

This PDF is a selection from an out-of-print volume from the National Bureau of Economic Research

Volume Title: International Migrations, Volume II: Interpretations

Volume Author/Editor: Walter F. Willcox, editor

Volume Publisher: NBER

Volume ISBN: 0-87014-017-5

Volume URL: <http://www.nber.org/books/will31-1>

Publication Date: 1931

Chapter Title: Canada

Chapter Author: R. H. Coats

Chapter URL: <http://www.nber.org/chapters/c5105>

Chapter pages in book: (p. 123 - 142)

## CHAPTER III

### CANADA<sup>1</sup>

By

R. H. COATS  
Dominion Statistician,

After the fall of Napoleon emigration became for a time a panacea for British social ills. Continuous official records of immigration into Canada begin with 1816, four years earlier than those of the United States. For some years after that date their basis is obscure and possibly variable. The following comparison between the number of immigrants arriving annually at the ports of Quebec and Montreal and the increase in the population of Upper Canada indicated by the annual censuses furnishes some check upon the accuracy of each.

The correlation between the population increases and the immigrant arrivals, 1832-42, shown in Table 41, will be noted at once. It would seem either that a large proportion of the arrivals remained in Upper Canada or that the conditions that brought about immigration also stimulated the natural increase of the population by excess of births over deaths. During the later periods, however, especially 1849-71, there is no such correlation. Attention may be directed particularly to the years 1849-51 and 1852-61. In general the increase of population was greater than the figures of immigration through ocean ports would lead one to expect. No doubt immigration from the United States supplies in part the explanation. The increase 1862-71 was unaccountably low. Emigration is probably the key; the foreign-born population decreased between 1861 and 1871 according to the census returns although in that decade 178,814 settlers entered

<sup>1</sup>[See *International Migrations*, Vol. I, pp. 357-70. See also *Canada Year Book*, 1918, pp. 27-31; *Idem*, 1929, pp. 184-202. Before 1897 "the figures of immigration as published cannot be trusted to furnish accurate information respecting the number of new settlers in Canada. Large numbers of immigrant arrivals in Canada were really destined for the United States and the proportion that actually settled in Canada is a matter of estimate rather than of actual statistics, the figures of settlement in Canada being derived from the reports of the Dominion Land Agents" (*Canada Year Book* 1918, p. 29).—Ed.]

TABLE 41.  
 IMMIGRANT ARRIVALS THROUGH QUEBEC AND MONTREAL  
 AND INCREASE IN POPULATION OF UPPER  
 CANADA COMPARED, 1832-71.  
 (In Thousands)

Year	Immigration	Year	Increase in Population
1832	52	1831-32	27
1833	22	1832-33	32
1834	31	1833-34	26
1835	13	1834-35	26
1836	28	1835-36	27
1837	22	1836-37	23
1838	3	1837-38	2
1839	7	1838-39	10
1840	22	1839-40	23
1841	28	1840-41	24
1842	44	1841-42	31
<u>Average yearly</u>			
1843-48	34	1843-48	40
1849-51	37	1849-51	75
1852-61	20	1852-61	44
1862-71	30	1862-71	22

Canada. The definiteness, however, with which sharp rises and falls in immigration are accompanied by corresponding rises and falls in the increase of population, as in 1837-40, is outstanding.

Another analysis may be based upon the statistics of persons not born in Canada or immigrants as contained in the censuses of 1851 and 1861. In the latter year there were in Canada in round numbers 580,000 immigrants. Now, the number of immigrant arrivals in Upper and Lower Canada, 1827-61, was approximately 680,000, a figure obtained by applying to the gross returns prior to 1851 the proportion *in transit* to the United States shown from that year forward and deducting the result. The difference of 100,000 between these two figures corresponds roughly to the losses that would have occurred from death. Hence, if the census of 1861 is accepted there had been before that year, apparently little loss through the emigration of immigrants. This is indicated also by comparing the increase of immigrants with the arrivals of intending settlers 1851-61. However, as in the early years, there was a considerable emigration, perhaps the immigration subsequent to 1841 was understated.

Do the statistics of natives throw light on this? In the twenty years following 1841 the increase of population according to the census was over 1,500,000 but the reported immigration without allowing for deaths was less than 500,000, a natural increase in the twenty years of over two-thirds of the total increase, is without parallel for all Canada in any later time though perhaps not higher than the rate at times in Quebec. This evidence also suggests that the immigration records for 1841-61 are too low. The stages in the immigration movement after the Dominion of Canada was organized in 1867, described in the following paragraphs, correspond to the general economic trend. A notable increase occurred until 1873, then came a decrease for three years to a minimum in 1876 followed by a sharper increase until 1883, and then slighter irregular fluctuations until almost the close of the century. An extraordinary expansion followed, 1896-1913, when the West came definitely into the Canadian appeal.

