



The Rt Hon Lady Smith
 Scottish Child Abuse Inquiry
 PO Box 24085
 Edinburgh EH7 9EA

26th September 2019

Dear Lady Smith,

**The Scottish Child Abuse Inquiry
 Child migrant case study**

In response to your letter dated 24th September 2018, please find attached the response by the Royal Over-Seas League (ROSL) to the Notice under s.21(2)(b) issued to us on 24 September 2018 relating to the migration of children whose primary care originated in Scotland. A methodology statement is attached which sets out the approach taken to formulating the response.

Incorporated in the response are comments and additional information provided by Professor Gordon Lynch in August 2019 and we are very grateful for this.

ROSL (established in 1910 as a private members' organisation) did not itself have any institutions for the care of children and although SCAI's questions are possibly more directed towards those organisations and institutions that did, we have done our best to answer the questions and provide documentation where this exists.

ROSL does not have any minutes of the Migration Committee which ROSL established in 1926, originally to support adult migration. It appears that ROSL and its Central Council delegated the practicalities of support for government policies regarding child migration after 1928 to this Committee and its Hon Secretary Mr Cyril Bavin.

Mr Bavin was an Australian, born in New Zealand, who was a ROSL Central Council member between 1920-1940. In 1940 the British government appointed Mr Bavin as Liaison Officer between the Home Government and the governments of Australia and New Zealand to safeguard the welfare of evacuee children sent there under the Children's Overseas Reception Board Scheme.

When the War ended, Mr Bavin resumed his role as ROSL Hon Migration Secretary and continued in it until his death in 1956. From research, it appears that he was mainly resident in the UK and that Mr Bavin made occasional visits to the ROSL Edinburgh clubhouse at 100 Princes Street.

The Migration Committee contributed brief updates of its work to ROSL's Annual Reports, ROSL Central Council meetings and ROSL's 'Overseas' magazine, back copies of which are in the British Library. ROSL branch and group reports in Annual Reports also refer to support for migration activities in general. We have recently discovered a photo album which has pictures of named child migrants to New Zealand between 1949-1953 and to Australia during 1954.

Royal Over-Seas League Tel: +44 (0)20 7408 0214
 Over-Seas House Fax: +44 (0)20 7499 6738
 Park Place Email: info@rosl.org.uk
 St James's Street Web: www.rosl.org.uk
 London SW1A 1LR
 United Kingdom

Patron: HM The Queen Vice Patron: HRH Princess Alexandra, KG, GCVO
 President: The Rt Hon the Lord Luce, KG, GCVO, DL

The photos show the children – sometimes with their parents - with the chaperones who accompanied the children on their sea voyages to New Zealand, the New Zealand High Commissioner, the ROSL Migration Hon Secretary, Cyril Bavin, and others at Farewell Tea Parties held at ROSL between 1949 – 1954 before sailings. It appears that there were 30 sailings to New Zealand on named ships and liners during this time and four sailings to Australia in 1954. From the photos it also appears that the children were given honorary ROSL membership if in their teens and junior membership and a badge if younger.

Some of the children pictured who were sailing to New Zealand did indeed have primary care in Scotland as captions give their names, ages and home areas but we have few details as to why they were chosen or where in New Zealand they went. It is possible that they were initially proposed by institutions or individuals in their home areas and applications sent to the ROSL Migration Bureau. It appears that applications were then passed on to New Zealand House for verification and that final selection was made by a Committee on which was represented the British Government, the New Zealand Government and the Over-Seas League.

To the best of our knowledge ROSL has received no formal, direct complaints of sexual or other abuse from any former child migrants much as it is aware of the difficulties, trauma and abuse that many migrants suffered through the research of Margaret Humphries in the late 1980's and subsequent inquiries, witness statements, films, books and press reports.

I mention all of this as our researchers, principally former Director-General Major General Roddy Porter and the present Director of Education Projects Margaret Adrian-Vallance MBE, consider that it is only by including the general overview of ROSL's migration activity since 1928 that light can be shed on possible Scotland-specific activity.

With no comprehensive or specific records relating to selection, parental approval, monitoring and other aspects for those whose primary care originated in Scotland, the best we can do is piece together what slender information we have and we much appreciate the recent input of Professor Lynch. However, regarding his concern that ROSL does not have Migration Committee Minutes, we have researched the records that we have and there is nothing 'apparent' in the absence of the records of the Migration Committee – we simply don't have them despite extensive searches.

