

GENDER AND SOCIAL CITIZENSHIP IN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE: THE DEVELOPMENT OF WELFARE POLICY IN ENGLAND AND WALES FROM THE POOR LAW TO BEVERIDGE

Bernard Harris

As Peter Breiner (2006, 1) has recently pointed out, 'almost all examinations of modern citizenship are compelled at a minimum to pay lip-service to T.H. Marshall's renowned essay, "Citizenship and social class"'. In that essay, Marshall (1950, 10-14) drew an important distinction between what he described as the civil, political and social rights associated with citizenship in England and Wales from the Middle Ages onwards. Marshall's account of the development of these rights has often been seen as a causal account in which civil rights provided the foundation for the acquisition of political rights which led, in turn, to the acquisition of social rights (see e.g. Pierson 1998, 20-22; Lister 2003, 70), but this may not be an entirely accurate summary of its author's intentions.

Although Marshall thought that social rights were radically curtailed during the course of the nineteenth century, he did not argue that they were eliminated altogether, and even though he thought that the acquisition of political rights (by men) had contributed to the expansion of social rights, he did not regard this as being either a necessary or a sufficient condition for their development (Marshall 1950, 21-46). Instead, one of the main aims of his paper was to examine the way in which the possession of one set of rights had become separated from the possession of a different set of rights, and the way in which the process of welfare

reform in the first half of the twentieth century enabled the three types of rights to be brought back together. In this sense, his paper was not designed to explain the 'evolution' of Britain's welfare state, but rather to identify the particular meaning of that welfare state.

This chapter seeks to explore the implications of this argument for our understanding of the relationship between gender and the history of British social policy since the introduction of the New Poor Law in 1834. During the nineteenth century, as Marshall (1950, 24) explained, it was often assumed that the possession of social rights was incompatible with the full exercise of either civil or political rights, and this was reflected in the organisation and distribution of poor relief. After 1906, the Liberal governments of Henry Campbell-Bannerman and Herbert Asquith introduced a series of reforms which removed some of the constraints on the exercise of welfare rights and allowed a new generation of men to receive social benefits. Forty years later, Clement Attlee's Labour government sought to extend the scope of the Liberal reforms to the entire population, so that many women and children became eligible for benefits which had previously been restricted to male breadwinners. However, as many commentators have recognised, the new benefits did not introduce an era of gender equality because many of the benefits extended to the female population continued to depend on their relationship to a male partner (see e.g. Pedersen 1990, 983-4; 1993, 1-21).

Although other commentators have also explored the relationship between gender and entitlement in the history of British welfare provision, they have tended to approach the issue in a rather different way. Several authors have examined the ways in which 'women's agency' contributed to the development of Britain's welfare state (see e.g. Thane 1991; Lewis 1994), and both Pat Thane (1978a) and Mary

Daly (1998) have emphasised the essential continuity between the ways in which the poor law and its successors dealt with women's claims for income maintenance. In contrast, the main aim of this chapter is to show how the changing relationship between social and political rights affected the welfare entitlements of both men and women between the introduction of the New Poor Law and the creation of the 'classic' welfare state after 1945.

1. *Gender and welfare under the New Poor Law*

The foundations of the English system of poor relief were laid by a series of Acts passed during the late-fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, culminating in the Elizabethan Poor Law Acts of 1597 and 1601 (Slack 1995, 1-13). These Acts gave the churchwardens and overseers of each parish the right to levy a tax, or poor rate, on every inhabitant or occupier of land, and made them responsible for 'setting the poor on work', maintaining those who were unable to work, and making arrangements for pauper children to become apprentices. Although several additional Acts were passed throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the basic framework of poor law provision remained intact until the passage of the Poor Law Amendment Act in 1834. This Act broke new ground by establishing a central government body, known as the Poor Law Commission, and giving it the power 'to make and issue ... rules, orders and regulations for the management of the poor' in England and Wales. It also gave the Commissioners the power to combine individual poor law parishes into Unions 'for the administration of the laws for the

relief of the poor', and enabled them to order the construction of workhouses if there was sufficient support for this (Harris 2004, 40-9).

Although the Act was primarily an administrative measure, its underlying aim was to reduce the 'burden' of poor relief by making it much more difficult for able-bodied men, in particular, to claim relief (Parliamentary Papers 1840, 5). During the early years of the New Poor Law, the Commissioners sought to achieve this aim by insisting that relief should only be given to able-bodied men (and their families) if they were prepared to enter a workhouse, but they were subsequently obliged to relax this policy, and allow Boards of Guardians to distribute outdoor relief to able-bodied men who were willing to perform an 'outdoor labour test' (Harris 2004, 49-50). However, despite this the number of able-bodied men who received poor relief remained very low, as Table 1 demonstrates. On 1 January 1859 the total number of able-bodied men in receipt of poor relief was 32,363, of whom 6245 were being relieved inside a workhouse. The majority of those who received outdoor relief were being relieved as a result of their own sickness or that of another family member. Only 85 were receiving relief as a result of 'sudden or urgent necessity', and only 2459 were being relieved 'on account of want of work or other causes'.

Table 1. Able-bodied men in receipt of poor relief, 1849-59.

	Indoor relief		Outdoor relief				Total
	Married	Others	Relieved in cases of sudden & urgent necessity	Relieved in cases of their own sickness, accident or infirmity	Relieved on account of sickness, accident or infirmity of any of the family, or of a funeral	Relieved on account of want of work, or other causes	
1 Jan 1849	2,389	8,695	708	25,506	10,996	17,427	65,721
1 July 1849	802	3,948	506	22,257	8,815	8,719	45,047
1 Jan 1850	1,690	8,160	308	22,650	9,071	9,314	51,193
1 July 1850	512	3,085	201	18,604	6,790	4,440	33,632
1 Jan 1851	1,396	6,958	200	19,799	7,489	5,347	41,189
1 July 1851	432	2,857	190	17,147	6,539	4,356	31,521
1 Jan 1852	1,001	5,681	220	17,650	6,801	4,108	35,461
1 July 1852	430	2,956	102	17,049	6,442	2,677	29,656
1 Jan 1853	749	4,630	125	17,179	6,476	1,611	30,770
1 July 1853	151	2,124	81	14,392	5,394	1,084	23,226
1 Jan 1854	1,192	6,307	225	17,606	7,431	3,216	35,977
1 July 1854	446	3,156	133	15,967	6,849	2,246	28,797
1 Jan 1855	1,052	5,331	116	17,781	7,587	4,245	36,112
1 July 1855	430	3,349	97	16,877	6,644	2,498	29,895
1 Jan 1856	998	5,495	164	18,526	7,579	4,967	37,729
1 July 1856	259	2,842	78	15,556	6,001	1,479	26,215
1 Jan 1857	842	5,052	88	17,210	6,835	3,784	33,811
1 July 1857	249	3,099	117	15,402	6,053	1,575	26,495
1 Jan 1858	957	6,505	141	19,146	7,820	12,155	46,724
1 July 1858	217	3,195	78	15,544	5,698	2,402	27,134
1 Jan 1859	552	5,693	85	17,239	6,335	2,459	32,363

Source: Parliamentary Papers 1859, 196-9.

Although the architects of the New Poor Law were particularly concerned to restrict the relief entitlements of able-bodied men, these restrictions had a direct impact on the welfare of the women and children whose husbands and fathers were denied poor relief. The significance of this is underlined by evidence from other sources which demonstrates that women and children tended to bear the brunt of poverty in poor households (Thane 1978a, 33-5; Harris 1998, 418; 2008, 194). However, many women also faced particular difficulties when applying for relief independently, as Pat Thane (1978a) has demonstrated. Married women only retained a right to relief in the parish or Union of their husbands' birth, and this meant

that many widows and deserted wives were transported back to their husbands' birth-parishes in order to seek relief. Many poor law authorities were also reluctant to give outdoor relief to widowed or separated mothers, on the grounds that the workhouse would provide a more suitable environment for the upbringing of their children, and they stigmatised unmarried mothers inside the workhouse by requiring them to perform the most onerous tasks. During the 1870s, the central authority launched a 'crusade' against outdoor relief, and this led to a further reduction in the number of women who received assistance outside the workhouse. For the first time, women could be asked to perform an 'outdoor labour test' in order to demonstrate their need for relief, and new restrictions were placed on the welfare rights of deserted mothers (Thane 1978a; Harris 2004, 54-6).

