

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

- Coloured covers /
Couverture de couleur
- Covers damaged /
Couverture endommagée
- Covers restored and/or laminated /
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- Cover title missing /
Le titre de couverture manque
- Coloured maps /
Cartes géographiques en couleur
- Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black) /
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- Coloured plates and/or illustrations /
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- Bound with other material /
Relié avec d'autres documents
- Only edition available /
Seule édition disponible
- Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion
along interior margin / La reliure serrée peut
causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la
marge intérieure.
- Blank leaves added during restorations may
appear within the text. Whenever possible, these
have been omitted from filming / Il se peut que
certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une
restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais,
lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas
été filmées.
- Additional comments /
Commentaires supplémentaires:

- Coloured pages / Pages de couleur
- Pages damaged / Pages endommagées
- Pages restored and/or laminated /
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- Pages detached / pages détachées
- Showthrough / Transparence
- Quality of print varies /
Qualité inégale de l'impression
- Includes supplementary materials
Comprend du matériel supplémentaire
- Pages wholly or partially obscured by errata slips,
tissues, etc., have been refilmed to ensure the
best possible image / Les pages totalement ou
partiellement obscurcies par un feuillet d'errata,
une pelure, etc., ont été filmées à nouveau de
façon à obtenir la meilleure image possible.
- Opposing pages with varying colouration or
discolourations are filmed twice to ensure the best
possible image / Les pages s'opposant ayant des
colorations variables ou des décolorations sont
filmées deux fois afin d'obtenir la meilleure image
possible.

Cover title page is bound in as last page in book but scanned as first page.

PAUPER CHILDREN (EMIGRATION TO
CANADA).

COPY of the REPLY of Mr. DOYLE to Miss RYE'S
REPORT on the EMIGRATION of PAUPER CHIL-
DREN to CANADA.

(Mr. Morgan Lloyd.)

*Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,
13 June 1877.*

PAUPER CHILDREN (EMIGRATION TO CANADA).

RETURN to an Address of the Honourable The House of Commons,
dated 11 June 1877; for,—

COPY “of the REPLY of Mr. DOYLE to Miss RYE’S REPORT on the
EMIGRATION of PAUPER CHILDREN to CANADA.”

Local Government Board, }
11 June 1877. }

JOHN LAMBERT,
Secretary.

Mr. *Doyle* to the President of the Local Government Board.

Sir,

Plas Dulas, Abergelle, 14 May 1877.

I HAVE read the printed letter addressed to you and just published by Miss Rye, to which you were good enough to call my attention on the 3rd instant. As that letter purports to be a reply to a report made by me nearly three years ago, I desire to submit to you very briefly the reasons why, after considering it, I am still of opinion that no pauper children ought to be sent to Canada under Miss Rye’s present system of emigration. I am satisfied, Sir, and I believe I shall be able to satisfy you—even upon the evidence that Miss Rye now lays before you—

1. That pauper children of advanced years who are taken out to be immediately placed in service in Canada, are collected without regard to special fitness, physical or moral, and are unsuited for such a mode of life.

2. That irrespective of their unfitness for the position into which they are suddenly thrown, they are, from the mere fact of their being “pauper” children, exposed to great disadvantages and to much obloquy.

3. That there is a total absence of efficient supervision, and consequently children are exposed to suffering and wrong for which they get neither relief nor redress.

A considerable number of the pauper children taken out by Miss Rye have had, as you will observe from her statements, very little experience of workhouse life, and it may be said with confidence that neither the guardians who send them, nor the agent who takes them, can have any knowledge of their fitness for emigration. With respect to them; guardians are tempted to avail themselves of an opportunity of getting rid at a cheap rate of paupers who are likely to become burdensome, and Miss Rye, who knows the condition of the Canadian labour market, is but too ready to take them. With respect to the larger class who may be fairly designated “workhouse children,” the sudden transition from an English workhouse to Canadian domestic service, the habits and conditions of which are essentially different from those to which they have been accustomed, is attended with very unsatisfactory results. “I know,” as one of them wrote to me, “that I had several places and me not know how to do their work as they did; they would scold and offer to strike me, and, of course, I would leave.” In Canada “the workhouse child exhibits,” Miss Rye has so stated, “the most frightful and disheartening obstinacy and deceit.” This unfavourable view is confirmed, not only as will be seen by her own detailed statements, but by the testimony of her friends and fellow labourers. Mr. Boyd “knows of two girls “who have fallen, but they had in their very looks on arrival a looseness that augured ill for their future.” Mr. Ball (Miss Rye describes this gentleman as “a legally appointed guardian” of these children) “does not consider the children from the industrial schools as the most desirable to have, or most likely to succeed in life.” Mr. Robson having had a portion of each class [workhouse and arab] through his hands, unhesitatingly says that he much prefers the latter, as they are more industrious and obedient, less inclined

"to be stubborn and sulky, and decidedly more grateful for what has been and is being done for them. The lack of industry of the former class," he continues, "I attribute to the mistaken system of training in the English workhouses, where the children, instead of being made to do the work of the establishment so soon as they are old enough to do so are waited upon according to their own account by hired servants." The consequence, according to Miss Rye's statement, is "at 15 or 16 nearly all these young people have what I call 'freedom-fever'; they are restless, discontented, disaffected, needing, amongst other things, possibly, liberty to go where they will." This remark of Miss Rye is exactly in accordance with the view taken by me in my Report. To the prevalence of this "freedom fever" and "liberty to go where they will," may, probably, be ascribed the fact that of the comparatively small number who up to the year 1875 had passed out of childhood no fewer than 16 have, to Miss Rye's knowledge, become mothers of illegitimate children, 11 of the number being under 18 years of age, the term up to which they were to be "looked after." To that number must be added others of whom Miss Rye apparently knows nothing. There are also 28 "of 15 years of age and under" admitted to be "lost sight of"; the total number either "reported or returned to the Home" for "extreme obstinacy and violent temper" is no fewer than 92. To this number must, I regret to say, be added rather more than 100 "lost sight of," above the age of 15.

If you could still, Sir, have any doubt that the children are, I won't say selected, but collected, with total disregard to fitness, physical or moral, for emigration, you may satisfy yourself of the fact by glancing over Miss Rye's "synopsis" referring especially to such cases as those numbered 77, 78, 79, 83, 199, 257, 352, 372, 444, 474, 497, 649, 658, 754, 780, 789, 854, 896, 911, 1,016, 1,019, 1,050, and 1,059. I may, however, give from that document a few illustrations of what I wish to convey, when I speak of the children being collected without any regard to special fitness.

