

answer the description that I gave, when she might have taken her choice of several others that did answer it? Emma Williams, for instance (356), whose address was "not known" in 1874, or Elizabeth Waite (405), who had "replaced herself," "not known where;" or Emily Williams (731) "believed" to be still in the place of service indicated. Miss Rye can have no excuse for dealing with those cases in such a way, for after I had stated them, with several others in my Report, I added, "The names in full, the dates of emigration, the names of the unions from which sent, and the characters given of them by the officers of the several workhouses can, of course, be furnished." But from the day that Report was written until the present hour, I have not been applied to by Miss Rye, or by any of her friends for the particulars of a single case, or for information upon any statements contained in it.

I think, Sir, I have said enough to support the statements with which I set out.

1. That the children are not selected with a view to fitness, and are unsuited for emigrants.

2. That the conditions of service in which they are placed are unfavourable to them, and that from the mere fact of their being "pauper" children they have to contend against very injurious prejudices.

3. That there is a total absence of efficient responsible supervision in this system of emigration as conducted by Miss Rye.

If I now request your attention to some statements made by Miss Rye that refer more immediately to my own conduct, it is not because I personally attach the slightest importance to them. But accusations of bad faith, of deliberately perverting facts, and of direct falsehood, very freely made by Miss Rye in her letters, and her speeches, and her "synopsis," if left uncorrected, might induce guardians to attach less weight to the statements I have made than they are certainly entitled to.

In a newspaper appeal for subscriptions published in 1875, shortly after my Report appeared, Miss Rye has gravely stated, that of 1,000 children placed in service from the commencement of her work down to 1875, "480, or nearly half, are in the same homes to-day that I placed them in six years ago." That, undoubtedly, would be a striking fact and at direct variance with statements contained in my Report. You will observe, however, from the "synopsis," that the total number of children placed in service "six years ago," that is in 1869 (the statement having been published in 1875), was only 68, of whom several had already changed places. The general public, to whom the appeal for funds was addressed, have no means of detecting such a misstatement as this.

In her evidence before the Canadian Committee, Miss Rye says: "Another charge against her was that she put out children in the United States, which was, according to Mr. Doyle, a deadly crime." I did not refer to this as a "charge," nor did I suggest that it was a "crime." I simply reported, without one word of comment, the fact that "many of Miss Rye's children are in the States, some of them having been placed in service there, others having been induced to leave their Canadian service and go over the border." Miss Rye, in her letter to you, now objects to my statement, that "many" of the children are in the United States, and asserts that only 24 out of 1,168 were placed there. In an address, however (a copy of which she handed to me), to the guardians of the Islington Union in 1874, she states that the number placed by her up to that time in the United States is, not 24, as she now alleges, but 42. Although Miss Rye may be allowed to forget in 1875 what she wrote in 1874, she might at least avoid contradicting in one page what she has written in other pages of the same letter. If she had looked through her "Synopsis," she would have found that the number of children placed in service in the United States was not 42, as she told the Islington guardians, or 24 as she now tells you, but 46. I added that, in addition to those placed by Miss Rye, "others had been induced to go." That undoubtedly is the fact. Be the number, however, what it may, it was surely my duty to communicate the fact to you, and I do not know that I could have done so in terms less open to objection. Had I desired to suggest a "charge" against Miss Rye, I might, instead of confining myself to the bare statement of fact, have reminded her that in taking children to the United States she was violating the condition under which they were entrusted to her, as well