WILEY

The Census of the Empire, 1911

Author(s): J. A. Baines

Source: *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, Vol. 77, No. 4 (Mar., 1914), pp. 381-414

Published by: Wiley for the Royal Statistical Society

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2340240>

Accessed: 24-06-2016 22:08 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://about.jstor.org/terms>

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.

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

JOURNAL
OF THE ROYAL STATISTICAL SOCIETY.

MARCH, 1914.

The CENSUS of the EMPIRE, 1911.

By SIR J. A. BAINES, C.S.I.

[Read before the Royal Statistical Society, February 17, 1914,
the President, Professor F. Y. EDGEWORTH, M.A., F.B.A., in the Chair.]

THE interest which this Society has taken in the enumeration of the people may be said to be, as it were, congenital; and from Dr. Farr—whom we might call the Father-in-law of the English census—onwards we have had a succession of Fellows who have devoted their experience to the improvement of methods of enumeration and to rendering the results of greater statistical value. Nor has their attention been confined to the United Kingdom. The need of more complete statistical information about the population of the Empire has been brought prominently to notice in the Inaugural Addresses of more than one of our Presidents, of whom I need only mention Sir Rawson Rawson and Major Craigie. We have also the masterly review by Mr. Hooker of the scope and details of the census of different countries of Greater Britain up to 1891, a work which has been of recognised service far beyond the limits of the Society, and which it would be well worth while to bring up to date, in view of the improvements introduced since its publication.

As for my own position in respect of this matter, I need only say that experience must have taught the Council that if they call upon me at short notice, as upon this occasion, to take my place at this desk, they will be letting the Society in for a good dose of census. It is more than forty years since I first took an interest in this subject, and that interest has never been entirely dropped. This persistence has, I admit, the inconvenience of probable repetition, as I have neither the time nor the inclination to sit down in cold blood to the *crambe repetita* of all I have written, and I am addicted, I fear, to so-called “autoplagiarism,” a vile hybrid, for which, however,

I have recent but respectable literary authority. I propose to deal here with the census of the Empire taken in the spring of 1911. It may be remembered that the Committee originally appointed by the Council to consider and put forward suggestions as to the census of this Kingdom was commissioned to extend the field of its labours to other parts of the Empire, with the view of promoting, as far as the conditions allow, uniformity in the main statistical matter that can be collected at a census. The Committee fully recognised the impracticability of complete uniformity in either procedure or scope of inquiry, but it strongly recommended first, that some census, even though not extending beyond the counting of heads, should be undertaken throughout the dominions, except, of course, in tracts where it might be inadvisable politically or administratively impossible to attempt the inquiry. Then, again, we suggested, for regions in which more detail can be obtained, the compilation of a few primary statistical facts of importance in tables more or less uniform, in order that comparison between the different parts of the Empire on these points might be instituted. In their endeavour to make known what are admittedly counsels of perfection, the Committee was gratefully indebted to the suggestions given at the end of the admirable first attempt at a Report on the census of the Empire made by the Registrar-General of England in 1906 ; but our suggestions certainly stopped short of what appeared to those acquainted with the conditions of many parts of the Empire to be the somewhat ambitious aspirations set forth by the International Statistical Institute.

It is not possible to say with certainty how far the marked improvement in the censuses of 1911 is connected with our propositions. In this country we have the evidence of the Schedule as well as of Papers recently read here, to assure us that our efforts have borne good fruit. The transmission of our report, too, to census authorities in the different colonies and dominions had at least one good result, in bringing to our library the reports and preliminary summaries far more promptly than before, thus enabling us to review the figures very soon after their publication. In regard to the greater detail and uniformity of the tables, which is a notable feature in the general run of the reports, it is prudent not to attribute too much to the action of the Society ; for, although the changes are for the most part in accord with our suggestions, the latter are mostly dictated by ordinary statistical common sense, and would thus commend themselves to any one of experience in census work. The larger units of the Empire—Australia, India and South Africa—have but little to learn from us in this respect. Canada

works upon the plan adopted in its great neighbour, and in the Crown Colonies and the Protectorates there is so great variety in geographical, social and administrative conditions that uniformity is at present out of the question. Even making allowance for these impediments to perfect enumeration, there are, I must admit, several points, chiefly connected with the compilation, in which useful information collected has not been reproduced, and, less venially perhaps, the degree of uniformity we endeavoured to compass has been needlessly sacrificed, and the returns, accordingly, have to be ruled out of comparative analysis. I here refer mainly to the returns of birthplace, in which want of detail is the principal defect, and to the return of ages, where special local considerations have sometimes dictated a classification other than that by quinquennial groups, now universally recommended where the compilation is not by single years. I may digress a moment, I hope, to point out how grievously the accuracy of the results, especially in regard to age, is diminished by any suspicion that the return may be connected in some way or other with the personal interests of the individual. In Ireland, and to some extent perhaps in Great Britain, the advantages of the year 70 have been appreciated since the Pension Act has been in force, as were previously the mystical virtues of "over 16," not to mention the classic instance of the ladies of what across the Channel used to be termed "entre deux ages," now, however, softened into "l'age dangereux." In countries where a poll or house tax is levied after a certain age, as in some of the African and West Indian possessions, the specification of that age in the census tables is no check upon a false return, and only leads, if I am not mistaken, to an exaggerated preponderance in the later parts of the return of the sex not liable to the impost. There is, again, the not rare practice of decennial grouping of ages after 20 or 25, and of giving one total for all over, say, 55, which is unusually early for such an expedient. The former defect is, of course, remediable by interpolation, but the results, *experto crede*, are often by no means as satisfactory as they would be where the population knows its ages better or is less disturbed by migration. Finally, whilst on this subject, I may say that some of the reviews of the results are of a high merit statistically, but others merely reproduce in the text the figures given in the tables. Others do not even do that, and in several instances the tables are not totalled. There is no ground for complaint in this, since the work of dealing with the census is often handed over to an official with no taste or experience for it, and already overlaid with other administrative duties.

The scope of the census inquiry varies, as stated above, from the mere enumeration of persons, without distinction even of sex, to the elaborate schedules of Australia, India and South Africa. One of the most satisfactory features of the 1911 census is that so few tracts were left altogether out of the operations. The greater number of those omitted are in Africa, with the addition of Borneo and Papua. Altogether, their population, roughly estimated, does not amount to much more than 3 per cent. on the total. The estimates, too, were more carefully made than before, with the result of eliminating some of the exaggerated figures which used to appear annually in official publications. In fact, to quote from one of the West African reports, "The imagination of the native peoples " the forest with spirits, and the imagination of the official peoples " it with men." It is still hard to believe, however, that in Northern Nigeria, where the estimate has fallen from 30 to 9 millions, the latter population should contain 1,698 females to 1,000 males. Can this be attributed to the form of taxation?

In several of the African protectorates, instead of attempting a regular census of the whole tract, sample villages were carefully enumerated, and the results applied to the larger area. This method has often been recommended, as, for instance, by Dr. Kiaer, of Christiania, and others, especially for the collection of agricultural statistics; and if the selection of villages be really typical, and the inquiry limited to the simplest facts, the results may be fairly approximate and good enough for administrative requirements, though statistically sterile. Between these estimates and the full census panoply of the larger dominions is found every grade of detail. It is clear, therefore, that returns including figures for the whole Empire must be confined to a very small number. The Registrar-General's report on the census of 1901 gives proof of this. The field has certainly been enlarged on this occasion, but the sphere of "Imperial totals" is still very restricted. From the statistical standpoint this is a drawback of comparative insignificance, as it is chiefly to the mind of that literary scapegoat, the "general reader" that conviction is borne by vast aggregates of incongruous figures. The social facts brought to light through a census have to be considered with regard for every variety of race, civilization, climate and geographical conditions. In a few cases the total for the Empire is of use as a standard by which local deviations may be measured, though in itself it is typical of no considerable tract. This point is well exemplified in the elaborate reports upon the Indian census, in which, it may be noted, nearly the whole of the statistical work is devoted to the provincial figures, and the total is brought but

cursorily under review, as representing a political, not a demographic, entity.

