

the other hand, everything was made easy. We had no Indian troubles of any importance. We had comparatively good transport, and we had a large immigration (though we could not keep the immigrants for the most part after we got them), yet we made no headway at all in that time; in fact, during a great part of it, if it had not been for the fraction of immigrants we were able to keep, our population would have been absolutely stationary, if not actually decreased. I greatly doubt the accuracy of the figures given in the census of 1891, but if they are assumed to be correct the total increase in the Province of Ontario in the ten years from 1891 to 1901 was barely 68,000 all told, immigrants included. It was given at 2,114,000 in 1891 and at 2,182,000 in 1901. This means that the annual increase was not quite 7,000 a year, or rather less than one-third of one per cent. per annum. Elsewhere it was worse.

REPORTER. At what figure do you estimate the total loss of population in those thirty years?

SIR RICHARD. That is easily calculated. In a country like Canada the population ought to increase by its natural growth at the rate of 25 per cent. in ten years without any aid from immigration. This is at the rate of $2\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. per annum, and is a good deal less than the actual increase which took place in the United States in the years above named, from 1790 to 1820, or the increase in Canada itself in earlier days. At this rate the population of Canada from natural growth alone should have reached 7,000,000 in 1896 instead of 4,800,000. Our total loss in the way of natural increase would, therefore, have amounted to 2,200,000. But besides this, a considerable number of immigrants did actually remain in Canada. Taking these into account we ought to have had a population of not less than 8,000,000 in 1896, and our loss would have been over 3,000,000. Even so, if we had attained 8,000,000 our rate of growth would have been much below that of the United States from 1790 to 1820.

REPORTER. These are terrible figures.

SIR RICHARD. They are, and we lost even more in