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PART ONE
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1. Migration in Nineteenth-Century Britain

Nineteenth-century population change has typically focussed on migration. This was the important human experience concomitant with Britain's transition from a predominantly rural society to one of a mainly urban industrial nature. In this process millions of individuals moved their home - some more than once - in response to the social and economic pressures which accompanied the growth of new industries and the spread of vast new communication systems. Traditional explanations of this phenomenon are rooted in E. Ravenstein's three articles on migration which were first published more than a century ago. In total, these articles contain eleven, 'principles', 'rules', or 'laws', about its dominant nature. Among these, and relevant to this thesis, are the hypotheses that the majority of migrants go only a short distance, that long-journey migrants 'generally go by preference to one of the great cities of commerce and industry', and that it was the young and single who usually moved.

Ravenstein's 'Laws of Migration' have sometimes been challenged by later writers, but they have never been
totally rejected. As one author has said, 'to review all the work on migration which Ravenstein's seminal papers have stimulated would be daunting', for, as another writer noted, there have been 'literally thousands of migration studies in many parts of the world since his papers were published'. Despite all this attention there are some areas of the literature which are seen as being deficient and to which this thesis can make a small contribution.

For example, the majority of conclusions related to the general characteristics of nineteenth-century migration are based on the analysis of aggregate census data, this being available in the printed census volumes for the larger towns and administrative districts only. Aggregate data is of limited value in the study of migration. Importantly, it gives no indication as to when a migrant moved from place of birth, or former residence, to place of enumeration. A further major disadvantage is that the criteria used for selecting published tabulations were 'those considered important and useful at the time'. As one writer has said, 'the defects of the published data suggest that nineteenth-century migration will not be properly understood until the enumerators' schedules for the century have been analysed'.

However, the uses to which published information has been put are various. They include studies of population change
in registration districts which assess the comparative contribution of natural increase and increase by migration. Changes in the net balances of population in large administrative units has received attention. Irish immigration has been considered, as has the subject of emigration. The growth of large towns has been studied, and, also, that which has traditionally been seen as the antithesis of this latter subject - namely, rural depopulation. Because of the limitations inherent in aggregate data, researchers have increasingly turned to the manuscript census in the interests of discovering the unique and the particular, as well as illuminating the generalities of nineteenth-century population change, including that of population mobility.

There are a number of published studies which use the census enumerators' schedules in an attempt to shed some light on different aspects of migration. Gwynne and Sill, for instance, analysed the birthplaces of children - as recorded in the census enumeration books - to trace the migration history of the Welsh element in the population of nineteenth-century Middlesbrough, and Jackson has examined the former employment of the St. Helens' glassmakers in order to test the hypothesis that there was a possible linkage between 'industrial structure and/or stage of industrial development with long-journey migration'. Anderson has used the census enumerators' books to plot the
birthplaces of migrants to Preston to assess the effect of distance on family relationships. Lawton sampled the 1851 manuscript census to indicate, among other things, the amount and pattern of population movement into Liverpool, and White has recently completed a systematic study of the relative importance of single people, married couples, and families in the migrant streams of two contrasting Lincolnshire towns. Another recent piece of research has used manuscript census data on birthplaces and occupations to compare the mobility of artisans with that of other occupational groups.9

At another level of analysis a group of students have used the census enumeration books to study a selection of small rural communities in an attempt to amass a body of comparable data on rural migration.10 Completed research based on the systematic record of the decennial census therefore ranges from studies at the macro level which use published census data to plot aggregate population trends in large administrative units - such as counties, registration districts, cities and large towns - to, at the other end of the scale, small investigations based on the census enumeration books; these latter studies often being undertaken by individuals and groups interested in investigating aspects of the demography of their own local community. These are often confined to simple counts of the migrant population. Major studies have sometimes
relied on a combination of both published and manuscript census data.\textsuperscript{11}

The manuscript census has been used to assess the effects of migration on, among other matters, the family, the household, various social and economic structures, residential patterns, and the cultural base of different communities. Well-known studies are those of cities and large towns such as mid-nineteenth century Preston, Nottingham, York, Liverpool and Hull, and numerous small rural communities have also been examined.\textsuperscript{12} The concentration of historical attention on these two widely different types of population - in terms of numerical size and related matters - is an indication of an area where the literature on nineteenth-century internal migration is seen as deficient, for there has been a notable lack of attention in major studies to populations which rank, in terms of size, between these two extremes, particularly small towns.