88. A. R.—This girl had been one month in the Kirkdale Workhouse; was taken out in 1870; has been in nine different places, and Miss Rye writes of her, "A thoroughly bad and incorrigible girl, quite beyond our management or anybody else's."

147. C. T.—Miss Rye says, that "This is a case that ought to be returned to the workhouse." This child, however, had been seen by Miss Rye before she left the Bristol Workhouse, and she is reported by the workhouse official to be "very slow, sly." Miss Rye took this child out in 1870, and although she was "bound for service" with her first master she has been in six different places, and at last "lost sight of." This child was "said not to be quite right in her mind." Two doctors examined her, and reported that her mind was not diseased.

224. A. N.—Was taken out in 1870. Miss Rye writes, "This girl has a sister in the incurable ward of Brownlow Hill, and was not a good case to emigrate, on account of bad health."

228. M. J. R.—"Bound for service" in her first place; since been in two other places. Of this case Miss Rye says, "I fear, consumptive."

275. E. H.—This child was taken out in 1870, "bound for service," but has been in four different places. "This girl," says Miss Rye, "ought never to have emigrated, as according to the account given by the other Toxteth Park children, she had repeatedly been brought before the guardians as an 'incorrigible' before she was given to me." But Miss Rye, herself, selected her. The workhouse officers report of her, "fair intelligence, but of an obstinate disposition."

384. M. A. S.—Miss Rye selected this child in 1871, and she was "bound for service," but on account of her health had to be taken to an hospital; was lost sight of for three years; she is now in service. Of this child Miss Rye writes, "a sickly child who will never do very well anywhere." The character she bore in the workhouse, where she had been for nine months, was "very slow."

399. E. M.—Miss Rye visited Birmingham Workhouse in 1871, "spoke to the girls collectively, and, with others, E. M. was taken out; at the workhouse her conduct

“conduct and intelligence both indifferent.” This girl when in Canada was “bound for service,” and although “bound” was “returned as too young, “dirty, and obstinate.” This child has been in 10 different places, in one of which she was kept “just 24 hours.” She had been in an hospital at Toronto, and examined “as to the state of her brain, not considered bad enough for “confinement.” She is now in the “Home,” and Miss Rye writes, “either an “incorrigibly naughty girl or else a semi-lunatic: such a girl should never have “been allowed to emigrate.”

437. J. T.—This child was taken to Canada in 1871 and “adopted.” Her character in the workhouse before she left was “not good.” She was returned by the person who adopted her for insubordination; she was upon one occasion “locked up for safety;” she is now in her ninth place, where she is “doing a “little better at last, under threat of being sent to a reformatory if returned to “the ‘Home’ again.” Miss Rye describes her as being “an indescribably “naughty and aggravating girl, with plenty of capability.”

453. G. P.—Miss Rye saw this girl at the workhouse before taking her out; she now writes of her, “decidedly below par, intellectually; ought never to have “been sent.” She is in her fourth place.

These cases, to which, however, I could add very many more of a similar character, are, I think, sufficient to prove that pauper children of advanced years, who are taken out to be immediately placed in service in Canada, are collected without regard to special fitness, and are, from whatever cause, unsuited for such a mode of life.

As to the second objection, I must repeat here what I said in my report, that the conditions under which the children are placed in service are far too unfavourable to them. In no other way can one account for the eagerness of Canadian employers to get them, and the unwillingness of the working people in Canada to send their own children into service upon the same terms. Nor is it easy to understand why managers do not avail themselves of those “splendid “homes” that are spoken of for the children who may be found in such numbers in the various charitable institutions of the chief cities of the Dominion. With every wish to abstain from making statements at which any class of people in Canada could reasonably take offence, I must repeat, without qualification, what I said in my report, that “there are 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.” “Starvelings,” and “Miss Rye’s guttersnipes,” are expressions that I find upon my notes applied to these children in my hearing. Nor can Miss Rye be acquitted of having some share in aggravating this evil, notwithstanding her assurance that she is ever “moved by Divine love and compassion for my own little “ones.” When I complain, for instance, of the filthy condition in which children are sometimes sent into service, her prompt published reply is, “This is too “true, and as we get the children chiefly from the workhouses, this cannot be “very much wondered at.” Nor does she hesitate to publish, and allow to be circulated in Canada, the letter of a foolish and insolent correspondent, who “only has to say, for the benefit of Poor Law Guardians, that my dogs have “more good fresh meat than any poorhouse child ever had.” I refer to such statements simply as illustrating the sort of impression that has been produced in Canada with reference to these children, and of the existence of which I had abundant evidence in my intercourse with persons of all classes. Nor, it must be said, is Miss Rye even now, after attention has been called to the subject, at much pains to mitigate or soften such adverse impressions. What object can that lady propose to herself in printing and publishing, as she does in her letter to you, such a story as this: “On one occasion, when we were leaving the Mersey, “and slowly steaming away, while the other passengers were waving their handkerchiefs and raising a true English cheer for the dear old land they were “leaving, my large crowd of workhouse children took up the strain from the “other passengers almost before it had ceased, and burst into a long, loud, and “terrible groan, and ‘three groans for England’ were raised and given before “I had power to gain silence.” If indeed such be the feeling that these children carry out to Canada, boards of guardians may feel assured that the fewer of them that are sent there the better, for in no other part of the world would this juvenile cargo of ingratitude and disloyalty to “the dear old land they “were

“were leaving” be less likely to find a welcome than in the Dominion of Canada.

That these children “are exposed to great disadvantage and much obloquy” needs no other proof—though other proof could be given in abundance—than what may be found in this “synopsis” of Miss Rye. Without a chance of telling their own story, or of having a word said in their defence, a very considerable proportion of them, dependant as they are on their character for their bread, are publicly stigmatised by name, with their Canadian addresses fully given, in a way that can hardly fail to bar them from service in any decent family. “Thoroughly bad and lazy,” “unmanageable,” “guilty of misdemeanour in every way,” “petty thieving,” “unmanageable and impertinent,” “decidedly unsatisfactory,” “gross immorality,” “insubordination,” “a discontented, lazy girl,” “carrying tales about the family from house to house,” “extreme filthiness of personal habits,” “impertinence and loose conduct,” “a rough, coarse, disobedient girl,” “a most incorrigibly lazy and incapable girl,” “below par intellectually, but not quite an idiot,” “transferred on account of her fearfully immoral tendencies,” “stubborn and insubordinate,” “incorrigibly naughty or else a semi-lunatic,” “thoroughly lazy and viciously disposed,” “a lazy and troublesome girl,” “an indescribably naughty and aggravating girl,” “selfwilled and unmanageable,” “a loose character,” “the grossest possible immorality,” “lying and deceit,” “a coarse, rough, and deceitful girl,” “a thoroughly bad girl,” “an illconditioned girl, who stole clothes from the other children,” “a bold disobedient girl”—such, Sir, are examples of the way in which scores of these children are now presented to the public of their adopted country by one from whose judgment they have no appeal.

