

Mr. BLAKE. I was responsible for passing the law, but I am not responsible for the hon. gentleman's neglect in collecting the statistics.

Mr. DAVIES. The law is very good, but the question is whether, as it is carried out, it is worth \$4,000 a year. If the statements made by my hon. friend to my left are correct, the statistics are worse than useless, they are misleading. They are only valuable when they are correct, and enable the law-makers to draw deductions with a view to improve the law. I am inclined to think there are defaults in the Department. I turn to my own Province, and I find returns given from the counties there. We have no municipal officers for the county, so the returns come from the different magistrates, and therefore they have to be added up and subtracted in the Department here, and I find egregious blunders, unpardonable blunders, in the addition of these figures. We have no municipal officers, so the mistakes which appear in this book of returns, *quoad* the Province which is within my own knowledge, must be made by the departmental officers, who are alone responsible for them, and I presume the other blunders can be accounted for in the same way.

Mr. McLELAN. I suppose in the hon. gentleman's Province it is the same as in other Provinces. I do not think the magistrates in the localities give the names of each of the parties separately and the crime and the sentence. They say there are so many guilty of assault and they add that up, and the same with regard to the other charges. In the Province of Ontario, I know that the Clerk of the Peace makes returns of so many persons charged with burglary, and he adds them up; so many charged with robbery, and he adds them up; so many charged with other crimes; and, instead of the calculation being made in the Department here, it is made in the office of the Clerk of the Peace in the Province of Ontario. So that he is the person who is responsible for the mistakes, if there are any.

Mr. DAVIES. We have no such persons in the counties of the Province which I come from, as Clerks of the Peace, who make one general return for the county. You have returns made up by the stipendiary magistrate and by the Clerk of the Crown of the cases tried in the Supreme Court, and you have returns from the magistrates of the cases tried by them. They are not added up before they leave Prince Edward Island.

Mr. MILLS. It is quite obvious, looking at these returns, that some of the officers make full returns and others leave blanks, and that whoever makes up the returns in the Department here makes up these statistics and puts them down as they are received here, where there are said to be a certain number of offenders charged with crime and a certain number convicted, and we find that the number convicted do not correspond with the difference.

Mr. McLELAN. That is because a certain number may be charged in a year and not all tried within the year, and their convictions will come in next year.

To meet expenses in connection with Census
(revote \$20,000) \$30,000 00

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am sorry the Minister who is specially charged with the Department is not here; that, of course, cannot be avoided. There is a great feeling of dissatisfaction in the way the Census has been done; the third volume does appear to me to be very inaccurately put together. If it be correct, we have some rather extraordinary results brought out as to industrial establishments. For instance, I find that ten years ago apparently \$78,000,000 were invested as the total capital; that 187,000 hands were employed, who produced \$221,000,000 worth of products. We find now that we employ \$135,000,000 of capital and 255,000 hands, but that

we only produce \$309,000,000 worth of products. I do not suppose that the productive value of capital has decreased in that ratio, but I just call the Minister's attention to that, as a very strong illustration of the doubtful character of the statistics, either in one Census or the other. It may be possible that the Census of 1871 is unreliable, or that that of 1881 is unreliable.

Mr. BLAKE. When may we hope to have the final volume of the Census?

Mr. McLELAN. It is in the hands of the printer, and has been for some time. We hope to have it before the close of the Session, and that will be about fifteen months earlier than the third volume of the last Census was issued. The first volume of the last Census was issued in 1873, the second in 1874, the third in June, 1875. This volume will be issued in March, 1884, about fifteen months earlier than the corresponding volume of the last Census, and at a less cost by \$47,785.

Mr. WELDON. Very gross blunders seem to have been committed regarding the city and county of St. John. My attention was called to it, in regard to book-binding. In that Province we have returned, of capital invested, \$221,000, with 911 hands employed, and \$971,000 as the total value of the products. Yet there is not a single one put down for the whole Province, though in the city and county of St. John there are several, and two of great importance, of which one has been established since 1882.

Mr. PATERSON. I would like on this subject to say something myself. I have looked a little into the matter, and I did it somewhat pleasantly, and I did it for this reason, that while the Census show many figures that somewhat strengthen the economic position I take, I think there are so many inaccuracies, especially in the third volume, that though the figures look rather gloomy to my hon. friends opposite, I confess they are very cheering to myself, and there is a little consolation in the thought that perhaps the whole thing is unreliable. There are some glaring discrepancies, though perhaps some of them may be capable of explanation. For instance, the vessels registered in the Province of Quebec are actually 285 less in 1881 than they were in 1871. In New Brunswick, the number is just one more, while in Ontario there are 105 more, and in Nova Scotia 443 more. I suppose there might be an explanation given, because there is an increased tonnage, but I should judge from the figures that there must be something wrong. Another point is that mentioned by the hon. member for South Huron, and which I alluded to myself in the debate on the Budget. If the Census are to be accepted as correct, they show that \$2 of capital invested in our manufacturing industries now are only producing what \$1 did in 1871. If that is correct, it will have a deterrent effect upon capital being invested in manufacturing industries. The impression that this volume is unreliable is strengthened by the withholding of another volume which is confessedly inaccurate. We can hardly imagine the extent of the evil results that flows from publishing such information that is not authentic, and from which calculations must be made and deductions must be drawn. We are not responsible for it, and are not to blame for it; but it seems to me that censure must fall on some one, whether on the inside or on the outside staff, I shall not say. I know that the populations are in many cases incorrect. I believe that in my own city a great mistake was made, for judging by the returns annually made, there is a discrepancy of a thousand or more, and it is quite probable the same occurred at other places. If this is so, it may account for some of the population we have been speaking of earlier in the evening; but if we were to impugn the veracity of these statements, we would be told that we were declaring the statistics unreliable, and announcing this fact to the world. As to which horn of the