

Feel 3512
new 1st

CANADA and BRITISH IMMIGRATION

BY

Brigadier-General M. L. Hornby
C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O.
of Lethbridge, Alberta and Invermere, B.C.

PRESENTED TO
ALL MEMBERS OF THE
FEDERAL PARLIAMENT OF CANADA
FEBRUARY, 1936

[SECOND EDITION - MARCH 1936]

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.

PART ONE—CANADA'S NEED OF MORE PEOPLE.

- I. The Objective of Canada's Development in the Past.
- II. Three major Economic Problems now demanding solution.
- III. What the new immigrant really means to Canada.
- IV. Our Manufacturers' and Merchants' interest in immigration.
- V. Some objections to more immigration now—and a reply.

PART TWO—BRITAIN'S EMPIRE MIGRATION POLICY.

- VI. Parliament's favourable outlook on organized Overseas Settlement:
 - i. The 1922 Empire Settlement Act.
 - ii. Report of the Parliamentary Migration Committee (1932).
 - iii. A Bill (1932) to Amend the 1922 Empire Settlement Act.
 - iv. Report of the Empire Development and Settlement Research Committee (1933).
 - v. Proceedings in the House of Commons at Westminster (1934).
- VII. A discordant note—The Report of the Inter-departmental Committee on Migration Policy (1934).
- VIII. The Newcastle-on-Tyne Empire Voluntary Migration Conference (1935).
- IX. Summary of the United Kingdom situation.

PART THREE—A PLAN FOR BRITISH FAMILY FARM SETTLEMENTS IN CANADA.

- X. The mistakes of the past.
- XI. Selection of immigrants.
- XII. A brief outline of the "Hornby Plan."
- XIII. Steps taken in Canada to give effect to the "Hornby Plan."
- XIV. Final settlement.
- XV. The Parent Organization.
- XVI. Table showing the security offered for the expenditures to be made.
- XVII. Cost and value of settlement.
- XVIII. A National Investment for the United Kingdom.

PART FOUR—SUMMING UP.

- XIX. Balance Sheet Changes—Liabilities become Assets—Mutual economic advantages.
- XX. Canada's contribution to settlement, and the chief obstacle.
- XXI. Canada's opportunity.

APPENDIX—SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS.

- Exhibit A.—The Report of the Parliamentary Migration Committee (1932).
- Exhibit B.—Extracts from the Report of the Empire Development and Settlement Research Committee (1933).
- Exhibit C.—Orders of the Day of the House of Commons (Westminster) of January 29th, 1934.
- Exhibit D.—The Newcastle "Brief" (1935).
- Exhibit E.—List of representatives who attended the Newcastle Conference (1935), and messages received.
- Exhibit F.—Resolutions passed in Canada in 1935 in favour of an early resumption of British Immigration, and of the "Hornby Plan."

INTRODUCTION

LETHBRIDGE, ALBERTA,

January 25th, 1936.

The object of this pamphlet is to provide material for a study of one of Canada's most vital and urgent national problems—of the present day and the future—her population problem.

Immigration is a topic which has for several years now been taboo in Canada. But it is a matter which is no less vital for her today than it was five, ten, fifteen or twenty years ago. The question cannot be shelved indefinitely. At the present juncture, when she is in grave economic difficulties, it is perhaps of more immediate importance than it ever was before.

When I speak of immigration, I do not mean the unrestricted immigration of past years—a throwing of the doors wide open, so to speak. I mean the organized immigration of selected families, to be established in self-supporting homes on the land, under a plan of financed and supervised settlement, with guarantees that they will not be allowed to become a burden on the communities which receive them.

I am not, of course, advocating the IMMEDIATE immigration of large numbers of people into Canada. We all know that no such immigration is possible until previous preparation on an ample scale has been made for the newcomers' proper establishment in self-supporting homes. We also know that such preparations require much organization and time. They should, therefore, be commenced at once. What I am advocating is that a Plan should be formulated now, and that the essential preparatory measures should be taken in hand without delay. The carrying out of the essential previous preparations will call for new goods and services on a great scale; will distribute large sums of new money in payment therefor; will give an impetus to new manufacturing; will create new employment; and will act generally as a fillip to business throughout Canada.

* * * * *

Here is a sketch of the ground covered in this pamphlet:

In PART ONE Canada's economic difficulties and their origin are dealt with; as a solution—an early resumption of immigration is advocated; and a reply is made to objections to new immigration now, which are voiced by certain sections of our people.

In PART TWO the emigration policy of the United Kingdom is discussed, and it is shown how the old conception of haphazard overseas settlement is giving way to saner views, which include the proper organization of migration; adequately financed settlement overseas; support and supervision of settlers until they have proved themselves assets to their new communities; and a guarantee to repatriate misfits.

Britain has a large surplus of population, and her declared national policy is to distribute it over the Dominions of the Empire. Canada needs these people. Britain's aim and Canada's in fact dovetail with each other. And there is every reason to believe that Britain intends to finance migration and overseas settlement of the right description.

In PART THREE a detailed Plan of Family Settlement is described, such as should meet the requirements both of Canada and of the United Kingdom. I ask my readers, when they come to consider that Plan, to distinguish between what is our ultimate national aim and what it is immediately possible to achieve. Our ultimate aim is based on our conception of Canada's destiny—that is to be a nation of at least twenty-five millions. But we all know that to reach that objective will take many years. **At present we have to move slowly, laying the permanent foundations for a continuous stream of desirable immigrants.**

In PART FOUR the mutual economic advantages to Canada and to the United Kingdom of an early resumption of immigration are summarized; Canada's contribution to settlement is defined; the chief obstacle to an agreed Settlement Plan is discussed; and the great opportunity now open to Canada is emphasized.

In the Appendix—Exhibits A to F—supporting documents of importance are printed *in extenso*.

* * * * *

If this pamphlet succeeds in promoting study and discussion of the problem with which it deals, it will have served its purpose. Study and discussion are all important. The more closely this vital national problem is studied, and the more fully it is discussed at the present juncture, the better for Canada; and the more publicity too, the better. The whole question is of too great national importance to remain the close preserve of any Government Department. **THE PEOPLE OF CANADA MUST MAKE IT THEIR OWN**, if it is to be solved in such a way that we shall receive that continuous and unbroken flow of good families satisfactorily settled in homes on the land, which is essential to our economic welfare, and without which we shall not achieve our destiny as a nation.

M. L. H.

PART ONE.

CANADA'S NEED OF MORE PEOPLE

Note.—The contents of PART ONE formed the subject matter of addresses given by the Author in cities, towns and villages in Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia, in January, February and March, 1935.

I.

THE OBJECTIVE OF CANADA'S DEVELOPMENT IN THE PAST.

The great development which took place throughout Canada, and particularly in the Canadian West, during the quarter century immediately prior to the recent so called "depression," may be said to have had as its objective the raising of our national population to a total of twenty-five million, of which seven million was to be in the Prairie Provinces. That was the definite and avowed objective which we all had in view. Our development was, in fact, preparation for incoming new population, which we all know that Canada can support, and which we then were agreed and openly declared that she needs.

It was to that end that our governmental structures in the Prairie Provinces were built up—our three Provincial Governments with their large staffs, costly buildings, and high annual overhead. On the basis of the present population of the three Prairie Provinces, which is less than two million five hundred thousand, there is little justification for three separate Provinces and three separate Governmental structures, with their high annual overhead. But there was ample justification for them in the light of our then objective of a seven million population in the Prairie Provinces, and there still is ample justification for them now, if we set ourselves to work without any further delay to realize our former aim and reach the population objective which we have set before ourselves for so many years past.

Similarly, the extensive public services of all sorts, which have been established in our three Prairie Provinces, are hardly justified by our present population,—if only on the grounds that our present population cannot bear the financial burden of them. But they are amply justified if we set to work again, even now, to bring in additional population.

Our railway development too, throughout the three Prairie Provinces, has had as its objective to furnish transportation services for a population at least twice what we at present have. If we had not had as our objective a population of at least seven million in the Prairie Provinces, such extensive railway development would never have been undertaken.

Everyone who has been in close touch with the Prairie Provinces the last twenty-five years will agree that the national objective of a large increase in our population was the sole motive for the great and costly development of all sorts which we have carried out. **Let us bear this in mind when we tackle the solution of the economic problems which confront us today.** Have there been any changes during the past five years either in our conception of our national destiny, or in the capacity of our country to support a larger population? **No! There are no grounds whatever for abandoning our old objective; no reasons why we should not pursue with confidence our former aim of doubling our present population with the least possible delay.**

The kernel of the matter is, then, that with our eyes open, and with the consequences of our actions patent to all of us, we went ahead with the material development of our country—far ahead of our own immediate requirements—in anticipation of an early large increase in our population by immigration. **Can**

we blame anyone but ourselves if we are now drifting—financially—on to the rocks, because we have failed to bring in the additional people required to enable us to carry the heavy financial load which we have—of our own free will—taken up?

II.

OUR PRESENT ECONOMIC PROBLEMS.

After five years of acute "depression," Canada is faced with three serious economic problems requiring immediate solution: **HEAVY TAXATION; RAILWAY DEFICITS; UNEMPLOYMENT.**

While it may be true that there is no single remedy which will of itself alone solve all of these problems, it is safe to say that a wisely formulated policy of organized immigration, in conjunction with a plan of supervised and financed land settlement, will go a long way towards alleviating the troubles that arise from them.

THE BURDEN OF TAXATION.

The burden of our taxation can only be eased in two ways—either by reducing it, or by spreading it over a larger number of persons. Can taxation be reduced? Probably not very much. Moreover,—is it wise to further reduce salaries of public officials and public employment, if we can find any other means of easing the burden of taxation for the existing population? In the judgment of many, our reductions have already gone far enough. The most effective solution of the problem of excessive taxation seems to be to bring in more people,—provided, of course, that they can be settled in such a way as to become self-supporting and not a burden on the communities in which they settle,—that is to say, provided that they can become effective taxpayers, and so share our taxation burdens with us. This, after all, has been our aim in the past, for many years back, when we made the expenditures which we have now to carry by taxation. We must resume the pursuit of our old population aims, if we are to pull out of our present taxation troubles.

At present we are but ten millions carrying the taxation burden of twenty millions.

RAILWAY DEFICITS.

The financial disequilibrium of our railways is due to the undoubted and generally admitted fact that, in comparison with our present population, we have too many railway facilities.

Our railways were constructed to serve a population at least twice as large as our present population. They were intended as a means to achieve our national population aims; if we abandon those aims, a great part of our railways necessarily become an expensive superfluity. A population of 25,000,000 has frequently been put forward as our national objective; and our existing railways were built in order to meet the requirements of a growing population. **A population of 25,000,000 was, and still is, a sane vision**—a conservative conception of what we may reasonably expect to achieve within a comparatively short period, if we go about it in the right way. **Our mistake lies in our failure to bring in new population after having carried out the development necessary in**

order to take care of the immigration in prospect when we incurred the heavy railway expenditures which we now have to carry as a burden.

What is the solution of the problem of insufficient railway revenues to make our two railways economically paying propositions? Fundamentally, there is but one solution—**M O R E T R A F F I C**;—more passengers to carry and more freight to haul. Considerable alleviation is, of course, to be found in a reduction of expenses by co-ordination and unification of services, and by improved methods of administration. But the amount that can be saved in those ways is not the full solution of the problem. **Heavier traffics are necessary, producing larger revenues.** This can only be brought about by means of a larger permanent population along the railway lines. It is true that, should trade revive, traffics would increase; but the amount of increase which can be looked for from an improvement in trade is not likely to be sufficient of itself to enable the railways to earn a return on the large amount of capital which they have spent on their development, particularly in the three Prairie Provinces,—development undertaken, I may again remind you, with the sole object of providing transportation services for a population at least twice our present population.

The problem of Canadian National Railways' deficits in particular is a matter of grave national concern. It is not only the government's problem; it is **OUR** problem—the problem of each citizen and of all. Throughout the length and breadth of Canada, the question is widely discussed, and there is a large measure of agreement that **increased passenger and freight traffics, on a scale adequate to set our National railways on their feet, can only be realized as the result of a larger permanent population in the districts served**—in other words, as the result of a resumption of immigration, in conjunction with a policy of organized and financed land settlement. At many points along the National lines in the west, where prospects for agricultural settlement are excellent—Melfort, Prince Albert, Lashburn, Vermilion, Tofield, Mayerthorpe, Grande Prairie, Prince George, and Vanderhoof—the City, Town and Village Councils and Boards of Trade have already expressed their views to the Federal Government, and have given assurances of their support and co-operation, as will be seen from the Resolutions published in Appendix F.

The cause of the present plight of our railways is that we set ourselves to prepare in advance for our obvious destiny, but have been diverted from the pursuit of our aims. **We are but ten million people, trying to carry a system of railways designed to serve twenty millions.**

UNEMPLOYMENT.

What is the remedy for unemployment? There is only one remedy — **W O R K**. Work is the only real solution for unemployment. How are we going to provide work for our at present unemployed? That is a national problem, requiring immediate solution.

Is it to be by a further extensive programme of public buildings in our cities? I doubt if many will agree with that. We have already a sufficiency of public buildings. They are not revenue producing. They do not provide an actual living for those in occupation of them. On the contrary, they necessitate the levying of additional taxes in order to maintain them.

Shall we create work by further railway development? The answer to this is definitely "No." It need not be discussed further, because at the present time our railway facilities are too great for our existing population, and indeed too great for a very much larger population.

Shall work be created by the construction of homes, and if so, whether in our cities or on the land? Let me remind you here that the construction of small homes is one of the most certain means of distributing wages to a large number of workers and over a large number of industries. If we consider all the materials necessary for the construction of small houses—lumber; hardware of many descriptions; bricks; cement; paper; paint, etc., it is easy to realize how many industries and subsidiary industries are affected by the demand for such materials. Then there are the carpenters and artificers of various sorts employed on the actual work of construction. And finally there is the furnishing of the houses with stoves and heaters; beds and bedding; tables, chairs and cupboards; carpets, rugs and linoleums; china, crockery and cutlery; cooking utensils, etc., etc. The range of industries covered by home building is, in fact, so extensive that it may be said to embrace seventy-five per cent of all our national industries. The construction of large buildings in our cities, on the other hand, does not distribute employment and wages to anything like the same number of persons in proportion to the amount expended; and it makes no call on many industries on which small home building makes heavy demands. The construction of small homes seems then to be the best means of dealing with unemployment at the present time. **It is generally accepted that of any total sum spent on home building, 84% goes to labour.** And our workers do not hoard their earnings; they spend them up to the hilt—on food supplies, and manufactured goods, thus again creating more work for other workers.

* * * * *

To sum up: We need more people to help us to carry the tax burden of the past development of this country; to help us to provide more traffics in order to produce revenue for our railways; and to help us to afford work to our present unemployed,—work which can best be afforded by the construction of small homes. Does not the solution of our present difficulties seem to be, then, new immigration in conjunction with a policy of financed home building for the newcomers?

It seems clear too that the new people must be placed on the land. Our cities and towns are already full enough, while of agricultural land we have much vacant, or only sparsely occupied. On the land the new people can get a good living, raising for themselves most of what they need. They must be so settled that they will have the best possible chance of making themselves self-supporting and independent; and in such a way too that they will be content to remain there. Real homes on the land must be our aim.

Canada must get back to her old objective of a 25,000,000 population; and she must take effective steps towards realizing that objective.

INCREASED POPULATION, SETTLED IN SELF-SUPPORTING HOMES ON THE LAND, WILL GO A LONG WAY TOWARDS SOLVING OUR PRESENT ECONOMIC PROBLEMS.

III.

WHAT NEW IMMIGRATION REALLY MEANS
TO CANADA.**An Employer of Labour—A Provider of Traffic for our Railways—
A Sharer of our Tax Burdens.**

One of the reasons why many are in favour of an early resumption of Immigration into Canada is that it would result in immediate productive employment of our own people.

Organized Labour throughout Canada seems to doubt this, and fears lest new comers to Canada should prove to be competitors for industrial employment, which is scarce enough as it is. This is a complete misconception. If one only thinks of all the various needs of new immigrants, one cannot but realize that **NEW IMMIGRANTS, WITH ADEQUATELY FINANCED SETTLEMENT, WILL CREATE EMPLOYMENT — NOT TAKE AWAY EMPLOYMENT FROM OTHERS.**

Every immigrant who enters Canada, backed by sufficient financial support to become established in a self-sustaining home on the land, is actually an employer of labour on a considerable scale for the first year or two years after his entry into Canada. A house must be built or re-conditioned for him, with a barn and other necessary farm buildings; the lumber, the bricks, the cement, the hardware, and all the other materials required for this work are produced in Canada by Canadian labour, and it is Canadian labour that carries out the work of construction; the fencing required for his farm is constructed of material produced by Canadian labour; the farm machinery and all the equipment and implements which he requires are produced in Canadian factories by Canadian workers; the foundation livestock necessary to give him a start in farming is raised by Canadian farmers and has to be purchased from them; the furniture of his new home—cookstove and heater, beds and mattresses, tables and chairs, carpets and linoleums, china and crockery, glass and cutlery, saucepans and kettles, lamps, buckets, etc., etc.—all these are manufactured right here in Canada by our own people, and for the most part out of Canadian materials; the warm clothing which he needs for his first winter is manufactured in Canadian factories by Canadian labour; the groceries which he requires are Canadian products.

There can be no doubt that organized new immigration, with properly financed land settlement, will immediately and directly alleviate present unemployment in Canada very considerably. It will also create at once, on the part of the re-employed workers, a demand for manufactured goods, which again will lead to further re-employment of industrial workers, and also a demand for farm products such as meat, milk, butter, eggs, etc., which demand cannot but benefit farm workers.

* * * * *

A further direct reaction will be an increase in railway freight traffic and passenger traffic, with probable resultant increases of railway employees. **It is estimated that each new family of five persons means a net revenue of \$177.62 annually to Canadian Railways.**

* * * * *

And as soon as they become established in their new homes and begin to produce, the new people will become effective taxpayers, and share our tax burdens.

* * * * *

The inflow of new immigrants, under a plan of organized migration, and their establishment on the land under a fully financed plan of land settlement, will continue for many years, providing large numbers of Canadian workers with steady employment. Let us remember that Canada, in the past, has been developed largely by immigration and capital. If she so desires, she may again move forward by the same means to employment, better business, and prosperity.

THERE IS A BRIGHT PROSPECT AHEAD FOR CANADA—IF WE DECIDE TO GO FORWARD AGAIN TO OUR OLD OBJECTIVE OF TWENTY-FIVE MILLION POPULATION.

NEW IMMIGRATION IN CONJUNCTION WITH FINANCED LAND SETTLEMENT WILL NOT ONLY GIVE OUR WORKERS THE WORK AND WAGES WHICH THEY ARE ASKING FOR; IT WILL ALSO HELP TO SOLVE OUR RAILWAY PROBLEM; AND IT WILL INCREASE THE NUMBER OF OUR TAXPAYERS TO HELP CARRY OUR TAX BURDENS.

IV.

OUR MANUFACTURERS' AND MERCHANTS' INTEREST IN IMMIGRATION.

That the settlement of new immigrants on the land will increase manufacturing and retail business throughout Canada is beyond argument.

Settlement is made up of what we have, what we produce, and what we manufacture. It consists of land, of which we have plenty to sell; of houses and buildings, or materials to construct houses and buildings, all of which is produced in Canada out of our own primary products, and by our own workmen; of farm implements produced in Canada out of our own material and by our own workmen; of foundation livestock raised in Canada by our own farmers, the result of their labour; of house furniture and equipment, clothing and food supplies, all of which are Canadian products, the result of the work of our own people on materials which we ourselves produce.

* * * * *

The following is a list of industries and trades in Canada which will be favourably affected by organized immigration, in conjunction with financed settlement on the land:

INDUSTRIES.

Logging, and manufacturing of lumber for buildings—shiplap, siding, flooring, etc.
 Manufacture of shingles.
 Sash and door making.
 Paper making.
 Glass making.

Cement making.
 Brick making.
 Manufacture of Paint.
 Manufacture of Hardware :
 Nails
 Door fittings
 Window fittings
 Fencing wire
 Tools of all sorts
 Kettles ; saucepans ; pails, etc.
 Many other items for household use.

Manufacture of cook stoves and heaters.
 Furniture making.
 Manufacture of beds and mattresses.
 Linoleum making.
 Manufacture of crockery.
 Manufacture of household china.
 Manufacture of household glass.
 Manufacture of cutlery.
 The clothing industry.
 Boot making.
 Manufacture of groceries.
 Raising of livestock (farming).
 Production of food (farming).
 Manufacture of farm machinery and implements.
 Transportation (railways).

TRADES.

Carpenters.
 Bricklayers.
 Lathers.
 Plasterers.
 Painters.
 Labourers.

Every Board of Trade and Chamber of Commerce throughout Canada should take up this matter with their representatives in the Federal House of Commons. Let us bear in mind that Canada has been developed in the past by **Immigration supported by Capital**. Through a resumption of Immigration, supported by Capital, she may again move forward by increased employment and better business generally to prosperity, if she so desires, and acts accordingly.

Each new family of five persons means an annual net revenue of \$1562.00 for manufactured goods purchased—according to an estimate made by the Colonization Department of one of our railways.

V.

SOME OBJECTIONS TO NEW IMMIGRATION NOW—
A REPLY.

One of the objections put forward to land settlement by new immigrants at the present time is that we have so many of our own people unemployed, who should be settled on the land before new people are brought in. That argument is based on two misconceptions:

In the first place, it is only a small percentage of our unemployed who are fitted, by training or by inclination, to become farmers. The majority of them are industrial workers and tradesmen, who are quite unadapted for the calling of a farmer.

Moreover we must remember that up till five or six years ago all these industrial workers, or the majority of them, were fully employed at their own callings, because Canada as a whole was busy; the tide of immigration was still flowing; there was a strong demand for manufactured goods of all sorts; new house construction was proceeding at a rapid rate; and generally development and expansion were in full swing. When those conditions come back—as they assuredly will,—every industrial worker will be wanted back again at his old job.

