mothers did in 1905.

On the positive side, there were other actions which the Association took to assist mothers when disease epidemics threatened. For example, during the influenza epidemic in 1919, all three day nurseries operated by the Association were closed, in the case of Woolloomooloo because the staff were ill but in the
case of Forest Lodge and Surry Hills out of fear of disease transmissions since none of the staff or children had contracted the disease. At Surry Hills nothing further was done, but at Forest Lodge the closure occurred so that all the staff and children could be sent to the fresh seaside air at Austinmer. The Woolloomooloo nursery continued to function as a food and milk supply service so that the nursery children could receive at least one meal a day.\(^{41}\) Doubtless these measures were instituted to continue the work of saving the children. But they also quite obviously assisted the mothers in feeding the children and in the case of the Forest Lodge mothers, allowed them to continue to work.

Also, some of the Honorary Medical and Dental Officers provided free treatment services for the children in addition to their inspection services at the nurseries.\(^{42}\) On many occasions children were referred to the Children's Hospital or the Dental Hospital for free medical, surgical or dental treatment.\(^{43}\) Early in 1927, Dr MacCallum obtained a supply of the Schick diphtheria vaccine from the Department of Public Health and immunised 27 children.\(^{44}\) He requested that parental permission for the children to receive the immunisation at the nursery should be a condition of entry for the child.\(^{45}\) In July, 1927, Dr Eakin immunised all children over nine months of age at the Woolloomooloo nursery.\(^{46}\) These were unfortunately isolated, individualistic efforts by concerned Honorary Doctors. For the next ten years, the Association harassed the state Health Department to immunise all the nursery children free of charge. The Department prevaricated, initially saying it could not be done until all parents had given their consent and then, when the Association provided the necessary documents, saying it did not have sufficient staff.\(^{47}\) Finally, the Department said it was a local government not a state government responsibility and it was not until the various councils began their programs in 1937 that at last all the nursery children were protected from this dreadful scourge.\(^{48}\)
Other measures were used to assist in the prevention of disease transmission at the nurseries. Two of the prime factors were clean air and sunshine. Throughout the years period judgements were made of the suitability of various premises in terms of space, light and ventilation. For example, within the first year, Nurse Breden gently condemned the terrace house at 126 Dowling Street because

*Fresh air! - that most important factor in the well-being of child-life - is at present restricted to what can be obtained within the limits of a few square yards of ground. The children are obliged to spend much of the time, therefore, within the Nursery, which although clean and cheerful does not compensate for the lack of sunshine and fresh air.*

Some years later, among the positive attributes of 24 Arundel Street, Forest Lodge were the light, spacious and airy rooms, the ground floor verandah on which babies' cots could be placed for sleeping and the large open playground at the back of the house. Similarly, the two terrace houses in which the ill-fated nursery at Chippendale began were assessed as suitable since they had a sunny back yard and an airy cot room. Also, when the premises at 6 Brougham Street, Woolloomooloo became so dilapidated that a ceiling fell in and the nursery was therefore unusable, great relief was expressed in being able to send the children to a beach cottage at Cronulla for a month. Further, when the children from Forest Lodge nursery were sent out of the city to Austinmer during the influenza epidemic, "it was noted with pleasure that they revelled in their seaside holiday ... [and] breathed so much fresh seaside air that they were fortified for some time against sickness." The value of fresh air and sunshine was therefore continuously extolled from the very beginning. Hence, when nursery schools were introduced in the 1930s, it was the British McMillan model which was adopted rather than the hot-house American laboratory-type nursery school. McMillan's emphases on correct breathing and outdoor living fitted comfortably with the Association's existing principles and so transporting children's meals and sleeping equipment outdoors did not
conflict in any way with established nursery practices.\textsuperscript{54}

A third important factor in the prevention of disease transmission was an emphasis on all aspects of cleanliness. It is apparent from the records that the relationships between dirt, flies, food contamination and gastro-enteritis were clearly recognised and the management of clean food preparation was a continuing focus at different levels of the organisation. It began with overall supervision by the Honorary Medical Officers and on at least one occasion Dr Fairfax went "to visit the dairy which served us and arrange for the special cans to be used for the Nursery twice a day and made a careful inspection of the dairy".\textsuperscript{55} At the next level, the Matrons either prepared the food themselves or supervised the assistant nurses in this task. They continually pressed for better facilities and the Committee co-operated with these requests as funds permitted. Over the years the several premises were adapted, particularly by constructing separate pantries for the hygienic preparation of infant food.\textsuperscript{56} When flyscreening became available, these pantries were proofed as also were the babies' sleeping quarters.\textsuperscript{57}

A separate cot, bed linen and towel was provided for each baby and laundresses were engaged to cope with the washing loads. Babies were bathed on arrival in the morning and were dressed in clothes belonging to the nursery.\textsuperscript{58} Their own clothes were hung on individual pegs so that they might "air" during the day.\textsuperscript{59} Older children were also bathed if necessary and boys and girls alike were dressed in a bright turkey red twill pinafore.\textsuperscript{60} Mrs Fairfax later commented that

... we thought they looked sweet, like little robins. In later years we were told that red was too exciting a colour, especially for boys! So we changed to blue and pink.\textsuperscript{61}

After 1922, each child also had a handkerchief pinned on its uniform.\textsuperscript{62} There is little information in the records about the actual bathing and toileting arrangements in the early years, but by the 1920s, plunge baths were used and
all premises were sewered. There were separate lavatories for boys and girls. In addition, despite some Committee women's scepticism, toothbrushes were introduced and the nursing staff agreed to teach the children how to use them. Hence again, by the time McMillan based nursery schools were introduced in the 1930s, the Association's focus on children's personal hygiene was already well established. The changes that were made were chiefly structural changes to fixtures so that the new approach which encouraged children's independence in management of their own hand-washing, tooth-brushing and clothes-changing could be implemented.

By the 1930s, there was one concomitant of the focus on cleanliness which had something less than desirable effects on the children. It is probably not surprising to find that there was also an associated emphasis on tidiness generally. Committee members could, and did, make unexpected visits to the nurseries in order to check that they were in spic-and-span condition. The Matrons knew that their merit would be judged in terms of the "tidiness of the room ... and the children who, under great difficulties ... were kept clean and tidy". Moreover, the Association advertised that any interested member of the public was invited to visit the nurseries after 11am, by which time it was expected that all would be in presentable order. Since dinner-time was 11.30am, the staff attempted to have the children "washed and all brushed-up ... They'd sit them in rows on a bench, waiting quietly for their meal ... of course they started squabbling". In desperation, the nurses sometimes tied the children's hands together or even tied them to the benches while waiting for the meal or visitors to appear. These undesirable practices were understandable in view of the nurses' fears of being judged negatively on the Committee women's criteria for assessment. They were not eliminated until after the nursery school teachers were employed and activities were provided to occupy the children.
7.1.3 Safety

As with the nutrition and health programs, the chief aim of the safety program in a day care centre must be prevention, in this case the prevention of accident and injury. One desirable way to achieve this aim is to ensure that the physical environment is so arranged that risk of injury is minimised. A second, and less desirable way, is to place restrictions and prohibitions on children's activities so that they do not expose themselves to risks which may unavoidably exist in the environment. In present day thinking, the best kind of day care centre safety program minimises both environmental hazards and the number of restrictive rules so that the possibilities for children's free, independent, active exploration and manipulation of the environment are maximised. To this end, state licensing, building and fire regulations have progressively set standards governing such items as indoor and outdoor space per child, building construction and materials, and equipment supplies and composition.

However, there were no such regulations governing day care centres in New South Wales until after 1956 when responsibility for licensing under the Child Welfare Act (1939) was finally passed from the Department of Education to the Child Welfare Department. Whatever policies and standards had been developed by the Day Nursery Association prior to this date arose out of interest by the Committee women and nursery staff in the children's physical safety. For the most part, since neither the Committee women nor the Medical advisers actually cared for the children daily, responsibility for developing safety principles and practices devolved on the nursery staff, who were themselves without professional preparation for their tasks. Nevertheless, the Committee women maintained an overarching authority to propose changes in nursery practices or to oppose practices which the nursery staff may have implemented.
Little can be gleaned from the Association records about just exactly what safety policies were developed for the various nurseries, each of which differed greatly in its physical environment. All the early nurseries except for the Wooolloomooloo Welfare Centre were converted domestic residences, hence none had been especially designed for the task of caring for up to 50 babies and young children for eleven hours a day. Each house was modified to make the facilities more suited to the new purposes, but nevertheless each remained essentially limited by the numbers and sizes of the rooms indoors and the area of outdoor space provided by the grounds. Indoors there were such hazards as cots to fall out of, steps to fall down, doors and windows to jam fingers in, broken glass and knives which cut, pots to pull off stoves and chemicals to ingest. Outdoors there could be poisonous leaves and berries to ingest, splinters in timber, water deep enough to drown in, ropes and swings to become entangled in and gates and fences to escape through or over. There must have been accidents and injuries to both staff and children over the years but only one incident appears to have been sufficiently noteworthy to be recorded. This occurred at the Surry Hills nursery in 1919 when "A second child had his fingers taken off in the hinges of the door", an event which provoked a reprimand for the Matron by the Branch Committee.\footnote{69} However, it was not until 1927 in a growing climate of concern about legal responsibility, insurance and workers compensation that the Association, on its Solicitor's advice, promulgated an "all care but no responsibility taken" notice.\footnote{70}

Until the introduction of nursery schools in the 1930s, the few references to safety practices which are made in the records indicate that the ways in which accidents and injuries to the children were avoided were by restricting the activities which were available to the children, either through limitation of equipment or by physical restraint. Babies not yet walking appear to have spent their entire days out of harm's way in their cots, either indoors or
wheeled out onto verandahs or into the garden. On occasion, the babies outgrew their cots and they were tied in for safety. Toddlers, then as now, presented particular problems. Even up to 1923, safety considerations and lack of suitable facilities meant that many of them also "were obliged to be kept in cots all day." In 1918 wooden pens were introduced at Woolloomooloo and a photograph in the Daily Telegraph in 1921 shows four toddlers in one elevated pen and three in another smaller pen on the ground (Plate 7a). There are no toys in the pens with the children. Another solution to the toddler problem was to enclose part of a verandah with wire or lattice thereby making a larger cage for the whole group of toddlers, providing them with light and air but keeping them safe. This practice of confined babies, whose chief stimulation appears to have been watching the equally confined activities of other babies, contrasts starkly with Jessie Ackermann's 1913 rosy picture of ordinary babies at home where

the nursery is transferred to the open, either the lawn or sand, where ... the baby is free to crawl about at will, investigating the mud-pies and play-houses of the older ones.

For the older children, outdoor activity was limited to a sandpit, some second hand mobile toys and perhaps a play-house. In 1927, at the Eastern Suburbs nursery

a roundabout was erected for the amusement of the children from old stumps and timber at the nursery. However, later on the Committee decided it was unsafe and had it replaced by a concrete sandpit.

Thus there was no climbing equipment to fall off and such water play as there was comprised washing up in dishes. Indoors, activities were even more constrained. The kitchen was certainly out of bounds, there were few toys and even less equipment. There were therefore few opportunities for the children to injure themselves. Perhaps the two little children who lost fingers in doors were playing with the doors because they were the only exciting things in the environment.
Plate 7a  Confined children, Woolloomooloo, 1921

Plate 7b  Children's activities, Woolloomooloo, 1921
As is discussed in the next section of this chapter, after nursery schools were introduced there was a much greater variety of both indoor and outdoor activities for children over eighteen months or two years. However, although there then were such hazards as climbing and sliding equipment, wading pools, hammers and nails, scissors and cooking apparatus, there were no records of accidents or injuries. Undoubtedly accidents did happen and they were simply not recorded. But, since the activities were designed, prepared and supervised by the teachers as part of planned educational programs, it is likely that accidents were only ever relatively minor and did not endanger life and limb. Also, as Mary Martin (Bird) later remarked "Now I find I'm constantly watching for accidents but when I was younger I didn't worry about these things." 79

7.2 The Educational Program

As was discussed in Chapter 6, until the 1930s, with the exception of the Kindergarten Nurse Miss Battley at Forest Lodge, nursery staff comprised a trained nurse as Matron, several "nurses" and a housekeeper. The Matron's duties were primarily administrative hence the chief work of caring for the children devolved onto the junior "nurses" who may or may not have completed any formal nursing training. Neither the "babies' nurses" nor the older children's nurses had any specifically relevant qualifications in either infant care or early childhood education. After the 1930s, nursing staff continued to be responsible for babies under eighteen months or two years who continued to be enrolled at six nurseries. By the 1940s, at least one cot room nurse was qualified in mothercraft and it was thought desirable that the Matron should also be both general and mothercraft nurse trained. 80 Also, after the 1930s, toddlers aged eighteen months or two years and older children were cared for by qualified nursery school teachers.

There were then major changes in the care and education programs for
both babies and older children during the 40 years studied here. For young babies, the changes happened gradually during the 1930s as Tresillian mothercraft ideas about proper infant care were progressively disseminated and accepted by the wider community. The changes chiefly concerned feeding, sleeping and weighing schedules which were made more technically exact and were rigidly applied. Since there was little knowledge of, or interest in, infant cognitive, language, social or emotional development, the babies' lives scarcely changed otherwise. If anything, their opportunities for stimulation became more restricted and confined since, by the 1940s, they were completely separated from the nursery school sections of the nurseries and removed from even the possibility of observing the older children's activities. For the toddlers over eighteen months or two years, and the older children, the changes were sudden and dramatic. There was a major discontinuity between their educational programs before and after the 1930s. As one Committee member recalled,

Before, you always knew when you were coming near a nursery. The nurses didn't know how to handle the children. There were a few toys but not many and the children were always squabbling and crying and shouting ... After, the difference came very quickly ... I am still amazed at the quietness, at the way the children in the nursery school play quietly and happily.81

The educational programs for toddlers and older children are the focus of the next sections of this chapter. What did the children do all day at the nursery and how did the staff manage them? In educational terms, what was the curriculum and how was it implemented? Up to the 1930s, these questions are not easy to answer, since the Association's records contain very few references to actual events in the nurseries and it has not been possible to collect any oral evidence prior to 1930. The early Matron's Reports contain some informative descriptions but unfortunately these ceased in 1917. Branch reports were written by Committee women, and these tended to focus on the charitable acts of others in providing outings and entertainments for the
children and on the physical facilities which either had been improved or desperately needed improvement. The Executive Committee minutes made almost no references to children. However, there are a few clues which allow a perhaps inadequate picture of the educational program to be drawn. After the 1930s, the information is more certain, since there are reports written by teachers whose professional concerns were the developmental and educational programs for the children.

7.2.1 Social and moral training

As Stella Davies pointed out in 1929

... the Day Nurseries do not exist merely for the purpose of 'minding' children, though it would appear that this view of the Association's activities still holds in many quarters ... Every effort is made during the time the children remain at the Nurseries - which in many cases is for the first six years of the child's life - to safeguard the future as well as the present welfare of the little ones ... The Committees recognise that if the work of the Day Nurseries is to be of any permanent value the child must be educated in formation of right habits. In this respect the Nurseries are in an advantageous position, inasmuch as the children are in their care for the entire day, and usually over a period of many months.82

This emphasis on training the children in "right habits" had been a focus at the Nurseries since the earliest days when Matron Breden reported that

... we have been thanked by parents for training the children in good habits, and in teaching them to be courteous - showing that our endeavours to devote special attention to training as well as nurture has not been in vain.83

The purpose of such training was so that "the beginnings of character are laid that make for good citizenship."84 The object was to develop in the children appropriate middle class behaviours which would assist them to fit into school programs and eventually to become sober, honest, and productive citizens. The training was designed to curb the kind of joyful enthusiasm for life which Jessie Ackermann observed in 1913:
They play out of doors ... romp, scamper, roll and frolic. They yell and shout, for they are lusty young creatures ... when in the house, they often forget to lower their voices, walk softly, close the doors without a bang. The romp and fun spirit is still upon them, and what might be considered most objectionable manners is but a lack of consciousness that lawn deportment should be subdued in the house.85

The children had to learn to be polite, clean, tidy, punctual, not outspoken or "forward" and, above all, to be docile and to submit themselves to the authority of adults. They were expected to be kind to others and three and four year olds were encouraged to assist the staff in feeding and caring for the babies.86

There were of course also shorter term benefits in developing approved behaviours in the children. First, the lives of the nursery staff were made somewhat easier and second, it was important that the children would impress the public on those occasions when the nurseries were on view, since it was necessary to attract donations for the work. And evidently the children did so impress. For example, when the children at the Darlington nursery were on show to 150 visitors in 1908, a visiting journalist reported that "They behaved beautifully ... and were a credit to the surroundings."87 Also, in 1916 after Miss Battley had begun her program at Forest Lodge, the Honorary Secretary was pleased to report that "we feel fully repaid for the venture, as the improvement in the manners and deportment of the children is certainly marvellous."88 And in 1921, another journalist enthused

Like a bed of scarlet poppies all-abloom the children are gathered around the white-robed nurses, or grouped on the floor with their beloved kindergarten mistress teaching them the first great art in life, how to be happy.89

The techniques used to achieve these desirable products can only be speculated upon, but one reference at least to a nurse who was dismissed in 1930 for beating one of the children suggests that physical punishment was not permitted.90 However, as discussed previously, physical restraint was certainly used unselfconsciously as undoubtedly were threats of physical punishment,
since this was the normal disciplinary measure used at home.\textsuperscript{91} There was probably also much use of verbal rejection of the children and shaming techniques. In addition, nursery routines followed time schedules as rigid as in any hospital. The children's days were structured by sequences of washing, toileting, dressing, brushing hair, cleaning teeth and an elaborate dinner-time performance in which

... two children act as waitresses or butlers at every meal, and set the table, clear away and wash the plates between the courses and afterwards tidy up the dining-room.\textsuperscript{92}

These routines provided opportunities for children to display wanted behaviours and to be rewarded with smiles and verbal encouragement. How much cuddling and hugging there was is however problematic.