However, despite these difficulties, women continued to form a majority of the adult recipients of poor relief throughout the period from 1834 to 1914, although there were important differences in respect of the numbers of men and women who were relieved inside and outside the workhouse, and in the numbers of male and female paupers who were described as being either able-bodied or non-able-bodied. The statistics for indoor pauperism are summarised in Appendix 1. This table shows that, during the 1850s, the numbers of men and women who received indoor relief were roughly equal, but the proportion of female inmates who were able-bodied was consistently greater. This continued to be the case during the following decades, but the overall number of male inmates began to outstrip the number of female inmates at the end of the 1860s, and by 1913 more than three-fifths of all adult inmates were male, with more than 64 per cent of all adult male paupers receiving relief inside a workhouse (see also Appendix 2).

Even though the number of adult males inside the workhouse ultimately outstripped the number of adult females, the majority of paupers were supported outside the workhouse, and the majority of outdoor paupers were female. This included both able-bodied and non-able-bodied paupers, as Appendix 2 demonstrates. During the 1850s, the number of able-bodied women who received outdoor relief exceeded the number of able-bodied men because, in addition to the wives of able-bodied men, relief was also granted to single women without children, unmarried mothers, widows, and the wives of prisoners, members of the armed forces and other non-resident males. The central authority did not publish the same amount of information for later decades, but it is reasonable to assume that the broad pattern did not change. These statistics reflect the fact that women faced a much greater risk of poverty as a result of lower wages and more limited labour market opportunities, as well as greater longevity (Thane 1978a, 33-5). However, they also reflect the way in which considerations of gender influenced the development and application of poor law policies. As Lynn Lees (1998, 179) has argued, even though the amounts of relief provided by the poor law authorities were often meagre at best, poor law officials were more willing to offer relief to women, children and the elderly than to Irish immigrants or healthy adult males.

2. *Pauper disenfranchisement and welfare reform*

Although tests such as the workhouse test and the outdoor labour test played an important part in deterring able-bodied men from seeking poor relief, they were not the only factors which discouraged people from becoming paupers. After 1832, the

recipients of poor relief were legally prevented from voting in Parliamentary elections, and although this made little difference to women, who were prevented from voting until 1918, it became increasingly important for men who might otherwise have been able to exercise their own voting rights. The significance of this was underlined by changes in franchise law and by the gradual expansion of poor law services.

As is well-known, the basis of voting rights in the mid-nineteenth-century was laid down by the Representation of the People Act of 1832. The Act granted voting rights to the freeholders of property worth more than £10 a year and to the tenants of properties worth more than £50 a year in County areas (2 William IV C. 45, sections 18-20). It enfranchised approximately 717,000 men, or roughly one-fifth of the adult male population (Pugh 1999, 49). Voting rights were extended more dramatically by the Acts of 1867 and 1884. The 1867 Act gave the vote to householders and lodgers in borough districts (30 & 31 Vict. C. 102, sections 3-6) and the 1884 Act established uniform rights for householders and lodgers throughout the country (48 Vict. C. 3, sections 2-3). As a result of these changes, more than sixty per cent of adult males enjoyed the right to vote in Parliamentary elections by the end of the century (Pugh 1999, 106).

However, there was also a long-standing tradition that political rights should be denied to individuals in receipt of poor relief. In 1795, Charles James Fox pointed out that, with very few exceptions, 'all those ... who had at any time received relief from the parish' were excluded from voting in Parliamentary elections (Parliamentary History of England 1795, col. 702), and this tradition was reinforced by the Reform Acts of 1832 and 1867. The 1832 Act excluded anyone 'who shall within twelve calendar months next previous to the last day of July in such year have received

parochial relief' from voting in cities or boroughs (2 William IV C. 45, section 36) and the 1867 Act extended this prohibition to voters in county areas (30 & 31 Vict. C. 102, section 40). The Divided Parishes and Poor Law Amendment Act of 1876 prevented anyone 'who shall be in receipt of relief given to himself or his wife or child, or who shall have been in receipt of such relief on any day during the year last' from voting in any local elections, including the election of members of Boards of Guardians (39 & 40 Vict. C. 61, section 14).

Although Parliament denied the vote to those who had been in receipt of poor relief, voting rights were extended to the recipients of other forms of public welfare provision, including both public vaccination and the payment of school fees by School Boards. The Vaccination Act of 1867 stated that even though the poor law authorities were responsible for the administration of the public vaccination service, vaccination against smallpox 'shall not be considered to be parochial relief', and neither the recipients of vaccination nor their parents should suffer any disabilities or disqualifications as a result of this service (30 & 31 Vict. C. 84, section 26). The Elementary Education Act of 1870 allowed School Boards to remit the fees of any child whose parents were unable to pay them, but such remission 'shall not be deemed to be parochial relief ... to such parent' (33 & 34 Vict. C. 75, section 17). However, the inclusion of these clauses only served to underline the fact that the recipients of benefits which were regarded as poor relief continued to be disqualified from exercising the right to vote.

These developments highlighted a growing tension associated with the expansion of public welfare services during the course of the nineteenth century. On the one hand, Parliament was anxious to maintain the deterrent aspects of the poor law and these were reinforced during the 'crusade against outdoor relief' of the

1870s, but it also recognised that there may be circumstances in which it was in the interests of the public as a whole for individuals to avail themselves of the services which the state provided. These tensions came to a head over the development of poor law medical services in the 1870s and 1880s. Even though Parliament wanted to discourage individuals from making themselves dependent on the receipt of poor relief, it also wanted to encourage people to take fuller advantage of some of the services which the poor law provided. It was also becoming increasingly aware of the demand for exemptions from some of the disabilities associated with pauper status on grounds of both political and social justice.

During the 1860s and 1870s, medical authorities were becoming increasingly aware of the role played by infected individuals in the transmission of infectious and contagious diseases, and this highlighted the need to ensure that individuals who might be suffering from these conditions should seek medical attention at the earliest opportunity (Harris 2004, 97). This was made more difficult if the same individuals were discouraged from seeking medical assistance under the poor law by the imposition of pauper disabilities. As a result of this, the Liberal MP for Liverpool, William Rathbone, made two unsuccessful attempts to introduce legislation which would have ensured that no person should be disqualified from voting in a Parliamentary election because 'he, or any member of his family, has ... received medical treatment or relief for any infectious or contagious disease as an in-patient or out-patient of any hospital, infirmary or dispensary established or maintained by any sanitary ... or poor law authority' (Parliamentary Papers 1878a; 1878b). The issue resurfaced during the debates on the Representation of the People Bill in 1884 and on the Registration (Occupation Voters) Bill in 1885. On 12 May 1885, the Liberal MP for Christchurch, Horace Davey, proposed an amendment to the

Registration Bill which would have meant that 'medical and surgical relief and the giving of medicine shall not be deemed to constitute parochial relief within the meaning of the Representation of the People Acts' (Parliamentary Debates 1884, cols. 859-66; 1885a, cols. 1882-10; 1885b, cols. 387-91, 958-70).

