WILEY

The Parliamentary Representation of the Metropolitan, Agricultural, and Manufacturing Divisions of the United Kingdom, with Suggestions for its Redistribution

Author(s): Arthur Ellis

Source: *Journal of the Statistical Society of London*, Vol. 46, No. 1 (Mar., 1883), pp. 59-100

Published by: Wiley for the Royal Statistical Society

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2979281>

Accessed: 25-06-2016 01:18 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://about.jstor.org/terms>

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.

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

The PARLIAMENTARY REPRESENTATION of the METROPOLITAN, AGRICULTURAL, and MANUFACTURING DIVISIONS of the UNITED KINGDOM, with SUGGESTIONS for its REDISTRIBUTION.

By ARTHUR ELLIS.

[Read before the Statistical Society, 20th February, 1883. The PRESIDENT in the Chair.]

CONTENTS :

	PAGE		PAGE
Part I.—Introduction.....	59	Proportion of Electors to Inhabited Houses	66
Explanation of Groups	60	Proportion of Electors to Population	67
Distinguishing Features of the Manufacturing Districts	60	Assessments and Population	67
Population of Divisions	61	Logical Result of Assimilation of Franchise	68
Part II.—The Tendencies of the Period under Review	62	Part IV.—Conclusion. A System of Representation	70
The Changes in Detail, by Divisions	62	A Further Suggestion	75
Part III.—Present Anomalies	65		

PART I.—INTRODUCTION.

EVERYBODY is aware, in a general way, that population and wealth have grown far more rapidly in the towns than in the rural districts. Free trade has shown our *forte* to be industry, not agriculture, and our hands, minds, and capital have forsaken the country for the towns. The following is an attempt to define the changed relations of town with country during the ten years from 1871 to 1881, in order to mark out the grounds for some necessary conclusions. It is proposed, first, to select and explain the facts bearing on the subject; secondly, to trace the tendencies of a recent period; and then to show the ill-fitting jacket with which our newest, most progressive, and most numerous populated places are clad in the way of Parliamentary representation. Perhaps action will be seen to be also necessary as the result of these conclusions. For instance, if it appear that important sections of the people are insufficiently represented in the national councils, and unimportant sections are over-represented, the sooner some remedy is applied, the better and more quietly will that remedy have chance of working. Old as the country is, face and features have changed marvellously—we might almost say its muscular power has been transferred in response to the wants of the time—during the ten years under review. But “land” is frightfully—the word is used in its full meaning—over-represented beside the flesh and blood and intelligence which crowd into the towns. Our representative institutions appear stiff, unyielding,

and what seems to be wanted is a system for giving them elasticity without impairing their solid character. Neither Liberals nor Conservatives desire revolution; but that will be the logical outcome of obstinate persistence in the system which has perpetrated a feudal deference to "acres," ignoring the sinew and intelligence of the close-huddled occupants of towns.

Explanation of Groups.

The clearness of this paper is throughout under the disadvantage which results from inability to sum up results in one total. It is necessary to compare rather than summarise. In order to sort and tie up the results arrived at as neatly as possible, the method adopted is to take the divisions into which the Local Government Board parcels out the country, and to group those into greater divisions thus:—

A includes	I. Metropolitan Division.
B „	II. South-Eastern.
	III. South-Midland.
	IV. Eastern.
	V. South-Western.
C „	VI. West-Midland.
	VII. North-Midland.
	VIII. North-Western.
	IX. York
	X. Northern.
	XI. Monmouth and Wales.
D „	Scotland.
E „	Ireland.

A includes the metropolitan area; B, the counties chiefly agricultural; C, those chiefly manufacturing; while D relates to Scotland, and E to Ireland.

Distinguishing Features of the Manufacturing Districts.

It may be seen in the statistics of coal production, which are those districts most attractive to manufacturing trades and industry. The figures may be thus set out:—

Coal Raised in United Kingdom.

	1871.	1881.	Increase.	Per Cent.
	Tons. Nil	Tons. Nil	Tons. Nil	—
A. Metropolitan division.....	674,000	732,000	58,000	8.6
B. Agricultural „	101,073,000	132,498,000	31,415,000	31.1
C. Manufacturing „	15,438,000	20,823,000	5,385,000	35.0
D. Scotland „	166,000	128,000	(-) 38,000	dec.
E. Ireland „				

The production of the year 1881 is put beside that for 1871 in order to bring out the tendency of things industrial in this country to develop, while, as we see elsewhere, things agricultural contract. It would have been extremely interesting to compare the number of factory workers in various districts in the same way; but unfortunately we have only the returns for 1871, which stand as follows:—

Factory Workers in United Kingdom (1871).

[See Miscellaneous Statistics of the United Kingdom.]

A. Metropolitan division	3,288
B. Agricultural „	22,417
C. Manufacturing „	688,047
D. Scotland „	126,317
E. Ireland „	61,965

These two sets of figures seem amply to justify us in separating the agricultural from the manufacturing divisions in England in the way pursued.

Population of Divisions.

The Local Government divisions have been kept in view as far as possible in classifying the population of England, but those divisions lap over and infringe upon neighbouring counties in a way which prevents us taking that classification for all purposes. When it is necessary to go by counties instead of Local Government districts we may include, as far as possible, the same counties, and, for instance, substitute Middlesex for the Metropolitan district, although the latter overlaps part of Surrey, Kent, &c. The results are thus contrasted:—

Population in 1881 of England and Wales.

	Poor Law Divisions.	County Divisions.	Increase in 1881 on 1871.	
			Poor Law.	County.
Metropolitan	3,814,571	2,918,814	17·3	14·9
Agricultural	7,283,561	8,172,059	8·6	10·2
Manufacturing	14,870,154	14,877,413	16·7	16·6
Total England and Wales	25,968,286	25,968,286	14·4	14·4

More stress may be laid on the Poor Law classification, inasmuch as it better throws up the distinction between the metropolitan and the agricultural divisions. The increase in the latter is from either view under average; but while it appears as 10·2 per cent. in the county divisions, it is only 8·6 per cent. according to the better defined Poor Law classification.

PART II.—THE TENDENCIES OF THE PERIOD UNDER REVIEW.

Having now sketched the plan of the present paper, I have to show what are the material changes referred to, which are so well calculated to bring out by contrast the stiffness of our anciently rooted institutions. The acreage alone of the country remains constant, and the representation of the people varies little more

I.—The Tendencies of the Decade.—

	1. Metropolis.		2. Agricultural.	
	1871.	1881.	1871.	1881.
Population. Number (for } Poor Law purposes) ..... }	3,252,358	3,814,571	6,706,586	7,283,561
Paupers ..... No.	135,576	95,822	429,573	324,456
" Poor " rates ..... £	2,471,516	£2,651,637	£4,739,321	£5,348,025
Cost of poor..... £	1,646,103	£1,907,155	£2,853,634	£2,515,023
Electors. Boroughs 263,431		337,692	195,249	239,396
Assessments A and B } 000's £20,029,		£25,272,	£67,051,	£75,786,
„ D ..... } omitted £63,184,		£84,886,	£30,958,	£38,678,
Inhabited houses 321,229		369,831	1,418,628	1,524,509
Factory workers 3,288		—	22,417	—
Coal raised ..... tons. nil		nil	674,000	732,000
M.P.'s (in 1874). Boroughs....	20		125	
Ditto, Counties. Total, all } England, say, all agricultural }	—		187	

Metropolis contains: Metropolitan Poor Law area, or in other cases, Middlesex.

Agricultural division: South-Eastern, South-Midland, Eastern, and South-Western counties.

Manufacturing division: West-Midland, North-Midland, North-Western, York, Northern, and Welsh counties.

The Changes in Detail, by Divisions.

We may proceed to review the extent of the relative increases in the following form:—

II.—Population (Poor Law Statistics).

Divisions.	1871.	1881.	Increase.	Per Cent.
Metropolitan	3,252,358	3,814,571	562,213	17.3
Agricultural	6,706,586	7,283,561	576,975	8.6
Manufacturing.....	12,747,087	14,870,154	2,123,067	16.7
Total England and Wales	22,706,031	25,968,286	3,262,255	14.4
Scotland	3,367,922	3,734,370	366,448	10.9
Ireland	5,395,007	5,159,839	— 235,168	4.4

than this acreage. All else—the population, their means of subsistence, their intelligence and ideas, their responsibilities—change, in some divisions the disturbance being more rapid and complete than in others. Those who can grasp the meaning of a multitude of figures, will be glad to have at once before them the following summary table, illustrating the tendencies referred to:—

Summary for Great Divisions.

3. Manufacturing.		4. Scotland.		5. Ireland.	
1871.	1881.	1871.	1881.	1871.	1881.
12,747,087	14,870,154	3,367,922	3,734,370	5,395,007	5,159,839
407,225	352,920	130,202	105,455	69,791	114,680
£4,910,603	£6,340,930	£894,896	£939,367	£734,686	£965,128
£3,386,987	£3,679,958	£810,456	£853,348	£729,300	£965,100
791,449	1,013,434	171,912	201,509	49,025	57,497
£87,728	£105,146	£22,368	£27,310	£25,836	£23,271
£82,274	£96,434	£19,411	£25,596	£8,050	£9,763
2,519,359	2,919,504	412,185	—	961,380	—
688,047	—	126,317	—	61,965	—
101,073,000	132,498,000	15,438,000	20,823,000	166,000	128,000
152		26		37	
—		32		64	

III.—*Paupers (Annual Local Government Report).*

Divisions.	1871.	1881.	Decrease.	Per Cent.
Metropolitan	135,576	95,822	— 39,754	20·5
Agricultural	378,950	268,285	— 110,665	29·2
Manufacturing	457,848	409,091	— 48,757	10·6
Total England and Wales	972,374	773,198	— 199,176	20·5
Scotland	130,202	105,455	— 24,747	19·0
Ireland	69,791	114,680	+ 44,889	64·2

IV.—*Expended on Poor Relief (Annual Local Government Report).*

Divisions.	1871.	1881.	Increase.	Per Cent.
	£	£	£	
Metropolitan	1,646,103	1,907,155	261,052	15·8
Agricultural	2,853,634	2,515,023	— 338,611	— 11·9
Manufacturing	3,386,987	3,679,958	292,971	8·7
Total England and Wales	7,866,724	8,102,136	215,412	2·7
Scotland	810,456	853,348	42,892	5·3
Ireland	729,300	965,100	235,800	32·3

V.—*Income Tax—Assessments A and B (Lands).*

[000's omitted.]

