WILEY

A Study of Some Portions of the Census of London for 1901

Author(s): T. A. Welton

Source: *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, Vol. 65, No. 3 (Sep., 1902), pp. 447-502

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

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2339450>

Accessed: 24/06/2014 23:36

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

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

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

<http://www.jstor.org>

A STUDY of SOME PORTIONS of the CENSUS of LONDON for 1901.

By T. A. WELTON, F.C.A.

[Read before the Royal Statistical Society, 17th June, 1902. The Right Hon. LORD AVEBURY, P.C., F.R.S., D.C.L., LL.D., President, in the Chair.]

THE general lines on which I think the occupations of the people should be classified are not unknown to the Society; but their most recent exposition was in two papers read before the Manchester Statistical Society in 1898.

I should be sorry to convey the impression that in my view the rough method I have used is at all perfect, but I consider it rather as a matter of necessity. We surely want to know, with reference to any urban district, whether it is an old trading centre like Chester, a purely manufacturing town such as Burnley, a seaport like Liverpool, a residential watering place like Southport, or a mining village like Rhondda. Where we can compare entire towns one with another, my method approximately shows, by reference to the primary occupations, what is the general character of the town, and if we then calculate the proportions of the secondary occupations, they indicate whether the inhabitants enjoy a good measure of well-being or the reverse, and whether any peculiarities resulting from local usages are noticeable; for instance, in an early paper on this subject I could distinguish counties where great numbers of people made their own bread from others where this duty was performed by bakers, and where consequently greater numbers of secondary workers were needful in order to attain equal comfort.

The present essay shows my method at its worst and at its best. At its worst, because we have here, even in the aggregate, no complete town, and in the several boroughs we have frequently striking contrasts rather than proper material for comparisons. The ratios of secondary workers cannot in such cases be regarded as measuring the local degree of well-being, since so many persons reside in one borough and work in another. But yet it is seen at its best from another point of view, because, with all its faults, this is the only way to evolve something like order out of the chaos of secondary occupations in London. Many features are brought to light which admit of explanation, and we gradually gain a dim insight into the distribution of trades which is

decidedly worth having. Any careful thinker will thus realise, for instance, how worthless is the death-rate of such a place as London City as an indication of healthfulness, and how many things have to be considered before it is possible to depict the industrial and social organisation of either of the twenty-nine boroughs. By attaining some knowledge of what is normal under different social conditions, we pave the way for local investigations, and my whole work is really preliminary to attempting a task which would require more space than this Society could be expected to afford.

The publication of the Census Volume for the county of London offers a tempting opportunity for the study of the occupations of the inhabitants of the Metropolitan boroughs. Previous censuses (except that for 1851) give no such fund of information on the subject.

In dealing with a metropolitan census, it is necessary to keep in mind that a large proportion of those whose daily life is passed in the cities of London and Westminster, and in the intervening borough of Holborn, reside, and are therefore counted in the remoter districts; it has also to be remembered that a large number of persons of independent means reside in certain boroughs, and their wants partially determine the occupations of the inhabitants of those boroughs.

On the other hand, there are a number of boroughs in which industrial pursuits occupy a large percentage of the inhabitants, and where the mercantile and the wealthy unoccupied classes do not tend to reside.

One of the features of my method of treatment of these statistics, is the endeavour to approximately separate the primary from the secondary occupations, the latter being those which are common in a greater or less measure to all English populations, and the former including those engaged in manufactures, commerce, mining and agriculture, with such numbers of tailors, shoemakers, cabinet makers, &c., as represent a manufacturing element in excess of local wants, and similarly any numbers of persons drawn together by special circumstances in excess of what is ordinary.

Thus classified, it will be found that London boroughs can be divided into four categories, including, besides the three already mentioned, certain boroughs which adjoin the central ones, and are rather of a mixed character, viz., Finsbury, St. Pancras, and Southwark. In the west, St. Marylebone and Chelsea have also special characteristics, but it has not been deemed necessary to separate them from the other western boroughs partly inhabited by a wealthy class.

First, as to the indications of the residence of the mercantile and wealthy classes; these are partly direct and partly inferential, the latter being such as denote luxury or expenditure.

	Living on Own Means.	Retired.	Mer- chants and Clerks.	Unclas- sified.*	Domes- tic Service.	Coachman, Cahman, &c. (not Domestic).	Law, Medicine, and Divinity.	Art, Music, and Drama.
I.								
London City.....	1.5	0.6	9.0	44.9	41.2	0.5	2.6	1.0
Holborn.....	6.4	2.1	8.5	58.4	25.9	2.9	3.8	5.3
Westminster.....	7.9	1.7	6.6	61.9	58.3	2.7	3.1	3.2
II.								
Southwark	1.9	2.9	5.3	65.6	13.3	2.7	1.0	1.8
Finsbury	1.4	0.9	4.4	60.3	14.6	3.4	1.0	1.3
St. Pancras	4.7	3.1	7.5	72.6	21.0	3.7	2.1	2.9
III.								
St. Marylebone....	9.3	4.4	6.4	75.2	53.2	4.7	4.0	3.6
Chelsea	9.6	10.3	6.2	93.1	58.8	5.4	2.5	3.9
Kensington	16.8	5.0	8.0	103.3	80.3	4.7	4.9	3.9
Paddington	12.6	3.2	9.0	91.8	50.1	5.3	3.9	2.8
Hampstead	13.3	3.7	16.0	111.1	75.7	2.6	5.4	4.9
Hammersmith	9.1	1.7	9.4	84.4	20.9	2.2	2.0	3.8
Fulham	7.9	2.6	8.2	89.5	22.2	3.4	1.9	3.7
Battersea	4.6	1.6	8.5	81.4	15.7	1.5	1.8	2.5
Wandsworth	9.1	5.6	13.0	104.1	35.8	1.6	3.2	3.0
Lambeth	6.4	3.2	11.1	85.2	21.4	2.5	2.0	3.8
Camberwell	5.1	3.8	12.6	87.1	17.9	2.2	1.9	1.9
Lewisham	9.3	4.6	16.6	105.1	36.2	1.3	2.7	2.6
Hackney	5.1	3.7	13.0	82.9	19.8	1.4	2.0	1.7
Stoke Newington	9.6	3.4	20.2	96.2	26.9	1.3	2.8	2.7
Islington	5.3	3.2	10.2	79.2	18.4	3.2	1.9	2.1
IV.								
Shoreditch	0.9	4.6	3.1	63.2	11.6	1.8	0.6	0.7
Bethnal Green ...	1.2	3.8	2.8	63.2	10.2	1.2	0.5	0.5
Stepney	1.2	2.2	4.2	62.9	11.6	1.0	0.7	0.7
Poplar	1.7	3.8	4.9	73.0	9.6	0.9	0.7	0.6
Bermondsey	1.4	2.5	5.4	69.2	10.5	1.0	0.7	0.5
Deptford	4.5	1.9	9.8	83.6	16.6	0.8	1.2	1.9
Greenwich	3.8	3.9	5.1	82.8	23.0	0.9	1.3	1.2
Woolwich	2.4	2.4	2.4	73.7	12.4	0.5	0.7	0.8

* Excluding persons under 15 years of age.

The above figures are all per hundred "working" males,¹ and, save the merchants, clerks, coachmen, and practitioners (law, medicine, and divinity) are for the two sexes combined.

For reasons connected with the dearness, and at the same time the undesirability of a city residence, all the numbers for the residential classes in London City, except that of merchants and clerks, are low. The borough of Holborn is more residential, and

¹ This standard is the one which I have used throughout the paper, in relation to occupations, wherever ratios are given, unless the contrary is specified.

seems attractive for lawyers and artists; those "living on their own means" in that borough are probably to a great extent temporary residents only. Somewhat similar observations apply to the great City of Westminster, but there the residential part of the population seems to be more wealthy, and professional persons are less strongly attracted.

I am inclined to believe that amongst populations made up of ordinary families to a great extent, the ratio of "unclassified" persons, that is to say, apparently idle people, would not sink below 79·2 per cent., the figure for Islington, composed of 6·2 men and 73·0 women aged 15 years and upwards. The lower ratios noticed in the central districts, including St. Marylebone, are probably owing to the numbers of isolated individuals or incomplete families who gravitate there, usually belonging to the active part of the population.

Southwark and Finsbury are unattractive as residences, and the low ratios of servants indicate poverty amongst the inhabitants. It will be found that Finsbury has a considerable industrial population; in fact, when measuring the industrial element in metropolitan boroughs, it will be expedient to exclude the mercantile sub-class and the "Defence" class, and we shall then find a very striking variety of ratios of "primary" workers in different parts of the county.

St. Pancras is a borough the statistics of which would be more intelligible if it were subdivided. Its southern border might approximate to Holborn as a seat of artists and professional men; northwards it would more resemble Islington.

St. Marylebone and Chelsea have something in common with Westminster, but have much larger proportions of settled families of more or less wealth. Yet the proportions of domestics and the "unclassified" suggest that family life is not nearly developed in these two boroughs as it is in Kensington and Hampstead, Wandsworth and Lewisham.

The remaining boroughs in this (third) category may be arranged in the following order, if we regard them as residential places:—

	Resi- dential Persons.	Domes- tics.	As 100 to		Resi- dential Persons.	Domes- tics.	As 100 to
Stoke Newington	33·2	26·9	81	Camberwell	21·5	17·9	83
Hampstead	33·0	75·7	229	Lambeth	20·7	21·4	103
Lewisham	30·5	36·2	119	Hammersmith...	20·2	20·9	103
Kensington	29·8	80·3	270	Fulham	18·7	22·2	119
Wandsworth ...	27·7	35·8	129	Islington	18·7	18·4	98
Paddington	24·8	50·1	202	Battersea	14·7	15·7	107
Hackney	21·8	19·8	91				

Naturally, there would be a great difference between the means of those residents who are respectively classed as "living on their own means," "retired," and "merchants, clerks, &c.," and many of the domestics would be in the service of members of the respective communities other than residential persons; yet I think we may fairly infer that Kensington, Hampstead, and Paddington must contain the most wealthy families, Camberwell and Stoke Newington many of those which are least wealthy. In Battersea a comparatively wealthy district is included, otherwise its ratio would be amongst the lowest. The boroughs with the highest ratios of domestics also show the highest proportions of unoccupied persons, principally, of course, women.

It will be difficult to draw any clear inference from the numbers of persons who are apparently idle, because this class may include many wealthy people, and possibly almost as many who are not valuable members of society. To each thousand working males there are, of unoccupied males aged 25—65 not described as having means:—

20 in Holborn.	17 in Kensington.	But only 6 in Bethnal
19 „ Westminster.	15 „ Chelsea.	Green.

The numbers of women returned as unoccupied are, of course, much larger, but most of these are wives: thus—

Age.	Married.	Unmarried.	Per Cent. on Working Males.	
			Married.	Unmarried.
25—35	239,195	31,117	17·1	2·2
35—45	197,674	13,027	14·1	0·9
45—55	134,649	6,769	9·6	0·5
55—65	79,382	4,219	5·7	0·3
	650,900	55,132	46·5	3·9

The numbers of unoccupied women between the above ages therefore average 50·4 to every 100 "working males." In districts swarming with young families in fair circumstances, like Hampstead, Lewisham, and Wandsworth, this ratio rises to 64·2, 63·8, and 62·6 per cent. respectively; in places where the ordinary family life is rare, most residents being attracted by business or pleasure, and single visitors numerous, such as London, Holborn, and Westminster, the ratios fall to 27·8, 34·6, and 37·4 respectively. In the poorer industrial boroughs, such as Shoreditch, Stepney, Finsbury, and Bethnal Green, we meet with such ratios as 42·4, 42·8, 43·3, and 43·5 respectively.²

² See the appended Tables III and IV, which latter shows that the distribution of aged unoccupied women is somewhat different.

The class of domestic servants includes two sections which mark the existence of a wealthy class, viz., male "in-door" and male "out-door" servants, the latter chiefly coachmen and gardeners. These may serve to test our conclusions as to which are the boroughs which most largely attract the wealthier classes :—

	Male Servants.			Male Servants.	
	In-door.	Out-door.		In-door.	Out-door.
Westminster.....	8.1	3.5	Camberwell	0.3	0.5
Chelsea	6.4	2.7	Stoke Newington....	0.2	0.4
Kensington	4.3	3.1	Battersea	0.4	0.2
St. Marylebone ...	4.2	2.9	Woolwich	0.1	0.5
Paddington	2.8	2.1	Islington	0.2	0.3
Hampstead	1.3	3.1	Finsbury	0.3	0.1
Wandsworth	0.6	2.2	Southwark	0.3	0.1
Lewisham	0.4	1.9	Hackney ...	0.1	0.2
London City.....	1.8	0.1	Deptford	0.1	0.2
Fulham	0.9	0.6	Shoreditch	0.2	—
Holborn	1.0	0.2	Bethnal Green.....	0.1	0.1
St. Pancras	0.7	0.4	Poplar	0.1	0.1
Lambeth	0.4	0.6	Bermondsey	0.1	—
Hammersmith	0.5	0.4	Stepney.....	0.1	—
Greenwich	0.3	0.6			

In the City of London and in Holborn most of the male servants are neither coachmen, gardeners, nor footmen, but are caretakers.

We may now, I think, safely draw a line dividing the boroughs in the third category into—

- (a) St. Marylebone, Chelsea, Kensington, Paddington, Hampstead, Fulham,³ Wandsworth, and Lewisham.
- (b) Hammersmith, Battersea, Lambeth, Camberwell, Stoke Newington, Islington, and Hackney.

Of the eight boroughs in the fourth category, Greenwich and Deptford appear to contain the greatest proportions of inhabitants in comfortable circumstances, whilst Woolwich, as a military place (with 5,083 soldiers and sailors), has a special character. The ordinary civil inhabitants of Woolwich do not seem to rise much above the average of the remaining boroughs in this category, which are mainly industrial. The figures just given as to unoccupied females in these boroughs appear to me to suggest the existence of a well-defined standard of living, below which the least favoured borough does not materially descend.

³ This borough seems nearly on the medium line between (a) and (b).

Primary Classes.

In describing the principal occupations of a primary character which characterise the metropolitan boroughs, I think it necessary to deal separately with the mercantile class, who to a great extent choose their own residences, and with the military and naval class, of whom exactly the reverse may be said. The boroughs are now arranged under categories as before, dividing the third into two sections:—

	Per Cent. on Working Males.			Per Cent. on Working Males.	
	Commerce.	Defence.		Commerce.	Defence.
I.			III (b).		
London City.....	19·3*	0·4	Hammersmith	10·7	0·4
Holborn	9·7	0·3	Battersea	9·5	0·6
Westminster.....	7·3	7·2	Lambeth ...	12·8	0·4
			Camberwell	14·4	0·4
II.			Hackney	14·8	0·2
Southwark	5·8	0·3	Stoke Newington....	23·7	0·2
Finsbury	4·9	0·4	Islington	11·7	0·3
St. Pancras	8·4	1·0			
III (a).			IV.		
St. Marylebone ...	7·4	1·0	Shoreditch	3·3	0·2
Chelsea	6·9	1·5	Bethnal Green.....	3·0	0·2
Kensington	9·5	2·5	Stepney	4·6	0·6
Paddington	10·4	1·0	Poplar ...	5·3	0·2
Hampstead	19·1	0·5	Bermondsey	5·8	0·2
Fulham	9·5	0·7	Deptford	11·1	0·4
Wandsworth	15·8	0·5	Greenwich	6·1	6·4
Lewisham.....	20·6	0·7	Woolwich	2·8	12·5

* Including the estimated number of drapers (wholesale) in the city.

The remaining “primary” classes, so far as concerns London, may be divided conveniently under the following heads:—

Metal workers, engine and machine makers, instrument and apparatus makers.

Merchant service, dock labourers, shipwrights, &c.

Manufacturers (other than metallic).

Railway servants (where specially numerous).

Hotel keepers and servants (where specially numerous).

Indefinite and other primary occupations.

