## SIGNIFICANCE OF EMIGRATION—DISCUSSION

EDWARD ALSWORTH ROSS: So far the most momentous consideration in reversing our immigration policy has not even been mentioned here—namely, the fact that free land is gone and the immigrant, instead of settling the public domain, now becomes a competitor in the labor market. Here is the deep significance of the fact that during the last decade, while the population of Minnesota grew 19 per cent, of Kansas, 15 per cent, of Wisconsin, 13 per cent, of Nebraska, 12 per cent, of Missouri, 6 per cent, and of Iowa, not at all, the population of Massachusetts grew 20 per cent, of Connecticut, 23 per cent, of Rhode Island, 27 per cent, of New York, 25 per cent, of Pennsylvania, 22 per cent, of New Jersey, 35 per cent. Thirty or forty years ago, Germans, Scandinavians, Poles, Bohemians, Mennonites, and even Icelanders, landing at Castle Garden, journeyed straight through to the frontier with a railroad ticket pinned to the shoulder. Today the still virgin lands lie beyond the ken of the insweeping tides. This new immigration, which has Constantinople as its geographical center, is so alien, so ignorant, and so helpless, that it takes refuge in the first industrial harbors it finds. The big, intimidating fact of our time is the progressive saturation of the Northeast with these newcomers, who have no intention whatever of seeking the remaining fragments of the frontier,—Idaho, the "Short-Grass" country, the Texas Panhandle, or the cut-over pine lands of the Northwest. Not scattered as in the flush day of free land, but marshaled in gangs of shovelers or concrete-mixers, or lodged in certain pockets,—a Ghetto, a Little Italy, or Little Hungary, or Little Armenia,—the later aliens form, as it were, insoluble clots. Few venture far inland in their raw state. The East is getting three times its share of the new immigration in comparison with the West. The result is that southern New England and the Middle States, thanks to this cheap labor, are filling with dumps, coal-breakers, tanneries, mills, sky-scrapers, wharves, subways, barge canals, and metaled roads. This explains the swelling return flow to Europe, the large immigration of single men, the reluctance to be assimilated, the failure of manufactures to migrate westward, the migration of American

miners to the Far West, and the growing difficulty of maintaining an American standard of life on eastern wages.

With free land gone and the labor market flooded from abroad, we may expect the birth rate of the old American stock to decline precipitously. And this is a pity, for I hold that the two centuries of wilderness conquest had built up in this country a superior type, the pioneer breed. The more venturesome pushed west and there left more offspring than if they had stayed east. The decendants of several generations of those daring enough to reach the dangerous but roomy frontier are, from the standpoint of physique, spirit of enterprise, and tenacity of will, one of the finest types ever seen in the white race. It was this breed that so stubbornly contested the Civil War that the per cent of losses in the battles of that war exceeds the rate of loss in any war of the last two centuries. This precious stock, of pioneer ancestry, is abruptly curtailing the size of the family rather than send its sons to compete in a labor market overstocked with sub-common representatives of certain unachieving and undistinguished strains of southern and southwestern Europe.

Already America has ceased to allure, as of yore, the British, the Germans, and the Scandinavians; but it strongly attracts the Italians, Greeks, and Slavs. By 1930, perhaps, the opportunities left will have ceased to interest them, but, no doubt, the Khivans, the Bokhariots, the Persians, and the Afghans will regard this as the Promised Land. By 1950, even they will scorn the chances here but then, perhaps, the coolies from overpopulated India will be glad to take an American wage. But by the last quarter of this century, there will remain, possibly, no people in the world that will care for the chances left in America. Then, when immigration has ceased of itself, when the dogma of the sacred right of immigration has wrought its perfect work, and when the blood of the old pioneering breed has faded out of the motley, polyglot, polychrome, caste-riven population that will crowd this continent to a Chinese density, let there be reared a commemorative monument bearing these words:

TO THE AMERICAN PIONEERING BREED
THE VICTIM OF TOO MUCH HUMANITARIANISM AND
TOO LITTLE COMMON SENSE.

S. A. Cudmore: The flow of population between Canada and

the United States has been guided, not mainly by political or religious, but by economic and social motives. The two chief motives of these have been (1) land-hunger, and (2) the nineteenth and twentieth century movement toward city life.

Up to about 1850 or 1855 there was comparatively little interchange of population between the two countries, except perhaps along their immediate boundaries. Both had abundance of free land available for settlement, while the rush from the country to the cities had not yet begun in its modern intensity.

From 1855 to 1885 Canada had little fertile land immediately available for settlement. Her land-hungry inhabitants, therefore, had to satisfy their hunger by emigrating to the Western States, which lie in the same latitudes as the eastern provinces of Canada. At the same time the rush to the cities began, and hundreds of thousands of Canadians flocked to the greater opportunities which they saw awaiting them in the great American cities. So for this period of thirty years both the great forces which bring about the movement of population were operating strongly in favor of the United States as against Canada.

In 1886 the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railroad gave Canada her Northwest—an immense area of fertile land available for settlement. But it took time to divert the current of land-hungry Canadians from the American Northwest to our own. At the same time our government was trying to build up cities in our own country that would satisfy those who desired the opportunities of city life. This was done by tariff legislation, and at first its success was very partial indeed.

In the last decade the first great force affecting migration—land-hunger—has been working strongly in our favor, while, in spite of our tariff wall, the second force still continues to operate in favor of the United States, though with diminished intensity. Our only hope of minimizing that force of producing a purely Canadian culture and civilization in great Canadian cities lies in our tariff and its encouragement of manufactures. It is Alexander Hamilton who has said it.

The policy has its dangers, but our Parliament has power sufficient to cope with the perils that may arise. The only appeal from Parliament is to the country.