WILEY

Notes on the Subjects Discussed at the St. Petersburg Meeting of the International Statistical Institute

Author(s): P. G. Craigie

Source: *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, Vol. 60, No. 4 (Dec., 1897), pp. 735-788

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

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2979743>

Accessed: 25/06/2014 07:12

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, 1897.

NOTES on the SUBJECTS DISCUSSED at the ST. PETERSBURG MEETING
of the INTERNATIONAL STATISTICAL INSTITUTE. By MAJOR P.
G. CRAIGIE, *Hon. Foreign Secretary.*

[Read before the Royal Statistical Society, 16th November, 1897.
The President, Rt. Hon. LEONARD H. COURTNEY, M.P., in the Chair.]

CONTENTS :

	PAGE		PAGE
Introduction	735	<i>Crime and Justice—</i>	
Constitution of Institute	736	International Comparisons	756
Countries represented at St. Petersburg	737	Acquittals in France and Russia	758
<i>Agriculture—</i>		Proposed International Judicial Statistics.....	761
Crop Statistics and Forecasts....	741	Statistics of Divorces	762
Annual Records of Areas and Live Stock	746	<i>Commercial Statistics—</i>	
Distribution of Landed Property in Russia	748	Comparability of Trade Statistics	763
Rural Inquiries	749	Railway Statistics	764
<i>Population—</i>		Effect of Low Prices on Commerce	765
Proposed Universal Census in 1900	752	<i>Miscellaneous Subjects—</i>	
Standard Population	753	Labour Statistics	765
Population of Roumania.....	753	Anthropometric Statistics	766
Russian Census of 1897.....	754	Typological Inquiries	766
		Savings Banks	767
		Valuation of Personal Property	768
		Conclusion	768
		Appendix	770

To this Society the biennial gatherings of the International Statistical Institute appeal with peculiar interest. The circumstances under which the Institute, the successor of the older congresses, came into being in connection with our own jubilee meeting of 1885 are fresh in all our memories, and this interest is quickened by the natural desire of statisticians to learn the class of subjects which a representative association of this character have found to be susceptible of international treatment, and what suggestions are offered for future modes of investigation.

It requires then no apology to bring under your notice some

account of the most recent discussions, and the impression they left on the mind of one who took part in them, but it is needful that I should apologise for two defects in the report which, as your foreign secretary, I have now the honour to lay before you.

The first of these is for the crude form in which my hasty notes must of necessity appear, as we are not yet in possession of the revised and official *compte-rendu* of the proceedings. The second apology is one, always due in connection with personal reports of discussions covering a very large field of diverse subjects, since no account so compiled can really be exhaustive, and the narrator cannot escape, any more than the reporter who attempts to describe a general action, the risk of giving special, and it may be undue prominence, to particular features coming most immediately under his notice, while bestowing scant attention on some equally important but less familiar topics.

The constitution of the International Institute limits its membership to 150 ordinary members, in addition to those on whom honorary membership has been conferred. The actual numbers now on the roll are 29 honorary and 147 ordinary members, whereof France claims 32, Great Britain 25, Germany 22, Italy 19, Russia 17, the United States 14, Austria 13, Hungary 7, and ten other States smaller quotas. Death had made some grievous inroads on the front ranks of the statisticians of the world since the Institute met in Switzerland in 1895, and several vacancies fell to be filled up at St. Petersburg. As the result of these elections we have seen two more of our own Fellows, my colleague in the secretariat, Mr. J. A. Baines, C.S.I., and our late Vice-President, Mr. Macdonell, LL.D., succeeding our lamented Presidents, Dr. Mouat and Mr. J. B. Martin, as members of the Institute, while Sir Robert Giffen, K.C.B., was promoted to the grade of honorary member, and our latest President, Mr. A. E. Bateman, C.M.G., who, with myself, has probably alone of our Fellows had the advantage of attending each session of the Institute at Rome, Paris, Vienna, Chicago, Berne, and St. Petersburg, has been called to the responsible and onerous post of Treasurer of the Association.

Another matter of gratification to this Society must be chronicled in the re-election to the Presidency of the International Institute of our much esteemed and indefatigable ex-President, Sir Rawson W. Rawson, to whose labours in the chair the Institute owes so much.

The sixth meeting of the International Statistical Institute was held in St. Petersburg on 30th August to 6th September, 1897, and (including five candidates who were duly elected members before the close of the session) the gathering was attended by 46 mem-

bers, representing twelve different nationalities. Of this number 16 were delegates appointed by the Governments of Denmark, France, Great Britain, Italy, Norway, Roumania, and Sweden. The session was also attended by 6 official delegates from Government Departments in France, and 1 each from Roumania and from the Grand Duchy of Baden, who were not also members of the Institute, and by 40 specially invited persons. Of the latter group 33 were Russian, of whom more than two-thirds held office in the Imperial Administration or were members of the Statistical Council of the Empire. The distribution of the several classes of statisticians present in respect of nationality may be conveniently shown as under:—

Country.	Members of the Institute.	Official Delegates included in Column of Members.	Official Delegates not being Members.	Persons Invited.	Total.
Austria-Hungary	5	—	—	1	6
Bulgaria	1	—	—	—	1
Denmark	1	1	—	—	1
France	12	9	6	3	21
Germany	7	—	1	1	9
Great Britain	3	2	—	—	3
Italy ..	3	1	—	1	4
Norway	1	1	—	—	1
Roumania	1	1	1	—	2
Russia	9	—	—	33	42
Sweden	1	1	—	—	1
United States	2	—	—	1	3
Total	46	16	8	40	94

Only three British members, it will be observed, took part in the proceedings, Mr. Bateman and myself representing our respective departments of H.M. Government, while our good colleague, Mr. Hendriks, who brought to our aid the valuable experience of having assisted at the St. Petersburg Congress of 1872, was in a position to represent the Royal Statistical Society.

It may be noted that the number of members (46) present at St. Petersburg was identical with the number attending the Berne meeting of 1895, while the roll of official delegates was larger. Of the countries represented at Berne two years ago, Belgium, Holland, and Switzerland sent no delegates to St. Petersburg, and Spain, Servia, and Argentina were the only other countries having members on the roll of the Institute which were not represented at the latest meeting.

The Institute was received in the Russian capital with the hospitality which has distinguished the administrators and people of the empire on similar occasions, and the labours of the

members were greatly facilitated by the arrangements made for their reception and convenience by the local committee of organisation presided over by M. Troïnitsky, the distinguished Director of the Central Statistical Committee at St. Petersburg.

The functions of Honorary President of the session were discharged by the Grand Duke Constantine Constantinovitch, who welcomed the members in the name of His Imperial Majesty the Emperor, and whose opening address gave prominent expression to the deep regret of the members that the health of the veteran President of the Institute, Sir Rawson W. Rawson, did not permit of his presence in the chair. He eulogised the study of statistics, and referred to the work of the Institute as the successor of the older Statistical Congresses which were held between 1853 and 1878. In particular, in illustration of the development of statistical methods, he drew attention to the success of the new census of the Russian Empire, whereby a population of over 129,000,000 souls was brought into enumeration in January last.

The Grand Duke's address was responded to by M. Levasseur, vice-president of the Institute, on whom, in the absence of the President through ill-health, the duties of the chair devolved. In an eloquent address M. Levasseur sketched the growth of the Institute since its formation in London in 1885, and described its composition as a body, combining the services of trained official experts and of eminent unofficial statisticians. The great services rendered by Sir Rawson Rawson in guiding the Institute—with a tact and energy which we in this Society have long had good occasion to recognise—to the position it now occupied were acknowledged, and the severe losses which the association had suffered since their last meeting at Berne, in the lamented deaths of Dr. Mouat, General Walker, Dr. Engel, and Messrs. Martin, Cossa, Costa, and Leon Say, were referred to with deep regret. In his speech M. Levasseur dwelt on the growing value of the public work of the Institute, and the personal services which it rendered to those engaged in like pursuits, in affording them opportunities of exchanging ideas and establishing valuable friendship—while alike for the independence of its private and unofficial constitution, and from its none the less close and cordial relations with Administrative Departments, the Association could offer advice freely to governments without attempt to impose its opinion. As an instance of the mutual benefit of their discussions, he cited the epoch-making census of the Russian empire which distinguished the present year, 1897.

The representative of the Minister of the Interior, Baron d'Uxkull-Gyldenbandt, welcomed the Institute in the name of Russian statistical departments, and claimed that his country had

not been inactive in the domain of statistics in the quarter of a century which separated this meeting from the eighth session of the older International Congress at St. Petersburg, in 1872.

Privy Councillor Yermolow, Minister of Agriculture and Domains, added his welcome, laying stress upon the special importance to Russia of agriculture and agricultural statistics. Some 90 per cent. of the Russian population were occupied in agriculture, while the value of the agricultural products of the empire had been put at a minimum figure of 10 milliards of francs (400,000,000*l.*). Agricultural statistics included estimates and records of the produce and distribution of crops, prices of grain and other products, wages of labour, &c.; and he saw with satisfaction the place accorded to such discussion in the programme.

Privy Councillor Troïnitský, Director of the Central Statistical Committee and President of the Committee of Organisation, in welcoming the Institute, besought the members to bear in mind, when considering Russian statistics, the vast extent of territory and diversity of the races and conditions of the empire. He reminded the Institute that there were three methods of exploration in statistics—local, administrative or official, and international. The first, which explores a local district, with minute investigation as to the *personnel* and the conditions of existence of families, was in Russia of primary necessity, and the abundance of the material thus collected was needed to indicate to the government the varying character of the measures required to satisfy the diverse circumstances of the inhabitants of the country. Administrative statistics presented more difficulty in that country, owing to the diversity of nationalities and form of social life; and here the official statistics of Russia approximated to international statistics, in the endeavour to bring together a mass of facts of different kinds. Hence it was with the greatest pleasure that he saw the Institute at St. Petersburg.

Privy Councillor Séménow, vice-president of the Imperial Geographical Society, who had been a member of the International Congress since its foundation, alluding to the census of the empire, said that they had made a point of carrying out all the wishes of the statistical congresses on the subject of censuses, as definitely formulated at the meeting at St. Petersburg in 1872.

Privy Councillor Kauffmann welcomed the Institute on behalf of the Faculty of Law of the university of St. Petersburg, insisting that statistics had no longer to beg from governments as formerly, but that now governments demanded the aid of statistics. Of two great Russian problems—the enumeration of the population, and the improvement of the registers of civil condition—the first was now done, while the second would soon be equally dealt with.

The work coming before the Institute during the session was then, in accordance with the practice adopted at Berne, divided into four sections or groups, which, with the presidents they subsequently chose, stood as follows:—

Section I. Methodology, population, justice, and historical statistics. (President: Dr. Von Mayr.)

Section II. Agriculture and landed property. (President: M. Tisserand.)

Section III. Industry, commerce, colonies, precious metals. (President: Prof. Lexis.)

Section IV. Finance, credit, savings banks, &c. (President: M. Millaud.)

These sections met in the early part of each day, leaving the afternoons free for the general meetings of the Institute. In most cases the nature of the conclusions arrived at by the sections is indicated by the recommendations finally brought up for the approval of the general assembly; but as the minutes of their detailed deliberations are not yet available, I may be allowed perhaps briefly here to note the work of the section to which, as "reporter" of the standing committee on agricultural statistics, I was myself attached

Agricultural Statistics.

At its first meeting I drew the attention of its members to the repeated reports offered since the meeting at Rome in 1887, respecting the collection in one country or another of statistics showing the number, size, and distribution of the separate "Exploitations," *i.e.*, separate holdings, farms, or undertakings by which the agriculture of each State was conducted; and laid on the table copies of the returns which were lately issued by the government of this country, giving the result of a special inquiry by the Board of Agriculture into the number, size, and distribution of agricultural holdings in Great Britain in 1895. The heads of information therein given were examined as regards the method of classification employed, the endeavour to show the proportion of arable land and pasture which each holding contained, and the extent to which the land of each holding was occupied by the owner of the soil, or by a tenant.

On the latter point considerable discussion arose as to the wisdom of recommending a general inquiry, in all countries, respecting the actual distribution of the ownership of land, and Professor Conrad submitted a detailed proposal for such an investigation, which he desired should have regard both to the extent and to the value of each landowner's possession, whether urban or rural. A somewhat similar proposal was submitted to the Section by

M. Rheinbott, who subsequently brought up to the general assembly a *résumé* of his elaborate work on the recent movements of landed property in Russia between one social class and another. After examining the nature of the investigation proposed, and noting the great difficulties, which M. Inama-Sternegg and others pointed out, in the way of uniform inquiry on so wide a topic, owing to the dissimilarity of the bases of information available in different countries, it was decided to leave this question over for more detailed consideration by the standing committee, before whom M. Conrad undertook to present a form of *questionnaire* to meet his object. The sanction of the general assembly of the Institute was subsequently accorded to this arrangement.

The other questions coming before the Agricultural Section embraced the preliminary examination of papers subsequently communicated to the assembly, such as the report of M. Pilat, and the communication of M. Timiriasew on Crop Reports, and a memorandum submitted by myself on the need of an annual publication of agricultural statistics. The Section took note also of a communication handed in (to be subsequently printed) by Mr. Edward Atkinson on the agricultural position of the United States of America, with special reference to the mortgages on landed property.

As in this *résumé* of a Section's work I have given prominence to agricultural inquiries, I may perhaps be forgiven if, departing from the strictly numerical or chronological order of the subjects dealt with by the Institute, I proceed here to refer to the substance of the agricultural papers subsequently communicated to the general assembly, and the discussions which they provoked.

Methods of Collecting Crop Reports.

M. Pilat, Director of the Provincial Statistical Bureau of Galicia, being unable to be present at St. Petersburg, submitted a report in which he referred to the conclusions at which the Institute had arrived at Berne, on the proposals he then submitted respecting the method of collecting agricultural statistics. These conclusions, it may be as well to recall specifically here, were to the effect that, while the system of an annual direct ascertainment of the area under each crop by schedules collected from each individual holding, as in Great Britain, was the most ideally complete statistical method, in countries where, as was so generally the case, this could not be done, it would be preferable to have an exhaustive ascertainment of the facts and areas once in five or ten years, rather than to trust to a general estimate made every year without local survey. If partial inquiries had to be made the facts should be ascertained by direct investigation on as large

a number of farms as circumstances permitted, and estimates allowed only for such data as were wanting.

On this point M. Pilat informed the Institute that action had been already taken in Galicia in the past year, for the method of inquiry by schedule had been extended to all seigniorial property, which, with rare exceptions, included all properties of more than 117 hectares (290 acres). Over 4,000 schedules had been sent by post, of which nearly half were returned within a month, and two-thirds of the whole were expected before the inquiry closed. As directing an annual inquiry in Great Britain, which involves the use of more than 500,000 occupiers' schedules annually, I may be allowed to welcome any beginning of this nature, but to point out that the limits to which the Galician Department had found it needful to confine their direct inquiries points to the great difficulty, not always recognised by us here, in the way of perfecting the agricultural statistics of many continental States, where the great mass of the cultivators of the soil have very small holdings, and too often have neither the ability nor the disposition to aid in supplying information.

