WILEY

The Presidential Address of the Right Hon. Sir Charles W. Dilke, Bart., M.P., for the Session 1907-08. Delivered to the Royal Statistical Society, 19th November, 1907

Author(s): Charles W. Dilke

Source: *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, Vol. 70, No. 4 (Dec., 1907), pp. 553-582

Published by: [Wiley](#) for the [Royal Statistical Society](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2339560>

Accessed: 11/06/2014 09:54

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Wiley and Royal Statistical Society are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

JOURNAL
OF THE ROYAL STATISTICAL SOCIETY.

DECEMBER, 1907.

*The PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS of THE RIGHT HON. SIR CHARLES W.
DILKE, BART., M.P., for the SESSION 1907-08. DELIVERED
to the ROYAL STATISTICAL SOCIETY, 19TH NOVEMBER, 1907.*

I HAVE already expressed my deep sense of the honour done me in my election to the Presidency for the year.

Before proceeding to the subject of my address, a brief reference must be made, in conformity with what is, I understand, the general practice at the opening of a new Session, to the domestic affairs of the Society during the past year. We have to deplore the death of Lord Goschen, who had been a fellow since 1868, and filled the presidential chair in 1886-88, and of Dr. Körösy and M. Olanesco, two distinguished honorary fellows of the Society. At the eleventh session of the International Statistical Institute, held at Copenhagen in August last, the Society was represented by one of its past presidents, its honorary foreign secretary, one of its honorary secretaries, and two members of Council, in addition to one of its vice-presidents, who was present as a visitor. The Bibliography of Cereals, which was prepared by the Society at the request of the Institute, was duly presented by Sir Athelstane Baines. At the International Congress on School Hygiene, held in London in August, the Society was represented by Sir Shirley Murphy and Dr. Dudfield. The complete catalogue of the library, which has been for some time in preparation, is now passing through the press, and will, it is hoped, shortly be published, together with a continuation of the index to the Journal. The Papers read before the Society last Session, which it is not necessary to recapitulate, covered a wide range of subjects, and those already offered for the present Session give promise of important contributions to statistical discussion. The presentation of the Guy Medal in gold to Professor Edgeworth and in silver to Mr. Noel Humphreys, which would in the usual course have taken place at this meeting, has, unfortunately, to be

deferred in consequence of the indisposition of both recipients as the result of accidents.

Parliament Street and its neighbourhood show that we are becoming bureaucratic. The War Office swells; the Local Government Board and the Board of Education display a stupendous growth. Scientific arrangement of the work of government did not precede, and has not accompanied, the change.

Rather more than a quarter of a century ago a distinguished member of the French Institute, formerly President of the Statistical Society of Paris, and still happily living, explained the organisation of Government statistics in various countries. He told us that the United Kingdom paid but little attention to the subject: "It is not surprising to find a total absence of any central or general supervision over official statistics."¹ Each department, M. Cheysson wrote, collected and tabulated its own statistics; in the Board of Trade, however, as he admitted, we had something like a true statistical office.

Certain questions were put by me in the course of the Income Tax inquiry of 1906 on the absence of such statistics as my Committee had hoped to find. The base was the inquiry of 1878-79.² Mr. Bowley, Mr. Chiozza Money, and Mr. Coghlan³ pointed out in their replies that there had been little improvement in the organisation of our statistics—unless it be within the Board of Trade—since the report signed by weighty names such as those of Childers, Ritchie, Welby, and Arthur Balfour.

The final Report of the Committee on Official Statistics had favoured the creation of a small central Statistical Department. The whole of the Blue Book of 1880 is of deep interest, and many of the general defects exposed by the late Lord Farrer, Lord Welby, and Sir Robert Giffen continue to this moment; while the determination of the Departments concerned to remedy the evils is less strong than it was when Mr. W. H. Smith, as Secretary of the Treasury, originally appointed the Committee in 1877. His Treasury minute was, perhaps, sounder than the ultimate recommendations, marked as they were by timidity. Sir Robert Giffen proposed a scientific system, to which the Committee offered the objection that it was hardly likely that the Registrar-General would concur. The whole controversy had arisen from a conflict between the Customs and the Board of Trade; and Sir Robert Giffen's warning that "there will be a natural tendency to this continual

¹ See Journal of the Statistical Society of Paris for September, 1882, and translation in our *Journal* for the same year.

² Official Statistics Committee Reports, 1880.

³ Q. 487, 499, 1403, 1410—1415.

“splitting-off of statistical offices,” such as “really ought to be “restrained,” although “endorsed” by the Committee, is even more needed at the present moment than when it was written. To the list of Departments given by Lord Farrer as those “which furnish “more or less independently a considerable mass of Parliamentary “statistics,” must now be added the Education Department and the Ministry of Agriculture as regards all their branches created since 1879. It is still true, as set forth in Appendix A, published in 1880, but drawn up in 1875, that since the institution of the Statistical Department at the Board of Trade in 1832, statistical offices have been created in connection with other departments, “totally independent of each other,” and “possessing but imperfect “knowledge of the work upon which the other offices have been or “are engaged.” Even now, “with but few exceptions, the statistics “of each Department are treated as having only an individual “departmental significance,” and “are often found to be perfectly “useless on occasions of general inquiry.” Few of the many illustrative cases of defect pointed out in 1875, and again, by Sir Robert Giffen in 1876, have been remedied, and fresh instances of similar defects may be found by comparison of Census and Local Government Returns with Returns under various recent statutes.

As our system of collating motions for Parliamentary Returns, notably between England, Scotland, and Ireland, and of indexing those returns when made, is as weak as are our official statistical methods, it requires the industry and experience of a Giffen to detect even one-tenth of those defects which now exist. It is still almost as true as it was in 1871, when Mr. Purdy contributed a paper to the Royal Statistical Society,¹ that Parliamentary statistics are confused and frequently ill-prepared for the press, by reason of defective supervision. Purdy, moreover, quoted on departmental statistics an admirable speech by Goschen criticising Local Taxation Returns, to which indeed the words of that illustrious President of the Local Government Board are still applicable. The fault is not entirely that of the departments, for members of both Houses often move for Statistical Returns without having first considered whether they desire them for England and Wales, or Great Britain, or the United Kingdom. Sometimes they intend the United Kingdom, but select words applicable only to England under the Local Government Board, and inapplicable to the Local Government of Scotland or of Ireland. It is at present not the duty of anyone to find the general form of words, or to point out difficulties which must arise after the return is granted. As Mr. Cannan also shows, it is still as hard

Journal, vol. xxxiv, pp. 21 *et seq.*

as it was in the Purdy-Goschen days to discover such apparently necessary statistical facts as the amount of the rates in an English rural parish. Averages of rates are officially published by the Local Government Board, but no one knows the highest or the lowest rated parish. In Scotland there are both statutory peculiarities and departmental "fads"; in Ireland also. Purdy's conclusions favoured supervision by a Statistical Department to point out if returns moved for are practicable in the shape proposed, and to see that the departments scrutinise the return in proof, with a view of ascertaining if the requirements of Parliament have been met on a uniform plan.

When an enquirer undertakes serious research into a matter concerning a Department of the State he finds the statistics crumble under his examination, where they are not (as is often the case) wanting. Parliament is an offender in making the year end for different purposes at different dates. But the departments are not, perhaps, exempt from reproach in sometimes allowing Parliament unwarned to show such levity.