It would be mere waste of words to insist at the present time upon the necessity of strict, methodical, and responsible supervision of children placed out in service. In every country in which children are so placed, in England, Scotland, Ireland, France, the strictest supervision is provided for. All those who take, or have taken, interest in the subject, legislators and administrators, have recognised this as the one indispensable condition. Miss Rye appears to be the solitary exception; she avows that she has “no set plans, no rules, no sharply defined policy about overlooking the children in Canada.” Regulations for supervision that are essential in other countries, and for other agents, she thinks may be dispensed with in Canada, and on behalf of Miss Rye alone. There are other labourers, however, in the same field who do not take the same view, either as to the necessity of supervision, or of their own responsibility. A list of them is furnished to you in Miss Rye’s letter; the first names on the list being “Messrs. McPherson and Bilbrough, with their Whitechapel and Belleville “Homes.” “Messrs. McPherson and Bilbrough” is not the title, as the style of this reference might lead you to think it was, of a mere trading firm. Miss Macpherson and Miss Bilbrough are ladies, engaged, and very earnestly engaged, in missionary and emigration work, the senior partner, or head of the house, if I may so express it, being “Annie Macpherson,” the familiar name that is as much and deservedly respected as it is widely known in the Dominion to which she is so true and disinterested a benefactor: the other, a patient, unostentatious labourer in a work of charity, to which she gives not merely her private means, but the most zealous personal services, guided by good feeling, intelligence, and admirable judgment. Miss Macpherson’s friends found as much fault with my report, and have favoured me with quite as much injustice, abuse, and misrepresentation as have other equally candid and charitable people both here and in Canada. Miss Macpherson notwithstanding has, I believe, recognised the importance of most of the suggestions that I made, and through her good sense and good feeling has adopted them in practice, though I greatly regret the omission of one, her own admirable suggestion indeed, not mine. I objected to the mixing of workhouse children with the “waifs and strays.” She now declines to take any more workhouse children. I pointed out the risks to which grown girls taken out as emigrants for domestic service were exposed. She now, as far as possible, confines herself, as I understand, to taking out very young children for adoption. I complained of the incompleteness of her system of supervision; she has “put on more visitors.” By effecting these changes, and still entrusting the administration to such fellow labourers as Miss Bilbrough, Miss Reavell, and Miss Barber, Miss Macpherson appears to have placed her system

of juvenile emigration on such a footing as to entitle it to the support of all persons who take an interest in the welfare of the most helpless of the poor; the destitute and neglected children, girls, as well as boys, who swarm in such localities as her "Whitechapel Home." Now, Sir, the wide and varied experience of Miss Macpherson in Canada has led her to the conclusion, that no matter what class of children you take out, or in what class of homes you may place them, the strictest personal supervision is absolutely indispensable. Even if I could appeal to no other or higher authority than that of Miss Macpherson, hers alone would be sufficient to justify the opinion I have expressed, that no children ought to be sent out until a complete and satisfactory system of supervision is established. Allow me to direct your attention specially to the following passage from an official report just made at the instance of the Local Government of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, upon the systems of Miss Rye and Mrs. Birt (a sister, I believe, of Miss Macpherson): "In passing from Miss Rye's children to those brought out by Mrs. Birt, we are at once enabled to see the great advantage resulting from the system introduced and established by Colonel Lourie and Mrs. Birt. The Local Government having passed a Bill, making the colonel the legal guardian of all the children brought out under Mrs. Birt's care, he is enabled to protect the child from unjust treatment, and to defend the guardian from being imposed upon by the interference of outsiders. *His system of quarterly reports being sent in from every child, is the brightest spot in his whole management, and is the only plan by which perfect success can be secured.*" Most valuable evidence on this subject is contained in the reports of "The Children's Home," with reference to "the Canadian branch" of that institution. While it is said that "Canada can find a welcome for as many children as we choose to send out," it is added that in the first place these children "*must be trained.*" They are not sent out to the Canadian Distributing Home "until they have been so far trained and tested that we can speak of their character with a reasonable amount of confidence." Then, lastly, "The agent *periodically visits the children in their situations and reports as to their condition and the treatment they receive.*" Mr. Turner, the chaplain of the *The Boys' Home*, Regent's Park, who visited the Canadian Home at Hamilton, Ontario, writes: "Previous training in your English Homes is just the very requisite for Canadian Homes." He found that "there is an excellent system of visitation," and adds, "*If the system is to flourish it can only do so by this supervision carefully carried out, profitable alike for master and servant.*" This society, like that of Miss Macpherson, is a Protestant Missionary Society, rather than a mere emigration agency. "The children are entitled to return to the Home in the case of sickness or in the intervals between holding different situations." The people amongst whom children are boarded out in Scotland are the same "simple country folks" in whom Miss Rye puts so much confidence in Canada. Yet there is no one point so much insisted upon in Scotland as strict supervision. Look at the evidence upon the subject in the very valuable report recently made by Mr. Skelton, Secretary to the Poor Law Board in Scotland. Replying to the same class of silly and groundless objections to inspection, that people who are absolutely ignorant of the whole question as it affects Canada are so fond of repeating, Mr. Skelton says, "It can only be replied that there *must be inspection; thorough, vigilant, constant inspection, is the keynote to the system.*" Miss Rye's keynote, however, is such letters as she can manage to get from the employers of the children. Writing of precisely the same class of children, Lord Shaftesbury, in a recent letter to *The Times*, says, "With children of this class it is not enough merely to launch them on the sea of life. Parentless, most of them, and friendless, they must have some one to advise them how to improve their advantages, but still more some one to counsel and assist them in circumstances of difficulty or temptation." With how much force that opinion of the highest authority that can be referred to on such a subject applies to the "parentless and friendless" children placed in service in Canada, you may judge from the fact that about 290 of these children have been removed or returned from *their first places* for precisely the sort of faults, "unmanageableness," "temper," "not suiting," and the like, that especially need the help of "some one to counsel and assist," and to whom such counsel might have proved of inestimable value. Indeed, while the work was still, comparatively speaking, in its infancy, Miss Rye

