I. INTRODUCTION

1. At its fourth session, the Population Commission drew up a series of draft recommendations describing in detail the first steps which should be taken to improve migration statistics. The Commission requested the Secretary-General to draw the attention of the Statistical Commission to these draft recommendations, and also

"(a) to call the attention of the various Governments to these draft recommendations together with such views as are expressed by the Statistical Commission;

"(b) to invite the various Governments to comment upon the draft recommendations, to indicate the difficulties that may attend their implementation, and to inform the Secretary-General whether and, if so, by approximately what date, they would be in a position to follow the recommendations;

"(c) to prepare a report, embodying the comments and suggestions of the various governments, for presentation to the Commission at its next session." 1/

---


2. The Statistical
2. The Statistical Commission, after being informed of the recommendations of the Population Commission, commented as follows:

"The Statistical Commission was informed of the recommendations of the Population Commission with reference to the improvement of migration statistics (E/1313). The Commission took note that proposals for improved definitions and practices to promote comparability were to be circulated to Governments for comments and that the views of the Governments regarding the difficulties involved in putting these proposals into effect would be incorporated in a report to be presented to the next session of the Population Commission.

"The Statistical Commission concurs with the views of the Population Commission as to the need for improvement of migration statistics, expressing the wish that the Secretary-General particularly take into account the observations contained in paragraph 11 of annex 31 of the Population Commission's Report."2/

3. Since the Statistical Commission made no substantive additions and proposed no alterations in the recommendations of the Population Commission, the document circulated to Governments for their comments consisted of annex 3 to the report of the fourth session of the Population Commission.

4. In accordance with the request of the Population Commission, a copy of the document was sent for comment to each of the 59 Member Governments. In addition, copies were also sent to the national statistical offices of 49 Member Governments and 21 non-member countries.

II. CLASSIFICATION OF REPLIES

5. Up to 16 February 1950, replies had been received from 48 countries and territories. This number includes 33 Member States and 15 non-member countries.

---

1/ The paragraph referred to reads: "In formulating its draft recommendations for the collection of migration statistics, the Commission has not been unmindful of the development of air travel and has also kept clearly in mind the importance of collecting migration statistics in such a way as not to complicate further the formalities attendant upon the crossing of frontiers."

2/ Report of the Statistical Commission (fourth session) to the Economic and Social Council (E/1312), paragraphs 117 and 118.
and territories. Of the 48 replies received, 17 are of the nature of acknowledgements only (Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bolivia, China, Columbia, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Hungary, Mexico, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Puerto Rico, Sweden, United Kingdom); eight indicate willingness to implement the draft recommendations in their present form if they are finally adopted (Ceylon, Ecuador, El Salvador, Honduras, Portugal, Thailand, Turkey, Venezuela); and 23 express reservations or suggest amendments in regard to one or more points of the draft recommendations (Belgium, Burma, Canada, Costa Rica, Denmark, East African Territories [Kenya, Tanganyika and Uganda], Germany [Allied General Secretariat], Greece, Guatemala, Hong Kong, Iceland, India, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Southern Rhodesia, Surinam, United States). Two of the replies among the last-mentioned group (Hong Kong and Ireland) report inability to implement the recommendations at this time. Several of the replies, including some which do not explicitly express reservations in regard to the draft recommendations, contain more or less detailed descriptions of the methods currently used in the collection and tabulation of migration statistics in the country concerned, without indicating if these will be changed where necessary to meet any recommendations finally adopted by the Commission.

III. ANALYTICAL SUMMARY OF REPLIES

A. General comments

6. Several of the replies comment on the advisability of attempting to secure more detailed information on arrivals and departures at a time when efforts are being made to simplify the formalities attendant upon such movements. Belgium, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and the United States express the opinion that the simplification of these formalities is of prime importance. The United States says in its reply: "the extent to which success of such efforts may result in impairment of the ability to provide certain detailed statistics of migration cannot be determined at this time, but it is the view of the United States that a higher priority should be accorded to this objective than to minor improvements in the availability of statistical information concerning migration."

