It was also, in his opinion, undesirable that the Committee of Experts should be empowered, as was proposed in the final paragraph of the report of the Sub-Committee, to issue binding recommendations based on the results of the suggested experiments.

The Chairman pointed out that the conclusions of the Committee of Experts would not be binding. They would merely be recommendations, submitted for further consideration by the countries concerned.

M. Pieckalkiewicz (Poland) said that the recommendations of the Committee of Experts, though they might not be legally binding, would have great moral force and would affect binding on the countries concerned. He would propose to substitute for the recommendation put forward by the Sub-Committee the following text:

"Each of the High Contracting Parties undertakes to study the indication of countries of origin, production and purchase, and to forward the results of these enquiries to the Committee of Experts. The Committee will formulate amendments to the Convention for consideration by a further Conference."

He would urge that his amendment gave the sense and substance of the proposals submitted by the Sub-Committee. A further study of the question was desired, but he did not think that any special method of enquiry or experiment should be laid down, but that each country should be left free to choose its own method of investigation.

The definitions of country of origin, consignment and purchase might, in his opinion, be more appropriately inserted in the Protocol.

The Chairman said he did not think there would be any objection to suppressing the words "of provenance and destination", as M. Pieckalkiewicz had proposed.

M. Gayon (France) said he was prepared to accept the suppression of the words in question. The delegate for Poland referred to four separate points.

First, he had argued that in certain cases the country of origin and purchase were the same. The experiment proposed by the Sub-Committee should not, however, be made in respect of such goods, but in respect of goods of which the countries of origin, consignment and purchase were different, it being understood that each country would be free to select the commodities in respect of which the enquiry would be conducted.

On the other hand, the Polish delegate had alluded to the practical difficulties of making the experiment, and in particular to the confusion which might result from applying to one particular class of goods a different method from that applied to goods in general. He would point out, however, that the Sub-Committee was not suggesting an experiment on a large scale, but a limited enquiry to be organised at the discretion of the countries concerned, and having regard to their commercial requirements and conditions.

The Polish delegate had also suggested that all reference to the method of experiment should be suppressed, and that each country should be left free to decide upon the lines of its enquiries. He would point out in this connection that enquiries might be theoretical or practical. The theoretical aspects of the problem had been considered for over fifty years, without any practical advance being made. It was now felt necessary to proceed to a practical experiment which might give the scientific experts a firm basis on which to work. It was for this reason that the Sub-Committee had decided to define the method to be applied in the experiment with the three systems under consideration.

The Polish delegate had referred to the compulsory character of the recommendations of the Committee of Experts. M. Gayon would point out that these recommendations would not be in any sense obligatory. The Committee of Experts would merely examine the results of the experiments made by the various States, and would express an opinion on those results. They might, as a result of the experiments, conclude that no general solution of the problem was possible and that each country should be left to its own devices. In any case, the views of the Committee of Experts would merely be presented in the form of an opinion and accompanied by an argued statement of reasons. The views of all countries interested in the question would be carefully considered, and the results of the enquiry would necessarily form the basis of discussion at a further Conference.

M. Pieckalkiewicz (Poland) said that, if his amendment were not acceptable, he would suggest that the words "if possible" should be inserted in the first sub-paragraph of Article 2, paragraph V. He agreed that a practical study of the question was necessary, but the enquiry would have to be conducted by each country according to methods which were most appropriate and no definite method should be imposed on any country. All possible methods should be studied, and it should be clear that any conclusions finally adopted would be subject to discussion by a further Conference.

M. Gayon (France), to meet the view of M. Pieckalkiewicz, proposed that the final paragraph of the proposal of the Sub-Committee should read as follows:

"Three months after the Committee of Experts has received all the reports of half the countries signing the present Convention it shall make a summary of the results of the experiment, which shall be communicated to the High Contracting Parties with a view to consideration at a further Conference."

Mr. Flux (British Empire) drew attention to the fact that the statistics of trade referred to in the fifth sub-paragraph of the text submitted by the Sub-Committee were intended to be statistics of aggregate trade by country of provenance or destination. He would therefore suggest that the word "aggregate" should be inserted.

M. Gayon (France) accepted the amendment.
Mr. Flux (British Empire) said that he did not agree with the views embodied in the text submitted by the Sub-Committee. The proposal was to study certain statistics based on three different systems, namely, import statistics indicating: (a) the countries of origin or production; (b) the countries of consignment; and (c) the countries of purchase. In the case of Great Britain, the country of consignment was for statistical purposes the country in which the goods had last been owned; in other words, the country of purchase. There would, therefore, in the British statistics, and perhaps in those of other countries, be only two, and not three systems, and there might as a result be confusion and a lack of comparability.

M. Pickalkiewicz had suggested that the words "if possible" should be introduced into the first paragraph of the proposals relating to the suggested experiment. It would, in his view, be better to state that the whole experiment was suggested in the form of a strong recommendation, and not in the form of a contractual obligation. Personally, he would wish the experiment to be made. In regard to certain important products, he felt it would be highly useful and desirable for the representatives of different statistical organisations to co-operate in order to ascertain, in respect of these commodities, not only the countries from which they were obtained but the countries in which they had been produced. If the experiment were put forward in the form of a recommendation, it would be possible to make it more definite and precise. There were certain delegates who would be glad to enter into agreements with a view to still further enquiries, and though the experiment were only embodied in a recommendation, there were certain countries which would accept that recommendation as in effect an obligation, and would certainly act upon it.

Mr. Ito (Japan) said he had not taken part in the discussions in the Sub-Committee. He sympathised with the objects of the experiment proposed, and thought it was desirable that it should be undertaken by a large number of countries. For technical reasons, however, he would be glad if the Conference were to put forward the proposals for that experiment in the form of a strong recommendation rather than in that of a contractual obligation.

Mr. Hobson (United States of America) said he thought that the difficulties of the proposed experiment had been somewhat exaggerated. If the Committee decided not to accept an obligation in this connection, but merely to put forward a recommendation, he felt that the recommendation should go further than the proposals embodied in the present text, and that in particular a specific reference should be made to certain commodities. It would, for example, be of great interest to the British and American authorities to make an enquiry of the kind proposed in respect of imports and exports of wheat. There should be some correlation between the commodities in respect of which the experiment was made, otherwise the value of the work would not be great. The commodities chosen should be such as could easily be identified, and such as entered into the import and export trade of the majority of countries.

M. Colombo (Italy) said that, as a Customs statistician, he did not see any serious difficulty in the way of the proposed experiment, particularly as each country was left free to choose the commodities to which the experiment should apply. In many cases, it would merely be necessary to issue instructions to the Customs officers to examine waybills, certificates of origin and bills of lading. It would not be necessary to ask traders for any further information, but merely to require a more thorough examination and more complete returns from the services concerned. The Italian Government was prepared to undertake the extra work, and was of opinion that the proposals should take the form of a contractual obligation.

Mr. Flux (British Empire) said he thought that the difficulty of obtaining the additional information necessary was rather greater than the delegate for Italy assumed. It would be necessary to ask traders to supply supplementary data. Most imported goods were not, in his country, accompanied by certificates of origin, and there was no provision in the forms used for the inclusion of the information required. Some way would have to be found of meeting this difficulty. It would not suffice merely to take and summarise data already available.

M. Barboza-Carneiro (Brazil) emphasised the scientific importance of the proposal. It was desirable that this experiment should be made, and, if the proposal were put forward in the form of a recommendation, the experiments would be made by only a small number of countries, and, as the results would be inadequate, their work would in effect be wasted. He would urge the Committee to accept the proposal as an obligation. In his country there would be no serious difficulty involved by the proposed enquiry, since in Brazil the system of consular invoices had been adopted, whereby the countries of provenance and purchase were indicated. The proposed experiment would merely mean more work for the services concerned, but the Brazilian Government was prepared to do what was necessary.

M. Julin (Belgium), Rapporteur, asked the Committee to support the proposals as submitted by the Sub-Committee. Agreement had been reached in the Sub-Committee on the previous day, and the points to which M. Pickalkiewicz had alluded had already been met. It was now suggested that the difficulty involved by the proposed enquiry, since in Brazil the system of consular invoices had been adopted, whereby the countries of provenance and purchase were indicated. The proposed experiment would merely mean more work for the services concerned, but the Brazilian Government was prepared to do what was necessary.

Mr. Riddell (Canada) said he had hoped that the proposals of the Sub-Committee would be even stronger and more definite than they were. There had been a very thorough and profitable
discussion of the question in the Sub-Committee. He felt that the Committee was indebted to the Sub-Committee and particularly to the representative of France for the work which had been done. The moment had now come for a final decision, and he would urge the Committee to accept the proposals before them without further discussion or amendment. The obligation accepted by the signatories of the Convention was an obligation for twelve months only. The experiment, to be successful, should be obligatory, and it would be better to embody that obligation in the Convention, subject to the reservations of countries which could not accept it, than to put forward a mere recommendation. It would certainly be possible to get an adequate number of countries to accept the obligation and possibly to agree upon the lines on which the proposed experiment should be conducted.

The whole question of the economic interdependence of nations was at issue. The proposed enquiry would do much to demonstrate that interdependence and, once that interdependence was realised, the world would more readily co-operate in the interests of peace. A reference to this general aspect of the question might perhaps be made in the report of the Committee. Canada was prepared to assume the proposed obligation and would welcome the opportunity of co-operating with other Governments.

The Chairman proposed that the Committee should vote on the question whether the proposals put forward by the Sub-Committee should be adopted in the form of a recommendation or of a contractual obligation. The Committee decided that the proposals should be adopted in the form of a contractual obligation.

M. Gayon (France) proposed that the text of the first paragraph of the provisions relating to the proposed experiment should read as follows:

"Each of the High Contracting Parties undertakes, by such methods of investigation which may be at its disposal, to prepare, as an experiment, for a period of twelve consecutive months, and in respect of a number of articles of trade to be selected by itself, statistical tables indicating on a comparative basis: (a) the countries of origin or production; (b) the countries of consignment; (c) the countries of purchase." The amendment was approved and the text of the proposals was adopted subject to the various amendments proposed and accepted during the discussion.

M. Gayon (France) then read the following amended text of the paragraphs contained in document C.S.O./Commerce/41, relating to the proposed experiment:

"Import and export statistics, indicating on a comparative basis, according to cases, the countries of origin, consignment and purchase; or of consumption, consignment and sale. By country of origin or production is meant the country. By country of consignment is meant the country where the goods were purchased or, failing this, the country of consignment. By country of consumption is meant the country where the goods will be put to the use for which they were produced or undergo a process of transformation, if it be understood that re-packing, mixing or re-sorting do not constitute transformation; By country of consignment is meant the country from which the goods were actually dispatched, with or without interruption of transit in the course of transport, but without any commercial transaction in the intermediate countries; By country of sale is meant the country to which the goods were sold or, failing this, the country of consignment. One year after ."

Mr. Flux (British Empire) said he was bound to raise the same objections to the above draft as he had raised to the text of the proposals relating to imports. In Great Britain, for statistical purposes, the country of sale and the country of consignment were identical, and no distinction could be drawn between them. In respect of the proposal relating to the country of consumption, he would urge that the proposed data would either be useless or impossible of collection. It would, for example, be useless in the case of a commodity such as wool, which came to England from Australia or elsewhere in its greasy state, and was scoured in England before proceeding elsewhere for final consumption. Statistics describing England as the country of consumption would in such a case be of no significance from the point of view of showing the distribution of products over the world. The process of transformation was in this case so trifling that for practical purposes it might be regarded as negligible. Such statistics would not show where the product was effectively utilised. Such statistics would, moreover, in many cases be impossible of collection. In the definition of special trade, there had been included a category known as nationalised goods. Such goods need not necessarily be goods which were radically transformed, or consumed, in the country in which they were nationalised. They were, in fact, lost in the special trade of the country. How, moreover, was it possible to deal with goods consigned "for orders"? Such goods would be allocated to their port of discharge, but the port of discharge did not necessarily afford any indication of the country of effective consumption or transformation, and it was impossible to ascertain what ultimately became of those goods.

He would, therefore, move that the Committee should not approve of the extension of the proposed experiment to exports.

He felt, however, that co-operation between certain countries in respect of articles of importance might lead to useful results, and he was in favour of such co-operation being encouraged. The system embodied in the present proposals, however, did not seem likely to further such enquiries.
M. GAYON (France) said he did not think there was any fundamental disagreement between himself and Mr. Flux. The stipulations relating to the conditions were prefaced by a statement of reasons. In the sixth paragraph of the statement of reasons, allusion was made to the respective difficulties of application in the various countries of the different methods, and it was understood that the experiment would be made in so far as those difficulties allowed. A country which could not furnish the whole programme of statistics provided for might be exempted by submitting to the Committee of Experts a statement of the special difficulties which it encountered, and it would be for the Committee of Experts to take those difficulties into account and estimate their validity. One of the objects of the experiment was precisely to reveal and define the difficulties to which Mr. Flux had alluded.

The Committee adopted the revised text, subject to the amendments proposed and accepted during the discussion.

The text of Article 2, paragraph V was adopted as a whole.

M. Funk (Free City of Danzig) said he had various textual amendments which he would like to submit for consideration.

The CHAIRMAN asked him to forward these amendments to the Drafting Committee.

Amendment submitted by the Japanese Delegation.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Japanese delegation had proposed the following amendment: "Repair trade is assimilated to finishing trade. There is, however, no objection to a country drawing up two separate tables for repair trade and finishing trade if it so desires."

The amendment was adopted.

TWELFTH MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE ON TRADE STATISTICS.

Held on Saturday, December 8th, 1928, at 3.30 p.m.

Chairman: M. Wagemann.

34. Adoption by the Committee of the Text of Paragraphs relating to Fisheries (Document C.S.O./Commerce/42.)

M. Ito (Japan) pointed out that in paragraph IV of the Annex the French and English texts were not in agreement. He suggested that the text would be clearer if in paragraph I of the Annex the words "and cultivated aquatic products" were deleted and in the English text of paragraph IV there were inserted at the end of the paragraph the words "and the aquicultural products of the countries concerned". (In the French text of paragraph IV, delete the words "et des produits aquicoles récoltés" and insert at the end of the paragraph the words "et des produits aquicoles des pays respectifs.")

M. Gayon (France) pointed out that the word "aquicole" did not exist in the French language.

The CHAIRMAN thought that the question of the right word to use was a matter of drafting, which might be left to the Drafting Committee. He noted that there was no objection to the text as revised, and declared it adopted.

35. Adoption of List of Countries (Document C.S.O./2/Annex).

M. Gayon (France) read out the list of modifications which he and Mr. Flux, to whom this question had been referred, proposed to make in the draft list of countries. Each delegation, of course, would be entitled to make such modifications as it thought fit at the time of signature of the Convention. It was proposed, further, to add two new items, namely: 206, "Supplies for Foreign Ships", and 207, "Goods consigned 'for Orders'".

36. Discussion of Text of Draft Articles to be submitted to the Conference (Document C.S.O./Commerce/43).

M. Gayon (France) observed that an amendment submitted by the French delegation to Article 2, paragraph III (see document C.S.O./17), had not yet been examined by the Committee, though it was in part covered by an amendment which had been proposed by the Brazilian delegation and adopted (see end of document C.S.O./Commerce/43). His amendment, which was in the form of a recommendation, was as follows:

"Whereas it would contribute not merely to the comparability of trade statistics, but also to the comparability of Customs tariffs, to the facility of international commercial transactions, etc., if all countries adopted:

"(a) Standard definitions of the terms 'gross weight', ‘actual net weight’, 'legal net weight', etc.;

"(b) A standard unit as a basis for the assessment for duty of one class of goods in all countries;"
"The Conference calls the attention of the Council of the League of Nations to the importance of this question, and requests it to instruct the Economic Organisation of the League to investigate the matter."

M. Piekalkiewicz (Poland) observed that the question of assessment for duty mentioned in the French delegation’s proposal was beyond the competence of the present Conference, and he would therefore suggest that the term should be altered to read “a standard unit as a basis for the statistics”.

M. Gayon (France) pointed out that in general the standard unit used for the compilation of statistics was the same as that used for the assessment of Customs duties. The Chairman remarked that in many countries, for instance in Germany, for statistical purposes, other units in addition to those required for revenue purposes had to be furnished.

Mr. Flux (British Empire) observed that the French delegation’s proposal consisted of two parts. It had not been suggested that the first part was beyond the competence of the Conference. The second part, on the other hand, seemed to be very closely allied with the work of the Committee on Customs Nomenclature, and Mr. Flux would ask M. Gayon if he would be satisfied with a proposal that the Committee on Customs Nomenclature should be requested to study the question inasmuch as the classification to be adopted for statistical purposes awaited the final preparation of the scheme to be submitted by that Committee. That proposal would in no way delay the results of the work of the present Conference.

M. Colomb (Italy) agreed with the Chairman. In Italy, for instance, the basis used for the assessment of duty was gross weight, but that employed for the compilation of statistics was net weight. He therefore supported the proposal of the Polish delegate.

M. Gayon (France) suggested the following amendment: “a standard unit as a basis for the commercial statistics of one class of goods in all countries.”

The Chairman noted that there was no objection to M. Gayon’s amendment, and that the French delegation’s proposal as amended was adopted.

M. Acklin (Switzerland), with reference to the articles dealing with fishery statistics, observed that Switzerland had no sea-coast and that her inland-water fisheries were of no great importance. He took it, however, that the articles in question did not concern Switzerland, and that it would therefore be unnecessary to make a special statement to this effect in the Convention.