I leave on one side, then, the imposing aggregate of 419 millions odd, with the additional excuse that, irrespective of the consideration above mentioned, the totals available under the main heads with which I am about to deal fall respectively far short of this figure. Birthplace, for instance, is recorded for about 404 millions; colour, or race, for 362 millions only, as the United Kingdom is excluded, along with one of the largest protectorates. Age and civil condition are recorded, for obvious reasons, in still smaller numbers. Nor am I going to dwell, again, upon the density or specific population. First, it is given for the different units, as a whole, in the official year-books, and then also the general average gives but little information as to the real weight of people upon area; and the analysis of detail, such as I have given on former occasions regarding Australia, India and Canada, is too minute a topic for this Paper. It is enough to emphasize the fact that the internal distribution of population in all the larger countries is very irregular.

In entering upon the details of the population, the first subject to attract attention, and, in an Empire like this, the most interesting and characteristic of its conditions, is difference of race or colour. In no census is this feature so prominent as in that of a dominion which includes amongst its subjects representatives of almost every race under the sun. I am tempted to preface my comments upon the figures with a quotation from a poem on Britannia, by one of the Victorian authors, better known by his initials perhaps than by his name:—

“ In fact, mankind at large,
Black, yellow, white and red,
Is given to her in charge,
And owns her as a Head.”—(J.K.S.)

From my compilation under this head, I have left out the United Kingdom. Northern Nigeria and Rhodesia were not enumerated. In parts of the West Indies the distinction of race is not recorded, and in Mauritius only Indians and Chinese are distinguished, the white, black and half-breeds being all shown together. The small communities of blacks in Australia and of Caribs in Guiana and Honduras were not enumerated.

This is a case in which the general total has enough statistical interest to bear quotation. In the following table, the 362 millions in question are given in their proportion to 10,000 of the total:—

	Number per 10,000 of population.			Number per 10,000 of population.	
	Total.	Omitting India.		Total.	Omitting India.
White	389	2,935	Malay	45	346
Mixed	28	192	Polynesians	6	43
Brown	8,470	1,070	Black.....	658	5,046
Yellow	401	345	Red	3	23

The group entitled brown comprises Western Asiatic as well as the inhabitants of India and Ceylon. The Burmese and Siamese are grouped with the Chinese and the few other Mongoloids in Northern India.

The immense preponderance of the Indian population tends to veil the general significance of the return, and in the second column this item has been omitted, thereby transferring the pride of place to the black man. If the northern part of Nigeria and Rhodesia were included, the numerical weight of this race would be substantially greater, as there would be about 34 millions of them, with 14 millions of whites and only 5 million Indians, of whom 4 are in Ceylon. The fall in the proportion of the yellow man in this column is caused by the withdrawal of the figures for Burma and the Himalayan tracts.

The local distribution of the various races differs a good deal. The American Indian, for instance, is confined to Canada, as no return has been received from Newfoundland. So, too, the Polynesians are not found, except for a few isolated seamen, beyond Fiji, the Tonga Islands, Australia and the Maori districts of New Zealand. The Chinese and allied races are almost as localized, since, though small numbers of them are returned from all parts of the Empire, except portions of Africa, about 60 per cent. of them are in the Malay Peninsula and its neighbourhood, where they are permanently employed in the mines and on rubber plantations. Most of the remainder are at home, so to speak, in Hong-Kong and Wei-hai-wei. Only just over a million of the blacks are found in countries out of Africa, mainly in the West Indies and Guiana, with a sprinkling of the Southern-State variety in Canada. Emigrants from India are spread more widely than any other race, except the white, though not usually in very large numbers. Leaving out India and Ceylon, they are mostly in the Malay Peninsula and in Mauritius, where they constitute the majority of the population. There are also fairly large communities in the West

Indies, especially in Trinidad and Guiana, where the indentured labourer has been till lately encouraged to settle, a policy which has recently been abrogated, as in South Africa. In this last dominion—to the discomposure, apparently, of the local authorities—no less than 150,000 Indians are resident. The Malays in Cape Colony, relics of a considerable settlement in the early part of last century, are the only large community of this race beyond their native countries, and are said to be responsible too for the greater part of the 436,000 half-breeds of South Africa. Elsewhere the mixed blood seems to vary with the white, in harmony to some extent with the length of settlement of the latter. In the West Indies and Guiana, for instance, the half-breed is numerous, and there are more than 100,000 in India. The high proportion in Mauritius is also partly due to many generations of colonisation by Europeans permanently domiciled in the island, and partly to the inclusion of other coloured races, as mentioned above.

There remain the white communities, the pivot of the Imperial situation. These fall into three groups; the first including the Australasian dominions, South Africa, Cyprus—the half-way halt between Europe and Western Asia—and India, where there are 200,000, not out for the good of their health. This group contains about 7 millions of the 14. Canada absorbs but few less, leaving only about 200,000 scattered over the rest of the Empire. The largest single aggregates of these are in Southern Rhodesia (23,600) and the West Indies (31,000). The numbers in the Malay Peninsula and East Africa have increased considerably of late years. Elsewhere they vary from 5,000 down to the gallant little garrison of 19 in Somaliland, of which we heard a good deal last year.

The extent of the white man's burden can be appreciated better if the distribution be shown in its proportional form, as in Table I appended. From this we see that the dream of a white Australia has been substantially realized, as only 117 in 10,000 are of a different colour. It should be noted, though, that half this remnant is yellow. Canada is nearly as white; and here, too, the ubiquitous Mongol is only exceeded proportionately by the indigenous Indian. The number of Maoris and their half-breeds reduces the proportion of the whites in New Zealand below 94 per cent. In Cyprus there is a considerable element of Syrians and other western Asiatics. We then come by a big drop to the little Bermudas, where not much more than a third of the population is white. Another step downward lands us in South Africa, where the 1½ millions of Afrianders and Europeans is side by side with 78 per cent. of Bantu and other coloured people. The proportions then grow less and less. Southern

Rhodesia has 306, grown up within the last few years. The long-colonised West Indies shows only 262—less than the proportion in Fiji; and the high proportion of mixed-breeds, which is only exceeded by that in Mauritius, can scarcely be said to add to the white prestige. Finally, it is well to note that in India the European element, including the army, the whole body of officials, merchants and professionals—men, women and children—amounts to no more than 6 persons per 10,000.

In connection with the position of these small but important outposts of white civilization, I will digress for a moment from the more general aspects of my subject, in order to put forward a few figures which have not, I think, been brought together before, and which throw some light upon the social character of these communities. In the following table, then, I show the age and sex-distribution of a number of isolated bodies of Europeans, amounting in the aggregate to about 80,000 persons:—

	Per 1 000 of population.							
	Under 20.		20—50.			Over 50.		All ages. Fe- males to males.
	Total.	Fe- males.	Total.	Fe- males.	Fe- males to males.	Total.	Fe- males.	
Ceylon	204	109	684	239	537	112	40	634
Straits Settlements	199	95	735	182	328	66	22	426
Malay States	166	86	790	177	288	44	14	384
Hong-Kong	309	158	628	237	607	63	22	716
Fiji	287	135	614	187	439	99	30	544
Falkland Isles	367	146	551	109	247	82	21	382
Uganda, &c.	110	51	856	216	337	34	11	385
Southern Rhodesia	295	143	644	180	387	61	17	515
Gold Coast	41	8	929	73	86	40	1	89
Bermudas	378	186	420	227	1,181	202	112	1,107
Barbados	352	177	405	238	1,422	243	154	1,320
St. Helena	504	252	351	201	1,339	145	83	1,153
Total	292	143	597	199	500	111	52	651
England and Wales	399	200	441	230	1,090	160	86	1,068

The selection covers a wide field. The long-established colonies of Barbados and the Bermudas apparently export white male workers as they are known to do their coloured people, and the same can be said of St. Helena. The Falkland Islands are frequented

by whaling vessels, which contribute largely to the adult population. Fiji, East Africa, the Malay Peninsula and Southern Rhodesia are examples of the more recent enterprise of the race, and Ceylon may be deemed a typical plantation settlement in the tropics. I give one sample of the white man's grave, in West Africa. The first point which strikes one in these figures is the predominance of adult life, and the comparative paucity of the young, still more of the old. To illustrate this I have added the corresponding figures for this country. The next feature in the table is the low proportion of women. The general average, it will be noted, is considerably raised by the high ratios in the emigrating countries, and in most of the rest there are not half as many women as men. The difference is more striking in the case of the people of working-ages, including the prime of life when each sex is most in need of the help and companionship of the other. In many settlements there is but one woman to every three men. I have not included India, as the military element there makes the proportions altogether abnormal. This brief statement of one aspect of the life of our fellow-countrymen in the tropics will help to show that the domesticity which appeals so strongly to British sympathies is denied to the majority of those whose avocations carry them outside their native zone.

