

ment in regard to the census returns were given by him at a public meeting in Toronto, and they were brought out again, I see, yesterday, by the mover of the Address in the House of Commons. In those statements it is set forth that there was an increase in the operatives of manufactures of 112,000 hands during the past ten years. Now, Sirs, I am inclined to doubt the correctness of these figures and I am inclined to think that there is a mistake, not wilful but a mistake nevertheless. The census returns show that there are engaged in fish curing and canning 29,000 operatives. I do not think these can be properly classified as manufactures, but they are so classified. I have looked at the census returns for 1881 and cannot find that these people were so included as among the manufacturing class, and unless it can be shown that these appeared under some other heading this would account for nearly 30,000 of the 112,000 now appearing in the census returns as an increase. In the same way in the present census returns, 14,646 establishments employing 51,494 operatives are classed as other industries not enumerated. It is impossible for us from the census returns to tell what the occupation of these 51,000 are and whether they were returned in the census of 1881 or not. You will observe that 51,000 in 14,646 establishments represent about four in each establishment and, therefore, it may be presumed that the industries are not of a very important nature, but whether important or not it is quite possible that a very large number out of these 51,000 may go to make up a fallacious increase of 112,000 operatives that have been pointed out to us as being an evidence of the increase in the industries of the people during the past ten years. We all recollect, hon. gentlemen, that during the past ten years we were presented annually with the return of the immigration coming into the country of the number of people being added to the population. I accepted these as facts. I thoroughly believed that the National Policy was accomplishing the result that these returns would lead us to believe, but, hon. gentlemen, when the census returns were brought down and presented to us and an accurate account made we found that the returns given to us previously were inaccurate and that we were not justified in considering or framing any measures upon the growth of the population as shown to us during that period. I merely mention these

facts in order to show you that the hon. leader of the House must not find fault with all of us if we do not accept absolute facts what the census returns have shown, because I believe myself that we should always try and ascertain the truth and the accuracy of such statements by inquiry as to whether the facts are as represented or not, or at any rate they should be in such a form as will enable us to ascertain, by comparison, how far any variation has been made from the usual course.

Hon. Mr. BOWELL—I did not deal with the census returns at all.

Hon. Mr. BOULTON—No, Sir; it was the hon. mover of the Address, but you told us that we should accept as facts statistics that are given to us, and I am merely giving reasons why it is not always wise to accept as absolute facts what is stated in the course of argument, and I am showing where I found a discrepancy, and a great discrepancy too, as regards the increase of the number of operatives in the country. I pointed out that there were engaged in the fish canning and curing, 29,000 persons which were classed as operatives in 1891, but which were not so classed in 1881, and that there is an item in the census returns of 51,000 operatives engaged in 14,464 industries which are returned as unenumerated, so that we cannot tell what kind of establishment they are working in. That is a very large number of men and a very large number of industries, but we cannot tell what they are working at, therefore it is open to doubt as to how far they help to swell the number or whether the same principle was adopted in getting out the census returns for 1881 in regard to those unenumerated industries.

An hon. MEMBER—Are they all included in the 112,000?

Hon. Mr. BOULTON—Yes, they are all included in the 112,000. Now, hon. gentlemen, the increase in trade has been illustrated to us by the exports and the imports during the period for which the official returns have been prepared, and they are described as most gratifying. I do not know, hon. gentlemen, if we inquire into the facts of the case, so far as the exports and imports are concerned, that we will find them as gratifying as His Excellency in his address leads us to hope and expect. I have