

ON THE POPULATION OF LANCASHIRE AND CHESHIRE,
AND ITS LOCAL DISTRIBUTION DURING THE
FIFTY YEARS, 1801-51.

By J. T. Danson, V.P., and T. A. Welton, Esqs.

(READ 23RD APRIL, 1857.)

PART FIRST.

The communication of which this paper is a first instalment, originated in an effort to follow out one of the suggestions contained in a letter addressed to the Society by one of its members, in March, 1855, entitled, "Science in Lancashire and Cheshire," and the greater part of which was reprinted in the seventh volume of our Transactions.

It was determined to take the six enumerations of the people made by the Government in the years 1801-11-21-31-41-51, and extracting all that related to the two counties of Lancashire and Cheshire,—as the locality occupied by this Society,—to endeavour to elicit from the materials thus obtained, a connected account of the actual progress and distribution of the population over every part of our district during the fifty years thus brought to view.

The labor involved in this attempt was soon found to be very considerable. Its projector, however, fortunately found congenial and efficient aid. All the computations on which the paper is based have for some time been made, and are comprised in a mass of tabular matter, the whole of which is completed, and the greater part of which will be presented to the Society for publication. It only remains that the matter thus accumulated be divided into such portions (probably three) as may each be properly laid before the Society on a single evening, and accompanied by such commentary as may seem requisite to develop its more interesting and important features.

The usual and most simple purpose of a census, or numbering of the people, may be said to be two-fold :—

1. To ascertain the total number of persons living, at the date of the census, on a given area.
2. To ascertain how they are distributed over this area.

To effect the second of these purposes, a division of the area into parts, and a distinct enumeration of the persons inhabiting these parts, is necessary. And the value of the result will depend much upon the manner in which this division is made.

It is a familiar fact that the inhabitants of a country may be, and usually are, found spread over its surface in such a manner as to exhibit, in different localities, great varieties of density. And it is equally matter of common observation that the most important of these varieties, where it exists, is that which indicates the existence of towns. The rural and the urban life of our race have so long, and so invariably, exhibited incidents and effects of a widely different character, that in popular opinion they are rather contrasted than compared. But, though the difference has long been recognised, it has never yet been precisely defined. Nor is such a definition easily settled, or carried into effect. No division of the area of a country which should not mark *the precise boundaries of its towns* at the date of the census could be expected to exhibit, with any degree of accuracy, the separate numbers of its rural and urban population. And no such division has yet been attempted in this country.

Again, when we turn to the merely rural districts, we do not find the local divisions recognized in the census to be such as correspond with the different degrees of density of the population prevailing at the date of the first, or at that of any of the subsequent censuses now before us. Nor, indeed, do those divisions correspond, otherwise than vaguely, with any other of the remarkable phenomena which become visible on a careful examination of these voluminous records.

These defects of division, or rather these obstacles, alike to a ready comprehension and to a clear statement of the changes which have been taking place in the growth and local distribution of the people, are obviously traceable to the adoption, for the purposes of the census, of previously existing, and in most instances, very ancient local divisions.

These divisions had been made when the work of the census was not anticipated, and when, had it been anticipated, it could not have been provided for.

It is requisite, however, to bear in mind that even had new divisions been made at the date of the first census,—though these might have been such as materially to facilitate the use, for practical purposes, of that and all subsequent censuses,—yet as the subsequent growth of the population could not have been in any degree foreseen, the defect here referred to would still have been incidental, in some degree, to comparisons made between successive censuses, seeing that an altered distribution of the population is one of the most constant results of the mere lapse of time.

A single census can, of course, show only the numbers and the distribution of the people at the period at which it was taken. If a second be taken at a subsequent period, a comparison of the two will exhibit the changes made in the interval; and these changes will almost invariably be of two forms: of the total number, and of the local distribution. And every subsequent census, as it increases the number of records of these two particulars at successive periods, will suggest, and afford means of making, new comparisons, developing new changes in both respects.

The first general relation to be marked is that of the entire number of the people to the area on which they are living. The next is the same relation, in detail, of the population of particular localities to their area. Then particular localities divide themselves, as before observed, into town and country; and it becomes necessary to attach to the colloquial term "town" a definite or scientific meaning. This has not yet been done—a fact in itself sufficiently demonstrative of the small amount of attention and thought yet attracted to this subject. How it may best be done is not for us to say. It seems, indeed, that any correct and practically useful definition of a town must have reference simply to a given density of aggregation, occurring within an area of limited extent. In this view of the question the distinction of town from country must needs be, to some extent, an arbitrary one. The distinction, however, being established and applied, we are in a position to make a separate enumeration of the urban and the rural population, the latter, of course, including every variety of density below that fixed upon as constituting a town.