Although Davey's amendment was rejected, it paved the way for two further Bills, introduced over the course of the following two months, which were both designed to dissociate the receipt of medical relief from the disabilities which were associated with the receipt of other poor law services. In June, the Liberal MP for Ipswich, Jesse Collings, introduced a Private Member's Bill which proposed that 'no person shall be disqualified from being registered as a voter or from voting under any Act relating to the Representation of the People by reason of the receipt ... of parochial or poor law relief in the form of medical or surgical assistance or medicine' (Parliamentary Papers 1884a), and in July the Government introduced a Bill of its own, which allowed the recipients of medical relief to vote in all elections other than the election of Boards of Guardians (Parliamentary Papers 1884b). This Bill became law on 30 July (48 & 49 Vict. C. 46) and provided a template for further attempts to extend voting rights to other recipients of poor relief and related services over the next two decades (see e.g. Parliamentary Debates 1906, col. 1585).

The debates over these Bills reflect the changing nature of the debate over pauper disabilities. In 1884, when the Irish MP Andrew Commins sought to extend voting rights to the recipients of medical relief in the Representation of the People Bill, his arguments were largely related to the control of infectious diseases. He pointed out that the Public Health Act of 1875 gave magistrates the power to order people who were suffering from infectious diseases to be admitted to a public hospital, and he argued that they should not be disenfranchised as a result of an

obligation imposed upon them for the public good (Parliamentary Debates 1884, cols. 859-66). However, when MPs agreed to support the Government's Medical Relief (Disqualifications Removal) Bill in 1885, they did so on the basis that no form of medical relief should disqualify a man from exercising his right to vote, and that there was a fundamental difference between the receipt of medical assistance and other forms of poor relief. As the Conservative MP for Hertfordshire, Frederick Halsey, explained 'in the majority of cases illness came upon people suddenly, often at most difficult times', and this meant 'that medical relief stood on a totally different footing to any other form of relief' (Parliamentary Debates 1885c, col. 1434).

Although MPs such as Halsey accepted the idea that voting rights should be granted to the recipients of medical relief, they continued to argue that men who received other forms of poor relief should be excluded from the rights of political citizenship, and this principle was reaffirmed on a number of occasions during the 1890s and early-1900s. In 1892, Sir Wilfred Lawson argued that men who were employed by Boards of Guardians on public works schemes should be allowed to retain the right to vote in all Parliamentary and local elections (Parliamentary Papers 1892), and Sir Theodore Fry introduced a very similar Bill in 1895 (Parliamentary Papers 1895a). However, when Parliament passed the Unemployed Workmen Act in 1905, it did agree that 'the provision of temporary work or other assistance for any person under this Act shall not disentitle him to be registered or to vote in a Parliamentary, county or parochial election, or as a burgess' (5 Edw. VII C. 18, section 1.7).

These were not the only attempts to either modify or remove the restrictions placed on the voting rights of poor relief recipients in this period. In 1895, Samuel Hoare proposed that paupers should not be disqualified from exercising the right to

vote if they received poor relief in an area which had been formally identified as a 'distressed district' (Parliamentary Papers 1895b), and three separate attempts were made to protect the voting rights of members of friendly societies who received poor relief in 1900, 1901 and 1902 respectively (Parliamentary Papers 1900; 1901; 1902). In 1905 and 1906 the Liberal MP for Manchester, Charles Schwann, tried to abolish the pauper disqualification clauses altogether, and his colleague, Patrick Marnham, attempted to extend the protection provided by the Unemployed Workmen Act to individuals employed in poor law labour yards in 1906 and 1908 (Parliamentary Papers 1905; 1906a; 1906b; 1908). However, despite these efforts, many MPs continue to argue that men who exercised their right to claim poor relief forfeited their right to be treated as political citizens. As the Conservative MP for Wigan, Sir Francis Powell, explained, when outlining his objections to Marnham's Bill in 1906, 'although [the] Bill discriminated in the preamble by using the word "deserving", there was no such discrimination in [its] enacting clauses.... How could they treat a person who was little more than a tramp or a vagrant in the same way as they treated the deserving persons to whom reference had been made by preceding speakers?' (Parliamentary Debates 1906, col. 1588).

3. *Extending the boundaries of welfare provision*

By the end of the nineteenth century, there was a growing recognition of the need for some form of welfare reform. This was encouraged by the publication of new studies of poverty in London and York by Charles Booth and Seebohm Rowntree and by mounting fears about 'physical deterioration', and it reflected widespread concerns

on the part of the political élite about the rise of the new Labour Party and the 'quest' for national efficiency (Harris 2004, 151-7). In 1905, the outgoing Conservative government appointed a Royal Commission to investigate the operation of the Poor Laws, and this led to the publication of both Majority and Minority Reports in 1909. However, instead of either reforming or abolishing the Poor Law, the Liberal government of 1906-14 decided to follow an alternative approach, based on the development of new forms of welfare provision to run alongside it. This approach enabled the government to introduce a new range of welfare benefits which could be claimed by 'respectable' workers without incurring the disabilities associated with the receipt of poor relief. This was particularly important for adult men, who were now able to claim welfare benefits for themselves and their families without surrendering their rights as political citizens (Harris 2004, 57-8, 165).

The Government's approach was reflected, initially, in the introduction of the Education (Provision of Meals) Act of 1906. This Act was based on a Private Member's Bill which had been introduced by a Labour MP, W.T. Wilson, earlier in the year. Its primary aim was to enable local authorities to cooperate with voluntary agencies to provide school meals to children whose parents could afford to pay for them, but it also allowed the authorities to give free meals to children who were 'unable by reason of lack of food to profit from the education provided for them', and by 1914 it had been adopted by more than 130 local education authorities (Harris 1995a, 77; 2004, 157-8). Although this was in many ways a rather minor measure, it represented a major extension of the scope of public welfare provision outside the poor law, as many contemporary observers recognised. In 1914, the conservative

constitutional theorist, Alfred Venn Dicey, summarised its significance in the following terms:

Noone can deny that a starving boy will hardly profit from the attempt to teach him the rules of arithmetic. But it does not necessarily follow that a local authority must therefore provide every hungry child at school with a meal ... [or] that a father who first lets his child starve, and then fails to pay the price legally due from him for a meal ... should ... retain the right of voting for a Member of Parliament. Why a man who first neglects his duty as a father and then defrauds the state should retain his full political rights is a question easier to ask than to answer (Dicey 1962, 1).

The next major reform to raise significant questions about the relationship between the social and political rights of citizenship was the Old Age Pensions Act of 1908. As John Macnicol (1998, 60-84) has shown, the earliest proposals for the establishment of old-age pensions were designed to encourage young people to behave in a more sober and thrifty way by saving money for their own old age, but there was also growing evidence that many older people were experiencing considerable poverty. In 1895, the Royal Commission on the Aged Poor highlighted the fact that many elderly people were living in poverty because they were not prepared to apply for poor relief, and Seebohm Rowntree claimed that as much as ten per cent of the household poverty in York in 1899 was attributable to the illness or old age of the principal wage-earner (Harris 2004, 57). These revelations reinforced the growing demand for a non-contributory pension scheme, and this culminated in the 1908 Act. The Act provided a means-tested benefit of up to five shillings a week for men and women over the age of seventy with an annual income of less than £31 10s.¹ However, it was not supposed to be paid to people who had

¹ Before 1971, the main units of currency in the United Kingdom were pounds, shillings and pence. Each pound contained twenty shillings, and each shilling contained twelve pence. In 1901, Seebohm Rowntree estimated that the sum needed to maintain a family of two adults and three children in a state of 'merely physical efficiency' was 21 shillings and eight pence a week, including rent (see Harris 2000, 78-80).

recently received poor relief, and it was conditional on tests of behaviour and good character (Macnicol 1998, 155-63; Harris 2004, 159).

The introduction of old age pensions represented a significant moment in the history (or pre-history) of the British welfare state for a number of reasons. In the first place, it is important to recognise that one of the main arguments in favour of the introduction of a non-contributory scheme was an acknowledgement of the fact that it would be very difficult for low income-earners in general, and women in particular, to afford the level of contributions needed over the course of their working lives to finance their own pension arrangements (Thane 1978b). Secondly, it is also necessary to recognise that the circumstances of both economics and demography meant that the majority of those who received old age pensions after 1908 were likely to be female, as Table 2 demonstrates. However, the introduction of old age pensions also possessed a major symbolic importance for elderly men because it meant, for the first time, that they were able to claim a cash benefit from the state without surrendering their rights as political citizens.