Areas.	1871.	1881.	Increase.	Per Cent.
	£	£	£	
Metropolitan	20,029,	25,272,	5,243,	26·2
Agricultural	67,051,	75,786,	8,735,	13·0
Manufacturing	87,728,	105,146,	17,418,	19·9
Total England and Wales	174,808,	206,204,	31,396,	18·0
Scotland	22,368,	27,310,	4,942,	22·0
Ireland	15,836,*	23,271,*	—	—

* No exact comparison for Ireland can be made, inasmuch as, before 1874 the *net* figures only were returned under Schedule B. The real rate of increase probably did not amount to 5 per cent.

VI.—*Assessment D† (Incomes).*

[Tables V and VI are taken from the Miscellaneous Statistics, 1875, and from the Parliamentary Paper on Income Tax, printed July, 1882.]

[000's omitted.]

	1871.	1881.	Increase.	Per Cent.
	£	£	£	
Metropolitan	63,184,	84,886,	21,702,	34·3
Agricultural	30,958,	38,678,	7,720,	23·0
Manufacturing	82,274,	96,434,	14,160,	17·2
Total England and Wales	176,416,	219,998,	43,582,	24·8
Scotland	19,411,	25,596,	6,185,	31·8
Ireland	8,050,	9,763,	1,713,	21·4

† In 1872, and again in 1876, exemptions were extended, but this applies all round.

VII.—*Electors: Boroughs and Cities.*

[Miscellaneous Statistics for 1871, and recent Parliamentary returns.]

	1871.	1881.	Increase.	Per Cent.
Metropolitan	263,431	337,692	74,261	28·2
Agricultural	195,249	239,396	44,147	22·6
Manufacturing	791,449	1,013,464	214,015	27·0
Total England and Wales	1,250,129	1,590,552	332,423	25·8
Scotland	171,912	201,509	29,597	17·2
Ireland	49,025	57,497	8,472	17·3
Universities in United Kingdom	23,209	29,365	6,156	26·5

VIII.—*Electors: Counties, Nominally Agricultural.*

	1871.	1881.	Increase.	Per Cent.
Metropolitan.....	23,396	33,173	9,777	42.0
Agricultural	303,638	345,121	41,483	13.6
Manufacturing.....	473,111	553,609	80,498	17.0
Total England and Wales	800,145	931,903	131,758	16.4
Scotland	78,919	96,570	17,651	22.4
Ireland	175,439	168,217	- 7,222	- 4.1

IX.—*Inhabited Houses (Census).*

	1871.	1881.	Increase.	Per Cent.
Metropolitan.....	321,229	369,831	48,602	15.1
Agricultural	1,418,628	1,544,509	125,881	8.8
Manufacturing.....	2,519,359	2,919,504	400,145	15.9
Total England and Wales	4,259,216	4,833,844	574,628	13.5
Scotland	412,185	—	—	—
Ireland	961,380	914,108	- 47,272	- 5.2

So much being gathered from the comparison of population, wealth, responsibility, &c., at the two periods, we have next to glance at the position now arrived at.

PART III.—PRESENT ANOMALIES.

A short sketch of the progress of the electoral reform is contained in the following passage, taken from the "Daily News" of 13th December, 1882:—

"The effect of Lord Grey's measure was to abolish the condition of things which left the franchise to be the monopoly and the exclusive possession of nobles and squires, and to admit the middle and industrial classes to their place in the constitutional system. But the Reform Act of 1832 left the working classes practically out of consideration altogether. It not merely failed to give them any extended privileges; it actually took away from them here and there certain privileges which they then possessed under various odd forms of 'fancy franchise.' Lord John Russell, Mr. Bright, Mr. Cobden, and later still Mr. Gladstone saw that the time had come when this mistake must be corrected. At length it so happened that even Mr. Disraeli became convinced of the need for a further step in the development of reform; and moving boldly on the way made smooth for him by the labour of his political opponents, he succeeded in carrying household suffrage in the cities and boroughs of England. It is obvious that the work is still incomplete. No possible reason can be assigned for treating the humbler residents of a county as a class politically apart from all other classes. Other anomalies too still remain in our constitutional system. We are warranted in the confident belief that it will be Mr. Gladstone's work to complete by their removal the reform legislation of 1832. In the new parliament which that reform called into existence he first took his seat as a member of the House of Commons. It will be a fitting crown for his career as a statesman if he is enabled to carry the reform of our electoral system to its full and proper development."

Proportion of Electors to Inhabited Houses.

Sir Charles Dilke, in a speech to his Chelsea constituents last December (30th), made two remarkable statements: First, he said—"The assimilation of the franchise to that existing in English or Scotch boroughs is a necessary first step, or else must be the accompaniment of any such redistribution of political power as all Liberals and Radicals desire, and which has been advocated here to-night. A real redistribution of seats is absolutely impossible unless you have an equal franchise through the length and breadth of the land." Secondly, he said—"There are two classes to be chiefly considered, and who would be introduced to share in the government of the country by an equalising of the franchise, viz., the townsmen who happen by mere geographical accident to live outside the borough boundaries, and the agricultural labourers. It has been computed, speaking roughly, that an assimilation of the franchise would confer about a million fresh votes, or half a million to each of these two classes, and it would undoubtedly admit to the franchise a large number of miners."

Now the proportion of electors to inhabited houses in England has increased on the whole during the ten years under review from 48.1 per cent. to 52.2 per cent., and that includes county as well as borough electors. It is apparent that the occupiers of nearly half the inhabited houses in England are still unrepresented, and allowing for female occupants, Sir Charles Dilke's numerical estimate appears well within the bounds of probability. As to his remark, that an assimilation of borough to county franchise is a necessary first step, it is plainly true, for at present there is no understanding the method of representation in England and Scotland. On a study of the proportions, the only conceivable conclusion is that there is no method. We are fast arriving at a state of things in which the borough and city electors will number double those of the county electors. In 1874 the English borough and city members were 297 in number, the county members of Parliament 187. In 1881 (various incompetent boroughs having been deprived of their abused rights) the number of borough and city members was only half as many again, numbering 285, while the counties returned 186 members; and thus the disproportion between the growth of non-electors and the stationariness of their representatives is more and more apparent. What system is there visible for accommodating the representation of either boroughs or counties to the rate of growth in the populations? The drift of numbers, wealth, and intelligence has been distinctly from the county areas to those of boroughs and cities. Unless something be done, unless a "sliding

“scale” with some approach to scientific self-adjustment be introduced, anomalies will be continually cropping up. Already the many in the towns are left to fight over the return of relatively few representatives. In the counties the canvassing for votes is not necessary to so wide an extent, and probably the county electors are amenable to pressure from landed proprietors. But if “land” is to be represented for itself without reference to the number of those who live on it, let us at least have an understanding. After an assimilation of county and borough franchise, there would be some possibility of getting at the quite elementary facts necessary for appreciating the proportion of qualified electors to representatives. There may possibly be some concealed reason why a county vote should be more rare, more precious, and more effective when got than a borough vote: but if so, let us understand on what principle the superiority rests, always supposing there is any such principle, of which doubts are justified.

Proportion of Electors to Population.

This head need not be here pursued, those who have seen the Financial Reform Almanac being familiar with the gross disproportions not only as between counties and boroughs, but also as between counties and counties on the one hand and boroughs and cities on the other:—

<i>Counties.</i>		<i>Boroughs.</i>	
	Members.		Members.
95 with 7,173,050 souls return	154	181 with 3,336,389 souls return	231
64 „ 13,000,590 „	129	71 „ 11,365,279 „	129

Assessments and Population.

If the disproportion between mere numbers and representation is growing worse, it is also apparent that wealth is shifting in a way which must put old methods of representation out of joint. Let us set side by side the ratios of increase on income tax assessments on landed property (Schedules A and B) and those on professional and trading incomes (Schedule D). Particulars will be found in Appendix B. The comparison for the great divisions runs thus:—

Increase of Assessments in Ten Years.

Area.	A and B.	D.
	Per cent.	Per cent.
Metropolitan	26·2	34·3
Agricultural	13·0	23·0
Manufacturing	19·9	17·2
Total, England and Wales....	18·0	24·8
Scotland	22·0	31·8
Ireland	(about) 5·0	21·4

The incomes from the ownership and occupation of land have increased at a great rate, considering the strict limitation in the quantity of land in this country. Land, it will also be observed, grows valuable most rapidly in and near the Metropolis; in purely agricultural districts we know without statistics that the tendency of land has not been towards greater value during the last six years; in the manufacturing districts land incomes have increased about 20 per cent. in the interval. Setting the increases beside those from trades and professions, they seem poor and small; and the conclusion is reasonable that any augmentation in the yield of land is largely due to its proximity to the scene of those pursuits which flourish best in towns—not due to its cultivation that is, but to the crowding together of the population in particular spots for profit or convenience. If this is correct, the argument in favour of numbers as a cause of wealth, and therefore a basis of power, is strengthened.

Logical Result of Assimilation of Franchise.

Although the aim of this paper is not of a partisan kind, it is useless to pretend to ignore the drift of a reform in county franchise. Accordingly a table is added, which shows by divisions how greatly the returns of Liberal members of the House of Commons predominate over those of Conservatives in the case of boroughs and cities: while the counties, especially those at a distance from the manufacturing districts, return far more Conservatives. Where acres are most Liberals are least, Scotland excepted. It appears therefore almost safe to predict that an extension of household suffrage would tend to diminish the strength of the party which has hitherto drawn so many of its members from landed constituencies in the counties. The figures, condensed, are these:—

Members of Parliament returned by Boroughs and Counties respectively, distinguishing Liberals from Conservatives.