It is a well known and perhaps inevitable difficulty that Revenue Returns relate to years ended 31st March, while trade, shipping, railway, post office, and most other statistics relate to years ended 31st December. Returns, however, for saving banks through the Post Office are for the latter or usual year, though returns for trustee saving banks are for years ended 20th November. Revenue returns are for the financial year, but the Income Tax year is not exactly the same. All figures for receipt of tax are for the financial year, but all figures relating to income assessed are for an Income Tax year ending 5th April. So too for inhabited house duty, with the exception of Scotland, where the House Duty year ends on 24th May. Excise licenses expire at varying dates. Statistics relating to the receipt of duty from these are for the financial year. The returns of brewers and brewing are for a Brewing year ending 30th September; though the tables relating to beer quantities falling under beer duty are for the financial year. As for the spirit licences, the tables relating to distilling follow a year ending 30th September. The Land Tax year ends on 25th March; but the figures of tax received follow the general principle that tables of receipt of duty are for the financial year, even where the periods covered by the charge or the assessment are for a different year. The Poor Rate years of the three kingdoms are all, I believe, still different from each other and also from the years just named, as was the case when Purdy wrote. The Board of Trade returns relating to gas undertakings refer to a year ending 25th March, and are not statistically comparable with the

gas figures in the Local Taxation returns, relating as these do to a year ended 31st March. On the other hand, the Board of Trade returns for tramways and light railways are not for the Board of Trade gas year, but for the usual financial year. Difficulties of comparison are increased by the Board of Trade returns placing the county boroughs under their geographical counties.

The defects pointed out by Sir Robert Giffen more than thirty years ago in the classification of diseases, combined with the artificial nature of the areas chosen for statistics of population and of occupation, are assuming every day increasing importance. The science of sociology is making strides, but the statistics on which it should be based are misleading. In the Report from the Select Committee on Official Publications, 1906, it was recommended that Members of Parliament should be told of more economical plans for accomplishing their end. On this ground, "the minister responsible" should consult the Stationery Office before agreeing to the form." But surely the form should be scrutinised, not only for cheapness, but also, statistically, for suitability and effectiveness.

The Treasury is frightened of the men of science, regarded in the light of sturdy beggars; but such is the amount of overlapping in our statistics, as well as of publication of statistics either wholly unnecessary or comparatively unimportant, that a Quetelet, or indeed any trained statistician, would save much money to the State if placed in command of the whole of our statistics with orders to make them as good as possible. In 1870 Mr. Shaw-Lefevre, now Lord Eversley, when Secretary to the Board of Trade, succeeded, by simplification of the Monthly Trade Returns, in bringing them out more usefully and promptly, at a saving, it is said, of 20,000*l.* a year.

It is enough for my historical case that the conclusive demonstration of waste and inefficiency made public in 1880 has been followed by no general improvement.

It seems hardly necessary to declare that the interest of the State should be considered rather than the rivalry of Departments; but no one can read the reports and evidence published between 1877 and 1881 by the Official Statistics Committee without discovering that Departmental considerations, to which the Secretary of the Treasury and Sir Robert Giffen had risen superior, played a leading part in the paralysis which overtook the movement for improved national statistics.

At the time when M. Cheysson examined the condition of Government statistics in the principal countries, there was none, unless it were Prussia, which could be taken as an exemplar. The organisation of statistics in Prussia dated from 1805. Attached to

the Central Department M. Cheysson found a school of Statistics of a highly scientific type and a magnificent statistical library. Since 1882 Germany has developed imperial statistics, especially as regards invalidity, old age, and accidents. The insurance legislation of Germany, and her rapidly increasing direct taxation, have both of them contributed to the progress of statistical science in that Empire. There has been improvement in Italy and in Austria, as well as in the federal work of the United States.

Although some prefer the Vienna Statistical Bureau, the Italian method is probably the most perfect in the old world. Mr. Labouchere is not usually thought of as a statistician: his writings and conversation are not of a dry description; but he is known to his friends as the kindest of men. I have to thank him for obtaining, through the highest Italian authority, an account of the system which prevails in the Direction-General of Statistics under the Ministry of Agriculture, Industry and Commerce. Of the two Divisions in which the office under the Director-General of Statistics is arranged, the first deals with "Administrative and Judicial Statistics," as well as with "General Statistical Affairs," while the second handles "Demographic, Economic and Educational Statistics," and includes the Census and movements of population such as that by emigration. There is no other country in the world which has so large an annual outflow and return of her own working-people. Estimates of population (dangerous everywhere) are specially useless in the case of Italy, as compared with tangible proof of facts: births, deaths, emigration, and immigration. The Italian *Annuario Statistico*, or Year-Book, has not recently been published every year.

The Bureau of Statistics at Washington is under the Department of Commerce and Labour. It is not a central statistical office for the whole of the statistics of the United States, and there still exist those separate investigations by the Department of Agriculture and other offices which cause defects pointed out in an article of the Political Science Quarterly in 1896. Nevertheless, in 1903⁵ the Division of Statistics of the Department of Agriculture of the United States, older by twenty years than the Department itself, received the more complete organisation of a Federal Bureau, and is now styled the Bureau of Statistics of the Department of Agriculture. It is still separate from the Bureau of the Census, permanently organised by an Act of 1902, and placed under the Department of Commerce and Labour. Thus the most important department in the United States from the statistical point of view is the Department of Commerce and Labour, with its Bureau of

⁵ "Publications of the American Statistical Association," vol. ix, p. 149.

Statistics and its Bureau of the Census, both distinct from the Bureau of Statistics attached to the Department of Agriculture. Roughly it may be said that in the United States the Commerce and Labour Department has all the statistical work of our Board of Trade and of our Census. The Treasury Department of the United States produces some statistics, but less than in this country, much of the statistical work done through our Customs and Inland Revenue belonging at Washington to the Commerce and Labour Department.

In the Dominion of Canada, by the Census and Statistics Act of May, 1905, and the organisation of an office under the Act in October of that year, there is developed a system of collection and publication of general statistics for Canada which gives to the permanent office, under the direction of the Minister of Agriculture, commercial, educational, vital, manufacturing and criminal statistics.

Certain defects in American and Canadian statistics have been pointed out in notes contained in the September number of our *Journal*. Moreover, the difficulties of the newer countries are less considerable than those which surround our own Departments, or those of a highly-developed bureaucratic country such as France. This fact in part explains the excellence of the statistics of the Australasian colonies. It is not possible, however, to read without envy the evidence of Mr. H. H. Hayter in 1879, or that of Mr. Coghlan before the Income Tax Committee in 1906.

To return to the old world, already in 1882, as M. Cheysson showed, Sweden had a central statistical commission or permanent census office which had lasted for a century and a quarter. Switzerland had a federal office of a similar description. It now possesses a Federal Statistical Bureau which combines in one annual publication the statistics of the various departments. In many countries, small and great, such as Belgium (thanks to Quetelet), Russia, Italy, Spain, Austria, Hungary, and Norway, were to be found central statistical commissions, mainly representative of the various ministries, holding monthly or quarterly meetings, charged with the duty of co-ordinating the statistics of the departments and settling in advance all questions relating to the organisation of future statistical work.