	Proportion of Males Employed to 100 Working Males.					
	Sailors, Dock Labourers, &c.	Metal Workers.	Other Manufac- tures.	Railway Men.*	Hotel Service.*	Others.
I.						
London City	3·0	2·0	4·4	—	6·6	1·2
Holborn	0·6	4·6	10·3	—	3·5	1·2
Westminster	0·6	2·8	5·7	—	5·3	1·0
II.						
Southwark	2·4	7·0	14·2	—	—	1·5
Finsbury	0·7	10·6	16·7	—	0·2	1·8
St. Pancras	0·3	4·9	11·4	4·1	0·8	1·5
III(a).						
St. Marylebone	0·3	3·2	6·3	—	1·3	1·0
Chelsea	0·6	3·3	2·3	—	—	1·3
Kensington	0·4	2·6	2·7	0·3	—	1·3
Paddington	0·5	3·1	3·5	4·1	—	1·0
Hampstead	0·3	3·2	3·5	0·4	—	2·0
Fulham	0·4	4·4	3·4	0·8	—	1·7
Wandsworth	0·8	4·4	4·3	0·6	—	2·3
Lewisham	0·8	3·9	3·5	0·7	—	3·3
III(b).						
Hammersmith	0·7	5·3	4·6	2·0	—	1·8
Battersea	1·1	7·0	6·6	4·1	—	2·0
Lambeth	0·9	5·8	7·6	1·2	0·1	1·8
Camberwell	1·1	5·3	10·8	—	—	1·6
Hackney	0·8	4·6	17·2	—	—	1·5
Stoke Newington	0·4	4·5	10·0	—	—	1·1
Islington	0·3	7·3	10·6	1·9	—	1·4
IV.						
Shoreditch	1·0	6·3	29·2	—	0·1	1·8
Bethnal Green	2·5	4·0	34·2	—	—	1·3
Stepney	10·3	3·4	26·0	—	0·1	1·3
Poplar	16·3	11·1	8·0	1·4	—	2·5
Bermondsey	14·6	5·4	14·9	0·3	—	2·1
Deptford	6·0	11·8	6·0	4·3	—	2·5
Greenwich	7·5	15·7	3·3	—	—	5·0
Woolwich	2·1	19·1	5·5	—	—	9·9

* The numbers represent the estimated excess beyond a full local quota.—
The column "Hotel Service" includes barmen and lodging house keepers where
these are in great excess.

This table shows that as respects primary occupations, very great diversity exists as between different boroughs. "Factory workers" (undescribed otherwise) are seen to be remarkably numerous in Woolwich and Greenwich. The high ratio for

Lewisham in the last column is due to the numbers of gardeners and florists (not servants) found there.

The principal industries classed as "other manufactures" shall now be shown:—

	Stepney.	Bethnal Green.	Shoreditch.	Finsbury.	Hackney.	Stoke Newington.
*Tailor	10,713	398	146	—	—	—
*Boot, shoemaker	3,677	2,041	867	—	1,736	—
*Hat, umbrella, &c., maker	1,025	255	456	190	150	—
Silk manufacture	21	253	40	19	35	16
Hemp	400	121	100	18	129	7
Artificial flower manufacture } turo	7	15	58	36	39	14
Tanner, currier, &c.	977	297	511	405	608	147
*Hair, feathers, worker	108	283	122	90	265	—
Indiarubber, waterproof, soap, oil, &c., workers }	296	119	104	90	290	40
*Upholsterer	—	247	226	—	61	10
*Cabinet maker	1,765	3,595	2,333	227	1,621	167
*French polisher.....	80	861	966	160	328	—
Printer, lithographer.....	1,555	1,279	1,581	2,010	2,333	589
Bookbinder	293	307	441	548	551	97
*Musical instrument maker	—	32	84	53	497	115
Glass, pottery, &c., workers	205	296	417	296	532	58
Chemicals, workers in	177	95	80	C6	347	30
*Food, workers in	670	124	27	—	34	—
Brewers, distillers, &c.	473	207	121	136	81	17
*Tobacco manufacture	1,172	167	—	—	—	—
*Sawyer, packing case maker, &c.	1,055	2,013	1,650	480	762	—

* In this and similar tables an asterisk denotes that *the excess* of workers beyond what is deemed a full local quota is shown. The figures are the absolute numbers of persons employed, it being thought unnecessary to compute ratios in these cases. Table VII will enable readers to calculate such ratios if desired.

It will be noticed that the chief of the miscellaneous industries shown in the above table are tailoring and shoemaking in Stepney; cabinet making with shoemaking in Bethnal Green and Shoreditch; printing in Finsbury; whilst in Hackney we find the trades of Bethnal Green and Shoreditch in a lesser measure. Stoke Newington is hardly reached by those trades. The silk manufacture, once important, has almost disappeared.

	South-wark.	Holborn.	West-minster.	Bermondsey.	Deptford.	Poplar.
Printer, lithographer	4,647	1,002	921	1,243	722	722
Bookbinder.....	643	146	110	172	92	120
*Paper manufacture, &c.	320	164	—	—	—	—
Hemp manufacture	125	6	10	127	31	269
Chemicals, workers in	153	44	62	103	102	474
Indiarubber, waterproof, soap, oil workers	162	27	33	213	148	460
*Sawyer, packing case maker, &c.	472	—	—	422	184	768
*Tailor	—	246	1,668	—	—	—
Tanner, currier, &c.	911	103	198	2,736	287	172
*Hair and feathers, worker..	348	—	—	88	—	33
Glass, pottery, &c., worker..	336	129	85	66	116	175
Brewer, distiller, &c	252	135	269	228	61	126
*Food, worker in.....	397	—	—	556	113	327

It will be noticed that the leather manufacture still holds its ground in Bermondsey.

	St. Pancras.	Islington.	St. Mary-lebone.	Lambeth.	Camberwell.	Battersea.
*Musical instrument maker	1,963	1,366	43	119	—	118
Printer, lithographer	2,234	4,016	512	3,701	3,812	1,148
Bookbinder	272	828	41	406	543	116
*Paper manufacture, &c.	57	418	—	353	324	59
Chemicals, workers in	183	220	43	135	187	210
Indiarubber, waterproof, soap, candle, oil, workers }	88	228	32	227	177	413
*Sawyer, packing case maker, &c.	260	209	—	—	608	134
*Tailor	438	—	1,067	—	—	48
Artificial flower maker	17	84	2	10	7	1
Tanner, currier, &c.	261	835	122	276	971	163
*Hair and feathers, worker..	—	121	—	—	113	—
Glass, pottery, &c., worker..	247	413	82	1,090	269	279
*Cabinet maker	941	737	121	—	—	—
*French polisher	843	341	77	—	—	—
*Upholsterer	186	—	—	—	—	—
*Food, workers in	—	209	—	—	300	253
Brewers, distillers, &c.	179	197	59	288	168	117
Coach, cycle, motor manufacture	308	374	125	216	243	182

In Woolwich 1,677 men working in explosives and matches, also deserve notice, but in the rest of the boroughs there are few noticeable industries which fall into this class.

Metal workers include watchmakers, of whom a small number still linger in Clerkenwell (borough of Finsbury) and Islington; goldsmiths and silversmiths in the same two boroughs showing

an excess above the ordinary of 1,300 men; and electrical apparatus makers numbering—

1,143 men in Greenwich,	1,036 men in Islington,
641 „ Woolwich,	714 „ St. Pancras,

and lower ratios elsewhere, in all 11,665 men. Engineering is largely developed at Woolwich, Greenwich, Deptford, Poplar, Battersea, and Southwark.

In dealing with the primary occupations of females, we may confine ourselves to three items, viz., the mercantile class (chiefly clerks), the hotel, &c., service, and manufactures not metallic. The other sub-divisions are small enough to be passed over without notice.

	Proportion of Women Employed to 100 Working Males.				Proportion of Women Employed to 100 Working Males.		
	Manu- factures, not Metallic.	Hotel Service.*	Com- merce.		Manu- factures, not Metallic.	Hotel Service.*	Com- merce.
I.				III (b).			
London City	4.1	10.1	1.6	Hammersmith...	10.0	—	1.8
Holborn	6.1	5.3	2.0	Battersea.....	6.0	—	1.7
Westminster	5.6	5.2	1.5	Lambeth	4.7	—	1.9
				Camberwell.....	7.8	—	1.9
II.				Hackney	13.0	—	2.0
Southwark	11.2	0.3	0.9	Stoke Newington	7.7	—	3.0
Finsbury	17.8	0.1	0.9	Islington	8.9	—	2.0
St. Pancras	6.7	0.4	1.6				
III (a).				IV.			
St. Marylebone	11.5	0.7	1.6	Shoreditch	24.2	—	0.4
Chelsea	6.7	—	1.7	Bethnal Green..	26.6	—	0.3
Kensington	9.2	1.0	1.6	Stepney	16.0	—	0.5
Paddington.....	6.6	0.4	2.0	Poplar	11.2	—	0.6
Hampstead	2.2	—	2.5	Bermondsey ...	12.9	—	0.7
Fulham	6.4	—	1.5	Deptford	2.4	—	1.5
Wandsworth	3.4	—	1.9	Greenwich	1.0	—	0.7
Lewisham	2.4	—	2.0	Woolwich	0.5	—	0.5

* These numbers represent the estimated excess beyond a full local quota.

The principal details will now be given (as in the case of male primary workers) with respect to the primary occupations of women comprehended in the first column of the above table.

	Stepney.	Bethnal Green.	Shoreditch.	Finsbury.	Hackney.	Stoke Newington.
*Tailor	7,807	1,666	540	120	462	55
*Boot, shoemaker	335	1,498	683	—	1,178	—
*Milliner	—	—	291	90	505	183
*Dressmaker.....	—	—	—	—	490	262
*Shirt maker, seamstress	611	538	1,151	564	1,627	195
*Hat, umbrella maker	512	386	287	91	54	—
*Laundry, washing service....	—	—	168	—	252	—
Artificial flower manufac- ture	49	146	498	410	166	29
Silk manufacture	44	387	57	61	60	8
Fancy goods, &c., manu- facture.....	351	698	494	339	563	81
Hemp manufacture	704	126	165	39	66	6
Furrier, currier, &c.	457	212	454	346	385	80
*Hair, feathers, worker	384	819	472	350	429	26
*Upholsterer	—	128	73	—	—	—
*French polisher	—	384	236	130	27	—
Paper box, bag maker	669	1,714	1,839	1,110	594	43
Envelope, stationery } manufacture	239	359	469	406	323	34
Bookbinder	526	478	617	1,157	471	71
*Food, workers in	552	44	19	—	225	—
*Tobacco manufacture	1,678	512	178	123	—	—

	South- wark.	Holborn.	West- minster.	Ber- mondsey.	Deptford.	Poplar.
*Tailor	397	260	1,365	—	—	1,638
*Dressmaker.....	—	—	1,418	—	—	—
*Shirtmaker, seamstress.....	807	—	—	1,328	311	591
*Boot, shoemaker	236	—	—	—	—	122
*Hat, umbrella maker.....	49	—	—	228	—	—
Fancy goods, &c., manu- facture.....	274	94	172	125	56	113
Hemp manufacture	145	5	3	278	16	319
Furrier, currier, &c.	520	32	52	566	60	57
*Hair, feathers, worker	250	7	—	155	—	110
Paper box, bag maker	797	90	32	274	36	441
Envelope, stationery } manufacture	657	73	104	303	56	77
Printer, lithographer	427	77	60	208	43	54
Bookbinder.....	1,784	443	247	675	103	163
*Food, workers in	466	—	—	848	—	979
*Tobacco manufacture	250	62	—	—	—	—
Indiarubber, waterproof, } soap, &c., workers	49	17	4	130	25	449
Lucifer match, cartridge } manufacture	21	7	1	6	4	595
*Paper manufacture, &c.	167	39	—	25	—	—

	St. Pancras.	Islington.	St. Mary-bone.	Lambeth.	Camberwell.	Battersea.
*Tailor	122	—	738	—	—	86
*Milliner	—	715	170	—	—	—
*Dressmaker	2,141	1,552	3,186	1,042	260	817
*Shirtmaker, seamstress	—	980	—	—	1,850	—
*Laundry, washing service....	—	605	—	884	1,615	1,165
Fancy goods, &c., manu- facture	401	733	177	262	259	252
Artificial flower manu- facture	114	555	32	55	22	19
Curriers, furriers, &c.	113	612	25	122	179	25
*Hair, feathers, worker	32	396	—	10	32	—
*Upholsterer	568	—	90	—	—	—
Bookbinder.....	399	1,112	86	841	733	100
Paper box, bag, maker	254	669	10	316	158	284
Envelope, stationery manufacture	390	472	56	319	255	104
Lucifer match, cartridge manufacture	167	239	2	12	4	7

The following occupations in the remaining boroughs are noticeable :—

Dress- makers	2,247 in Paddington.	Laundry, washing service	2,531 in Kensington.
	1,295 „ Kensington		2,248 „ Hammersmith.
	1,174 „ Chelsea.		1,355 „ Fulham.
	901 „ Hammersmith.		1,105 „ Wandsworth.
	1,017 „ Fulham.		367 „ Lewisham.

In each case the numbers given represent the excess beyond a full local quota.

Secondary Occupations.

The proportion of male secondary workers to the entire number of male workers was, in the county of London, 61·4 per cent. in 1891. I find the proportion in 1901, after excluding as primary a few persons in trades not so counted in my earlier calculation, works out slightly less, viz., 60·3 per cent. The situation, in fact, is but little changed. In Table VI (annexed) I transcribe a few figures from my Manchester paper, contrasting them with similar figures from the same source for three metropolitan counties, and one which is fairly remote from London; the object being to show how far the composition of the secondary classes (males) may be expected to vary. I also insert corresponding figures for London, as in 1901, which indicate an increase in the trades supplying food, in the Government (local and general) service, and in the service of road and railway traffic.

The position in each borough (per 100 working males) was as under in 1901 :—⁴

	Secondary.		Primary.			Secondary.		Primary.	
	Males.	Fe- males.	Males.	Fe- males.		Males.	Fe- males.	Males.	Fe- males.
I.					III (b).				
London City..	60.9	46.7	37.0	16.0	Hammersmith.	66.9	35.2	25.6	12.2
Holborn	63.4	43.2	30.2	14.4	Battersea	62.9	29.4	30.9	8.2
Westminster	66.6	60.2	29.9	13.1	Lambeth	64.3	37.9	30.6	7.1
II.					Camberwell ...	62.6	34.6	33.5	10.1
Southwark	61.5	27.7	31.2	13.4	Hackney	57.3	38.1	39.1	15.7
Finsbury.....	60.4	29.3	35.1	20.7	Stoke New- ington }	58.1	45.2	39.9	11.1
St. Pancras	64.1	36.5	32.3	9.7	Islington	62.5	35.8	33.5	12.1
III (a).					IV.				
St. Maryle- bone..... }	75.0	66.9	20.4	14.1	Shoreditch	53.0	26.2	41.9	26.1
Chelsea	77.9	67.5	15.8	8.6	Bethnal Green	50.0	24.6	45.3	27.9
Kensington....	75.3	90.7	19.2	12.1	Stepney.....	46.9	24.5	46.3	17.2
Paddington....	73.2	63.2	23.6	9.3	Poplar	44.1	23.0	44.8	12.8
Hampstead	68.3	91.1	29.0	4.9	Bermondsey	47.8	23.4	43.3	16.0
Fullham	73.6	33.7	20.8	8.1	Deptford	50.9	32.5	42.1	4.8
Wandsworth	66.4	47.7	28.6	5.5	Greenwich	43.7	33.8	44.0	2.2
Lewisham ...	61.6	49.3	33.4	4.5	Woolwich.....	37.8	23.0	51.9	1.4

Woolwich, at the bottom of the scale, ranks with Swansea, Halifax, Wigan, and Warrington in respect of its proportion of secondary workers.⁵ Poplar and Greenwich are nearly level with Leeds and Cardiff. Stepney and Bermondsey would rank in this respect above Portsmouth and Newcastle-on-Tyne, but I really think somewhat greater numbers of their inhabitants should have been transferred to the "primary" classes, thus reducing the apparent ratios of secondary workers, which would be further diminished if those who not serve the local populations could be excluded.

One of the characteristics of secondary occupations is, that unless some unusual cause is in operation all the sections rise or fall together. We have, therefore, an interest in studying their *relative* magnitudes, especially when dealing with parts of a great whole like London, because of the likelihood that their irregularities may be significant of the various functions of the several parts :—

⁴ The ratios of males (secondary and primary) do not amount to 100, because there are some occupations (general labourers, &c.) so indefinite that they are not counted in either class. See the proportionate numbers of such persons in Table I.

⁵ The ratio would, however, be raised from 37.8 to 43.2 if the military, &c., were not counted as "working males;" their demands on local services cannot but be small.