As we stated at the time of the IICSA inquiry:

The Royal Over-Seas League (ROSL) deeply regrets and apologises for its support of government initiatives relating to child migration and condemns unreservedly the abuse and ill treatment of children. ROSL welcomes the report (IICSA) and will continue to cooperate with the Inquiry's work in any way we can.

Ms Adrian-Vallance and I plan to attend the hearings in early December as members of the public.

In the meantime, I should particularly like to thank you for granting an extension until 30 September 2019. We are a small team here and being relatively new myself to the post of Director-General, this extra time was much appreciated.

Yours sincerely



Dr Diana Owen OBE
Director-General

ROSL - METHODOLOGY STATEMENT**Main researcher**

Margaret Adrian-Vallance, ROSL's present Director of Education Projects and former Director of PR and Development was the main researcher.

Margaret joined ROSL in 1993 and had previously assisted the former Director-General, Roddy Porter and others with research into ROSL's involvement with child migration. When he retired in 2017, Margaret was delegated by the ROSL Central Council to be the main point of contact on such matters and in September 2018, the present Director-General, Diana Owen, asked her to continue this research and provide answers as far as possible to SCAI questions. In September 2019 ROSL gratefully acknowledged and incorporated additional information from Professor Gordon Lynch. (We had been advised that there was no need to duplicate statements and reports that could be found on the IICSA website).

Documental – general overview to shed light on Branch activity

We have focused on the fact that this Inquiry was about 'children whose primary care originated in Scotland' and a summary overview was included in our covering letter as possibly helpful background information.

ROSL appears to have delegated child migration activities to its Migration Committee, established in 1926 and based in London, originally to support adult migration. However, ROSL has not been able to locate any minutes or correspondence from this Migration Committee, or its successor the Migration Bureau.

Research at ROSL HQ, Park Place, London SW1A 1LR, has therefore been largely reliant on the brief reports from the Migration Committee to be found in ROSL Annual Reports, equally brief reports in the Central Council Minutes of the time and back editions of 'Overseas' magazine (established 1917; British Library has all editions). Other documents researched at ROSL HQ for a general overview of ROSL child migration activity include those presented to the House of Commons Health Committee's Inquiry into the Welfare of former British Child Migrants whose third report was published in July 1998, and a small amount of correspondence, press cuttings and documents prepared for the Independent Inquiry into Child Sex Abuse (IICSA) re Child Migration during 2016 – 2018.

Documental – Scottish Branch specific activity

Scottish Branch reports in ROSL Annual Reports (held at the London clubhouse) have been the main source of information. However, in early November 2018, a photo album containing over 90 press photos of children attending tea parties at ROSL HQ between 1949-54 before sailing was discovered. The album was amongst items sent to the London clubhouse after the closure of ROSL's Edinburgh clubhouse. This was the first time that ROSL had in its possession any details relating to name, age and home town of a child about to migrate. Relevant photo copies were forwarded to SCAI.

In mid-November 2018, further boxes of archives from the Edinburgh clubhouse were searched and nothing further of relevance to this Inquiry was found. In February 2019 ROSL forwarded its response to SCAI questions. In August 2019, SCAI forwarded helpful comments and IICSA based information from Professor Gordon Lynch, and these have been incorporated into this response.

RESPONSE FROM ROSL TO APPENDIX 1 OF THE NOTICE ISSUED IN TERMS OF SECTION 21(2)(b) OF THE INQUIRIES ACT 2005, DATED 24 SEPTEMBER 2018

(Note: Inquiry's questions in bold, ROSL's responses in standard text but those relevant to Scotland in bold italics)

1. A report addressing the following in relation to the Royal Over-Seas League ("the Organisation")'s policies and procedures in respect of the migration of children whose care originated in Scotland, for the period 1 January 1900 to 17 December 2014:

The Royal Over-Seas League (ROSL - a not for profit membership organisation founded in 1910 as the Over-Seas Club) possesses few records of migration activities and did not itself have any establishments for the care of children.

i. The Annual Report of the ROSL for 1926 records that a Migration Committee was established in the autumn of 1926, with Mr Cyril Bavin as its Honorary Secretary.

ii. The ROSL Annual Report for 1927 indicates that migration issues are still primarily concerned with "the emigration of ex-officers and civil servants but that at the present moment it is considering the question of extending its activities."