Of what value to Canada would it be, then, to place these unemployed industrial workers on the land as a temporary measure, when it is accepted that the majority of them would seek the first opportunity of getting back to their old jobs. Rather let us seek—by wise national immigration and development policies,—to get them back to their old jobs at once.

* * * * *

On the part of organized labour there is, I know, a deep rooted objection to any new immigration. That objection is based on the assumption that new immigrants would be competitors for existing employment which is scarce enough as it is; and that they would soon stand in the breadline and become a drain on our finances. These ideas are founded on an entire misconception of what properly organised immigration and financed settlement means—a subject which has been fully dealt with in the two preceding chapters.

Considering the great volume of employment to be afforded by properly financed land settlement, there is no class in Canada which should be more in favour of new immigration than our artificers, tradesmen, and manual workers generally.

* * * * *

I am well aware, too, of the objections which our farmers have to new settlement on the land, on the grounds that it will increase production. Farmers need not fear increased production by new settlers. It will not make itself felt for three or four years, and then, if it is properly organized and supervised, as it must be, it will be chiefly in the form of livestock, and other locally consumable products, rather than in wheat.

Moreover, the increased employment for manual workers, in preparing readymade farm homes for the new immigrants; in supplying new implements and tools to operate them; and in providing numerous necessary equipments and supplies will distribute large sums of money in wages, and so create purchasing

power, which in turn will create a demand for farm products—meat, butter, milk, eggs, etc.—and so will tend to raise prices long before any increase in the amount of agricultural products will be felt. And the local price of livestock will be further improved by purchases of foundation livestock for the new settlers. Purchases of land will tend to stabilize land values and to improve its price—a further advantage to farmers. As a farmer myself, I anticipate only advantage from a denser population, and a busier Canada, with more money in the hands of manual workers owing to better employment.

In this connection let me give you some figures, showing the proportions of Canadian farm products consumed internally, and exported,—in the fiscal year 1933-34 (taken from "The Canadian Year Book"):

LIVESTOCK	Domestic	
	Consumption	Export
Cattle and Beef	97.3%	2.7%
Hogs and Pork	95.4	4.6
Sheep and Lambs	99.4	.6
BUTTER	98.9	1.1
POULTRY	98.3	1.7
EGGS	99.8	.2
POTATOES	96.9	3.1
OATS	94.1	5.9
BARLEY	88.2	11.8

The above figures should be studied in conjunction with the figures of our "per-capita" consumption of meat for the past five years, which are as follows, in pounds:

1929	1930	1931	1932	1933	1934
153.09	145.64	148.43	148.60	136.99	(no figures yet published)

It will be noted that our "per-capita" consumption of meat decreased 11% between 1929 and 1933—five years of "depression." The decrease was largely due to the inability of our workers to purchase meat supplies on the same level as in prosperous times. If it were possible to compile figures of the decrease in meat consumption **applicable to our industrial workers only**, the per capita decrease would in all probability be much larger.

A further examination of the figures of home meat consumption and meat exports, given in "The Canada Year Book," shows that if our "per-capita" meat consumption should return to the level of 1929, we should not only have no margin of meats for export but should actually have to import meat on an increased scale in order to meet our own consumption requirements.

Do not all the above figures show that an increased demand for meat, cream, butter, poultry and eggs, arising from increased purchasing power of our largest class of consumers, would create conditions very favourable to "livestock farmers" in the marketing of their products? What would follow? Surely better prices for such agricultural products would follow.

With improved prices for meat, poultry, eggs, cream and butter, farmers who are in a position to raise fodder and to keep livestock, will turn from the exclusive production of wheat for direct marketing to the elevators; the practice of using wheat in conjunction with coarse grains as stock feed will become **more general**; and wheat marketing problems will find a corresponding solution.

PART TWO.

BRITAIN'S EMPIRE MIGRATION POLICY

Introductory Note.

IN PART ONE, Canada's population needs have been examined, and arguments have been put forward in support of the proposition that a resumption of immigration, in conjunction with financed, and supervised settlement on the land, would be to the advantage of all workers in Canada—including manufacturers, merchants, artisans, labourers, and farmers.

Most Canadians will agree with this proposition; but many will ask—and it is quite reasonable that they should ask—the question: “Where is this immigration, adequately financed for settlement on the land under proper supervision, to come from?”

The likelihood of Canada obtaining such immigration from the United Kingdom is discussed in PART TWO. It will be shown that the United Kingdom's national policy has for many years been, and still is, to assist her surplus population to distribute itself over the Empire; that her Parliament has voted money for that purpose; and that her national sentiment has been very clearly expressed several times in recent years in favour of a policy of organized migration, with adequately financed and supervised settlement—a policy which actually dovetails with Canada's needs.

In support of these contentions, official and public documents and reports are quoted, the actual documents and reports being included in the Appendix, Exhibits A, B, C and D.

VI.

PARLIAMENT'S FAVOURABLE OUTLOOK ON ORGANIZED
OVERSEAS SETTLEMENT.

i.

The 1922 Empire Settlement Act.

By the Empire Settlement Act, passed in 1922, Parliament granted up to £3,000,000 annually, from 1922 to 1937, to promote overseas settlement within the Empire. The conditions governing the expenditure of this grant were however too restrictive to admit of its being expended in full on the purpose intended by Parliament, one of the requirements of the Act—the so called "Fifty-Fifty proviso"—being that the Dominion receiving migrants from the United Kingdom must provide half the cost of "settling" them in new homes. The result was that, year by year, moneys which should have been available to promote Empire Settlement, remained unexpended; not one-fifth of the grant has been utilized.

According to a statement made recently in the House of Commons at Westminster by the Dominions' Secretary, out of £39,000,000, which might have been expended between 1922 and 1935, scarcely £7,000,000 has actually been expended—over £30,000,000 remained unspent. This unsatisfactory condition of affairs has been the more subject to criticism because of the simultaneous and continuous decline in the numbers of new British settlers in Canada, concurrently with a comparative increase in the number of foreign-born settlers. The advisability of amending the 1922 Empire Settlement Act has been warmly advocated by members of the House of Commons on several occasions.

* * * * *

ii.

Report of the Joint Parliamentary Migration Committee (1932)

In June 1932, just prior to the Ottawa Economic Conference, the Parliamentary Migration Committee issued a report urging the Government to bring the question of a resumption of Empire migration before the Conference. The report emphasized the views of the committee on the following points:

That, from the population standpoints both of the United Kingdom and of the Dominions, British migration to the Dominions should be resumed as early as possible.

That, from the trade standpoint too, both the United Kingdom and the Dominions would be advantaged by a resumption of Empire migration.

That assisted settlement schemes should be formulated, having as their object the successful establishment of migrants in the overseas Dominions, with provision for the repatriation of misfits.

That, unproductive expenditure on "relief" should be turned to more profitable account in the development of the Empire.

This report, with the names of its signatories, is of such importance, as a spontaneous expression of opinion by a group of notable members of both Houses of Parliament, that it is printed *in extenso* in the Appendix, as Exhibit A.

Though the questions dealt with in this Committee's report were not placed on the agenda of the Ottawa Conference, they were discussed informally with the Department of Immigration by one of the signatories of the report, acting as the representative of the Committee. The result was unsatisfactory, inasmuch as but little encouragement was given to the principles of organized and supervised settlement, put forward by the Committee.

* * * * *

iii.

A Bill (1932) to Amend the 1922 Empire Settlement Act.

Towards the end of 1932 further action was taken by the House of Commons members of the Parliamentary Migration Committee. A bill to amend the 1922 Empire Settlement Act was again introduced into the House of Commons. This bill included:

An increase in the annual grant of £3,000,000.

The abolition of the "Fifty-Fifty proviso."

The appointment of an Empire Settlement Authority.

The bill passed its second reading early in 1933. The Dominions' Secretary, the Rt. Hon. J. H. Thomas, spoke during the debate favourably to the principle of the bill. Although the bill has not yet been carried further, the principle of the United Kingdom shouldering the whole cost of settling her migrants overseas seems to be established in the House of Commons at Westminster.

* * * * *

iv.

Report of the Empire Development and Settlement Research Committee (1933)

In the autumn of the same year, an important report on migration was published—The Report of the Empire Development and Settlement Research Committee. This Committee, composed mainly of members of the House of Commons, was non-party, and was not directly responsible to any organization. Its chairman was Sir Henry Page Croft, M.P. It was formed in March and devoted some nine months to its investigations. A curtailed and extracted version of its report, as circulated later at the Newcastle-on-Tyne Empire Voluntary Migration Conference, is printed in the Appendix, as Exhibit B. Outstanding features of the report were:

The frankness and clearness with which it linked up the problem of continued Empire-wide depression and unemployment, with existing obstacles to migration.

Its condemnation of the system of the dole—when the huge sums of money devoted to it could be used productively and profitably in the development of the Empire.

Its advocacy of the use of Government credit to promote approved Schemes of Empire Development and Settlement.

Its recommendation that an Empire Settlement Board should be set up at the earliest possible moment.

This report merits renewed attention at the present juncture. It should be carefully studied by those seeking facts and figures bearing on the problem of Empire-wide unemployment and its solution.

* * * * *

v.

Proceedings in the House of Commons (1934)

In January, 1934, over 300 Members of the House of Commons signed a Resolution, urging the importance of organized Overseas Settlement. The text of the Resolution, and a list of the signatories, were published in the House of Commons (Westminster) "ORDERS OF THE DAY" of January 29, 1934—an imposing and very important document, which is reproduced in the Appendix, as Exhibit C.

From the debate which took place on this Resolution, it was clear that sentiment in the House of Commons was strongly in favour of early attention being given to Overseas Settlement, as a vital and urgent Empire problem. The Resolution, in a somewhat amended form, was adopted by the Government. Other discussions which took place in Parliament shortly afterwards emphasized the strength of the feeling that Overseas Settlement is a vital and urgent problem, demanding early attention.

During these discussions the House was informed by the Under Secretary of State for the Dominions that an inter-departmental Committee, appointed in 1933 by the Dominions' Secretary to examine the whole question of Migration and Overseas Settlement, was expected to conclude its work shortly, and he undertook, on behalf of the Dominions' Secretary, that when the Committee had presented its report, he would approach the Dominions regarding a resumption of migration. The report was published in September 1934. Unfortunately it took quite a negative view of the possibilities of migration at the present time. It was immediately subjected to adverse criticism by several leading members of Parliament, both in respect of its conclusions and also on the grounds of its lack of vision.

In view of its somewhat discouraging nature, and of the wide publicity given to it, it is advisable to examine both the origin of this report and its conclusions, with a view to forming an estimate of their probable effect on future Empire Migration policy. This will be done in the next chapter.

VII.

A DISCORDANT NOTE—REPORT OF INTER-DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE ON MIGRATION POLICY.

The report of the Inter-departmental Committee on Migration Policy has received, throughout the Empire, so much publicity as an official publication, that it must be dealt with fully here, in order that its value and influence may be assessed correctly.

Notwithstanding the justifiable criticisms directed at its lack of vision and negative attitude towards an early resumption of migration, the report is generally admitted to be worthy of praise as a painstaking effort to carry out a difficult task. The fact that the committee took considerably over a year to complete its task and compile its report, and the very detailed character of the report, are proofs of the care with which the examination of the subject was carried out. The sharp divergence of its opinions, conclusions and recommendations from those of the two earlier reports, mentioned in the preceding chapter, serves to focus attention on the fact that there are two entirely different outlooks on overseas settlement. The report will have served a useful purpose if it does nothing more than afford a comparison of the Departmental point of view with that of members of both Houses of Parliament and other public men, such as composed the Joint Parliamentary Migration Committee (1932), and the Empire Development and Settlement Research Committee (1933), and such as took part in the Newcastle-on-Tyne Voluntary Empire Migration Conference (1935).

It would be unwise to attach to the report of the Inter-departmental Committee an importance based solely on its prestige as an official publication. In assessing its value, other factors also should be taken into consideration, of which the first is its origin,—that is to say, the composition of the Committee which produced it.

This Inter-departmental Committee was appointed by the Dominions' Secretary, and was composed entirely of departmental civil servants, with the single exception of the Rt. Hon. Malcolm MacDonald, M.P., its chairman, who was at that time Under-Secretary of State for the Dominions. Departmental civil servants, as a class, are generally considered to lean towards an ultra-conservative outlook, and to view with some suspicion any proposals or measures which do not carry the seal of established official usage. The composition of this Committee has, therefore, certainly conveyed to some minds an idea of bias in that direction.

The appointment of a committee of departmental civil servants to pronounce on such an important matter as Empire Migration Policy is open to criticism on the grounds that Empire Migration Policy is a matter for the House of Commons to discuss and the Government to decide, the function of departmental civil servants being not to lay down policy, but rather to carry policy into effect, after it has been decided on by the Government. A Royal Commission, or a Committee of the House of Commons would perhaps have been a more suitable instrument for the purpose in view.

It seems unfortunate too that a committee, appointed to consider such an important subject as Empire Migration Policy, should not have

included some Empire statesmen, or at least some persons of recognized practical experience in overseas settlement.

It is to be noted, however, that the **United Kingdom Government have not yet adopted the report, nor expressed any opinion on it; they have simply circulated it to the Overseas Dominions, and asked for their observations.** Time has not yet been allotted for the House of Commons at Westminster to discuss the Report.

Inasmuch as it deals with economic questions which are of a distinctly debatable character, it would certainly be advisable that the Report should be discussed in Parliament. For instance, the following strange doctrine is propounded in the Committee's report:

"The idea that migration can of itself bring about an economic recovery is a fallacy. On the contrary, migration is one of the products of such recovery."

It is to be hoped that such a doctrine will not be accepted as gospel merely because it was enunciated from Whitehall. Many citizens of the Empire hold an entirely different opinion, which is at least worthy of consideration, namely that **Migration is itself a producer of prosperity because—if adequately financed, as it should be—it increases employment, produces new wealth, and creates demands for manufactured goods, thereby encouraging and promoting industry, and acting as a fillip to trade and business generally.**

In this connection it is worth noting that the Parliamentary Migration Committee, composed of members of both Houses of Parliament, which submitted its report to the Government immediately before the 1932 Ottawa Economic Conference, referred to the economic aspect of Migration in the following terms:

"Trade follows migration, and migration encourages trade. Every migrant from the Homeland, who successfully establishes himself overseas, is a prospective purchaser of British goods, and provides employment for other workers in the Homeland and overseas."

The Report of this Joint Parliamentary Committee might well be studied carefully at the present juncture. It is printed *in extenso* as Exhibit A in the Appendix to this pamphlet.

Another instance of a report dealing with economic aspects of migration, and coming to conclusions very different to those of the Inter-departmental Committee, is the report of the Empire Development and Settlement Research Committee on the "Redistribution of the Population of the British Empire," submitted to the Government in November 1933. This Report too merits renewed attention at the present time. It is printed, in a curtailed and extracted form, as Exhibit B in the Appendix to this pamphlet.

The finance of overseas settlement is another debatable question dealt with in the Inter-departmental Committee's Report, on which public discussion would be of value. Should the "FIFTY-FIFTY PROVISIO" of the 1922 Empire Settlement Act be retained or abolished? What should be the contributions of the Dominions? The Inter-departmental Committee in its report recorded

its opinion that the "Fifty-Fifty Proviso" of the 1922 Empire Settlement Act should be adhered to, but made no suggestion that any account should be taken of all that the Dominions are contributing to the satisfactory settlement of new immigrants. The Dominions are contributing practically everything that makes the settlement of the United Kingdom's migrants possible, without subjecting them to the hardships and privations of a pioneer life, for which they are not fitted. The contribution of the Dominions is in the form of the development of their countries and their social and public services—their roads and railways; police and law courts; postal, telegraph and telephone services; marketing facilities; educational facilities — schools, colleges and universities, etc., etc. The Dominions are, in fact, contributing everything that makes the establishment of new settlers possible without the difficult and slow pioneering of twenty-five years ago,—indeed, all that affords the required opportunities for them and their families to "make good" and prosper. **When mention is made of the "Fifty-Fifty principle," what value shall be set on all that?**

Another of the recommendations of the Inter-departmental Committee, from which many persons of practical experience in Empire Settlement will strongly dissent, was that small-group Community Settlements, and indeed any land settlement schemes, should be discouraged. The Committee's opposition to this type of settlement is apparently based on its want of success in the past. Let it be granted that there have been examples in the past of the failure and partial failure of this type of settlement. It can, however, be clearly shown that such failures were due to avoidable mistakes, which were the result of lack of practical knowledge and parsimony on the part of those sponsoring them. An instance of this is the recent Victoria (Australia) Settlement Scheme, the causes of failure of which—all of them avoidable—were revealed by the Report of the Royal Commission, which investigated the settlers' complaints, and particularly in the very detailed and informative schedule contained on pages 23 to 34 of the Commission's Report. Small group Family Settlements are indeed considered by many persons of practical experience in overseas settlement to be the best means of overcoming just those mistakes which the Victoria (Australia) Royal Commission found to be responsible for the failures of the settlers.

The Inter-departmental Committee was evidently out of touch with the views and requirements of the Dominions. It advocated cheap assisted passages for emigrants, but contained little recognition of the Dominions' standpoint,—that the crux of the problem of the transference of people from the United Kingdom to the Dominions is how to settle the migrants satisfactorily after they arrive in the Dominions, and that the cost of this should be borne by the United Kingdom. To the Dominions it is of the first importance that no immigrant should be allowed to land unless he comes to definite and assured employment which will afford him a certain livelihood, or unless he has with him, or is assured of, sufficient funds to enable him to establish himself in a self-supporting home, so that he shall not be a burden on the community which receives him.

It is unfortunate that the Inter-departmental Committee made so little constructive contribution to the solution of the problem with which it dealt. That its final recommendations afforded small hope of an early resumption of overseas settlement, unless some other influences intervened, has however acted as a spur to many who are convinced that an early resumption of Empire Settlement is vital to the well being of the Empire as a whole and of every Dominion.

That conviction, and the determination to pursue their objective, in spite of the discouraging effect of the Inter-departmental Committee's Report, led to the calling of the Newcastle-on-Tyne Empire Voluntary Migration Conference, which is dealt with in the next chapter.

VIII.

THE NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE EMPIRE VOLUNTARY MIGRATION CONFERENCE (1935)

This Conference was held on September 24th and 25th, 1935. It was called by Councillor R. S. Dalglish, then Lord Mayor of Newcastle-on-Tyne. The motives which actuated him, as well as his general views on the migration problem and his opinion as to the form which future overseas settlement should take, are given in his own words, in the following extracts from his stirring and logical address at the opening of the Conference:

“You may ask for an explanation of my reasons for calling this Conference, and these can be summarized briefly:

This Conference has been called, not at the request of the British Government, nor of the Newcastle Migration Committee, nor of the City Council, but on my personal responsibility. Why, then, you may well ask, has this step been taken?

On the Tyneside I am confronted every day with the poverty, the disappointment, the sense of frustration, which fall to those who suffer loss of employment and appear condemned to a stultifying dole-supported existence.

What do I find in my travels abroad? British Dominions suffering from a grave lack of population while we are suffering from over-crowding in the Home Country—millions of undeveloped acres—and people who shake me by the hand and show a ready desire for British companionship and co-operation.

Then the Reports of the Overseas Settlement Committee—in their early years so pleasing and latterly so disappointing. The last Report for the year ended March, 1935, states: ‘Generally speaking, schemes of assisted migration have remained in abeyance.’

Well, I flatly refused to accept such an atmosphere of defeatism and decided to try and focus attention on the steps which should be taken to find the remedy.”

.

“I should like to invite attention to certain matters which seem to me to be at the very root of the grave unemployment problem confronting us today throughout the country, and nowhere more urgently than here on the Tyneside. Let me say first that there is no desire to shift our unemployment burden on to the shoulders of the Overseas Dominions. On the contrary, I am convinced—and the whole past history of the Overseas Dominions bears this out

—that migration from the United Kingdom to the Dominions, if properly financed, will promote employment in the Dominions, give a further impetus to their development, and restore their prosperity. The advantages of organized migration, with adequately financed settlement in the Dominions, will in fact be mutual and reciprocal. I maintain that such a policy is essential to the welfare and indeed to the continued existence of the Empire. Who will people the British Empire if we do not undertake this responsibility ourselves? Those open spaces will be populated in the future. I want to see settlers of British stock there. Let the Dominions rest assured that our people have not deteriorated in their character, their capacity for work, or their will to succeed. If given real opportunities they will not hesitate to take advantage of them.”

.

“In the Home Country we have some two million unemployed men and women. In the Depressed Areas many men have been unemployed for years. Young men, married and with children at school, have never known employment, and thousands of children are growing up for whom, at present, the future holds no hope.

In the Dominions the same problem has to be faced. Secondary industries have been set up and vast effort and money expended in order to prepare the way for greater settlement. None of these undertakings can hope to succeed, nor can they show profitable return so long as the population remains inadequate. Nor can the Home Country absorb the products of the Dominions while hundreds of thousands of our people are unemployed, and the purchasing power of millions is severely restricted. With a quarter of the world's surface at our disposal, thousands of tons of shipping lying idle, a vast financial machine working at only half capacity, and two million men out of work, the future cannot be contemplated with confidence. *But alongside this grave problem lie great opportunities. All the material assets necessary for the successful development of the Empire are at our disposal.*

Under the Empire Settlement Act our Parliament authorized expenditure up to £3,000,000 annually for Migration purposes from 1922 to 1937, and only a tithe of this sum is being spent. I believe that a sound and solid scheme of Migration is essential to our National recovery, because the frozen assets, men and women, millions of pounds sterling, and rich vacant lands throughout the Empire, would be combined and mobilized, and thereby assist to speed up the wheels of industry and commerce, with consequent relief to unemployment and human misery.