	To every 100 Males of the Secondary Classes there are engaged upon									
	Food, &c.		Dress.		Domestics.		Build- ing.	Rail- way Car- riage.	Road Car- riage.	Messen- gers, &c.
	Males.	Fe- males.	Males.	Fe- males.	Males.	Fe- males.	Males.	Males.	Males.	Males.
I.										
London City	13.9	5.5	12.1	11.4	18.1	49.6	4.7	1.1	3.4	17.7
Holborn	14.6	8.0	8.2	12.1	7.7	33.0	10.3	0.8	10.0	9.9
Westminster	13.1	5.2	7.7	13.6	25.3	62.3	9.2	0.9	8.1	7.5
II.										
Southwark	14.3	4.8	9.2	13.8	3.7	18.0	16.3	2.6	16.3	10.5
Finsbury	14.3	5.2	8.3	13.4	3.7	20.6	14.2	2.4	18.0	12.8
St. Pancras	13.9	5.5	8.1	13.1	4.9	28.0	18.0	3.1	15.4	8.1
III (a).										
St. Marylebone	12.8	4.9	10.4	14.5	13.0	57.9	15.1	2.0	12.3	7.7
Chelsea	13.0	3.7	7.4	10.9	14.4	61.0	20.5	0.7	12.3	7.0
Kensington	12.8	4.5	6.5	10.2	12.6	94.0	17.7	2.8	12.8	5.8
Paddington	13.2	4.9	8.3	11.4	8.9	59.6	18.8	2.8	14.9	5.8
Hampstead	14.4	3.8	8.8	10.2	8.0	102.8	16.2	3.0	9.5	4.0
Fulham	13.6	3.0	6.5	8.7	4.3	25.8	26.0	2.7	13.4	6.1
Wandsworth	13.6	3.0	7.7	10.1	6.1	47.7	23.2	5.1	8.6	4.4
Lewisham	15.6	3.1	9.0	11.0	5.1	53.7	22.9	3.3	7.0	4.4
III (b).										
Hammersmith	13.6	3.6	8.1	10.4	3.0	28.3	26.5	3.0	11.2	5.1
Battersea	12.5	3.3	7.8	12.4	3.1	21.9	25.9	3.1	9.1	6.7
Lambeth	15.0	4.6	7.6	14.0	4.2	29.1	19.0	3.1	12.7	6.7
Camberwell	14.8	4.4	9.2	15.2	3.1	25.5	20.8	3.2	12.2	7.2
Hackney	15.3	4.8	11.9	16.8	2.6	31.9	18.3	3.1	10.1	7.5
Stoke Newington	15.9	4.4	12.3	16.4	2.6	43.8	18.3	1.8	7.5	5.9
Islington	13.9	4.6	8.9	15.3	2.6	26.9	18.9	3.1	15.8	7.1
IV.										
Shoreditch	14.4	5.2	10.3	15.6	2.9	19.1	15.7	1.6	16.6	12.7
Bethnal Green	15.9	5.0	9.9	14.9	2.4	18.1	14.3	2.9	18.7	11.2
Stepney	17.8	5.7	11.1	15.3	2.8	21.9	13.0	1.9	16.3	9.6
Poplar	15.5	5.9	8.4	16.5	2.1	20.1	18.6	4.4	13.1	8.5
Bermondsey	16.9	6.2	7.1	14.6	2.4	19.4	13.7	4.0	17.4	12.0
Deptford	16.4	5.0	8.0	15.5	2.0	30.8	20.0	3.9	9.9	6.6
Greenwich	15.1	3.9	5.8	13.2	5.1	47.5	20.3	3.5	8.9	6.0
Woolwich	14.0	4.3	7.4	17.0	3.0	30.0	24.5	2.4	6.7	4.3

In the tables numbered I and II appended, the ratios are given per 100 male "workers," and thus we have before us the absolute as well as the relative numbers of these classes.

One of the first conclusions we derive from a study of these figures is a conviction that the same reasons which deter the merely "residential" class from living in London City, operate to exclude many other persons. The building trades, and those engaged in road and railway traffic, avoid the central boroughs, especially London City. The male servants there are mostly caretakers, and in the class of warehousemen, messengers, &c., are

included many messengers and porters, often in charge of premises. Those engaged about local and general government, including Post Office and Inland Revenue and Customs officers, also rise to a high percentage. We have seen that the primary classes include wholesale drapers, commercial clerks, and hotel proprietors and servants. Ordinary family life is comparatively rare.

The trades concerned in providing food and lodging employ in the City almost a medium proportion of males, and more than that proportion of females. The proportions in Westminster are slightly higher, and in Holborn they exceed the average, with a specially great number of women. Those supplying dress in the City of London include a high ratio of men, but comparatively few women. In Westminster the proportion of men supplying dress is moderate, and that of women high. In St. Marylebone both sexes are engaged in unusually high proportions in providing dress, notwithstanding the numbers transferred to the primary classes in that borough. I am inclined to believe that in St. Marylebone, Paddington, Southwark,⁶ and elsewhere many drapers reside, so as to be near their work, whilst many others, more free to choose their places of residence, find their way to Islington, Stoke Newington, Hackney, Hampstead, Lewisham, Wandsworth, Camberwell, and Hammersmith. These and other tradespeople who live at a distance from their work do not really serve the districts where they reside, and might properly (if it were possible) be left out of account as secondary workers there.

The fact that I have in many cases transferred to the primary classes portions of the tailors, shoemakers, dressmakers, &c., after reserving a full quota for local service, would tend to diminish the value of the figures for secondary workers shown in Tables I and II. In some striking instances, such as Hackney, Shoreditch, and Stepney, the true numbers serving local demands may be much lower than those estimated. Yet we are safe in saying that besides St. Marylebone, Chelsea and Paddington present high proportions of both sexes in this class, and Lambeth a full proportion of women, some of whom may spend their days in Westminster workrooms. St. Pancras as usual occupies a middle place.

The boroughs where the supply of dress engages fewest hands are Bethnal Green, Bermondsey, Poplar, Deptford, Greenwich, Woolwich, Battersea, and Fulham. The figures are also low in some of the best residential districts, such as Kensington, Hampstead, Wandsworth, and Lewisham.

⁶ This borough offers a cheap place of residence for many people who work in London City.

Returning to the dealers in food, &c., we find the absolute proportions are high in Chelsea, Kensington, Paddington, and St. Marylebone, also in Fulham and Lambeth. It is less easy to see why the proportions, especially of male workers, are rather high in Hampstead and Lewisham.

Perhaps the more scattered populations on the outskirts require a greater number of persons to maintain their supply than are needed in denser-peopled neighbourhoods; but more probably the residential boroughs may attract tradesmen from a distance.⁷

The places where the absolute proportions of food suppliers are lowest are Woolwich, Greenwich, Deptford, Poplar, Stepney, Bermondsey, Bethnal Green, Shoreditch, and Battersea. But *relatively* to the whole number of the secondary classes this class stands fairly high in those boroughs, as might be expected when it is considered that it supplies the most urgent necessities. The range is from 12·5 males, 3·3 females per 100 "male secondary workers" in Battersea, to 17·8 males, 5·7 females in Stepney, comparable with 12·8 males and 4·5 females in Kensington, 13·1 males and 5·2 females in Westminster.

The ratios of domestic servants are shown in the tables. Kensington, Chelsea, Westminster, St. Marylebone, Paddington, and Hampstead are best provided; whilst the ratios in Poplar, Bermondsey, Stepney, Bethnal Green, Shoreditch, and Southwark are at the bottom of the scale, and show a remarkable approach to uniformity. Finsbury shows nearly as low a ratio, and so would Battersea but for the influence of its wealthy corner. The absolute ratio in Woolwich is low.

The building trades reach their highest dimensions in Fulham, Hammersmith, Battersea, Wandsworth, Lewisham, and Chelsea, Paddington and Kensington ranking next. It is evident that the Fulham, Hammersmith, and Battersea men go elsewhere to work, but Wandsworth and Lewisham are fast advancing in population, and may give employment to all those within their bounds. The other places mentioned have need of many decorators, and these probably do service also in Westminster, where, as in London City and Holborn, the ratio is low. St. Marylebone shows a medium figure.

The places where this class falls to a minimum are (excluding the above) Stepney, Bermondsey, Bethnal Green, Poplar, Shoreditch, Finsbury, Greenwich, and Woolwich. It seems curious that higher proportions are not found in some of these boroughs,

⁷ It is beyond a doubt that many tradesmen reside some miles away from their place of business. Were it possible, it would be right to exclude these from the reckoning of secondary workers in the boroughs where they reside.

considering their nearness to London City, where work certainly has to be done by men from outside.

Little need be said about those railway servants who are found in boroughs not affected by termini or workshops, and I will only remark that some of those who have been transferred to the primary class may really be "residential" in the sense of having chosen to live in Hampstead, Lewisham, and Islington, at some distance from their work. The numbers found in London City, Westminster, Holborn, and Chelsea are extremely low.

"Road Carriage." This class includes persons engaged in passenger and goods traffic. The central boroughs—London City, Westminster, and Holborn—show moderate or low figures; but Finsbury, Southwark, St. Pancras, Chelsea, and Marylebone show higher ratios, and even Bethnal Green, Shoreditch, and Bermondsey may be largely influenced by the demand in the City. There remain, amongst the highest ratios, Paddington, Fulham, Islington, and Kensington, and even Lambeth, where doubtless many reside who work between those places and more central districts. This class falls to a minimum in the more remote places, such as Woolwich, Greenwich, Lewisham, Stoke Newington, and Deptford.

Messengers, porters, and watchmen (with whom are conjoined comparatively small numbers of other other persons employed as warehousemen, telegraph and telephone workers, and coal labourers) figure largely in the City, as already mentioned. They are also numerous in other boroughs near the centre, such as Finsbury, Shoreditch, Southwark, and Holborn, whence it may be they repair to the City during the day. The class is least numerous in remote places such as Woolwich, Greenwich, Hampstead, and Lewisham.

The Class XI (*e*) described as "Sundry shopkeepers," embraces chemists, stationers, booksellers, newsagents, oil and colour men, furniture dealers, ironmongers, goldsmiths, and tobacconists, with a few others. It falls very low in London City, Westminster, and Chelsea, and is also low in Kensington. But it is lowest in Woolwich, Greenwich, Poplar, Bermondsey, Stepney, and Deptford. Those engaged in these trades seem to a very considerable extent to be "residential," *i.e.*, they choose to reside at a distance from their work, at Stoke Newington, Hampstead, Hackney, &c. But in Holborn, Shoreditch, and Finsbury, where residential attractions are not conspicuous, many are found who probably work to some extent in London City. St. Pancras and Islington, boroughs which include residential areas, show full proportions.

The Class XI (*f* and *g*⁸) includes the gas, water and other

⁸ I have used the same symbols as in my Manchester paper, though the correspondence is not quite perfect.

services (electric, sanitary), also road labourers, railway contractors' labourers, blacksmiths, &c. It takes in brush and broom makers, coopers, carvers and gilders, and sundry workers in wood. It were to be desired that supplementary tables had been furnished in respect of grouped trades, such as that of carvers and gilders, as I think it very desirable to separate shopkeepers from others engaged in industries.

In some respects the distribution of this section of the population resembles that of the section last referred to. In London City, Westminster, Chelsea, and St. Marylebone its dimensions are small. But instead of being "residential," it also falls very low in Stoke Newington, Hampstead, Hackney, St. Pancras, and Islington, and rises to a maximum in such places as Greenwich, Battersea, Poplar, Fulham, Deptford, and Camberwell, where gas workers are numerous, also in Woolwich, where there are many smiths. Oddly enough, it rises to rather more than average numbers in Holborn, but that is not due to the elements "carver and gilder," and "house and shop fittings maker;" the excess there is entirely amongst navvies and paviors or road labourers.

We have now run through the class of tradesmen, and may come to that of professional people. And first, as to "Law, Medicine, and Divinity."

Of those who choose to reside at a distance from the centre, many are found in the boroughs of Hampstead and Wandsworth. Those who favour the western parts are most numerous in Kensington, St. Marylebone, and Paddington. Holborn and Westminster also show high ratios. Then come some more suburbs, such as Stoke Newington and Lewisham. In London City and Chelsea, though male workers are fewer, there are numerous women acting as sick nurses who fall into this class.

The other end of the scale is occupied by Bethnal Green, Shoreditch, Stepney, Bermondsey, Poplar, Woolwich, Finsbury, and Southwark.

The second division of professional people is that of "Education, Literature, and the Arts," and here, to a certain extent, is a greater necessity to live near the place of work; yet surprising numbers are found in Hampstead and Wandsworth, which boroughs again show the highest ratios, except Holborn, which ranks between them. This borough is exceptionally situated, affording a fairly cheap residence for those who must work in the City, in Westminster, or in St. Marylebone. After Wandsworth, we have the suburban or semi-suburban boroughs—Hammersmith, Lewisham, Lambeth, and Fulham—and the richer boroughs of Kensington and Chelsea.

At the bottom of the scale we find Shoreditch, Bethnal Green,

Bermondsey, Poplar, Stepney, Woolwich, and Finsbury. Of these, Woolwich is best provided, having more women "teachers" than the other places.

General and Local Government. Besides London City (already referred to) this class reaches a comparatively important number in Westminster, Chelsea, and Woolwich. It is found that some who can select their residences live in Wandsworth, Stoke Newington, Islington, Lambeth, and even Battersea. The lowest proportions (of males) are in Shoreditch, Bethnal Green, Stepney, and Poplar.

Ages and Civil Condition.

The extreme diversity which exists in the matter of occupations between the inhabitants of the several metropolitan boroughs, reflects itself in the ages and also the civil condition of their people. If in the section devoted to birth-places we had a table showing for each borough the number of inhabitants of each sex born in London, and the numbers of each sex born in the following places, viz. :—

	Enumerated in 1901.	
	Males.	Females.
Divisions III and IV (Middlesex, } Herts, Essex, &c.) }	186,949	242,640
Division II (Kent, Surrey, &c.)	142,747	179,244
„ V (Devon, Somerset, &c.)....	65,280	85,488
Elsewhere in England and Wales ...	139,883	159,841
British subjects born elsewhere	85,913	96,599
Foreigners	79,804	55,573
	700,576	819,385

the proportions of strangers in each borough would be full of interest, and the table would occupy but two pages.⁹ Very full information is given as respects the foreigners.

Turning to the civil condition of the population of the county of London, in combination with the census of ages, we find the following variations on the whole in the ten years between 1891 and 1901, viz. :—

⁹ It is also highly desirable that tables giving *the ages* of the total immigrants of each sex in each of the first five categories should be given. We could then compute with confidence the numbers and ages of immigrants from each quarter in intercensal periods.

Civil Condition and Age.	Numbers.		To 100 Married Women Aged 15—65.	
	1891.	1901.	1891.	1901.
Married women 15—65	691,234	766,659	100·0	100·0
„ men 15—65	667,753	736,390	96·6	96·1
„ women 65 and upwards	23,631	26,438	3·4	3·4
„ men 65 „	37,847	40,973	5·5	5·3
Single women {	15—35	517,361	74·8	76·3
	35—45	51,699	7·5	8·6
	45 and upwards	59,816	8·7	9·2
	15—35	471,024	68·1	68·8
„ men {	35—45	37,039	5·4	6·3
	45 and upwards	31,088	4·5	5·3
	All ages	186,479	27·0	25·8
Widows	64,565	72,128	9·3	9·4
Widowers	1,372,207	1,357,874	198·5	177·1
Children	4,211,743	4,536,541	609·3	591·7

This table shows there were in 1891 100 wives aged 15—65 amongst 410·8 persons aged 15 and upwards, but in 1901 the same number amongst 414·6 persons of like age. The change, being less than 1 per cent., betokens great stability in this ratio. I have based the calculation on the number of wives rather than that of husbands, although both ratios are well maintained, because for business reasons or otherwise husbands more often than wives are absent from home.

The proportions of single women have become perceptibly higher, also those of single men above 35 years of age.¹⁰ There is a material decline in the proportion of widows.

The great fact, however, which dwarfs all others, is a decline in the proportionate number of children under 15 years of age, from 198·5 to 177·1 per 100 wives. This means a difference of about 164,000 children, which would, had they been counted, have raised the number to about 1,522,000, and converted an actual decline in numbers into a considerable increase.

We are not in possession of the National Census of Ages for 1901; but turning to the previous census, we obtain the following table for England and Wales:—

¹⁰ A reason is given later on for this change.