The condition of the Dominion in the years which immediately followed confederation warranted a lively optimism. The stage seemed to be set for a steady and prosperous development. Clearly the need of the hour was men. The population was only 3,500,000, Ontario and Quebec containing more than three-quarters of the whole. That agriculture was the mainstay of the country is shown by the fact that the population was, at the time of the first census in 1871, predominantly rural. An energetic settlement policy was launched by both Dominion and Provincial governments. Propaganda began in Europe. Cheap passages by sea were granted, while at the end of the voyage free railway fares assisted in placing settlers in New Brunswick, Ontario, and Quebec. Dominion and Provincial governments spent by 1872 over half a million dollars annually in promoting immigration. The homesteading policy of the United States was imitated. The construction of a Pacific railway was approved and plans to open the West were completed. Under such stimulus immigration mounted from about 12,000 in the first year of the Confederation to about 50,000 in 1873, the crest of the early good times. The latter year was the first in over a quarter of a century in which the number of immigrants declaring their intention of settling in Canada exceeded the number passing through Canada to the United States.<sup>1</sup> Ontario received the lion's share. The Canadian West still lagged for lack of transportation.

<sup>1</sup>[See Volume I, pp. 361, 363, Tables II and V.—Ed.]

With the world-wide depression that set in soon after 1873, signalized by a downward trend in prices that continued almost without interruption until 1896, Canada entered upon a period that tried the faith of those who had builded the Confederation. Before the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, begun in 1881 and completed in 1886, the West had been Canadian only in name. Manufactures were established under the frankly protectionist policy of 1878. Agriculture was diversifying its operations; Ontario in particular turned to animal husbandry and dairying, in which marked progress was recorded, especially after hostile tariffs closed the United States market to barley.

Notwithstanding these changes, immigration and land settlement were disappointingly slow. A bound upward occurred after 1881 when the West was opened and its fertile prairies weremade accessible. Rail connection with the East had been established via St. Paul in 1879, and direct connection via Lake Superior in 1883. The inrush from eastern Canada and the British Isles in 1882 was considerable, the number of immigrants for the first time exceeding 100,000; in 1883 it was larger still and the acreage then homesteaded was not again equalled until 1901. But the hour of the West had not yet struck. After the first rush, tens of thousands of the settlers returned to the East or drifted across the border, swelling that exodus from Canada which was a lamentable feature of succeeding years. The decline in prices through alleged overproduction persisted and struck at the root of agricultural prosperity. Trade in livestock and animal products expanded, and there was some gain in exports of products of the mines, the fisheries and manufactures, but exports of grain and of lumber remained small. In the '90's immigration went back to levels not greatly above those of twenty years before.

This period of probation found its compensation in the recovery which set in soon after 1896, and after 1900 reached the proportions of a "boom." With the advent of the new century came a broadening of credit. Capital in huge amounts began to flow into the undeveloped countries—Argentina, Brazil, Australia, Africa, India, Canada—there to bring larger and larger areas under cultivation. Other countries, like the United States and Japan, made extensive developments on their own capital. Into this movement Canada was rapidly drawn. Of the loans by Great Britain to the whole world during most of these years, Canada received one quarter. Upwards of \$2,500,000,000 were sent to the Dominion be-

tween 1900 and 1914, doubling foreign investments and adding perhaps one-third to the existing capital. The basic motive was the increase of the world supply of cereals, primarily to feed Great Britain's work-shop population. As a preliminary, however, there was need for a huge program of building railways and towns. To meet this the older sections of Canada turned rapidly to industrialism. While agricultural production went up 40 per cent and mining production 65 per cent in the decade 1901-11 there was a doubling of manufacturing output and a trebling of transportation activities, general merchandizing, and banking. The proportion of urban population increased from 37.5 to 45.4 per cent; both railway and municipal facilities were overbuilt, and when the First Balkan War checked the inflow of capital there was serious unemployment, a burdensome cost of living, and other phenomena usual at the close of a trade cycle. Canada in 1914 was in the throes of readjustment.

Of this expansion an unprecedented immigration was the dominant feature. Transportation was made so cheap as to be almost free. Better arrangements were made for the reception and distribution of immigrants. Under such encouragement, arrivals increased by leaps and bounds. After 1902 for 13 years they were steadily over 100,000 a year, over 200,000 in 1907, over 300,000 in 1910, and over 400,000 in 1912.<sup>1</sup> In the decade ending with 1913 over 2.5 million people came into Canada, more than had entered previously in the 36 years since confederation. A century earlier the United States had grown for several decades at the rate of 35 per cent; Canada touched this rate in the decade 1901-11. It is necessary, of course, to distinguish between the permanent additions and those who arrived to work upon the large undertakings and departed when they were finished, fully a third being of the latter class. Aside from the general growth in numbers, an important phenomenon of these years was the redistribution of the Canadian population. In 1901 there were in the three Prairie Provinces but 114,000 persons born in eastern Canada; in 1911 the number was 326,000, nearly three times as many. These settlers, attracted by the free lands, were drawn in large part from the rural districts of the older provinces.