B. Collection of total of various categories of arrivals and departures at the cessation of frontier control

7. While most Governments agree to the desirability of obtaining totals and breakdowns
breakdowns into various categories of international travellers, a number of them object to the collection of such data at the occasion of frontier control. The principal objection is that any attempt to secure data from persons at the time of the crossing of the frontier would unnecessarily impede traffic, if, in fact, the volume of traffic did not make such a collection impossible. This comment is made by Belgium, Denmark, Ireland, Luxembourg and the Netherlands. The reply from Ireland states, "difficulties of a complete count are so great that we have even been contemplating sample inquiries in order to enable us to obtain some estimate" of the magnitude of passenger movements from, and into, the country.

3. It is the opinion of the Netherlands that there is little value in any form of frontier collection for countries interested in de jure population figures. It is stated that such registration secures only data on the increments to or subtractions from the de facto population figures.

C. Tabulation of categories for each calendar year

9. The proposal that the calendar year be the time period used for the tabulation of categories is approved by most countries. New Zealand, however, remarks that the calendar year is suitable for use in the Northern, but not the Southern Hemisphere. This is considered to be so because of the climatic difference in the two hemispheres, which results in different peak seasons of travel. New Zealand uses a year ending on 31 March. "A small amount of tabulation work is, however, done monthly and this enables annual figures for these classifications to be done for any 'years' required."

10. The only suggestion that shorter time periods should be shown is the United States proposal that tabulation should be by months or calendar quarters, thus providing data for fiscal years and inter-censal periods, for which data cannot be readily interpolated because of seasonal variations and fluctuations due to the movement of refugees or transferred populations.

D. Classification of arrivals and departures

11. The proposed classification of arrivals and departures into major categories is accepted by almost all countries whose methods of obtaining migration statistics allow of such a breakdown. Only two countries (Greece and Italy) state that the categories should undergo considerable revision. The majority of comments deal with the methods of identifying travellers in the various categories. In addition,
the need for instituting separate categories for refugees and transferred populations is questioned by some countries. A few countries state that they do not, at present, collect data on emigrants. Southern Rhodesia explains that the cost of such collection is prohibitive. The only emigration data collected by Canada are those on persons changing from a resident to a non-resident status, based upon information obtained by the Foreign Exchange Control Board. It is hoped that such data will be collected in Uganda and Tanganyika, starting some time in 1950.

12. Both Greece and Italy express the view that not only the demographic, but particularly the economic implications of migration should be considered in framing definitions and classifications.

13. Greece proposes a classification of all arrivals and departures into three major categories: (a) permanent migrants, that is, persons entering or leaving for at least six months; (b) temporary migrants, that is, persons entering or leaving for less than six months but intending to work for remuneration originating in the country of destination, and (c) tourist, that is, persons entering or leaving for a period of less than six months without intending to work for remuneration originating in the country of destination (including persons intending to work in the country of destination but paid from the country of origin, as well as tourists in the restricted sense of the word). These major categories are sub-divided as follows: Under permanent migrants are: permanent refugees and transferred populations; under temporary migrants are refugees planning to work temporarily in the country of destination, and frontier traffic; and under tourists are travellers remaining in the country less than 24 hours, travellers in transit, refugees entering the country of destination, temporarily and not intending to work there, tourists proper, and finally travellers for health, study, business, family visits, and for other reasons. Further, each major category and sub-group is classified by residence, arrivals being grouped into residents of the country from which they come and residents of the country which they are entering, while departures are divided into residents of the country to which they are going and residents of that which they are leaving.

1/ For the change proposed by Greece in the definition of a permanent migrant, see para. 74.
B. Comments on suggested classifications or definitions

14. While the need for a distinction between residents leaving or returning, and permanent migrants, is generally recognized, several countries question the proposed criterion of removal for a year or longer to identify permanent migrants. In some cases a longer or shorter period is suggested. Greece prefers a minimum period of six months, in order to include in this category persons who migrate to another country in order to work there, but return to their country of nationality for vacations of one or two months a year, thus never remaining in the country of immigration for a full year at a time. New Zealand suggests that, although the criterion proposed in the draft recommendations is actually used in New Zealand, it might be better to substitute a two-year limit, since many persons now leave New Zealand temporarily to go to the United Kingdom for more than a year. "A period of two years would be more satisfactory, particularly in countries where long and expensive sea journeys are involved and are often not undertaken unless considerable time is available." Another reason for lengthening the period is given by Southern Rhodesia, where persons entering the country for more than a year are considered permanent immigrants, but a person does not lose domicile unless he is absent from the country for three years or has indicated that his departure is permanent. This is done to allow for persons such as students who often must go overseas for more than three years in order to secure an education. In such cases, the one-year limit would not be meaningful, since those persons have not lost their domicile after one year abroad.