The focus of the children's social training changed after the 1930s. In the nursery school educational theory, emphasis was placed on the free and healthy development of the children's personalities. "Naughty" children became "mal-adjusted" or "problem" children to be guided by new psychological techniques into proper adjustment.\textsuperscript{93} The "correct social attitudes" which children were to learn were Independence and Co-operation. Discipline became a matter of internal control rather than external control and hence

The discipline consists very largely of helping the child to a common-sense point of view of his place in society, a lesson which his contemporaries join ably in giving. Conformity to a workable social code (e.g., Thou shalt not be a nuisance unto others) thus comes from the child's own volition and is not imposed on him as a half-understood edict. It is from this training, above all, that we hope the Day Nursery is building up a good social attitude for the future.\textsuperscript{94}

In addition, the nursery school teachers' techniques for achieving this desirable product were different. These were summarised in a "Re-statement of the Principles of Pre-school Education" and distributed to all staff as guidelines for their interactions with the children. It is worth quoting these principles in full since they not only stated the new theory and practices to be
followed but also indicated what were the harmful earlier practices that had
not been eradicated even by 1950:

**RE-STATEMENT OF THE PRINCIPLES OF PRE-SCHOOL EDUCATION
AS LAID DOWN BY THE SYDNEY DAY NURSERY & NURSERY
SCHOOLS ASSOCIATION**

1. Every child in our care should have an opportunity of free and
   healthy development of his personality and he should be set on
   the path to good citizenship.

2. We believe that we can give the children not only physical well-
   being through diet and medical care, but an attitude to life of
   co-operation, good-will and courage, by giving them in pre-school
   years (a) a feeling of security and (b) confidence in the wisdom
   and sympathy of adults. We believe that by doing this we can
   remove from the minds of our children the unwanted attitudes
   and fear, frustration, aggression, and rebellion against authority
   which cause most of the world's troubles.

3. To further these aims, our policy is perhaps ambitious, but
   possible in the hands of a staff trained in modern pre-school
   educational methods. For instance -

   (a) No child should be smacked or shaken. Punishment should
       only be given by trained staff, not by students or domestic
       workers. Physical violence on the part of an adult is a
       confession of failure to gain the child's confidence and
       understanding.

   (b) No child should be left unattended, especially under 3 years,
       on "pottie", nor should he be allowed to sit on it for more
       than a few minutes. He should not be scolded or made feel
       guilty if unable to carry out regular lavatory duties.
       Regularity in such matters is nowadays considered of little
       importance compared to the harm of making a moral issue
       of the digestive system.

   (c) No child should be forcibly fed to the point of tears,
       tantrums or intimidation. Like adults, a child feels the need
       of more or less food at different times, and can't in any
       case digest it if emotionally upset.

   (d) A child should never be tied down either in bed, on a chair
       or corner or on "pottie", nor should his hands or arms be
       tied because of thumb-sucking, nail-biting, or any other
       habit. The strait waist-coat and tight swathing treatment
       are frightening, and only used on adults in cases of acute
       mania.

   (e) Cot room children as well as all older ones should have
       material for constant occupation, interest, and self-
       expression in all free play times. To frustrate their desire
       for occupation, to withhold toys for handling, building, etc.
       even at early stages is to retard their adjustment to social
       life. Also, a bored child is often a mischievous and quarrel-
       some one.
(f) The cot-room years are part of our Five-Year-Plan for the pre-school child and education along approved modern nursery school lines should be stream-lined through the whole of the Nursery.

(g) A child should not be allowed to cry if obviously unhappy, nor should he even be intimidated into silence or stillness; children who are left alone during long crying fits or tantrums are apt to become maladjusted adults later on.

(h) A child needs discipline but not a violent or revengeful attitude. A safe rule is taught the students - be sure that the child's interests come first, before your own convenience or gratification, and you are not likely to go wrong. Affection and approval should outweigh the discipline and disapproval in a child's life. He should feel that adults are friends, not enemies, and it is sometimes only in the Nurseries that he has an opportunity of learning this. The staff should at all times appear calm, serene and sympathetic to the child.

(i) We believe that it is only on some educational principles as these that a better and happier society can be built later on by the children for whom we are responsible.\(^5\)

7.2.2 Educational activities

The predictability of the schedules and routines of the nursery day probably provided all the children with a sense of security which for some at least was lacking in their home environments. For the younger babies and toddlers, although they spent their days confined in cribs, cots, baskets, indoor hanging swings, and a variety of chairs and playpens, at least their physical needs were regularly attended to and there was human contact. Until the 1930s, the babies could see and hear the activities of other children, and there were opportunities for language development through both interaction and modelling. Provided that the nurses were responsive, sympathetic and gentle in their interactions, the program was undoubtedly more conducive to the babies' psychological as well as their physical growth than were some of the reported alternative care arrangements. Sterile as the environment was, it was at least filled with people, noise, and activity which would promote some intellectual development, even if fine and gross motor development may have been severely retarded.
However, for both the babies and the older children, it is quite evident that by any standards, facilities and equipment to promote active learning and a spirit of inquiry were singularly lacking. Up to the 1930s such toys as were available were on the whole second-hand, donated by "well-to-do Sydney families ... when Reggie had outgrown his Noah's Ark, and Mabel had tired of her dolls." The range included pushing and pulling toys on wheels, balls, trumpets, dolls, dolls' cots and rocking horses (Plates 4a and 7b). Since the toys were second-hand, they were then the same kinds of toys as were available to wealthier children at the time. It was not that the day nursery children were supplied with toys of any less educational value than those of more fortunate children. Widespread manufacture and marketing of children's manipulative blocks, puzzles, construction sets, teases and household equipment developed only in the late 1920s and 1930s. The chief problem was under-supply. Throughout the 1920s, this fact regularly concerned the visiting Committee women. However, except for a total expenditure of less than £10 on "kindergarten equipment" for the Forest Lodge nursery between 1910 and 1915, until the 1930s not a single penny was spent on children's toys (see Table 8). Such money as was available was spent on the other necessary aspects of the service provision. Evidently, although the Committee was concerned about the "lack of toys for the children's amusement", children's equipment and supplies were at the bottom of the priority list.

After the move to Rose Street, Darlington in 1907, this and later nurseries provided a reasonable amount of outdoor space. A sandpit became standard, safe outdoor equipment at each nursery and it "provide[d] never-ending delight to the older ones." Also, a shelter shed was usually erected to provide protection in hot or wet weather. There was an additional "play house" at some nurseries. However, there was insufficient space for swings or a slide and in any case, as the removal of the roundabout at Eastern Suburbs nursery
demonstrated, such equipment was found to be too dangerous with so many children in a confined space. Climbing equipment was not yet common, even in public playgrounds.\textsuperscript{101} Hence it would seem that, while the sandpit and playhouse gave the children some scope for creative play, the children's activities outdoors were required to be as quiet and controlled as their indoor activities.

Most excitement was probably generated by the two or three outings a year which various charitable-minded individuals and organisations associated with each nursery arranged for the children's benefit. Precedent for actually taking the children out of the nursery and into the community was established by the two events in 1919 described earlier in this chapter, when the entire staff and children of Forest Lodge and Woolloomooloo nurseries were removed to seaside resorts for short periods. These expeditions must have been major logistical exercises yet no mishaps to the children were reported. Subsequently, given the belief in the benefits of fresh, sea air for the children's health, and the successful experience gained in managing the operations, Forest Lodge staff and Committee felt sufficiently confident to repeat the exercise but in a less major way. The following year they used £10 donated by the Manly Circle "in periodical 'days' at the sea-side for the children."\textsuperscript{102} Thereafter, excursions and outings organised by such diverse groups as "the tramway men of Rozelle", the Sunshine Club and the Checker Cab Co., as well as by private individuals, Committee women and nursery staff, became regular highlights of the children's experiences.\textsuperscript{103} The children were taken on ferry rides to the Zoo, for picnics in parks and the Botanical Gardens, to the beach, the circus, pantomimes, and theatrical performances. These experiences, even if only two or three in number each year, greatly enriched the monotony of the children's daily programs. Coincidentally, of course, the excursions made the day nursery children visible to the public. Therefore the quality of the children's behaviour
while on those excursions was even more critical, since public acceptance of, and financial support for, the institution had continually to be won.

The daily dose of Froebel

As was noted in Chapter 6, the practice of sending older children to a neighbouring kindergarten began in 1908. However, because of the locations of new nurseries and the dates when they were established, it was really only children from Woolloomooloo, Surry Hills and Eastern Suburbs nurseries who received the daily dose of Froebel. Until the early 1930s, for the most part their experiences comprised a morning only program in which

... [Froebel's] 'Gifts', though used more imaginatively, still played an important part in the daily activities. The work was planned in great detail and followed an established pattern of morning greeting, songs and 'news' on the circle, work period with gifts, handwork, sand tray etc., talk or 'planned' period, music, games and story. There was much teacher direction, the groups were large and the children were expected to sit quietly and listen attentively ... 104

Hence, although the children received some additional input from the highly esteemed kindergarten program, their activities at the kindergarten were as confined and constrained as they were at the nursery. What educational benefits they derived from their kindergarten experiences are a matter of conjecture.

It might be expected, given the similar interests of the Association and the Kindergarten Union in caring for, protecting and educating young children, that the two organisations would have worked together harmoniously in their common cause. However, the Association's records show that during the 1920s there was continuing bickering between the two organisations. There was a spirit of co-operation at the Committee level, since from 1927 each organisation sent a representative delegate to the other's management board.106 But the co-operation dissipated in practice for two main reasons. First, each organisation was jealous of its hard won money and hence there were regular
disputes about who should pay for such things as construction of shared lavatories and fences and how common fuel bills would be apportioned. The respective delegates to the opposing camps needed all their skills in diplomacy and negotiation to achieve such co-operative outcomes as were occasionally recorded. Second, and more importantly, the kindergarten teachers continuously rejected the day nursery children. Their three main causes of complaint were identified clearly at a joint conference in August, 1923, which was chaired by the Kindergarten Union's aging but highly respected Maybanke Anderson. The kindergarten teachers objected to the nursery children's irregular attendances; to their lack of compliance with the kindergarten rules; and to their bright red "nursery uniforms". They insisted that the children should attend daily; that they must obey the kindergarten behavioural rules; and that they should wear their ordinary clothes.

The attendance and discipline questions were most acute at the Wooloomooloo kindergarten where the Director, Miss Margery Ford, was experimenting with a free choice program in which she

... allow[ed] the children to work out their own ideas, only giving suggestions and help when necessary. If the children choose to work with material away from a certain table they have perfect liberty to do so.

The children were provided with larger Patty Hill blocks; boxes of various sizes, cardboard, hessian, pieces of wood, real saws, hammers and nails to build with; and large pieces of paper, large brushes, paint and easels for self expression. They were allowed to select their own occupations, and to join in with story, music or quiet periods with books and manipulative materials as they chose. It was a revolutionary program in Sydney kindergarten circles and for it to be successful Miss Ford required regular attenders who had been well socialised into self-directed behaviour patterns. These the nursery children were not, since they only attended the nursery on the days when their mothers worked, and in addition, they were used to strongly restrictive adult direction of their
activities. They clearly were unable to handle Miss Ford's modern approach to early childhood education.

The nursery children's overalls were a bone of contention at each kindergarten. During yet another dispute in 1930, Miss Dumolo observed that "the children are marked as nursery children by the uniform" (italics added). At this time space, it is not possible to determine exactly why the kindergarten teachers did not wish the nursery children to be thus identified but it is easy to speculate that both the teachers and the older children were aware of the class differences between the kindergarten and the nursery children's families. The teachers may simply have wished to spare the nursery children from cruel remarks by other children. They may also have preferred not to have the nursery children identified with the kindergarten, since by definition they were children with working mothers and the teachers did not approve of this.

There were never any satisfactory resolutions to these three problems. Nursery children, who were considered by the Association to be "regulars" since they attended several days each week, continued to be "irregulars" in the kindergarten teachers' view, since they did not necessarily attend daily. The children continued to find difficulty in adjusting to the different expectations of them at the two institutions. And although the "nursery uniform" colour was changed in 1927, the Association continued to send the children to the kindergartens dressed in their uniforms. The disputes did not cease until finally the Association trained its own nursery school teachers and the children were removed forever from the kindergartens.

**Nursery schools**

The faltering start, the battles for recognition and the ultimate success of the Association's nursery schools are discussed in Chapter 8. Here it is relevant to comment on the educational programs for children which the
nursery schools provided. The principles on which those programs were based were summarised by Miss Elizabeth Town, Superintendent of Nursery Schools, in 1936:

The nursery school is a community of children ranging in age from the toddlers to those ready for primary school. Because in Sydney the nursery school has developed within the day nursery, it is open all day without a break from 7 in the morning to 6 at night. It is obvious that the nursery school children spend most of their waking hours there as well as some of their sleeptime. Provision is made for their physical well-being, their meals, their midday rest, cleanliness, exercise, fresh air, also for their examination by doctor and dentist for the treatment of their minor ailments. Provision is also made for training in social habits, sharing things and duties, waiting for one’s turn, helping one another, enjoying things together, bigger people caring for smaller; provision is also made for things of every kind for the children to do, or experience, singing, rhythmic games, stories, nature work, drawing, painting, modelling, paperwork, bead threading, simple weaving and other forms of handwork; play of many kinds; sense training play with things of varied colour, shape, size, sound, texture and material; imaginative play with dolls, etc.; dramatic play; the beginning of reading, writing and number work and other things beside.

The staff of the nursery school must do all these things with the children in small groups as in a private nursery and be trained in these things themselves, and in the best way of handling the children, the equipment and the time at their disposal, and they must have the love of the children and enthusiasm to carry them and their work through the long day in a pleasant and orderly manner.

Equipment ... must be enough in quantity, suitable in quality and in great variety to make all this work possible, and much of it, even used with care and reasonable economy, is consumed in the normal course of work. In the happy atmosphere and with plenty of suitable interests and occupations, the children unfold like flowers and the troublesome child is rare.113

These were the principles with which Miss Town (1934-1938) and Miss Bird (1938-1944) imbued their students but the extent to which their ideals became reality was always problematic. At every turn, the nursery school teachers were constrained by the physical facilities which the nurseries as converted domestic residences offered; by the Association’s parsimony especially with children’s equipment and staff employment; by high child to staff ratios; and by undersupply of qualified teachers. Nevertheless, they coped as best they could. Indeed, they would not have become teachers unless they had satisfactorily passed assessments on the criteria of
1. INITIATIVE ... the effectiveness with which the student works and the degree of zeal and vigour with which she attacks new problems ...
2. JUDGEMENT ... insight and skill in using pertinent facts and in making judicious decisions ...
3. PLANNING ABILITY ... skillfulness in anticipating problems and planning for their satisfactory solution ...
4. CO-OPERATION ... co-operates ... with fellow students, teachers ... and other people ... responds uncomplainingly when asked ...
5. ADAPTABILITY ... readily adjusts to a variety of situations, to institutional life ...
6. PERSONALITY ADJUSTMENT ... mental health, poise, self control and ability to meet difficulties ... remaining calm under trying circumstances.\textsuperscript{114}

The nursery schools ranged in size from 40 or 50 children at the smaller ones to 100 children at Woolloomooloo.\textsuperscript{115} In a nursery school with 50 children, there were usually two groups, one of 20 toddlers and one of 30 older children. Each group was staffed with one teacher and one helper. Since both indoor and outdoor spaces were limited, activities were timetabled for at least part of the day so that the older children would be inside while the younger ones were outside and vice versa. When the children arrived at 7am they were greeted in the locker room by one of the teachers and then sent into the playground for free play supervised by one of the helpers (Plates 8a and 9b). After morning milk at 8.45am, older children had two three-quarter hour group work periods of music, language, sense training and other occupations (Plates 8b and 9a). Early dinner was followed by an hour or more sleep. The afternoon was almost entirely free play except for a half hour period of creative activities following afternoon tea at 3pm. Interspersed during the day were two washes (one before dinner and one after the creative activities period), teeth and lavatory after dinner and hair combing and lavatory after sleep. The toddler group followed a similar program except that their morning group time was shorter and there was an additional rest period before dinner.\textsuperscript{116} At larger nursery schools, such as Redfern and Woolloomooloo, the children were divided into three age groups and they followed essentially the same timetables.\textsuperscript{117} The schedules have been
Plate 8a  Rooftop playground, Woolloomooloo, 1931

Plate 8b  Sense training work, 1935
Plate 9a  Story time, 1948

Plate 9b  Running free, 1948
changed very little in subsequent years and much the same timetables are followed in day care centres today. Also, in so many ways, then as now, the timetable became the educational program.

Thus, by the end of the 1930s, the experiences of all two to five year old children in the nurseries had changed significantly. No longer were they subject to the rigid and restrictive practices of unsuitably prepared nursing staff. No longer were they subject to overt or covert rejection by kindergarten teachers. Henceforth, they were to be cared for and educated by nursery school teachers who were specifically prepared for the task according to the principles and practices of the English nursery school. These teachers had at least some knowledge of child development and some competence in planning and implementing educational programs based on that knowledge and the children's individual needs. They had some relevant skills in group management and, most importantly, they wanted to teach disadvantaged children. The teachers' professionalism and personal commitment to the job ensured marked improvement in the quality of the children's daily lives, even though equipment was not yet plentiful, child to staff ratios were high and there were still many unqualified helpers working with the children. At last the reality of the children's experiences had begun to match the rhetoric so proudly proclaimed so many years before.
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CHAPTER EIGHT

NURSERY SCHOOL TEACHER TRAINING

As was discussed in earlier chapters, from the very beginning of its service provision in 1905, the Association had always believed that

... it is not enough to take a child and feed him and keep him clean and safe during the hours of separation from his mother. Much more is needed. He needs ... the kind of play that will help him to develop intelligently and the wise handling that will help him to adjust himself easily to his surroundings, to form the right habits and to become a good citizen.1

However, until the 1930s, the Association experienced great difficulty in putting those ideals into practice. It was limited directly by its own facilities, by its funds, and most importantly by the knowledge and skills of the staff it employed. It was also limited by its own inability and the inability of its sister organisation, the Kindergarten Union, and the kindergarten teachers which that organisation trained, to work together harmoniously in the interests of small children. The ideological divisions between day care and early education were profound and apparently unbridgeable. These divisions were deeply rooted in the kindergarten teachers' rejection of the legitimacy of mother's paid work outside the home and in their perceptions of day nurseries as welfare institutions, and of their own kindergartens as educational establishments, legitimated by Froebelian theory, curriculum, materials and methods.