The Report further records that "The Liverpool Branch started the idea of adopting a child under the 'godparent' scheme of the Child Emigration Society. The cost is £30 a year and the child, who can be selected by the members, is sent to the Fairbridge Farm Schools, Western Australia. Half year reports will keep the members in touch with their 'protégé'".

iii. The Annual Report of 1928 adds that funding, "...is being spent to send 1000 boys and young men to Canada." No information is provided as to ages, home areas, selection procedures or exact destination in Canada.

iiii. The Annual Report for 1929 speaks of the newly established protégé scheme, "...whereby Members (of ROSL) ... can now become "godparents" to children who wish to go overseas and are thus enabled to follow the subsequent careers of their protégés in the new world. The children (boys and girls) are selected by the League and placed, often in conjunction with some other Society, in Canada or Australia."

It is not known how this selection process functioned or who the children thus selected were or to which locations they emigrated. The Report states that 88 protégés of the League were established overseas in 1929 and that similar opportunities were to be offered to "the Public School boy."

v. In 1930, the Annual Report for that year records that immigration was difficult because the depression had forced the Dominions to place strict limits on this. It also records that 92 protégés had been successfully settled in "good positions" (presumably work opportunities), mostly in Canada and that 241 others had been assisted with letters of introduction. It is unclear whether ROSL had assisted their move overseas more directly. Again, there is no information as to where these young people came from.

vi. The 1931 Annual Report states that the Migration Bureau - as the Migration Committee was then known - closed down because of "...the practical cessation of all emigration from Great Britain to the Dominions." which seems to have focused on adults, rather than children. The Bureau had helped 375 men and women to migrate and had given advice to 5,213 others. However, the protégé scheme continued. The Report states that, "190 boys" (their ages are not recorded) "faced with the dull monotony of blind-alley jobs in this country, or with the alternative of taking their place in the queues outside the Labour Exchange to receive the dole, have been placed in positions overseas, where they are now happy and hard-working citizens of the Dominions." The Report also mentions that the Ulster Branch had two godchildren at the Kingsley Fairbridge Farm School in Western Australia.

vii. The 1933 Annual Report highlights an initiative called the 'Back to the Land Scheme', in cooperation with the YMCA British Boys for British Farms Scheme, which seemed to seek to place unemployed British boys on farms

in England. ROSL had sponsored 100 boys in this collaboration. The Report also mentions that the Perth (Australia) Branch had collected sufficient money to have its own godchild at the Fairbridge Farm School.

viii. The 1934 Annual Report states that "eight children at Kingsley Fairbridge Farm Schools were now being supported by Scottish Members of the League".

This is the first reference in the documents examined to the involvement of Scottish members in the migration of children. It is not clear whether this support was given to children from throughout the UK or Scotland only. Some of these children could well have migrated from Scotland.

ix. The 1935 and 1936 Annual Reports indicate that the work of the Migration Bureau was temporarily suspended. Instead, members focused on giving financial support to the Fairbridge Farm Schools. The reasons for this suspension are not stated but might be attributable to increased unemployment overseas.

x. The 1937 Annual Report records that "...the Kingsley Fairbridge godchildren adopted by Scottish branches now number eight and there is every indication that this number will be increased in 1938".

Again, there is no indication as to from where in the UK these 'godchildren' migrated from, but some could well have migrated from Scotland.

xi. The Report for 1938 indicates that migration work was to resume with an appeal for 'godfathers' to sponsor boys through training in agriculture in Britain and then meet the costs of their migration and settlement overseas. Sponsorship of 100 boys was sought. The Report also records that ROSL members were being asked to adopt Jewish and other male child refugees from Germany not classed as Aryan refugee boys from Germany and sponsor them through training in farm work in Britain. ROSL sought to ensure that these boys became British subjects.

xii. The 1939 Annual Report refers to 'the cost of becoming a godfather to a boy and paying for his training on the land in Great Britain and all transport expenses to his destination overseas is in the case of Australia £25'. **It also reports that the Scottish Members continued their 'godparenting' of children at the Fairbridge Kingsley Farm Schools and a number of centres adopted two Godchildren.**

The Report gives no details of names, ages or home areas of the children or indeed which Fairbridge Schools they attended.

xiii. The reports of 1940 and 1941 make brief mention of ongoing support by ROSL members in general for children at the Fairbridge Farm Schools.

xiiii. In the Annual Reports until 1945, there are no references to specific child migrants whose primary care was in Scotland.

xv. In 1947, Cyril Bavin resumed his post as the League's Honorary Migration Secretary. The League's Annual Report for that year refers to assistance made by the League to enable wartime evacuees to Australia, who had returned to Britain after the War, as agreed by the British Government, to return to Australia to make it their permanent home. It is also clear that the League began to provide a service in the late 1940s to assist families and individuals inquiring about migration to find out what was involved and how they could make the necessary arrangements.