The object of M. Cheysson was to secure a general supervision and a controlling authority, and so to bring about "harmony, proportion, order and uniformity of arrangement in national statistics." Although France has been since Richelieu and Colbert, and still more since the Consulate, a highly centralised country, he pointed out that there was no other country in which decentralisation of statistical activity was so marked, unless indeed it were

chaotic England. As a result of the labours of M. Cheysson there was founded in 1885 a French Conseil Supérieur de Statistique modelled on that of Belgium. M. Arthur Fontaine, the Directeur du Travail—nominally permanent head of the new Ministry of Labour, but in reality still the head of a separate Department in close touch, as was also previously the case, with the Ministry of Commerce—tells me that he separates administrative statistics from those “drawn up for scientific observation in view of economic or social study without direct administrative interest. La Statistique Générale de la France, attached to the Ministry of Labour, co-ordinates and publishes, in a statistical *Annuaire*, the précis of the statistics of the other Departments. It helps them when necessary in the statistical treatment of their documents, and is responsible for the statistics of population, as well as for other statistics with which no special Department has been charged. Connected with the same Ministry is the Conseil Supérieur de Statistique, which has for its duty to advise Government on the undertaking and publishing of new statistics, and on statistical methods The Council consists of 29 members taken from Parliament and from learned bodies, and 35 delegates of Ministries.” It has recently dealt with the difficult branch of criminal statistics, in respect of which Sir John Macdonell has rendered great, but partly as yet unsuccessful, service in this country. La Statistique Générale de la France publishes “the statistical results of the Census, taken every five years.” The portion of the Census which has administrative importance as regards the work of the Ministry of the Interior in its relations with Local Authorities, is published, however, by that Ministry. It will be seen that France has not yet obtained the statistical unity at which M. Cheysson aimed. There results that perplexity from which all suffer who investigate the state of France as well as of the United Kingdom.

Examples of overlapping and even contradiction, waste and confusion, as regards this country, have been given by many Presidents, and in many papers read before the Royal Statistical Society. It is perhaps safer to criticise another country than our own, though I shall have to run the greater risk. M. Cheysson called attention to the lack of facilities for training those who were to conduct the Census, decennial with us, quinquennial in France since 1801. He gave as his best example of overlapping, and of sources of error, the failure in an agricultural country such as France to produce by departmental treatment, uniform or intelligible statistics even of the growth of crops. “The figures for cereals are set forth in different measures by the several Ministries concerned.”

The Society has appointed a Census Committee, and we await their proposals. Mr. Bowley has already suggested, in connection with the last Census, improvement in the classifications of occupations. I believe that Mr. Cannan doubts whether occupation statistics obtained through Census investigations can ever be useful. In the case of the millions who have mixed occupations, it is difficult to describe these on a uniform plan. Mr. Cannan thinks that for occupations we must trust to the administrative statistics of those concerned with factory, workshop and home workers, seamen and so forth. Mr. Cannan and Mr. Bowley have joined in suggesting the remedy of much lack of uniformity between England, Scotland and Ireland, and correction of misleading estimates of population.⁶ Mr. Cannan, in 1898, complained of the nature of our estimates of population. The Registrar-General informs the country how many are added by birth and lost by death, while the Board of Trade states the numbers who come in and go out. The so-called estimate is not, however, based upon these facts, but upon a rate of increase in a previous period; except in Ireland, where account is taken of addition to and subtraction from the previously-existing population. Up to the Report of 1893, published in 1895, it was explained that the method followed "was not likely to lead to "serious error." The estimates are obviously not worth much, and may be made by anyone. When the estimated increases come to be (as we are told in the Annual Report of the Registrar-General for 1905, published this year) "distributed among the counties, "after making due allowance for their several rates of increase," there is further liability to error, the extent of which is illustrated by the intermediate numbering of the population in the case of London. The Kentish parishes of London in a period of Government activity in the manufacture of war stores, as compared with a period of reduction of staff, form an obvious case in point. To the confusion between the Registrar-General's figures and those of the Local Government Board it may be necessary for me to return. The Local Government Board can never be a satisfactory statistical Department for National purposes, if for no other reason, on account of its want of direct authority in Ireland and in Scotland. The same difficulty, to some extent, exists in the case of the Board of Agriculture, which also is represented in Ireland and partly in Scotland by separate bodies under different control.

By the modest reform he recommended, M. Cheysson desired to allay Departmental suspicion. Opposition is not aroused by mere co-ordination through a representative advisory Committee. It is,

⁶ "Demographic Statistics of the United Kingdom," by Edwin Cannan, M. A., *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 1898, vol. lxi, pp. 49 *seq.*

however, the fact that there exists a real reason, wholly apart from political or working difficulties, for continuing to collect some at least of our statistics through administrative departments in separate ministries. The occupier who is called upon by the Board of Agriculture to fill up some, to him, more or less unintelligible form, and those connected with the fishing industry who are similarly "worried" by the Fisheries Department, can hardly be induced to perform their task, and would retire into bankruptcy (or suicide) if asked to do it twice. They may, perhaps, be less unwilling to make their returns to a department from which they may hope for aid, than to a purely statistical office in whose machinations they would detect some lurking devilry. The owners of coal mines and of quarries, the occupiers of factories and workshops, must make their returns to the Home Office, as these are chiefly needed for the administrative purposes of the inspectors of that ministry. Military statistics are the immediate concern of the Director of Recruiting, of the Army Council, and of the Secretary of State for War. But there is no obvious reason why statistics departmentally collected should not be at once available for statistical, as contrasted with administrative, purposes, when shaped by a director of national statistics or a statistical office. Those, however, who desire to follow the line of least resistance are perhaps inclined to be content with the representative commission or meeting of Departments advocated for France by M. Cheysson.

Mr. Purdy was one of those who first pointed out in the paper already quoted the improvement which might be made even by the smaller scheme. Were there a Department which merely indexed and explained the statistical returns of other Departments, and the statistical part of the principal papers published by them, upon some intelligible system, it would for the first time be ascertained what information exists upon any given subject. Such investigation must lead to uniformity of plan in the reports of Medical Officers of Health, now most valuable locally, but affording no means of comparing district with district, or of giving a complete view of the country. This duty could not be undertaken by the Local Government Board on account of the Irish and Scotch difficulty already named. So, too, would gradually be co-ordinated such inquiries as those undertaken privately by Mr. Booth in London, Mr. Rowntree in York, Miss Jebb in Cambridge, and Miss Mona Wilson and others in Dundee and in West Ham. As has been shown by Mr. Coghlan, and in the valuable paper on "The Future of Statistics" by a Hungarian economist,⁷ the money

⁷ Mandello, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 1905, vol. lxviii, pp. 725 seq.

and energy saved by diminution of printing in the adoption of an orderly plan would be sufficient to transform our statistics. "Why should busy people hunt in big volumes, compile, calculate, making mistakes, and hardly ever finding what they really want, if their requests could be easily answered, or if they could be told that the figures looked for are not known, or the question raised is not answerable statistically?"