M. Rothe (Austria) and M. Mráz (Czechoslovakia) associated themselves with the declaration of the Swiss delegate.

The Chairman observed that reservations to this effect might be inserted in the Protocol.

M. Dvolaitsky (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), with reference to the articles dealing with fishery statistics, observed that the text should be amended to read: “Showing the countries from which the goods were despatched.” He suggested, therefore, that the text should be amended to read: “country of despatch and country of receipt.”

M. Piekalkiewicz (Poland) supported the U.S.S.R. delegate’s argument and suggested that the passage should be amended to read: “country of despatch and country of receipt.”

Mr. Hobson (United States of America) thought it would be desirable to consider the document paragraph by paragraph.

The Chairman suggested that, as the English text of M. Julin’s report had not yet been distributed, the Committee should decide to regard that report as the report of the Rapporteur, and, if so, it would be accepted at the meeting of the plenary Conference. In the meantime, the Committee might confine itself to the document C.S.O./Commerce/43, which contained the text of the articles reproduced in M. Julin’s report, and consider that document article by article.

The Committee assented.


Article 1.

M. Rothe (Austria) referred to the reservation on the subject of monthly returns that he had made on behalf of the Austrian Government during the discussion of Article 1, paragraph V, §1. He stated that, as the discussion of this article and of the provisions laid down in document C.S.O./Commerce/28 had shown that it would suffice to publish only aggregate monthly figures and as such figures, arranged in the five groups provided for by the Brussels Convention, were published in the papers every month by the Austrian Government in the form of summaries with specific reference to each country, he would now be able to abandon this reservation.

Article 1 was adopted.

Article 2.

M. Claessens (Netherlands) suggested that the order of the paragraphs in Article 2 should be changed and that paragraph IV should be put in the place of paragraph I.
The CHAIRMAN said that the Drafting Committee would consider the suggestion.

M. DVOLAITSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) presented the following observations on the text of the preparatory document (C.S.O.1), where there was a reference to the U.S.S.R.

It was shown in Table 1, page 68 of the document quoted, which dealt with the methods of compiling statistics of foreign trade, that the U.S.S.R. used official estimates in assessing the value of imports and exports. That was not quite exact. In respect of exports, the basis of the valuation was afforded by the declarations of the exporters, verified according to data obtained by the commercial representative of the U.S.S.R. in regard to the prices at which the goods were sold abroad, not including the cost of transport and insurance. For imports, this valuation was made according to the figures given in the invoices. The figures were checked by the commercial representative, and the values increased by the costs of transport and insurance.

It would be seen that the statistical methods applied by the U.S.S.R. authorities did not in any way differ from the methods proposed under the draft Convention.

M. GAYON (France) suggested that paragraph II of Article 2 should follow paragraph III.

The CHAIRMAN said the Drafting Committee would consider this suggestion.

M. ITO (Japan), referring to paragraph IV (a), pointed out that transhipment formed part of direct transit trade and did not represent a separate category. He proposed that the reference to transit trade in this paragraph should read: “particulars of: (a) indirect transit, and (b) direct transit, including transhipment”.

The Committee agreed.

Mr. HOBSON (United States of America) enquired as to the meaning of the word “constructive” in the last sub-paragraph of paragraph IV (a) in the English text.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the word “constructive” was intended to be the equivalent of the French word “fictive”. The Drafting Committee might perhaps find a better translation.

M. ROTHE (Austria) asked whether, in accordance with the suggestion in document C.S.O./Commerce/38, the words “or repairs” should not be inserted after the words “for transformation or additional treatment” in paragraph IV of Article 2.

The CHAIRMAN reminded the Austrian delegate that it had been decided on the previous day that repairs were to be regarded as part of the finishing trade.

M. MRÁŽ (Czechoslovakia) thought that the last sub-paragraph of paragraph V, which referred to statistics of aggregate trade by countries, might give the impression that countries which only made returns of special trade were being required to make returns of general trade. He proposed that the text should read “statistics of special or aggregate trade by countries”.

M. GAYON (France) proposed to suppress the word “aggregate”.

The proposal of M. Gayon was adopted.

M. FUNK (Danzig), referring to the first sentence of paragraph V, asked whether provision should not be made for a Customs territory which might not be a country within the meaning of the Convention.

M. GAYON (France) suggested that the words “of a country” should be deleted.

The Committee agreed.

Mr. FLUX (British Empire) pointed out that there was in the paragraph following the recommendation attached to paragraph V, a reference to one or more countries which had entered into a Customs union. The Drafting Committee might perhaps consider this point in relation to the point raised by the delegate of the Free City of Danzig. The paragraph in question should logically be taken with sub-paragraph I of paragraph V.

The CHAIRMAN said the Drafting Committee would consider this observation.

M. COLESCO (Roumania) asked whether the statement of reasons for the adoption of the sub-paragraphs of paragraph V should not be inserted in the Protocol.

The CHAIRMAN said that this statement should remain where it stood, as it constituted an explanation of the sub-paragraphs to which it was attached.

M. MRÁŽ (Czechoslovakia) suggested that the words “or, failing this, the country of consignment” should be struck out from the definitions of the country of purchase and the country of sale. The words in question did not form part of the definitions.

M. GAYON (France) agreed that logically the words were hardly justifiable. They had been added, however, on the motion of the delegate of Sweden, because in certain countries the country of consignment was taken when the country of purchase or the country of sale was not known.

The CHAIRMAN suggested that a vote should be taken on the suppression of these words.

The Committee, by 7 votes to 4, decided in favour of their suppression.
M. Mraž (Czechoslovakia) suggested that the words "with or without interruption of transit in the course of transport, but without any commercial transaction in the intermediate countries" should be struck out of the definition of the country of consignment. It was impossible to ascertain what happened to the goods after consignment.

M. Gayon (France) said that in certain cases it was practically possible to ascertain the final destination of the goods. It was also well to lay down as a matter of principle that these facts should, if practicable, be ascertained. If countries encountered special difficulties in ascertaining these facts, they might draw attention to such difficulties in their report to the Committee of Experts.

M. Mraž (Czechoslovakia) said he was satisfied with that explanation.

M. Rothé (Austria), referring to paragraph VII, asked that there should be inserted in the Protocol a statement to the effect that the provisions of Article 2, Paragraph VII, concerning bunker coal should not apply to Austria, because Austria had only one or two ports on the Danube engaged in international commerce. Austria had no coal, and the vessels did not take their bunker coal from these ports in any appreciable quantity.

M. Nathan (Germany) moved that the word "ports" should be replaced by the expression "seaports".

M. Colombo (Italy) said that Italy had intended to make a reservation in regard to this paragraph, because Italy had no coal. The Convention, however, would provide for returns of transit trade, and figures relating to coal would necessarily enter into those returns. He would therefore not find it necessary to make the contemplated reservation.

M. Gayon (France) pointed out that the expression "seaports" had been avoided at the request of the United States of America and Canada, as it was desired that the bunker coal used on the ports of the Great Lakes should be included.

The Chairman suggested that the expression should read "seaports and ports situated on the Great Lakes".

Mr. Hobson (United States of America) said that the United States had not desired to press a reference to the ports on the Great Lakes. If, however, statistics of international trade were desired, it was better to include the bunker coal used on those lakes. It was merely a question of uniformity.

M. Claessens (Netherlands) asked whether the bunker coal supplied on the Rhine ports was to be included. This bunker coal entered into international commerce.

M. Dvolařítsky (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that there were great lakes in addition to those between United States and Canada. The Caspian Sea must be regarded as a great lake, and was used for purposes of international trade.

M. Colesco (Roumania) thought that all international ports should be included, whether sea, river or lake ports.

The Chairman asked the Committee to vote on the question whether the present text, which referred to ports only, should be retained. The Committee decided not to introduce any amendment.

The proposal of M. Gini was adopted.

The Chairman said the Drafting Committee would consider the point.

M. Piekalkiewicz (Poland) suggested that the reference to bunker coal in paragraph VIII (b) should be deleted. The Chairman said that this reference had been put in, as otherwise the sub-paragraph might seem to conflict with paragraph VII. Mr. Flux (British Empire) said that the reference could very well be omitted from paragraph VIII (b).

Article 1 was adopted, subject to the amendments suggested and approved during the discussion and subject to textual revision by the Drafting Committee.

Clauses of the Protocol.

M. Colombo (Italy) said that the name of his country might be deleted from paragraph IV concerning the reservation in regard to bunker coal.

M. Colesco (Roumania) said that the name of Roumania might also be deleted.
M. Acklin (Switzerland) said that the name of Switzerland would have to be added to the list. The clauses of the Protocol were adopted.

Draft Recommendations.

M. Birkovitch (Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) made the following declaration:

"With reference to the recommendation that, until the new tariff nomenclature has been adopted, the States shall furnish the International Bureau of Commercial Statistics at Brussels with summaries in accordance with the International Convention of Brussels of 1913, the delegation of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes considers that this recommendation entails certain inconveniences for States, which, like the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes have not signed the Convention.

"The application of such a provision would involve a provisional modification in the organisation of the external trade statistics of the country and no inconsequential expenditure for a relatively brief period until the new statistical nomenclature of international commerce has been adopted.

"The delegation of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes makes no reservation because the provision is embodied in a recommendation, but desires, however, that this declaration should be placed on the Minutes."

M. Duzmans (Latvia) said he desired to make a declaration on behalf of his own country and on behalf of Estonia. He did not think a reservation was necessary as the provisions to which he desired to refer were only embodied in a recommendation. In Estonia and Latvia, a new nomenclature, based on the provisions of the International Convention of 1913, would be introduced in January 1929. He trusted that the application of this new nomenclature would not be regarded as in any way inconsistent with the spirit of the provisions of the present recommendation.

M. Janssen (Belgium) said that the Latvian and Estonian Governments were at liberty to act as they pleased in the matter, since the reference to changes in existing statistical practice was only the subject of a recommendation. He would, in view of the reference which had been made to the Convention of 1913, urge the delegates to support the Brussels Bureau to the fullest possible extent. The Convention of 1913 marked an important step forward in the progress of international statistics. He would emphasise the importance of as many States as possible signing and ratifying that Convention.

M. Gini (Italy) thought that Recommendation 4 should only apply to States which had ratified the Brussels Convention. Italy had signed the Convention, but had not yet ratified it. He proposed that the words "which have ratified the Brussels Convention" should be inserted after the word "States".

Mr. Flux (British Empire) pointed out that certain countries, like the United States of America and some of the South American countries, supplied the International Bureau of Commercial Statistics at Brussels with summaries as approved by the Convention of 1913, even though they had not ratified that Convention. These States would not be included if the scope of the recommendation were limited, as M. Gini suggested.

M. Gini (Italy) said that, as Italy had signed but not ratified the Convention, he would feel it necessary to make a reservation on behalf of his country, if the scope of the recommendation were not limited in the way he had suggested. Nothing would prevent States from supplying the International Bureau of Commercial Statistics if they so desired, even though they were not explicitly included in the terms of the recommendation.

M. Janssen (Belgium) said that the supplying of the Bureau with summaries and returns was not the only question at issue. It was important that States should sign and ratify the Convention, because the expenses of the Bureau were borne by the High Contracting Parties. It was only fair that those who acted in accordance with the principles laid down in the Convention and forwarded their returns to the Bureau should share its expenses.

M. Gayon (France) hoped that all countries would ratify the Convention of 1913. He suggested that Recommendation 4 should be amended so that it might refer, not to States which supplied the International Bureau of Commercial Statistics with summaries, but to States which "published the summaries approved by the International Convention of Brussels, 1913". Such States would, under the recommendation as amended, publish the summaries themselves instead of sending them to Brussels to be published at the expense of the Bureau.

The Chairman asked the Committee to vote on the amendment of M. Gini. The amendment was rejected. Recommendation 4 was adopted without amendment.

M. Gini (Italy) said that, in view of the rejection of his amendment, he would be obliged to make a reservation in the Protocol if the plenary meeting of the Conference did not modify the decision of the Committee.

M. Dvolaitsky (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that the U.S.S.R. had not ratified the Convention, which had been signed and ratified by the former Government of Russia. The U.S.S.R., however, had agreed to send the necessary statistics to the Bureau in Brussels.
M. COLESCO (Roumania) said he would be obliged to make the same reservation as the representative of Italy.

M. PIEKALKIEWICZ (Poland) said he desired to submit various textual amendments to Recommendations 1, 2 and 3. In the first recommendation, he thought that the expression “tariff nomenclature” should be replaced by the expression “statistical nomenclature”. In Recommendation 2, the reference to Article 8 needed modification as that article had itself been amended. Lastly, in Resolution 3, he would suppress the words: “which impose so few Customs duties as to be unable to employ”, etc. The recommendation would accordingly read: “That it should be likewise adopted by those countries which are unable to employ . . .”. The recommendation thus became more general in its scope.

M. GAYON (France) proposed that Recommendation 1 and Recommendation 2 should be transposed and that the amendments suggested by M. Piekalkiewicz should be accepted.

The Committee agreed.

The Chairman said the Drafting Committee would make the necessary textual alterations.

Article 13.

M. GAYON (France) said that, under Article 13, the present Convention would come into force three hundred and sixty-five days following its ratification. It would be impossible, however, for the statistical authorities to enforce the provisions of the Convention on a given date, as the necessary changes could only be made at the beginning of the year.

The Chairman said that the Bureau had already dealt with that difficulty.


M. JULIN (Belgium), Rapporteur, read his report.

M. GAYON (France) and Mr. FLUX (British Empire) proposed certain slight modifications, which were introduced in the final text of the report (document C.S.O./Commerce/44 (1)).

The report was provisionally adopted, subject to verbal amendment.
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FIRST MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE ON PRODUCTION STATISTICS.

Held on Wednesday, November 28th, 1928, at 4 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Durand.

The Chairman thanked the delegates for the honour they had done him in electing him Chairman of the Committee on Production Statistics. He was afraid that he was not very familiar with the statistical problems which were peculiar to Europe and the world at large, but perhaps it was better that a chairman had been chosen who was not involved in present controversies. The United States of America had an appreciably developed system of statistics and they would doubtless not find it very difficult to adopt in practice the resolutions of the Conference. As an American, he was not very familiar with the methods of procedure and discussion which obtained in Europe, and he would appeal to the indulgence of his colleagues if he should fail at times to act in accordance with their customs. He was happy to feel that he could rely on the assistance of the Secretariat.

1. Election of a Vice-Chairman and Rapporteur.

The Chairman said that the Bureau had thought that, as the Vice-Chairmen of the two Committees were to be attached to the Bureau of the Conference, it was preferable for each Committee to appoint only one Vice-Chairman. He would propose M. Breisky (Austria) as Vice-Chairman.

This proposal, supported by M. Gini (Italy), M. Ito (Japan) and M. Vermaire (Luxemburg), was unanimously adopted.

The Chairman proposed as Rapporteur M. Jahn (Norway), member of the Economic Committee.

This proposal, supported by Mr. Flux (British Empire), M. Gini (Italy), M. Holsti (Finland) and M. Ito (Japan), was unanimously approved.

2. Agenda of the Committee.

The Chairman explained that the Bureau had proposed that the various parts of the draft Convention and other instruments submitted to the Conference should be divided between the two Committees. There were certain general questions, moreover, which might be of interest to one or other of the Committees and which would have to be discussed later by the plenary Conference. Although the two Committees would work to a certain extent in touch with one another, the Bureau had felt it advisable to make a preliminary study of this second series of questions.

The items assigned to the Committee on Production Statistics were the following:

Draft Convention: Article 1, Paragraphs I, II and III, except sub-paragraph (e), which dealt with fisheries and was assigned to the Committee on Trade Statistics; Articles 3, 4 and 5.

Draft Protocol: Paragraph III.

Draft Recommendations: I, III and IV.

Annexes: I, II and III.

Mr. Flux (British Empire) asked whether it was owing to an omission that no mention was made in the distribution of items of certain matters referred to in Chapter III of the draft Convention.

The Chairman replied that these questions were left to the Bureau. The paragraph referring to index numbers of prices, which was a question of a commercial character, fell within the province of the Committee on Trade Statistics, whose programme was appreciably less heavy than that of the present Committee.

Mme. Falkner-Smit (U.S.S.R.) proposed to begin the discussions by studying separately the questions relating to industrial statistics, which formed the most important part of the work of the Committee. The Committee might then take up agricultural statistics and finally statistics of occupations.

The Chairman observed that, for the moment, the Committee was defining the programme of work assigned to it, but not the order in which the various questions would be taken. In reply to a question by M. Dore, he said that the whole question of fisheries had been referred to the Committee on Trade Statistics. Nevertheless, it might happen that certain delegates who sat on the Committee on Production Statistics were specially interested in the problem of the fisheries. Every facility would be given to those delegates to submit their observations on that question, which would be examined at a convenient moment.

M. Huber (France) asked whether the question of the index-numbers of prices would be referred to the Committee on Trade Statistics or to the Bureau.
Mr. Flux (British Empire) hoped that the time for the discussion of the question of fisheries would be chosen with special care, as it was a very important subject for certain countries. Those who were interested in the question should have an opportunity of taking part in the discussion. Doubtless his French colleague had been moved by similar considerations when he had raised the question of the index numbers of prices.

The CHAIRMAN said that he would arrange the work in such a way that the members of the Committee on Production Statistics would be able to be present at the discussion on the question of fisheries.

He was himself particularly interested in the question of the index numbers of prices and would do his utmost to ensure that the discussion of that question would not coincide with the meeting of that Committee.