In Canada the immediate economic effects of the World War were beneficial. Many thousands of unemployed were swept into military service. Later came the enormous stimulation of food pro-

<sup>1</sup>[Volume I, p. 364 f, Table VI.—Ed.]

duction which turned to full account the outlay upon the new lands; in two years the wheat crop rose from less than 200,000,000 to more than 400,000,000 bushels. Simultaneously the demand for war materials transformed Canadian industrial plants, swelling their output and increasing their efficiency. Government expenditures on the war, amounting to nearly \$2,000,000,000 were financed without outside help in a country which previously had found it necessary to go abroad for a loan of one-twentieth the amount. Immigration declined to a fraction of the pre-war movement; on the conclusion of peace it did not immediately revive, for the first care of the Canadian Government was the re-establishment of its returned soldiery; even the hectic post-war boom of 1920 was accompanied by an immigration of less than 150,000. With the rise of agricultural prices in 1925, joined to a succession of good crops, the turning point apparently was reached. Immigration in 1924 reached the figure of 1921; in 1927 it again was high and in 1928 higher than for any years since 1914, though less than half the pre-war average.

Let us now attempt a trial balance of the Canadian population in successive decades, using as basic materials the census and the immigration data collected for the present review, the main object being to test the latter. For the earlier decades birth and death statistics are wholly lacking; for the final decade they are incomplete, though they give indications. Emigration figures also are lacking. It is with the latter, perhaps, that the discussion may best start: What has been Canada's loss by emigration?

Two methods of estimate have been applied in the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. The first is based on the natural increase of the population living at the beginning of a decade, and of the immigrant population arriving from year to year during the decade. To estimate the number of births, the number under one year of age at each census was increased by 10 per cent (to allow for short-count), and to the result was added three-quarters of the estimated deaths of infants in the preceding year. Death-rates were estimated by increasing the average death-rate for Canada, 1921-24, the death rates for earlier years being unknown, by the per cent by which the rates in the United Kingdom in earlier years exceeded its average in 1921-24. The resulting rate of natural increase in each census year was applied to the four preceding and the five subsequent years. The difference between the figure obtained in this way for the final year of each decade and that obtained by the

census was regarded as measuring the emigration of the decade. The method involves doubtful assumptions (notably those of uniformity in birth and death rates), and an error in any one of them is cumulative, but it is of interest as a check.

The second method consists in applying mortality rates derived from Massachusetts life tables to quinquennial age groups from 5-9 to 65-69, that is, calculating in each age group at a census the number expected to be alive at the end of the succeeding decade. Subtracting the number of those 5-69 years old at the beginning of the decade, and expected to be alive at its end, from the number actually found alive by the census in the age-groups 15-79, should give the net decennial increase from immigration. Then subtracting from the total immigration during the decade the deaths among them should give the increase from immigration if there had been no emigration. Finally the subtraction of the net decennial increase from immigration from this computed increase should give the loss through emigration. The method is logical and free from cumulative error. A serious omission is that of those surviving immigrants who were under 15 at the date of the later census. Allowing for this,<sup>1</sup> we obtain the estimate of emigration contained in Table 42 for each decade covered by the census since the Dominion was created. It will be seen that a total emigration from Canada since 1871 of approximately 4,300,000 is indicated. The total obtained by the first method is over 5 million, but this is undoubtedly excessive.

The estimated amount of emigration is large, but the relation between Canada and the United States is unique. They have a common boundary for over three thousand miles, and the more populous country (with its similar language and institutions and with organizations throughout the social and economic fields, many extending into Canada) offers numerous opportunities to a mobile

<sup>1</sup>In 1921 the number of British-born and foreign-born under 10 was 13,034. These must have come in during the decade. Further, of 112,424 between the ages of 10 and 15, all must have come in during the decade except those under 5 at the beginning of the decade. Now in 1921 there were 25,947 under 5 years of age, 47,087 of ages 5 to 10, and 112,424 of ages 10 to 15. From these proportions it is safe to assume that of the British-born and foreign-born between 10 and 15 years old between 75 and 80 per cent must have come in during the decade. If the number of immigrants under 15 years of age living in Canada in 1921 who arrived during the decade is thus calculated, and the result subtracted from that obtained without such allowance, the estimate comes very close to one in the latter years based on the number of births, deaths, and immigrants as known. A similar calculation for 1911 (when, however, only the broad age-group 0 to 15 is available for the immigrant-born) gives similar satisfactory results. To avoid over-refinement, a flat rate of 10 per cent is deducted from the number of immigrants arriving during the decade expected to be living at the end as obtained by this method.



TABLE 42.

CANADA'S POPULATION BALANCE, 1861-1921.<sup>a</sup>


---

Decade 1861-71:	
Total Population (1861),	3,156,418
Natural Increase,	727,099
Immigration,	178,814
Emigration,	373,074
Decade 1871-81:	
Total Population (1871),	3,485,761
Natural Increase,	923,077
Immigration,	342,675
Emigration,	426,703
Decade 1881-91:	
Total Population (1881),	4,324,810
Natural Increase,	544,670
Immigration,	886,177
Emigration,	922,418
Decade 1891-1901:	
Total Population (1891),	4,833,239
Natural Increase,	618,692
Immigration,	321,302
Emigration,	401,918
Decade 1901-11:	
Total Population (1901),	5,371,315
Natural Increase,	853,566
Immigration,	1,847,651
Emigration,	865,889
Decade 1911-21:	
Total Population (1911),	7,206,643
Natural Increase,	1,150,659
Immigration,	1,728,921
Emigration,	1,297,740

---

<sup>a</sup>[Compare *Canada Year Book 1929*, p. 94.—Ed.]

people. At least 25 million cross the border yearly in either direction between Canada and the United States.