In his Presidential Address to his Section of the British Association in 1906, and in his recent writings on our national position, Mr. Bowley has advocated the institution of a central statistical department. To obtain one will require a strong popular or Parliamentary demand, sufficient to overcome the hesitation of the Treasury and of all, or perhaps all but one, of the Government Offices. Of such popular or Parliamentary pressure there is little sign, although the Royal Commission on Local Taxation and the last two Committees on Income Tax, not to speak of the fiscal or tariff reform agitation, have all shown the need of co-ordination, re-arrangement, and simplification of our national statistics. An article, signed "B.M.," in the new volume of "The Dictionary of Political Economy," quotes the evidence of Mr. Money, M.P., and refers to that of Mr. Coghlan before the last Income Tax Committee. The writer adds: "There is a quantity of valuable statistical material in connection with the collection of the Income Tax which might be utilised if a Central Statistical Bureau existed in this country." It may be as confidently asserted now as it was by William Newmarch in 1869,⁸ that any Chancellor of the Exchequer desiring to reform our whole system of taxation would find himself without the necessary statistical equipment for his task. The alteration of relations between the national and municipal exchequers will also meet with unnecessary difficulties, by reason of the absence of organisation in our national statistics.

It is understood from some references in his speeches that Mr. Austen Chamberlain, when Chancellor of the Exchequer, was not satisfied with the statistical system of the country; but it is perhaps best to base an allusion to the opinions of British Chancellors of the Exchequer on an addition made by Lord Goschen in an edition of "Essays and Addresses," published in 1905. The essay in question was, in its original form, a Presidential Address to the Royal Statistical Society in 1877, but the words that I shall quote are from the supplemental study annexed to it by Lord Goschen

⁸ "The Progress and Present Condition of Statistical Inquiry." Presidential Address, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, vol. xxxii, pp. 359 *seq.*

after the date of his last tenure of high ministerial office. At the close of the essay on "The Increase of Moderate Incomes," he explains that "The methods of the Inland Revenue Department do not contribute sufficiently to this class of research. Nor does there appear to be enough co-ordination between the various official centres which distribute statistical information." "The labours of the Inland Revenue Department have not been sufficiently utilised for statistical purposes." These last words have been echoed in the evidence of Mr. Bowley before the Income Tax Committee. Lord Goschen went on: "It has often occurred to me that our national statistics should be concentrated under one head." Goschen desired that there should be some person, Committee, or Department "to take a wider survey than the mere tabulation of figures," and "consider scientifically what further materials . . . throwing light on the economic condition of the country might be extracted from official records and made available . . . for public use." He urged that "the tedium" of his own examination of incomes, constantly stopped at points "of great economic . . . importance," should induce others to "call attention in the proper quarters to the need of reforms." There could be no higher authority upon such a subject than Lord Goschen, whose immense administrative experience and whose carefulness of the public purse make him a safe guide. Unfortunately, as was proved to me by my experience in the Chair of the Income Tax Committee, his weighty advice has not been followed.

No one can doubt the truth of Mr. Coghlan's strictures, or of Mr. Bowley's words: "Whenever a scientific enquirer endeavours to describe accurately some social or industrial development, or wishes to bring to the test of statistics the effect of some proposed reform, whether in taxation . . . care of young children, or whatever it may be, some essential information is found lacking, for the reason that it has been no one's business to collect it . . . We continue in our ignorance of the aggregate national income and of its distribution. We have no adequate knowledge of the age, physical condition, or former occupation of the persons who receive public relief. Illustrations such as these could be multiplied by everyone who has tried to use official statistics." One by Mr. Bowley has been the obvious lack during the last three years of true statistics of unemployment. Credit is due to the Board of Trade for doing what it can, and to the present President for undertaking the Census of

⁹ Presidential Address to Section F of the British Association, York, 1906, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 1906, vol. lxix, p. 543.

Production. Certain improvements, Mr. Bowley admits, we owe "to the enterprise of the Board of Trade but "there are as yet no signs of the consideration of the general "question of what statistical measurements of the wealth, industry, "occupations, and physical condition of the nation should " be undertaken."

There is a good deal of matter bearing upon our topic of to-day in the Report from the Select Committee on Official Publications already named. It is pointed out that Government Departments include "in their Annual Reports quantities of matter, not because "it is instructive or interesting but because it "shows how much work has been done during the year." A good deal of that work itself has, in fact, been undertaken because Government Bills have been improved by amendments impossible of insertion in a direct or mandatory form. Matters are left to the discretion of a Department, with the intention that action shall take place universally or generally, as well as with promptitude. The power once given to the Department, a different view prevails, and each case becomes the subject of costly and prolonged inquiry, and swells the huge fabric of unnecessary work. When a Government draftsman, who thought that the English "Rural Parish" was rural, and that the "Urban District" was urban in its character, drew a sharp distinction between the two, it was at once shown and admitted that no such distinction in fact exists, and that in many cases the line is arbitrary. The central authorities at one time adopted, for a moment, the fashion of conferring "urban powers" upon purely rural parishes to give them control of roads. The policy was reversed, but the result continues in the technically "urban" nature of many of the most rural parishes in our most rural counties. How was the difficulty to be overcome and the hard and fast lines between municipalities of 2,000 people, urban districts of 60,000, urban districts with 1,500 people living in vast agricultural or pastoral parishes, and other, or "rural," parishes to be effaced? Parliament, hampered by reference legislation without consolidation, threw the decision on the Local Government Board. The result is inquiry with all formalities in every case where extension of local privilege is proposed, and often now double inquiry, by the County and by the Central Authority of England. Such inquiries in their turn swell false statistics and burden us with cost, as well as disgust the politician who receives vast masses of unnecessary printed matter. Thus do we kill true and valuable statistics.

In "Plain Tales from the Hills" is to be found a little-known story misnamed "Pig." It contains Kipling's admirable explanation

of how official statistics often grow. Let us hope that we are not as yet so bureaucratic as our Indian Empire ; no one can pretend that we are not more bureaucratic than we were.

The Select Committee on Publications of 1907, appointed in consequence of the Report of 1906 already named, in order to examine the publications presented through Public Departments from the point of view of "unnecessary expense," dealt at length with Local Government Board publications, though not from the statistical point of view. The only paragraph which it is necessary to quote refers to the Local Taxation Returns, and states that it is intended to simplify them in the future, while it is pointed out that "the set for 1903-04 was only completed in December, 1906."

There are statistical allusions in the Report of the Departmental Committee of 1907 on the Accounts of Local Authorities,¹⁰ but it is to be remembered that the inquiry related to England and Wales only, and rather illustrated such difficulties as those which I have described than pointed towards a remedy. It is clear, as Mr. Runciman's Committee declared, that "The Statistical information thus obtained is not uniform."

My reference just now to "Urban Districts" reminds me of the special difficulties of England and Wales, caused not only by overlapping boundaries but also by differences of names. Nomenclature is as confusing to the inquirer in the special case of Local Government and Vital Statistics as it is in the indexing of official papers, where, for example, "Africa," "Egypt" and "South Africa" clash, and India has to be sought for as "East India." Dr. Tatham, when presenting his last decennial Report as Superintendent of Statistics in the General Register Office, used pathetic words to express "regret that the elaborate series of Tables . . . cannot, except "in a few instances, be utilised . . . because of the overlapping "and confusion of areas." He added a list of 109 Urban Districts of which the names differ from those of the Registration Districts in which they are wholly or partly situate. Such a word as "Liverpool" may refer to the city of Liverpool or to the Poor Law Union of that name, or even to some other area not existing as a Local Government unit. A further drawback is that Part I of the Supplement was only circulated at the end of June, 1907, while Part II is still promised "in due course." It is not denied that the returns of occupations clash with the vital statistics owing to the artificial nature of Registration Districts. In cases where the statistics do not clash the ordinary inquirer is, nevertheless, unable to utilise them on account of the confusion in the names.

