

Total rural population, 1901 .....	3,349,516	Estimated rural loss without allowing for natural increase of rural immi- grants .....	340,660
Total rural population, 1911 .....	3,924,394	<i>Canadian Immigration by Years.</i>	
Actual rural increase in census period.	575,878	1901-2 .....	67,379
Actual percentage of rural increase.	17.6	1902-3 .....	128,364
Estimated natural increase at 1.2% per annum .....	401,941	1903-4 .....	130,331
Total urban population, 1901 .....	2,021,799	1904-5 .....	146,266
Total urban population, 1911 .....	3,280,444	1905-6 .....	189,064
Actual increase in census period .....	1,258,645	1906-7 .....	124,667
Actual percentage increase .....	62.5	1907-8 .....	262,469
Estimated natural increase at 1.5 per cent per annum .....	303,269	1908-9 .....	146,908
Total immigration to Canada, 1901- 1911 .....	1,715,326	1909-10 .....	208,794
Estimated farmers and farm laborers, based on 1911 (at 30 per cent.)....	514,597	1910-11 .....	311,084
		Total .....	1,715,326

The first obvious fact gathered from the tables is that the population of the United States increased in the decade just 21 per cent., while that of Canada increased by 34 per cent.

It will be further observed that the urban populations have notably advanced relatively to the totals in both countries, that in the United States from 40.5 to 46.3 per cent. of the total, and that of Canada from 37.7 to 45.6 per cent. of the total in the first instance by almost 6 per cent., and in the latter by 8 per cent.

A still closer examination of the tables shows that the urban population of the United States increased during the period by the enormous amount of 38 per cent., while the rural population increased by only 9.2 per cent. Similarly and in even greater relative proportion in Canada the urban population increased by 62.5 per cent., while the rural increase was only 17.6 per cent.

If we compare the populations which in the two countries might logically be expected in urban and rural districts, we may first estimate the natural increase of that in 1900, which in the urban we may place at 15 per cent. and in the rural at 12 per cent. This in the cities of the United States has been exceeded by 23 per cent., while in the rural population it has fallen to less than 9 per cent. increase over what it was in 1900. In Canada we find that the urban increase has exceeded the normal by 47.5 per cent., and the rural has exceeded the normal by only 5.6 per cent.

At first sight the significance of these comparative figures may not be appreciated until we examine that other influence upon population, viz., immigration.

Thus the total immigration increase in the United States was 11.2 per cent. of the population in 1900, while in Canada it amounted to 31.3 of that in 1901.

Yet another point in the figures is that of the proportion of immigrants who gave farming as their occupation. In the United States the ratio obtained from answers secured at ports of entry was 29 per cent., while in Canada it is estimated at 30 per cent. of the total immigration. Thus in the United States the deficiency in the assumed normal rural increase is over 48 per cent., while that in Canada was 37.5 per cent.

We have thus before us the main facts relating to the urban and rural populations of the two countries, which will help us to study and understand some outstanding phenomena presented by the commercial, industrial, and social life amongst these two peoples in many ways common in their origin and in their civilization.

Most economists are agreed that there is in any well-balanced population a certain proportion of what we may call producers of the raw materials of wealth, which primarily include those foods necessary to the subsistence in health and comfort of any people. As a corollary to this it follows that such foods should be generally distributed and obtainable, at prices possible for every member of such population.

Clearly this depends upon the climate of the country, the industry of the people,