The Bureau had, moreover, reserved the right to examine a certain number of questions before they were brought before the plenary Conference. The articles thus reserved were Articles 7 to 16 of the draft Convention and Paragraphs I, II and V of the draft Protocol. The Bureau asked delegates who wished to submit to the plenary Conference amendments of a general nature on these articles to communicate them first in writing to the Bureau for a preliminary examination.

The Committee on Production Statistics would probably be obliged before the end of its work to constitute one or more small sub-committees to examine the suggestions and proposals put forward in the course of the discussions. Evidently there would have to be a general drafting committee, but special items would have to be dealt with by sub-committees, of which neither the number nor the constitution could at present be decided. It would probably be found that certain questions would not give rise to any serious difference of opinion; such questions might be settled at a plenary meeting without its being necessary to refer them to a special sub-committee.

3. Programme of Work.

The CHAIRMAN said that the delegate of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics had proposed to begin the discussion with the most difficult questions. The Committee could, of course, accept that procedure if it thought it desirable to do so, but personally he thought it would be better to study first the questions in regard to which settlement appeared to be easy, so that afterwards more time could be devoted to the more delicate problems. The discussion that had taken place in the plenary Conference showed that agreement might easily be reached in regard to a certain number of points. He was the last to desire in any way to curtail the discussion of the more important points and it was precisely for that reason that he proposed first to take the questions which could be most rapidly settled.

Certain members of the present Committee who had not spoken in the plenary Conference might still have observations to make with regard to the general programme of the Committee. He would ask the delegates in question to communicate their names to the Bureau and to confine themselves to observations of a general character, without bringing forward special motions or amendments.

The procedure suggested by the Chairman was approved.

4. General Discussion.

M. van Dam van Isselt (Netherlands) said that the Netherlands Government desired to bring forward objections in regard to Articles 3, 4, 5 and 6, whereby it was proposed that the States should organise or modify their statistics on production in conformity with the methods laid down in Annexes I to IV. It would be impossible for the Netherlands Government to furnish all the information requested. During conversations which had taken place with the representatives of industry in the Netherlands, it had been said that the employers of labour had objections to communicating certain information referred to in the Annexes as such information might prejudice their business interests. For that reason, the Netherlands Government was opposed to the adoption of the draft, which would lay upon it the obligation to furnish such information. On behalf of his Government, he proposed that a paragraph to the following effect should be added to the Protocol:

"It is understood that the Annexes will be used generally as a guide and there will accordingly be no obligation to include in the statistics all the categories of information mentioned in them, but only those the collection and publication of which are, in the opinion of the Government concerned, desirable and possible."

The CHAIRMAN suggested that the observation of the Netherlands delegate should be reserved for further consideration at an appropriate moment.

M. Cavalcanti Albuquerque de Gusmao (Brazil) stated that the public services of Brazil were anxious to make their statistics more and more comprehensive and detailed in order to obtain a better knowledge of local conditions. There still remained, however, a great deal to be done and the difficulties in the way of carrying out adequate enquiries in such a vast country were considerable. The population of the country was very scattered and means of communication were inadequate. The Federal Government had recently organised an important census which was particularly successful. Concurrently with the census of the population, a first general census of the principal branches of production had been taken. The census covered agriculture, cattle-raising and industry properly speaking. The conditions of life of the population had also been studied by means of the enquiries that had been made into the public services, such as lighting, drainage, and the supply of water and electrical energy.
Obviously, these measures would facilitate further enquiries; new material could thus be added and new technicians trained in order that better results might be obtained in the future. The general census which the Federal Government had decided to take in 1930 would put these expectations to the test.

Favourable results could only be obtained gradually, however, and by periodic enquiries progressively comprehensive in character and conducted in accordance with the best methods and the most appropriate measures of research. The draft Convention would be an effective means of obtaining general progress in this direction, provided that due account were taken of the special circumstances of each individual country.

M. Jansson (Sweden) thought he was right in saying that the Swedish annual production statistics were among the most ancient in the world. They had, in fact, existed for a century. Sweden, therefore, had a long experience in this field and that experience had convinced the Swedes of the immense importance of economic statistics. On the other hand, certain difficulties had been encountered, some of which had not been satisfactorily met.

In the first place, emphasis should be laid on the great importance of securing that the various statistical data should be exact and compiled at regular intervals. As the delegate of Italy had said during the general discussion, it was clear that, by extending the field of statistics too rapidly, there was a risk of losing in precision what was being gained in scope. Perhaps, therefore, it would be better to be content with a little less in cases where very inaccurate results could be foreseen.

The scope of the economic statistics of Sweden corresponded in general with the requirements of Article I of the draft Convention. But the Swedish statistics on production were deficient in certain respects. The following were the principal shortcomings:

The censuses of establishments were not quite as complete as was contemplated in the draft Convention. No difficulty was found in obtaining the data requested in respect of industrial establishments of some importance, but the only information in regard to small industries and commercial establishments was that furnished by the censuses of the population. The Swedish Government was at present examining the possibility of taking more complete censuses of establishments than hitherto, but the carrying out of that scheme would involve considerable expense and no decision had yet been taken on the subject by the Government.

Among other fields in which the Swedish statistics were, in certain respects, deficient, that of raw materials must be mentioned.

Finally, he would draw attention to another aspect of the question. In Sweden, the requirements of the system at present in force in respect of the data to be furnished had not encountered any opposition from industrialists. It was clear, however, that one could not be sure of obtaining the same results if such requirements were very much increased. It was essential to be able to count on the goodwill of the interested parties if accurate statistics were to be obtained. It would be quite impossible to compile an index of production without the cordial collaboration of the industrialists. The Swedish Government was convinced of the great importance of an index of the kind proposed and the competent authorities would be keenly interested in the plans for the establishment of a reliable official production index.

Mme. Falkner-Smit (U.S.S.R.) said that the delegation of the U.S.S.R. was proposing to return later to the amendments which it would submit. For the moment, she would confine herself to formulating certain general desiderata and principles in respect of industrial statistics and to describing the results of the work in this field which had been done in the last two years in the U.S.S.R.

A detailed statistical study of industry showed that it was impossible to confine such enquiries to a mere arithmetical enumeration of what was produced. The conditions of a scientifically organised economy like that of the U.S.S.R. required that not only the results of production be studied but also the factors which determined the efficiency and conditions of that production. On that subject, important work had been done in the U.S.S.R. in the form of annual returns relating to all the large and medium-sized industries. For example, annual statements relating to mechanical power and fuel had been drawn up and coefficients of energy utilised and electrification had been calculated. The fixed capital of the different industries and the forms in which it existed had also been studied. Further, a solution had been found to the problem of depreciation charges, which had for a long time been unsuccessfully discussed. When that problem was studied in the U.S.S.R. in connection with a detailed study of the forms in which fixed capital existed, it presented a new aspect and a solution had been found possible. Solutions had been obtained to several questions relating to the enquiry into motive power, thanks to the assistance of the engineers and experts of the U.S.S.R. In addition to the more or less detailed annual statements which could not be prepared very rapidly, the U.S.S.R. published monthly statements compiled on the basis of much shorter questionnaires; monthly figures obtained from these questionnaires were available from the 17th of the month following. The data given in the monthly statements included the volume of production, the number of workers employed, the amount of wages paid, etc. The information obtained dealt with 75 per cent of the larger industries. The results of the efforts made in the U.S.S.R. would to some extent be comparable with those of the American censuses and the censuses of motive power taken in France at the beginning of the century.

The U.S.S.R., however, lacked certain elements of international comparison. In the opinion of the delegation of the U.S.S.R., it was extremely desirable that, during the discussions of the Committee on Production Statistics, light should be thrown on several questions—for example, that of an enquiry into the productivity of industry, particularly in relation to the employment of mechanical and electrical energy. The delegation of the U.S.S.R. also thought it extremely desirable to draw up a classification of the different branches of industry, grouping the units in each category into large, average or small industries and on the basis of a scale which would render
the data comparable between the different countries. Similarly, it would be useful to divide the industrial returns and censuses into those relating to establishments and those relating to production. In order to study not only the results of production but also the conditions determining industrial productivity, it would seem necessary to take together the two aspects of the enquiry just mentioned and to draw up a single statement covering the large industries, which would embrace the various forms of production, on the one hand, and establishments, on the other.

The CHAIRMAN thought that the suggestion to compile statistics of motive power as well as statistics of quantities produced corresponded to the proposals relating to the census of industrial production contained in Annex 1. When a country like the United States of America took a census, the census would naturally cover, not only production proper, but also the number of workers, establishments, motive power, etc. It had, however, been thought advisable to separate these various factors in the draft in order to enable countries which were not in a position to undertake a complex census of agricultural and industrial production to undertake a census of a more simple form.

M. JAHN (Norway), Rapporteur, said he would like to explain briefly the original idea of the Preparatory Committee in regard to statistics of establishments. Statistics of establishments were understood to cover industrial establishments of all kinds. The question how these statistics might be combined with statistics of agriculture and production, etc., was one of organisation and procedure. It had been said in the Preparatory Committee that it was impossible to impose on all countries so extensive a census as that originally contemplated, and this consideration explained the somewhat fragmentary form which had been given to Article 1, Paragraph II.

The CHAIRMAN said he would like to explain how the clause in question would be interpreted in the United States. In that country, a census of factories and mines had already been taken. That census, however, only covered establishments of a certain size and did not extend to small establishments, such as artisans' workshops, shops for the repair of automobiles, etc. In respect of large establishments, therefore, the United States at present conformed with the provisions of Article 1, Paragraph II. An endeavour would be made in the future to include less considerable establishments as far as possible. He would emphasise, however, that the expression used was vague. At what point did an establishment begin to be recognised as an industrial establishment? Allusion had also been made to the census of commercial establishments. Such a census was not at present taken in the United States, but there had been keenly felt and there was reason to hope that it would be carried out in the near future.

5. Programme of Work (continued).

The CHAIRMAN said that the general discussion was now closed. He proposed briefly to review the articles on which agreement appeared to be easy and in regard to which it would be advisable to begin the discussion.

Article 1, Paragraph I, dealt with statistics of occupations. It would be remembered that in Articles 7 and 8 it was proposed to set up a committee of technical experts, who would be instructed to formulate recommendations as to the methods to be followed in dealing with the statistics contemplated in Article 1, in respect of which the other articles of the draft did not lay down any methodological principles. The detailed discussion of the methods to be employed in the compilation of statistics of occupations would therefore be undertaken by the proposed committee of experts. The same was true in regard to statistics of establishments (Paragraph II). Certain parts of Paragraph III, on the other hand, seemed to require long and delicate discussion (non-metallic minerals, ores, statistical series, etc.). Finally, for reasons which had been more or less explained in the plenary Conference, it did not seem necessary to discuss in detail the problem of agricultural statistics, with which other organisations were already dealing.

The Committee on Production Statistics would accordingly begin its discussions on points of detail by taking up the three points indicated above.

He would point out that the International Chamber of Commerce had presented a number of reports from a number of sub-committees of experts on various industries. He would draw the attention of the Committee to those reports and particularly to the reports dealing with the coal, the iron and the metallurgical industries.

He hoped it would be possible for representatives of those committees of experts to take part in the discussions of those questions. He would suggest that the Committee should examine that problem at its meeting on Saturday next without assuming any formal engagement.

The Committee agreed.

The CHAIRMAN said he would like to have some explanations in regard to the relation between Paragraph III, sub-paragraph (g), of Article 1 ("figures, as adequate as each country finds possible, of industrial production") and Article 3.

M. JAHN (Norway) Rapporteur, explained that originally sub-paragraph (g) had not been included in its present form. Only a census of industrial production had been contemplated. It had subsequently been indicated that certain countries could not undertake such a census. For that reason, the original formula had been replaced by the vaguer text of sub-paragraph (g). Article 3, on the contrary, dealt with the case of countries which were prepared to take the census in question. Such countries were invited to adopt the methods indicated in the Annex, which were based on the recommendations of the International Institute of Statistics.

The CHAIRMAN thought that the Committee would be able to discuss sub-paragraph (g) quite apart from the question of the census of production dealt with in Article 3. It need not...
discuss immediately the complicated problem of method raised in the Annex, but could confine itself to examining the problem of production statistics in a general manner.

It seemed advisable to distinguish between sub-paragraphs (g) and (h) of Article 1. It was said in sub-paragraph (h) that the indices of the productivity of the most representative industries should be published at least at quarterly intervals. A State might be prepared to send periodical statements without for that purpose undertaking to make the frequent statistical returns referred to in sub-paragraph (h). In the United States, returns were sometimes made every month or every week, but that did not mean that a State accepting the stipulation of sub-paragraph (g) was undertaking to adopt the system contemplated in sub-paragraph (h).

To sum up, after the Committee on Production Statistics had first examined the three relatively simple articles to which he had referred, it would proceed to examine sub-paragraph (g) and then pass to the more detailed provisions of sub-paragraph (h).

He would, in conclusion, ask those of his colleagues who had amendments to submit on special points to communicate them without delay to the Secretariat in order that discussion might be facilitated and expedited.

SECOND MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE ON PRODUCTION STATISTICS.

Held on Thursday, November 29th, 1928, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Durand.


The Chairman read the following textual amendment which had been submitted by the British delegation (document C.S.O./Prod./8):

"After 'published at least', delete the remainder of the paragraph and substitute: 'once in each decade and should relate to the closing year of the decade (that is to say, 1930, 1940, 1950 and so on) or to a year as near as possible to that closing year' ."

The Delegates of France and of Italy supported the amendment.

The Chairman said that, as no objection was raised, the amendment of the British delegation to Article 1, Paragraph I, was adopted and referred to the Drafting Committee.

M. Platz (Germany) said that censuses of occupations and establishments as envisaged in Article 1, Paragraph I, would not give rise to any difficulties in Germany nor probably in the majority of countries. In Germany, as in many other countries, a census of occupations and establishments was regularly taken. In order that the results of such a census might be comparable, an international agreement would have to be reached in regard to various points of importance and particularly in regard to the analysis of the results of the census.

It was of the first importance that a comparable classification of occupations and establishments should be established. It was well known that preparations for such a classification had for a long time been under consideration by the International Labour Office. Without such an agreement, it would be impossible to compare the results of the censuses in the various countries.

Further, it would be necessary to find an international definition of the term "occupation". Hitherto, auxiliary occupations had been included in certain countries, whereas others did not take them into account. Such was also the case in respect of members of a family working in their father's establishment. He did not think it would be possible to discuss these points in detail at the moment. It would be one of the first duties of the future committee of experts to draw up an international classification and to bring about an agreement on the other points to which he had referred. He would, for the moment, confine himself to the suggestion he had just made; he thought it was particularly desirable that it should be put into effect, as the article in question struck him as rather summary.

The Chairman read the following observations submitted by the delegations of Estonia and Latvia:

"It is laid down in Article 1, paragraph I, that the statistics showing the occupations of the population shall be established at least for the closing year of each decade, that is to say, for 1930, 1940, 1950, etc. Similarly, Article I, Paragraph III, contemplates an agricultural census for the same date. A draft recommendation also contemplates a census of industrial production for the last year of each decade.

"It would therefore seem that, at the same time and during the same year, three distinct censuses are to be undertaken — a census of the population, of agriculture and of industrial production.

"The simultaneous taking of three censuses in the course of a single year is difficult, from the material and technical point of view.

"As the census of the population is usually taken in years which conclude one decade or begin another, it would seem desirable to keep to that date.

"On the other hand, it is necessary to realise the full significance from the point of view of the national finances of taking a census of agriculture and industry at the same time."
In view of the above considerations, is it not desirable to arrange for the censuses of agriculture and industrial production to be taken on other dates, as, for example, in the middle year of each decade?

This objection does not apply to the censuses of agriculture in 1929-30.

The Chairman said that the question might be reserved until the Committee was called upon to discuss the censuses of agriculture and industrial production.

M. Gini (Italy) said he had been struck with the arguments of M. Platzer, and he would remind the Committee that the experience of the Conferences of Labour Statisticians convened by the International Labour Office had shown how difficult it was to establish a detailed classification of industries. He would therefore propose to limit the statistics requested to the main branches of occupations. As a similar amendment would have to be added to the article dealing with the statistics of establishments, it would be preferable to submit a single amendment, to be added to Article 8 where allusion was made to the Committee of Experts.

He would therefore propose to add the following text relating to statistics of occupations as an amendment to Article 8:

"A Committee of Experts will be asked to submit to the various States a draft schedule of the more important occupational categories to be adopted for the purpose of compiling statistics of occupations."

The text of the amendment of the Italian delegation was adopted without objection and referred to the Bureau.

Mr. Riddell (Canada) asked what would be the character of the Committee of Experts which it was proposed to appoint. The International Labour Office had convened a Conference in 1924 to study the question of statistics of employments and occupations and that Conference had established a framework and laid down the principles to be applied to this class of statistics. He had no doubt that the Committee of Experts would feel it necessary to co-operate with the International Labour Office in dealing with the matter. He asked whether the intention was to entrust the Committee of Experts with an entirely independent task.

The Chairman replied that the proposal of M. Gini referred, not to the convening of a special committee, but to the Committee of Technical Experts which was to be set up under Articles 7 and 8. He had no doubt that this Committee, appointed under the auspices of the League of Nations, would keep in constant touch with the International Labour Office so as to avoid any overlapping. It should nevertheless be remembered that the International Labour Office looked at these statistics from a rather special standpoint, having particular regard to wages, unemployment, etc., in each category. Possibly, therefore, the classifications recommended by the Committee of Experts and by the International Labour Office would not always be identical.