Table 2. Number of pensions payable in England and Wales, and in the United Kingdom, 1909-14

	England and Wales			United Kingdom		
	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
26 March 1909	-	-	393,700	-	-	647,494
31 March 1910	-	-	441,489	-	-	699,352
31 March 1911	-	-	613,873	-	-	907,461
29 March 1912	-	-	642,524	351,397	590,763	942,160
28 March 1913	245,418	423,228	668,646	363,811	604,110	967,921
27 March 1914	251,126	433,509	684,635	369,365	614,766	984,131

Sources: *Annual Reports of the Local Government Board, 1908-14.*

The significance of these changes was underlined by the National Insurance Act of 1911. Part I of this Act introduced a national health insurance scheme which, at the time of its inception, covered approximately thirteen million workers engaged in manual occupations earning less than £160 a year. Under the scheme, female employees paid three pence a week and male employees four pence a week, and their contributions were supplemented by additional contributions from their employers (three pence a week) and the State (two pence a week). If they were unable to attend work as a result of ill-health, insured women were able to claim a weekly benefit of seven shillings and sixpence for the first twenty-six weeks of their illness and insured men were able to claim a weekly benefit of ten shillings; both men and women were eligible for a disablement benefit of five shillings a week if they remained off work for more than twenty-six weeks. The scheme also provided insured workers with a range of other benefits including access to a general practitioner, free accommodation in a tuberculosis sanatorium for themselves and their dependants, and a maternity allowance of thirty shillings for insured women and the wives of insured men (Harris 2004, 162-3).

The second part of the Act was designed to provide compensation for loss of earnings as a result of unemployment. Under this scheme, both employees and employers contributed 2.5 pence a week and the state contributed the equivalent of 1.67 pence per week. In return for their contributions, insured workers were entitled to claim an unemployment benefit of five shillings a week for up to fifteen weeks in each 52-week period. When the scheme was first introduced, it was confined to approximately 2.25 million workers in a small number of clearly-defined occupations, but both the extent and the coverage of the scheme expanded dramatically after 1918. By the end of 1921, the scheme covered the vast majority of manual workers

and non-manual workers earning less than £250 a year, and provided insurance against both short- and long-term periods of unemployment. The financial value of the benefits was greatly enhanced by the addition of separate allowances for the dependants of insured workers from November 1921 onwards (Harris 2004, 163, 204-5).

Although the National Insurance Act has often been depicted as a major extension of public welfare provision, it also represented a major change in the relationship between social and political citizenship. During the nineteenth century, it was widely accepted that a man who applied for poor relief during periods of financial hardship forfeited his rights as a political citizen, but the introduction of both the health and unemployment insurance schemes enabled working men to obtain statutory welfare benefits without surrendering their rights as political citizens. This was also reflected, if only implicitly, in many of the arguments used by the supporters of national insurance, when they claimed (as Winston Churchill did) that the introduction of these schemes would help to 'increase the stability of our institutions by giving the mass of industrial workers a direct interest in maintaining them' (see Harris 2004, 155).

However, the introduction of national insurance also had a profound impact on the gendered nature of welfare entitlements in Britain between 1911 and 1939. As we have already seen, the main role of the poor law was to provide welfare support to those who were on the margins of the regular labour force, and the majority of these individuals were either children, adult women, or the elderly. By contrast, the unemployment and health insurance schemes were designed to offer statutory welfare benefits to those who were normally in paid employment, and the majority of these workers were adult men. These differences were reflected in the statistics of

both unemployment and health insurance (see Tables 3 and 4). In 1936, only 22 per cent of women between the ages of sixteen and 64 were eligible for unemployment insurance but 64 per cent of 16-64 year-old men were covered by the scheme, and in 1938 63 per cent of the entire male population was eligible for health insurance, but the equivalent proportion of the female population was less than thirty per cent.

In addition to the expansion of the unemployment and health insurance schemes, the interwar period also witnessed a major change in pension provision, with the introduction of the Widows', Orphans' and Old Age Contributory Pensions Act of 1925. This Act was grafted onto the existing health insurance scheme and established a basic pension of ten shillings a week for insured workers between the ages of 65 and 70, the wives of insured men (where the man was over the age of 65 and the woman was aged between 65 and 70), and the widows of insured men, with additional allowances for the widows' children and for orphans. In 1929, a second Act was passed, granting pension rights to the widows of men who had died before the 1925 Act came into operation, and a third Act was passed in 1936. In 1937, the scheme was extended to enable women with an annual income of less than £250 and men with an annual income of less than £400 to insure themselves voluntarily (Harris 2004, 216).

Table 3. Number of workers eligible for unemployment insurance benefits in Great Britain, 1922-36

	Insured population ≥16		Employed population ≥16		Total population ≥16		Total population 16-64		Insured population as % of Employed population ≥16		Total population ≥16	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
	1922	8,189,290	2,991,660	13,205,294	5,366,713	14,165,329	16,169,339	13,029,898	14,648,413	62.02	55.74	57.81
1923	8,335,200	2,896,780	13,331,214	5,426,970	14,327,803	16,330,247	13,160,219	14,768,129	62.52	53.38	58.18	17.74
1924	8,390,000	2,977,510	13,457,135	5,487,228	14,490,276	16,491,155	13,290,540	14,887,846	62.35	54.26	57.90	18.06
1925	8,553,790	3,069,430	13,583,055	5,547,486	14,652,750	16,652,063	13,420,861	15,007,562	62.97	55.33	58.38	18.43
1926	8,680,970	3,092,730	13,708,976	5,607,744	14,815,224	16,812,971	13,551,183	15,127,279	63.32	55.15	58.59	18.39
1927	8,745,500	3,130,100	13,834,897	5,668,001	14,977,698	16,973,878	13,681,504	15,246,996	63.21	55.22	58.39	18.44
	Insured population ≥16		Employed population 16-64		Total population ≥16		Total population 16-64		Employed population 16-64		Total population 16-64	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
1928	8,469,700	3,159,300	13,287,782	5,575,194	15,140,172	17,134,786	13,811,825	15,366,712	63.74	56.67	61.32	20.56
1929	8,597,300	3,236,700	13,410,463	5,634,756	15,302,645	17,295,694	13,942,146	15,486,429	64.11	57.44	61.66	20.90
1930	8,769,000	3,369,000	13,533,144	5,694,319	15,465,119	17,456,602	14,072,467	15,606,145	64.80	59.16	62.31	21.59
1931	9,021,000	3,479,000	13,655,825	5,753,881	15,627,593	17,617,510	14,202,788	15,725,862	66.06	60.46	63.52	22.12
1932	9,139,300	3,403,700	13,778,506	5,813,443	15,790,067	17,778,418	14,333,109	15,845,579	66.33	58.55	63.76	21.48
1933	9,181,400	3,438,600	13,901,187	5,873,006	15,952,541	17,939,326	14,463,430	15,965,295	66.05	58.55	63.48	21.54
1934	9,266,600	3,423,400	14,023,868	5,932,568	16,115,014	18,100,234	14,593,751	16,085,012	66.08	57.71	63.50	21.28
1935	9,356,000	3,424,000	14,146,549	5,992,130	16,277,488	18,261,142	14,724,072	16,204,728	66.14	57.14	63.54	21.13
1936	9,538,000	3,512,000	14,269,230	6,051,693	16,439,962	18,422,050	14,854,394	16,324,445	66.84	58.03	64.21	21.51

Notes: Figures for the employed population and total population aged 16 and over, and between the ages of 16 and 64, have been estimated from the census returns for 1921 and 1931.

Source: Parliamentary Papers 1937, 2, 3, 14.

Table 4. Number of workers eligible for statutory health insurance benefits in the United Kingdom, 1914-38.

