WILEY

The Enumeration of Paupers--A Correction

Author(s): Charles Booth

Source: *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, Vol. 55, No. 2 (Jun., 1892), pp. 287-294

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

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2979594>

Accessed: 25/06/2014 05:39

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>

The ENUMERATION of PAUPERS—a CORRECTION.

By CHARLES BOOTH, ESQ.

THE following extracts from “Pauperism and the Endowment of “Old Age,” the volume just issued by Mr. Charles Booth, refer to errors which occurred in the figures given in the Paper on the subject published in the December number of the *Journal*:—¹

From Part I, chapter vi.

“The figures, if they were in themselves correct, would show “that the paupers counted for six months were, thirty-five years “ago, rather less than two-and-a-half times the number on one “day. It is probable that this was then an exaggeration, and “would be still more so now.

“This probability is borne out by the evidence of a parliamentary return, made in 1881 at the instance of Mr. J. R. Hollond, “then member for Brighton, which seems to have been entirely “overlooked and forgotten by those who have been content to “quote and requote the figures used by Mr. Dudley Baxter. This “return, which is signed by Mr. Purdy, as statistical secretary to “the Local Government Board, gives the ‘number of persons “‘relieved as paupers (exclusive of vagrants) during the half- “‘year ended with Lady-day, 1881, in each union county of “‘England,’ and may be compared with the return of the number “in receipt of relief on the 1st January in that year. The comparison shows a total of 1,291,424 for the six months, against “803,303 on the single day, or an addition to the number on one “day of 61 per cent.

“The following table shows how the 61 per cent. is distributed “between in-door and out-door relief (stating the lunatics separately “as in a different category, and assuming that 6 per cent.² is for “them a sufficient percentage of addition):—

	Counted 1st January.	Counted for Six Months.	Percentage Addition.
Lunatics	62,954	66,731	6 p. ct.
In-door poor	172,722	299,788	74 „
Out-door „	567,450	924,905	63 „ } 65½ p. ct.
Total.....	803,126	1,291,424	61 p. ct.

Vol. liv, p. 621. 1891.

The actual percentage of increase at Stepney.

U 2

“The difference between the 61 per cent. addition, according to Mr. Hollond’s return of 1881, and the 134 per cent. according to Mr. Dudley Baxter’s version of Mr. Purdy’s figures in 1857, may be accounted for in three ways—

“ (1.) Error in the earlier count.

“ (2.) Difference in the time of year chosen for the ‘one
“ ‘ day ’ return.

“ (3.) Changes in the character of pauperism since 1857.

“ (1.) As to possible error in the earlier count, St. Pancras furnishes some evidence. Both at Stepney and at St. Pancras the officials have continued making up the half-year’s figures in the old way, and by the kindness of the guardians I have had access to the books in which the returns are preserved. A comparison of the figures in Mr. Hollond’s return with the figures in these books shows, at Stepney, an exact agreement, but at St. Pancras, while the books show 24,048, the return gives 20,618 as the true number. At St. Pancras, I understand, no attempt was usually made to strike off duplicate entries due to the passing of paupers from institution to institution, if indeed re-entries in the same institution were allowed for, and thus the current figures involved an error which had probably been characteristic of many of the returns on which Mr. Purdy must have based his figures in 1857, but on which it seems he did not entirely rely. At Stepney the workhouse system is more simple, and exceptional care has been taken to avoid any duplication, and thus the return made for Mr. Hollond contains exactly the same figures as appear in their own books, and may be accepted as correct.

“ (2.) The effect of a different time of year is very evident. The number in receipt of relief on the 1st of January is at its largest, and consequently the addition to be made for others relieved in the twelve months will be at its smallest. Mr. Hollond’s figures are compared with the 1st January. Mr. Dudley Baxter’s are compared with those on the 1st of July. The difference between the numbers in January and in July is about 10 per cent. Allowing for this difference, if we take for Mr. Hollond’s return the 1st July as the starting point, in place of 61 per cent. we get 79 per cent.

“ (3.) There have been many changes since 1857. Out-door relief has been less loosely given; the proportion of the old has undoubtedly increased, and an altered policy with regard to children and the sick may have assisted in making the character of pauperism generally more stable.

“ The difference is nevertheless so great between 61 per cent. (or 79 per cent.) and 134 per cent., and the question so important, that I am glad to know that a return to cover the twelve months ending Lady-day, 1892, has been moved for, and will be made by the Local Government Board. Meanwhile Mr. Hollond’s return represents the latest and best official evidence on the subject.

“ But both these percentages refer to a six months’ count, and give no positive information as to the numbers for a whole year. We have to add something, but it is difficult to say how much ; and just as a good deal depends upon what day is chosen in arriving at the percentage of increase for six months, so the addition to be made for the second half-year will depend much on which six months have been counted first.