was herself of opinion that "when the work grew," supervision would become necessary, and she went so far as to suggest that her friends, Mr. Ball and the Rev. Mr. McMurray, both, I believe, "legally appointed "guardians," should be invited, even then, to accept payment for services as visitors. Instead of the personal supervision which every one but herself considers to be necessary, Miss Rye adopts "an extensive system of "correspondence," the result of which she communicates to you in what she calls a "synopsis." Almost all that she now pretends to know about the children is derived from the accounts given to her by the employers. "The method," she says, "that I pursued in obtaining information about the children was to write "simultaneously to the persons with whom I had placed them." Their replies to her letters are the basis of this synopsis. I must say that a less satisfactory "method" of obtaining such information it would not be easy to adopt. In the first place there are 35 cases in which she "can get no replies" to her letters, and so far the "method" of correspondence as a means of eliciting information of any sort appears to be open to objection. Miss Rye is just now of opinion that "no criticism is so severe as that which it is possible for us to apply to our own "labours, and no questioning so keen as the scrutiny by which we query a "creation of our own." I should be more inclined, however, to concur in the view expressed by her in 1872, when dealing it was supposed with the "method" of another worker in the same field. "The extreme absurdity of anyone reporting "upon their own work is so apparent that the proposal to do so is not "worthy a second consideration," was Miss Rye's view in 1872, and certainly the absurdity of inviting employers to tell her how they treat the children entrusted to their care, in order that she may found her reports upon their reports is at least as glaring as she seemed to think it would have been to look for an impartial report "upon their own work" from Miss Macpherson and her fellow labourers. What was not "worthy a second consideration" if done directly by others in 1872, must be accepted as perfectly satisfactory if done indirectly by Miss Rye in 1875. I will go so far as to assume that Miss Rye's letter of inquiry, unlike some that were written to employers of children when my report reached Canada, was in no way suggestive of the sort of answer that it would be agreeable to her to receive. Still it was a letter calling upon people to give their own account of the way in which they discharged their duty to these children, and this account, set off by the artistic contribution of the travelling photographer, Miss Rye accepts, and expects boards of guardians to accept upon "trust," as she says. I would ask you, Sir, to compare that "method" of inquiring into such a subject with the course adopted by your own inspectors under similar circumstances. Compare it with Mr. Henley's "method" in Scotland: with the elaborate process of investigation, almost inquisitorial in its character, which the late Mrs. Senior was of opinion could alone justify any trustworthy conclusions as to the actual condition of children placed out in service. The Committee of the Canadian Government, to whom my report was referred, suggested as the only means of "setting at rest any doubts" about the condition of these children, that either the Dominion Government or the Local Government should make through their own agents "a complete inspection of the children who have been "brought out," and Miss Rye herself, before the same Committee suggested "a house-to-house visitation," as the only means of satisfying opinion in England. Instead of an inquiry of this nature so imperatively called for, Miss Rye contents herself with accepting without question the master's version of his own conduct towards his servant. Though she had herself suggested "a house-to-house visitation," which might very easily have been made during the last 30 months if it was really desired, she now thinks "inspection of the children of "comparatively small moment," because "if she writes to you or to any member "of your board and asks plain questions, she receives plain and straightforward "answers. The same rule of life governs respectable people, and people of "probity all the world over." Nevertheless I am afraid that even in Canada, as "all the world over," there are people who, if they answer troublesome inquiries at all, are but too ready to take advantage of the credulity of others when it may happen to be for their interest to do so. Let me illustrate what I mean by a single case. If you will turn, Sir, to No. 194, page 16 of Miss Rye's "synopsis," you will find this case: "Elizabeth Lynes, 12. Bound for service. First place "with Mr. W. McKeel, Greenwich, King's County, New Brunswick. Remained

“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 “per-centages.” 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 “per-centage” 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

"the few we have to record in the list of man's wickedness and woman's frailty;" or, in Miss Rye's more homely English, "Had a child by one of the young "Gourleys." Miss Rye and her friend the "legally appointed guardian," lived within an hour's journey of that unhappy girl's place of service.

A girl named Ellen Evans was sent out from Wolverhampton in the year 1870; Miss Rye informed me that she was placed with Mr. David Beattie, Westminster, adding she was "moved within the last month," that is in August 1874. With reference to that child, however, the following letter was addressed to an officer of the Wolverhampton Workhouse, not "last month," but just a year before the time that, according to Miss Rye's statement, the child was removed:—

"Dear Sir,

"London, Ontario, 31 July 1873.

"I now take the liberty to write to you and let you know that a girl, by the name of Ellen Evans, who was brought to this country by Miss Rye, and it is her request that I should tell you she was with a family by the name of Beattie for two and a half years, where she took sore eyes and was blind four months, and only had the doctor once or twice; and getting tired of her place she came to my house, and I repaired her clothes and got her a new situation, and she likes it very well; they have taken her to the doctor, and her eyes are much better; she can see to work in the house, but not to read or sew. She lost the envelopes and address that was given to her, and she cannot tell her age, or where she is from. She wants to know if her father is living, Benjamin Evans, and sends her respects to her uncle and aunt, Mr. and Mrs. Jeremiah Evans. She is a big stout girl, and very civil and quiet. Please answer this soon. Address London, Ontario, C.W., Mrs. Alex. Marr. The doctor says it is scrofula that is in the blood that makes Ellen's eyes sore; he says it will take about 12 months before they are better. I have a large family of my own, and I had pity on her.

"Ellen Marr."

Such is the sort of "supervision" exercised by Miss Rye over these children. When I inquired about this child at "our Western Home," Miss Rye was wholly ignorant of her change of place, or of the miserable condition to which she had been reduced.