In August 2019 Professor Lynch drew attention to the fact that "IICSA also received evidence of a case of two boys, who do not appear to have had any previous connection to the Children's Overseas Reception Board (CORB) scheme, whose proposed emigration by the League in spring 1948 was a source of concern to officials in both London County Council and the Home Office. This case was understood to have raised concerns about the standards of rigour in children's selection for migration by the League. It was also noted that Cyril Bavin had claimed, in a statement to the Overseas Migration Board in 1955, that all of the 194 children sent to Australia by the League (which did not include those sent to Dhurringile) since 1947 were returning CORB evacuees when this does not appear to have been the case.

Evidence received by IICSA indicates that the League formally proposed its migration scheme to Australia to the Australian Commonwealth Government and State immigration officials in 1948. IICSA received evidence that this proposal was refused by Australian immigration officials on the grounds that a) there should be personal

contact between a child and their adopter before any transfer of custody took place, b) that State Governments would require full family and medical histories of child migrants to ensure that proposed placements were unlikely to break down, c) that adoptions should not take place without a probationary period to ensure the suitability of the placement, and d) the League did not have the organisational structure to manage any adoption placements that broke down in Australia, meaning that responsibility for the care of children in these cases would become the responsibility of State Child Welfare departments. Evidence submitted to IICSA suggested that the League was aware that their proposed scheme had been rejected.

The League appears to have continued to arrange for the migration of children to Australia despite their scheme not receiving formal approval. Whilst the circumstances around this appeared somewhat unclear, IICSA received archival evidence indicating that this may have taken place through immigration officials at Australia House marking children migrated by the League as returning CORB evacuees despite this not being the case.

xvi. The ROSL Annual Report for 1949 records that "Early in 1949 it was agreed:

- 1) that the New Zealand Government Child Welfare Department should appeal for homes in New Zealand in which the children would be regarded as members of the family; 2) that the Over-Seas League should be the sole recruiting agency in the UK to recruit children from the ages of 5 to 17 whose parents were willing to allow them to emigrate to New Zealand where they would have a better chance of a fuller, happier and healthier life; 3) that after a trial period of six months, the friends who took charge of these children if the arrangement proved satisfactory on both sides should be given legal guardianship of the child until he or she attained the age of 21 years. The parents' consent to this is given in a sworn declaration before a magistrate".**

xvii. Between 1949 – 1953, it was also League policy to host at the London clubhouse, farewell parties for migrating children sailing to New Zealand and to give them ROSL membership.

The photo album discovered in November 2018 shows that these parties were attended by the children to be migrated, some of their parents, the mainly female escorts who would accompany the children on their sea voyage and various New Zealand dignitaries such as the High Commissioner, the New Zealand Speaker and several Government Ministers. Some of the children pictured in the photo album captions came from Scotland. They are named and the ages and home areas of some of them are also provided.

xviii. The Annual Report for 1950 refers to the first meeting in London of a Council of Voluntary Organisations for Child Migration, the details and provenance of which are unknown, and that several thousand letters of inquiry had been received that year by the League's Honorary Migration Secretary, Mr Bavin. There is no breakdown of areas from which requests came but due to the evidence within the photo album, it is clear that some did come from Scotland.

xix. The Annual Report for 1951 provides updates on developments and numbers of children migrating to New Zealand but no breakdown by area.

xx. In 1953 the Annual Report makes mention of the intent to maintain an Honorary Migration Secretary, "...as on account of the well-established place which the League holds among the Emigration Societies in this country (Britain), it continues to receive many requests for advice re emigration...". Focus appears to have switched to Australia during that year and the League became a recruiting agency for organisations involved in migration to that country. It is also clear from this Annual Report that League branches were involved in raising donations for the Fairbridge Society.

xxi. There is also evidence of Australian branches which had a commitment to individual children, for example, the Sydney Branch referring to, "two Godchildren at the Fairbridge Farm School, Molong'. There are no further details as to where these children came from, how they were selected or their ages.

Although the League appears to have intended to enable its New Zealand branches to contact child migrants by sending them their names and the addresses of the foster placements to which they were being sent, it is not

clear that any comprehensive system was set up by the League to follow children through changes in foster placements (with 196 children sent to New Zealand by the League having more than one foster placement by 1953, according to the New Zealand Superintendent of Child Welfare).

