

been receiving children not only from philanthropic and church refuge homes in the UK but from Poor Law institutions. Amongst other matters, Doyle was critical of:

- (i) the lax and informal manner in which consent to emigration was secured from legal guardians (p.7),
- (ii) the lack of consent to their migration given before magistrates by children from voluntary refuge homes, as required by children from Poor Law institutions (p.7),
- (iii) the conditions and care on board ships sending them out and on arrival (pp.8, 16-17),
- (iv) the poor facilities at the distribution centres into which children were received before being dispatched to farms across Ontario (pp.8, 17),
- (v) the inadequate training of many children before they were sent overseas, and in Canada before and after they were dispersed (pp.7, 14-16, 31),
- (vi) the limited information obtained by Macpherson and Rye concerning the places to which children were being sent and about the people being made responsible for their care (pp.19-20),
- (vii) the doubtful legal basis on which children were supposedly 'indentured' or 'adopted' (pp.11-13),
- (viii) the work obligations placed upon many children on farms or as domestic servants, and the poor rewards for their labour (pp.13-14, 20, 30),
- (ix) the limited education and religious upbringing the children received in Canada (pp.29-30),
- (x) the misbehaviour of many of the children sent from refuges run by voluntary societies - less troublesome were those from Poor Law institutions (pp.15, 35),
- (xi) the inadequate inspection and aftercare by the organisers who had brought these children to Canada and dispersed them over vast distances (pp.14, 21-27, 29, 31-3),
- (xii) the loss of contact with many of their young charges (pp.25-28).

5.1.2 Doyle made clear his doubts about child migration and his belief that the welfare of children in need was better effected in Poor Law institutions in the UK (pp.34-6). There are no explicit references to what would now be termed sexual abuse. However, his report refers to the harsh treatment of some children (p.30), and to girls being at risk and some 'losing their characters' (pp.21-2, 24). He was also aware of the need to safeguard children's sexual vulnerability in his comments about the failure of existing inspections to check on the children's sleeping arrangements. He expressed particular concern (p.29) about the case of 'a girl of 11 or 12 in a room away from that of her mistress, without fastening, opening to a lobby from which were the rooms of two men, one hired harvest man of whom the people know nothing except that he was "a good farming hand".'

5.1.3 The Local Government Board took Doyle's report seriously, and a reassuring Canadian government response following inspections it carried out left UK officials unconvinced. Indeed, the Local Government Board imposed a moratorium on the sending to Canada of children by Poor Law institutions in the UK (but not by voluntary societies). This lasted until 1887 until, following sustained UK government pressure, Canada introduced safeguards and provided