A possible explanation for the concentration of historical attention on large cities, or, alternatively, on small rural communities, is that, on the one hand, as one historian has inferred, '...there has been an implicit assumption in much of the literature...that the great industrial towns are brim-full of migrants behaving in a multitude of interesting ways',\textsuperscript{13} and, on the other hand,
that the flight from the land has been the salient concept in traditional explanations of the process of urbanisation.

The literature also lacks dynamic studies of population change in nineteenth-century communities. The emphasis has been firmly on studies of the 'snapshot' in time, or static reconstruction variety, which focus on a community at just one censal date, and therefore do not explain the on-going process of population change." There is a need for population studies which investigate the symbiotic relationship between gross inter-censal population movement - this always having been greater than the final net balance in any one decade - and the stages of industrial development of a town or region. Given the limitations of the available data, this is not an easy task, and any attempt to undertake work of this nature - which would necessarily include a study of out-migration - involves recourse to, at least, parish registers and civil registration data in addition to the linkage of information in successive censuses.

The literature is also regarded as wanting in that, with a very few exceptions, the majority of nineteenth-century populations which have undergone study, have done so in isolation from each other. This means that the making of meaningful comparisons is not generally a practical possibility. The reasons for this particular situation are
various. Among them is the fact that local conditions, circumstances, and the interests of different researchers vary, and thus demand different approaches. Another, and more pertinent reason, is that there is still no agreed methodology - two decades after this possibility was first suggested - for the stratifying and grouping of nineteenth-century communities in terms of economic and social function.

There is, also, a dearth of research into long-distance migration. It has been noted that an article reviewing the literature on nineteenth-century migration gave fifty references to short-distance movement but only four to long-distance migrants. In 1926 Redford's pioneering study on 'Labour Migration in England: 1800-1850' elaborated Ravenstein's work and concluded that, although nineteenth-century migration was predominantly short-distance, certain factors had operated which caused a variation in this general trend. One such variation was that which Redford described as 'special industrial migration'.

Redford used this term to describe the long-distance movement of workers in the old traditional industries of cotton, wool, coal, and iron to specialised industrial districts as these became established in different parts of Britain in the early part of the nineteenth century. The
term indicates, in this thesis, the long-distance migration (this based on census evidence of birthplace) of members of two occupational groups whose current employment - for divers reasons - had become scarce, or contracted, to a destination where specialised skills and/or work experience were in demand, or to one where a specialised industry appeared to have a better future. While, therefore, it is this particular aspect of long-journey industrial migration which is at the heart of this work, the thesis, because of its orientation and the characteristics of the study location, will be able to make a contribution to some other areas of the literature, which, as referred to above, are seen as being deficient.

2. The Nature of Special Industrial Migration

Examples which Redford cited of special industrial migrations include the drift of displaced cotton spinners from the Scottish, Irish, and Nottingham centres to Manchester - this movement resulting from the cotton trade becoming more closely identified with Lancashire. Similarly, workers from the older, decaying woollen industrial areas of the West Country and East Anglia migrated northwards, particularly to Bradford; this move being largely a result of Yorkshire's comparatively early transition to the factory system and power-driven machinery. With the extension of the iron-founding industry in the early decades of the nineteenth century,
iron-workers were attracted from Cheshire, Ireland, South Wales and Yorkshire to Furness and some moved from Shropshire - once the chief centre of iron production - to South Wales and Scotland. There is evidence that when Shropshire iron-masters migrated to the Black Country coalfield they sometimes took their skilled workers with them. A recent study has established that the supply of skilled labour for the iron-works in the Lincolnshire town of Scunthorpe was a case of special industrial migration of the type identified by Redford. 19

The transition to railway transport, especially in the second half of the nineteenth century, is seen by Redford as having 'strengthened industrial migration sufficiently' to have caused 'an appreciable (though slight) modification' in the common trend of short-distance movement; this having operated in different ways to create this effect. 20 In general terms the existence of the rail network made travel easier, and some people thus migrated a longer distance than might otherwise have been the case. Specifically, Redford saw the 'revolution' in transport as having facilitated industrial migration to the extent that some towns had been 'practically created', or owed their development, to the railway. Improved transport facilities in the second half of the nineteenth-century, had, for instance, resulted in miners and iron-workers flocking from Durham, South Wales, Staffordshire and other centres to
Middlesbrough after a seam of ironstone was found to outcrop in the Cleveland Hills.