Evidence was received by IICSA concerning a 1953 report written about the League's scheme by the New Zealand Superintendent of Child Welfare which identified significant shortcomings in the scheme, including problems arising from foster-parents who were initially enthusiastic about participating but failed to maintain their responsibilities to children. This contrasted with Bavin's claim in a League publication in December 1951, that its child migration work was 'one of, if not *the* most, satisfactory Child Emigration schemes in existence', and with Bavin's reported surprise at the New Zealand Government deciding to withdraw its support for this scheme in the autumn of 1953.

Evidence was presented to IICSA that the UK Government had refused to approve the League as a recognised sending organisation for child migrants until the autumn of 1953 on the grounds that it was not a specialist child-care organisation and lacked the resources to be able to monitor children that it sent overseas.

IICSA received evidence that the UK Government eventually approved the League as a sending organisation under pressure from the Australian Commonwealth Government, who argued that despite these shortcomings it was no worse than other organisations of a similar kind (such as the Church of England Advisory Council of Empire Settlement) which had already been approved by the UK Government. IICSA also received evidence that, whilst unconvinced about the League's suitability as an organisation for arranging children's migration, the Home Office took the view that the introduction of draft s.33 regulations under the 1948 Children Act would probably mean that the League would have to withdraw from this work as it was unlikely to have the organisational resources to maintain required standards in relation to children's selection or post-migration monitoring. The Home Office's failure to introduce these regulations, however, meant that the League was able to continue its child migration work until Cyril Bavin's death in 1956.

xxii. In the 1954 Annual Report, there is a short mention of recruitment to the Dhurringile Farm Training School in Victoria of twenty boys and further evidence of "god parenting" by UK branches.

xxiii. In 1956 the Annual Report records the death of Mr Bavin, Hon Migration Secretary and Prof Lynch has recently pointed out that 'we understand that IICSA received evidence that standards of care and accommodation at Dhurringile were so poor that the 1956 UK fact finding mission led by John Ross, confidentially identified it as an institution which should be black listed with no further child migrants being sent to it'.

xxiii. Also In 1956, a strategic change is highlighted in the Annual Report as numbers applying to migrate had fallen and the League decided to switch its focus to family migration. Plans appear to have been made with the Fairbridge Society for this to occur at some stage after the end of the year.

xxv. From the 1957 Annual Report, it appears that the Fairbridge Society had become the focus of most of the migration-related funding activity of the League and the Society placed fund raising advertisements in the 'Overseas' magazine. In this year there appears to have been family migration to Australia and there is also the first mention of ROSL supporting the YMCA "British Lads for Canada" Scheme, which sought to settle older teenage boys in Canadian farms in conjunction with the United Church of Canada.

xxvi. From the 1958 Annual Report, there is evidence that these boys were specifically sponsored by the League, given membership and put in touch with the branch closest to them. Sponsorship continued in 1960 and 1961.

xxvii. *The Edinburgh Branch report for the 1958 ROSL Annual Report includes the fact that 'the ladies of the Handicraft Centre continued their excellent work; the funds raised by them during the year going to support children in the leper colonies and young British emigrants to the Kingsley Fairbridge Farm Schools in Australia; they also provided funds to send two Scottish boys to Canada under the YMCA British Lads to Canada Scheme.'*

In 1963 the Annual report records that the League was grateful to the Ladies Handicraft Centre at Edinburgh for providing sponsorships for four of the twelve young men going to Australia under the Big Brother Movement. There is no indication as to whether these four were from Scotland or elsewhere. However, the 1964 Annual report does record the names of two 'boys' from Ladybank who went to Australia, also via the Big Brother Scheme.

xviii. Reporting is scant in the years 1965-67 and the Annual Report for 1968 demonstrates that the level of support had not increased since 1964. Finally, the Annual Reports for 1972, 1975 and 1978 continue to report on funding and other support for the Big Brother Scheme and the Fairbridge Society for which the 'Overseas' magazine carried fund raising advertisements.

(a) What policies and/or procedures did the Organisation and its establishment(s) have in place in relation to child migration work

The material referred to above indicates that the "godparenting/protégé" scheme was the ROSL's key policy relating to child migration as was the policy regarding the migrating of children to New Zealand as outlined in the 1949 Annual Report. ***The photo album discovered in November 2018 demonstrates there was also a policy of holding farewell parties in London at which honorary ROSL membership was given to the children.***

The records examined also indicate both an intent and practice from early on in the migration scheme to ensure that many children migrating to New Zealand and Australia went to individual homes and that, where possible, these children were linked with Branches of the League in the countries to which they travelled and that they should be made Junior Members of the League.