In the communication made to the Institute this year, M. Pilat deals with the advantage of organising periodic monthly or even fortnightly reports, by way of forecasts of the condition of the growing crops. As examples he cites—what some of us here would hesitate perhaps to call—the success of the United States of America in the practice of forecasting; and he adds that in his own country of Austria the Ministry of Agriculture have collected fortnightly reports for more than twenty years through the agency of the agricultural societies or provincial agricultural councils—a second network of agents reporting directly to the Ministry having been employed in Austria as a check during the last four years. Germany since 1893 had obtained by the use of post cards a series of monthly reports of crop condition from April to November, with preliminary estimates of the harvest yields in September, October, and November, prepared by reliable experts chosen by the governments of the several States on the recommendation of the agricultural societies. This practice M. Pilat prefers to the collection of periodic crop reports through administrative channels, as by the Prefects of Departments in France.

None of these current estimates, although valuable for checking exaggerated and incorrect opinions, would dispense with the necessity of final returns of the ascertained yield of the harvest. These, he urges, every State should secure for all the larger crops, with estimates of areas from which the crops are actually harvested, due regard being had in calculation to the extent of area to which the estimate of yield applies.

As a final conclusion he presses the point that no estimates of crop results can be accepted as sufficiently accurate, unless the area taken as the basis of cultivation has been determined by exact inquiry.

M. Pilat's views were necessarily considered in conjunction with a further contribution to the same section by M. Timiriasew, the Director of the Division of Statistics and Rural Economy in the Russian Ministry of Agriculture. In that he claimed a system of crop forecasts as of special importance, in view of their bearing alike on agriculture, on commerce, and on the food supply of the people.

He indicated two differences in the mode whereby data of this class were collected by the Agricultural Departments of different States. The information is obtained in some States by direct administrative means, with or without the co-operation of agricultural societies: in other countries the data rest on the collected opinions of special voluntary correspondents. Neither class of estimates, he very properly observed, has any claim to rank with statistical results obtained by a direct census—a point I fear too often forgotten by commentators in the press of all countries. They remain but opinions, more or less closely approximate according to the number and the honesty of the agents supplying them—and M. Timiriasew seemed to hold that there was nothing to indicate that the voluntary correspondents did not merit the preference. Another cause of the merely approximate character of crop estimates was the impossibility of getting in good time reliable data of the actual area presented as a basis for the calculation.

None the less he urged that, as well as final estimates, preliminary *forecasts* should be attempted, as a matter of importance to both producing countries with a surplus to dispose of, and consuming countries importing grain. But he urged greater uniformity in the mode adopted by the different governments in publishing their estimates. The form of final estimates was nearly uniform—a rate of production per unit of area, and an aggregate total production in absolute figures. Only a uniform system of weights and measures, such as the metric system could improve this.

Among countries giving monthly, during the period of growth, provisional estimates of the forthcoming harvest, were the United States, Germany, and Austria-Hungary, while France and Russia, according to M. Timiriasew, were attempting to do so.

These estimates were given in three different ways—by means of verbal statements, by means of marks (numerically expressed

in figures), or in percentage, each of these methods presenting variants.

Verbal estimates he instanced as adopted in Italy, Austria-Hungary, and in Russia. In the two latter countries the following seven terms or categories are employed:—

Austria-Hungary.	French Equivalent.	English Equivalent.
Sehr gut	Très bon	Very good.
Gut	Bon	Good.
Gut mittel	Assez bon	Good average.
Mittel	Moyen	Average.
Schwach mittel	Passable	Under average.
Schwach	Mauvais	Bad.
Sehr schwach	Très mauvais	Very bad.

Here the meaning of “average” has no definite signification.

The plan of estimate by marks was that adopted in Germany, which admits of 5 marks (with decimals), as follows:—

1. Very good; 2. Good; 3. Satisfactory; 4. Inferior; 5. Bad. Here the idea even of *an average* is wanting altogether.

Lastly, we have an estimate in percentages such as is adopted in France and the United States, and now being followed in Holland. In France the system, although presenting the appearance of a forecast in percentages, is really a combination of the two preceding systems.

100 = very good.	50 = “passable.”
80 = good.	30 = inferior.
60 = fair.	20 = bad.

In the United States the forecast is in percentages, 100 being taken as corresponding to what is called a “full average crop.” This, as M. Timiriasev very properly pointed out, is a very vague term, and it is an expression which I confess I have seen with some regret employed in place of an ascertained average as a standard in some of the unofficial estimates which the newspapers of this country have adopted.

The weak side of all these estimates lay in the diversity and indeterminate character of the notation, and the instability of the bases on which they rest, and which M. Timiriasev maintained ought to be identified with the *average* of the harvest. Usually the basis of comparison is taken to be the average of the preceding ten years, but he questioned the absolute justice of this system, which if more or less correct for States where the yield varied comparatively little from year to year, was not admissible in a country with a production so extensive, and a climate so variable as Russia, where the range of variation in the yield of the soil reaches 300 per cent. In this last

case, an average established in this manner, while being mathematically true, would have no real value, and it would be needful either to carefully eliminate exceptional years, or else to have recourse to personal estimates of a normal average made by competent agents on the spot. With this object the Russian Minister of Agriculture has addressed questions to its numerous correspondents to determine what may be considered an average crop in each locality and for each producer—an attempt which recalls to my mind, and possibly to some of our members, the description which I gave to this Society in my paper on “Statistics of Agricultural Production” in 1883, of an unofficial attempt in the same direction which I made in 1882 with the aid of 800 voluntary correspondents in Great Britain. M. Timiriasew also referred to the possibility of making the dates of publication of the forecasts coincide as well as the final results of the harvests in different countries. But he rightly himself appreciated the difficulty arising from the fact that, taking the case of wheat alone, the market was constantly extending, already embracing nearly the whole world, with harvests distributed over all the twelve months of the year.

In the discussion which followed these papers, M. Tisserand, speaking with the remarkable authority which his long and distinguished tenure of the post of Director of Agriculture in France conferred, explained the French method of crop estimates, under which the cultivators from whom information was sought compared their estimates with the results of the immediately preceding harvest, which alone was fresh in their memories, a simpler and therefore preferable method to a reference to any “average,” which must involve a calculation more or less complicated.

Another eminent authority, M. Von Inama-Sternegg, acknowledged the strength of this opinion on the ground of practical facility, although that of M. Timiriasew presented the more scientific character, while M. Von Mayr preferred M. Tisserand's view to that of his Russian colleague, on the ground that it was impossible each cultivator should retain an exact view of what an “average” crop was, and the central bureau could itself subsequently convert any estimate given into relation with an assumed average figure. To this M. Timiriasew rejoined that his point was rather as to the mode of recording and publishing the forecast with direct reference to an ascertained average, than of collecting opinions from the growers in the first instance. Among other speakers Professor Conrad took occasion to eulogise the American system, giving forecasts before the final valuation. Their mode of procedure enlisted the interest and help of the cultivators them-

selves. He alluded also to the value of a periodic inquiry on stocks of grain as the best check on harvest estimates.

The Institute finally agreed with M. Timiriasew in asking the agricultural committee to further study the question how far a more complete understanding between the various administrations collecting crop statistics, would be possible for the publication of their data in a more uniform manner, and at short and definite intervals.

Annual Records of Areas and Live Stock.

In connection with the questions coming under discussion in the agricultural section, both at St. Petersburg and at Berne, respecting the proper period and best methods of collecting statistics of agricultural produce, I laid before the Institute three tables designed to show in a concise form what was the present position of each country as to the frequency of its ascertainment of the area of the crops grown, and of the number of live stock.

I have reproduced these tables in the Appendix to this paper (p. 771-3), and I would submit that, apart from their primary use in exhibiting the extent to which comparable data are, or are not, as a matter of fact available, for successive years in the several countries named, the particulars given are also in themselves of interest in presenting a more or less complete picture of what we know, from official sources, respecting the extension or contraction of the areas under wheat, and regarding the development or the reduction of the stock of cattle and of sheep in each country over the whole period of thirty years from 1867 to 1896 inclusive.

As regards wheat areas, which I take as a sample of what is generally recorded respecting the areas of the cereal crops, it will be observed that only as regards five countries out of twenty—*i.e.*, the United Kingdom, Australasia, France, Holland, and the United States of America, do we possess, so far as the data reaching my own department here from official sources are concerned, a complete or nearly complete series of *annual* records going back to 1867. Coming next in degree of continuity of record we have the annual figures from Austria, and less fully from Hungary. From 1878 the German empire has supplied continuous annual reports, and similar serial data have been more lately begun in some provinces of Canada, in India, Roumania, Sweden, Italy, and Russia. Recent reports from Algeria, and even from Japan, suggest that the example of an annual record of areas may be in future hoped for from regions less statistically familiar to ourselves. Elsewhere, and in some of the countries named, before the beginning of consecutive statistics, the areas on which wheat was grown were apparently ascertained only by inquiries made

at more or less long intervals and for particular years—which may or may not have been typical or normal in their climatic and other conditions. Perhaps the most defective case is that of Belgium, where the wheat area appears to be recorded only twice in thirty years, and to be unknown for any year subsequent to 1880.

In view of the annual attempts now made nearly everywhere to estimate, with more or less elaborate machinery, the production of wheat in each season—such as are the subject of suggestions in M. Pilat's and M. Timiriasew's papers—I had urged on the section the primary need of some endeavour to record the actual area whence each year's harvest was obtained. As an illustration of the danger of selecting single years not necessarily typical, I might point to the fact that the almost perfectly uniform area of wheat credited to France over thirty years, 17 to 17½ million acres, was nevertheless broken by the single notable exception of the crop of 1891, when, solely from peculiar climatic conditions, only 14 million acres of this cereal were reaped. Had France been, like Belgium or some other States, content to assume a single year's recorded area as a normal standard instead of making yearly inquiry as to variation of areas, and had the date selected fallen on the year 1891, it is easy to see how wide an error must have been introduced into any subsequent calculation of produce on the basis of an entirely exceptional state of matters.

In like manner, in my second and third tables it may be seen how the absence of continuous annual statistics of the numbers of cattle and sheep leaves room for the occurrence of considerable changes which, in default of annual enumeration or estimate, may remain unknown to the countries themselves, where a census of animals taken only at comparatively distant dates is relied on.

The practice of our own country and our Australian Colonies is in accord on this point with the records of France, Holland, and Sweden in Europe, and with the United States of America only, and the wide gaps in such important live stock owning countries as Russia, Germany, Italy, Austria, and Hungary, indicate the danger to the statistician who may be making an estimate of the total herds or flocks of the world at any given date, from the absence of annual particulars. An examination of the tables shows the numbers of live stock are by no means free from considerable periodic variation.

Apart from the lesson these tables teach as to the value of a strictly consecutive series of international statistics, I may be forgiven in view of the interest felt in the agricultural changes of recent years, in inviting some attention to the figures themselves,

and to the apparently stationary aspect of wheat areas not only in Europe but latterly in America. The tables suggest increase in some, but not in all, countries of cattle, and a very general decrease in the flocks in continental Europe, a decline which in the more recent years extends to the United States, although happily it is not so perceptible in our own mutton eating island, which absorbs, as we know from other sources, so large an importation from the expanding flocks of Australasia and Argentina.

Statistics of Russian Landed Property.

M. Rheinbott having, in 1895, been appointed by the Russian Minister of Finances, in connection with a revision of the statutes of the Peasants' Agricultural Bank, to collect and examine certain statistical data concerning the distribution of landed property among the different classes of the population, submitted an instalment of a special study that he had made of the sales and purchase of land occurring in Russia in 1893. The data were based on the judicial notices of the Senate referring to the transfer of properties, which gave both the name and the social position of the seller and purchaser, the quantity of land sold, and the price. The available figures, though for one year only, related to no less than 34,443 separate transactions, and indicated, so far as they went, a slow but important change in the distribution of landed estates in Russia.

The total sold by the class of nobles was 2,091,412 *déciatines*, while the purchases of that class were 1,104,411 *déciatines* only. The holdings of this class had therefore diminished by a million *déciatines*, or, roughly, 2,700,000 acres, in a year. The sales of land by nobles were also mainly of large areas, only 1·7 per cent. of the area transferred, or about 100,000 acres out of 5,646,000 acres, being in lots of less than 25 *déciatines* (67·5 acres).

In the year 1893 several communes appeared as purchasers of land to the extent of 63,535 *déciatines*, these sales being only 23,126 *déciatines*, showing a net increase in holdings of this description of over 40,400 *déciatines*, or 109,000 acres. A more active movement is recorded in the purchases of land by special associations of the peasants, these co-operative groups acquiring 331,517 *déciatines*, and selling only 40,626 *déciatines*, in 1893, a net addition of 291,000 *déciatines*, or 786,000 acres.

There is, however, yet another feature of note recorded in M. Rheinbott's figures—the purchase of land by the wealthier persons belonging to the nominal peasant class. Their transactions in lots exceeding 25 *déciatines* each, and reaching in some instances 2,000 and 3,000 *déciatines* apiece, and even occasionally still higher figures, are numerous. The purchases being 284,347

déciatines, and the sales 145,056 *déciatines*. A like increase is indicated in the land holdings of the classes defined as "petit bourgeois," and "bourgeois notables," while the merchant class in Russia, as in some other countries, would appear to have been comparatively active in possessing themselves of some portions of the territory passing out of the nobles' hands—their purchases reach 528,521 *déciatines*, against 295,419 *déciatines* sold.

So far as they go these statistics, which were noted with interest in the committee of the Institute on landed property, undoubtedly point to a reduction of the amount of land owned by the nobility, a slight increase of property owned by rural communities, and a very evident extension of landed property owned especially by individuals belonging to the merchant and even to the peasant classes, but in economic circumstances entirely different from the status of an ordinary peasant labourer.

Rural Inquiries.

The local statistical work of the Zemstvos or district councils of Russia formed the subject of a very interesting publication by the Central Statistical Committee, and the attention of the Institute was drawn to some of the features of these researches by a note communicated by M. N. T. Annensky. Created by the organic law of 1864 at the epoch of the great reforms then made in Russian rural life, the Zemstvos had been entrusted with large self-governing powers, and found it needful to set to work to collect, as has been done throughout the past thirty years, an almost infinitely varied series of inquiries of a statistical and economic nature, for the purpose of obtaining the necessary information respecting the social life and conditions of the peasantry. Statistical inquiries of some sort have been in progress in 31 out of 34 provinces possessing Zemstvos, local statistical bureaux being at present established in 25 provinces. An attempt to bring the figures together was made in 1894, by which time the publications of the Councils had already reached 600 volumes. A form of economic census had then been made in 182 districts of the 25 provinces, dealing with 80,000 villages, containing 4,300,000 households and over 25,500,000 persons, and if all the data collected and printed concerning village economy were included, detailed observations must have been made over nearly 5,000,000 households. It is obvious that in the space I have at my command here, it would be impossible to do more than direct attention to the mass of information which is being accumulated by the machinery thus set to work; but I would venture to suggest that even the descriptions of what is being done and of the methods resorted to,

might usefully be studied hereafter from the memoranda submitted to the Institute.

Professor Tchouprow of the University of Moscow, in a separate paper, drew attention to a series of suggestions in connection with the proposed scheme for a universal census of 1900, for a parallel inquiry into the conditions of popular life in the different countries of Europe, especially in the case of the rural populations.

