

THE 1901 CENSUS: AN INTRODUCTION

Matthew Woollard

Matthew Woollard is Senior Research Officer, Department of History, University of Essex. He is editor of the journal *History and Computing* and currently researching the development of official and unofficial occupational classification schemes, c.1660–1951.

The public release of a new series of census enumerators' books (CEBs) is a significant event in local population studies, making available information relating to every member of the population of Great Britain.¹ On 2 January 2002 the CEBs for the 1901 census will be made publicly available; and, as editorials in this journal have described, for the first time these data will be made available over the internet.² The manner of dissemination has not received universal approbation, especially by local and family historians who will feel that the cost of retrieving whole communities may prove prohibitive. The purpose of this article is not to discuss the controversial issues of dissemination but to consider the processes involved in the creation of the CEBs which impinge on their use by local and community historians, and also to examine some of the voluminous published material which was a product of the census process.

The first census of the twentieth century was not a radical departure from its immediate predecessor in terms of information collected; however, the consultation process involved in the planning of the census was wider and more visible than any previous enumeration had seen. The most important innovation in the 1901 census was in the manner of the publication of the results: for the first time separate county reports were published including a greater range of statistics over a wider range of geographical areas. This article considers the background to the census, along with the numerous proposals made to the Local Government Board (LGB), which superintended the census process in England and Wales but devolved the task to the General Register Office (GRO); the alterations in the questions on the householders' schedule and thus in the information collected; and discusses the implications of the newer methods of publication of the results.

Proposals

While the 1891 census was preceded by a Treasury Committee which made numerous recommendations, which were not wholly carried out, the 1901 census was marked by increased formality in the design process.³ Recommendations were proposed to the LGB by the Institute of Actuaries and the Royal Statistical Society (RSS), and the General Register Office set up

interdepartmental meetings with the Labour Department of the Board of Trade and the Factory Department of the Home Office, which specifically considered occupational classification.⁴ Other deputations were received from the Census Committee of British Registrars, the London County Council, the Conference of Poor Law Guardians, the Lunacy Commission, the Education Department and the Board of Trade.

The Royal Statistical Society (RSS), as had been usual, set up a committee to lobby the LGB.⁵ Its first salvo was to draw the attention of the President of the LGB, Henry Chaplin, to the contents of their report for the 1891 census, and to attempt, using the London census of 1896 as the prime example, to have quinquennial censuses.⁶ The RSS's committee was also anxious that the census machinery be put into place as soon as possible. Their second salvo was more concerned with the wording of the Census Act than with the information to be collected; including the use of the word 'tenement' rather than 'storey' (and vice versa!), that the householders' schedules should not necessarily be copied into enumerators' books (a process which had been carried out since 1841, but was not done in Ireland), that 'occupied' houses which were uninhabited on census night should be enumerated separately, that the schedules for England and Wales, Scotland, and Ireland, should be as uniform as possible, and that those born abroad should be grouped as either 'British subject', 'Naturalised British subject', or 'Foreign subject'. These proposals, as will be seen, were generally acted upon. The exception was the quinquennial census, which was eventually ruled out at the committee stage of the bill.

The Institute of Actuaries also petitioned the LGB. They had five main requests.⁷ To ensure better figures for actuarial statistics they highlighted the necessity to have the correct age enumerated, and also requested that the age statistics for each year of life should be published. Their third suggestion was to ensure that census returns along with death records, not only of the UK but also for India and the colonies, were presented in a uniform fashion. Fourth, they recommended that the 'card system' be used for tabulation of the results, as in the Australian colonies. (This is not a reference to the Hollerith tabulating machine, but to hand-written cards which would probably have been used instead of the enumerators' books.)⁸ Their final recommendation was for the formation of a permanent census office. The Institute were less successful than their RSS colleagues, as only the first of the suggestions listed here was actually carried out, and then annual age returns were only published for selected areas.⁹

The other recommendations can be swiftly outlined. The London County Council petitioned for more detailed tabulations for London boroughs and for analyses by enumeration districts.¹⁰ The Conference of Poor Law Guardians asked for returns on paupers and epileptics.¹¹ The Education Department requested further information on deaf people.¹² The Board of Trade, as will be shown later, wanted alterations in the occupational classification scheme, but also hoped for tabulations of heads of families according to the number of domestic servants.¹³ Finally, the Census Committee of British Registrars lobbied for, among other things, higher fees for all those involved with the census.¹⁴

Lest it be forgotten, the taking of a decennial census was not a foregone conclusion. Although it was traditionally held every ten years, it was not a permanent feature, and did not become one until the 1920 Census Act. The Bill for taking the 1901 census of Great Britain was introduced into Parliament on 19 February 1900. There was little debate in Parliament over the Census Bill—where there was concerned the provision of a quinquennial census and whether to include questions on religion. There were three peripheral areas of debate. First, over the exact date of the census: Herbert Robert, MP for Denbighshire, asked for the census to be taken on a day other than a Sunday, so that those who kept the Sabbath would not be forced to ‘work’ on a Sunday. This amendment was withdrawn. An amendment to have separate Acts for Scotland and England was defeated. A further amendment, made by David Lloyd-George, proposing that the language question (which was planned to be asked of Welsh speakers in Wales) should be extended to England in order to ascertain the numbers of Welsh speakers in England was also defeated.¹⁵ The Act was passed soon after on 27 March and, for the first time, parliamentary provision had been made for the census more than seven months before it was to occur.¹⁶ The Act laid down that the census should be taken on midnight of 31 March 1901. This Act also marked a return to the practice of having a single Act for the whole of Great Britain, the previous occasion being in 1851.¹⁷ Incidentally, this Act was the first Census Act to invoke the Official Secrets Act of 1889—anyone communicating any information from the census without the correct authority would be in breach of the Act.