Early in the year 1873, I happened to be present at the meeting of the guardians of the Merthyr Tydfil Union, when an application was read from Miss Rye to entrust to her care some children for emigration to Canada. Objections were made by some of the guardians, but, upon the whole, they consented, and, looking to the fact that the system had been approved of by the Local Government Board, I expressed myself in favour of the application being acceded to. Amongst the children sent out upon that occasion was a girl named Mary Ford, whose address was given to me by Miss Rye as with Mrs. Dallas, Wellington-street, Hamilton. Walking up Wellington-street, Hamilton, in quest of Mrs. Dallas's house, I asked a coloured man whom I met if he could direct me to it, and, to assist him in doing so, told him I was looking after a little English child who was there in service. "Oh!" he replied, "I am glad that anybody has come to look after her; I have seen that child flogged worse than a slave; but don't mention me as telling you, for I do all the white-washing of the house." Upon visiting Mrs. Dallas, who, I was informed, kept a boarding-house for young men, she told me that she had been frequently obliged to punish the child severely; that she was a thief and a liar; she stole money and anything else she could lay her hands on; there was no believing a word she said. She further described the way in which the child had been sent to her by train, with a label pinned upon her breast, "as if she was a parcel of goods." More than once, she told me, she was on the point of turning the child out of the house. "Why," I asked, "did you not write to Miss Alloway?" (Miss Rye's assistant). "I did write to her, and she took no notice of my letter." "But Miss Rye is in the country, why did you not write to her?" "I did write to Miss Rye asking her to change the child, but she has taken no notice of my letter." From the time the child was placed in this service no person had been to see her or inquire about her. I may add, that she left the workhouse of the Merthyr Tydfil Union with a very good character. With this child I had a long conversation apart from her mistress. She admitted quite frankly some of the offences with which she was charged; but there was no mistaking her character—that of an affectionate and very impressionable child. It may seem a trivial thing to mention, but when I spoke to her of her former teachers and associates, of whom I knew something, her eyes filled with tears.

I am

I am persuaded, sir, that the visit at an early period of a judicious friend, who took an interest in her, might have saved that child from the trouble that I greatly fear is in store for her, as such visits might have saved Annie McMaster and other children from the fate that has befallen them. Before you read Miss Rye's account of this child in her "synopsis," I would ask you to look, in confirmation of my view, at this short letter, addressed to her brother in England not very long since:—

"Dear Edward,—I take the greatest pleasure in writing to you these few lines, as I suppose that you have long been expecting a letter from me, but you must please pardon my neglect; give my best love to darling Willie, and tell him that I feel very anxious about him; I hope that both of you may see better days to come; I hope my dear sister Jane has been to see you, and I hope, dear, that you are improving in your lessons, as I feel very anxious about you. I have been very sick for a long time, as the winter has been very cold, but summer has been very warm, and I hope in time to come, that I may be able to take you both out of the poorhouse, but I can think nothing more now, but perhaps, in my next letter, I may have more to say.

[Then follow some childish verses.]

"My pen is bad, my ink is pale,
"My love for you will never fail."—And so on.

"Your affectionate Sister,
"Mary Ford."

Here is what Miss Rye says of Mary Ford in her "synopsis":—"Mary Ford, 15. Bound for service, 1st place, Mr. Dallas, Wellington-street, Hamilton, returned; girl unmanageable, mistress impertinent. 2. Mrs. Sorby, Rice Lake, Ontario; girl returned, absolutely unmanageable; ran away from the 'Home,' returned to Mrs. Sorby, who sent her back (some 60 miles) by a confidential servant; replaced. 3. Mrs. Bayly, Oakville; returned to the 'Home' since my return to England; an unmanageable, ill-conditioned girl, who ought never to have been sent abroad. Illegitimate. One year-and-a-half in workhouse school. Doing very badly in 1875." That case in all its circumstances, is not an unfair illustration of the method and the consequences of Miss Rye's system of supervision." [The name of this child is erroneously placed by Miss Rye amongst the Bristol children.]

The particulars of another case which occurred after I left Canada, indicates very clearly the hardships to which children may be exposed, and the sort of protection that is afforded to them. Towards the close of 1875, an American lady, Mrs. Barclay, of Buffalo, accidentally heard that a girl named Charlotte Williams, who had been brought out to Canada by Miss Rye, was an inmate of the poorhouse at Lockport. Mrs. Barclay saw her, and was informed by her that she had been placed in service with a farmer, a neighbour and friend of Miss Rye, that she continued there for three years and two months, when she was discovered to be pregnant. (It is not necessary at present to repeat the particulars of the case as they are detailed by Mrs. Barclay, and by a Mrs. Campbell, the wife of a dissenting minister in Niagara, further than to say that Miss Rye's "presumption" as to the paternity of the child was considered to be more than doubtful.) Mrs. Barclay states that she wrote to Miss Rye, a perfectly civil note, in which she expressed regret "that though rightfully dismissed, some shelter had not been found for the orphan girl other than an "American poorhouse." The only notice taken of Mrs. Barclay's communication was the following letter addressed to Mrs. Barclay's husband by Miss Rye:—

"Sir,

"11 October 1875.

"Are you aware that your wife is constantly interfering and annoying me with absurd letters concerning matters about which she really knows nothing? Will you kindly tell me how long I am to bear this nonsense, and why I am subjected to this interference? The last letter I have received is about a girl, named Charlotte Williams, aged nearly 18 years of age, who confessed to me before witnesses, and signed a paper to that effect, that she had had criminal connection with three men (I can give you their names if you wish them), one of them a coloured man, and we presume the father of her child, and she certainly left her last situation in the night in his company, and was seen driving about with him all round Niagara afterwards." [This black man may not have been quite so black as Miss Rye would paint him, for I observe that Mrs. Campbell, the minister's wife, writes to her friend Mrs. Barclay underlining the announcement with exculpatory emphasis, "*The child is born WHITE.*"] "If Mrs. Barclay thinks that I am to turn my Home into a bad house for the reception of such girls

“during their confinements, all I can say is, she must think so, for I certainly shall never do it; and if Mrs. Barclay instead of writing insulting letters to me, repeating village gossip, would open a Home for the ‘Orphan’ and the ‘Fatherless,’ about whom she so pathetically writes, I think it would be much more to the purpose, and probably you will let me send her the next such case that I hear of. At any rate, I am thoroughly ashamed of anyone, who like your wife, can make a profession of Christianity, and yet be as wickedly spiteful and malicious as she is to—

“Mr. Barclay, 71 Seventh-street, Buffalo.”

“Yours truly,
“*Maria S. Rye.*”

“P. S.—I just remember that we have in the Home, an incorrigible ‘orphan and fatherless’ girl, for whom we have found 10 good homes. On my return to Niagara I shall send her by express to Mrs. Barclay, and no doubt she will be delighted to welcome her.”

Whatever may be the merits of that case, I do not think that any person of good feeling and good sense should be satisfied to leave these emigrant children with no better protection than is afforded by the “supervision” of the writer of that letter. The circumstances under which the girl is alleged to have made the confession and signed the paper referred to by Miss Rye are, if authentic, most discreditable to all parties concerned.