Until 1851 Middlesbrough's population growth was mainly the result of short-distance migration, and, in 1861, nearly three-quarters of its population were Yorkshire-born. In the next ten years the population more than doubled, mostly due to the long-distance - and railway facilitated - influx of miners and ironworkers, with the result that, by 1871, half of Middlesbrough's inhabitants had, by that time, been born outside the county boundaries. Other towns owing their nineteenth-century development, or genesis, to the spread of the railway network, include, to name but a few, West Ham and Crewe - both cited by Redford in this context - as well as York, a major railway town, Swindon, with its great railway workshops, and Peterborough, an important railway junction. 21

To summarise, Ravenstein, in his Laws of Migration, recognised a 'special class' of migrants who moved long distances and who generally went 'by preference to one of the great centres of commerce or industry'. Redford later identified a population movement wherein members of some occupational groups travelled long distances to destinations where existing skills and work experience could be practised. Since then, although relatively little attention has been paid to long-distance movement, the
subject has been marginally developed. It is now suggested, for example, that long-distance migrants possessed certain attributes not generally present in short-distance movers. Among these are the propositions that they were more skilled or better educated.\(^{22}\) It is also thought that those travelling long distances could have had a 'disproportionate influence' at destinations where skills were scarce, and, thus, in demand, especially in new or developing towns. One study has suggested that long-journey migrants were 'crucial' to the 'take-off' stage of new industrial sites, and, in some cases, to 'whole new industrial regions'.\(^{23}\)

With these assertions in mind, this thesis explores some of the broad concepts that underlie the theory of special industrial migration, as defined on p.8 above, and tests them against a case study of representative members of two uniquely different nineteenth-century occupational groups. The majority of the members of the groups studied (i.e. dock-construction workers and deep-sea fishermen) according to the census, appeared to be long-distance migrants who had moved to Grimsby, a formerly decayed port, then undergoing discrete stages of railway sponsored development.
3. Nineteenth-Century Port Development and Special Industrial Migration

The enlargement of existing dock systems, the development of new ones, and the regeneration of some decaying ones, went on around the coasts of Britain - and on certain inland water-ways - throughout most of the nineteenth century. Much of this work was instigated by railway interests and had become necessary because of the needs of new transport systems. Also, 'the increased traffic carried by the national railway network established in the 1840s gave a great boost to steam navigation' and, thus, to the building of new types of vessels. Many older docks were unable to accommodate larger ships as well as changing patterns of working. 24

Ports which were created or re-developed at some time during the nineteenth century were many in number, and the motivations behind such activities diverse. Although institutions such as local Commissions or Trusts and Municipal undertakings, as well as private companies and individuals, were responsible for the development of many nineteenth-century ports, a considerable number were developed, and their destinies subsequently controlled - either in the long or short term - by railway companies. The following selective survey is therefore confined to a few of the mainly lesser ports which all, to some degree, owed their nineteenth-century genesis, or re-generation, to
the coming of the railway. Most of the ports concerned are indicated on Map 1, below.

As the map shows, on the north-east coast are the mineral ports of Middlesbrough, Hartlepool, and Sunderland. Middlesbrough had a dock opened in 1842; the Stockton and Darlington Railway Company contributing the sum of £160,000 towards its cost. Hartlepool owed its 1832 dock to the enterprise of the Hartlepool Dock and Railway Company, and the York, Newcastle and Berwick Railway Company and the Wearmouth Dock Company were responsible for dock developments and river improvements at the port of Sunderland in the 1840s. Lowestoft, further south, was confirmed as a minor port in 1844 when it was acquired by Samuel Peto, the railway contractor, and 're-orientated around railway working'.

In 1846, Barrow, on the north-west coast, was linked to the iron-ore mines at Dalton by the construction of the first section of the Furness railway, and, in 1863, the same railway company began the construction of two large docks of 32 and 31 acres. Heysham harbour was constructed by the Midland Railway Company under an Act obtained in 1896 - mainly in connection with that company's steamer service to Belfast. The natural harbour at Fleetwood, also on the north-west coast, was the subject of several attempts at development by different railway companies; these attempts
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beginning in 1835 when the Preston and Wyre Railway Company obtained parliamentary powers to construct a dock. In 1859, the Carlisle and Silloth Bay Railway and Dock Company opened a new port to replace Port Carlisle, which had become inadequate. Newport, Barry, Penarth, and Llanelli in the south-west were all developed for the 'railway-borne' coal trade of the Welsh coalfields.26