Quinquennial censuses

The Treasury Committee’s report (1890) recommended limited quinquennial censuses, but this recommendation was never followed.¹⁸ There was a population-only census of London in 1896 connected with the collection of rates rather than for demographic, medical or economic reasons.¹⁹ Following this there were further calls for quinquennial censuses to be held with national coverage. Despite the good reasons put forward by many statisticians, it would seem that the Treasury was against the idea mainly because of the cost and the implicit need to establish a permanent census office. However, the government did say, in 1900, that they had considered the question and that if a census were to be held in 1906 provision would be made for it a year earlier.²⁰ No provision was made. In late 1904 the LGB requested estimates of the cost of both a full and partial census for 1906, but when the figures were presented to the Treasury the plan was vetoed. A draft Bill for an enumeration of London was prepared for 1906, along the same lines as the one taken in 1896, but it never entered parliament.²¹ Thus, by the middle of the decade, the GRO were willing to accept the need for quinquennial enumerations, but the Treasury were unwilling to sanction the cost.

A further case for quinquennial censuses surrounds the ‘Eastbourne fiasco’. The Registrar-General’s mid-year population estimate for 1899 for this town

was 51,227. Under the Trustee Act of 1893 towns with a population of over 50,000 were able to issue corporation stock. Accordingly Eastbourne Town Council issued such a prospectus, claiming that the Registrar-General's population estimate for 1900 would be over 54,000, which it would have been had the 1900 estimates been calculated as the other intercensal years. The later published estimate was only 47,629 and the census gave the population as 43,337. In October 1907 the Town Council took an informal census which gave the population as 50,696, but the LGB were reluctant to grant county borough status on the basis of this enumeration. The GRO were called in to take a census, which they did on 24 January 1909—revealing a population of 49,286.²²

Carrying out the census

The census of 1901 for England and Wales was organised very much the same as its immediate predecessors.²³ Local registrars decided on the boundaries of enumeration districts, which were later confirmed by the Census Office. Registrars also appointed the enumerators who were to work under them. As in 1891, men and women between the ages of 18 and 65 were invited to apply. Enumerators, as before, circulated schedules to the householders in their enumeration district, and filled in details of the houses along their route in a memorandum book.²⁴ They were also required to recover the schedules from the householders after census night and subsequently copy out the details into their enumeration book, as well as cast up the totals of houses and persons in the spaces provided at the front of the enumeration book. Special double schedules had been provided for schools and hotels and other such establishments, and institution schedules were provided for institutions with more than 200 residents (which were to be, as before, enumerated by the head of the institution rather than an ordinary enumerator.) Welsh schedules were provided for Welsh speakers in Monmouthshire and Wales, and a special circular was drawn up in Yiddish and German for the recently-arrived Jewish population in London and Manchester, explaining how to fill in the form. Once enumerators had completed their tasks, they were to forward the books (including their memorandum book) to the local registrar, who after checking would forward it to the superintendent-registrar, who after scrutinising these returns would return them all to the Census Office. By all accounts the enumeration proceeded smoothly though, as always, there were letters to the press from householders who had not received schedules, or from those who had received them but the enumerator had not returned to collect them.²⁵

The questions asked were little different to those posed to the householders in 1891, though there are some interesting and potentially significant alterations. Figure 1 shows the information that was asked for and students of the census will recognise most of the column headings. As for alterations, first, the columns which in 1891 related to employment status (headed 'employer', 'employee' and 'neither employer nor employed but working on own account') were altered from tick-boxes (actually cross-boxes) to a separate column where the words 'employer', 'worker' and 'own account' were to be written out in full by the occupier. The purpose of this alteration was, no

doubt, to get better quality information than in 1891. In the *General report* for 1891 the authors are almost scathing in their description of the information collected in these three columns:

In numerous cases...no cross at all was made; in many others, crosses were made in two or even three columns, and, even when only one cross was made, there were often very strong reasons for believing that it had been made in the wrong column.

The authors argued that sometimes the error was intentional, but for others they had a more withering conclusion:

It appears to us scarcely reasonable to expect such a man [—an ordinary working man or labourer] laboriously to spell out the instructions, and, follow them duly, to select out of three columns the proper one in which to make his cross.

At this point the commentary abruptly concludes that these data were 'excessively untrustworthy' and would not be commented on further.²⁶ Close examination of the CEBs for 1891 might vindicate the Registrar-General and his Statistical Superintendent, but it seems that this was more a case of being reluctant to deal adequately with a question which had been poorly framed and had been unwillingly foisted upon the GRO by the LGB.