	Number of persons eligible for health insurance benefits (1000s)		Population (1000s)		Eligible persons as % of population	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
1914 ^{a, b, c}	9,667	4,020	20,187	21,527	47.89	18.67
1915 ^{b, c, d}	9,947	4,146	18,311	21,744	54.32	19.07
1916 ^{b, c, d}	10,316	4,532	17,536	21,901	58.83	20.69
1917 ^{b, c, d}	10,514	4,853	16,977	22,030	61.93	22.03
1918 ^{b, c, d}	10,705	5,183	16,742	22,094	63.94	23.46
1919 ^{b, c, d}	10,308	5,139	18,173	22,074	56.72	23.28
1920 ^{b, c, d}	10,215	5,064	19,920	22,192	51.28	22.82
1921 ^{b, c}	10,245	4,905	20,446	22,369	50.11	21.93
1922 ^c	10,429	5,043	21,226	23,146	49.13	21.79
1923	10,687	5,214	21,328	23,269	50.11	22.41
1924	10,946	5,415	21,508	23,407	50.89	23.14
1925	11,110	5,513	21,567	23,492	51.51	23.47
1926	11,427	5,640	21,662	23,570	52.75	23.93
1927	11,607	5,747	21,733	23,656	53.41	24.29
1928 ^e	11,901	5,985	21,823	24,024	54.54	24.91
1929	12,064	6,097	21,877	23,796	55.14	25.62
1930	12,326	6,199	21,986	23,880	56.06	25.96
1931	12,469	6,239	22,087	23,987	56.46	26.01
1932	12,566	6,258	22,235	24,100	56.52	25.97
1933	12,463	6,228	22,332	24,189	55.81	25.75
1934	12,522	6,273	22,403	24,263	55.89	25.85
1935	12,705	6,347	22,504	24,364	56.46	26.05
1936	13,246	6,573	22,605	24,476	58.60	26.85
1937	13,546	6,735	22,726	24,563	59.60	27.42
1938 ^f	14,303	7,285	22,822	24,672	62.67	29.53

Notes. ^a The figures for 1914 are for the period 12/1/14-31/12/14; all other figures for calendar years. ^b The figures for the years 1914-21 are for Great Britain only (i.e. excluding Ireland). ^c The figures for the years 1914-22 include older members (i.e. aged 70 and over) who qualified for medical benefit in Scotland, Wales and (in 1922 only) Northern Ireland, but they do not include equivalent individuals in England. The English members are included from 1923 onwards. ^d Population figures for 1915-20 are for civilians only. ^e Individuals aged between 65 and 70 ceased to be eligible for sickness and disablement benefits from 2 January 1928 onwards, but they continued to be eligible for medical benefit. ^f Under the terms of the National Health Insurance (Juvenile Contributors and Young Persons) Act, 1937, boys and girls aged 14-16 became eligible for medical benefits from 4 April 1938.

Source: Harris 2004, 224.

Although the Act represented a substantial increase in the extent of state support for widows, orphans and older people of both sexes, many contemporaries

complained about the method by which they were financed and the level at which benefits were paid. In 1937, the contemporary research organisation, Political and Economic Planning, pointed out that even though the majority of women married men who were older than themselves, they still had to wait until their husbands had reached the age of 65 before they themselves could benefit, and this was reflected in the smaller number of women in the 65-70 age bracket who received contributory pensions (see Table 5). The development of the scheme also reflected the way in which the entitlements of female claimants depended on the status and contributions of a male breadwinner or pensioner. It therefore provided a further illustration of the gendered nature of welfare provision before 1939 (Harris 2004, 216; Pedersen 1993, 167-77).

Table 5. Number of individuals receiving contributory pensions in the United Kingdom under the Widows', Orphans' and Old Age Contributory Pensions Acts of 1925, 1929 and 1936.

	65-70 pensions		Widows		Children		Total
	Men	Women	Contributory	Non-contributory	Contributory	Non-contributory	
1926	-	-	49,099	116,085	40,961	230,435	436,580
1927	-	-	107,480	99,648	84,989	197,053	489,170
1928	364,219	180,023	162,749	83,473	124,157	166,153	1,080,774
1929	380,504	201,761	224,644	70,138	166,615	139,826	1,183,488
1930	400,986	243,094	280,171	289,852	206,186	122,425	1,542,714
1931	423,360	254,183	332,345	352,653	238,199	103,782	1,704,522
1932	437,484	262,369	378,793	330,668	263,024	83,267	1,755,605
1933	454,502	272,997	426,477	309,476	283,637	65,284	1,812,373
1934	469,428	285,741	465,055	287,580	291,688	47,676	1,847,168
1935	484,846	298,695	505,363	265,504	295,693	32,996	1,883,097
1936	501,559	296,717	561,168	241,673	293,535	21,041	1,915,693
1937	518,719	310,212	603,376	218,929	291,540	12,375	1,955,151
1938	534,210	323,054	637,948	197,607	286,374	6,760	1,985,953

Source: Parliamentary Papers 1940, 88-9.

Despite the expansion of public welfare provision, a substantial number of people continued to rely on the means-tested benefits provided by the poor relief system or, as it became known after 1930, public assistance (Harris 2004, 203). Although the Ministry of Health did not distinguish between male and female recipients in its published returns, the average number of individuals in receipt of either domiciliary (outdoor) or institutional relief in England and Wales on 1 January and 1 July 1939 was just over 1.2 million, out of a total population of 41 million (Parliamentary Papers 1940, 93-4). However, although the poor law survived after 1918, it did not remain unchanged. In 1918, Parliament abolished the clauses which prevented the recipients of poor relief from voting in either local or national elections (7 & 8 Geo. V C. 64, section 9), and in 1927 a Ministry of Health official complained that 'there is now much less reluctance on the part of the community generally to accept assistance from the Guardians who, on their part, have become much more ready to give it' (Harris 1995b, 532). This was another important dimension of the changing relationship between social and political rights during the interwar period.

4. *Gender and welfare after 1939*

By the end of the 1930s, 'the provision of unemployment benefit, as with other social services, was probably more comprehensive in Britain ... than in any other country which operated a democratic system' (Stevenson and Cook 1994, 83). In Marshallian terms, the growth of these services represented a significant expansion of the social rights of British citizens, but it also reflected the reconciliation of social and political rights associated with the Liberal welfare reforms of 1906-11 and the

abolition of the pauper disqualification clauses by the Representation of the People Act of 1918. However, these rights were not enjoyed equally by all members of the population. In a number of important respects, women were less likely to enjoy access to social rights than men, and some of the entitlements they did enjoy were directly dependent on their relationship to a male breadwinner.

The years between 1939 and 1945 also played a vital formative role in the development of Britain's welfare state. In June 1941, the Minister-without-Portfolio invited Sir William Beveridge to lead an enquiry into 'the existing national schemes of social insurance and allied services' and the relationship between them (Parliamentary Papers 1942, 5). Although the Committee's initial aim was to develop plans for the creation of a unified scheme of national insurance which would incorporate the health and unemployment insurance schemes, together with the existing workmen's compensation scheme, Beveridge insisted that the final proposals could only work if they were linked to a more comprehensive programme of social renewal, incorporating the introduction of family allowances, the establishment of a national health and rehabilitation service, and the maintenance of full employment (Parliamentary Papers 1942, 153). He also argued that the achievement of these aims could not be separated from the broader attack on what he called the 'five giants on the road of reconstruction', namely Want, Disease, Ignorance, Squalor and Idleness (Parliamentary Papers 1942, 6).