Divisions.	Boroughs and Cities.		Counties.	
	Liberals.	Conservatives.	Liberals.	Conservatives.
Metropolis	14	8	—	2
English agricultural	63	49	16	66
„ manufacturing	123	28	49	53
Scotland	25	1	25	7
Ireland	26	11	53	11

These figures should, on the other hand, reassure those who vaguely fear an entire obliteration of the Conservative party as a result of the assimilation of county to borough franchise. Even

the boroughs in the agricultural division return a large proportion of Conservatives; while in Scotland there is little room for the Liberals to gain many more representatives, so much do they preponderate already. The details, of which the foregoing is a summary, are now appended. No. 1 includes the metropolitan area; Nos. 2 to 5 inclusive comprise the agricultural division, to which reference has been repeatedly made; and Nos. 6 to 11 comprise the distinctively industrial section of England and Wales:—

	Borough and City Members.		County Members.		Total M.P.'s.	Number of Acres. (000's omitted.)
	L.	C.	L.	C.		
1. Middlesex	14	8	—	2	24	181
2. Surrey	—	1	—	6	7	483,
Kent	3	8	—	6	17	1,004,
Sussex	4	7	—	4	15	934,
Hants.....	7	4	—	4	15	1,032,
Berks	4	1	1	2	8	450,
	18	19	1	22	60	3,903,
3. Hertford	—	1	1	2	4	391,
Bucks	4	1	1	2	8	467,
Oxford	1	1	1	2	5	470,
Northampton.....	4	—	1	3	8	630,
Hunts.....	1	2	1	1	5	230,
Bedford	2	—	2	—	4	296,
Cambridge	2	—	1	2	5	525,
	14	5	8	12	39	3,009,
4. Essex	3	1	—	6	10	1,055,
Norfolk	3	1	1	5	10	1,356,
Suffolk	2	3	—	4	9	950,
	8	5	1	15	29	3,361,
5. Wilts	4	7	—	4	15	859,
Dorset	3	4	1	2	10	627,
Devon.....	7	5	1	5	18	1,655,
Cornwall	5	3	4	—	12	870,
Somerset	4	1	—	6	11	1,050,
	23	20	6	17	66	5,061,
6. Gloucester	7	1	2	2	12	805,
Hereford	2	1	2	1	6	533,
Salop	3	3	—	4	10	841,
Stafford	8	3	3	3	17	732,
Worcester	6	1	2	2	11	472,
Warwick	5	2	1	3	11	566,
	31	11	10	15	67	3,949,

	Borough and City Members.		County Members.		Total M.P.'s.	Number of Acres. (000's omitted.)
	L.	C.	L.	C.		
7. Leicester	2	—	1	3	6	512,
Rutland	—	—	—	2	2	95,
Lincoln	6	—	—	6	12	1,768,
Notts	7	1	1	3	12	526,
Derby	2	—	5	1	8	656,
	17	1	7	15	40	3,557,
8. Cheshire.....	3	1	—	6	10	705,
Lancashire.....	14	8	4	4	30	1,208,
	17	9	4	10	40	1,913,
9. Yorkshire	24	5	7	3	39	3,883,
10. Durham	9	—	3	1	13	648,
Northumberland	5	1	2	2	10	1,290,
Cumberland	3	1	3	1	8	970,
Westmoreland	1	—	—	2	3	501,
	18	2	8	6	34	3,409,
11. Monmouth.....	1	—	—	2	3	368,
South Wales	10	—	7	1	18	2,727,
North „	5	—	6	1	12	1,995,
	16	—	13	4	33	5,090,
Scotland	25	1	25	7	58	—
Ireland	26	11	53	11	101	—
Universities (2 Liberals, 7 Con- servatives).....	—	—	—	—	9	—

PART IV. CONCLUSION.—*A System of Representation.*

It seems necessary to formulate some kind of basis upon which representation should rest. Various tests present themselves in a review of the qualifications requisite on the part of those to whom votes are to be confided. These are: the population test, the wealth test, the responsibility test, as defined by the burden of the support of the poor, the acreage test. At present *acres* seem to have most to do in determining the quality of members for any part of the country; but some concessions—these being quite inadequate, however—are made for population, when closely packed, as in the metropolis, while bog and heath, as in Ireland and Scotland, naturally do not count for so much as agricultural or town lands. We see from the table given below, that for every member returned from the metropolitan area (the acreage of Middlesex is here taken to represent that area), there are 7,542 acres;

while the agricultural division returns one member per 79,000 acres; the manufacturing division one per 86,170 acres; Scotland one per 336,138 acres; and Ireland one per 206,089 acres. Judged by this test alone, it would seem at first that the Metropolis is over-represented; but that is far from being the true state of the case. Taking *population*, we find there is only one member per 158,940 souls for the metropolitan area; while the agricultural division sends one per 37,544 souls; the manufacturing, one per 58,776; Scotland, one per 64,386 souls; and Ireland, one per 51,087 souls. Or, taking the proportion of members to the number of qualified voters, the following similar result comes out:—

	Voters per Member Returned.
Metropolitan division, England	15,824
Agricultural „	3,108
Manufacturing „	6,190
Scotland	5,139
Ireland	2,235
Universities	3,263

This test shows that the Metropolis (Middlesex) is by no means over-represented, but very much otherwise: to return one member, whether for county, borough, or city, an average of 15,526 voters are called into the contest. In the agricultural division less than one-fifth of this number are qualified to vote, and who is there hardy enough to say that a clodhopper's vote is really so much better weighed or deservedly accounted so far more valuable than that of the average dweller in or around London? The thing is absurd. Irish votes again have a force seven times that of those belonging to dwellers about the Metropolis. This may be because, so many Irishmen being unprovided with votes, it is necessary to give the able voters all the more power; and something is also to be said in the same way, because Irish peers do not sit in the House of Lords of their own right. Still the anomaly is striking, after all allowances are made. Next we come to the *wealth* test: there again the Metropolis is severely ill-treated. Taking the assessments of income tax from land (A and B Schedules), and from employments (D), the proportions per member are:—

	A and B.	D.
	£	£
Metropolitan division, England....	1,053,000	3,537,000
Agricultural „	387,000	197,000
Manufacturing „	416,000	381,000
Scotland	471,000	441,000
Ireland	230,000	97,000

Metropolitan wealth is therefore of singularly small account as an electoral qualification. The wealth test is of itself of the less importance, since wealth, in modern times at least, is transferable, and

in a sense portable. Those in towns who, being wealthy, desire voting power and influence in the county can get it, and do get it occasionally by bringing their wealth to bear upon rural districts. Wealth may have been made in the slums of cities, but it can be made effective in the country. As a matter of fact, the tendency of rich merchants, shopkeepers, &c., has been towards a settlement in country places. Much stress should perhaps not be laid on the wealth test, a man and voter being a man and voter "for a' that;" but in conjunction with the non-recognition of the metropolitan population, the way in which numbers and wealth alike are pushed aside in deference to the feudal attributes of "acres," is too startling to be passed over without noting the mute but strong protest of the statistics. Take Ireland now. The average income from land which returns a voter is but a fifth of the similar income about the Metropolis, while the average professional, &c., income is about a fortieth. The disproportion between the agricultural and the metropolitan divisions in these respects is hardly less striking. Again, with inhabited houses, although the happy agricultural divisions return one member per 7,972 houses—a great part of these houses conferring no votes, be it remembered—the Metropolis has, so to speak, to expend 15,410 inhabited houses on each member, and the manufacturing division expends 11,540 houses on each member returned to the House of Commons. Lastly, we come to the *responsibility* test. The Metropolis has a far greater charge in number of paupers to be supported than any other division, taking the proportion per member returned; while Ireland has a disproportionately small responsibility of the kind. Whether we look at the number of paupers, or the cost of their maintenance, these disproportions are manifest. The following table (to be read downwards) shows the anomaly better than words could bring it out:—

Charge of Paupers on Constituencies : average per M.P. returned (1881).

Divisions.	Number of Paupers.	Direct Cost of Maintenance.	Poor Rates Inclusive.
		£	£
Metropolis	3,993	79,465	120,524
Agricultural	1,383	12,964	27,286
Manufacturing	1,395	14,546	25,063
Scotland	1,818	14,713	16,334
Ireland	1,135	9,555	9,556

Having thus stated some of the chief tests on which, theoretically considered, the representation of the people should rest, it remains most perplexing how they are to be assimilated. Should, for instance, 10,000 acres be considered to confer as much right to a representative as 10,000 inhabited houses? Or should the payment of 20,000*l.* for maintenance of the poor, count for as much

as half a million assessed under Schedules A and B? The qualifications of various constituencies are too various, they will not mix. It would be easy enough to draw up a set of arithmetical rules according to which population, acreage, houses, pauper charges, &c., should confer rights in their degrees; but who is to fix the basis for these rules? I only venture here to lay stress upon the apparent necessity, if anything like system is to be adopted, of weighing *all* the considerations enumerated, and not taking one qualification to the exclusion of the rest. Perhaps, however, the following figures will help in defining our notions of what is right or wrong in this matter:—

Comparison per M.P. (Exclusive of House of Lords).

Extent, Population, Electors, Assessments, Inhabited Houses, Paupers, Burden of Paupers, Poor Rates, by Counties* and Divisions, in 1881.

	Acres.	Popula- tion.	Electors	Assessments. [000's omitted.]		In- habited Houses.	Paupers.	Churge of Paupers.	Number of Members Returned.
				A and B.	D.				
1. Metropolis or } Middlesex .... }	7,542	158,940	15,824	£ 1,053,	£ 3,537,	15,410	3,993	£ 79,465	24
2. Surrey	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	7
Kent	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	15
Sussex	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	15
Hants	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	15
Berks	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	8
Average 2	65,050	41,435	4,187	476,	366,	10,493	1,257	13,889	60
3. Herts	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4
Bucks	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	8
Oxford	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	5
Northampton ...	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	8
Hunts	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	5
Bedford	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4
Cambridge	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	5
Average 3	77,155	31,435	2,556	360,	115,	6,665	1,470	14,047	39
4. Essex	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	10
Norfolk	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	10
Suffolk	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	9
Average 4	115,900	47,505	3,374	385,	160,	9,895	1,743	16,350	29
5. Wilts	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	15
Dorset	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	10
Devon	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	18
Cornwall	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	12
Somerset	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	11
Average 5	76,682	28,073	2,305	290,	115,	5,560	1,290	10,025	66
Average for Division } (Agricultural) .... }	79,000	37,544	3,108	399,	200,	7,972	1,383	12,964	194

* Population and pauperism statistics for main divisions according to Poor Law estimate; electors by electoral divisions, grouped as nearly as possible to accord with the main divisions, but other figures by counties.