Mr. Meek (India) hoped that the Committee of Experts, in its proposal relating to the general census of employments and occupations, would take into account the classification already adopted by the countries which took such censuses. India, for example, had taken a census of employments and occupations since 1890.

The Chairman said he did not doubt that the Committee of Experts to be set up would take into account the systems of classification already in existence. He was persuaded that the Committee would, as far as possible, avoid adopting methods and classifications which might have the effect of completely upsetting the systems at present in use. It must, however, not be forgotten that the object was to obtain uniformity in respect of methods and results. He would point out, in this connection, that the United States, in view of new conditions, had been obliged to adopt methods totally different from those which she had followed some years previously and that, in consequence, certain old statistics had ceased to be comparable with the new.

M. Dore (International Institute of Agriculture) said that the International Institute of Agriculture had already had occasion to deal with the question of the census of occupations. He had made a comparative study of the methods of taking censuses adopted in the various countries and had realised that the great diversity of the systems employed made it impossible to secure any comparability between the statistics compiled, particularly in the realm of agriculture. It would be desirable, in his opinion, for a representative of the International Institute of Agriculture to be included among the members of the Committee of Experts to be set up, so that the Committee might profit from the experience acquired by the Institute.

The Chairman said that the Committee would not fail to co-operate with the International Institute of Agriculture, and would certainly take into account the work already done by the Institute.

M. Riemer (Austria) raised an objection to the drafting of Paragraph 1. He wondered whether it was advisable to use the term "occupation" in the French text of that article, in view of the difficulties which might arise in regard to temporary occupations. In his opinion, the French word "occupation" should be replaced by the word "profession".

In order to secure the maximum of advantage from the census of occupations, an enquiry would have to be made, not only into the various occupations in the technical sense of the word, but into the position of each individual in his occupation and the kind of establishment in which he was employed. A questionnaire drawn up on these lines would not only serve for the preparation of the census of establishments, but would also help to complete and define more
clearly the returns relating to occupations. Such a procedure would enable each individual to be classified according to the kind of establishment in which he was employed.

Such a method of taking a census of occupations was already applied in certain countries—for example, in England and Germany. It was not, however, generally applied. He accordingly thought that the Conference would do well to adopt a recommendation to the following effect:

"In order to emphasise the importance of statistics of occupations in relation to the general economy, the Conference recommends that the census of occupations should extend, not only to occupations in the technical sense of the word, but also to the special position of each individual in his occupation and the kind of establishment in which he exercises it."

The Chairman said he agreed with the distinction drawn by M. Riemer, but he thought this was a question which would have to be referred for examination to the Committee which was to be set up, in view of the fact that the Committee would first have to take a decision in regard to the exact definition of the word "occupation". Certain countries did not draw the distinction which M. Riemer desired. Those countries might be recommended, if they thought it desirable, to apply the method proposed by M. Riemer. He would add that, in the United States, for the purpose of taking a census, a double questionnaire was distributed, dealing, first, with the occupation of the individual and, secondly, with the number of persons employed in the particular industry. The data collected, however, were not the result of a double census, which would be a fairly costly operation. Nevertheless, if the Conference considered this double distinction to be of importance, there was no objection to adding to the recommendations a paragraph in the sense proposed by M. Riemer.

He felt bound to note that, in the opinion of M. Riemer, a distinction was to be drawn between employers, employees and independent workers. The English word which conveyed that idea was the word "status".

In the United States, the expression "usual occupation" was employed. Perhaps it would be necessary, as M. Riemer had suggested, to adopt the word "profession" in the French text.

Mr. Holloway (South Africa) said that, to present the greatest measure of usefulness, statistics of occupations should indicate:

1. The personal occupation of the individual;
2. The industry in which he carried out that occupation;
3. His personal status in regard to the occupation, e.g., of independent means, proprietor, wage-labourer, etc.

He felt convinced that any country which started collecting statistics of occupations, on however limited a scale, would not be satisfied until its statistics covered all these points. He therefore supported the proposal of M. Riemer.

The Committee adopted the proposal of M. Riemer.

M. Huber (France) also thought that the word "occupations" should be replaced in the French text by the word "professions". He reminded the Committee that, in the draft, statistics of occupations were independent of the statistics of industry. There were two ways of taking a census of occupations. Each employed person might be classified according to his individual occupation or according to the industry in which he was employed. In France, statistics of occupations were compiled every five years, and an employed person was classified according to the industry in which he worked and not according to his individual occupation. Thus an accountant who, by reason of his occupation, should be classified among office staff would, if employed in a tobacco factory, be classified under the textile industry. In the original plan for censuses in France, on the other hand, censuses of the active population should be taken every five years. The classification would be alternately by industry and by individual occupation. This last method, however, was only followed in 1911.

M. Kritzmann (U.S.S.R.) approved in principle the proposal embodied in the draft Convention concerning returns of occupations. He thought, however, that the mere declaration of the necessity of such returns was not sufficient, since the object of this Convention, as already indicated, consisted in the compilation of statistics in such a manner that they might be compared. This comparability should also be obtained in regard to statistics of occupations. It was thus necessary to set forth in the text of the Convention itself the principal features of these returns, while the details of application should be discussed by the Committee of Experts. He was in favour, however, of drawing a very clear distinction between statistics of occupations and of "professions" and of classing them separately. He accordingly proposed that, in Article 1, Paragraph I, there should be added, after the words "statistics showing the occupations", the words "and the social position", and, after the words "to these dates", the words "the compilation of these data will be made according to the principles laid down in Annex A". The delegation of the U.S.S.R. proposed that that Annex should be drafted in the following terms:


1. Object of the Census. — The statistics of occupations should include, not only the active population, but also all the other elements of the population, such as housekeepers, rentiers, dependent members of the family, etc.

2. Classification of Occupations. — The classification of occupations should be based, not only upon the occupations of the persons concerned, but on the principal branches of economy to which the establishments where these persons are employed belong.
"3. With a view to studying the social constitution of the population, persons will be classified according to their social position and the branches of activity in which they are occupied. Special attention will be given to clearly distinguishing the following indications:

(a) The members of the family who assist in the work of production shall be distinctly separated from persons drawing a salary or working for wages and others.

(b) Salaried persons working for wages in various branches of production should be separated at least into two principal groups, namely, employees and implem, a distinction being drawn in the group of employees between the auxiliary groups of technical staff, office staff and general services.

(c) In the employers' groups, it is essential to distinguish between persons using salaried labour and persons who are assisted in their work only by members of their family. Persons working alone should be indicated separately."

M. Gini (Italy) thought that the proposal submitted by the U.S.S.R. delegation was interesting, but asked whether it was not somewhat dangerous to introduce into the text of the Convention a scheme which was much too detailed appropriately to form part of an international convention. He would suggest that the proposal should be referred to the Committee of Experts.

M. Colson (France) supported the proposal of M. Gini.

The Chairman said it would be difficult for the Committee to take a decision on the amendment proposed if it dealt with the question of method. The Committee could only decide to refer the suggestion to the Committee of Experts. He would, moreover, draw the attention of the U.S.S.R. delegation to the fact that the question of the social position of workers of all classes had been provided for in the text of the recommendation submitted by M. Riener.

M. Kritzmann (U.S.S.R.) said that, although he recognised that detailed proposals could not be inserted in the text of the Convention itself, he thought, nevertheless, that the Annex which he proposed might be adopted for purposes of general guidance and that the Committee of Experts could deal with the details.

M. Jahn (Norway), Rapporteur, said that the method of taking the census proposed by the delegate of the U.S.S.R. had been applied in Norway in 1920. He was nevertheless convinced that it was impossible to introduce that amendment into the text of the Convention. The various countries had not had time to take a decision on that proposal, since it had not been distributed in advance as a proposal which would be included in the annexes and had not, therefore, been examined by the Government experts. The insertion of that text in the Convention would therefore render adherence to the Convention difficult for a certain number of countries. In his opinion, it was necessary to proceed gradually and to do no more for the moment than adopt the general principles, leaving it to the Committee of Experts to elaborate the details of application at a later date.

M. Villegas (Mexico) said that there was an essential difference between the proposal of the delegate of the U.S.S.R. and the proposal of M. Gini. M. Gini had suggested that the amendment of M. Kritzmann should be forwarded to the Committee of Experts by way of information. M. Kritzmann, on the contrary, asked that the text of his amendment should be included among the general instructions forwarded to the Committee of Experts in respect of Article 1. He accordingly proposed that the text of the amendment of the U.S.S.R. delegate should be distributed to the members of the Committee, and that a Sub-Committee should be appointed and asked to decide whether the text of the amendment should be referred to the Committee of Experts by way of information or for its general guidance.

M. Kritzmann (U.S.S.R.) said that the object of his amendment was to secure for the statistics under consideration as large a degree of comparability as possible. If the text of the Convention with its present provisions were adopted, the States would not be obliged to furnish precise information and therefore the degree of comparability of the statistics would be considerably diminished.

The Chairman said that the Committee had to deal with two proposals:

1. The proposal of M. Gini, supported by M. Colson, to communicate the amendment of M. Kritzmann to the Committee of Experts by way of information.

2. The proposal of M. Kritzmann, supported by M. Villegas, that a Sub-Committee should be appointed to examine the proposal of the U.S.S.R. delegation with a view to its possible insertion in the Convention for the general guidance of the Committee of Experts.

Mr. Holloway (South Africa) said that no question of principle was at issue, but only a question of the classification of the data obtained. He thought that the discussion of the draft Convention should be continued and that a recommendation should be inserted in the Final Act covering the proposals which had been put forward during the discussion for improvements in the collection of statistics. He would point out that the Convention merely formulated a limited number of requests in order that it might secure the greatest possible number of adhesions. It was possible, however, to indicate in the resolutions the two successive stages in the achievement of what was the real object of the Convention, namely, more comparable statistics. He accordingly proposed that the following paragraph should be inserted in the Final Act of the Conference:

"It is desirable that the statistics relating to employments and occupations should include, as far as possible, a classification in respect of the different industries and a
classification in respect of the social position of each individual included in the classification by occupations.”

He would point out that, in South Africa, the authorities had for some time stopped short at the first stage in the above process and had now passed to the second and third stages without any international convention having been necessary. The whole question was merely a question of funds.

The CHAIRMAN noted that the proposal which the delegate for South Africa had just made was implicitly included in the proposals of M. Riemer and M. Kritzmann.

Mr. Meek (India) supported the proposal of M. Gini. He reminded the Committee that there were two procedures in dealing with international conventions. It was possible to formulate a large number of requirements and rest content with a small number of ratifications, or to formulate a small number of requirements and secure as considerable a number of ratifications as possible. He thought it was preferable to adopt the second procedure.

The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the proposal of M. Gini that the amendment of M. Kritzmann should be referred to the Committee of Experts merely for information.

The proposal of M. Gini was adopted.

M. Gini (Italy) said he desired to raise a general point of order. He wondered whether it would not be more practical to follow the English procedure, which consisted in refusing to discuss in detail a proposal which was not supported by at least one other delegation. It seemed to him useless to continue the discussion of a proposal which had not at least received the support of one delegation.

M. Bernardi (Italy) said that the procedure proposed by M. Gini was followed at the International Labour Conference.

The CHAIRMAN said that this procedure was not customary in continental Europe. He fully agreed in recommending that proposals which were obviously unacceptable should not be discussed indefinitely.

Mr. Dewhurst (U.S.A.) was of opinion that the field of statistics referred to in Paragraph I of Article I should be limited. He would therefore propose to draft the first sentence of the article as follows: “Statistics showing the paid occupations of the population”. He did not think that the census should apply to schoolchildren, sick persons, housekeepers, etc. The new draft, in his view, dealt with the difficulty which might arise in such cases from the method of taking the census adopted in countries such as France.

M. Jahn (Norway), Rapporteur, said he was not in favour of restricting the scope of Article 1. In his opinion, the countries which made a distinction in their censuses between paid and other occupations should be invited to continue to do so. The countries which did not make this distinction would not change their practice. The framing of the details of application would be the work of the Committee of Experts.

The CHAIRMAN said that his personal experience of censuses justified him in saying that a too minute classification of occupations entailed considerable technical difficulties. He thought it was desirable to be satisfied in the Convention with a vague text which might afterwards be further defined by the Committee of Experts. That Committee would also be asked to determine the machinery of application.

An explanatory statement might be made for the guidance of the Committee of Experts to the effect that the present Conference regarded the formula under discussion as one to be interpreted in its widest sense.

M. Huber (France) explained that in France, when the census was taken, the population was divided into two classes: active persons — in other words, persons engaged in remunerated work — and persons whose work was not remunerated, such as children and housekeepers. Such statistics enabled all the necessary information to be given.

Mr. Dewhurst (U.S.A.) said he was convinced by the explanation of M. Huber and withdrew his proposal.

THIRD MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE ON PRODUCTION STATISTICS.

Held on Thursday, November 29th, 1928, at 3.30 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Durand.


M. Bernardi (Italy) said that the census of the population was compulsory by the terms of the first paragraph. This was not, however, the case in regard to a census of industrial production. He would therefore submit the following amendment: After the words “at regular intervals” were to be added “and if possible once in each decade”. He also asked that, in the last paragraph, an expression corresponding to the Italian expression “potenza installata” should be substituted for “mechanical power in use”.

...
The Chairman thought there would be opposition to this amendment, for a text which did not specify the period for which statistics must be established would be of doubtful value. He also thought that the scope of the text should be defined by the addition of a heading worded somewhat as follows: "General Census of Employed Persons and of Machinery used in Industrial Establishments".

M. Jahn (Norway), Rapporteur, recalled that originally the authors of the preparatory document for this Conference had intended to propose a general census of industrial establishments on the lines of the German "Allgemeine Betriebszählung", but it had been realised that it would be very difficult to secure agreement to such a scheme.

He mentioned that in his own country there existed complete annual statistics for the factories, giving the number of workers, the number of hours worked, the total pay-bill, etc. For artisans and small workshops there had, however, been only one census (1910), and, although he recognised the importance of a complete census in this field, he thought that the existing financial situation would make it necessary shortly to use the funds available for more urgent needs, and therefore he could not promise that his country would undertake a complete census of all industrial establishments in the near future.

The Chairman pointed out that the term "industrial establishments" was somewhat vague. There was perhaps no objection to this, for a country which had already drawn up statistics on its main industrial establishments and on individual workshops could easily carry out the terms of this article, while a country which only included important industrial establishments in these statistics would also, and justly, have fulfilled the terms of the Convention. The method to be followed was a question which could be left to the future Committee of Experts.

M. Jansson (Sweden) saw no necessity for including small establishments in the general census of industrial establishments, particularly in view of the fact that so detailed a census would give rise to great technical and practical difficulties. A certain restriction, as was proposed by the Chairman, should therefore be contemplated. As a general rule, only establishments employing at least 10 workmen, or possessing at least 10 h.p. motive power, were included in Swedish censuses, unless there were special reasons for including smaller establishments. M. Jansson would support the reservation made by the Rapporteur in regard to the undertaking of such a census in Norway.

M. Platzer (Germany) said that the difficulties just raised would not be very great if the three censuses were carried out simultaneously, for they would mutually complete one another; thus, a census of the population would give an indication of the number of artisans working at home.

The Chairman agreed that it was difficult to achieve an exact definition of the term "industrial establishments". It could perhaps be said that the census should comprise at least all industrial establishments of a certain size.

M. Schmidt (Austria) thought that it was necessary to agree on the standard to be adopted for defining a "large establishment". Was it the amount of power used or, as seemed to him to be preferable, the number of workers employed?

M. Jahn (Norway), Rapporteur, did not think that it would be possible to achieve a definition on a basis of this kind. A flour-mill, for example, might employ very few workmen, though its productive capacity might be considerable.

Mr. Meek (India) thought that it would be preferable not to use too precise a definition. It could be laid down that the industrial establishments included in the census must be of sufficient importance for the factory laws to be applied to them.

M. Colson (France) thought that it would be for the Committee of Experts to decide the figures by categories of industries.

The Chairman agreed.

Mr. Holloway (South Africa) added that, in discussing the smallest factory to be included, the Conference was overlooking the more important question of the sizes of the different categories to be tabulated. Some countries might not be able to include workshops with less than, say, 10 employees, but if all workshops were classified into the same categories, say under 10 employees, 10 to 25, 25 to 50, etc., each country could compare its statistics with such figures as the other countries found it financially possible to supply. He thought this question of classification according to number of employees should be specially referred to the Committee of Experts.

The Chairman thought that it would be useless to give detailed instructions to the Committee of Experts, which would naturally take up these questions in the course of its work.

He submitted a draft amendment proposed by the U.S.S.R. delegation, which suggested that Paragraph II should run:

"General censuses of industrial establishments and, if possible, also of commercial establishments to be drawn up at regular intervals simultaneously with the censuses of industrial production," etc.
This amendment connected the two classes of statistics and implied that a census of industrial production would be carried out. He thought that the amendment could be examined when the Committee had decided during its discussions whether or not an industrial census should be compulsory.

He put this amendment to the vote. It was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the countries undertaking a census of industrial production would quite naturally combine it with a census of commercial establishments, which meant that the adoption of that amendment would not have modified the practice in, for example, the United States. The present unchanged text would make it possible for States which had not yet carried out a census of industrial production to proceed with a census of establishments.

Sub-Paragraph (1), Paragraph II.

Mme. Falkner-Smit (U.S.S.R.) proposed the following amendment to sub-paragraph (1):

"The numbers and various classes of each sex employed, distinguishing adults from young people; and the hours of labour."