¹⁰ Cd. Paper 3614.

The complication of our legislation, and the absence of consolidation—due, generally, to overwork or, in a few cases, laziness—are responsible for many of the evils for which we have now to find palliatives on their statistical side. It is disagreeable for a statistician to have to snub unscientific though statistically-minded inquirers. In connection with the rival schools of advocates of women's franchise, we have been bombarded with imaginary statistics, and, when these were questioned, with requests for real ones. Unfortunately, such is our franchise legislation, that in this country true franchise statistics are unattainable. When asked the number of voters affected by a Plural Voting Bill, the total number of voters in the country, or the number of women who would be enfranchised by any form of limited franchise or extension to women of the male franchises, or even by the franchise of all grown women, unless accompanied by the abolition of the plural vote, Governments and Oppositions can make no reply. The estimates of skilled observers as to the number of plural voters differ by 10 to 1, and are insusceptible of statistical treatment. The absence of sufficient interest in statistics and of sufficient supervising authority vitiates even those statistics which can be given and are given, such as the Tables of the number of registered electors. The return of "Parliamentary Constituencies (Electors)," which, like most of our Parliamentary statistics, contains one or two obvious errors, detected at a glance by the skilled eye, is used in books of reference, and naturally taken to be authoritative and correct. The absence of supervision already named is sometimes shown in this Annual Return by such footnotes as "Excluding duplicates," or "Including duplicates," phrases which reveal to the well-informed want of knowledge upon the real meaning of the Registers.

War Office statistics are usually left alone by statisticians, which accounts, perhaps, for the fact that that department for many years issued figures in which garrison artillery was contrasted with horse and field artillery in parallel columns, but in which the garrison artillery was over-stated by a very considerable number of thousands of men; the imaginary garrison gunners being, in fact, more numerous than the total garrison artillery of any other power on a peace footing.

Our one attempt at general statistical work for the United Kingdom and for the Empire is to be found in the Statistical Abstracts prepared by the Board of Trade. These compare unfavourably—even making allowance for the advantage in such respects possessed by the less populous new countries—with Mr. Coghlan's "Statistical Account of Australia and New Zealand."

There is a Colonial Abstract which included Protectorates under the Foreign Office, some of them now at last transferred to the Colonial Office, and an Abstract for the Empire, which includes India. In some respects they overlap, and they also do not exactly coincide with statistics of the Home Office, as, for example, in regard to coal production, or with the Inland Revenue publications as regards consumption of spirits.

One of our Vice-Presidents, Mr. Coghlan, organised the Statistical Department of the Commonwealth of Australia under the Act of 1905, relating to the census and to the statistics of the Commonwealth. By this Act was given leave to appoint a Commonwealth Statistician with enormous powers covering all the Departments. The Statistician was to be allowed to collect the statistics of the entire Commonwealth on population, employment, trade (foreign and inter-State), on posts and telegraphs, on factories, mines and industries, on agriculture, banking, insurance and finance, railways, shipping, land tenure and occupancy, and virtually on all matters.

Even before federation, the South Sea colonies had held conferences of statisticians, as, for example, in 1875, to settle the bases of a uniform system of statistics. Such gatherings continue, and we now possess a most valuable report on the unification of Australasian statistics, as the result of the conference held in December last in which the Commonwealth, the Australian States, and the Dominion of New Zealand took part. The result of past care may be seen by comparing Mr. Coghlan's "A Statistical Account of Australia and New Zealand" with our Statistical Abstracts. The Australian document is not confined to bare figures, but contains elaborate essays of a really useful character; and the Australian vital statistics are immeasurably superior to our own. The Commonwealth gives to its people fuller information, made accessible by an excellent system of indexing, and provides explanations which both bring out the significance of the figures and enable inquirers to handle them with safety. In our Statistical Abstract for the United Kingdom those who are dealing with public finance, for example, are continually referred to other parliamentary papers and so referred by means of symbols which will not always help them to find the Blue Books wanted. If we compare Mr. Coghlan's "A Statistical Account of Australia and New Zealand" with our Abstract, in the matter of revenue and expenditure we find here a display of tables, many of which cannot be understood by an ordinary statistician, while the Australian volume contains an essay, the intention and the effect of which are to make the financial position of the Commonwealth plain to every reader. Were we able to produce such Abstracts for the United Kingdom and the

Empire as would correspond to the Australian volume, every elementary school in the United Kingdom might be supplied with a handbook, now lacking. The defects and omissions of the Abstracts are not the fault of the present compilers so much as of the departmental figures which they have to use.

The Board of Trade, being allowed, in certain cases, to give us statistics of a general nature, but hampered by the statistical departments of other offices in other cases, often favours us with details as to some remote part of the Empire such as are not given for the United Kingdom. It has, I think, been pointed out that we know the number of private schools in Fiji by our official statistical tables published here, but not the number of such schools in the United Kingdom. So, too, we know officially, at the expense of the home taxpayer, the average prices of the principal commodities in each year in Fiji, but fewer in the United Kingdom. For Fiji we receive the wages of labour, including that of house servants. There are no wage figures in the Statistical Abstract for the United Kingdom, published by the same Department. The wage figures in the "Abstract of labour statistics" are avowedly so incomplete as to be misleading, and those published elsewhere are far from being scientific. We receive from the Board of Trade banking statistics for the colonies, but not for the United Kingdom.

A reply may be made to the effect that it is not fair to compare the issue "Colonies, Statistical Tables," with the "Abstract" for the United Kingdom. But there exists no comprehensive official volume of United Kingdom statistics. In face of the excellent separate colonial statistics published in most colonies, we need one volume for the Colonies here, it would seem that we also require a volume containing the principal statistics of the United Kingdom, fuller and better than the present "Abstract." The "Abstract" is far from dealing only with that part of the administrative figures obtained by the departments which is capable of scientific treatment. For example, the tables which give the number of paupers in receipt of relief on "one day in winter and on one day in "summer," and base on these figures the tables of proportions, select a different day in winter and a different day in summer for each of the three kingdoms. The "summer day" in Scotland is the 14th or 15th day of September. No doubt, the variation of the harvests affects the summer proportion of paupers, but not in the same degree as the variation of the dates selected. The difference between the 15th January and the 1st January as the winter day is also of disturbing importance as the 1st January (the date chosen in England) is far nearer to Boxing Day than is the 14th or 15th January to the similar festival of New Year's Day in Scotland.

One point in a comparison between colonial statistics officially published here and the volume compiled for the United Kingdom by the same department, suggests a further remark. The criminal statistics of the Fiji Islands are much more completely and elaborately given to us in the volume which receives general circulation than in the corresponding volume for the United Kingdom, where we find less classification of offences, trials, and convictions in superior and inferior courts.

As regards the full but unsatisfactory Criminal Judicial Statistics, published for England and Wales by the Home Office, and separately for Scotland, and at Dublin, enough might be written to furnish an interesting paper on the subject; such as was, indeed, contributed to the Society's *Journal* in 1867,¹¹ when those differences between the three Kingdoms had been reduced, which have now grown again to vitiate our statistics further.