On the south-east coast Ipswich had a 33-acre dock constructed in 1841 and was linked to the rail network in 1846; steamers then starting to run to Holland. Dover, in the south, already well established due to the shortness of the channel crossing to Calais, had its pre-eminence as a packet and passenger port confirmed with the opening of the railway from London. Folkestone gained in importance as a port of embarkation for the continent after the completion of the South-Eastern Railway, and Newhaven was established as a result of the London, Brighton and South Coast Railway Company agreeing with the Western Railway of France to run ferries jointly between Newhaven and Dieppe.27

Some new, or regenerated, ports underwent at least two discrete developmental stages, each separately capable of actuating special industrial migrations. The idea of nineteenth-century port development occurring in stages is analogous to Leyland Jenks' theory that nineteenth-century railroad development had distinctive 'phases' or 'moments'.

15
Writing in 1938, Jenks distinguished between the railway as a 'construction enterprise' and the railway as a 'producer of transportation services'. An early stage of port development, like that of the railroad, was construction. Most developing ports at the construction stage experienced some degree of primary, and mainly peripatetic, industrial in-migration by specialist and/or experienced members of a labour force charged with the sometimes complex, and often lengthy, task of building a dock or harbour, or carrying out improvements to existing port facilities. The possible exceptions were those ports sited in, or adjacent to, cities and large towns where skilled labour might have been available from indigenous resources.

Newly developed ports such as Fleetwood, Hartlepool, Middlesbrough, Barrow, Grimsby, Ipswich, and Newhaven - according to the census returns - all owed subsequent population increase to dock and/or rail developments. It was in ports such as these, which were developed around a small existing population, that an influx of long-distance special industrial migrants would have had the greatest social and economic impact, even if this was for only a limited period of time, as in the case of a mainly peripatetic dock-building labour force. In the middle of the nineteenth century, for instance, Barrow-in-Furness was a small village of less than 400 people and it was still only a small town when large-scale dock construction began.
about a decade later. The dock contractors brought in 'several thousand labourers' and about 2,000 men were employed on the contract for the three and a half to four years that the project took to complete. 30

In 1841, when a new dock was being built at Middlesbrough, the population was only 6,000. Harwich, with an even smaller population of 3,829 in 1841, underwent harbour construction and restoration. In 1832 the Hartlepool Dock and Railway Company were improving the existing harbour, constructing docks, and making a railway to connect the port with the valuable coal mines in the county, and Hartlepool's population at that time was only 1,330. The site of Fleetwood, not long before it became the terminus of the Preston and Wyre railway and having a new harbour constructed and other public works executed was 'a rabbit warren without any houses' or other buildings save 'one solitary kiln for burning limestone'. In the case of Grimsby, that town's 1841 enumerated population of 3,700 had, by 1851, become host to a dock-building labour force of 'upwards of a thousand hands'. 31

Following Jenks' theory of railroad development having distinctive 'phases', the second phase of port development can be seen as a port becoming - to borrow his term - a 'going concern', or, more specifically, a complex dock system which functioned to change one form of transport,
whether of passengers or freight, for another. At this stage some newly developed ports attracted a secondary, more permanent, type of special industrial migrant. Miners and ironworkers, for instance, as already described, flocked to nineteenth-century Middlesbrough, and their products were exported through the port. Many deep-sea fishermen migrated to Grimsby - among other east coast destinations - and used the port's new facilities to land catches and dispatch them to inland markets. As a result, deep-sea fishing industries developed, or expanded, at some east coast ports.

4. Orientation of the Research and the Study Location

Despite the extensive dock building and port development which characterised Victorian Britain, an author has said that little has been written about the phenomenon 'either in general or in particular'. It can also be said that even less attention has been paid to the population movements which port development generated. The process of dock construction taking place at mid-nineteenth Grimsby was broadly analogous to the kind of work going on at different locations up and down the coasts of Britain through much of the century, some of which has been outlined above. The building of Grimsby's large, and, for its time, technologically advanced new dock, was part of a move towards establishing railway communication across the
centre of England, the idea being to link Manchester and South Yorkshire with an outlet to the North Sea. Grimsby was to be the terminus and was chosen for that role because of its geographical location, and, importantly, because it was a decayed port.