The second innovation was the addition of a question on homeworking. Those who worked from their own home were asked to state whether they were working at home. This question was asked at the request of the Home Office, but the Labour Department was also certainly in favour:

while the proposed distinction would doubtless be of greater value to the Home Office than to the Board of Trade, it would be of considerable service in the compilation of Board of Trade statistics especially as regards women's employment which forms an important branch of the work of the labour department. I understand that the letter from the Home Office refers in more detail to the exact important public service which will be served by the distinction in facilitating their administrative work under the Factory Acts, and throwing light on questions which are likely to be the subject of legislative proposals.²⁷

The third change was made in the 'infirmary' column, the heading of which was altered from three categories—(i) deaf and dumb (ii) blind and (iii) lunatic, imbecile or idiot—to four categories; the third being sub-divided to (iii) lunatic and (iv) imbecile or feeble-minded.²⁸

The occupiers' schedules were also redesigned so that better quality information was likely to be recorded. The instructions provided on the reverse of the schedule were rewritten to assist those completing the forms, and a memorandum was circulated to the local census officers, detailing the occupational titles that were deemed to contain insufficient information for

precise classification. For example, sawyers were to provide information regarding the material or trade in which they worked, and terms like agent or inspector were deemed too vague to be returned alone.²⁹ The *General report* suggests that these innovations were reasonably successful: in terms of occupational information the report states that 'there is no doubt that occupations have been more definitely and correctly returned at the census of 1901 than at previous censuses.'³⁰

Publication of the reports

The most striking innovation in the 1901 census was in the publication of the reports. The form of the Scottish report was not significantly altered, but the tabular material for England and Wales was transformed substantially. The first results of the enumeration were published rapidly. The GRO released the first preliminary population figures in May. The total given was 32,525,716, which compares well with the final return of 32,527,843 (and with the Registrar-General's estimate for mid-1901 of 32,356,731). County information was compiled in separate county parts, which were published as soon as they were prepared (London first in January 1902 and finally Radnor in February 1903) and characterised by splendid heliozincographed maps of each county showing the major administrative boundaries down to registration sub-district level. A separate volume of summary tables for the whole of England and Wales was issued later along with a topographical index of all the places mentioned in the county reports as well as a multitude of other smaller places. For the local historian working with the 1901 returns this index will be of great value. The set was completed by a *General report* that contains a valuable 'official' history of the census. These publications are listed in the Appendix to this article, the county volumes in order of publication (see pp. 38–40, below). A further publication which should be mentioned is William Sanders's digest of the results, which provides a handy reference to the returns.³¹

The period after the 1891 census saw considerable changes in local government boundaries. The 1888 Local Government Act had simplified administrative areas by creating Administrative Counties.³² The later Local Government Act of 1894 simplified matters further by ensuring that each civil parish (with a single exception) was only located in a single Administrative County.³³ As a result of these acts and other lesser legislation, the main administrative units of the country were more tightly defined. However, the major geographic units which the GRO worked with remained Registration Districts which, as a result of this legislation, became even less closely related to the local government units. Over 30 per cent of the Registration Districts were located within two or more administrative districts (either Administrative Counties and/or County Boroughs) which makes some comparative analyses difficult.³⁴

The publication of the reports in the sequence shown in the Appendix obviously necessitated a transformation in the management of the tabulation process, which was mainly put into practice by the newly appointed Registrar-General Reginald McLeod. The census was planned while Brydges Hennicker was Registrar-General. At around his 65th birthday in 1900 he retired (through ill health) and was replaced by McLeod, who remained in post until 1902 when William Dunbar took office. Three Registrar-Generals in the space of three of the most important years for the census would seem not to have been detrimental to the smooth running of this massive operation. Most likely, Noel Humphreys (the Assistant Registrar-General) and Dr John Tatham (the Superintendent of Statistics) ensured consistency. The administration of the process was obviously improved, as considerably more time for planning had been made available. The Census Office opened in Somerset House in May 1900 and by February 1901, when it moved to temporary accommodation at Millbank behind the Tate Gallery, it had a staff of 33. Peak employment at the office was in September 1901 when a total of 185 clerks (including, for the first time, female clerks) were at work. The whole process finished in July 1904 when the *General report* was published, a little over three years from the actual enumeration.³⁵

Occupational classification

While the census was being prepared the Board of Trade and the Home Office asked for further changes in the classification of occupations to bring the census figures 'into closer harmony with those issued by the Department represented.'³⁶ The number of occupational headings used in the 1901 census was 382, compared with 414 in 1881 and 347 in 1891. 'This number would have been even higher if many numerically small occupational descriptions had not been deleted to provide for the further sub-division of certain important groups, and the separate tabulation of others'.³⁷

The new classification differed most noticeably in detail rather than in essence. The basic occupational orders were re-ordered, but their constituent parts were roughly comparable with the previous classification. In the detail however, significant changes were made in the agricultural order after consultation with the Board of Agriculture.³⁸ The most obvious alteration was to take the two groups 'Agricultural labourer, farm servant' and 'Horsekeeper, Horseman, Teamster' from 1891 and disaggregate them into 'Agricultural labourers, farm servants—distinguished as in charge of cattle', the same 'distinguished as in charge of horses' and the same 'not otherwise distinguished'. But these alterations are not as important as the changes in definition of the group 'Farmer, Grazier', which had the same heading in 1891 as in 1901 but in 1901 included fruit, hop and potato farmers, and poultry breeders and rearers, which had been in different categories in the past.