In 1891.	Numbers.	To 100 Married Women Aged 15—65.
Married women..... 15—65	4,672,635	100·0
„ men 15—65	4,493,390	96·2
„ women..... 65 and upward	244,014	5·2
„ men 65	358,158	7·7
Single women..... {	15—35	68·1
	35—45	6·0
	45 and upwards	7·3
	15—35	68·1
„ men {	35—45	5·1
	45 and upwards	4·9
	228,338	
Widows All ages.....	1,121,310	24·1
Widowers „	484,990	10·4
Children 0—15.....	10,172,235	217·7
	29,002,525	620·7

From this table it appears that 100 wives to 403 persons aged 15 years and upwards was in 1891 the national average, wives being thus in London a little fewer than the average. As respects children under 15, the national proportion was materially higher in England and Wales than in London, at all events in 1891, and this makes the falling off just mentioned seem the more abnormal.

The facts mentioned have induced me to consider whether the fertility of marriages may not have greatly decreased, a solution of the phenomenon which appeared to me to be feasible, having regard to the circumstance that since about the year 1885 articles have been exposed for sale in chemists' shops for use in preventing conceptions.

It appears that the London birth-rate has considerably decreased of late years, not because of any material reduction in the proportion of adult persons in the married state, but in consequence of diminished fertility, thus:—

	Wives 15—45 Years of Age.	Births.		Ratio per 100 Wives.	
		Total.	Legitimate.	Total.	Legitimate.
1880.....	—	133,310	128,137	} 28·3	27·2
'81.....	469,541	132,904	127,716		
'90.....	—	128,161	123,259		
'91.....	506,192	134,484	129,697	} 25·9	25·0
1900.....	—	130,868	—		
'01.....	*554,125	130,889	—	} 23·6	—

* Excluding South Hornsey, added 1st April, 1901.

The mean number of births in the ten years 1881-90 was 132,917, the ratio to the mean number of wives under 45 being

27·2 per 100. In 1891-1900 it was 132,943, the similar ratio being 25·1 per 100.

In the former period the mean ratio was 1·1 per 100 below the commencing figure, and the descent in the ten years 2·4 per 100. These facts are consistent with the idea that the initial figure 28·3 per 100 approximately represents what is natural in such a place as London, and that all decline below this ratio indicates a changed condition of things.

In the second period of ten years the mean ratio was only 0·8 per 100 below the commencing figure, but the total decline was nearly as great, namely, 2·3 per 100.

It follows that we have gradually reached a condition of things when (the ratio of births having sunk from 28·3 to 23·6 per 100) the natural births are reduced by artificial means to the extent of 26,000 per annum, or say 500 weekly.

The national figures, exclusive of London, shall next be shown, the only fact not ascertained being the number of wives aged 15—45 at the date of the last census. This figure has been supplied upon the assumption that persons of this class in England and Wales have increased as rapidly since 1891 as the mass of population, viz., at the rate of 12·17 per cent. Should it prove (as is most likely) that the children under 15 have considerably fallen off in relative numbers, the increase of wives is likely to have been at a higher rate.

	Wives 15—45 Years of Age.	Births.		Ratio per 100 Wives.	
		Total.	Legitimate.	Total.	Legitimate.
1880.....	—	748,333	710,964	} 30·3	28·8
'81.....	2,473,612	750,738	712,806		
'90.....	—	741,776	708,266	} 27·8	26·6
'91.....	2,737,340	779,673	745,679		
1900.....	—	795,286	—	} 25·8	—
'01.....	3,084,143	793,381	—		

The mean number of births in the ten years 1881-90 was 756,117, the ratio to the mean number of wives under 45 being 29·0 per 100. In 1891-1900, it was 782,774, and the ratio 26·9 per 100.

Here again we have some reason to suppose the commencing ratio 30·3 per 100 wives to represent the ordinary fertility of women, having regard to English customs, especially recollecting that the average must be affected by the very high birth-rates in certain important districts where coal-mining is the principal industry.

The mean ratio in the ten years 1881-90, was 1·3 per 100 below the commencing ratio, and the end of the decade marked a total decline of 2·5 per 100.

In the next decade the mean ratio was 0·9 per 100 below the commencing figure, and the final ratio showed a fall of 2·0 per 100 in the ten years, being perceptibly less than in London.

The total decline in the ten divisions outside London was 4·5 per 100, being slightly less than in London. This may be consistent with a decline having occurred in some important centres even greater than that observed in London, whilst in other outside districts the ratio of decline may have been smaller. It is impossible in this place to carry the investigation further without losing sight of the main object of this paper, but local changes in the county of London may properly claim our notice. For the purpose of tracing these the ratios of legitimate births should be used. Many illegitimate children are born in hospitals, far from the mother's proper home, but the same cannot be said of legitimate children.

In this inquiry we are compelled to group together those boroughs which are coupled in one Registration District, viz., Wandsworth with Battersea, Deptford with Greenwich, Fulham with Hammersmith, and Finsbury with Holborn. In the case of Finsbury, its population is so much greater than that of Holborn as to make the ratios represent most closely the condition of the former borough. The changes of boundary which occurred in April, 1901, are ignored, and a slight correction is accordingly introduced in the numbers of births in the last three quarters of 1901.

The boroughs showing the most numerous births to 100 mothers are the industrial ones, where luxury and forethought are comparatively unknown. The *highest* ratios of legitimate births shown in 1880-81 and in 1890-91 were as under:—

	1880-81.		1890-91.
Bethnal Green	30·7	Stepney.....	29·4
Bermondsey	30·0	Bethnal Green.....	29·3
Poplar	29·5	Bermondsey	28·5
Stepney	29·3	Poplar	28·1
Greenwich and Deptford....	28·8	Finsbury and Holborn ...	*26·9
Shoreditch	28·6	Shoreditch	26·8

* This figure would doubtless be higher, if Holborn could be eliminated.

The *lowest* ratios shown in 1880-81 and 1890-91 were as under:—

	1880-81.		1890-91.
St. Pancras ¹¹	25'4	Islington	23'6
Hampstead	25'3	St. Marylebone	23'5
St. Marylebone	24'7	Lewisham	23'1
Kensington.....	24'3	St. Pancras	23'0
Paddington.....		Chelsea	22'7
London City	23'3	Hampstead	21'7
Westminster	22'7	Kensington	21'5
		Paddington	21'5
		London City	21'2
		Westminster.....	20'1

It is not difficult to understand why the births which take place in London City or in Westminster are few in number. The populations of those cities are in a considerable measure fluctuating and transitory. It may also be the case that many mothers in Kensington, Paddington, St. Marylebone, and Chelsea, prefer to be in the country at the date of their confinement. What surprises me much is that the ratios in these boroughs, already low in 1880-81, have fallen considerably since that time. It will assist us in comprehending the movement if we here note the boroughs where the decline in the ratio has been most important:—

	1880-81.	1890-91.	Decline.		1880-81.	1890-91.	Decline.
Lewisham ¹¹	27'2	23'1	4'1	Wandsworth and	27'5	24'4	3'1
Chelsea	26'6	22'7	3'9	Battersea			
Hammersmith	27'9	24'0	3'9	Greenwich and	28'8	25'8	3'0
and Fulham }				Deptford.....			
Hampstead.....	25'3	21'7	3'6	Camberwell	28'1	25'1	3'0
Hackney	28'3	24'8	3'5	Kensington.....	24'3	21'5	2'8
Islington.....	26'9	23'6	3'3	Paddington.....		21'5	2'8
				Westminster	22'7	20'1	2'6

The above-named boroughs are many of them residential, *i.e.*, places to which city clerks and tradesmen from the central boroughs gravitate. Chelsea hardly comes under this description, but might be expected to approximate more closely to Kensington. However, a part of the district since detached (Kensal Town) is included in the above calculation, and might account for the decline being so large.

I have to regret the absence of statistics as to the civil condition of the inhabitants of sub-districts. It is in vain for the

¹¹ These tables show ratios of *legitimate* births. In Table VIII all the facts given are collected for purposes of comparison.

Registrar-General to furnish annually elaborate statistics as to these divisions, unless the decennial census gives us some means of reducing such recorded facts into ratios. I venture to suggest that a table giving for each sub-district the thirteen facts contained in the table on p. 468 (or rather fourteen facts, since wives aged 15—45 and 45—65 should be separately shown) would not be bulky, and would have great value. By the use of such a table it would be found, I am sure, that in the borough of Lambeth such wards as Brixton, Tulse Hill, and Norwood resemble Wandsworth borough in their conditions, but the other Lambeth wards approximate more closely to those of Southwark.

The only borough in which children under 15 are a little more numerous than in 1891 is Stepney, where alone the average fertility in 1891-1900 was higher than in the preceding decade. Children fell off least in the following boroughs in the interval 1891-1901:—

	1891.	1901.	Decline.		1891.	1901.	Decline.
Shoreditch	204.1	196.1	8.0	Holborn and			
Bethnal Green ..	224.0	214.3	9.7	Finsbury}	189.6	174.0	15.6
Southwark	195.9	185.1	10.8	St. Pancras	180.5	163.8	16.7
Bermondsey	218.2	203.5	14.7	St. Marylebone....	164.6	146.9	17.7
Poplar	218.0	204.3	13.7				

They fell off to a much greater extent in the following boroughs:—

	1891.	1901.	Decline.		1891.	1901.	Decline.
Hampstead	195.3	154.4	40.9	Camberwell	218.6	188.5	30.1
Lewisham	211.6	175.1	36.5	Islington	194.1	166.2	27.9
Wandsworth } and Battersea }	211.0	176.5	34.5	Fulham and Hammersmith }	203.0	176.0	27.0
Chelsea	187.1	154.8	32.3	Deptford and			
London City ...	184.8	153.0	31.8	Greenwich.... }	218.2	191.2	27.0

For the ten years 1891-1901 I can only show the further decline, locally, in the fertility of marriages by a comparison of figures including illegitimate births, but when the Registrar-General's annual volumes for 1900 and 1901 appear this difficulty can be remedied. In the meanwhile I exclude St. Marylebone (containing Queen Charlotte's Lying-in Hospital) from my consideration, because of the great number of illegitimate births there, and I find in the other boroughs the following changes:—

The highest ratios of total births were, in 1900-01—

Stepney	29'5	Holborn and Finsbury.....	27'1
Bethnal Green	28'3	Southwark	25'2
Poplar.....	28'2	Greenwich and Deptford.....	24'4
Bermondsey	27'3	Lambeth.....	24'3
Shoreditch	27'2		

and the lowest were—

London City	16'4	Chelsea	20'6
Westminster	17'4	Lewisham	20'8
Hampstead	18'3	St. Pancras.....	21'5
Kensington.....	20'1	Wandsworth and Battersea ...	21'6
Paddington	20'3	Islington.....	21'7

and the places showing the largest diminutions in the ratios were—

London City, decrease	5'2	Wandsworth and Battersea, } decrease	3'6
Woolwich	4'4	Chelsea	3'3
Hampstead	3'9	Lewisham	3'3
Westminster	3'6	Camberwell	3'1

whilst those in which the ratio was not diminished very much were—

Holborn and Finsbury, } decrease	0'4	Shoreditch, decrease.....	0'5
Poplar.....	0'4	Stepney	0'5
		Southwark	1'0

We find therefore that the industrial boroughs still exhibit the highest ratios of births, and the central districts divide with the residential ones the list of lowest ratios; that the decline (save a sudden descent at Woolwich) has hardly been accelerated, and in some boroughs is very small, especially in the industrial ones.

Returning to the subject of the apparent short return of about 164,000 children under 15 in the last London census, we may, I think, conclude that fully 100,000 of these are non-existent, owing to the falling off in births, but we are entitled, I imagine, to suppose the remainder to be represented by an increased number of non-residents. The tendency to travel is continually on the increase, and doubtless more and more children are sent to country schools, and even to the Continent, for their education. Then there are many portions of the county of London which formerly contained numerous private schools, and which being now densely inhabited have become less eligible for such establishments. Many I suspect have removed across the county boundary. I say nothing of the removal of children to the sea-

side or the country for their health, though even here a number of absentees, beyond what might once have existed, may reasonably be supposed.

I now turn to the variations between borough and borough at other ages. A convenient summary of the facts is contained in Table V. It must not however be forgotten that Kensal Town has been transferred from Chelsea to Paddington, lowering the relative numbers of servants and dependents in that borough, but increasing the corresponding ratios in Chelsea. Hackney has lost Stoke Newington; Greenwich has gained Charlton from Woolwich, and Lewisham has lost Eltham to Woolwich, each of the changes affecting the proportion of servants and other dependent elements. On reviewing the figures, it will be easy to see that much of the apparent variation during ten years is simply the natural effect of altered limits.

It will be seen that where many families keep servants, the numbers of single women are high; thus referring to Table II, the ratios of domestics are found to be as under in the boroughs where single women most abound, or are most rare:—

	Single Women Aged 15 and upwards to 100 Wives in 1901.	Females of the Domestic Class per Cent. on Working Males.		Single Women Aged 15 and upwards to 100 Wives in 1901.	Females of the Domestic Class per Cent. on Working Males.
Hampstead	203.5	70.2	Shoreditch	68.3	10.1
Kensington	189.2	70.8	Bethnal Green ..	67.4	9.0
London City ..	161.9	30.2	Stepney	67.3	10.3
Westminster...	159.9	41.5	Bermondsey	64.0	9.3
St. Marylebone	155.4	43.4	Poplar	62.8	8.7
Chelsea	141.8	47.5	Southwark	62.1	11.0
Paddington ...	141.4	43.6	Woolwich	54.9	11.3

The numbers of single *men* are not so excessive as those of single women save in London City and Westminster, where ordinary conditions do not prevail. The other boroughs noted for high ratios of single men are St. Marylebone, Holborn, and Chelsea, which more or less resemble the City in having considerable floating populations, and Woolwich, where the presence of 5,083 soldiers, &c., accounts for the excess. St. Pancras is affected by the great railway termini, and Stepney by the sailors and others connected with shipping, who are specially numerous in that borough. It seems singular that bachelors are comparatively few in Battersea and Fulham; this may, however, indicate prosperity amongst men engaged in the building trades.

Widows and widowers seem to have accumulated in Chelsea; a decrease of widows in Paddington shows that this is in part due to the transfer of Kensal Town.

The total members of adults in proportion to 100 wives are highest in London City, Westminster, St. Marylebone, Kensington, Hampstead, Holborn, and Chelsea. But this simply signifies that the attendants of wealthy families are usually unmarried people, not that the marriage-rate is less.

A regular augmentation of the proportion of single women in Shoreditch, Bethnal Green, Stepney, Poplar, and Bermondsey is observed. This, however, is not due to any extension in the numbers of female domestic (in-door) servants. The following table shows the numbers in 1891 and 1901 in five divisions of London, adjusting the latest returns so as to make them comparable with those for 1891:—

	Working Males.		Female Servants, In-door.		Percentage.	
	1891.	1901.	1891.	1901.	1891.	1901.
West	208,288	236,846	80,569	83,397	38·7	35·2
North	294,296	321,131	63,325	60,519	21·5	18·8
Central	83,498	73,567	10,958	8,337	13·1	11·3
East	221,408	227,059	13,365	11,162	6·0	4·9
South	446,837	536,266	70,149	70,304	15·7	13·1
	1,254,327	1,394,869	238,366	233,719	19·0	16·8

This table exhibits an actual decrease in the numbers of female domestic servants in most parts of London, and a decrease, relatively to population, seems universal.¹² The eastern division includes the boroughs of Shoreditch, Bethnal Green, Stepney, and Poplar.

Abandoning the idea of an increased demand for domestic servants, another explanation has to be sought for the increased proportions of single people in these eastern boroughs; and I think we may find it in the fact that whilst there are fewer one-room tenements than in 1891, a larger proportion of those tenements are occupied by one person, so that probably many married people have gone further afield in search of quarters. The following table will illustrate this change:—

¹² This may be due partly to the decline in the numbers of children, partly to the increasing difficulty in obtaining servants.

	Number of One-Room Tenements.		Inhabited by 1 Person.		Inhabited by 2 Persons.		Inhabited by 3 or more Persons.		
	1891.	1901.	1891.	1901	1891.	1901.	1891.	1901.	Decrease per Cent.
Finsbury	8,505	6,364	2,283	1,993	2,862	2,144	3,360	2,227	34
Shoreditch ...	8,373	6,705	2,337	2,042	2,869	2,358	3,167	2,305	27
Bethnal Green }	6,561	5,378	1,555	1,519	2,079	1,817	2,927	2,042	30
Stepney	16,101	13,282	4,136	3,081	5,132	4,273	6,833	5,928	13
Poplar	4,348	3,935	1,488	1,435	1,526	1,313	1,334	1,187	11
Bermondsey	5,111	4,258	1,731	1,645	1,640	1,424	1,740	1,189	32
Southwark	11,767	9,896	3,593	3,646	4,262	3,544	3,912	2,706	31
Greenwich and Deptford }	3,799	3,349	1,523	1,520	1,180	1,027	1,091	802	27
Total	64,565	53,167	18,651	16,881	21,550	17,900	24,364	18,386	25

The decrease in the number of tenements occupied by one person is less than 10 per cent., whilst that in the number of tenements occupied by three or more persons is almost 25 per cent. In the rest of the metropolitan boroughs similar changes occurred, so that we are justified in concluding that many married couples migrated beyond the county boundary. It may be here noted that the boroughs in which symptoms of over-crowding are most marked are Stepney and Bethnal Green; and Stepney is the one borough in the above table to which my general remarks do not apply.