From race I pass to birthplace, as denoting the relative dependence of a country upon recruitment from abroad. Here, again, it is convenient to treat the figures in their proportional form, as is done in Table II, appended. The aggregate of population included amounts to over 404 millions, taking into account the United Kingdom, but showing it apart from the rest of the Empire. Taking the total for what it is worth, $98\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the population concerned was indigenous where it was enumerated. Of the $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. remaining, about two-fifths were born in countries immediately adjacent to that in which they were at the time of census, and the rest were natives of more remote territory. Of the latter, more than half hailed from the United Kingdom.

Omitting the West and East African returns, in which detail is incomplete, the least reinforcement from abroad is received by India and Cyprus, with the West Indies a bad third. Mauritius, Malta and Ceylon, too, are comparatively self-supporting. The Falkland Islands at the time of the census were entertaining a large and fortuitous company of Scandinavian whalers. Most dependence upon abroad is found in the Malay Peninsula and, of course, Hong-Kong, all of which look to China for the bulk of their labour supply, supplemented, in Malay countries, by India and Java. It is on the latter country, too, that Guiana and Fiji, which import a little more

than a quarter of their population, rely. Mauritius, as already stated, is more than half Indian, though a comparatively small number of its inhabitants were actually born in that Dependency. In New Zealand 28 per cent. of the population was born outside the islands, and the Old Country and Australia are the principal contributors. Of the three large dominions, South Africa, with its large black population, has its immigrants in the lowest proportion, though it indents for labour on its neighbours both north and east. About 17 per cent. of the denizens of the Island continent were born beyond its limits, largely in this country, in the United States and on the European continent. Canada, as is well known, shelters considerable numbers of Russians, Galicians, Icelanders and other Europeans, in addition to over 300,000 citizens of the United States and a large draft upon the Mother Country. In regard to the exchange of population with the United States, I can only say that the latter, as usual, gets the better of the bargain as far as numbers are concerned, since 1,205,000, nearly half women, are sent by Canada across the frontier. I offer no general comment upon the recruitment from adjacent territory, as the geographical considerations involved are obvious, and the economical well known. The interchange of population between one part of the Empire and another can be roughly found by subtracting from the total born in each unit the number enumerated there. I have worked out these figures, but am not burdening the Paper with them, as most of the emigrants go no further than the vicinity of their birth-country, except those from India, Canada and Australia, who are widely spread. The only feature which is worth noticing here is the dispersion of those born in the United Kingdom and enumerated elsewhere in the Empire; these amount to just under 2 millions. Canada shelters 40 per cent.; Australia, 30; 12 per cent. are in New Zealand, 9 in South Africa and 6 in India. Thus only about 64,000 are left for the rest, and a good many of these are in Gibraltar and Malta. Proportionally to the population of the country, natives of this Kingdom bulk largest in New Zealand, 21·4 per cent. In Australia they are 13·4, and in Canada about 11 per cent. They still constitute about a fifth of the population of the Falklands and St. Helena.

In concluding my review of this part of the subject, I may call attention to the relative proportions of the British and foreign-born, which are, in the aggregate, 99·3 and 0·7 per cent. It is only in the Malay Peninsula and in tracts like Hong-Kong, Gibraltar and Honduras, which are closely connected geographically with foreign territory, that the latter form an appreciable element. Of the

more independent countries, Canada imports relatively most from non-British sources, and below it, at a long distance, come South Africa, Australia and the Bermudas, the last-named being, I believe, a sort of health resort from the Eastern States of North America. In the United Kingdom, I may remark in passing, the percentage of the foreign-born is higher than the general average, but would fall below it were we to exclude India from the latter.

I now leave the relations of the States and Colonies to each other and to the foreigner in regard to race and nativity, and come to the more personal part of the census inquiry, beginning with the relative proportions of the sexes, in which the variety throughout the Empire is, as is to be expected, greater than that found in the case of either of the topics hitherto discussed. In the following table the countries are arranged in the serial order of the proportion of females to males among their inhabitants :—

Country.	Females to 1,000 males.	Country.	Females to 1,000 males.
North Nigeria	1,698	Gambia Protectorate	980
Barbados	1,449	South Africa (black)	970
Leeward Isles	1,307	Cyprus	967
Nyassaland....	1,259	India	953
Bahamas	1,244	Newfoundland	952
Swaziland	1,231	British Guiana	926
Windward Isles	1,213	Australia....	926
Uganda	1,211	Trinidad	912
Basutoland....	1,197	Mauritius	903
Gibraltar (civil)	1,176		
South Nigeria	1,166	South Rhodesia	899
		New Zealand	896
Channel Isles	1,128	Ceylon	888
Bermudas	1,094	Wei-hai-wei	887
Jamaica	1,092	Canada	886
England and Wales	1,068	South Africa (whites)	863
Scotland	1,062	Sierra Leone (colony)	840
Ireland	1,003	North Borneo	812
Malta (civil)	1,003		
		Fiji....	744
Bechuana Protectorate	999	Hong-Kong	542
Siam States	997	Straits Settlements	528
Gold Coast Protectorate	988	Malay States	429
British Honduras	986	Falkland Isles	382

That proportion ranges, it appears, from the very doubtful 1,698 per mille in South Nigeria to the exceptional dearth of the fair sex in the Falkland Islands, which is explained, as above stated, by the presence of a number of whaling vessels. A general average is out of place in these conditions, but, for the sake of illustration, not comparison, I here use the figure 1,038 per mille, which was

that of Western Europe in 1901, as found by me for a paper I read here four years ago. That figure is exceeded in sixteen of the countries on the list, and is not nearly reached in the rest. I must not assume that all the ratios here quoted are correct; for, setting aside the preposterous proportion in North Nigeria, it is not at all improbable that in other of the more primitive parts of our African Protectorates, adult males, liable to taxation, are coy of putting themselves forward when an official inquiry is in progress. On the other hand, in India and some other Oriental countries the presence of women, especially young ones, in the recesses of the dwelling is not considered a matter with which the Government has anything to do. Taking the return as it stands, however, it will be found that there is generally a fairly adequate explanation of the proportions, at the extremes, at least, of the list. For instance, in the West Indies, there has been, as is well known, an extensive exodus of men to the works on the Panama Canal, whilst the mines of South Africa similarly attract the adult males of Basutoland and Swaziland. In this country, also, emigration has some effect upon the sex proportions, though in Ireland, as the Registrar-General lately told us, there has been of late a tendency for women, as well as men, to seek work in the United States. In the case of the Malay Peninsula, the immigration of Chinese, Javanese and Indians accounts for the small proportion of women. Amongst the first-named, indeed, in the Malay States, there are only 187 women to every 1,000 men. Hong-Kong is, of course, dependent on the mainland for its labour supply. Trinidad, Guiana and Fiji, too, have their settlements of Indians who, like those in South Africa, bring comparatively few women with them. In Mauritius and Ceylon the Indian immigrant is more of a family man. In the White Dominions, again, the proportion of women is decidedly low. South Africa, with its large mining industry, which outweighs the large domiciled population, stands at the bottom of the list.

The influence of a special movement like that of migration can be traced more clearly when the sex-distribution at different ages is given. I have added, therefore, a table (No. III), showing the number of females per 1,000 males at 7 age-groups. The most instructive of these groups for the present purpose is that between 20 and 44 years of age, into which most of the migrants tend to fall. Unfortunately, the age returns are not available for the African territories in which women appear to be in so great a majority. If we had them, the mystery of this Hamitic feminism might perhaps be solved. I may remark in passing, that in none of the countries of Greater Britain do we find that continuous increase in the pro-

portion of women from infancy to old age that is so remarkable a feature in the return for Western Europe.