Of course, both immigration and emigration figures may be too large. On the whole, however, it is preferable to seek the explanation in the fluidity of our immigrant population. This view is borne out by the smallness of the increases in the immigrant

population reported by the census decade by decade as compared with the undoubtedly large volume of new immigration. This fluidity, however, appears to be less in the present century than formerly. The comparison is given in Table 43.

TABLE 43.

IMMIGRATION AND INCREASE OF PERSONS BORN OUTSIDE OF CANADA,  
COMPARED BY DECADES, 1851-1921.

Decade	Total Immigration <sup>a</sup>	Net Increase in Persons Born Outside of Canada
1851-61 <sup>b</sup>	203,743	192,278
1861-71	178,811	-91,074
1871-81	341,995	11,409
1881-91	886,177	40,887
1891-1901	321,302	51,129
1901-11	1,453,391	981,961
1911-21	1,780,688	368,775

<sup>a</sup>Excluding the returning Canadians, cabin passengers, tourists, and immigrants in transit.

<sup>b</sup>Upper and Lower Canada only.

Further analysis reveals an interesting and important trait. In 1921 the total population born outside of Canada was 1,956,000.<sup>1</sup> This was made up (as we know from the census rubric on year of immigration) of 855,000 who came in during 1911-21, or 742,000 who came in during 1901-11, and of 332,000 who came in before 1901.<sup>2</sup> Now, if 1,781,000 immigrants arrived in Canada between 1911 and 1921, while the net increase in population born outside of Canada was only 369,000, clearly a total of 1,412,000 immigrants either emigrated or died during the decade. Again, if 855,000 of the non-Canadian-born in 1921 had arrived during the preceding decade and the total arrivals were 1,781,000, clearly some 926,000 of the 1,412,000 who emigrated or died, 1911-21, had also arrived during that decade. It follows, therefore, that of the total immigrant population who emigrated during this decade, some 400,000 (making allowance for deaths) must have been immigrants who came to the country prior to 1911. The analysis can be carried further back with similar results. In brief, the 332,000

<sup>1</sup>[*Canada Year Book 1929*, page 111.—Ed.]

<sup>2</sup>[*Ibidem*, page 112.—Ed.]

immigrants who were found resident in Canada in 1921 having arrived prior to 1901, are probably not more than one-sixth of the number that might have been of their class in residence. In other words, the tendency in the immigrant to leave Canada is often slow in working itself out; a considerable element in fact may remain for years and then leave. That there are numbers who come in from year to year as short-time labor, leaving their families abroad, is of course immediately reflected in the statistics of the money-order business with countries like Italy, Austria, and Sweden, which undoubtedly represents in large measure the remittance of wages to friends. It is also shown by the surplus of males appearing in the immigration from certain countries.

In fact, a rough measure of the number of Canadian immigrants who enter the country with the intention of remaining may perhaps be obtained by multiplying the number of female immigrants by two. The reasoning is as follows: About two male immigrants come to Canada for every female; if children under 18 are omitted, the discrepancy is still wider. Taken in conjunction with the comparatively small difference between the numbers of the sexes in the total population, one-half of the male immigration is probably transient. This conclusion is buttressed by the fact that over twice as many males as females among the immigrants are reported married. More than half of these married men accordingly did not bring their wives; they may intend to send for them later, but likewise some of the married women may be wives coming to rejoin their husbands.

An inconsistency in the immigration record must be mentioned. From 1866 to 1891 statistics are given for immigrants in transit to the United States, but in later years they disappear. Was the in-transit record based upon the statement of the immigrant? If so, at what point and under what circumstances did these statements, or a record of them, cease? Are in-transit immigrants included in the figures after 1891?

The census counts of Canadian-born in the United States also are of interest. The figures as presented in Table 44 bear out the general trend of emigration already shown. On the whole, we conclude that the immigration figures stand up well under what tests are available.

An interesting addendum is provided by correlating the number of immigrant arrivals from year to year with the number of home-stead entries made. Two analyses of the kind have been made.

TABLE 44.

CANADIAN-BORN IN THE UNITED STATES, 1850-1920.<sup>a</sup>

(In Thousands)

Census	Total	Census	Total
1850	148	1890	981
1860	250	1900	1,180
1870	493	1910	1,210
1880	717	1920	1,138

<sup>a</sup>*U. S. Census 1920*, Vol. 2, page 695. The figures include Newfoundland-born, but the number of the latter was only 13,249 in 1920, and 5,080 in 1910. Prior to the 1910 census no segregation was made of the Newfoundland-born.