Reverting to Table V, it will be observed that the constituents of population in some boroughs have varied very little. These are Wandsworth (with Battersea), Lambeth, and Islington. In the last-named borough I venture to imagine there are signs of a declension, more markedly shown in the figures for Hackney.¹³ These boroughs are fast filling up and losing their attractions, and the tendency will be for them to descend towards the level of Shoreditch. Camberwell, on the contrary, seems for the present to maintain its status.

It is not easy to determine how far the visible change in Lewisham is due to the exclusion of Eltham. Throwing together the four boroughs of Woolwich, Greenwich, Lewisham, and Deptford, we obtain the following comparison:—

¹³ Possibly the exclusion of Stoke Newington may sufficiently account for this apparent decline.

	Per 100 Wives.		Difference.	
	1891.	1901.	More.	Less.
Single women.....	83.9	80.8	—	3.1
„ men.....	75.7	78.4	2.7	—
Widows	23.3	21.0	—	2.3
Widowers	8.4	8.4	—	—
Old married men	6.3	5.7	—	0.6
„ women	3.9	3.7	—	0.2
Married, 15—65.....	196.3	195.7	—	0.6
Differences	0.1	0.1	—	—
	397.9	393.8	2.7	6.8

This calculation shows that collectively a decrease has taken place in the proportion of single women, and also of widows, which seems to me to point to a loss of residential attraction in some parts of the borough of Lewisham.

Similar observations apply to the aggregation of Hammersmith and Fulham, and to Hampstead.

Paddington requires to be taken together with Chelsea, if we would eliminate the consequences of the altered boundaries, as shown in the following table:—

	Per 100 Wives.		Difference.	
	1891.	1901.	More.	Less.
Single women.....	130.1	141.5	11.4	—
„ men.....	81.0	84.4	3.4	—
Widows	32.4	32.7	0.3	—
Widowers	9.4	11.2	1.8	—
Old married men	5.7	6.3	0.6	—
„ women	3.5	3.9	0.4	—
Married, 15—65	194.8	194.2	—	0.6
Differences	0.1	—	—	0.1
	457.0	474.2	17.9	0.7

This table suggests a certain increase in prosperity, which may probably affect Chelsea the most.

Kensington indicates hardly any change in circumstances. A small addition from Chelsea of 3,275 inhabitants (part of Kensal Town sub-district) was not sufficient to counterbalance the slightly favourable tendency.

St. Marylebone seems to grow industrious, the increased numbers of single women not representing an augmentation of the ranks of domestic servants. St. Pancras, in a much less marked manner, displays a similar tendency.

London, Westminster, and Holborn all show increased proportions of unmarried men and women, in decreasing populations. There is a curious decrease in the numbers of resident widows and widowers, yet these classes stand high, having regard to the non-residential character of such places. In the City of London there are 112·7 husbands at ages 15—65 against 100 wives; thus the usual order of things is reversed, doubtless through the number of temporary visitants on commercial errands.

Table V may be usefully studied with a view to the points of *resemblance* which will be found to exist between the statistics of several boroughs, notwithstanding the sharp contrasts which are also noticeable. For instance, the Islington figures in 1901 resembled those for Hammersmith.

Female Population in Wards.

It may be of interest if I state that the 28 boroughs outside London City are divided into 269 wards, whereof

61	showed an excess of male over female inhabitants.
57	„ females not more than 5 per cent. in excess.
62	„ „ in excess from 5 to 15 per cent.
89	„ „ more than 15 per cent. in excess.

	Excess of Males.	Females in Excess.				Excess of Males.	Females in Excess.		
		Under 5 per Cent.	5 to 15 per Cent.	Over 15 per Cent.			Under 5 per Cent.	5 to 15 per Cent.	Over 15 per Cent.
Stepney	11	5	3	—	Fulham	—	3	2	3
Poplar	6	6	2	—	Camberwell ...	—	7	6	7
Woolwich	9	—	1	1	Hammersmith	1	1	3	2
Finsbury	2	7	2	—	Islington	2	—	6	3
Bernondsey	4	5	3	—	Paddington ...	1	—	2	5
BethnalGreen	—	3	1	—	Kensington ...	—	1	—	8
Southwark	4	3	3	—	St. Marylebone	1	—	—	8
Greenwich	4	1	2	1	Chelsea	—	—	1	4
Shoreditch	—	5	3	—	Hampstead ...	—	—	—	7
Battersea	2	3	1	3	Lewisham	—	—	2	8
St. Pancras...	1	3	4	—	Wandsworth....	—	—	3	6
Deptford	2	1	1	2	Hackney	—	—	3	5
Holborn	4	—	2	3	Stoke New- } ington }	—	—	1	5
Lambeth	2	2	1	4					
Westminster	5	1	4	4					

The wards in London City are numerous, and as many of them are insignificant in population, I do not here refer to them.

TABLE I.—Percentages of "Working Males," in each Class of Occupation, for the Metropolitan Cities and Boroughs.

	London, City.	Holborn.	Westminster, City.	Southwark.	Finsbury.	St. Pancras.	Shoreditch.	Bethnal Green.	Stepney.	Poplar.
I and II. Agriculture and fishing	0.2	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.5	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1
III (a.) Commercial	19.3	9.7	7.3	5.8	4.9	8.4	3.3	3.0	4.6	5.3
(b.) Ship building	—	—	—	0.1	—	—	—	0.1	0.4	2.8
(c.) Merchant and dock service	3.0	0.6	0.6	2.3	0.7	0.3	1.0	2.4	9.8	13.6
(d.) Railways, hotels, &c.	6.6	3.5	5.3	—	0.2	4.9	0.1	—	0.1	1.4
IV. Mining, quarrying	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2
V. Textile and allied manufactures	1.0	1.6	2.8	0.8	1.3	0.9	4.8	8.3	16.6	0.7
VI. Metal, tools, manufactures	2.0	4.6	2.8	7.0	10.6	4.9	6.3	4.0	3.4	11.1
VII. Other manufactures	3.4	8.7	2.8	13.4	15.4	10.5	24.4	25.9	9.4	7.3
VIII. Defence	0.4	0.3	7.2	0.3	0.4	1.0	0.2	0.2	0.6	0.2
IX. Primary occupations, indefinite	0.9	0.7	0.6	1.1	1.6	0.9	1.6	1.1	1.1	2.2
	37.0	30.2	29.9	31.2	35.1	32.3	41.9	45.3	46.3	44.8
X (a.) Railway traffic	0.7	0.5	0.6	1.6	1.5	2.0	0.9	1.4	0.9	2.0
(b.) Road traffic	2.0	6.3	5.4	10.0	10.9	9.9	8.8	9.3	7.7	5.8
(c, d.) Messages, warehousing	10.7	6.3	5.0	6.5	7.7	5.2	6.7	5.6	4.5	3.7
XI. (a.) Buildings and furniture	2.8	6.5	6.2	10.1	8.6	11.5	8.3	7.2	6.1	8.2
(b.) Food and lodging	8.5	9.3	8.8	8.8	8.6	8.9	7.6	7.9	8.3	6.9
(c.) Dress	7.4	5.2	5.2	5.7	5.0	5.2	4.9	4.9	5.2	3.7
(d.) Carriages and harness	0.3	1.0	0.8	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.2	0.7	0.6	0.7
(e.) Sundry shopkeepers	3.4	5.1	3.6	3.8	4.4	4.8	4.6	3.8	3.1	2.6
(f, g.) Sundry tradesmen	1.2	3.8	2.1	3.5	3.4	3.2	3.4	2.9	3.2	5.2
XII. Domestic	11.0	4.9	16.8	2.3	2.2	3.1	1.5	1.2	1.3	0.9
XIII (a.) Law, medicine, divinity	2.6	3.8	3.1	1.0	1.0	2.1	0.6	0.5	0.7	0.7
(b.) Education, literature, arts	1.7	5.2	3.3	1.6	1.4	3.1	0.6	0.6	1.0	0.7
XIV. General and local government	7.3	2.6	4.8	3.0	2.8	3.0	1.4	1.7	1.6	1.8
XV. Secondary occupations, indefinite	1.3	3.0	1.1	2.6	1.9	1.1	2.0	2.1	2.6	1.2
	60.9	63.4	66.6	61.5	60.4	64.1	53.0	50.0	46.9	44.1
Indefinite workers	2.0	6.4	3.5	7.3	4.4	3.7	5.1	4.7	6.8	11.1

TABLE I *Contd.*—Percentages of "Working Males" in each Class of Occupation, for the Metropolitan Cities and Boroughs.

	Barnoldsey.	Deptford.	Greenwich.	Woolwich.	St. Marylebone.	Chelsea.	Kensington.	Paddington.	Hampstead.	Fulham.
I and II. Agriculture and fishing										
III (a.) Commercial	0.1	0.4	1.1	0.9	0.5	0.8	0.7	0.5	1.7	0.9
(b.) Ship building	5.8	11.1	6.1	2.3	7.4	6.9	9.5	10.4	19.1	9.5
(c.) Merchant and dock service	1.1	0.8	1.5	0.1	—	—	—	—	—	—
(d.) Railways, hotels, &c.	13.5	5.1	6.0	2.0	0.3	0.5	0.3	0.5	0.3	0.4
IV. Mining, quarrying	0.3	4.3	—	—	1.3	—	0.3	0.5	0.4	0.8
V. Textile and allied manufactures	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	—	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
VI. Metal, tools, manufactures	0.6	0.3	0.1	0.1	3.1	0.1	0.9	0.6	0.2	0.3
VII. Other manufactures	5.4	11.3	15.7	19.1	3.2	3.3	2.6	3.1	3.2	4.4
VIII. Defence	14.3	5.7	3.2	5.4	3.2	2.2	1.8	3.0	3.4	3.0
IX. Primary occupations, indefinite	0.2	0.4	6.4	12.5	1.0	1.5	2.5	1.0	0.5	0.7
	1.8	2.0	3.7	8.9	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.7
	43.3	42.1	44.0	51.9	20.4	15.8	19.2	23.6	29.0	20.8
X (a.) Railway traffic	1.9	2.0	1.5	0.9	1.5	0.5	2.1	2.0	2.1	2.0
(b.) Road traffic	8.3	5.0	3.9	2.5	9.2	9.6	9.5	10.9	6.5	9.9
(c, d.) Messages, warehousing	5.8	3.3	2.6	1.6	5.8	5.4	4.4	4.3	2.7	4.6
XI (a.) Buildings and furniture	6.6	10.2	8.9	9.3	11.4	16.0	13.4	13.7	11.0	19.1
(b.) Food and lodging	8.1	8.3	6.6	5.3	9.6	10.1	9.7	9.6	9.9	10.0
(c.) Dress	3.4	4.1	2.5	2.8	7.3	5.8	4.9	6.1	6.3	4.8
(d.) Carriages and harness	0.9	0.9	0.8	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	0.9	1.1
(e.) Sundry shopkeepers	3.0	3.4	1.9	1.3	4.2	3.5	3.6	4.3	5.8	4.0
(f, g.) Sundry tradesmen	3.7	4.8	5.5	4.2	2.9	2.8	3.3	3.4	2.4	4.4
XII. Domestic	1.2	1.0	2.2	1.1	9.8	11.3	9.5	6.5	5.5	3.2
XIII (a.) Law, medicine, divinity	0.7	1.2	1.3	0.7	4.0	2.5	4.9	3.9	5.4	1.9
(b.) Education, literature, arts	0.6	2.4	2.1	1.2	3.4	4.1	3.1	3.1	5.9	3.9
XIV. General and local government	2.5	2.7	3.1	5.2	3.2	4.5	3.1	3.6	5.6	3.8
XV. Secondary occupations, indefinite	1.2	1.6	0.6	0.6	1.1	1.2	1.8	0.7	0.5	1.0
	47.8	50.9	43.7	37.8	75.0	77.9	75.3	73.2	68.3	73.6
Indefinite workers	8.9	7.0	12.3	10.3	4.6	6.3	5.5	3.3	2.7	5.6

TABLE I *Contd.*—Percentages of "Working Males," in each Class of Occupation, for the Metropolitan Cities and Boroughs.

	Wandsworth.	Lewisham.	Hammermith.	Battersea.	Lambeth.	Camberwell.	Hackney.	Stoke Newington.	Islington.
I and II. Agriculture and fishing									
III (a.) Commercial	1.6	2.6	0.9	0.4	0.8	0.6	0.5	0.6	0.4
(b.) Ship building	15.8	20.6	10.7	9.5	12.8	14.4	14.8	23.7	11.7
(c.) Merchant and dock service	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	—	—	—	—	—
(d.) Railways, hotels, &c.	0.7	0.7	0.5	0.9	0.9	1.0	0.8	0.4	0.3
IV. Mining, quarrying	0.6	0.7	2.0	4.1	1.3	—	—	—	1.9
V. Textile and allied manufactures	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1
VI. Metal, tools, manufactures	0.3	0.2	1.2	0.3	0.2	0.5	3.6	0.5	0.4
VII. Other manufactures	4.4	3.9	5.3	7.0	5.8	5.3	4.6	4.5	7.3
VIII. Defence	4.0	3.2	3.4	6.3	7.4	10.3	13.5	9.5	10.3
IX. Primary occupations, indefinite	0.5	0.7	0.4	0.6	0.4	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.3
	0.6	0.6	0.8	1.4	0.9	0.8	0.9	0.4	0.9
	28.6	33.4	25.6	30.9	30.6	33.5	39.1	39.9	33.5
X (a.) Railway traffic	2.1	2.0	2.0	1.9	2.0	2.0	1.8	1.0	2.0
(b.) Road traffic	5.7	4.3	7.5	5.7	8.2	7.7	5.8	4.4	9.9
(c, d.) Messages, warehousing	2.9	2.7	3.4	4.2	4.3	4.5	4.3	3.4	4.4
XI (a.) Buildings and furniture	15.4	14.1	17.7	16.3	12.3	13.0	10.5	10.7	11.8
(b.) Food and lodging	9.0	9.6	9.1	7.8	9.7	9.3	8.7	9.2	8.7
(c.) Dress	5.1	5.6	5.4	4.9	4.9	5.7	6.8	7.2	5.6
(d.) Carriages and harness	1.0	0.9	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.9
(e.) Sundry shopkeepers	4.5	4.5	4.3	3.9	4.2	4.3	5.3	6.0	4.9
(f, g.) Sundry tradesmen	3.4	3.5	3.7	4.8	4.0	4.1	3.2	2.4	3.3
XII. Domestic	4.1	3.1	2.0	1.9	2.7	2.0	1.5	1.5	1.6
XIII (a.) Law, medicine, divinity	3.2	2.7	2.0	1.8	2.0	1.9	2.0	2.8	1.9
(b.) Education, literature, arts	4.4	4.1	4.2	3.2	4.0	2.6	2.4	3.5	2.5
XIV. General and local government	4.6	3.9	3.2	4.2	4.0	3.3	3.1	4.4	4.0
XV. Secondary occupations, indefinite	0.9	0.5	1.2	1.3	1.2	1.2	1.0	0.6	1.0
	66.4	61.6	66.9	62.9	64.3	62.6	57.3	58.1	62.5
Indefinite workers	5.0	4.9	7.5	6.2	5.0	3.9	3.5	2.0	4.0

TABLE II. — Working Females. Numbers Enumerated (to each 100 "Working Males") in the Principal Classes of Occupations.