At the end of the 1920s, kindergarten programs began to change. Miss Dumolo returned from an overseas study tour in 1928 enthusiastic about what she had seen in America, and the enlightened Miss Ford joined the College staff in 1929.2 At last the teacher training program shifted away from the old Froebelian focus to the newer progressive kindergarten methods and materials
which Patty Smith Hill had pioneered some 25 years earlier. In addition, teachers at inner city kindergartens responded to the needs of growing numbers of underfed, tired, dirty and diseased children, victims of the worsening economic climate. In 1928, Ethel Lakeman at Golden Fleece Kindergarten, Chippendale, Beatrice Geraghty at Little Citizens Kindergarten, Surry Hills and Dorothy Francis and Muriel Rogers at Lance Kindergarten, Millers Point, persuaded their respective Committees to provide hot midday meals for the children, and stretchers for an afternoon sleep. By 1929, five of the fifteen kindergartens provided 9am to 3pm programs which included lunch and sleep, while five others were struggling to do so. But these were uncoordinated, grass-roots efforts by a few concerned individuals. Their initiatives were not legitimated by changes in the teacher training program for ten years. Kindergarten teachers had to wait until Miss Jean Wyndham returned with a BSc from Teachers College, Columbia University and introduced a nursery school specialisation into the teacher training program. By the time the Kindergarten College produced its first Nursery School and Child Development graduates in 1939, the Day Nursery Association had taken the momentous step of introducing its own teacher training program. Its Nursery School Teacher Diploma course was well established and its eight nursery schools were staffed by its own products.

8.1 British and American Nursery Schools

The nursery school for two to five year olds is generally acknowledged to be an institution begun in England early in the twentieth century in response to the large numbers of children below compulsory school age who attended schools. The history and development of the British nursery school system are well known and do not need elaboration here. There are however four aspects of British nursery schools which require comment since they relate to the
introduction of nursery schools in Sydney. First, nursery schools were made part of the national education system by Fisher's 1918 Education Act, though their provision was always optional and therefore subject to "the inevitable game of Snakes and Ladders, with ... successive Governments careful to pay lip service to the nursery school but equally careful to check its expansion." They were however state supported and seen to be legitimate educational services. Second, for the most part, the nursery schools were located in socially and economically depressed areas. No fees were charged, except for food and medical services at cost, and the schools were open for longer than the normal school day so that older children could deliver and collect their siblings on their way to and from school. They were therefore intended to assist working mothers who lacked alternative child care arrangements. Third, the nursery schools had

... a twofold aim: first, the personal care and medical supervision of the individual child, involving provision for its comfort, rest and suitable nourishment; and secondly, definite training - bodily, mental and social - involving the cultivation of good habits in the widest sense ... and the orderly association of children of various ages in common games and occupations.

They were part of national fitness campaigns, designed to ensure that children would enter formal schooling physically, intellectually and socially competent to cope with the schools' demands. Fourth, the nursery schools were "under the guidance of skilled and intelligent teachers" whose salaries were "not ... less than the minimum salary prescribed ... for teachers of those grades employed in public elementary schools." The National Union of Teachers developed standards for entrance qualifications, curricula and assessment of special teacher training programs, the most important of which were those led by Margaret McMillan at Deptford, Lillian de Lissa at Gipsy Hill and Grace Owen at Mather College in Manchester. These courses were assisted by state grants and by 1949 no tuition fees were charged.
American nursery schools developed somewhat later than in England and they did so for different reasons and along different lines. In America as in England at the beginning of the twentieth century there were similar broad social concerns about young children's health, education and welfare, and similar protective legislations were enacted. However, America was deeply involved with the new God Science and hence it is not surprising that, once public attention was focused on little children, the American response was to turn to research for answers to problems.\textsuperscript{14} The infant science of child development was born, distinct from the nineteenth century child study movement in its rationale and methods.\textsuperscript{15} During the 1920s, supported by a massive \$12 million from the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Foundation and by other philanthropists, University based child research centres were established for the specific purposes of research, teaching and dissemination in the field of early childhood development. A steady stream of scientific publications issued from all these research institutions and by 1931 there was sufficient content knowledge for publication of the first \textit{Handbook of Child Psychology} under Murchison's editorship.\textsuperscript{16}

Simultaneously with their observational research work, many of the research centres established nursery schools for children from eighteen months to school age. Their common purpose was scientific study of child growth and behaviour and definition of the right kind of environment which would promote the best present and future development.\textsuperscript{17} Their aims and methods were diverse but there were four key features which distinguished them as different from traditional kindergartens and day nurseries. First, emphasis was placed on children's satisfactory social and emotional adjustment. This meant the acquisition of "social virtues such as fair play, responsibility and consideration for younger children" and freedom from "any manifestations of anger, fear, jealousy, and other marked evil feelings."\textsuperscript{18} Second, educational focus was
placed on children aged eighteen months to three years, that is, younger than accepted kindergarten age. Third, unlike kindergartens and day nurseries which tended to serve selected sub-groups of the population, the nursery school was promulgated as an essential service for all children and their families, regardless of economic status. Fourth, the nursery school program focused strongly on parent education because

... its inclusive program ... touches very closely upon the educational functions of the home ... It represents a new social attitude towards the respective rights and duties of the child, the parent and the community.19

8.2 The First Nursery Schools in Australia

Given its earlier beginning and its multiple health care, welfare and educational purposes, the British model of nursery schools fitted more naturally with the Association's needs than did the American laboratory school model. In 1919, nursery school provision under Fisher's 1918 Education Act was publicised in Sydney and the local press published detailed and illustrated accounts of both McMillan's nursery school at Deptford and Dr Lissa's nursery school at Gipsy Hill.20 Early in 1921, Mrs MacCallum suggested that the Association should seriously investigate nursery school methods.21 Nothing further eventuated at this time, since, in theory if not always in practice, the educational needs of the children were being catered for by Miss Battley at Forest Lodge and by the kindergartens next door at Woolloomooloo and Surry Hills. However, by 1928, relationships with those kindergartens were tenuous, there were two new nurseries at Paddington and North Sydney which had no nearby kindergartens and Newtown was being planned (see Table 3). Mrs MacCallum raised the question of nursery schools again, and this time she was not to be diverted.22 She was now Lady MacCallum and President of the Association and she proceeded to use the powers inherent in her social status and executive position,
as well as her own personal dynamism, to introduce the first system of nursery schools and nursery school teacher training in New South Wales.

The first step was an information gathering exercise. Lady MacCallum obtained materials from the British National Society of Day Nurseries and the Nursery School Association of Great Britain about nursery nurse and teacher training programs. She and other Committee members sought the assistance of the Department of Education through Miss M. Simpson, Inspector of Schools. They consulted Miss R.W. Stevens who had visited and studied English nursery schools and they went to see what she was doing at Blackfriars Demonstration School. Finally, the Executive Committee was sufficiently convinced that the question was worth exploring further and it asked the British Nursery School Association to assist one of its members and two eminent women educationalists in their enquiries while they were visiting England in 1930. However, necessary as all these enquiries were to shift the conservative Committee women's focus towards better quality care and educational services for older children, they delayed positive action and the opportunity to be the first to introduce nursery schools to Australia was lost.

8.2.1 Victorian initiative

The lead was instead taken in Melbourne in 1930, after Mary Gutteridge, Principal of the Melbourne Kindergarten Teachers College, returned from two years study of nursery schools in America, England and Europe and with a BSc from Teachers College, Columbia University. Miss Gutteridge had observed McMillan's work in the immediate post First War years but she had not been inspired to introduce any of McMillan's methods after she became Principal of the Melbourne College in 1923. However, she was excited by her American experiences and the new research-based study of child development. At the beginning of 1930, she took two significant initiatives. First, she introduced
two new courses at the College, one a one-year course for experienced and qualified kindergarteners who wished "to lead in the organisation of kindergarten and nursery schools and to fit themselves to train students, to conduct lecture courses and to undertake Child Research" and the other a two-year course to run parallel with the existing kindergarten course but "specialising in the education and management of younger children and fitting students for responsibility in the babyroom of our kindergartens."\textsuperscript{27} The post-graduate program included courses in Nursery School Principles and Management, Child Development, Mental Testing and Parent Education, all taught by Miss Gutteridge; Child Research Methods, taught by Dr K.S. Cunningham, Director of the newly created Australian Council for Educational Research; and Speech Development by Mrs T.M. Cherry, a kindergartener who had also studied at Columbia University.\textsuperscript{28} The first three post-graduate Nursery School Diplomas were awarded in 1931 and by the time Miss Gutteridge departed again for America in 1936, more than 20 experienced kindergarteners had completed the course.\textsuperscript{29} Second, she began to plan a demonstration nursery school for research observation and student practice and on 1 November, 1930, she succeeded in opening the first Australian nursery school for two to four year olds at the Keele Street, Collingwood Kindergarten.\textsuperscript{30} Her report of the first year's work of this nursery school was published by the Australian Council for Educational Research in 1932.\textsuperscript{31} This report makes it quite clear that the Keele Street nursery school was a sanitised, clinical institution modelled closely on the American laboratory research centres. There were no concerns in it about the economic depression and grinding poverty which were affecting so many families in Collingwood at the time.

There was nothing soft or fuzzy about Mary Gutteridge. She was a gaunt, impressive, somewhat masculine person whose energy, drive and academic interests helped to upgrade the general standards of the Melbourne Kindergarten
Teachers College and to encourage promising students to pursue degree and higher degree studies in America. Her interests coincided with those of leading medical and educational experts such as Dr K.S. Cunningham, Dr Guy Springthorpe, Dr J.F. Williams and Professor J. Alexander, all of whom were active in the influential Victorian Council for Mental Hygiene. Mary Gutteridge emerged as an intellectual figure of a calibre well above the general standard of kindergarteners. She was successful in obtaining research grants from the Australian Council for Educational Research and she achieved public popularity through her lectures on child development and management. By 1932 she was recognised as one of Australia's leading experts on the care and education of young children so it was with no false modesty that she wrote to Dr Cunningham:

Since my visit to Sydney, it has seemed increasingly clear that, for the time at least, the standard of nursery school work in Australia is of necessity in our hands in Melbourne ... I am sure that it is better for each state to contribute, rather than for the power to be too much in the hands of one city and yet for the time being we must accept the responsibility and prepare ourselves to meet the obligation and forward the movement for nursery schools and the psychological treatment of young children.

8.2.2 The Sydney beginning

Meanwhile, in Sydney, despite the terrible economic conditions, Lady MacCallum pressed ahead tenaciously in her determination to introduce nursery schools into the Association's day nurseries. Early in 1930, the Free Kindergarten Union of Victoria informed the Association about its introduction of training for nursery school teachers but the Association was singularly disinterested in the Victorian initiative. It replied that it was "awaiting a report from certain of its representatives in England before proceeding further". Then, early in 1931, Lady MacCallum became inspired by the quite substantial financial grants which had begun to flow from the Carnegie Corporation's Commonwealth Fund to various Australian educational institutions following the 1928 investigative visit for that Corporation by Dr J.E. Russell, formerly Dean
of Teachers' College, Columbia University. She wrote to Dr F.P. Keppel, President of Carnegie Corporation, requesting consideration of a grant towards establishing a nursery school in Sydney. This contact bore no immediate fruit but it did pave the way for a later successful application. Lady MacCallum also met Mrs Evelyn Hamilton, an American "graduate of Smith College, who had done post-graduate work in connection with nursery schools at Columbia University, New York, the Montessori School of New York and with Miss McMillan at Deptford." Mrs Hamilton was visiting Sydney with her husband and was looking for some outlet for her energies. She was amazed that Sydney had no nursery schools and she proposed to Miss Aileen Fitzpatrick, Supervisor of the Board of Social Study and Training students' fieldwork, that she would be prepared to begin training nursery school teachers if the Board provided her with some students. Then, in September, 1931, she "offered her services to the Association in an entirely honorary capacity, for five mornings a week for a period of six months at the Woolloomooloo Day Nursery, the roof shelter and playground at that Branch being well adapted for nursery school work."

Here at last was the qualified practitioner which Lady MacCallum so desperately needed for her project and, at least for six months, there was a golden opportunity to introduce the nursery school at the relatively minor cost of some additional equipment. Mrs Hamilton addressed a special meeting of the Executive Committee on 2 October, 1931, and explained yet again the origin, development and purposes of nursery schools. She spoke persuasively and she was supported by equally persuasive arguments from those members of the Committee who by now were committed to the idea, notably Mrs McElhone and Mrs Michaelis, as well as of course Lady MacCallum. Mrs Fairfax was concerned about a possible clash with the Kindergarten Union and wondered if perhaps the two organisations might amalgamate. This was a proposal which Lady MacCallum supported in principle but suggested deferring until they had
actually begun the project.\textsuperscript{41} She was more concerned about the critical question before the meeting, the matter of money. Mrs Hamilton's offer of free services was for a limited period only and hence if the nursery school was to continue, it would be necessary to employ a qualified teacher after Mrs Hamilton's departure. Miss Gutteridge in Melbourne had advised that one of her graduates would cost £150 per annum with residence or £250 per annum without residence. Mrs Dixson observed that, while the salary did not seem excessive, the real issue was that it would be an additional expense in what were already financially constrained circumstances, with each nursery practising economies through reducing staff numbers and asking staff to take leave without pay. To counter such negative thinking, Lady MacCallum and others immediately pledged donations towards the first year's salary. Also it was pointed out that two of the Board of Social Study and Training students were available as voluntary assistants. With these inducements, the majority of the Committee women were won over and, noting Mrs Dixson's continuing dissent, the Committee agreed

that the Association proceed with the experiment of the nursery school even though a special effort to raise funds for the salary of a teacher may be necessary.\textsuperscript{42}

Thus, in October, 1931, the Association began at last to provide an educational program for some of its toddlers aged eighteen months to three years. It was a joint project with the new Board of Social Study and Training, which had begun in July, 1928 in association with the University of Sydney in order to train social workers.\textsuperscript{43} Excitement within both organisations ran high. Professor Tasman Lovell, Chairman of the Board, wrote in his congratulatory letter to Lady MacCallum

\textit{We know that for you yourself and for your Association this is the fulfillment of a long cherished hope. The need also is very compelling. We feel that the gap that has existed between Infant Welfare and Kindergarten has at last been bridged ... The Board of Social Study and Training is very gratified that two of its students}
are training in nursery school work, and looks forward to continued happy association. We feel sure that the nursery school movement will be a success in every way.\footnote{44}

However, despite these high hopes, the project began on very shaky foundations indeed. The experiment was well-intentioned, but it was also ill-conceived and it did not comprise a carefully designed and well-orchestrated program for change such as Mary Gutteridge had begun in Melbourne. It did not directly involve either the Kindergarten Union or, more importantly, the Kindergarten Teachers' College staff.\footnote{45} Also, apart from Mrs Hamilton who was a well-qualified and experienced expert, no one within either the Association or the Social Work Board had any professional knowledge of nursery school principles and practices. In addition, Mrs Hamilton was a temporary, part-time volunteer. The lack of continuing educational expertise was therefore a severe handicap and consequently the project lurched from crisis to crisis until 1934 when Miss Elizabeth Town arrived to set nursery school teacher training on a firm foundation.

8.3 The Nursery School Training College

The Nursery School Training College, although not yet so entitled, began at the Woolloomooloo Welfare Centre in October, 1931 simply because the nursery there provided the best facilities in which to establish a separate group of toddlers aged 18 months to three years. The first two students were an ill-assorted pair. One was Miss Jessie C. (Daisy) Hutchinson, a shy yet somewhat prickly person, who had completed a BA at Sydney University prior to becoming one of the first cohort of social work students in 1929.\footnote{46} By the end of 1931, Miss Hutchinson had completed all coursework required for her Diploma but had been unable to find a congenial fieldwork placement to complete her casework. She had taught (not very successfully) for one term only at Redlands prior to beginning the social work course. The idea of a
nursery school appealed to her and she found Mrs Hamilton inspiring. The other student was Miss Allison Christie, a registered nurse, who began her social work course in 1931. Neither of these women had previously worked with such young children and they had no theoretical or practical background in either child development or nursery school principles and practices. Nevertheless Miss Hutchinson was put in charge of the toddlers and the rooftop playground while Miss Christie worked with the babies in the downstairs nursery.

Mrs Hamilton gave the two students some preliminary ideas and they set to work. At the end of October, Miss Gutteridge visited Sydney at the Association's invitation, to provide further basic information. Miss Gutteridge stayed for five days, giving public lectures and discussing nursery schools with the Association, the Board of Social Study and Training and the Kindergarten Union. She was not impressed by what she found in Sydney. On her return to Melbourne, she reported to the Melbourne Kindergarten Training College Council that the situation in Sydney was most confused and that so far no real progress had been made in training nursery school directors.

8.3.1 The Board of Social Study and Training Nursery School Certificate

Both the social work Board and the Association believed that Mrs Hamilton would only be available until January, 1932. They knew that the two students could not be adequately trained by that time and therefore, if the nursery school was to continue, a replacement trainer was urgently required. The Association had a great interest in the successful continuation of the project and hence the Committee actively canvassed many schemes independently of the social work Board. The idea of obtaining an American teacher was raised but Lady MacCallum reported that the Department of Education would not recognise such a person. The possibility of sending a
student to train in America was discussed but, since this was a long term solution and it did not satisfy the immediate need, the idea was shelved. The Federation of University Women was contacted to see whether an English exchange teacher could be arranged. Miss Gutteridge was asked to recommend one of her own graduates. Two prospectively suitable candidates were located and one was offered the position but she declined. Desperate for a solution, Mrs McElhone cabled the Nursery School Association of Great Britain to see if it could "obtain a teacher fitted to train students and undertake pioneer work on loan for twelve months." The Association found Miss Winifred Gillespie, NFU (London), Montessori Diploma and a Rachel McMillan graduate, who was willing to accept the challenge and become a pioneer in the Colony at a salary of £180 per annum with residence. This gentle, unassuming woman arrived early in March, 1932, to set up nursery school teacher training and nursery school organisation under the Day Nursery Association's auspices. She was completely unaware of the hornet's nest of conflicting territorial interests into which she was unceremoniously thrust.