Ladies and Gentlemen—these factors and figures speak for themselves. They cry aloud that now is the time to formulate new policies and schemes for Migration. **Not the despatch abroad of a few uncared-for individuals, but for comprehensive colonization—Group Settlements of several hundred families**

and the like who will form a friendly community, carrying prosperity to the Dominions receiving them, and heartfelt wishes of Godspeed from the Home Country they leave behind."

* * * * *

The proceedings of the Conference lasted two days.

During the afternoon session of the first day three Resolutions were passed, and to these a fourth was added later. The text of the Resolutions is as follows:—

1. That this Conference is of opinion that organized migration within the Empire, with adequately financed and properly supervised overseas settlement, will lead to an increase of employment both in the United Kingdom and in many parts of the Overseas Dominions.
2. That this conference calls upon His Majesty's Government to take immediate action to formulate, with the assistance of the Dominions' representatives, and to put into operation, plans which will ensure the speedy commencement of a great voluntary migration movement.
3. That any Resolutions passed at this Voluntary Empire Migration Conference shall be presented formally to His Majesty's Government by a Committee headed by Councillor R. S. Dalglish, and that an agreed explanatory statement be submitted setting forth the lines of policy we advocate, such statement to be communicated to the Press.
4. That a Standing Committee be appointed for the purpose of continuing the work started at this Conference.

* * * * *

On the second day of the Conference, an explanatory statement, setting forth the lines of policy advocated, was agreed and passed. This took the form of a "Brief" or "Statement of Case," which is printed in extenso in the Appendix, as Exhibit D. As a spontaneous expression of belief in organized migration, with adequately financed and properly supervised settlement, affording relief to Empire-wide depression and unemployment, it is worthy of close consideration; the facts put forward in support of its contentions should be carefully weighed.

* * * * *

Finally a Committee or Deputation was appointed by the Conference to present the Resolutions and "Statement of Case" to the Dominions' Secretary, its personnel being as follows:

Chairman—The Lord Mayor of Newcastle-upon-Tyne (Councillor R. S. Dalglish).

Newcastle Migration Committee and Northumberland & Durham Empire Settlement Committee—Sir Arthur W. Lambert, M.C., J.P.

Yorkshire Migration Committee—Coun. R. Thorpe and Mr. J. H. Gough, F.C.I.S., A.S.A.A.

Empire Development & Settlement Research Committee—Sir Henry Page Croft, Bt., C.M.G., M.P., and Mr. A. A. Somerville, M.P.

The Imperial Policy Group—Lord Mansfield, Mr. W. Nunn, M.P., and Mr. Kenneth de Courcy.

Empire Migration Settlement Group—Mr. O. B. Schonegevel, J.P., Mr. Vincent C. Vickers, Mr. H. B. Donaldson and General J. J. H. Nation, C.V.O., D.S.O., M.P.

Trade Union Leaders—Mr. Wm. Westwood, J.P., and Mr. J. S. Bowman.

The National Citizens' Union—Capt. W. Bruce Brown, M.I. Struct. E., and Major M. C. Haines, T.D.

The Birmingham Migration Committee—Lieut.-Col. Cecil Crosskey.

British Empire Service League—Capt. Donald Simson, O.B.E.

Individual capacity—T. Magnay, M.P., Colonel Sir Henry Fairfax-Lucy, W. G. Pearson, M.P., J. J. Lawson, M.P., and two Labour M.P.'s from depressed areas.

One nominee from each of:

- (a) British Empire League.
- (b) Royal Empire Society.
- (c) British Legion.

* * * * *

The presentation of the Resolutions, with the "Statement of Case," by the Committee to the Dominions' Secretary took place at the Dominions' Office, London, on October 24th, 1935. The Dominions' Secretary was accompanied by the Chairman, the Vice-Chairman, and the Secretary of the Overseas Settlement Committee. After delivery of the Conference Report by the Lord Mayor of Newcastle, and speeches by leading members of the Committee, the Dominions' Secretary made a cordial reply, the tenor of which is indicated by the following extracts, taken from the official report of the proceedings:

"I express my thanks to you all for the great voluntary work and the great Empire work you are out to try and accomplish."

"I do not think, in approaching the problem of migration, you must look at it exclusively from the standpoint of cost, because the benefits that will accrue and must accrue from peopling the whole Empire with our own stock cannot be measured in a balance sheet of that kind. Therefore I say straight away that I not only attach importance to the subject, but I welcome your co-operation."

“The spirit of adventure is not entirely lost in this country. There is a lot of talk about people being too spoon-fed, and that people will not take risks, but I want to remind you that for the past five years at least there have been over 50,000 people ready and willing to take their chance if they were given the chance to migrate—that shows conclusively that the spirit is there.”

“I speak for the Government as a whole when I say that if a proper scheme of co-operation, and I mean co-operation with the Dominions as well, if a proper scheme of co-operation can be worked out, the Government will be prepared to give every assistance. . . .”

“. . . I will say no more except that I welcome your offer of help, I welcome your co-operation.”

“I think the case has been well stated, and I shall see that my colleagues in the Cabinet not only have the Newcastle Resolution, but a full statement of what has happened today. . . .”

A list of delegates attending this important Conference, and a selection from messages received from persons unable to attend, is given in the Appendix, as Exhibit E.

IX.

SUMMARY OF THE UNITED KINGDOM SITUATION.

Let us now review the migration position in the United Kingdom.

The following is a summary of what has taken place in recent years:—

i. In the House of Commons, the opinion that the 1922 Empire Settlement Act, with its grant of £3,000,000 annually, has not come up to expectations, has been frequently and warmly expressed. According to figures given by the Dominions' Secretary in the House of Commons, over £30,000,000, which might have been expended is unspent; and it appears from public statements elsewhere that for the last five years over 50,000 persons desirous of migrating have not been accorded facilities to do so.

ii. Several attempts made in the House of Commons to amend the 1922 Act, by removing the “Fifty-Fifty Proviso,” have come to nothing, the most recent being in 1933, when the Dominions' Secretary himself spoke favourably to the principle of the Amending Bill then before Parliament.

iii. In 1932, the Parliamentary Migration Committee, in its Report to the Government, urged an overhaul of Migration Policy and machinery, recommended an early resumption of migration, and advocated the better organization of settlement overseas. (See Appendix, Exhibit A).

iv. In 1933, the Empire Development and Settlement Research Committee issued its Report, urging an early resumption of migration. An outstanding feature of this Report was its recommendation of large expenditures on Empire development and settlement as a means of relieving unemployment both in the United Kingdom and in the Dominions. (See Appendix, Exhibit B.)

v. Early in 1934 over 300 members of the House of Commons signed a Resolution urging the Government to take up the question of organized overseas settlement without delay. (See Appendix, Exhibit C.)

vi. In September 1935 the Inter-departmental Committee on Migration Policy made its Report,—a document of a negative character, not favourable to an early resumption of migration, and definitely discouraging to organized settlement on the land overseas.

vii. In September 1935, a two-day Empire Voluntary Migration Conference was held at Newcastle-on-Tyne. Its Report and "Statement of Case" (see Appendix, Exhibit D), which were warmly in favour of organized migration, with adequately financed and properly supervised settlement, were presented to the Government on October 24th by a Committee led by the Lord Mayor of Newcastle.

IT IS REMARKABLE THAT, WITH THE SOLITARY EXCEPTION OF THE REPORT OF THE INTER-DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE ON MIGRATION POLICY, ALL THE REPORTS AND RESOLUTIONS REFERRED TO WERE DEFINITELY IN FAVOUR OF AN EARLY RESUMPTION OF MIGRATION, WITH ORGANIZED SETTLEMENT OVERSEAS.

* * * * *

Now let us compare the weight behind the conflicting views:

Take the list of twenty-two members of the Joint Parliamentary Migration Committee (1932), published in Appendix A; the list of nine members of the Empire Development and Settlement Research Committee (1933), published in Appendix B; the list of 301 members of Parliament signatories of the "Organized Empire Settlement Resolution," published in the House of Commons (Westminster) Orders of the Day of 29th January 1934—see Appendix C; the list of representatives who attended the Newcastle Empire Voluntary Migration Conference (1935), and supported its Resolutions and "Brief," published in Appendix D. Is not the sum total a weighty showing in favour of organized Empire Migration, and of financed and supervised settlement?

On the other side of the balance, discountenancing organized and financed settlement, there is but the list of members of the Inter-departmental Committee, seven in all, all except one being departmental civil servants.

It is an emphatic line-up of the new outlook on migration against the old methods, which the results of the last decade of Empire Settlement have shown to be inadequate and ineffectual.

* * * * *

Finally let us examine briefly the two conflicting points of view:

Those who stand for **new methods** urge that before there can be any approach to a solution of the migration problem, there is an important question

to be settled—**Is Empire migration and settlement in future to be the haphazard, hit-or-miss, unfinanced, and unsupervised gamble of the past, or is it to be an organized and business-like effort, adequately financed and properly supervised?** They hold that the crux of the problem is how to settle the migrants in the new countries so that they may become self supporting as soon as possible and not be a burden to the communities which receive them.

They do not accept recent statements made in Parliament that the Dominions are not ready for immigration, for they know that this depends on what description of immigration is offered to the Dominions. If, they contend, England has nothing more to offer the Dominions than the worn-out overseas settlement ideas of the past, it is correct to say that the Dominions do not want further immigration; they certainly do not want an influx of new people without any means of self support, who will compete with their industrial workers for such work as is now open. But if England openly offers organized migration, in conjunction with financed and supervised settlement on the land, the answer of the Dominions will be very different. For the Dominions know that the financed settlement of new immigrants means work for many of their at present workless people; they realize that it will, in the course of a short time, be a cure for their unemployment; and they need more British people in order to achieve their destiny.

Is there any reason why migration and overseas settlement should not be adequately financed? Without adequate finance no industry or undertaking can function as it ought to. To deny to overseas settlement the support of state-guaranteed and, therefore, cheap finance, means that the settlement of individual migrants is made too costly for them to bear, while the period within which they can make themselves self-supporting is considerably lengthened, and their ultimate success is prejudiced.

If Britain is prepared to use the national credit to give her people a fair chance in the Dominions overseas, there should be no difficulty in formulating and giving effect to a Plan of Settlement which will be a permanent and most valuable Empire investment, bringing in a return in many ways—by curtailing unemployment both in the United Kingdom and in the Dominions; by increasing Empire trade; by opening up careers for our young people; and in the course of a few years in money interest also.

Against the above contentions, those who oppose an early resumption of migration and are satisfied with the results of the old methods, urge:—

That migration cannot bring about economic recovery being itself but a product of such recovery;

That schemes of organized settlement in the past have not been successful, and that in future all land settlement schemes should be discouraged;

That markets do not exist for the produce of new settlers on the land overseas;

That the best migration policy for the United Kingdom is to wait for recovery in the Dominions, and then to rely on cheap passages, and individual infiltration without organized settlement.

To these arguments the various bodies in favour of organized, financed and supervised overseas settlement reply with the following counter-arguments:

That migration is not merely a product of prosperity, but on the contrary is itself a producer of prosperity for, if properly financed, it increases employment, produces new wealth, creates demands for manufactured goods and for services, and acts generally as a fillip to trade and business;

That where schemes of organized settlement on the land have failed in the past, they have failed owing to avoidable mistakes; and that we can, and must, take our lesson from them;

That the history of Empire Migration and of Empire Trade shows that migration has never waited on markets; that on the contrary, markets have been built up by migration; that "trade follows migration, and migration encourages trade"; and that "every migrant from the home-land who successfully establishes himself overseas, is a customer for British goods, and provides employment for other workers both in the United Kingdom and overseas";

That there is no reason for further delay; that it is a mistake to think that migration from the United Kingdom to the Dominions is not possible as long as there is unemployment in the Dominions; that on the contrary, unemployment, both in the United Kingdom and throughout the Empire, is being fostered by the holding up of migration from the United Kingdom to the Dominions.

*

*

*

*

*

On which of these two conflicting points-of-view the United Kingdom will shape her immediate migration policy remains to be seen. It is however safe to say that she will be guided largely by the views and wishes of the Dominions, as expressed by their Governments.

PART THREE.

A PLAN FOR BRITISH FAMILY FARM SETTLEMENTS IN CANADA

Introductory Note.

In PART ONE Canada's population needs have been discussed.

In PART TWO an outline has been given of the United Kingdom's emigration policy, and of opinion and sentiment both in the House of Commons and among migration associations, which seem to be definitely in favour of organizing migration on a Group Settlement basis, with adequate finance and supervision.

From the facts and considerations set out, and from the contents of the Reports and other documents quoted, it seems clear that the United Kingdom's policy dovetails with Canada's needs. So far, so good. But it is not of itself enough to actually bring about a resumption of migration. A definite Plan of action is required. Without a Plan of action nothing can be accomplished.

In PART THREE a detailed Plan is set out for establishing new British families on the land—a Plan which it is claimed will result in satisfactory settlement and in an unbroken inflow of good immigrants.

X.

MISTAKES OF THE PAST.

In the past, schemes of Overseas Settlement have not given the full success expected from them. The Victoria (Australia) Settlement scandal is fresh in the minds of all of us. In Canada, the Three Thousand Family Settlement Scheme is an instance of only partial success. We cannot, of course, expect 100 per cent success of any Settlement Scheme. But we should be able to go much nearer to success in the future, provided that we are willing to be guided by the experiences of the past.

Unfortunately, the reaction of the authorities, both in London and in Ottawa, to the partial failure of the Three Thousand Family Settlement Scheme and of other Settlement Schemes of the past, is such as to set them against all Schemes for the settlement of migrants on land. They say, illogically, that because they have not made a financial success or a full human success of past Land Settlement Schemes, they will not try any other Land Settlement Scheme. They should rather examine the Settlement Schemes of the past carefully, in the light of up-to-date experience of their working, and try to learn from their mistakes. Many men with practical experience of settlement conditions in Canada can be found to help in such an examination of facts and results. For myself, I believe that the mistakes of past Settlement Schemes can be summed up as follows:

FAULTY METHODS OF SELECTION.

UNSUITABILITY OF LAND.

INADEQUATE FINANCE.

INSUFFICIENT SUPERVISION.

ISOLATION.

Past experience has shown the above mistakes to have contributed largely to the non-success of British Settlers in Canada.

Let us now examine in detail each of the points mentioned:

(1) Selection has not been quite on the right lines.

Though considerable care and attention has been given to this matter by the appointed selectors, in many cases they had not full opportunities of making satisfactory selections. They did not know intimately the people whom they were asked to examine. Their selection was often based on one or more interviews of short duration, and perhaps on a fleeting visit to the home of the prospective settler; that is to say, they were so situated that they could only judge by superficial appearances. But the proper basis for selection of a settler overseas is his character, his ability for hard work, his honesty, and such like qualifications, which are known only to his friends and neighbours in the community in which he lives. It would seem then that representatives of the community in which the prospective overseas-settlers live are the best people to make selections, subject to the proviso that selection must be followed by responsibility on the part of the community for the selected families—for a period of years at any rate—that is to say, that those who select

the settlers should be responsible for their supervision and financial backing until finally and satisfactorily settled overseas, and for returning them to their homes in the Old Country should they prove to be definitely "misfits." All over Canada there is a very strong feeling that proper selection is the foundation of successful settlement, and it is agreed that methods of selection are demanded which will go more deeply and thoroughly into these matters of individual character than has been possible in the past. **The migrant's wife is just as important as the migrant himself.**

(See also Chapter XI., pp. 35, 36, 37.)

(2) **Land.** More care must be taken to see that the land purchased for the use of new settlers shall be of really good quality; suitable in every way for mixed farming; and adjacent to a good market, or a convenient shipping point.

(3) i. **Overloading With Debt.**—A feature of many settlement schemes in the past has been to sell the settler land, implements and livestock "on time," immediately after his arrival in Canada. The result of this is that he is loaded up with a heavy weight of debt before he has had time to look round and get his bearings—a weight which he has great difficulty in carrying and which he often entirely fails to lift. This practice disheartens the settler himself, and frequently leads to financial loss on the part of the Governments or Organizations which have weighted him down with high interest-bearing loans for land, equipment and livestock sold "on time."

These methods must be replaced by some system which will give the new settler time to look around, to get experience in actual farming, and to save a bit of money out of his earnings, before he launches out "on his own."

ii. **Lack of Financial Support at Critical Times.**

There are times in the first few years of every new settler's life when he urgently needs a bit of financial support—when perhaps a few dollars stand between him and the possible loss of his crop, owing to some delay or obstacle which he cannot overcome without a few dollars in his hand; or it may be some matter connected with livestock management. On such occasions he needs someone behind him on whom he can rely. This has been lacking in many settlement schemes.

(4) **Lack of Supervision.**—Inadequacy of supervision is another frequent cause of failure. In many cases, although Supervisors have been appointed to supervise new settlers, they have not been able to carry out their work properly because of the great distances separating the farms of individual settlers. Supervision cannot be adequately or economically carried out unless the farms of individual settlers are closely grouped, so as to make them easily accessible to the Supervisor and so save time and money.

(5) **Isolation.**—A feeling of isolation is a frequent cause of failure on the part of individual settlers. This is especially the case with women. This can be avoided only by closely grouping farms and by settling friends and neighbours from the Old Country in the same locality.

The foregoing considerations would seem to indicate the following principles as applicable to the settlement in Canada of new British immigrants:

(i.) **The initial selection of migrants is the foundation of successful overseas settlement.** This selection can be carried out best by those who know the characters of the intending migrants best—their fellow citizens of the same community. Those who select the migrants should accept responsibility for their selections, by undertaking to establish the selected migrants overseas, and by returning to their Old Country homes those who do not succeed.

(ii.) **All new settlement from the British Isles should be in the already developed districts, in close contact with established markets, not in outlying and not yet fully opened-up areas.** Only really first class land should be purchased.

(iii.) **New settlers require close supervision and support—both agricultural and financial.**

(iv.) **In order that supervision may be effectively exercised, the farms and other holdings occupied by new settlers should be grouped as closely as practicable.**

(v.) **New settlers should be established first as tenants of fully equipped farms on a crop-share-rental basis, until they have found their feet.** They should not be loaded down at the outset with debt, incurred by purchases of land, of equipment, and of livestock. They should not be encouraged to purchase land for themselves until they have proved their capacity to farm as tenants, and have saved some money.

(vi.) **New settlers who do not “make good” should be returned to the United Kingdom by those who sent them out to Canada.**

If the above principles be accepted as a basis for formulating a Settlement Plan, the details of the Plan can be easily worked out.

XI.

SELECTION OF IMMIGRANTS.

This is a subject to which all Canadians rightly attach great importance. Actual methods of selection are however not studied in Canada as fundamentally as they should be. The basic principle of responsibility of selectors for their selections is not appreciated, probably because up to the present no Government has sought to apply it.

When Canadians refer to the necessity of careful selection of new immigrants, they have in mind of course those characteristics which they know are necessary for the success of new immigrants—a capacity for hard work, determination to succeed, honesty, respect for laws and institutions, and such like.

The question is—how are these qualifications to be judged? It is obvious that they cannot be judged in the course of an interview, or even several interviews, or by a visit, or several visits to the homes of the prospective migrants. It does not seem possible that they can be judged except as the result of long acquaintance with the individuals concerned. In other words, it is only the people amongst whom the prospective migrants live, and have lived for a long time, who are capable of judging whether they have all the qualifications which are necessary for success in a new country. One can always obtain, from what should be reliable sources, opinions as to the merits of prospective migrants; but the difficulty is that, where there is no responsibility, particularly financial responsibility, for the opinions given, there is a tendency to give doubtful cases, and sometimes even impossible cases, the benefit of the doubt, and to send them overseas, hoping that they will be lucky.

The problem is how to link up selection with financial and other responsibility. The best way of effecting this is to have those who select the migrants responsible for establishing them in the new country; for supervising and looking after them there, for a certain period; and for returning failures to the place from which they came, without cost to the new country.

In the Plan which I advocate, known as “The Hornby Plan,” the selection of the migrants lies in the hands of Committees of counties and towns in the Old Country, the said Committees being also responsible for establishing the migrants in Canada, and for looking after them until they obtain their Canadian citizenship.

The Federal Government of Canada should continue, by means of its inspections carried out in the United Kingdom before the prospective migrants are accepted for immigration into Canada, to eliminate all who have bad health and medical histories, or whose forebears had undesirable health or medical histories.

* * * * *

There are in Canada, I know, some people who have doubts as to whether men and women of the successful settler type can be obtained any longer from the Old Country. The recent numerous deportations of unsuccessful British settlers lend support to such views. But I believe that the unfortunate deportees were rather victims of an unthorough settlement policy. My intimate knowledge of both agricultural and industrial workers in the United Kingdom, from such widely different communities as Shropshire, Lancashire, the West Riding and Sussex, enables me to express my very confident opinion that there is in the Old Country no lack of the right material for successful overseas settlement—provided that a sane and safe policy of settlement is adhered to. And as a result of my experience in Western Canada during the past ten years, I can say with assurance that there is nothing whatever to prevent a willing worker from any part of the United Kingdom making a success of his new life here—if only he is given a **FAIR START**. **In cases where a new settler fails, the fault often lies with those who should have given him a fair start, but failed to do so.**

* * * * *

There is an idea prevalent in Canada that prospective immigrants, who have been on the "dole" in the United Kingdom, are not likely to make good settlers in Canada or satisfactory Canadian citizens. Although there is no substantial foundation for such an idea, it is as well to examine it, and to place before students of Canada's population problem considerations which will help them to form their own opinion on this point.

What matters, after all is said and done, is NOT whether a man has had the bad luck, in times when employment was scarce, to lose his job and not to have found another; the important thing is his character and capacity. Who are we in Canada, with so many of our own people in unemployment, to turn down an immigrant simply because he has had the bad luck to be unemployed for some period of time, if he comes to us with such backing and finance behind him, as can give him and his family a fresh start? What would some of our own unemployed people say to such a verdict in their own case?

* * * * *

What both England and Canada need is a system which will ensure that prospective migrants are selected on their character and qualifications, by those who are best qualified to know them, placing at the same time on the selectors some responsibility for looking after their fellow citizens in their new life overseas, until such time as they have become assets to the new country and have obtained its citizenship.