*Comparison per M.P. (Exclusive of House of Lords)—Contd.**Extent, Population, Electors, Assessments, Inhabited Houses, Paupers, &c.—Contd.*

	Acres.	Popula- tion.	Electors	Assessments. [000's omitted.]		In- habited Houses.	Paupers.	Charge of Paupers	No. of Members Returned.
				A and B	D.				
				£	£			£	
6. Gloucester	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	12
Hereford	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	6
Salop	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	10
Stafford	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	17
Worcester	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	11
Warwick	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	11
Average 6	58,940	45,365	5,047	340,	252,	8,950	1,493	12,466	67
7. Leicester	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	6
Rutland	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2
Lincoln	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	12
Notts	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	12
Derby	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	8
Average 7	88,925	41,640	4,597	425,	250,	8,720	1,097	10,521	40
8. Cheshire	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	10
Lancashire	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	30
Average 8	47,825	102,436	9,734	610,	900,	19,550	2,127	23,030	40
9. Yorkshire.....	99,565	74,010	8,570	515,	483,	15,270	1,868	16,175	39
10. Durham	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	13
Northumberland	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	10
Cumberland.....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	8
Westmoreland....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3
Average 10	100,270	47,542	4,948	308,	275,	8,235	1,165	10,335	34
11. Monmouth	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3
South Wales	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	18
North Wales	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	12
Average 11	154,240	47,615	4,611	316,	190,	9,507	2,053	15,705	33
<i>Average for Divi- sion (Manufac- turing) .....</i>	86,170	58,776	6,190	416,	381,	11,540	1,395	14,546	253
Scotland	336,138	64,386	5,139	471,	441,	—	1,818	14,713	58
Ireland	206,089	51,087	2,235	230,	97,	9,050	1,135	9,555	101
Universities	—	—	3,263	—	—	—	—	—	9
Total for United } Kingdom.....	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	639

Summary of the foregoing Table. Average Number, &c., per M.P.

	Acres.	Popula- tion.	Electors.	Assessments. [000's omitted.]		Houses.	Paupers.	Cost of
				A and B.	D.			Paupers.
								£
Metropolis	7,542	158,940	15,824	1,053,	3,537,	15,410	3,993	79,465
Agricultural divi- sion	79,000	37,544	3,108	399,	200,	7,972	1,383	12,964
Industrial division	86,170	58,776	6,190	416,	381,	11,540	1,395	14,546
Scotland	336,138	64,386	5,139	471,	441,	—	1,818	14,713
Ireland	206,089	51,087	2,235	230,	97,	9,050	1,135	9,555

A Further Suggestion.

Leaving for a moment the domain of fact for the fields of speculation, I should like to air a suggestion. Beforehand it must be admitted that the oaken constitution of this country cannot be remodelled as if it were in the ductile or sapling stage. Nevertheless, if the patience of the hearers of this paper may be so far tried, it could be suggested that a rational distribution of direct electoral power might serve at least two ends. We have lately been brought in face of the obstruction, the diluted rhetoric, the clumsy and inconsequent debating by a whole House of Commons, in connection with subjects for which sectional committees would be far better suited. Now, might it not be right for Metropolitan voters to elect members for a Metropolitan committee; voters having industrial qualifications to elect members for a committee entrusted with industrial matters; agricultural voters to return members fitted for a permanent committee on rural matters; Irish voters—I hazard this only in logical consequence of the general principle suggested—to elect an Irish committee; Scotch members a Scotch committee? The general conclusions to which these permanent committees came would of course be subject to the decision—a plain Yes or No—of the whole House; but the hurling of an incongruous multitude of debaters upon remote and minor details would perhaps be brought to an end by the method proposed. Other possible developments of systematic voting could easily be pointed to; but public attention at present is not likely to be attracted by anything beyond the immediate cry for rational redistribution of voting power, although a system of permanent committees of the House of Commons is in the background, and may perhaps yet have to be brought forward. Obstructionists could not well be in two committees at once.

APPENDIX A.

	Population (by Poor Law Divisions).		Persons Employed in Factories.	Mines : Coal Raised.	
	1871.	1881.		1871.	1881.
Total England and Wales....	* 22,706,031	25,968,286	—	101,748,000	133,234,000
1. Metropolis, containing	3,252,358	3,814,571	3,288	—	—
Part of Middlesex	2,284,666	2,548,993	—	—	—
„ Surrey	742,155	930,218	—	—	—
„ Kent	225,537	285,360	—	—	—
2. South-Eastern	2,166,756	2,486,151	153	—	—
Part of Surrey	365,279	460,790	—	—	—
„ Kent	628,163	707,936	—	—	—
Sussex	420,910	494,027	—	—	—
Southampton	526,136	575,451	—	—	—
Berks.	226,268	247,938	—	—	—
3. South Midland	1,442,648	1,596,041	2,071	—	—
Part of Middlesex	264,854	380,685	—	—	—
Hertford	194,612	202,315	—	—	—
Bucks	155,007	155,885	—	—	—
Oxford	178,329	181,564	—	—	—
Northampton	248,228	277,002	—	—	—
Huntingdon	58,046	53,218	—	—	—
Bedford.....	151,539	154,249	—	—	—
Cambridge	192,033	191,123	—	—	—
4. Eastern.....	1,218,726	1,342,923	8,414	—	—
Essex.....	440,878	551,765	—	—	—
Suffolk	347,210	353,509	—	—	—
Norfolk	430,638	437,649	—	—	—
5. South-Western	1,878,456	1,858,446	11,779	—	—
Wilts.....	244,667	248,644	—	—	—
Dorset	189,000	184,936	—	—	—
Devon	605,881	609,157	—	—	—
Cornwall	356,266	325,205	—	—	—
Somerset	482,642	490,504	—	674,000	732,000

* Population in 1871, according to periodical pauperism returns. The census gave the total 22,712,266.

APPENDIX A.—*Contd.*

	Population (by Poor Law Divisions).		Persons Employed in Factories.	Mines: Coal Raised.	
	1871.	1881.		1871.	1881.
6. West Midland	2,720,669	3,029,362	24,110	—	—
Gloucester	488,760	525,123	—	1,412,000	1,361,000
Hereford	120,723	118,148	—	—	—
Salop	267,003	265,707	—	1,350,000	892,000
Stafford	877,435	1,006,741	} —	14,281,000	14,858,000
Worcester	336,276	383,188			
Warwick	630,472	730,455			
7. North Midland	1,406,911	1,637,624	45,485	—	—
Leicester	275,171	326,006	—	700,000	1,145,000
Rutland	23,385	23,007	—	—	—
Lincoln	428,051	463,367	—	—	—
Notts	355,404	438,712	—	2,469,000	4,758,000
Derby	324,900	386,532	—	5,360,000	8,509,000
8. North-Western	3,388,399	4,107,155	406,822	—	—
Chester	539,351	621,544	—	975,000	782,000
Lancaster	2,849,048	3,485,611	—	13,851,000	18,500,000
9. York	2,444,592	2,894,527	202,849	—	—
West Riding	1,854,172	2,197,811	} —	12,801,000	18,294,000
East „	306,410	362,390			
North „	284,010	334,326			
10. Northern	1,365,041	1,624,468	6,936	—	—
Durham	693,012	875,507	} —	29,191,000	35,592,000
Northumberland	386,646	434,024			
Cumberland	220,253	250,630	—	1,424,000	1,769,000
Westmoreland	65,130	64,307	—	—	2,000
11. Welsh	1,421,475	1,577,018	1,845	—	—
Monmouth	219,708	234,440	—	4,915,000	5,413,000
South Wales	766,764	881,263	—	9,120,000	16,822,000
North „	435,003	461,315	—	2,500,000	2,672,000
Scotland	3,367,922	3,734,370	126,317	15,438,000	20,823,000
Ireland	5,395,007	5,159,839	61,965	166,000	128,000

APPENDIX A—*Contd.*

	Paupers.		Expenditure on Poor Relief.	
	1st July, 1871.	1st July, 1881.	1871.	1881.
			£	£
1. Metropolis	135,576	95,822	1,646,103	1,907,155
2. South-Eastern..... Total	105,724	75,418	920,593	831,329
Part of Surrey	14,618	11,876	147,808	148,501
,, Kent	28,037	19,418	242,827	216,665
Sussex	21,986	16,966	197,720	180,453
Southampton	28,983	19,738	222,404	199,101
Berkshire	12,100	7,420	109,834	86,609
3. South Midland ..... Total	81,460	57,286	634,354	547,946
Part of Middlesex	9,674	8,871	86,181	99,559
Hertford	11,883	8,835	88,510	81,473
Bucks	9,711	6,175	77,410	58,141
Oxford	10,796	7,470	85,178	69,330
Northampton	14,687	9,625	111,737	92,192
Hunts	3,035	1,542	24,741	17,408
Bedford	9,596	6,118	65,312	54,843
Cambridge	12,078	8,650	95,285	75,000
4. Eastern ..... Total	78,397	50,558	560,632	474,120
Essex	27,868	18,199	206,014	189,974
Suffolk	22,060	13,112	150,762	116,829
Norfolk	28,469	19,247	203,856	167,317
5. South-Western ..... Total	113,375	85,023	738,055	661,628
Wilts	17,705	11,197	128,572	101,552
Dorset	13,577	9,199	86,908	69,839
Cornwall	17,796	13,805	219,305	203,289
Devon	33,470	26,606	102,241	96,717
Somerset	30,827	24,216	201,029	190,231
6. West Midland..... Total	106,927	100,044	758,781	837,229
Gloucester.....	25,834	21,454	182,249	180,855
Hereford	6,651	4,994	46,599	46,751

APPENDIX A—*Contd.*

	Paupers.		Expenditure on Poor Relief.	
	1st July, 1871.	1st July, 1881.	1871.	1881.
			£	£
6. West Midland—<i>Contd.</i>				
Salop	9,235	6,417	77,178	68,783
Stafford.....	32,276	36,811	192,733	255,353
Worcester.....	12,992	11,448	92,515	92,459
Warwick	19,939	18,920	167,507	193,028
7. North Midland ..... Total	56,310	43,873	441,264	420,846
Leicester	11,686	8,457	97,076	86,887
Rutland.....	1,204	797	11,252	8,116
Lincoln	20,579	15,444	169,960	148,184
Notts.....	13,845	9,845	96,278	90,949
Derby	8,996	9,330	66,698	87,210
8. North-Western ..... Total	91,649	85,049	807,783	921,219
Chester	16,010	13,612	124,158	138,453
Lancashire	75,639	71,437	683,625	782,766
9. York.....	70,266	72,852	522,896	630,955
10. Northern	51,136	39,639	338,553	351,449
Durham	25,057	20,106	155,138	172,174
Northumberland	15,984	10,851	113,188	107,107
Cumberland	8,170	7,085	53,731	55,571
Westmoreland	1,925	1,597	16,496	16,597
11. Welsh ..... Total	81,560	67,634	517,710	518,260
Monmouth	11,012	10,061	80,243	80,660
South Wales.....	42,686	36,492	262,524	274,469
North „	27,862	21,081	174,943	163,131
Scotland	130,202	105,455	810,456	853,348
Ireland	69,791	114,680	729,300	965,100

APPENDIX B.