It seemed reasonable, first, to suppose that the arrivals of a certain race known to settle on the land in large numbers would show correlation with the homestead entries by members of that race. The Scandinavians were selected and the number of Scandinavian immigrants compared with the number of homestead entries by Scandinavians in the four western provinces, 1891 to 1924. The correlation is not high, presumably because of such interfering factors as settlement on land elsewhere, absorption into other occupations, or emigration to the United States. A second correlation, however, has a stronger bearing upon the point, viz., that between the number of male immigrant arrivals in Canada declaring themselves farmers or farm laborers, and the number of homestead entries made by non-Canadians in the four western provinces. Although interfering factors might be expected here as in the preceding, a remarkably high correlation (over 80) is shown. In effect, the figures reveal that homestead entries by non-Canadians increased on an average by 36 for every 100 arrivals of the type mentioned. This, of course, does not mean that 36 per cent of these arrivals took up homesteads in the four western provinces; that is only one of several possible explanations. The condition which caused the immigration of 100 agriculturists may have been responsible for the increase of 36 homestead entries by non-Canadian agriculturists already in the country, or persons not giving agriculture as their occupation may have taken up some of the homesteads. It is important, however, that the correlation exists, for it indicates that the statement by immigrants of their occupation, past or intended, has value, and this has sometimes been doubted.

The immigration tables show countries of origin, as officially chronicled; for the later years they are given in considerable detail. But the final result of immigration must be read in the decennial census. This reports the place of birth, citizenship, the language of customary speech, the year of immigration for persons born in

TABLE 45.

ORIGINS OF THE PEOPLE ACCORDING TO THE CENSUSES OF  
1871, 1881, 1901, 1911 AND 1921.

The figures for 1871 are for the four original provinces (Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia) only. Origins were not recorded in 1891.

Origins	Enumerated in				
	1871	1881	1901	1911	1921
British—					
English.....	706,369	881,301	1,260,899	1,823,150	2,545,496
Irish.....	846,414	957,403	988,721	1,050,384	1,107,817
Scotch.....	549,946	699,863	800,154	997,880	1,173,637
Other.....	7,773	9,947	13,421	25,571	41,953
<i>Total British.....</i>	<i>2,110,502</i>	<i>2,548,514</i>	<i>3,063,195</i>	<i>3,896,985</i>	<i>4,868,903</i>
French.....	1,082,940	1,298,929	1,649,371	2,054,890	2,452,751
Austrian.....			10,947	42,535	107,671
Belgian.....			2,994	9,593	20,234
Bulgarian and Rumanian.....			354	5,875	15,235
Chinese.....		4,383	17,312	27,774	39,587
Czech (Bohemian and Moravian).....					8,840
Dutch.....	29,662	30,412	33,845	54,986	117,506
Finnish.....			2,502	15,497	21,494
German.....	202,991	254,319	310,501	393,320	294,636
Greek.....			291	3,594	5,740
Hebrew.....	125	667	16,131	75,681	126,196
Hungarian.....			1,549	11,605	13,181
Indian.....	23,035	108,547	127,941 <sup>a</sup>	105,492	110,814
Italian.....	1,035	1,849	10,834	45,411	66,769
Japanese.....			4,738	9,021	15,868
Negro.....	21,496	21,394	17,437	16,877	18,291
Polish.....			6,285	33,365	53,403
Russian.....	607	1,227	19,825	43,142	100,064
Scandinavian <sup>b</sup> .....	1,623	5,223	31,042	107,535	167,359
Serbo-Croatian.....					3,906
Swiss.....	2,962	4,588	3,865	6,625	12,837
Turkish.....			1,681	3,880	313
Ukranian-Bukovinian.....				9,960	1,616
Galician.....			5,682	35,158	24,456
Ruthenian.....			<sup>d</sup>	29,845	16,861
Ukranian.....					63,788
Various.....	1,222	3,952	1,454	20,652	18,915
Unspecified.....	7,561	40,806	31,539	147,345	21,249
Grand Total	3,485,761	4,324,810	5,371,315	7,206,643	8,788,483

<sup>a</sup>Includes "half-breeds". <sup>b</sup>Includes Danish, Icelandic, Norwegian and Swedish; in 1921 they were: 21,124, 15,876, 68,856 and 61,503 respectively. <sup>c</sup>Included with Austrians. <sup>d</sup>Included with Galicians.

TABLE 46.

PER CENT WHICH THE PEOPLE OF EACH RACIAL ORIGIN FORM OF THE TOTAL POPULATION, 1871, 1881, 1901, 1911 and 1921.

Origins	Per cent of population				
	1871	1881	1901	1911	1921
British—					
English.....	20.3	20.4	23.5	25.3	29.0
Irish.....	24.3	22.1	18.4	14.6	12.6
Scotch.....	15.8	16.2	14.9	13.9	13.4
Other.....	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.4
<i>Total British</i> .....	<i>60.6</i>	<i>58.9</i>	<i>57.0</i>	<i>54.1</i>	<i>55.4</i>
French.....	31.1	30.0	30.7	28.5	27.9
Austrian.....			0.2	0.6	1.2
Belgian.....			0.1	0.1	0.2
Bulgarian and Rumanian.....			0.0	0.1	0.2
Chinese.....		0.1	0.3	0.4	0.5
Czech (Bohemian and Moravian).....					0.1
Dutch.....	0.9	0.7	0.6	0.8	1.3
Finnish.....			0.1	0.2	0.2
German.....	5.8	5.9	5.8	5.5	3.4
Greek.....			0.0	0.0	0.1
Hebrew.....		0.0	0.3	1.0	1.4
Hungarian.....			0.0	0.2	0.1
Indian.....	0.7	2.5	2.4	1.5	1.3
Italian.....	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.6	0.8
Japanese.....			0.0	0.1	0.2
Negro.....	0.6	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.2
Polish.....			0.1	0.5	0.6
Russian.....	0.0	0.1	0.4	0.6	1.1
Scandinavian.....	0.0	0.1	0.6	1.5	1.9
Serbo-Croatian.....					0.1
Swiss.....	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2
Turkish.....			0.1	0.1	0.0
Ukranian-Bukovinian.....				0.1	0.0
Galician.....			0.1	0.5	0.3
Ruthenian.....				0.4	0.2
Ukranian.....					0.7
Various.....	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.3	0.2
Unspecified.....	0.2	0.9	0.6	2.0	0.2
<b>Total</b> .....	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

