

"had continued to increase until 1871, as fast as they were said to have done for the ten preceding years, they would now have numbered four millions and a quarter. Instead of under three millions and a half. The difference between the anticipated figures and the actual statement is grave and the public are as steadily denying the accuracy of the recent census, as the officials are upholding it. It does not follow from the fact that the general expectation has been disappointed, that the officials are mistaken."

I answer, that the ascertaining of the population of a country is not a question of anticipation, expectation, induction, comparison or of geometrical progression, but one of evidence, to be obtained *de visu* and *in situ* by sworn witnesses, from house to house, every individual being recorded one by one, *by name*, and in no other way. It is not a matter of argument, but essentially of fact.

The rate of increase of one period, in a young country yet undergoing the process of colonization and traversed by migratory currents, is no criterion whatever of the rate of increase of the next period. The population of Upper Canada was 465,357 in 1841, (end of that year) as ascertained by the census of that year; it was 952,004 in 1851, (end of the year); and 1,396,091 in 1861, (end of 1860) showing a total increase of 104 per cent for one decennial, and 46.00 for the period next following; But as the second period was made, in reality, only of nine years, the correct statement is to say that the annual increase was at the rate of 7.42 during the first, and 4.34 during the second period.

This example shows the fallacy of calculations based on a mere regular geometrical progression, made to anticipate the knowledge of a fact which still lies under the veil of futurity, and of which the multifarious influencing causes, such as the action of density, of migrations, &c., &c., are quite in rebellion to the laws of mathematics.

Therefore, 'between the anticipated figures and the actual statement,' there is simply the difference that exists between fallacious calculations and an ascertained numerical fact.

Mr. Harvey a little further on says:

"The Census of 1861 was taken in one day; and the *de facto* population, that is, the population actually there, was assigned to each house, village, county, city."

This is what is asserted and copied and made an argument of, sufficient (however irrelevant to any reasoning) to delude the prejudiced portion of the public; but what are the facts? The Census of 1861 was not taken in one day, nor in two weeks, but although much less extensive, took as many weeks to complete as the Census of 1871. It was not taken under either of the two systems (the *de jure* or the *de facto*);

but without system, and made to include both the *present* and *absent* of every family; thereby making a double entry of all the fluctuating population, travellers, school-ars, inmates of public institutions, lumbermen in the forest, &c., &c., who were all counted twice, first where found and second with their families at home, all that in addition to foreigners happening to be, for the time being, present at some place in the country.

That the Census of 1861 gives a somewhat exaggerated figure is a fact that never was doubted by those who have had opportunities of studying the proceedings of that Census, for the simple reason that the proof of the double entries exists on the very face of the schedules and in no concealed form. The same proportionate exaggeration, by making use of precisely the same proceeding, was made in the Census of 1851. It follows that the enormous increase, heretofore signalized for the period 1841-51 (although widely differing from the next following) contains an important error, and that the falling off in the ratio of increase for the decennial 1861-71 (although in reality very large) is not, by a notable figure, so large as is made apparent by comparing the returns of the two last censuses.

Mr. Harvey enters into a rather over-philosophical examination of the systems of Census taking, in which the system *de jure* is represented as a sequence of the "Roman jurisprudence... which mystifies the unwary litigant," and the system *de facto* as following the "Common Law" ideas and whatever is most practical: of all of which Mr. Harvey concludes that the system *de jure* is "cognate" to the Latin peoples and "foreign" to the Teuton. I shall not enter into any discussion of such transcendental nature, being rather inclined to restrict myself to facts and to arguments derived therefrom. The facts are, that there is no discrimination as to the races which have adopted one of the two above mentioned systems. There are Latin peoples who have preserved the traditional system *de jure*, and there are Latin peoples who have adopted the comparatively recent system of *de facto*, and so it is with the Teutonic races. Two examples will suffice to show the error into which Mr. Harvey has fallen, just in consequence of relying entirely on the use and the abuse of the method of induction in relation to pure matters of fact. The largest Latin agglomeration, France has, for some time, adopted the system *de facto* for the quinquennial enumeration of her people. The largest English speaking agglomeration, both in point of population