

personnel chosen in the same manner, the preliminary instruction, both by books and oral teaching, imparted in the same way, and the same processes of verification resorted to. For those who are acquainted with the proceedings of the last census, the supposition I am refuting and the conclusion derived therefrom are simply ludicrous.

Mr. Harvey a little further, when attacking the *de jure* system, says.

"In this connection we should consider that the *de jure* system works injustice anywhere it is in the towns and cities. The travellers staying at hotels, the young lads at schools and boarding houses, the servants in families—all these are referred to their homes, while those chiefly in the country, while foreigners passing through the Dominion who are not enumerated—at all, are almost altogether in cities and towns."

Speaking of injustice, because the travellers and foreigners are not added in, as part of any population, to which they are of course perfect strangers, is rather a serious misapprehension of the idea of right.

What is the object of an enumeration of the population of a country? Is it the mere childish vain desire of crowding the largest possible figures on paper? Is it not, on the contrary, for the honest and reasonable purpose of knowing the real strength, or the weakness of the agglomeration and of every portion thereof; of knowing the relative proportion of sexes, ages, &c., &c.; is it not to ascertain what are the elements of vigor or of feebleness, and where, and how they are in existence, in order to divulge the causes and suggest future invigorating or curative action? If, to the real population of a frontier town were added (as a local operation has done) the few hundreds, travellers, strangers and foreigners, who gather there, will it be a greater producer or consumer, or a greater bulwark against invasion? Might it not, on the contrary, mislead the administration and induce the country to calculate upon a fictitious strength, and to count as contributors to the resources of the country or as defenders of the soil, a number of men actually arrayed against its interests or peace; men, whose first movement, on an emergency, would be to return to their legitimate quarters?

When the *de facto* system is *bona fide* put into practice, the difference as a whole, in the result is quite insignificant one way or the other. Where adopted it is not because it is apt to show a larger figure (an argument which no statistician would venture offering) but because it is argued that it simplifies the proceedings and that the omission of the number of the temporary absent is made up by the temporary present be-

ing counted, or in the words of the Registrar General of England: "*Foreigners are a set off against the number of Englishmen abroad.*" Therefore, such statisticians are longing for a system to increase the figures and make them look more respectable must lay aside the *de facto* as well as the *de jure*, to take up the superb system of 1851 and 1861 of counting both hands and both ways, which system, however well imagined for the purpose, is yet quite inadequate to reach the "*anticipated figures.*"

The mere fact that a Census has been taken under one or other of the two systems cannot be argued against the correctness of the result. The two systems have their advocates, and are both practiced; neither of them is a dogma of salvation; neither of them the abomination of sin. One may be better adapted than the other to given circumstances. The *de jure* system has been resorted to, both by the United States and the Canadian authorities, as being the better in view of the circumstances of special difficulties of organization, of the immense extent of territories and of federal political institutions. It has the immense advantage that it does not necessitate the very great haste which is a natural sequence of the adoption of the *de facto* system.

In connection with this, it is well, however, to remark that an idea, which has been prevalent and urged as a kind of by-word of criticism, is that the census of a large community, as of a vast extent of country, can be done in one day, and its results published within a week. It is, however, quite erroneous. But even if such expedition were possible, it would be of no decided advantage, in ordinary circumstances, and certainly no panacea against errors. Mr. Harvey himself gives a very good reason why, we in Canada, should not sacrifice to the impatient desire of being very fast, when he says, speaking of the difficulties existing in statistical enquiries and census taking in America: "*Duties which of all others require most training and most special study, are thus of necessity placed in the hands of unskilled, untrained and hastily appointed persons.*" Is it not then plain that to adopt a system which necessitates ten times as many officers and enumerators, and which requires the most haste, would be adding to the difficulties and chances of errors to a very great extent, if not in a proportionate ratio?

There has been a falling off in the ratio of increase of our population during the last decennial, and although the extent of it could not have been surmised before the actual taking of the census, still, men who had spent some time in analyzing the