The CHAIRMAN saw no objection to adding "various classes", provided that this was not made compulsory. The amendment would therefore read "and, if possible, the various classes".

This part of the amendment was approved with the change suggested by the Chairman.

Mme. Falkner-Smit (U.S.S.R.) returned to the second part of the amendment, urging that statistics of the hours of labour should be added. It was necessary, if a complete picture were to be obtained, to ascertain the number of hours worked and the shifts used. The delegation of the U.S.S.R. would give more detailed explanations when the Annex to the Convention was under examination.

The CHAIRMAN said that there was no annex in regard to Article 1. In any case, the principle of the amendment and the question of its insertion in the text should be discussed immediately.

Mr. Dewhurst (U.S.A.) recalled that this part of Article I had been inserted to make it possible for States possessing no census of industrial production at any rate to submit information regarding the number of workers and employees at work. Detailed information should not, therefore, be asked from them. This was particularly important in the present case, as the information requested by the delegation of the U.S.S.R. was very difficult to obtain.

M. Kritzmann (U.S.S.R.) pointed out that in Annex I, Paragraph 5 B, mention was made of the hours of labour, and the present amendment was therefore quite in place in the draft Convention. The U.S.S.R. delegation would furnish explanations in regard to it when Annex I was under examination.

Mr. Holloway (South Africa) urged the adoption of the following form of words: "distinguishing, whenever possible, adults from young people". In South Africa, the natives employed did not know their age.

M. Huber (France) said that, even in countries where the age of the workers was known, it was necessary to know what was the age-limit at which a person ceased to belong to the category of young people and passed into the category of adults.

The CHAIRMAN replied that the Committee of Experts would settle this question, together with the others submitted to it. He noted that Mr. Holloway's amendment was adopted.

Sub-Paragraph (2), Paragraph II.

The CHAIRMAN submitted the following draft amendment on behalf of the delegation of the United States of America:

"In the case of establishments using mechanical power, the rated capacity of prime movers installed, distinguishing between those ordinarily in use and those idle or in reserve and distinguishing between those operated by steam, gas, oil, and water power; and that of electric motors installed, distinguishing between those ordinarily in use and those idle or in reserve, and distinguishing between those using current generated in the establishment and those using purchased current."

M. Colson (France) thought that this form of words could be adopted, provided that it were made clear that such distinctions should only be asked for in cases when it was possible to supply them.

M. Kritzmann (U.S.S.R.) recalled that his delegation had proposed the following wording:

"In the case of industrial establishments, mechanical power in use, distinguishing steam, gas, oil, electric and water power, machinery equipment capacity and working hours of the prime movers and electric motors and energy produced (kw.-hours)."

The U.S.S.R. delegation withdrew this amendment and accepted the amendment of the delegation of the United States.

The proposal of the delegation of the United States, with the addition proposed by M. Colson, was adopted.

M. Horáček (Czechoslovakia) said that his delegation had no objection to that part of Paragraph II of Article I dealing with the methods of compiling statistics of industrial
establishments. But it was in a somewhat difficult position in regard to the periodical maintenance of this branch of statistics. The Czechoslovak Government had decided to carry out a census of industrial establishments as well as of agricultural enterprises in 1930, but could not undertake to do so for the following period. He must therefore give notice of a reservation to the effect that Czechoslovakia could only undertake to carry out a census of industrial and agricultural establishments in the year 1930.

The Chairman said that the date at which such censuses should be carried out had not been compulsorily fixed. Provision had merely been made for such a census to take place every ten years. He did not think that it would be necessary for the moment to discuss this point in detail.

M. Horácek (Czechoslovakia) said that he would bring forward this reservation when the general discussion took place.

The Chairman said that the delegation of the U.S.S.R. proposed to add third and fourth sub-paragraphs to this paragraph, drafted in the following form:

"(3) The study of the various forms of the economic and technical development of industry.

(4) The amount and structure of the fixed capital invested in industry."

Mme. Falkner-Smit (U.S.S.R.) explained the scope of this amendment. The delegation of the U.S.S.R. thought that the definition of the term "industrial establishments" should not be vague but elastic. It asked, therefore, for information of a sufficiently detailed character to enable a distinction to be made between the various categories of industry. With regard to fixed capital, it was essential to have information on the forms under which it existed, for without such information the problem of depreciation could not be solved.

M. Colson (France) asked the Committee not to adopt this amendment, which was quite outside the scope of statistics and amounted to a separate economic study. It was certainly of considerable interest, but it involved so large a degree of estimation that he did not understand how the information could be drawn up in statistical tables. The difficulties in regard to the study and comparison of balance-sheets were well known, especially during recent years when currency had been subjected to constant variation. The matter for investigation was extremely interesting, but was outside the scope of statistical work.

The Chairman recalled that the United States, which had a very highly developed census system, had been compelled to abandon the compilation of statistics of the capital used because of the insurmountable difficulties encountered. In a few years, it might be possible to reach an understanding with the object of unifying censuses in this respect, but it was impossible to require forty-two countries to carry out such a census.

Mme. Falkner-Smit (U.S.S.R.) said that the problem had been solved in her country. She submitted a volume which unhappily had not yet been translated from the Russian but which contained detailed statistics of the capital of the industries belonging to the State, to private enterprise and to people holding concessions. The study of the different forms of industry presented a statistical problem of long standing. During the discussion on the annexes, a classification would be proposed that would make it possible to group industry under its various economic forms.

The Chairman hoped that, in these circumstances, the U.S.S.R. delegation would not insist upon the amendment already proposed, which involved an obligation, as it would be able when the annex was discussed to suggest a logical and detailed method of grouping.

Mme. Falkner-Smit (U.S.S.R.) explained the scope of this amendment. The delegation of the U.S.S.R. proposed to add third and fourth sub-paragraphs to this paragraph, drafted in the following form:

"(3) The study of the various forms of the economic and technical development of industry.

(4) The amount and structure of the fixed capital invested in industry."

The resolution of the amendment by the U.S.S.R. was rejected.

The Chairman put the amendment of the U.S.S.R. delegation to the vote. It was rejected.

M. Colson (France) said that, if this question were to be discussed once more in connection with the annex, it would be useful to ascertain in what manner capital accounts could be drawn up. He was sorry not to be able to read the Russian statement to which Mme. Falkner-Smit had just referred, but he wondered under what form would appear therein the considerable amounts of capital that had been provided by Europe for the construction of factories in Russia which no longer received any return.

Mme. Falkner-Smit (U.S.S.R.) replied that her delegation would give the information required.

M. Pullerits (Estonia) wished to make a statement on behalf of his delegation and that of Latvia. The information sought was compiled annually in Estonia and Latvia by means of an enquiry, and through the intermediary of labour inspectors in the case of small establishments. Consequently, it would not be necessary to have a special census in this respect.

The Chairman pointed out that the present regulations in no way prevented any Government from using a special method to collect information. The study to which the Committee of Experts would proceed would probably make it possible for States to abandon several reservations.


M. Michaykoff (Bulgaria) stated that on December 31st, 1926, when the census of the population was taken, a census of all agricultural enterprises was also carried out. The following information was given: the number, the nature and the area of all agricultural enterprises in
he country; the area of land worked by its owner, of land leased, and of land under crops; the persons working upon it, distinguishing members of a family and persons engaged outside the family. In the latter category, distinction was made between the directors of a particular enterprise, the employees and the labourers. If the head of an agricultural enterprise was a member of any co-operative organisation, this fact was stated. The amount and kind of machinery used, the amount and kind of mechanical apparatus and the number and kind of animals used in agricultural work were also given.

He pointed out that the statistics required in connection with a general census of agriculture on the lines laid down by the International Institute of Agriculture might be obtained mainly by means of information available as a result of the census of agricultural enterprises already carried out and from the census of harvests. The information concerning harvests, however, differed from that which was required, in that it did not distinguish individual enterprises but was shown by localities. It was difficult to obtain information concerning the production of milk, eggs, wool, honey and silkworms, because most of the rural agricultural establishments of the country possessed no properly organised accounts department. The information concerning drainage, irrigation and flowers could in future be collected, but it would be difficult to obtain information on the hours of work. In view of this fact and of the low level of education in the rural population, it would be difficult to guarantee that the statistics concerning the wages of persons engaged in agriculture were accurate. The official Bulgarian Statistical Service was of opinion that more accurate information on these questions could be obtained by means of an enquiry into model agricultural enterprises. If account were taken of the fact that no public grain elevators existed in Bulgaria, it was obvious that it would be difficult to give the stocks of cereals in Bulgaria with even approximate accuracy.

The Chairman noted that no formal amendment had been made and that M. Michaykoff was merely stating the reservations he wished to make.

M. Estabrook (International Institute of Agriculture) pointed out that the formula, the means of carrying out a census and the list of compulsory and optional questions were contained in the pamphlet issued by the International Institute of Agriculture.

M. Lorenz (Switzerland) asked whether by "annual statistics" were meant mere estimates or a census based on a questionnaire to be filled in by the producer.

M. Jahn (Norway), Rapporteur, replied that in sub-paragraph (a) provision was made for a census and that in sub-paragraph (b) provision was made for estimates. Methods varied considerably from one country to another and all countries could not be compelled to carry out a yearly census.

M. Pullerits (Estonia) said that Article 1, Paragraph I, laid down that occupational statistics should be compiled for at least the last year of each ten-year period. Article 1, Paragraph III, provided for the compilation of censuses of agriculture for the same period. A draft recommendation also provided for the taking of a census of industrial production in the last year of each ten-year period. Three separate forms of census would therefore have to be carried out in the same year, which would give rise to considerable material and technical difficulty. As what was generally drawn up in years ending in a 0 or a 1 was population returns, it would be desirable to compile them at that date. Further, the full significance of the simultaneous execution of agricultural and industrial censuses from the point of view of the national economic life of a State must be considered. Would it not be possible to arrange for the collection of these statistics on another date — for example, in every year ending with a 5?

Mr. Estabrook (International Institute of Agriculture) said that the dates had been fixed as the result of an agreement between the International Institute of Agriculture, the American Institute of Education and the American Department of Agriculture. The Preparatory Committee had thought that it would be preferable to take the last months of 1929 in the case of harvests. After long negotiations, the date had been fixed by the Eighth Assembly of the International Institute of Agriculture, on which 90 per cent of the States of the world were represented. He hoped that this date would not be changed.

The Chairman asked whether it was in the interest of the whole world for each country to carry out its censuses in the same year. This might be the case in so far as agriculture was concerned, but he had the impression that the simultaneous collection of statistics was not of equal importance in the case of industrial establishments.

Mr. Estabrook (International Institute of Agriculture) replied that simultaneous agricultural censuses not only gave definite information but also — and this was more important — information which was comparable. For this reason, they should take place during the same year. Thus in Queensland, as the result of a drought which had lasted three consecutive years, the herds of sheep had been reduced 25 per cent in 1926. It would have been impossible to compare a census carried out in 1926 in Australia with a census carried out two years later in another country.

The Chairman said that, if the Committee desired to recommend that the censuses should take place in the same year, a slight change would have to be made in the text, and it would have to be explained that within the same year account should be taken of the difference of six months between the two hemispheres.

M. Dore (International Institute of Agriculture) pointed out that it was mainly in the interests of the great countries that simultaneous censuses should be carried out. He had the impression,
however, that the present text would not prevent certain countries for which the simultaneous carrying out of the censuses would present difficulties from holding the various censuses by stages.

Mr. Estabrook (International Institute of Agriculture) replied that in several countries the dates of the censuses were fixed by law and that it would be difficult to amend these laws. He asked that the present text should be maintained, for it was sufficiently elastic.

M. Gini (Italy) agreed with Mr. Estabrook on the necessity of carrying out simultaneous agricultural censuses in all countries. It might be possible for countries to be asked to carry out a census once in every ten years "if possible", and the International Institute of Agriculture might be left to adjust the date. He proposed the following amendment (document C.S.O./Prod./4):

Sub-Paragraph (a), Paragraph III.

"(a) General censuses of agriculture . . . to be taken, if possible, once during a ten-year period according to the directions and in the year proposed by the International Institute of Agriculture."

M. Jahn (Norway), Rapporteur, thought that it would be impossible for several countries to bind themselves in advance to carry out the census on the particular date chosen by the Rome Institute. If the agricultural census coincided with the census of population, it might well be that a satisfactory result would not be obtained, for experience showed that, if the same person was asked a lot of questions at the same time, he would give very bad answers to most of them; it was therefore much better — at least, in a small country — to carry out the censuses separately. Nor was it practical in a small country where statistics were centralised to start many censuses at the same time. It was of the utmost importance for the administration to be able to distribute its work evenly from year to year, and therefore not to take the different censuses in one and the same year.

M. Gini (Italy) referred to his proposal to add the words "if possible". He thought that the International Institute of Agriculture, which had been fortunate enough to command the support of the great majority of States in the world, would be equally successful in arranging the date of agricultural censuses, a matter which came within its competence.

M. Jahn (Norway), Rapporteur, accepted the amendment provided that the words "if possible" were maintained.

M. Kritzmann (U.S.S.R.) recalled that the Committee was to confine itself to a general discussion. The Italian delegation had, however, presented a formal amendment. In view of the fact that the delegation of the U.S.S.R. would also desire to make proposals in regard to all agricultural questions, he asked that the adoption of this amendment should be adjourned to the next meeting.

FOURTH MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE ON PRODUCTION STATISTICS.

Held on Friday, November 30th, 1928, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. Durand.


The Chairman said that, after a short general exchange of views on censuses of agriculture, he would call upon the Committee to examine the various amendments already submitted.

M. Platzner (Germany) said that, after long discussion, preparation had been made, through the good offices of the International Institute of Agriculture, for the taking of general censuses of agriculture. Nevertheless, these discussions had not yet been based on the view that the decisions reached would be embodied in a Convention requiring all contracting parties to carry out censuses in accordance with the agreed conditions. It would therefore be necessary to ascertain what would be required from countries which carried out the suggestions made by the International Institute of Agriculture.

It was particularly difficult to ascertain these requirements in view of the fact that the Institute did not state what data should be furnished to it after the census had taken place, but merely submitted a model formula for a census. In other words, the Institute had submitted no specimen tables, as, for example, the table in Annex III of the Convention for mining and metallurgical statistics; a mere indication was given, e.g., of a number of questions to be put to peasants, etc. This procedure must necessarily involve much uncertainty and difficulty.

M. Platzner thought that each country should be left free to decide for itself how to collect the necessary data for purposes of international comparison. It was proposed by the International Institute of Agriculture that the results of the census should be classified according to the size of the agricultural enterprises to which they referred. This would lead to considerable and often useless work. What was of interest was to discover whether grain crops, as a whole, were to be found in greater numbers in large agricultural enterprises than in small, but not, for example, whether spring wheat was cultivated more often in large enterprises than in small.
For this reason, he suggested that model tables should be drawn up for the censuses of agriculture stating exactly what data were required. Only thus would it be possible to ascertain what was necessary. To follow such a course would be to avoid useless work, and every country would thus furnish data which would be really comparable and capable of collection. This work could be entrusted to a sub-committee or to the Committee of Experts which had been so frequently mentioned, but, naturally, the International Institute of Agriculture would be called upon to assist.

The Chairman understood that the German delegate did not suggest the immediate appointment of a committee to study the question. This question would be submitted for closer investigation to the Committee of Experts. Would the German delegate be content with a note of his observations in the Minutes, provided that the Secretariat forwarded these to the Committee of Experts on its creation, or did M. Platzer wish the Committee to adopt a special resolution drawing the attention of the future Committee of Experts to this problem?

M. Platzer (Germany) would be satisfied if the Secretariat would take note of his observations. He did not ask the Committee to adopt a special resolution.

M. Riemer (Austria) said that Austria had up to the present only carried out one census of industrial and agricultural enterprises, and that had taken place in 1902 in virtue of a special law. No legislation existed by which censuses of this nature were to be taken at regular intervals. Austria had contemplated carrying out a census of industrial establishments at the same time as a general census of agriculture in 1930. For financial reasons, however, Austria could not give any formal undertaking on this point, and provisionally reserved her right not to draw up and publish the statistics referred to in Article 1, Paragraphs II and III (a). He had been instructed by the Austrian Ministry of Agriculture to make the following declaration:

"Noting that the Convention now under discussion does not contain any provision covering the methods to be used in establishing the statistics mentioned in Article 1, Paragraph III (b), (c), (d), the Austrian delegation states that, in signing the Convention, it does not intend to bind the Federal Government to draw up and publish these statistics according to the methods which will be laid down at a subsequent date. The Federal Government reserves its full freedom of action should new methods be recommended. Further, the Federal Government must provisionally reserve its right not to publish annually periodical statistics of live-stock, and to limit the periodical statistics of forest resources to information regarding the area of forests."

M. Kritzmann (U.S.S.R.) thought that, before dealing with the statistical aspect of sub-paragraphs (a) (b) and (c) of Article 1, paragraph III, it was important to consider the form of the question before the Committee.

It was understood that the draft Convention was a draft international treaty to be concluded between various Governments. Such a treaty, however, must be drafted in definite terms to avoid all misunderstanding. For this reason, a mere reference to the suggestions put forward by the International Institute of Agriculture would lead to grave inconvenience.

For this reason, it would be preferable for the suggestions in question to be inserted in the draft Convention, if necessary in the form of an annex, with any amendments and formulae which the contracting parties might think useful to make in or add to them. In the first place, the Committee must take into consideration the fact that, in the field of agricultural statistics, literally millions of agricultural enterprises had to be dealt with and that, as a rule, such enterprises kept no accounts.