Mrs Hamilton's departure was delayed and, at the Association's request, she and the two students continued the nursery school until Miss Gillespie's arrival. In March, 1932, there were then in Sydney two nursery school experts, one American and one English, working with two of the social work Board's students, all under the Association's banner. Recognising the complex situation, the new Supervisor of social work students, Miss Aileen Fitzpatrick, proposed the formation of a nursery school sub-committee of the Board, "to determine what standards the Board would accept before granting a Certificate to Nursery School Teachers." This sub-committee, comprising Mrs Hamilton, Miss Gillespie, the Board's Executive, representatives from the Day Nursery Association, the Kindergarten Union, the Kindergarten Training College and the Department of Education, first met in April, 1932. Miss Zoe Benjamin
represented the Kindergarten Training College, not Miss Dumolo. Unlike Miss Dumolo, Miss Benjamin, a diminutive, vital and forward thinking kindergartener who had been a member of the College staff since 1913, was interested in the new child development approach to early childhood education. She also had a strong interest in parent education. At the sub-committee's request, Miss Benjamin joined Mrs Hamilton and Miss Gillespie in designing a nursery school training course "from the prospectuses of the well-known English and American Nursery School Training Centres."

Their proposed course was a one-year post graduate program requiring either the diploma of the Board of Social Study and Training, or the Diploma of Kindergarten Training College or equivalent as an entrance qualification. It included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Number of Lectures</th>
<th>Suggested Lecturers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nursery school principles and management</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Miss Gillespie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Development</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Miss Benjamin, Miss Gillespie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Education</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Miss Benjamin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Nursery Education</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Miss Gillespie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handwork</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Miss Gillespie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical Problems of Early Childhood</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Matron Kaibel (Tresillian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygiene</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Professor Harvey Sutton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mr Herbert</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Practical components were attached to the Handwork and Physical Education subjects and students were expected to construct simple apparatus and toys and to devise games consistent with their knowledge of children's cognitive and physical development. The program included five half-days per week practical work in a nursery school for two terms and observation visits to hospitals, mothercraft training centres, nurseries, special schools, children's homes and
parents clubs. It also included six weeks continuous practical work in charge of
a nursery school at the end of the program. 60

Although the proposed program was distributed for comment, the Kinder-
garten Training College Council never discussed it. 61 The Day Nursery Associa-
tion did, at some length, at both its Executive and Nursery School Committee
meetings early in May, 1932. They considered the program to be comprehensive
but thought that the Physical Education, Practical Problems of Early Childhood,
and Hygiene subjects were either too elaborate or unnecessary. They also
thought that Literature and Story-telling should be included. They requested
Miss Gillespie to present their comments to Miss Fitzpatrick and the Board's
sub-committee at its next meeting. 62

However, the proposed program was never implemented because by May,
1932, it was becoming clear that Miss Gillespie simply could not cope with all
the tasks with which she was charged. First and foremost, she was responsible
for establishing a nursery school for the toddlers within the Woolloomooloo Day
Nursery. However, she was an English nursery school teacher and hence her
sights were set wider than the narrow American focus on eighteen months to
three year olds. After all, the nursery had babies under eighteen months and
children over three in its care and Miss Gillespie considered her role to include
responsibility to these children as well. Moreover, while her staffing formula
included two nurses, one for the babies and one for the toddlers, as well as
domestic staff and a young helper, it did not include a Matron. Miss Gillespie
expected to oversee housekeeping, keep accounts and interview applicants
herself. After some argument, the Association agreed to Miss Gillespie's
formula, the Matron was dispensed with and Miss Gillespie became Director of
the entire establishment, supervising five staff, two students, and the daily care
and education of 40 to 50 children as well as overseeing all aspects of domestic
management and parent contacts. 63
To add on top of this workload the preparation and delivery of formal lectures for both students and the general public seemed then just too much to require of one person. In addition the forceful and forthright Mrs Hamilton had developed strong doubts about Miss Gillespie's competence. In her final report to the social work Board and the Association, at the end of May, 1932, Mrs Hamilton concluded that

In undertaking the management of the day nursery and the nursery school, I am sure that Miss Gillespie's time will be fully occupied. This is clearly shown by the fact that after two months work, no physical record keeping or regular system of parental visiting has been attempted. In any case I consider her handling of the two students now at the nursery as decidedly haphazard and inefficient.

I therefore strongly recommend that the present two students ... be sent to Melbourne to finish their training with Miss Gutteridge enabling them to take complete charge of two nurseries at the expiration of Miss Gillespie's year in Sydney.

Both the Board and the Association accepted Mrs Hamilton's recommendations and from that point, Miss Gillespie lost all authority and respect as a trainer of nursery school teachers. Although the Association valued her work in the nursery school, it was now a foregone conclusion that Miss Gillespie's contract would not be extended. Indeed, her health broke down as the year progressed, reportedly resulting in her threatened blindness. The records give the impression that she lost heart and, with the Association's concurrence, she completed only nine of her twelve months contract, sailing home to England on Christmas Eve, 1932, under something of a cloud.

Miss Daisy Hutchinson, one of Miss Gillespie's students believed that Miss Gillespie was harshly judged and unfairly treated. She thought that Miss Gillespie found life difficult within Australia. She was a gentle, sweet woman, but not able to cope with Committees. She was quite trained, a very nice woman, gentle with the children ... but sensitive, far too sensitive for this dealing with the Committee. You see, Committees are made up of people who really have no training with young children and really don't know anything about them except that they've brought up their own perhaps. And they came telling you what to do and you just had to take it. These ladies raised the money and therefore they thought they had control of the whole bit.
I daresay they were very nice people ... but they were the sort of people who liked to come into the nursery and see every block in the right place and every child - which was against what we thought.

From Miss Hutchinson's perspective then, it seems that Mrs Hamilton did not make any allowances for the impact of the Committee women's demands on the self-effacing Miss Gillespie. Motivated by ideals of service and constrained by her position as an employee, Miss Gillespie was morally bound to accommodate the Committee women's expectancies, no matter how superhuman the task became. She did struggle to maintain her professionalism, making efforts to keep in touch with parents, to ensure that children were bathed daily and medically examined monthly, to obtain stretchers and equipment for the children. She even agreed to accommodate the Woolloomooloo Kindergarten children as well, both in the nursery school and in the day nursery's mid-day meal program. However, since the day nursery was open for eleven hours a day Monday to Friday and six hours on Saturday, she was working at least a 60 hour week. Moreover, almost every initiative she took was questioned by one Committee member or another and many of her efforts were delayed or completely thwarted either by the Committee's essential conservatism or its questioning of expenditure. Small wonder then that Miss Gillespie became the first nursery school teacher in Australia to fall victim to the burnout syndrome.

In June, 1932, following Mrs Hamilton's report, there was frantic activity by the social work Board, the Kindergarten Training College and the Association. All turned to Miss Gutteridge in Melbourne for assistance. The Board wrote seeking immediate admission of the two students into the Melbourne nursery school diploma course, stating that if the two students could complete their training in the second half of 1932, they would then be able to take charge of the nursery school in 1933 and to begin theoretical and practical training of new nursery school students. Miss Gutteridge replied that admission halfway through the year was not possible since the College only accepted students in
February. She held firm to this position, despite telegraphed entreaties and Professor Lovell’s assurances that "Diploma not required if full work impossible." She pointed out that "Council [had] already refused the Principal of a Training College in another state" and that "there was no ruling yet as to length of time for University graduates or trained nurses." In a state of near panic, Aileen Fitzpatrick left immediately for Melbourne. After hours of discussion with the Melbourne KTC Council and Miss Gutteridge, it was finally agreed that, although the students really should go to America to become fully trained, in the interim they would go to Melbourne in August for two weeks observation in the three nursery schools now operating there and that Miss Gutteridge would come again to Sydney in September to give a two week lecture program.

This solution suited all parties. The Board was satisfied that a special program had been devised for its two students and that if they were assessed as satisfactory by the respected Miss Gutteridge, the Board’s Nursery School certificate could be awarded at the end of 1932. The Sydney Kindergarten Training College was delighted with the prospect of a lecture program in Sydney which its own students and teachers could attend. The Melbourne Kindergarten Training College was pleased that it had not sacrificed its own standards and the status of its Nursery School Diploma. It basked in the warm glow of recognition of its pre-eminence in the nursery school field. The Day Nursery Association was comforted because it could see at last the prospect of having two replacement teachers ready for the beginning of 1933 when Miss Gillespie was to depart. Last but not least, the students themselves felt that their achievement of certification in nursery school work was actually about to become a reality.

The students duly visited Melbourne in August and in September they attended Miss Gutteridge's comprehensive course of nine public lectures on child development, adult-child and child-child relationships, the history, aims
and principles of the nursery school, the nursery school environment and "true" parent co-operation. From the end of September to early November they undertook six weeks teaching practice in the Wooloomooloo nursery school under Miss Gillespie's supervision, working together for the first four weeks then Miss Hutchinson took full charge in the fifth week and Miss Christie in the sixth week. Their work was assessed by both Miss Gillespie and Miss Benjamin. Miss Gillespie commended Miss Christie for her resourcefulness, initiative, courage, understanding of children's interests and showing "a disinterested and scientific attitude ... [with] no hint of sentimentality or coddling." She found Miss Hutchinson's consistent, thorough, conscientious, calm and showing a "practical application of psychology particularly with difficult children." Miss Benjamin found Miss Hutchinson more "conservative" than Miss Christie and, although she thought that both students needed more guidance in approaching young children, she concluded that "they have done wonderfully well and whatever their weaknesses, nursery school work should be safe in their hands."

Miss Gutteridge set the students a written paper after the lecture program and she reported her generally negative assessments of the students to the Board early in December, 1932. She found that both students' work was inconsistent, with gaps in their knowledge which resulted from the disjointed program and lack of textbooks. While their observational studies of children were satisfactory, their understanding of the teacher's role in the nursery school did not meet Miss Gutteridge's standards. Moreover, Miss Christie lacked writing skills to such an extent that "the meaning is often obscured." Miss Gutteridge concluded that Miss Christie could not possibly be passed and that she should be set further work, but that Miss Hutchinson could pass if her practical work was satisfactory. She recommended that neither student should be awarded a Nursery School Certificate but that they could have their Social
Work Diplomas endorsed with a statement of the work undertaken in 1932.\textsuperscript{82} The Board thanked Miss Gutteridge politely for her report but it declined her advice. It was determined that Certificates should be granted to both students and it justified its decision to proceed with the awards on the grounds that "Social schools must be begun and the standard raised with the passing of time and the gaining of greater experience. And finally the Day Nursery Association in Sydney has to carry on the work of its nursery school."\textsuperscript{83} However, having decided that the Certificates should be awarded, the Board was then in a quandary about who should be the accrediting authorities. Clearly, it was the Board's award, but assessment had been done by Miss Gutteridge, Miss Gillespie and Miss Benjamin. The Board could not ask the Melbourne Kindergarten Training College to be a signatory since it had decided not to accept Miss Gutteridge's advice. It did not question that the Association should be included since, even though Miss Gillespie's competence had been questioned by Mrs Hamilton, her credentials were satisfactory and she was a registered teacher in England. There remained the question of endorsement by the Kindergarten Union and the Sydney Kindergarten Training College, especially in view of Miss Benjamin's involvement and the fact that the Kindergarten College was the acknowledged local authority on early childhood teacher education. Moreover, following Miss Dumolo's resignation, the Kindergarten Union had advertised internationally for a new Principal and the Board decided that "it would be wise to implicate them in the granting of this certificate so that they could not repudiate it if by any chance their new Principal is a nursery school expert."\textsuperscript{84} Therefore, in March, 1933, the Board wrote to the Kindergarten Union inviting it to be a joint signatory with the Day Nursery Association and "reminding them that Miss Benjamin acted as convenor of the sub-committee that arranged the syllabus and supervised the students' training."\textsuperscript{85} However, the Kindergarten College Council had not officially
sanctioned Miss Benjamin's participation in the course. It therefore rejected the Board's invitation and decided that "as the Kindergarten Union had had no part in establishing the course it could not join in issuing the certificates but ... Miss Benjamin ... could give a personal certificate that these students had attended certain lectures." The Kindergarten Union refusal was noted by the Board at its meeting in June, 1933 and finally without any further discussion the Board unanimously decided in September of that year to eliminate both organisations from accreditation of the students and "that the Board alone should be responsible for the issue of certificates for special courses."

In deciding to be solely responsible for issuing the certificates, the Board acted honourably in acknowledging what had proved by mid-1933 to be a monumental mistake. The Association desperately wanted to believe that Miss Christie and Miss Hutchinson were qualified to train others in nursery school work as well as to manage nursery schools. Early in 1933, it offered training programs for both Tresillian mothercraft and Kindergarten students. Miss Christie and Miss Hutchinson were asked to give lectures to the mothercraft students on Child Development, Nursery School Principles and Handwork and to supervise batches of two students five days a week for three months each. They were also asked to supervise two second year kindergarten students for one full day and two half days each week, to involve them in weekly planning and discussion sessions and to arrange for their observation of special features of nursery school work such as habit training.

Neither arrangement was successful. As Miss Hutchinson commented,

Our training was of poor quality, they were groping, hadn't the facilities ... I was very tired, had to do a lot of physical work, solphal lavatories, a lot of that kind of work ... I was supposed to be giving lectures at night but I was so tired. This girl ... must have told them they weren't getting any theoretical talks so they didn't send any more.- I was very pipped because they never told me why.

Most importantly, the kindergarten students, the College staff and the
Woolloomooloo kindergarten teachers immediately found the nursery school programs to be less than satisfactory and they informed the Association of their views.\textsuperscript{92} Indeed, Lady MacCallum had already decided that Misses Christie and Hutchinson were "not ... fit to train students to be Directors" and had informed the social work Board of her opinion.\textsuperscript{93} She was then not surprised when, in June, 1933, the Kindergarten Union decided not to send any more students to the nursery school on the ladylike pretext that "as only a small number of students could participate ... it was found unwise to vary the curriculum."\textsuperscript{94} The real reasons of course were Misses Christie and Hutchinson's lack of competence, which Miss Gutteridge had so clearly identified.

Faced with both the Association's and the Kindergarten Union's rejection of its two nursery school teachers, the social work Board could do little else but proceed alone. However, its experiment with nursery school training had been so traumatic that the experience was never repeated. The social work Board effectively withdrew from the nursery school arena. It did not send any of its own students to train under its new graduates. Moreover, since it wished to award the two Certificates simultaneously, it had to delay the ceremony until the end of 1935 when Miss Christie finally completed her Diploma of Social Work.\textsuperscript{95} Miss Christie and Miss Hutchinson were therefore the first, and only, holders of the Board of Social Study and Training Nursery School Certificate (Plate 10).\textsuperscript{96}

\textbf{8.3.2 Sydney Teachers College connection}

By the second half of 1933, it was patently clear to everyone, including the Association, that if training nursery school teachers was to continue, a competent Director had to be found. This time the Association did not even consider seeking an Australian appointee. Instead, it first appealed to the Carnegie Corporation for assistance but when no help was forthcoming from
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that source, it looked to England.97 One of the Association's Vice Presidents, Mrs McElhone was currently spending a year there and Lady MacCallum asked her to find a suitable Director.98 Mrs McElhone was diligent in her task, not wanting to make any mistake this time in selecting the right person. She talked with Principals of Training Colleges, and listened particularly to Lillian de Lissa who after all was an Australian who knew Sydney.99 She arranged for the position to be advertised and personally interviewed applicants, selecting two possible candidates. After her return to Sydney, she reported all her activities to the Association. The Committee dithered a little but it soon took Mrs McElhone's advice and in March, 1934, it decided to offer the position of Superintendent of Nursery Schools to Miss Elizabeth Town, a Rachel McMillan graduate and possessor of the British Board of Education Certificate with Distinction.100 Miss Town was available on secondment for three years and she accepted the position at a salary of £150 per annum with residence. She arrived in Sydney on 4 July, 1934 with a brief "to organise and set in motion a training course, substantially of the same standard as those which are recognised in Great Britain and elsewhere."101

This time the whole approach was professional. The Association had learnt from its previous experience and the Committee women were more willing to take second place and defer to the expert. The only steps they took before Miss Town's arrival were to inform Misses Christie and Hutchinson of Miss Town's appointment and to decide that aspiring students would only be accepted on one month's probation which allowed both sides time to assess the student's suitability.102 The Committee was a little concerned about Miss Hutchinson's future since it clearly intended to terminate her appointment, but it need not have worried since Miss Hutchinson resigned prior to Miss Town's arrival, leaving the way clear for Miss Christie to be transferred to the Northern Suburbs Nursery School and for Miss Town to assume responsibility at
Woolloomooloo without any possible opposition.

One week after Miss Town's arrival, a special meeting of the Nursery School Committee was held. This meeting laid the foundations for the future. Miss Town submitted drafts for three courses - a three month course for Tresillian students, a twelve months course for nursery nurses, and a twelve months follow-on course for nursery teachers. Of particular concern was the course for nursery school teachers. Everyone present was painfully aware of the need for acceptable educational standards, both at the student entry level and in terms of the qualifications of the lecturing staff, so that the courses would be credible both in Australia and in England. They decided to co-opt Miss Stevens of Blackfriars Demonstration School and Mrs Clunies-Ross of the University Tutorial Classes to the Committee and to ask these two women to evaluate Miss Town's proposed courses. Miss Stevens and Mrs Clunies-Ross presented their criticisms at the next meeting of the Committee late in July, 1934. This meeting finalised the proposed Syllabus (Plate 11) and with this in hand the Association was ready

... to approach the Department of Public Instruction so that our students might attend lectures, demonstration and practice both at the Teachers College and at Blackfriars thus providing for their teaching by highly qualified instructors in certain subjects.

Lady MacCallum began immediately to convince the Department of Education of the merits of the Association's proposal. In August, 1934 she wrote to G. Ross Thomas, Director of Education, pointing out that nursery schools were part of the "Official System of Public School Education in Great Britain" and enclosing a copy of Lady Astor's recent speech in the House of Commons pleading for more money for British nursery schools. She also enclosed a report of a British Commission into the practice and results of the nursery school system. She explained that the Day Nursery Association had been endeavouring to establish nursery schools for some time and that the Association was
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SYLLABUS OF WORK FOR NURSERY SCHOOL COURSES.

Inevitably the Nursery School system already so widely accepted in other countries, and part of the official State Education System of Great Britain, must make its way in Australia. The Woolloomooloo Training Centre offers the first organised course in New South Wales under a qualified Superintendent to those students who wish to be pioneers in Nursery School work. The Training Centre and Nursery School are in close contact and the training is thereby enhanced.

ENTRANCE REQUIREMENTS.—For a one year course the Intermediate Certificate standard of education is necessary. For the two year Course the Leaving Certificate standard is desirable.