When a second census introduces the consideration of differences due

to the lapse of time, as distinguished from those incidental to various localities *at the same time*, we are confronted with further differences, as in the rate of change, whether by increase or decrease, in compared localities. One census presents us only with variety of contemporary density. Two will exhibit, also, differences marked by comparative increase or decrease in different localities absolutely, and also by variety of rate of increase, or of decrease with reference to the pre-existing population. A third census will develop still further differences, by comparison of the fact of increase or decrease, and its rate and amount, in the interval between the first and second, and between the second and third censuses; and the number and variety of these comparisons will similarly increase with each additional census.

It will be observed, that all the changes of detail here referred to, might take place among a population whose total number on the whole area should be stationary. On the other hand, a population, the whole mass of which should be continuously increasing, though it must needs show, at each successive census, a general increase of density, might yet show little or no change in the local distribution of the entire population, or little or no difference between the common rate of increase, and that incidental to particular localities.

In Lancashire and Cheshire, however, all the changes which can impart interest to an inquiry like the present, have undoubtedly been taking place. The population has been increasing, and that rapidly, during the whole of the period of fifty years here brought to view; and of this increase we have the records furnished by six censuses, taken at very nearly equidistant periods of ten years.

The two counties, fortunately for the separate treatment of them here attempted, now form one of the great primary divisions of England and Wales—the north-western district. Their total area is 1,874,230 acres. This area was peopled, at the date of the first census, in 1801, by 872,663 persons. In 1851 we find that the population upon the same area was 2,490,937; so that it was increased in fifty years by 185 per cent. Neither in 1801 nor in 1851 was the population distributed at all equally over the area occupied. Looking only at districts of considerable extent, there were many in 1801 which, on an average, had fewer than 100 persons to the square mile of 640 acres; and many more which had upwards of 500

to the square mile. And there were, in 1851, districts, but of smaller extent, which had in the preceding fifty years increased their population ten, twelve, and even thirteen-fold; while others, though these were few, not only had not increased at all, but had even a smaller population in 1851 than in 1801.*

We have said that at both the beginning and the end of the fifty years in view the people were distributed over the surface of the two counties with considerable irregularity. Popularly speaking, they lived partly in towns, and partly in the country. As already observed, the only distinction we can universally and consistently recognise, as marking the existence of a town, is the density of its population, as compared with that of the surrounding country. It is also obviously necessary to the purpose of the definition to confine it to aggregations of not less than a given number of persons, even though, in other instances, the required density be present.

The Registrar-General accepts, as a town, every aggregation of persons, so-called, and numbering not fewer than 2,000. But he disregards the element of density; and therefore gives no regard to the area on which this number shall be found congregated. The number—two thousand—as it appears to have been fixed upon after consultation with a large number of local authorities, and after careful consideration by those who were undoubtedly well acquainted with the results of several prior censuses, we take to be unobjectionable. But as we have now to deal with both town and country, and must divide their areas, we must also take the area of the towns into consideration. And for this purpose we have fixed upon 180 acres as the largest area, spread over which, 2,000 persons living together shall be deemed to form a town. This area has been fixed upon after repeated observation of the area actually occupied by such towns as are most common in Lancashire and Cheshire. It gives a total area of less than 200 square yards to each person; and about 1000 square yards to a family of average number. This, of course, is apart from any allowance for unoccupied spaces within the area of the town, or for the space occupied by roads, buildings, &c.

Now, taking these preliminary conditions, and applying them to the

* The average density of the population of England and Wales in 1801, was 153, and, in 1851, 307, per square mile.

census of Lancashire and Cheshire taken in 1851, we find that there were in that year within the two counties, so many as *fifty-three* towns;* and that these towns then contained about two-thirds of the whole population, or 1,610,000 out of 2,490,000. The Registrar-General, under a less careful division of the two classes of population, makes the town population of Lancashire and Cheshire only 63 per cent. of the whole.

If we go back to 1801, and count the towns under the same rule, we find that they were then only twenty-nine in number, containing a population of 364,000. And as the entire number of the inhabitants of the two counties was then 872,600, it follows not only that the town population, at the beginning of the half-century, was very much less, (in absolute number,) than at its end, but that it also bore a much less proportion to the whole. The two forms of population had both increased, but they had greatly changed their numerical relation to each other. While the whole population had been trebled, that portion of it dwelling in towns of 2,000 inhabitants had increased nearly in the proportion of three-and-a-half to sixteen, or more than fourfold.

It is next to be observed that the towns of 1851, and therefore the chief groups of the denser population, are so placed together on the map, as at once to suggest the division of the tract of country now before us into four parts or regions. These regions are unequal in size, but they are sufficiently distinguished by the manner in which the towns lie grouped together, and by other local peculiarities, amply to justify their being dealt with apart.

