

man who goes to Canada is often not much good. The younger men are, in many cases, of small credit to any one; the family type is sound, but it will not prosper in this generation. In England we have lost the "habit" of the land—why, there are few labourers who know how to turn an allotment to profit—and most of our aid or philanthropic societies are handling dwellers in the towns. These, when once in Canada, will doubtless go under, or "clem" out the rest of their weary days; their children and their children's children will be good Canadians and prosperous.

"Ah!" said to me a leading Canadian at Brandon, "no one knows the misery in many of the immigrant homes. I myself saw early this year the home of a family who came out last spring from England and settled well up towards the north. The man was a boot-finisher or something of the kind at home, and knew nothing about the soil. He only broke up some 2 acres of his 160 in the year, and had no crop at all. Throughout the winter, he, his wife, and four children had been simply living on what the man could shoot around him. They had no money to purchase other supplies. No wonder they all looked starved and despondent."

This crystallises one aspect of the matter. English immigrants know little—mostly nothing—about the cultivation of the land. Yet this is hardly the class responsible for originating the byword, "No English need apply." It may have emphasised the soundness of the underlying view, but it did not evoke it. The originators were the remittance man, the ne'er-do-weel, the hopeless younger son, the dumped criminal, the

"no
in-
we
]
cur
are
des
not
exi
a r
do-
to
high
be
seer
quie
alw
whe
was
Sec
cha
ther
a fi
Can
the
Imm
"sor
learn
a hi
a ra
"los
St