He urged that from fifteen to twenty years would have passed since agricultural inquiries had been held in most of the principal European States on the scale of the Italian inquiry towards the end of the decade 1870-80, the French inquiry of 1882 and the English Commission reporting about the same date, while many changes had since occurred, which were more particularly pronounced at present owing to the growth of agricultural depression.

Here however the professor had no doubt overlooked the completion of the French inquiry of 1892, of which the tables are only now beginning to appear, and the still more recent and exhaustive reports of the English Royal Commission on Agriculture just issued.

Dealing with the rural position in Russia, the local statistics organised by the Zemstvos were no doubt voluminous, but mostly collected some time back, and many in 1870-80, only to a certain extent completed by current data, while so many were the changes since the emancipation of the serfs, that a general inquiry was particularly called for. The patriarchal customs of Russian rural life were disappearing. Formerly nearly all the population of the villages devoted themselves to agriculture; now factories and mills were springing up, and the rapid growth of certain towns was evidenced by the figures of the census. The old three course system of rotation was being abandoned around Moscow, and fodder plants were being cultivated. Better implements were in demand, and in the south the upper class of peasants now rarely dispensed with threshing and reaping machines, and where the peasants were unable to purchase these individually, they were co-operating in groups for the purpose. Changes were occurring in the distribution of landed property, and in common lands, the land of the *mír* was being no longer apportioned, as formerly, according to the number of males, or even the number of able bodied men, but to the number of mouths in the parish. Alongside of the communal possessions, free associations were being formed to buy or lease farm lands. The old equality of fortune distinguishing the earlier rural life was passing into the sphere of legend. Such statistics as there were showed that the differences in wealth in the country were tending to increase. In view of such changes as these M. Tchouprow proposed:—

1. That the end of this century and beginning of the next should be commemorated in all the countries of the civilised world by detailed local inquiries of popular life, particularly agricultural.

2. That the inquiries should be separately made for each household.

3. That while the data by households could be compiled in general tables, detailed descriptions should be obtained of one or more typical households in each particular district, including complete data on the budgets, and real and personal property of each household.

4. That to secure as much uniformity as possible in these inquiries, their execution should be confided to special statistical agents rather than amateur volunteers or mere printed schedules.

5. That where, as in Russia, such inquiry was confided to autonomous civil institutions, it would be necessary that the national statistical societies should formulate a limited number of fundamental questions, reserving to the competent institutions the right to complete and extend the programme.

6. That where inquiries into popular life have been already undertaken, as in Baden and Würtemberg, it was desirable that the new work should conform as much as possible to the earlier, so far as concerns both the choice of localities and the programme.

The wide range of the professor's proposals provoked some criticism, M. Bodio indicating that it would not be easy to persuade the parliaments of the various countries to find funds at once for a census and a general agricultural inquiry. He alluded, however, to the German practice of interposing a "Gewerbe-Statistik" in the intervals between the classification of occupations. M. Tarde could see no utility in linking an agricultural inquiry—a purely social investigation with the census—and the line of division between centuries possessed no scientific importance, and did not correspond with any historical period. M. von Mayr, while differing from some of M. Tarde's opinions, attributed importance to M. Bodio's suggestion, and, supported by M. Bertillon, proposed that the whole subject be referred back to the second section for examination by the competent committees.

Among the communications relating to agricultural subjects, one by M. Pokrovsky, of the Russian Customs Administration, deserves a longer notice than it is possible here to afford, as it offers a mass of statistics not previously published, indicating the relation between the movement of population in Russia and the quantity of each year's harvest and the prices realised. I have given in the appendix an abstract of one of his tables.

Population Statistics.

These partial population statistics and the proposed survey into the conditions of rural life in 1900, lead up to the reports bearing on the proposal of the Berne meeting of the Institute, for a synchronous census of population throughout the world in that year. The report of Dr. Guillaume, whose absence in person from the St. Petersburg meeting was a matter of much regret to his colleagues, dealt with the replies received from various countries to the proposition for a universal census. A summary of these answers was reported by M. Körösi on behalf of the first section. Favourable replies were received from Norway and from Sweden, where the census would occur in any case on the 31st December, 1900, under the law of 1859, while Denmark intended to range itself with its Scandinavian neighbours in this matter; Finland also agreed, and Belgium regarded assent as probable. The reply from Hungary gave hope that the government would agree. Brazil reported favourably, since its census fell, in any case, to be held in each year ending with "0." Portugal for a similar reason was altogether favourable, and Uruguay assented to whatever was decided, while Japan regarded the step as possible.

Spain on the other hand considered a further census than that of 1897 as impossible. Roumania was unable to give a definite reply. In Italy the already delayed census would probably have to be taken at an earlier date.

England and her colonies could not, it was stated, alter the date of April, 1901, for their next census, while Russia having just completed her general census of 1897, could not possibly renew that operation in 1900. France does not appear in the list, but M. Moron, on the subject coming before the Institute, gave it to be understood that the date of April, 1901, already fixed in France, as in England, would not be varied.

M. Körösi then submitted the detailed suggestions of the first section for a uniform scheme on the universal census proposed, and the dealing in a uniform manner with the figures after collection. These conclusions of M. Körösi, which are very voluminous, were adopted.

M. Körösi communicated also some notes, based solely however on data collected in the city of Budapest over a period of five years, by which he endeavoured to show the varying influences of race and of religion on twenty-four different causes of death—the figures were however complicated by preponderance of particular occupations in specific groups of nationalities or creeds. He added a table classifying, again, according to religions, the number of insane persons per 100,000 inhabitants in Hungary in 1891, with

a note of the number of illiterate persons among each creed. The proportion of insanity was greatest among the Jews, 103 per 100,000, and the Lutherans, 80 per 100,000, in both of which classes the number of illiterates was small, while insanity was least apparently in the ranks of the Greek church, 43 per 100,000, where the proportion of illiterate was between twice and three times greater than in the religions above named.

In another paper on vital statistics M. Kőrösi raised also the question of the standard population, explaining that as any country might be adopted as standard, Sweden had been selected, on account of the vital statistics of that country extending furthest back. He admitted also that his proposition, that the standard population should be corrected every ten years, was not advisable; as, however, the Institute had not endorsed this point, the objections raised on that account fell to the ground.

M. Bortkévitch opposed the idea of a standard population. By M. Kőrösi's system it was proposed to correct the death-rates of a country by making allowance for the various distribution of ages among different peoples, but M. Kőrösi's method did not eliminate the question of ages, since the distribution of age depended not only upon the births, but also on the mortality itself.

A note by Dr. J. Bertillon drew the attention of the Institute to certain conclusions he had drawn as to natality according to the degree of comfort in great European capitals. In so far as the statistics of large towns enabled a distinction to be drawn between social classes, the rich and the poor tending to live in different quarters, he found that the births per 1,000 women aged 15 to 50 per annum, in different quarters of the four under noted cities, yielded the following comparative results:—

Classification.	Paris.	Berlin.	Vienna.	London.
Very poor quarters	108	157	200	147
Poor quarters	95	129	164	140
Comfortable quarters	72	114	155	107
Very comfortable quarters.....	65	96	153	107
Rich quarters	53	63	107	87
Very rich quarters	34	47	71	63
Average.....	80	102	153	109

It thus appeared that in each of these four towns the birth-rate in the very poor quarters was about three times that in the very rich. M. Bertillon held that these distinctive differences were not due in any way to the summer migration of the rich.

Among the papers dealing with population statistics, it would

be invidious to overlook a contribution to the better knowledge of the numbers of the Roumanian people supplied by M. Basilescu, who, on the authority of the researches of M. Stourdza, permanent Secretary of the Roumanian Academy and President of the Council of Ministers, announced a most important correction in the former estimates of the inhabitants of that kingdom, which places the total at 6,919,738—or excluding the trans-Danubian province of the Dobroudja, added in 1878, 6,645,023—a very considerable rise from the 5,035,000 formerly estimated by the Roumanian Statistical Office, or even from the 5,406,000 of Dr. von Juraschek's calculations, or the 5,800,000 which I think is the latest figure in our own statistical publications.

The General Census of the Russian Empire.

The most interesting communication made to the meeting, both from the international and Russian point of view, was probably the account given by M. Nicolas Troïnitsky himself, of the methods and preliminary results of the recent Russian census. The decree authorising this census was sanctioned by the Emperor on 5th June, 1895, and the work was carried out by a Central Commission, under the presidency of the Minister of the Interior, M. Sémenow being vice-president; while in his capacity of director-general, M. Troïnitsky was in actual charge of the operations. The Census Budget amounted to 3,916,682 roubles, or 400,000*l*.

In each province and in each arrondissement were appointed special commissions for their respective territories—a few large towns being also provided with separate commissions of the second order. There were thus 96 provincial and 757 arrondissement and town commissions. Each arrondissement was divided into sections, corresponding as far as possible with existing “cantons,” with a chief, under whom were the census agents. The sections (7,000 in all) included from 15,000 to 30,000 inhabitants as a rule. The returns of large institutions, barracks, railway companies, &c., were of course specially dealt with.

Each census agent had to enumerate a population which normally did not exceed 400 households (or 2,000 inhabitants) in the country, and 150 “lodgings” (or 750 people) in towns. The remuneration, 12 roubles per agent in the country, and 7 in the towns, proving insufficient to attract an adequate number of census agents, a special medal was struck for voluntary unpaid agents, and the required number was thus made up.

The Central Commission settled the forms employed, and issued all the schedules. A household, rather than an individual schedule, was adopted, and three forms, of which samples were

given to members of the Institute, were printed in the various languages required; one form was for peasant households, one for all other households which were not urban, and the other for urban households. The particulars required embraced the name and christian name; sex; relation to head of household; age (years and months); civil condition; social position or class; place of birth; place of registration; ordinary domicile; information as to temporary or prolonged absence (where the person was not at his usual domicile); religion; mother-tongue; degree of education (*a*, ability to read; *b*, particulars as to place of education); occupation (both principal and subsidiary, including condition in respect of military service). Questions were put also as to the substance of which each house was built, and the material with which it was covered.

The particulars required as to the "place of inscription," were designed so that the legal population domiciled in each village as distinct from that temporarily present could be ascertained.

In the towns it is stated that the answer to the questions in the schedules were usually filled in by the householders themselves. The distribution of the schedules in large towns was made five days, and in smaller towns ten days, before the census date. When replies were not filled in they were taken by the census agent from the mouth of the householder or his representative at the moment, and recourse to other information was forbidden. In country districts the enumerators began to fill in the returns twenty to thirty days beforehand, and on the actual census day, the 9th February, 1897 (of the Russian style 28th January), they went round finally a second time to record any changes that might have occurred since. The schedules were then returned to the chief of the section, who made out the summary totals for the section, for transmission with the schedules themselves to the special commissions, after making duplicates in case of accident. The commissioners in their turn checked the sectional results, made up their totals and forwarded them to the central commission.

Some modification of the system had, owing to climatic conditions, to be made for some localities in the north, in Siberia, and in the Caucasus.

The Central Commission was enabled to publish the preliminary returns on the 28th April (10th May), and in August it had begun to work out the final results with 70 Hollerith machines, 35 of which had been purchased by the commission and 35 obtained on hire.

The chief results of the preliminary enumeration by the local commissions of districts and towns, are as follows:—

Country.	Number of Governments.	Population.	Density per Square Mile.
European Russia	50 governments....	94,188,750	50
Poland	10 „	9,442,590	192
Caucasus	11 „	9,723,553	54
Siberia	9 „	5,731,732	1
Steppe regions	5 „	3,415,174	4
Transcaspia and Turkestan	4 „	4,175,101	9
Russian subjects in Khiva and Bokhara	—	6,413	—
Grand Duchy of Finland.....	—	126,683,312	15
		2,527,801	20
Total of the Empire	—	129,211,113	15

Compared with previous estimates of populations (based chiefly upon returns of taxable persons), the increase in the population has been 96 per cent. since Keppen's calculation of 1851, 73 per cent. since the estimate of the Central Commission in 1858, and 18 per cent. since the like estimate for 1885.

The average density of population in the empire on the basis of the new census figures was very effectively illustrated by a coloured map exhibited to the members of the Institute, showing the great variations per square verst, which are indicated (per square mile) in the preceding table. The distribution of the population varies considerably in different governments within the groups just shown. The 50 governments of European Russia contained four provinces of which the density was under 11 persons per square mile, and six provinces where the density exceeded 136 persons per square mile; and the minimum of population was recorded in the government of Arkhangel—the maximum in Volhynie, where it approached the Polish average.

In European Russia and in Finland 102 women were enumerated to 100 men, in Poland only 98·6 per 100 men, while in all the eastern regions the men appear still more numerous than the women, so that in the whole empire the men form an actual, though very slight, majority. There are however interesting variations on this point in different districts. Some of these may be found in the summary of the tables which I have thought it useful to reproduce as a record of this famous statistical work, in the Appendix to these notes (Tables IV and V).

Crime and Justice.

M. Bodio presented the Report of a Committee on Criminal Statistics, which conveniently reviewed the efforts of the International Institute to secure uniformity in the criminal statistics of

different countries. It was necessary to distinguish carefully between crimes (*délits*) properly so called, and mere infractions of the code which could not be regarded as serious offences. The number of these contraventions must inevitably increase as new laws on sanitation, hygiene, education, &c., were added to the statute book, and municipal regulations were extended to new subjects; although this increase would not by any means prove that the criminal condition of a town or country had deteriorated. M. Bodio quoted England as an instance of a reduction in the number of crimes properly so called, while in the same country breaches of the Education Acts increased from 56,000 in 1880 to 62,000 in 1894.

Criminal statistics have continuously improved in all countries. Germany continues to collect statistics by means of the individual bulletin. Italy adopted the same method in 1890, and has further added to it a special bulletin for each penal offence proved, but in which the author of the crime has not been discovered. In England several improvements have been introduced in the records, and they now contain references to the statutes and acts concerning the different offences. M. Bodio was able to present to the Institute a work on comparative criminal statistics by M. Bosco, of the Italian Statistical Bureau, bearing upon four groups of offences, viz., 1, homicide; 2, assault and wounding; 3, rape and attempts; 4, theft, robbery with violence, and extortion. These criminal data are available in the greater number of European States, and M. Bodio stated that the work could be extended to other offences against the person, and to offences against property, as well as embezzlement, breach of trust, &c. Referring to the Rev. W. Douglas Morrison's work on "Juvenile Offenders," M. Bodio thoroughly endorsed the opinion there expressed, that it is only on this class of delinquents that the preventive action of the State can be profitably exercised. A very serious side of this question was the suggestion of several eminent French writers, that the criminality of children and young persons was increasing.

On the question of recidivism, which had also been occupying the attention of the International Institute of Criminal Law, two elaborate reports having been presented on the subject by M. O. Hübner, of Berlin, and M. G. von Mayr, M. Bodio had also himself drawn up some statistical parallels for several States, and included them in his report.

One of the most important advantages in the method of individual bulletins in conjunction with bulletins of each case, was that by which the movement of criminality for each year could be exactly determined in the different phases of information, trial, and sentence. Without these bulletins only vague approximations

could be made. The adoption of the individual bulletin system enables the criminal budget to be ascertained with just as great precision for the number of offences actually committed, even though the authors may not have been discovered, as for the verdicts pronounced in the presence of the accused.