other countries, the birthplace of father and mother, and "racial origin," in the sense of original family habitat. It is possible,

therefore, to trace with some clarity the general "melting-pot" process. Tables 45 and 46 will be of assistance.<sup>1</sup>

British and French form the basis of the Canadian population, but a basis that is shrinking. In 1871 the British were 60.6 per cent, the French 31.1 per cent, and people of other stocks 8.3 per cent of the population. Fifty years later the British had dropped 5.2 per cent to 55.4 per cent and the French 3.2 per cent to 27.9 per cent, a combined decrease of 8.4 per cent, while people of other stocks had increased from 8.3 to 16.7 per cent of the population, thus doubling their earlier proportion. In the '80's the possibilities of the United States as a source of immigration were emphasized, nearly twice as many entering thence as from the United Kingdom, and six times as many as from the continent of Europe. From the standpoint of ultimate derivation, immigrants from the United States may be divided into those of British and those of other origin—the former perhaps 50 per cent of the whole—but all of them have served an apprenticeship to life in the New World. In the '90's British immigration greatly preponderated. The non-British came in strength only after the beginning of the twentieth century, with the movement previously described, which brought 2,000,000 people during the first twelve years. Of these, only 800,000 were British and, though another 700,000 came from the United States, it would be safe to say that more than a third of the 2,000,000 coming directly or through the United States were of continental European races. In 1901 there were roughly 650,000 of "foreign", or non-British non-French, extraction in Canada; in 1921 there were more than twice as many. The problem which the foreign immigrant presents therefore is new, and of considerable proportions.

The stocks of continental Europe are of many types, but they may be grouped as two: those of north-western Europe (chiefly Scandinavian and Germanic) and those of central, southern, and eastern Europe (Slavic, Latin, Hebrew). The significant fact is that, while in the opening decades of the century the number in Canada of persons born in northwestern Europe increased by 80 per cent, the number born in central, southern, and eastern Europe almost trebled. In 1901 the numbers of the two groups were fairly equal, but in 1921 the foreign-born from central, southern and eastern Europe were two and one-half times those from northwestern Europe. Of course, the accumulated stocks including the

<sup>1</sup>[See *Canada Year Book*, 1929, page 114 f.—Ed.]

descendants within the country have not changed in these proportions; those from northwestern Europe remain in excess of the southern, central, and eastern group by approximately 20 per cent, but the gap is rapidly narrowing. In 1900 the excess was more than 5-fold. Next to those of German derivation, if the Scandinavian be divided into Norwegians and Swedes, the Hebrews (who come chiefly from central and eastern Europe) are now the most numerous non-British non-French stock in Canada, followed directly by the Italians and the Russians.

The several nationalities differ widely in their tendency to become naturalized or to "take out papers." Eighty-six per cent of the foreign-born Icelanders are naturalized, but only 5 per cent of the Chinese. The Scandinavians and Germans are among the highest and the southern Europeans among the lowest. Rural dwellers are readiest to naturalize. The percentage of foreign born in the Prairie Provinces who are naturalized is larger by a third than in Ontario or Quebec. Comparing the year of immigration with naturalization, those born in Scandinavia and those born in the United States have naturalized most rapidly, the German and Slavic immigrants more slowly, while the rate for Greeks and Italians is the lowest of all Europeans. Large numbers of these last apparently come to Canada with no intention of becoming citizens.

Deeper indexes than naturalization are racial intermarriage and progress in acquiring the language of the country. The foreign races in Canada show marked differences in the extent to which they have intermarried with one another and with the basic stocks. Orientals, Hebrews, and certain Slavic peoples are practically unassimilable by marriage. Others assimilate readily. Thus 24 per cent of the married males of northwestern European races have married women of British or French origin, but only 5.2 per cent of southeastern and central Europeans have done so. The color barrier is, of course, permanently operative, as the figures of Japanese, Chinese, Indian, and Negro marriages show. Length of residence in the country is another factor. It has had little effect, however, in mitigating the Hebrew aversion to marrying with other races. The Ukrainians likewise, though reckoning 55 per cent of their number as born in Canada, have intermarried racially to an almost negligible extent—not greater than the Negroes or the Chinese—and where they have thus intermarried it has not been with the basic stocks. Much the same is true of the Galicians, Austrians, Poles, and Russians. The Italians have a percentage of



Canadian and American-born about three-quarters that of the Danes, but only a quarter as many Italian men proportionally and only a twenty-fifth as many Italian women have married outside of their race. From the language standpoint, it suffices to say that only three per cent of those belonging to northwestern European races are unable to speak French or English, while 17.5 per cent of the southern, eastern, and central Europeans are unable to do so. The races which intermarry least have shown the least disposition to acquire the national languages.

