

was paid by the Government of Ontario, the actual cost of taking a child from Liverpool to its destination in Canada would be thus reduced to 2*l.* 1*s.* The children are taken from Quebec to the several Homes by the railways free of cost. The sum expended by Miss Macpherson for each Home is only 200*l.* per annum. The cost of Miss Rye's Home can very little, if at all, exceed that sum. If we allow 1*l.* per head as the extra cost for each child, and it would, I believe, be a liberal allowance, there would be a clear gain of 5*l.* per head upon every pauper child taken by these ladies as emigrants to Canada. That calculation applies to the last and present year. If the assisted passage be reduced to 2*l.* 5*s.*, the gain upon each child would be so much more. I would repeat that this calculation is made in the absence of detailed information which I had hoped to receive but which I have not received from Miss Rye and Miss Macpherson.

Again, it would be impossible to arrive at the cost, even approximately, of maintaining pauper children at the Homes without knowing the collective number of days that each child was maintained in them.

Connected with the receipts for emigration purposes, there is an item in Miss Macpherson's accounts that calls for notice, especially as from the form in which it is entered it is certainly open to misconception; I mean the item "repayment of passage money." Miss Macpherson has been in the habit of inviting children to repay the cost of their emigration in order to assist the emigration of other children. This has always been carefully explained to the children, but even with such explanation I think it is a mistake to allow a child to contribute 6*l.* or 7*l.* nominally as repayment of passage money. Upon several occasions employers have spoken of this as a hardship, and have asked me whether it was true, as the children had told them, that the Guardians had paid their passage out. I am sure that Miss Macpherson's motive is not to get so many dollars for her emigration expenses, but to enlist the sympathy of the children in her undertaking. The contribution would certainly have more value if made without suggestion, and after the children were able to judge from their own experience how far the undertaking was one that deserved their support. In the case of Union children, at all events, the practice should be discontinued.

Before I left Canada the Honourable Alex. Mackenzie, the Prime Minister of the Dominion, favoured me with a long interview at which Mr. Edward Jenkins, M.P., the agent in England of that Government, was present; the result of which will, I believe, be that Mr. Jenkins will be authorised to discuss the subject of the emigration of pauper children with the Local Government Board, with a view, if it should be thought desirable to continue it, to place the system upon a more satisfactory footing. It may therefore be convenient, in concluding this Report, that I should recur to one or two points to which I have already called your attention.

Guardians will decide for themselves whether or not it be desirable to send from their several Unions children who are supposed to have been already trained for service. Unless so trained they will be less fit for service in Canada than they would be in England, and to send them as emigrants can be regarded not as a way of improving their position, but simply of getting rid of them at a cheap rate. But if they be reasonably well prepared for service, it is difficult to understand why they should be sent out of a country in which one hears from every household complaints of the dearth of domestic servants, and of the want of young hands in various branches of industry.

If Guardians, however, are satisfied that they have a superabundance of pauper children under their care, and desire to have recourse to