The headings in the mining sub-order were altered considerably to distinguish coal miners into 'hewers', 'others below ground' and 'workers above ground'. The headings relating to the manufacture of iron and steel were enlarged and

split into 'blast furnaces', 'puddling/rolling mills', 'steel smelting and founding', and 'iron founding' and 'manufacture of iron articles', and other divisions were created between other metal manufacturers and the manufacturers of metal goods. In the building trades, for the first time, labourers were separated from their respective masters. Sub-divisions were also made in the cotton, wool and silk industries to separate out spinning from weaving and other processes. A better distinction was made within occupational groups regarding makers and dealers (which had indeed been first introduced in Scotland in 1891) and in some cases a distinction to separate out artisans from labourers, 'although the records of previous experience did not lead us to anticipate that these efforts would yield useful results'.³⁹ The occupational classification was said to be so altered as to make comparison with the 1891 census figures very difficult, but Table 33 in the *General report* gives a detailed breakdown of the changes in each category in these two censuses, and Table 34 gives aggregated classifications for all three census years 1881–1901.⁴⁰ It must also be remembered that when the quality of information collected in the schedules increases, effective comparisons with earlier years can decrease. This is particularly pertinent for 'indefinite' occupations like labourer or artisan, numbers of which decline between 1891 and 1901 because of better occupational reporting. According to the *General report*, a complete revision of the occupational dictionary was produced for the 1901 census, rather than reformatted with some additions as was done in 1891.⁴¹

At the request of the Home Office and the Board of Trade, information was also collected for the first time on the numbers of people working at their own homes and, while the information collected would seem to have been for all people, it was only published for certain occupational groups and not consistently over the whole country. Sometimes the county tables have this information for almost all occupations, sometimes only for selected occupations, and sometimes not at all. Statistics were given again distinguishing between employers, workers and those working on their own account. Unusually the *General report* does not comment on the possible improvement in quality of these statistics due to the alteration in the form of the question.⁴² It is the information contained in the three columns asking questions about employment status that presents the most interesting challenge to the local historian. The occupational status column, first used in 1891, has hardly been exploited in historical analysis, possibly because it was as flawed as the General Register Office suggested, but with the release of the 1901 census data, comparisons could be made, to ascertain at a local level the possible significance and extent of these errors.⁴³ This could be carried out using other sources like local directories, but these will tend to be biased towards the occupationally stable.

There were other modifications in the publication of the occupational material. Administrative counties were used for the first time, rather than registration counties, which allow for better comparisons with other routinely produced statistical data, such as poor law statistics and employment data. Details were

also given for county boroughs and urban districts with populations greater than 5,000 (rather than 50,000 as previously). Tables showing occupations of women were broken down by marital status for the first time: two groups, the 'unmarried' and the 'married or widowed', were distinguished. As with the 1891 census, only the occupations of those aged 10 and over were required, but the age grouping in the published reports was increased, splitting the earlier 10–14 group into 10–13 and 14, and the group 65–74 was reinstated after having been used only in 1871. There were also supplementary tables showing the occupations of children aged 10–13, and of pensioners and the retired showing their previous occupations.⁴⁴

Other material

Regarding housing no dramatic changes were made from 1891, though dwelling houses which were usually inhabited but uninhabited on census night were enumerated separately from those which were either inhabited or uninhabited. The 1851 definition of a house was still used in 1901 (the alteration was to be made in 1911.)⁴⁵ No definition of a dwelling was provided to the householder, and there was no definition given of separate rooms, which the householder with less than five was supposed to return.⁴⁶

Population was published by the same quinquennial age groups as previously, with single numbers for those aged under five. The 1901 tabulations were augmented with separate age totals for those aged 13–21. The *General report* contains a long section concerning the accuracy of age reporting, resulting mainly from an experiment where the separate ages of approximately half a million people were tabulated.⁴⁷

As noted above the question on nationality was altered. Foreigners filling in the birthplace column in the occupiers' schedule were asked for country of nationality as well as country of birth. Previously those born abroad were only asked to add whether they were British subjects and, if appropriate, whether they had been naturalised.⁴⁸ As the *General report* makes clear this information was not answered uniformly and, as in 1891, those born abroad who had 'distinctly British surnames' were classified as British subjects (with the exception of United States natives).⁴⁹ Finally, as in the most recent censuses, there was a question on language spoken for those in Scotland and Wales (and Monmouthshire), but for the first time a similar question was asked in the Isle of Man.

Before concluding, it is worth mentioning that the British census of 1901 was, like its predecessors, a *de facto* census, meaning that people were enumerated where they were on census night, not where they should have been. It is estimated that over 200,000 men were on military service, mostly in southern Africa, at the time of the census who were not enumerated at their usual place of residence, an issue which might limit some analyses of this census.⁵⁰

The 1901 census and local population studies

For the student of local population studies the 1901 census and its CEBs provide further possibilities for analysis. The release of the CEBs in January 2002 will be unusual as for the first time access will be made (predominantly) via the internet. This fact notwithstanding, the usual analysis which has taken place with earlier CEBs will obviously be possible, though it may prove more difficult for some to get access to the CEBs. The aspirations of family and community historians should not be subordinated to those of genealogists, and it is to be hoped that satisfactory arrangements will be made for the dissemination of CEBs to this particular user-community.