15. Some countries believe that the criterion for permanent migration should not be based at all on length of stay or absence. The United States says, "To the extent that national governments tend toward greater selectivity in acceptance of immigrants from other countries, a definition based on length of stay would tend to drift farther away from the facts." It is thus proposed to be permanent immigrants only if they are legally admitted for permanent residence. Hence some persons coming into the country for more than a year are not legally considered to be immigrants. The United States, therefore, suggests that a legal definition of immigrants should be applied in each country, while abandonment of domicile rather than absence of a year should be the criterion of /permanent
permanent emigration. It may, however, be possible, while retaining the present practice in national statistics, to include among permanent immigrants for international statistics aliens who remain in the United States for one year or longer, since a classification by length of stay is now tabulated for aliens admitted who do not fall within the legal classification of immigrant. Denmark defines immigrants or emigrants as persons who abandon their permanent residence abroad or in the country, and states that it would not be practicable to accept the distinction between permanent and temporary migrants proposed by the Commission. The situation in Burma is described as such that the recommended definition is not applicable. All foreigners who have not resided in the country for at least eight out of the ten years prior to January 1942 or January 1948 are considered to be temporary immigrants although they are permitted to stay in the country for periods of three to four years, which may be extended.

15. Norway says that, although the practice is not now followed, it may be possible to obtain information from the central passport office on foreigners who receive permission to take up permanent residence in the country.

17. Belgium says that the Ministry of Labour collects detailed statistics on migrants for the issue of work permits, and questions the necessity of collecting the data again, in less detail, through frontier control. In the Netherlands, supplementary enumeration cards to be used in connection with entries and removals from the population registers will, before January 1951, contain a question on probable or actual duration of stay in the country or abroad, thus making possible a separation of persons present or absent less than one year from permanent migrants. In the Philippines a distinction is made between permanent migrants and temporary migrants or visitors, but the basis for the differentiation is not explained in the reply.

b. Visitors and temporary migrants

18. New Zealand offers the opinion that it is sufficient to use a single category for all temporary arrivals, if the purpose of the visit is indicated. No necessity is seen for classifying departing visitors by the purpose of the visit, since this is shown on arrival. The United States suggests that a clearer distinction should be made in the recommendations between visitors for business purposes and temporary immigrants intending to exercise temporarily an occupation. The plan suggested by Greece, as shown in paragraph 13, makes the basis for this distinction quite explicit.
Iceland states that it can provide information on visitors and on temporary immigrants, but for nationals it can give only total numbers arriving and departing. Southern Rhodesia feels that its classification of temporary visitors approximates the proposed classification of business visitors, except for a very small number of prohibited immigrants with temporary permits which are sometimes renewed for considerably more than a year.

c. Refugees and transferred populations

19. A number of the replies question the necessity of these classifications because the numbers involved are too small to merit separate consideration in the statistics of the countries concerned. This attitude is taken by Denmark, Iceland, Costa Rica, Southern Rhodesia, and the East African Territorial States (Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika). New Zealand expresses this opinion about departures in these categories, and explains that for arrivals such data can be collected only if the persons concerned arrive in sufficiently large groups to make identification possible. The migration forms now in use do not provide for the identification of refugees.1/

20. Changes in the definition of refugees have been suggested by two countries. Guatemala points out that many refugees do not lack the necessary papers, and that in Latin America many political refugees lack the necessary papers only because of the circumstances of their departures from their own countries. The United States is reluctant to tabulate statistics on refugees as defined, since this "would exclude some persons who are refugees in the usual sense and would include others who could be more properly classified as immigrants."

d. Additional classifications suggested

21. A classification of inadmissible or undesirable aliens deported is suggested by the Philippine Republic. Greece believes that provision should be made for

1/ Some replies point out that changes in methods of collection, or even in the forms used, require legislation. In addition, it is pointed out that the collection and tabulation of migration statistics often require the collaboration of several governmental agencies, all of which are not always agreed upon the desirability of changes or upon the ways of carrying them out.

