

---

All this looks so plain, that the wonder to me is that it could escape the understanding of any one. The Marine returns convey one sort of information, and the Census returns another sort of information; they cannot take the place of each other, cannot be tested one by the other, and they cannot agree, unless it be a mere and not to be expected coincidence. The only relation they bear, one towards the other, is that they belong to cognate subjects.

---

*The changes which have taken place between the Two Censuses in the Ownership of Lands in Districts.*

Of course, changes in the acreage of lands owned by the inhabitants of each district are continual; if such were not constantly taking place it would show a total stagnation in land transactions, in a country where several millions of acres of wild lands are owned by individuals, and where millions over millions of Crown lands are for sale; and when the two Censuses show that, the private ownership of lands in Canada has actually undergone, between the years 1871 and 1881, an increase of several millions of acres.

What astonishes these critics especially is, that in several districts the acreage owned is less in 1881 than in 1871, and very considerably so for few districts. But the figures of the Census are simply the expression of facts, of which reasoning alone demonstrates the necessary existence. It is precisely in such districts where the largest ownership of wild lands was formerly existing that immense reduction of acreage owned must take place. Why? Simply from changes in residence of owners or of limits of districts, and because these lands were to be sold, and were actually, to a large amount, sold to inhabitants of other districts. The City of Quebec had 2,632,874 acres of lands owned in 1871, and only 588,117 in 1881; but the County of Quebec, which encircles the city, had only 363,727 acres owned in 1871, and as much as 1,078,005 in 1881. A simple change of residence of large owners from the limits of the city to the surrounding district explains the vastness of the change, so far as the figures go, and when by inquiry you learn that hundreds of thousands of acres of wild lands, owned by Quebec inhabitants, have been sold to inhabitants of other districts, such as vast tracts situated in Anticosti, in the Eastern Townships, in the seigniories of Beaulieu, Fossambault, and in many other places, the wonder vanishes away.

There are other changes which are due to another cause, in addition to those mentioned, from the fact that the readjustment of electoral districts, following the Census of 1871, has made many census districts materially different in 1881 from what they were in 1871, in extent of territory, population, and in every other respect.

Therefore, again, it is not the Census which on this point is caught in "extravagances of falsehood, &c., &c.," but the critics.

The same remarks apply to village lots, houses, warehouses, shops and vessels; this is so self-evident that it would be almost an insult to the intelligence of the reader to insist on it, and follow that manner of criticising through its vagaries.

---

*The Excess of Acres of Land Occupied Over the Area in Few Districts.*

The reason and meaning of that is explained in the introduction to the third volume, where it is said: "The exceptions are, when residents of cities and towns occupy and work lands situated outside the limits thereof, and upon which no person resides. It occasionally happens in villages and old settled townships that a part of the holding extends beyond the limits of the village or of the township." It is very simple; the acres occupied are made to follow the person of