Closely allied to the proportion of women in a community is the question of the relative prevalence of marriage and celibacy. In treating of this, however, the distribution of the population by age is a leading factor. I must therefore devote a little comment to the latter, although a subject involving so much study of detail cannot be handled in a paper of this sort otherwise than superficially. The returns, as I said above, are decidedly better than those of previous censuses, and a good many of them can be combined into uniform groups of ages, whilst a few others have been brought into harmony with the rest by a little ordinary adjustment. One or two, however, mostly in the West Indies, take the sixth year into the earliest group, and proceed in quinquennial periods from that point, which throws out comparison with other more orthodox tables. In Table IV appended, I have shown the ages in the usual proportional form, at 7 periods, not altogether identical, I regret to say, with those defined by the melancholy Jaques, of which the later do not quite fit in with modern statistical requirements. The table shows the principal features of the distribution of the inhabitants of each country by age, and the differences in this respect between the various parts of the Empire. In order to facilitate comparison, a standard is necessary by which the local deviations may be measured. The "Imperial total," which here exceeds 379 millions, is added to the table, but, as was stated in connection with Race, the 312 millions of India swamp the variety of the smaller units. I have therefore betaken myself again to the figures for Western Europe, which are reproduced at the foot of the table. The general lines of this standard distribution are doubtless familiar, but I should point out, before applying the table to the census returns, that the standard ages from 55 onwards bear a higher proportion to the total than in any part of Greater Britain, and, indeed, than in this kingdom, were it not for the extraordinary incursion of the aged into Ireland before the last census.

The 30 countries mentioned in the age-table fall into 6 groups : (1) the United Kingdom ; (2) the White Dominions and Colonies ; (3) India, Ceylon and Mauritius ; (4) the Malay Peninsula and Hong-Kong ; (5) The Black population of our African possessions ; and (6) the West Indies and their British neighbours in America. The total deviations in each group from the standard, both above and below, are, of course, very considerable, and average, on the whole, 784 on a base of 10,000 of the total population. The least mean deviation is, of course, in the United Kingdom, where it is ± 280 .

The White dominions reach 491, and the maximum of $\pm 1,842$ is found in the immigrant-laden Malay Peninsula and Hong-Kong. It may be pointed out that the deviation is generally the result of abnormal differences at certain age-groups only, not confined to any particular part of the distribution, except in the case above mentioned, of the general deficiency of the aged. If the plus and minus deviations of each group be taken separately for each age-period, the result indicates fairly the general differences between the distribution of these very diverse populations as a whole, and that of the long-established and highly organised civilisation of Western Europe. To put it briefly, the average net differences per 10,000 are as follows :—

Age.	M.	F.	Total.	Age.	M.	F.	Total.
0—4....	+ 67	+ 91	+ 158	55—64	—113	—142	—255
5—14....	+226	+ 115	+ 341	65, &c.	—136	—171	—307
15—19....	— 24	— 55	+ 79				
20—44....	+211	+ 74	+285				
45—54....	— 40	—103	—143	Total....	+ 191	—191	± 784

The main difference, accordingly, is in the high proportion borne by the young and those of working age in the newer countries, and the unusually low proportion there of the people past middle life. The very young are most prominent in the West Indies and South Africa, the latter being the only Dominion where the proportion of white children is not unusually low. I ought to mention here that the age-returns for Canada have not yet reached us, and their absence is much to be regretted in connection with this question. At the school-going ages our own country and Australasia show up badly, but the Black and Brown elements of the Empire are well to the fore. In the case of the Malayo-Chinese communities, the enormous preponderance of male immigrants between 20 and 45 reduces the proportions of other age-groups to comparative insignificance. As to this period of the prime of life, the average excess denoted by the figure 285, comprises 74 per cent. of men and only 26 of the other sex. In the West Indian group, however, excluding Trinidad and Guiana, the proportion of men at this period falls more below the standard than that of women rises above it, but everywhere else the reverse is the case, except in this country, where 64 per cent. of the deviation above standard falls to the share of the women. In regard to the senescent and the sexagenarians, the relative paucity is in some cases obviously due to the superabundance of those at earlier ages. In other tracts, the people do not know much of the higher numbers, whether applied to age or to any other fact of everyday life, and

in others again, as in India, there is no doubt a really shorter period of old age. The extension of life in this country during the last generation or so is well known, and the old women of Malta, Gibraltar and Barbados seem to be catching up ours.

I have left myself but little space for the consideration of the figures relating to marriage, which are, indeed, less susceptible of comparison than any of the rest, and have been compiled, moreover, less uniformly than any others. There is also this to be said, that marriage does not mean the same thing all over the Empire; nor, again, does it occupy the same position in social life. For instance, in most of the West Indies, coloured men and women live together maritally in probably much the same proportions as elsewhere; but the marriage ceremony is not popular, and, if we were to judge by the census returns, the islands would appear to be in a parlous state as regards connubial bliss. In Guiana, on the other hand, there is said to be an inclination to return concubinage as marriage. In Mauritius, again, marriage is illegal under 18 for men and 15 for women, and the religious ceremony is not recognised unless the union be civilly registered. The Indian immigrant cares for none of these things, but marries under his caste rules. Many of the mixed or general population also ignore registration, and contract stable connections without it. For most of the negro populations no return of marriage was asked for at the census, as it is considered safe to assume that every girl is married as soon as she reaches womanhood. In India, as is well known, the marriage ceremony is generally what would be here deemed betrothal, a fact which has a somewhat startling effect when age is combined with civil condition on paper. But in Burma and Ceylon, custom is more in accord with that of the West.

The proportion of children, as already remarked, varies so greatly that a return of civil condition irrespective of age conveys little information as to the relative prevalence of marriage in the different countries. Unfortunately, the detail of age is wanting in many of the tables, including those for Canada. I append, however, Table V, in which all below 15 have been omitted, and the proportions taken on the rest. The special local characteristics mentioned above are fairly well shown in the figures. In the West Indies, for example, the Bahamas are the only group in which the married of either sex reach a moderately high proportion, and it is the bachelor, apparently, who seeks the Canal. In Mauritius no more than from 20 to 22 per cent. of either sex are set down as married, but it would seem as though the concubine, upon the death of her partner, has a tendency to assume the honorary rank of widow, like the "step on retirement" in the Army!

The highest proportion of married are, as is to be expected, in India, where, too, the widows constitute more than a quarter of the women over 15, in consequence of the prohibition of remarriage amongst the better-off castes. It should be noted that between 25 and 35 only 20 per mille of the Indian women are single, and this falls to half a few years later. In this country the corresponding proportions are 355 and 196 per mille. Here, too, the bachelors between 25 and 35 number 385 per mille, whilst in the Dependency they are only 139; from this period onward they are outnumbered by the widowers. Under 15, $15\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. are wives, but the acme of marriage prevalence among the women of India is reached between 20 and 25. Widows predominate after 45, and constitute 85 per cent. of their sex over 65, whereas in this country they are then only a little more than half. But here, 12 per cent. are still spinsters, and in India no more than $1\frac{1}{2}$. It will be seen that Cyprus again justifies the position I before assigned to it, of a half-way halt between East and West. More than half the women between 20 and 25 are married, and wives are at their maximum proportion between 25 and 35. The men, however, though connubially disposed beyond the average, keep closer to the Western habit, and one of the results of this distinction is a lot of middle-aged widows and comparatively few widowers.

As to the white Dominions, there are relatively fewer husbands in Australasia and South Africa than in Great Britain, and fewer widowed, but more wives. The women of South Africa, too, marry a good deal earlier, and the proportion of the married of both sexes continues high to a later age. But the widows get proportionately more numerous after 50, and the high proportion of wives is kept up by the comparatively small number of spinsters. Throughout the working-period the immigrant bachelor keeps the ratio of his order well above the British figure, though below that of Australia and its neighbour.

I have now reached the end of the subjects I proposed to review, and, as far as can be compassed in a paper of this length, I have accomplished, I hope, to some extent, my main object, which is to make use of the census in calling attention, not to the size and population of the Empire, but to the astounding variety of social conditions therein prevailing, in their numerical aspect. Our knowledge in this direction is still far from complete or even adequate, but we, as a Society, have not spared our efforts in the past, and I trust we shall not fail to continue our endeavours to increase this knowledge, and in this way to bring home to our fellow-citizens the real significance of the often quoted question, "What do they know of England who only England know?"

TABLE I.—*Colour, per 10,000 of population.*

Country.	White.	Mixed.	African.	Asiatic.			American.		Polynes.
				Black.	Brown.	Malay.	Yellow.	Red.	
Australia	9,883	33	1		14	5	59	—	5
New Zealand	9,367	66	—		—	—	24	—	543
Fiji	266	172	—		2,887	—	23	—	6,652
Tonga Islands	72	45	—		—	—	—	—	9,883
Cyprus	7,928	—	—		2,072	—	—	—	—
Canada	9,771	—	24		3	—	52	150	—
Bermudas	3,523	—	6,477		—	—	—	—	—
West Indies	262	1,891	7,231		598	—	18	—	—
British Guiana	133	1,362	4,142		4,274	—	89	—	—
India	6	3	—		9,581	—	410	—	—
Ceylon	21	65	—		9,879	34	1	—	—
Straits Settlements	104	114	—		1,160	3,395	5,227	—	—
Malay States	29	22	1		1,481	4,356	4,111	—	—
Siam States	3	1	—		102	8,999	895	—	—
North Borneo	17	3	3		45	8,670	1,262	—	—
Hong-Kong	121	56	—		68	9	9,746	—	—
Wei-hai-wei	14	—	—		—	—	9,986	—	—

VOL. LXXVII. PART IV.