	London, City.	Holborn.	Westminster, City.	Southwark.	Finsbury.	St. Pancras.	Shoreditch.	Bethnal Green.	Stepney.	Poplar.
III (a.) Commercial	1.6	2.0	1.5	0.9	0.9	1.6	0.4	0.3	0.5	0.6
(d.) Hotels, &c.	10.1	5.3	5.2	0.3	0.1	0.4	—	—	—	—
V. Textile and allied manufactures	1.1	2.0	4.8	3.0	5.3	3.7	11.7	13.9	10.8	5.4
VI. Metals, tools, manufactures	0.1	0.4	0.5	0.6	1.2	0.6	0.9	0.6	0.2	0.4
VII. Other manufactures	3.0	4.2	0.8	8.2	12.6	3.0	12.6	12.7	5.2	5.8
Remaining primary occupations	0.1	0.6	0.2	0.5	0.6	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.5	0.6
	16.0	14.4	13.1	13.4	20.7	9.7	26.1	27.9	17.2	12.8
XI (b.) Food and lodging	3.3	5.1	3.5	3.0	3.1	3.5	2.7	2.5	2.7	2.5
(c.) Dress	6.9	7.7	9.1	8.5	8.1	8.4	8.3	7.5	7.2	7.2
Other shopkeepers, &c.	1.4	2.0	1.0	1.7	2.3	1.8	2.4	2.9	1.3	1.6
XII. Domestic	30.2	21.0	41.5	11.0	12.4	17.9	10.1	9.0	10.3	8.7
XIII (a.) Nurses, &c.	2.8	2.1	1.7	1.2	1.0	1.3	0.7	0.8	1.1	0.8
(b.) Teachers, artists	0.9	3.2	2.3	1.2	0.6	2.2	0.4	0.4	0.8	1.1
Remaining secondary occupations	1.1	2.2	1.1	1.1	1.7	1.3	1.5	1.4	1.2	1.0
	46.7	43.2	60.2	27.7	29.3	36.5	26.2	24.6	24.5	23.0

TABLE II *Contd.* — Working Females. Numbers Enumerated (to each 100 "Working Males") in the Principal Classes of Occupations.

	Bermondsey.	Deptford.	Greenwich.	Woolwich.	St. Marylebone.	Chelsea.	Kensington.	Paddington.	Hampstead.	Fullham.
III (a.) Commercial	0.7	1.5	0.7	0.5	1.6	1.7	1.6	2.0	2.5	1.5
(d.) Hotels, &c.....	—	—	—	—	0.7	—	1.0	0.4	—	—
V. Textile and allied manufactures	4.9	1.3	0.2	0.3	10.7	6.4	9.0	6.3	1.9	6.1
VI. Metals, tools, manufactures.....	1.7	0.7	0.4	0.3	0.1	—	—	0.1	0.1	0.2
VII. Other manufactures	8.0	1.1	0.8	0.2	0.8	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.2
Remaining primary occupations	0.7	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1
	16.0	4.8	2.2	1.4	14.1	8.6	12.1	9.3	4.9	8.1
XI (b.) Food and lodging	3.0	2.5	1.7	1.6	3.7	2.9	3.4	3.6	2.6	2.2
(c.) Dress	7.0	7.9	5.8	6.4	10.8	8.5	7.7	8.4	6.9	6.4
Other shopkeepers, &c.....	1.6	1.2	0.5	0.4	1.4	1.0	0.9	1.1	1.0	0.7
XII. Domestic	9.3	15.6	20.8	11.3	43.4	47.5	70.8	43.6	70.2	19.0
XIII (a.) Nurses, &c.	0.6	1.1	1.6	0.7	3.5	2.4	2.3	2.1	3.1	1.5
(b.) Teachers, artists	0.8	3.0	2.3	1.7	3.1	3.4	4.1	3.3	6.3	3.0
Remaining secondary occupations	1.1	1.2	1.1	0.8	1.1	1.8	1.6	1.1	1.0	0.9
	23.4	32.5	33.8	23.0	66.9	67.5	90.7	63.2	91.1	33.7

2 1 2

TABLE II *Contd.* — Working Females. Numbers Enumerated (to each 100 "Working Males") in the Principal Classes of Occupations.

	Wandsworth.	Lewisham.	Hammersmith.	Battersea.	Lambeth.	Camberwell.	Hackney.	Stoke Newington.	Islington.
III (a.) Commercial	1.9	2.0	1.8	1.7	1.9	1.9	2.0	3.0	2.0
(d.) Hotels, &c.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
V. Textile and allied manufactures	2.8	2.2	9.6	4.4	2.5	5.4	8.5	5.4	5.0
VI. Metals, tools, manufactures	0.2	0.1	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.5	0.3	0.9
VII. Other manufactures	0.6	0.2	0.3	1.4	2.2	2.4	4.5	2.3	3.8
Remaining primary occupations	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.3
	5.5	4.5	12.2	8.2	7.1	10.1	15.7	11.1	12.1
XI (b.) Food and lodging	2.0	1.9	2.4	2.1	3.0	2.7	2.7	2.6	2.9
(c.) Dress	6.7	6.8	6.9	7.8	9.0	9.5	9.6	9.5	9.5
Other shopkeepers, &c.	0.7	0.7	1.0	1.1	1.5	1.5	1.6	1.2	1.8
XII. Domestic	31.7	33.1	18.9	13.8	18.7	15.9	18.3	25.4	16.8
XIII (a.) Nurses, &c.	1.8	1.8	1.5	1.0	1.5	1.0	1.8	1.5	1.1
(b.) Teachers, artists	3.8	3.9	3.3	2.5	3.0	2.5	2.8	3.7	2.3
Remaining secondary occupations	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.3	1.3	1.2	1.3	1.4
	47.7	49.3	35.2	29.4	37.9	34.6	38.1	45.2	35.8

TABLE III.—*Proportions, per 100 "Working Males," of Persons Aged 25—65 described as Living on their Own Means, Retired or Pensioners, or Undescribed (including Students).*

	Females 25—65.				Males 25—65.			
	Living on Own Means.	Retired and Pensioners.	Others.	Total.*	Living on Own Means.	Retired and Pensioners.	Others.	Total.
Hampstead	7.1	0.4	64.2	71.7	1.6	1.2	1.2	4.0
Lewisham	4.8	0.3	63.8	68.9	0.8	1.4	0.9	3.1
Wandsworth	4.7	0.7	62.6	68.0	1.0	2.1	1.1	4.2
Kensington	9.6	0.6	55.9	66.0	2.0	1.2	1.7	4.9
Stoke Newington	4.6	0.2	59.2	64.0	0.8	1.1	1.0	2.9
Fulham	4.4	0.2	58.5	63.1	0.9	0.9	0.7	2.5
Paddington	6.7	0.3	54.6	61.6	1.3	0.9	1.1	3.3
Camberwell	2.3	0.3	55.8	58.4	0.4	1.2	1.3	2.9
Battersea	2.2	0.1	55.9	58.2	0.5	0.6	0.7	1.8
Lambeth	3.1	0.3	54.2	57.6	0.6	0.9	1.1	2.6
Deptford	2.0	0.1	55.4	57.5	0.5	0.7	1.2	2.4
Hammersmith	4.6	0.2	51.4	56.2	1.0	0.7	1.1	2.8
Chelsea	5.1	0.9	50.0	56.0	1.1	2.9	1.5	5.5
Hackney	2.3	0.3	53.3	55.9	0.5	0.8	0.8	2.1
Islington	2.6	0.3	51.7	54.6	0.5	0.8	1.0	2.3
Greenwich	1.8	0.3	52.0	54.1	0.3	1.0	0.8	2.1
St. Pancras	2.2	0.3	47.4	49.9	0.5	0.7	0.8	2.0
Poplar	0.6	0.2	48.9	49.7	0.2	0.7	1.0	1.9
Woolwich	1.0	0.2	48.4	49.6	0.2	1.0	0.5	1.7
St. Marylebone	5.0	0.4	43.9	49.3	1.4	0.9	1.2	3.5
Bermondsey	0.5	0.3	48.0	48.8	0.1	0.5	0.9	1.5
Southwark	0.8	0.3	45.7	46.8	0.2	0.7	0.7	1.6
Bethnal Green	0.5	0.3	43.5	44.3	0.1	0.6	0.6	1.3
Finsbury	0.6	0.2	43.3	44.1	0.2	0.3	0.9	1.4
Stepney	0.5	0.2	42.8	43.5	0.1	0.4	0.8	1.3
Shoreditch	0.3	0.4	42.4	43.1	0.1	0.8	1.1	2.0
Westminster	3.6	0.2	37.4	41.2	2.0	0.6	1.9	4.5
Holborn	3.2	0.2	34.6	38.0	1.4	0.7	2.0	4.1
London City	0.5	—	27.8	28.3	0.3	0.3	1.0	1.6

* The table is arranged in the order of these totals.

TABLE IV.—*Proportions, per 100 "Working Males," of Persons Aged 65 and upwards described as Living on their Own Means, Retired or Pensioners, or Undescribed.*

	Females 65 and upwards.				Males 65 and upwards.			
	Living on Own Means.	Retired and Pensioners.	Others.	Total.*	Living on Own Means.	Retired and Pensioners.	Others.	Total.
Chelsea	2.4	3.3	4.7	10.4	0.5	6.3	0.3	7.1
Kensington.....	3.7	1.5	5.1	10.3	0.8	2.0	0.5	3.3
Hampstead.....	3.5	0.4	5.8	9.7	0.7	1.9	0.3	2.9
Stoke Newington	3.3	0.4	5.7	9.4	0.6	1.9	0.4	2.9
Lewisham	2.9	0.8	5.6	9.3	0.5	2.5	0.4	3.4
Paddington.....	3.5	0.8	4.6	8.9	0.7	1.3	0.3	2.3
Wandsworth	2.6	0.6	5.2	8.4	0.6	2.5	0.4	3.5
Hackney	1.8	1.0	5.1	7.9	0.4	1.8	0.4	2.6
Camberwell	1.8	0.7	5.2	7.7	0.5	1.9	0.4	2.8
Hammersmith ..	2.7	0.2	4.6	7.5	0.6	0.9	0.4	1.9
Lambeth	2.1	0.6	4.8	7.5	0.4	1.7	0.4	2.5
St. Marylebone	2.0	1.5	3.9	7.4	0.5	1.8	0.3	2.6
Greenwich	1.4	0.9	4.9	7.2	0.3	2.3	0.4	3.0
Islington	1.8	0.8	4.5	7.1	0.4	1.6	0.4	2.4
St. Pancras	1.4	1.1	3.9	6.4	0.4	1.3	0.3	2.0
Fulham	1.8	0.7	3.8	6.3	0.4	1.2	0.3	1.9
Deptford.....	1.5	0.2	4.4	6.1	0.4	1.3	0.3	2.0
Shoreditch	0.4	1.6	3.9	5.9	0.1	2.0	0.3	2.4
Poplar	0.7	1.0	4.2	5.9	0.2	2.1	0.4	2.7
Battersea.....	1.3	0.2	4.1	5.6	0.3	1.0	0.3	1.6
Bermondsey	0.5	0.7	4.3	5.5	0.2	1.1	0.5	1.8
Bethnal Green	0.4	1.2	3.5	5.1	0.2	1.8	0.4	2.4
Woolwich	0.8	0.4	3.8	5.0	0.3	2.1	0.3	2.7
Westminster ...	1.2	0.4	3.0	4.6	0.5	0.8	0.3	1.6
Southwark	0.6	0.7	3.2	4.5	0.2	1.4	0.3	1.9
Stepney	0.4	0.8	3.2	4.4	0.1	1.0	0.4	1.5
London City	0.5	0.3	3.6	4.4	0.1	0.3	0.3	0.7
Finsbury	0.5	0.1	3.4	4.0	0.1	0.4	0.3	0.8
Holborn	0.8	0.5	2.6	3.9	0.2	1.0	0.2	1.4

* This table is arranged in the order of these totals.

TABLE V.—*Proportions of Population (to every 100 Wives Aged 15—65), Enumerated in various Metropolitan Boroughs.*

	London, City.				Holborn and Finsbury.			
	Per 100 Wives.		Difference.		Per 100 Wives.		Difference.	
	1891.	1901.	More.	Less.	1891.	1901.	More.	Less.
Single women.....	143·0	161·9	18·9	—	77·6	84·6	7·0	—
„ men	162·8	185·8	23·0	—	87·3	96·8	9·5	—
Widows	46·6	40·5	—	6·1	29·0	28·4	—	0·6
Widowers	12·4	11·0	—	1·4	11·0	10·5	—	0·5
Old married men	8·0	7·1	—	0·9	4·6	4·4	—	0·2
„ women	4·5	4·6	0·1	—	2·6	2·6	—	—
Married, 15—65	207·1	212·7	5·6	—	197·9	197·6	—	0·3
Differences *	0·2	0·2	0·4	—	0·1	0·1	—	—
	584·2	623·8	48·0	8·4	410·1	425·0	16·5	1·6

	Westminster.				Southwark.			
	Per 100 Wives.		Difference.		Per 100 Wives.		Difference.	
	1891.	1901.	More.	Less.	1891.	1901.	More.	Less.
Single women.....	139·2	159·9	20·7	—	57·4	62·1	4·7	—
„ men	121·5	133·2	11·7	—	76·3	78·0	1·7	—
Widows	35·0	32·1	—	2·9	24·4	23·5	—	0·9
Widowers	11·8	10·3	—	1·5	9·9	10·7	0·8	—
Old married men	6·3	6·0	—	0·3	4·5	4·1	—	0·4
„ women	3·7	3·5	—	0·2	2·8	2·6	—	0·2
Married, 15—65	198·9	198·7	—	0·2	197·2	197·0	—	0·2
Differences	0·1	—	—	0·1	0·2	—	0·2	—
	516·5	543·7	32·4	5·2	372·3	378·0	7·4	1·7

	Kensington.				Paddington.			
	Per 100 Wives.		Difference.		Per 100 Wives.		Difference.	
	1891.	1901.	More.	Less.	1891.	1901.	More.	Less.
Single women.....	188·0	189·2	1·2	—	160·7	141·4	—	19·3
„ men	80·0	78·8	—	1·2	79·3	80·7	1·4	—
Widows	37·2	36·6	—	0·6	34·5	30·4	—	4·1
Widowers	9·3	9·2	—	0·1	8·5	8·5	—	—
Old married men	7·0	7·3	0·3	—	6·4	6·1	—	0·3
„ women	4·0	3·9	—	0·1	3·8	3·9	0·1	—
Married, 15—65	192·9	198·7	—	1·2	193·8	194·4	0·6	—
Differences	—	0·1	0·1	—	0·1	—	—	0·1
	518·4	516·8	1·6	3·2	487·1	465·4	2·1	23·8

* These are simply fractions, to reconcile the correct total ratios with the approximately correct details.

TABLE V *Contd.*—*Proportions of Population per 100 Wives.*

	Hampstead.				Hammersmith and Fulham.			
	Per 100 Wives.		Difference.		Per 100 Wives.		Difference.	
	1891.	1901.	More.	Less.	1891.	1901.	More.	Less.
Single women.....	206.4	203.5	—	2.9	82.3	77.5	—	4.8
„ men	82.9	81.9	—	1.0	60.7	66.0	5.3	—
Widows	31.2	29.1	—	2.1	25.0	23.6	—	1.4
Widowers	8.1	7.9	—	0.2	7.2	7.3	0.1	—
Old married men	6.8	6.9	0.1	—	4.6	4.4	—	0.2
„ women	4.0	4.3	0.3	—	3.0	2.9	—	0.1
Married, 15—65	193.8	192.6	—	1.2	195.5	195.3	—	0.2
Differences	0.1	—	0.1	—	0.2	—	0.2	—
	533.1	526.2	0.5	7.4	378.1	377.0	5.6	6.7

	Camberwell.				Hackney.			
	Per 100 Wives.		Difference.		Per 100 Wives.		Difference.	
	1891.	1901.	More.	Less.	1891.	1901.	More.	Less.
Single women.....	82.9	84.4	1.5	—	102.6	97.6	—	5.0
„ men	69.2	72.9	3.7	—	73.2	73.9	0.7	—
Widows	25.2	25.0	—	0.2	27.3	25.5	—	1.8
Widowers	8.5	9.1	0.6	—	9.4	8.6	—	0.8
Old married men	5.5	5.4	—	0.1	6.1	5.9	—	0.2
„ women	3.6	3.7	0.1	—	3.9	4.1	0.2	—
Married, 15—65	195.8	195.4	—	0.4	195.7	195.4	—	0.3
Differences	0.1	—	0.1	—	0.1	0.1	—	—
	390.6	395.9	6.0	0.7	418.3	411.1	0.9	8.1

	Islington.				Shoreditch.			
	Per 100 Wives.		Difference.		Per 100 Wives.		Difference.	
	1891.	1901.	More.	Less.	1891.	1901.	More.	Less.
Single women.....	88.4	86.1	—	2.3	61.3	68.3	7.0	—
„ men	75.3	76.0	0.7	—	69.8	75.6	5.8	—
Widows	27.0	25.9	—	1.1	27.0	27.0	—	—
Widowers	8.9	9.1	0.2	—	10.7	11.5	0.8	—
Old married men	5.3	5.3	—	—	4.7	4.6	—	0.1
„ women	3.3	3.5	0.2	—	2.9	3.2	0.3	—
Married, 15—65	197.1	196.6	—	0.5	196.9	197.0	0.1	—
Differences	—	0.1	—	0.1	0.1	—	—	0.1
	405.3	402.4	1.1	4.0	373.4	387.2	14.0	0.2

TABLE V *Contd.*—Proportions of Population per 100 Wives.