(b) Was there a particular policy and/or procedural aim/intention?

The general policy aim/intention was to support UK Government policy and organisations like the Fairbridge Society whose aim was to enable children from very poor families to obtain what was thought at the time to be a better life in Australia, Canada or New Zealand.

The procedural aim and intention therefore varied in pursuit of the general policy. An example would be that the 'back to the land schemes' were aimed mainly at young men and older boys whereas the 'godparenting' option enabled some sort of personal contact and support between the 'godparent' and the 'godchild' via letters and reports.

A letter dated 3 July 1998 sent by the New Zealand Government's Social Service Policy Group to their Secretary for Foreign Affairs regarding the UK Health Committee Inquiry into the Welfare of Former Child Migrants sets out its understanding of the ROSL's role based on New Zealand files. It describes how Mr Bavin proposed the scheme to the New Zealand High Commissioner in 1947 and that final selection was made by a Committee composed of British and New Zealand Government representatives and ROSL.

(c) Where were such policies and/or procedures recorded?

ROSL recorded a short summary of the work of the Migration Committee/Bureau in its Annual Reports each year as outlined above. The minutes of the Migration Committee/Bureau cannot be located in spite of searches which began as far back as 1990.

(d) What did the policies and/or procedures set out in terms of the following?

*** Identification and checking the suitability of the places where children were sent**

ROSL supported other organisations and governments which had already identified the suitability – as perceived at the time – of where children were to be sent. We have seen no evidence that ROSL itself had a policy of double checking this suitability.

*** Selection of children to migrate including age, gender and background**

ROSL has been unable to locate any files on how individual children were selected including those who came from Scotland.

*** Provision of information to the child and/or his/her parents before migration**

ROSL has been unable to locate any records as to this information. However, the photo album referred to shows parents being present. This indicates that parents had some awareness.

*** Provision of information and records to children and/or their parents once child had been migrated**

The only record ROSL has been able to find about this is contained in the 1949 Annual Report relating to New Zealand at (xvi). This refers to parents swearing a declaration consenting to legal guardianship being given to the guardians in New Zealand after 6 months if the arrangement there proves to be satisfactory.

Obtaining consent of child

ROSL does not have any records relating to this.

*** Obtaining consent of parents of child**

ROSL does not have any records relating to this other than the reference in the 1949 Annual Report to parents swearing a declaration consenting to legal guardianship being given to the guardians of children in New Zealand after 6 months if the arrangement there proves to be satisfactory.

*** Obtaining of consent of others e.g. Secretary of State**

This is not mentioned in ROSL's surviving records – apart from the 3 July 1998 letter from the New Zealand Government's Social Service Policy Group sent to their Secretary for Foreign affairs referred to in the response to 1(b) above which refers to a document from 1949 prepared by the NZ Head of the League and sent to the NZ Director of Employment describing how the migration scheme to New Zealand worked with a final selection of applications made by a Committee composed of representatives of "...the British Government, the New Zealand Government and the Over-Seas League."

*** Responding to requests for information from former child migrants**

Since at least 1991, when Robert Newell became ROSL Director-General, ROSL has had a policy of responding as helpfully as possible to the few former child migrants who have contacted ROSL direct requesting information (ROSL has no evidence of the policy before then). This included personal responses by Robert Newell by letter or telephone and also making it known that the UK's legal deposit libraries which includes the British Library retained copies of the League's 'Overseas' magazine. ROSL's Child Protection policy prepared in 2016 sets out the present procedure for dealing with such requests.

However, Professor Lynch has drawn ROSL's attention to the following background information.

A Memorandum by the British Child Migrants Society (NZ) Incorporated which was submitted as publicly available evidence to the 1997/98 House of Commons Health Committee investigation into the welfare of former British child migrants to which the League also gave evidence. Part of this Memorandum states:

'Approaches made to persons known to have come under the ROSL scheme, and who have not subsequently joined [our] Society, fall into two main categories. Firstly, there are those whose lives have been so badly damaged by the trauma of immigration that they cannot bear to have any reference made to it. Secondly, there are those at the other end of the scale for whom the experience of migration has been satisfactorily coped with, and is an event in their past which does not hold the same significant meaning as it holds for other people. Of course, there will be many and varied reasons why people do not wish to come forward. Prior to the incorporation of [our] Society, the Steering Committee working on that project had begun negotiations with the officials of the New Zealand Government, and others, in an effort to see what assistance could be given to the concerns of former migrants. Approaches made to the Royal Overseas League Headquarters in London were entirely fruitless. It seems that the League has no wish to claim its part in the resettlement schemes of which it was such a big player, indeed, its standard response is that it simply now has no records pertaining to those times.' (Health Committee, Third Report, The Welfare of Former British Child Migrants, vol. II, Minutes of Evidence and Appendices, London: HMSO, 1998, p.237).