TABLE I *Contd.*—*Colour, per 10,000 of population.*

Country.	White.	Mixed.	African.	Asiatic.			American.	Polynes.
				Black.	Brown.	Malay.		
Mauritius	—*	3,435	—	6,471	—	—	—	—
Uganda	1	—	9,991	8	—	—	—	—
East African Protectorate	13	—	9,937	50	—	—	—	—
Nyasaland	8	—	9,987	5	—	—	—	—
Somaliland	1	—	9,914	85	—	—	—	—
South Rhodesia	306	20	9,662	11	—	—	—	—
South African Union	2,137	730	6,842	252	—	—	—	—
Swaziland	8	14	9,878	—	—	—	—	—
Basutoland	35	32	9,933	—	—	—	—	—
Bechuana Protectorate	135	—	9,836	29	—	—	—	—
Gambia	20	—	9,971	9	—	—	—	—
Gold Coast	11	—	9,989	—	—	—	—	—
Sierra Leone	6	1	9,991	2	—	—	—	—
South Nigeria	3	—	9,997	—	—	—	—	—
Total	389	28	658	8,470	45	401	3	6
Without India	2,935	192	5,046	1,070	346	345	43	23

* Included with Mixed.

+ Included with Malay.

† Included with Malay.

* Included with Mixed.

TABLE II.—*Birthplace, per 10,000 of population.*

Country.	Indigenous.	Adjacent countries.		Remote countries.			Total Foreign born.
		British.	Foreign.	United Kingdom.	Other British.	Foreign, white countries.	Foreign, others.
Gibraltar, total	5,536	—	1,232	2,841	315	68	1,308
Malta, civil	8,990	—	128	782	33	36	195
Cyprus...	9,898	—	79	12	2	9	88
Canada	7,799	21	422	1,089	46	562	1,045
Bermudas	8,330	—	—	774	320	470	576
West Indies	9,477	7	65	28	382	16	106
British Guiana	7,394	415	—	82	2,023	41	86
British Honduras	8,218	205	1,453	46	27	40	1,504
<i>Falkland Isles*</i>	434.3	—	10.4	206.6	10.1	338.6	349
India	9,979	9	6	4	1	1	7
Ceylon...	8,839	1,147	—	10	3	1	1
Straits Settlements	4,452	1,109	360	60	19	16	4,360
Malay States	3,393	2,036	691	18	19	2	3,984
Siam States	8,406	749	102	1	7	—	3,841
North Borneo...	8,050	77	1,793	17	46	—	735
Hong-Kong	3,303	—	6,551	46	69	27	837
Wei-hai-wei	9,918	—	62	13	2	4	1,810
							6,582
							67

* Below 10,000.

TABLE II *Contd.—Birthplace, per 10,000 of population.*

Country.	Indigenous.	Adjacent countries.		Remote countries.				Total Foreign born.
		British.	Foreign.	United Kingdom.	Other British.	Foreign, white countries.	Foreign, others.	
Mauritius	8,935	—	6	39	931	10	79	95
East Africa	9,966	—	—	4	28	2	2	2
West Africa	9,984	—	11	1	2	2	—	13
South African Union	9,023	191	202	305	175	98	6	306
South Rhodesia	9,516	213	90	125	26	18	12	120
St. Helena*	954.3	—	—	23.3	17.2	5.2	—	5.2
Australia	8,297	76	—	1,338	44	177	68	245
New Zealand	7,157	472	—	2,141	42	155	33	188
Fiji	7,274	548	—	63	2,100	14	1	15
Total	9,825	38	30	55	11	16	25	71
England and Wales	9,645	205	33	—	46	66	5	104
Scotland	9,172	715	6	—	38	68	1	75
Ireland	9,643	293	5	—	21	36	2	43
Islands	7,843	1,491	517	—	92	57	—	574
United Kingdom	9,861	—	29	—	42	68	—	97

* Below 10,000.

TABLE II (a).—*Birthplace.*

British-born.			Foreign-born.	
Birth-country.	Total.	Enumerated outside birth-country.	Birth-country.	Total.
United Kingdom ...	46,373,791	1,973,246	Austria-Hungary ...	146,383
Gibraltar and Malta	234,493	15,371	Belgium	15,914
Cyprus.....	271,527	228	Denmark, &c. ...	27,276
India	314,143,591	1,359,939	France	73,711
Ceylon.....	3,649,918	20,263	Germany	162,184
Straits Settlements....	386,938	69,104	Holland	20,019
Malay States	417,882	14,395	Italy	74,171
Siam States.....	381,981	18,185	Greece	9,450
North Borneo.....	184,379	16,793	Norway	36,142
Hong Kong.....	148,204	3,732	Portugal	7,270
Wei-hai-wei	146,840	—	Russia	253,482
Asiatic Colonies unspecified	267	267	Spain ..	9,566
Mauritius	360,910	3,999	Sweden	44,646
South African Union	5,414,514	26,001	Switzerland	15,973
Swaziland	21,876	21,876	Rumania, &c.	14,114
Basutoland	76,043	76,043	Turkey in Europe....	7,095
Bechuana Protectorate	5,364	5,364	Europe unspecified	9,598
Southern Rhodesia	738,750	5,541	Arabia, Persia, &c.	136,742
Uganda	2,840,623	—	China.....	1,218,725
East African Protectorate	2,395,435	—	Japan.....	19,193
Nyasaland	12,242	12,242	Macas	5,380
Gambia	115,325	—	Philippines	5,902
Gold Coast	1,494,598	—	Siam	8,610
Sierra Leone	1,398,014	—	Java, &c.	114,744
Southern Nigeria ...	7,856,605	—	Asia unspecified ...	2,996
West Africa unspecified	1,170	1,170	Egypt.....	1,347
South Africa unspecified	12,662	12,662	Mozambique	122,787
African Colonies unspecified	1,327	1,327	North Africa unspecified	1,433
St. Helena	5,631	2,333	West Africa (foreign)	7,259
Canada	5,647,673	27,991	Africa unspecified...	17,494
Newfoundland	16,883	16,883	United States	372,403
Bermudas	15,776	18	Central and South America	19,951
West Indies	1,531,005	16,646	West Indies (foreign)	3,242
British Guiana	221,785	3,080	America unspecified	5,002
British Honduras ...	32,807	2	Foreign unspecified	16,648
Falkland Islands ...	1,421	—		
Australia.....	3,758,156	90,484		
New Zealand	805,891	41,632	TOTAL FOREIGN ...	3,006,942
Fiji	102,913	1,435	Total returned	404,282,116
Tonga Isles, &c.....	7,093	7,093	At sea	14,738
British unspecified...	42,851	—	Unspecified	2,139,541
TOTAL BRITISH...	408,275,174	—	Grand Total	406,436,395

TABLE III.—*Number of females per 1,000 males in each age-group.*

Country.	All ages.	0—4.	5—14.	15—19.	20—44.	45—54.	55—64.	65 and over.
England and Wales ...	1,068	991	1,003	1,015	1,095	1,081	1,116	1,321
Scotland ...	1,062	988	989	982	1,084	1,094	1,127 ⁸	1,450
Ireland ...	1,003	974	968	969	994	989	1,051	1,157
Australia ...	926	967	979	977	828	801	814	903
New Zealand ...	896	965	961	973	878	839	775	726
South Africa (whites)	863	970	978	966	776	752	774	884
Malta (civil) ...	1,003	951	967	1,054	1,018	1,028	1,009	1,032
Gibraltar (civil) ...	1,176	1,023	1,033	1,187	1,193	1,133	1,456	1,760
Cyprus ...	967	971	940	1,009	1,008	941	901	850
India ...	954	1,031	891	929	969	916	1,036	1,052
Ceylon ...	888	949	912	949	872	872	692	729
Straits Settlements ...	528	1,018	952	679	378	424	629	629
Malay States ...	429	973	868	621	301	279	438	438
Siam States ...	997	1,016	965	1,078	1,009	889	1,024	1,278
Hong-Kong (Chinese)	551	954	971	413	423	541	766	1,278
Mauritius ...	901	992	947	996	855	809	783	914