XII.

A BRIEF OUTLINE OF THE "HORNBY PLAN."

The objective of the HORNBY PLAN is to establish in Canada a number of what may be called Foundation Community Family Farm Settlements, that is to say, small Communities of selected British families, established on areas of proven good "mixed farming" land, to be sponsored by approved Voluntary Migration Committees of Counties and Towns in the United Kingdom.

Each Committee will acquire by purchase from 5,000 to 15,000 acres of well situated farm lands, suitable for "mixed farming," consisting of 75 to 100 developed and partly developed farms, not necessarily contiguous to each other but grouped closely enough to make supervision convenient. These farms will be held by the Committee in perpetuity; they will not be sold to the individual settlers, but will be worked by the settlers on a rental basis, the rentals being a proportion of the annual produce. Each Committee in the United Kingdom will select a Settlement Manager or Agent, from the district in the United Kingdom from which the settlers come. This manager will be responsible for the management of the Settlement as a whole, particularly for its finance and for its human or social side. He will have the assistance of an Agricultural Supervisor, or Field Foreman, and of other staff, all with local Canadian experience. The purchased land will, if necessary, be further subdivided into suitable farm holdings of varying sizes, and developed by erecting new buildings, and reconditioning old ones. Each holding will be equipped with the necessary dwelling and buildings, and will be supplied with livestock, implements, and everything else necessary to make it a going concern. The Manager will live with the Community to look after its interests.

The Committee in the United Kingdom will, with the assistance of a representative from the district in Canada, select the settler families, and will send them out to Canada when notified by the Settlement Manager that Farms are available and ready. The new families will be met on arrival by the Settlement Manager, who will assign their holdings. The settlers will be provided with all necessities until their first crop is reaped. The settler's obligation, outside of the maintenance of his family, will be limited to the payment of a rental of one-half of the produce and other returns of the farm, or such other proportion as might be agreed on.

It is not the purpose of the Scheme that the settlers remain permanently tenants on the Committee's lands. After having proved their ability to farm as tenants, they will be encouraged to "branch off," so to speak, and acquire farms of their own. The aim is to let the settler gain experience of farming by Canadian methods and save as much as possible out of his returns during the first three to five years, or longer where necessary. Assuming that he saves \$1,000,—it is the intention to arrange, through the County Committee concerned, for a personal loan of at least an equal amount at a low rate of interest, to enable the settler to start on his own. The Settlement Manager would assist him to select and purchase land, and where possible would loan him stock and equipment until he is in a position to purchase for himself. The farms vacated by the "branching off" settlers would be occupied at once by new settlers sent out by the Old Country Committee; thus a continuous inflow of British families into the district concerned would be assured. Settlers who do not prove their ability to farm within five years will be returned to the Old Country by those who sent them out, without expense to the Canadian Government or other public authority in Canada.

The beginnings of these Community Farm Settlements will necessarily take time, and their success can only be built up gradually. But they will eventually lead to a great voluntary, and continuous migration movement from the United Kingdom. They will offer a natural channel for a free, spontaneous and automatic stream of carefully selected migrants, and will be a guarantee that the latter will not become a burden on the Dominion. They will afford openings, opportunities and careers to thousands of young people in Great Britain, who are desirous of trying their luck in the Overseas Dominions, if only they can get a foothold there. They will undoubtedly lead to a continually increasing amount of "individual infiltration," and they will assure continuity of orderly settlement.

In addition to the new settlers arriving each year to replace the farmers who, having acquired experience of farming under Canadian conditions, move off the Foundation Settlement to take up farms of their own, thus making room for new settlers—there would probably be room on each Settlement for a number of un-married young men from the Old Country to be taken in every year as agricultural workers. These young men would in the course of time themselves purchase or rent farms outside the Foundation Settlement, and so would make way for other young agricultural labourers from the Old Country. Probably a number of young women also would arrive at each Settlement every year from the Old Country; by degrees they would find their way into domestic service in the nearby cities and towns, or would "infiltrate" by marriage, making way for other young women from the Old Country. There would be room too

for a number of juveniles, boys and girls, to join each Settlement every year; under a competent Settlement Manager, it would not be difficult to place such juveniles in good families on the Community Settlement, where they would be well looked after, and trained; they too would by degrees be absorbed by infiltration into the general community.

STEPS TAKEN IN CANADA TO GIVE EFFECT TO THE HORNBY PLAN.
ENDORSEMENT BY PUBLIC BODIES CONCERNED.

N.B.—For details of Resolutions by Public Bodies, see Appendix, Exhibit F.

Fifteen (15) detailed Schemes for local Farm Settlements for incoming British Families have now been completed, namely:

PROVINCE OF NOVA SCOTIA:

A Settlement of 50 Farms in CUMBERLAND County, near AMHERST.

PROVINCE OF NEW BRUNSWICK:

A Settlement of 60 Farms in YORK County, near HARVEY.

PROVINCE OF QUEBEC — EASTERN TOWNSHIPS:

A Settlement of 100 Farms in COMPTON County.
 A Settlement of 100 Farms in RICHMOND County.
 A Settlement of 100 Farms in MISSISQUOI-BROME.

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO:

A Settlement of 100 Farms in STORMONT County.
 A Settlement of 100 Farms in OXFORD County.
 A Settlement of 100 Farms in BRANT County.
 A Settlement of 100 Farms in GLENGARRY County.

PROVINCE OF MANITOBA:

A Settlement of 100 Farms in the BIRTLE District.

PROVINCE OF SASKATCHEWAN:

A Settlement of 100 Farms in the WOLSELEY District.

These three Settlements are sponsored by the Eastern Townships Settlement Society.

Under the sponsorship of the Maple Leaf Colonization Committee.
 Sponsored by the Oxford County Council.
 Resolutions in favour of this Settlement have been passed by the Brant County Council, and by the Burford Municipal Council.

Resolutions in favour of this Settlement have been passed by the Town Council and Board of Trade of the Town of Wolseley, and by the Municipal District of Wolseley.

Resolutions in favour of these Settlements have been passed by the local Boards of Trade and Town Councils. FINAL SETTLEMENT of all settlers, who "make good" and have the necessary cash resources, will be arranged by the Canadian National Land Settlement Association.

Resolutions in favour of these Settlements have been passed by the local Boards of Trade and Town Councils. FINAL SETTLEMENT of all settlers, who "make good" and have the necessary cash resources, will be arranged by the Canadian National Land Settlement Association.

A Settlement of 100 Farms in the MELFORT District.

A Settlement of 100 Farms in the LASHBURN District.

PROVINCE OF ALBERTA:

A Settlement of 100 Farms in the MAYERTHORPE District, N. W. of Edmonton.

A Settlement of 100 Farms at GRANDE PRAIRIE, in the Peace River District.

Each Scheme gives a full description of the district in which the Settlement is; its proved agricultural possibilities; its markets; its road and railway communications; its educational facilities; and its social amenities. It also includes a report on each of the 100 "earmarked" farms, which make up the Settlement. Copies of the Schemes have been forwarded to the proper authorities both in Canada and in the United Kingdom, and to other interested organizations and persons.

41

OTHER SCHEMES ARE IN COURSE OF PREPARATION.

It is proposed to link up each of the above Settlements with a County or Town in the United Kingdom as soon as circumstances permit.

The above mentioned fifteen Settlements, each 100 Farms (more or less) are but a first step toward what may become a great overseas migration movement from the Old Country to Canada—a voluntary, spontaneous, and continuous movement, involving the establishment of 250 such Community Settlements, 25,000 Farms in all, absorbing at the outset 25,000 new settler families, 125,000 persons, and maintaining an uninterrupted flow of 5,000 families, 25,000 persons, to Canada every year. Every County in the United Kingdom, and every Town of importance should have its Community Settlement in Canada, to take care of its selected emigrants, and to offer opportunities, openings and careers to thousands of young people who are desirous of emigrating to Canada if only they can find a foothold there.

Copies of all the detailed Schemes have been filed at the Office of the Overseas Settlement Department, Caxton House, Tothill Street, Westminster, S.W.1.

Copies have also been distributed to the Secretaries of the Voluntary Migration Committees of the following Counties:

NORTHUMBERLAND - SHROPSHIRE - YORKSHIRE - WARWICKSHIRE - DERBYSHIRE
ESSEX - CHESHIRE and LANCASHIRE.

XIV. .

FINAL SETTLEMENT.

As has been explained already in Chapter XII., it is not the purpose of the "Hornby Plan" that the settlers remain permanently tenants on the Committee's lands. **After having proved their ability to farm as tenants**, they will be encouraged to "branch off," so to speak, and acquire farms of their own. **The aim is to let the settler gain experience of farming by Canadian methods**, and save as much as possible out of his returns during the first three to five years, or longer where necessary. Assuming that he saves \$1,000,—it is the intention to arrange, through the County Committee concerned, for a personal loan of at least an equal amount at a low rate of interest, to enable the settler to start on his own. The Settlement Manager would assist him to select and purchase land, and where possible would loan him stock and equipment until he is in a position to purchase for himself. The farms vacated by the "branching off" settlers would be occupied at once by new settlers sent out by the Old-Country Committee; thus a continuous inflow of British families into the district concerned would be assured. Settlers who do not prove their ability to farm within five years will be returned to the Old Country by those who sent them out, without expense to the Canadian Government or other public authority in Canada.

This plan for final settlement is based on the principle that what the newcomer chiefly needs is **experience**. He needs not only experience of Canadian farming methods, of the seasons, and of the type of weather that he has to contend with; he also needs experience of the values of land, livestock, and implements; he needs too, experience of the amount of accommodation and shelter required for livestock, and the relative cost of different types of accommodation and shelter; above all, he needs experience to tell him what description of farming his own particular qualifications and tastes fit him for. One man may decide on dairy farming, another on poultry farming, another on general farming, and so on. Need any more be said in order to show how essential it is that the new settler on the land should get experience before he is allowed to invest any capital in farming operations. The Plan described herein has as its object to first give him such experience, by putting him to farm for a few years as a tenant under supervision, and then helping him to make a start for himself, after he has acquired the necessary experience to enable him to know what description of farming is best for him, and how to invest some capital in it advantageously.

Another reason for insisting on this probationary period as a tenant farmer is to ascertain if the new settler possesses those qualities of grit, determination, and adaptability to new circumstances, which are so essential to his success, the object in view being to restrict the "starting off" loans to those who are fitted to use them advantageously.

The "Hornby Plan" was criticised in the Report of the Inter-departmental Committee, in respect of the details of final settlement, on two grounds, namely:

That it is unlikely that a new settler would save \$1,000 in his first five years of farming in Canada; and

That \$2,000 is insufficient for a farmer to set himself up in farming.

The reply to the first of these criticisms is that it is due to misconception of agricultural and settlement conditions in Canada. It is the opinion of experienced settlement organizations in Canada that a new settler, placed under supervision on a well developed farm, fully equipped with implements and with livestock, situated in an existing and thriving community, in proximity to a good market, with no cash or other obligations except the payment of a stated proportion of his crop as rental for his land, should certainly be able to save an average of \$200 every year over five average years.

The reply to the second criticism, too is that it is due to a misconception of settlement conditions in Canada. It is the opinion of experienced settlement organizations in Canada that a new settler, with five years' experience of farming in Canada under adequate supervision, and with \$2,000 available to set himself up in a farm of his own, should be in an excellent position to do so—certainly in a much better position to do so than have been the majority of farmers who have successfully established themselves in past years. It is true that the sum I have suggested is not so large as the amount contemplated by the United Kingdom Government in the "British Boys' Land Settlement Scheme," which was \$3,000. I am, however, of the opinion that, speaking generally, \$2000 should suffice, though I have no intention of laying down that sum as a hard and fast rule. Until it comes to the point of actually launching out for himself, no settler knows exactly what sum of money he will require in order to enable him to establish himself. This depends on the size of the land holding to be acquired, and on the description of agriculture which he intends to practise. While the basis of all final settlement must be "mixed farming," one man may decide to extend himself in the direction of poultry farming; another in the direction of market gardening; another in the direction of dairying, etc., etc. Each of these types of farming will require a different amount of capital—some more, and some less.

Whatever may be the exact amount of capital required and available in each individual case, it is safe to say that the settler's five years' experience should enable him to lay it out to the best possible advantage. A settler with five years' experience of farming under supervision and a capital of \$2,000 to start on, is in a far better position to make a start than a new settler without experience, with a capital of \$5,000. The experience of the five-years-man is, in fact, part of his capital, and the best part at that.

To sum up: **The essence of "the Hornby Plan" is that it provides the new immigrant with a home and a farm, on a tenancy basis, with agricultural training under expert supervision, and with financial backing, until such time as he has proved his fitness to farm on his own; then, and not till then, it provides him with finance to make his own start.**

XV.

THE PARENT CORPORATION.

In order to assist the Voluntary Migration Committees of Counties and Towns in the United Kingdom to establish their Foundation Family Farm Settlements in Canada, a Parent Corporation will be set up.

The objects and purposes of the Parent Corporation will be to encourage and promote British Immigration into Canada, and the settlement of the newcomers in self-sustaining homes on the land, by the following means:

i. By promoting the formation of subsidiary corporations, having the same purpose, to be sponsored by Counties, Towns, and Voluntary Emigration Societies in the United Kingdom.

ii. By assisting such subsidiary corporations to obtain the necessary finances to enable them to establish their own Foundation Farm Settlements in Canada.

iii. By advising and assisting in the establishment of such Foundation Farm Settlements, and by continuing to look after them until they are firmly on their feet.

The Government of the United Kingdom will be asked to assist the Parent Corporation in the following ways:—

i. By paying the Parent Corporation an annual subsidy to enable it to carry out its objects and functions without seeking pecuniary gain out of its operations—such subsidy to be based on the extent of its operations, the number of subsidiary Corporations which it promotes, and the degree of assistance and support which it affords in establishing Settlements in Canada.

ii. (a) By authorizing the Parent Corporation to raise a Loan in London, in order to finance the capital expenditure necessary in order to enable 240 Counties, Towns and other United Kingdom Organizations to acquire and develop their own Foundation Farm Settlements in Canada—the security for the Loan to be all the property acquired—land, equipment and livestock.

(b) By giving a guarantee of the service of the said Loan, so that it may be raised at as low a rate of interest as possible, thereby reducing the cost of settlement both to the operating Counties and Towns, and eventually to the individual settlers.

iii. By making an annual grant-in-aid to each County, Town or other Migration Committee, for the annual maintenance and upkeep of its Settlement in Canada, and for its general operations.

NOTES

1. The maximum amount of capital required by each County, Town or other Committee is estimated to be £250,000, to be expended as shown in the Table on Page 46.

The total number of Settlements which it is planned to establish is 240.

The total capital sum required will therefore be £60,000,000.

2. All the proposed 240 Settlements cannot be established at once; but it is best to raise all the capital required now, so as to take advantage of present low interest rates, and also with the object of obviating constant applications for further capital.

When the proposed Loan has been sanctioned and raised, the funds will be received by Trustees, who will invest the greater part of them in United Kingdom and Dominion Government short and medium dated Securities, retaining in cash only sufficient for estimated immediate requirements. The proceeds of said securities, on redemption or on realization, will be made available, as required from time to time, for making advances to the County, Town, and other Settlement Committees, in accordance with the Table on Page 46, the contents of which can be amplified by (Treasury) Regulations.

The major portion of the advances required by the operating County, Town or other United Kingdom organizations, will be expended in Canada, and will be made through the Trustees' Canadian Agents, who will receive and hold for the Trustees the security for all cash advances as shown in the Table on Page 46.

3. It is estimated that without a government guarantee the cost of capital will be $4\frac{1}{2}\%$ per annum; with the support of a government guarantee, it is hoped to raise the required capital for 3% or less. The cost of the Settlements, and the eventual cost to the individual settlers, could be still further reduced to about $2\frac{1}{2}\%$ or less, if the United Kingdom Government would agree to the Loan being "free of Income Tax" for holders of Bonds up to a specified limit.

4. It is considered that the support asked for by way of subsidy, guarantee and grants-in-aid from the United Kingdom Government is justified by the evident far-reaching beneficial effects of the scheme on the United Kingdom's population problem, and by the resulting reduction in unemployment there.

XVI.

TABLE SHOWING IN OUTLINE HOW THE CAPITAL ALLOTTED TO EACH COUNTY, TOWN OR OTHER COMMITTEE WILL BE ADVANCED, ON WHAT ITEMS IT WILL BE EXPENDED, AND WHAT WILL BE THE SECURITY FOR EACH ITEM OF CAPITAL EXPENDITURE

Class of Advance	Purpose for which to be made.	Maximum Amount of Advance	Security to be given	Remarks
A	(i.) For the purchase of land. (ii.) For the improvement of land, by the construction of Dwellings, Farm Buildings, Fences, Lakes and Water Supplies, Ditches and Drains, Roads and such like.	Not to exceed £120,000 for a Settlement of 100 Farms.	First Mortgages on the land and improvements.	
B	(i.) For the purchase of Farm Implements, Machinery & Equipment. (ii.) For the purchase of Livestock.	(i.) Not to exceed £25,000 for a Settlement of 100 Farms (ii.) Not to exceed £25,000 for a Settlement of 100 Farms	Chattel Mortgages on the Implements, Machinery, Equipment and Livestock.	In cases where a Settlement of more than 100 Farms is approved, these amounts may be exceeded proportionately.
C	Advances to new settlers to help to meet living expenses for the first 18 months after arrival in Canada, said advances to be made in the form of Groceries, Meat and Clothes.	Not to exceed in value £6 per mensem in summer or £10 per mensem in winter for any one family, nor more than a total of £150 in all for any one family.	Settlement Manager's certified lists, to be endorsed by the Committee or Society concerned.	
D	Advances for general purposes of the Settlement during the first three years.	Not to exceed £7,500 yearly for a Settlement of 100 Farms	Settlement Manager's certificate to be endorsed by the Committee or Society concerned.	
E	Loans to approved individual settlers, who leave the Settlement to take up farms of their own.	Usually up to £200 to each approved head of a family Not to exceed in the aggregate £50,000 for a Settlement of 100 Farms.	Mortgages on land, or equipment or livestock purchased by the Settler.	

NOTE

Referring to the Table on Page 46 (Opposite)

The "Hornby Plan" has been criticised in some quarters on account of its estimated cost, which is stated to be too high.

It should, however, be borne in mind that the Plan contemplates the purchase of really good developed land in proven agricultural districts near to good markets, and its further development, if that is necessary, in order to fit it for the purpose in view; the purchase of good equipment and good foundation livestock; adequate supervision; and some assistance to individual settlers at the outset.

If such measures seem costly, they are at any rate likely to be more economical in the long run than attempts to establish new settlers overseas on poor quality land situated at a distance from markets, with inadequate accommodation, poor equipment, low grade livestock, and insufficient supervision.

In this connection, attention is particularly invited to Chapter XVII., page 48, in which the cost and value of Overseas Settlement are fully discussed, and also to Chapter XVIII., page 49, which deals with the cost of Overseas Settlement from the standpoint of a National Investment.

XVII.

COST AND VALUE OF SETTLEMENT.

Settlement for overseas migrants is like most other articles which are bought and sold—one usually gets what one pays for. A cheap article is often a shoddy one. If we do not pay a fair price for overseas settlement, we cannot expect to get good settlement.

Overseas settlement is made up of land; houses and farm buildings, or timber and other materials to construct houses and farm buildings; house furniture and equipment; farm implements, machinery, and tools; foundation livestock; etc.—in fact everything which is necessary to build up farms. With the possible exception in some cases of land, all these items have to be purchased from merchants and individuals for cash. In cases where a free grant of land is obtainable from a Government, it is generally raw undeveloped land, requiring the hire of labour and the purchase of material in order to develop it. The cost of settlement, then, depends on how much of the various items is purchased, and the price paid, which is usually a matter of quality. Poor quality settlement certainly costs less than good quality settlement, but it is usually worth less; to buy shoddy settlement is just throwing money away.

A great deal of money has been wasted on ill-conceived and insufficiently financed settlement schemes in the past. Some of our past schemes did not recognize even the minimum requirements of a settler family in respect of housing accommodation, land development, farm implements and machinery, livestock, etc. Cheapness seems to have been an obsession of the overseas settlement authorities.

The Victoria (Australia) Settlement Scheme and the Canadian Three Thousand Family Settlement Scheme are both instances of shoddy settlement. They were attempts to buy settlement too cheaply. The result has been loss to the settlers and to the Governments concerned—loss of money and loss of effort. The unfortunate settlers have borne the brunt of it, being less able to stand up against hardships than are the Governments.

The Victoria (Australia) Settlement Scheme was condemned by the Victoria Royal Commission of 1933.

That the Three Thousand Family Settlement Scheme, in Canada, has been only partially successful can be judged from the 1932 and 1933 Reports of the Overseas Settlement Department in London.

Bad settlement is costly both to the nation and to the individual. In addition to the anxieties, waste of years of life, and monetary losses caused to individual settlers by breakdowns in any scheme of Overseas Settlement, there is an equally serious national and Empire side of it—the bad name given to Overseas Settlement generally by such breakdowns.

Good settlement costs money; but there is no reason why paying a fair price for good settlement should involve either the settler or the Government in financial loss. On the contrary, the more adequately good settlement is financed, the more successful is it likely to be,—subject to the proviso that the money outlay must take the form of an investment of capital, and that the plan of settlement

must be based on a recognition of the mistakes of the past, and on a determination to eliminate them. Insufficient finance has been one of the chief mistakes of past settlement schemes.

The Overseas Settlement Department in London seems to be still obsessed by an idea that it is essential that Overseas Settlement should be **cheap**. The Department has not yet realized, although it has ample proof, that cheap overseas settlement is a waste of money.

XVIII.

A NATIONAL INVESTMENT FOR THE UNITED KINGDOM.

Under a properly organized and fully financed plan of Overseas Settlement, such as the Plan described herein, whatever money the United Kingdom decides to expend will be AN INVESTMENT OF CAPITAL, the expenditure of which will be offset by the value of the properties and other assets acquired.

