

country ; but I have the strongest objection to seeing our own people driven out of this country, as they are being driven out, and seeing them replaced by a wholly inferior class from the more or less pauperised countries of the old world. I do not know what result is likely to arise from the proposed transference, of which the Minister speaks, of a branch of his department to the Department of the Interior. The mode in which the Department of the Interior has been managed up to the present time, is not calculated to inspire with implicit confidence the members of this House in the wisdom of the proposed change. Up to the present time the Department of the Interior has been nearly as unsuccessful as the Department of Immigration in promoting settlement in our country. The results of the sale of land in the North-West, the results of settlement in the North-West, the extent to which we have deprived ourselves of all control over that territory, are anything but reassuring. On the whole I am inclined to think, if that is to be the policy of the Government, they will do far better to place the money in the hands of the Local Governments in the North-West. They have, at all events, a direct strong personal interest, so to speak, in promoting the settlement of this country, and I am inclined to think they would exert themselves to the best of their power to promote it. I doubt very much whether the Department of the Interior, although it may have certain conveniences such as the hon. gentleman has alluded to, is likely to make any more of a success than the Department of Immigration has done in the way of settling up the North-West, and so far I must say that all we are at present achieving by this expenditure is simply to bring a number of people, more or less unfit for settlement in Canada, into this country. They drift to our large cities and towns, and there, as I have seen, and as everybody who has had anything to do with the charities of these large places know, they form a section of the population of a very undesirable class. There is a small part who no doubt form desirable citizens, but a very large number of them indeed are men whom Canada could do very well without, and who at the very best are exceedingly inferior to the people who are daily and hourly leaving under the present Administration. I must say that I think that the whole of this money we are asked to vote, judging the future by the past, is likely to be entirely wasted unless most radical changes are introduced by the Government in the mode of administration.

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to offer a few remarks, before this item passes, upon the policy of the Government in securing immigration. If we bring immigrants into this country it is necessary, as a preliminary step, to take measures to promote their welfare and comfort, and the policy of the Government should be one conducive to their prosperity, and one calculated to make the country a desirable one for them to live in, one calculated to assist them when they come here to make progress in the accumulation of property, and a policy that would minister to the necessities and wants of the citizens. That there is something wrong with the condition of affairs in this country is evidenced by our census returns and the various sources of information open to us with respect to this matter. We have, as the hon. member for South Oxford (Sir Richard Cartwright)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

said, a very unsatisfactory exhibit made by the last census returns, an exhibit which I am sure must strike with pain every member of the House to whichever side he belongs. The increase of a little less than 12 per cent in our population in the face of the fact that we had received 886,000 immigrants during the ten years, is a very startling revelation. We started at the commencement of the decade closing in 1891, with a population of 4,324,000. The natural increase of population in a country like Canada I estimate at 25 per cent, which is a low estimate. The population of the United States increased over 30 per cent during each decade from 1790 to 1830 ; the natural increase of population between 1830 and 1840 was 29 per cent and a fraction over, and the natural increase in population between 1840 and 1850 was over 25 per cent. So I assume that our natural increase is at least 25 per cent in ten years. If that is the case we should have added to our population 1,081,000, if we had no immigration whatever. But in addition to that natural increase, we have received 886,000 immigrants, or we have received 380,000 more immigrants than our total increase of population during ten years, and this makes no allowance for the difference between the birth rate and death rate of these immigrants, which in ten years would have swollen that number by 50,000 at least. This, however, is not taken as an element in the calculation. When we come to analyse these figures we find that we have lost 380,000—to say nothing of the difference between the birth rate and the death rate of the immigrants we have received—so that, adding the natural increase, we have lost 1,500,000 of our population in round numbers, or, to be more correct, 1,460,000. This is a condition of things that requires consideration. A young country like this with unlimited resources, with millions of acres of fertile lands not yet brought under cultivation, with enormous mineral resources, with enormous timber resources, with the best fisheries in the world, with a good geographical position, one of the provinces having the best commercial position on this continent with respect to the other commonwealths—with all these social, commercial, and climatic conditions, and with an energetic and virtuous population, I say that, under all these circumstances, to present such a showing as we do, with a paltry increase of 504,000 in ten years, an increase of less than 12 per cent, calculating that during that time we received from the old world 886,000 immigrants, it is a state of things that requires most serious consideration. It is time to stop and see what is the matter. This is not a party question ; the life of the nation is at stake. If this condition of things is to continue it is no use to talk of party squabbles and party divisions, because we shall soon have no country unless we can remove the evils now existing and in progress, which threaten to destroy the community. Something has to be done. We are not going to cure this great evil by the voting of a supply of money to induce immigrants to pass through this country on their way to the United States. We must do something to keep our own citizens here. We must do something to keep immigrants from the old world who come here, and unless we can do these things we might as well close up our experiments of creating a nation here. What has to be done? The hon.