	St. Pancras.				St. Marylebone.			
	Per 100 Wives.		Difference.		Per 100 Wives.		Difference.	
	1891.	1901.	More.	Less.	1891.	1901.	More.	Less.
Single women.....	80·7	83·8	3·1	—	139·7	155·4	15·7	—
„ men	81·9	87·0	5·1	—	90·7	99·3	8·6	—
Widows	27·6	27·2	—	0·4	34·9	33·7	—	1·2
Widowers	9·1	10·1	1·0	—	10·3	11·4	1·1	—
Old married men	5·1	5·4	0·3	—	6·9	6·3	—	0·6
„ women	3·2	3·6	0·4	—	4·1	3·7	—	0·4
Married, 15—65	196·4	196·5	0·1	—	194·5	193·8	—	0·7
Differences	—	—	—	—	—	0·1	0·1	—
	404·0	413·6	10·0	0·4	481·1	503·7	25·5	2·9

	Chelsea.				Wandsworth and Battersea.			
	Per 100 Wives.		Difference.		Per 100 Wives.		Difference.	
	1891.	1901.	More.	Less.	1891.	1901.	More.	Less.
Single women.....	95·4	141·8	46·4	—	92·0	92·1	0·1	—
„ men	82·6	92·0	9·4	—	67·3	68·2	0·9	—
Widows	30·0	37·4	7·4	—	21·9	22·0	0·1	—
Widowers	10·8	16·8	6·0	—	8·0	7·9	—	0·1
Old married men	5·0	6·6	1·6	—	5·2	5·0	—	0·2
„ women	3·0	4·0	1·0	—	3·3	3·3	—	—
Married, 15—65	195·9	193·6	—	2·3	196·5	195·6	—	0·9
Differences	0·1	—	—	0·1	0·1	0·1	0·2	—
	422·8	492·2	71·8	2·4	394·1	394·2	1·3	1·2

	Lewisham.				Lambeth.			
	Per 100 Wives.		Difference.		Per 100 Wives.		Difference.	
	1891.	1901.	More.	Less.	1891.	1901.	More.	Less.
Single women.....	140·8	113·1	—	27·7	85·9	86·8	0·9	—
„ men	69·9	67·7	—	2·2	73·8	76·0	2·2	—
Widows	27·9	24·2	—	3·7	27·5	25·9	—	1·6
Widowers	7·9	7·8	—	0·1	9·5	9·4	—	0·1
Old married men	7·4	6·3	—	1·1	5·6	5·6	—	—
„ women	4·6	4·1	—	0·5	3·7	3·7	—	—
Married, 15—65	194·5	194·0	—	0·5	196·1	195·0	—	1·1
Differences	—	0·1	0·1	—	0·1	—	0·1	—
	453·0	417·3	0·1	35·8	402·0	402·4	3·2	2·8

TABLE V *Contd.*—*Proportions of Population per 100 Wives.*

	Bethnal Green.				Stepney.			
	Per 100 Wives.		Difference.		Per 100 Wives.		Difference.	
	1891.	1901.	More.	Less.	1891.	1901.	More.	Less.
Single women.....	60·9	67·4	6·5	—	62·0	67·3	5·3	—
„ men	66·8	69·9	3·1	—	83·2	86·8	3·6	—
Widows	24·3	24·3	—	—	25·1	23·4	—	1·7
Widowers	9·1	10·3	1·2	—	9·9	9·1	—	0·8
Old married men	5·3	4·8	—	0·5	4·9	4·4	—	0·5
„ women	3·7	3·1	—	0·6	3·1	2·8	—	0·3
Married, 15—65	197·4	196·5	—	0·9	198·4	199·0	0·6	—
Differences	—	0·2	—	0·2	0·2	0·1	—	0·3
	367·5	376·1	10·8	2·2	386·8	392·7	9·5	3·6

	Poplar.				Bermondsey.			
	Per 100 Wives.		Difference.		Per 100 Wives.		Difference.	
	1891.	1901.	More.	Less.	1891.	1901.	More.	Less.
Single women.....	53·7	62·8	9·1	—	56·3	64·0	7·7	—
„ men	72·2	78·2	6·0	—	72·4	76·6	4·2	—
Widows	21·5	22·6	1·1	—	22·9	24·0	1·1	—
Widowers	9·9	11·7	1·8	—	9·7	10·5	0·8	—
Old married men	5·2	5·3	0·1	—	4·7	4·8	0·1	—
„ women	3·0	3·3	0·3	—	3·1	3·4	0·3	—
Married, 15—65	197·2	196·6	—	0·6	198·5	197·6	—	0·9
Differences	0·1	—	0·1	—	0·2	0·1	0·1	—
	362·6	380·5	18·5	0·6	367·4	380·8	14·3	0·9

	Deptford and Greenwich.				Woolwich.			
	Per 100 Wives.		Difference.		Per 100 Wives.		Difference.	
	1891.	1901.	More.	Less.	1891.	1901.	More.	Less.
Single women.....	72·3	76·3	4·0	—	57·3	54·9	—	2·4
„ men	67·2	77·0	9·8	—	93·4	91·6	—	1·8
Widows	23·2	20·9	—	2·3	20·0	18·0	—	2·0
Widowers	9·0	9·1	0·1	—	7·9	8·1	0·2	—
Old married men	6·3	5·5	—	0·8	5·5	5·4	—	0·1
„ women	3·8	3·7	—	0·1	3·7	3·3	—	0·4
Married, 15—65	195·8	196·4	0·6	—	198·5	196·4	—	2·1
Differences	0·2	—	0·2	—	0·1	—	—	0·1
	377·4	388·9	14·7	3·2	386·4	377·7	0·2	8·9

The figures for 1901 in separate boroughs, conjoined above for purposes of comparison, were:—

	Fulham.	Hammersmith.	Holborn.	Finsbury.
Single women	69·2	88·5	112·7	69·6
„ men	58·3	76·0	127·3	80·6
Widows.....	21·8	26·0	32·4	26·3
Widowers.....	6·8	7·8	13·1	9·1
Old married men.....	3·7	5·3	5·3	3·9
„ women	2·5	3·3	2·9	2·4
Married, 15—65	194·6	196·4	198·9	196·9
Differences	—	0·1	0·1	0·3
	356·9	403·2	492·7	389·1

	Wandsworth.	Battersea.	Deptford.	Greenwich.	Stoke Newington.
Single women	111·6	67·4	72·9	80·7	122·5
„ men	69·6	66·5	71·1	84·3	78·4
Widows.....	23·8	19·7	19·9	22·3	26·9
Widowers.....	8·5	7·2	8·1	10·3	8·3
Old married men.....	5·7	4·2	5·1	6·0	6·8
„ women	3·7	2·9	3·6	3·9	5·1
Married, 15—65	195·7	195·4	195·7	197·2	195·0
Differences	0·1	0·2	0·1	0·1	—
	418·7	363·1	376·3	404·6	443·0

TABLE VI.—*Showing the Composition of the Secondary Classes (Males) in 1891 in certain Counties (per 100 "Working Males"), with London figures for 1901.*

	London.		1891 (Registration Counties).			
	1891.	1901.*	Middlesex.	Surrey.	Hertford.	Lincoln.
Conveyance, &c.—						
Railways	1·96	1·65	2·50	1·81	2·13	2·13
Roads	7·31	7·64	5·39	6·20	5·13	3·08
Storage	0·76	4·58	{ 0·45 2·44	0·15 1·95	0·05 1·48	0·03 1·38
Messages	4·44					
Retail supply—						
Houses and furniture	10·97	11·05	13·37	12·45	9·73	6·51
Food and lodging	7·94	8·69	8·38	8·37	7·20	6·02
Dress	5·64	5·21	3·66	3·49	3·36	3·44
Carriages	1·01	0·94	1·05	1·04	1·43	1·32
Other trades.....	7·97	7·59	7·14	6·02	6·69	6·65
Domestic and other service	4·23	3·61	2·52	2·87	2·09	0·77
Professions	4·68	4·67	5·46	4·90	3·06	2·58
Government	2·93	3·33	2·80	2·34	1·39	1·02
Indefinite	1·60	1·35	0·87	0·86	0·88	0·74
	61·44	60·31	56·03	52·45	44·62	35·67

* There are some small changes in the arrangement of the occupations, but not such as to invalidate this comparison, with the exception that in 1891 materials were not available for transferring to the commercial class the large excess of hotel keepers, &c., and railway men found in certain boroughs. This excess being restored to the secondary class, raises the section food and lodging to 8·96, that of railway carriage to 2·67, and that of domestic service to 3·78, the total being 61·77, as against 61·44 per cent. in 1891.

TABLE VII.—*Numbers of Males and Females Returned under Occupations in each of the Boroughs in 1901, with the Numbers of Males Aged 15 and Upwards not so Returned.*

	Males.		Fe- males Work- ing.		Males.		Fe- males Work- ing.
	Work- ing.	15 and upwards not Work- ing.			Working.	15 and upwards not Work- ing.	
I.				III (b).			
London, City	10,523	609	6,612	Hammersmith	34,351	2,450	16,328
Holborn	21,539	1,661	12,454	Battersea	52,313	2,764	19,721
Westminster	63,198	5,005	46,388	Lambeth	93,504	6,693	42,226
II.				Camberwell	76,894	6,140	34,435
Southwark	68,202	3,083	28,099	Hackney	65,379	4,282	35,227
Finsbury	33,115	1,166	16,593	Stoke Newington	15,274	1,219	8,614
St. Pancras	78,125	4,578	36,186	Islington	105,974	6,613	50,911
III (a).				IV.			
St. Marylebone	40,704	3,201	33,008	Shoreditch	37,430	2,091	19,617
Chelsea	21,041	3,165	16,033	Bethnal Green....	39,364	1,836	20,708
Kensington	45,035	5,261	46,369	Stepney	96,650	4,238	40,446
Paddington.....	41,626	3,446	30,203	Poplar	53,615	3,204	19,274
Hampstead	20,775	2,284	19,974	Bermondsey	41,623	1,936	16,473
Fulham	39,985	2,678	16,768	Deptford	34,006	2,163	12,741
Wandsworth	64,475	7,123	34,377	Greenwich	29,677	2,289	10,729
Lewisham	35,043	3,421	18,901	Woolwich	40,529	2,611	9,916

TABLE VIII.—*Proportions of Children under 15 to Wives Aged 15—65 in 1901, and ratios of Annual Births to Wives Aged 15—45 in the preceding Twenty Years and in 1900-01.*

	1901. Children 0—15 to 100 Wives 15—65.	To 100 Wives Aged 15—45.						
		Average Total Births Ten Years.		Legitimate Births.		Total Births.		
		1881-90.	1891-1900.	1880-81.	1890-91.	1880-81.	1890-91.	1900-01.
Bethnal Green.....	214·3	31·0	29·4	30·7	29·3	31·3	29·8	28·3
Stepney	211·1	29·5	30·6	29·3	29·4	30·1	30·0	29·5
Bermondsey	206·5	29·5	29·1	30·0	28·5	30·6	29·0	27·3
Poplar	204·3	29·6	28·5	29·5	28·1	30·2	28·6	28·2
Shoreditch	196·1	28·8	27·8	28·6	26·8	29·7	27·7	27·2
Deptford and Greenwich}	191·2	28·7	25·7	28·8	25·8	29·8	26·5	24·4
Camberwell	188·5	27·9	24·9	28·1	25·1	29·0	25·9	22·8
Southwark	185·1	27·3	26·2	26·9	25·4	27·9	26·1	25·2
Woolwich	181·6	27·0	23·6	27·7	25·6	28·5	26·2	21·8
Hackney	180·6	27·1	24·8	28·3	24·8	29·1	25·7	23·3
Wandsworth and Battersea}	176·5	27·4	22·8	27·5	24·4	28·4	25·1	21·6
Fulham and Hammersmith ..}	176·0	27·3	24·1	27·9	24·0	29·0	25·0	22·5
Lewisham	175·1	26·3	20·6	27·2	23·1	27·9	24·1	20·8
Holborn and Finsbury}	174·0	28·2	27·4	28·0	26·9	28·7	27·4	27·1
Lambeth	169·0	27·7	26·0	27·2	25·3	28·4	26·6	24·3
Islington	166·2	26·1	23·4	26·9	23·6	27·9	24·3	21·7
St. Pancras	163·8	25·5	23·5	25·4	23·0	26·7	24·1	21·5
Chelsea	154·8	27·5	23·0	26·6	22·7	28·1	23·9	20·6
Hampstead	154·4	24·1	19·8	25·3	21·7	26·1	22·2	18·3
London, City	153·0	22·0	18·7	23·3	21·2	23·8	21·6	16·4
Kensington	151·5	23·8	21·3	24·3	21·5	25·5	22·6	20·1
Paddington	149·3		22·0		21·5		22·7	20·3
St. Marylebone.....	146·9	28·2	28·0	24·7	23·5	28·8	28·0	27·6
Westminster	131·7	22·3	19·4	22·7	20·1	23·8	21·0	17·4
Average.....	171·1	27·2	25·1	27·2	25·0	28·3	25·9	23·6

APPENDIX.

Concerning Women Aged 15 to 25 Years.

It occurred to me that a useful inquiry might be instituted, in the absence of local statistics as to birth-places, into the occupations of single women at the age 15 to 25 (which is greatly influenced by migrations) in each of the metropolitan boroughs. The females counted for the county of London at this age were 493,478 in number, divided thus:—

	Single.	Married and Widowed.
Female inhabitants	419,662	73,816
Viz.—		
Domestic servants (not inn), in-door	115,952	588
Teachers	7,219	36
Commercial clerks.....	12,117	46
Drapers, &c.	7,672	24
Other occupations	174,371	7,929
Total employed	317,331	8,623
Not returned under occupations	102,331	65,193

We have the number of persons at this age, single or married, in each borough, and the total numbers employed, so that it is only necessary to distribute by estimation the 8,623 married women who are employed, in order to arrive at an approximate number of unemployed single women in each borough. As respects the workers, so large a proportion are single that it is hardly necessary in a table of absolute ratios (in proportion say to 100 married women in each borough aged 15 to 65) to distinguish the married.

The first result which emerges, rather unexpectedly, is an immense variation in the proportions of single women unemployed, thus:—

	Per Cent. Unem- ployed.		Per Cent. Unem- ployed.		Per Cent. Unem- ployed.
Woolwich	38·5	Camberwell	28·7	Holborn	19·9
Greenwich	35·1	Hampstead	26·6	Southwark	19·3
Lewisham	33·6	Poplar	25·3	St. Marylebone....	18·0
Wandsworth	33·4	Hackney	24·0	Stepney	17·7
Deptford	32·2	Islington	23·9	City of London...	16·9
Hammersmith	31·0	Paddington	22·9	Westminster	15·7
Fulham	29·7	St. Pancras	22·7	Finsbury	14·8
Lambeth	29·3	Kensington	22·4	Bethnal Green....	11·5
Stoke Newington	29·2	Chelsea	22·3	Shoreditch	11·5
Battersea	29·0	Bermondsey	20·9		

The *relative* numbers being discordant, I have calculated the absolute ratios of the unemployed per 100 wives aged 15 to 65, and the result is below :—

	Women Aged 15—25 Unemployed.			Women Aged 15—25 Unemployed.	
	Single.	Married and Widowed.		Single.	Married and Widowed.
Hampstead	26·3	6·0	St. Marylebone ...	13·2	8·1
Lewisham	21·3	6·5	Fulham	12·8	8·5
Wandsworth	20·8	6·8	Battersea	12·8	7·9
Stoke Newington...	19·6	6·5	Westminster.....	12·2	6·9
Kensington	19·2	6·9	Islington	12·0	8·4
Greenwich	17·5	8·4	Holborn	11·9	8·6
Hammersmith	15·7	8·2	Poplar	11·7	9·6
Paddington	15·4	7·7	St. Pancras	10·9	8·9
City of London ...	15·2	4·0	Bermondsey	9·7	9·2
Deptford	15·1	8·4	Stepney	8·7	12·0
Camberwell	15·0	7·3	Southwark	8·2	10·0
Lambeth	14·8	8·2	Finsbury	7·0	9·6
Woolwich	14·6	9·9	Bethnal Green....	5·8	10·4
Chelsea	14·6	7·0	Shoreditch	5·6	10·2
Hackney	14·2	8·2			

It will be observed that the five highest boroughs in this table are residential, with low proportions of young wives; the six lowest are industrial, with high proportions of young wives.