COURSES OF STUDY.

NURSERY NURSE (One Year Course).—Theory and Practice of Nursery School Method; Education; Psychology; Nature Study and Gardening; Literature; Speech Training; Hygiene; Music and Rhythm; Games; Art and Handwork. Throughout the Course the students have daily practice in the Nursery School under supervision. Weekly and Monthly group discussions are held.

NURSERY TEACHERS' COURSE (Two Years).—Education; Child Psychology; Intelligence Testing; History of Education; Biology; Gardening; Anatomy; Study of Drama; Folk Lore; Myths; Eurythmics; Art and Handwork Story illustration Continuation of practical work with instruction in arrangement of programmes and Nursery School management and organisation. Forming of clubs for parents.

The Courses of Lectures are delivered by various qualified lecturers associated with practice among the children.

DIRECTORS' COURSE.—Two years as for Nursery Teachers, further experience in charge of Nursery School under supervision during which research is undertaken and a thesis written.

SPECIAL COURSE will be arranged for applicants already holding recognised teaching qualifications.

EXAMINATIONS.—Written; Oral Tests; Inspection of notebooks; Art and Handwork display; Record of Students' work throughout the period of training.

UNIFORM.—A smock and cap of approved design will be worn always in the School.

POSITIONS.—Preference will be given at all times to students who have satisfactorily completed the courses.

SUITABILITY.—Only applicants with aptitude for the work will be trained. To ascertain this prospective students are accepted for one month's trial, without fees. If found suitable, this period is included as part of the course.

A special Course in Handwork is available for NON Nursery School Students.

Any further information required by prospective students is available from:

The General Secretary,

DAY NURSERY ASSOCIATION,
92b Pitt Street, Sydney.
... anxious that the training should follow the McMillan College, not only in plan, but also in soundness and efficiency, and it [is] difficult to see how this can be achieved without help from the Department in [those] sections in which its staff is so pre-eminently excellent.106

She enclosed a copy of Miss Town's syllabus for Mr Ross Thomas' inspection and she requested that the Association's students be permitted to attend the Department's Teachers College for those subjects which the Association could not provide, and which at Teachers College were "in charge of experts in their subject. We could not hope to get anything so good outside the Department - and they are essential portions of the training." These subjects were Speech Training, Music and Rhythm, Literature and Intelligence Testing.107

Somewhat amazed by the request, particularly since it appeared that "the Association ... hoped the Department would admit these students to the College without payment of fees", Mr Ross Thomas was nevertheless sympathetic to it since "This Association is doing work which the State cannot as yet undertake".108 He inquired how many students might be involved and what their educational standard might be. After being assured that there would be no more than ten students, approximately half of Intermediate Certificate standard and half of Leaving Certificate standard, he passed the matter on to the College Principal, Professor Mackie.109 Mackie considered that the Teachers College was a Public Institution and open to all who wished to be prepared for teaching, therefore he could not see any objections. The fact that the students were not matriculated was of no importance since they were not applying for the Department's Certificate nor for admission to the public service. Mackie pointed out that such a small number of students did not require a special class and that they could be fitted in with first or second year classes after he had confirmed requirements with Miss Town. He also commented that there were no special courses in Rhythm and Mental Testing but that these were included in Physical Training and Psychology respectively.110

On the basis of this advice, the Minister for Education, D.H. Drummond,
approved the Association's request. The students could attend Teachers College in 1935 for classes in Speech Training and Music and could undertake practical work at Blackfriars Demonstration School. But there remained the matter of payment. Mr Ross Thomas noted that he had initially suggested that, since the classes to be attended comprised approximately one-third of the normal teacher training program, the Association should pay £9 per annum for each student. The Association was horrified. It cried poor, pointing out that it charged its students a small fee only, that it had to provide them with board and maintenance at its own expense, that it had no educational subsidy and that what it received from the Chief Secretary's Department was spent entirely on maintenance of the nurseries. Mr Ross Thomas, while again sympathetic, was however concerned that, to allow the Association's students to attend without payment, would create an undesirable precedent for church missionary societies who were in equally impoverished circumstances but who had always been required to pay full fees for their students. He therefore then suggested a nominal fee of £2 per student per annum. However, the Minister decided that

On further consideration I am of the opinion that the full fee should be charged subject to the proviso that if the trainee finishes satisfactorily so much of the course agreed upon the amount shall be waived. The D.N.A. is purely undenominational in character. There is therefore no precedent to be construed as favourable to any church.111

At the end of January, 1935, Mr Ross Thomas advised Lady MacCallum of the Minister's decision, and that therefore a fee of £27 per student per annum should be paid.112 Aghast, Lady MacCallum contacted H.P. Fitzsimmons, Minister for Public Works and Health, who then intervened with Drummond on the Association's behalf. Drummond was annoyed that Ross Thomas' letter to the Association did not make the refund point sufficiently clear. He then wrote himself to Lady MacCallum saying that the fee would be £9 per student per annum "which sum will definitely be refunded if the Principal's report on
the work of the students after they have completed their course at the College is satisfactory." Lady MacCallum thanked Mr Drummond for the concession but, again crying poor, she noted that the current students were doing well and therefore requested that

If you could take our guarantee for the payment of fees, which you have promised would afterwards be refunded, it would be of enormous assistance to us and would not ultimately be a demand on the Department. Mr Ross Thomas was outraged by this suggestion. He again noted, as he had at the time of the initial request "In effect, Lady MacCallum is asking for free tuition for her students." He appealed again to the Minister, but Drummond, exasperated by the affair, curtly responded "I am not prepared to vary the decision last made." In the meantime, unknown to Ross Thomas, Miss Town had quietly enrolled twelve first year and one second year students at Teachers College. Lady MacCallum wrote swiftly to Drummond saying "I am pleased to be able to inform you that our students began to attend lectures at the beginning of the session and are enjoying the opportunities given at the College." Ross Thomas fumed. Periodically during 1935, he sent the Association accounts for the students' fees and finally, in December, 1935, Mrs Ormsby, the Association's General Secretary, returned all the accounts to the Department, saying that the Association

... would be glad if you would adjust [the account] in connection with Professor Mackie's report on the work of these students and in accordance with the Minister's letter to our President of 1st March last.

I trust that my action in returning the account is a satisfactory one to you. If there is any other way in which your Department may wish the matter to be handled I should be glad to discuss it with you.

Mr Ross Thomas was stumped. He sought a report on the Association's students from Professor Mackie and was informed that the students had all been satisfactory in classwork and examination tests and that their "attitude
and their response to College interests (both in theoretical and practical work) have been gratifying." Not at all pleased at having been outwitted, Ross Thomas reported to the Minister:

While the spirit of the Minister's decision regarding the admission of these students to the Teachers' College has not been observed, insofar as payment of fees is concerned, I consider that no good purpose would be served by insisting upon payment being made, and I recommend that payment be waived ... [Handwritten annotation] I think this principle [of payment] should be insisted upon in future. Doubtless the Asscn, banking on a final satisfactory report to keep their assets liquid.

Ross Thomas had indeed identified Lady MacCallum's successful business strategy but short of refusing the students admission if payment had not been made in advance, he was hamstrung by the Minister's decision to refund fees when the students had passed successfully. Lady MacCallum, dishonourably in Ross Thomas' view, relied on Ross Thomas' unwillingness to exclude the students and having won the first round, she sailed ahead. To Ross Thomas' horror, in February, 1936, the next batch of six first year students and also a continuing group of five second year students were enrolled in Literature and Physical Training classes and further practical work at North Newtown Demonstration school. In April, Professor Mackie dutifully informed Ross Thomas of the situation and sought advice. Ross Thomas again wrote plaintively to the Minister saying that

the procedure is likely to be a permanent one if agreed to. This means virtually that the Association will have the right to send free students to the College. I feel that this was never contemplated.

The Minister was clearly not interested in exacting payment. He replied shortly "Appvd that an aggregate of not more than 20 students be permitted to attend the College i.e. combined 1 and 2 year students."

For the next two years it was stalemate. Miss Town continued to enrol students at the beginning of the year, without prior notification to the Department. Mackie continued to advise Ross Thomas of the enrolments and seek
confirmation, and Ross Thomas continued to complain to the Minister, seeking to uphold the principle he believed had been established. Finally in June 1938, the new Acting Director of Education, B.C. Harkness, wanted the matter concluded. He summarised the events in a Minute to the Minister, noting that

The Minister's approval had provided that a maximum of twenty students should be accepted in any year, and this number does not appear to have been exceeded. In view of the difficulty, however, of obtaining any fees in consideration of their attendance, the matter is submitted for decision by the Minister as to whether fees should be waived in the case of these students.123

The Minister simply annotated the Minute "Appvd" and the decision was endorsed by seven Departmental officers, two of whom noted "I concur".

So Lady MacCallum won the game by stonewalling. The Association's students continued to attend classes at Sydney Teachers College without payment until 1948 when both the Association's and the Department's student numbers had increased so dramatically that Teachers College found it difficult to cope with even its own increased demand. Until 1946, first year students continued to do courses in Biology, Phonetics (Special Training), and practical work at Blackfriars and second year students continued courses in Physical Training, Biology (Nature Study), Children's Literature and practical work at North Newtown.124 In 1946 and 1947, the student numbers were so great (45 first years in 1946 and 34 in 1947) that Teachers College could only allow first year enrolments in Phonetics (Speech Training) and practical work at Blackfriars and second year enrolments in Biology (Nature Study) and practical work at North Newtown.125 In 1948, Sydney Teachers College regretfully decided that it could no longer accommodate any nursery school students in its classes but that students could continue to use the library and have their practical placements.126 Finally, in 1951, the practical work concession was discontinued and formal connection between the Association and Teachers College ceased.127

No fees were ever paid for the 105 students who graduated between 1935
and 1948. Thus, for the eleven years to 1945, the state effectively subsidised the Association for what its Senior Departmental officer considered to be equivalent to one-third of the teacher education program, a contribution of some £1100 by default. With the increased student numbers in 1946 and 1947, even the reduced assistance comprised a further contribution of some £600. More importantly, since the students were assessed by highly respected Teachers College staff in a number of academic subjects and in their teaching practice, there should have been no question about the educational status of the nursery school teacher training. The graduates were of a calibre at least equivalent to that of the Department's primary school teachers and therefore the Kindergarten Union and its College had no real basis for repudiating the Association's Nursery School Diploma (Plate 12). The fact that both the Kindergarten Union and its College did denigrate the nursery school teacher education program and did consider nursery school teachers to be second class citizens was a function of ideologies related to their conceptualisations of early childhood education and care. As Miss Mildred Cookson, one of the first cohort of Miss Town's students in 1935, later commented

The antipathy wasn't on our part. They really looked down on us because we worked in the poorer areas. The basis of it was that they didn't recognise our curriculum as being training for teachers and the fact that we worked with disadvantaged children and we worked longer hours than they did. They frowned on working mothers and wouldn't take anyone who went to work. They thought the children in the day nursery were substandard and so were the teachers. We were the poor relations always.  

8.3.3 The Nursery School Diploma

Elizabeth Town proved to be a happy choice as Superintendent. She was like Miss Gillespie in that she was gentle and sensitive, but she was sufficiently strong not to crumble when faced by autocratic and unsympathetic committee women. She managed to work successfully with them despite what sometimes seemed to be insurmountable odds. She was calm yet enthusiastic, and inspired
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her students by encouraging a spirit of inquiry. Miss Cookson was among those who were deeply impressed by Miss Town. She said that

Miss Town was the sort of person who told you things and then let you work it out for yourself. She changed my ideas about a lot of things, about life and whatnot. I'll never forget her.\textsuperscript{130}

Miss Town was a dedicated McMillan disciple, particularly with respect to the importance of sensory training. She had a creative flair for making children's equipment and she believed that this

... must be sufficient in quantity, suitable in quality, and in very great variety to make all this work possible ... It cannot be bought ready made; it must be the expression of the teachers' own ideas and must also satisfy the children's needs (aesthetic, social, imaginative, etc. etc.).\textsuperscript{131}

Consequently, students spent much of their time both at the nursery school and in their leisure hours making and mending equipment.\textsuperscript{132} The originality of this equipment and the amount of careful thought which had preceded its preparation were important criteria to Miss Town for judging a student's merit. Of course, the children in the equipment-starved day nurseries were the beneficiaries of the "valuable stock of such material ... which has flowed out to every other Nursery School."\textsuperscript{133}

By the time Miss Town returned to England in March, 1938, she had successfully completed the task with which she had been charged. Indeed, news of her achievements had reached England by the end of 1936 and the Nursery School Association of Great Britain sent her a congratulatory letter.\textsuperscript{134} Sternly warned by Lady MacCallum to take great care in awarding the Nursery School Diploma "as the reputation of the Training Centre is always at stake", Miss Town selected students very carefully.\textsuperscript{135} They were required to possess at least the Intermediate Certificate or its equivalent and to have a satisfactory IQ.\textsuperscript{136} Their personal suitability for nursery school work was assessed first by a confidential report from the applicant's school Headmistress and then by
close observation of their aptitude during the probationary first months. Students who did not prove satisfactory on scholastic, social or health grounds were counselled out of the program. The students who did survive the rigorous personal scrutiny were then both able and enthusiastic, as their Teachers College academic and practical assessments attested. The 22 nursery school teachers which Miss Town produced by the end of 1937 were, on the whole, worthy exponents of nursery school education.

Miss Town's successor, Miss Mary Bird (1938-1944) continued the work which Miss Town had so securely put into place. Selected by Lillian de Lissa, she was a 23 year old Gipsy Hill graduate with three years teaching experience in English nursery schools when she arrived. She was prepared for the situation in Sydney by detailed notes which Miss Town left for her in Colombo, when she realised that they would not be able to meet as planned. Although so young, she quickly won the Committee women's respect. One committee member recalled that

She was a strong minded kind of woman - red hair. I think they all admired her. She made some changes - took a bit of fitting in ... She had a very good opinion of herself ... She might have been socialistic, though politics didn't really come into the Committees. With the children you know you must grow on the socialist side of things.

Miss Bird was indeed ambitious, intelligent and interested in human justice. She was also clear-thinking, courageous and articulate. Those characteristics were critical at this stage of nursery school teacher training, and they helped to ensure that in future years the employment of early childhood teachers in day care centres in New South Wales became accepted and expected practice. First, she introduced the title Nursery School Training College and by 1940 she had persuaded the Association to entitle her Principal. Second, she upgraded the teacher training program by increasing the academic content of the course, introducing study skills courses, establishing a proper library, removing the Training Centre from the Woolloomooloo
nursery to separate student oriented facilities at the Linthorpe Street, Newtown, premises and finally introducing a third year into the program in 1941. She paved the way for the ultimate achievement of an identifiable Nursery School Teachers' College in its own handsome building at 146 Burren St, Newtown, in 1945 (Plate 13). Third, she was active in wide professional circles, making the Nursery School Training Centre and its Diploma not only visible but also acceptable to other educationalists. She was a respected member of the Pre-School Child Committee of the Child Welfare Advisory Council and she used the standards developed by this group to pressure the Association into upgrading its Diploma program. She attended the first conference of the Australian Association for Pre-School Child Development in Melbourne in 1939 and she began the process of achieving the Association's acceptability to the extremely reluctant Kindergarten Unions. She was of sufficient educational stature to be a keynote speaker on "The Pre-School and Infants' school child" at a NSW Teachers Federation Conference in 1943, sharing the platform with such eminent people as Professor C.R. McRae, Principal of Sydney Teachers College. Fourth, recognising that quality child care depends so greatly on a well-cared-for staff, she championed campaigns for improved salaries and working conditions. She began with the hours staff worked and over the years she battled the Committee women on issues ranging from staff and student uniforms to the respective responsibilities and duties of teachers and Matrons. Just before she resigned in 1944, she addressed an Executive meeting attended by 45 Committee women, to make clear to them the severe difficulties under which the teachers were working and the urgent needs for reforms. Indeed, she resigned from her position because of her own workload. She recalled that

I was still the only full-time lecturer and I had to supervise all the nurseries and I was on the government committees not to mention all the Association's Committees and I was doing a part-time degree. I was working all day, still at 9pm, only got one month's holiday a
year, not school holidays. I had married and I wanted something less, so I applied for a job with the Department of Education and started their first nursery annexe at Annandale.148

So she was lost from the Association but not before she had consolidated and extended the aims which Miss Town had set in 1934.
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CHAPTER NINE

CONCLUSION

Over the 40 years examined here, the nature of the Association's day care services changed but the fundamental ideological basis for the service provision did not. The services were always residual welfare services, provided as necessary family supports when the idealised nuclear family form of child-rearing had broken down. They supplied physical care and some form of education for babies and young children under school age so that some semblance of family life, imperfect as it was, could be maintained. For the most part, the reasons for the family breakdowns were men's failures in their socially prescribed roles as financial providers for their families. The clients were predominantly those women who wished to continue with their socially prescribed roles as mothers even though the loss or inadequacy of their male partners' financial power required them to assume both financial and nurturant responsibilities for their children. They were widows, deserted wives, women with invalid or intemperate husbands or husbands in jail, and unmarried mothers. The legitimacy of their marital status was never of any great importance. As one Committee member observed,

That was not our business. It was never the principle to let anyone know the status of our mothers. I remember our Matrons always had some wedding rings and they'd say "You're Mrs So and So, put that ring on - it's the status of your child that we're interested about." We were never concerned. It wasn't our business to judge people's morals.2

What was important however was that the client women were honestly trying to be financially independent and that they were willing to conform to their social responsibilities as mothers. They were therefore carefully screened to ensure that the services were only available to cases which were truly deserving on
those criteria.

