

any well-considered proposal to obtain immigration from any country on the continent. We made special arrangements to obtain Mennonite emigration when we thought such arrangements were likely to be successful; we endeavoured to secure a German emigration, a Scandinavian and Teutonic immigration and, of course, looked for an increase of population from the United Kingdom; and I entirely agree that if there be any reasonable prospect of obtaining emigration from France, we ought to make every effort to obtain that also. I thoroughly sympathize with the views of the hon. Secretary of State and the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Laurier) and with their natural desire that there should be emigration from that country to Canada, and I see no reason why we should not devote ourselves, if it be proved we can devote ourselves with any reasonable expectation of practical results, to securing emigration from France, as ardently, at any rate, as we do, to secure emigration from Germany or Scandinavia or any of these other quarters. That is the reason I felt it to be necessary, when I saw the report of the High Commissioner and found he had left out France, to call his attention to that omission, and we received from him a short verbal report in the usual flowery language of the hon. gentleman, but which did not contain as much practical information as I would desire as to what had been done or what was contemplated to be done in France. The question is a great one. The hon. gentleman says the population of France remains stationary or diminishes, and that this is due to emigration. He said when he found the population of a country diminishing, he attributed it to emigration. For instance, the population of Ireland diminished, and was there not emigration from Ireland? He put the two things together as cause and effect. We know where the great refuge of immigrants from all nations of the world has been for a long time; we know it has been this continent; we know if there has been a French emigration to a large extent, it has been, unfortunately, not to our side, but to the other side of the line—and we know there has been a larger French emigration to the United States from the little Province of Quebec than from the Empire or Republic of France. Look at the statistics of emigration from France:

“From 1821 to 1830, 8,497, or 850 a year; from 1831 to 1840, 45,575, or 550 a year; from 1841 to 1850, 77,252, or 7,700 a year; from 1851 to 1860, 76,358, or 7,635 a year; from 1861 to 1870, 37,749, or 3,770 a year; from 1871 to 1880, 73,301, or 7,303 a year.”

That has been the emigration of France to the United States. Compare that with the emigration from Quebec to the United States, and compare the population from which the emigration from Quebec is drawn and the population from which the emigration from France is drawn, and then tell me whether France is an emigration country or not. The statistics are not hard to find; they are at hand, and they have been abstracted, not very long ago, from two important and authentic sources of information, the “*Annales Démographiques Internationales*” by Cheroin, and the article on mortality in France in the *Encyclopædic Dictionary of Medical Science*, by Bertillon; and these statistics indicate results which I do not think agree with the view of the hon. Secretary of State, whose view I understood certainly to be, that if the population of France was not increasing rapidly but was stationary, that was due to emigration.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I did not say that. I said that the argument which has been drawn by the hon. member for Quebec was not correct, or logical, or conclusive. It was not because the population of a country was decreasing that one was obliged to say, as he did, that there was no emigration. I said the population of Ireland decreased and there is emigration; therefore, because the population decreased, we must not necessarily conclude there is no emigration.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman desired the House to draw the inference that the decrease was due to emigration, and in that lay the strength of his argument. If you find a country in which, compared to the amount of its population, there is a very small emigration, and if you find that notwithstanding that small emigration the condition of the population is stationary or not increasing, then you certainly find, by these two circumstances, that it is not a very fruitful field for an immigration agency. The condition of things in France is this:

“The several territorial changes that have taken place in France during the past half century have very nearly counterbalanced each other. The annexation of Savoy and Nice, in 1861, brought an addition of 1,346,949 to the population, while the annexation to Germany of Alsace and Lorraine entailed a loss of 1,964,143. Making proper allowance for the slight difference in these figures, we find that the average annual increase of population during the present century in France has been 95,039. The rate, moreover, is not increasing, but, on the contrary, is diminishing. But when we compare these figures with the statistics of the other large nationalities, we discover that there is a startling difference. For example, during the last five years the annual increase of Great Britain and Ireland has been 310,118, that of the German Empire, 493,360, and that of the United States, 1,158,446. These figures reveal the absolute increment to the nations. But when we analyze them, the result is not less striking. We find that for every 10,000 inhabitants in the United States an addition is annually made of 280; in Germany of 115; in Great Britain and Ireland of 101, while in France the increase is only 28. A similar result is reached by an inspection of the excess of births over deaths. In 1879 this excess in Great Britain and Ireland was 436,780; in Germany 592,098, but in France only 96,647.

“These figures are somewhat modified by making the proper deductions for excess of emigration over immigration, inasmuch as the losses to England and Germany are much greater from this source than to France; but the modification is less than at first thought would be supposed. In 1879 the loss to Great Britain and Ireland from this source was 160,157, and to Germany only 28,004, while that of France was 2,793. Even after making all necessary deductions, we find that the net increase in Germany was 564,094; in Great Britain and Ireland, 276,603, while in France it was only 93,854. In view of these suggestive facts, it is a matter of interest to enquire whether this slowness of increase is owing to a low birth rate or to a high rate of mortality. On this subject the statistics give conclusive evidence. For example, in Austria the average annual death rate is one in 310 of the inhabitants; in Italy, one in 340; in Germany, one in 400; in France, one in 450, and in England, one in 500. Thus we see that the death rate in France is more favourable than in any of the other large European nations, with the single exception of England. The cause of the diminishing rate, therefore, must be sought in the decreasing number of births. If we enquire whether the number of marriages has diminished to any very considerable extent, the answer, perhaps contrary to the general impression, must be in the negative. The statistics show that from 1801 to 1865 the number of marriages per year in every 1,000 of the inhabitants slightly increased; and, although since 1865 there has been a slight diminution, the difference is not enough to be taken into serious account. We are, therefore, driven to the conclusion that the chief, if not the only cause of the diminished increase of the population, is to be found in the decreasing average number of births in the French family. This conclusion is strikingly confirmed by the statistics. Bertillon gives a table showing the annual number of births per annum since 1801 for each 1,000 of the inhabitants. The diminution, though not rapid, is very considerable, and what is most remarkable, is so regular that there is no one year in which the rate is not a trifle less than it was in the year that preceded.”

Now, in contradiction to what the hon. member from Manitoba said:

“The diminution, moreover, seems to be characteristic of the rural districts as well as of the cities. In the Department of the Pyrénées, for example, the birth rate in the course of the century has fallen from 44 to 32 per 1,000; in Rhône, from 36 to 26; in Tarn, from 34 to 25, and in Indre, from 37 to 27. But while such are the facts in regard to France, what do we find to be the proportional increase in other European States? The answer is at hand. While the average number of births per 1,000 inhabitants in France is only 26, in Switzerland it is 30; in Denmark, 31; in Norway, 31; in Belgium, 32; in England, 35; in Austria, 38; in Prussia, 35.5; in Saxony, 40, and in Russia, 50. While in Germany, the average number of children per marriage is 5.25, and in England, 4.79; in France it is only 3.31.”

I think these statistics answer the question.

185. To provide for the painting of an historical picture commemorative of the establishment of Confederation (revote).....\$4,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Who has got this in hand, pray? This is an important vote. Who is to commemorate the Fathers of the Confederation, and are they being done cheap? There are some 25 or 30 of them at \$100 a piece.