TABLE III *Contd.*—*Number of females per 1,000 males in each age-group.*

Country.	All ages.	0—4.	5—14.	15—19.	20—44.	45—54.	55—64.	65 and over.
South Africa (coloured)	970	1,067	955	994	895	997	1,147	1,298
Basutoland	1,197	1,112	983	1,366	1,524	1,201	1,083	1,007
Gambia (Colony)	884	928	1,017	707	752	1,110	958	1,312
Sierra Leone (Colony)	840	1,008	917	918	743	781	1,109	1,109
Jamaica	1,092	1,006	990	1,078	1,169	1,159	1,148	1,356
Barbados	1,449	1,017	1,003	1,230	2,187	1,676	1,602	2,081
Bahamas	1,244	1,067	996	1,424	1,611	1,212	1,097	1,199
Grenada	1,194	1,000	981	1,184	1,515	1,171	1,266	1,503
St. Vincent	1,283	1,004	985	1,047	1,731	1,481	1,468	1,460
Dominica	1,223	1,017	1,085	1,147	1,336	1,684	1,480	1,526
Santa Lucia	1,178	973	992	1,211	1,473	1,233	1,216	1,141
Trinidad	913	984	972	1,049	874	754	838	1,000
British Guiana	926	1,006	970	1,100	876	784	923	1,177
British Honduras	986	1,055	958	1,094	946	889	989	1,324
<i>Standard population</i> (<i>Western Europe, 1901</i>)	1,038	987	990	1,011	1,045	1,074	1,107	1,182

TABLE IV.—*Age-distribution per 10,000 of both sexes.*

Country.	0—4.		5—14.		15—19.		20—44.		45—54.		55—64.		65 and over.		Total.	
	Males.	Fe- males.	Males.	Fe- males.	Males.	Fe- males.	Males.	Fe- males.	Males.	Fe- males.	Males.	Fe- males.	Males.	Fe- males.	Males.	Fe- males.
England and Wales	537	532	996	999	459	466	1,850	2,026	470	508	301	336	224	296	4,837	5,163
Scotland	563	556	1,060	1,048	490	481	1,775	1,924	448	490	292	329	222	322	4,850	5,150
Ireland	503	490	1,001	969	489	474	1,769	1,759	451	446	314	330	466	539	4,993	5,007
Australia	603	583	1,005	984	512	500	2,022	1,875	544	436	279	227	226	204	5,191	4,809
New Zealand	596	575	996	965	445	433	2,229	1,957	441	370	293	227	274	199	5,274	4,726
South Africa (white)	738	716	1,109	1,085	501	484	2,237	1,736	428	322	226	175	129	114	5,368	4,632
Malta (civil)	618	588	1,096	1,060	496	523	1,728	1,759	465	478	341	344	248	256	4,992	5,008
Gibraltar (civil)	443	453	875	904	465	552	1,900	2,267	467	529	274	399	171	301	4,595	5,405
Cyprus	681	661	1,228	1,155	456	460	1,710	1,723	456	429	314	283	240	204	5,085	4,915
India	679	700	1,304	1,162	434	403	1,946	1,885	416	381	221	229	116	122	5,118	4,882
Ceylon	760	721	1,365	1,245	433	411	2,003	1,746	366	319	237	164	133	97	5,297	4,703
Straits Settlements	385	392	835	795	476	323	3,930	1,487	585	248	334	210	—	—	6,545	3,455
Siam States	671	682	1,331	1,285	386	416	1,901	1,918	350	311	370	379	—	—	5,009	4,991
Malay States	447	435	764	663	417	259	4,386	1,322	662	185	313	137	—	—	6,999	3,001
Hong-Kong (Chinese)	303	289	793	770	715	295	3,720	1,573	573	310	248	190	97	124	6,449	3,551
Mauritius	633	628	1,202	1,138	511	509	2,106	1,801	430	348	240	188	139	127	5,261	4,739

TABLE IV *Contd.*—*Age-distribution per 10,000 of both sexes.*

Country.	0—4.		5—14.		15—19.		20—44.		45—54.		55—64.		65 and over.		Total.	
	Males.	Fe- males.	Males.	Fe- males.	Males.	Fe- males.	Males.	Fe- males.	Males.	Fe- males.	Males.	Fe- males.	Males.	Fe- males.	Males.	Fe- males.
South Africa (blacks)	732	781	1,301	1,242	515	512	1,915	1,713	312	311	170	195	131	170	5,076	4,924
Basutoland	883	982	1,550	1,524	432	590	1,150	1,753	239	237	156	169	142	143	4,552	5,448
Gambia (Colony)	500	464	1,051	1,069	560	396	2,504	1,883	390	433	403	447	—	—	5,398	4,692
Sierra Leone (Colony)	384*	387	1,036	950	535	491	2,586	1,921	493	385	262	251	138	181	5,434	4,566
Jamaica	689	693	1,308	1,295	463	499	1,629	1,905	333	336	209	240	149	202	4,780	5,220
Barbados	576	586	1,292	1,296	504	620	994	2,174	333	558	249	399	136	283	4,084	5,916
Bahamas	687	733	1,395	1,389	458	652	1,188	1,914	345	418	228	250	156	187	4,457	5,543
Grenada	730	730	1,438	1,411	499	591	1,259	1,907	304	356	184	233	143	215	4,557	5,443
St. Vincent	735	738	1,072	1,056	636	666	1,186	2,053	293	434	220	323	239	349	4,381	5,619
Dominica	852*	867	1,147	1,245	488	560	1,422	1,900	256	431	196	290	137	209	4,498	5,502
Santa Lucia	827*	805	1,301	1,291	511	619	1,274	1,877	283	349	204	248	192	219	4,592	5,408
British Guiana	491	494	1,116	1,083	380	418	2,340	2,051	480	381	248	229	130	153	5,191	4,809
British Honduras	694	732	1,271	1,217	481	526	1,874	1,773	387	344	190	188	139	184	5,036	4,964
Trinidad	617	607	1,096	1,065	428	449	2,244	1,962	463	349	234	196	145	145	5,227	4,773
Total	661	677	1,261	1,140	440	414	1,948	1,890	422	393	232	240	134	148	5,098	4,902
West Europe, 1901	594	586	1,035	1,025	464	469	1,737	1,816	462	496	345	382	270	319	4,907	5,093

* Under 6 years.

TABLE IV (a) —*Age-deviation per 1,000 from standard (West Europe).*

Group.	0—4.	5—14.	15—19.	20—44.	45—54.	55—64.	65.	Total.
United Kingdom { M. F. Total ... }	- 58 - 56 -114	- 31 - 24 - 55	+ 1 = + 1	+ 97 + 173 + 270	+ 4 + 5 + 9	- 44 - 47 - 91	- 23 + 3 - 20	- 54 + 54 ± 280
White Dominions { M. F. Total ... }	+ 35 + 22 + 57	- 16 - 17 - 33	+ 34 + 18 + 52	+ 345 + 37 + 382	+ 42 88 - 46	- 71 - 158 - 229	- 53 - 180 - 183	+ 316 + 316 ± 491
India, &c. { M. F. Total ... }	+ 86 + 114 + 200	+ 270 + 138 + 408	- 30 - 65 - 95	+ 210 + 67 + 277	- 47 - 116 - 163	- 123 - 154 - 277	- 153 - 197 - 350	+ 213 - 213 ± 885
Malaya, &c. { M. F. Total ... }	- 169 - 167 - 336	- 196 - 252 - 448	+ 18 - 172 - 154	+ 2195 - 353 + 1842	+ 136 - 261 - 125	- 33 - 194 - 227	- 254 - 298 - 552	+ 1697 - 1697 ± 1842
Africa { M. F. Total ... }	+ 145 + 205 + 350	+ 280 + 233 + 513	+ 45 + 49 + 94	+ 129 - 96 + 33	- 153 - 185 - 338	- 175 - 188 - 363	- 138 - 151 - 289	+ 133 - 133 ± 990
West Indies, &c. { M. F. Total ... }	+ 50 + 61 + 111	+ 202 + 195 + 397	- 10 + 35 + 25	+ 18 - 114 + 162	- 85 - 102 - 187	- 123 - 136 - 259	- 125 - 124 - 249	- 73 + 73 ± 695
Total { M. F. Total ... }	+ 67 + 91 + 158	+ 226 + 115 + 341	- 24 - 55 - 79	+ 211 + 74 + 285	- 40 - 103 - 143	- 113 - 142 - 255	- 136 - 171 - 307	+ 191 - 191 ± 784