“ At Stepney, starting with those in receipt of relief at the end of April, and working backwards, we find that we have to add on the whole 130 per cent. to reach the six months’ total for the winter half-year ending on Lady-day, and to the six months’ total we have to add 29 per cent. to give the year’s total. At Ipswich, comparing those relieved on 1st January with the whole number relieved (also during the winter half-year), the addition is found to be 92 per cent., and to the six months’ total 40 per cent. must be added to give that for twelve months.³

“ The number of paupers for six months and twelve months compared is as follows :—

	Counted on One Day.	Counted for the Winter Six Months.	Counted for Twelve Months.
Stepney Ipswich	1,087 (1st May)	2,530 or 130 % additional	3,259 or 200 % additional
	895 (1st Jan.)	1,723 „ 92 „	2,406 „ 169 „
		Average, 112 per cent.	Average, 185 per cent.

“ If we may venture to apply a similar rate of progress to Mr. Hollond’s six months’ figures, we should have—number of paupers for all England :—

Counted on One Day.	Counted for Six Months.	Counted for Twelve Months.
740,172* (1st January)	1,224,693* or 65½ % addl.	1,581,303 or 110 % addl.

* Lunatics deducted.

³ Lunatics are excluded from these figures, but no deduction has been made for deaths.

“ I am able to compare this estimate with actual returns from Paddington and Ashby, as well as Stepney and Ipswich, but in this comparison I have deducted the deaths that have occurred amongst those relieved, for it is evident that those who die during the year should not be included in an estimate of existing pauperism. I assume that the dead as well as the living are included in Mr. Hollond’s return, and, guided by the facts at the unions I have examined, I adjust the figures by assuming a death-rate of 6 per cent. The table is arranged to show in-door and out-door poor separately:—

A Year’s Pauperism, excluding Lunatics and Vagrants, and deducting those who Died during the Year.

Parish.	Year.	In-door.			Out-door and Medical.			Total.			
		Number on One Day.	Number for Twelve Months.	Per Cent. of In-crease.	Number on One Day.	Number for Twelve Months.	Per Cent. of In-crease.	Number on One Day.	Number for Twelve Months.	Per Cent. of In-crease.	
epney	1889	925	1,905	106	162	1,142	637	1,087	3,047	182	
ddington {	'90		1,083	2,478	129	510	1,888	270	1,593	4,366	180
	and '91										
(mean)											
shby - de - la-Zouch }	1889	122	224	84	565	916	62	687	1,140	67	
	'91	290	568	96	605	1,737	187	895	2,305	158	
swich		2,420	5,175	114	1,842	5,683	209	4,262	10,858	155	
ll England estimated)	1881	172,722	370,039	114	567,450	1,118,891	97	740,172	1,488,930	101	

“ This table shows in a very remarkable manner the more constant character of country as compared with city pauperism, especially as regards out-door relief; and, taking this into account, there is nothing improbable in the estimated figures here given for all England, which point to a probable addition of more than 100 per cent. on the in-door, and rather less than 100 per cent. on the out-door, or on the average of about 100 per cent. all round.

“ On the information which I had before me when I wrote the paper on this subject for the Royal Statistical Society last December, before seeing Mr. Hollond’s 1881 return, I assumed that for in-door pauperism an addition of 85 per cent., including lunatics, or 106 per cent. excluding them, might fairly be made, but that for out-door pauperism double this rate would not be too much. This last assumption, though true of the unions I

“ had examined, and perhaps true of city pauperism generally, “ is plainly not true of country pauperism, and consequently the “ hypothetical figures I put forward at that time involved a considerable error. It now seems that, if we take the whole country, “ the percentage to be added to obtain the annual figures for out-door pauperism is actually less than that needed for in-door pauperism, and an analysis of Mr. Hollond’s return shows conclusively that it is in the country districts, where out-relief is “ most freely given, that it is also most stable in character. In “ towns, and especially where out-relief is checked, there is usually “ a great development of medical or other forms of temporary assistance given to those in trouble; and as the people relieved “ in this way vary from month to month, the total numbers on the “ books are much swollen in the course of a year.

“ The revised estimate which I now put forward of 100 per cent. to be added on the whole, in-door and out—and probably “ rather more than this rate in-door and rather less than this rate out-door—differs very widely from the 3 or $3\frac{1}{2}$ times laid down “ by Mr. Mulhall and Mr. Baxter. It does not pretend to exactness, and should be used with some reserve pending the completion of the present official inquiry.”

From Part II, chapter ii.