The first wave of special industrial migration experienced by mid-nineteenth century Grimsby - the dock-construction workers - was of comparatively short-term duration (i.e. probably lasting for the six or so years of the main dock contract). The second - the deep-sea fishermen - was of a more permanent character. Taking the dock-construction workers first, the sometimes large gangs of tradesmen and labourers who built and/or enlarged Britain's nineteenth-century docks and harbours - and of whom Grimsby's dock builders were representative - have attracted little, if any, historical attention. One possible reason for the neglect of this occupational group is that some dock-construction labour forces left behind no manuscript census evidence of their presence at a particular location. This was the case at, for instance, Barrow, where the construction of two large docks commenced in 1863 - two years after the taking of the 1861 census - and was completed in 1867, that is, four years before the date of the census of 1871.
The second wave of special industrial migrants began to arrive in Grimsby in the middle to later years of the 1850s. These were the deep-sea fishermen, many of whom, by 1861, were resident at the port. The majority of the fishermen originated from long-established fishing stations in the south and south-west of the country and some individuals, according to the birthplaces of their children, had followed a particularly circuitous migration route to the town.

In exploring the concept of special industrial migration, as defined earlier, this thesis analyses socio-demographic characteristics, and the antecedents, of the migrant construction workers who built Grimsby's mid-nineteenth century dock and of the deep-sea fishermen who later became users of the newly developed port. Relevant aspects of the local and regional area are examined so as to identify and explain the nature and workings of the socio-economic factors which operated to 'pull' the industrial migrants to Grimsby, as are, also, those of wider than regional significance which effectively 'pushed' the two groups of workers to the developing port. The patterns and processes of the two migrations are traced and analysed, and, in the case of the fishermen, tested against some of the existing literature on the subject.
Grimsby, with its railway company built dock, owed its genesis as a modern town and port to the revolution in transport which Redford saw as having strengthened industrial migration to the extent that it modified the general trend of short-distance movement. A purely practical point in favour of Grimsby as the study location, was, that in spite of the comparative magnitude of the social and economic changes which overtook the town in the middle decades of the nineteenth century and the resultant increase in population which occurred between 1841 and 1861, this latter remained of a size throughout the whole of the period under review (i.e. 1841-1861) to render a detailed examination of manuscript census data relevant to the aims of the thesis a realistic undertaking. 34

The orientation of the research and the characteristics of the study population also meant that the work would be able to make a contribution to some general areas of the literature on nineteenth-century internal migration, which, as discussed earlier in the chapter, are perceived as being deficient. For instance, there were some circumstances connected with the presence of a large, and mainly transitory, dock-building labour force in Grimsby in 1851 which provided an opportunity to develop the thesis beyond a straightforward analysis of the characteristics and antecedents of the construction workers.
Firstly, the majority of the dock builders, as will be shown in Chapter 6, left the town following the completion of the Royal Dock in 1852, and it was therefore possible to examine the implications that a relatively large out-migration of people might hold for gross, as opposed to net, inter-censal population development in a smaller urban community where the effect of such an event would have been the greatest. Secondly, of the group of 650 dock-construction workers selected for analysis, a minority were found to have originated from places in Lincolnshire less than 50 miles distant from Grimsby. In terms of the conventions followed in this research these individuals are regarded as short-distance migrants. It has therefore been possible, in some cases, to compare relevant census data in an attempt to discover if there were any obvious differences between the demographic characteristics and migrational behaviour of long-distance and short-distance migrants possessed of the otherwise common attribute of belonging to the same occupational group.

The thesis also examines some of the processes - focussing especially on aspects of migration - through which a small market town with a failed dock, became, in the space of just a few decades, a relatively important general port and, arguably, the premier fishing port of the world. Despite a comparatively large increase in population during this period and profound social and economic change,
Grimsby, like many other smaller urban centres which became important in their own unique sphere of economic activity, never attained the population growth and industrial standing comparable with the large towns and cities which have so often attracted researchers trying to explain the phenomenon of internal migration. At the other extreme mid-nineteenth century Grimsby could not be categorised, in any sense of the term, as a small depopulating rural community - such communities also having received a fair share of historical attention. These facts - in terms of physical size and overall economic stature - place the study location at a point on a scale somewhere between the two extremes of those migration destinations which have figured so prominently in the existing literature.

Because of the historical time-scale of the two population movements on which the thesis concentrates, the work has, perforce, moved away from the more usual 'snapshot' in time studies of migration. It links, over three censal dates, census and civil registration data, parish registers, and other relevant sources and is thereby able to relate the process of on-going population development to changes in some of the social and economic structures of the study location. In studying, too, the characteristics of special industrial migration, this work can help to redress a perceived imbalance in the literature, for, as noted earlier, it is clear that much attention has been directed
to short-distance migrants at the expense of long-journey movers.