In the discussion which followed, some expression of dissent on the part of M. Tarde to the use of individual bulletins, led to an emphatic endorsement of M. Bodio's recommendations on this head by M. von Mayr and by the President, M. Levasseur.

M. Albanel followed with a paper on the treatment of juvenile criminals, and gave a *résumé* of his conclusions from a series of statistics he had collected respecting the children under 16 years of age brought to trial in France as a whole from 1887-94, in the Department of the Seine, 1887-96, and of cases coming before M. Albanel himself, as *juge d'instruction* in Paris, in the first six months of the current year. He sought to prove that short penalties for offences by minors must be abandoned, that each case of an offender under 16 should be dealt with by a *juge d'instruction*, and that courts of law should only regard a criminal of 16 years and under as having acted with discernment in exceptional cases. The methods for prevention of juvenile crime and for the protection of children in France were noticed, and a claim preferred for special statistics in each country respecting the legal age of discernment for each particular crime, and the age and disposal of convicted children—with details as to the moral and social position and degree of education of juvenile criminals, and the position of their parents.

M. Tarnovsky read a paper, which presented features of special interest, on the proportion of Acquittals to Offences and Crimes in Russia from 1889-93. He thought that sufficient attention had not hitherto been given to the numerically recorded results of the different systems of jurisdiction in vogue in the great European countries. There were difficulties owing to varied forms of criminal procedure, but points for comparison might be found in such questions as the relative proportion of acquittals by different tribunals.

In general there were more acquittals in trials by jury than without. He gave a table illustrating this by the proportion of acquittals for every 100 persons tried in a court of first instance in the following countries:—

	With Jury.	Without Jury.
Russia (1889-93)	34	26
France (1889-93)	29	7
Austria (1883-93), excluding Hungary	26	14
Germany (1889-93)	25	13

These figures were however not entirely homogeneous, as in Russia notably the *tribunaux d'arrondissement* try in the first instance more than half their cases with the assistance of a jury, whilst in the other three countries the number of cases tried by a jury does not exceed 5 or 6 per cent. of the total cases tried by a court of first instance, and in France the proportion is even less than 3 per cent. But if only those cases are taken for Russia, which are tried both in France and Russia equally with the assistance of a jury, the proportion of acquittals for Russia would be 32 per cent., as against 29 per cent. for France.

The figures quoted show that both jury and magistrates are more indulgent in Russia than in Western Europe, but it is especially remarkable that the difference is much greater for the courts which try cases without the assistance of a jury, than for those which have a jury. Moreover, in Germany and Austria the jury acquits twice, in France as much as four times, as often as the State tribunals (*tribunaux d'État*); in Russia the jury only acquits to an extent of one-third more than the magistrates.

The high proportion of acquittals in Russia is due to a variety of reasons, which render criminal procedure slow and insecure: chief of these is the immense area of the different judicial districts which on an average occupy in Russia 40,000 square kilomètres, while in Germany and Austria they consist of 3,000 to 4,000 square kilomètres, and in France of only 1,000 square kilomètres. In the same way a court of first instance in Russia has to deal with 1,200,000 inhabitants, in Austria with 370,000, in Germany with 300,000, and in France with only 110,000.

The greater indulgence of a jury becomes especially noticeable when regard is had to the sex of the accused. In Russia juries, on the average, for the period 1889-93, acquitted 34 per cent. of the men, and 51 per cent. of the women. The corresponding acquittal figures for France during the same period were 25 per cent. men, and 49 per cent. women. Magistrates, on the contrary, hardly make any difference between the sexes. In Russia they acquitted 26 per cent. men, and 25 per cent. women in the *tribunaux d'arrondissement*, and in France 6.6 per cent. of the men, and 9 per cent. of the women.

Making a comparison of the crimes which are almost identical

in the two countries, France and Russia, the following table shows the proportion of acquittals by a jury :—

Russia.		France.	
Offences.	Acquittals per Cent.	Offences.	Acquittals per Cent.
Forgery (<i>Faux Divers</i>)	57	Wounding and assaulting ...	45
Destruction of property } (incendiarism)	50	Forgery (<i>Faux Divers</i>)	39
Swindling and breach of } trust	50	Breach of trust.....	39
Offences against morality.....	48	Destruction of property	37
Wounding and assaulting	45	Uttering false coin	34
Uttering false coin	39	Offences against morality ...	33
Robbery with violence	38	Homicide	31
Homicide	34	Robbery without violence ...	19
Robbery without violence.....	27	" with " 	14
Sacrilegious robbery	26	Sacrilegious robbery.....	9

The causes producing the proportion of acquittals in the various offences are thus almost the same in the two countries; habitual criminals have much less chance of being acquitted either by a jury or a magistrate than first offenders. Recidivism is most frequent among the various forms of theft and robbery, while, further, these offences are generally not very complicated, proofs being readily obtainable. But forgery and breach of trust are very different; here the offenders are generally educated persons, who can make a good defence, and thus are the more likely to obtain an acquittal. The same analogy can be showed, though to a smaller extent, in the acquittals of courts without a jury, as, taking the same quinquennial period 1889-93, the following table shows :—

Russia. Tribunaux d'arrondissement without a Jury.		France. Tribunaux correctionnels.	
Offences.	Acquittals per Cent.	Offences.	Acquittals per Cent.
Libel	54'5	Libel	30'8
Wounding and assaulting ...	49'5	Perjury	23'4
Destruction of property.....	38'1	Manslaughter	16'2
Swindling, breach of trust ...	37'6	Swindling, breach of trust	10'4
Perjury	37'0	Offences against morality ...	7'0
Homicide	25'0	Wounding and assaulting ...	6'3
Rebellion and assaults on } officials	16'0	Destruction of property	6'2
Theft	13'7	Theft	5'7
Vagrancy and Begging	6'0	Vagrancy and Begging.....	2'4
		Rebellion and assaults on } officials	2'3

The greatest proportion of acquittals by a jury are reported from Southern Russia. But, as regards acquittals in decisions by magistrates without a jury, the most indulgent districts are those in the west, although the juries in these same districts are severe; so much so, that in 11 courts (*tribunaux*) in the west and north-west of Russia in Europe, the magistrates acquit more often than the jury.

A series of suggestions for an international organisation of civil judicial statistics were indicated by Mr. Macdonell to the Institute. Referring to what had already been done to secure some degree of uniformity in international criminal statistics, he urged that civil judicial statistics should be classified on somewhat the same basis in the various countries. The adoption of the proposals which he submitted would imply the accomplishment of the undertaking initiated by M. Yvernès in his book, "*L'Administration de la justice Civile en Europe*;" but the situation had completely changed since M. Yvernès made his investigations. In England, for example, the procedure had been very much modified by the "Judicature Acts," which had been adopted, not only in many of the British colonies, but also in several of the United States of America. The Institute should now go further, and endeavour to discover and define the principles, and elucidate the methods which, subject to certain local or national circumstances, might be universally applied.

He wished to call attention to the following points as being especially important:—

1. An enumeration of all existing tribunals, with information as to their functions and scope. What greatly lessens the value of some judicial statistics is that they contain no information as to special or extra-judicial tribunals, which in some countries take the place of the ordinary courts of law. In England, for example, special kinds of dispute are more and more referred to private or public arbitration or to administrative bodies. The Charity Commissioners, the Board of Trade, and the Railway Commission now decide questions which were formerly submitted to the ordinary courts of the country. It was remarkable that when the Workmen's Compensation Bill was being drawn up, it was stipulated that the amount of the indemnity recoverable by the injured workman should not be assessed by judge or jury, but rather by arbitrators.

2. An explanation as to how far criminal and civil rights are administered, together with a list showing by what tribunals or procedure punishment is awarded in the interest of the public, at the same time that private rights are determined.

3. To come to some general agreement on matters which ought

to be entered in the criminal or civil statistics. With regard to this subject there is great variety of procedure. Matters enumerated in the judicial statistics of one country are not mentioned at all in those of another. For example, figures of guardianship, tutelage, and legitimisation, trusts and mortgages, are included in some statistics, while in others there is absolutely nothing except contentious matters.

4. An agreement as to what constitutes one cause in litigation. The official publications of some countries show how many suits have been begun; but what advantage can there be in a comparison of this sort if the unit is not first agreed on?

5. A classification of the subject and nature of the suits (*procés*). In some judicial statistics, in those of Scotland for example, there is no information as to the nature of the suit. Some other judicial statistics only enumerate two kinds of law suits. In France the suits are divided according to the articles of the codes on which the cases are supported. In England a classification is employed which has some historical value, but which is not suited to universal use. The adoption of a universal classification of suits would certainly be difficult, but ought not, in Mr. Macdonell's opinion, to be impossible, with the help of the International Institute.

He concluded by suggesting that a committee should be appointed by the Institute to consider the matters referred to in his paper, and to construct, if possible, a system of judicial statistics which, subject to slight modifications as required by local circumstances, might be applied to all the countries of Europe. This was agreed to.

Divorce Statistics.

In a report presented by M. Yvernès, the results of the inquiries made on the subject of international statistics of divorces and judicial separations were submitted to the Institute. He had had the aid of eighteen out of twenty-two correspondents, but the data thus collected from sixteen countries showed regrettable deficiencies of information, statistics of this class being altogether absent in some countries. As M. Yvernès had summarised some of the leading figures of his report in the form of a comparative table, I have thought it well to reproduce this in the Appendix (p. 777), as illustrating one of the attempts made by the Institute to secure comparable data, and as exhibiting, in the necessary blanks in many columns, the extent to which complete particulars are wanting.

From a note appended to M. Yvernès' summary it appeared

that the proportion of divorces per 1,000 marriages in the different countries compared as follows :—

Country	Period.	Divorces per 1,000 Marriages.	Country.	Period.	Divorces per 1,000 Marriages.
German empire	1889-93	17'0	Prussia	1891-95	18'0§
England and Wales..	'90-94	1'6	Roumania	'87-91	20'0
Austria	'90-94	4'8*	Russia—		
Bavaria	'90-94	14'0†	Orthodox church..	'82-86	{ 1'7 0'2 6'7
Belgium	'91-95	11'0	Roman Catholic...		
Denmark	'75-84	13'0	Protestant		
France	'90-94	21'0	Sweden	'90-94	10'6
Italy	'90-94	2'8‡	Switzerland	'91-95	40'0
Netherlands	'91-95	12'0	Württemberg	'91-95	10'0

* Divorces and judicial separations.

† Divorce petitions.

‡ Judicial separations.

§ Divorce cases settled judicially.

The data in M. Yvernès' summary table show that divorces were granted in the countries named in a proportion of from 60 to 92 per cent. of the petitions presented. Speaking generally, the figures indicated that the wife, in countries where she had the choice, preferred a judicial separation to a divorce. The existence of children and the duration of the marriage at the time of divorce differed greatly. The greatest number of divorces were found in the class of artisans and persons engaged in commerce. Lastly, personal violence was the cause most frequently accounted for.

The Committee were not however satisfied with the results obtained, and recommended the adoption by the Institute of a resolution that each country should record :—

1. The number of petitions presented, and their results.
2. The persons (husband, wife, or both) presenting the petition.
3. The existence of children of the marriage.
4. The profession of the husband.
5. The duration of the marriage.
6. The motives inducing the petition.

In those countries in which a judicial separation can be changed into a divorce, the Committee were of opinion that it was of the greatest importance that the number of cases in which this conversion had been effected should be returned.

The recommendations were adopted.

Commercial Statistics.

Although the discussion of commercial and trade statistics from an international point of view did not bulk so largely on the St. Petersburg programme as the three branches of statistical

inquiry with which I have dealt, perhaps one of the most permanently useful reports laid before the Institute was that in which Mr. A. E. Bateman, as reporter of the Commerical Committee, explained in a concise and categorical form the principal differences which still exist in the modes of recording, valuing, grouping and classifying the imports and exports of various States.

In one of the tables, which I have reproduced in the Appendix (Table VII), Mr. Bateman, it will be seen, gave for eighteen countries the distinctions which mark the attempts made to record the country of origin of the imports, and the country of ultimate destination of the exports, in such countries as make any endeavour to show more than the country of immediate import and export. In another table (VIII) the methods of determining values are dealt with—the authority for the description being in each case quoted. These statements are, apart from their immediate use in keeping before the Institute the divergencies of existing methods, valuable in themselves for reference on many questions.

So too are the further statistics offering comparisons, so far as they can be made, between the categories or classes employed in the export and import returns of seven countries where the groups are uniform for both series of figures—together with separate statements for countries, like the United States of America and the United Kingdom itself, where the classes are more numerous, and where one form of classification is employed for the imports, and a different one for the exports.

Attention was drawn by M. Issakow, to a volume of statistics relating to the pension funds of employes on Russian railways. Another paper related to the railways and railway traffic of Russia generally. This was laid before the Institute by General Barkovsky, with cartograms which had already been brought under notice at the Berne meeting of the Institute.

M. Bodio recalled the attention of the Institute, as the legitimate heir of the old Statistical Congress, to the endeavours made by that body to prepare comparative formularies for the presentation of railway statistics. In the publication of these suggestions the Institute might expect the aid of the railway companies themselves. He proposed that the Institute should keep the question before them, and that the Bureau of the Institute should be charged to see whether anything could be done to give effect to the recommendations of the old committee; and this course was agreed to, after M. von Inama Sternegg had intimated a doubt whether any practical conditions could be arrived at for the moment.

M. Timiriasew offered a note bearing on the effect of low prices on the general course of international commerce. His conclusions raised a short discussion, which incidentally touched on points which have been subjects of controversy among economists of late in connection with bimetallism. The figures he submitted, with a diagram, were based on the aggregate in value of the imports and exports of all the countries shown in the review of the world's trade, for which Neumann-Spallart, and latterly, Juraschek are responsible. The series for 1860-72 were not complete, but showed a rate of increase which the later series of totals from 1873-94 did not exhibit, the last period exhibiting considerable fluctuations and a general advance at the rate of only 1 per cent. per annum, or no more than that of population. This he regarded as practical stagnation, although he pointed out that the alteration in prices, and particularly in those of agricultural products, affected countries very differently, according to the nature of their foreign trade, England gaining largely on balance in her imports, and Russia, whose exports were so largely agricultural, losing heavily. M. Timiriasew attributed the fall to the appreciation of gold, while Professor Lexis and M. Juglar urged that he had left out of view other factors of greater importance. The subject was not, however, pursued, it being agreed that controversy on the causes of lower prices was outside of the matters immediately before the Institute.

Labour Statistics.

Mr. Mayo Smith communicated to the meeting of the Institute a memorandum presented by Mr. Carroll D. Wright of the United States on behalf of the Committee on Labour. He expressed his concurrence in the action of the Committee at Berne in not adopting M. Denis's suggestion for the establishment of a special international bureau of statistics of labour. Despite the advantages such a scheme suggested in the direction of good and uniform information, he held there were difficulties important enough to prevent the institution of such a bureau. Existing labour bureaux dated from different periods; many had already made costly inquiries, and they could not be expected to repeat them; the different characters of the industries of different States were an obstacle to harmonious work, and each country must devote its energies to the things which interested it individually. He doubted if the means of fully equipping an international bureau with a proper force of experts, &c., could be faced, and if it were to be a mere office for compiling statistics already existing, so much could be secured by the existing Institute. Mr. Carroll Wright desired however again to draw attention to the proposals of Dr. Böhmert at Vienna in

1891, for the collection of international statistics of wages, which he highly approved, offering the suggestion that tables of wages should be so drawn up as to show not merely the general average but the number and percentage of persons, both male and female, earning wages of different amounts, alike for particular industries and for the country as a whole. Such tables would show the concentration of numbers at a given range.