Sir John Macdonell has more than once written introductions to the Criminal Judicial Statistics in which he has drawn attention to some of their anomalies and to the discrepancies between them and other official statistics. He has also, I understand, communicated with Local Authorities and with officials who collect criminal statistics, calling attention to differences and trying to ensure that the figures should be collected in different places in the same manner. There are some serious and, perhaps, insuperable obstacles to obtaining satisfactory judicial statistics; a remark which applies, not only to the criminal statistics, but also, and still more, to the Civil Judicial Statistics, statistically less important, because inevitably less clear. Not only are statutory powers to call for the right statistics wanting, but it would be difficult in any case to prevent the various Courts concerned from giving only such information as they might feel disposed to give. Criminal Courts fill up forms sent out by the Home Office, but it has often been found that there was a lack of the exact information desired. Where such information has been asked from Civil Courts, it has frequently been refused. It has sometimes been given in one year and refused in others. There is no adequate staff in many Courts which could collect and record statistics, a matter outside the ordinary work of the officials, to whom no payment is given for an expenditure of time which they look upon as being outside their duties. There is no paid editor of the Judicial Statistics, and the work which Sir John Macdonell has done has been a labour of love. Even the best foreign judicial statistics contain obvious defects; and there are points in which the English figures answer important questions upon which the corresponding foreign statistics

¹¹ Vol. xxx, p. 424.

fail to throw light. From the point of view of the lawyer the English statistics may possibly seem better, and seem good: by no means the same thing; but from the statistician's point of view the case is different. To obtain such judicial statistics as exist in Prussia and other German States, or in Italy, would mean increased control.

The apparently transcendent criminality of the County Borough of Newport, as compared with Cardiff, and the apparent immunity from Crime (as compared with its rivals) of which Preston may boast, are, obviously, in whole or in part, imaginary. "Crimes known to the Police" mean different things in different places. Cumberland is probably not really twice as criminal as Cornwall, nor East Sussex twice as criminal as the North Riding.

In the Judicial Statistics also the figures affecting Reformatory Schools clash with those in the Report of the Inspector of Reformatory Schools. It is suggested that they may be reconciled by allowing for re-admissions, re-captures, and transfers. But our point here is only that statistics offered to the public as dealing with the same matter are compiled on varying principles, and spoil all investigation based upon them. Comparison of the two sets of figures in this case also reveals a bewildering difference in official nomenclature, maddening to all who require to refer to special cases. The order and grouping of the schools are different, and when the enquirer has had the patience to decipher the cryptogram, he finds at last that in the one case the Hampshire school is to be looked for under H, and in the other under S. Lastly, although the Judicial Statistics with which I am now dealing (unlike those in the Abstract of the Board of Trade) are issued by the Home Office in both cases, the children admitted to reformatories are grouped in steps of one year, where they are over 10 years of age, and in the Report of the Inspector of Reformatories, under the same Department, in steps of two years.

The ages of juvenile offenders are a fruitful source of statistical absurdities. If we turn to the Reports of the Commissioners of Prisons, we find odd titles and odd divisions. This Department has invented for the Home Office a class who in factories would be partly "M.Y.P.," "F.Y.P.," or "Adults, M. or F.," and styles them "Juvenile Adults." In the case of inquests on deceased persons the Judicial Statistics of the same Department describe as "Youths" all who are between 16 and 25, thus including as youths those four years older than the oldest of the "Juvenile Adults." As the ages, sexes, and other sub-divisions are again differently grouped in Scotland and Ireland, there are certainly not fewer than 30 different age-divisions, mostly with different titles or nicknames,

in our Judicial Statistics and Home Office documents dealing with the same figures.

The tabulation of ages and the steps of graduation in separate sets of statistics may need to be different in some cases, on account of their use in statute and administration, but the differences are infinitely more numerous than can be accounted for by this obvious cause. If we take deaths, paupers, immigrants, and so forth, we find that all differ from the Judicial Statistics, and that Poor Law Statistics differ from those of the Registrar-General. In short, it may almost be said that all our statistics differ each from the other where they in the least degree cover the same ground.

The reason given for certain differences otherwise inexplicable is that a conference between the Home Office and Board of Trade with the Registrar-General before the last Census showed that revision would have broken the continuity of the occupational mortality statistics and made the statistics of one Census not comparable with those of previous decades. As for ages, the excuse given is that Census classification, being decennial, and in some degree quinquennial, cannot agree with factory statistics, where the critical ages are 12, 16, 18, and a few others. This latter explanation will not bear examination, and the statement that although Census and Factory Department "Classifications are not identical, they are very "readily comparable," cannot be accepted.

That educational statistics must deal with age-groups of a special kind may be admitted, but there seems no obvious reason why our education statistics should vary between themselves and should also vary as between England, Scotland and Ireland. Neither are things growing better, for in such simple matters as children on the register in England and in Scotland, or on the rolls in Ireland, we find the age-groups even more various now than they were when examined above thirty years ago.

One main reason of inconsistencies in our local statistics comes, as we have already learnt in Dr. Tatham's words, from the artificial choice of districts. The Census gives us statistics of vital conditions and occupations under administrative districts. Births and deaths are treated in detail by the Registrar-General under registration districts. It is difficult to work out the deaths, say, from potter's rot, or the special phthisis of any trade, for areas in the least resembling those of the particular employment. Enquirers are puzzled when they try to deal even with the great towns, separately treated though these are, in the annual summary of deaths, for administrative areas corresponding to the Census. Administrative Birmingham has more than twice as many inhabitants as registration "Birmingham," and administrative Liverpool nearly five times as

many as registration "Liverpool." On the other hand, Blackburn registration district includes nearly 50 per cent. more people than administrative Blackburn. In the "Annual Report of the Registrar-General" many towns besides "Blackburn," as, for example, "Ashton-under-Lyne," appear with a population far larger than that included in the area of the borough. Not only are the figures of births and deaths by unions misleading, but the "registration counties" are in the same position. People are now familiar either with the administrative county and county borough or with the "ancient" or cricket county, but no one has ever known anything about the registration county. Although this striking discrepancy is in some degree remedied in the annual summary dealing with the large towns, sex is not distinguished, so that the figures are rendered useless for certain purposes, such as occupation-disease inquiry; while in the "Registrar-General's Report" deaths are distinguished between male and female, but births only between legitimate and illegitimate.

Such is the confusion between the figures of different Departments concerning the same subjects that there are branches of enquiry in which no amount of research can reconcile the discrepancies or elucidate the facts. The mere difference of the year chosen in the tramways' accounts of the Board of Trade and of the Local Government Board respectively cannot explain the differences in the case of some towns. Revenue in the Local Taxation Returns sometimes exceeds gross receipts as given in the Board of Trade Returns, and occasionally exceeds fourfold the net receipts as stated in the latter figures. The "revenue" from tramways in the case of Burnley for the last year I have examined exceeds, in the Local Taxation Returns, the gross receipts, in the Board of Trade Returns, for a "Burnley," which includes another borough, two urban districts, and, again, a rural parish, all, of course, outside the borough of Burnley.