	Members Elected, 1880.		Population (Counties).		Inhabited Houses.	
	Boroughs.	Counties.	1871.	1881.	1871.	1881.
1. Middlesex	22	2	2,539,765	2,918,814	321,229	369,831
2. Surrey	1	6	1,091,635	1,435,842	168,443	214,788
Kent	11	6	848,294	977,585	151,344	173,311
Sussex	11	4	417,456	490,316	75,385	87,805
Hants	11	4	544,447	593,487	98,232	110,531
Berks	5	3	196,475	218,382	39,638	43,126
	39	23	3,098,307	3,715,613	533,042	629,561
3. Hertford	1	3	192,226	202,990	39,056	41,295
Bucks	5	3	175,879	176,277	37,257	37,599
Oxford	2	3	177,975	179,650	37,849	38,165
Northampton	4	4	243,891	272,524	52,539	57,671
Hunts.....	3	2	63,708	59,614	14,032	13,282
Bedford	2	2	146,257	149,461	30,506	31,545
Cambridge.....	2	3	186,906	185,475	40,272	41,312
	19	20	1,186,842	1,225,991	251,511	260,869
4. Essex	4	6	466,436	575,930	92,356	109,100
Norfolk	4	6	438,656	444,825	99,428	99,439
Suffolk	5	4	348,869	356,863	76,501	78,529
	13	16	1,253,961	1,377,618	268,385	287,068
5. Wilts	11	4	257,177	258,967	54,874	55,756
Dorset.....	7	3	195,774	190,979	39,461	39,819
Devon	12	6	601,374	604,397	105,200	106,407
Cornwall.....	8	4	362,343	329,484	73,950	69,899
Somerset.....	5	6	463,483	469,010	92,205	95,130
	43	23	1,880,151	1,852,837	365,690	367,011
6. Gloucester	8	4	534,640	572,480	101,474	108,827
Hereford	3	4	125,370	121,040	26,371	25,627
Salop	6	3	248,111	247,993	50,800	50,756

APPENDIX B.

Electors.				Assessments. [000's omitted.]				
Boroughs, Cities, &c.		Counties.		1871-72.		1880-81.		
1871.	1881.	1871.	1881.	A and B, Lands.	D, Trades, &c.	A and B, Lands.	D, Trades, &c.	
				£	£	£	£	
				20,029,	63,184,	25,272,	84,886,	
263,431	337,692	23,396	33,173					1. Middlesex
1,223	1,454	31,171	51,859	6,880,	7,778,	9,198,	11,233,	2. Surrey
24,049	28,815	32,171	38,454	6,942,	3,515,	8,102,	4,382,	Kent
22,913	28,940	13,803	14,516	3,727,	1,900,	4,348,	2,550,	Sussex
24,468	33,938	19,297	21,223	3,819,	1,720,	4,774,	2,720,	Hants
7,424	9,532	7,610	8,107	1,939,	859,	2,139,	1,091,	Berks
80,077	102,679	104,052	134,159	23,307,	15,772,	28,561,	21,976,	
765	1,101	9,610	10,186	1,813,	728,	1,951,	724,	3. Hertford
8,653	8,391	7,559	8,159	1,942,	472,	2,048,	535,	Bucks
8,203	9,186	7,476	7,642	2,000,	648,	2,132,	727,	Oxford
8,406	11,735	11,569	12,038	2,768,	694,	2,968,	1,022,	Northampton
2,258	2,073	3,704	3,927	865,	200,	894,	216,	Hunts
2,122	2,601	6,590	7,335	1,300,	404,	1,368,	468,	Bedford
4,021	5,015	10,147	10,294	2,445,	692,	2,616,	772,	Cambridge
34,428	40,102	56,655	59,581	13,133,	3,838,	13,977,	4,464,	
5,221	6,048	19,516	26,409	4,634,	1,433,	5,206,	1,873,	4. Essex
7,266	10,786	15,426	15,506	4,901,	1,255,	5,188,	1,598,	Norfolk
14,798	18,351	21,017	20,756	3,602,	1,000,	3,808,	1,136,	Suffolk
27,285	35,185	55,959	62,671	13,137,	3,688,	14,202,	4,607,	
13,248	16,380	10,697	10,974	2,931,	808,	3,091,	852,	5. Wilts
6,695	8,044	7,309	7,478	1,929,	487,	2,140,	558,	Dorset
17,783	21,911	27,242	28,596	5,090,	2,075,	5,628,	2,006,	Devon
7,205	7,356	16,609	15,423	2,215,	980,	2,408,	760,	Cornwall
8,528	9,739	25,115	26,239	5,309,	3,310,	5,779,	3,455,	Somerset
53,459	63,430	86,972	88,710	17,474,	7,660,	19,046,	7,631,	
37,569	44,511	20,797	21,306	3,993,	1,754,	4,414,	2,002,	6. Gloucester
3,131	3,722	9,431	9,004	1,825,	253,	1,895,	290,	Hereford
9,200	9,487	13,585	13,524	2,798,	991,	2,992,	976,	Salop

APPENDIX B.—*Contd.*

	Members Elected, 1880.		Population (Counties).		Inhabited Houses.	
	Boroughs.	Counties.	1871.	1881.	1871.	1881.
<i>6.—Contd.</i>						
Stafford	11	6	858,326	981,385	167,614	187,869
Worcester.....	7	4	338,837	380,291	69,988	77,337
Warwick	7	4	634,189	737,188	131,442	149,279
	42	25	2,739,373	3,040,377	547,693	599,695
<i>7. Leicester .....</i>						
	2	4	269,311	321,018	58,606	68,020
Rutland	—	2	22,073	21,434	4,766	4,551
Lincoln.....	6	6	436,599	469,994	94,212	100,830
Notts	8	4	319,758	391,984	68,418	82,567
Derby	2	6	379,394	461,141	78,309	92,783
	18	22	1,427,135	1,665,571	304,311	348,751
<i>8. Cheshire .....</i>						
	4	6	561,201	643,237	110,449	126,421
Lancashire	22	8	2,819,495	3,454,225	530,490	655,496
	26	14	3,380,696	4,097,462	640,939	781,917
<i>9. Yorkshire .....</i>						
	29	10	2,436,355	2,886,304	507,040	595,488
<i>10. Durham .....</i>						
	9	4	685,089	867,586	114,705	147,207
Northumberland.....	6	4	386,646	434,024	62,436	70,761
Cumberland.....	4	4	220,253	250,630	44,061	49,055
Westmoreland.....	1	2	65,010	64,184	12,671	12,894
	20	14	1,356,998	1,616,424	233,873	279,917
<i>11. Monmouth .....</i>						
	1	2	195,448	211,374	36,169	39,698
South Wales	10	8	764,339	879,841	150,813	170,496
North „	5	7	452,796	480,054	98,521	103,542
	16	17	1,412,583	1,571,269	285,503	313,736
Scotland	26	32	3,360,018	3,734,370	—	—
Ireland	37	64	5,412,377	5,159,839	—	—

APPENDIX B.—*Contd.*

Electors.				Assessments. [000's omitted.]				
Boroughs, Cities, &c.		Counties.		1871-72.		1880-81.		
1871.	1881.	1871.	1881.	A and B, Lands.	D, Trades, &c.	A and B, Lands.	D, Trades, &c.	
£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	
53,663	62,493	28,849	34,230	4,495,	4,799,	5,416,	5,541,	6.— <i>Contd.</i>
23,079	28,641	16,879	19,023	2,731,	1,486,	2,963,	1,728,	Stafford
55,756	73,901	16,392	18,355	4,365,	4,430,	5,105,	5,340,	Worcester
182,398	222,755	105,933	115,442	20,207,	13,713,	22,785,	15,877,	Warwick
14,397	18,977	14,514	15,913	2,692,	988,	3,093,	1,337,	7. Leicester
14,532	19,885	2,054	1,763	362,	59,	375,	67,	Rutland
—	—	29,239	31,598	6,768,	1,383,	7,304,	1,670,	Lincoln
41,610	47,756	10,266	12,404	2,543,	1,592,	2,963,	1,943,	Notts
10,155	13,167	19,393	22,419	2,661,	3,558,	3,169,	5,018,	Derby
80,694	99,785	75,466	84,097	15,026,	7,580,	16,904,	10,035,	
28,838	34,201	23,289	28,880	3,895,	2,066,	4,636,	2,527,	8. Cheshire
194,032	241,685	63,608	84,607	14,911,	27,969,	19,789,	33,494,	Lancashire
222,870	275,886	86,897	113,487	18,806,	30,035,	24,425,	36,021,	
182,324	231,642	87,835	102,597	16,474,	17,704,	20,101,	18,885,	9. Yorkshire
39,436	59,867	19,880	24,836	2,684,	4,095,	3,696,	4,559,	10. Durham
18,879	37,730	10,372	13,426	2,995,	2,628,	3,657,	2,996,	Northumbria
7,457	9,186	12,717	15,568	1,941,	1,234,	2,249,	1,507,	Cumberland
1,859	1,957	5,070	5,652	763,	245,	886,	274,	Westmoreland
67,631	108,740	48,039	59,482	8,383,	8,202,	10,488,	9,336,	
3,797	5,116	7,764	8,617	1,065,	875,	1,219,	737,	11. Monmouth
37,943	51,920	32,850	38,370	4,438,	2,954,	5,343,	4,105,	South Wales
13,792	16,629	28,327	31,527	3,329,	1,241,	3,861,	1,438,	North „
55,532	73,656	58,941	78,514	8,832,	5,070,	10,423,	6,280,	
171,912	201,509	78,919	96,570	22,368,	19,411,	27,310,	25,596,	Scotland
49,025	57,497	175,439	168,217	15,836,	8,050,	23,271,	9,763,	Ireland

APPENDIX C.

Electors on Register.