As we have already seen, one of the major limitations of interwar welfare provision was the gendered nature of the health insurance scheme. The scheme provided insured workers with compensation for loss of earnings due to ill-health and free access to a general practitioner; it also offered a maternity benefit for insured women and the wives of insured men, and free accommodation in a tuberculosis

sanatorium for insured workers and their dependants. However, the emphasis upon the needs of the insured worker meant that the proportion of adult women who qualified for free general practitioner services was much lower than the equivalent proportion of adult men, and this meant that women were much less likely to seek medical aid when they needed it (Digby and Bosanquet 1988, 89; Harris 2004, 225). Beveridge went beyond this by arguing that the provision of health care was a basic right and should not be dependent on the payment of individual insurance contributions, and this meant that his proposals for the creation of a comprehensive national health and rehabilitation service, and the subsequent establishment of the National Health Service, represented a substantial addition to the health-care rights of the female population (see Parliamentary Papers 1942, 158-9).

However, although contemporary writers described the health care proposals as a 'cardinal change' in the development of health service provision (Abbot and Bompas 1943, 2), the main purpose of the Report was to construct a 'Plan for Social Security', and the plan for social security was much more strongly wedded to the insurance principle. As we can see from Table 6, the population was divided into six 'security classes', including 'employees', 'others gainfully occupied', 'housewives', 'others of working age', children, and those above working age, but married women were defined as 'housewives' whether they were occupied or not, and this reflected Beveridge's own belief that married women should not be regarded as independent earners, but as individuals who were dependent on their husbands' incomes (Parliamentary Papers 1942, 50-53, 123).

Table 6. The six 'security classes' identified in the Beveridge Report

Class	Number (000,000s)	Contribution provisions	Relation to security scheme							
			Medical treatment	Funeral grant	Retirement pension	Disability benefit	Unemploy- ment benefit	Training benefit (f)	Industrial pension	Other provisions
I. Employees	18.4	Insured by weekly contribution on employment book	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	-	✓	Removal and lodging grant; industrial grant
II. Others gainfully occupied	2.5	Insured by contribution on occupation card	✓	✓	✓	✓(b)	-	✓	-	
III. Housewives	9.3 (a)	Insured on marriage through the Housewife's Policy	✓	✓	✓	- (c)	- (c)	✓	-	Marriage grant, maternity benefit (d) and grant, widows' benefit, guardian benefit, separation benefit
IV. Others of working age	2.4	Insured by contributions on Security Card	✓	✓	✓	-	-	✓	-	
V. Below working age	9.6 (g)	None	✓	✓	-	-	-	-	-	
VI. Retired above working age	4.3	Insured by contributions made during working age	✓	✓	✓	-	-	-	✓ (e)	
Total	46.5									

Notes: (a) Married women gainfully occupied estimated at 1.4 million are included in the numbers shown for Class III and excluded from the numbers shown in Classes I and II; (b) After thirteen weeks of sickness; (c) If gainfully occupied and not exempt; (d) If gainfully occupied even though exempt; (e) If granted before reaching the age of retirement and if higher than the retirement pension; (f) Includes removal and lodging grant where needed; (g) The numbers shown in Class V are on the basis of the present minimum school leaving age, viz. 14. In the Report it is assumed for the purpose of children's allowances that the minimum school leaving age is 15.

Source: Parliamentary Papers 1942, 123.

One of the most controversial features of the Beveridge Plan was the 'Married Woman's Option' (Abbott and Bompas 1943, 10-11). Although Beveridge expected women to be employed and to contribute to the scheme before marriage, he also argued that 'most women will not be gainfully occupied' during marriage, and should therefore be given the option of withdrawing the scheme at that point (Parliamentary Papers 1942, 50). Over the next thirty years, approximately three-quarters of married women chose to exercise this option and therefore surrendered their right to independent benefit, and even though the Married Woman's Option was phased out after 1977, its long-term consequences persisted for much longer (Pascall 1986, 208).

Although the aim of the Beveridge Report was to establish a basis for 'social security' for the entire population, critics have argued that the social insurance system which emerged after 1945 failed to meet women's needs in at least two main ways. In the first place, the emphasis placed on the relationship between contributions and benefits discriminated against women because they were more likely to be in low-waged, part-time or intermittent employment, and this meant that it became more difficult for them to sustain the contribution records needed to qualify for short-term unemployment benefits. The second major problem concerned the payment of retirement pensions. As we have already seen, many women surrendered their right to an independent pension by accepting the Married Woman's Option, and this continued to limit the pension rights of older women into the present century. However, even after the abolition of the Married Woman's Option, women continued to be at a disadvantage as a result of lower lifetime earnings and the growth of earnings-related pensions, and this problem has been further compounded by the increasing importance of occupational pensions. As Pat Thane (2006, 77)

has recently observed, occupational pensions and state pensions were the two main 'pillars' of the British pension system after 1945, and 'both have failed older women'.

The history of gender and welfare provision in England and Wales over the last two centuries has been closely associated with the concept of dependence and the changing relationship between social and political rights. During the nineteenth century, women were regarded as members of the dependent population, but this also helped to legitimise their entitlement to poor relief. A man who asserted his right to poor relief forfeited his claim to independent status and this meant that he also surrendered his right to vote. A number of attempts were made to address this issue during the final quarter of the nineteenth century but these were only partially successful. As a result, the separation of social and political rights was largely maintained until the early years of the twentieth century.

The assumptions which had protected women's welfare rights during the nineteenth century also helped to limit them during the twentieth century. The most important changes introduced by the Liberals between 1906 and 1914 were the establishment of a national system of old age pensions and the introduction of national insurance. The second of these changes provided a mechanism which enabled men to exercise their social rights without surrendering their political rights, but the fact that benefits were directly linked to participation in the labour market meant that these benefits also tended to reinforce the inequalities which existed within it. The persistence of these inequalities also illustrated the limitations of Marshall's view of social citizenship. Although he was right to emphasise the importance of the new welfare measures, he failed to acknowledge the limitations of a view of social citizenship which was based on the career patterns of male workers

and defined women by their relationship to a male breadwinner. The significance of this failure was reinforced by the economic, social and cultural changes which affected the development of British society after the Second World War.

Appendix 1. Indoor paupers (excluding children, insane paupers and casuals), 1849-1913.

	Males						Females						All	
	Able-bodied			Not able-bodied			Able-bodied			Not able-bodied			Male	Female
	Married	Others	Total	Married	Others	Total	Married	Others	Total	Married	Others	Total		
1849	1,596	6,322	7,917	1,407	17,628	19,035	1,826	12,285	14,111	1,250	13,277	14,527	26,952	28,638
1850	1,101	5,623	6,724	1,188	17,321	18,509	1,227	10,815	12,041	1,055	12,596	13,651	25,232	25,692
1851	914	4,908	5,822	1,113	17,805	18,917	1,023	10,361	11,384	1,015	12,993	14,007	24,739	25,391
1852	716	4,319	5,034	1,085	18,193	19,277	828	9,834	10,662	1,028	13,048	14,076	24,311	24,738
1853	450	3,377	3,827	1,015	17,946	18,960	608	9,471	10,078	925	13,554	14,479	22,787	24,557
1854	819	4,732	5,551	1,247	19,578	20,824	1,033	11,770	12,803	1,119	15,460	16,579	26,375	29,381
1855	741	4,340	5,081	1,184	20,469	21,652	954	13,123	14,077	1,102	16,159	17,261	26,733	31,338
1856	629	4,169	4,797	1,174	20,870	22,044	861	13,315	14,176	1,087	16,949	18,035	26,841	32,211
1857	546	4,076	4,621	1,118	21,720	22,838	696	12,493	13,189	1,023	16,978	18,001	27,459	31,190
1858	587	4,850	5,437	975	22,041	23,016	587	12,664	13,251	975	16,930	17,905	28,453	31,156
1859	-	-	4,763	-	-	24,797	-	-	11,777	-	-	19,971	29,560	31,748
1860	-	-	4,499	-	-	25,018	-	-	11,354	-	-	19,466	29,516	30,820
1861	-	-	5,932	-	-	26,891	-	-	14,175	-	-	20,928	32,822	35,103
1862	-	-	6,722	-	-	28,706	-	-	15,615	-	-	21,993	35,428	37,608
1863	-	-	7,033	-	-	29,765	-	-	15,224	-	-	22,419	36,798	37,642
1864	-	-	6,009	-	-	29,496	-	-	13,763	-	-	22,205	35,505	35,967
1865	-	-	6,215	-	-	30,272	-	-	13,478	-	-	22,555	36,487	36,033
1866	-	-	5,773	-	-	30,698	-	-	13,219	-	-	23,249	36,470	36,468
1867	-	-	6,435	-	-	32,283	-	-	14,391	-	-	24,036	38,718	38,427
1868	-	-	8,141	-	-	34,535	-	-	16,013	-	-	25,215	42,676	41,227
1869	-	-	8,621	-	-	35,794	-	-	16,243	-	-	24,719	44,415	40,961
1870	-	-	9,629	-	-	37,603	-	-	15,618	-	-	25,055	47,232	40,673
1871	-	-	9,496	-	-	37,869	-	-	7,134	-	-	25,803	47,365	32,937
1872	-	-	7,394	-	-	36,263	-	-	13,429	-	-	25,386	43,657	38,815
1873	-	-	6,320	-	-	36,469	-	-	12,632	-	-	26,214	42,789	38,846
1874	-	-	6,082	-	-	36,703	-	-	12,104	-	-	26,852	42,785	38,955