In accounting, or trying to account, for cases of children “lost sight of,” Miss Rye has a peculiar way of dealing with facts. Assuming that her responsibility ceases when the girl has attained the age of 18, she either directly questions the age as given by the Board of Guardians, or seeks to convey that the age of 18 was attained at the time that the child was “lost sight of.” Thus Harriet Howell, from the Alverstoke Union, certified as being 10 years old in 1871, is assumed by Miss Rye to be “nearly 18” in 1875. In the “Synopsis” this child is described as “a second edition of *Potiphar’s wife*—an incorrigible.”

Mary Jane Green (222), Miss Rye states, “Girl 19 years old.” It appears, however, that she was 13 years old in 1870. “Had a child in 1874.” So that although she may be “19 years old now,” she can have been barely 17 when she became a mother.

Mary McNulty, reported by the authorities of the Bristol Workhouse as “industrious and well conducted,” is reported by Miss Rye in the “Synopsis” as having “thrown herself on the town.” “Girl 20 years old.” She may have been 20 years old at the date of Miss Rye’s letter to you, but she could not have been yet 18 when she “threw herself upon the town.”

Alice Parsons was 15 when taken to Canada, and “bound for service” in 1871. “Replaced herself” the following year, 1872, when she would be 16. That was all Miss Rye could tell me about her, though she is now able to add, “Girl 20 years old.” Possibly 20 years old now, or at the date of Miss Rye’s letter to you, but barely 16 when “lost sight of.”

Another easy way of accounting for a similar class is to take the initials that I have given of particular cases to look out for successful cases that the same initials will fit, and thus imply that I have misrepresented the facts. For example, I have given the initials M. C. as the case of a child who has changed places several times, and whose address is not known. Miss Rye chooses to convey that M. C. stands for Mary Anne Craddock, and refers you to Synopsis 708, where, of course, you will find that the address of Mary Anne Craddock is known, and that the child is doing well. Why should Miss Rye suggest that the initials M. C. represent Mary Anne Craddock, rather than Mary Anne Cook (No. 14), lost sight of in 1874: Or Mary Anne Campbell, also lost sight of? Or Maria Cooper (No. 985), brought out to Canada and placed in service in 1873, but address not known in 1874. Why again should Miss Rye suppose that the initials C. C., whom I described as having “left her second place a year ago, present address not known,” represent Catherine Cousens, who is still in her first place, and “doing well,” rather than Charlotte Crowley, of whom Miss Rye could give me no information, though I had been told by Mr. Robson, that after some negotiation, she had just consented to pay one-third of the expense of sending the girl to the United States, to avoid the scandal of her being confined of an illegitimate child in the neighbourhood of her place of service—where by the way the poor creature, whose story is a sad one indeed, died in childbirth. The initials E. W. do not, as Miss Rye would assume, represent Emma Western. Why pitch upon that particular name, which does not

answer

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

as the rules of the Department, that had sanctioned their emigration to *Canada only*; that it was improbable that the Government of the Dominion, or of the Province of Ontario, would subsidise the emigration of children to the United States; that it was a matter of public notoriety that the Government of the United States had, only a few years ago, emphatically protested against sending pauper children to that country. "While the Government of the United States," Mr. Secretary Fish wrote in 1872, "is ready to receive all classes of healthy and sound emigrants, of industrial habits and good moral character, who voluntarily seek a residence and the opportunity of working for their own support within its territory, and who come at their own expense and of their own free choice, it is not willing and will not consent to receive the pauper class of any community who may be sent, or who are assisted in their emigration at the expense of Government, or of municipal authorities. With reference to the particular proposition suggested" (the emigration of pauper children) "it is regarded with disfavour. Children of the ages between seven and twelve can have and can exercise no judgment or choice of their own. The statement that they are sought in the hope that their services will amply compensate for the cost incurred in their care, maintenance, and education" ("in view of their future usefulness" is Miss Rye's expression of the same idea) "suggests the possibility of a service which this Government is not inclined to tolerate." Although in sending children into the United States Miss Rye has acted in contravention of her agreement, she may not have done so to quite the extent she supposes; as I accidentally found in Drummondville, close by "Our Western Home," a child, Isabella Wilson, of whom she had altogether lost sight, and whose address she had given to me as at "Pittsburg, Pennsylvania."

In my Report I referred to the case of a girl, named Harriet Bonsor, as reported by Miss Rye, "upon the town." That lady now writes to you: "Mr. Doyle, twisting my words about this girl, makes me to report her as 'on the town,' while I only said, what I repeat, that I had lost sight of her between 1872 and 1874." One of the inconvenient results of the delay in answering my Report is, that, through lapse of time, Miss Rye has forgotten some things that are matters of fact, as she seems to remember other things that are not matters of fact. So far from "twisting her words," I simply copied them, "on the town," from her own Report, in her own handwriting, now before me.

Reference has been made to my having spoken favourably in Canada of what, at an early period, I had seen of this system, though the tenor of my Report is represented as being unfavourable. I have already explained that before I made any independent inquiry, I placed myself in the hands, so to speak, of those persons who were, in fact, the administrators of the system. Judge Dunkin allowed me to accompany him to see a certain number of the children in the Knowlton District, as did Miss Bilborough at Bellville, Miss Rye at Niagara, Mr. Robson at Newcastle, and Miss Reavell at Galt. It was inevitable that in these visits I should see one side only, and that the best side of the system. I spoke of what I then saw in terms of commendation. There was, I am sure, no intention to mislead or keep anything back; indeed, the information afforded to me at Miss Macpherson's Homes, whether facts told for or against the administration, was most fully and unreservedly communicated. It did so happen, however, that cases to which I have referred as illustrating the defects of the system came under my notice only when I pursued my inquiry independently. If, in accompanying Miss Bilborough, for instance, I saw abundant evidence of care and strictness in visiting, of remarkable tact and firmness in asserting authority on behalf of children, I also subsequently found in the more remote cases abundant evidence of want of care, indeed I must say of actual neglect, which not even the zeal of Mr. Thom could prevent. I hope that explanation will be at least intelligible, if not altogether satisfactory, to those persons who complain of what they appear to regard as inconsistency or partiality.