It has also been said that not much attention has been paid to the relative importance of natural increase and increase by migration in accounting for the growth of urban centres and that 'here is a major field of research'. An aim of this thesis has been to establish, as far as sources allow, the gross movement of population in the study area in the period under scrutiny. This step became necessary in order to provide factual evidence that a comparatively large out-migration of population occurred in the years following the end of main dock building at Grimsby. The work on out-migration involved using civil registration data to break down decadal population increase into its twin components of natural increase and increase by migration. The findings of this particular aspect of the research will show that the final net balance of population at the end of a decadal period, as represented in the census, can be an unreliable indicator of, among other matters, the pace, and chronology, of the economic development of a given community as well as the pattern of population growth.

Finally, the existing literature on migration presents relatively little opportunity for the comparative analysis of contrasting destinations in terms of social and economic function. It is sufficient to note here that this present
work, where appropriate, stratifies the study community, in terms of occupational structure, in a manner which goes some way towards meeting criticisms that general schemes of social and industrial classification tend to be too rigid and inflexible. The scheme in question is discussed in detail elsewhere and it is not therefore necessary to reiterate it here. Appendix 'A', pp.350-359 explains the salient points. It needs to be emphasised, however, that the scheme is flexible to the extent that it allows account to be taken of the aims of this particular research, and, importantly, of some special circumstances related to the study population.

5. Plan of the Thesis
The thesis is divided into four Parts and each Part is largely self-contained. Part I comprises the Introduction (Chapter 1) and Chapter 2. Chapter 2 is a necessarily brief overview of aspects of Grimsby 1801-1845. It describes the recent social and economic background, including the origins of the 1841 population, the occupation structure of the town in that year, and the physical landscape. The purpose of the chapter is to set the two instances of special industrial migrations which are central to the thesis into local historical context, and, also, to provide a bench-mark against which can be measured population growth and other changes which arose
from the mid-nineteenth century development of the port of Grimsby.

Part II contains Chapters 3 to 6 and is concerned with the phase of dock construction. Chapter 3 considers some of the preliminaries to dock building and examines the proposition that nineteenth-century docks and railways were largely built, not only by the same contractors, but, often, by the same labouring men. It uses data abstracted from the 1851 Grimsby manuscript census to analyse the social and demographic characteristics of a group of 650 dock-construction workers. Chapter 4, also using data from the 1851 manuscript census, establishes the origins of this group of special industrial migrants. Chapter 5, again using data from the same source, especially that relating to the birthplaces of children, arrives at some conclusions as to the former employment and migration patterns of a section of the dock-building labour force. Chapter 6 examines the projected out-migration of the dock builders - following the completion of the main dock contract - in quantitative perspective.

Part III comprises Chapters 7 to 10, and is centred on the deep-sea fishermen special industrial migrants who became the 'users' of the facilities at the newly developed port. Chapter 7 uses the evidence of railway company records and other primary sources to examine relevant aspects of the
role of the Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire Railway Company (hereafter the M.S. & L.R.) - the developers of mid-nineteenth-century Grimsby - in the rise of the port's deep-sea fishing industry. It explicitly looks at the chronology of the provision of specialist facilities for the industry, and, importantly, at the implications stemming from the fact that there was no pool of local experienced labour on which the railway company could draw in its early attempts to attract the fishing trade to the port.

Chapter 8 arises from the above point. When the M.S. & L.R. set out to develop the deep-sea industry at Grimsby there was a long-established fishing industry at Cleethorpes, a small township on the north-Lincolnshire coast about three miles or so south-east of Grimsby. The local understanding is that it was the Cleethorpes fishermen who provided the nucleus of the crews for the vessels of the early Grimsby smack-owner migrants. This matter is important in the context of the circumstances, manner, and chronology, of the arrival of an in-migrant deep-sea fishing labour force at Grimsby. There is little factual evidence about the workings of the traditional Cleethorpes fishery, or about the size, constitution, and characteristics of its mid-nineteenth century labour force. Nothing is known about the fishery's alleged contribution to the nascent Grimsby industry, or, conversely, whether
developments at nearby Grimsby had any effect on the underlying structures of the Cleethorpes industry. In explicitly seeking answers to these questions, all of which are relevant to the thesis, Chapter 8 goes some way towards developing the literature on this subject.