The essential basis for the provision of adequate finance for any Plan of Settlement is that, by the expenditures incurred, not only should the settlers themselves be afforded every opportunity of success, but also that there should be good security for the money laid out.

It must be emphasized, however, that if the Plan of Settlement does not eliminate the mistakes of past settlement schemes, there will be no security for the money expended.

The Plan of Settlement described above is an example of establishing local Settlements overseas as a national investment, affording good security for the money expended. It will be noted that there is security, in the possession of the County Committees, for all the expenditure incurred. Assuming that a sum of £200,000 is expended by a Committee on purchasing and equipping a Settlement of 100 farms, the Settlement itself stands as an investment of £200,000 value. The nation has expended £200,000, and there are assets worth £200,000 to show for it—namely a group of good mixed farms, fully equipped, situated in a well developed district and close to a good market,—a security which should have a tendency to increase in value year by year, and which will bring in a good return in many ways: in migration and overseas settlement value; by a considerable curtailment in unemployment relief in the Homeland; by providing openings and opportunities overseas for ambitious young people; by developing the Empire; by an increase in Empire trade; by enabling Empire shipping to do remunerative work; and finally in annual money interest also.

With money in great abundance in the United Kingdom, and with deposit interest rates as low as they are now, it should be possible to raise all the money required for a comprehensive scheme of British Settlement in Canada at a very moderate rate of interest, especially under A GOVERNMENT GUARANTEE.

Hundreds of millions of money are now lying idle in the Banks in London. Banks and investors alike are baffled as to where they can find a remunerative outlet for their accumulated surpluses. This money should be put to

work. Part of it can be used to promote Empire migration, to the advantage of the United Kingdom and of the Empire.

All that the Government of the United Kingdom is asked to do is to pledge the country's credit, and to make advances of money for the development of the Empire itself, in just the same way as she has recently guaranteed many millions for development outside the Empire.

There can be no safer or sounder security in the British Empire than developed farms and farm-homes in well-settled and proven mixed farming districts in the Overseas Dominions. The more the agricultural resources of the Dominions are developed, the stronger will the security become.

British settlement in the overseas Dominions cannot expand as it should do without some outlay of money, or some pledging of credit by the United Kingdom. If the British Empire is to increase in population and in influence—nay more, if it is to retain its present position among the Nations of the world—the overseas Dominions must be built up to be stronger than they are today—more numerous in population, richer in developed resources, greater in trade and commerce; and **this must be accomplished by British settlers, British work, and British money.**

PART FOUR.

SUMMING UP

Introductory Note.

The reader should now be in a position to come to some conclusion as to whether an early resumption of immigration from Britain would be to Canada's advantage, and if so whether the present movement in the United Kingdom in favour of organized migration, with adequately financed and properly supervised settlement, is likely to give Canada what she needs.

He should also be able to decide whether the Plan of Settlement set out in PART THREE will meet requirements, or not.

Assuming that the answer to these three questions is affirmative, we will now discuss what steps Canada should take in order to put the Plan across. We must bear in mind **first** that the economic advantages, to the United Kingdom and to Canada respectively, of a comprehensive plan of settling British families in Canada will be mutual; and **secondly** that Canada has something of definite value to offer as her contribution to satisfactory settlement. **Any agreement made by Canada with the United Kingdom should be based on a recognition of these two factors.**

XIX.

BALANCE SHEET CHANGES—LIABILITIES BECOME ASSETS—MUTUAL ECONOMIC BENEFITS.

By the co-operation of the United Kingdom and Canada in formulating a Plan of organized migration, in conjunction with fully financed and supervised settlement on the land in Canada, and by the use of the Empire's credit to give effect to such measures, present liabilities on the National Balance Sheets of both countries may be transformed into valuable assets.

The United Kingdom's population surplus, at present supported by her at vast annual expense, will become a market for her manufactured goods. Meagre subsistence "on the Dole" can be made to give way to a more generous standard of living, making welcome demands on Canada's agricultural products. The ambitions of her young people will again have full scope at home and overseas.

Canada will obtain people to fill up her empty spaces, and to make use of the public services and railway facilities, already established in all her Provinces at great cost, in the expectation of receiving additional population, which she knows she can accommodate and which she needs in order to realize her destiny. In preparing homes and making equipment for the newcomers, her present unemployment will quickly disappear. With an expanding market for her agricultural products, both locally and in the United Kingdom, her agricultural workers will prosper, and will become again purchasers of manufactured goods on a great scale, giving employment to industrial workers both in Canada and in the United Kingdom.

Thus the United Kingdom will help Canada to solve her three great economic problems: the burden of excessive taxation on individual citizens; the strain on public finances caused by annually recurring national railway deficits; and nation-wide unemployment.

Canada, by taking some of the United Kingdom's surplus population off her hands, will contribute to the solution of a problem which is at once a very burdensome expense and a grave danger to the United Kingdom.

The trade of both countries too will benefit. There is a close inter-relationship between Empire settlement and Empire trade. To quote again from the Report of the Joint Parliamentary Migration Committee:

"Trade follows migration, and migration encourages trade. Every migrant from the Homeland, who successfully establishes himself overseas, is a prospective purchaser of British goods, and provides employment for other workers in the Homeland and overseas."

Migration and overseas settlement are in fact a potent means of developing Empire trade. **The resumption of migration from the United Kingdom to the Dominions will reopen one of the main channels of Empire trade, the closing of which for so long has seriously restricted markets and fostered unemployment throughout the Empire.**

Working hand in hand, the United Kingdom and Canada may move forward rapidly to more prosperous times.

XX.

CANADA'S CONTRIBUTION TO SETTLEMENT, AND THE CHIEF OBSTACLE.

That Canada is in a position to offer a very real and valuable contribution to the settlement of incoming British families, is not generally understood outside Canada. It is not cash which Canada offers, but something of far greater value to newcomers—a well developed country, with roads and railways; markets and marketing arrangements; schools and universities; postal, telegraph and telephone services; police and law courts, etc., etc.

In some quarters in the United Kingdom a great deal of importance is attached to getting from Canada a FIFTY-FIFTY contribution towards the settlement of migrating families, in accordance with the terms of the 1922 Empire Settlement Act. Canada's contribution is as described above. It is fully a FIFTY-FIFTY contribution. Canada is in fact providing everything which makes the settlement of new people on the land possible without the difficult and slow pioneering of twenty-five years ago—all that makes it possible for them to become self-supporting and independent within a reasonable period of time. All this development represents cash expenditures made, and indebtedness created by municipal, civic, Provincial and Federal authorities—a generation of effort, carried out with the object of preparing the country in advance for incoming people. On what grounds can Canada now be asked to make a further cash contribution towards the settlement of individual immigrant families or persons?

The "FIFTY-FIFTY proviso" of the 1922 Empire Settlement Act of the United Kingdom Parliament is at present the chief obstacle to a satisfactory agreement between the United Kingdom and Canada on the subject of the settlement of new British families in Canada.

There has for some years been a strong feeling in the House of Commons at Westminster that the "FIFTY-FIFTY proviso" should be removed from the Act; more than one Bill to that effect has been introduced by private members. The most recent occasion was in 1933, when a Bill sponsored by Mrs. Ward, M.P., and Mr. A. A. Somerville, M.P., passed its second reading in the House of Commons. The Dominions' Secretary, the Rt. Hon. J. H. Thomas, spoke during the debate favourably to the principle of the Bill. Although the Bill has not yet been carried further, the principle of the United Kingdom shouldering the whole cost of settling her migrants overseas seems now to be established.

More recently the Newcastle-on-Tyne Empire Voluntary Migration Conference recommended **"the amendment of the 1922 Empire Settlement Act, with its FIFTY-FIFTY basis, as this is one of the chief obstacles to Migration."** This recommendation was handed to the Dominions' Secretary on October 24th by a Committee of the Newcastle Conference, headed by the Lord Mayor of Newcastle.

While, then, at the present time the "FIFTY-FIFTY proviso" undoubtedly stands as the chief obstacle to a satisfactory agreement between Canada and the United Kingdom, there is every hope that it will shortly be removed from the Empire Settlement Act.

XXI.

CANADA'S OPPORTUNITY.

The movement in the United Kingdom in favour of organized migration, with adequately financed and supervised settlement, seems to be now sufficiently developed to justify Canada making an immediate step forward to meet it half way—that is to say, to get into contact with the United Kingdom and lay a definite Plan before her. This in fact should be Canada's immediate objective.

Here, in a nutshell, is what Canada has to decide: IS HER IMMIGRATION IN FUTURE TO BE A SPASMODIC FLOW AND EBB OF UNCOORDINATED INDIVIDUAL VENTURES, OR A REGULAR AND CONTINUOUS STREAM, WITH ORGANIZED, FINANCED, AND SUPERVISED SETTLEMENT, DIRECTED TO SUITABLE DISTRICTS WHERE IT IS MOST NEEDED, AND WHERE IT IS MOST LIKELY TO BE SUCCESSFUL.

The Federal Minister of Immigration of Canada has a great opportunity today—far greater than that of any other Minister, for the future results to the nation of the policy which he decides to pursue are of such a far-reaching character. He has a clear four years ahead of him in which to give effect to a national immigration policy which may be the means of solving not only our population problem, but also those kindred economic problems of heavy taxation, railway deficits, unemployment, and the absorption of agricultural products, all of which depend so largely on an increased productive population.

What is that policy to be?

It is worth while now to review some of the leading factors in the present situation, and to examine the openings and opportunities existing today for action which will give Canada what she needs.

Our old ideas of immigration have already been discarded:—the inducement of cheap passages; the open door, with a minimum landing capital of \$10.00; 160 acres of free land "at the back of beyond"—all these are things of the past. Assisted passages are now barred; the minimum capital requirement is now set around \$1,000.00 (by no means too high); and there is no longer any encouragement given to these prospective immigrants who seek a free "homestead." But what is the result of those changes? They are effective enough in keeping out prospective immigrants! **BUT THEY ARE NOT AN IMMIGRATION POLICY. THEY ARE MERELY AN EXCLUSION POLICY.**

A policy of excluding immigrants is contrary to Canada's interests. She is a young country, with plenty of room for population, and already developed and equipped for a very much larger population than she has at present. **Her policy should be to encourage immigration.**—but subject to definite provisos:—All immigrants must be of types which will readily assimilate our national

ideals and fit into our political structure; and they must be so "fixed" or "backed" financially that they will not be a burden to the communities which receive them, but will make themselves self-sustaining, and share with us the taxation cost of carrying the public-services and amenities of which they will have the advantage and the enjoyment.

That there is an opening for obtaining such immigration from Great Britain is shown by the Reports of several recent important Committees there, and particularly by the Report of the Newcastle-on-Tyne Empire Voluntary Migration Conference, all of which have been fully dealt with in Part II. It will be clear from a perusal of the Newcastle "Brief," published in full in the Appendix, as Exhibit D, that many of the aims of those who took part in that Conference are so akin to Canada's national views and requirements, that it should not be difficult to negotiate an immigration agreement which would be to the mutual advantage of Britain and of Canada.

In our negotiations with the United Kingdom, Canada's standpoint should be that, having thoroughly developed her settlement opportunities by large expenditures on public-services of all sorts, she has a right to require that new immigrants in future shall be so "fixed" or "backed" financially that they will not be a burden to her, but will make themselves self-sustaining, and share with their fellow citizens the cost of carrying the services which they enjoy. If Canada is asked to contribute anything more towards the settlement of new immigrants, her reply will be that she is already contributing practically everything which makes it possible to successfully settle new people without the slow and difficult pioneering of the old days—roads and railways; markets and marketing organizations; schools and universities; postal, telegraph and telephone services, etc., etc.

Mere passive acquiescence in the general principle that we need additional population, and that we can best obtain it from Britain, is not sufficient. Our Federal and Provincial Governments should go after the business; should make closer contact with United Kingdom Parliament and migration organizations; should formulate a definite settlement Plan and offer it to them; and should use every endeavour to put an agreed Plan into effect without any further delay.

With the growing conviction in the United Kingdom that new methods in migration and settlement must replace the old careless haphazard ways; with the tide of sentiment there rising in favour of organized migration, with adequately financed and properly supervised settlement; and with the more general recognition by business men there that migration helps to produce prosperity—if Canada will now make an advance on the right lines, she may shortly—in all probability within the next twelve months—see the arrival of the first contingents of new families for planned and financed small-group Settlements, which will give her that unbroken stream of selected immigrants so indispensable to her from an economic standpoint, in order that she may use fully and advantageously not only her available lands, but also all those public facilities and services which she has created to serve the new people whom she knows to be necessary in order to enable her to fulfill her destiny.

APPENDIX.**SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS**

- Exhibit A.—The Report of the Joint Parliamentary Migration Committee (1932).
- Exhibit B.—Extracts from the Report of the Empire Development and Settlement Research Committee (1933).
- Exhibit C.—Orders of the Day of the House of Commons (Westminster) of January 29th, 1934.
- Exhibit D.—The Newcastle “Brief.” (1935).
- Exhibit E.—List of representatives who attended the Newcastle Conference (1935), and messages received.
- Exhibit F.—Resolutions passed in Canada in 1935 in favour of an early resumption of British Immigration, and of the Hornby Plan.

Note.—The above-mentioned documents, which are set out in the following pages, are of considerable importance. They show how Parliamentary and public opinion in the United Kingdom regards organized migration, with financed and supervised settlement, and also that Canada is ready to receive such settlement NOW !

EXHIBIT A.

EMPIRE MIGRATION AND SETTLEMENT AND THE OTTAWA CONFERENCE.

MEMORANDUM prepared and submitted by the Joint Committee of the Parliamentary Migration Committee and the Migration Committee of the Royal Empire Society.

WE ARE OF OPINION:

1. (1) That a redistribution of our white population is of urgent importance; it is at once a political and economic necessity, vital to the stability and future well-being of the Empire; that, while Canada and Australia are more largely affected than other parts of the Empire, the matter concerns New Zealand, South Africa, Newfoundland, India, Southern Rhodesia, and the Colonies.
 - (2) That the concentration of one-half of the population of the world in and around the Eastern Pacific is a factor which cannot be ignored, and that, while no active steps are being taken to increase by immigration the British population of Australia and New Zealand, there is the risk that other races may not be content to continue only to cast envious eyes on the vast empty spaces of the Southern Continent.
 - (3) That there is also a political danger in Canada, arising from the large influx of non-British immigrants which has taken place, and that the holding-up of emigration from Europe during recent years arising from a variety of causes, political, economic, and financial, is likely, in the near future, to reach a point where an overflow must find some outlet, and that Canada offers natural advantages for the absorption of such an overflow.
 - (4) That, in this connection it should be noted that the gross emigration from Europe over a period of thirty years before the war was about 750,000 per annum. Of this, for ten years prior to the war, the British movement overseas varied from about 250,000 to 400,000 annually; last year it was only 27,151. Notwithstanding deaths in the war, a falling birthrate, and other factors, it is thought by many serious observers that the pressure of population in the Homeland remains undesirably dense.
 - (5) **That the economic factors in the situation are of the greatest importance. We believe that trade follows migration, and that migration encourages trade. We are also convinced that every successful settler in the undeveloped parts of the Empire is a potential customer, and thereby provides employment for workers both overseas and in the Homeland.** Migration from the home country has always been associated with development overseas, both on the land and in industry. We see, also, in many parts of the Dominions, much capital not fully productive in railways, mines, irrigation works, and other enterprises, together with millions of acres of easily accessible good land—still unoccupied—all of which would yield new or increasing return under a carefully directed flow of emigration.
2. (1) That steps should be taken to give effect to some of the findings of:
 - (a) The Industrial Transference Board (Report C.M.D., 3156-1928).
 - (b) The Migration Committee of the Economic Advisory Council (C.M.D. 4075-1932).
 - (2) We would draw attention, in particular, to the following statements:
 - (a) The Industrial Transference Board, (Sir Warren Fisher, Sir John Cadman, and Sir David Shackleton) came to the conclusion:

That there were approximately 200,000 workers who cannot expect to earn a livelihood from the industries in which they have been hitherto employed . . . that emigration on a big scale would provide a way

out . . . that the human material available for such a movement was first class . . . and that, if such a policy were made really effective it would "not only . . . bring a direct cumulative gain to the Dominions" but it would "also go far towards a solution of the special problem confronting us."

This is a situation which is now even graver than when the above report was issued in 1928, and one which our Joint Committee feels can no longer be ignored.

- (b) The Economic Advisory Council's Committee on Empire Migration, under the chairmanship of Lord Astor, considered the question under two main divisions:

- (1) As a long range policy and (2) the form migration should take over the period of the next few years. They came to the conclusion that:

"It is hardly likely that large-scale migration would be economically advantageous for us as a long-period policy," and that "emigration would be economically advantageous for us as an emergency policy for the next few years."

- (c) Our Joint Committee consider that the Astor Committee has, in some respects, taken a somewhat restricted view of the situation and we believe that there are desirable possibilities in both "ranges." We note with satisfaction, however, that, on the general question, the Astor Committee came to the conclusion:

"On balance, we are satisfied that, under the conditions of unemployment which prevail today in Great Britain, migration, regarded as a whole, is of definite economic advantage to the State."

This finding we regard as of great importance.

- (d) The Astor Committee say that: "If the sentiment (sense of unity) is to be maintained, and the political character of the British Empire is to remain what it has been, fresh accession to the population of the Dominions must contain a large proportion of persons of British origin." Our Joint Committee feels that the Conference at Ottawa presents a unique opportunity of exploring the possibilities of giving practical effect to this suggestion.

- (e) In the Astor Report we note that: "The growing unfamiliarity of the people of Great Britain with rural pursuits and rural life has been in recent years one of the primary obstacles to Empire migration." But the experiences of the Voluntary Societies and other agencies go to show that the present cessation of movement arises almost entirely from failure in the absorbing power of overseas Dominions. We find also the statement in the Report that:—

"owing to the agricultural depression some 150,000 agricultural workers have left the land (in this country) during the last decade."

Large numbers of these men have always been and are now available for migration overseas.

3. (1) Our Joint Committee, in making some attempts to visualize the problem, have naturally been impressed by its magnitude, and see that it must be approached from many angles, and attacked in various ways. **We are strongly of opinion that no scheme should be considered that might result in transferring anyone from the ranks of the unemployed here to a "bread-line" overseas.**

We would favour only such schemes as would (a) ensure, as far as possible, that every migrant, adult or juvenile, might hope to be a successful settler overseas; (b) provide appropriate machinery for the repatriation of such of the migrants as ultimately proved to be unsuitable.

- (2) We think that the machinery of transfer should be simplified in harmony with the suggestions of the Industrial Transference Board, and would urge that the greatest possible facilities be granted not only to workers on the land, but also to skilled artisans assured of work, and to all classes of approved migrants proceeding overseas under the auspices of Voluntary Societies who maintain adequate reception and after-care organizations in the respective Dominions.
- (3) Our Joint Committee, fully recognizing that unfavourable economic conditions, both in the Homeland and the Dominions, together with like depressing conditions in all parts of the world, have militated against migration, believe:
- (a) That the present stagnation could be gradually removed, and that plans could be devised whereby much of the present unproductive expenditure could be turned to profitable account in development of the Empire's resources.
- (b) That, while the social services provided here are more comprehensive than in any other part of the world, there are, nevertheless, tens of thousands of men and women in the Homeland in whom the spirit of adventure is still alive, and who would gladly seize any opportunity to embark upon a new and hopeful life overseas.
- (c) That nothing but a "beneficial disturbance" of existing depressing economic conditions, at home and in the Dominions, would follow carefully directed transplantations of British folk.
4. (1) We think it is desirable, at this time to give serious consideration to some efforts to prepare for revived migration from the Homeland, notwithstanding failures and disappointments of the past. We think that steps should be taken to re-open successful schemes of training, settlement, and productive development. Present difficulties should not dull the memory of what has been accomplished in the past or obscure the view of what is necessary for the future. **The Empire should profit by its experiences and apply the lessons of recent endeavours and plan other schemes while these experiences, especially of failures, are fresh in mind.**
- (2) We believe that, apart from the re-opening of proved successful schemes, other large schemes of settlement under the provisions of a Royal Charter should be discussed, and we would urge the careful consideration of such possibilities. We are inclined to the view that only by the appointment of an Empire Settlement and Development Commission, located in London, with corresponding Commissions in each of the Dominions, consisting of informed and experienced men who would devote their whole time to the task, can the best results be secured. Such Commissions would consider all schemes, encourage and direct migration, and they should be empowered to submit schemes for sanction by the Governments concerned.
5. Our Committee believe that, whether migration has a place on the agenda or not, it should be discussed at Ottawa and we believe, also, that, while other subjects on the agenda are under discussion, questions having a direct bearing on Migration and Settlement are bound to arise. For these reasons we urge the appointment of a representative body of persons from the United Kingdom, having a special knowledge of migration, to confer at Ottawa with others from the Dominions who are similarly qualified. This body should sit during the Conference and should report their recommendations to the Conference in time for them to be considered before it disperses, or alternatively should report to the various Governments, whichever is considered the more convenient procedure.

The following are the members of the Parliamentary Migration Committee:

Mr. A. A. Somerville, M.P., (Chairman).

The Lord Apsley, D.S.O., M.C., M.P.

Mr. C. M. Barclay-Harvey, M.P.

The Viscount Burnham, G.C.M.G., C.H.

Major the Hon. E. Cadogan, C.B., M.P.

Miss Thelma Cazalet, M.P.

Mr. E. T. Campbell, M.P.

The Viscount Elibank.

Lieut.-Colonel A. Hamilton Gault, D.S.O., M.P.

Mr. Clifford W. H. Glossop, M.P.

Mr. J. J. Lawson, M.P.

The Lord Lovat, K.T., G.C.V.O., K.C.M.G., C.B., D.S.O.

Mr. A. M. Lyons, M.P.

Miss Irene Ward, C.B.E., M.P.

Sir John Wardlaw-Milne, K.B.E., M.P.