Miss Rye has repeatedly complained of my having neglected to attend a "gathering" of children at her "Home" in September 1874, to which I had received a printed invitation, the children being collected as she states for my inspection. Re-calling the circumstances, I cannot help being amused by such a complaint, to which I certainly should not think of referring but for the pertinacity with which this attempt to prejudice the authority of my report is repeated.

repeated. Until I read Miss Rye's letter, I was not aware that I had been invited to this gathering "upon the express understanding that the "children were being collected for my inspection." I was all the while indulging the agreeable delusion that I had been invited, not to an official "inspection" of children, but to the wedding of a very charming young lady, Miss Rye's friend and fellow-labourer at Niagara. The only "printed invitation" that I ever saw or that, I believe, was ever issued was one addressed to the employers of the children, suggesting that the mistresses and children should come "in white dresses," as that would help to make "a very pretty "wedding," and (by way, I suppose, of killing two birds with one stone) "show Mr. Doyle what great things Canada can do for poor children." To Miss Rye personally I expressed my regret, several days before the interesting event, that I should not be able to be present, as I had already given a very undue proportion of my time to visiting children in the neighbourhood of her "Home." Nor, if I had been present, is it quite clear that I should not have run some risk of getting a wrong impression of the ordinary condition of some, at least, of these children. For it fell out that a few days before this exhibition, I visited at London one of the children, Emma Bennett, who had been placed as a servant with a working bricklayer named Webber. He and his wife appeared to be very kind, decent, hardworking folks. But the place was altogether unsuited to the child, as the child was to the place. The man had written to Miss Rye that he wished to return the child, as he could not afford to keep her, and got for answer that he must fetch her himself. Being but a working-man, and just then out of employment, that was impossible. Equally impossible was it for his wife to accept Miss Rye's printed invitation, which she had just received, to accompany the child, both in white dresses, to the "gathering." If they had gone, and I had been present and observed the honest bricklayer's wife with the poor little seven-year-old mite whom I had just seen grubbing in a dustbin, I should doubtless have been expected to accept them as witnesses in white dresses "of what great things Canada can do for poor children"—for the "refuse of the workhouses," as I saw these same children designated in an account given of this "gathering" by one of the most influential newspapers in Canada.

Undoubtedly, Sir, Canada can do great things for poor children, not however by the indiscriminate deportation of such children as guardians may desire to get rid of, but by the gradual and not too hasty development of a well-organised system, such as that which appears to be now established by Miss Macpherson, and for the same destitute-class. It is not, however, for "pauper" children that this sort of public aid and sympathy should be invoked. Every board of guardians in the kingdom has the means of training pauper children, so as to fit them to supply the demand for labour of every description, especially in domestic service. And recent inquiries have proved beyond question the general success for this purpose of workhouse education, and shown what commendable efforts guardians are making throughout the country still further to improve it. It is not, I repeat, for workhouse children that emigration is needed, or should be encouraged. It is otherwise, however, with the very young destitute children who are not "paupers," but may be said to be the raw material of our criminal classes, and who swarm in our cities and large towns. With reference to the position in Canada of that class of children, it is, as I said in my Report of 1874, "the "most perfect realisation of the principle of boarding-out that can be well "conceived." But for that class of children the supply of homes is far indeed from being inexhaustible. I believe that from Miss Macpherson's Distributing Homes at Knowlton, Belleville, and Galt, all the homes that are really available might be found for such destitute children as could be sent from England with advantage, either to themselves or to the Dominion. For it would be a very great mistake, and would be simply misleading guardians, to say that the people who take children are all, or even a majority of them, those "simple country "folks" of whom Miss Rye speaks in her letter to you. Miss Rye knows perfectly well that a very large proportion of girls taken out by her are either directly placed in cities, towns, and villages, or find their way there after a little while. She knows too, or ought to know (she has experience of the fact every year), that children so placed are exposed to the greatest danger. This is the uniform testimony of every unprejudiced person who has had to do with the distribution of these children in Canada.

Miss Rye has taken a good deal of trouble to contradict a remark which I made at the close of my Report, to the effect that I had been informed that she had taken up so large a number as 50 children for distribution to New London. She has got an affidavit and other evidence to contradict the statement of my informant as to the number of children so taken up. I observe, however, that what she contradicts with reference to New London is nevertheless perfectly true with respect to Chatham. Her friend Mr. Stephenson, M.P., states that in the year 1874 she brought up from 50 to 60 children to Chatham, the greater portion of whom were taken to their new homes "immediately upon their arrival in town." The way in which these new homes were obtained for them was described to me, in the presence of a local magistrate, by two of the children and the mistress of one. The children, from 50 to 60 of them, were ranged round the Public Hall, on view, with their backs to the walls, while persons seeking them came in one by one, and selected the child to which he or she might happen to take a fancy. Now, if that were an objectionable way of disposing of these children, it matters little whether the circumstance occurred at Chatham or at London, and it would have been less uncandid to have stated that the circumstance to which I had referred occurred at Chatham, and not at London, instead of parading an affidavit which was calculated, if not intended, to give the impression that it had not occurred anywhere.

In my Report, I observed that, "whereas at least 90 per cent. of the pauper children who are sent as emigrants to Canada, have been brought up as Members of the Church of England, full 90 per cent. of those placed out in the country attend the places of religious worship, when they attend at all, of some denomination of Protestant Dissenters, Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, or of Bible Christians." That statement I must again bring under your notice, as I observe that considerable pains are taken, not to contradict it, for it cannot be contradicted, but to misrepresent the object with which it was made, and by that means, to divert the attention of guardians from a matter that some of them at least will regard as important, and which at all events ought not to be kept back from any of them. Every pauper child that Miss Rye has taken from this country, being a member of the Church of England, would, if kept at home, be brought up in communion with the Church of England. The law so provides, and guardians are careful, as a rule, to protect that legal right of the child. But under Miss Rye's system, the security of the "Creed Register" is set at naught, and the provision of the law completely disregarded. It is not through carelessness, still less, I need hardly say, from design; but owing partly to the position of the Church of England in Canada, still more to the condition of society in a sparsely populated and peculiarly "settled" province, that so large a proportion of these workhouse children are so placed, that either they do not attend any place of religious worship at all, or when they do, it is not of their own denomination.

I stated in my Report of 1874 that the receipts upon account of pauper emigration during the years 1873 and 1874 very considerably exceeded the expenditure.