TABLE V.—*Civil condition, per 1,000 over 15.*

Country.	Males.			Females.		
	Married.	Single.	Widowed.	Married.	Single.	Widowed.
England and Wales	545	403	52	506	390	104
Scotland	484	462	54	452	440	108
Ireland	385	555	60	386	483	131
Malta	493	461	46	489	409	102
Cyprus	601	354	45	614	242	144
Australia	462	497	41	507	403	90
New Zealand	469	491	40	534	384	82
South Africa (whites)	501	471	28	590	334	76
South Rhodesia (whites)	374	595	31	666	272	62
India	710	203	87	685	39	276
Ceylon	534	412	54	602	222	176
Straits Settlements	437	563		658	342	
Johore (Malay)	329	671		684	316	
Siam States*	709	291		712	288	
Mauritius	203	764	33	223	674	103
South Africa (coloured)	501	476	23	576	284	140
Swaziland....	539	461		795	205	
Gambia (colony)	288	712		383	617	
St. Helena	454	432	64	411	495	94
Jamaica	335	630	35	297	617	86
Barbados	468	493	39	304	598	98
Bermudas....	444	500	56	413	458	129
Bahamas	565	390	45	469	413	118
Grenada	392	546	62	333	571	96
St. Vincent	359	609	32	265	636	99
Dominica	367	596	37	291	610	99
Santa Lucia	397	561	42	329	567	104
Trinidad	250	719	31	285	631	84
British Guiana†	370	590	40	386	509	105
British Honduras	388	555	57	411	449	140
<i>All ages—</i>						
Canada	624	351	25	575	371	54
Hong-Kong (Chinese)....	332	646	22	190	680	130

* Kedah and Perlis only.

† Above 10.

DISCUSSION *on* SIR J. A. BAINES'S PAPER.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON, in moving the vote of thanks to the reader of the Paper, said that at the end of his Paper Sir Athelstane had called attention to the astonishing variety of social conditions existing throughout the British Empire; but if these questions really were discussed they were rather more political than social, and more social than statistical. At the same time he thought it brought home to all of them, when they saw the very small number of white men who lived in the oversea Dominions of the Empire, in some sense the nature of the burden which they bore in the administration of the countries in which they lived. The figures which Sir Athelstane had skilfully grouped together naturally pointed to certain conclusions; and he thought he might say throughout the Paper, with very few exceptions, the conclusions were what one would anticipate. But he wished to call attention to one or two points which he thought were worthy of special notice. There was one statement which rather surprised him on page 390 in connection with the inter-change of population between Canada and the United States. Sir Athelstane remarked: "In regard to the exchange of population with the United States, I can only say that the latter, as usual, gets the better of the bargain" "as far as numbers are concerned, since 1,205,000, nearly half women, "are sent by Canada across the frontier." He was under the impression that during recent years the balance was the other way, and that the opening up of the territories in the west had caused a very considerable migration of subjects of the United States over the border. It might be that that migration had been taking place subsequent to the Census, but it was rather a surprise to him to hear that there was such a very large balance in favour of the United States as that mentioned by Sir Athelstane. There was one set of figures which specially interested him, namely, the relation of men to women. It would be noted on page 391 that the proportion of women in Wales and England to a thousand males was 1,068. In Scotland it was 1,062, and in Ireland it was only 1,003. He thought the general inference they drew from migration was, that the more the population of the country immigrated the greater was the disproportion between the women and the men, because the men went in much larger proportions as a rule than women. That was undoubtedly the case in this country, and he thought also in Scotland. In England—excluding Ireland—he thought there was a majority of women over men of something like 15,000. In Ireland immigration had been on a very much larger scale than in either Scotland or England. How it had come to pass, that notwithstanding this great immigration, this proportion had not been disturbed, he could explain in this way—that he thought a very large proportion of the female relatives of the Irish were not averse to entering domestic service, and there was a very great demand for domestic

servants in the United States. He therefore assumed that the male immigrant carried his female folks with him when he immigrated. In England and Scotland, on the other hand, among certainly a considerable proportion of the class of immigrants there was a reluctance on the part of family relatives to entering into domestic service and they stayed at home. He did not know whether that was the explanation ; but it was a curious fact that where immigration was on a very large scale the proportion of women to men had not been disturbed.

Sir EDWARD BRABROOK, in seconding the vote of thanks, said he was inclined to think that the untoward circumstance that the Executive Committee of the Society were now and then disappointed of a Paper they expected to have, was really one of those calamities which were blessings in disguise, because the Executive Committee usually resorted to Sir Athelstane, who produced a Paper full of learning and humour, and probably more interesting to the Fellows at large than the Paper they would have had if the original arrangements had been carried into effect. On the present occasion, they had had a most interesting and suggestive Paper relating to an ambitious proposal, of obtaining, if possible, something like an approximately simultaneous Census of the whole of the British Empire. The lesson, he took it, to be derived from the Paper was, that even if an ambitious proposal of that kind could be carried into effect, much must not be expected from it until someone possessed of Sir Athelstane's encyclopædic knowledge had expounded the significance of the facts relating to so many diverse races in different social circumstances.

Sir JAMES WILSON said the most outstanding consideration which occurred to him was the enormous responsibility which rested upon them of the good government of such a very large proportion of the world's population. From the figures given on page 386 he understood there were 362 millions, which practically meant the total population of the British Empire outside the United Kingdom, and if he understood rightly it meant, of that population, less than 4 per cent. were white. That was including India and including the Dominions of Canada, Australia, South Africa and other places. That meant that practically the whole of that enormous population was dependent for its good government, not upon the white population altogether, but in the last resort upon the population of the United Kingdom. Even in the Dominions the Legislative and Executive authority exercised there derived its basis from the Legislation and the Executive Authority of their little Kingdom, and that was especially the case in India and the Crown Colonies, where every official, white or dark, who exercised authority derived it from the King in Parliament of the United Kingdom ; and ultimately, one might say, to a very large extent, the burden of governing these races rested upon the electors of the United Kingdom, who sent Members to

the House of Commons. He did not realize that only 2 millions of people in the British Empire were born in the United Kingdom. He would have thought that the number of people living in the Empire outside the United Kingdom was more than 2 millions. It was a considerable number, but it was less than he would have expected to find. He was rather surprised also to find that in proportion to the population of the country the natives of the United Kingdom bulked largely in New Zealand, and he understood that 21 per cent. of them were born in the United Kingdom. At one time New Zealand was one of the favourite places for people to go to from this country, but he would have thought that more recently emigration had been very much more general into Canada from this country than perhaps to Australia and to New Zealand. However, he supposed the figures were correct and that his impression was a false one. Sir Athelstane Baines had told them that the statistics regarding age were not to be depended upon, and one had plenty of experience in support of that suggestion. He remembered when he was checking the Census in India in an out-of-way district he was looking down the Census Tables and found a man in a very primitive village had entered himself as 100 years of age. He went to see the old gentleman, and he said to him, "How old are you?" He said, "About 100." I said to him, "You do not look more than 70." He said, "Perhaps it is only 70." He then corrected the Table from 100 to 70; but whether it was correct or not one could not tell, and even in this country one could not depend on ages.

Dr. JOHN POLLEN said he had visited New Zealand and Australia and he knew something about India. He had, of course, noted the great ambition of the people of Australia to make their land exclusively a white man's country; he had also noted the impossibility, in his opinion, of the realisation of that idea. It seemed to him perfectly impossible that the few millions of white men in that country could succeed in developing that great Continent as it ought to be developed. He had heard on all sides of the desirability of keeping out the man of dark complexion from the land, but he could not help realising how perfectly impossible it was for the white man to do under an Australian sun the work that there was to be done if that great Continent was to be developed. He shared in the appreciation expressed for the admirable Paper, and was grateful for being allowed to express that appreciation.

