natural increment, in proportion to the initial population 22·78 per cent., or a total increase of 30 07 per cent. It will be seen thus that on this hypothesis, on the hypothesis that we have received during the decade that immigration which the reports of the Department say we did receive, our comparative failure—because I have shown you that our total increase was but 17·38 per cent., as against an increase in the United States of 30·07 per cent.—was not due to a deficient immigration, because the immigration in the States was 7·29, while ours was 9·05 per cent. on the initial population, making an excess in proportion to the initial population on our side of very considerable proportions. But, while you look at these figures and ascertain that the immigration was more favourable than the immigration for the States, if the figures be true, you find on the other side, that the proportions as to natural increment are nothing less than appalling, because our rate is 8·33 per cent., and the United States rate 22·79 per cent., or nearly three times as large as ours. A more exact enquiry, however, requires the division of the natural increment, and the assignment of a share of the natural increment to the increment on the immigration, because not merely did there subsist at the end of the decade an excess of those who were in the country, but an excess, due to the excess of births over deaths, on the part of those who immigrated. For example, in the United States, assuming the immigration to be equally distributed over the ten years, the rate of increment for such immigration would be about 10 per cent. for the decade, and the result would be: immigration, 2 812,200; natural increment thereon, 281,200; total increase due to immigration, 3,093,400; leaving the natural increment on the old population, 8,501,100, or a rate of a trifle over 22 per cent. of natural increment, and, as near as the data in the United States will permit, I make that out to be the annual increment of their population, as their statistics show, for the last decade, 22 per cent. Now, if you apply to Canada these rates of the United States you will find it as follows: immigration given by the returns of the Department, 333,700; natural increment, 33,400; due to immigration, 367,100, leaving a balance due to natural increase of 272,700, or a rate of only 7·4 per cent. instead of the United States rate of 22 per cent., or about one-third of the United States rate. Had we realized the United States rate, the result would have been this: immigration and increment on immigration, 367,000; increment on the old population, 810,700; total increase, 1,177,700. The actual increase is 639,000, showing a comparative loss of 538,000 souls. Now, the natural increase in England and Wales is, of course, very different from the natural increase in the United States. The conditions are entirely different, and one must not expect to find a natural increment at all so great. I find that, by the last returns, the rate of increment during the last decade was 15·08 per cent, instead of 22 per cent. in the United States; and if you apply even that rate of England and Wales to Canada, the results will be these: immigration, 333,700; increase thereon at 7 per cent., 22,400, a total due to immigration of 356,100, leaving due to increment on the old population, 283,800, or a rate of 7·7, about one-half the British rate, which is so far below the rate we ought to have. Had we realized that rate, the result would have been this: immigration and increment thereon, 356,000; increment on the old population, at 15·08 per cent., 555,700, a total increase of 911,700, as against an actual increase of 639,800, showing a comparative loss of 271,900 by that calculation. Then if you take the mean rate—which I do not believe we ought to take, for I believe that the natural increment on the population is at least as great as the natural increment on the population of the United States — the mean rate between the United States rate and the English rate is 18½, the mean between 15·08 and 22—the immigration would be 333,700; increment thereon,

Mr. BLAKE.

28,400, or a total of 362,100, leaving due to increase on the old population, 277,700, or a rate of 7·42 per cent. instead of 18·5—about two-fifths. If we realized the mean rate, the immigration would be 362,000; increase on the old population, at 18·5, 681,600, giving a total increase of 1,043,600, as against 639,800, showing a comparative loss of 403,800 souls. Now, I do say that the mean rate is too low to take for Canada. We know the boasted fertility of the French Canadian population, and I do not believe that it is reasonable to put the rate of natural increment in that Province at the rate of the United States, in the eastern parts of which we know families are and have been for a long time very small indeed; and there are large families—although they will not compete with those of my hon. friends from Quebec—in the other Provinces of this Dominion; and I see myself no reason why the rate of increment of the United States should not be the rate of increment for Canada. Well now, these results indicate, Sir, conclusively, that there is a leakage some where or other: either that those who are reported as having settled in Canada during the last ten years did not stay here, or that the home population of the country has left it, or both. It is utterly impossible to reconcile the figures I have given, even the least favourable figures, even applying to this new, and young, and vigorous country the rate of increase of England and Wales—it is utterly impossible to reconcile these figures with the facts, as they are, except by adopting one or both of these theories, either that the immigrant population did not stay with us, or that the home population has left us, or both. It would seem that there is a good deal in the view that a large portion of the Canadian population has left us and gone to the United States. By the Census of 1870, the native-born Canadians there were about 490,000, and in 1880, 712,000, out of 6,680,000 foreigners, being over one-tenth of the whole. The increase thereof between 1870 and 1880, was 222,000. But to ascertain how many left us during the decade, you must, of course, make allowances for much more than 222,000, because there did not only enough leave us to increase the numbers at the end of the decade by 222,000, but also to fill up all the gaps created by death in the initial population of 490,000, and in the immigration in the course of ten years. You must find thereon what addition should be made for the decrement by death during that period. Now, the rate of decrement by death in England and Wales during the last decade was 21·27 per cent. A calculation which I have made at a less rate than that, at 2 per cent. a year, would produce results indicating that the decrement of the Canadian born population in the United States, making proper allowances in each year for the immigration, would amount to 123,000 souls in the decade, and thereon you must add that number to the number that I have given as being in the United States in excess of the number there at the commencement of the decade, making a total shown by these figures of about 340,000 souls as the emigration to the United States from Canada during the decade. That there has been a very large depletion of our population, and that it has gone very largely to the United States, is shown also by the contrasted numbers shown by the Census in the United States, of which I will give the round figures of some of the more important:

1870.		1880.
10,600	California	18,800
10,800	Connecticut	16,400
32,400	Illinois	34,000
17,900	Iowa	21,000
5,300	Kansas	12,500
26,200	Maine	37,500
67,700	Massachusetts	116,*00
88,300	Michigan	144,400
16,700	Minnesota	29,600
8,400	Missouri	8,600
2,600	Nebraska	8,600
12,900	New Hampshire	27,100
78,500	New York	83,700