Anthropometrical Statistics.

Dr. R. Livi, Chief of the Bureau of Health Statistics in the Italian Ministry of War, drew attention to an anthropometrical inquiry conducted from 1880-85.

The Italian soldiers were measured as to height, weight, and thoracic measurement, with other details, their occupations being at the same time noted. As a result of combining these measurements with the occupations of 300,000 soldiers, he found that the group of students show the greatest height, being 22 millimetres above the average, but their chest measurement was 13 mm. below the average. The group of peasants proved below the average height, but of more than average chest measurement. He concludes that abundant nourishment is conducive to height, but a sedentary life and confined space lead to low chest development. Exercise without air is not so favourable, as blacksmiths show a smaller thoracic perimeter than peasants. The most favoured group appeared by these statistics to be that of waggoners.

Methods of Typological Inquiry.

M. Kiær submitted a series of proposals for typological studies. He contended that in addition to general statistics, which could alone ensure exactitude in the fundamental outlines of demography, there was, especially as regards social questions, a large field allowing of partial investigations. He regarded it, however, as important that each partial investigation, whether monograph or statistical "exploration," should be connected with the general statistics, so as to be controlled by the latter on many points.

Partial investigations of the nature proposed should be as representative as possible, and the published results must include a complete explanation of the method followed to ensure as exact a representation as possible.

He proposed, therefore, that the International Statistical Institute, while reserving its opinion as to the limits of the application of partial investigation, should refer the question as to the best representative typological methods to a special committee. The suggestion for a special committee was approved.

Savings Banks Deposits.

M. Rasp presented a report on behalf of a committee appointed to investigate international statistics of savings banks with reference to the classification of deposits according to the occupation of depositors. After quoting certain figures from Belgium, England, Würtemberg, Baden, and Bavaria, details were given for a population of 1,250,000 in Bavaria. The deposits were there divided into three classes:—

1. Actual deposits of persons engaged in industry.
2. Deposits of those not engaged in industry (almost entirely children).
3. Deposits of sums held in trust for certain objects.

Of the first class 65 per cent. belonged to the working classes, and 48 per cent were held by women. In the second class, which includes 30 per cent. of the total deposits, the percentage in the hands of working people was naturally less. Grouping the first two classes together the following percentages were quoted:—

Depositors.	Per Cent. of Depositors.	Per Cent. of Total Sum Deposited.
"Unternehmer"	32·8	33·6
Administration officials.....	3·9	4·9
Artisans, workmen, and domestic servants	53·9	50·6
Persons without specified occupation	5·8	5·8
„ following the legal profession ...	3·6	5·1

On the whole there is little difference between the amounts deposited by the individual working people and the classes above them. As to the amount of the deposits the following figures were obtained, also from Bavaria:—

Amounts.	Per Cent. of Total Sum Deposited.	Per Cent. of Total Sum Deposited by	
		"Unternehmer."	Working People.
0— 5 marks	3·7	5·7	6·3
5— 10 „	6·1	7·9	8·2
10— 50 „	31·2	30·7	35·5
50— 100 „	21·7	18·0	21·1
100— 500 „	29·1	28·0	23·7
500—1,000 „	6·1	6·9	4·0
Over 1,000 „	2·1	2·8	1·2

M. Rasp finally urged that such statistics as he had given ought to be obtainable internationally.

Valuation of Personal Property.

I have kept to the last any mention of the very elaborate and remarkable report made by M. Neymarck, on behalf of the Committee appointed at Berne, to examine the best methods of obtaining a valuation of invested capital and of the income derived from personalty national and international. This report, which contains the exhaustive replies made and estimates tendered from Germany, England, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Italy, Norway, Holland, and Roumania, as well as M. Neymarck's own conclusions on the portion of the inquiry thus far conducted, covers so large and important a field, that no review or condensation of the results can be attempted in this paper. The investigation would provide matter of importance for a paper in itself. Many of the estimates deduced from the values of stocks current on the Stock Exchanges of the different States, are of course matters open to some difference of view, but the names and authority of M. Neymarck's coadjutors entitle the communication to very careful study by the statisticians of all the countries concerned. Perhaps our much esteemed colleague Mr. Hendriks, who has taken an able part in this inquiry, as member both of the Committee of the Institute and of the section in which it was debated, can supplement my inability to offer any abstract of the provisional results at which M. Neymarck has arrived. The inquiry, it must be added, is intended to be further continued by the Committee, who received from the Institute additional powers with this object.

Conclusion.

In recapitulating thus a considerable number of the communications coming before the International Institute, it will be seen they necessarily take three different forms. Perhaps I ought rather to group them in four categories, if we are to reckon as a separate class the more or less ceremonial addresses by the occupants of the chair, and the official representatives of the government acting as the hosts of the gathering. With these, too, may be classed the formal communication to the Institute of published works of statistical importance.

The three forms of ordinary communications are, however:—

(1.) Those embodying the conclusions of a committee or the opinions of an individual member as regards existing statistical methods, or making proposals for new researches, or for improving the international comparability of returns.

(2.) Those which offer for consideration or amendment actual figures supplying more or less complete comparisons from existing

data; and showing by tabular demonstration where the gaps or variation of classification now occur.

(3.) Papers which supply details for a single country, among which the most useful are those which provide direct and original information respecting some specific features of the country in which the meeting is held. In this group the St. Petersburg Congress was comparatively rich.

All forms of communication are of value, but it would be of much advantage were it possible to have papers of the two former classes in future printed and circulated some months in advance of the meeting, so that their details might be duly studied by members before they were called upon at the Congress to come to definite conclusions.

APPENDIX.

Table	I.	Wheat Average, 1867-96 (Major Craigie).
"	II.	Number of Cattle " "
"	III.	" Sheep " "
"	IV.	Russian Harvests and Population (M. Pokrovsky).
"	V.	Russian Census of 1897 (M. Troïnitsky).
"	VI.	Divorce Statistics (M. Yvernés).
"	VII.	Imports and Exports—origin and destination (Mr. Bateman).
"	VIII.	Imports and Exports—mode of valuing (Mr. Bateman).
"	IX.	Imports and Exports — classifications adopted (Mr. Bateman).

APPENDIX.—TABLE I. *Statement showing the Area of Land under Wheat in the undermentioned Countries for such Years as can be given from 1867 to 1896.*

MILLIONS OF ACRES.—NOTE: 1 acre = .405 hectare = .37 dessiatine.																				
Year.	United Kingdom.	Australasia.	Canada.	Austria.	Hungary.	France.	German Empire.	Italy.	Romania.	Russia in Europe.*	Belgium.	Denmark.	Holland.	Norway.	Sweden.	United States.	Argentina.	Japan.	Algeria.	India.
1867...	3.6	1.1	—	—	—	17.9	—	—	—	—	0.70 ^f	0.10 ^f	0.20 ^g	—	0.1 ^h	12.3 ^g	—	—	—	—
'68...	4.0	1.1	—	—	—	17.5	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.21 ^g	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
'69...	4.0	1.2	—	—	—	17.4	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.22 ^g	—	—	19.2 ^g	—	—	—	—
'70...	3.8	1.2	—	2.4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.21	0.01	—	—	—	—	—	—
'71...	3.8	1.4	—	2.3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.21	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
'72...	3.8	1.5	—	—	5.0	17.1	—	—	—	28.7	—	0.14	0.21	—	—	19.9	—	—	—	—
'73...	3.7	1.5	—	—	—	17.2	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.21	—	—	20.9	—	—	—	—
'74...	3.8	1.5	—	2.4	—	17.2	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.21	—	—	22.2	—	—	—	—
'75...	3.5	1.5	—	2.4	—	17.2	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.24	0.01	—	25.0	—	—	—	—
'76...	3.1	1.8	—	2.4	6.4	17.0	—	—	—	—	—	0.15	0.21	—	—	26.4	—	—	—	—
'77...	3.3	2.2	—	2.3	6.0	17.2	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.22	—	—	27.6	—	—	—	—
'78...	3.4	2.6	—	2.5	6.2	17.2	4.5	—	—	—	—	—	0.23	—	—	26.3	—	—	—	—
'79...	3.1	2.8	—	2.4	6.1	17.1	4.5	—	—	—	—	—	0.23	—	—	32.1	—	—	—	—
'80...	3.1	3.4	—	2.4	6.0	17.0	4.5	—	—	28.9	0.68	—	0.23	—	—	35.4	—	—	—	—
'81...	3.0	3.4	2.0 ^b	2.5	6.3	17.2	4.5	—	—	—	—	—	0.22	—	—	38.0	—	—	—	—
'82...	3.2	3.4	—	2.5	6.2	17.2	4.5	—	—	—	—	—	0.23	—	—	37.1	—	—	—	—
'83...	2.7	3.7	1.9 ^b	2.6	6.4	17.0	4.7	11.7	—	—	—	—	0.21	—	—	36.5	0.6	—	—	—
'84...	2.8	3.7	1.9 ^b	2.7	6.8	17.4	4.7	—	—	—	—	—	0.21	—	—	39.5	—	—	—	—
'85...	2.6	—	2.0 ^b	2.9	6.8	17.2	4.7	—	—	—	—	—	0.21	—	—	34.2	—	—	—	—
'86...	2.4	—	1.8 ^b	2.9	6.8	17.2	4.7	—	—	—	—	—	0.20	—	—	36.8	—	—	—	—
'87...	2.4	—	1.8 ^b	2.9	7.3	17.2	4.7	—	—	—	—	—	0.21	—	—	37.6	—	—	—	—
'88...	2.7	—	—	2.9	6.8 ^c	17.2	4.8	—	—	—	—	0.12	0.21	—	—	37.3	—	—	—	25.9
'89...	2.5	3.9	1.8 ^b	2.7	7.2 ^c	17.4	4.8	—	3.3	—	—	—	0.21	—	0.16	38.1	—	—	—	24.8
'90...	2.5	3.5	2.3 ^b	2.8	7.4 ^c	17.4	4.8	10.9	3.7	—	—	—	0.21	0.01	0.17	36.1	—	—	—	26.6
'91...	2.4	3.7	2.3 ^b	2.7	7.9 ^d	14.2	4.7	11.1	3.8	—	—	—	0.11	—	0.18	39.9	—	1.1	3.1	21.5
'92...	2.3	3.8	2.5 ^b	2.8	8.1 ^d	17.3	4.9	11.2	3.7	32.6	—	—	0.18	—	0.18	38.6	3.30	1.1	3.2	26.4
'93...	2.0	4.2	2.3 ^b	2.8	8.6 ^d	17.5	5.0	11.3	3.2	32.6	—	—	0.17	—	0.17	31.6	—	1.1	3.2	26.0
'94...	2.0	3.8	2.0 ^b	2.7	8.5 ^d	17.3	4.9	11.3	3.4	32.9	—	—	0.16	—	0.18	34.0	—	1.1	—	26.0
'95...	1.5	3.8	2.1 ^b	2.6	—	17.3	4.8	11.3	3.6	31.9	—	—	0.15	—	—	34.0	—	—	—	21.8
'96...	1.7	3.9	2.1 ^b	2.6	—	17.1	4.8	—	3.7	—	—	0.08	—	—	—	34.6	—	—	—	—

• Ex Poland.

b Ontario and Manitoba.

c Excluding Croatia and Slavonia.

d Including Croatia and Slavonia.

e Including spelt.

f In 1866.

g Estimated.

TABLE III.—Statement showing the Number of Sheep in the undermentioned Countries for such Years as can be given from 1867 to 1896.

Year.	NUMBER OF SHEEP IN MILLIONS.													
	United Kingdom.	Australasia.	Canada.	Austria.	Hungary.	France.	German Empire.	Italy.	Romania.	Russia in Europe ^a	Belgium.	Denmark.	Holland.	Norway.
1867...	33.8	47.3	—	—	—	30.4 ^b	—	11.0	—	—	0.6 ^b	1.9 ^b	1.00	—
'68...	35.6	41.1 ^d	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.95	—
'69...	34.3	40.2 ^d	—	5.0	15.1	—	—	—	—	45.3	—	—	0.93	—
'70...	32.8	51.3	—	5.0	15.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	1.8	0.90	—
'71...	31.4	49.8	3.3	—	—	24.6	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.87	—
'72...	32.2	51.5	—	—	—	25.9	25.0	—	—	—	—	—	0.86	—
'73...	34.0	58.7	—	—	—	23.9	—	7.0	—	—	—	—	0.90	—
'74...	34.8	61.6	—	—	—	23.8	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.94	—
'75...	33.5	64.9	—	—	—	23.9	—	—	—	51.8	—	—	0.89	—
'76...	32.3	64.4	—	—	—	23.4	—	—	—	—	—	1.7	0.89	—
'77...	32.2	59.7	—	—	—	23.5	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.83	—
'78...	32.6	62.7	—	—	—	23.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.91	—
'79...	32.2	67.0	—	3.8	9.8 ^f	22.5	—	8.6	—	—	0.37	—	0.90	—
'80...	30.2	75.2	—	—	—	22.3	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.85	—
'81...	27.9	78.1	—	—	—	21.6	19.2	—	—	47.5	—	—	0.79	—
'82...	27.4	80.3	1.9 ^g	—	—	21.6	—	—	—	46.7	—	—	0.75	—
'83...	28.3	83.4	1.9 ^g	—	—	22.1	—	—	4.7	—	—	—	0.70	—
'84...	29.4	75.6	1.9 ^g	—	10.6 ^h	22.9	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.75	—
'85...	30.1	82.2	1.8 ^g	—	—	22.6	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.77	—
'86...	29.0	86.2	1.6 ^g	—	—	22.9	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.80	—
'87...	29.4	97.2	1.4 ⁱ	—	—	22.9	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.80	—
'88...	28.9	96.1	1.3 ^g	—	—	22.6	—	—	5.0	44.5	—	—	0.78	—
'89...	29.5	101.3	1.3 ^g	—	—	22.0	—	—	—	—	—	1.2	0.77	—
'90...	31.7	114.1	1.3 ^g	3.2	—	21.7	13.6	6.9 ^e	5.0	—	—	—	0.82	—
'91...	33.5	124.3	1.7 ^g	—	—	21.7	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.81	—
'92...	33.6	121.7	1.9 ^g	—	—	21.5	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.75	—
'93...	31.8	119.1	2.0 ⁱ	—	—	20.3	—	—	—	—	—	1.2	0.69	—
'94...	30.0	121.0	2.1 ⁱ	—	—	20.7	—	—	—	—	—	—	0.67	—
'95...	29.8	111.6	2.1 ⁱ	—	7.5 ^h	21.2	—	—	4.5	—	—	—	0.68	—
'96...	30.9	110.4	1.9 ⁱ	—	—	20.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
														0.27

^a Except Poland. ^b In 1866. ^c Estimated. ^d Excluding New Zealand. ^e Not including lambs.^f Including Croatia and Slavonia. ^g Ontario only. ^h Exclusive of Croatia and Slavonia. ⁱ Ontario and Manitoba.

