

systematic emigration as a remedy, the children should be sent out at a much earlier age than at present.

With reference to girls, I am decidedly of opinion that they ought not to be sent out at a later age than from *seven to eight*; all the better if still younger. Girls who are sent out at ages from *nine to fifteen* are at once placed in service. By whatever name that service may be called, though disguised as "adoption" it is in fact domestic service, quite as hard as, and in some respects more uninviting to the children, than the service in which at the same age they might be placed out in England. Their habits have been to some extent already formed, and they have ties and attachments, the recollection of which, when the novelty of their new position is worn off, makes them discontented with it, and leads to constant complaints and changes of situation. I was often painfully struck in speaking to children of that age with the sense of loneliness manifested by them. It was a long time, employers have frequently told me, before that class of children could get over the feeling of home sickness. I have already indicated the very serious risks to which children are exposed who are left to pass out of that sort of friendless and isolated service into early independence. With children who are sent out very young, and who are adopted into families, the case is altogether different. They are completely adopted by the families into which they are received, not by needy cottagers for the sake of a few shillings a week, but into a class of homes that have no counterpart in England, partly in view, as Miss Rye puts it, of their future usefulness, and partly to fill a void in the household. All the influences by which these children are surrounded are healthy, and one may reasonably look to their being ultimately absorbed into the best part of the best population of the American Continent, the Canadian yeomen. So long as homes can be found for these children, such as those in which I saw so many of them, and so long as they are watched over by women like Miss Bilbrough and Mrs. Robson, there can be no question as to the advantage of sending them to Canada, if they must be sent out of England. But the utmost care should be taken not to send them out merely upon speculation or in excess of the means, *ascertained beforehand*, of disposing of them by adoption.

If, contrary to the opinion that I have ventured to express, Boards of Guardians should still desire to send out children of more mature age to be at once placed out in service, I can only repeat what I have already said as to the necessity of correcting the defects that I have pointed out in every stage of the emigration, from the selection of the children to their being finally emancipated and left to act for themselves.

I would repeat, too, that if the emigration of pauper children to Canada is to continue, it should be wholly disconnected with the emigration of arab children. Apart from the pernicious influence of such association there are, I am sure, few Boards of Guardians in England who would not feel indignant if fully aware of the light in which the children sent out by them are too often presented to the people of Canada. In order, I suppose, to enlist public sympathy in favour of the destitute children who are sent out, they are represented without distinction as the offspring of thieves and vagabonds just swept from the slums of our great cities. Occasionally indeed the pauper children are referred to as a distinct class, but only as being "the refuse of our workhouses." Irrespective of the great injustice of so characterising these children, I am quite sure, as I have already stated, that it tends materially to prejudice their position in service. Many a child in Canada might repeat what is said by that unhappy girl whose letter is before you. "I was not going to be told that I was glad to come to Canada, for I was half