1907	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	105,911	70,820
1908	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	104,975	72,315
1909	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	114,376	73,918
1910	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	114,535	72,815
1911	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	112,573	71,031
1912	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	109,415	68,953
1913	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	103,798	67,717

Notes. These figures are based on the average of the number of paupers resident in workhouses on 1 January and 1 July of each calendar year.

Sources: 1849-58: Parliamentary Papers 1859, 196-9; 1859-89: Parliamentary Papers 1890, 366-9; 1890-1913: Parliamentary Papers 1914, 87.

Appendix 2. Outdoor paupers (excluding children, insane paupers and casuals), 1849-1913.

	Males		Females				Totals		
	Able-bodied	Not able-bodied	Able-bodied			Total	Not able-bodied	Men	Women
			Wives of able-bodied men	Widows	Others				
1849	47,467	97,562	37,962	50,930	20,008	108,900	201,642	145,029	310,542
1850	35,689	100,127	28,451	51,910	17,528	97,889	208,892	135,816	306,781
1851	30,534	100,775	24,476	49,388	15,498	89,361	212,130	131,308	301,491
1852	27,525	100,333	21,977	46,355	14,261	82,593	213,088	127,858	295,681
1853	23,171	97,338	18,532	45,227	12,988	76,747	210,556	120,509	287,303
1854	26,837	98,041	21,901	47,457	14,539	83,897	215,238	124,878	299,134
1855	27,923	98,004	22,671	50,363	17,238	90,272	217,128	125,927	307,400
1856	27,175	96,718	22,165	51,502	17,798	91,465	219,536	123,893	311,001
1857	25,532	97,357	20,772	49,871	15,326	85,969	220,996	122,889	306,965
1858	31,492	97,114	25,730	51,495	17,668	94,892	221,530	128,606	316,422
1859	25,146	98,895	-	-	-	87,958	226,380	124,040	314,338
1860	26,114	98,906	-	-	-	86,883	226,889	125,019	313,772
1861	30,667	100,531	-	-	-	92,979	230,235	131,197	323,214
1862	37,530	103,863	-	-	-	103,891	236,729	141,392	340,620
1863	59,889	110,445	-	-	-	137,959	247,462	170,333	385,421
1864	37,916	108,529	-	-	-	109,698	245,968	146,445	355,666
1865	33,074	107,637	-	-	-	102,115	243,808	140,711	345,923
1866	28,174	104,821	-	-	-	95,298	240,633	132,994	335,931
1867	31,481	106,508	-	-	-	99,180	245,915	137,988	345,095
1868	37,456	110,049	-	-	-	108,810	251,704	147,505	360,514
1869	35,852	111,687	-	-	-	108,354	256,512	147,539	364,866
1870	38,003	114,499	-	-	-	111,273	262,307	152,502	373,580
1871	36,457	114,847	-	-	-	108,368	262,800	151,304	371,168
1872	25,392	106,629	-	-	-	91,739	251,206	132,020	342,945
1873	14,821	97,245	-	-	-	79,899	237,269	112,066	317,168
1874	16,939	90,271	-	-	-	72,838	225,099	107,210	297,937
1875	17,313	85,519	-	-	-	70,146	215,544	102,832	285,690
1876	13,691	78,244	-	-	-	61,860	201,903	91,935	263,762
1877	13,247	74,691	-	-	-	59,651	193,774	87,938	253,425
1878	14,562	73,129	-	-	-	61,418	189,930	87,691	251,348
1879	21,657	74,685	-	-	-	70,067	189,300	96,342	259,367
1880	19,961	77,051	-	-	-	69,737	191,643	97,011	261,380
1881	16,142	76,959	-	-	-	65,813	190,802	93,101	256,614
1882	14,521	77,072	-	-	-	63,236	190,378	91,592	253,614
1883	14,406	76,327	-	-	-	62,314	188,865	90,733	251,179
1884	13,279	74,321	-	-	-	59,966	185,071	87,599	245,036
1885	14,673	74,100	-	-	-	60,625	184,306	88,773	244,931
1886	16,812	76,202	-	-	-	63,105	187,420	93,014	250,525
1887	16,140	78,122	-	-	-	62,221	190,100	94,262	252,321
1888	16,339	79,732	-	-	-	62,016	192,311	96,070	254,327
1889	14,280	79,695	-	-	-	58,424	193,460	93,975	251,884
1890	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	90,849	246,884
1891	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	87,412	240,795
1892	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	85,604	236,549
1893	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	87,440	240,657

1894	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	90,690	247,094
1895	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	93,625	253,957
1896	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	95,577	258,274
1897	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	96,143	258,946
1898	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100,839	264,677
1899	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	92,067	254,257
1900	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	89,150	248,795
1901	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	86,882	249,373
1902	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	88,976	253,196
1903	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	90,847	255,854
1904	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	94,605	260,394
1905	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	103,113	269,599
1906	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	101,937	268,976
1907	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	101,634	267,435
1908	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	102,408	267,417
1909	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	101,482	263,676
1910	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	94,078	252,969
1911	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	72,175	193,758
1912	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	62,509	166,554
1913	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	58,307	163,091

Notes. These figures are based on the average of the number of paupers receiving outdoor relief on 1 January and 1 July of each calendar year.

Sources: 1849-58: Parliamentary Papers 1859, 196-9; 1859-89: Parliamentary Papers 1890, 366-9; 1890-1913: Parliamentary Papers 1914, 87.

References

Acts of Parliament

2 William IV C. 45, *An Act to amend the representation of the people in England and Wales* (1832).

30 & 31 Vict. C. 84, *An Act to consolidate and amend the laws relating to vaccination* (1867).

30 & 31 Vict. C. 102, *An Act further to amend the laws relating to the representation of the people in England and Wales* (1867).

33 & 34 Vict. C. 75, *An Act to provide for public elementary education in England and Wales* (1870).

39 & 40 Vict. C. 61, *An Act to provide for the better organisation of divided parishes and other local areas, and to make sundry amendments in the law relating to the relief of the poor in England* (1876).

48 Vict. C. 3, *An Act to amend the law relating to the representation of the people of the United Kingdom* (1884).

48 & 49 Vict. C. 46, *An Act to prevent medical relief from disqualifying a person from voting* (1885).

5 Edw. VII C. 18, *An Act to establish organisation with a view to the provision of employment or assistance for unemployed workmen in proper cases* (1905).

7 & 8 Geo. V C. 64, *An Act to amend the law with respect to Parliamentary and local government franchises and the registration of Parliamentary and local government electors, and the conduct of elections, and to provide for the redistribution of seats at Parliamentary elections, and for other purposes connected therewith* (1918).