/furnishing
furnishing data on changes in status after arrival - e.g., a tourist who becomes a temporary or permanent migrant.

F. Estimates of the volume of frontier movement of workers

22. Only three countries comment on this subject. Ireland feels that such data are as difficult to collect as any other data on entries and departures because of the great volume of travel over the land frontier. Belgium states that it now publishes such data on a semi-annual basis and that a change to a monthly basis would be very difficult to accomplish. Burma expresses approval of the suggestion. Such figures can easily be collected in Burma because of the seasonal nature of the frontier movement.

G. Collection and tabulation of detailed statistics

23. The advisability of collecting and tabulating detailed statistics on certain classes of arrivals and departures is not questioned in any of the replies. It is sometimes difficult, however, to determine from any given reply which categories of arrivals and departures are recorded, or to determine all the items on which data are obtained or tabulated either in current practice or in intended compliance with the recommendations.

24. Similarly, it is sometimes not possible to tell from the replies whether it is planned to collect the statistics by the use of a statistical slip at the occasion of frontier control, or from population registers.

25. In two cases (Belgium and the Netherlands) mention is made of a separate statistical slip which is apparently to be used in connexion with the population registers. Belgium states that the Ministry of Labour now collects detailed statistics on migrants for the issue of work permits and that in addition a slip will be used for that type of migration which affects the de jure population. No indication is given, however, of the specific items to be included. In the Netherlands, a separate enumeration card is to be used in connexion with entries or removals from the registers. This card is to be used for obtaining data on birthplace and probable or actual duration of stay in or out of the country.

26. Denmark says that the statistics are available on sex, age and marital status of migrants and could probably be made available on place of birth and citizenship. Norway attempts to collect statistics on age, place of birth, and occupation of emigrant nationals, but says that at present the data are not complete. Iceland
says it should be possible to give details on sex, age, nationality, and occupation for visitors, temporary immigrants, and permanent immigrants. Sweden publishes data on "immigrants" and "emigrants" (the terms are not defined in the reply) by sex, age in single years, marital status, countries from which immigrants come and countries to which emigrants go.

27. Among those countries which endorse the use of a statistical slip at the occasion of frontier control are the United States, Burma, Guatemala, New Zealand, the Philippine Republic, Southern Rhodesia, India, Canada and Surinam.

28. In the Philippines, the statistical slip items will be filled in on the basis of passenger manifests submitted by masters of vessels and officers of airlines. For persons arriving or departing by ship, the information to be collected includes: date of arrival or departure, legal nationality, country of birth, sex, age at last birthday, usual occupation, country of permanent residence of temporary immigrant (visitor) arriving or departing, and country of last or intended permanent residence of permanent migrant. It is, however, noted that the manifests of the airlines do not indicate place of birth, occupation, country of permanent residence of temporary immigrant, or country of last permanent residence of permanent migrant.

29. The United States says that the statistics recommended for collection are easily available from official travel documents in use under pertinent United States laws and regulations. No necessity is seen, therefore, for using another document solely for statistical purposes. Detailed statistics on nationals are collected only for those departing for permanent residence abroad. Although such collection might be extended to all nationals departing or arriving, the United States is not prepared to adopt such measures at the present time, and cannot state when or whether this will be done. Canada states that in the future an individual form will be used for immigrants only and endorses the topics to be tabulated, India agrees strongly with the idea, but states that at present the only data available are totals of males, females, adults and children. Burma is also in favour of the system, but says that the collection of detailed statistics cannot be implemented at present because of the cost. Surinam states that detailed statistics are collected for non-Surinam new arrivals only, with a note on the card kept for each indicating the date of departure. New Zealand states that the recommendations concerning classifications and tabulations in paragraphs 26 (i) to (iv) are already in force, with the exception of the data on occupation,
which are collected only for new immigrants and New Zealand residents departing permanently. The usefulness of a detailed tabulation of occupations is questioned even for permanent migrants, since migrants often change their occupation.

Southern Rhodesia finds the recommendations generally acceptable for tabulations of arrivals, with the exception of data on literacy, which cannot be collected.