The draft Convention suggested that the data obtained would correspond completely to the real facts of the situation. It would be somewhat difficult to maintain this point of view, for such an assumption involved superficial confidence in the accuracy of the data.

The annex was especially necessary in view of the fact that the U.S.S.R. did not participate in the work of the International Institute of Agriculture, and that, consequently, suggestions from that organisation were in no sense binding upon the U.S.S.R.

As far as the statistical substance of the paragraphs under discussion was concerned, the U.S.S.R. delegation, as the Committee could learn from the documents circulated, took the view that it was absolutely necessary to enlarge the scope of the Convention in the field of agricultural statistics.

It was essential that representative enquiries should be carried out, quite apart from the measures for verifying the data relating to area by means of surveying instruments and aerial photographs, in order to control the results obtained and to reach a greater degree of accuracy. The balance-sheet method of return should be employed, i.e., a comparison should be made between receipts and expenditure, including stocks of corn and forage and stocks of industrial crops. This method had been in use in the U.S.S.R. for some years; a model formula would be found in Annex B submitted by the delegation of the U.S.S.R. (document C.S.O./Prod./6).

He also thought that the system of classification proposed by the International Institute of Agriculture was insufficient. Such a classification would necessarily treat a hectare of wheat and a hectare of cotton, tobacco or tea as equivalent, or a hectare under Chinese or Japanese intensive cultivation and a hectare under Siberian or Canadian cultivation, which was of the extensive type; a hectare of land upon which three or four crops a year had been grown would be regarded as equivalent to a hectare of land bearing only a single crop in the year. Such a process would in no way fulfil the principle of international comparability aimed at by the draft Convention.

It was necessary, besides this classification, to establish another based on the actual size of the agricultural enterprises.
It should also be realised that the draft Convention did not make it possible to study several economic problems of great importance. Many farmers and agriculturists were considerably interested in finding a proper solution for such problems. What was more, this solution was perfectly possible from the statistical point of view. The problems concerned the leasing of land and mortgages. To solve them, a representative enquiry, with a much more detailed programme, appeared necessary. Such enquiries had been made for eight years in the U.S.S.R.

The delegation of the U.S.S.R. found that, among the resolutions of the International Institute of Agriculture, which it had only been able to study the previous day, several were in conformity with its own. This could only give more force to its proposals, and accordingly it urged that these proposals should be considered by the Conference.

Mr. Estabrook (International Institute of Agriculture) observed that the representative of the U.S.S.R. said that he had not been informed of the work of the Rome Institute in regard to the agricultural census until the memorandum of the Institute had been circulated to the Conference. This seemed to be an error of fact. Up to the time when a change of Government had taken place, Russia had been one of the States members of the International Institute of Agriculture, and Russia continued to figure among the members of the Rome organisation. She invariably received all documents circulated by it.

The Government of the U.S.S.R. had been asked to send delegates to the eighth and ninth General Assemblies of the Institute, and the President had officially notified it of the proposal concerning the agricultural census. Mr. Estabrook had himself gone to Moscow in August 1926. He had been most warmly welcomed by the competent authorities and by the Ministry of Agriculture. He had been assured that Russia would very willingly co-operate in the proposed agricultural census. When the Committee instructed to carry out the preliminary work in regard to that census had finished its task, the result of its discussions had been forwarded to the Government of the U.S.S.R.

The proposals of the U.S.S.R. had been rapidly examined by Mr. Estabrook, who could not forego recalling the days of his youth when, before having gained experience, he had, in common with all men, dreamed beautiful dreams of what could be achieved in life. Such dreams were always of an impracticable nature.

When Mr. Estabrook had begun the preparatory work for the agricultural census, he had taken as a basis the experience gained in the United States. That country possessed perhaps the largest Ministry of Agriculture in the world. It employed 16,000 persons, who had specialised for twenty years in the study of the thousand and one aspects of the agricultural problem. If there was one conviction to be acquired from the United States, it was that there were many things which it was impossible to do, and many questions to which it was impossible to obtain a reply. In that case, why should such questions be put? There were two hundred Governments in the world, all in a different position; some had no statistical organisation, others lacked the necessary resources, others again lacked the necessary experience. He had thought that the best way to begin would be to follow the simplest system and to leave States whose resources were limited, and who must therefore content themselves with furnishing elementary data, entirely free.

For this reason, the questionnaire submitted by the Institute of Rome was based on three main questions: (1) arable resources; (2) the area covered by the various crops; (3) the grouping of live-stock. There were a fairly large number of other important questions contained in a supplement to the questionnaire, but a compulsory reply was not required in their case. Replies to the three fundamental questions would be enough to furnish a basis of comparison for annual statistics.

Mr. Estabrook would draw the attention of the representative of the U.S.S.R. to the fact that the Committee, which had met at Rome, had considered that some information could not be obtained by means of a census, because the persons concerned could not reply, and would have to be made the object of special expert enquiries in certain representative areas. He would point out that most of the proposals of the delegation of the U.S.S.R. covered this second class of subjects; these must be made the object of expert enquiries and not of questions to be put to persons who could frequently neither read nor write.

10. Appointment of a Sub-Committee on Agricultural Questions.

The Chairman noted that a fairly large number of persons still desired to speak on the general question of an agricultural census, and particularly on the proposals of the delegation of the U.S.S.R. In view of the limited time at the disposal of the Committee, which was scarcely sufficient to allow it to discuss the general aspect of the problem, he suggested that a Sub-Committee should be appointed to examine any special suggestions and, in particular, how the draft Convention could best be related to the work already carried out by the Institute at Rome. This Sub-Committee would submit a report to the Committee, if possible at the beginning of the afternoon.

M. Kritzmann (U.S.S.R.) supported this proposal. He wished to explain that, though the former Russian Empire might have been a member of the International Institute of Agriculture, the U.S.S.R. was not. Secondly, Mr. Estabrook had considered that the proposals of the U.S.S.R. delegation were purely theoretical. These proposals, however, were based on the eight years' practical experience acquired by the Statistical Department of the U.S.S.R.

In actual fact, the question which arose was not whether it was possible to procure the information indicated, but merely whether States were willing to take the necessary steps.

M. Breisky (Austria), Vice-Chairman, speaking as a representative of Austria, said that it would be dangerous for the success of the future Convention to enter into too great detail. It was better to confine themselves to rather general points of view if they wished to reach a concrete
result. It would be useful to submit points of detail to the sub-committee proposed by the Chairman and to draw up a text which would allow States with limited organisation or means to sign the Convention and thus to co-operate with all other States in bringing about the establishment of internationally comparable statistics.

M. Colson (France) asked whether the plenary Committee would have to hold up its work while the proposed Sub-Committee was meeting. If that was the case, there would be a risk of losing instead of saving time.

The Chairman replied that, in his opinion, the Sub-Committee should meet either between meetings of the plenary Committee or else during these meetings. The Sub-Committee would be composed of a very small number of members and, as the majority of delegations included two or more members, the plenary Committee could, without inconvenience, work simultaneously. Further, it was certain that the plenary Committee would take no final decision on the questions dealt with during the meetings of the Sub-Committee before the members of the latter body had had the opportunity of expressing themselves.

The Committee adopted the proposal of the Chairman with regard to the setting-up of a Sub-Committee.

On the motion of M. Gini (Italy), the Chairman was asked to nominate the members of the Sub-Committee.

The Sub-Committee was composed of M. Ito (Japan), Chairman; M. Platzer (Germany); M. Kritzmann (U.S.S.R.) and Mr. Estabrook (International Institute of Agriculture).

Mr. Estabrook (International Institute of Agriculture) asked that the Sub-Committee should include a person with experience of tropical agriculture.

The Chairman said that he would ask the Representative of India, or else M. Le Cosquino de Bussy (Netherlands), to sit upon the Committee, or perhaps both might be members.

The terms of reference of the Sub-Committee would be to examine the question of the general census of agriculture, and especially the amendments of detail submitted. Its discussions would not prevent a possible general discussion in the full committee.

He called on the Committee to return to the general discussion on agricultural statistics.


M. Dore (International Institute of Agriculture) explained that, in the opinion of those who had undertaken the preparatory work for the draft Convention, it was necessary for the Conference to confine itself, in the realm of agricultural statistics, to drawing up the different categories of statistics which the Governments should undertake to establish, without any mention of the methods to be used, for this aspect of the question came within the competence of the International Institute of Agriculture. He thought it useful to emphasise this point because it should not be forgotten that the Institute was an official organisation upon which were represented, among others, all countries taking part in the present Conference, with the exception of two, and that, in accordance with the functions entrusted to it by the Convention by which it was created, it was the duty of the Institute to deal, not only with the collection of statistics of agriculture and forestry, but also to assist in their improvement. The reason why M. Dore had desired to recall the spirit in which the draft Convention had been prepared was that, in agreement with the League of Nations, the Institute had reserved its right to propose a number of additions to Paragraph III of the Protocol concerning the competence of the Institute in regard to the methods of agricultural statistics.

These considerations were in conformity with the attempt that was being made to rationalise the work between the League and the Institute, which co-operated most cordially and had made special arrangements to carry out their work in common. These observations might also apply to the remarks of M. Platzer concerning the agricultural census. The work hitherto accomplished in regard to this census had mainly concerned the standard form, but it was not stated that this work had been concluded, and the most appropriate organisation to carry out these studies and to bring about future agreements was the International Institute of Agriculture.

The Chairman did not wish to go beyond his duty in ruling that observations in regard to the relations between the International Institute and the Conference were outside the terms of reference of the Committee. He wondered, however, whether emphasis should be laid on this aspect of the question, and whether it would not be better to refrain from too detailed a discussion, and to be content with inserting a passage in the Protocol, or with adopting a recommendation alluding to the part played by the International Institute.

M. Le Cosquino de Bussy (Netherlands) said that the Government of the Netherlands was ready to adopt the model formula proposed by the International Institute of Agriculture as a general guide. It reserved the right, however, to depart from the formula whenever this seemed desirable because of local conditions. This was particularly the case in the overseas territories of the Netherlands. The Netherlands intended to carry out an agricultural census of the Dutch East Indies in 1930, but a census on the lines suggested by the Rome Institute did not seem to be very practical for tropical countries.

M. Pando y Cintia (Cuba) recalled what had been said by his colleague, M. de Blanck, on the previous day in regard to a Cuban law which laid down that a census should be held every ten years. The next census, which would satisfy more than one desire of the Conference, would take place in 1930. Should the International Institute of Agriculture choose a date which was not the same as the date fixed by the Cuban law, it would be impossible for the Government of that
country to adopt its suggestion. For this reason, the representative of Cuba urged the adoption of the present text, and was against the adoption of the amendment. He proposed that the agricultural census should take place simultaneously with the census of the population during the last year of each ten-year period, as was proposed in Paragraph III of Article 1 of the draft Convention, and that no amendment should be allowed to this proposal.

M. Kovero (Finland) said that agricultural censuses had taken place in Finland in 1910 and 1920. The Finnish Government proposed to carry out a third census in 1929. Finland had adopted the date proposed by the Rome Institute, in order to facilitate the development of international agricultural statistics.

The Chairman closed the general discussion, and called upon the Committee to take a decision on sub-paragraphs (a), (b) and (c), with special reference to the date of the censuses and to the amendments submitted.

Sub-Paragraph (a), Paragraph III.

Amendment of the Italian Delegation (document C.S.O./Prod./4).

“(a) General censuses of agriculture to be taken, if possible, once in each decade, on the lines proposed and in the year proposed by the International Institute of Agriculture.”

M. Gini (Italy) explained that the object of the Italian amendment was to give greater freedom to States, and to provide the Rome Institute with the means of conciliating various requirements. States might urge the value of their own special experience, or point out that their legislation already fixed the date of censuses, or that they were faced with special difficulties which it was impossible to foresee at the moment. He thought that the Rome Institute, in view of the technical methods and the experience at its disposal, would be the most competent organisation to form an opinion of the various needs of the Governments and to arrive at an agreement with them with the object of achieving the best possible result.

M. Jahn (Norway), Rapporteur, proposed to insert in two places the words “if possible” in the text of sub-paragraph (a), in order to satisfy the various desires expressed.

M. Gini (Italy) pointed out that, in the French text, the words “if possible” would apply to the whole sentence.

The Chairman said that this was a mere question of drafting, which could be settled subsequently.

The amendment of the Italian delegation was adopted.

Mr. Mitchell (British Empire) proposed to delete the words “on the lines proposed by the International Institute of Agriculture”. This was already stated in the Protocol and it seemed unnecessary to repeat it in the text of the Convention, where as wide an agricultural census as possible should alone be provided for. It should be stated in the Protocol that, in respect of this census, the suggestions of the Rome Institute should be followed wherever possible.

M. Pando y Cintra (Cuba) pointed out that the Italian amendment had already been adopted.

The Chairman thought that, in adopting the Italian amendment, the Committee had not decided either upon the date or upon the lines of the census.

M. Gini (Italy) replied that, both in accordance with the terms of the Italian amendment and with those of the original text of the Convention, the question of the lines to be followed was within the terms of reference of the Rome Institute. The proposal of the British delegate was in no way contrary to this view. The Italian delegation did not think it superfluous to insert a reference to the Institute in sub-paragraph (a).

The Chairman proposed that this matter should be submitted to the Sub-Committee.

Mr. Mitchell (British Empire) agreed.

This proposal was adopted.


Mme. Falkner-Smit (U.S.S.R.) said that her delegation proposed to add, after the words “International Institute of Agriculture”, the words “with such changes and amendments as are indicated in Annex B (proposed by the delegation of the U.S.S.R.).”

The Chairman said that this amendment came within the terms of reference of the Sub-Committee. If the Sub-Committee accepted the proposed annex, the corresponding amendment would be inserted in sub-paragraph (a) of Paragraph III of Article 1.

Sub-Paragraph (b), Paragraph III.

Amendment of the Japanese Delegation (document C.S.O./Prod./3).

The Chairman said that the Japanese delegation proposed to add, after the words “area under the main crops”, the words “if possible, with division into sown or planted area and harvested area.”
M. GINI (Italy) did not understand whether the Japanese amendment was designed to make a distinction between areas sown and areas harvested, or whether it mainly concerned the addition of the words "if possible".

The CHAIRMAN wondered whether the Japanese delegation wished to contemplate the possibility of States furnishing two figures, one for sown or planted areas, the other for harvested areas, or whether it merely wished them to specify whether the single figure furnished covered sown or planted areas and harvested areas, without obliging them to furnish two figures.

M. COLSON (France) pointed out that the difference between the two areas was often so small that the figures given would not furnish statistics of any great interest.

M. DORE (International Institute of Agriculture) supported the Japanese proposal. There were countries where the difference between the two categories of areas was considerable. For example, the United States, where the difference amounted sometimes to millions of hectares; in other countries the difference was so small that they could not reasonably be asked to give two figures. The Japanese proposal covered both cases.

The CHAIRMAN proposed to add, after the words "if possible" in the Japanese amendment, the words: "and if this distinction is important".

This proposal was adopted.

M. GINI (Italy) explained that the expression "if possible" should not apply to the submission of harvest statistics. States were free to make a distinction between areas sown or planted and harvested areas, but not to refuse to draw up harvest statistics. Consequently, he proposed to place the Japanese amendment between brackets.

The CHAIRMAN said that the Rapporteur would follow the suggestion if the Japanese amendment were adopted.

Mr. HOLLOWAY (South Africa) said that, generally speaking, South Africa had no reservations to make regarding the paragraph under discussion. Nevertheless, though his country might be able to furnish the information required by the Rome Institute and by the Japanese delegation, as so far as its European population was concerned — the difference between the two categories of areas being sometimes very great — the South African delegation must make a reservation in regard to the native population. It was impossible to obtain information from that population, for it had no idea of figures.

The Japanese amendment was adopted.


The CHAIRMAN said that the delegation of the U.S.S.R. proposed to add, after the words "harvest returns", the words: "and mean harvest returns. Balance-sheets of the principal crops of corn, forage and technical crops in conformity with the scheme set forth in Annex B, proposed by the U.S.S.R. delegation".

The Chairman asked whether the average per hectare was required, or the average calculated over a certain number of years.

Mme. FALKNER-SMIT (U.S.S.R.) replied that both figures were asked for, if it were possible to furnish them.

The CHAIRMAN observed that a simple calculation would determine the average production for a department or a province. The method to be followed in calculating the production over a certain area was merely to have the average yield per hectare determined by census officials. He did not think that the proposal of the U.S.S.R. delegation added anything to sub-paragraph (b).

Mme. FALKNER-SMIT (U.S.S.R.) replied that it was frequently impossible to discover the averages from the figures furnished. If the amendment of the U.S.S.R. were adopted, each statistical department would have to furnish its figures in such a manner as to make it possible to calculate the averages in question.

The CHAIRMAN thought that, in these circumstances, the amendment concerned the presentation of the statistics furnished. He wondered whether this was a question for the Committee to discuss. If, on the other hand, the amendment involved the provision of average figures for a period of several years, it was equivalent to asking States to compile statistics additional to those laid down in sub-paragraph (b).

Mme. FALKNER-SMIT (U.S.S.R.) agreed with the first observation of the Chairman if it were understood that the manner in which the statistics collected should be published would be dealt with elsewhere.

The CHAIRMAN said that this question of detail could be referred to the Sub-Committee. The remainder of the amendment of the U.S.S.R. in regard to sub-paragraph (b) would certainly be studied by the Sub-Committee.
Sub-Paragraph (c), Paragraph III.

