

The foregoing provisions of the Act of 1910 are quoted to show that Canada, like the United States, was becoming more and more awake to two imperative features of the problem of immigration, first, that the natural resources of the country needed for their development the presence of large numbers of people, but that the exploitation of the country was not synonymous with the exploitation of the immigrant for the latter had rights as a human being whose adoption into the citizenship of Canada must be based on a sound mind in a sound body; and, therefore, secondly, the immigrant as a potential citizen must be selected, safeguarded and helped into the dignity of that position. Indeed the history of immigration legislation in the United States and Canada is an interesting and instructive chapter in humanitarian legislation, and the Canadian law of 1910, despite its defects, placed in the hands of the officials an instrument which at any rate would avoid many of the evils which had been glaring enough in the two preceding decades. Definite conditions for exclusion were now laid down, and certain other conditions had to be fulfilled as a basis for admission. True, the conditions for entry were not so strictly specified as those for exclusion, since it was assumed that if an immigrant did not directly and clearly fall under any of the classes rejected, he would naturally be admitted. But, nevertheless, there was in the Act of 1910 a better instrument than had hitherto been used in Canada for the control of immigration, and if the examinations physical and mental were thoroughly made and ample time given, if possible, for their performance, the decade succeeding 1910 should have better safeguarded Canada's interest than the one preceding. Let us compare the two decades.

For the period 1901-09 inclusive the number of immigrants entering Canada was approximately one and a quarter million—an increase in the population from that source alone of 23%. They came from forty different countries, but the United Kingdom supplied 40%, the United States 32% and the balance of 28% from practically the rest of the world. Out of such different types of people it might be expected that the number of rejections and deportations would be high. Yet the rejections in Canada were much lower proportionally than in the United States if we may assume the year 1908 as typical. That year Canada had 262,469 immigrants, and 1,002 were rejected, a proportion of 1 to 262. In the same year the United States had 782,820 immigrants and 10,907 rejected, or a proportion of 1 to 72. That looks as if Canada were about four times as lenient as the United States in selecting immigrants, or that the immigrants were of a superior type. To settle the last point consider the attitude of the two countries toward the same areas of Europe. For the North and West of Europe including Iceland the ratio of rejections in Canada, for the specified year, was 1 to 876, the ratio in the