30. A few suggestions have been made relating to the possible clarification of details or a broadening of the scope of the statistics recommended for collection. The interest of Greece in developing statistics of tourists leads to a suggestion that a statistical slip be used for tourists, which would ask for date of arrival or departure, name, habitual residence, legal nationality and reason for visit. New Zealand suggests that data on refugees or persons in transferred populations should be obtained by direct question on the statistical slip, instead of under Remarks, as now contemplated, since such columns are usually left blank if a specific question is not asked. The United States points out that data on the industrial or social status of immigrants could be taken only as indicative of their previous status. On the other hand, industrial or social status "... can be inferred in some instances from information on usual or intended occupation, but such inferences would not yield reliable statistics." Three topics are mentioned, which, in the view of the United States, might merit consideration. These are: (1) the treatment of persons for whom information is lacking or inadequate; (2) the desirability of including in all tabulations a statement of the definitions used and the categories included or excluded from each classification; and (3) "... other devices to facilitate the analysis of the data on appraisal of their comparability with other statistics."
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Report submitted by the Secretariat

I. SCOPE OF THE ANNEX

1. Between 16 February and 1 May 1950, ten additional replies have been
   received from Governments. These replies are analysed here in the same manner
   as the replies received up to 16 February were analysed in the main document.
   In addition, the comments received from the International Labour Office and from
   the International Union of Official Travel Organizations (a non-governmental
   organization having consultative status of category B) are summarized below.
   The comments of the International Civil Aviation Organization have been
   requested, but have not yet been received.

II. CLASSIFICATION OF REPLIES

2. One of the ten replies from Governments is of the nature of an acknowledgement
   (Syria); one is an interim reply, containing the comments of the appropriate
   ministerial commission, from which it would appear that the draft recommendations
   are accepted in principle (Iran). One reply states that statistics analogous
   to those recommended are already collected (Argentina); one contains most useful
   general comment but does not indicate specifically the extent to which the
recommended information is or could be collected in the country concerned (Brazil); two express general agreement while making a number of minor reservations or suggestions (Australia and Israel); three contain more far-reaching reservations (France, Poland and the United Kingdom); while one intimates that it will not be possible for the country concerned to implement the draft recommendations for the time being (Switzerland). The reply from the International Labour Office contains several suggestions on specific points, which will be considered below. The International Union of Official Travel Organizations states that the draft recommendations are in general agreement with those of its study commission on international travel statistics.

III. ANALYTICAL SUMMARY OF REPLIES

A. General comments

3. The reply of Argentina has already been noted. Australia and Israel also support the draft recommendations, the former stating that many of the suggestions are already being largely followed, but adding that where differences exist between the Australian practice and the suggested international procedure there would be certain practical difficulties in the way of adopting the latter. Israel in welcoming the recommendations speaks of "the central role played by immigration in the life of this country".

4. Poland indicates that in general the draft recommendations are acceptable but that it is not possible to state the exact date by which it will be possible to follow them. The reply adds that, as emigration from Poland is hardly perceptible, really large-scale development and reorganization of statistics in this field would entail more work than the importance of the subject deserves. The United Kingdom reply stresses the importance of striking a balance between the improvement of migration statistics and the simplification of frontier formalities; it further suggests that great emphasis should be placed on the possibility of co-ordinating the collection of migration statistics with other administrative processes and that the aim should be to work towards comparability in a limited field in the first place, considering later to what extent the scope of the statistics might be extended.

5. France and Switzerland both emphasize the difficulty of obtaining detailed migration statistics at busy land frontiers. The French reply refers to the great importance attached by France, as a country of immigration, to the
collection of migration statistics, but considers that it is not possible for the time being to put into effect in their entirety the improvements recommended by the Commission. The reply states, however, that appreciable progress might be made by a more thorough exploitation of existing material, without any stiffening of existing controls. In this way it might be possible to secure statistics - though not with all the details contemplated in the draft recommendations - of the following classes: tourists; seasonal workers; workers resident for more than one year; frontier traffic. The Swiss reply does not hold out hope of following the draft recommendations at the present time; it considers that the great intensity of the traffic across the Swiss frontiers makes it impracticable to obtain the necessary statistics at the occasion of frontier control; it adds that the internal registration machinery, which might provide some data, could not be used for the purpose without undue expenditure and the employment of additional staff.