Brig.-Gen. J. J. H. Nation, C.V.O., D.S.O., M.P. (Hon. Secretary).

The following are the members representing the Migration Committee of the Royal Empire Society:

Lieut.-Colonel Sir Archibald Weigall, K.C.M.G. (Chairman).

Mr. Cyril Bavin (Y.M.C.A.)

Mr. Robert Culver.

Commissioner D. C. Lamb (Salvation Army).

Mr. Kenneth Lindsay.

Captain C. J. Sutton (Boy Scouts).

EXHIBIT B.

SOME EXTRACTS FROM THE REPORT OF THE EMPIRE DEVELOPMENT AND SETTLEMENT RESEARCH COMMITTEE ON THE REDISTRIBUTION OF THE POPULATION OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE.

(N.B.—The extracts given were arranged for the convenience of those attending the Newcastle-on-Tyne Empire Voluntary Migration Conference in Sept. 1935.)

The above Committee was formed in March 1933 for the purpose of investigating the possibilities of Empire Settlement on a large scale. The Committee was non-political and not directly responsible to any organization but, for the sake of convenience, it was known as the Empire Development and Settlement Research Committee and consisted of the following members:

Sir Henry Page Croft, Bt., C.M.G., M.P. (Chairman).
Rt. Hon. Sir Montague Barlow, Bt., P.C., K.B.E.
Mr. G. Hall Caine, C.B.E., M.P.
Mr. L. St. Clare Grondona.
Captain Rt. Hon. F. E. Guest, C.B.E., D.S.O., M.P.
Colonel C. Kerr, M.P.
The Lord Middleton, M.C. .
Mr. M. Petherick, M.P.
Mr. A. A. Somerville, M.P.

The Committee issued its Report in November, 1933.

The Report states, with great clearness and frankness, the case for Migration and Overseas Settlement within the Empire as a permanent relief for Empire-wide "depression" and unemployment. Its findings and conclusions are logical and convincing. The extracts which follow have been arranged for the convenience of those interested in Overseas Settlement:

(Note.—The cross-headings do not appear in the original Report).

.
THE NEED OF BRITAIN.

"There is no problem comparable in its urgency to that of the employment of the people. To whatever party any statesman may belong, he is brought up against this all-absorbing subject at every turn. The fact remains that in no country in the world are there so many persons per square mile as in England, and however successful the Government may be in the promotion of economic policy, and even if the buying capacity of the world is restored, it is highly probable that there will always be a large number of permanent unemployed unless some entirely new policy is adopted with regard to the redistribution of the populations of the Empire."

.

"Since the war, £1,000,000,000 has been spent in keeping life in our unemployed. At the same time, this astonishing paradox exists—that, whilst there are millions of idle Britons in the homeland, there are hundreds of millions of acres of unoccupied territory in healthy areas of the Empire overseas capable of development."

.

"This great central fact confronts us. Since 1914, net emigration has totalled 1,246,000. Had the average rate of the five years prior to the war been maintained, the number of emigrants would have been greater by some 3,000,000. When it is remembered that the number of unemployed, at the end of September, 1933, was 2,300,000, the lesson is most striking."

(Note.—The total number of unemployed at the end of July, 1935, was in the neighbourhood of 2,000,000).

.

RECENT EFFORTS TO SOLVE THE PROBLEM OF UNEMPLOYMENT.

"Recent Governments have appreciated the grave effect upon the morale of workers suffering from prolonged unemployment. The last Conservative Government spent great sums in endeavouring to create work, and the Socialist Government which followed it extended these operations. The Liberal Party would have gone even further and launched out on enormous schemes of development.

When the total cost of these various schemes, undertaken and suggested, was available, it transpired that it was out of all proportion to the relief afforded to the unemployment problem and tended to stabilize taxation at such a height as gravely to handicap our industries and export trade. The financial and economic situation of 1931 forced the present Government greatly to curtail this vast and unremunerative expenditure. It was estimated that the cost of putting 1,000 people into employment directly or indirectly by these means amounted approximately to £250,000, and at the end of a year or so these thousand workers were thrown back on the labour exchanges. In all, over £200,000,000 was expended in this manner between 1920 and 1932."

WHAT MIGHT HAVE BEEN DONE.

"The contention of the Empire Development and Settlement Research Committee is that, had this vast sum of money been spent in mass settlement, 200,000 settlers with families of three (wife and two children), or 800,000 souls, could have been settled permanently overseas with every hope that the total expenditure of £200,000,000 would have been paid back over a period of thirty years.

The immediate financial benefits to Great Britain would have been a relief in unemployment benefit amounting approximately to £75,000,000 spread over ten years, a relief in pressure on school space with consequent saving in education grants and a relief in housing expenditure by municipal and state authorities.

LONDON FINANCIAL INTERESTS AID FOREIGN COUNTRIES, BUT NO FINANCE YET FOR EMPIRE MIGRATION.

"Since the war, we have seen total issues on the London market (according to the Midland Bank figures) of £200,000,000 lent to Germany, Austria and other European countries in what has turned out to be a speculative and, in some cases, disastrous undertaking. Had that sum been advanced for the purpose of organized Empire settlement, or had the British Government guaranteed the interest on such a sum, a great contribution would have been made towards the solution of our unemployment problem, with every hope not only that the capital investment would be paid off in full, but that there would have been a reasonable return for the benefit of British investors."

WANING MIGRATION.

"The decline in the proportion of British migrants into Canada is most alarming. During the ten years 1920 to 1930 less than half of the newcomers to the Prairie Provinces were of British stock, and during that period no less than 600,000 foreigners entered Canada. The increasing preponderance of foreign settlers in these Provinces therefore tends to create a political danger in the Middle West.

Canadians who are believers in the Imperial connection are witnessing this process with grave concern."

"600,000 foreigners have entered Canada in the years 1920 to 1930. Had those migrants been British instead of foreign, and assuming that they were adult males, no less a sum than £300,000,000 would have been saved to the British people; 600,000 persons at present crowding the labour exchanges would have become producers of wealth and customers for Empire goods."

"Further, this great mass of people would have been given new hope, new opportunity and a livelihood, instead of remaining a burden on their fellows in Great Britain and suffering moral and physical deterioration."

.

THE BRITISH SETTLER OVERSEAS.

"It is not enough to say that the British immigrant is unsuitable, for in the United States, where careful analysis is made of 'Superiority' and 'Inferiority' types of immigrants, the overwhelming conclusion is that British immigrants are in every way most successful in that country."

.

"We believe that the adventurous spirit of our people is not dead, and that there are hundreds of thousands who will be ready to take their chance of fortune so long as they have real faith in the promoters and know that they are not going into isolation but are partners in a new great movement for Empire development."

.

"The main inspiration will be that the British citizen, who is at present in the humiliating position of existing at the expense of the State, of industry and his fellow-workers, will have an opportunity on just terms of winning for himself his own home and his own land and of providing a livelihood for himself and his children in new and healthy surroundings."

.

THE BATTLE FRONT.

"To make any real impression upon the population question, the settlement problem must be dealt with on the grand scale. Unemployment should be fought with the same energy as if we were fighting a war, with this difference—that it is a war of construction, instead of a war of destruction and a war to provide livelihood instead of destroying life."

.

"There is an emergency, and it requires emergency measures with the vision that looks ten, twenty or a hundred years forward."

.

FINANCE HAS BEEN AUTHORIZED BY PARLIAMENT.

"The Government is authorized to spend up to £3,000,000 a year on migration."

(NOTE.—This authority was given by the 1922 Empire Settlement Act. From 1922 to 1934 £36,000,000 might have been spent. According to a reply given by the Dominions Secretary in the House of Commons recently, under £7,000,000 had actually been spent up to the end of 1934—not one-fifth of what might have been spent).

.

AN EMPIRE SETTLEMENT BOARD IS NEEDED.

"We unanimously decided that it was essential that an Empire Settlement Board should be set up at the earliest possible moment."

.

"Once the Board is set up, big schemes of migration, requiring the assistance of Government credit, could be speedily investigated and, if the Board were convinced of their soundness, submitted to Parliament for sanction."

Although Government credit is essential, we contend that Governments are not best fitted to run settlements of this description."

.

MIGRATION—SOLUTION FOR MANY SOCIAL PROBLEMS.

"We are convinced that such a policy as we have indicated (Migration, in conjunction with adequately financed and properly supervised settlement), would be

the most powerful factor in the solution not only of the problem of our surplus population but of many of the social evils confronting the British nation today, and that the effects would be far-reaching in improving the status of our people and in promoting the strength, health, prosperity and safety of the Empire."

.

"A SUMMARY OF THE COMMITTEE'S REPORT."

"The main contentions and proposals contained in the Committee's report, are summarized below:

A PARADOX.

Britain has a surplus population to her industrial and agricultural needs and can never hope to absorb the whole of her unemployed. Over £1,000,000,000 has been spent in doles and relief since the war, thus retarding recovery and greatly increasing taxation.

The Self-Governing Dominions, whilst they have their own unemployment problems, are yet inhabited by a fraction only of the population which their natural resources could support; thousands of miles of valuable fertile soil lie untouched for want of development; the inhabitants carry a heavy burden of taxation which can only be lightened by spreading it over a greater number of persons, and their railways are unremunerative owing to insufficient passengers and freight.

The Committee accordingly consider that a substantial contribution towards the solution of mutual difficulties could be found in a more equitable distribution of the population of the Empire."

EXHIBIT C.

Extract from
 "ORDERS OF THE DAY"
 (No. 23, pages 427 - 432)
 OF THE UNITED KINGDOM HOUSE OF COMMONS
 for
 29th January, 1934.

COPY OF RESOLUTION.**Redistribution of Population of Empire,—**

"That this House is of the opinion that the time has arrived when active steps should be taken to consider schemes for the redistribution of the population of the Empire, and therefore urges the Government to consult with the Dominions and Colonies with a view to the promotion of organized Empire Settlement."

COPY OF LIST OF SUPPORTERS (of above Resolution).

Brigadier-General Sir Henry Croft,	Sir Gifford Fox,
Captain Guest,	Captain Heilgers,
Mr. Campbell Kerr,	Mr. Lyons,
Mr. Hall-Caine,	Mr. Petherick,
Brigadier-General Nation,	Mr. Annesley Somerville,
Mr. Hannon,	Mr. Herbert Williams,
Lord Apsley,	Lt.-Colonel Acland-Troyte,
Mr. Vyvian Adams,	Mr. Smedley Crooke,
Lieutenant-Commander Agnew,	Colonel Crookshand,
Mr. Albery,	Mr. Croon-Johnson,
Brigadier-General Sir William Alexander,	Mr. Culverwell,
Lt.-Colonel Sir William Allen,	Captain Cunningham-Reid,
Mr. Anstruther-Gray,	Earl of Dalkeith,
Lieutenant-Colonel Applin,	Mr. Clement Davies,
Mr. Bailey,	Sir William Davison,
Sir Adrian Baillie,	Sir Philip Dawson,
Captain Balfour,	Mr. Danville,
Mr. Barton,	Mr. Dickie,
Mr. Bateman,	Mr. Dixey,
Sir Brograve Beauchamp,	Mr. Donner,
Mr. Ralph Beaumont,	Captain Dewar,
Sir Alfred Beit,	Mr. Drewe,
Sir Arthur Shirley Benn,	Mr. Duckworth,
Mr. Stuart Bavan,	Mr. Duncan,
Sir John Birchall,	Mr. Eady,
Sir Robert Bird,	Mr. Eales,
Sir Reginald Blaker,	Mr. Eastwood,
Mr. Boothby,	Major Edmondson,
Mr. Boulton,	Mr. Emmett,
Colonel Sir Vansittart Bowater,	Mr. Entwistle,
Lieutenant-Commander Bower,	Captain Erskine-Dolst,
Mr. Leslie Boyce,	Mr. Ensonhigh,
Major Braithwaite,	Captain Arthur Evans,
Mr. Gurney Braithwaite,	Mr. Everard,
Captain Sir William Brass,	Lord Farway,
Colonel Broadbent,	Mr. Fielden,
Brigadier-General Clifton Brown,	Mr. Fleming,
Mr. Alexander Browne,	Sir Patrick Ford,
Mr. Burnett,	Sir Leolin Forestier-Walker,
Colonel Burton,	Sir Francis Fremantle,
Sir Alfred Butt,	Captain Fuller,

(COPY OF LIST OF SUPPORTERS—(Continued))

Sir Edward Campbell,
 Vice Admiral Campbell,
 Mr. Campbell Johnson,
 Mr. Caporn,
 Major Carver,
 Mr. Cassels,
 Sir Henry Cautley,
 Sir Charles Cayzer,
 Major Sir Herbert Cayner,
 Miss Thelma Caralet,
 Colonel Chapman,
 Mr. Charlton,
 Mr. Christie,
 Mr. Clarry,
 Sir Christopher Clayton,
 Sir Cyril Cobb,
 Commander Cochrane,
 Major Colfax,
 Mr. Conant,
 Mr. Thomas Cook,
 Mr. Douglas Cooke,
 Mrs. Copeland,
 Major Courtauld,
 Sir Reginald Craddock,
 Mr. Craven-Ellis,
 Sir Robert Horne,
 Miss Hornbrugh,
 Mr. Howard,
 Mr. Howitt,
 Mr. Hunter,
 Sir Gerald Hurst,
 Mr. Hutchison,
 Sir Henry Jackson,
 Wing-Commander James,
 Major Jesson,
 Mr. Joel,
 Mr. Wellwood Johnston,
 Sir George Jones,
 Mr. Lewis Jones,
 Mr. Campbell Ker,
 Mr. Hamilton Kerr,
 Mr. Kimball,
 Mr. Holford Knight,
 Major-General Sir Alfred Knox,
 Sir Joseph Lamb,
 Mr. Lambert,
 Sir Paul Latham,
 Sir Alfred Law,
 Mr. Law,
 Mr. Leckie,
 Dr. Leech,
 Mr. Lees-Jones,
 Sir John Leigh,
 Major Leighton,
 Mr. Lennox-Boyd,
 Mr. Levy,
 Mr. Liddall,
 Mr. Noel Lindsay,
 Mr. John Lockwood,
 Capt. Lockwood,
 Lieutenant-Colonel Gault,
 Sir Fergus Graham,
 Mr. Granville Gibson,
 Mr. Gledhill,
 Mr. Glossop,
 Sir Park Goff,
 Mr. Goldie,
 Colonel Goodman,
 Sir Nicholas Gratten-Doyle,
 Sir Walter Greaves-Lord,
 Colonel Gretton,
 Sir Edward Grigg,
 Mr. Howard Gritton,
 Mr. Gluckstein,
 Mr. Guy,
 Captain Hall,
 Mr. Hammersley,
 Sir George Hamilton,
 Mr. Hanley,
 Mr. Hartland,
 Mr. George Harvey,
 Mr. Haslam,
 Mr. Hepworth,
 Major Hills,
 Mr. Hope,
 Mr. Hornby,
 Mr. Murray-Philipson,
 Sir Joseph Nall,
 Mr. Nall-Cain,
 Mr. Godfrey Nicholson,
 Mr. North,
 Mr. Nunn,
 Dr. O'Donovan,
 Sir Charles Oman,
 Major Sir Hugh O'Neill,
 Mr. Ormiston,
 Captain Peake,
 Mr. Pearson,
 Mr. Peat,
 Lord Eustace Percy,
 Sir Basil Pato,
 Mr. Geoffrey Pato,
 Miss Pickford,
 Mr. Pike,
 Mr. Potter,
 Lieutenant-Colonel Powell,
 Sir Assheton Pownall,
 Mr. Purbrick,
 Mr. Radford,
 Mr. Raikes,
 Mr. Alexander Ramsay,
 Captain Ramsay,
 Sir Eugene Ramsden,
 Mr. Rankin,
 Sir Cooper Rasson,
 Sir William Ray,
 Mr. Arthur Reed,
 Mr. James Reid,
 Mr. Allan Reid,
 Mr. Remer,

(COPY OF LIST OF SUPPORTERS—(Continued))

Mr. Lovat-Fraser,	Mr. Richards,
Sir Murdoch Macdonald,	Mr. Robinson,
Captain Peter Macdonald,	Colonel Ropner,
Major Sir Alan McLean,	Colonel Ruggles-Brise,
Dr. McLean,	Mrs. Runge,
Mr. Macmillan,	Mr. Hamar Russell,
Mr. Magnay,	Mr. West Russell,
Mr. Maitland,	Sir Hugo Rutherford,
Brigadier-General Makins,	Mr. John Rutherford,
Lt.-Col. Sir Mervyn Manningham-Buller,	Sir Isidore Salmon,
Commander Marsden,	Mr. Salt,
Mr. Martin,	Sir Arthur Michael Sasnel,
Colonel Mason,	Sir Nairne Stewart Sandeman,
Lieutenant-Colonel Mayhew,	Colonel Sanderson Allen,
Sir Richard Mellar,	Sir Frank Sanderson,
Sir Frederick Mills,	Mr. Savery,
Major Mills,	Lord Scone,
Sir Reginald Mitchell Banks,	Mr. Seans,
Mr. Mitcheson,	Mrs. Shaw,
Mr. Morgan,	Sir Ernest Shepperson,
Lieutenant-Colonel Moore,	Colonel Shute,
Lieutenant-Colonel Moore-Brabazon,	Mr. Simmonds,
Mr. John Morris,	Colonel Sinclair,
Mr. Owen Morris,	Mr. Slater,
Mr. Morrison,	Lt.-Col. Sir Walter Smiles,
Mr. Moss,	Mr. Bracewell Smith,
Mr. Munroe,	Sir Jonah Walker-Smith,
Mr. Robert Smith,	Mr. Louis Smith,
Mr. D. G. Somerville,	Mr. Tree,
Mr. Soper,	Mr. Turton,
Captain Sotheren-Estcourt,	Miss Ward,
Brigadier-General Spears,	Mrs. Ward,
Mr. Spencer,	Sir John Wardlaw-Milne,
Mr. Stevenson,	Captain Watt,
Mr. Henderson Stewart,	Mr. Wedderburn,
Mr. William Stewart,	Mr. Wells,
Mr. Storey,	Viscount Weymouth,
Mr. Stourton,	Mr. Whiteside,
Captain Strickland,	Mr. Whyte,
Mr. Stuart,	Mr. Charles Williams,
Rear-Admiral Seuter,	Lord Willoughby de Erosby,
Mr. Sutcliffe,	Mr. Wills,
Vice-Admiral Taylor,	Lt.-Col. Sir Arnold Wilson,
Mr. Ross Taylor,	Mr. G. H. A. Wilson,
Mr. Templeton,	Lieut.-Colonel Windsor-Clive,
Mr. Luke Thompson,	Earl Winterton,
Mr. Thorp,	Mr. Wise,
Captain Todd,	Sir John Withers,
Mr. Touche,	Viscount Wolnar,
	Mr. Wragg.

NOTE by Brigadier-General M. L. Hornby:

The above mentioned Resolution, in an amended form, came before the House of Commons on January 31st, when it was moved by Sir Arthur Shirley Benn and seconded by Sir Henry Page Croft. A very interesting discussion followed, which occupied four hours, and is reported fully in Hansard Vol. 585, No. 26, pages 440 to 503 (sixty-three pages).

The Under-Secretary for the Dominions, Mr. Malcolm MacDonald, speaking for the Government at the conclusion of the discussion, accepted the Motion, stating that a special Committee on Empire Settlement would have a report on their problem ready for presentation within the next few weeks, and that the Secretary of State for the Dominions would approach the Dominions as soon as possible thereafter,—not with a cut and dried scheme, but with a plan for discussion.

The Resolution was finally adopted in the following form:

“That this House is of opinion that the time has now come when His Majesty’s Government should get in touch with the Governments of the Dominions with a view to putting forward a scheme for the voluntary redistribution of the white peoples of the Empire and the stimulation of shipping and trade under the flag.”

M. L. H., 15-ii.-34.

EXHIBIT D.

THE
CASE FOR EMPIRE MIGRATION
APPROVED BY THE NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE
VOLUNTARY MIGRATION CONFERENCE
FOR PRESENTATION TO THE
UNITED KINGDOM GOVERNMENT
AND TO
THE MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT
24th and 25th SEPTEMBER, 1935.

I. GENERAL OUTLINE OF POLICY.

The primary aim is to assist the United Kingdom and the Dominions to escape from the shackles of unemployment by a voluntary movement of the population of the Empire to the climatically suitable and sparsely populated areas of the Dominions, thereby promoting employment throughout the Empire, and developing its vast resources for the betterment of the British race.

The immediate objectives are: (a) The establishment of an Empire Migration and Settlement Authority charged with responsibility and statutory authority by the Government of Great Britain, and recognized by the Dominions, to carry out a programme of voluntary Empire Migration, adequately financed and properly supervised. (b) The amendment of the Empire Settlement Act, 1922, with its fifty-fifty basis, as this is one of the chief obstacles in the way of migration.

II. HOW UNEMPLOYMENT IN THE DOMINIONS WILL BE REMEDIED BY IMMIGRATION.

If voluntary migration from the United Kingdom to the Dominions is properly organized, and if it is combined with a policy of financed and supervised settlement, it will necessarily have the effect of affording increased employment to all trades and to all classes of industrial workers in the Dominions where the migrants are established, and thereby will ameliorate economic conditions generally, with the result of increasing trade with the United Kingdom.

Many immigrants from the United Kingdom who are established overseas, under a plan of financed settlement, require a house, furniture, beds and bedding, cooking stove and cooking utensils, plates and crockery, and possibly a barn, farm implements and tools, and much other equipment. Most of these items are made by workers in the Empire out of raw materials, produced in the Empire. It is beyond any argument that the needs of new immigrants from the United Kingdom to the Dominions will provide a very great amount of work for workers in the Dominions, and the purchasing power thus distributed will act as a fillip to trade, to manufacturing, and to business generally, producing just those conditions of prosperity in the Dominions which it has frequently been said in the House of Commons that Great Britain is desirous of obtaining.

