

"in same family till 1873, when she returned to England." Miss Rye of course asked "a plain question," in this as in all other cases, and believes, equally "of course," that she received a "plain and straightforward answer." And possibly she did, but "returned to England" does not tell the whole story. At least the girl herself adds some material facts to Miss Rye's synoptical account. Shortly after my return from Canada I found her an inmate of the able-bodied women's ward of the Wolverhampton workhouse, waiting to be confined of an illegitimate child. Here is her statement as she made it to me in the presence of the master of the workhouse :

"Was taken from the Wolverhampton workhouse by Miss Rye in 1870, landed at St. John's (as well as she remembers the place), was taken with other children and women to some institution from which, after a week, she was sent up the country to service with a farmer, Mr. McKeel, while there was often and severely beaten by her mistress's children; wrote to her brother, complaining of this; her mistress took possession of the letter, and told her she must write no letter without submitting it to her; in her 16th year she was seduced by her master's son; her pregnancy being discovered she is taken by her master to the port, put on board a steamer, her passage having been paid, and sent to Liverpool with a few dollars in her pocket," to find her way back as best she can to the workhouse from which she had been taken, "to be looked after till she is 18." I observe that the name of this girl is amongst those who are either reported or returned to the Home at Niagara for extreme obstinacy and violent temper." In the synopsis, however, she is reported as having remained in the same family till she returned to England and "did well while there."

Miss Rye complains, and in not very measured terms, of my referring to individual cases in illustration of the effects of her system of providing homes for these emigrant children. How else can anyone fairly judge of the merits of the system? If I refer to a score of cases of children taken to Canada by Miss Rye, and already brought to ruin, I am told that it is unfair to draw unfavourable conclusions from individual cases. There is "great cruelty" in doing so. The cases are "exceptional" (it happens somehow that cases of mismanagement, neglect, and misconduct are usually found to be "exceptional"). I ought, it is said, to judge according to "percentages." That is to say, upwards of a thousand children have been sent out, by far the largest proportion of whom are still below the age of 15. But the "percentage" of that worst class of failures should be taken, it seems, not upon the number who have barely passed from childhood to girlhood, but upon the total number of all ages. If Miss Rye will have patience for a few years that may be practicable, however deplorable the result; but for the present I must take the cases as I find them, leaving to those who may be at the trouble to read what I write, to judge for themselves whether the "system" under which such things can occur, indeed must inevitably occur, is one that deserves the encouragement of Boards of Guardians, or should receive the sanction of the central authority. Two children, brother and sister, George McMaster, aged eight, and Annie McMaster, aged 13, were, in 1870, committed to Miss Rye's care by the guardians of the Chichester Union. The boy's story I have already told in my report; how, after much suffering and hardship, having been twice turned out of doors by his employer, he is found sitting upon his box crying in the street; is taken into her house by his sister's mistress, a woman in humble circumstances who got him employment with a market gardener close by where I found him. The girl, Annie McMaster, was placed with a Mrs. Gourley, as a "general servant," and if placed by guardians in similar service in England would be considered to be simply a "drudge." One of those "papers," upon which Miss Rye lays so much stress, one of her "forms of indenture," was sent to Mrs. Gourley, but she declined to sign it, and no notice was taken of the refusal. This girl, although in her 17th year, received no wages, nor did her mistress, as she told me, consider that she was entitled to any. From the day she was placed in this service until the day I called to see her—a period of four years—no person had ever been to visit her or to inquire about her. As soon, however, as my report reaches Canada a visit is at last paid, the result of which is thus virtuously recorded by Mr. Ball, the "legally appointed guardian." "The case is one of