Dr. T. H. STEVENSON referred first of all to the tendency of Irishmen to congregate around the age of 70. He thought it had been commented upon at various times, and they had noticed the fact with great interest when the Irish Report came out; but on looking into the figures for the Irish Census of ten years ago they found there was a remarkable tendency to be 60. So that, apparently for some reason, there had been a wave of population around

that age or at all events of persons who either thought they were that age or in whose interest it was to describe themselves ten years ago as 60 and now as 70. They found that, although it was not so marked ten years ago, it was now very marked indeed, so that possibly it was not so entirely connected with old-age pension considerations as one at first sight would be inclined to suppose it to be. He then referred to the inter-change of population between Canada and the United States, and he said he heard with no surprise that there should be more inhabitants of Canadian birth in the United States than inhabitants of the United States in Canada. It left out of consideration the fact, in the first place, that the emigration of French Canadians into the factory districts of the New England States had been going on for many years, and was a very considerable item in the immigration statistics of those States, whereas the movement from the Western United States into Canada was a comparatively recent one. Again, they were accustomed to seeing statistics of the flow into the Western areas of Canada from the Western United States, and they seldom saw any account of the return flow; but there was a considerable return flow. He saw the figures the other day, and speaking from memory he thought they amounted to from 30 to 40 per cent. of the in-flow. Therefore, taking into consideration the fact that the one was an old movement and the other was a new one, and that although the new movement was of very large extent or to a considerable extent offset by a return flow, no surprise need be felt that the figures which referred not only to the movement of the last few years but for the last fifty years or more, should come out as Sir Athelstane showed they did.

Mr. E. A. H. JAY said the impression he had got some years ago when going round Ireland with the Royal Commission on the Feeble-Minded was very similar to what came out in the Paper. He thought it was clearly the fact from what he then observed, that young families did emigrate largely from Ireland to the United States, and the consequence was they naturally got a very large proportion of older people remaining in the country, quite apart from any artificial or false statistics attributable to old-age pensions. He thought it also bore out what Lord George Hamilton had said about the proportion of the male sex, because in Ireland families emigrated, and not single men only. They remained out there for a considerable period, sending money home to support old people in the old country, and then returning in comparatively old age and settling again in Ireland for the remainder of their years. The impression one had seemed to be exactly what the figures bore out. He referred to another interesting point with regard to Barbados. Sir Athelstane mentioned in his Paper the export of expert white workers from Barbados. Some eighteen years ago he was out there, and he remembered at that time there was a population of a rather curious type, the descendants of convicts who were deported

there in the time of Cromwell. It was quite a different population from the ordinary governing classes in a Colony and climate of that type. On one side of the island there was a considerable white population, and they were quite peculiar. It was a rather remarkable fact also that they did not get there the same mixture of the black and white race as in some other islands, notably Martinique. The white and black elements kept very much apart. One might suggest various causes. He thought the existence of the peculiar class of population he had mentioned might be some explanation of the point that was mentioned on page 388 of the Paper.

Mr. COLEMAN P. HYMAN said that one of the interesting points concerned the possibility of Irish people imagining they were older than they were, with the prospect of pensions and that sort of thing. Talking one day with a prominent official in New South Wales, at the time the Old Age Pensions were introduced there, he was told they had had a remarkable number of applicants for pensions from natives of Ireland. With regard to one application in particular the forms had been sent in backed by authority which should have been convincing; but by reference to previous applications in other departments this, and others, were found to be quite at variance with the original particulars forwarded to the authorities, especially on the question of age. Dr. Pollen had referred to the possibility of Australia maintaining its present position in regard to immigration restriction. He was one of those who thought Australia would never be able to develop the Northern territory particularly, while it insisted on that policy, and it certainly would never be able to defend Australia against the incursion of, say, the Japanese, if, when the Anglo-Japanese Alliance was abrogated, the latter Power felt inclined to enter Australia. He thought the Paper was extremely valuable, as was the work of the Society in encouraging co-ordination of effort to secure at least comparative uniformity in the compilation of statistics which must be of extreme value. In Australia a few years ago each of the States in the Commonwealth had some different system of compilation. It was not nearly so much so to-day. When they came to consider that the population of the whole of Australasia, including New Zealand, was between two and three millions less than that of London alone, one could understand that the value of statistics compiled without uniformity was lessened. Australian Government statisticians now met before the Census was taken and arranged upon certain uniformity of work. One of the omissions of the last Commonwealth Census was, he considered, rather unfortunate. The "Religions of the People" were not noted. He thought that, particularly for students in future years, such statistics would be found to be very valuable. The reason for the comparatively large proportion of people from the United Kingdom in New Zealand was probably that New Zealand had attracted such a large number of Scotsmen. Dunedin

was said to be another Edinburgh; and these emigrants were a good type.

The PRESIDENT asked whether Sir Athelstane Baines would a little soften the expression which he had applied to the method of sample—"statistically barren." In careful hands like those of Dr. Kiaer and Dr. Bowley that method promised to prove an effective implement of statistical research. It might even conceivably be employed to reduce the error due to falsification of returns such as that which had been mentioned in connection with the poll-tax. They had only to secure that the persons taken as samples were honest, always provided that the attribute under investigation was not correlated with honesty. Apropos of the particular falsification which had been mentioned, it might be interesting to recall that a poll-tax in England in the time of Richard the Second had produced an opposite kind of misrepresentation. The tax was imposed equally on males and females, and to evade it the number of females, as Professor Oman had pointed out, was greatly understated. Presumably in those early days girls were not so much in evidence as boys, and their existence was more easily concealed from the tax-collector.

SIR ATHELSTANE BAINES, in reply, said that he had been afraid lest the subject and his treatment of it might not lend itself to a good discussion; but he had been agreeably disappointed, and would do his best to reply to the interesting questions that had been raised. He began, of course, with the remarks of the President as to the value of "sampling." There was no intention on his part of underrating the statistical merits of this process in general, and he fully recognised its value in economic inquiry, such as into agricultural and pastoral resources. But there the field of variety was comparatively restricted, and far greater uniformity prevailed than in the case of social facts, where the variation was almost infinite. Here the samples would have to be so numerous and so widely scattered that they would approach, in fact, to the operations of a census. As to the interchange of population between Canada and the United States, the movement into the New England manufacturing districts of the latter had been in progress, he thought, for the last half-century or more. At first the Roman Catholic authorities had been adverse to permanent migration, but since their religion had spread there was a tendency to settle in the States, and one of the reasons why he had stated in the Paper that the States had got the better of the bargain was that they had secured almost as many women as men; whereas the influx from the States into the western provinces of Canada was chiefly that of men only. In regard to the low proportion of the excess of women in Ireland, the age-returns indicated a deficiency at the periods when girls would be most likely to seek service abroad. At these periods in England there was an excess, to some extent, which increased with

the age. A committee of the Society was engaged in an inquiry into that subject, and he would only say that it was amongst the able-bodied widows chiefly that any demand by our Colonies might find a response. Sir Edward Brabrook had expressed a wish to see the census taken simultaneously throughout the Empire. This was hardly practicable in the geographical and other physical conditions of so wide-spread a domain. Nor was the difference of a month or so inimical to the general accuracy of the results as a whole. The unfavourable circumstances in which their countrymen spent their life in the smaller settlements had been put forward by him for the reasons well stated by Sir James Wilson. When he was referring to the larger British element in New Zealand than in Canada, he was speaking of the proportion to the total population, not in absolute figures. The latter were about 229,000 born in this country in the southern Dominion, and 784,000 in Canada. A speaker had mentioned with an approbation in which all would concur the number of Scotsmen in New Zealand. He had heard it said that the congregation of this race in Dunedin was due to the fact that there they enjoyed the same amount of fog which they would have in their native country. Into the question of a White Australia he was not going to enter further than to point out the difficulty of maintaining a racial frontier where geographical conformation was not specially favourable to it. He was glad to have the explanation of Mr. Hastings Jay of the character of much of the white population of Barbados and some other islands of the West Indies, as the figures had puzzled him. The number of aged Irish in Australia and the United States might be accounted for, perhaps, by the larger population of which they formed part at the time of the great emigration of the later forties. The point, however, to which Mr. Yule and he had been directing their attention was the source of the astonishing influx of the aged into Ireland since 1901 ; and this, he thought, it might not be unfair to attribute to the appreciation by a quick-witted people of benefits to be placed shortly within their reach.

The following Candidates were elected Fellows of the Society :—

C. W. Beak.
Arne Fischer.
F. H. Keeling.
J. N. Paterson.
A. B. Pilling.

H. L. Rietz.
T. W. Shackel.
G. A. Vaidya Raman.
W. F. S. Wilkinson.