Having noted that some who were badly affected by their experiences of migration to New Zealand through the scheme operated by the League and the New Zealand Government felt unable to discuss it in any way, the Society's Memorandum went on to present findings from a survey of 42 former child migrants sent to New Zealand under this scheme who were prepared to give information about their experiences. This indicated that amongst these respondents, 12 said their lives had been affected 'very badly' by their involvement in this scheme, 24 raised concerns over loss of identity, 13 complained of abuse and ill-treatment (including exploitation of labour), 9 of neglect, 30 as experiencing problems arising from family separation, and 22 experienced sustained problems in forming relations as adults (with associated problems of addiction and/or mental illness) (see *ibid.*, pp.238-41). We also note that in its final report, the Health Committee recommended *'that the League reconsider its disavowal of responsibility for child migration to that country. It should join with other voluntary agencies in making a contribution towards improving the welfare of former child migrants'* (House of Commons Health Committee, *The Welfare of Former British Child Migrants*, 1997-98, HC755, London: HMSO para 31).

Professor Lynch also refers to the fact that IICSA received oral evidence from ██████████ who was sent to Dhurringile by the League in 1954 in which he gave accounts of sustained experiences of serious physical and sexual abuse at that institution. IICSA also received evidence that Mr ██████████ had been migrated to Australia by the League apparently without Secretary of State consent for his migration on his LEM3 form, despite this having been a legal requirement under s.17 of the 1948 Children Act given that Mr ██████████ had been in the care of a local authority at the time of his emigration.

*** Other issues**

In early 2018 ROSL issued the following press statement:

The Royal Over-Seas League (ROSL) deeply regrets and apologises for its support of government initiatives relating to child migration and condemns unreservedly the abuse and ill treatment of children. ROSL welcomes the report (IICSA) and will continue to cooperate with the Inquiry's work in any way we can.

(e) Who compiled the policies and/or procedures

As stated, the Annual Reports indicate that the Central Council delegated the job of finding practical ways of supporting government policy to the Migration Bureau (established in 1926 and initially called the Migration Committee to assist with adult migration) and its Hon Sec, Cyril Bavin.

In the absence of any Migration Committee or Bureau minutes, or exact and detailed material as to who compiled policies and procedures, it is thought that the Migration Committee/Bureau would have sought advice from the home government and the governmental agencies of the countries to which the children migrated.

(f) When were the policies and/or procedures put in place?

Support for government policies was first put in place in 1926 with the establishment of the Migration Committee.

(g) Were such policies and/or practices reviewed?

The ROSL Annual Reports indicate that the Migration Committee/Bureau reviewed matters over the years. In relation to children, there was an initial emphasis on "Back to the land schemes" for boys and this changed to the god parenting and protégé schemes. The destination countries also changed in prominence from Canada to New Zealand and Australia. The war years saw a cessation.

After the war, there seems to have been a focus on migrating children from all parts of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to New Zealand. The Migration Bureau was disbanded in 1956 following the death of Cyril Bavin, who was then the League's Hon Migration Secretary. Support for the Fairbridge Society continued through the placing of fund-raising advertisements in the 'Overseas' magazine.

With the benefit of witness statements to SCAI and comments from Professor Lynch, additional information on the overview of ROSL's involvement in child migration is at xxi.

(h) If so, what was the reason for review?

Adverse economic circumstances and the Second World War appear to have led to changes. It may be that Mr Bavin's personal knowledge of New Zealand where he was born and later, after the Second World War, appears to have maintained contact with government officials, was influential here. With the benefit of witness statements to SCAI and comments from Professor Lynch, additional information is at xxi

(i) What substantive changes, if any, were made to the policies and/or procedures over time?

The response to 1(g) is referred to here. ROSL has no minutes or paperwork from branches in Scotland covering any changes in policies of procedures over the period in question.

(j) Why were changes made?

The response to 1(h) is referred to here.

(k) Were changes documented?

Brief accounts in ROSL Annual Reports record some changes which are attributable to the great Depression and the Second World War. Regrettably ROSL has not been able to locate any additional records that might assist such as Migration Committee/Bureau Minutes or any personal

notes made by Mr Bavin.