“ We have seen that for pauperism of all ages, excluding “ lunatics, it is probably necessary to double the number relieved “ on one day to arrive at the total number relieved in a year. But “ as people grow older they become more settled in their habits, “ and a larger and larger proportion of those who occasionally “ accept relief either enter the house to stay there or receive “ out-relief in a permanent form. The deduction for the deaths “ occurring amongst those relieved during the year also chiefly “ affects the old. The result is that instead of doubling the “ number on one day, we do not need to add more than from “ 30 to 50 per cent. This rate is considerably less than I estimated when addressing the Royal Statistical Society in December last. The estimate made at that time was admittedly “ supposititious; that now put forward is based on actual count “ in five unions, and though still open to question, as the basis “ is not broad enough for safety, is certainly nearer the truth “ The following table gives the percentages for the five unions in “ which an actual enumeration has been made:—

Percentages to be added to the Number of Paupers, as Counted on One Day, to arrive at the Total Numbers for a Whole Year (Lunatics excluded and Deaths deducted).

Union.	In-door.		Out-door (Ordinary).		Medical.		Combined.	
	All Ages.	Over 65.	All Ages.	Over 65.	All Ages.	Over 65.	All Ages.	Over 65.
Stepney	Per cent. 106*	Per cent. 37	Per cent. 32	Per cent. Nil	Per cent. 657	Per cent. 361	Per cent. 182	Per cent. 69
Paddington.....	129	23	65	11	1,091	508	180	32
Ipswich	96	32	93	23	1,256	1,860	158	53
Bradfield.....	{ No return }	45 {	{ No return }	27 {	{ No return }	{ No return }	{ No return }	38 }
Barton-upon-Irwell	„	23	„	Nil	„	300	„	12†

* Division of Stepney:—Under 16, 42 per cent.; 16 to 60, 308 per cent.; 60 to 65, 60 per cent.; 65 and upwards, 37 per cent. = 106 per cent.

† There was a heavy mortality amongst the old at Barton. If deaths are not deducted, the percentage for in-door becomes 53 per cent., and for out-door 14 per cent., or in all combined 31 per cent.

“ Guided by the actual percentages at the different ages shown “ by count at Stepney, we may perhaps assume that the total “ addition of 100 per cent. would be allotted as under to the “ different ages:—

Under 16	40 per cent.	} 100 per cent.
16 to 60 { In-door, 286 per cent. { Out-door, 310 „ }	305 „	
60 to 65	60 „	
Over 65	40 „	

“ Applying these percentages to the figures of pauperism on “ one day, we are able to construct the following table. As these “ figures do not pretend to accuracy, I treat in-door and out-door “ alike, and do not attempt to distinguish between the sexes. It “ is, however, probable that the out-door figures are rather over- “ stated, and we know that of those relieved outside the work- “ house a very large proportion are women.

A Year's Pauperism, 1890-91 (excluding Lunatics and Vagrants).

	In-door.				
	Under 16.	16—60.	60—65.	Over 65.	Total.
Number of paupers on 1st July, 1890*	47,069	35,670	13,372	54,752	150,863
Estimated additions for twelve months	40 % 18,827	286 % 102,112	60 % 8,023	40 % 21,901	100 % 150,863
Total	65,896	137,782	21,395	76,653	301,726

	Out-door.				
	Under 16.	16—60.	60—65.	Over 65.	Total.
Number of paupers on 1st July, 1890*	178,258	110,688	27,808	190,935	507,689
Estimated additions for twelve months	40 % 71,303	310 % 343,326	60 % 16,686	40 % 76,374	100 % 507,689
Total	249,561	454,015	44,494	267,309	1,015,378

* Divided by ages according to Mr. Burt's return of 1st August, 1890.

In-door and Out-door (combined).

	Under 16.	16—60.	60—65.	Over 65.	Total.
Number of paupers on 1st July, 1890	225,327	146,358	41,180	245,687	658,552
Estimated additions for twelve months	40 % 90,130	305 % 445,438	60 % 24,709	40 % 98,275	100 % 658,552
Total	315,457	591,796	65,889	343,962	1,317,104

“ If, pending better information, this table may be taken to represent the facts or a reasonable approximation to them, we can go a step further, and show what proportion of our population at each age are to be accounted paupers.

	Population.	Paupers.*	Ratio to Population.
Under 16.....	11,144,021	315,457	Per cent. 2·8
16—60.....	15,722,273	591,796	3·8
60—65.....	812,028	65,889	8·1
Over 65	1,322,696	343,962	25·9
Total	29,001,018	1,317,104	4·5

* Pauper lunatics excluded.

“ When the results of the promised inquiry are published by the Local Government Board we shall know what degree of error is shown by the figures given above. It may meanwhile be accepted as probable that the ratio of paupers to population, if on the average it is $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., will be for those from 16 to 60 (the naturally self-supporting years of life) less than 4 per cent., but that for those between 60 and 65 the rate will rise to about 8 per cent., while for those over 65 it is probably more than 25 per cent.”