Chapter 9 uses the 1861 manuscript census to analyse the social and economic characteristics of the early Grimsby in-migrant fishermen. Chapter 10 draws upon the same kind of data to establish the origins of the fishermen and Chapter 11, using census data relating to the birthplaces of children, traces the routes, and the patterns and processes, of the migrations which brought the deep-sea men to Grimsby. The findings of the analysis of the census data are compared with the history, as represented in the literature, of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth-century migration of fishermen from the south, south-west, and the Thames fishing stations, to the new east coast ports. Findings have been discussed as different themes have arisen throughout the work. The chief function of Part IV (Chapter 12), therefore, is to draw these together and to expand on them where it seemed necessary or desirable.
CHAPTER TWO

THE STUDY LOCATION: ASPECTS OF GRIMSBY 1801-1845

This chapter sets the successive waves of special industrial migration experienced by mid-nineteenth century Grimsby into local historical perspective. It also provides a bench-mark against which can be measured the effects these population movements had on some of the social and economic structures of a small town, which, like others in Victorian Britain, mentioned on pp.16-17, underwent dock and associated rail construction.

* * * * * * * *

1. Progress and Stagnation

Towards the end of the eighteenth century the number of ships calling at Grimsby with cargo averaged 0.6 per annum, and the population in 1801 was still only 1,524. In contrast to Grimsby's poor commercial showing there was a national trade boom in the middle and later decades of the eighteenth century and a countrywide lack of dock facilities to accommodate it. Bearing in mind Grimsby's advantageous geographical situation at the mouth of the Humber, local landowners, encouraged by the tradespeople of the town, formed the Grimsby Haven Company and built -
what was for its time - a large new dock which opened to shipping in 1801. It was hoped this venture would attract the kind of trade and prosperity which had long eluded the town.

After a slow start following the opening of the new dock, trade picked up a little by 1805, but, by 1811 - by which time the dock had been in use for a decade - shipping inwards totalled only 5,413 tons; the principal foreign trade being that from the Baltic in timber, deals, tar, seed, bones and iron. There was a boom in the trade of the port in 1824 and 1825, but this upward surge was soon over, tonnage inwards remaining at around 11,000 tons per annum for the rest of the 1820s. By 1844 it was down again to only 6,208 tons. In 1845, just before the commencement of the railway and dock building which was finally to set Grimsby on course for a long period of economic development and population growth, shipping inwards amounted to 9921 tons; this latter rise exemplifying the erratic course of trade at the port in the early decades of the nineteenth century.

A discussion of the reasons for the lack of success of the Haven Company's 1801 dock is outside the scope of this thesis, this matter having been considered in detail elsewhere. Briefly, the failure of the port to 'take-off' was due to an amalgam of factors. Among these were that
Grimsby had no established community of merchants, and those located at other places were unwilling to move to a port which lacked brokers, bankers, ship-owners and the like. Importantly, the town had no communication with an industrial hinterland and there was no local supply of exportable material. This created an imbalance in trade which made shipping through the port expensive and uneconomic to operate. These reasons for failure were exacerbated by continuing technical problems with the dock and a long-standing propensity for the Haven to silt up. Persistent troubles necessitated an ongoing programme of expensive repairs, cleaning operations and improvements.

Attempts to attract industries to the town in the early nineteenth century had met with only a modicum of success. A few comparatively small-scale enterprises were established such as a flour mill, brewery, brick and tile making, and steam mills for crushing bones and producing linseed oil, but industries such as these were relatively commonplace in many small nineteenth-century Lincolnshire towns. Gainsborough, Owston Ferry, and Brigg, as well as places in the south of the county, all had similar industries. Grimsby's brewery, for example, was just one of twenty-eight such establishments located in the county's ten main towns. From the 1820s a brick and tile making industry developed on the south bank of the Humber, this part of Lincolnshire having a plentiful supply of excellent
clay for bricks, tiles and coarse earthenware. A brick company was formed in Grimsby to make use of the clay excavated from the site of the 1801 dock. Apart from this one instance it is probably true to say that the small industries which were established in Grimsby in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, were common to many other small Lincolnshire towns, and therefore seemed to owe little to the activities of the Haven Company, and its dock, for their genesis.