	I. Cities and Boroughs.		II. Counties.	
	1871.	1881.	1871.	1881.
1. Metropolis—				
Tower Hamlets	31,560	40,681	23,396	33,173
Chelsea	16,825	30,601		
Finsbury	34,007	44,166		
Greenwich	14,921	22,737		
Hackney	37,930	45,130		
Lambeth	35,181	49,040		
City of London	22,716	25,310		
Marylebone	32,130	34,687		
Southwark	19,321	23,566		
Westminster	18,840	21,774		
	263,431	337,692		
2. Surrey (extra Metropolitan)—				
Guildford	1,223	1,454	31,171	51,859
Kent—				
Canterbury	3,156	3,238	32,171	38,454
Chatham	4,970	5,641		
Dover	3,443	4,326		
Gravesend	2,639	3,456		
Hythe	2,303	3,080		
Maidstone	3,357	3,899		
Rochester	2,551	2,938		
Sandwich	1,730	2,207		
	24,049	28,815		
Sussex —				
Brighton	9,626	12,657	13,803	14,516
Chichester	1,226	1,253		
Hastings	2,823	4,284		
Horsham	800	1,263		
Lewes	1,382	1,445		
Midhurst	997	1,074		
Rye	1,257	1,366		
Shoreham	4,802	5,598		
	22,913	28,940		
Hants—				
Andover	640	869	19,297	21,223
Christchurch	1,534	2,827		
Lymington	680	800		
Newport, Isle of Wight	1,165	1,332		
Petersfield	817	822		
Portsmouth	11,928	17,912		
Winchester	1,611	1,957		
Southampton	6,093	7,419		
	24,468	33,938		

C.—*Electors on Register—Contd.*

	I. Cities and Boroughs.		II. Counties.	
	1871.	1881.	1871.	1881.
2.— <i>contd.</i>				
Berks—				
Abingdon	845	876	7,610	8,107
Reading	3,730	5,312		
Wallingford	1,098	1,229		
Windsor	1,751	2,115		
	7,424	9,532		
3. Herts—				
Hertford	765	1,101	9,610	10,186
Bucks—				
Aylesbury	3,729	4,440	7,559	8,159
Buckingham	1,105	1,135		
Wycombe	3,003	1,907		
Marlow	816	909		
	8,653	8,391		
Oxford—				
Oxford	5,387	6,242	7,476	7,642
Banbury	1,715	1,873		
Woodstock	1,101	1,071		
	8,203	9,186		
Northampton—				
Northampton	5,912	8,185	11,569	12,038
Peterborough	2,494	3,550		
	8,406	11,735		
Hunts—				
Huntingdon	921	1,061	3,704	3,927
St. Ives	1,337	1,012		
	2,258	2,073		
Beds—				
Bedford	2,122	2,601	6,590	7,335
Cambridge—				
Cambridge	4,021	5,015	10,147	10,294
4. Essex—				
Colchester	2,975	3,762	19,516	26,409
Harwich	637	801		
Maldon	1,609	1,485		
	5,221	6,048		

C.—Electors on Register—Contd.

	I. Cities and Boroughs.		II. Counties.	
	1871.	1881.	1871.	1881.
4.— <i>contd.</i>				
Suffolk—				
Bury St. Edmunds.....	1,284	2,231	15,426	15,506
Eye	1,196	1,020		
Ipswich	4,786	7,535		
	7,266	10,786		
Norfolk—				
Lynn	2,460	2,849	21,017	20,756
Norwich	12,338	15,502		
	14,798	18,351		
5. Wilts—				
Calne	600	802	10,697	10,974
Cricklade.....	5,761	7,469		
Devizes	860	921		
Malmesbury	1,022	1,057		
Marlborough	626	658		
Salisbury	1,451	1,962		
Westbury	1,102	1,101		
Wilton.....	885	1,415		
Chippenham	941	1,015		
	13,248	16,380		
Dorset—				
Bridport	983	1,070	7,309	7,478
Dorchester	656	886		
Poole	1,419	1,949		
Shaftesbury.....	1,306	1,372		
Wareham	972	1,073		
Weymouth	1,359	1,694		
	6,695	8,044		
Devon—				
Barnstaple	1,636	1,785	27,242	28,596
Devonport	3,306	3,917		
Exeter	6,152	7,562		
Plymouth	4,671	6,366		
Tavistock.....	849	876		
Tiverton	1,169	1,405		
	17,783	21,911		
Cornwall—				
Truro	1,442	1,522	16,609	15,423
Bodmin	897	895		
Helston	1,066	1,021		
Launceston	740	852		
Liskeard	887	759		
Penryn	2,173	2,307		
	7,205	7,356		

C.—Electors on Register—Contd.

	I. Cities and Boroughs.		II. Counties.	
	1871.	1881.	1871.	1881.
5.— <i>contd.</i>				
Somerset—				
Bath	5,189	6,017	25,115	26,239
Taunton	1,989	2,326		
Frome	1,350	1,396		
	8,528	9,739		345,121
6. Gloucester—				
Bristol	21,816	25,744	20,797	21,306
Cheltenham	3,533	5,134		
Cirencester	1,075	1,157		
Gloucester	4,681	5,320		
Stroud	5,757	6,399		
Tewkesbury	707	757		
	37,569	44,511		
Hereford—				
Hereford	2,298	2,821	9,431	9,004
Leominster	833	901		
	3,131	3,722		
Salop—				
Bridgenorth	1,335	1,208	13,585	13,524
Ludlow	868	996		
Shrewsbury	3,766	3,821		
Wenlock	3,231	3,462		
	9,200	9,487		
Stafford—				
Lichfield	1,309	1,379	28,849	34,230
Newcastle-under-Lyme	2,849	3,152		
Stafford	3,151	3,344		
Tamworth	1,652	2,260		
Walsall	8,170	9,538		
Wednesbury	17,644	19,561		
Wolverhampton	18,888	23,259		
	53,663	62,493		
Worcester—				
Bewdley	1,053	1,261	16,879	19,023
Droitwich	1,370	1,445		
Dudley	12,013	14,947		
Kidderminster	2,350	3,774		
Worcester	5,592	6,393		
Evesham	701	821		
	23,079	28,641		

C.—Electors on Register—Contd.

	I. Cities and Boroughs.		II. Counties.	
	1871.	1881.	1871.	1881.
6.— <i>contd.</i>				
Warwick—				
Birmingham	46,302	63,909	16,392	18,355
Coventry	7,773	8,263		
Warwick	1,681	1,729		
	55,756	73,901		
7. Leicester—				
Leicester	14,397	18,977	14,514	15,913
Rutland	—	—	2,054	1,763
Lincoln—				
Boston	2,581	3,043	29,239	31,598
Grantham	2,023	2,383		
Grimsby	4,712	6,956		
Lincoln	4,083	6,182		
Stamford	1,133	1,321		
	14,532	19,885		
Notts—				
East Retford	7,622	8,183	10,266	12,404
Newark	1,119	2,194		
Nottingham	14,674	17,555		
Stoke-on-Trent	18,195	19,824		
	41,610	47,756		
Derbyshire—				
Derby	10,155	13,167	19,393	22,419
8. Chester—				
Birkenhead	6,738	9,107	23,289	28,880
Chester	6,324	5,804		
Macclesfield	4,839	5,447		
Stalybridge	4,918	5,685		
Stockport	6,019	8,158		
	28,838	34,201		
Lancashire—				
Ashton-under-Lyne	5,286	5,893	63,608	84,607
Blackburn	9,053	13,160		
Bolton	11,801	14,250		
Burnley	5,628	7,414		
Bury	5,518	6,859		
Clitheroe	1,630	1,958		
Liverpool	46,455	63,221		
Manchester	56,699	58,712		
Oldham	15,663	21,383		
Preston	10,032	11,748		
Salford	17,538	23,928		
Warrington	4,152	6,222		
Wigan	4,577	6,937		
	194,032	241,685		

C.—Electors on Register—Contd.

	I. Cities and Boroughs.		II. Counties.	
	1871.	1881.	1871.	1881.
9. York—				
Bradford	20,662	26,437	87,835	102,597
Dewsbury	7,899	10,060		
Halifax	10,083	12,055		
Huddersfield	11,131	13,266		
Hull	19,012	26,581		
Knaresborough	788	758		
Leeds	41,407	49,414		
Malton	1,206	1,396		
Middlesborough	6,368	10,750		
Northallerton	820	918		
Pontefract	1,927	2,360		
Richmond	677	708		
Ripon	1,035	1,132		
Rochdale	9,561	10,788		
Scarborough	2,816	4,301		
Sheffield	31,329	42,402		
Thirsk	973	976		
Wakefield	3,584	4,087		
Whitby	1,946	2,145		
York	9,300	11,108		
	182,324	231,642		
10. Durham—				
Darlington	3,598	5,214	19,880	24,836
Durham	1,946	2,390		
Gateshead	8,632	11,685		
Hartlepool	3,746	7,107		
South Shields	7,378	10,112		
Stockton	4,948	8,062		
Sunderland	9,388	15,297		
	39,436	59,867		
Northumberland—				
Berwick	1,336	1,989	10,372	13,426
Morpeth	2,539	5,749		
Newcastle	12,500	24,261		
Tynemouth	2,504	5,731		
	18,879	37,730		
Cumberland—				
Carlisle	4,426	5,504	12,717	15,568
Cockermouth	1,064	1,100		
Whitehaven	1,967	2,582		
	7,457	9,186		
Westmoreland—				
Kendal	1,859	1,957	5,070	5,652

C.—Electors on Register—Contd.

	I. Cities and Boroughs.		II. Counties.	
	1871.	1881.	1871.	1881.
11. Monmouth—				
Monmouth.....	3,797	5,116	7,764	8,617
South Wales—				
Brecon	808	879	32,850	38,670
Cardiff	5,718	8,831		
Cardigan	1,788	2,074		
Carmarthen	3,529	5,752		
Haverfordwest	1,462	1,555		
Merthyr.....	14,097	14,200		
Pembroke	3,212	3,361		
Radnor	875	947		
Swansea.....	6,454	14,321		
	37,943	51,920		
North Wales—				
Beaumaris	1,773	2,559	28,327	31,527
Carnarvon	3,178	4,093		
Denbigh.....	2,841	3,084		
Flint	3,208	3,795		
Montgomery	2,792	3,089		
	13,792	16,620		

DISCUSSION on MR. ELLIS'S PAPER.

MR. LIONEL L. COHEN said it appeared to him to be difficult, within the limits of such a discussion as would be appropriate to a meeting of the Statistical Society, to test by statistics the theories which the writer of the paper had propounded. In no civilised country could the theory of government be founded entirely upon an arithmetical basis, and such a theory was still more difficult of application in the case of a nation in which various rights and customs had grown up, and were closely interwoven with the life and habits of the people. The author of the paper had said that, theoretically considered, representation should rest upon a certain basis, but what that basis should be was a matter about which opinion was very much divided, and which could not be brought to the test of figures. The true basis was that which the majority of the people held to be the most suitable for their happiness, and that could not be brought to the test of figures in any way. The paper stated that different qualifications would not mix. So much the better. They did not want to reduce any voter to the position

of a uniform unit. They would rather that every man's intelligence, and the influence which he exercised, should also be taken into account. They wanted the preponderance of genius, and perhaps also the superiority of social power and hereditary influence, to be taken into account. Another point, with regard to which the writer of the paper had travelled into the region of speculation, was his recommendation of committees of the House of Commons elected by the voters, on whose decisions the House itself should merely say "Aye" or "No." That raised the old political question whether the House of Commons should merely be an executive body to register or reject decrees, or whether it should be a deliberative assembly. Questions which touched human feelings and the impulses of the human mind could not be brought to the absolute test of statistics; and, in his opinion, the discussion which the paper must tend to elicit was hardly one suitable to such a Society as theirs.