III. EFFECT OF MIGRATION ON EMPLOYMENT IN THE UNITED KINGDOM.

That a resumption of migration will have a favourable effect on employment and on the unemployment relief situation in the United Kingdom is also beyond argument. Every unemployed person who leaves the United Kingdom for a new home overseas causes a direct and immediate saving in unemployment relief expenditure; every employed person who leaves his home and work in the United Kingdom and migrates to the Dominions throws his job in the United Kingdom open to some unemployed person there, who thus comes off unemployment relief; at the same time he has the opportunity of a career for himself and his family. This aspect of migration has been emphasized quite recently by the Report of the Commissioner

for Special Areas, published on July 18. "If," he says, in paragraph 11 of his Report, "in the years 1931 to 1935 there had been the same emigration as in the years 1911 to 1913, there would have been a million fewer people in this country." His recommendation in this respect is expressed in the following words: "Transference by migration to the Empire overseas would help to solve the (unemployment) problem, and the earliest opportunity should be taken to reopen with the Dominions negotiations for a resumption of Empire migration."

IV. METHODS OF SETTLEMENT OVERSEAS.

Local conditions are not identical in all parts of the Empire; different methods of settlement are required to meet different conditions; but the basis of all settlement must be that the Mother Country shall be responsible for the "after-care" of all migrants until they have become established.

Speaking generally, there are two different plans applicable to overseas settlement:

- (a) Increasing the settlement in already developed and partially settled areas in the Dominions; and
- (b) The more intensive development of virgin areas in the Dominions and their subsequent settlement.

There will, no doubt, be different variations of these two types to conform to local conditions in different Dominions. It will, however, suffice for the present purpose to present for consideration some of the main features of these two types:

As regards (a):

Small-Group Community Family Settlements are advocated. Emphasis must be laid on thorough organization, on careful selection both of the land and of the migrant families, on adequate finance, and on close and continued supervision, without all of which it is impossible to expect success. Some Overseas Settlement schemes in the past have lacked these essentials, and have therefore failed to give the success hoped for. There is no reason why full success should not be ensured in the future if actions are guided by the experience of the past.

As regards (b):

At the outset much of the work would be of a pioneering nature. Experts in planning, building, road-making, and public utility services would prepare the way for succeeding contingents of migrants. The development of Settlements would necessitate the construction of houses and farm buildings, and the clearing and preparation of land for farming on carefully planned lines. The work might include the construction of harbours and canals, river improvements, irrigation works, and the establishment of power plants, broadcast stations, aerodromes, telephonic and telegraphic systems, etc., etc. Mines as available and as required might be developed and worked. There would be erected saw-mills to utilize forests and clear more rich land for cultivation; and other manifold activities such as fisheries, dairies, canning, meat-packing, refrigeration, and factories for the supply of the many necessities of the populations would be established and worked. In fact, new townships would grow up, surrounded by farming areas, linked up by suitable means of communication with each other, and complete with all the amenities of modern civilization. The British public includes a surplus of industrial types suitable for the activities specified which are not of an agricultural nature.

The Dominions would benefit even before the vanguard of the new movement arrived, for the enterprises, carefully studied and planned before-hand, and organized by experienced men, would be backed by capital, much of which would be expended in payment of wages and purchase of materials.

In general, people would be taken to the places of operations by groups and communities, so that friends, relations and neighbours would keep together. Schools, training establishments and hospitals would be opened; libraries and cinemas built;

recreation grounds laid out; and so, with their friends and pastimes, with the added amenities of the new land around them, and with the opportunities to become independent and to banish the nightmare of unemployment, a new day would dawn for many who, at present, see no ray of hope for the future.

V. SELECTION OF MIGRANTS.

Selection of migrants from the United Kingdom should be undertaken by local committees or others qualified to select suitable aspirants. None would be sent out until accommodation had been provided for them. Misfits would be repatriated without the stigma of deportation. Let the Dominions rest assured that our people have not deteriorated in their character, their capacity for work, or their will to succeed. If given the opportunities, they will not hesitate to take advantage of them. The Dominions' representatives should be associated in the selection of the migrants.

VI. THE HUMAN ASPECT.

Under this scheme the human aspect of settlement would receive every consideration. Therefore, the aid of organizations which understand human and social needs of large bodies of people would be enlisted to safeguard physical, educational and spiritual welfare. Settlers would not be dumped, neither would they be placed in circumstances where they would have the feeling of being stranded.

VII. FINANCE.

No large-scale scheme of Organized Migration and Settlement can succeed if it entails any considerable financial burdens on the Dominions. It is therefore essential for the British Government primarily to assume financial responsibility for this specific purpose. The aim should be to make the settlers self-supporting.

The progressive transference of large numbers of migrants for absorption into self-supporting and productive enterprises in the Dominions will release proportionate charges on British Government revenues now utilized for Unemployment Insurance and Public Assistance payments and other Social Services in Great Britain. Having regard to these immense annual disbursements, and to the fact that the settlement in the Dominions of migrants from Great Britain will progressively lessen the drain on those revenues by decreasing unemployment in this country, it is obvious that the Government will be able to grant financial assistance by way of guarantee of loans and grants-in-aid without in any way adding to the taxpayers' already heavy burdens.

The expenditure will fall under two heads, namely:

- (a) Capital Expenditure, for acquisition and development on an economic basis of land, houses, stock and equipment, etc., etc.
- (b) Recurring Expenditure on:
 - (i) Sea and Rail Passages.
 - (ii) Upkeep and Maintenance of Settlements.
 - (iii) Miscellaneous items.

These two main heads of expenditure are applicable to every individual plan of Settlement.

The following method of raising the necessary funds is recommended:

(a) Capital Expenditure.

In order to obviate recurring applications to Parliament, it would be preferable that the "Empire Migration and Settlement Authority" should be authorized to raise a loan or loans, guaranteed by the United Kingdom Government, the proceeds of which would be devoted to Empire Migration and Settlement. The capital expenditure would be an investment, which would bring in many ways—in migration and settlement value; by providing opportunities and openings for many of our people who now lack them; by helping to develop the Overseas Dominions, with a resulting increase in Empire Trade and Shipping; by curtailing our Unemployment Relief; and, ultimately, in money interest also.

(b) Recurring Expenditure.

The establishment of Settlements Overseas would take place gradually. An Empire Settlement Act should provide *inter alia* for the necessary annual grants-in-aid to Settlements.

Recapitulation of Financial Proposals.

The proposal is, then, that capital expenditure should be provided under Government Guarantee, while the annual grants-in-aid should be provided out of the annual grant under an Empire Settlement Act.

Every scheme or plan, whether put forward by a Dominion or by any other body or person, will have to be considered on its general merits. To do this will be the function of the appropriate Empire Migration and Settlement Authority.

VIII. SUMMARY.

Thus there would be organized and developed on properly financed lines new communities overseas, which, by working to support themselves, would create fresh demands for manufactured goods and stimulate Dominions' and Empire trade.

Our frozen assets—men and women, millions of pounds sterling, and rich vacant lands throughout the Empire—would be combined and mobilized, and thereby assist to speed up the wheels of industry and commerce, with consequent relief to unemployment and human misery throughout the Empire.

EXHIBIT E.

i.—LIST OF DELEGATES ATTENDING NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE EMPIRE VOLUNTARY MIGRATION CONFERENCE.

The Lord Mayor of Newcastle-upon-Tyne (Councillor R. Stanley Dalglish).	
Appleby, Capt. W.	Nat. Executive, British Legion.
Blake, J. Godfrey	Western Australia.
Bloomfield, Leonard	Salvation Army.
Bowman, J. S.	Industrial Advisory Council.
Bramble, John	Newcastle Migration Committee.
Brown, Capt. Bruce	National Citizens' Union.
Brown, J. S.	Industrial Advisory Council.
Cook, R. C.	National Citizens' Union.
Crosskey, Lieut.-Col. Cecil	Birmingham Migration Committee.
Cruddas, Colonel B., M.P.	Wansbeck Division.
Deas, E. T.	Newcastle Rotary Club, and Newcastle Migration Committee.
De Courcy, Kenneth	Imperial Policy Group.
Donaldson, H. B.	Empire Migration Settlement Group.
Fairfax-Lucy, Col. Sir Henry	Lord-Lieut. of Warwickshire.
Ferguson, J. W.	New South Wales Government.
Gilbert, Coun. E.	Industrial Advisory Council.
Gordon, Capt. E. A.	Economic League.
Gough, J. H., F.C.I.S., A.S.S.A.	Yorkshire Voluntary Migration Committee.
Granger, Alfred	Salvation Army.
Gregory, George	Birmingham Migration Committee.
Haines, Major M. C.	National Citizens' Union.
Henderson, H. M. B.	South Shields Migration Committee.
Hodgson, Mark	Industrial Advisory Council.
Hornby, Brig.-Gen. M. L., C.B., Empire Migration Settlement Group, of Lethbridge, C.M.G., D.S.O.	Alberta and Invermere, B.C., Canada.
Jeffryes, Geo. K.	Canadian National Railways (Newcastle).
Jones-Neilson, Mrs. Orpah, T.D.	British Immigrants Club, Dunedin, New Zealand.
Lambert, Sir Arthur W., M.C., J.P.	Newcastle Migration Committee, and Northumber- land and Durham Empire Settlement Committee.
Louis, Mrs. Henry	Newcastle Migration Committee.
Magnay, T., M.P.	Gateshead.
Mann, Russell, F.C.A.	National Citizens' Union.
Mansfield, Earl of	Imperial Policy Group.
McCall, Mrs. J. L.	E.W.C.A., Edinburgh.
Merz, Miss Teresa, O.B.E., J.P.	Newcastle Migration Committee, and Citizens' Service League.
Miller, Wm.	High Heaton, Newcastle upon Tyne.
Morgan, Sir Benjamin	British Empire League.
Murray, Lt.-Col. Eric, O.B.E.	British Empire League.
Nunn, Wm., M.P. (Whitehaven)	Empire Settlement Group & Imperial Policy Group.
Pearson, W. G., M.P.	Jarrow and Hebburn Migration Committee, and Northumberland and Durham Empire Settlement Committee.
Pott, Miss Gladys S., O.B.E.	Society for the Overseas Settlement of British Women.
Ranson, Ald. James	South Shields Migration Committee.
Ridley, Arthur H., J.P.	Northumberland and Durham Empire Settlement Committee.
Robbins, Arthur H.	Newcastle Migration Committee, and Juvenile Or- ganizations Council.
Sanders, Miss Nesti	Imperial Policy Group.
Schonegevel, B. O., J.P.	South Africa.
Simm, Mrs. L. E.	Newcastle Migration Committee, and Society for Overseas Settlement of British Women.
Sprot, Mrs. E.	Woodlands Hall, Consett, Durham

LIST OF DELEGATES—(Continued)

Thorpe, Coun. Richard	Yorkshire Voluntary Migration Committee.
Vickers, Vincent C.	Empire Migration Settlement Group, and National Citizens' Union.
Webb, Sir Montague De P., C.I.E., C.B.E.	Royal Empire Society, and National Citizens' Union.
Westmacott, Henry A., J.P.	Newcastle Migration Committee.
Westwood, Wm.	Industrial Advisory Council.
Whillance, J. C.	Newcastle Migration Committee, and Northumberland Boy Scouts' Association.
Wilson, W. S.	

ii.—SELECTION FROM MESSAGES RECEIVED BY THE CONFERENCE.

1. Commander J. B. Adams, D.S.O., C.B.E., late Hon. Secretary, Yorkshire Voluntary Migration Committee.

"You know my interest in Migration. I hope the Conference will result in stimulating thought throughout the Empire, followed by a determination for action. British migrants prove the most valuable settlers in the world. More power to your elbow."

2. Colonel Lord Barnard, C.M.G., M.C., T.D., Lord Lieutenant of Durham.

"Needless to say, any sound and workable scheme that could be devised to make migration possible again would have my entire support, but I believe, to be effective, any scheme must be of a much more comprehensive character than has ever been attempted before."

3. Lord Bledisloe, G.C.M.G., K.B.E., recently Governor-General of New Zealand.

"I wish all success to your Empire Migration Conference. Our great Imperial Heritage sadly needs peopling with the best types of British stock belonging to all classes with adequate provision for their comfort and well-being after arrival overseas."

4. Major M. Owen Culshaw, Salvation Army.

"Over forty years ago, the Founder of the Salvation Army said: 'Of all the remedies propounded for the immediate and permanent relief of distress arising from unemployment, emigration holds the field.' If he were here today, I think he would say that his words were still true, or he might be tempted to ask: 'Is there any better way?'"

5. Alfred Denville, Esq., M.P.

"I am in sympathy with the subject, and I hope the Conference will be a success. We could certainly do with a lot of migration from Newcastle upon Tyne."

6. P. J. Hannon, Esq., M.P.

"This Conference should give a very helpful stimulus to public opinion in relation to migration, and I hope very much that in the next Parliament the subject will be made one of outstanding interest and that the Government will be pressed to take concerted and effective action."

7. James Stanley Little, Esq., C.M.G.

"The subject of Empire Plantation should be ventilated, and considered steps taken to initiate and prosecute a big and embracing scheme."

8. Right Hon. J. Ramsay MacDonald, M.P.

"Is greatly interested in the subject and hopes that something practical may result in consequence of the deliberations."

9. General J. J. Nation, C.V.O., D.S.O., M.P.

"Migration is a subject of great and increasing importance to the Empire, and one that must be taken up seriously by Parliament in the immediate future."

10. A. A. Somerville, Esq., M.P.

"The Conference is welcome evidence that the vital question of migration is again coming to the front. May I wish you great and practical results."

11. Right Hon. J. H. Thomas, M.P., Secretary of State for the Dominions.

"I appreciate the telegram which you have sent to me on behalf of the Newcastle-upon-Tyne Empire Voluntary Migration Conference, and trust that it may not be long before conditions will once more enable a substantial movement of population from this country to Dominions overseas. You may rest assured that the Government will do all that they can, in co-operation with Overseas Governments, to encourage and facilitate such a movement."

EXHIBIT F.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED IN CANADA IN 1935 IN FAVOUR OF AN EARLY RESUMPTION OF BRITISH IMMIGRATION, AND OF THE "HORNBY PLAN."

Resolutions have been passed by the undermentioned Cities and Towns, and by their
Boards of Trade:

Saskatchewan:

Wolseley,
Melfort,
Prince Albert,
Lashburn,

Alberta:

Vermilion,
Tofield,
Mayerthorpe,
Grande Prairie,
High River.

British Columbia:

Prince George,
Vanderhoof,
Prince Rupert.

Copies of the Resolutions are given on the following pages:

**COPIES OF RESOLUTIONS.
WOLSELEY, SASK., BOARD OF TRADE.**

Office of the Secretary.

Wolseley, Sask.,
April 6, 1934.

To:—
Honorable Wesley Gordon, M.P.,
Minister of Agriculture,
Ottawa, Canada.
Honorable Sir,—

At a meeting of the Wolseley Board of Trade, held on the 4th instant, the matter of settling one hundred British Families on 16,000 acres of land adjacent to this town under the Hornby Land Settlement Scheme was fully discussed, and the Board unanimously agreed to give utmost support to the proposition.

Many advantages are to be gained by the Town through such settlement and the Board of Trade will be prepared to co-operate to the fullest extent in the establishment of these settlers. We are given to understand that buildings will be erected on each quarter section where necessary, wells will be drilled, trees planted and fences put up. This will give employment to some 200 men for the best part of a year. These men will all deal in this town for the purchase of food, clothing, etc., and all food products which they will consume will, as far as possible, be purchased from the farmers of the district. The purchase of the land will put in circulation a large amount of money, which will benefit many of the business men. There is also the purchase of livestock and equipment and many other items, all of which will be beneficial not only to this district but will be reflected in general business conditions even in the City of Regina.

The following Resolution was, therefore, passed unanimously by the Board, and the Secretary was instructed to forward a copy to the Minister of Immigration at Ottawa through our local Member of Parliament, Mr. E. E. Perley:—

Resolved that the Wolseley Board of Trade is strongly in favor of One Hundred British Families being established in the Wolseley district under the Hornby Land Settlement Scheme.

Yours truly,

(Signed) S. I. COLE, Vice-President.
E. F. CHESNEY, Secretary.

TOWN OF WOLSELEY, SASK.

Office of the Secretary-Treasurer.

Wolseley, Sask.,
April 12th, 1934.

To:—
Honorable Wesley Gordon, M.P.,
Minister of Immigration,
Ottawa, Canada.
Honorable Sir,—

At a meeting of the Wolseley Town Council held on the 9th instant, Mr. John R. Garden met the Council and explained the Hornby Scheme of Land Settlement for the settling of one hundred British families in the district next year.

The land selected for the purpose is very suitable and we are of opinion that the Scheme will be highly beneficial to this Town and district and we will assist in every way to make a happy and contented settlement.

The following Resolution was moved by Councillor Rigney and carried unanimously:—

"That this Council go on record as being heartily in favor of the establishment of a British Community Settlement in the Wolseley District as set forth in the Hornby Scheme."

Yours very truly,

(Signed) S. I. COLE,

Mayor.

(Signed) THOS. W. TILLER,

Sec.-Treasurer.

RURAL MUNICIPALITY OF WOLSELEY, SASK.

No. 155.

Office of the Secretary-Treasurer.

Wolseley, Sask.,

April 7th, 1934.

Jas. A. Cowan, Reeve.

J. B. Smiley, Sec.-Treasurer.

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

At a meeting of the Council of the Rural Municipality of Wolseley No. 155, held at Wolseley on Saturday, April the seventh, the following Resolution was moved by Councillor Platt and carried:—

"That this Council endorse Hornby British Settlement Plan."

That a copy of this Resolution be presented to Mr. E. E. Perley, M.P., and Mr. John R. Garden.

Yours truly,

(Signed) J. B. SMILEY,

Sec.-Treasurer.

Copy of this Resolution was handed to the Minister of Immigration by Mr. E. E. Perley, M.P., in April last.

THE RURAL MUNICIPALITY AND TOWN OF WOLSELEY, SASK.

Wolseley, Sask.,

December 10, 1934.

To:—

Honorable W. A. Gordon, K.C.,
Minister of Immigration & Colonization,
House of Commons,
Ottawa, Canada.

Dear Sir,—

Further to our Resolutions to you of April last re the proposed Hornby Colonization Plan at this point, we note that recently the inter-department Committee of the British House of Commons made certain recommendations respecting Immigration from Great Britain.

The Wolseley Town Council and the Council of the Rural Municipality of Wolseley are anxious to see the Hornby Scheme of Settlement consummated here in the very near future. We are of the opinion that this particular proposition can be embodied in the proposition outlined by this inter-departmental Committee, and the Hornby Scheme of properly financed colonization is heartily endorsed by us.

This particular district has had very good crops over a long period of years and has contributed to the alleviation of distress in the dried-out areas. The district being classified as "Park Land," it is particularly adaptable to mixed farming. The type of soil is excellent and from a standpoint of scenic beauty the district is unexcelled. There is no reason whatever why each farm of 160 acres, with not less than 120 acres cultivated, cannot produce a good living for those who are farming it, with a fair surplus for sale each year.

The financial affairs of this Municipality are in excellent condition and the Town of Wolseley has the lowest tax rate of any town of its size.

The Wolseley District is composed predominantly of English speaking people, who would welcome new settlers of British stock. There are excellent rural schools, giving instruction up to and including Grade Ten, while the High School in Wolseley gives the equivalent of first year arts.

In view of the general approval of the Hornby Scheme and its adaptability to this locality we respectfully urge you to support it in the House of Commons at Ottawa and to exert your favourable influence in replying to the British Government's communication.

For The Rural Municipality of Wolseley No. 155,
JAS. A. MCGOWAN, Reeve.

For The Town of Wolseley,
S. I. COLE, Mayor.

TOWN OF MELFORT, SASK.

Regular meeting of the Council of the Town of Melfort, Sask., this 4th day of February, 1935.

Moved by Councillor A. G. Badgley,

Seconded by Councillor W. E. Hornby; THAT

1. This Council do endorse the Hornby British Settlement Plan;
2. That a copy of this Resolution be sent to the Honorable Robt. Weir, M.P., Federal Minister of Agriculture; the Honorable R. J. Manion, Federal Minister of Railways and Canals; the Honorable Wesley Gordon, M.P., Federal Minister of Immigration and Colonization; the Honorable J. G. Gardiner, M.L.A., Premier of the Province of Saskatchewan; and A. G. Sinclair, Esq., Canadian National Railway Colonization Department, with a letter in accordance, or more or less so, with draft of letter marked Exhibit "A" and attached hereto, the said letter to be drawn up, as aforesaid, and signed by the Clerk of the Town of Melfort.—Carried.

Certified a true copy.

(Signed) EDGAR D. CORDWARDINE,
Town Clerk.

(Signed) THOS. McCOSH,
Mayor.

TOWN OF MELFORT, SASK.

February 8, 1935.

To:—
Brigadier-General M. L. Hornby,

Dear Mr. Hornby:—

Enclosed herewith is a copy of Resolution passed unanimously by the Council of the Town of Melfort, Saskatchewan.

The Council begs to point out as regard the territory that is tributary to Melfort as follows:

1. The soil is known as black loam on a clay sub-soil.
2. The district has never had a crop failure within a period extending over not less than thirty-five years.

3. The average production of grain per acre per year over said period has been as follows:—

Wheat 20 to 25 bushels per acre; Oats 60 to 70 bushels per acre, and Barley, approximately 35 to 40 bushels per acre. As a vegetable producing country there is nothing to surpass it in the whole of Northern Saskatchewan.

4. The district has a reputation in regard to hogs. The Melfort Livestock Pool Commission shipped 17,000 hogs in 1934. Over 10,000 of those were of a quality suitable for export being composed of bacons and selects. A private concern with headquarters in Melfort, shipped some 95,000 hogs during the year 1934 from what may be termed as being, more or less, the Melfort district.