TABLE IV.—*Movement of Population in the Fifty Governments of Russia in Europe, compared with Variations of the Harvest and the Prices of Grain, 1867-96.*

Years.	In- habitants. [000's omitted.]	Difference between Births and Deaths per 100 of Population.	Relation of the Harvest to the Average over the 25 Years (1870-94).			Price of a "Poud" of		Average Price of a "Poud" of		
			Wheat.	Rye.	Oats.	Rye at the Ports.	Rye and Flour (Army Supply).	Rye.	Wheat.	Oats.
						Copecks.	Copecks.	Copecks.	Copecks.	Copecks.
1867.....	63,380,	1.43	—	—	—	64	75	—	—	—
'68.....	63,988,	0.90	—	—	—	88	100	—	—	—
'69.....	64,579,	1.12	—	—	—	99	92	—	—	—
'70.....	65,729,	1.39	114.3	117.5	136.5	74	87	—	—	—
1871.....	66,590,	1.22	91.8	107.0	85.7	71	79	—	—	—
'72.....	67,206,	0.85	77.6	102.6	119.0	71	88	—	—	—
'73.....	68,321,	1.54	93.8	114.0	101.6	79	88	—	—	—
'74.....	69,485,	1.58	118.9	125.4	103.2	75	98	—	—	—
'75.....	70,715,	1.64	65.3	91.2	81.0	73	83	—	—	—
1876.....	71,884,	1.53	67.4	91.2	109.5	76	90	—	—	—
'77.....	73,025,	1.47	110.2	107.8	103.2	80	96	—	—	—
'78.....	73,721,	0.89	85.7	106.7	111.1	76	101	—	—	—
'79.....	74,910,	1.51	73.5	93.0	104.8	86	92	—	—	—
'80.....	76,080,	1.33	69.4	83.3	98.4	99	121	—	—	—
1881.....	77,264,	1.45	106.0	90.0	108.0	129	173	—	—	—
'82.....	78,163,	1.09	96.0	90.0	102.0	122	122	—	—	—
'83.....	79,225,	1.26	95.9	92.1	115.9	104	104	—	—	—
'84.....	80,635,	1.65	114.3	114.0	98.4	—	—	70	90	60
'85.....	81,824,	1.37	75.6	114.0	76.2	—	—	53	78	55
1886.....	82,945,	1.57	67.4	106.1	109.5	—	—	39	85	40
'87.....	84,069,	1.54	112.3	116.7	117.5	—	—	41	85	38
'88.....	85,367,	1.77	117.2	110.4	102.0	—	—	52	80	42
'89.....	86,454,	1.47	69.2	78.1	83.3	—	—	62	77	46
'90.....	87,489,	1.26	80.7	98.9	95.8	—	—	56	68	47
1891.....	88,493,	1.45	65.3	66.7	68.7	—	—	127	114	68
'92.....	88,872,	0.49	94.2	88.6	74.9	—	—	60	62	51
'93.....	89,959,	1.42	134.6	107.3	120.8	—	—	60	62	51
'94.....	91,100,	1.45	125.0	129.1	120.8	—	—	42	42	35
'95.....	92,600,	1.43	107.6	111.4	110.4	—	—	43	51	36
1896.....	94,189,	1.61	101.9	106.2	110.4	—	—	43	66	48
1867-70	64,319,	1.22	—	—	—	81	89	—	—	—
'71-75	68,364,	1.38	89.7	108.0	98.1	73	87	—	—	—
'76-80	73,924,	1.35	81.2	96.4	105.4	83.4	100	—	—	—
'81-85	79,422,	1.37	97.6	100.0	100.1	—	—	—	—	—
'86-90	85,265,	1.53	89.4	102.0	101.6	—	—	48	80	43
'91-95	90,205,	1.25	105.3	100.6	99.1	—	—	72	72	52

Note.—One "poud" = 36 lbs.

TABLE V.—*Preliminary Returns of the Population of the Russian Empire, according to the Census of ^{28th January}_{1st February} 1897.*

Number.	Governments and Provinces.	Population according to Census of 28th January, 1897.			Number of Females per 100 Males.	Population per Square Verst.	Area in Square Versts, excluding large Inland Waters.
		Males.	Females.	Total.			
	Governments of Russia in Europe.						
1	Arkhangel	164,700	182,860	347,560	111·0	0·5	742,050·7
2	Astrakhan	512,791	489,525	1,002,316	95·5	4·8	207,193·1
3	Bessarabia	994,185	942,218	1,936,403	94·8	49·6	39,014·9
4	Vilna	794,236	797,676	1,591,912	100·4	43·2	36,825·3
5	Vitebsk	749,051	753,844	1,502,895	100·6	39·0	38,649·5
6	Vladimir	733,221	837,509	1,570,730	114·2	36·7	42,831·8
7	Vologda	654,610	710,703	1,365,313	108·6	3·9	353,349·4
8	Volhynia	1,513,584	1,485,762	2,999,346	98·2	47·6	63,036·8
9	Voronezh	1,267,092	1,280,228	2,547,320	101·0	44·0	57,902·0
10	Viatka	1,473,778	1,608,837	3,082,615	109·2	22·8	135,019·7
11	Grodno	826,534	789,281	1,615,815	95·5	47·7	33,900·8
12	Region of the Don ...	1,300,342	1,275,475	2,575,818	98·1	17·9	144,586·1
13	Ekaterinoslav	1,088,560	1,024,091	2,112,651	94·1	37·9	55,705·5
14	Kazan	1,078,151	1,111,924	2,190,075	103·1	39·1	55,954·8
15	Kaluga	545,187	633,648	1,178,835	116·2	43·4	27,777·9
16	Kiev	1,774,939	1,789,494	3,564,433	100·8	79·6	44,777·9
17	Kovno	761,605	788,367	1,549,972	103·5	43·9	35,315·5
18	Kostroma	658,038	770,855	1,428,893	117·1	19·4	73,809·1
19	Courland	326,866	345,673	672,539	105·8	28·3	23,747·2
20	Kursk	1,187,233	1,207,660	2,394,893	101·7	58·7	40,821·1
21	Livonia	630,475	669,926	1,300,401	106·3	32·5	40,002·4
22	Minsk	1,077,872	1,078,471	2,156,343	100·0	26·9	80,152·3
23	Moghilev	846,758	860,855	1,707,613	101·7	40·5	42,134·6
24	Moscow	1,224,573	1,208,783	2,433,356	98·7	83·2	29,236·4
25	Nijni-Novgorod	760,840	842,194	1,603,034	110·7	35·6	45,036·7
26	Novgorod	672,695	720,236	1,392,931	107·1	13·4	104,163·4
27	Olonets	173,879	192,768	366,647	110·9	3·2	112,322·0
28	Orenburg	802,936	805,452	1,608,388	100·3	9·7	166,710·9
29	Orel	1,001,933	1,052,676	2,054,609	105·1	50·0	41,057·7
30	Penza	720,912	763,036	1,483,948	105·8	43·5	34,129·1
31	Perm	1,450,351	1,552,304	3,002,655	107·0	10·4	290,168·7
32	Podolia	1,516,277	1,514,763	3,031,040	99·9	82·1	36,921·7
33	Poltava	1,388,008	1,406,748	2,794,756	101·4	63·7	43,844·0
34	Pskov	551,626	584,954	1,136,580	106·0	29·9	37,955·7
35	Ryazan	865,454	962,083	1,827,537	111·2	49·6	36,844·7
36	Samara	1,364,480	1,397,371	2,761,851	102·4	20·2	136,713·5
37	St. Petersburg	1,123,123	981,388	2,104,511	87·4	53·9	39,203·2
38	Saratov	1,183,867	1,230,889	2,419,756	103·5	32·6	74,244·8
39	Simbirsk	750,249	800,209	1,550,458	106·7	35·6	43,491·0
40	Smolensk	742,124	808,849	1,550,973	109·0	31·5	49,212·2
41	Taurida	760,661	683,174	1,443,835	89·8	27·2	53,053·8
42	Tambov	1,330,154	1,385,111	2,715,265	104·1	46·4	58,511·0
43	Tver	826,185	986,374	1,812,559	119·4	31·9	56,837·0
44	Tula	677,214	754,108	1,431,322	111·4	52·6	27,204·4
45	Ufa	1,111,904	1,107,934	2,219,838	99·6	20·7	107,209·7
46	Kharkov	1,267,182	1,243,196	2,510,378	98·1	52·4	47,874·8
47	Kherson	1,397,480	1,331,028	2,728,508	95·3	43·9	62,213·2
48	Chernigov	1,140,409	1,181,598	2,322,007	103·6	50·4	46,042·3
49	Esthonia	203,525	210,199	413,724	103·3	23·9	17,306·3
50	Yaroslavl	460,787	612,806	1,073,593	133·0	34·4	31,230·7
	Total	46,433,636	47,755,114	94,188,750	102·8	22·2	4,242,697·3

TABLE V *Contd.*—*Preliminary Returns of the Population of the Russian Empire.*

Number.	Governments and Provinces.	Population according to Census of 28th January, 1897.			Number of Females per 100 Males.	Population per Square Verst.	Area in Square Versts, excluding large Inland Waters.
		Males.	Females.	Total.			
	Governments of Poland.						
51	Warsaw	983,580	948,483	1,932,063	96·4	125·8	15,359·2
52	Kalisz	418,516	427,818	846,334	102·2	85·1	9,961·3
53	Kielce	375,526	388,561	764,087	103·5	86·2	8,868·6
54	Lomza	306,502	279,279	585,781	91·1	63·2	9,265·9
55	Lublin	584,026	568,636	1,152,662	97·4	77·9	14,789·4
56	Piotrkow	700,635	706,316	1,406,951	100·8	130·7	10,563·4
57	Plock	278,610	277,209	555,819	99·5	67·1	8,287·3
58	Radom	410,069	409,712	819,781	99·9	75·0	10,854·0
59	Suwalki	305,170	299,803	604,973	98·2	55·9	10,824·3
60	Siedlce	391,245	382,894	774,139	97·9	61·5	12,580·8
	Total	4,753,879	4,688,711	9,442,590	98·6	84·6	111,554·2
	Governments and provinces of Caucasasia	5,129,931	4,593,622	9,723,553	89·5	23·6	411,324·6
	Governments and provinces of Siberia	2,959,557	2,772,175	5,731,732	93·7	0·5	10,922,479·7
	Provinces of the Steppes	1,803,560	1,611,614	3,415,174	89·4	1·8	1,946,838·2
	Provinces of Turkistan and the Transcaspian Territory	2,281,340	1,893,761	4,175,101	83·0	3·9	1,069,790·0
	Totals	63,361,903	63,314,997	126,676,900	99·9	6·8	18,704,684·0
	Russian colonies in Bukhara	1,739	736	2,475	42·3	—	—
	Russian subjects in Khiva	2,212	1,725	3,937	78·0	—	—
	Total according to census of 1897	63,365,854	63,317,458	126,683,312	99·9	—	—
	Grand Duchy of Finland	1,250,426	1,277,375	2,527,801	102·2	8·8	286,051·4
	General total	64,616,280	64,594,833	129,211,113	100·0	6·8	18,990,735·4

TABLE V *Contd.*—*Population of the Twenty Largest Russian Towns.*

Names.	Population.			Number of Females per 100 Males.
	Males.	Females.	Total.	
St. Petersburg*	693,907	573,116	1,267,023	82·6
Moscow.....	560,940	427,670	988,610	76·3
Warsaw	297,893	316,859	614,752	106·4
Odessa	217,063	187,588	404,651	86·4
Lodz	153,583	161,197	314,780	105·0
Riga†.....	143,723	139,220	282,943	96·9
Kiev	135,970	112,780	248,750	82·9
Kharkov	90,605	80,077	170,682	88·4
Tiflis	95,647	64,215	159,862	67·1
Vilna	81,596	77,972	159,568	95·6
Tashkend	88,598	67,908	156,506	76·6
Saratov	65,257	67,859	133,116	104·1
Kazan	70,028	61,480	131,508	87·8
Ekaterinoslav	65,107	56,109	121,216	86·7
Rostov-on-Don‡	62,796	57,093	119,889	90·9
Astrakhan.....	58,503	54,572	113,075	93·3
Baku	67,148	45,105	112,253	67·2
Tula	60,964	50,084	111,048	82·2
Kishinev	56,866	51,640	108,506	90·8
Nijni-Novgorod	53,358	45,145	98,503	84·6

* Including suburbs.

† Including the "arrondissement patrimonial."

‡ Including Nakhichevan, the total population is 149,201.

One square verst = 0·44 square mile.

TABLE VI.—International Statistics of Divorce and Judicial Separations.

	NUMBERS PER CENT. OF										JUDICIAL SEPARATIONS IN				
	DIVORCES IN										Austria, 1890-94.	England and Wales, 1890-94.	France, 1890-94.	Italy, 1890-94.	Switzer- land, 1891-95.
	Austria, 1890-94.	Belgium, 1891-3-95-6. ^a	England and Wales, 1890-94.	France, 1890-94.	Ger- many, 1890-93.	Nether- lands, 1891-95.	Rou- mania, 1897-91.	Sweden, 1890-94.	Switzer- land, 1891-95.						
I. Petitions—															
Accepted	—	84	71	86	63	—	60	—	93	—	—	26	76	46	—
Dismissed	—	16	8	8	33	—	12	—	8 ^b	—	—	5	11	2	—
Abandoned	—	—	21	6	—	—	28	—	—	—	—	69	13	52	—
II. Petitions—															
By husband	3	—	62	34	—	—	29	45	23	5	4	—	11	17	91
" wife	4	—	38	58	—	—	71	29	46	10	96	—	78	54	59
" both	93	—	—	8	—	—	—	26	31	76	—	—	11	29	20
III. ^c Condition as to family—															
With children	41	—	64	56	—	47	20	66	62 ^d	49	—	—	66	53	—
Without "	59	—	36	44	—	53	80	34	38	51	—	—	34	47	—
IV. ^e Occupation—															
Agriculture	5	—	—	9	—	—	61	21	25 ^e	11	—	—	18	12	—
Manufacturing industry and transport	71	—	—	73	—	—	17	64	66	61	—	—	60	47	—
Reverend	3	—	—	11	—	—	2	15	5	3	—	—	22	19	—
Professional classes	19	—	—	7	—	—	20	—	4	6	—	—	5	—	—
Domestic service	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
V. ^e Duration of marriage—															
Less than one year	7	—	2 ^f	3	—	—	11	1	3 ^g	6	—	—	3	8	—
One to five years	38	—	22	28	—	—	68	12	33	28	—	—	23	27	—
Five to ten	29	—	31	39	—	—	21	29	26	27	—	—	36	27	—
Ten to twenty years	21	—	35	23	—	—	—	43	27	28	—	—	27	27	—
Twenty years and upwards	5	—	10	7	—	—	—	15	11	11	—	—	11	11	—
VI. Cause of petitions—															
Violence	—	—	—	78	—	—	96	—	18 ^h	7	—	—	89	23	—
Adultery of wife	—	—	—	13	—	—	2	8	12	2	—	—	5	7	—
" husband	—	—	—	7	—	—	1	4	4	2	—	—	5	2	—
Conviction for crime	—	—	—	3	—	—	1	5	5	3	—	—	1	—	—
Desertion of husband	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	34	8	—	—	—	—	8	—
" wife	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	17	1	—	—	—	—	—	—
Insanity	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	1	—	—	—	—	—	—
Extravagance, drunkenness, violence	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	58	57	—	—	—	—	61	—
and incompatibility of temper, and	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
mutual consent	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Other and unknown	100	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	86	—	—	—	—	—

^a Judicial year.
^b Divorces and judicial separations.
^c III, IV, V, cases where the condition as to family, occupation, or duration of marriage were unknown have been omitted from these calculations.
^d 1876-80.
^e 1881-85.
^f All matrimonial cases.
^g 1876-80.
^h 1891-95.