Major CRAIGIE said the Society was indebted to the reader of the paper for placing before them a great mass of facts in a compendious form, which might be useful in causing discussion. He did not, however, think that the Statistical Society was the best body to discuss the political deductions of this paper. They could not help seeing the particular line of political thought which ran through it, and gave it something more than a statistical colour. It was an attack on the basis of the present system of representation in this country. But the author had not been very careful in forming the groups of areas on which this attack was based, and on which new theories of representation were founded. The grouping which he had adopted struck him, on looking at the map exhibited, as singularly inapt. For example, Herefordshire and Lincolnshire were two of the most distinctively agricultural counties in England, and yet the author of the paper had so drawn his classification as to place them, as well as all the mountainous counties of Wales, in the "manufacturing" division. It must be misleading to mix up data for agricultural and mining districts, and group them with those relating to counties of a totally different and more urban character. Cumberland, Westmoreland, some parts of Derbyshire, and the Midland counties, were surely more agricultural than the thickly-peopled home counties immediately surrounding the metropolis. There was no attempt in this paper to give the different classes of employment in the different groups, distinguishing the persons employed in agriculture in the so-called agricultural counties from the whole population of those counties. It was assumed in the paper that the divisions marked out were more or less homogeneous, which was far from being even roughly the case. With regard to the statistics of wealth, the income tax assessment under Schedules A and B was rightly enough used as a local test, but he declined to accept the assessment to Schedule D as a local test at all. Schedule D was a very misleading test if taken geographically in the localities where trading profits were returned. Anyone who had looked at the Inland Revenue reports would know how often this had been

pointed out, and how, for instance, the enormous apparent wealth of the city of London consisted largely of assessments under Schedule D, such as those of the railway and other large companies whose head offices happened to be in the metropolis, while the possessors of that wealth did not live in London, and their income afforded no reason why Londoners should have more representatives. He questioned if they had any purely statistical basis for determining how localities should be represented. So far as he understood it, the theory of representation in this country was not the representation of persons at all, but of all separate interests and classes and phases of national life. Thus we had small boroughs and growing towns, the seats of special industries; and again pleasure resorts and seaside places, where the types of life represented were essentially different from that of a county or of a huge manufacturing or metropolitan borough. So long as each group was represented, the mere numbers in each group was of secondary importance. He wished to ask the author of the paper whether the statement that "the incomes from the ownership and occupation of land have increased at a great rate," was founded on the increase, as it appeared, of both Schedules A and B, or of Schedule B only; because the increase in Schedule A taught nothing with regard to the increase in the value of land, two-thirds of the total, and by far the most of the development, being made up of houses. He would also ask Mr. Ellis if he was right in taking as one of the bases of "responsibility" the amount paid by a district for the cost of its paupers. He should have thought that a big pauper bill was rather a reproach to a district than a credit. Those places which spent a large amount on pauperism were surely not, on that account, entitled to extra representation. Something might be said in favour of some relations between local outlays and representations for local authorities; but he protested against the pauperism of a district being held up as one of its titles to importance in the national scale. He wished that some estimate had been given of the revenues derived from different portions of the country, and the proportion of the representation to the taxes paid. He was quite sure if that were done, Ireland, at all events, would be found grievously over-represented. It was surely a matter of importance that the representatives in the House of Commons should bear some proportion to the taxes paid by the districts they represented. It was more necessary to consider this point, because the very class which was daily growing up more and more into political power, and to which some people desired at this moment to give yet further representation, was the very class which, of all others, paid the least share of the taxes. Labourers, and especially agricultural labourers, it had been repeatedly shown, whatever voluntary taxation they elected to bear by the consumption of dutiable articles, in proportion to their income paid now a vastly smaller proportion of the unavoidable taxation of the country than any other class of the community.

Mr. WM. MILLER said he agreed that in the parliamentary representation of the country, numbers with knowledge and wealth, *i.e.*,

the possession of intellectual, real, or personal property, should be taken into account; but surely it was time that the House of Lords, which, as well as the House of Commons, consisted or should consist of representatives of the nation, might be supposed to represent somebody or something more than a few old and too often effete families. Major Craigie had spoken of the absurdity of considering that the districts which supported a large number of paupers should be allowed exceptional representation; but almost all the worst paupers of the empire seemed to flock to London; and if the people of London paid for the support of the scum of the nation, they had a good claim to additional and even exceptional representation; instead of which London had hardly any representation at all worth speaking of in a statistical point of view. It was too often said that the working classes paid very little into the national treasury, and on this ground a preceding speaker wished now to ignore their claim to more representative power; but they paid a tax on every glass of beer they drank, and unfortunately most of them might be set down as beer drinkers. Well, then, if representation was to go with taxation, working men were entitled to a large measure of representation in the imperial parliament.

Mr. R. B. MARTIN, M.P., said he was very much surprised to find that the west midland counties were, by the author of the paper, included in the manufacturing districts, because he himself represented a borough in the west midland which was a purely agricultural borough. The principles laid down by Mr. Ellis as the result of his figures would totally upset the whole of the existing representation in the House of Commons. For instance, Mr. Gladstone, who represented a Scotch county, would hardly like to be relegated to a Scotch committee, and to give his advice only on Scotch questions. The question that had been raised as to the proportion of Irish members to the whole representation of the House of Commons was one of very practical political importance, but it depended upon the Act of Union, and it would be very dangerous to deal with it unless the country was prepared to grapple with the Irish question in a far more thorough spirit than appeared probable at the present time. He thought that there was a good deal to be said in favour of collecting statistics of the various interests represented in the House of Commons, and no doubt careful study of the figures in the paper would show that they were of more practical value than could be detected at the first glance.

Mr. C. WALFORD said the tendency of the paper was in favour of numerical representation; but he regarded that as the very worst basis which could be adopted. It would reduce the House of Commons to a dead level of mediocrity. Every time there had been a change in that direction there had been a consequent deterioration in the mental capacity of the House. Small towns, middle class towns, and large towns had their separate interests, and in his judgment, if there were a hundred and fifty towns to be represented, it would be fair to give fifty members to each of those three classes. By that means all the different interests of the country would be

represented. No Government could be a Government in the proper meaning of the term, unless all the classes of the community were represented in it. If numbers alone were taken into account, variety of interests would be unrepresented.

Mr. J. GLOVER said it was true that questions brought before the Society were to be tested by statistical data, but he had never understood that in the use of those data readers of papers or gentlemen taking part in the discussion were to be precluded from giving to the Society the benefit of their views on political principles as they might be illustrated by statistics. Mr. Ellis had done nothing which had not been done scores of times in the Statistical Society. The last speaker had evidently forgotten that statistics existed with regard to the representation in the House of Commons before the first Reform Bill in 1832. It had been stated that in 1830-31 more than half the members in the House of Commons were elected by about a hundred and sixty individuals. When it was remembered that the House of Commons so constituted increased the national debt in one generation by 600 millions sterling, and kept the country at war for a great part of the time, he thought no one could deny that the public interests were not duly cared for under that system. In his opinion the Statistical Society ought to use the statistics which it obtained in illustration of political principles. The question of the representation of the people was not a mere question of symmetrical representation, as stated by a previous speaker, but a matter of right and principle. If an Englishman was taxed, he was entitled to be represented. He entirely agreed with Mr. Cohen, that the best system was that which the majority of the nation thought best for the time being; but had there ever been a time when the majority of men in England had had the opportunity of saying what they thought was best? The paper by Mr. Ellis was conclusive evidence that in the laws of England the most astute precautions had been taken to prevent the majority of the English people ever saying by clear vote what they thought. It was impossible to consider the figures put before them without coming to that conclusion. Previous speakers had referred to the extreme desirability of having a good representation of classes; but what did this mean? Were they prepared for class legislation? He had been under the delusion that for years the great object of legislation had been to frame laws in accordance with sound principles, and not in accordance with the prejudices of classes. If they advocated class representation, were they prepared for class taxation? If they were, then some classes would have to pay a great deal more than they did now.

Professor LEONE LEVI said it appeared to him that the function of that Society was pre-eminently to furnish the materials for legislation. In his opinion the paper was very opportune, because the subject with which it dealt was now more or less before the country. The principal materials required for framing a sound system of political representation were the progress of population, the geographical conditions of all its component portions and great

divisions, and the various interests, agricultural, manufacturing, and industrial, spread all over the country, and Mr. Ellis had supplied tables which would be helpful in the consideration of those points. Besides these, however, the comparative extent, strength, and power of the various elements throughout the country, from time to time, should be taken into consideration, as also the relative increase of wealth of the higher, middle, and lower classes, as well as the amount of taxation, direct and indirect, pressing upon them respectively. He wished that the author of the paper had favoured them with some comparison between the electoral representation systems of England and other countries, taking into account the educational and fancy franchises, including members of the universities, of scientific societies, of different orders of knighthood, of the civil service, &c. These were all elements to be taken into account in the consideration of any modification of the representative system of any country from time to time. He therefore thought that the Council had acted quite rightly in allowing the paper to be read.

Mr. H. R. DROOP thought that a better case for the existing system of representation might have been made out if the paper had distinguished between the rural districts and the small towns, and had shown that the small towns with representatives, represented not only themselves but also a number of other similar towns. But he did not believe that the existing system could long be maintained intact; and as any changes that might be made would necessarily be approximative to some arrangement on a statistical basis, he suggested that those who desired to avoid universal suffrage, should look out for and insist upon statistical principles that would lead to different results. Thus the question might be raised whether every person who had a vote should only have one vote. It appeared to him that the best way to prevent the extension of the county franchise from giving an overwhelming predominance to one particular class would be to give a larger number of votes to the wealthier classes, *i.e.*, to carry further the distinguishing process which at present gives the franchise to persons holding certain qualifications and refuses it to those who want these qualifications, by giving additional votes to electors above a certain level in wealth and position; and that seemed to him to be the only way in which the higher classes could be protected against class legislation in the interests of the more numerous lower class. He quite agreed with a previous speaker that legislation ought not to be influenced by class interests; but on looking at the proceedings of trades' unions, farmers' alliances, &c., he found that every class of electors looked upon legislation and political questions mainly from the point of view of their own interests; therefore the country must be prepared for class legislation if one class were allowed to have an enormous predominance in the representation. Another point which was worthy of consideration was whether the whole of the representation of a particular district should always be given to the party which happened to have a majority in that district. It was most illogical

that only half the electors in England should be represented in Parliament. As to this the speaker referred to a paper he had read before the Society in 1881.