It is not necessary here to recapitulate the centrality of CEBs for local population studies in the Victorian era as countless articles (many of which can be found in previous issues of *Local Population Studies*) attest to their usefulness and also to their limitations. The 1901 census is of especial importance as it is the last census which used the now-familiar CEBs. In 1911 machine-tabulation of the results was carried out for the first time and the enumerators' books were by-passed in this process, as information from the household schedules was punched directly onto cards. This does not mean that the schedules for 1911 will not be made available for general use, but doubts have been raised. The seven censuses for which CEBs exist are in many respects comparable, and the information collected was augmented year on year by changes in the questions and by the addition of new questions. The 1901 census was no exception, and a number of alterations were made which provide interesting points of analysis for local and community historians. For example, the explicit inclusion in CEBs of houses that were temporarily unoccupied will make studies attempting to 'repopulate' communities much easier and more accurate.⁵¹ The altered question on place of birth is likely to have minimal effect on the analysis of migration,⁵² just as the alteration to the question on infirmities is unlikely to change the main thrust of any analysis of disabilities, a subject which has not received its due attention. Information collected on age, marital status, relationship to head of household and on the extent of households were unaltered, allowing comparative analysis to be carried out in all these areas. The question on the number of rooms, another variable which has not received its share of interest, can also be taken into account in studies of the household, and used in comparative work with the 1891 census, though latitude must be made in both years when interpreting what householders considered to be a room. The form of question on occupation was the same, and while the newly created classification will affect the published returns, the availability of the CEBs will allow this classification to be stripped away and occupations will be able to be reclassified to create comparative statistics. The alteration to the question on employment status and the introduction of a question on homeworking are likely to have the most profound repercussions on CEB-based studies. These new (and revised) questions on employment will provide further evidence on the industrial questions of the time, most notably using the higher quality occupational information, but also with the question relating specifically to homeworking.

It will be difficult to assess the accuracy of the employment status question, because the form of the question differed from that in 1891, but community studies may provide sufficient evidence by linking individuals from these two censuses and using other local sources. Also in this area, figures relating to female employment should be re-examined. The published returns suggest a decrease of over 2 per cent in women working in domestic service between 1891 and 1901, which is usually taken as a result of structural alterations in the labour market. However, because the definitions of this occupational order changed between 1881 and 1891 and again by 1901, we should be chary of accepting these figures.⁵³ The new question on homeworking will allow further conclusions to be made on the internal family economy and the role of women within the labour market.⁵⁴ A number of vital questions in this area demand answers: what was the household situation of these homeworkers? Are these women deserted wives and/or those with large numbers of children? Furthermore, it should be asked whether homeworking was indeed solely 'woman's work'.⁵⁵ The 1901 CEBs will therefore allow further analysis of all of the 'traditional' questions for which they have already been put to use and widen the chronological scope of this analysis, but they will also be able to be used to answer more detailed questions about the relationship of employment to the family because of the revised or new questions on employment status. Finally, with the release of a second census with questions on employment status and 'overcrowding', it is to be hoped that work will be carried out in these areas as there would seem to have been some hesitation in their use to date.

Appendix: the published returns for the Census of Britain, 1901

Note: the British Parliamentary Paper references are in two parts, the first refers to the Command number of the report. The second, in square brackets here, refers to the volume number of combined reports and the first page of that particular report. References in the endnotes refer to the page numbers of the individual reports rather than that of the combined volume.

Census of England and Wales, 1901, *Preliminary report and tables of the population and houses*, BPP 1901 Cd. 616. [Vol. XC, 1-.]

Census of England and Wales, 1901, *Area, houses, and population, also population classified by ages, condition as to marriage, occupations, birthplaces, and infirmities. County of...* Published in 53 parts, as below:

London, BPP 1902 Cd. 875 [Vol. CXX, 1-]

Lancaster, BPP 1902 Cd. 1002 [Vol. CXIX, 389-.]

York, BPP 1902 Cd. 1107 [Vol. CXXI, 639-.]

Stafford, BPP 1902 Cd. 1125 [Vol. CXXI, 1-.]

Durham, BPP 1902 Cd. 1147 [Vol. CXVIII, 673-.]

Essex, BPP 1902 Cd. 1148 [Vol. CXVIII, 769-.]

Kent, BPP 1902 Cd. 1171 [Vol. CXIX, 279-.]

Warwick, BPP 1902 Cd. 1175 [Vol. CXXI, 389-.]