I should like to see a table showing how many of the unemployed single women aged 15—25 lived in tenements of one or two rooms, and how many of these were living with married women. The results would I fancy be striking, and the contrasts remarkable as between one borough and another.

I venture to assume that the following boroughs (with Bethnal Green and Shoreditch) are the most industrial and poorest, and

that in them not much more than six single women of the age of 15—25 can fairly be expected to be counted as adjuncts (unemployed) of families. If so, there will be surplus idle women, not so accounted for, as follows:—

	Per cent.		Per cent.
In Poplar	5·7, or 1,645 persons	In Southwark	2·2, or 805 persons
„ Bermondsey 3·7 „	823 „	„ Finsbury	1·0 „ 175 „
„ Stepney	2·7 „ 1,336 „		

If we assume, as I think we may, that the remaining boroughs might each be expected to show a proportion of idle unmarried women bearing some relation to the number of families in fair circumstances, we may find it useful to bring the following data, as to the proportion of female servants aged 15—25 to a hundred wives aged 15—65, into comparison with the figures in the last table:—

	Women Aged 15—25.			Women Aged 15—25.	
	Domestic Servants.	Unoccupied (Single).		Domestic Servants.	Unoccupied (Single).
Hampstead	54·9	26·3	Hammersmith	13·5	15·7
Kensington	46·6	19·2	Hackney	13·2	14·2
Westminster	33·9	12·2	Lambeth	13·2	14·8
St. Marylebone	31·2	13·2	Holborn	12·2	11·9
Chelsea	30·8	14·6	Fulham	12·1	12·8
Paddington	29·3	15·4	Deptford	11·6	15·1
Lewisham	27·0	21·3	St. Pancras	10·9	10·9
City of London	25·3	15·2	„ Camberwell	10·8	15·0
Wandsworth	24·1	20·8	Islington	10·7	12·0
Stoke Newington	21·8	19·6	Woolwich	9·8	14·6
Greenwich	17·3	17·5	Battersea	8·9	12·8

In the seven other boroughs the ratio of domestic servants ranged from 5·7 down to 3·5 only, per hundred wives.

I think we may assume that the following boroughs show excessive numbers of idle young women, on the theory that the number of such women ought not to be more than nine-tenths that of female domestic servants (not inn servants) of the same age:—

	Per cent.		Per cent.
Greenwich.....	2·0, or 317 persons	Deptford	4·7, or 924 persons
Hammersmith 3·5 „	684 „	St. Pancras	1·0 „ 407 „
Hackney	2·3 „ 852 „	Camberwell	5·3 „ 2,352 „
Lambeth	2·9 „ 1,532 „	Islington	2·4 „ 1,413 „
Holborn.....	0·9 „ 84 „	Woolwich	5·8 „ 1,215 „
Fulham	1·9 „ 486 „	Battersea	4·8 „ 1,490 „

If we deduct the numbers just recited from the totals of unoccupied single women, we arrive at the following ratios in lieu of those shown in the first table above. It will be recollected that these are ratios calculated on the numbers of single women aged 15—25.

	Per Cent. Unem- ployed Remain- ing.		Per Cent. Unem- ployed Remain- ing.		Per Cent. Unem- ployed Remain- ing.
Lewisham	33'6	Kensington	22'4	City of London	16'9
Wandsworth	33'4	Chelsea	22'3	Westminster.....	15'7
Greenwich	31'0	Deptford	22'2	Southwark	14'2
Stoke Newington	29'2	St. Pancras	20'6	Poplar	13'0
Hampstead	26'6	Hackney	20'1	Bermondsey	12'9
Fulham	25'2	Islington	19'1	Finsbury	12'6
Hammersmith ...	24'1	Camberwell	18'6	Stepney.....	12'2
Lambeth	23'5	Holborn	18'4	Shoreditch	11'5
Woolwich	23'2	Battersea	18'1	Bethnal Green...	11'5
Paddington	22'9	St. Marylebone....	18'0		

Of course this table is hazardous, but I submit it is not an unreasonable one. It represents the probable numbers of respectable young women living with their relatives.

It remains for me to show how the women aged 15—25 were employed, and for that purpose I will rank them in the order of the ratio of their total number (employed and unemployed) to that of wives aged 15—65. The object of the table being to show which are the occupations which attract immigrants of this sex and age, there is here no need to discriminate between primary and secondary occupations.

To 100 Wives Aged 15—65.

Persons over 15 Years.	Females Aged 15—35.	Domestic (not Inc).	Teacher.	Commercial Clerk.	Draper.	Dress.	Laundry.	Food.	Paper Box, Bag, Bookbinding.	Other Occupations.
Hampstead.....	105.3	54.9	2.0	2.1	1.7	5.1	0.7	1.4	0.1	4.8
London City	96.0	25.3	1.1	3.1	1.5	9.4	0.2	17.3	2.0	17.0
Kensington.....	93.7	46.6	1.1	1.5	1.2	6.2	4.2	1.6	0.1	5.0
Westminster.....	543.7	33.9	0.7	1.7	1.7	11.1	0.9	4.5	0.6	11.5
St. Marylebone	82.7	31.2	0.9	1.6	2.9	14.5	0.8	2.5	0.3	6.7
Paddington.....	75.8	29.3	1.1	2.1	2.0	9.3	1.8	2.1	0.2	4.7
Stoke Newington	74.6	21.8	1.4	3.0	1.2	11.0	1.3	2.0	0.7	6.0
Chelsea	73.0	30.8	0.7	1.5	1.5	8.9	0.9	2.1	0.1	4.9
Lewisham	417.3	27.0	1.5	2.0	1.4	4.3	2.0	1.1	0.1	3.2
Holborn	70.0	12.2	0.5	1.9	0.4	7.9	1.0	5.1	2.6	18.0
Wandsworth	69.8	24.1	1.4	1.8	1.2	4.8	3.1	1.3	0.4	4.2
Hackney	411.1	13.2	1.3	2.3	1.0	13.1	2.0	3.1	1.8	8.5
Stepney	392.7	5.5	0.7	0.7	0.3	18.1	0.8	6.7	1.6	7.7
Bethnal Green	376.1	3.7	0.2	0.4	0.3	15.6	0.9	4.3	6.0	14.5
Camberwell.....	395.9	10.8	1.2	2.1	0.9	9.7	3.8	3.1	1.2	5.8
Shoreditch.....	387.2	3.5	0.2	0.5	0.4	14.6	1.7	3.6	6.7	13.9
Hammersmith	403.2	13.5	1.1	1.8	1.1	6.4	6.1	1.9	0.1	4.3
Islington.....	59.8	10.7	1.0	2.3	1.1	9.5	1.9	2.7	1.8	8.4
Lambeth.....	59.6	13.2	1.0	2.1	1.0	7.0	2.2	2.8	1.4	6.1
Greenwich	59.0	17.3	1.2	1.0	1.1	4.5	1.4	1.3	0.1	5.3
Finsbury.....	389.1	5.0	0.2	1.0	0.3	9.1	1.2	4.1	6.7	14.4
St. Pancras	413.6	10.9	0.8	1.7	0.9	8.8	1.4	3.3	0.9	9.5
Bermoudsey	380.8	4.6	0.6	0.9	0.4	9.8	1.6	5.8	2.7	11.8
Poplar.....	380.5	5.7	0.9	0.8	0.5	10.8	0.8	5.7	1.5	9.0
Deptford.....	376.3	11.6	1.1	1.5	0.9	6.8	1.8	2.6	0.5	5.8
Southwark	378.0	4.8	0.5	1.0	0.7	8.2	1.6	5.1	4.2	9.7
Battersea.....	363.1	8.9	1.1	2.0	0.9	7.7	3.7	2.2	0.9	4.7
Fulham	356.9	12.1	0.8	1.4	0.9	6.2	4.1	1.5	0.1	3.3
Woolwich	377.7	9.8	1.2	0.8	1.1	5.6	1.1	1.5	0.1	2.7

In explanation of the considerable numbers of persons employed in "other occupations" in certain boroughs, it may be stated that the following proportions were employed in the manner shown:—

	Proportions per 100 Wives in		
	London, City.	Holborn.	Westminster.
Domestic servants, in-door (in hotels, lodging, eating houses) ... }	6·9	6·1	5·2
Professional persons (except teachers and nurses)..... }	0·4	2·2	1·1
Sick nurses and invalid attendants....	1·6	0·9	0·4

	Proportions per 100 Wives in				
	Bethnal Green.	Shoreditch.	Finsbury.	Bermondsey.	Southwark
Miscellaneous metal trades.....	0·3	0·6	0·7	2·4	0·6
Working in skins, hair, and feathers..... }	2·9	2·6	2·4	1·7	0·9
Working in wood, furniture, &c.	3·1	2·0	1·0	0·5	0·5
Envelope, stationery manufacture }	1·2	1·4	1·5	0·9	1·2
Textile manufacture (mixed or undefined materials) }	1·7	1·3	1·1	0·4	0·4

I must admit that the table of occupations surprises me. I was prepared to find many barmaids (classed under workers, dealers in food, drink, &c.) and hotel servants in the City of London and in Holborn, but I did not suppose this was practically the only exception to the rule that ordinary domestic service is the chief attraction, almost the only one for immigrants. I expected to find larger numbers in the drapers' and mercers' shops. To be sure there are the dressmakers' workrooms in St. Marylebone, Westminster, and other places which attract immigrants, but there are still higher ratios of dressmakers in boroughs which are doing the reverse.

Here it should be noticed that beyond doubt there has been an important total of female migration *from* such boroughs as Stepney, Bethnal Green, Shoreditch, Poplar, Bermondsey, and Southwark,¹⁴ but not from Woolwich. On the other hand, there must have been some immigration into Woolwich on balance, and as we are all cognizant of the foreign population which has settled in Stepney, it follows that we must add the amount of such foreign immigration to the net loss of inhabitants in that borough, if we would arrive at its

¹⁴ Finsbury might present like characteristics, but this borough does not correspond with a registration district or districts, hence its progress cannot so well be followed.

actual loss of native inhabitants. This loss might amount amongst females at age 15—25, to from 10 to 25 per cent. of those who would have survived supposing no migrations had taken place in the six boroughs just named. We may conclude then that below the first twelve places shown in the table immigration has in most cases been more than balanced by outward migrations, even at age 15—25, which is emphatically the age of immigration. At other ages we know London City, Westminster, St. Marylebone, Chelsea, and Holborn have lost heavily. The facts as to Woolwich and Fulham seem to demand special study, as these places are at the bottom of the scale, without obvious reason. Both boroughs are still attracting population, and in both the high proportion of married women rather tends to dwarf the relative number of single women, and really accounts for their ranking low.

I think the following figures are not far from the truth as to migration in 1891-1901 :—

Females. Age in 1901.	Counted in 1891.		Of whom there probably Survived in 1901.		Counted in 1901.		Net Immigration in Ten Years.	
	Woolwich.	Fulham.	Woolwich.	Fulham.	Woolwich.	Fulham.	Woolwich.	Fulham.
15—20....	6,091	5,749	5,878	5,549	5,677	6,246	201*	697
20—25....	5,303	4,736	5,091	4,546	5,891	6,915	800	2,369
25—30....	4,600	4,113	4,370	3,907	5,793	7,200	1,423	3,293
30—35....	4,685	4,679	4,399	4,394	5,135	6,615	736	2,221
35—40....	4,557	4,795	4,223	4,445	4,370	5,388	147	943
40—45....	3,833	4,181	3,473	3,788	3,565	4,442	92	654

* Emigration.

These figures are rendered somewhat doubtful because of the uncertainty we are in as to the correctness of the returns of ages,¹⁵ but may be accepted as showing that many of the female inhabitants counted in 1901 had immigrated during the preceding ten years. If the ages of immigrants were before us we could form a better opinion, and a quinquennial census of *ages* would immensely assist us in detecting the effect of mis-statements.

¹⁵ The number of domestic servants at this age, 15—25, in Fulham (3,091) compares with 3,066 immigrants shown above; but as there are 2,055 servants in Woolwich, if these are all or nearly all immigrants, there must have been an exodus of girls born in Woolwich.

DISCUSSION *on* MR. WELTON'S PAPER.

MR. R. HENRY REW was sure everyone would be struck with the enormous amount of work that the author had put into the paper, and the thorough way he had examined the problems with which he dealt. He was not in any way prepared to discuss the paper, but he might venture to suggest that there might be some risk in assuming without considerable qualification that the characteristics of particular parts of London were indicated by the occupations of the persons who were returned as residing therein. Southwark, for example, was returned as having the largest number of printers and lithographers, but he should think that Southwark could hardly be taken as representing the principal location of the printing trade in London. He believed the printing industry was carried on north of the Thames to a still greater extent, though no doubt people employed on this side of the river lived on the other side. The same consideration might apply to other trades in London, where people probably lived away from their places of occupation to a greater degree than they did in many other parts of the country. It might possibly therefore be somewhat misleading to try to locate too definitely from these figures particular industries in different parts of the metropolis.

MR. A. H. BAILEY, F.I.A., asked if the terms "primary" and "secondary" occupations were not somewhat misleading. He did not find any definition of the expression in the paper, but he concluded it had no reference to the relative positions of employer and employed.

MR. JOHN SHAW suggested perhaps the terms "productive" and "non-productive" would better express the author's meaning than those of primary and secondary.

THE CHAIRMAN (MR. E. W. BRABROOK) observed that Mr. Welton's studies of the phenomena of the census now went back for a considerable number of years. He had rendered public service by the analyses he had given of successive census returns, and also by the ingenious forms of comparison he had devised in order to get at the facts which he had marshalled with so much labour and skill in this paper. Taking, for instance, a community of 100 male workers, he gave in a compendious and interesting form figures which conveyed to the mind a much more clear idea than could be conveyed by any long columns of aggregate numbers. In like manner the ingenious and suggestive arrangement of taking the married women between 15 and 65 as the unit, brought out with great force some curious and interesting circumstances. He (the speaker) confessed it surprised him to find that, taking the married women between those ages, the average number of children to each married woman was something under two. He should have thought,

primâ facie, it would have been more. The paper also showed—that was perhaps not so deplorable from every point of view—that the ratio was decreasing rather than increasing. That opened up a number of social questions which he would leave to be developed further by those who were disposed to take up the subject in the future. Another point of considerable interest was the statistics with regard to the employment of women. That was a subject into which a committee of the British Association, with which he himself was concerned, was making some inquiry. He might say that the details which Mr. Welton had collected would be useful to that committee, especially if it were possible for him to supplement them by similar particulars relating to previous censuses. If such particulars happened to be in Mr. Welton's possession, he would, he was sure, be rendering great service to that committee if he would allow them the use of his collections. He presumed that the fact that Mr. Welton's paper had not given rise to any more active discussion on this occasion was due to the circumstance that the subject had been dealt with in such a masterly manner that it did not lend itself to much criticism. It was moreover a subject which required careful study before anyone could possibly pretend to be ready to discuss it. He concluded by moving that the thanks of the Society be given to Mr. Welton for his excellent paper.

Mr. T. A. WELTON in reply observed that he believed Mr. Rew's point was a good one; but one of his objects in writing this paper had been rather to challenge all that and to induce people who lived in the various localities to point out the corrections required. One could only make a beginning in a matter of this description. He had in various parts of the paper pointed to the fact that plenty of people worked in one part and lived in another. As regards Mr. Bailey's question, he had thoroughly threshed out the distinction between primary and secondary occupations in a paper recently read before the Manchester Statistical Society. The term "primary" occupations related to such occupations as agriculture and mining, to everything in fact that developed the natural powers of the soil or of the situation; while the "secondaries" were the butchers, bakers, doctors, and all those people who were simply there because they were wanted by the community, and not because there was a special field for them in that particular place. Mr. Shaw, he thought, was wrong in suggesting that he said that "secondaries" were not productive. Some of them were very useful indeed and, after all, what was production? Everything that produced comfort was good and was production. He would refer Mr. Brabrook and others who were interested in the point, to a paper which he had contributed some few years ago to the transactions of the Manchester Statistical Society. There the occupations existing in the years 1851 and 1891 were compared with a view to showing what occupations had arisen in that period, what occupations had died out, and what changes had occurred. The whole were marshalled in categories of that kind, and female occupations were dealt with with great particularity.