The Rev. I. DOXSEY said that if the decision of the Council to admit this paper needed justification, it would be found by comparison of the representation of London with that of certain small boroughs in Ireland and in England. There were 22 small boroughs in Ireland the united constituencies of which amounted to only 8,732, while the metropolitan boroughs returned the same number of representatives, although they had a constituency of 351,836. It therefore appeared that 396 men of some obscure town in Ireland had the same political power as about 16,000 men in the great metropolitan boroughs. That showed how important was the consideration of the question statistically. One reason why Irish questions occupied so much time in the House of Commons, while those relating to 4 millions residing in the great metropolitan boroughs were set aside session after session, was that Ireland had 106 representatives in the House of Commons, while the city of London and metropolitan boroughs had only 22. Similar discrepancies existed in some small boroughs in England and Scotland, where there were a total of 20,638 electors returning 24 members, while some of the metropolitan boroughs, having from 40,000 to 50,000 electors, only returned two members. It was impossible to look at those facts without feeling that something must be done, and he did not think that the Statistical Society should be afraid to look this question fairly in the face. Aylesbury sent two members to Parliament, while its constituency only numbered 4,440, and Barnstaple also sent two members from a constituency of 1,785, while Lambeth with 54,000 returned but two. On what ground could this anomaly be maintained? Was there superior intelligence or were there peculiar interests in Aylesbury and Barnstaple to be represented? These facts were sufficient to convince everybody that this matter ought to be statistically considered. He hoped that the Society would have another paper on the same subject, carrying Mr. Ellis's conclusions still further.

Mr. DAVID NASMITH considered that when such a subject came before the Statistical Society it ought to be treated not merely from a political or partisan point of view, but on the principles both of ancient and modern times. That a redistribution of seats must take place before long was undeniable, and if such a redistribution was to be creditable to the nation, it must be upon some given principle. If the principle was to be that all persons should have equal voting power, then let statisticians tell what the result would be. If it was to be that every man should have a vote in proportion to the amount of income tax he paid, or if the number of votes was to be regulated by the amount which a man paid towards the maintenance of the State, that also was a subject with which the statistician could deal. In ancient Rome the latter principle was adopted, and he had never heard of a more equitable distribution of power.

Mr. H. T. W. ELLIOTT thought that the classification which the author of the paper had adopted was entirely incorrect, and it seemed to him that Major Craigie had done good service by pointing out some of the errors in that classification. If counties were classified and compared for statistical purposes, they ought to be properly described; and agricultural counties like Rutland and Lincoln ought not to be called "distinctively industrial." Again, Surrey was grouped with the agricultural counties, but it was well known that its urban population governed the representation. The population of Battersea alone was almost sufficient to swamp the representation of one of the divisions of that county. According to the paper, the number of electors in the metropolis was 337,000, and an extension of the county suffrage would not, of course, increase that number; but it would be interesting to know the relative number of voters which would be added to the agricultural and the industrial constituencies by the extension of household suffrage. He was of opinion that a considerable number of the new voters would be in the so-called agricultural districts. He also wished to ask the author of the paper whether he considered that the present House of Commons misrepresented the opinion of the country; for, apart from theory, he doubted very much whether at any time during the last fifty years an extended suffrage would have altered the general character of the House of Commons. He also thought that any proposal for altering the representation would be worth very little if it did not deal with the great question of the representation of minorities. In Birmingham, for instance, there were between 11,000 and 12,000 voters unrepresented. If an additional number of members was given to Birmingham, was it intended to provide for the representation of that minority? With regard to the comparative increase of the income tax under Schedules A and B, he would point out that the Schedule A assessments might be taken as practically correct, because the subjects upon which they were made were tangible and visible. But this was not the case as to Schedule D, which became more accurate every year, in consequence of the increased knowledge and experience of the officers charged with its assessment, and there thus existed, apart from its normal growth, an apparent tendency to increase. In any reconsideration of the question of representation, it should be remembered that a considerable portion of the taxation of the lower orders was indirect, and therefore any proposals based upon the payment of direct taxes were likely to be unsatisfactory to those classes.

Mr. S. BOURNE thought that the Council needed no justification whatever for having allowed the paper to be read; for the statistical elements ought to have a very great influence indeed in determining political action upon such a subject. Every such contribution must necessarily at the outset be very imperfect, and be taken for what it was worth. He thought that the paper was deficient in that no statistics had been given with regard to the educational *status* of the voters. He looked upon the franchise as a matter not entirely of right, but of privilege and fitness for

the exercise of the power. That fitness depended very much on the educational qualifications of the various classes of voters. Mr. Glover's argument tended to the establishment of the very closest class representation that could be conceived; for if representation were to be based on numbers, the most numerous class would overrule the class which was best able to form a judgment on the points submitted to them. He thought that the representation of each class, in due subordination to numbers, was the true basis. The concluding paragraph of the paper was perhaps its weakest part. Nothing could be more fatal to the efficiency of a representative body than deputing the settling of details of measures to several committees, the members of which were chosen because they belonged to particular classes, leaving the whole House to simply affirm or negative. Another point alluded to was the small number of representatives which the metropolitan constituencies had in proportion to those sent by small constituencies, and that was a matter with regard to which statistical information would be useful, but still it was very defective. If they took the number of members in the House who owed their position to the fact of their being residents in the metropolis, they would find that the metropolis had a larger representation than any other district in the country. Mr. Martin, the member for Tewkesbury, had claimed to represent an agricultural community, but it was his position in the city of London which caused him to be elected for that borough. The intelligence, the wealth, and the power of the city of London were completely represented by the members who were chosen by many small places; and if the number of representatives for London was increased according to the number of voters it possessed, there would be an overwhelming preponderance which would be fatal to the interests of the country. There could be no question that a large amount of the taxation paid by the wealthy portion of the community was, in point of fact, paid by their dependents, or the persons whom they employed. If a man paid a large amount of revenue—say on beer consumed by his dependents—it was, in point of fact, paid by those who consumed the beer, because they suffered in their wages by having it given to them instead of money. In the same way there could be no doubt that the income tax which was collected in one particular place, was not wholly or principally due to that place; and the only safe mode of estimating the tax-paying community was to combine wealth and numbers together. He hoped it would not be considered that numbers or wealth were to be the great basis of representation, or any other one particular qualification. He doubted very much whether any probable alteration in the franchise would so far improve on the present system as to make it a more just representation of the whole interests of the community. What was wanted was that every class, and every section, should have the opportunity of making its voice heard in the great council of the nation.

The PRESIDENT, in proposing a vote of thanks to Mr. Ellis, said some criticisms had been passed upon the paper because of alleged

defects in it, and also on the ground that it was not a paper suitable for the Statistical Society; but as far as he could gather, the balance of opinion was entirely in favour of the view that it contained valuable materials, and that although it trenched upon the domain of politics, it was suitable for the Society to discuss. There really could be no question as to the suitability of discussing what might be called electoral statistics, and in doing so they must take into account the ideas which influenced politicians in fixing the basis of representation. It would be very singular indeed if such a statistical subject of great popular interest was not to be discussed in the Statistical Society. He could hardly imagine the use of the Society unless such topics were brought before them and discussed. It was quite unnecessary that there should be any partisan spirit in the matter. The great fault of many political discussions was that there was unbounded exaggeration on both sides; but it might be hoped that within the walls of that Society only the purely scientific aspect would be dealt with. The chief use of the paper seemed to him to be that it brought to notice the changes in those elements which were usually held by politicians to determine representation. There could be no doubt that to a large extent population was one of the elements which guided politicians. He would express no opinion as to the right or wrong of that, but at least one great nation—the United States—had deliberately adopted the principle of numbers in determining the representation for one House of the Legislature. They had also an automatic system by which every ten years the representation was changed according to the change in numbers which had taken place. Such a state of things fully justified the discussion of the numbers of population, when dealing with electoral questions. In former discussions also some consideration had been given to the principle of wealth in determining the representation. If some districts had grown in importance in point of wealth, and presumably also in point of taxation, then it had been considered that they had a sort of title to increased representation. At any rate, it was desirable that the Society should see from time to time what changes were taking place in those factors, and in this respect the paper was a very valuable one. It showed that between 1871 and 1881 very great changes had taken place in those factors, and whatever opinion might be held with regard to them, it was very interesting to have them brought before them. He hardly agreed with the criticisms which had been passed upon the grouping which Mr. Ellis had adopted. Any grouping of that kind was necessarily a matter of discussion, and he would appeal to the experience of Major Craigie himself with reference to other matters where a geographical division seemed more easy, but where it was found in practice difficult to make a satisfactory division. Although Mr. Ellis had called one of his divisions agricultural and another manufacturing, he apprehended that that was only for brevity's sake, for the division was essentially a geographical one, Scotland being one of the divisions, Ireland another, and England being divided into three. No such grouping could be very exact in itself, but if it could be put in such a way as to bring the facts broadly

before them, he thought the division for many rough practical purposes would be found very useful. Some of the speakers had suggested that a great deal more might have been put into the paper, and it was quite evident that Mr. Ellis might have shown them exactly how far, following the principle of population, changes might be made in the existing representation, and how far, following the principle of wealth and taxation, changes might be made; but to say that a paper did not do more than it did, when it had done very good work up to a certain point, was not to pass a very effective criticism upon it. They ought to be thankful for what they did get, because the time which could be devoted to the preparation of such papers was in most cases very limited indeed, and if they received a valuable contribution of any kind, they ought to accept it, and not be too critical about it. No doubt the point that Mr. Bourne raised with regard to education was very important, but the absence of that point in the paper could scarcely be regarded as a defect when it included so much of great value.

The vote of thanks having been agreed to,

Mr. ELLIS, in reply, said that one of his reasons for not further pushing his individual construction of the facts set before the Society, was, that he might thereby lay himself open to the charge of political bias.