Although the Committee women and the nursery staff accepted that the client women were forced to work, they never encouraged it. Nor was there ever any thought that mothers of young children might want to work. Both the Committee women and the nursery staff, including the professional teachers and nurses, were constrained by social and economic forces which insisted that women of whatever social status did not work after marriage because of their potential motherhood. They hoped either that the client mothers would soon find replacement men who would be able financial providers or that the mothers' existing partners would soon be well or back in work or out of jail or eschew the demon drink. Moreover, neither the Committee women nor the professional teachers and nurses expected that they would work after marriage. Indeed few of the Committee women had worked even prior to marriage and none of them, not even those who were professionally qualified, expected to do so afterwards. Those teachers and nurses who achieved the highly prized state of connubial bliss resigned immediately. All these women derived their social status from the positions in business and professional life which first their fathers and later their husbands managed to achieve. Their menfolk had been successful and they wished for the same derivative benefits for other women. Neither the Committee women nor former professional nursery staff wanted their children to become nursery clients.3

The Committee women were therefore deeply conservative and constrained by the prevailing family ideology. Some were simply warm, fuzzy, well-intentioned women who, because they were themselves mothers, thought they knew what quality group child care entailed. These women were often sublimely ignorant of the differences between their own comfortable home lives and those of their client women and children. They assumed that, if children were clean, tidy, quiet, polite and well-fed, then all their needs were catered for. These
conditions applied to their own children at home so therefore it was not surprising that they expected the same conditions in the nurseries. They were so often unaware that their own children had many compensatory experiences which encouraged their intellectual and emotional development while the nursery children did not. Other Committee women, while equally constrained by family ideology, were more aware of social class differences and the miserable lives of their client women and children. Some even ventured into the women's homes, with devastating personal effects. One Committee member recalled that

One day when I was at Woolloomooloo, a child got ill and the Matron couldn't contact the mother. Staff was short so I said I would take the child home. So off I go down Palmer Street and I climbed three floors, up the top to this room. And this woman had elderly people with her and there was no water on in the place, there was no convenience and it was so poorly furnished. And the smell and the dingy. You know she was not a dirty person, it was just so poor and so, so terrible. I had that smell in my nose for ages. I went home and said to Ted "This is really terrible. I don't know how some women keep their sanity." It broke me up, did me good, showed me how the other half live ... It's some of these things, when your mind goes back, that keep you doing, keep you working.4

These women knew that they had to give the children more than merely safe physical care to compensate for their severe disadvantages. They understood that providing quality group care and education for these children was a complex operation which required skilled, intelligent and professionally qualified staff who were competent to analyse and provide for the children's intellectual, social and emotional needs as well as their physical care. They tried to increase the quantity and quality of the children's equipment and to employ sufficient and suitably trained staff. But such perceptive Committee women were few in number and until there was a strong enough force of nursery school teachers to pressure for change, their ideas were so often swamped by the more widely held beliefs of the "nice, warmhearted housewives who were there because they loved children but they didn't have any conception of education."5
Many Committee women found productive and socially acceptable outlets for their organisational and entrepreneurial talents in the Association's necessary fundraising activities. Others were competent and efficient business managers with enormous competitive drive. Once their own children were safely at school, they were able to devote their energies to the Association's business and commercial activities. For many, the Association became their business. They were skilled and effective lobbyists. They persuaded their husbands' and fathers' business and professional colleagues to donate services and goods either free of charge or at cost. They dealt with tradesmen and negotiated the best prices for repairs and renovations of buildings. They persuaded local government authorities to relax rates and taxes. Most importantly, they persuaded politicians and bureaucrats to provide state financial support for the nurseries. They were of course most successful when state interests coincided with their own but once initial state support was obtained in 1911, they were able to obtain continuing state subsidy which comprised an average 27 percent of the total nursery costs over the 40 year period studied here.6 The financial success of the organisation must be attributed to the negotiating skills, financial management and business acumen of those women, at both Branch and Executive Committee levels, who harassed, importuned, charmed and stubbornly persisted in order to obtain conditions which would be most advantageous to their own financial empire.

These bourgeois women provided care and educational services for very young children for which neither working women's employers nor the state would take responsibility. The employers were willing to accept the women's labour and, with male trade unionists' connivance and in the interest of maximising profits, to offer them half of men's wages. At no time were employers willing to consider that care for their employees' children was in any way connected with their roles as employers. For the most part, the state
supported the employers and male trade unionists. It too did not consider that providing care and education for the very young children of working women was one of its functions. It was prepared to provide universal child care services for children aged six to fourteen years but these were legitimated by being entitled schools and by being under the control of teachers whom the state itself prepared in its own way. Why the state chose six years as the starting age for its universal entitlement is a moot point. The answer depends on a complex interrelated set of factors connected with the social control functions of schools, finite financial resources and state acceptance of the nuclear family as the ideal location for early childrearing. In any case the decision meant that care and education services for children aged under six years developed outside the state system and that such financial support as the state chose to give was based on the residual welfare principle rather than one of universal entitlement. Hence, early childhood services have remained subject to fluctuations depending on state interests. Their status has always been that of political footballs.

State support of the family as the ideal location for childrearing was broadly expressed through infant welfare and domestic science education campaigns and through industrial, family law and child welfare legislations. Wages and child endowment determinations confirmed men's workforce status and their financial responsibilities to their families. Punitive family law legislations required men to pay for their wives and children after divorce or desertion but in practice, given that the law enforcers were men, these were more honoured in the breach than in the observance. Women's workforce status was confirmed as marginal and expendable. Their participation could be expanded or contracted dependent on capitalists' needs and national emergencies. Cash allowances and pensions for supporting mothers were introduced but these were made difficult to obtain, subject to intense personal
scrutiny, did not encompass all supporting mothers and never provided a standard of living beyond abject poverty. The principle seems always to have been that if a woman lost her male financial provider then that was somehow her fault. If she happened also to have children then that too was her fault. She should then be punished by being required to survive either on half a man's wages or the meagre allowances which the state so generously offered. If she could not manage to keep going under these financial stringencies, then she should be further punished by losing her children to foster families which did fit the ideal family form, in theory if not always in practice.

The state was however prepared to support the administrative model of co-operative state-charity service provision which had been established early in the nineteenth century. In this case the services were for the group care and education of children under six years of age. Both the Day Nursery Association and the Kindergarten Union profited from the continuation of the scheme. Under this model, well-socialised bourgeois women were provided with outlets for their talents and energies while serving state interests. They laboured without rebellion in causes in which they believed and for which they believed that they, as women, were ideally suited. They were hard-working but they were also comfortable and self-fulfilled. They had many successes in advancing their causes but, without real power at political, bureaucratic and trade union levels, they were often unwitting pawns in what were in actuality power plays by men.

Over the years, the Association's Committee women became progressively dominated by the motherhood ideology and they were subverted from their original purpose to provide care for young babies. They never considered closing down the six nurseries which did provide this care but, after the mid 1930s, neither did they agitate to provide more services for babies under two years. By the 1930s, the infant welfare campaigns had been so successful that
the original rationale for the nurseries as part of the infant mortality campaign was no longer relevant. Much more was known about infant care, and mortality rates had been so reduced that they were no longer of any community interest. Moreover, the Committee women were as much affected by the motherhood ideology as women of other social strata, since they too were clients of the Baby Health Clinics' advice. Hence, many of them came to accept that babies under two years of age belonged at home with their mothers. Consequently, by the 1950s, places for such young babies comprised only thirteen or fourteen percent of the Association's total service provision.7

The Association also became progressively dominated by its need to be considered respectable in a world which did not accept the legitimacy of women with young children in the paid workforce. It never wanted to change its objects nor to change its long day service provision. But it did wish to demonstrate that the services it provided were of positive educational benefit to the children within its care. The agent for this demonstration was the nursery school for two to five year olds. The Association took McMillan's term and based its system on her principles. However, the word "school" was a two-edged sword. It was useful in that it implied an educational focus and education was clearly of higher status than "mere care". But it also carried negative connotations since to most people in the community it was inconceivable that two to five year olds could be "schooled". The Association was at pains to point out that

The Committee realise that the word "School" may give rise to misunderstanding. It cannot be too definitely stated that IN NO SENSE does it imply formal education, being preliminary even to the partial formality of Kindergarten work. It really means the nurture and development, physical, social psychological, of very young children by means of simple and carefully directed play and free physical activity.8 (original emphasis)

However, despite this and later explanations, the Association was no more successful in communicating the philosophical bases of its form of early
childhood education than the Kindergarten Union had been. The notion of a curriculum based on individual child development and the value of play as an educational method have never been fully accepted as comprising "proper" education by either state bureaucracies or the community at large. Education systems and most parents today still equate tangible products, such as writing or the correct answer to a sum, with education. Early childhood education programs, by whatever names they may be called, have suffered the same negative evaluations as have other progressive educational approaches which are more interested in process than in product.

The Association faced four additional major problems in its quest to establish its services as respectable, educational institutions. These problems arose in part from the earlier and continuing identification of the services as social welfare institutions and in part from rejection of the Association's nursery school and teacher training programs by kindergarten teachers and staff of the Kindergarten Teachers College.

First, the Association's annual state grant was never made under the Minister for Education's vote, even though the Child Welfare Department was under that Minister between 1924 and 1956. The one serious effort by a Minister for Education to place the Association under his control during World War II was thwarted by the territorial interests of both the Social Services and the Health Ministers. Indeed, the Association's own identification of its clients as women who worked because they lacked adequate male providers was used by the Social Services Minister to justify placement of the Association's services under his portfolio. In subsequent years, the identification of the Association's day nurseries and nursery schools as welfare services impacted strongly on the development of the Nursery School Training College. As Miss Joan Fry, Principal of the College from 1951 to 1972, commented,
We kept asking the Government for money for the College. When we asked Welfare who subsidised the nursery centres, we were told education was not their responsibility. When we asked Education, they said Welfare was funding us and it was not the policy for one Department to interfere with the rights of another.9

Hence the College fell between Departments and there was no state funding for it until it became a Commonwealth funded College of Advanced Education in the 1970s. The only finance for its staff salaries and teaching program came from student fees and whatever the Committee women were prepared to spare from funds raised for the nursery service provision. Consequently, until the 1970s, staff salaries were considerably lower than those of the Kindergarten Training College staff, the number of staff was smaller and the academic content of the training program was often less than ideal.

Second, although the Association added "and Nursery Schools" to its title in 1938, it continued to refer to itself and to be referred to by others by its long-established, commonly used referent "The Day Nursery Association." Hence, as one respected nursery school teacher pointed out to the Committee women in 1944,

This may seem a small and irrelevant point but I sometimes wonder if non-members of the teaching profession realise that the term Day Nursery generally carries with it, among pre-school educational circles, the idea of a creche staffed by either nurses or untrained personnel: such centres have always suffered from a type of educational stigma: because of this I wish to urge the use of the full title Day Nursery and Nursery Schools Association, or the dropping of the Day Nursery ... part, and above all, the use of N(ursery) S(chool) for the N.S. section for children 2-6 years.10

However, the problem was never solved. No simpler alternative to the long, clumsy title was ever proposed. Nor has any single term yet been devised to overcome the conceptual division created by continued usage of the two words care and education. Indeed, even Margaret McMillan could not find a more elegant title for her early childhood professionals than nurse-teacher or teacher-nurse.
Third, kindergarten teachers' rejection of work with day nursery children was well established prior to the Association's introduction of nursery schools. Indeed, the Association's inability to attract or retain kindergarten teachers in employment in the nurseries had been one of the major reasons for the Association's entry into teacher training in 1931. There were numerous bases for the kindergarten teachers' disdain, even though the kindergartens in which they worked had been established in the same depressed inner city suburbs and under the same kinds of philanthropic motivations. These basically stemmed from the kindergarten teachers' beliefs in what comprised education; from the simple fact that the nursery children were more disadvantaged than the kindergarten children; and from the salaries and working conditions which the Association offered. Kindergarten teachers were more interested in their planned Froebelian programs than in the children's physical care or in the welfare focus of the nurseries. They were embarrassed by association with a welfare agency and in any case they did not believe that women with young children should be working. Moreover, even though the salaries paid by the Kindergarten Union were low, those offered by the Association were lower still and the Association expected more than the regular three hours interaction with the children. After the 1930s, when the kindergartens run by the Kindergarten Union had extended their programs to six hours a day, and the kindergarten teachers were required to be involved in feeding and toileting the children and arranging for their midday sleep, the situation did not change. The nursery school clients were still working women and their children; the Association's salaries for its nursery school teachers were still lower than those paid by the Kindergarten Union; and the hours teachers were required to work in the Association's nursery schools were not only longer but they were on a shift basis, with the first shift starting at 7am and the second shift not finishing until 6pm. In addition, the nursery schools were open for all working days of the year except
those days between Christmas and New Year, and nursery school teachers were only given four weeks holiday per annum, not the ten weeks which kindergarten teachers received by default, since the kindergartens were only open for the same weeks of the year as the public schools. Hence, although their own working conditions in kindergartens had changed, there was little inducement for kindergarten teachers to seek employment in the Association's nursery schools.

Fourth, and with unfortunate long term consequences in early childhood educational circles in Sydney, staff of the Kindergarten Teachers College rejected the legitimacy of the Association's nursery school teacher training program. It is not clear just what exactly was the main reason for this rejection. It does not seem that the Association's training program was any less respectable or rigorous than that offered by the Kindergarten Training College. The Association's records indicate that the curriculum content of the teacher training program was at least equivalent to that of the Kindergarten College. Also, particularly under Mary Bird's leadership, the professional standing of both herself as Principal and the part-time specialist lecturers was very high. In addition, the students were taught and assessed in some important curriculum subjects by highly respected staff of the Sydney Teachers College and some of their practicum placements were also assessed by Sydney Teachers College staff. There had therefore to be other reasons for the Kindergarten College's negative assessment. One was undoubtedly based in the two different approaches to nursery school education which were adopted by the respective institutions. The Kindergarten College was dominated by the clinical, American laboratory school model which Jean Wyndham introduced after her return from Teachers College, Columbia University, while the Nursery School Training College program was modelled on the less scientifically rigorous Margaret McMillan program. A second reason was that, no matter how well prepared the
Association's nursery school teachers were, in practice staffing and working conditions were such that they could not possibly implement what they had been taught. The Nursery School Training College staff and the teachers in the nursery schools regularly complained about inadequate facilities, insufficient equipment, too few trained staff, too many untrained helpers, too long hours, and insufficient and inadequately spaced holidays. These complaints were also identified by such relatively independent observers as Dr Grace Cuthbert, Director of the Department of Maternal Child Welfare, who began systematic health services to both the Kindergarten Union and the Association in 1946, and Miss Jean McKenzie, a Department of Education Inspector of Schools who began to inspect the kindergartens and nursery schools operated by the two organisations in 1948.11 The conditions in the Association's nursery schools meant that teachers worked such long hours that they had little energy left over for program planning; that they had little professional support from either other teachers on the job or supervisory staff; and that they had such high numbers of children to manage that individual planning was beyond their capacity. Small wonder then that, late in the afternoon shift when both they and the children were tired, they could do little else but try a few finger plays to keep the children occupied.12

Nevertheless, despite continuing state identification of the services as welfare institutions and continuing rejection by the "other" early childhood organisation in Sydney, the very fact that the Association, its day care services and its Nursery School Training College existed meant that New South Wales became the only Australian state which, by the 1940s, had developed the same standards for physical facilities and staffing in both day care services and kindergartens. This is not to say that the standards were actually specified in any legislation or Regulations attached to any legislation. It was to be 30 years before that degree of state control over the operation of early childhood
services was achieved.\textsuperscript{13} It is beyond the scope of this thesis to detail the territorial infighting, sheer opposition and long periods of inertia which contributed to the delay. Suffice it here to say that it was significant for the future of day care services in New South Wales that an organisation which, since 1905, had striven to ensure high quality care and education services for the young children of working women, was there to participate in the development of advisory standards during the 1940s and subsequent years. Mary Bird and her successor Joan Fry, as Principals of the Nursery School Training College, were members of Advisory Committees which were set up under the 1939 Child Welfare Act to develop those standards and they strongly influenced the directions which were taken by the Committees.

Hence, undoubtedly prompted by Mary Bird's arguments, the first Pre-School Committee of the state's Child Welfare Advisory Council saw no differences between day nurseries, nursery schools and kindergartens. Consequently, one of its important staffing principles was that

It is essential that the director of every day nursery, nursery school and kindergarten or any institution providing group care for preschool children should be a professionally trained and experienced teacher who is capable of planning and carrying out the daily programme in accordance with the best principles of nursery school education.\textsuperscript{14}

Moreover, this Committee was of the opinion that

... any difference[s] which may exist between nursery school kindergarten and lower primary school practice are differences of emphasis rather than of essential points of view. The Committee, therefore, feels that no action should be taken in regard to nomenclature, training standards, or certification of teachers which would set up arbitrary divisions between the several aspects of the work of caring for young children.\textsuperscript{15}

Later Committees, again undoubtedly prompted by Joan Fry's later arguments, fought hard to retain these principles and hence over the years it became accepted practice in New South Wales that qualified early childhood teachers were employed in day care centres to at least the same extent as they were
employed in kindergartens. Therefore, when precise licensing Regulations were finally achieved in 1969, not only were no distinctions made between the physical facilities of the two kinds of services but also no differences were made in the staffing requirements for two to five year old children. In addition, Regulations governing the group care of babies under two years were directly based on the standards which the Association had developed over its years of service provision. These requirements were based in the strongly-held belief that socially and economically disadvantaged children had just as much right as socially and economically advantaged children to high quality care and education services. They were made possible by the strenuous labours of hundreds of bourgeois women volunteers and a small number of professionally qualified teachers whom the Association had itself trained.

Postscript

By 1945, after 40 years of day care service provision, the Sydney Day Nursery and Nursery Schools Association operated six day nurseries which cared for over 100 babies aged six weeks to two years and twelve nursery schools which provided educational programs for 650 two to five year olds each day. Five more nursery schools were being planned including a demonstration centre. The Association had established a teacher training college for 100 students and its Nursery School Diploma program prepared teachers to work in its day care services. Its system of day nurseries and nursery schools employed over 100 teachers, nurses, untrained assistants, cooks and other support staff. Its training college was staffed by one full-time and several part-time lecturers. Its property holdings and other assets amounted to over £46,000 and its annual income was more than £27,000. The whole enterprise was managed by a group of bourgeois women volunteers, supported by a small number of clerical, financial and administrative staff who were located in a central office.
The Association had clearly been a remarkably successful voluntary organisation and its achievements were substantial. In its early period from inception to incorporation in 1924, it had defined and clarified its policies, principles and procedures on each of the six major dimensions of its day care service provision. The first dimension was its administrative structure, which comprised a system of Branch Committees, each of which having some independent authority over the daily management of its nursery but each of which being subordinate to an Executive Committee in which all powers to conduct the affairs of the Association were vested. The second dimension was its definition of its clients, which by the end of 1907, comprised the children aged from six weeks to six years of "needy" working women. "Needy" women were widows, deserted wives, women with disabled husbands or husbands in jail and unmarried mothers. The third dimension was the availability of the services. They were located in depressed inner city areas where concentrations of working women lived and they were open eleven hours each weekday and six hours on Saturday for all weeks of the year except between Christmas and New Year. New services were established as funds allowed and there were never enough of them to satisfy the demand for places. The fourth dimension was definition of funding sources to operate the services. Three sources were used. First, the mothers were required to pay a nominal fee on the grounds that by doing so they would not consider the service to be a charity and that, in paying, they demonstrated their rights to respect. Their fees comprised some ten percent of the Association's total income. Second, the state was asked to contribute and after 1911 it did so, providing some 30 percent of the Association's total income. Third, the Association expected to raise most of the service cost through fundraising activities and direct donations and its own efforts produced 60 percent of its total income. The fifth dimension was staff for the services. These were defined as nurses supported by domestic assistants.
No previous training for the group care of babies and young children was available and skills, whether good or bad, were learnt on the job. The sixth dimension was the definition of care and education programs for the children. These were focused on physical health and safekeeping, with a daily dose of Froebelian kindergarten training for older children. There was little concern about children's psychological development since the scientific study of child development had barely begun.

