

seemd to contrast the United States census very favourably to that of Canada, and sought to give the impression to the House that the taking of such industries set down by the enumerators of Canada, carpet factories in Antigonish, knitting factories in Shelburne and basket factories in some other counties, is a practice not followed by the United States enumerators. The instructions given to the United States enumerators are precisely the same as in this country. They are instructed to take every industry they find but when they come to the matter of tabulation there is a difference. In the United States they do not tabulate any industry which has an output of less than \$500, while in Canada with its comparatively less advanced development it is thought well to tabulate industries that have an annual output of \$200. There is no harm in that. There is no deception in any way. It was not professed by each of these industries taken down by the enumerator represented a factory with a tall chimney, with a large number of employees and a large pay-list. The enumerators were careful to put down nothing but what was absolutely true in the enumeration of industries, and therefore, a more unwarranted use of the term fraud or fraudulent when applied to the facts collected by the enumerators of the census of 1891 was never used by any one particularly by any public man in this or any other country. I believe you will search the annals of parliamentary utterances the world over without finding a parallel for such an argument as was addressed to the House of Commons by a leading minister of the administration. But, the hon. gentleman says that this was for a purpose. The purpose was to glorify the national policy. The purpose was to grossly magnify the rate of progress made by Canada through the national policy. Well, if that hon. gentleman had taken the trouble to inform himself or had not forgotten the facts that came to his knowledge when he discussed this matter years ago, he would have recollected that the theory was put forward by him at that time and was answered and utterly exploded. Instead of magnifying the advancement made by the country, instead of exaggerating the rate of progress made by the country under the national policy, the including of these small industries has the very opposite effect, as I shall proceed to prove to the House. I have already explained that in the United States the practice is to tabulate industries down to \$500 of an annual output, and in this country down to \$200. Now, taking the industries—I am now quoting from that invaluable third volume of the census from which the hon. gentleman derived so much comfort. I am referring to the total which will be found in the fourth volume, although the materials for it are found in the third volume. In 1881 the number of these industries from \$2,000 down, referring to their annual out-

put, was 32,072. In 1891 the number had increased to 50,777 from which it appears that the census of 1891 was not the first in which the practice was adopted of enumerating these smaller industries. The same practice had been followed as it necessarily would be under the same instructions in the census of 1881. Therefore, the government in 1881, two years after the inauguration of the national policy, adopted this very same principle—and I believe it was in force in 1871 as well—by which all industries with an annual output of \$200 or upwards would be included.

Under this heading of industries, with an output of \$2,000 a year, there were in 1881, 32,072; and in 1891, 50,777; an increase of 18 per cent. The value of the produce of these factories had increased from \$20,734,080 in 1881, to \$32,195,192 in 1891. Of industries with an output of from \$2,000 to \$12,000 annually, there were 13,514 in 1881, and 19,629 in 1901; the annual output of these being \$64,939,604 in 1881, and \$93,260,957 in 1891.

Of industries with an output of from \$12,000 to \$25,000 per annum, there were 2,061 in 1881, and 2,679 in 1891. The annual output of these industries was \$36,808,242 in 1881, and \$47,709,005 in 1891.

Take the industries with an annual output of from \$25,000 to \$50,000, and there were 967 in 1881, which had increased to 1,208 in 1891. The annual output of these factories was \$33,482,170 in 1881, and \$42,238,542 in 1891.

Take the large class of factories; the great industries that have been established and brought into existence by the national policy; the industries with an annual output of \$50,000 and upwards, and of these factories there were 1,108 in 1881, and 1,675 in 1891; the total output being \$153,767,771 in 1881, and \$260,795,190 in 1891.

If we take these for the purpose of comparison it will be seen at a glance that the effect of including all these small industries, which were so provocative of merri-ment to the Minister of Trade and Commerce; instead of showing a largely increased rate of progress and a greatly increased output; instead of glorifying the national policy, have the opposite effect. The inevitable result of that consideration is to show that there was no fraud in this matter; that it was not a new feature of the census of 1891; that it had been done in the census of 1881, and was done innocently in both cases, the census enumerators simply doing their duty according to their instructions and placing upon their schedules precisely the same information that is placed upon the schedules of the United States census, simply to show us the value of the annual work of those who may be classed as engaged in industrial occupations in Canada. In order to make the matter clearer, let us take the total increase of all the factories of all classes. In 1881, the

Mr. BELL.