TABLE VIII.—*Method of Valuing Imports and Exports in the Trade Returns of certain European Countries and of the United States.*

Country.	Imports.	Exports.	Authority.
Austria	Official values—revised annually by a Permanent Valuation Commission	Official values—revised annually by a Permanent Valuation Commission	Austrian Trade Vol. 1895, part 1. Introduction, sec. 8, p. xvii <i>et seq.</i>
Belgium	Declared values—where goods are shown by value; in all other cases official values—revised annually by a Valuation Commission	Declared values—where goods are shown by value; in all other cases official values—revised annually by a Valuation Commission	Belgian Trade Vol. 1895, pp. viii and xxxvii
Bulgaria	No information	No information	—
Denmark	Values based on the foreign exporters' prices, with addition of expenses of bringing the goods to Denmark	Values based on the home exporters' prices, with addition of expenses of sending the goods to their foreign market	Danish Trade Vol. 1895. Introduction, p. vii
France	Actual values—revised annually by a Permanent Valuation Commission	Actual values—revised annually by a Permanent Valuation Commission	French Trade Vol. 1895, p. ix, sec. vi
Germany	Official values—revised annually by a Valuation Commission	Official values—revised annually by a Valuation Commission	German Trade Vol. 1895. Part 1, p. 1, and part 2, p. 61
Greece	Official values—fixed in 1889 by a Special Commission	Official values—fixed in 1839 by a Special Commission	Greek Trade Vol. 1893, p. 9, and Trade Vol. 1895, p. 21
Holland	Declared values in the case of dutiable goods; but in the case of goods free of duty official values computed on a quantitative basis	Official values computed on a quantitative basis	Dutch Trade Vol. 1895, part 1, p. xxi
Italy	Official values—revised annually by a Valuation Commission, and approved by the Minister of Finance	Official value—revised annually by a Valuation Commission, and approved by the Minister of Finance	Italian Trade Vol. 1895, p. viii
Norway	Official values—revised annually	Official values—revised annually	Norwegian Statistical Abstract, 1896, p. 112. <i>et seq.</i>
Portugal	No information	No information	—
Roumania	No information	No information	—
Russia	No information	No information	—
Spain	Official values—revised annually	Official values—revised annually	Spanish Monthly Trade Accounts, June, 1897, p. 35
Sweden	Official values—decided upon after inquiries made by the Department of Commerce	Official values—decided upon after inquiries made by the Department of Commerce	Swedish Trade Vol. 1895, pp. ii and iii
Switzerland	Partly official,* partly declared values. (The former are revised annually by a Valuation Commission)	Declared values	Swiss Trade Vol. 1895, pp. A 2 and A 54 (note), and Annual Report on Swiss Trade, 1895, p. 63 <i>et seq.</i>
United States ...	Actual market value, or wholesale price in the principal markets of the country whence imported, including value of packages, &c., and all other expenses incident to placing the merchandise ready for shipment to the United States	1. Foreign exports— (a.) The exports "from warehouse" are stated at the "import" value (b.) Exports <i>not</i> "from warehouse" are stated at their value at the United States Port whence exported 2. Domestic exports— These are given at their market value at the time and place of shipment	United States.— Trade Vol. 1896. Vol. i, part 1, p. vii
United Kingdom	Declared values, as landed ...	Declared values at port of shipment	—

* The majority of the values are official values, only a small proportion being declared.

TABLE IX.—*Classification of Imports and Exports into and from the under-noted Countries, showing the per Cent. of Total Value in each Class.*

RUSSIA.

Years.	Animals, Living.		Articles of Food.		Raw and Semi-Manufactured Materials.		Manufactured Articles.	
	Imports.	Exports.	Imports.	Exports.	Imports.	Exports.	Imports.	Exports.
	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.
1884 ...	0.2	2.4	29.0	59.0	51.1	36.0	19.7	2.6
'85 ...	0.3	2.7	26.8	62.1	53.6	32.1	19.3	3.1
'86 ...	0.3	2.4	28.9	56.6	52.8	37.3	18.0	3.7
'87 ...	0.3	2.0	22.4	60.3	60.7	34.6	16.6	3.1
'88 ...	0.4	1.7	20.2	63.9	61.8	31.4	17.6	3.0
'89 ...	0.3	1.7	19.0	57.4	61.6	38.2	19.1	2.7
'90 ...	0.4	1.6	20.5	56.4	60.3	39.1	18.8	2.9
'91 ...	0.4	2.4	20.5	59.6	58.3	35.0	20.8	3.0
'92 ...	0.5	3.3	20.3	43.0	59.8	49.2	19.4	4.5
'93 ...	0.5	2.2	21.8	56.3	57.7	38.1	20.0	3.4
'94 ...	0.7	1.9	17.0	65.1	57.8	30.4	24.5	2.6

HOLLAND.

Years.	Articles of Food and Live Animals.		Raw Materials.		Manufactured Articles.		Miscellaneous Articles, not Classified.	
	Imports.	Exports.	Imports.	Exports.	Imports.	Exports.	Imports.	Exports.
	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.
1885 ...	33.5	36.2	43.3	34.5	23.7	25.5	0.5	3.8
'86 ...	33.1	35.1	39.5	37.8	26.3	21.7	1.1	5.4
'87 ...	34.0	37.0	39.6	30.0	25.7	26.3	0.7	6.7
'88 ...	34.4	32.8	43.9	34.6	20.5	23.1	1.2	9.5
'89 ...	34.0	33.4	45.3	35.3	19.3	22.0	1.4	9.3
'90 ...	36.4	32.5	44.4	34.4	18.2	24.7	1.0	8.4
'91 ...	34.1	34.1	44.6	36.4	20.1	21.2	1.2	8.3
'92 ...	32.4	32.6	41.4	32.6	24.3	25.0	1.9	9.8
'93 ...	34.8	37.9	42.2	38.1	19.3	22.2	3.7	1.8
'94 ...	35.8	39.5	42.6	36.9	18.6	21.8	3.0	1.8
'95 ...	37.4	39.1	41.2	36.1	19.2	21.5	2.2	3.3

ITALY.

Years.	Articles of Food.		Materials Used in Industry, Raw.		Materials Used in Industry, Half Wrought or Prepared.		Manufactured Articles.	
	Imports.	Exports.	Imports.	Exports.	Imports.	Exports.	Imports.	Exports.
	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.
1884 ...	20.9	39.0	28.7	17.7	17.1	29.2	33.3	14.1
'85 ...	27.9	33.9	26.8	18.2	14.5	31.7	30.8	15.2
'86 ...	25.9	36.2	27.8	17.2	15.7	32.4	30.6	14.2
'87 ...	25.0	40.3	28.2	15.5	14.8	30.1	32.0	14.1
'88 ...	22.7	30.8	32.9	18.5	15.6	36.7	28.8	14.0
'89 ...	26.0	28.9	32.6	18.7	15.7	36.9	25.7	15.5
'90 ...	24.2	29.1	35.6	19.6	16.0	35.5	24.2	15.8
'91 ...	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
'92 ...	25.4	29.7	34.8	18.9	16.8	37.7	23.0	13.7
'93 ...	24.5	30.4	36.1	20.4	16.8	33.4	22.6	15.8
'94 ...	18.2	32.7	41.8	17.5	17.9	33.1	22.1	16.7
'95 ...	20.4	29.8	38.1	16.9	20.4	35.5	21.1	17.8

INDIA.

Years.	Live Animals, Food and Drink, and Narcotics.		Raw Materials.		Manufactured Articles.		Coin and Bullion.	
	Imports.	Exports.	Imports.	Exports.	Imports.	Exports.	Imports.	Exports.
	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.
1891 ...	10.8	42.4	10.5	37.5	60.4	17.7	18.3	2.4
'92 ...	10.6	40.3	10.1	33.2	59.3	19.7	20.0	6.8
'93 ...	10.1	35.1	9.6	37.7	58.6	24.0	21.7	3.2
'94 ...	10.7	32.4	9.6	36.4	65.5	22.5	14.2	6.7

TABLE IX *Contd.*—*Classification of Imports and Exports.*

GERMANY.

Years.	Articles of Food and Live Animals.		Raw Materials.		Manufactured Articles.	
	Imports.	Exports.	Imports.	Exports.	Imports.	Exports.
	% of total value.	% of total value.	% of total value.	% of total value.	% of total value.	% of total value.
1885.....	30.3	18.5	41.2	18.6	28.5	62.9
'86.....	29.3	16.3	41.3	18.6	29.4	65.1
'87.....	30.9	15.9	42.4	18.7	26.7	65.4
'88.....	27.6	15.2	45.8	20.1	26.8	64.7
'89.....	30.6	12.7	44.6	21.0	24.8	66.3
'90.....	33.5	14.2	42.9	21.3	23.6	64.5
'91.....	36.4	13.8	41.8	21.7	21.8	64.5
'92.....	37.4	12.5	41.3	21.5	21.3	66.0
'93.....	33.2	13.8	44.0	21.6	22.8	64.6
'94.....	36.5	14.0	42.3	22.6	21.2	63.4
'95.....	33.7	12.5	43.8	21.8	22.5	65.7

FRANCE.

Years.	Articles of Food.		Raw Materials.		Manufactured Articles.	
	Imports.	Exports.	Imports.	Exports.	Imports.	Exports.
	% of total value.	% of total value.	% of total value.	% of total value.	% of total value.	% of total value.
1885.....	35.6	24.3	49.5	22.9	14.9	52.8
'86.....	36.6	22.5	49.5	23.8	13.9	53.7
'87.....	35.4	21.7	50.0	24.8	14.6	53.5
'88.....	36.7	22.4	49.2	25.0	14.1	52.6
'89.....	33.4	22.6	52.4	25.4	14.2	52.0
'90.....	32.6	22.8	52.8	23.9	14.6	53.3
'91.....	34.7	22.7	50.7	23.4	14.6	53.9
'92.....	33.4	21.9	51.9	23.8	14.7	54.3
'93.....	27.5	22.0	57.9	24.2	14.6	53.8
'94.....	31.1	21.6	54.7	24.5	14.2	53.9
'95.....	27.8	17.5	56.5	25.9	15.7	56.6
'96.....	26.5	19.2	57.2	24.6	16.3	56.2

SWITZERLAND.

Years.	Articles of Food.		Raw Materials.		Manufactured Articles.	
	Imports.	Exports.	Imports.	Exports.	Imports.	Exports.
	% of total value.	% of total value.	% of total value.	% of total value.	% of total value.	% of total value.
1886.....	29.1	12.4	37.7	15.1	33.2	72.5
'87.....	28.9	11.5	38.6	14.6	32.5	73.9
'88.....	29.0	10.8	37.5	15.6	33.5	73.6
'89.....	29.0	10.5	38.7	13.6	32.3	75.9
'90.....	31.0	11.2	37.2	12.2	31.8	76.6
'91.....	32.6	11.9	34.6	12.0	32.8	76.1
'92.....	31.1	12.3	37.7	12.8	31.2	74.9
'93.....	29.8	12.0	40.3	12.9	29.9	75.1
'94.....	32.0	13.0	37.6	12.2	30.4	74.8
'95.....	30.3	11.8	39.0	12.3	30.7	75.9

AUSTRIA.

Years.	Articles of Food (Raw and Unprepared).		Raw Materials.		Manufactured Articles.	
	Imports.	Exports.	Imports.	Exports.	Imports.	Exports.
	% of total value.	% of total value.	% of total value.	% of total value.	% of total value.	% of total value.
1885.....	19.5	19.9	34.0	25.4	46.5	54.7
'86.....	16.4	21.4	37.2	23.9	46.4	54.7
'87.....	14.9	21.9	38.8	24.7	46.3	53.4
'88.....	14.0	23.3	38.7	25.5	47.3	51.2
'89.....	13.8	22.2	38.4	27.0	47.8	50.8
'90.....	15.5	22.8	38.8	27.4	45.7	49.8
'91.....	16.0	24.2	37.6	24.7	46.4	51.1
'92.....	14.4	23.2	37.2	25.9	48.4	50.9
'93.....	14.9	25.0	37.8	25.3	47.3	49.7
'94.....	17.4	29.5	34.2	24.9	48.3	45.6

TABLE IX *Contd.*—*Classification of Imports and Exports.*

UNITED STATES.

Years.	Imports (entered for Consumption).					Exports (special).					
	Articles of Food and Live Animals.	Articles in a crude condition used in Domestic Industry.	Articles wholly or partially Manufactured for use in Manufactures.	Manufactured Articles ready for Consumption.	Articles of Voluntary use, Luxuries.	Products of Agriculture.	Products of Mines, including crude Mineral Oils.	Products of the Forest.	Products of the Fisheries.	Products, Miscellaneous.	Manufactures, Domestic.
	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.
'86.....	31.4	23.0	12.6	20.2	12.8	72.8	2.0	3.2	0.8	0.7	20.5
'87.....	30.9	24.3	11.7	19.9	13.2	74.4	1.7	3.0	0.7	0.7	19.5
'88.....	30.8	23.6	11.9	20.3	13.4	73.2	2.6	3.5	0.8	0.8	19.1
'89.....	32.5	23.2	11.4	19.9	13.0	72.9	2.7	3.7	1.0	0.7	19.0
'90.....	32.1	23.1	10.9	20.0	13.9	74.5	2.6	3.5	0.9	0.6	17.9
'91.....	31.0	21.9	12.8	17.2	13.1	73.7	2.5	3.3	0.7	0.4	19.4
'92.....	36.8	24.3	9.9	17.5	11.5	78.7	2.0	2.8	0.5	0.4	15.6
'93.....	31.9	25.9	11.2	18.2	12.8	74.0	2.4	3.4	0.7	0.5	19.0
'94.....	43.3	19.9	10.3	15.6	10.9	72.3	2.4	3.2	0.5	0.5	21.1
'95.....	31.0	25.6	11.5	19.2	12.7	69.7	2.3	3.6	0.7	0.5	23.2
'96.....	30.1	26.6	10.5	21.1	11.7	66.0	2.3	3.9	0.8	0.5	26.5

UNITED KINGDOM.

IMPORTS (General Trade).

Years.	Animals, Living, for Food.	Articles of Food and Drink, Free of Duty, and Dutiable, including Tobacco.	Raw Materials for Textile Manufactures.	Raw Materials for sundry Industries and Manufactures.	Metals.	Chemicals, Dye-Staffs, and Tanning Substances.	Oils.	Manufactured Articles.	Miscellaneous Articles, including Parcel Post.
	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.	% of total value.	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.
'90.....	2.7	39.5	20.3	9.9	5.6	1.9	1.7	15.0	3.4
'91.....	2.1	41.1	20.5	9.2	5.3	1.7	1.7	14.9	3.5
'92.....	2.2	42.2	18.3	9.9	5.0	1.6	1.7	15.4	3.7
'93.....	1.6	42.6	16.8	10.1	5.1	1.6	1.8	16.3	4.1
'94.....	2.2	40.9	17.3	10.6	4.7	1.5	1.8	16.9	4.1
'95.....	2.2	40.4	17.0	10.6	4.5	1.6	1.9	18.1	3.7
'96.....	2.4	39.9	17.0	10.7	4.6	1.5	1.9	15.4	3.6

EXPORTS (Special Trade).