In its next period from the late 1920s to the end of World War II, the Association grew dramatically and expanded its capacities and its programs. All of the six dimensions of day care service provision were redefined to a lesser or greater extent. Least changed were the first three dimensions, those which concerned the Association's administrative structure, its definitions of its clients, and the locations and capacity of its services to meet client demand. With respect to the administrative model, the only significant adjustments were the addition of a Nursery School Committee in September, 1931, to oversee this new direction, and the establishment of a Council for the Nursery School Training College in December, 1944, for similar purposes. However, the Nursery School Committee was, like the Branch Committees, responsible to the Executive Committee and its decisions required ratification and endorsement by that body. The College Council, which really only began to function properly at the end of 1948, had a greater degree of independence but even so, since the only sources of income for the College were student fees and what the Association could spare from what was needed to run the nurseries, the Executive Committee maintained final authority at least as far as expenditure was concerned. With respect to definition of the client women, this also was little changed although it did require adjustment during the depression years since so many men, who were normally responsible financial providers for their families, were out of work. However, once the worst of the depression was over,
definition of client women returned to normal. In this period, as in the previous period, cases of women needing to work because their husbands were absent in the service of the nation during war-time, were treated in the same way as the more usual cases of deserted wives. With respect to the location of services, this too remained essentially unchanged except that a service was established in the mountains at Katoomba and planning for services in several country towns was begun. In addition, although the number of places for children increased dramatically, the supply continued to be just as inadequate to meet the demand. This was particularly the case for places for babies under two years of age, since the Association did not create any new places for them at all after the early 1930s.

Greatest change occurred in the other three dimensions of service provision, those which concerned the sources of funding for the services, their staffing and the programs which were provided for the children. With respect to funding, World War II marked a permanent change in the balance between the proportions of the service cost which were paid for by the mothers as fees, by the state as subsidy and by the Association's fundraising efforts. By the 1930s the Association produced approximately 60 percent of the service cost, and mothers and the state paid for approximately 20 percent each. During the Second World War the Association's capacity to provide income for its own empire was drastically reduced, and it never recovered afterwards. Hence, by the 1950s, approximately 90 percent of the service cost was borne by the mothers and the state, with the mothers paying almost half of the cost of their children's care. The Association became a manager of other people's money rather than a manager of money which it itself had worked directly to raise. With respect to staffing, the changes were dramatic. Specialised professional training programs for mothercraft nurses to care for babies under two years of age and for nursery school teachers to care for and educate children over two
years of age were introduced. Hence, by the 1940s, all children were in the
care of qualified women and the dream of "professional tenders of babies" was
realised. Although these women were not yet unionised and there were no
arbitrated awards for them, the Association responded as best it could to
recognise that their qualifications required some reasonable recompense.
Hence, by the 1950s, while staff salaries still only comprised a little over half
of the cost of nursery provision, salary costs were increasing and they con-
tinued to do so. With respect to the programs for children, the changes were
equally dramatic. Despite high child to adult ratios, the professionalism of the
staff meant that the quality of the programs offered to the children was
significantly improved. There was a long way to go but at least during this
period, some knowledge of child development became available and the
children's psychological development as well as their physical health became
the focus of attention.

The scope of this thesis does not extend to the later development of the
Association in its six dimensions of day care service provision. Sufficient unto
itself, however, is the achievement up to 1945, for by that year the Association
had built a powerful organisation which endured, relatively unchanged, for the
next 30 years. It had made for itself a place in the field of early childhood
services. It was unique and pre-eminent in day care service provision. It could
not escape its welfare service tag but why should it? At least the children who
were its real clients were better cared for and educated than children in other
services who were "merely minded."
Notes  Chapter 9  Conclusion
1. There were occasionally men clients who had been deserted by their wives or left as widowers with young children but they never formed any significant proportion of the Association's clientele.

2. Interview with Mrs Frances Norton, 24 February, 1981.
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5. Interview with Mrs Katharine Thyne Reid, 20 February, 1981.

6. See Tables 6 and 8. From 1911 to 1945, state grants totalled £55,835. For the same period, total nursery costs were £206,066.

7. The first exact enrolment figures for all nurseries and nursery schools were listed in EC Minutes, 12 February, 1951.

8. ARSDNA, 1931-32. 6.

9. Interview with Miss Joan Fry, 12 September, 1979.

10. Report by Miss Margaret Blythe, Acting Principal, to NS Committee, 14 July, 1944.


12. Interview with Miss Dorothy Francis, 8 September, 1981.

13. The first critical step was taken when day nurseries and kindergartens were included together under Part VII of the 1939 Child Welfare Act. This Part of the Act required both kinds of early childhood services to be licensed and to be subject to the same licensing conditions. Although no licenses were actually issued for almost 20 years and although no exact specifications of physical facilities and staffing in early childhood centres were legally promulgated for 30 years, advisory standards were developed by the Advisory Committees which were set up from time to time under Section 8 of the 1939 Act. Part VII of the 1939 Act was replaced by an amending Act in 1966. The new Part VII applied to "Child Care Centres" which were defined in part as "premises ... for the purpose of educating, minding or caring for" children under six years of age.
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Executive Committee Minutes, 1905-07, 1917-75 (minutes for 1908-16 have been lost).

Finance Committee Minutes, 1917-19, 1926-33.

Nursery School Committee Minutes, 1931-73.

Press Cuttings Books, 1905-75 (cuttings are referenced in Chapter Notes).

Sydney Kindergarten Training/Teachers College. Papers held at Head Office, Kindergarten Union of NSW, Sydney.

College Council Minutes, 1930-51.

Student Program Book, 1910-16. (Held at IECS, Waverley)

Student Record Book, 1911-15. (Held at IECS, Waverley)

Victorian Association of Day Nurseries. Papers held at the Association's Office, Melbourne.

Extracts from Annual Reports, 1913-50.

Summary notes of history, 1890-1971.

1.3 Oral Sources

Following initial identification of major events in the Association's history, open ended interviews were conducted with women whose connections with early childhood services began during the period studied here. Each interview was structured by probes based on the written records. All interviews with members of the Association and the Nursery School Training/Teachers' College were taped with the interviewee's permission. The tapes were transcribed and both tapes and transcriptions are held by the author.

Interviews varied in both length and content. Some took two to three hours, other five to six hours in two sessions. Some interviews generated new material to be followed up. Others were simply descriptive accounts of the individuals' recollections of experiences. For the most part, interview material fleshed out the written records and confirmed ideas generated from those records.

Committee members, Sydney Day Nursery and Nursery Schools Association

Mrs Barbara Brocklehurst, interviewed 1 March, 1981.

Mrs Brocklehurst joined the Newtown Committee in 1939; was the Association's Honorary Treasurer, 1955-70; and a member of the Nursery School Teachers' College Council 1950-75.
Lady Margaret Morrow, interviewed 23 February, 1981.

Lady Morrow joined the Forest Lodge Committee in 1974; was President of that Committee 1976-77; and an Executive Committee member from 1978 until her death in 1986. Her mother was Mrs Marguerite Fairfax, foundation Vice President, 1903, and President of the Forest Lodge Committee 1924-26, 1928 until her death in 1962.

Mrs Frances Norton, MBE, AASA, interviewed 24 February, 1981.

Mrs Norton joined the Noel Club in the 1930s and became a member of the Woolloomooloo Committee in 1940. She was an Executive Committee member, 1948-58; Vice President of the Association, 1959-65, 1969-71, 1977-81; President of the Association 1966-68, 1972-76; and a member of the Nursery School Teachers' College Council 1950, 1961-74. She was awarded the MBE in 1969 for her services to early childhood care and education and was made a Life Member of both the Association and the Australian Early Childhood Association in 1981.

Mrs Katharine Thyne Reid, MA (Cantab), interviewed 20 February, 1981.

Mrs Reid joined the Newtown Committee in 1934; was an Executive Committee member 1944-59, 1974-80; Vice President of the Association 1960-73; and a member of the Nursery School Teachers' College Council 1950-73. She was made a Life Member of the Association in 1981.

Mrs Barbara Selby, BA (Syd), interviewed 19 February, 1981.

Mrs Selby completed a special nursery school teacher training course in 1937 and assisted in the teacher training program for several years. She joined the Redfern Committee in 1963; was an Executive Committee member 1971-81; and Vice President of the Association 1982-88. Her mother was Mrs Helene Phillips, Vice President of the Woolloomooloo Committee 1908-20, 1922-26; President of the Woolloomooloo Committee 1927-30; Acting President of the Redfern Committee 1944-48; Vice President of the Association 1932-67; President of the Association 1920-22; and was made a Life Member of the Association in 1969. She died in 1979.

Mrs Nan Van Andel, Dip SKTC, interviewed 17 February, 1981.

Mrs Van Andel was a teacher at Woolloomooloo Kindergarten 1935-38; teacher at Woolloomooloo Nursery in the early 1960s; and a member of the Woolloomooloo Committee 1968-81.

Nursery school teachers and Nursery School Training/Teachers' College staff

Miss Mildred Cookson, Dip NSTC, interviewed 12 February, 9 September, 1981.

Miss Cookson completed a one year diploma in 1935 and the third year program in 1942. She taught in nursery schools until 1965 when she joined the Nursery School Teachers' College staff. She retired in 1975.
Miss Joan Fry, Dip NSTC, interviewed 12 September, 1979; 12 May, 1981.

Miss Fry completed a two year diploma in 1941 and a Child Development Course at London University in 1946. She joined the Nursery School Training College staff in 1948; was made Vice Principal and Supervisor of Practical Training in 1949; and was Principal of the College 1966-73.

Miss Jessie C. Hutchinson (Daisy), BA (Syd), Dip Soc Sc (B of SS and T), Nursery School Certificate (B of SS and T), interviewed 3 March, 1981.

Miss Hutchinson completed her BA in 1918; her social work diploma in 1932; and the Nursery School Certificate in 1935. She undertook post-graduate studies at Teachers College, Columbia University in 1934-35. She taught at Woolloomooloo School and opened the North Sydney Nursery School in 1933. On return from America, she opened her own nursery school in Mosman and continued there until retirement.

Mrs Mary Martin (Bird), BA (Syd), interviewed 30 December, 1981.

Mrs Martin completed her teacher training under Lillian de Lissa at Gipsy Hill in 1934; and was Principal of the Nursery School Training College 1938-44. She continued an active professional life until the early 1980s.

Kindergarten teachers, Sydney and Melbourne

Miss Ruth Drake, interviewed Melbourne, 23 May, 1981.

Miss Drake completed the Melbourne Kindergarten Training College governess course in 1916 and the nursery school course in 1931. She taught in the Free Kindergarten Union of Victoria's kindergartens, 1917-34 and opened the Guidance Nursery School at the Children's Hospital in 1934.

Miss Dorothy Francis, Dip SKTC, interviewed Sydney, 8 September, 1981.

Miss Francis completed her diploma in 1920 and taught in inner city kindergartens until 1946 when she joined the Kindergarten College staff. She retired in 1967.

Miss Wyn Griffith, Dip MKTC, interviewed Melbourne, 19 May, 1981.

Miss Griffith completed her diploma in 1924 and the nursery school course in 1938. She taught in the Free Kindergarten Union's kindergartens 1925-38; was Director of the Melbourne Lady Gowrie Centre, 1939-42; and Supervisor of the Church of England's kindergartens from 1943 until retirement.

Mrs Patsy Walford, BEd (IECD), interviewed Melbourne, 19 May, 1981.

Mrs Walford was Miss Mary Gutteridge's niece and has researched her aunt's life and work.
2. SECONDARY SOURCES

2.1 Early Books, Pamphlets, and Articles


Anderson, M. *Mother Lore*. Sydney, Angus and Robertson, 1919.


Cleveland, E. *Training the Toddler*. Philadelphia, Lippincott, 1925.


Fairfax, M.  Memories of Sydney's First Day Nursery. No publisher, no date.


Ford, M. "Short notes on an experiment in free work at Woolloomooloo Kindergarten" The Kindergarten College Magazine, 1921, 1. 13-14.


Heath, H.L.  The Infant, the Parent and the State. London, King and Son, 1907.


2.2 Later Books and Articles


Scott, D. 'Don't Mourn for me - Organise ...': the social and political uses of voluntary organisations. Sydney, George Allen and Unwin, 1981.


2.3 Theses


APPENDIX I

INCOME AND EXPENDITURE, 1905-06 TO 1954-55

1. **INTRODUCTION**

1.1 Financial statements were published in each of the Association's Annual Reports for the whole period. However, no Annual Reports for 1906-07, 1907-08 and 1909-10 could be located.

1.2 Up to 1917-18, financial statements comprised simple Accounts of Receipts and Expenditure including bank balances. Between 1918-19 and 1954-55, surplus capital was held in an Accumulation Account. However, in 1925-26 a Nursery Building and Furniture Fund account was also established, to which amounts were transferred from the Accumulation Account from time to time. In 1938-39 the name of the Nursery Building and Furniture Fund was changed to Capital Fund. In 1945-46, the Capital Fund and Accumulation account were consolidated into Accumulated Funds.

1.3 In 1918-19 the first Balance Sheet showing Assets and Liabilities was published. This continued throughout the whole period.

1.4 From 1918-19, separate Accounts of Receipts and Expenditure for each nursery were published in addition to the Account of Receipts and Expenditure for the Association as a whole.

1.5 The financial year for the whole period was 1 July to 30 June.

2. **DEFINITION OF CATEGORIES**

For the whole period examined here, the Accounts of Receipts and Expenditure for both the Association as a whole and for individual nurseries were most detailed. These details permitted definition of broader categories which could be consistently applied for the whole time span. The following sections list the definitions which were used.

2.1 **INCOME SOURCES**

Three major categories of income were defined, each with several sub-categories.
2.1.1 Association Fundraising

This included all income from fundraising activities listed in the balance sheets. The value of volunteer labour or gifts in kind could not be assessed. Each category was identifiable for all years 1905 to 1955, except Entrepreneurial activities which was included with Individual capital donations after 1942.

A1 Capital donations
   A1.1 Individual subscriptions, donations, bequests, legacies, endowments
   A1.2 Organisational Walter and Eliza Hall Trust; United Charities Fund; Carnegie Corporation

A2 Entrepreneurial activities balls, fêtes, theatre parties, other entertainments; circles; art unions; street appeals

A3 Commercial services catering services; jumble sales

A4 Business activities interest on investments; rent; sale of property and plant

A5 TOTAL ASSOCIATION FUNDRAISING total of A1.1, A1.2, A2, A3, A4

2.1.2 Fees for Services

This included all income directly paid as fees for services offered by the Association.

B1 Children fees, nurseries and nursery schools

B2 Students tuition fees, Nursery School Teachers' College

B3 TOTAL FEES FOR SERVICES total of B1, B2

2.1.3 Government Subsidy

This includes all direct money grants by local, state and Commonwealth governments. The value of indirect subsidy through relief from rates and taxes could not be assessed.

C1 Municipal

C2 State

C3 Commonwealth

C4 TOTAL GOVERNMENT SUBSIDY total of C1, C2, C3

2.1.4 TOTAL INCOME total of A5, B3 and C4.
2.2 EXPENDITURE CATEGORIES

Three major categories of expenditure were defined.

2.2.1 Nurseries and Nursery Schools

This included all expenditure which was directly related to the costs of service provision.

D1 Salaries salaries; wages; workers' compensation; insurance on workers; long service leave provision

D2 Food meat, bread, groceries, fruit and vegetables, milk

D3 Other recurrent expenses gas, electricity, fuel, ice; laundry; cleaning materials; linen renewals; furniture renewals; telephone; petty cash; miscellaneous expenses

D4 Play equipment children's indoor and outdoor equipment

D5 Building expenses purchase costs, land and buildings; interest; repairs; initial furnishing costs; initial equipment costs; rates; rents

D6 TOTAL NURSERIES WITHOUT BUILDINGS total of D1, D2, D3, D4

D7 TOTAL NURSERIES WITH BUILDINGS total of D5, D6

2.2.2 Nursery School Teachers' College

Costs associated with the Nursery School Training Centre/Teachers' College were only partially identifiable from 1930-31 to 1944-45 but were fully detailed from 1945-46 to 1954-55. Where Nursery School Training Centre costs were identifiable in the Association's account, they were included in this category.

E Nursery School Training Centre/Teachers' College salaries; visiting lecturer fees; administration; buildings; equipment

2.2.3 Central Administration

This category included all costs identifiable as directly related to maintenance of the central office.