Other references

Abbott, E. and Bompas, K. (1943), *The woman citizen and social security: a criticism of the proposals made in the Beveridge Report as they affect women* (London: Katherine Bompas).

Breiner, P. (2006), 'Is social citizenship really outdated? T.H. Marshall revisited'. Unpublished paper presented at the annual meeting of the Western Political Science Association, Hyatt Regency Albuquerque, Albuquerque, New Mexico, 17 March 2006.

Daly, M. (1998), 'A matter of dependency: gender in British income maintenance provision', *Sociology*, 28:3, 779-97.

Dicey, A.V. (1962), *Lectures on the relation between law and public opinion in England during the nineteenth century*, (1st edition published 1905; 2nd edition first published 1914) (London: Macmillan).

- Digby, A. and Bosanquet, N. (1988), 'Doctors and patients in an era of national health insurance and private practice, 1913-38', *Economic History Review*, 41:1, 74-94.
- Harris, B. (1995a), *The health of the schoolchild: a history of the school medical service in England and Wales* (Buckingham: Open University Press).
- Harris, B. (1995b), 'Responding to adversity: government-charity relations and the relief of unemployment in interwar Britain', *Contemporary Record*, 9:3, 529-61.
- Harris, B. (1998), 'Gender, height and mortality in nineteenth- and twentieth-century Britain: some preliminary reflections', in J. Komlos and J. Baten, eds., *The biological standard of living in comparative perspective* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 413-48).
- Harris, B. (2000), 'Seebom Rowntree and the measurement of poverty, 1899-1951', in J. Bradshaw and R. Sainsbury, eds., *Getting the measure of poverty: the early legacy of Seebom Rowntree* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 60-84).
- Harris, B. (2004), *The origins of the British welfare state: society, state and social welfare in England and Wales, 1800-1945* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan).
- Harris, B. (2008), 'Gender, health and welfare in England and Wales since industrialisation', *Research in Economic History*, 26, 157-204.
- Lees, L.H. (1998), *The solidarities of strangers: the English Poor Laws and the people 1700-1948* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Lewis, J. (1994), 'Gender, the family and women's agency in the building of "welfare states": the British case', *Social History*, 19:1, 37-55.
- Lister, R. (2003), *Citizenship: feminist perspectives*, 2nd edition (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan).
- Macnicol, J. (1998), *The politics of retirement in Britain 1878-1948* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Marshall, T.H. (1950), 'Citizenship and social class', in T.H. Marshall, *Citizenship and social class and other essays* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1-85).
- Parliamentary Debates (1884), *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd series, vol. 289 (19 June 1884).
- Parliamentary Debates (1885a), *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd series, vol. 297 (6 May 1885).
- Parliamentary Debates (1885b), *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd series, vol. 298 (12 May 1885 and 20 May 1885).
- Parliamentary Debates (1885c), *Parliamentary Debates*, 3rd series, vol. 299 (21 July 1885).
- Parliamentary Debates (1906), *Parliamentary Debates*, 4th series, vol. 153 (16 March 1906).
- Parliamentary History of England (1795), *The Parliamentary History of England*, vol. 32 (9 December 1795).
- Parliamentary Papers (1840), PP 1840 (245) xvii, 397, *Sixth Annual Report of the Poor Law Commissioners for England and Wales*.

Parliamentary Papers (1859), PP 1859 (2500) ix, 741, *Eleventh Annual Report of the Poor Law Board, 1858-59.*

Parliamentary Papers (1878a), PP 1878 (282) ii, 329, *A Bill to remove disqualification by medical relief for infectious or contagious disease.*

Parliamentary Papers (1878b), PP 1878-79 (22) iii, 21, *A bill to remove disqualification by medical relief for infectious or contagious disease.*

Parliamentary Papers (1884a), PP 1884-85 (206) iv, 77, *A Bill to provide that no person shall be disqualified from voting at Parliamentary elections by the receipt of medical relief for himself or for his family.*

Parliamentary Papers (1884b), PP 1884-85 (232) iii, 405, *A Bill to prevent medical relief disqualifying a person from voting.*

Parliamentary Papers (1890), PP 1890 C. 6141 xxxiii, 1, *Nineteenth Annual Report of the Local Government Board for 1889-90, with Appendix.*

Parliamentary Papers (1892), PP 1892 (317) v, 193, *A Bill to remove disqualification from voting at elections of persons employed on labour by Guardians of the Poor.*

Parliamentary Papers (1895a), PP 1895 (18) vi, 11, *A Bill to amend the law relating to the disfranchisement of persons receiving outdoor relief in return for labour.*

Parliamentary Papers (1895b), PP 1895 (59) vi, 27, *A Bill to remove under certain circumstances the disqualification of voters in receipt of poor relief.*

Parliamentary Papers (1900), PP 1900 (56) ii, 331, *A Bill to relieve members of friendly societies of certain disqualifications from receipt of temporary outdoor relief.*

Parliamentary Papers (1901), PP 1901 (51) ii, 385, *A Bill to relieve members of friendly societies of certain disqualifications arising from the receipt of temporary relief.*

Parliamentary Papers (1902), PP 1902 (38) i, 955, *A Bill to relieve members of friendly societies of certain disqualifications arising from the receipt of temporary relief.*

Parliamentary Papers (1905), PP 1905 (38) v, 543, *A Bill to prevent the disfranchisement of persons receiving poor law relief.*

Parliamentary Papers (1906a), PP 1906 (40) v, 561, *A Bill to prevent the disfranchisement of persons receiving poor law relief.*

Parliamentary Papers (1906b), PP 1906 (22) iv, 351, *A Bill to remove certain disqualifications at Parliamentary elections.*

Parliamentary Papers (1908), PP 1908 (18) iv, 41, *A Bill to remove certain disqualifications at Parliamentary elections.*

Parliamentary Papers (1914), PP 1914 Cd. 7444 xxxviii, 1, *Forty-third Annual Report of the Local Government Board for 1913-14.*

Parliamentary Papers (1937), PP 1936-37 Cmd. 5556 xxvi, 869, *Twenty-second abstracts of labour statistics of the United Kingdom (1922-36).*

Parliamentary Papers (1940), PP 1939-40 Cmd. 6232 xi, 367, *Eighty-third statistical abstract for the United Kingdom.*

- Parliamentary Papers (1942), PP 1942-43 Cmd. 6404 vi, 119, *Social insurance and allied services: report by Sir William Beveridge*.
- Pascall, G. (1986), *Socioal policy: a feminist analysis* (London: Tavistock).
- Pedersen, S. (1990), 'Gender, welfare and citizenship in Britain during the Great War', *American Historical Review*, 95:4, 983-1006.
- Pedersen, S. (1993), *Family, dependence and the origins of the welfare state: Britain and France 1914-45* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Pierson, C. (1998), *Beyond the welfare state? The new political economy of welfare* (Oxford and Cambridge: Basil Blackwell and Polity).
- Pugh, M. (1999), *Britain since 1789: a concise history* (Basingstoke: Macmillan).
- Slack, P. (1995), *The English Poor Law 1531-1782* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Stevenson, J. and Cook, C. (1994), *Britain in the depression: society and politics 1929-39* (London: Longman).
- Thane, P. (1978a), 'Women and the poor law in Victorian and Edwardian England', *History Workshop*, 6:1, 29-51.
- Thane, P. (1978b), 'Non-contributory *versus* insurance pensions 1878-1908', in P. Thane, ed., *The origins of British social policy* (London: Croom Helm, 84-106).
- Thane, P. (1991), 'Visions of gender in the making of the British welfare state: the case of women in the British Labour Party and social policy, 1906-45', in G. Bock and P. Thane, eds., *Maternity and gender policies: women and the rise of the European welfare states 1880s-1950s* (London: Routledge, 93-118).
- Thane, P. (2006), 'The "scandal" of women's pensions in Britain: how did it come about?', in H. Pemberton, P. Thane and N. Whiteside, eds., *Britain's pensions crisis: history and policy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press and the British Academy, 77-90).