In one of the tabular statements appended to this paper will be found a list of the registration districts included in each of the four regions, with the acreage of each district, its population in 1801 and 1851, and the rate per cent at which its population had increased in the interval. The following are some of the more striking results of an examination of the figures here referred to:—

Taking each region by itself, and disregarding the difference between town and country, we find that the Northern region includes five registra-

* The town of Todmorden is not included, as will be observed in the list appended to this paper. The greater part of the town is in Lancashire, and the rest in Yorkshire; but the Registrar-General has placed it in the "Registration County" of York.

tion districts, the Eastern eighteen, the Western five, and the Southern seven, making a total of thirty-five.

Of the Northern region the area is 504,260 acres; and its population was increased between 1801 and 1851 by 55 per cent. Its chief town is Lancaster. It is by much the most thinly peopled.

The Eastern region is by much the most densely peopled of the four; and has been so all through the period in view. It includes the great "Manchester District," with which one of the authors of this paper has dealt in a previous communication to the Society. The density of its population has caused it to be divided into registration districts of smaller average area. Its total area—645,800 acres—does not very much exceed that of the Northern region. But its population was increased, in the same fifty years, by 203 per cent. Its chief towns are Manchester, Bolton, and Preston.

The Western district is comparatively small: only 231,900 acres. Part of it is very densely, and part but thinly peopled. It includes the populous districts on the banks of the Mersey; but it also comprises the extensive flats between the estuary of the Mersey and the Ribble. Its principal towns are Liverpool and St. Helens. Its population was increased in the fifty years by 307 per cent.

The Southern region has an area of 492,000 acres. It lies nearly all south of the Mersey, and so is nearly identical in area with the County of Chester. Its chief towns are Warrington, Congleton, and Chester. Its population was increased in the fifty years by 185 per cent.

Now, taking into our view the whole thirty-five registration districts making up the four regions, we observe that every one of them, from the borders of Westmoreland down to the southern confines of Cheshire, had a larger population in 1851 than in 1801. The increase, then, may be said to have been general. But in the comparative amount of increase there was a prodigious variety. And the further we descend into detail the greater do we find this variety—many parts of registration districts showing a decrease of their population, and some others exhibiting a transition, even within a few years, from the comparative stillness and solitude of a merely agricultural district to the crowded dwellings and busy hum of a densely peopled manufacturing town.

The smallest increase in any registration district was in Garstang—32

per cent. This is in the Northern region. But here the greatest increase in any one district was only 94 per cent. (in Fylde), and the general average, as I have said, is only 55 per cent.

The greatest increase in any registration district throughout the two counties was in Chorlton. Here it was 1226 per cent. This is in the Eastern (or Manchester) region--Chorlton being a small district of about 11,500 acres, lying between Manchester and the river Mersey, and whose population was increased, in the fifty years, from 9,300 to nearly 124,000, apparently without, in any instance, bringing together so many as 2,000 persons with a degree of density sufficient to constitute what we have agreed to term a town. The registration district in this Eastern region which showed the smallest increase in the fifty years was Chorley, a district of 52,060 acres in extent, and lying about midway, in a direct line, between Preston and Wigan.

In the Western (or Liverpool) region there was one registration district showing nearly as large a growth, in the fifty years as the largest above-mentioned. This was West Derby. Here, however, as with Chorlton, which had evidently received much of the overflowing population of Manchester, we find the cause in the immediate neighbourhood of a large and growing town, combined with those facilities of communication which at once enable and invite a large proportion of the active inhabitants of our great towns to spend their leisure and their sleeping hours away from the streets among which their daily labours are carried on. West Derby, at the beginning of the century a tract of country only partially suburban, had, in 1851, contributed a section of its area to the town of Liverpool, and nearly the whole of its surface to the suburbs.

The district of least growth in this Western region was Ormskirk, lying nearly in the centre of the level tract of country stretching from the mouth of the Mersey up to Preston. But even there it was 107 per cent. So that the district of least growth in the Western showed a larger increase than the one of greatest growth in the comparatively thinly peopled Northern region.

In the Southern region the greatest increase took place about Runcorn, and the least about Nantwich. Runcorn has had the advantage of lying at the head of the estuary of the Mersey, and at the starting point of the canal navigation which carries on the water-way thence towards Manchester,

and also up the valley of the Weaver. Runcorn is thus closely connected with the Eastern region, and might not improperly have been included in it. The town of Nantwich, and its neighbourhood, forms one of the remotest of the salt producing centres of the Weaver Valley.