The reason for this reputation is, that there has been a breeding station operated by the Dominion Government at Melfort for the past four years which has given every encouragement to the farmers of the district to specialize in hog raising. Some of these hogs were shipped from an area which includes and is a little larger than the Melfort district. There is an overlapping but at the same time, for general purposes, these figures are sufficiently correct.

5. The Town has one of the best creameries in the Province of Saskatchewan. Its capacity with the present equipment is capable of producing one and one-half million pounds of butter per year. It has in connection with it a modern cold storage plant which is and forms part of the building. The quantity of cream received by the creamery for the year 1934-35, when checked up, if it has not already been done, will prove to be approximately 525,000 pounds of butter fat. The creamery year expired immediately upon the termination of the 31st January, 1935.

6. The dairy business is a magnificent source of cash revenue for farmers within the Melfort district. The country is especially adapted for the raising and supporting of cattle of the dairy breed.

7. The Melfort district is well equipped from the standpoint of public schools. It may be said that the pioneering day has come to an end in this regard. Melfort, itself, supports a high school and some of the public schools in the Melfort district do high school work.

8. Highways. The district is very well supplied with highways and farm roads. Each year sees a progressive development and improvement of these roads.

9. The country, for the most part, is divided into rural municipalities and the councillors of these rural municipalities will be found to be men of progress, of a high intelligence, energetic and in many cases, experts in regard to one or more phases of farming.

10. Throughout the district there are quite a number of community halls as well as churches. Societies appertaining to the men and also to the women, all tending to the improvement of living conditions and based on splendid ideals suitable to the country, are in abundance. Actually the day of isolation of the farmers in this part of Saskatchewan is largely a thing of the past.

11. Our Rural Telephone System and Telegraph Offices are within reach of most of the district.

12. The district is quite heavily railroaded.

13. The large majority of conventions and meetings appertaining to farmers in the district are held in the Town of Melfort. The Town is actually the centre of community interest for the farmers over a large area. The area extends 35 to 40 miles North of Melfort; 20 miles West of Melfort; 15 to 20 miles South of Melfort, and 15 to 20 miles East of Melfort.

14. The opportunities of care for the sick are very fair. The Town of Melfort has a hospital. It is well equipped with competent physicians and surgeons. It has also a chiropractic doctor practising in the Town.

15. Melfort, itself, is a judicial centre. The Court House is a splendid building situate in the Town.

16. The Melfort district is justly proud of its Agricultural Society. The Society has been managing a fair in the Melfort district for quite a number of years. The present agricultural fair that the Society has been promoting during the past few years is a Regional Fair. A reasonable nomenclature for this fair is the Melfort Regional Class B Fair. That type and/or class of fair is and/or are the type and/or class that is and/or are favoured by the Society at the present time. There is no Fair of its kind anywhere else in the Carrot River Valley.

17. It occurred to the Council that these points set forth herein might be of interest to you. If you require any further information, the Council suggest that you communicate with the Melfort Board of Trade. That body, which is an incorporated body, would be only too pleased to furnish you with any information appertaining to the district that it has at its disposal. The Council hopes that the Resolution, a copy of which has been enclosed herewith, as aforesaid, will meet with your approval, and that you will use your influence to assist in converting the Hornby Land Settlement Scheme from a proposition to an existing fact.

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) EDGAR D. CORWARDINE, Clerk.

PRINCE ALBERT, SASK.

Copy of Resolution passed at meeting of Prince Albert Board of Trade, dated 24th January, 1935, re Hornby Settlement Plan.

WHEREAS Brig.-General M. L. Hornby, of Lethbridge, Alberta, has outlined in detail a scheme of British settlement for Canada which would be entirely financed by British capital.

AND WHEREAS we have carefully studied the Scheme, which provides for groups of settlements throughout the Dominion.

AND WHEREAS in our opinion the scheme has great merit if it is properly carried out.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this Board of Trade goes on record as endorsing the Hornby Plan of settlement and recommends its study and endorsement by the Federal Government, and that copies of this Resolution be forwarded to the Prime Minister, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, the Minister of Railways, the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Immigration, the Secretary, National Immigration Committee of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, Montreal, and to our Federal Member, the Rt. Hon. W. L. MacKenzie King.

(Sgd.) JOHN P. CURROR, Secretary.

LASHBURN AND DISTRICT BOARD OF TRADE

Lashburn, Sask.,

February 28th, 1935.

To:—

Brig.-General M. L. Hornby,
The Hornby Farms,
Lethbridge, Alberta.

Dear Sir,—

Our Board of Trade have passed Resolutions endorsing your Plan of Settlement and we have forwarded copies of our Resolution to the Prime Minister, the Minister of Railways, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, the Minister of Agri-

culture, the Minister of Immigration, our Federal Member for this district, and also to our Saskatchewan Premier and Member from this constituency.

Our Resolution reads as follows:

"RESOLVED that the Lashburn Board of Trade is strongly in favour of One Hundred British Families being established in the Lashburn District under the Hornby Land Settlement Scheme."

This Resolution was also accompanied by a letter outlining the advantages to our district, etc., and asking for support and that the matter be taken up actively.

At a later meeting of our Board the plan was again discussed and the following Recommendation was made:

That the Settlement Manager be known as "The County Agent" and in a settlement as outlined for this district, it is believed that to satisfactorily manage the Settlement, he would require the following assistants:—

1. A Farm Instructor—"A Practical Farmer."
2. A University Department of Agriculture Nominee.
3. An expert Accountant.

The following motion was also unanimously carried by our Board:

"THAT the Lashburn and District Board of Trade express their hearty co-operation and offer their assistance as far as they possibly can in the successful promotion of the Hornby Scheme."

Should there be any matter which we have overlooked or if there is anything which we may do to help in the promotion of your Scheme we would be pleased if you would advise us.

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) W. E. IBBOTT, Sec.

VERMILION, ALBERTA, BOARD OF TRADE

Minute of a Resolution passed unanimously by the Vermilion Board of Trade at a general meeting held on Monday evening, January 21st, 1935.

"RESOLVED" that this meeting heartily approves of the Hornby Plan of organized land settlement in Canada, and that we will co-operate to the fullest possible extent in furthering the Scheme if arrangements are made to establish a Settlement under the Plan in this District."

To:—

Rt. Hon. R. B. Bennett,
Prime Minister,
House of Commons,
Ottawa,
Canada.

January 24, 1935.

Honourable Sir:

We beg to submit herewith for your information a copy of a Resolution passed by our Board. We understand that your Government requires to approve of this Scheme before it can be proceeded with, and would respectfully urge upon you an early and favourable consideration of it.

Yours respectfully,

J. D. ADAM, Sec.-Treasurer,

VERMILION BOARD OF TRADE.

To:—
The Deputy Minister,
Department of Agriculture,
House of Commons,
Ottawa, Canada.

January 24, 1935.

Honourable Sir:

I am instructed to forward for your consideration the enclosed copy of a Resolution recently passed by our Board. We are informed that the arrangements proposed by Brig.-General Hornby will require the approval of the Government, and we would urgently request that you give this matter your attention at an early date, also that you be good enough to render all assistance possible towards launching the Scheme.

Yours respectfully,

J. D. ADAM, Sec.-Treasurer,
VERMILION BOARD OF TRADE.

Same letter to:

The Deputy Minister,
Department of Railways
and to
The Deputy Minister,
Department of Trade and Commerce.

THE TOWN OF TOFIELD, ALBERTA.

J. W. Chapman, Secretary-Treasurer,

Tofield, Alta.

Tofield, Alta.,
February 20th, 1935.

To:—
Brig.-General M. L. Hornby,
Lethbridge, Alberta.

Dear Sir,—

I am in receipt of your letter of the 15th inst., and beg to advise that the following resolution was passed by the Council of the Town of Tofield at a regular meeting held on January 21st last:

“Resolved that this Council go on record as being heartily in favour of the establishment of a British Community Settlement Scheme, and is of the opinion that the establishment of a number of these settlements throughout the Dominion will be of substantial benefit to the country as a whole.”

A copy of this resolution was sent to the Minister of Immigration and another to the local member, Michael Luchovich, on January 22nd.

Yours respectfully,

(Sgd.) J. W. CHAPMAN,
Sec.-Treasurer.

MAYERTHORPE, ALBERTA, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

Mayerthorpe, Alberta.

To:—

Brig.-General M. L. Hornby,
Lethbridge, Alberta.

Dear Sir,—

The following Resolution was recently unanimously passed by this Chamber of Commerce, to wit:—

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

“That this body go on record as being heartily in favour of the establishment of a British Community Settlement in the Mayerthorpe district, as set forth in the Hornby Scheme.”

Also:

“That a copy of the above Resolution be placed before the following gentlemen:—

The Honourable Prime Minister, at Ottawa,
Our resident Member, Mr. D. M. Kennedy, at Ottawa,
The Minister of Railways, at Ottawa,
The Minister of Trade and Commerce, at Ottawa,
The Minister of Immigration, at Ottawa,
The Minister of Agriculture, at Ottawa,
and to Brig.-General M. L. Hornby at Lethbridge, Alberta.

(Sgd.) P. WOLOCHOW, Pres.
M. M. WEBER, Secy.

Mayerthorpe, Alberta,
January 16th, 1935.

MAYERTHORPE — CHAMBER OF COMMERCE**(Copy for Brig.-General M. L. Hornby)**

Sixteenth
January
1935.

To:—

Mr. D. M. Kennedy, M.P.,
Ottawa, Canada.

Dear Sir,—

Re: Empire Migration Policy.

On behalf of the Local Chamber of Commerce, I wish to place before you a resolution recently passed by this body. Also, to submit to the Prime Minister and the Minister of Immigration, the questions attached.

Needless to say, your co-operation and support in this matter, will be greatly appreciated by the members of this Chamber.

With best personal regards, I am,

Yours sincerely,

(Sgd.) P. WOLOCHOW, Pres.

Mayerthorpe C. of C.

VILLAGE OF MAYERTHORPE

Mayerthorpe, Alta.

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

The Council of the Village of Mayerthorpe, in a recent session, unanimously Resolved :—

“That this Council is of the opinion that the HORNBY SETTLEMENT SCHEME is a very practical project and highly desirable for new districts where settlement is required, and that we urge the Federal Government to give it their earnest and favourable consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

(Sgd.) M. M. WEBER, Sec.-Treas.

Village of Mayerthorpe.

January 16, 1935.

VILLAGE OF MAYERTHORPE

Mayerthorpe, Alberta,

24th January, 1935.

To:—

Brig.-General M. L. Hornby,
The Hornby Farms,
Lethbridge, Alberta.

Dear Sir,—

Re: **Village Resolution.**

Acknowledging yours of the 23rd instant, I beg to say that the Resolutions of this Village, endorsing the Settlement Scheme, was sent to the following, without accompanying letter:—

The Right Hon. R. B. Bennett
The Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King
The Hon. D. M. Kennedy (Our Resident Member)
The Minister of Railways
The Minister of Agriculture
The Minister of Immigration
The Minister of Trade and Commerce
The Hon. Charles Stewart
All addressed at Ottawa.

Trusting this is the information you wish, I beg to remain, at your further service.

Yours respectfully,

(Sgd.) M. M. WEBER, Sec.-Treas.

Village of Mayerthorpe.

GRANDE PRAIRIE, ALBERTA — BOARD OF TRADE.

January 22, 1935.

D. M. Kennedy, M.P.,
Ottawa, Canada.

Dear Sir:

At a meeting of the Grande Prairie Board of Trade held on the 18th inst., the matter of establishing a foundation farm settlement consisting of one hundred farms for British agricultural families under the Hornby Land Settlement Plan was fully discussed and the following Resolution was passed:

"Resolved, that the present time is opportune for resuming British Immigration in conjunction with a policy of financed land settlement and this Board advocates the adoption of the Hornby Plan as a scheme which, in our judgment, would be well adapted to the satisfactory settlement, especially of British people."

The many advantages which are to be gained by Town and District are very apparent and the Board of Trade will be prepared to co-operate to the fullest extent in the establishment of British settlers. Besides the purchase of land, food, clothing, lumber, machinery, etc., there is the purchase of livestock and equipment and other items, all of which will be beneficial to the district and would reflect better general business conditions throughout the entire West.

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) P. J. TOOLEY, Secretary,
Grande Prairie Board of Trade.

Copy of the above Resolution sent to the

Prime Minister
Minister of Trade and Commerce
Minister of Railways
Minister of Agriculture
Minister of Immigration.

HIGH RIVER, ALBERTA, BOARD OF TRADE.

" RESOLUTION "

The Hornby Plan of British Settlements

WHEREAS Brigadier-General Hornby, of Lethbridge, Alberta, has appeared before this Board and has fully outlined his Plan for British Settlement in Canada, and WHEREAS, after full discussion and careful consideration, it has been agreed:—

- (1) That the time is now ripe for a resumption of selective immigration, preferably of immigrants with agricultural knowledge.
- (2) That this District offers distinctive opportunities for new settlers, being located in a splendid Mixed Farming area and possibly one of the most outstanding in the Province of Alberta.
- (3) That the Plan as outlined by Brigadier-General Hornby is essentially sound and, in our opinion, marked care has been taken to avoid the mistakes of many immigration schemes of the past.
- (4) That the Plan is admirably adapted for this District.
- (5) That the principal need of the District tributary to High River is for more settlers.
- (6) That the Plan will be of material benefit to this community and, when adopted, will assist in solving the economic conditions of Canada and Great Britain.

WHEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this meeting of the High River Board of Trade heartily endorses the Hornby Plan of British Settlement and does recommend to the various Ministers of the Crown a thorough inquiry into the merits of the Plan with a view that the Dominion of Canada shall, at an early date, request the Government of Great Britain to give immediate effect thereto and that copies of this Resolution be sent to the Right Honourable Premier R. B. Bennett; the Right Honourable Mackenzie King; the Honourable the Minister of Railways; the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture; the Honourable the Minister of Trade and Commerce; the Honourable the Minister of Immigration; and the Secretary National Immigration Committee, Canadian Chamber of Commerce, Montreal.

(Sgd.) W. B. WAY, Secretary,
High River Board of Trade.

TOWN OF HIGH RIVER

Province of Alberta

Office of Secretary-Treasurer

To:

The Honourable R. B. Bennett, Ottawa,
 The Honourable W. L. Mackenzie King, Ottawa,
 The Honourable Dr. R. J. Manion, Ottawa,
 The Honourable Robert Weir, Ottawa,
 The Honourable W. A. Gordon, Ottawa,
 Mr. G. G. Coote, M.P., Ottawa,
 Senator D. E. Riley, Ottawa,
 W. L. Mc. Clark, Esq., Secy., Chamber of Commerce, Montreal.

Dear Mr.—

I am taking the liberty of sending you herewith a copy of Resolution recently passed by the Town of High River in connection with the Hornby Land Settlement Plan, with which you are no doubt familiar. The following outlines the action taken by the Town in respect to this:

RESOLUTION unanimously passed by members of the Council of the Town of High River, at a meeting held on Monday the 20th day of May, 1935.

WHEREAS after careful consideration of the Hornby Land Settlement Scheme as presented by Brigadier-General Hornby on a former and recent visit to High River,

THAT we do heartily endorse the Resolution passed by the High River Board of Trade, wherein it was resolved that we do recommend that a colony under the Hornby Plan be established in the High River District.

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) FRANK L. WATT, Mayor.

PRINCE GEORGE, B.C., BOARD OF TRADE.

Prince George, B.C.

February 27, 1935.

To:—

Brigadier-General M. L. Hornby,
 The Macdonald Hotel,
 Edmonton, Alberta.

Dear Sir,—

Copies of the Resolution passed by us supporting your land settlement scheme have now been sent to our Federal and Provincial representatives, and to the Prime Ministers of Canada and British Columbia.

We are enclosing a copy for your files, and would like to thank you again for the splendid address you gave us, and to wish you all success in your work.

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) G. O. WILSON, Secretary.

RESOLUTION

Unanimously passed at a General Meeting of the Prince George Board of Trade, held January 30th, 1935:

WHEREAS Brigadier-General Hornby has presented to the Prince George Board of Trade a land settlement plan which is known as the "Hornby Land Settlement Plan,"

AND WHEREAS this district is now very thinly settled and a great amount of money has been spent providing facilities such as railways, motor roads, schools, creamery, etc., and a much greater population is required to make use of those facilities,

AND WHEREAS it is felt that a properly financed settlement colony, which will not become a burden to the taxpayers of this country, is required to produce sufficient crop in the district to produce orderly marketing and thereby improve the condition of settlers already residing in the district,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Prince George Board of Trade endorse the Hornby Land Settlement Plan and recommend that a colony be established in the Prince George District where good land is available.

CERTIFIED a true copy.

(Sgd.) J. O. WILSON, Secretary.

CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF PRINCE GEORGE, B.C.

Prince George, B. C.

2nd March, 1935.

To:—

Brigadier-General M. L. Hornby,
Lethbridge, Alberta.

Dear Sir,—

At the Council Meeting held last Monday evening I was instructed to forward to you for your favourable consideration, the following Resolution, unanimously passed by the City Council of Prince George:

“Moved by Alderman Armstrong, seconded by Alderman Taylor,

“That this Council endorse the Hornby Land Settlement Plan and recommend that a colony be established in the Prince George District, where good land is available.”

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) W. S. FRASER, City Clerk.

Copies sent to:

The Prime Minister; The Minister of Railways; The Minister of Agriculture; The Minister of Immigration; The Secretary National Immigration Committee, Canadian Chamber of Commerce, Board of Trade Building, Montreal; and J. A. Fraser, M.P.

VANDERHOOF, B. C.—BOARD OF TRADE

Resolution endorsing Hornby Plan of British Settlement as passed by the Vanderhoof and District Board of Trade, Vanderhoof, B.C., on February 19th, 1935.

WHEREAS Brigadier-General Hornby, of Lethbridge, Alberta, has appeared before this Board and has fully outlined his Plan for British Settlement in Canada, and Whereas after full discussion and careful consideration, it has been agreed:

- (1) That the time is now ripe for a resumption of immigration.
- (2) That this district offers opportunities for new settlers unexcelled in any other part of British Columbia.
- (3) That the Plan as outlined by Brigadier-General Hornby is essentially sound, and marked care has been taken to avoid the mistakes of many immigration schemes of the past.
- (4) That the Plan is admirably adapted for this district.

- (5) That the prime need of the Vanderhoof district is for more settlers.
- (6) That the Plan when adopted will benefit not only this portion of British Columbia, but will, when extended, greatly benefit the whole of Canada, and help in a substantial measure towards a better economic condition.

WHEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this meeting of the Vanderhoof and District Board of Trade heartily endorses the Hornby Plan of British Settlement, and does recommend to the various Ministers of the Crown, a thorough enquiry into the merits of the Plan, with a view that the Dominion of Canada shall at an early date, request the Government of Great Britain to give immediate effect thereto, and that copies of this Resolution be sent to the Right Hon. R. B. Bennett; the Hon. The Minister of Railways; the Hon. The Minister of Trade and Commerce; the Hon. The Minister of Agriculture; the Hon. The Minister of Immigration; and the Secretary, National Immigration Committee, Canadian Chamber of Commerce, Montreal.

THE CORPORATION OF THE VILLAGE OF VANDERHOOF

Incorporated 1926

Vanderhoof, B.C.,
March 4th, 1935.

To:—

Brigadier-General M. L. Hornby,
The Hornby Farms,
Lethbridge, Alberta.

Dear Sir,—

I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of February the 15th which was read to the Commissioners at their meeting last Thursday evening.

I am attaching herewith a copy of our Resolution which was dispatched on February the 2nd last. To date favourable replies have been received from the following:—

John A. Fraser, M.P.
Ian A. Mackenzie, M.P.
The Secretary to the Minister of Railways.
The Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture.
The Secretary to the Prime Minister.

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) JAS. H. F. LACEY, Clerk.

THE CORPORATION OF THE VILLAGE OF VANDERHOOF

Incorporated 1926.

Vanderhoof, B.C.,
February 2nd, 1935.

Dear Sir,—

The Commissioners of the Corporation of the Village of Vanderhoof are pleased to submit the following Resolutions regarding the Hornby Settlement Plan, which were passed at a meeting held by them on the afternoon of Friday, February the 1st, 1935, all the Commissioners being present.

- (1) Resolved that there is need for more settlers in the General Interior of British Columbia.
- (2) Resolved that the Hornby Settlement Plan be thoroughly endorsed.

Regarding Resolution No. 1, the Commissioners desire to point out that in their opinion increasing the number of settlers along the lines of railway in the Central Interior would tend to increase the passenger traffic on the railway as well as increasing the amount of freight to be handled by the railway. They believe that more money would be put into circulation and that business generally would be greatly stimulated.

Regarding Resolution No. 2, and in endorsing the Hornby Settlement Plan the Commissioners feel that the fundamental principles of the Plan are sound and that it has been well thought out. They believe that the right kind of settlers, in whose minds the British spirit predominates, will be great and lasting benefit not only to this District but to the whole Dominion. General Hornby's meeting here was largely attended by farmers of the District who also approve of the Plan.

The above Resolutions are respectfully submitted for your kind attention and consideration.

Yours faithfully,

J. F. H. LACEY,
Clerk.

PRINCE RUPERT, B. C.—CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

The City Hall,
Prince Rupert, B.C.,
February 11th, 1935.

Dear Sir,—

I beg to advise you that at a Special Meeting of this Chamber of Commerce, held February 5th, 1935, called for the purpose of hearing Brigadier-General M. L. Hornby speak on his Immigration Plan, it was Resolved to endorse the Hornby Plan of Immigration, and that copies of the Resolution be forwarded to the Rt. Hon. R. B. Bennett, Prime Minister of Canada; The Hon. R. B. Hanson, Minister of Trade and Commerce; The Hon. Major Robt. Weir, Minister of Agriculture; The Hon. Dr. R. J. Manion, Minister of Railways and Canals; The Hon. W. A. Gordon, K.C., Minister of Immigration and Colonization; Olof Hanson, M.P.; and the Canadian Chamber of Commerce.

Respectfully submitted,

A. Brockbank, Sec.-Treas.

PRINCE RUPERT CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.