Middlesex, BPP 1902 Cd. 1211 [Vol. CXX, 195-]
Glanmorgan, BPP 1902 Cd. 1212 [Vol. CXVIII, 869-.]
Chester, BPP 1902 Cd. 1213 [Vol. CXVIII, 143-.]
Hants (Southampton), BPP 1902 Cd. 1270 [Vol. CXIX, 95-.]
Devon, BPP 1902 Cd. 1271 [Vol. CXVIII, 487-.]
Surrey, BPP 1902 Cd. 1272 [Vol. CXXI, 207-.]
Gloucester, BPP 1902 Cd. 1289 [Vol. CXIX, 1-.]
Sussex, BPP 1902 Cd. 1290 [Vol. CXXI, 287-.]
Nottingham, BPP 1902 Cd. 1292 [Vol. CXX, 347-.]
Worcester, BPP 1902 Cd. 1293 [Vol. CXXI, 553-.]
Northumberland, BPP 1902 Cd. 1294 [Vol. CXX, 613-.]
Derby, BPP 1902 Cd. 1303 [Vol. CXVIII, 399-.]
Lincoln, BPP 1902 Cd. 1304 [Vol. CXIX, 689-.]
Norfolk, BPP 1902 Cd. 1305 [Vol. CXX, 425-.]
Dorset, BPP 1902 Cd. 1320 [Vol. CXVIII, 601-.]
Oxford, BPP 1902 Cd. 1322 [Vol. CXX 705-.]
Cambridge, BPP 1902 Cd. 1362 [Vol. CXVIII, 73-.]
Suffolk, BPP 1902 Cd. 1345 [Vol. CXXI, 113-.]
Leicester, BPP 1902 Cd. 1346 [Vol. CXIX, 609-.]
Somerset, BPP 1902 Cd. 1347 [Vol. CXX, 775-.]
Northampton, BPP 1902 Cd. 1359 [Vol. CXX, 527-.]
Cornwall, BPP 1902 Cd. 1360 [Vol. CXVIII, 251-.]
Monmouth, BPP 1902 Cd. 1361 [Vol. CXX, 273-.]
Berkshire, BPP 1902 Cd. 1362 [Vol. CXVIII, 1-.]
Cumberland, BPP 1902 Cd. 1376 [Vol. CXVIII, 331-.]
Hertford, BPP 1902 Cd. 1377 [Vol. CXIX, 209-.]
Wiltshire, BPP 1902 Cd. 1378 [Vol. CXXI, 475-.]
Bedfordshire, BPP 1903 Cd. 1406 [Vol. LXXXIV, 415-.]
Buckingham, BPP 1903 Cd. 1407 [Vol. LXXXV, 1-.]
Carnarvon, BPP 1903 Cd. 1410 [Vol. LXXXV, 217-.]
Carmarthen, BPP 1903 Cd. 1411 [Vol. LXXXV, 165-.]
Denbigh, BPP 1903 Cd. 1412 [Vol. LXXXV, 271-.]
Cardigan, BPP 1903 Cd. 1425 [Vol. LXXXV, 115-.]
Hereford, BPP 1903 Cd. 1426 [Vol. LXXXV, 373-.]
Salop, BPP 1903 Cd. 1430 [Vol. LXXXVI, 81-.]
Westmoreland, BPP 1903 Cd. 1431 [Vol. LXXXVI, 157-.]
Pembroke, BPP 1903 Cd. 1432 [Vol. LXXXV, 575-.]
Montgomery, BPP 1903 Cd. 1435 [Vol. LXXXV, 527-.]
Merioneth, BPP 1903 Cd. 1436 [Vol. LXXXV, 479-.]
Brecknock, BPP 1903 Cd. 1437 [Vol. LXXXV, 65-.]
Huntingdon, BPP 1903 Cd. 1438 [Vol. LXXXV, 433-.]
Flint, BPP 1903 Cd. 1439 [Vol. LXXXV, 329-.]
Anglesey, BPP 1903 Cd. 1447 [Vol. LXXXIV, 371-.]
Rutland, BPP 1903 Cd. 1448 [Vol. LXXXVI, 45-.]
Radnor, BPP 1903 Cd. 1499 [Vol. LXXXVI, 1-.]

Census of England and Wales, 1901, *Islands in the British seas. Isle of Man, Jersey, Guernsey and adjacent islands*, BPP 1903 Cd. 1473 [Vol. LXXXIV, 313–.]

Census of England and Wales, 1901, *Summary tables, area, houses, and population, also population classified by ages, condition as to marriage, occupations, birthplaces, and infirmities*, BPP 1903 Cd. 1523 [Vol. LXXXIV, 1–.]

Census of England and Wales, 1901, *Index to population tables for England and Wales in the county volumes of the census report, 1901*, BPP 1904 Cd. 1826 [Vol. CVIII, 335–.]

Census of England and Wales, 1901, *General report with appendices*, BPP 1904 Cd. 2174 [Vol. CVIII, 1–.]

Census of Scotland, 1901, *Preliminary report*, BPP 1901 Cd. 644 [Vol. XC, 203–.]

Census of Scotland, 1901, *Parliamentary burghs, districts of burghs, etc. Counties, population, etc, 1901 and 1891*, BPP 1902 Cd. 898 [Vol. CXXIX, 1133–.]

Census of Scotland, 1901, *11th decennial census of population of Scotland with report, Vol. I*, BPP 1902 Cd. 1257 [Vol. CXXIX, 687–.]

Census of Scotland, 1901, *11th decennial census of population of Scotland with report, Vol. II*, BPP 1903 Cd. 1481 [Vol. LXXXVI, 205–.]

Census of Scotland, 1901, *11th decennial census of population of Scotland with report, Vol. III*, BPP 1904 Cd. 1798 [Vol. CVIII, 625–.]

NOTES

I am most grateful to Dr Eilidh Garrett, Dr Eddy Higgs and Professor Kevin Schürer for their very useful comments on a draft of this paper and to Dr Elizabeth Hallam-Smith of the PRO for supplying me with Figure 2 in advance of its release.