In the same district, and only five or six miles east of the town of Nantwich, has sprung up, during the last fifteen years, the railway town of Crewe, which, in 1851, had a population of 4,500 persons. This addition to the population of the district, arising from the junction of the Chester and Crewe, the Manchester and Birmingham, and the North Staffordshire Railways with the Grand Junction line, at a spot before thinly inhabited, can scarcely be attributed to local influence. And deducting the new population of Crewe, the slow progress of this Nantwich district becomes the more apparent.

We have, perhaps, now arrived at a point at which we may, without risk of confusion, regard the growth of the entire population with reference to the simultaneous growth of that portion of it dwelling in towns. And it is here that the importance of this enquiry becomes most apparent. The growth of the town population of the world is highly significant. It has already gone further in England than anywhere else; and so far as it implies concentration of all the various forms of human power, goes far to explain the dominant influence of the English people in the affairs of nations. We are, however, now concerned with the phenomenon itself; its causes, its progress, and its immediate effects upon our own district, rather than with its place in history, or its influence upon the national power or policy.

The inducements to a town life seem to be in every case nearly identical with the inducements to combined action; and these all resolve themselves into a real or supposed economy of power—of power to produce, to distribute, or to consume—implying new or additional means of obtaining subsistence, of finding amusement, or of exercising power. In England, the town population now forms more than half of the whole. This is a proportion never before attained in any other country, and at least three times as great as exists in any like extent of country in the world. But it does not follow that the balance of town and country has, on the whole, been so much disturbed as at first sight might from this single fact be

inferred. Beef and corn cannot be raised in towns; nor can other articles, of equal necessity, or nearly so, be produced, with economy, in the country. Thus an equilibrium is maintained far too absolute to admit of any such disturbance as has apparently been effected in England. The facts being duly regarded, it will be observed that the country districts belonging to the towns of England—belonging in the sense of necessary mutual dependence—are not only in England, but are spread over a large portion of the habitable globe. They are connected with us by our foreign commerce. For instance, many millions of acres of land within the torrid zone are cultivated with as perfect a relation to, and reliance on, the people of Manchester, as the consumers of the resulting produce, as are the few thousands of acres immediately around that town, and which within sight of its chimneys, and in contention with their smoke, grow wheat and oats, hay, potatoes, and milk, for the same consumers. Our manufacturing towns, and our great ports, may already be said to belong to half the human race.* To serve purposes which, through the connecting links of commerce, have become at once ours, and those of hundreds of millions of persons, ruled by numerous governments, and speaking many languages, our people have, for the last fifty years, been concentrating their habitations, and forming towns. This process is going on more rapidly now than at any past time. Nearly all the national energy is devoted, directly or indirectly, to its promotion. And as far as can yet be foreseen, it is likely to go on during the next fifty years much more rapidly than in the past. Our present purpose is to mark its rate of progress, and something of its methods; and this with a view to knowing ultimately something more of its effects, and thence of its probable action on the destiny of the English people, and especially on that of our own district.

Already some of its more immediate effects are visible enough. The greater efficiency of labour attained by bringing large numbers of men to act continuously together, and in concert, has long been obvious; and it is now practically illustrated in our towns to an enormous extent, and in a great variety of ways. But it is hardly less obvious that this increase of

* "Commerce brings the parties engaged in it into connection and contact with almost the whole known world. Liverpool is not the Liverpool of Lancashire only, or of Cheshire only, or of England only—Liverpool is the Liverpool of India, of China, of Africa, of North and South America, of Australia—the Liverpool of the whole habitable globe."—*Speech of Mr. Hope Scott on the Mersey Conservancy Bill, 24th June, 1857.*

power is bought at a price—that privation of light and air, for instance, has induced new and fatal diseases. It is now some years since the Registrar-General announced that the average duration of life among the population of the towns of England was about seventeen years less than among the population of the country. And with shortened life has come a lowered physical condition. Comparatively few of the inhabitants of our large towns are now found to possess the physical requisites looked for in those who enlist into the army. Intellectually, the results are similar. It is impossible to doubt, much less to deny, the good effects of a town life in promoting the education of most of the faculties. But it is doubtful whether it promotes the healthy action of these faculties, or gives to them a better direction. Morally, there seems to be a similar counterpoise. The action of public opinion, and of an efficient police, being allowed for, we find life and property in our large towns is tolerably secure. There is undoubtedly much vice; but there is also much virtue. And excepting that the tendency of a town life, in its almost exclusive devotion to money getting, results in an increased and sometimes exclusive action of the merely selfish propensities, it may be doubted whether the popular notion of the comparative viciousness of a town population is not a mistake. Here, however, we are on ground proper to ulterior enquiries, and not within the scope of the present paper.