Amendment of the Japanese Delegation (document C.S.O./Prod./3).

The CHAIRMAN said that the Japanese delegation proposed to complete the paragraph with the words: "if possible, according to sex and age".

This amendment was adopted.


The CHAIRMAN said that the delegation of the U.S.S.R. proposed to complete the paragraph by the words: "and of the principal live-stock products, namely, milk, wool (principal kinds and average per head), butcher's meat (with average weight of slaughter cattle according to the age), honey, eggs and dairy produce".

He said that the Sub-Committee would examine this amendment. He added that the texts which had just been examined would be formally adopted after the report of the Sub-Committee had been discussed.

Sub-Paragraph (d), Paragraph III.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the question of periodical surveys of forest resources concerned only a small number of delegations. The question was, however, whether it should be examined at a special meeting only by the delegations particularly interested or by a Sub-Committee.

Mr. RIDDELL (Canada) supported the proposal that the question should be examined at a special meeting of the delegates of the countries specially concerned.

This proposal was adopted.

FIFTH MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE ON PRODUCTION STATISTICS.

Held on Friday, November 30th, 1928, at 3 p.m.

Chairman: Mr. Durand.

12. Appointment of a Sub-Committee on Industrial Statistics.

The CHAIRMAN referred to a point of procedure. In order to expedite the discussions, general questions would be considered at plenary meetings of the Committee. Questions of detail would be referred to sub-committees.

A new document prepared by the International Chamber of Commerce and dealing with mineral resources had been communicated to the Committee. This document would be referred to a Sub-Committee which would be appointed later and which would examine it and submit a report to the plenary Committee.

A Sub-Committee which would meet at 9.30 a.m. on the following day would be responsible for the question of forestry statistics. The Chairman requested all members interested in that question to take part in the discussions of the Sub-Committee.

Mr. MITCHELL (British Empire) observed that the British delegation had proposed an amendment to Annex III the adoption of which would obviate a discussion on points of detail.

M. COLSON (France) said that the French delegation, in agreement with the British delegation, thought that the memorandum from the International Chamber of Commerce should be taken as a basis of discussion.

The CHAIRMAN was not sure that it would be possible to examine Annex III as amended by the British delegation at a plenary meeting of the Committee. He thought that the discussion on statistics of mineral resources might be opened and that the Committee might then decide whether the question should be referred for study to a Sub-Committee. It could, however, be stated at once that it would be necessary to appoint a Sub-Committee to consider industrial statistics. So many amendments had been received that they could not possibly all be examined at a plenary meeting of the Committee.

M. GINI (Italy) supported the Chairman's proposal to designate a Sub-Committee on Industrial Statistics. Further, the simplest procedure would, he thought, be to request the Chairman himself to nominate the members of the Sub-Committee, subject to the reservation that any delegations which were really anxious to take part in the discussions of the Sub-Committee could apply for authorisation to do so.

It was decided to appoint a Sub-Committee on Industrial Statistics; the members of the Sub-Committee should not exceed seven in number and should be nominated by the Chairman.

Mme. FALKNER-SMIT (U.S.S.R.) asked that the U.S.S.R. might be represented on the Sub-Committee, because it had a number of proposals to submit.

The CHAIRMAN replied that he would take note of Mme. Falkner-Smit's request.

Article 1, Paragraph III, Sub-Paragraphs (a), (b), (c).

M. Ito (Japan), Rapporteur, gave a brief account of the discussions held in the Sub-Committee with regard to the proposals of the U.S.S.R. (document C.S.O. /Prod./6). The Sub-Committee had been unable to reach a unanimous decision on any point except one, namely, the amendment proposed by the U.S.S.R. delegation to sub-paragraph (a). The U.S.S.R. delegation had proposed to complete that sub-paragraph by the addition of the words: "with the changes and amendments indicated in Annex B" (a new annex proposed by the delegation) after the words: "lines proposed by the International Institute of Agriculture".

The Sub-Committee had not accepted the U.S.S.R. delegation's amendment, but had noted that there were important differences between the French and the English wording of the draft text, and had agreed upon the necessity of amending the French text so as to bring it into harmony with the English version. The French text would now read: "recensements généraux de l'agriculture dans l'esprit des propositions de l'Institut international d'Agriculture". The U.S.S.R. delegation had then consented to withdraw its amendment on this point.

M. Gini (Italy) wondered whether the new term "dans l'esprit" was preferable to the previous expression "selon les directives".

The Chairman did not think that there was any great difference between the two expressions, or that one was more binding on the Governments than the other. He thought, however, that the Committee should take a decision on the point and he therefore put to the vote the drafting modification proposed by the Sub-Committee.

The Committee decided to accept the amendment by twelve votes to five.

M. Ito (Japan), Rapporteur, added that the U.S.S.R. delegation had proposed to insert in an annex the draft standard form for the world agricultural census of 1930 submitted by the International Institute of Agriculture. The majority of the Sub-Committee had rejected that proposal.

Mme. Falkner-Smit (U.S.S.R.) said that her delegation's amendments had not been distributed in time and that it had therefore been impossible to give them sufficient consideration.

In this connection, she would press only for the insertion in Paragraph III of a special sub-paragraph setting forth the need of representative enquiries more detailed in scope and permitting of a more thorough investigation into the questions of agricultural production and also of certain rural economic and social conditions (tenancies, mortgages, etc.).

The Chairman asked if the U.S.S.R. delegation was putting forward its text as an amendment to the Convention itself, or as a recommendation, or merely for the purpose of inclusion in the Minutes.

Mme. Falkner-Smit (U.S.S.R.) said that she would prefer if her amendment could be included in Paragraph III of Article 1; if that were impossible, she would consent to its appearing as a recommendation.

The Chairman thought that it would be better to hold over consideration of the amendment until the Recommendations came under discussion. It would, in fact, be difficult to find a place in the actual text of the Convention for the U.S.S.R. delegation's proposal.

M. Ito (Japan), Rapporteur, continuing his statement, observed that the Sub-Committee had rejected the amendments proposed by the U.S.S.R. delegation to sub-paragraphs (b) and (c). The Sub-Committee had, with only one dissentient voice, decided to refer to a committee of experts the amendments proposed to sub-paragraphs (b) and (c) and those proposed to Annex B (document C.S.O./Prod./6). The committee of experts for this subject would not be the same as that the setting up of which had already been suggested.

M. Ito further said that the majority of the Sub-Committee had agreed that those questions should be left to the International Institute of Agriculture to investigate, but the U.S.S.R. delegation had said that it would prefer that, on account of certain political difficulties, no mention should be made of the Rome Institute. For this reason, the Sub-Committee was proposing the reference of the various amendments in question to a committee of experts to be designated later.

M. Dore (International Institute of Agriculture) pointed out that negotiations had recently been entered into with a view to the representation of the U.S.S.R. on the Rome Institute. He would like the delegate of the U.S.S.R. to explain what she meant in alluding to difficulties of a political nature.

M. Krizmann (U.S.S.R.) wished to state explicitly that the difficulties to which attention had been drawn were not in the least political; they bore rather on questions of organisation due to the fact that the U.S.S.R. was not a member of the Rome Institute.

The Chairman noted that the Committee had before it a proposal to refer the U.S.S.R. delegation's amendments to a committee of experts. Speaking for himself, he would have preferred that they should be sent for examination to the International Institute of Agriculture, since the latter had already studied the questions involved and the relation between it and the Conference was a close one.
The CHAIRMAN noted that the Committee approved the report of the Sub-Committee, the U.S.S.R. delegation alone voting in the opposite sense.

14. Article 1, Paragraph III, Sub-paragraphs (g) and (h): Industrial Statistics: General Discussion.

The CHAIRMAN observed that sub-paragraph (f) would be referred for examination to a special Sub-Committee. He therefore suggested that the Committee should proceed to a general discussion of the purport of sub-paragraphs (g) and (h), Articles 3 and 4 and Annexes I and II, which related to the same subjects as the afore-mentioned sub-paragraphs.

M. Mráz (Czechoslovakia) proposed (document C.S.O./Prod./2) that sub-paragraphs (g) and (h) be deleted from Article 1 and included among the Recommendations. He observed that the compilation of statistics of the kind in question involved difficulties both of method and of collection. It would be impossible to collect them in Czechoslovakia and probably also in a number of other countries.

The CHAIRMAN did not think it possible to put the Czechoslovak proposal to the vote. He wished first to know the general opinion of the Committee.

M. de Calheiros y Menezes (Portugal) seconded the Czechoslovak delegation's proposal.

M. Michaykoff (Bulgaria) gave a summary of the method of collection of industrial statistics in Bulgaria. In substance, he said that, in regard to industrial statistics, Bulgaria had on two occasions, in 1908 and 1921, conducted a very extensive inquiry into the more important industries. The survey for 1908 had been conducted in respect of industrial establishments enjoying advantages granted to them by the law concerning the encouragement of national industry, whereas that of 1921 had covered all establishments held to be covered by the terms of the said law, regardless of whether they did or did not belong to the industries specially encouraged. According to the amendments made in the law in 1928, the establishments covered had to have not less than 10 workers in their employment, plant of not less than 10 h.p., and machinery and plant representing not less than 20,000 gold francs in capital value. The survey of 1921 had gone into minute details regarding the number of establishments, the nature of their production, their legal situation, the periods of production, hours of work by night and day, the number of days in the year on which no work was done, capital invested in real estate, machinery and buildings, national and foreign capital, taxes, insurance, places of work, workers' housing conditions, machinery and plant, etc. A system adopted in Bulgaria, which consisted of entering on a special schedule the most detailed information concerning the entire personnel engaged in the different industries, had made it possible for the enquiries into the industries encouraged in Bulgaria to be carried out in a much broader manner than was required by Annex I of the draft Convention. These enquiries did not cover and could not cover small commercial establishments or domestic industry. Nor could they be developed in this direction, on account of the increase in statistical work that would be involved, and on account of the absence of accounts in small establishments. In consequence, in respect of these undertakings, Bulgaria would have to content herself with information obtained from the census of industrial establishments which was taken in connection with the population census.

In regard to index numbers of industrial production, M. Michaykoff said that the recent modifications made in the Law on the encouragement of domestic industry under date of May 23rd, 1928, had made it possible for Bulgaria to compile up-to-date returns, to be published annually, of the activity of all the more important industries in the country.

M. Pullerits (Estonia) said that, although he recognised the great importance of statistics indicating at regular intervals the variations of activity in the most representative industries, Estonia and Latvia nevertheless considered that the quarterly compilation and publication of index numbers occasioned very serious difficulties for many branches of industry. Industrial activity was estimated on the basis of the products manufactured and ready for market. Nevertheless, the figures in many cases were not such as to give a true picture of the activity of an establishment — for instance, in cases where it was engaged on the transformation of raw materials.

M. Lorenz (Switzerland) explained that his country had very few raw materials, and therefore her entire industry, with the exception of that of aluminium, was engaged in processes of transformation. Switzerland prepared statistics of production for each branch separately, but she encountered considerable difficulties. Since 1924, she had compiled quarterly indices of production, but the preparation of the indices was based on a procedure other than that proposed in Annex II. It would therefore appear to be impossible for Switzerland to apply the recommendations in Annex II relating to the preparation of indices of industrial production. The Swiss delegation, therefore, would support the proposal of the Czechoslovak delegation.

M. Gini (Italy) said that his delegation realised the difficulties which had been placed before the Conference by the various delegations. It intended, moreover, to make a proposal which was similar to the amendment of the Czechoslovak delegation. It thought, however, that, by making the wording of the paragraphs in question more elastic, the Convention might be made applicable to all countries. The Italian delegation therefore proposed the two following amendments, the first to sub-paragraph (g) and the second to sub-paragraph (h) (document C.S.O./Prod./4):
Paragraph III, Sub-Paragraph (g).

Replace the sub-paragraph by the following words:

“Figures of industrial production that each country may be able to furnish with a sufficient degree of accuracy.”

Paragraph III, Sub-Paragraph (h).

Replace the sub-paragraph by the following words:

“Series of statistical indices at regular intervals—if possible quarterly or preferably monthly—indicating the variations of the industrial activity of the most representative branches of production.”

The amendment proposed to sub-paragraph (h) was intended solely to make the text more precise. The English and French versions gave different impressions. It had never been the intention of those who had prepared the draft to ask the countries to supply figures which might be incomplete. If States were unable to supply accurate figures, it was preferable that they should furnish none at all.

In sub-paragraph (h) the draft Convention was asking too much. It assumed that there existed a census of industrial production in every country, whereas such a census was in no way compulsory. The Italian delegation was proposing the elimination of the last part of sub-paragraph (h), and that the wording of the first part should be made more elastic in order to make allowance for the obstacles to the compilation of statistics of industrial production to which certain delegations had drawn attention. An effort should, of course, be made to obtain quarterly indices, but if that was impossible, States could not be forced to compile them. If, however, almost every country was prepared to supply annual indices, some of them would find it difficult to furnish quarterly indices and still more difficult to furnish monthly indices; hence the text proposed by the Italian delegation.

M. Bikelas (Greece) said that his Government was obliged to make certain reservations in regard to statistics of industrial production and to indices of the productive activity of the most important industries.

The reservations put forward were the result of experience, which led the Greek Government to think that, in the present state of the national economic development, the immediate application of the principles mentioned above would be impossible. In the absence, on the one hand, of any special legislative measures obliging those concerned to supply accurate particulars, in correlation, on the other hand, with the absence of any technical staff to inspect the factories, to give guidance to such persons as were competent to supply the statistics and later to verify on the spot the particulars supplied, investigations of the kind indicated would be almost impossible and would give only a very faint picture of the truth.

The practical difficulties which had been mentioned, and which would prevent the Greek delegation from signing that part of the Convention without reservation, could not be overcome for the moment, notwithstanding the ceaseless efforts made in Greece to obtain the necessary particulars.

M. Cavalcanti Albuquerque de Gusmão (Brazil) said that his country would have difficulty in collecting the particulars required for the compilation of the series of industrial statistics indicated in Article 1, Paragraph III, sub-paragraph (h), for many of the most important industries, among which were those mentioned in Annex II (brewing; the distilling of alcoholic liquor; the manufacture of tobacco; the refining of sugar, exclusive of the manufacture of sugar in the strict sense of the term; the manufacture of boots and of glass; and the textile industries—cotton, silk, wool, jute and hemp). If, for the calculation of index numbers, the bases were the quantity and value of the annual production of the factories to which the consumption tax applied, it would be impossible—at any rate, for the moment—to follow out in toto the recommendations of sub-paragraph (h). That sub-paragraph laid down a minimum period of three months for the publication of the statistical data, a period which was far too short to make it possible to prepare a statement, in view of the present position of the statistical service and the fiscal service, to which allusion had been made.

M. Sztrum de Sztrem (Poland) said that, in his country, the statistics of industrial production had developed in the course of the last four years. These statistics might be said now to comprise all industries, as they covered all establishments employing five or more workmen. The statistics showed:

1. Number of workmen, with particulars as to age and sex, and the technical and administrative staff.
2. Power (according to kind).
3. Fuel utilised.
4. Capital invested in the industry.
5. Products obtained from 108 types of industry; quantity only.
6. Materials employed; quantity only.
7. For certain branches, the principal machines.

Each industry had a special form. For the year 1926, only part of the particulars had been obtained for experimental purposes. Almost all the forms would be filled in and all the data obtained for 1927. Poland, therefore, was already in possession of sufficient statistical data to begin work in regard to indices of activity in the most representative branches of industry.
The Polish Government was prepared to develop its industrial statistics in accordance with the requirements of the Convention, but its statistics did not yet cover the value of the products of the materials in course of transformation. Statistics of that kind necessitated considerable preparatory work.

Furthermore, technical and legal conditions were a great obstacle to the compilation of these statistics.

M. Szatum de Sztram thought that, without the necessary preparatory work, the industrial statistics would be inaccurate and the work useless. For that reason, the Polish delegation would propose an amendment to Article 3 and to Annex I, as well as a motion that the annex should in part be made non-obligatory.

M. Mraz (Czechoslovakia) thought that his proposal was calculated to satisfy those countries which could not easily comply with the requirement as to industrial statistics formulated in the draft Convention. That did not mean that those countries refused to compile statistics of industrial activity, but that it might be difficult for them to do so under the conditions laid down. Speaking for his own part, M. Mrz had received instructions from his Government to avoid entering into any legal commitment on the point. For that reason, he had thought it right to propose a rather more elastic form of wording.

M. Pando y Cintra (Cuba) said that his country was in the same situation as Brazil and would have difficulty in supplying the statistics mentioned in sub-paragraph (h). The preparation of those statistics might perhaps be possible at the time of the census, to be taken in 1930, but the Cuban Government would have difficulty in binding itself to supply them quarterly or even annually.

Mme. Falkner-Smit (U.S.S.R.) said that her delegation accepted sub-paragraphs (g) and (h) without reservation. The obstacles mentioned by certain other delegations had been overcome in Russia, where all the requisite indices for the compilation of the statistics in question were now available. In order to define the purport of sub-paragraph (h), the U.S.S.R. delegation proposed to add, after the words "of those industries", the following words:

"... in particular, the index of the physical volume of industrial production, the index of workers' employment, the index of wages, the index of power and the index of fuel consumption.

"Countries where no census is taken at relatively frequent intervals shall publish, in addition to the above indices, annual statistics relating to the chief branches of industry, covering production, manual labour and power plant, and also annual summaries regarding the condition and working of public-utility electric power-houses, on the lines laid down in the documents annexed to the Convention."

