

IMMIGRATION, PAST AND FUTURE.

(Continued.)

BY W. G. SMITH, B.A.

Professor of Psychology, University of Toronto.

THE financial resources required of immigrants by the Order-in-Council of 1908 (see previous article in this Journal, Vol. I, No. 1, p. 57) indicate that governments were becoming alert to the necessity of regulating the immense tide of people flowing to Canada's shores. But that Order-in-Council was only one in a long series of enactments to improve the lot of the immigrant and also to safeguard the interests of such a new and promising country. And the history of legislation in Canada regarding immigration is about as interesting as the similar history of the United States. But Canada had the advantage of being able to profit from the experiences, mistakes, and efforts at correction on the part of her big neighbour to the south. In the years immediately following Confederation the legislation was frequently on the lines already adopted by the United States. The old Passengers' Act of 1825 and 1835 was superseded by new regulations which in turn were superseded by the provisions of the Immigration Act of 1906. But amendments were coming thick and fast, impelled by the features of the immigration tide. The Act of 1906 was amended in 1907 and that again in 1908, and finally in 1910 there issued the most advanced piece of legislation regarding immigration that Canada had yet produced. The complex character of the peoples coming into our midst, the various sources of supply from which it could scarcely be expected that all the immigrants would be highly desirable, the increasing number of rejections and deportations made it imperative that certain conditions of exclusion be clearly laid down. In this Canada followed largely the United States. Both laws excluded idiots, insane, feeble-minded, deaf and dumb, blind, infirm—unless the applicant for admission belonged to a family accompanying him or already in the country and giving security for his permanent support if admitted—persons with loathsome, contagious, or infectious disease; paupers, destitutes, professional beggars, vagrants, or who are likely to become a public charge. But in some matters the hand of Canada was still lenient, for it did not debar the entrance of polygamists, anarchists, contract labourers, nor did it definitely exclude assisted immigrants. In all of these the attitude of the United States was pro-