In the five districts of the *Northern* region there were, in 1801, a population, in round numbers, of 79,000; and in 1851, a population of 122,000 persons; shewing, as I have said, an average increase of fifty-five per cent. In this region there were in 1801 only three towns—Ulverstone, Lancaster, and Kirkham. Clitheroe was then a considerable village, and Blackpool a small one; but Fleetwood had no existence. All the six now rank as towns, under the rule before stated, and in 1851 had an aggregate population of 37,000.*

In 1801 the whole town population of this region was about 15,500, or

* It has been found impossible, in many instances, to ascertain the actual area and population of the towns of 1801. The table (see Appendix) in which these results are stated has, therefore, been so framed as to exhibit only the (known or estimated) areas of the towns of 1851, with the population (known or estimated) of the same areas in 1801. If minute accuracy were aimed at in the text, this method would be objectionable; but as round numbers only are used, and approximate proportions only are indicated, it is, when marked, of little consequence.

about two parts in eleven of the whole. In 1851 it formed about three parts in ten of the whole. While the entire population had increased by 55 per cent., the towns had increased 140 cent.

In the eighteen districts of the *Eastern* (or Manchester) region, in 1801, there was a population of 512,000, and in 1851 of 1,556,000, an increase of 203 per cent. Here there were, in 1851, no fewer than thirty towns, with an aggregate population of very nearly one million, to say nothing of numerous villages so formed and inhabited as to share nearly all the ordinary characteristics of a town. Of the thirty towns of 1851, only twenty-four could be considered towns in 1801; and several of those might rather be set down as large villages. The six towns undoubtedly new are Bacup, Rawtenstall, Over-Darwen, Leigh, Horwich, and Hyde.

In 1801 the town population of this eastern region formed nearly half of the whole (231 parts out of 512). In 1851 it formed nearly two-thirds of the whole (999 parts out of 1556). In the fifty years the general population had increased by 203, and the town population by 325 per cent.

In the five districts of the *Western* (or Liverpool) region, the whole population increased from 138,000 to 563,000, or 307 per cent. Here there was in 1801 only one large town (Liverpool), and three small ones (Ormskirk, St. Helens, and Prescot.) To these, in 1851, had been added Southport. Birkenhead might also be classed as a new town, but I have preferred treating it, as I think it may more accurately be deemed, as a southern section of Liverpool. The towns of 1801 had an aggregate population of 93,700, and those of 1851 of 474,600, an increase of more than 400 per cent. And in 1851 the town population formed more than two-thirds of the whole (93 parts out of 138).

In the seven districts of the *Southern* (or Cheshire) region, the whole population increased from 143,000 to 249,000, an increase of only seventy-five per cent. But in 1801 there were here only five towns, and in 1851 this number had risen to eleven. Here, then, we see a very moderate increase of the general population accompanied by a rapid increase in the mere number of towns. The new towns are Runcorn, Frodsham, Altrincham, Knutsford, Sandbach, and Crewe. The town population increased more rapidly than the total; yet not with any remarkable degree of rapidity—being only from 44,000 to 99,000, or 125 per cent.

Hitherto we have compared only the censuses of 1801 and 1851. To introduce the other four censuses, and thence to mark the rates of increase in the towns and in the country districts, in each period of ten years—though it would undoubtedly throw much additional light on the probable future increase in particular localities, as well as on the causes and character of the increase already observed—would expand too much this, the first, section of the inquiry. It will therefore fall into the second. And in the third and concluding section we hope to deal with the sources of the increased population, and with its principal occupations.

APPENDIX.

TABLE I.

REGISTRATION DISTRICT.	Area excl. Water.	Population.		Alteration.		Per Cent.	
	Acres.	1801.	1851.	Increase.	Dec.	+	-
Ulverstone	135,043	17,887	30,556	12,669		71	
Lancaster	138,746	24,942	34,660	9,718		39	
Garstang	61,192	9,647	12,695	3,048		32	
Fylde	54,587	11,327	22,002	10,675		94	
Clitheroe*	114,697	15,143	22,478	7,335		48	
Northern Region	504,265	78,946	122,391	43,445		55	
Burnley	54,126	24,419	63,868	39,449		162	
Haslingden	26,681	17,265	50,424	33,159		192	
Blackburn	43,569	33,173	90,738	57,565		174	
Preston	66,340	29,899	96,545	66,646		223	
Chorley	52,213	21,449	37,701	16,252		76	
Wigan	47,018	34,565	77,539	42,974		124	
Leigh	23,610	17,557	32,734	15,177		86	
Bolton	43,896	40,763	114,712	73,949		181	
Bury	32,990	31,852	88,815	56,963		179	
Rochdale	35,340	26,577	72,515	45,938		173	
Oldham	16,872	26,646	86,788	60,142		226	
Manchester	12,628	81,299	228,433	147,134		181	
Salford	4,830	18,525	87,523	68,998		372	
Barton-upon-Irwell	23,279	15,173	31,585	16,412		108	
Chorlton	11,549	9,342	123,841	114,499		1226	
Ashton-under-Lyne	38,657	27,371	119,199	91,828		335	
Stockport	30,709	32,772	90,208	57,436		175	
Macclesfield	81,561	24,215	63,327	39,112		162	
Eastern Region	645,868	512,862	1,556,495	1,043,633		203	
Ormskirk	87,278	18,479	38,307	19,828		107	
Prescot	51,154	20,703	56,074	35,371		171	
West Derby	37,752	11,994	153,279	141,285		1178	
Liverpool	1,560	77,653	258,236	180,583		233	
Wirral	54,155	9,410	57,157	47,747		507	
Western Region	231,899	138,239	563,053	424,814		307	
Warrington	29,794	19,602	36,164	16,562		85	
Runcorn	43,636	11,408	25,797	14,389		126	
Altrincham	73,665	21,684	34,043	12,359		57	
Congleton	52,889	14,803	30,512	15,709		106	
Northwich	65,445	17,252	31,202	13,950		81	
Nantwich	121,051	24,163	37,986	13,823		57	
Great Boughton	105,718	33,704	53,294	19,590		58	
Southern Region	492,198	142,616	248,998	106,382		75	
GRAND TOTAL	1,874,230	872,663	2,490,937	1,618,274		185	

* Including Tosside, in Settle district, Yorkshire.

TABLE II.

TOWNS AS THEY STOOD IN 1851, WITH THE ESTIMATED OR KNOWN POPULATION OF THE SAME AREAS IN 1801. IN ORDER OF POSITION.

TOWNS.	Area. Acres.	POPULATION.		INCREASE.		Density, 1851. ♯ 100 acres.
		1801.	1851.	No.	♯ Cent.	
Ulverstone	450	2737	6433	3696	135	1429
Lancaster	870	10135	15982	5847	58	1837
Fleetwood	250	—	3121	3121	New	1245
Blackpool	180	198	2180	1982	1001	1211
Kirkham	280	1543	2777	1234	80	922
Clitheroe	475	838	6604	5766	688	1390
Northern Region	2505	15451	37097	21646	140	1481
Colne	475	2476	6644	4168	168	1399
Burnley	1225	2224	20828	18604	837	1700
Accrington	500	1946	7481	5535	284	1496
Bacup	475	1246	6981	5735	460	1470
Rawtenstall	500	650	4844	4194	645	969
Haslingden	430	2790	6154	3364	121	1431
Over Darwen	475	787	7020	6233	792	1478
Blackburn	2500	11330	45536	34206	302	1980
Preston	2753	12174	69542	57308	471	2326
Chorley	600	2891	8907	6016	208	1485
Wigan	1061	10901	33761	22860	210	1723
Hindley	385	1532	5285	3753	245	1373
Leigh	385	700	5206	4506	644	1352
Atherton	250	2109	2780	671	32	1112
Tyldesley	280	1809	3608	1799	99	1280
Horwich	180	315	2104	1789	568	1169
Bolton	1820	17429	60711	43282	248	3336
Radcliffe	363	1847	5002	3155	171	1378
Bury	1470	6852	27762	20910	305	1889
Heywood	750	2800	12194	9394	336	1626
Rochdale	1130	8500	29195	20695	243	2584
Middleton	400	1765	5740	3975	225	1435
Eccles	325	2000	4108	2108	105	1264
Manchester	9785	94409	404808	310399	329	4137
Oldham	2317	9024	46820	37796	419	2021
Ashton-under-Lyne	1525	4837	40723	35886	742	2670
Staleybridge	1240	1500	23877	22377	1492	1926
Hyde	650	863	10051	9188	1065	1546
Stockport	2155	18880	53610	34720	184	2488
Macclesfield	1720	9293	38648	29355	316	2247
Eastern Region	38824	235879	999030	764051	324	2576
Southport	350	100	4765	4665	466	1362
Ormskirk	385	2214	5548	3334	151	1441
St. Helens	900	3167	14866	11699	369	1652
Prescot	500	3665	7393	3728	102	1479
Liverpool, (north)	11495	84706	399466	314760	372	2708
„ (south)*	4828	1212	42639	41427	3418	
Western Region	18458	95064	474677	379613	399	2572
Warrington	1290	10621	22392	11771	111	1736
Runcorn	550	1179	8049	6870	583	1463
Frodsham	180	1170	2099	929	79	1166
Northwich	957	3974	8338	4364	110	871
Altrincham	357	1602	4298	2696	168	1204
Knutsford	250	1802	3127	1325	74	1251
Congleton	650	3461	10020	6559	190	1541
Sandbach	225	1194	2752	1558	130	1223
Crewe	350	81	4491	4410	544	1283
Nantwich	400	3353	5426	2073	62	1356
Chester	2008	15474	27916	12442	80	1390
Southern Region	7217	43911	98908	54997	125	1370
TOTAL	67004	390305	1610612	1220307	313	2404

* Birkenhead.

TABLE III.

AREA AND POPULATION OF TOWNS IN 1801 AND 1851, WITH THE INCREASE (1801-51)
IN POPULATION, AND RATE PER CENT. OF INCREASE.

Towns.	1801.		1851.		Increase in Popn.	
	Area, Acres.	Populatn.	Area, Acres.	Populatn.	Number.	% Cent.
Ulverstone	250	2700	450	6493	3733	138
Lancaster	650	10000	870	15982	5982	60
Fleetwood	—	—	250	3121	—	—
Blackpool	—	—	180	2180	—	—
Kirkham	—	—	280	2777	—	—
Clitheroe	—	—	475	6604	—	—
Northern Region	900	12700	2505	37097		
Colne	200	2400	475	6644	4244	177
Burnley	—	—	1225	20828	—	—
Accrington	—	—	500	7481	—	—
Bacup	—	—	475	6981	—	—
Rawtenstall	—	—	500	4844	—	—
Haslingden	250	2700	430	6154	3454	128
Over Darwen	—	—	475	7020	—	—
Blackburn	700	10500	2300	45536	35036	334
Preston	750	11400	2753	69542	58142	510
Chorley	250	2700	600	8907	6207	230
Wigan	700	10400	1961	33761	23361	225
Hindley	—	—	385	5285	—	—
Leigh	—	—	385	5206	—	—
Atherton	180	2070	250	2780	710	34
Tyldesley	—	—	280	3608	—	—
Horwich	—	—	180	2104	—	—
Bolton	900	16425	1820	60711	44286	270
Radcliffe	—	—	363	5002	—	—
Bury	475	6250	1470	27762	21512	344
Heywood	250	2450	750	12194	9744	398
Rochdale	550	8200	1130	29195	20995	256
Middleton	—	—	400	5740	—	—
Eccles	—	—	325	4108	—	—
Manchester	2600	87500	9785	404808	317308	363
Oldham	600	7000	2317	46820	39820	569
Ashton-under-Lyne	350	3500	1525	40723	37223	1064
Staleybridge	—	—	1240	23877	—	—
Hyde	—	—	650	10051	—	—
Stockport	1000	18350	2155	53610	35260	192
Macclesfield	600	9000	1720	38648	29648	329
Eastern Region	10355	200845	38824	999930		
Southport	—	—	350	4765	—	—
Ormskirk	—	—	385	5548	—	—
St. Helens	250	2900	900	14866	11966	413
Prescot	280	3575	500	7393	3818	107
Liverpool, North	2500	81000	11495	399466	318466	446
„ South	—	—	4828	42639	42639	
Western Region	3030	87475	18458	474677		
Warrington	650	10400	1290	22392	11992	115
Runcorn	—	—	550	8049	—	—
Frodsham	—	—	180	2099	—	—
Northwich	600	3850	957	8338	4488	117
Altrincham	—	—	357	4298	—	—
Knutsford	—	—	250	3127	—	—
Congleton	280	3400	650	10020	6620	195
Sandbach	—	—	225	2752	—	—
Crewe	—	—	350	4491	—	—
Nantwich	250	3300	400	5426	2126	64
Chester	1500	15350	2008	27016	12566	82
Southern Region	3280	36300	7117	98908		
TOTAL	17565	337320	67004	1610612		

TABLE IV.

COMPARATIVE PROGRESS OF LARGE TOWNS AND THE REMAINING PART OF THE
COUNTRY, IN DECENNIAL PERIODS.

TOWNS.	POPULATION.					
	1801.	1811.	1821.	1831.	1841.	1851.
Liverpool, North	85786	108907	145960	221576	302929	396601
„ South	1462	1768	2570	7087	18913	42639
Manchester	98020	119633	166300	244297	320654	416350
Preston	12174	17360	24859	33871	50887	69485
Bolton	18574	25551	32973	43396	52229	63217
Stockport	22036	28287	35571	46868	56061	59163
Oldham	12024	16690	21662	32381	42595	52820
Blackburn	11980	15083	21940	27091	36629	46536
Ashton-under-Lyne	15632	19052	25967	33597	46304	56621
Macclesfield	11064	15129	21819	32068	34723	41189
Wigan	11951	15125	19078	22677	27947	35611
Rochdale.....	17780	22036	27798	35764	44159	54979
Chester	15718	16800	20850	22244	23860	27648
Bury.....	9152	11302	13480	19140	25912	31966
Staleybridge	2792	4157	6705	17121	26299	30997
Warrington	11321	12682	14822	18184	21342	23342
Burnley	5224	7207	10990	13368	18966	27042
Lancaster	10308	10501	11427	13964	15754	16149
St. Helens	5797	7283	8274	11026	16475	22754
Heywood.....	4283	5148	6552	10429	14856	16048
Hyde	1063	1806	3355	7144	10170	11569
Congleton	3861	4616	6405	9352	9222	10520
Totals	388002	486123	649367	922645	1216886	1554136
Balance	484661	577043	681400	754873	847995	927831
Lancashire and Cheshire ..	872663	1063166	1330767	1677518	2064881	2481967

TABLE V.

REGISTRATION DISTRICT.	TOWN PART.			COUNTRY PART.									
	Area.		Population.	Area.		Population.		Alteration		Per Cent.		Density per sq. mile.	
	Acres.	1801	1851	Acres.	1801	1851	Inc.	Dec.	+	-	1801	1851	Inc.
Ulverstone	450	2737	6433	134593	15150	24123	8973		59		72	115	43
Lancaster	870	10135	15982	137876	14807	18678	3871		26		69	87	18
Garstang				61192	9647	12695	3048		32		101	133	32
Fylde	710	1741	8078	53877	9586	13924	4338		45		114	165	51
Clitheroe*	475	838	6604	114222	14305	15874	1569		11		80	89	9
Northern Region	2505	15451	37097	501760	63495	85294	21790		34		81	109	28
Burnley	1700	4700	27472	52426	19719	36396	16677		85		241	444	203
Haslingden	1905	6632	25160	24776	10633	24964	14331		135		275	645	370
Blackburn	2775	12117	52556	40704	21056	38182	17126		81		330	599	269
Preston	2753	12174	69542	63587	17725	27003	9278		52		178	272	94
Chorley	600	2891	8907	51613	18558	28794	10236		55		230	357	127
Wigan	2346	12433	39046	44672	22132	38403	16361		74		317	551	234
Leigh	915	4618	11594	22695	12939	21140	8201		63		365	596	231
Bolton	2000	17744	62815	41896	23019	51897	28878		125		352	793	441
Bury	2583	11499	44958	30407	20353	43857	23504		115		428	923	495
Rochdale	1130	8500	29195	34210	18077	43320	25243		140		338	810	472
Oldham	2717	10789	52560	14155	15857	34228	18371		116		717	1548	831
Manchester	4005	72331	210796	8623	8968	17637	8669		97		666	1309	643
Salford	2540	16938	80773	2290	1587	6750	5163		325		444	1886	1442
Barton-upon-Irwell	675	2300	6608	22601	12873	24977	12104		94		364	707	343
Chorlton	2890	4840	110739	8659	4502	13102	8600		191		333	968	635
Ashton-under-Lyne	2765	6337	64600	35892	21034	51599	33565		160		375	974	599
Stockport	2805	19743	63661	27904	13029	26547	13518		104		299	609	310
Macclesfield	1720	9293	38648	79841	14922	24679	9757		65		120	198	78
Eastern Region	38824	235879	999930	607044	276983	555565	279582		101		292	587	295
Ormskirk	735	2314	10313	86543	16165	27994	11829		73		120	207	87
Prescot	1400	6832	23259	49754	13871	33815	19944		144		178	435	257
West Derby	9935	7053	141230	27817	4941	12049	7106		144		114	277	163
Liverpool	1560	77653	258236										
Wirral	4828	1212	42639	49327	8198	14518	6320		77		106	188	62
Western Region	18458	95064	474677	213441	43175	88376	45201		105		129	265	136
Warrington	1290	10621	22392	28504	8981	13772	4791		53		202	309	107
Runcorn	730	2349	10148	42906	9059	15649	6590		73		135	233	98
Altrincham	607	3404	7425	73058	18280	26618	8338		46		160	233	73
Congleton	875	4655	12772	52014	10148	17740	7592		75		125	218	93
Northwich	957	3974	8338	64488	13278	22864	9586		73		132	227	95
Nantwich	750	3434	9917	120301	20729	28069	7340		35		110	149	39
Great Boughton	2008	15474	27916	103710	18230	25378	7148		39		112	157	45
Southern Region	7217	43911	98903	434081	98705	150090	51385		52		130	198	68
Grand Total	67004	390305	1610612	1807226	482358	880325	37967		83		171	312	141
Area covered by Town since 1801	49439	52985		49439	52985								
Corrected figures for 1801	17665	337320		186666	535343						185	312	127

* Including Tosside, in Settle District, Yorkshire.