The Chairman said that the amendment proposed by the U.S.S.R. delegation would be examined when the discussion on points of detail was opened.

Mr. Meek (India) observed that he spoke on behalf of a country of three hundred million inhabitants, and he hoped that the difficulties which the compilation of statistics of industrial production were likely to present in a country like India would be realised. He admitted that the final text of the Convention would probably be very different from the original one, and he understood that the signatory States would not be required to commit themselves to the immediate compilation of industrial statistics.

He pointed out that, in India, there were no statistics relating to industrial production of the kind provided for in the Convention (Annex I), with the exception of statistics relating to cotton, jute, tea and coffee. He had not had any attempt been made to compile such statistics. Mr. Meek then made a statement on the situation of industry in India and of the difficulties concerning the compilation of accurate statistics.

(a) With the exception of mines and large industrial and commercial establishments, there were no organised capitalist enterprises in India. What did exist was a large number of scattered and independent undertakings generally run by people working on their own account. In these circumstances, the compilation of statistics was not merely difficult but impossible without the help of a very considerable staff.

(b) Domestic industries or industries organised on a small scale were very numerous in India, and, according to the report of the Indian Industrial Commission, the number of persons working in the different domestic industries was much greater than that of workers employed in organised industries. The majority of these workers were illiterate and kept no accounts, and the difficulty of collecting statistics from this mass of scattered workers would be insuperable. Without figures relating to domestic industry, statistics of production in India would, of course, be incomplete.

(c) The Indian Industrial Commission had prepared a scheme for the compilation of production statistics covering industrial production, but the provincial Governments, which would have to bear the greater part of the expense involved, considered that this scheme was to a large extent impracticable, and that the funds could be used to greater advantage in other directions.

M. Jensen (Denmark) drew attention to the difficulty which small countries encountered in compiling and publishing periodic indices of their industrial production. The Danish Government fully realised the great importance of the compilation of the indices required. They
also thought that these indices should be based on voluntary declarations by the industries concerned. Danish manufacturers were not at present disposed to divulge, with a view to publication, the figures relating to their industries, for reasons the propriety of which would be readily apparent, when it was remembered that in many branches of industry the number of Danish factories was very small. The publication of figures for industrial production would indeed practically amount to the publication of the balance-sheets of one or two industries.

Mr. Craig (Egypt) said that he had not yet spoken because Egypt had no difficulty in supplying the agricultural statistics required. Agricultural statistics in Egypt were very highly developed. In regard to industrial production, on the contrary, Egypt was in the same position as India. There were very few big industries in Egypt. Almost the entire industry of the country took the form of home manufactures, and a census would accordingly be very difficult. As almost all the cultivable land in Egypt was under crop, the Government was endeavoring to carry out a census of production of the country. In the previous year, an industrial census had been begun. It was hoped that in five years this operation would be carried out with greater facility. It was necessary to overcome both the ignorance and the prejudices of the inhabitants, who regarded every census as the beginning of additional levies for military service or of increased taxation.

Mr. Craig therefore hoped that a certain elasticity would be given to the requirements of subparagraphs (g) and (h). He suggested that the countries should be divided into two categories: those which consented to be bound and undertook to supply the statistics required, and those for which this obligation would not be absolute owing to the difficulties which the compilation of the statistics required would present for them. Egypt would ask to be classified in the second category.

Sir Sydney Chapman (British Empire) thought the question an important one. He considered that sub-paragraphs (g) and (h) were not very well drafted and did not give a sufficiently clear idea of what was expected from the Governments. The sub-paragraphs in question should be given a form of wording more in conformity with the suggestions of M. Gini. The first thing, therefore, was to go back to the review for statistics relating to home industries. These paragraphs related solely to industrialised manufactures in the strict sense of the term. In reply to the objection made by the Danish delegate, Sir Sydney Chapman did not think that figures could be published which would disclose information about particular concerns. In regard to the proposal made by Mr. Craig, Sir Sydney Chapman thought his idea an admirable one. A classification of the countries in two categories might be adopted, as had been done in the case of data for forestry production. He thought that it would be possible to introduce in the Protocol a clause to the effect that the countries whose industry was developed would only be required from countries whose industry was developed. He hoped, however, that the Conference would not restrict itself to formulating simple recommendations with regard to those countries from which a statement was considered to be highly desirable, although for the others the publication of these data might form the subject, not of an obligation, but of a simple recommendation. In any case, he hoped that for the genuinely industrial countries the furnishing of figures for industrial production would be made obligatory. The great difficulty, to his mind, was that of obtaining official data in the field of industrial production. At the present time, there were few precise data as to the variations which occurred in that field. The majority of the countries issued useful figures in regard to their trade but very little in regard to their industrial production. The ideal would be to have a periodical census of production for the different industries, as such a census would make it possible to have both trustworthy data, to which reference could be made subsequently, and periodical data showing the variations of production. An endeavour had been made in England to realise that ideal. Sir Sydney Chapman acknowledged that few countries were in a position to carry out, in the near future, a census of production, but there was no reason why the Governments should be entirely discharged from the duty of making an effort on these lines; however modest, any beginning should be encouraged.

Allusion had been made to the difficulty of obliging producers to furnish figures for their industry. Sir Sydney Chapman pointed out, first, that in M. Gini's amendment there was no question of an obligation; and, secondly, that the greater part of the data on which the indices were based was supplied voluntarily. He thought that most of the countries which had a developed industry had at their disposal the statistics compiled by the big associations, and these sufficed to give a fairly accurate index of the development of the production of those industries. To his mind, it was useless to introduce into the Convention a hard-and-fast obligation on this point. Sir Sydney Chapman would complete and define M. Gini's proposal thus: "as complete figures as possible". On the basis of the ideas which he had put forward, he thought that it would be possible to re-draft the text of the Convention without it being necessary for the Conference to restrict itself to making simple recommendations.

M. Gini (Italy) considered that M. Jensen had drawn attention to a particularly important point, and thought that the Committee should be grateful to him for having done so. M. Jensen had drawn attention to the difficulty facing the Governments of certain countries in which the manufacturers were opposed to providing returns for their industries which would be published. If the Committee accepted the Italian delegation's amendment, those countries would not be required to furnish any data except those which they were able to supply without inconvenience, but the data would in all cases have to be as accurate as possible. M. Gini added that, in subparagraph (h) of the draft Convention, there was no requirement to compile figures but only indices of industrial production. He called to mind, on this point, the discussions which had taken place in the Experts Committee which had prepared the Convention, and which had resulted in
the adoption of the present form of wording of sub-paragraph (h), i.e., the requirement that only simple indices of production should be published. The Italian delegation therefore proposed that the opening words of sub-paragraph (h) should be amended to read: "Series of statistical indices".

M. Jensen (Denmark), in reply to M. Gini, explained that no difficulty was experienced in Denmark in obtaining the data for annual production, as the supply of such data was compulsory. M. Jensen had wished to draw attention to the difficulty presented by the supply of monthly data.

The Chairman thought that the Sub-Committee appointed to examine questions relating to industrial production would be able to discover a form of wording which would satisfy all delegations.

M. Schmidt (Austria) said that hitherto his country had held no census of industrial production, as there was no statutory instrument on the basis of which such a census could be taken. There were, however, in Austria, for a certain number of industries, statistical data showing the sum total of production. The industries concerned were mainly those which were liable to a tax on consumption, such as breweries, distilleries, the sugar industry and match factories. As the object of these statistics was quite a special one, the data on which they were based were limited to the quantities produced in a given period. They did not show the value of the production, nor the other data required by the Convention. It was possible to obtain precise data for the tobacco industry, which was at present a State monopoly.

In addition to the statistics mentioned above, a certain number of industries supplied statistical data of their own accord — for instance, the paper factories, the glass industry and the electrical industry.

Seeing that, mainly for financial reasons, there could be no prospect for many years to come of holding an industrial census in Austria, the Austrian delegation would support the Czechoslovak delegation's proposal.

15. Appointment of a Sub-Committee on Industrial Statistics.

The Chairman thought that the Committee's work would be appreciably facilitated by the preparatory work of the Sub-Committee which it had been decided to set up. He therefore invited those delegations which had amendments to submit their amendments in writing, at the next meeting.

The Chairman proposed that the Sub-Committee should consist of the following members:

Sir Sydney Chapman (British Empire), Chairman.
M. Platz (Germany).
M. Jensen (Denmark).
Mr. Durand (U.S.A.).
M. Huber (France).
M. Bernardi (Italy).
Mme. Falkner-Smit (U.S.S.R.).

The proposal of the Chairman was adopted.

The Chairman requested the Sub-Committee to meet on Saturday, December 1st, at 9.30 a.m. Further, he reminded the Committee that all delegations which had an interest in the question of forestry statistics would be entitled, at the same hour, to take part in the discussion dealing with that subject.

M. Kritzmann (U.S.S.R.) thought it important to make provision for annual data relating to the production of arms and ammunition to be supplied. He added that he had himself clearly set forth the reasons for this proposal in the speech which he had made at a plenary meeting of the Conference. He therefore proposed to add to Paragraph III of Article 1 a clause providing for the supply of statistics relating to (document C.S.O./Prod./15):

(1) Rifles, including automatic and magazine rifles, and ammunition for same;
(2) Revolvers and automatic pistols, and ammunition for same;
(3) All kinds of machine-guns, including automatic light and heavy rifles, and ammunition for same;
(4) Mine-throwers, grenade and bomb throwers, flame throwers, and ammunition for same, and rifle and hand grenades;
(5) Guns of all calibres and types, and ammunition for same, whether complete or in component parts;
(6) Tanks and other armoured vehicles;
(7) Gunpowder and explosives employed for exclusively military purposes;
(8) All poisonous materials for war, as well as the appliances by which they are diffused, such as gas projectors, pulverisers, balloons and other apparatus;
(9) Capital ships, cruisers, aircraft-carriers, destroyers and submarines;
(10) Fighting machines and other military aircraft.
The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the proposal made by the U.S.S.R. delegation was an entirely new one, and it would therefore be difficult to consider it at the end of the meeting, especially in view of the advanced hour. Furthermore, the proposal would seem to be political rather than economic in character. He therefore requested delegates to think over the matter and to consider whether a proposal of this kind could be admitted within the scope of general statistics.

M. KRITZMANN (U.S.S.R.) said that his delegation would be satisfied if the question were discussed at a plenary meeting. He added that his proposal was entirely justified on economic grounds, although the question at issue was not free from political considerations.

M. GINI (Italy) enquired whether, in the improbable event of the Conference's accepting the U.S.S.R. delegation's proposal, that delegation had considered the means of ensuring the accuracy of the statistical data covered by that proposal.

M. COLSON (France) observed that the U.S.S.R. delegation was asking that for certain industries detailed enquiries should be made which bore no relation to their economic importance. He added that, if similar proposals on points of detail relating to all the branches of industry under consideration were to be examined, the Conference would be forced to sit for many months.

SIXTH MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE ON PRODUCTION STATISTICS.
Held on Saturday, December 1st, 1928, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman: Mr. DURAND.

16. Appointment of a Sub-Committee on Mining and Metallurgical Statistics.

The CHAIRMAN recalled that Annex III contained detailed tables relating to mining statistics. The British delegation and the International Chamber of Commerce had each submitted a simplified draft. He proposed that the annex and the proposals concerning it should be referred to a Sub-Committee, to be composed as follows:

Mr. MITCHELL (British Empire), Chairman.
M. Platzer (Germany).
Mr. Dewhurst (United States).
M. Colson (France).
M. SZTURM DE SZTREM (Poland).
M. Jansson (Sweden).
Mr. Lockock (International Chamber of Commerce).

Any expert who desired to assist the Sub-Committee would naturally be able to do so.

17. Article 1, Paragraph III, Sub-Paragraph (f) (Mining and Metallurgical Statistics).

The CHAIRMAN recalled that the first amendment submitted by the U.S.S.R. delegation (document C.S.O./Prod./6) urged the entire deletion of this sub-paragraph. The second amendment, proposed by the British representatives (document C.S.O./Prod./8), contained drafting amendments.

M. Parent (International Chamber of Commerce) said that experts on coal had been called together by the International Chamber of Commerce to deal with the preparatory work. They had based their discussion on their professional experience and on the enquiry which had been carried out during the past three years by the International Labour Office into the industry.

During the course of their work, the extreme difficulty of preparing complete monographs on industries such as the coal industry, and the time which an extensive documentation even on the structure of the industry involved, had become apparent. It had eventually proved necessary to select information of immediate interest for the industrial and commercial world and to have it published as expeditiously as possible.

The majority of producer countries already published monthly and annual returns but under slightly different forms. Statistics of production were published monthly for Germany, Belgium, and France, and quarterly for England. It was equally necessary that the information should be furnished on the same basis for all countries in order to allow useful comparisons to be made.

It was for this reason that the International Chamber proposed tables for monthly and annual information to be provided in respect of each country, and, indeed, of each important coal area. The monthly returns would give the production of coal, the number of working days in the month, the registered staff, the production of briquettes, etc., and coke in the mines. The annual statistics would contain more complete returns covering the production of briquettes, etc., and coke in industrial establishments not connected with the mines.
Returns of production would naturally be amplified by the monthly and annual Customs statistics of the movement of imports and exports.

The International Chamber of Commerce felt that its proposals satisfied a widespread desire for full and expeditious information on the production of and the trade in coal.

The Chairman recalled that one single principle dominated the whole discussion: an endeavour must be made to achieve a minimum. Countries, however, which would do more than the minimum would always be free to meet in order to establish comparable statistics in certain other directions.

M. Solente (International Chamber of Commerce) said that the Chamber had submitted a report (document C.S.O.6) on iron ore and metallurgical products. For these industries it would be even more difficult than for the coal-mining industry to enter into details, for little information was available on iron ore up to the present. Each country had a special classification for metallurgical products apart from pig-iron and steel. Consequently, in order to secure comparable statistics, the International Chamber of Commerce had adopted a limited number of headings relating to broad groups of products. This was essential if information was to be available in good time. The necessity for obtaining information very promptly was, he said, paramount, because on this depended the usefulness of the information obtained. The large producers would only agree to give information which they considered confidential on the condition that the provision of such information might be to their advantage. Statistics should therefore be obtained as quickly as possible. M. Solente would give more detailed information to the Sub-Committee.

Mme. Falkner-Smit (U.S.S.R.) said it was obvious that a country which possessed so developed a mining industry as the U.S.S.R. would not be opposed to the collection of statistics of this nature. The U.S.S.R. delegation would therefore agree to the present text without any reservation and would withdraw its amendment. Monthly statistics relating to ores were compiled in the U.S.S.R. The idea underlying the amendment had been that annual statistics should not be collected in this field only, but should also be given for all manufacturing industries. It was for that reason that the U.S.S.R. delegation had wished to add, after the phrase “Annual returns of the output of minerals and metals,” the words “and of manufacturing industries.”

The Chairman said that this proposal, which concerned manufactured products, was not within the direct terms of reference of the Sub-Committee on Industrial Statistics.

M. Cavalcanti Albuquerque de Gusmão (Brazil) said that official statistics of the production of the main kinds of minerals mentioned in Article 1, Paragraph III, sub-paragraphs (f) (1) and (2), had only recently been developed in Brazil. Among the enquiries which had already been set on foot, he would refer to those concerning the production of coal and its derivatives, the production of iron ore and steel, of gold and silver and certain other minerals of economic value. A number of mining establishments possessed their own statistical services. For this reason, it would be fairly easy to group official enquiries of this kind according to a systematic plan.

Monthly statistics were not compiled for the production of metals mentioned in Article 1, Paragraph III, (f) (3), which was carried out in numerous establishments where the raw materials either coming from a national or a foreign source were used, for this would necessitate too wide an enquiry.

M. Ito (Japan) said that, in the draft Convention, it was laid down that the statistics need only cover metals of national importance. In Japan, a mining law existed dealing with metals of importance for the country. Statistics only showed figures collected in accordance with the terms of that law. The Japanese delegation would be grateful if the Sub-Committee would not lay down too detailed regulations in regard to the statistics under discussion.

The Chairman pointed out that the present text contained the following safeguard: “when they are of national importance”. The probable meaning of the passage was that each country would decide for itself on this point. In any case, the Sub-Committee would settle the matter.

M. Bernardi (Italy) said that his country, which possessed very detailed statistics, was in principle in favour of the hourly production, of the average metal content, etc. He was aware, however, of the fact that some countries did not furnish such detailed statistics. He thought it would therefore be preferable to restrict the volume of figures asked for and to achieve an inclusive estimate for the production of minerals. The Italian delegation also thought that the proposal of the International Chamber of Commerce might form the basis of discussion rather than Annex III.

The Chairman asked the Italian delegation to co-operate with the special Sub-Committee.

18. Article 1, Paragraph III, Sub-Paragraph (e) (Forestry Statistics).

M. Jahn (Norway), Chairman of the Sub-Committee on Forestry Statistics and Rapporteur, said that, after discussion of Paragraph III, sub-paragraph (d), the representative of the United States had submitted an amendment the intention of which had been to compel countries to give more than what was laid down in the former text. This amendment, which had been supported by the northern countries of Europe and Canada, had not been adopted by the Sub-Committee.

The Japanese delegation had also submitted the following amendment: to substitute, for the words “the chief timber-producing countries”, the words “countries to whose economy the production of wood was important”. This expression was the same as that in sub-paragraph (e). This amendment had been adopted by the Sub-Committee.