1. The literature is large. The more important are: E.A. Wrigley, ed., *Nineteenth-century society. Essays in the use of quantitative methods for the study of social data* (Cambridge, 1972); E. Higgs, *A clearer sense of the census. The Victorian census and historical research* (London, 1996); D.R. Mills and K. Schürer, eds, *Local communities in the Victorian census enumerators' books* (Oxford, 1996) and R. Lawton, ed., *The census and social structure. An interpretative guide to nineteenth century censuses for England and Wales* (London, 1978).
2. Some of the CEBs for 1901 have previously been made available in an anonymised form to researchers. Dyos's pioneering study of Camberwell was the first: see H.J. Dyos and A.B.M. Baker, 'The possibilities of computerising census data', in H.J. Dyos, ed., *The study of urban history* (London, 1968), 87–112. Researchers from the Cambridge Group also had access to samples from selected communities: see, for example, E.M. Garrett, 'The dawning of a new era? Women's work in England and Wales at the turn of the twentieth century', *Histoire Sociale/Social History*, 28 (1995), 421–464 and E. Garrett, A. Reid, K. Schürer and S. Szreter, *Changing family size in England and Wales, 1891–1911. Place, class and demography in England and Wales* (Cambridge, 2001).
3. *Report of the committee appointed by the Treasury to inquire into certain questions connected with the*

- taking of the census, BPP 1890 LVIII. For a discussion see K. Schürer, 'The 1891 census and local population studies', *Local Population Studies*, 47 (1991), 16–29.
4. PRO RG 19/10. Letter from Arthur Whitelegge to Reginald McLeod dated 11 January 1901.
 5. The file PRO RG 19/4 contains the RSS's recommendations. Their memorials to the LGB are also to be found in the *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*. The initial approach was in March 1894 when a deputation met the President of the LGB. (*JRSS*, 57 (1894), 379–83.) Later approaches are reported in *JRSS*, 62 (1899), 385–9, 679–3; 63 (1900), 107–11. A further report on the proposed census of 1906 is in *JRSS*, 63 (1900), 335–6. See also J.A. Baines, 'On census taking and its limitations', *JRSS*, 63 (1900), 41–71.
 6. The census of London of 1896 was enacted under the London (Equalisation of Rates) Act, 1894 (57 & 58 Vict. c. 53). It only collected information on name, age and sex. Population totals for unions, parishes and wards resulting from the enumeration are published in *London Census, 1896, Copy of the return of the population enumerated in each of the civil parishes in the administrative county of London on the night of 29th March 1896...*, BPP 1896 LXXII. No other information would seem to have been published.
 7. The memorial is published in the *Journal of the Institute of Actuaries*, 25 (1901), 362–65. See also the files at PRO RG 19/3.
 8. By 1901 census authorities in USA, Canada, Austria and Russia had used Hollerith machines. See Herman Hollerith, 'The electrical tabulating machine', *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 57 (1894), 678–82. Higgs suggests that the short lead time for any census (and the ill-health of the Registrar-General Brydges Hennicker) was the prime reason for tabulating machines not being tested and used in the 1901 census. See E. Higgs, 'The determinants of technological innovation and dissemination: the case of machine computation and data processing in the General Register Office, London, 1837–1920', *Yearbook of European Administrative History*, 9 (1997), 161–77.
 9. A further attempt to influence census-taking was made by G. H. Ryan, 'The case for census reform', *Journal of the Institute of Actuaries*, 26 (1902), 329–65. (Also issued as a separate pamphlet without the discussion.)
 10. PRO RG 19/5.
 11. PRO RG 19/6.
 12. PRO RG 19/8. A request which was rejected.
 13. PRO RG 19/9. (This request caused a change in the classification of domestic servants—separating out more closely domestic servants working in a household and servants working in hotels, clubs and eating houses, etc.) Nationally, there were some 18 female domestic servants to every 100 households. See *Census of England and Wales, 1901, General report with appendices*, BPP 1904 Cd. 2174, 95–6. Hereafter cited as *General report*.
 14. PRO RG 19/2.
 15. 63 & 64 Vict. c. 4. *Census (Great Britain) Act, 1900*. The main parliamentary proceedings were reported in *The Times*, 10 March 1900, 9d and 16 March 1900, 11c. G. Parry and M.A. Williams, *The Welsh language and the 1891 census* (Cardiff, University of Wales Press, 1999) confine their discussion to the census of that year.
 16. This speedy administration wrong-footed some. Reginald Duffield, the Medical Officer for Health of Paddington, was to present a paper to the Institute of Actuaries in April 1900 with suggestions on the proposed census: the Act was passed a month before his paper. See Reginald Duffield, 'Census taking', *Journal of the Institute of Actuaries*, 25 (1901), 341–61.
 17. Separate acts were passed for the Scottish censuses between 1861 and 1891. The organisation of the census in Scotland in 1841 and 1851 was supervised from the General Register Office in London. After the passing of the Registration of Births, Deaths, and Marriages (Scotland) Act in 1854 and the creation of a Scottish General Register Office the census in Scotland was controlled by this body, and superintended by the Secretary of State for Scotland.
 18. *Report of the committee appointed by the Treasury to inquire into certain questions connected with the taking of the census*, BPP 1890 LVIII, vi–vii.
 19. See note 6 above.
 20. See the comments of Henry Chaplin reported in *The Times*, 16 March 1900, 11c.
 21. PRO RG 19/42.
 22. PRO RG 19/44B contains lengthy correspondence surrounding the Eastbourne census of 1909.