Two other important characteristics in the immigrant are illiteracy and the tendency to crime. Of the ten most illiterate races in Canada, nine come from southeastern and central Europe, the tenth being Chinese. Those born in northwestern Europe have an illiteracy of under three per cent but the average for those born in southeast and central Europe is 23 per cent, the Ukrainians and Austrians being the highest with 39 and 35 per cent respectively. The good work of the Canadian schools is reflected in the fact that Canadian natives of non-British origin invariably show smaller proportions illiterate than the foreign-born of the same stock. Yet even among the natives, racial tendencies persist over and above the influence of environment; in other words, those races having many illiterates in their native habitat reveal the same pre-eminence (though less marked) in their descendants born in Canada.

Turning to the crime record, reformatory and penitentiary statistics of indictable offenses show that the proportion of convictions for immigrant-born is twice as great as for Canadian-born. Of children in Canada between 10 and 20 years of age and born in northwestern Europe, the Scandinavians had 32 per 100,000 in the reformatories, the Germanic peoples 38, the British 135, the Slavs 166, and the Latins and Greeks had 340. Analyzing by racial strains as distinct from nativity, the percentages of Polish, Russian, and Austrian children in institutions of correction are many times larger than those obtaining for the Germanic and Scandinavian races. The average foreign race shows a marked improvement, however, in the behavior of the children of the second and subsequent generations in Canada. The penitentiary statistics point in much the same direction; crude penitentiary rates per 100,000 for the Canadian-born, British-born, and foreign-born are, in ascending order: 191, 27 and 75. Allowing for sex and age distribution, the problem of law enforcement in respect to major offences is twice as great for the foreign-born as for the Canadian-

born. For males born in the five foreign countries from which the largest number of male immigrants have come in recent years, the penitentiary rates per 100,000 in 1921 were: Russia, 144; Poland, 182; Rumania, 209; Austria, 273; Italy, 337. For males born in northwestern Europe the rate was 59; for those born in south, central, or eastern Europe, 185; for those born in the United States, 159; and for Asiatics, 53. If minor offenses are included, the disparity is about the same, the Canadian-born and British-born being about on a parity, and the rate for the foreign born about twice as high. The relation between criminality and nationalization may be summed up in the statement that of 608 foreign-born inmates of penitentiaries in 1921, the aliens numbered 526 or 87 per cent. Race, however, is undoubtedly a dominating factor in criminality. Irrespective of birth-place, the Negro race is the most criminal in Canada in respect to major offences. The Rumanians, Italians, Greeks, Austrians, Serbians, and Russians scale down from a crude rate of 341 to one of 141, the average for Slavs being 115 and for the Italians and Greeks 252. On the other hand, for Scandinavians the rate was 25, and for the Germanic peoples, 20. These differences persist, though they are reduced in scale, when allowance is made for age and sex distribution.

The point illustrated by several instances above, that racial traits persist, makes the question of relative racial fertility one of importance. From the direct evidence afforded by age distribution, it is apparent that the Slavic, Latin, and Greek races in Canada are much more fertile than British stocks. The French, German, and Scandinavian stocks are also more fertile than the British, but the difference is smaller. These statements take into account both the sex distribution and the infant mortality. Infant mortality rates in 1925 for the average British race were 6.16 per 100 births; for the average Scandinavian race, 5.37; for the average Slavic race, 8.98; for the average Latin and Greek race, 10.73; for the Asiatics, 10.86; and for the French, 11.45. Not only are more immigrants arriving from southern, central, and eastern Europe, but they are reproducing more rapidly after arrival—and this in spite of their higher infant mortality.

From the standpoint of occupation, if to build up the farming class be the aim of immigration then the United States has been the best recruiting ground for Canada. The British immigrant—to about double the extent of the American—goes in for the town trades of manufacturing, transportation, and building. The immigrants

from the continent of Europe enter occupations in proportions very similar to those of the native Canadians. The Asiatics are absorbed in domestic service, fishing, logging, and the lighter forms of agriculture. Of women workers, the largest proportion is found among the Canadian and British-born—in domestic service first, and in manufactures second. Canadian-born women lead in the professions, with women born in the United States second.

An immigration movement of any considerable size sets up certain strains and stresses in the general population. Changes in such particulars as the proportion of the sexes, the marital classes, and age classes, have far-reaching effects on social phenomena. Now, immigrants are preponderantly male, unmarried, and past the age of childhood. Thus for every 100 females there is a surplus of 14 males among the British-born immigrants; of 46 among the southern and eastern European-born; and of 50 among the north-western European-born. As to marital condition, the British-born females show a larger percentage married than the Canadian-born, and the foreign-born a larger percentage than the British-born. Notwithstanding the shortage of immigrant women, the foreign-born males between the ages of 15 and 25 years show larger percentages married than the British or Canadian-born. In age, the proportion of children under 10 is half again as great in the Latin and Greek stocks as in the British, and 25 per cent greater than in the Germanic or Scandinavian. When we speak of race, the varying length of family residence in Canada must be considered. The extent to which the different stocks have their roots in the country is shown by the fact that 97 per cent of the French but only 75 per cent of the British were born in Canada. The Germanic group is the oldest non-British, non-French stock resident in Canada, followed by the Scandinavian.<sup>1</sup> Allowance for these factors has been made in preceding remarks.