Years.	Animals, Living.	Articles of Food and Drink.	Raw Materials.	Yarns and Textile Fabrics.	Metals and Articles Manufactured therefrom (except Machinery).	Machinery and Millwork.	Apparel and Articles of Personal Use.	Chemicals and Chemical and Medicinal Preparations.	All other Articles either Manufactured or partly Manufactured, including Parcel Post.
	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.	Per cent. of total value.
90.....	0.3	4.3	8.2	42.7	17.2	6.2	4.3	3.4	13.4
91.....	0.3	4.3	8.6	42.9	15.8	6.4	4.6	3.6	13.5
92.....	0.3	4.6	8.5	44.1	14.6	6.1	4.6	3.8	13.4
93.....	0.3	4.9	7.8	44.3	14.1	6.4	4.4	3.9	13.9
94.....	0.3	5.0	9.2	44.5	13.0	6.6	4.0	3.9	13.5
95.....	0.3	5.0	8.1	44.8	12.8	6.7	4.1	3.7	14.5
96.....	0.4	4.7	7.4	43.9	14.0	7.1	4.4	3.4	14.7

DISCUSSION *on* MAJOR CRAIGIE'S PAPER.

MR. F. HENDRIKS said, in responding to Major Craigie's invitation, that he should give some account of the proceedings in Section 4, of which he was Vice-President, that it was perfectly impossible in ten minutes to go minutely into the conclusions of a Committee whose labours were comprised in a volume of some fifty or sixty pages. However he would deposit a copy of the report with the Statistical Society, so that if any member took an interest in the proceedings of that Section, they would be at his disposal. He might say, however, that they had not advanced one step in getting at any figures of personalty in the general acceptation of the term, *la fortune mobilière*, as the French called it, but had simply got at a rough estimate for different countries of the *valeurs mobilières*, which was quite a different matter. That term merely implied stock exchange negotiable securities of various countries. These results could not be accepted as more than a rough approximation; still, for a comparison of different countries *inter se* they had their value, and it was probable that some of the suggestions of his colleagues on the occasion of the St. Petersburg meeting would be found extremely interesting. He believed the report was intended also to appear, as indeed a notice of it had already appeared, in the *Journal* of the Statistical Society of Paris, of which M. Neymarck was a former President. By M. Neymarck's able initiative and untiring perseverance the inquiry on personal property by the International Statistical Institute was in point of fact set on foot. In conclusion he wished to bear testimony to the admirable manner in which Major Craigie had carried out the very difficult task of putting into reasonable compass the exhaustive discussions of statistical work in St. Petersburg.

Mr. A. E. BATEMAN agreed with Mr. Hendriks that Major Craigie had done his work admirably. The only point he need allude to was his own particular branch, in which he acted as *rapporteur* in connection with international statistics of trade. There was no subject on which people were more fond of dogmatising than on trade statistics, and talking about the trade of one country going down and another going up, of one country having the balance of trade and the other not. But really great caution was required in comparing the trade accounts of different countries, as would be seen by turning to Tables VII, VIII, and IX in the Appendix, and observing what great divergence of method there was in preparing the returns. Some returns specified the country of origin of the imports, others only the place whence the goods were imported. In the latter case there might be a great difference from one particular line of steamers making a change in the port from which they started. Similarly, as regards the exports, some countries registered the ultimate destination of the goods, while others took the port of immediate destination. Then there were other difficulties, such as the method of valuing, which was different in most countries. Our own method in England

appeared to be the best, as it took into account the market value at the moment as declared by the importer and exporter. Other countries as a rule had official values which were revised every year, or sometimes once in three years, so that the monthly accounts of those countries never showed what the actual value of the goods coming and going was, but the values of a year or two before. A third point was that of classification. In Table IX he had taken out the different categories under which the chief countries classified their articles of import and export, and anybody who was studying the situation of a country would find this table of some value. When changes were found in these categories, say, for instance, in manufactured articles, and that, as in the case of Germany, Italy, Switzerland, and other countries, the exports of manufactures were increasing, while those of food were decreasing in percentage, a good idea might be obtained of their industrial activity and their competition with England. In the same way with raw materials and articles of food. The categories did not all agree between different countries, but they remained the same from year to year, so that the percentages would not be affected. It was desirable to draw attention to these points at the present time, when there were so many controversies about trade.

He thought they deserved credit at St. Petersburg for sticking to the business of the Institute, which was to try and make more comparable the statistics of different countries, and to show each other what they were doing. One small point which Major Craigie had just alluded to was the number of ladies found in the census offices. He made further inquiries, and found that there had recently been an interesting economical and social development in Russia. Owing to the recent fall in price of corn, many landed proprietors and others who had houses in St. Petersburg were glad that their daughters should earn something towards the cost of their clothing and keeping up their proper position. They had therefore procured their daughters admission to government offices as clerks, for which they received about a rouble a day, equal to 2s. 1½d. These ladies were not the daughters of small shopkeepers, but as a rule the daughters of the minor *noblesse* in Russia, and were found in large numbers in all the offices. The accounts he had of them were very favourable. Four or five of these ladies were attached to the International Institute's bureau during the recent congress, and were a great help in making French translations, typewriting, &c. He had received great assistance from them which he should like to acknowledge there as he had done on the spot. Some of them seemed to have a great aptitude for statistics, which gave him the idea that if they could persuade more ladies to join the Society and read papers, it would be much to the Society's advantage.

SIR RAWSON W. RAWSON said that before making any remarks on the paper he believed he had, through the lamented death of one of their oldest members, the late Mr. James Heywood, F.R.S., become the *doyen* and certainly the oldest member connected with

the direction of the Royal Statistical Society, and therefore he might be entitled to speak in the name of the Society, and say with what pleasure they saw Mr. Courtney in the Chair, and express the confidence which he felt they would have in him during his term of office as a most active, zealous and sympathetic supporter of their labours.

The paper, he thought, was hardly one for general discussion, but he should be disloyal to the Institute which had done him the honour to name him as its President, and to repeat that nomination now for six biennial terms, if he did not thank Major Craigie for his very valuable *résumé* of the proceedings at St. Petersburg, in which he had unhappily been unable to take any part himself through illness. The Statistical Society, as the parent of the Institute, must feel some interest in what had been done, and in finding how far its offspring had walked in the ways and profited by the example of the parent Society. The Statistical Society had of course taken up as its principal field of labour their own kingdom; the Institute had a very much larger field, dealing with the statistics of every nation, and therefore had been naturally obliged to step slowly and warily in the endeavour to conciliate and bring together the representatives of the different civilised countries, and to mould their statistics in such a manner as to render them comparable. At the commencement there had been a good deal of jealousy and fear of intrusion, but though they might not have marched at a pace which might gratify the expectation of ardent statisticians, they had at least not been idle. They had attacked a number of important subjects, and had reconciled the representatives of other governments, who were sometimes very difficult to please, to the consideration of these subjects in a body constituted like the Institute. He did not say there were no jealousies still existing, but they had to a great extent been reconciled, and the members were all working most cordially together. He agreed with Major Craigie that they had perhaps attempted too much. The short time they were together prevented their discussing as fully as was desirable many of the subjects brought forward, but it was their object to elicit the views of the very competent and distinguished men who attended the meetings, amongst whom were most of the directors of the Statistical *Bureaux* of the governments of Europe. Major Craigie had given a very full and impartial account of the proceedings, but, of course, as he could not be omnipresent, he might not have been able to do equal justice to all the papers, or might even have overlooked some details, but he (Sir Rawson) could vouch for it, he had been impartial, and both this Society and the International Statistical Institute were much indebted to him. Further information might be obtained on any of the subjects treated at this meeting in the *Bulletin* of the Institute, which was published annually.

Mr. JOHN MACDONELL desired to point out the very great value of some of the contributions laid before the St. Petersburg meetings with regard to subjects which he happened to have studied, and in particular international criminal statistics. That

question had passed through three stages. First, the stage of youth and faith, in which statisticians believed it was perfectly easy to establish comparisons between the criminal statistics of any two countries. There was the second stage, which he might call the stage of despair, in which statisticians, looking more closely into the difficulties of the subject, came to the conclusion that such comparisons were deceptive and useless: that a crime which was designated by a particular name in France for example, did not turn out on closer examination to have its exact equivalent in any crime known to the English law; and that facts which had been compared had little in common. A third stage had now been reached, the stage of moderate expectations, and he believed the papers that had been referred to by M. Tarnovsky and M. Bodio were examples of this stage. Excellent though those papers were, he noticed, on the hasty inspection which he had made of them, some slight slips. At p. 758 there was a very interesting comparison between the acquittals in Russia and in France, and there was a table at the bottom of p. 760 in which the subject of libel was dealt with. It appeared there that acquittals in Russia in cases of libel amounted to 54 per cent., whilst in France in the years 1889-93 they were 30 per cent. Now he happened to look at some figures dealing with a slightly earlier period in France, 1881-85, and he found that the figures for that period were almost exactly the same as those given for Russia, namely, 52 per cent. Taking another period in France, the figures were 51 per cent. That showed how careful one must be not to lay too much stress on figures which related only to short periods. Again, on p. 777, there was an extremely interesting table with reference to divorce and judicial separation in the chief countries of Europe. That table, read subject to all proper limitations, so far as he knew, was correct, but he feared it was not always read with the proper qualifications and reservations. Some of the figures related to divorce only, some to judicial separation only, and some to both. With regard to England and Wales, there was one important omission which was passed over in almost all statistical inquiries with regard to this subject. The figures printed in this table were those relating to divorce and judicial separations decreed in the divorce court. But it was well known that magistrates had, under certain circumstances, powers, which had been fortified by a recent Act, to make orders which had virtually the same effect as decrees for judicial separation. This was rather an important qualification, because, if it were lost sight of, England and Wales would be near the bottom of the list, while, adding that information, it might not be far from the top. Another qualification also occurred to him in looking at another interesting paper, that of M. Tarnovsky—The writer spoke generally of acquittals in Russia. He was not sufficiently familiar with the state of things in Russia to speak with confidence on that point, but if Russia were in that respect at all like England and Wales, figures given for the whole of that vast empire would not be very instructive. The percentages of acquittals varied in the most astonishing manner throughout England and Wales. The highest percentage was to be found in

the Welsh counties, where, roughly speaking, it was 50 per cent., while it fell to something like 20 or 25 per cent. in other counties. A very important consideration in that respect was the nature of the offence. In the case of certain crimes, such as burglary, there were nearly 90 per cent., whereas in other cases its percentage did not amount to more than 30. These studies were of great value, and he was confident that the more they were carried out the more clearly one important conclusion would be brought out, namely, that all statistical phenomena, moral and commercial, were closely connected, and that just as the physicist could find a sort of likeness in the fauna, flora, and geology of a district, so the student of moral statistics must come to the conclusion that there was a close relationship between all the phenomena which he studied.

Mr. R. H. HOOKER remarked that the author had reproduced one table which seemed to require qualification. Dr. Bertillon's table on p. 753, showed that the birth-rate per 1,000 women aged 15—50 was about three times as great in the poor quarters of large cities as in the rich. But this was no guide to the comparative birth-rates of rich and poor, for in the rich districts there was a very large number of domestic servants who were precisely of the ages considered, and nearly all of whom were necessarily unmarried. To estimate in some degree the effect of these he (Mr. Hooker) had worked out the birth-rate per 1,000 married women aged 15—45, and he found that, comparing Hampstead with Whitechapel (taken as instances of a rich and a poor district), while Dr. Bertillon's method gave birth-rates of 61 and 178 respectively—practically as given in the paper—the rate per 1,000 married was 225 and 338; *i.e.*, an excess of over 200 per cent. was at once reduced to 50 per cent only, so that three-quarters of Dr. Bertillon's excess was knocked off by this consideration alone. The number of domestic servants for each London district was not given in the census, but in the quarter termed "west" it appeared that no less than 23.6 per cent. of all the occupied women were domestic servants, a number which would evidently completely disturb the marriage-rate.

Mr. J. A. BAINES said that considering the lateness of the hour, he would reserve any remarks he had to make with regard to the Russian Census, 1897, and the proposed Universal Census of 1900 for a future number of the *Journal*.

The RIGHT HON. LEONARD H. COURTNEY (President) said that he had to offer his sincere thanks to Sir Rawson Rawson for the way in which he had spoken of himself. He was afraid he should prove a very inefficient President, owing to circumstances over which he had not entire control, but what he could do he should try to do. With respect to the paper read by Major Craigie, it would be manifestly impossible in the course of half an hour to master all the multifarious topics which were dealt with. He could not express too highly the value of the work to which the International Institute devoted itself. It was quite possible, as

had been said by Mr. Macdonell, that their labours were not yet perfect; probably it would be a long time before they approached any degree of perfection, but they might establish what might be called the same vocabulary, the same point of observation, the same dates of departure, and the same method of compilation. If this could be realised in any degree amongst the civilised nations of the world, a great advance would be made towards arriving at really exact statistics, not merely of particular kingdoms, but for comparison between different nations. The question of population was one which ought to be one of the simplest matters, but it was not so. The same methods of enumeration, division, and classification not being followed by various nations, there was considerable difficulty in getting the same data fixed upon. He did not think himself that, if the period of observation was sufficiently short and the censuses sufficiently numerous, it was of the utmost importance that they should get the same date. He despaired entirely of nations agreeing to make all their enumerations on one day. It would not be easy for England to depart from the periods for which they had so many decennial censuses, as they would then lose the advantage of comparison, so that they were almost bound to adhere to the period which had been adopted beginning in 1801. They might, he hoped, at no distant date obtain intermediate censuses, and if other nations did the same, they would get a pretty fair comparison as to the movement of numbers between nations, even although they had different dates of departure. They might also fairly hope in time to get something like the same method of classification. Sex, of course, was extremely easy, but the classification of occupations was a matter in which no great advance to exactness had been made even amongst ourselves, and therefore we could not expect to find other nations at once ready to join with us in any particular line. He noticed that Major Craigie omitted any reference to the United States, but on the question of time, no doubt they would find much the same difficulty as ourselves, although as their censuses were coincident with the years 1860, 1870, 1880, and so on, there would be no change of year, but the date would be different from that suggested for an international census. He confessed he thought Mr. Bateman was a little sanguine in expecting to get pretty exact valuations in commercial matters in respect of trade. No doubt justifiably, he said we had the best method, although that was only introduced within recent times, namely, that of taking the declared values of the exports and imports as the basis of calculation. That was pretty easy, and in this country pretty trustworthy. But in dealing with a nation or colony that had import duties *ad valorem*, he thought there would be considerable hesitation in taking the value on importation declared by the importer as forming a trustworthy basis of comparison. In this matter, as in many others, they might try to get uniformity, but it was no use to aim at that if in the pursuit they lost exactitude and trustworthiness. He would conclude by moving a most cordial vote of thanks to Major Craigie for the extremely careful and complete paper he had submitted.