B. Collection of statistics on major categories of arrivals and departures at the occasion of frontier control

6. Australia does not count arrivals and departures by categories at the occasion of frontier control; it relies instead upon details drawn from ships’ manifests which are found to be preferable in practice to statistical cards, as far as Australian conditions are concerned. Israel, on the other hand, uses statistical cards to register all movements except frontier traffic. Poland endorses the suggested count at the frontier. France points out the possible inaccuracy of a simple count and also refers to the danger of obtaining unbalanced statistics, where the processes of simplifying exit formalities and entry formalities develop at different rates. The International Union of Official Travel Organizations' reply refers to the possibility of obtaining detailed statistics on emigrants through the use of information given to immigration authorities in visa applications rather than through additional frontier controls.

C. Tabulations by calendar year

7. No comments on this point are contained in the replies analysed here.

D. Classifications of major categories of arrivals and departures

8. Brazil suggests that the proposed categories might be replaced by a twofold division into "permanent" and "temporary" migrants with a number of sub-divisions
based largely on the purpose of removal. Refugees and transferred populations would be distributed between the two main divisions.

9. Israel proposes an additional category, covering "residents returning after more than one year" or, alternatively, the classification of residents returning according to the length of time spent abroad. Israel also points out that the category "temporary immigrant" loses much of its point in countries where special visas are not issued to this class of travelers.

10. The United Kingdom suggests a threefold division into (a) Permanent immigrants (i.e., those intending to stay for one year or more), (b) Residents returning after less than one year abroad and (c) Visitors and temporary migrants (i.e., those who say they intend to stay for less than one year), with similar divisions in the case of emigrants. The International Labour Office suggests that there should be supplementary entries for total permanent addition to the population arising from migration (i.e., the sum of categories 4, 5(b), and 6 of arrivals) and for total permanent subtraction (i.e., the sum of categories 4 and 6), and that similarly the total temporary immigrants and emigrants should be shown.

F. Definitions of major categories of arrivals and departures

11. The definition of permanent removal as removal for one year or more has attracted a number of observations and caused counter-suggestions to be made. The International Labour Office suggests a review of the dividing line between temporary and permanent migration; the use of the categories "over one year" and "one year and less" which would have the advantage of putting in the temporary class migration of workers with contracts of exactly one year had been proposed by the Office in the report prepared by them for the Conference on Migration Statistics (1932); the Conference preferred the other division (which was subsequently adopted by the Commission) probably because it is less ambiguous: "over one year," may be taken to mean actually two years and over, since one year and eleven months might be loosely interpreted as one year. Australia comments on the discrepancies revealed by statistical inquiries between the results of questioning outgoing travelers as to the object of their removal and results based on the recommended definition. Israel describes in some detail a method of measuring the actual length of a resident's stay abroad by attaching a counterfoil to the passports of outgoing travelers that could be
could be removed and collated with statistical cards when the person in question returns. Brazil and Poland also make detailed observations in connexion with this definition, which is, nevertheless, described in one part of the Brazilian reply as being acceptable as "an appropriate way of cutting the Gordian knot of how to distinguish between temporary and permanent absence."

F. Estimates of the volume of frontier movements of workers

12. No comments on this point are contained in the replies from Governments analysed here, but it is relevant to note that Australia has no frontier traffic and that Israel, as already mentioned, does not register such traffic. The International Labour Office notes that no method of measuring frontier traffic is specified. Is it desired to measure the number of crossings or the number of workers provided with border crossing permits? Should not also a provision be made for frontier movements of persons other than workers?

G. Collection and tabulation of detailed statistics

13. Australia collects detailed statistics of all travellers arriving and departing, but states that it would be impracticable to tabulate statistics as regards families. On this point Poland suggests that migrants should be asked whether they are travelling alone or with their families and that in the latter case the composition of the family should be obtained. The United Kingdom suggests that a statement of marital condition should be obtained from all adults; it adds that in the United Kingdom most of the desired information is obtained from passengers on long sea routes, but that no details are available in respect of British subjects travelling by short sea routes or by air. Israel already produces detailed monthly statistics of all types of traffic through its frontiers and is conducting a number of internal surveys of the characteristics and degree of assimilation of various immigrant groups.