The tendency to "urbanization", as measured by the proportion residing in cities of 25,000 or over, is also a factor. In Canada the Hebrews, Greeks, Italians, Chinese, and Negroes, show a pronounced tendency to congregate in populous centers. The British and French races follow, and after them the Slavs, Germans, and

<sup>1</sup>This includes Scandinavians born in the United States. Excluding these, the Slavs, Italians, and Greeks, have a larger proportion of Canadian-born. If length of residence creates a racial type, it is interesting to note that in 1921 there were 4,858,000 Canadian-born having both parents also Canadian-born and therefore a Canadian family residence of at least three generations. Of these there were 2,296,000 of French, and 2,256,000 of British origin. Thus of the non-British, non-French races, there were but 325,352 of three generations family residence.

Scandinavians. The range of urbanization is great, from 80 per cent for the Hebrews to 2.6 per cent for the Ukrainians. The tendency to racial segregation in large cities or isolated rural communities is a check on Canadianization. Another general result of the heavy immigration in recent years and of its distribution in Canada is the differentiation it has produced in the racial structure of the Canadian provinces. Quebec of course remains overwhelmingly French. But the proportion of continental European stocks in the three Prairie Provinces is now three times greater than in Ontario or Nova Scotia, and ten times greater than in Quebec, Prince Edward Island, or New Brunswick. Vice versa, the proportion of British stock in Ontario and the Maritime provinces is nearly half greater than on the prairies. From the standpoint of birthplace, the proportions of the foreign-born range from one per cent in Prince Edward Island to nearly 30 per cent in Alberta and Saskatchewan. Ontario alone has as many British-born as the entire west, while the west, with a combined population smaller than Ontario, has three times as many foreign-born. In a word, not only has the west been thrown into a state of rather violent flux, but there has been a progressive differentiation in the population structure of east and west (carrying the seeds of increase as the fertility rates show).

Canadian immigration policy is now the concern of a distinct Department of Government. From the beginning it has run a consistent course, though more cognizant today than in the past of the many-sided nature of its task. Landmarks in legislation are the Immigration Acts of 1869, 1886, 1906, 1910, and 1924. Their direct effect upon the flow is difficult to establish; like the flow itself, they are result as well as cause. For the most part, these acts aimed at three objectives: propaganda, the protection of the immigrant, and the protection of the country from undesirables. Methods have varied in vigor of execution, if not greatly in principle. Today the policy is one of active encouragement, the Department maintaining elaborate machinery in Great Britain, in the western and northwestern countries of Europe, and in the eastern, central, and western parts of the United States. Lectures, advertisements, and assisted passages are the weapons. Undesirable individuals—the criminal, the vicious, the diseased, the imbecile, the pauper—are excluded, but no support has developed for a quota system like that of the United States. Canada's restrictive policy as yet is purely qualitative and applied to the individual immigrant, not numerical or quantitative; agriculturists with capital,

sound farm laborers and domestic servants are the classes desired; all of these who come are welcome. Orientals are virtually debarred—the Chinese by a head-tax of \$500, the Japanese by a “gentleman’s agreement” whereby the Japanese Government limits the number of passports issued to Japanese emigrants to Canada, the Asiatic Indian by a provision as to continuous passage—and southeastern Europeans are scrutinized with special care. The abuses of the emigrant ship and the crimp have been eliminated. For handling the immigrant on arrival, there are “Commissioners of Immigration” in the eastern, western, and Pacific divisions of Canada. A “Land Settlement” branch of the Department assists the settler in selecting his farm and protects him from exploitation, while special divisions are devoted to the supervision of female and juvenile immigrants. Other departments of the Government coöperate where they can, and several of the provincial governments as well some large private organizations are engaged in the distribution and settlement of immigrants. *Laissez faire* is gone or rapidly passing. The so-called “Empire Settlement Agreement,” under joint direction of the British and Dominion Governments, is designed to encourage dealing with individuals. The broad Canadian objective is so to increase population that the railway problem may disappear and the country may securely dominate its war taxation, as it is already doing.

At what pace will the Canadian population increase? A gain of 2,500,000 or 3,000,000 in the next decade would meet the requirements just mentioned. Not more than half of this can normally come from natural increase. An immigration, therefore, of 200,000 a year would assure Canadian prosperity. Two hundred and fifty thousand would spell “boom.” This is not an “optimum” figure, nor is it based on any special theory of population increase. But it may be noted that, projecting the curves which fit best the observed growth of the several provinces from the earliest times, the total population indicated for 1950 approaches 16,000,000. Such calculations have, of course, a mere *interest de curiosité*; the future of so new a country is on the knees of the gods. Canada grew into existence while the rate of human increase was still moderate, though from the beginning she was a symptom of the new expansion. The world’s population probably did not quite double during the nineteenth century, but Canada’s increased 20-fold. In the future, we may be sure, the vacant spaces of the North American continent will be the habitat of an increasing number of persons and an increasing proportion of mankind.