

Emigration vs. Colonisation

A SUMMARY OF THE PROPOSALS MADE BY GENERAL BOOTH AND MR. RIDER HAGGARD—
WITH REFERENCES TO VARIOUS EXPERIMENTS.

GENERAL BOOTH has drawn attention to the difference between emigration and colonisation, and emphasised the value of the latter. In emigration, as it is carried on from Great Britain to Canada, the emigrant is brought here and then left to shift for himself. Some attempt is made by the various Canadian governments to guide him to the spot most fitted for him, but at best these efforts are but advisory. Under colonisation, the man would be taken to a definite piece of ground, furnished with implements and capital, and looked after until he is financially independent.

The New Zealand Advances to Settlers' Act, for example, inaugurated a land settlement system in that colony which has been eminently successful. No loss has been incurred; on the contrary a profit has been realised. Under that Act, between 1895 and 1904, advances amounting to \$20,000,000 were made to settlers; and in the latter year the securities were valued at forty millions with a sinking fund of three-quarters of a million. Any sums advanced under that Act are to be paid back with interest at five per cent in 73 half-yearly instalments. The instalments increase gradually from about \$2.50 to about \$15.

Under some such system as this, Great Britain and Canada might work together to bring unemployed and ambitious but impecunious farm labourers to this country from the congested districts of the old land. These people would be taken direct to special settlements provided for the purpose and there taught, trained and encouraged to become good farmers. They would not be allowed to crowd into the cities and become cheap labourers and perhaps burdens on growing communities. They would have an opportunity of becoming farmers, owning their own land and stock, and enabled to raise their children in healthful and wholesome surroundings.

The Salvation Army has colonies of various kinds, mainly experimental, but nevertheless successful. Fort Romie in California has only 690 acres. On it 18 families of indigent people from San Francisco were settled. The land was "dry" and the settlement proved a failure until irrigation was secured. Since that reform, the colonists have created an equity of \$41,000, an average of over \$2,000 each. The Army itself has lost money on the experiment, but has learned some valuable lessons.

Another Salvation Army colony exists at Fort Amity, Colorado. Its area is 1,760 acres, with about sixty houses. There are 38 settlers, of whom six are tenants. They have an equity, that is a balance of assets over liabilities, of more than \$1,000 a head. Like the previous case, the Army has lost money. This is due to the selection of poor land, lack of capital, a high rate of interest, and too great generosity to its settlers. Nevertheless both settlements are prosperous in spite of these drawbacks and in spite of the unskilled and untrained characters of the city dwellers who were transported thither from San Francisco and Chicago.

In the Amity settlement, twelve years' purchase time on land and buildings is allowed. For the first two years, interest only is expected. Afterwards, one-tenth of total cost each year, with interest at six per cent. is required. Loans for live stock and equipment are secured by chattel mortgage and are payable in five equal annual instalments with interest.

Near Cleveland is the Fort Herrick colony of 280 acres. On this, there is a home for inebriates, and men are nursed back to health and trained in the elements of agriculture. It is doing an excellent work.

At Hadleigh in Essex, England, there is a settlement with 3,000 acres. It has a population of about 500,

with fruit farms, market gardens, chicken farms and brick-yards. The kind of persons sent there is so bad that a small yearly deficit is shown.

In Canada much better success should attend land settlement because land is cheaper and more fertile. The Dominion Government is now talking of throwing open several million acres to settlement at \$3 per acre—much better land than the Army has heretofore purchased at many times that price. To be successful, however, the immigrants should be well selected and well looked after.

Perhaps the best idea would be for the Canadian Government to adopt and adapt the New Zealand plan and work out a scheme of settlement under a trust supplied with funds secured by a government guarantee. Land for the purpose might be granted free. There are communities in England, with numbers of people now on the poor-rates, which would be glad to pay the expense of transporting their indigent to such colonies.

To give these people a start and to enable them to work out their own regeneration, is a most worthy object. It has the additional advantage of providing our unsettled lands with settlers under a system which would prevent them leaving the land to join the semidle classes in the larger cities. In his report to the British Colonial Office on this subject, from which much of this information is drawn, Mr. Rider Haggard estimated the cost of settling 1,500 families of 7,500 souls on free grants of land, with a system of equipment, would entail an investment of about one and a half million dollars.



General Booth and His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario.