

WORKING-CLASS HOUSING IN BARROW AND LANCASTER 1880-1930

Elizabeth Roberts, B.A.

IT is only in the last few years that social historians have turned their attention to surveys of working-class housing,¹ an area previously somewhat neglected. A. Sutcliffe, in 1974 argued that the study of the social history of housing in industrial Britain is still in its infancy.² S. D. Chapman in 1971 had already written of the paucity of published material and suggested that 'an adequate appreciation of the subject must be founded in a series of local studies of the problem'.³ The research already done tends to concentrate very considerably on the large conurbations; as yet there is little published material on medium-sized towns like Barrow and Lancaster. This article is an attempt, using both documentary and oral⁴ evidence, to describe the changing provision of working-class housing in Barrow and Lancaster in the fifty years between 1880 and 1930. Although direct comparisons of Barrow and Lancaster with the large conurbations are not possible, the histories of them all had a common theme. S. D. Chapman writes of 'the endless difficulties involved in the improvement of working-class housing in the second half of the nineteenth century'.⁵ These difficulties are equally apparent in Barrow and Lancaster, for the provision of working-class housing depended on a complex and sometimes fortuitous interaction of many factors; government legislation, locally initiated legislation, the actions and attitudes of local councils, industrialists, builders, the Medical Officers of Health, the Inspectors of Nuisances, public opinion in general and that of the working classes in particular and changing economic circumstances. The difficulties of providing adequate working-class housing not surprisingly resulted in a generally slow movement towards improvements and by 1930, a century after central government had first displayed an interest, however limited, in working-class housing and had established the Central Board of Health, some working-class people in both towns were still living either in grossly overcrowded

conditions or in houses hazardous to health, or indeed in homes afflicted with both problems.

There are considerable difficulties in attempting to assess the degree of severity of both towns' housing problems by comparing them with other similar urban areas partly because published evidence is so directly concerned with large cities and also because the nature of the housing problems in both towns changed from decade to decade, so that for example Barrow throughout this period cannot be described as a town suffering particularly from overcrowding. Indeed it is not only impossible to compare Barrow and Lancaster with other areas; it is also difficult to compare them with each other because despite their geographical proximity, comparable sizes and the similarity in their social life and customs, Barrow and Lancaster had housing problems created by different factors and dealt with in very different ways and it is less confusing if they are examined separately; common themes which emerge are summarised in the conclusion.

BARROW

Barrow's housing, built in general after 1860, had a higher standard of amenities than that in Lancaster and there was consequently little need for slum clearance, but there were recurring housing crises created by gross overcrowding. It is in fact impossible to discuss the provision of working-class housing in Barrow without considering the extreme rapidity with which the town grew. The Census of 1871 gave the population as 18,911, which was six times the total of 1861, but the most rapid growth was yet to come; by 1874 the population was estimated at 40,000.⁶ The 1881 Census enumerated 47,259 people crowded into 6,789 houses which gave an average of 6.96 persons per house (compared with 6.7 persons per house in 1871). These figures meant that Barrovians were more overcrowded than the inhabitants of any other city in England and Wales with the exception of London (7.85 persons per dwelling), Newcastle (7.17) and Sunderland (7.24).⁷ Although these figures were never equalled again⁸ they mean that Barrow began this fifty-year period with an appalling problem of overcrowding. One of the major difficulties in solving the problem was that there was no consistency in the figures for overcrowding because there was a direct correlation between the provision of housing and the state of Barrow's basic industries, iron and steel, shipbuilding, and heavy engineering. These industries were liable to periodic slumps and booms in demand for their products. In the years when industry was depressed (e.g. 1884, 1891, 1893, 1895 and 1897)

houses stood empty as workers left the town. In boom years there was a desperate shortage of houses. This family migrated from Scotland in the booming 70s, the father being a skilled shipwright. 'Anyhow he hunted around and there wasn't a house to be had so in the end of all places he got a loft over some shipping offices in Fisher Street. M'dad got the use of this loft which was the only place he could get to put his family in. Of course there was no water tap or anything and when they went to bed they could see the stars through the roof. This was in the 70's'.⁹

The late 1890's saw another boom and more migration into the town and in 1899 the Medical Officer of Health¹⁰ wrote, 'Never before in my recollection has it been so difficult for the working-class population to find suitable house accommodation. Building of new houses has been lamentably short of demand.' The following year he wrote somewhat astringently: 'There has been no adequate provision to relieve the congested condition of the town spoken of in the last report. . . . I believe that 1,000 additional houses would have been filled at once so great seems the over population of nearly every working man's house.'¹¹ The 1901 Census figures are interesting because while giving a total of 5.58 persons to a house, which apparently compared favourably with 6.91 persons in the 1891 Census, they also show that the number of persons to a tenement of less than five rooms was 1.65 compared with 1.58 in 1891,¹² thus indicating that overcrowding in the smaller houses had increased significantly. The Medical Officer of Health's criticism of the builders' failure to match the supply of houses with demand was not a new one. At the height of both the building and the migration boom of the early 1870's the *Barrow Times* remarked that despite the liberal exertion of private enterprise in building speculations and despite the efforts of employers 'houses are crowded to an incredible extent and an empty home is regarded as a sort of traditional curiosity'.¹³

Thus there was from the earliest days of Barrow a realisation that private builders could not, by their own efforts, provide sufficient houses; they were physically unable to build enough in boom years and because they were interested in profits and not charity, would not build houses in years of slump when no one was prepared either to buy or rent them. Therefore although private speculative builders continued until the First World War to provide the greater part of Barrow's housing, there was also a significant proportion built and owned by leading industrialists. They were not acting idealistically or altruistically; they were men who had come to Barrow in search of profitable investment and this remained their chief concern. They discovered, however, that to guarantee their profits they had to attract and keep labour

in the town and that the absence of adequate housing was an obstacle to its recruitment. Sir James Ramsden, first Mayor of Barrow and Director of the Furness Railway, said in 1873:¹⁴ 'Up to the present time I have been in fact obliged to discourage persons who desired to settle from the want of accommodation for their people. This is the drawback to the doubling of the population tomorrow. I have no hesitation in saying that if tomorrow houses could be found for 60,000 people, people could be found to fill the houses'. The occasion of Sir James' remarks is significant, for the Barrow-in-Furness Corporation Act of 1873 did provide for the Corporation to build artisans' dwellings. But the demands on the rates were so immense for such basic necessities as sewerage, water supplies and street making that the whole question of municipal housing was shelved. In the meantime the housing situation was desperate and the major industrial concerns began to buy houses. By 1873-4 the Furness Railway Company had 194 houses, the Haemetite Iron & Steel Company 696, the Shipbuilding Company 437 and the Flax and Jute Company 160.¹⁵

The most significant (because they were built to order and not purchased from a speculative builder) and the most notorious constructions were the 'Barrow Island Huts' erected jointly as a temporary expediency by the Furness Railway Company and the Shipbuilding Company in 1871.¹⁶ These insanitary hovels were cleared away by the early 1880's¹⁷ and it is probable that the public resistance and hostility to such sub-standard dwellings¹⁸ was instrumental in ensuring that subsequent house building by industrialists was of an appreciably better standard. (These huts, in standards of design, construction and in health and hygiene compared very unfavourably with earlier railway housing developments in Crewe, Wolverton and Swindon.¹⁹)

In the 1880's the Furness Railway Company built the huge sandstone tenements always referred to as the 'Barrow Island Buildings'. They were closely modelled on Glaswegian tenements. A memorandum of Sir James Ramsden in 1884²⁰ indicates that as always, the Directors of the Furness Railway were attempting to minimise costs and maximise profits. He compared his buildings to those of George Peabody and pointed out that the latter's had cost £75 per room with an average rental of 2/- per room per week whereas the Barrow Buildings cost only £49 10s. per room and brought in a rental of 1s. 6d. per room per week. Correspondents in the Barrow press and recent historians have found the Buildings aesthetically displeasing and they have been described as barrack-like and repellent.²¹ As they still stand and are still inhabited it is possible to investigate them: it is obvious

that despite their unattractive appearance they had one very considerable advantage over the terraced houses being built at the same time, the spaciousness of their rooms—an important consideration for large families. The Furness Railway eventually built thirty-seven blocks of tenements and this building effort was not equalled by any other company until the late 90's when the new owners of the Shipbuilding Company, Vickers, began building their 'model marine garden city'²² suitably named Vickerstown. The houses were to accommodate the new wave of migrants pouring into the town and as the tenants had to be Vickers employees this housing provision facilitated the recruitment of skilled workers and also ensured some degree of loyalty from them; if they left Vickers employment they also lost their homes. By 1904 930 houses had been built; nineteen acres were allocated to institutes, football and cricket pitches and a public park, sites for churches of different denominations were determined and £6,000 was spent on the King Alfred Hotel and to this date the project had cost £413,900.²³ Despite the admiration of contemporary writers concerning the allocation of recreational spaces, the planning of Vickerstown was not influenced by the garden suburb movement and aesthetically and architecturally it compares unfavourably with contemporary developments at Bournville, Port Sunlight and Letchworth.²⁴ There was a conspicuous lack of trees and green verges in the streets and it would seem that Vickers' chief motive in building these houses was not altruistic or idealistic but was just the same as their fellow-industrialists mentioned above, one of self-interest, of recruiting and keeping a labour force at a time when there was a great demand for their products, especially their armaments.

There was, however, a striking improvement in the provision of amenities in each of the three housing projects undertaken by major industrial concerns. Many of the larger Vickerstown houses had bathrooms, all had electricity and Vickers were noted as landlords for their efficiency in maintaining the properties.

It is probable that this considerably improved housing provision was due in some appreciable if unquantifiable part to the pressure of public opinion. This was most clearly demonstrated in the protests about the Barrow Island Huts. Only one month before the protest meeting the shipyard manager had described the huts in glowing terms.²⁵ No one could be in any doubt about the true state of the huts after 1874 and by 1877 the Council insisted that the wooden huts were vacated immediately and the brick huts made sanitary immediately but be demolished within ten years.²⁶ There were continued complaints about housing and many letters in the local press. One from 'Sanitas', a tenant in one of the

Barrow Island Buildings, is typical.²⁷ He complained that the newly installed rubbish chutes were not cleaned out regularly enough and pointed out forcefully that the rents (ranging from 5s. 3d. to 7s. 6d. a week) were high enough to warrant attention being given to the hygiene of the building. Continually rising public expectations of what standards housing should reach are clearly revealed in oral evidence. Expectations were rising all over the country but there are specific reasons for the particularly vociferous public opinion on housing in Barrow. Firstly Barrow was and continued to be until the end of the First World War a town of migrants. Many of them were highly skilled craftsmen in shipbuilding and engineering. All of them were, to some extent, materially ambitious.²⁸ And this ambition included the provision of adequate, up-to-date housing. There was, too, some indoctrination by socialist politicians who taught working-class people to regard their homes in a new way and to be critical of their short-comings. There is an account of a speech made by Keir Hardie in Barrow in 1892. The interesting parts of the account are the audience's initially hostile reactions to what he said and then their ultimate agreements. 'He had walked through our ugly dirty streets (No! No!) . . . he had seen dirt everywhere and improvement nowhere (No! No!). Yes that was true and if they chose he would undertake within a week to make them ashamed of their town' (Hear! Hear!).²⁹ It is perhaps not without significance that the letter from 'Sanitas' went on to quote Keir Hardie: 'He would undertake in half an hour to make any Barrovian heartily ashamed of the sanitary condition of the town.' Keir Hardie's original week had been reduced in three months to half an hour and thus the concept of appalling housing conditions which had to be improved, indeed fought against, entered the popular mythology of left wing politicians.³⁰

Pressure groups, however, did not succeed in persuading the Council to build council houses in the period up to the First World War. The Council had obtained this power in the Barrow-in-Furness Corporation Act 1873 (thus anticipating the terms of the Artisans' Dwelling Act by two years) and the existence of this power was quickly realized by sections of the working classes. During the protest meeting about the Old Barrow Huts, a Mr Gough remarked that 'the council had the power to borrow money for the purposes of building cottages and he had heard that they had borrowed £10,000 for that purpose. He wanted to know where those cottages were. They were not on Old Barrow.'³¹ Nearly twenty years later Keir Hardie was demanding that the Council erect workmen's cottages.³²

One searches in vain, however, for records of debates about

council housing in council minutes or Medical Officer of Health Reports. Although there were minority calls for council housing in the 1890's because there were so many bad years in terms of economic depression (1891, '93, '95, and '97), it seems likely that the majority of the working classes were more concerned with the problem of feeding their families than with questions of improving their town's housing stock.

The last two years of the nineteenth century, however, saw the beginning of a boom period which, with the exception of the period 1907-8, lasted until the end of the First World War. This meant a renewed wave of migration into the town, more assured wages and consequently more pressures on existing accommodation and demands for new and better housing. And yet still there were no discernible demands for council houses and no debates about this possibility within the Town Hall. It is probable that the building effort made both by Vickers and by private builders more than met the demand for new and better housing. Between 1907 and 1911 2,559 houses were built in Barrow increasing the total housing stock by 24.8 per cent whilst the population increased by only 10.8 per cent. The problems of overcrowding were not solved, for there was still 8.7 per cent of the population living more than two to a room in 1911, but the pressure on the smaller houses (those with fewer than five rooms) was reduced, the number of people to a room declining from 1.65 to 1.33.³³

Whilst private enterprise and notably the largest local industry was willing to build houses few were prepared to demand that the considerable expense involved should be transferred to the rates. The local Trade Unions and especially the Trades Council did in fact pay little attention to questions of housing in these years; their main efforts were concentrated on getting Barrow's first Labour Member of Parliament elected in 1906, and on questions of wages, bonuses and general conditions of work. Their only recorded interest in the housing question was a series of advertisements in 1904:³⁴ 'You are tired of paying rent, very well write or call at J. C. Carney, 28 James Street and he will show you how to purchase your house with the rent.' The Trades Council argued that if a purchaser could raise a deposit of £10 he could pay off his mortgage at about 12s. a month instead of paying at least £1 a month in rent. There is oral evidence from respondents that some families had already realised the force of this argument. Four respondents' families (three of whose wage earners brought in less than £1 a week) bought their houses between the years 1900 and 1902.

It is not surprising, in face of these various assertions, that

private enterprise, in one form or another, could cope with the housing problem, that councillors and council officials displayed both indifference and complacency about working-class housing. During the years 1910-12 the Council and the Health Committee in particular were obliged to consider the Housing and Town Planning Act of 1909.³⁵ They were both dilatory and unwilling to act. By 1912 two town plans had been produced for two very small areas on Walney and in Hawcoat and permission was given to the Medical Officer of Health to inspect houses as instructed in the Act. Some attention too was given to closing cellar dwellings in the Barrow Island Buildings. But much business was deferred or constantly referred backwards and forwards between committees and sub-committees. The Medical Officer of Health was blunter than the councillors but can be presumed to be expressing their point of view. Forgetting the reports of 1899 and 1900 he wrote in his report for 1909:³⁶ 'The housing of the working-classes question has no significance in the town. There has never been any difficulty except on rare and temporary occasions for the workers to find houses for their wives and families.'

This apparent complacency is partly explained by some easing of the problem of overcrowding. Until the Census of 1911, it is only possible to estimate the average number of persons per house, a rather crude measure of overcrowding. This census however, provided percentages of the total population living more than two to a room, this measurement being considered a rather truer indication of the extent of overcrowding in an area. By 1911 the problem of overcrowding in Barrow was no longer acute. Nationally 9.1 per cent of the population lived more than two to a room, in Barrow the percentage was 8.7. Compared with the other sixteen county boroughs and cities in Lancashire, Barrow was seventh, the town with the worst overcrowding being St Helens with seventeen per cent of the population living more than two to a room. (Nowhere in Lancashire was comparable with Glasgow where no less than 55.7 per cent of the population lived in grossly overcrowded conditions).

The First World War, however, created an immense housing problem in Barrow by causing the sudden immigration of thousands of munition workers. In 1912 according to the Borough Treasurers' Report 65,257 people were living in Barrow in 12,902 houses and flats (5.05 persons per house). With a sudden increase of people pouring into the town, great efforts were made to build houses and by 1916 there were 14,588. This increase of 1,686 houses is remarkable when it is remembered that during this period house building in most of the United Kingdom almost

came to a halt. But the building effort did not keep pace with the tide of immigration. By 1916 there were 85,000 in 14,588 houses (giving an average of 5.82 persons per house). These averages of people per house do not indicate the misery and unrest of the population. Indeed the population was so restive that the Commission of Enquiry into Industrial Unrest, which reported in 1917, included a special supplemental report solely concerned with Barrow.³⁷ The Commission concentrated much of its attention on the problems of overcrowding and commented: '[Barrow] has had a very large influx of new population coming into the town to work on munitions for Vickers and the wants of its citizens have undoubtedly been gravely neglected . . . For nearly three years the population of this important working centre has been constantly increasing and there was no evidence before us that either the government or the Municipality had up to now taken any practical step to deal with the problem that has been urgent at all times and has now become a crying scandal.' The Commission revealed many actual cases of overcrowding which had been brought to their attention by witnesses to the Commission of Enquiry. This was one of the worst: 'Father and mother, eight children, two of whom a boy and girl was over seventeen years of age, all living in one room. The mother was confined after, with child in this same room.' This respondent came as a young shipwright³⁸ to Barrow in 1913 and remembers most clearly problems of young men in lodgings: 'As a matter of fact we were working seven days a week in the yard for most of the war and the beds were never cold. As one left bed the next lot moved in—night shift and day shift, and it was like that all the time!'

Whilst roundly condemning both the local and national government for its inaction, the Commission commended the actions of Vickers, 'It did not take [them] three years to discover there would be such a thing as a housing problem in Barrow.' When the war began Vickers already owned 1,000 houses. They continued their building and by the summer of 1916 had constructed another 610 houses and had in addition subsidised the building of another 111 houses by the Cavendish syndicate: but even this effort was insufficient. The Commission reported that since the war had begun the workforce at Vickers had increased from 16,000 to 35,000. The Commission urged the government to act immediately to produce more houses and concluded with this warning: 'The condition to our mind is a very serious and urgent one and if not dealt with at once will eventually be the cause of serious unrest in the future.' The government's first action was to rush up an area of temporary dwellings which the critical and

abrasive inhabitants of Barrow immediately nick-named 'China Town'. 'They were one-roomed and two-roomed houses. It was just simply a box with a lid on... they built them for war workers.'³⁹ These were the responsibility of the Commissioner of Public Works, but the Ministry of Munitions also belatedly assumed some responsibility for housing the people it had drafted into the town and whom its tribunals refused to allow to leave. The Abbotsmead Estate was well built by the Ministry, pleasantly laid out, but unfortunately not completed until the war had finished.

Throughout 1916 and 1917, despite the evidence submitted to the Commission of Enquiry and the ultimate publication of its Report, there was a continual reluctance by many bodies in Barrow to consider the possibility of municipal housing. The Trades Council wrote about the lack of living accommodation to the council in November 1916, urging the council to press the Ministry of Munitions to build more houses.⁴⁰ Councillors in August 1917 were still urging the Ministry of Munitions to build 1,000 houses.⁴¹ The Medical Officer of Health in his report at the end of 1917 still was placing all the responsibility for solving Barrow's housing needs on the government. 'The only solution for gross overcrowding is a scheme for the provision of houses carried out by the Ministry of Munitions.'⁴²

In Barrow by the end of the war in November 1918 it was clear that the Ministry of Munitions would build two hundred and fifty houses on the Abbotsmead Estate but no more. The remedy for the housing problem must be sought nearer at hand. It is just possible that without the Addison Act of 1919 the council still would not have contemplated building municipal housing, and this was in fact the view of at least one local newspaper. An editorial, noting the council's prevarications and dilatoriness, tartly commented that 'the duty to build houses is now laid upon them by the government.'⁴³ The criticism may have been fair but it was rather late, for a month before the council had acknowledged its responsibilities: 'This council is of the opinion that the provision of housing is one of its most pressing needs.'⁴⁴ By April 1920 the council had decided to apply to borrow £100,000 for one hundred and thirteen houses in Devonshire Road and another £39,960 for forty-four houses in Vickerstown.⁴⁵

By the time the 1921 Census took place the building in Devonshire Road was well in hand but the census figures confirmed the deterioration in housing provision since 1911, and the urgent need for more dwellings. The Census also showed how much worse overcrowding must have been during the war, for the estimated population of 90,000 in 1917 had fallen to 74,244 by

1921. There were 11 per cent of the population (8,166) living more than two to a room compared with 8.7 per cent (5,547) in 1911 (the County figure was 8.67 per cent). And while the number of dwellings had increased by 18.5 per cent the number of families had increased by 29.5 per cent. The Census estimated that there was a deficiency of 6,085 rooms in the town.⁴⁶

In view of the evident need for housing and the council's commitment to municipal building, it is bizarre in the extreme to look at the figures of the 1931 Census and discover that Barrow's total housing stock had increased by exactly thirty-four dwellings by 1931.⁴⁷

The Borough Engineer's and Surveyor's Report for 1925 enumerated 475 houses being built from 1921-5 inclusively. Of these 191 were built in 1921 and there is no way of estimating what proportion of them were built before the Census was taken. The three years 1923, '24 and '25 produced 12 new houses. The reason for the small overall increase in the number of houses in the years 1921-31 was because of the closure and demolition of the temporary houses in 'China Town'.⁴⁸

Barrow's incredible housing history in these ten years is only explained by reference to the total economic collapse experienced by the town in 1922 when a total of 11,000 men or 44.1 per cent of the insured workers were unemployed. The movement of workers out of the town which started in 1919 as soon as the war was finished became a migratory flood in the 1920's. The population decreased by 10.0 per cent or 8,042, between 1921 and 31 but the percentage lost through migration was estimated at 16.2 per cent⁴⁹ (12,027 people). (The excess of births over deaths was given as 4,009.) The percentage of population lost through migration was only surpassed in the whole of Lancashire by the neighbouring township of Dalton, which lost 22.5 per cent. The council finished about ninety houses on the Devonshire Road Estate and sixty-eight on Walney but when the disaster of 1922 happened and when mass unemployment continued from year to year there seemed little point in continuing to build council houses, for now there were empty houses all over the town. One old man who worked for a while as a carpenter for the council said, 'There were 1,400 houses empty in Barrow and twenty in Cardiff Street alone. I know the joiner who had to go and board them up.'⁵⁰ Moreover the council had the greatest difficulty in collecting rents from the tenants of the houses it already owned. In a court case about rent arrears in 1922 the Town Clerk claimed that out of the sixty-eight houses the council owned on Walney there were rent arrears totalling £546 on sixty of them. (The rents were 11s. a week.)⁵¹ The Council was not only preoccupied with getting

rents from its tenants during the 1920's but also rates from tenants in private houses, and there were even cases of the council turning off water supplies to houses where the occupant had not paid his rates.⁵²

In view of this difficulty of obtaining council income and the continuing migration from the town, there was no further question of municipal housing in Barrow. It is an irony of history that economic depression did more to solve the problem of overcrowding in Barrow than did government legislation, municipal effort, private enterprise, or public opinion. By the Census of 1931 the number of persons to a room had fallen for the first time ever to below 1, i.e. 0.89.⁵³ But it would be wrong to assume that the problem was solved entirely: empty houses did not mean there was no overcrowding. There was still 6.95 per cent of the population (4,601 people) living more than two to a room (compared with the county average of 6.82 per cent) and at the same time there were 591 empty houses. The Depression, while succeeding in removing some of the pressure on housing, failed entirely in the case of these 4,601 people to provide them with an adequate income to spend on housing.

LANCASTER

In 1881 Lancaster's population was 20,663; by 1901 this had risen dramatically to 40,329 but some of this increase was due to extensions of Lancaster's boundaries.⁵⁴ The population remained rather static during the rest of the period reaching 43,303 in 1931. The largest employers of labour were Williamsons and Storeys, manufacturers of oil-cloth and linoleum. Their typical employee was a labourer who before the First World War earned an average £1 a week and who, between the wars, was fortunate to earn £2. (Skilled men were employed by the Lancaster Carriage and Wagon works till 1908 and by Gillows the furniture manufacturers). Lancaster's basic housing problem throughout the fifty years remained one of providing housing of an adequate standard but at rents which the poorer parts of the population could afford.

Throughout the fifty-year period it is clear from all the available evidence that Lancaster was in possession of a large stock of old unfit houses which required demolition, and that its inhabitants needed to be rehoused with adequate ventilation, sewerage, water supplies, W.C.'s, baths, drains and proper facilities for rubbish disposal.

In Lancaster, there was, as in Barrow, a reliance upon private enterprise to provide new houses. There was one very significant difference however; with the exception of a few houses built by

some of the mill owners for their workers no industrial concern in Lancaster either built or owned property on any appreciable scale. Houses in general were built by small firms and owned in small numbers by a great variety of private landlords. No mention of council housing is to be found in Council Minutes, but in view of the greater health hazards presented by Lancaster's housing the Medical Officer of Health in the years before the First World War did display rather less complacency than his counterpart in Barrow. One can trace through his reports the realisation that the demolition of the houses in the ninety-five courts and alleys (enumerated in 1910 under the terms of the 1909 Housing and Town Planning Act) was essential but he was unable to see what would happen to the inhabitants of these unfit houses. As early as 1907 he wrote, 'My only regret is that I can see no prospect of low rental houses being built and this is a serious matter in a town like Lancaster with so many people earning small wages.'⁵⁵ Certainly the newer houses being built after 1880 and up to about 1910 were rented for anything between 4s. 6d. and 8s. a week whereas the small back-to-back tenements cost no more than 3s. a week. Extra shillings were vital in a town where the vast majority of working-class men were labourers earning between 18s. and £1 os. 3d. a week before 1914.

In the years immediately preceding the First World War two intractable difficulties about building new working-class housing became apparent. In 1908 the Wagon Works closed down putting an estimated two thousand men out of work. An unknown number left the town; others who remained eked out a miserable existence doing relief work for the Board of Guardians.⁵⁶ The whole economic prosperity of Lancaster was adversely affected. In the six years up to and including 1908, 823 new houses were built, in the six years after 1908, only 240 were built (including 111 in 1912). Again, as in Barrow,⁵⁷ builders were reacting to market forces; if there was migration out of the town and unemployment for many who were left, then there was little point in continuing with the construction of new houses.

Indeed the 1911 Census figures suggested that building new houses did not in any case solve the intractable housing problems of the large families living on small incomes. In the ten years 1901-11, the number of houses in Lancaster increased by 10.16 per cent while the population increased by only 2.68 per cent and yet there were still 1,276 people in 1911 living more than two to a room while at the same time 655 houses stood empty.⁵⁸ As there is absolutely no evidence to suggest that Lancastrians enjoyed being overcrowded it is reasonable to assume that they could not afford the rents of the empty houses. Retrospectively it is clear that

Lancaster's housing problems could only be solved by massive slum clearance, subsidised local authority housing and a substantial rise in basic wages. These solutions were unthinkable before the First World War and the somewhat fatalistic attitude of the Medical Officer of Health in 1907 was echoed by many of the tenants of the unfit houses. 'It didn't suit me to be brought up in them surroundings but there was nothing I could do about it. There was nothing my parents could do about it.'⁵⁹

The First World War brought many changes to Lancaster; as in Barrow there was a sudden influx of munition workers, an influx which created more overcrowding and a housing shortage. There were many cases of hardship of which one typical example is a respondent who was a child in the war and lived with his mother and brother in a series of back-to-back houses which he said were 'just more or less habitable.'⁶⁰ His father was away at the war. He claimed that there was a man in the town responsible for billeting munition workers and who asked all the landlords, including the owner of the respondent's house, for accommodation for the migrant workers. Consequently the landlord visited the house and told the family they had to get out, as the house was needed for munition workers, or alternatively, he would let them stay if they paid double rent. The respondent did not know whether this was before or after the Rent Restriction Act of 1915 but in any case his mother was not the kind of woman to fight. He added, 'it's like attacking widows, just putting the screws on.' The family left. The hardship and overcrowding did not however, as in Barrow, result in working-class protest and unrest, and so there was no special Commission of Enquiry for Lancaster. But it would be wrong to assume that attitudes and values were not changing. There were signs that among the city officials the old fatalistic acceptance of the *status quo* was disappearing. By 1917 the housing situation was grave enough for the Lancaster Medical Officer of Health (unlike his counterpart in Barrow), to consider the hitherto unthinkable: 'There is a considerable amount of overcrowding. The number of new houses now required is 1,000 but the local authority cannot estimate the number that should be built at the close of the war. The local authority are willing to prepare a scheme for 1,000 houses on the assumption that financial facilities will be afforded by the government, but they do not commit themselves to erect municipal houses.'⁶¹

Lancaster's record in municipal housing after the First World War presents a total contrast to that of Barrow. There was some initial hostility to the idea of council houses. There were references by some local property owners to 'charity houses for the select few,'⁶² and landowners held up the purchase of land by the

council for the building of houses under the terms of the Addison Act of 1919. The land was finally obtained with a compulsory purchase order in 1920. This was the beginning of an ambitious municipal housing programme. In the ten years 1921-31, Lancaster increased its housing stock by 1,177 (14.01 per cent) whilst its population increased by only half that percentage (7.88 per cent). Out of the total increase 886 houses were built by the council.⁶³

The reasons for this great building activity are at first difficult to establish; Lancaster's workers were not in the main unionised nor were they particularly vocal; the council itself was neither radical nor socialist having predominantly liberal and conservative members until after the Second World War. The Council minutes do not reveal any particular group or individual passion for council housing; they are simply a dry factual record, minute after minute recording the surveying of sites, the purchasing of land, the tendering for contracts and the eventual building of houses. There appears to have been three main factors which resulted in the council's almost perpetual building. Firstly, although not shown in council minutes, press reports and discussions with a council official reveal, that whatever their political affiliations, the majority of councillors took seriously their responsibility to rehouse slum dwellers and to go on building council houses until no more families remained on the waiting list. A typical council debate usually had one or two councillors urging an end to council building and a reliance for housing on private enterprise, but the majority urging the continuance of the council building houses.⁶⁴ 'They took very seriously the homes for heroes to live in.'⁶⁵ Secondly the Medical Officer of Health, who was still exhibiting caution on the question of municipal housing in 1917, had become a passionate advocate of more and more council housing throughout the 1920's. His continual criticism of bad drainage, ill-ventilated houses and shared taps, lavatories and middens, appeared in his annual reports, and each report urged the need for more and more new and adequate housing. Thirdly, and perhaps even more significantly, were the changing social and familial patterns of working-class people and most especially their rising expectations about housing. (It is probable that this was part of a national trend when the national demand and provision of council housing is considered but obviously research needs to be done in comparable urban areas.)

Despite the yearly increase in the total of houses available for renting the number of applicants for council houses continued to grow. In 1919 there were 200 applicants;⁶⁶ by 1930, despite the 886 council houses built, there were 1,058 families on the waiting

list.⁶⁷ This huge increase in the number of families wanting council houses cannot be ascribed to an increase in overcrowding. The number of people to a room dropped from 0.83 in 1921 to 0.79 in 1931.⁶⁸ Overall overcrowding was somewhat ameliorated. The reasons for this dramatic increase in the council house waiting list appears to have been a genuine working-class demand for better housing and a decreasing willingness for young families to share houses with either parents or landladies. The Medical Officer of Health wrote in 1925;⁶⁹ 'With the advent of Municipal Housing Schemes a new standard of housing has been introduced from which it is difficult to depart'. Tenants who moved into council houses in the 1920's enjoyed facilities previously unknown—hot water systems, indoor lavatories, bathrooms and gardens: 'It had a bathroom, that was another luxury . . . and what my mother particularly enjoyed was hot water from the boiler, just open the tap and that was it, smashing. And there was an open space at the back and a garden to sit in. You could see some green grass instead of flags and cobbles.'⁷⁰ 'They were really nice houses . . . it was so modern and I loved it'⁷¹ 'It had a nice outlook and a good wide road.'⁷² There was in the 1920's no stigma attached to living in a council house, partly because they were not as yet used for widespread rehousing of slum dwellers and partly because, despite various government subsidies provided under the Addison and later the Chamberlain and Wheatley Acts, the rents of council houses were not cheap compared to those of privately owned houses. One respondent claimed that when her family moved into a council house in the 1920's their rent was 14s. a week, which was nearly double the amount they had previously been paying. Even with both unmarried children working the family were unable to continue for long with this rent and they moved into a rent-free cemetery lodge (father was a grave digger earning about £2 a week).⁷³

The council with its building programme had in fact opened a Pandora's Box; the greatest building efforts simply increased the waiting list. The 1,058 families on the waiting list in 1930 can be taken as a significant indication of growing public expectations about housing standards.

But the building programme did little for the poorest sections of the community. The case of the non-skilled family being forced to relinquish its much prized council house even with three wages coming in has been mentioned; many labouring families were never even able to aspire to a council house. The Medical Officer of Health in 1907 had formulated the problem of providing accommodation for families on low wages. The problem was still largely unsolved in 1930 and it is all too easy to apportion blame.

The size of government subsidies and council expenditure policies resulted in high rents for council houses whilst in the private sphere the worst houses which the poor could afford rapidly deteriorated. Repairs were not carried out. The Medical Officer of Health wrote caustically in 1925:⁷⁴ 'Management of property in this area consists almost entirely of the collection of rents. Tenants as a rule complain to the Health Department of defects after they have complained more than once to the owners and yet nothing has been done'. And yet this default on the part of the landlords was compounded by the council's policy which showed too much consideration for property owners' financial susceptibilities. The Medical Officer reported in 1925 that the policy of the council prior to the First World War had been to demolish unfit property and this had continued to some extent. (By 1927 he was able to record that 300 houses had been demolished in the previous fifteen years.)⁷⁵ The council had, however, while deciding that many houses were fit only for demolition, not ordered their clearance, nor had the Council insisted that landlords did any repairs in the years 1915-25 because 'it was unfair to ask for money for property which was to be demolished.'

In 1925 the Council did, in fact, reverse its policy and decided that as it would be years before all unfit housing could be dealt with, they would again press owners to carry out repairs. The Medical Officer and the Inspector of Nuisances in the period 1925-30 annually reported hundreds of cases where, due to council pressure, repairs were carried out to drains, downspouts, damp walls, lavatories, and middens. But despite their efforts there were still 765 houses enumerated as unfit for habitation in 1930 (400 of this total were judged to be totally unfit and 365 as unfit in some respect).⁷⁶

The Medical Officer, the council officials and councillors, the owners and the tenants all accepted the fact that no amount of repairs would make these 400 houses fit for human habitation. But there emerged the dreadful dilemma of what to do with the inhabitants if they were demolished. This problem was referred to again and again by the Medical Officer of Health. He remarked in 1925 on the hundreds of families unable to pay more than 5s. a week rent. (Labourers' rates of pay in the 1920's were rarely above £2 a week.) In 1927 he described how many families with one member suffering from tuberculosis were unable to move into healthier surroundings because they could not afford council houses. His strongest condemnation of the provision of housing for the poor was in 1928: 'The condition of these unfit houses are such that health whether physical, mental, or moral is almost impossible of attainment. It is in these houses too that the most

severe cases of overcrowding are found. Overcrowding in fit houses is serious enough but when it is associated with poverty, dampness, lack of ventilation, drainage and facilities for cleanliness the inevitable result is a high sickness and mortality rate with a large proportion of damaged survivors. There can be no question of reconditioning the large majority of these houses. They are unfit for habitation and incapable of being made fit. The problem of rehousing those who exist in them still awaits solution.⁷⁷ In 1930 he again returned to his theme, criticising the council for renting houses only to smaller families well able to pay: 'This policy has left the housing of the poor where it was after the war.'⁷⁸

Despite the beginning made in 1925 when fifty-two families were cleared from the courts and alleys off St Leonardsgate (forty-five of these were rehoused in council houses), it was in the 1930's and under the provision of the Greenwood Act (1930), which specifically provided subsidies for slum clearance and the rehousing of the occupants, that a large proportion of the very poor began to enjoy improved housing. The fact that they were the last to enjoy the benefits of municipal housing was illustrated by the 1931 Census. Whilst overcrowding in general was improved that amongst the poorest had worsened, the percentage of the population living more than two to a room having increased from 3.5 per cent in 1911 to 4.7 per cent in 1921 and 4.49 per cent in 1931.⁷⁹

CONCLUSION

Throughout the period both Barrow and Lancaster had serious housing problems; but the ways in which each town approached their problem were very different. Before the First World War, despite the enabling legislation passed by central government⁸⁰ neither council considered building council houses (nor indeed did any other council of similar size) nor were they pressed to do so except by a small minority in Barrow. Both towns relied upon private enterprise to build new houses, but there were significant differences; in Barrow private builders were unable to meet the demand for new houses and the large firms, notably Vickers, were compelled to both build and rent out houses. In Lancaster there was no building by large firms; we have no evidence as to why neither Lord Ashton nor the Storey family embarked on a house building programme for their workers although such an activity would have been in keeping with their paternalistic policies towards their employees. Some respondents feel strongly that Lord Ashton would have done better to have built workers' houses than his memorial in the park; but there is no evidence to explain why he followed the latter rather than the former course.

The other significant difference between the two towns before the First World War was the role of public opinion. There is little doubt that the more abrasive inhabitants of Barrow with their well publicized complaints about housing did something towards ensuring a continually improving standard of newly built houses. Although individual families in Lancaster were anxious to improve the standards of their homes, there were no visible public pressure group or groups and consequently no significant improvement in newly built houses is discernible until about 1900 (thirty years after the start of improvements in Barrow) when in fact builders did begin to respond to market demand for houses with amenities like bathrooms.

The First World War produced a marked change in attitude to housing both on the part of local and national government and on the part of individuals. The working classes rising expectations about housing which began before the war were increased by the promises of politicians like Lloyd George with his slogan 'A fit land for heroes to live in'. Public demand and central government pressure forced both councils to start to build council houses in 1920. But the 1920's revealed that this policy on its own could not and did not solve either town's problems. It was clear in both towns that the most significant factor affecting the provision of housing for the working classes was the local general economic conditions.⁸¹ In times of economic depression houses were not built either by private enterprise or public endeavour because too many prospective tenants were either emigrating or were unemployed and unable to pay their rents. Even in more prosperous times the problems of providing satisfactory housing for the families of unskilled men were almost insuperable. Council housing much more heavily subsidised than in the 1920's was one possibility but a more satisfactory solution would have been a substantial increase in wage rates. The very poor had the longest to wait for their 'fit land for heroes'.

NOTES

- 1 J. N. Tarn, *Working-class housing in 19th century Britain* (1971), J. N. Tarn, *Five Per Cent Philanthropy* (1973), S. D. Chapman, ed. *The History of Working-Class Housing* (1971), A. Sutcliffe, ed. *Multi-Storey Living* (1974), Enid Gauldie, *Cruel Habitations* (1974).
- 2 A. Sutcliffe, *ibid.*, p. ix.
- 3 S. D. Chapman, *ibid.*, p. 10.
- 4 The writer was working (1974-6) on a S.S.R.C. financed project entitled 'The Standard of Living and Quality of Life in Barrow and Lancaster, 1880-1930.' A smaller, pilot investigation (1972-4) was

- supported by a Nuffield Small Grant. The work has been carried out under the aegis of the Centre for North-West Regional Studies, University of Lancaster. Evidence for the project is drawn from both documentary and oral sources. One hundred old people born between 1872 and 1910 have been interviewed and their evidence provides much detailed information which is not available from other sources. The evidence displays both an internal consistency within a series of interviews with an individual respondent and also an external consistency with the evidence of other respondents.
- 5 S. D. Chapman, *ibid.*, p. 11.
 - 6 *Barrow Times*, 28.4.1877.
 - 7 *Census of 1881*, General Report, iv, p. 14.
 - 8 See Appendix, Table 3.
 - 9 Mrs M₃B b. 1886.
 - 10 M.O.H. Annual Report, 1899. All the annual reports of the Medical Officers of Health are included in the *Borough accounts of Barrow-in-Furness*, published annually from 1880.
 - 11 M.O.H. Annual Report, *Borough accounts of Barrow in Furness* (Barrow 1900).
 - 12 *Census of 1891*, I, Table 5, p. 169; II, Table 6, p. 815. *Census of 1901*, County of Lancaster, cd. 1002 cxx. 389. Tables 9 and 20, p. 18 and p. 91.
 - 13 *Barrow Times*, 30.3.1872.
 - 14 J. D. Marshall, *Furness and the Industrial Revolution* (Barrow 1958), p. 371.
 - 15 S. Pollard, 'Town Planning in the nineteenth century; the beginning of modern Barrow-in-Furness' *T.L.C. Antiq. Soc.*, LXIII (1952-3) p. 110.
 - 16 For a fascinating account of life in the huts and the appalling small-pox epidemic which swept through them in 1871 and 1872 see 'Life in the Forty Huts, an account by one who lived in them', *Barrow News*, 16.6.1917.
 - 17 The Medical Officer of Health in 1884 reported that 344 huts had been demolished.
 - 18 For details of a mass protest about the sanitary conditions of the Old Barrow Huts, see *The Barrow Pilot*, 31.1.1874.
 - 19 J. N. Tarn, *Working-Class Housing*, *op. cit.* p. 33.
 - 20 J. D. Marshall, *op. cit.* p. 4.13.
 - 21 S. Martin Gaskell in, *Multi-Storey Living*, ed. A. Sutcliffe (1974), p. 90.
 - 22 J. E. Hutton, *A Practical Record of War-Time Management* (1918), *passim*.
 - 23 F. W. Barnes, *Barrow and District* (Barrow, 1967), p. 113.
 - 24 W. Ashworth, *The Genesis of Modern British Town Planning* (1954), p. 163; J. N. Tarn, *Five Per cent Philanthropy* (1973), pp. 156-61 and pp. 164-8.
 - 25 *The Barrow Pilot*, 29.12.1873.
 - 26 S. Pollard, *op. cit.* pp. 108-9.
 - 27 *Barrow News*, 10.1.1893.
 - 28 See Charlotte Erikson, *Invisible Immigrants* (1974), for a study of the motivations of migrants to the United States from Great Britain. The chief reason for their migration was the search for economic betterment for themselves and their families. As, in many cases, it was the same families which provided immigrants both to Barrow and to the United States one may deduce from Miss Erikson's evidence and

from the oral evidence of respondents that migrants came to Barrow determined to 'better' themselves. See also E. Hunt *Regional Wages Variations, 1850-1914* (1973), p. 268 and *passim*. It is clear that the underlying reason for the large numbers of migrants within Great Britain was their determination to move to areas where wage-rates were high.

- 29 *Barrow Herald*, 18.10.1892. The change of mood seems hardly credible, but the validity of the report was not challenged in the press.
- 30 Interviews with some very old Socialist politicians reveals the strength of this tradition. One lady when asked why she had become a Socialist (and later an active Communist) commented 'Oh it was the conditions, the housing conditions.' When pressed upon this point she admitted that in fact housing was not so bad in Barrow as in many other areas.
- 31 *Barrow Pilot*, 31.1.1874.
- 32 *Barrow Herald*, 18.10.1892.
- 33 *Census of 1901*, Vol. cited., Table 20, p. 91. *Census of 1911*, County of Lancaster, Table 27a. p. 216.
- 34 A copy of this is in the possession of a respondent Mr M6B. J. C. Carney was Secretary of the Trades Council.
- 35 *Barrow Town Council Minutes*, 1910-11 and 1911-12, *passim*.
- 36 M.O.H. Annual Report, *Borough accounts of Barrow-in-Furness* (Barrow 1909).
- 37 *Commission of Enquiry into Industrial Unrest, Report of the Commissioners for the North Western area including a supplemental report on the Barrow-in-Furness District* (1917).
- 38 Mr M6B, b. 1892.
- 39 Mr M6B.
- 40 *Barrow-in-Furness Town Council Minutes*, Health Committee, 22.11.19.
- 41 Report of Council Meeting, *Barrow News*, 4.8.1917.
- 42 M.O.H. Annual Report, *Borough Accounts of Barrow-in-Furness* (Barrow 1917).
- 43 *Barrow Guardian*, 3.4.1920.
- 44 *Barrow Town Council Minutes 1919-20*, Min. 140, 1.3.1920.
- 45 *Barrow Guardian*, 3.4.1920.
- 46 *Census of 1911*, Vol. Cited. Table 27a p. 216. *Census of 1921*, County of Lancashire, Table IX. p. XX.
- 47 *Census of 1931*, County of Lancashire, Table VII. P. XVII.
- 48 *Barrow Guardian*, 18.7.1925.
- 49 *Census of 1931*, County of Lancashire, Table 2 p. 2.
- 50 Mr M6B.
- 51 *Barrow News*, 26.8.1922.
- 52 Copies of correspondence to and from the Town Clerk in the possession of Mr M6B.
- 53 *Census of 1931*, County of Lancashire, Table VII, p. XVII.
- 54 Appendix, Table 1.
- 55 M.O.H. Annual Report (Lancaster 1907). Some of the Medical Officer of Health's Annual Reports are kept in the Lancaster City Library. Others including those in manuscript form are kept by the Lancaster District Community Physician.
- 56 *Lancaster Guardian* 5.9.1908, 19.9.1908, 3.10.1908, 5.12.1908, 7.12.1908.
- 57 See above, p. 119.
- 58 M.O.H. Annual Report (Lancaster 1914); *Census of 1901* County of

- Lancashire, Tables 9 and 20 p. 27 and p. 96. *Census of 1911* Vol. cited. Tables 27 and 28, p. 197 and p. 242.
- 59 Mr M1L. b. 1910. He lived in a very old house without a back access or water or inside sanitation. It has been demolished.
- 60 Mr H1L. b. 1904.
- 61 *M.O.H. Annual Report* (Lancaster 1917).
- 62 J. H. Jennings, 'Geographical Implications of the Municipal Housing Programme in England and Wales 1919-39, *Urban Studies*, 8 (1971) p. 134.
- 63 *M.O.H. Annual Report* (Lancaster 1930).
- 64 *Lancaster Guardian*, 2.4.1927.
- 65 Mr B3L. A retired council official.
- 66 *M.O.H. Annual Report* (Lancaster 1919).
- 67 *M.O.H. Annual Report* (Lancaster 1930).
- 68 *Census of 1931*, County of Lancashire Table VII, p. XV iii.
- 69 *M.O.H. Annual Report* (Lancaster 1925).
- 70 Mr M1L. see above.
- 71 Mrs A2L. b. 1907.
- 72 Mr A2L. b. 1906.
- 73 *Ibid.*
- 74 *M.O.H. Annual Report* (Lancaster 1925).
- 75 *M.O.H. Annual Report* (Lancaster, 1930).
- 76 *M.O.H. Annual Report* (Lancaster, 1930).
- 77 *M.O.H. Annual Report* (Lancaster, 1928).
- 78 *M.O.H. Annual Report* (Lancaster, 1930).
- 79 *Census of 1931*, County of Lancashire, Table VII. p. XVII. *Census of 1911*, County of Lancashire, Table 27, p. 197.
- 80 Housing of the Working Classes Act (1890) 53 and 54 Vict. C.70. J. N. Tarn, *Five per cent Philanthropy* (1973) p. 123-4.
- 81 J. Parry Lewis, *Building Cycles and Britain's Growth* (1965), p. 2

APPENDIX

Population and overcrowding in Barrow and Lancaster 1881-1931 (Statistics derived from Censuses).

Percentage Increase or Decrease in Population in Intercensal Periods

	BARROW	LANCASTER
1881-1891	+9.4%	+50.2% ^a
1891-1901	+11.35%	+29.93% ^b
1901-1911	+10.73%	+2.68%
1911-1921	+16.4%	-2.3%
1921-1931	-10.2%	+7.88%

Percentage Increase in Number of Houses in Intercensal Periods

	BARROW	LANCASTER
1881-1891	35.7%	53.5% ^a
1891-1901	11.9%	35.2% ^b
1901-1911	24.81%	10.16%
1911-1912	18.5%	3.5%
1921-1931	0.23%	14.09%

^a The Lancaster Corporation Act of 1888 extended the municipal boundaries to include parts of Skerton and Scotforth. This boundary extension accounts for 17.30% increase in population based on the 1881 figures.

^b The Local Government Board Provisional Orders Confirmation Act 1900 added further parts of Bulk, Skerton, Scotforth and Halton to Lancaster adding 7.13% to the population based on the 1891 figures.

Number of Persons to Each Dwelling

	BARROW	LANCASTER
1881	6.96	5.70
1891	6.91	5.66
1901	5.58	5.35
1911	6.70	5.38
1921	5.04	4.81
1931	4.48	4.55

Number Person to a Room for All Houses/Tenements

	BARROW	LANCASTER
1911	1.01	0.98
1921	1.05	0.94
1931	0.89	0.79

Percentage of the Population Living in Tenements of Less than Five Rooms

	BARROW	LANCASTER
1891	27.05	24.96
1901	28.5	22.5
1911	32.24	26.20
1921	46.11	29.26

Number of Persons to a Room in these Tenements of Less than Five Rooms

	BARROW	LANCASTER
1891	1.58	1.40
1901	1.65	1.20
1911	1.33	1.11
1921	1.32	1.15

Percentage of the Total Population Living More than two to a Room

	BARROW	LANCASTER
1911	8.7% (5,547 people)	3.5% (1,449 people)
1921	11.0% (8,166 people)	4.1% (1,648 people)
1931	6.95% (4,601 people)	4.49% (1,945 people)

Number and Percentage of Uninhabited Houses

	BARROW	LANCASTER
1891	178 (1.93%)	116 (2.08%)
1901	293 (2.84%)	466 (6.18%)
1911	326 (2.53%)	694 (8.36%)
1921	333 (2.21%)	243 (2.82%)
1931	591 (3.95%)	78 (0.80%)