F Central administration rent; salaries and associated on-costs; stationery; telephone; postage; catering purchases

2.2.4 TOTAL EXPENDITURE total of D7, E, F.
Table 1: Annual income from all sources, 1905-06 to 1935-36

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Individual capital donations</th>
<th>Entrepreneurial activities</th>
<th>Association fundraising</th>
<th>Fees for Services</th>
<th>Government subsidy</th>
<th>Total government subsidy</th>
<th>TOTAL INCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>donations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>services</td>
<td>Association</td>
<td>Children</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>1328</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>1152</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>1531</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>2888</td>
<td>686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1358</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>1587</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3136</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>1254</td>
<td>1254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>3397</td>
<td>1420</td>
<td>1420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>1161</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>4002</td>
<td>1364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>986</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>1671</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>3822</td>
<td>1533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>1406</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>3644</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>1342</td>
<td>1025</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>1693</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>5097</td>
<td>1804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>1430</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>4368</td>
<td>1276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>1077</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>3741</td>
<td>946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>2664</td>
<td>917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>2817</td>
<td>1127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>391</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>2703</td>
<td>1337</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Individual capital donations</th>
<th>Entrepreneurial activities</th>
<th>Organisation capital donations</th>
<th>Commercial services</th>
<th>Business activities</th>
<th>Total Association</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Total fees for services</th>
<th>Municipal</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>C'wealth</th>
<th>Total government subsidy</th>
<th>Total income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>831</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>1267</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>3802</td>
<td>1498</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>1786</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td></td>
<td>1610</td>
<td>7198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>1722</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>1360</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>4827</td>
<td>1743</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1388</td>
<td></td>
<td>1798</td>
<td>8609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>1336</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>5562</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>2198</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>1650</td>
<td></td>
<td>1860</td>
<td>9620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>2382</td>
<td>1037</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>1311</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>5924</td>
<td>2447</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>2643</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td></td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>10590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>3875</td>
<td>2844</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>2122</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>9408</td>
<td>2747</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>2970</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>14678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>3692</td>
<td>1323</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>2222</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>7694</td>
<td>2899</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>3246</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>2750</td>
<td></td>
<td>2970</td>
<td>13910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>2650</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>6086</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7155</td>
<td>4661</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>5074</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>5300</td>
<td></td>
<td>5825</td>
<td>18054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>5252</td>
<td></td>
<td>426</td>
<td>5545</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11223</td>
<td>6249</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>6579</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10004</td>
<td></td>
<td>10104</td>
<td>27906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>2993</td>
<td></td>
<td>447</td>
<td>6530</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7470</td>
<td>7611</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>8215</td>
<td>1053</td>
<td>7500</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>11533</td>
<td>27238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>3583</td>
<td></td>
<td>334</td>
<td>3803</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>7792</td>
<td>8042</td>
<td>1156</td>
<td>9198</td>
<td>1654</td>
<td>12500</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>15459</td>
<td>32444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>4793</td>
<td></td>
<td>623</td>
<td>2507</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>7867</td>
<td>8949</td>
<td>1666</td>
<td>10613</td>
<td>1502</td>
<td>13000</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>15132</td>
<td>33634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>6813</td>
<td></td>
<td>328</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>1217</td>
<td>6948</td>
<td>14072</td>
<td>1700</td>
<td>15772</td>
<td>2046</td>
<td>12500</td>
<td></td>
<td>14546</td>
<td>37266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>6389</td>
<td></td>
<td>380</td>
<td>1307</td>
<td>1678</td>
<td>7754</td>
<td>19705</td>
<td>1412</td>
<td>21117</td>
<td>1790</td>
<td>12500</td>
<td></td>
<td>14320</td>
<td>43161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>6509</td>
<td></td>
<td>193</td>
<td>1676</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>20273</td>
<td>1469</td>
<td>21742</td>
<td>1721</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td></td>
<td>21721</td>
<td>51893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>10035</td>
<td></td>
<td>310</td>
<td>1794</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>12283</td>
<td>23395</td>
<td>1695</td>
<td>25090</td>
<td>5093</td>
<td>17500</td>
<td></td>
<td>22593</td>
<td>59966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>8663</td>
<td></td>
<td>173</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>1618</td>
<td>11268</td>
<td>34431</td>
<td>1263</td>
<td>35694</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>20000</td>
<td></td>
<td>20629</td>
<td>67591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>7263</td>
<td></td>
<td>173</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>8136</td>
<td>40175</td>
<td>1391</td>
<td>41566</td>
<td>4298</td>
<td>29000</td>
<td></td>
<td>33298</td>
<td>83000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>8835</td>
<td></td>
<td>288</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>9784</td>
<td>47843</td>
<td>1355</td>
<td>49198</td>
<td>6188</td>
<td>35250</td>
<td></td>
<td>61938</td>
<td>100620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>8911</td>
<td></td>
<td>230</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>9970</td>
<td>69479</td>
<td>1313</td>
<td>50792</td>
<td>5307</td>
<td>36500</td>
<td></td>
<td>61807</td>
<td>102569</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: No Annual Reports for 1906-07, 1907-08 and 1909-10 could be located
Note 2: Insufficient detail published in 1941-42
Note 3: Entrepreneurial activities were not separable from Individual Capital Donations from 1942-43 to 1954-55
Note 4: Commonwealth subsidy was not identifiable in 1943-44
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Salaries</th>
<th>Food</th>
<th>Other recurrent</th>
<th>Play equipment</th>
<th>Buildings</th>
<th>Total nurseries and nursery schools without buildings</th>
<th>Total nurseries and nursery schools with buildings</th>
<th>Total Nursery School Teachers College</th>
<th>Total central administration</th>
<th>TOTAL EXPENDITURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>Note 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>1164</td>
<td>383</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>1204</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>145</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td>251</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>382</td>
<td></td>
<td>347</td>
<td>1279</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>270</td>
<td></td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1609</td>
<td>1789</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>237</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1711</td>
<td>1777</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>1054</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>207</td>
<td></td>
<td>273</td>
<td>1819</td>
<td>2092</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>1277</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>289</td>
<td></td>
<td>805</td>
<td>2153</td>
<td>2938</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>1444</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>369</td>
<td></td>
<td>472</td>
<td>2502</td>
<td>2974</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>1616</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>425</td>
<td></td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>2773</td>
<td>3928</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>1771</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>470</td>
<td></td>
<td>2458</td>
<td>3031</td>
<td>5069</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>2035</td>
<td>1028</td>
<td>454</td>
<td></td>
<td>1362</td>
<td>3517</td>
<td>4879</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>2238</td>
<td>1047</td>
<td>447</td>
<td></td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>3732</td>
<td>5594</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>2535</td>
<td>1142</td>
<td>563</td>
<td></td>
<td>662</td>
<td>4242</td>
<td>6904</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>2447</td>
<td>1041</td>
<td>839</td>
<td></td>
<td>285</td>
<td>4327</td>
<td>5722</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>2716</td>
<td>1160</td>
<td>932</td>
<td></td>
<td>2546</td>
<td>4808</td>
<td>7356</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>2799</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>465</td>
<td></td>
<td>1278</td>
<td>4223</td>
<td>5501</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>2259</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>363</td>
<td></td>
<td>522</td>
<td>3460</td>
<td>3982</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>2702</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>422</td>
<td></td>
<td>1153</td>
<td>4017</td>
<td>5170</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>2823</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>423</td>
<td></td>
<td>691</td>
<td>4233</td>
<td>6926</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>2873</td>
<td>1127</td>
<td>499</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>4996</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>507</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: Total expenditure for 1906-1915.

Note 2: Total expenditure for 1916-1935.
### Table 2 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Salaries</th>
<th>Food</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Play</th>
<th>Buildings</th>
<th>Total nursery &amp; nursery schools</th>
<th>Total nursery &amp; nursery schools</th>
<th>Total Nursery School Teachers</th>
<th>Total central administration</th>
<th>TOTAL EXPENDITURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>3185</td>
<td>1266</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>5189</td>
<td>3370</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1181</td>
<td>6641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>3405</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>1159</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1563</td>
<td>6004</td>
<td>7547</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1583</td>
<td>9184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>3886</td>
<td>1672</td>
<td>1127</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1175</td>
<td>6741</td>
<td>7916</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>9990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>5321</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1670</td>
<td>8527</td>
<td>9997</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>2122</td>
<td>12313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>5356</td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>1301</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2312</td>
<td>8519</td>
<td>10831</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>2729</td>
<td>13768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>5722</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>2254</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2886</td>
<td>9982</td>
<td>12868</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>13764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>6335</td>
<td>2533</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>2175</td>
<td>10966</td>
<td>13139</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>13900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>6977</td>
<td>2293</td>
<td>1735</td>
<td>3780</td>
<td>10923</td>
<td>14705</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>15575</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>10927</td>
<td>2871</td>
<td>2661</td>
<td>3108</td>
<td>16459</td>
<td>19567</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1244</td>
<td>20811</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>14072</td>
<td>3478</td>
<td>4064</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>5917</td>
<td>22008</td>
<td>24925</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1461</td>
<td>26386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>15784</td>
<td>4431</td>
<td>3575</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10285</td>
<td>23802</td>
<td>34087</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>5395</td>
<td>41505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>16691</td>
<td>4521</td>
<td>4328</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>12318</td>
<td>25965</td>
<td>38283</td>
<td>2357</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>42640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>19974</td>
<td>4940</td>
<td>5046</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>7617</td>
<td>30090</td>
<td>37707</td>
<td>2519</td>
<td>2440</td>
<td>42666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>24251</td>
<td>5776</td>
<td>6346</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4990</td>
<td>36428</td>
<td>41414</td>
<td>2281</td>
<td>2256</td>
<td>45951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>28001</td>
<td>5754</td>
<td>6284</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5967</td>
<td>40051</td>
<td>46018</td>
<td>2283</td>
<td>2358</td>
<td>50659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>31248</td>
<td>6075</td>
<td>7706</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>13938</td>
<td>43095</td>
<td>59033</td>
<td>2601</td>
<td>3677</td>
<td>65311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>42740</td>
<td>8780</td>
<td>8804</td>
<td>6571</td>
<td>60324</td>
<td>66895</td>
<td>3346</td>
<td>3981</td>
<td>79222</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>51433</td>
<td>10341</td>
<td>7013</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>16263</td>
<td>69663</td>
<td>85926</td>
<td>3814</td>
<td>4873</td>
<td>94613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>56122</td>
<td>10992</td>
<td>8090</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>16979</td>
<td>76032</td>
<td>93011</td>
<td>4133</td>
<td>6942</td>
<td>102086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>61296</td>
<td>10398</td>
<td>7763</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>11241</td>
<td>80323</td>
<td>91564</td>
<td>4284</td>
<td>3405</td>
<td>101253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note 1:** No Annual Reports for 1906-07, 1907-08 and 1909-10 could be located.

**Note 2:** Not all Training Centre/Teachers College expenses were identifiable, 1933-34 to 1936-37.

**Note 3:** It was not possible to identify Nursery School Training College expenses 1940-41 to 1944-45.
Table 3: Annual balance between income and expenditure, 1905-06 to 1954-55

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total income (£)</th>
<th>Total expenditure (£)</th>
<th>I-E</th>
<th>% I-E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>1204</td>
<td>-268</td>
<td>-28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>2884</td>
<td>2071</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>2326</td>
<td>2366</td>
<td>-42</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>2283</td>
<td>2653</td>
<td>-370</td>
<td>-16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>3774</td>
<td>3201</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>2713</td>
<td>3233</td>
<td>-520</td>
<td>-19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>4686</td>
<td>4230</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>6427</td>
<td>6065</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>6017</td>
<td>5337</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>7066</td>
<td>6493</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>7035</td>
<td>6581</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>6744</td>
<td>5997</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>8201</td>
<td>9337</td>
<td>-1136</td>
<td>-14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>7769</td>
<td>6923</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>6200</td>
<td>5169</td>
<td>1036</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>5281</td>
<td>5520</td>
<td>-239</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>5819</td>
<td>6290</td>
<td>-671</td>
<td>-8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>5814</td>
<td>6042</td>
<td>-228</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>7198</td>
<td>6641</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>8609</td>
<td>9189</td>
<td>-575</td>
<td>-6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>9620</td>
<td>9990</td>
<td>-370</td>
<td>-3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>10590</td>
<td>12313</td>
<td>-1723</td>
<td>-16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>14678</td>
<td>13764</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>13910</td>
<td>13764</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>12095</td>
<td>13900</td>
<td>-1805</td>
<td>-14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>18534</td>
<td>15575</td>
<td>2479</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>27906</td>
<td>20811</td>
<td>7095</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>27238</td>
<td>26386</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>32444</td>
<td>41505</td>
<td>-9061</td>
<td>-27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>33630</td>
<td>42640</td>
<td>-9006</td>
<td>-26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>37266</td>
<td>42666</td>
<td>-5200</td>
<td>-14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>43161</td>
<td>43951</td>
<td>-2790</td>
<td>-6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>51893</td>
<td>50639</td>
<td>1234</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>59966</td>
<td>63311</td>
<td>-3345</td>
<td>-8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>67391</td>
<td>74222</td>
<td>-6631</td>
<td>-9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>83000</td>
<td>96613</td>
<td>-11613</td>
<td>-14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>100420</td>
<td>102086</td>
<td>-1666</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>102369</td>
<td>101253</td>
<td>1316</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Annual net worth (assets minus liabilities) 1905-06 to 1954-55

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Capital Property</th>
<th>Total assets</th>
<th>Liabilities</th>
<th>Net worth (Accumulated funds) (A - L)</th>
<th>Conversion Index, Base year 1911</th>
<th>Corrected value Net worth</th>
<th>Note 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>335</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>593</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>Note 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>404</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>399</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>511</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>494</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>637</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>1348</td>
<td>2050</td>
<td>3989</td>
<td>1061</td>
<td>2337</td>
<td>1375</td>
<td>Note 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>1102</td>
<td>2126</td>
<td>3228</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>2688</td>
<td>1393</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>2126</td>
<td>3030</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2910</td>
<td>1722</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td>1014</td>
<td>2773</td>
<td>3789</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>3669</td>
<td>2265</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>2922</td>
<td>3422</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3422</td>
<td>2061</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>950</td>
<td>5206</td>
<td>6156</td>
<td>2360</td>
<td>3796</td>
<td>2345</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>1111</td>
<td>6520</td>
<td>7631</td>
<td>2460</td>
<td>5171</td>
<td>3134</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>1690</td>
<td>7620</td>
<td>9310</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>8311</td>
<td>9497</td>
<td>Note 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>2486</td>
<td>10010</td>
<td>12996</td>
<td>2400</td>
<td>10096</td>
<td>6082</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>2960</td>
<td>10009</td>
<td>12969</td>
<td>2455</td>
<td>10516</td>
<td>6297</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>3707</td>
<td>10010</td>
<td>13717</td>
<td>3015</td>
<td>10702</td>
<td>6238</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>2898</td>
<td>13674</td>
<td>16522</td>
<td>4700</td>
<td>11822</td>
<td>7298</td>
<td>Note 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>3293</td>
<td>14356</td>
<td>17647</td>
<td>4799</td>
<td>12848</td>
<td>8861</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>4329</td>
<td>14049</td>
<td>18738</td>
<td>5050</td>
<td>13689</td>
<td>9919</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>3439</td>
<td>14635</td>
<td>17874</td>
<td>4400</td>
<td>13674</td>
<td>10131</td>
<td>Note 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>3278</td>
<td>14713</td>
<td>17993</td>
<td>4700</td>
<td>13293</td>
<td>9774</td>
<td>Note 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>3030</td>
<td>14765</td>
<td>17814</td>
<td>4710</td>
<td>13104</td>
<td>9496</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>3606</td>
<td>14779</td>
<td>18385</td>
<td>4700</td>
<td>13689</td>
<td>9706</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>2971</td>
<td>16112</td>
<td>19083</td>
<td>4741</td>
<td>14342</td>
<td>9891</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>2599</td>
<td>17062</td>
<td>19661</td>
<td>4642</td>
<td>15019</td>
<td>10080</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>3122</td>
<td>27790</td>
<td>30912</td>
<td>4211</td>
<td>26701</td>
<td>17452</td>
<td>Note 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>2268</td>
<td>29059</td>
<td>31327</td>
<td>4133</td>
<td>27194</td>
<td>17103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>2297</td>
<td>29253</td>
<td>31530</td>
<td>3896</td>
<td>27659</td>
<td>16539</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td>3533</td>
<td>28476</td>
<td>32007</td>
<td>4457</td>
<td>27550</td>
<td>15220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td>3058</td>
<td>27600</td>
<td>34944</td>
<td>4316</td>
<td>30028</td>
<td>15372</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>10595</td>
<td>31843</td>
<td>42438</td>
<td>5315</td>
<td>37123</td>
<td>19812</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td>9237</td>
<td>36988</td>
<td>46264</td>
<td>8270</td>
<td>37976</td>
<td>20307</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td>6875</td>
<td>46860</td>
<td>53735</td>
<td>13551</td>
<td>40184</td>
<td>21149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>2921</td>
<td>56336</td>
<td>59237</td>
<td>17112</td>
<td>41943</td>
<td>20982</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>3056</td>
<td>58986</td>
<td>60242</td>
<td>22422</td>
<td>39620</td>
<td>18174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>3166</td>
<td>57347</td>
<td>60712</td>
<td>23320</td>
<td>37392</td>
<td>15580</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>10301</td>
<td>57320</td>
<td>67821</td>
<td>26759</td>
<td>41062</td>
<td>21367</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>8934</td>
<td>63821</td>
<td>72755</td>
<td>28624</td>
<td>44131</td>
<td>313</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>13020</td>
<td>64328</td>
<td>77348</td>
<td>38208</td>
<td>38840</td>
<td>12409</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>12740</td>
<td>71680</td>
<td>84420</td>
<td>46926</td>
<td>37994</td>
<td>9790</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>10537</td>
<td>78645</td>
<td>89182</td>
<td>42636</td>
<td>46796</td>
<td>12110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>13510</td>
<td>79298</td>
<td>92808</td>
<td>42033</td>
<td>50775</td>
<td>12887</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note 1: The conversion index used was "an index of retail price movements derived by linking together the following indexess from 1901 to 1914, the A Series Retail Price Index; from 1914 to 1946-47, the C Series Retail Price Index; from 1946-47 to 1968-49, a composite of Consumer Price Index Housing Group (partly estimated) and C Series Index excluding Rent; and from 1948-49 onwards, the Consumer Price Index. The continuous series derived in this way is shown in the table ... As the indexes differ greatly in scope, the resulting series is only a broad indication of long-term trends in retail prices." (Commonwealth Year Book, 1983, 133). The base year was 1911.

Note 2: Property assets were not listed 1912-13 to 1917-18; Forest Lodge purchased 1913.

Note 3: Assets and liabilities were listed from 1918-19

Note 4: L4261 was transferred from Accumulation Account to Nurseries Building and Furniture Fund (NBFF)

Note 5: $849 was transferred to NBFF

Note 6: L675 was transferred to NBFF

Note 7: $350 was transferred to NBFF

Note 8: The increase in property value was caused by J.P. Johnson gift of Redfern.