- RG 19/44A demonstrates the pains the GRO went to in securing acceptable enumerators at this very individual census.
23. Details of the enumeration process in 1901 and earlier censuses can be found in Higgs, *Clearer sense* and in D.R. Mills and K. Schürer, 'The enumeration process', in Mills and Schürer, eds, *Local communities*, 16–26.
 24. Higgs, *Clearer sense*, 204 notes that PRO RG 27/7 containing the instructions to the officers is 'wanting'. A copy of these instructions has subsequently been deposited at PRO RG 27/15.
 25. For example, the letters from 'Occupier', an outraged occupier in Peckham whose house with a 200 foot frontage had not received a schedule; 'Quis Custodiet?' a London mansion-block dweller, who had ascertained from his butler that the schedule had not been collected; and 'Colonel' who occupied chambers in Victoria Street who had not received a schedule. (Letters to *The Times*, 3 April 1901, 15c, 4 April 1901, 6e and 5 April 1901, 9d.)
 26. Census of England and Wales, 1891, *General report, with summary tables and appendices*, BPP 1893–4 CVI, 36. See also Schürer, '1891 census and local population studies', 24–6.
 27. PRO RG 19/10. Letter from H. Llewellyn Smith to A. J. Mundy (Secretary of the Census Office) 2 November 1900. A letter of the same date signed by Arthur Whitlegge and Malcolm Delevingne from the Home Office states: 'it is of very great importance for the purpose of the administration of the Factory Acts and future legislation that the Home Office should know the numbers of home workers.'
 28. This alteration was made after consultation with the Lunacy Commission. PRO RG 19/7. The correspondence between the Registrar-General and Sir John Hibbert and the Lunacy Commission suggest that the GRO was not in favour of this innovation.
 29. *General report*, Appendix B, 323–5.
 30. *General report*, 90. See also p. 74.
 31. William Sanders, comp., *A digest of the results of the census of England and Wales; arranged in tabular form, together with an explanatory introduction...produced under the general supervision of Thomas G. Ackland* (London, 1903).
 32. 51 & 52 Vict. c. 41. The population of the ancient county of Berkshire was 256,509 while that of the administrative county was 180,354. Even allowing for the County Borough of Reading with a population of 72,217 there is a shortfall.
 33. 56 & 57 Vict. c. 73. The exceptional parish was Stanground in the administrative counties of the Isle of Ely and Huntingdonshire.
 34. See *General report*, 11–15 for further details.
 35. *General report*, 189–91. However, the census work was not entirely over. In December 1905, the GRO completed a report on the census of the British Empire: *Census of British Empire, 1901, Report with summary*, BPP 1905 CII, 1–. A document of interest to those working on comparative census analysis, and also fulfilling some of the Institute of Actuaries requests.
 36. *General report*, 73. See also the considerable correspondence in PRO RG 19/10.
 37. *General report*, 73–4.
 38. *General report*, 103 and 247.
 39. *General report*, 74. The discussion in the *General report*, 97–8, describes the problems faced in this classification, and gives grounds for the Census Office not fully acceding to the wishes of the Home Office and Board of Trade.
 40. This can be usefully compared with the table in *Occupations of the people (England and Wales) enumerated in 1871, 1881 and 1891*, BPP 1890 LXXX.
 41. PRO RG 27/16. *Instructions to the clerks employed in classifying the occupations and ages of the people*. (A reproduction of one of the pages of the 1881 occupational dictionary can be found in Higgs, *Clearer sense*, 208.)
 42. Though it briefly comments that they thought the figures were untrustworthy in 1891 (*General report*, 10.)
 43. One of the few publications considering the use of employment data from the 1891 CEBs is P. Jennings, 'Occupations in the nineteenth century censuses: the drink retailers of Bradford, West Yorkshire, *Local Population Studies*, 64 (2000), 23–37.
 44. A useful, if somewhat haphazard guide to the occupational information, mainly relating to London was published in M.G. Spencer and H.J. Falk, *Employment pictures from the census* (London, 1906).

45. Defined as 'all the space within the external and party walls of a building'. See Higgs, *Clearer sense*, 53–6.
46. In Scotland, the Act read: 'the particulars to be furnished by the enumerators shall show, with respect to each dwelling-house, the number of rooms, including a kitchen (if any) as a room, having a window, not being a window with a borrowed light.' 63 & 64 Vict. c. 4., § 12 (4).
47. *General report*, 46–67.
48. The problem faced by some foreigners in understanding the distinction between these three categories in the absence of any explanation on the occupiers' schedule may invalidate some of the distinction between these categories. While the Jewish Board of Deputies may have clarified the position for this particular group there may be many instances of inadvertent error with this information. See the letter from Mr Charles Emanuel to *The Times*, 2 April, 1901, 4c. A point which had previously been made in correspondence between the London Committee of Deputies of the British Jews. See PRO RG 19/11.
49. *General report*, 139.
50. The Registrar-General estimated a net loss of 277,197 English and Welsh men in the army, navy, marines and merchant service. See *General report*, 43–4 and 17.
51. D.R. Mills and K. Schürer, 'Residential patterns', in Mills and Schürer, eds., *Local communities*, 348–62.
52. See K. Schürer, 'Work, migration and the family: the example of Bethnal Green, 1891–1921', in M. Woollard, ed., *New windows on London's past: information technology and the transformation of metropolitan history* (Glasgow, 2000), 75–132.
53. *General report*, 76–7. See also E. Higgs, 'Women, occupations and work in the nineteenth century censuses', *History Workshop Journal*, 23 (1987), 59–80.
54. See S. Pennington and B. Westover, *A hidden workforce. Homeworkers in England, 1850–1985* (London, 1985). This work does not even cite the published returns for homeworking.
55. The gendered title of V. de Vesselitsky's study *The homemaker and her outlook* (London, 1916) is presumably indicative of contemporary feeling.