

1. Was the enumeration of the French element of the population, in the taking of the Census of 1891, intended and carried on to convey the same information as was furnished by the previous Census of 1851 and 1861 of the former Province of Canada, and the Canadian Census of 1871 and 1881?

2. What was the meaning intended and the interpretation given, in the taking of the Census of 1891, to the words *French-Canadian* and *Canadian-French* as heading of one of the columns of Census Schedule No. 1?

3. What is the precise meaning and what is to be understood by the various words made use of in the Census Bulletin No. 11, signed George Johnson, Statistician, namely, the words *Nationalities*, *Nationalités*, French-speaking, English-speaking, *Canadiens-Anglais*, as part of the new nomenclature adopted?

4. Were there people of French nationality, real Frenchmen, excluded from the registration of the French element of the population on account of being born outside of Canada, and were there French people included among the English-speaking on account of being able to speak the English language? Is there any connection between such cases and the nomenclature of Bulletin No. 11, and if not, why is it that the simple word French, formerly used as meaning the French element, was abandoned, to be variously replaced by the words French-speaking, French-Canadians, and so forth?

5. What were, in addition to the printed instructions, the practical explanations and directions given to the Officers, Commissioners and Enumerators, as regards the registration of the French element of the population, or persons of French origin or nationality?

6. Was the actual enumeration of the French, in 1891, uniformly carried on throughout, in the various Census Districts, Sub-Districts and Divisions?

7. Are there reasons to apprehend, from direct investigation, personal knowledge, or statistical criticism, that the figures given as representing the number of French people, are notably deficient in some or many returns of the enumeration of 1891?

8. Were the returns delivered by the Enumerators examined by the Commissioners, the Officers, and at the Central Office under the supervision, the responsibility of the Superintendent, in view to test their accuracy and to correct apparent errors?

9. Was it noticed by some of the Officers or the Superintendent, that very serious discrepancies existed in the return of the French between the Census of 1891 and the statistical series of previous censuses, and was thereby trouble taken to investigate the serious question raised by the very striking want of concordance?

10. Is there any rational explanation of the returns of 1891 by which the French appear to have met abnormal losses in their number, especially in Nova Scotia, Ontario and the Territories?

11. Are there local or accidental causes capable of explaining the vast differences in the multiplication of the French which would have taken place, if the figures of the Census of 1891 were correct, between Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, for instance?

12. Was there, at any time, steps taken to ascertain the cause and extent of such extraordinary returns; if not, what was the cause of that omission; if so, what were the proceedings adopted, and what the results?

13. Has the Superintendent of the Census of 1891 taken notice of the very determined objection to accept the extraordinary figures of 1891, as representing the actual number of the French in Canada, and has any serious investigation of this important question been undertaken by him; if so, what are the conclusions arrived at, including the statistical criticism involved?

14. And that the said information include all instructions given to the Enumerators in the several years, 1881 and 1891, be brought down with the return.

Ordered, That the same do lie on the Table, and it is as follows:—

(*Vide Sessional Papers, No. 46A.*)