The differences between the figures of the Local Government Board in the Local Taxation Returns and those given by the Board of Trade in so far as they relate to gas and tramways (leaving aside electric light) are, of course, capable of explanation, though this does not meet our statistical case. The Local Taxation Returns aim at being a statement of cash receipts and of cash payments during a financial year, both arranged under the head of the purposes in respect of which local authorities possess powers. It is the cash finance of the local authority for the year that is in view, rather than the particular undertaking and its income and expenditure. On the other hand, the Board of Trade has a different point of view, and its Returns relate primarily to the undertakings of

local authorities as trading concerns. Gross receipts and working expenditure are shown, and the difference—if it yields a surplus—is called “Net Receipts.” The principle of the Local Government Board Returns seems to break down where a corporation, as in the case of Burnley, has undertakings beyond its boundaries; Burnley, for example, paying rental to the borough of Nelson and to other local authorities for its tramways in their districts. Another cause of confusion is that where tramways and electric lighting have both been established by the same municipal corporations, the current supplied, which may work for the tramways, is sometimes differently treated by the two departments. The boroughs themselves annually publish an abstract of the accounts of their Treasurers, and a close scrutiny of these will no doubt explain the reason of the discrepancies in any particular case. Statistical confusion, however, remains. The Board of Trade themselves explain that “in many cases the columns will not correspond with . . . the “municipal accounts.” In the case of gasworks the different way in which expenditure for the purposes of public lighting is treated is another cause of statistical error.

Not only do Board of Trade and Local Government Board figures clash (with one another and) with figures of the Census and of the Registrar-General, but so also do Home Office figures in the case of Occupation. In the returns of persons employed, published as Supplements to the Report of the Chief Inspector of Factories, the classification of the trades does not agree with that of the Census; as for instance in the cotton trade. The Board of Trade figures of employment are based on voluntary returns made monthly by the principal firms. Some do not report at all, and others only intermittently. The figures given are those from the firms which report continuously; and in all cases new works are obviously excluded. Although not sharing their views I cannot wonder at some of the complaints made by members of the so-called Tariff Commission. The grouping of commodities has led to misconception as to the growth or decline of particular branches of trade. Change and finality are both difficult to procure. New trades develop and old trades are split up; but statistical supervision would have lessened the difficulty by creating originally a sounder classification. The recent change officially effected which classifies imports as far as possible under the countries of origin instead of the countries from which they are shipped would have been made much sooner had there been a controlling or even an advisory official statistical department or council. The familiar example of the enormous import of Dutch beef occurs to us all. It is not easy to feel sure how much of the beef which now figures as either German or Dutch is in fact

Hungarian or of still more distant origin. But if we are not yet accurate in our facts we are at least far nearer to accuracy than was previously the case, and the fact that the change has been deferred now causes the mistaken impression of an increase of German imports more rapid than is the case.

Our trade returns are still imperfect as regards internal commerce and coasting trade. The coal trade is fairly known, but with the other exception of British-grown grain, general statistics of internal commerce are lacking, while apart from coal little information is available as to the nature of goods carried coast-wise from our ports. Attention has recently been called to the incompleteness of the returns of interchange by way of trade between Great Britain and Ireland. Figures of production are full for minerals, agriculture, and fisheries, but wanting for steel production and the textile industries. The iron trade and cotton trade publish their own statistics. The Census of Production will be unnecessarily complete for general purposes, but, on the other hand, the intervals will be too long for most inquirers. In our knowledge of the income of our people we still stand behind many other countries, and our legislation on unemployment and old-age pensions will have to be based chiefly on incomplete trade-union returns; while unorganised labour virtually escapes statistical treatment.

The most pressing need is that we should hand over to a Statistical Department those statistics which are collected by various Departments in the course of administrative work, and of which the publication is not necessary for the purposes of administration. This Statistical Department should arrange such statistics (except those purely administrative) as are collected by the other Departments.

The responsibility incurred by Census makers or compilers of official information sometimes extends like an earthquake wave over large portions of the surface of the globe. In most books of reference, for example, statistics will be found of "Catholics," affecting both the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Canton of Geneva, in which there are added together Catholics of the faith officially known as "Catholic, Apostolic, Roman," "Old Catholics," and those of the Jansenists who claim to be Catholics rightly in communion with the Western Church under the authority of the Pope, but are rejected by that Church for holding doctrines which, as a fact, they may or may not hold. It is better to be without statistics than to gather them in such a way as to mislead the inquirers of the world.

It may perhaps be well to state my own opinion as the result

of some experience and some recent inquiry. A mere meeting of statisticians from the various Departments, to constitute an advisory committee, would in my judgment be an insufficient result of our labours. A permanent statistical direction is, I think, required. The Treasury is the Department which ought to bring about reform, but it seems to shrink from creating an office to do work that should have been taken-up long ago. To advocate a true statistical direction of national statistics is doubtless a "counsel of perfection," the object sought being important to the country, but, like most great ends, difficult of accomplishment. Want of co-ordination in the work of the various offices is obvious and is not denied, but, save for the efforts of the Board of Trade, now redoubled under Mr. Lloyd George as President, we do not adopt a remedy.

APPENDIX A.

In respect of certain alleged "discrepancies between Local Government Board Returns and Census or Registrar-General Returns," the following table shows for what kinds of areas information is published in recurring Returns of the Registrar-General and the Local Government Board.

Statement as to the Classification of Areas in certain Periodical Statistical Returns mentioned below, which are issued (i) by the Registrar-General, and (ii) by the Local Government Board.

(i) Returns issued by the Registrar-General.

Titles of Returns, and Nature of Information Given.	Areas for which Information is Given.		Remarks.
	Registration Areas (<i>i.e.</i> , Divisions, Counties, Districts, and Sub-Districts).	Administrative Areas (<i>i.e.</i> , Counties, County Boroughs, Non-County Boroughs, other Urban Districts, and Rural Districts).	
<i>Census, 1901.</i>			
Areas*.....	Yes, and separately for each constituent parish	Yes, and separately for each constituent parish, Rural Districts excepted	Nil.
Population	Do.	Do.	A table gives the population, &c., of parishes situate in one Registration County, but in another, Administrative; and <i>vice versé</i> .
Number of houses	Do.	Do.	
Number of tenements	Nil	Yes	Nil.
Births, Marriages and Deaths (1891-1901)	Yes, sub-districts excepted	Nil	Nil.
Ages.....	Yes, sub-districts excepted	Yes	Nil.
Condition as to Marriage	Yes, Counties only	Yes, for the Administrative County, for the aggregates of Urban and Rural Districts in each Administrative County, for each County Borough, and for each Urban District of over 50,000 population	Nil.

* See also part of General Report on Census of 1901 relating to "Areas," pp. 11 to 15.

