

the practice of the enumerators was to go to a house and say: 'Have you a son or daughter?' 'Are they in the States?' 'Yes.' 'How long have they been there?' 'Ten' or 'fifteen' or 'twenty years.' 'Do you expect them to return?' 'Oh, yes, I hope to see them again.' And so that name went down. The hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce knows that, in taking the census of 1891 that system was changed. Though the *de jure* system continued in force, yet in addition to the questions formerly asked by the enumerators, which might lead to a dialogue such as was suggested by Mr. Blake and the enumeration of people who had not been resident in Canada for ten, fifteen or twenty years, a new question was added to those to be put by the census enumerators. It was made the business of the enumerators to ask whether the absent members of the family had been away for over a year, and if they had they were not to be counted. Whereas, in the census of 1881, it was possible to have persons counted who has been ten, fifteen or twenty years away from the country. Under the rules of the census of 1891, no person was likely to be counted who had been away for more than twelve months. Now, as it happens, this instruction to the enumerators was adopted with the consent of the government of Sir John Macdonald. The census officer of that day suggested this, and said to Sir John Macdonald: This will make a more accurate census, but it will have the effect of reducing the population of Canada as compared with the census of 1881. And Sir John Macdonald said: What we want is an accurate census. And the government of Sir John Macdonald consented to this change in the instructions. That government contained two future premiers, representatives of the Conservative party, Sir John Abbott and Sir John Thompson, and these gentlemen consented to this method, which had for its object the learning of the truth regarding the population that the men at the head of affairs might intelligently legislate for the country they were to lead. Now, as it happens, I think it would not be difficult to bring to the recollection of the Minister of Trade and Commerce the fact that he himself was consulted upon that subject, and he agreed that it would be a rational and advisable improvement, though it would have the effect of diminishing the population of Canada as revealed by the census of 1891. In respect to another matter, in respect to the instructions issued to the enumerators as to taking persons who were not living at home, such as domestic servants and clerks in the employ of other persons, in respect to that matter as well, a change was made in the census instructions so as to secure greater accuracy by providing against duplications and counting the same individual in two different census divisions.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

Mr. BELL.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. BELL. The chief interest in the discussion of the census arises of course from the statements made in reference thereto by the Minister of Trade and Commerce. The Minister of Trade and Commerce accused the government and their subordinate officials who took the census of 1891, with having perpetrated a fraud upon the people of Canada, and he took the trouble to explain his reasons for thinking so, and the reasons which, in his opinion, induced the government and their subordinates to perpetrate this fraud. That statement made by the Minister of Trade and Commerce in the House, I see, is echoed by the press supporting the government outside the House. The Montreal 'Herald' has a leading article on census stuffing in 1891, in which, referring to the statements of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, it says that he has made out such a case as would justify and require that the government of the day should proceed to investigate the matter fully. In that opinion I agree, as I think it is in the interests of the people of Canada that that investigation should be made complete. However, I think I will be able to show the House, before I conclude my remarks, that there is no warrant, at least no sufficient warrant, for the mischievous and improper statement made in this House by the Minister of Trade and Commerce. The census of 1891, as I was pointing out when the House rose at six o'clock, was taken more carefully and on a system calculated to give more accurate results than the census of 1881, although the principle on which the two censuses were taken was identical. The *de jure* system was adopted in both cases. But special pains were taken by the commissioner who took the census of 1891 to avoid, as far as possible, errors arising from duplication and from counting individuals who had gone off for a long time beyond the confines of Canada. I propose to quote now from the manual which was issued as a body of instructions for the use of the enumerators. The matter of duplication is dealt with in this manual under the head of domestic servants:

Domestic servants come under three classes: 1st. Those who have homes within Canada from which they are temporarily absent; 2. Those who have no homes at all in Canada; 3rd. Those in settled employment and resident with families other than their own.

The instructions go on to describe how these are to be taken. The first class are to be taken with the families from which they are temporarily absent; then the second and third class, those who have no homes at all in Canada except where they are living and finding employment, and those who are in settled employment and resident with