For having made that statement I am accused, and I must add abused, as having imputed mercenary motives as alone influencing those who are engaged in this work of emigration. I attributed no motives. I made a specific statement, and by that statement I abide. The audit of accounts "from the beginning," in which public subscriptions and contributions by guardians are mixed up, and credit appears to be taken for the purchase out of these funds of property which elsewhere Miss Rye states "was bought by her own money, by money which she earned by writing for the press in England," all this has nothing whatever to do with the statement that I made, although it may divert attention from it. With reference, however, to this Western Home, I find the following question and answer in Miss Rye's examination before the Committee:—"Q. Mr. Doyle "states that the 'Western Home' of Miss Rye, at Niagara, is the old gaol of the town, bought for Miss Rye by subscription, and "so altered and improved as to be in many respects a suitable building; "please state whether the Western Home was so purchased, and if not, how it "was purchased?"—"A. The house was not bought for me; it was bought by "money which I earned by writing for the press in England." I can only say that

that I had no intention of conveying any reflection upon Miss Rye; I but repeated a statement which she herself had made. In a letter to the Local Government Board of 10th June 1872 she says, "The moneys which purchased "and furnished our Western Home came by public subscription." It now appears, however, that it is her private property bought by her own money.

I did not, Sir, as you are aware, enter upon the question of expenditure voluntarily or officiously. It was referred in the papers communicated to me as instructions for inquiry. I ascertained before I left England that the amount for which the Local Government Board had issued orders gave an average of, at the very least, 8 l. 8 s. per head. Miss Rye now asserts that the amount was only 8 l. per head. Giving her the benefit of the difference, 8 s., you will see, Sir, that I do her no injustice in the statement that I made. In order to make that statement as accurate as possible, I repeatedly asked Miss Rye to furnish me with information as to the cost of maintenance in her home, of her other expenditure, and of the assistance which she received from the Governments of the Dominion and the Provinces. Of not one of these items could I succeed in obtaining from her any information whatever. Failing to get the information with reference to the assisted passages of the children, I applied to the Agricultural Department at Ottawa, and the statement in my Report which is objected to is copied word for word from a letter addressed to me by the secretary. In her printed letter now addressed to you, Miss Rye states that vouchers for each item of expenditure were handed by her to the Dominion Government for examination, "after I had declined the work in Canada." Here is another instance of Miss Rye's forgetfulness of facts. I did not "decline the work in Canada." More than once I told Miss Rye that I was prepared to undertake it if she would produce the vouchers. She told me the only thing she could produce was her banker's book, but that she would endeavour to give me the others: Not having obtained them, I wrote to her immediately before I left Canada renewing my former application. Not until long after I had left Canada, and my report was printed, did I receive Miss Rye's answer. In it she says:—"I blush, when I look at the date of your last letter, but soon after you left "Canada I was sick, very sick, the reaction I suppose from the over-exertion "and worry of this last past summer; since I am well again, I have been "trying to make time to copy out my accounts, which at present, as I told "you when here, are all in bills, and my cheque-book. I have not succeeded "in doing so yet, but all being well, I will, for I must do so." Yet, notwithstanding that letter, she now asks you to believe that I had absolutely refused to examine these vouchers in Canada. I am sure, Sir, that I did Miss Rye more than justice when I wrote in my Report that as to her receipts and expenditure she was "prepared to give the fullest information," as I did myself less than justice when, certainly from no unfriendly feeling to Miss Rye, I refrained from stating the facts more fully than I did.

With this explanation of the fruitless efforts that I made to extract information from Miss Rye, I submit to you a statement of the grounds upon which I was, and still am, led to conclude that the receipts upon account of pauper emigrants in 1873 and 1874 would very considerably exceed the expenditure. The statement would stand thus:—

RECEIPT.		EXPENDITURE.	
	£. s. d.		£. s. d.
Paid by Guardians (exclusive of a full outfit of clothing.)	8 - -	Passage from Liverpool to Home.	3 15 -
Bonus by Ontario Government.	1 4 -	Assumed cost per head of each Child at the Home.	1 - -
		Profit on each Child -	4 9 -
	£. 9 4 -		£. 9 4 -

It is of course possible that Miss Rye may have devoted the profits upon the emigration of "pauper" children to assist the emigration of street children, just as I intimated that Miss Macpherson did with repayments of passage money.

To one item in the preceding statement I desire to call your attention. I give Miss Rye credit for 1 *l.* as cost of maintenance at the Home *upon every child taken out*. Now, as a very considerable number of these children never set foot in the Home at all, no fewer than 192 going no further than "New Brunswick," Nova Scotia," or "Halifax," the allowance will amply cover what in poor-law accounts is known as "establishment charges." I observe, Sir, that Miss Rye's suggestion now is that English boards of guardians should entrust to her 1,000 girls per annum for the next 10 years, paying not 8 *l.* but 12 *l.* per head.

Miss Rye, in her letter to you, lays stress upon the assertion that she has "lost sight of" only 28 children "*of the age of 15 and under*." Even that is bad enough, considering that of children taken out in the last six months of 1873, 12, all of tender age, were already "lost sight of" within the following year. But the fact to which Miss Rye omits to call your attention is far more important than is that to which she refers. How many children lost sight of are *above the age of 15 and under 18*? It is at that age, as Miss Rye states, that children are subject to "freedom fever" become "restless," "discontented," and "disaffected." The number of that age who are "lost sight of," Miss Rye does not think it necessary to state. It appears, however, to be no fewer than 100!

Bearing in mind that so large a proportion of these emigrant children are "lost sight of," "reported or returned to the Home for extreme obstinacy and violent temper," are mothers of illegitimate children, some of them seduced by their masters or their master's sons, and that others are for one cause or other unfit for service, it may be reasonably asked whether, instead of adding to the number, some efficient means might not be even now adopted for the protection of those who have been already sent out.

It does not appear to me, Sir, to be necessary to say more in confirmation of the statements and opinions that I submitted to you in my Report of 1874. It is possible that some few applications to sanction emigration may yet be made to you under the influence of representations which are reported in public journals as having been made to boards of guardians, and which are certainly very little creditable to the candour of the person who is reported to have made them, or to the good sense of some at least of those who support them. Writing to you, Sir, it is hardly necessary to notice misrepresentations of such a character as that I was compelled to resign my office as Inspector of your Board in consequence of official disapproval of my Report, or that you, notwithstanding that Report, are satisfied with the system of emigration to which it refers. I cannot believe that any board of guardians in the kingdom, when informed of the conditions and results of Miss Rye's present system of emigration, would ask you to sanction the emigration of another child under it. In conclusion, Sir, I have only to assure you, that in making the inquiry that you entrusted to me, I spared no pains to fulfil your instructions, to carefully ascertain the facts connected with this system of emigration, and to submit them to you fairly, and in sufficient detail, to enable you to judge of its merits.

I have, &c.

(signed) *Andrew Doyle.*

The Right Honourable G. Sclater-Booth, M.P.,
President of the Local Government Board,
Whitehall, London, S.W.