*Classification of Areas in certain Periodical Statistical Returns—Contd.**(i) Returns issued by the Registrar-General—Contd.*

Titles of Returns, and Nature of Information Given.	Areas for which Information is Given.		Remarks.
	Registration Areas (<i>i.e.</i> , Divisions, Counties, Districts, and Sub-Districts).	Administrative Areas (<i>i.e.</i> , Counties, County Boroughs, Non-County Boroughs, other Urban Districts, and Rural Districts).	
Occupations	Nil	Yes, for the Administrative County, for the aggregates of Urban and Rural Districts in each Administrative County, for each County Borough, and for each Urban District of over 5,000 population	Nil.
Numbers of blind, deaf, dumb, and insane	Nil	Yes, Counties and County Boroughs only	Nil.
Birthplaces	Nil	Yes, only for residents in County Boroughs and for residents in Urban Districts of over 50,000 population; also for residents in Ancient (or Geographical) Counties	Nil.
Language spoken in Wales and in Monmouthshire	Nil	Yes, for the Administrative County and for each Urban and Rural District	Nil.
Persons enumerated in Workhouse Establishments, in Hospitals and Lunatic Asylums, in Prisons, and in certified Reformatory and Industrial Schools	Yes, divisions excepted	Nil	Nil.
<i>Annual Report of Registrar-General (1905).</i>			An Index indicates the Registration area or areas in which each urban district is comprised. A note refers to Tables in the Census giving particulars as to the constitution of each registration and urban area. At the end of 1905 only 149 of the 1,164 urban districts were co-extensive with one or more registration areas (districts or sub-districts).
Populations	Yes, corrected for alterations of boundaries subsequent to date of Census	Nil	
Areas	Do.	Nil	
Births	Yes.....	Nil	
Deaths.....	Do.	Nil	
Marriages	Yes, sub-districts excepted	Nil	
Causes of death.....	Do.	Nil	

Classification of Areas in certain Periodical Statistical Returns—Contd.

(i) Returns issued by the Registrar-General—Contd.

Titles of Returns, and Nature of Information given.	Areas for which Information is Given.		Remarks.
	Registration Areas (i.e., Divisions, Counties, Districts, and Sub-Districts).	Administrative Areas (i.e., Counties, County Boroughs, Non-County Boroughs, other Urban Districts, and Rural Districts).	
<i>Annual Summary of Births, Deaths, &c.</i> (1906).			
Estimated Population	Yes, Divisions and Counties only	Yes, limited to all towns, as at present consti- tuted, with population of 20,000 and over at Census of 1901	Nil.
Births	Yes, Divisions, Coun- ties, and London and suburban areas only	Do.	Nil.
Deaths (limited classi- fication of causes)	Do.	Do.	Nil.
Marriages	Yes, Divisions and Counties only	Nil	Nil.
Notified cases of in- fectious disease	Nil	Yes, limited to towns with population of 20,000 and over at Census of 1901	Nil.
<i>Quarterly Return of Marriages, Births and Deaths.</i>			
Estimated Population	Yes, Divisions and Counties only	Yes, limited to all towns, as at present constituted, with population of 20,000 and over at Census of, 1901	A table gives the population (1901) of areas transferred from one registration area to another dur- ing the quarter. The Index indicates the registration area or areas in which each Urban District is situated.
Births	Yes	Do.	
Deaths (limited classi- fication of causes)	Yes	Do.	
Notified cases of in- fectious disease	Nil	Yes, as regards certain large towns	
Marriages	Yes, except sub-dis- tricts	Nil	
<i>Weekly Return.</i>			
Estimated Population	Nil	Yes, for towns with more than 50,000 population in 1901	Nil.
Births	Yes, for London and Suburban areas	Do.	Nil.
Deaths (limited classi- fication of causes)	Do.	Do.	Nil.
Notified cases of in- fectious disease	Nil	Yes, for Metropolitan Boroughs	Nil.

*Classification of Areas in certain Periodical Statistical Returns—Contd.**(i) Returns issued by the Registrar-General—Contd.*

Titles of Returns, and Nature of Information Given.	Areas for which Information is Given.		Remarks.
	Registration Areas (i.e., Divisions, Counties, Districts, and Sub-Districts.	Administrative Areas (i.e., Counties, County Boroughs, Non-County Boroughs, other Urban Districts, and Rural Districts).	
<i>Decennial Supplement.</i> <i>Part I.</i>			
Estimated Population	Yes, for sexes and for separate ages in the ten year period. Counties and Dis- tricts	Nil	Nil.
Births	Yes, Totals, Males and Females for ten years in Counties and Districts	Nil	Nil.
Marriages	Yes, Totals for ten years in Counties and districts	Nil	Nil.
Deaths (abridged clas- sification of causes)	Yes, Totals at several age groups in ten years in Counties and Districts	Nil	Nil.
Life Tables.....	For England and Wales and Selected Healthy Districts	Nil	Nil.
<i>Part II.</i>			
Deaths in Different Oc- cupations (abridged classification of causes)	Yes, for England and Wales and groups of Selected Registra- tion Areas	Nil	Nil.

*Classification of Areas in certain Periodical Statistical Returns—Contd.**(ii) Returns issued by the Local Government Board.*

Titles of Returns, and Nature of Information Given.	Areas for which Information is Given.		Remarks.
	Registration Areas.*	Administrative Areas.	
<i>Pauperism Returns.</i> Number of paupers on 1st January and 1st July Cost of In-Mainten- ance and Out-Relief —half-years ended Lady Day and Michaelmas Monthly Returns of Numbers of Paupers	Yes, for Poor Law Unions and Union Counties, <i>i.e.</i> , groups of entire Unions	Nil	The particulars for “Divisions” are not now given.
	Yes, for Divisions only	Nil	Nil.
<i>Local Taxation Returns.</i> <i>Part I (1905-06).</i> Valuation	Yes, for Poor Law Unions, and Union Counties	Yes, limited to Counties and County Boroughs	Nil.
Accounts of Over- seers (exclusive of London)	Nil	Do.	Prior to 1905-06 the accounts of Overseers were also classified according to Poor Law Unions.
Accounts of Boards of Guardians (exclu- sive of London)	Yes, for Poor Law Unions	Nil	A summary gives cer- tain particulars for each Union County and Division inclu- sive of London.
<i>Part IV (1904-05).</i> Accounts of Boards of Guardians in London	Yes, for Poor Law Unions	Nil	The receipts and ex- penditure of the overseers of the poor for the parishes in City of London Union are shown in a foot- note.
Accounts of other authorities	Nil	Yes (generally)	Nil.
<i>Parts II, III, V, and VI (1904-05)</i>	Nil	Do.	Nil.

* In the Local Government Board Returns the Poor Law Unions represent, with a few exceptions, the same areas as the Registration Districts, and the Divisions and the Union Counties correspond with the Registration Divisions and Counties.

APPENDIX B.

The Melbourne Conference last December dealt with the "Unification of Australian Statistical Methods and Co-ordination of the work of the Commonwealth and State Bureaux."

Australia has recommended to the Australian States, and is likely to obtain exactly that improvement and unity which we need as between, for example, England, and Scotland, and Ireland.

So also, the recommendations and improvements as regards inter-State trade closely resemble those still required as regards trade between Ireland and Great Britain.

The "Conference of Statisticians" included not only the Commonwealth and States of Australia, but New Zealand—now the Dominion of New Zealand.

The New Zealand system, as superior in certain points, was recommended for adoption in Australia in such cases. The conference inculcated the "Advantages of statistical uniformity"; "Uniformity in categories in collection," and in settling districts. It made special reference, needed for these days, to finance: *i.e.*, to bases and possibilities of taxation, which it put high in its lists. We find recommendation of calendar year; agreement to retain certain exceptional State bases of certain population estimates and other tables up to a fixed date before complete uniformity; settlement of uniform forms of Returns; valuable record of reasons for dissent of the State of Victoria on certain points.