(l) Was there an audit trail?

Other than brief reports from the Migration Committee/Bureau in ROSL's Annual Reports, no further evidence has been located which could show this.

RESPONSE FROM ROSL TO APPENDIX 1 OF THE NOTICE ISSUED IN TERMS OF SECTION 21(2)(b) OF THE INQUIRIES ACT 2005, DATED 24 SEPTEMBER 2018

2. A report addressing the following in relation to Organisation's practice in respect of the migration of children whose care originated in Scotland, for the period 1 January 1900 to 17 December 2014:

(a) Did the Organisation and its establishment(s) adhere in practice to its policy/procedures in terms of child migrants relating to the following?

Regrettably, ROSL has been unable to locate any records which enable this question to be satisfactorily addressed. The absence of any surviving records or minutes from the Migration Committee/Bureau impedes this task and means that ROSL is not in a position to answer (a) - (f).

(g) How many children were sent as child migrants from the Organisation's establishments, and where were they sent?

ROSL does not and never has had establishments for the care of children but rather was involved in assisting with migration.

(h) What was their age and gender?

We would refer to the answer to (g).

(i) Over what time period were children migrated from the Organisation's Establishments?

We would refer to the answer to (g).

However, it would appear from research that the ROSL and many of its members and branches did support financially the migration of children from other organisations which did have such establishments or went to establishments such as Fairbridge Society schools in Canada and Australia.

(j) Who funded the child migration?

The ROSL Migration Committee/Bureau, ROSL members and branches helped fund the travel of individual young people overseas as part of 'god parenting' or protégé schemes as mentioned earlier.

(k) Who received the funding in relation to migrant children?

ROSL HQ and branches. With regard to branches, the Annual Reports referred to in the response to

question 1 lead us to surmise that it is probable funding came from the branches own, local fund-raising efforts, as in the case of the Edinburgh Ladies Handicraft Centre referred to at (xxvii) of the response to question 1.

(l) In general terms, how much was this funding?

With regard to Scotland, there are no records as to how much this funding was. However, as narrated in the response to question 1, sums of £25 to £30 per person funded overseas travel.

(m) How did the Organisation/establishment respond to requests for information from former child migrants?

The policy has been to offer as much information as possible to give to any former child migrants who have contacted ROSL and also to make it known that the Copyright libraries, including the British Library, had copies of 'Overseas' magazine which included references to child migration and pictures of pre-sailing tea parties at ROSL (but without the names of the children in the captions).

3. All records, correspondence, policies, procedures, reports, file notes, minutes, and other documents of a similar nature in whatever form, in the possession or otherwise within the control of the Organisation, or anyone acting on their behalf, showing or tending to show any information relating to the migration abroad of children whose care originated in Scotland who had resided in any establishment operated by the Organisation, (i) generally and (ii) in respect of specific children, during the period 1 January 1900 to 17 December 2014 including but not restricted to (a) - (p):

As stated, ROSL has never operated establishments for the care of children. Although ROSL does not consider that any of the documentation referred to in the course of this response falls within the scope of the documentation which the Inquiry seeks in the Notice, it would of course be pleased to provide the Inquiry with copies of any of the documentation referred to in this response in the event this would assist the Inquiry with its endeavours.

4. Correspondence and other documents in the possession or otherwise within the control of the Organisation or its establishment(s) in respect of the period 17 December 2014 to the date hereof in relation to past migration abroad of children whose care originated in Scotland

ROSL possesses no documents of this kind.

5. An inventory of all documents falling within paragraph 3 and 4 above

Not required.

6. Any record or document indicating, showing or describing the whereabouts of any record or document falling within paragraph 3 and 4 above where such record or document is outwith the possession and/or control of the Organisation

ROSL is not aware of any such document.

7. Failing principals, copies, electronic copies, digital or other medium copies, drafts or duplicates of the above or any of them

Not applicable.

8. A list of all the children whose care originated in Scotland and who had resided in any establishment operated by the Organisation who were migrated abroad during the period 1 January 1900 to 17 December 2014 including their names, dates of birth, where they were from, their parental situation, the establishment they resided in prior to migration, where they were migrated to (including name of institution or other carer) and when, whether or not they had siblings in care and whether or not any such siblings were also migrated.

Although ROSL never had any establishments for the care of children, the photo album discovered in November 2018 disclosed the names of a number of children from Scotland who were subsequently migrated along with the ages, areas of residence and date of departure from the UK. Copies of this information were provided to the Inquiry in February 2019.

Date 26 September 2019