Shipbuilding, an industry associated with most ports, was unimportant in Grimsby in comparison with, for instance, the Lincolnshire towns of Boston and Gainsborough. At both of these places the building of ships of up to 800 tons was not uncommon. A few ships were launched in Grimsby between 1800 and 1813, but the average size of these was only 52 tons. The chief function of the few shipbuilding yards which had become established in the town was that of repairing. Whaling was the only industry of any potential significance to be operated at the port in the early nineteenth century, but this was of little consequence in comparison with the situation appertaining at Hull on the opposite bank of the Humber, which, at that time, was the leading British whaling port. The whaling industry commenced in Grimsby in the first decade of the nineteenth century with the arrival of two whaling vessels. Despite making regular sailings for many years neither of these
ships made large profits. Both vessels were eventually lost, the last in 1821, and the ships were never replaced. 11

In 1831 an extensive rope factory and flax-spinning mill was established in the town, but this project failed after only a few years. There is little information about the enterprise but what there is suggests the business was of no mean stature, either in the size and impressiveness of its buildings, or in its function as an employer of labour. 12 Although, therefore, the early part of the 1840s seemed to offer little prospect of any upturn in the fortunes of the port, not many years were to pass before things started to change for the better.

In the autumn of 1844 the Sheffield, Ashton-under-Lyne and Manchester Railway Company, which was seeking an eastern outlet to the sea, took the decision to build to Grimsby. As a result of the Grimsby Docks Act becoming law on 8 August 1845, the Grimsby Haven Company was dissolved and its interests became vested in the newly formed Grimsby Docks Company. At the first general meeting of shareholders in October of that year a resolution was carried to amalgamate the Docks Company with the Great Grimsby and Sheffield Junction Railway. Estimates were immediately drawn up for a large new dock, which, it was confidently stated, 'will undoubtedly make Grimsby the best
steam packet and mercantile harbour and shipping port on the Eastern coast'.

2. The Physical Landscape in the early 1840s

In 1790, eleven years before the Haven Company's dock was opened to shipping, the houses of Grimsby were 'mean and straggling...several being thatched'. The shops were 'small and insignificant' and the inhabited part of the town 'all about a bow-shot from the church'. In contrast, in 1842, some forty-one years after the opening of the dock, but still several years before the coming of the railway and the building of yet another new dock were to have the effect of rescuing the port from stagnation, the town presented a much improved picture. Although it was described as 'narrow', its principal streets were 'well-built', and Grimsby had 'a generally modern aspect', with 'many neat houses and other buildings'. The events which generated the change in the physical landscape of the town began when the Corporation, in order to facilitate the trade which the building of the 1801 dock was expected to bring, started to lay-out building lots in the east marsh. Those laid out between 1799 and 1825 were in the area now bounded by Victoria Street, Pasture Street and the railway, and included Burgess Street, King Edward Street, and the many other streets, courts and alleys leading therefrom. (See Map 2, below).
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This development came to be known as the 'new town', and, in its early years, the area suffered from alternating periods of depopulation and repopulation, mostly in response to the fluctuating fortunes of the dock. One period when it was noted that people were leaving the area — and, in this instance, returning to the old town — was in 1819; the reason given for the exodus being the 'great deficiency in... Sea Trade'. Another period of depopulation culminated in the situation reflected in the 1841 census, when 122, or about one in eight of all houses in Grimsby, were listed as unoccupied. Around 70% of these properties were in the new town.

The new town comprised a long main street running along the east side of the dock, then known as Loft Street, and, according to census data, this contained a mix of private residences and business premises. Behind it lay a complex of streets and courts inhabited, in the main, by the labouring classes and those connected with the trade of the port, including most of the sea-faring community. In contrast, the middle classes, including the professional people, such as doctors, druggists, bankers, solicitors and accountants, were heavily concentrated in the old town which clustered around the parish church a mile or more to the south.
White's 1842 Directory of Lincolnshire listed the more important retail businesses and this, read in conjunction with the 1841 census, suggests that, despite the development of the new town, the main retail trading area remained in the part of Grimsby known as the Old Market Place and the surrounding streets. The most northerly part of the new town seemed to have few, if any, retail businesses of any kind. Loft Street, which was later renamed Victoria Street, fronted the new town, and had a number of shops and other businesses catering for the needs of the general public. These included boot and shoe makers, confectioners, druggists, fishmongers, fruiters, grocers, hairdressers, a beerhouse and a draper. Most people who lived in the streets east of, and behind, Loft Street, would, therefore, be able to satisfy most daily needs independently of Grimsby's main trading centre situated in the heart of the old town.

In the early nineteenth century Grimsby is said to have suffered little, if any, serious over-crowding. In the 1801-1811 decade the average number of persons per inhabited house was slightly above the average for the United Kingdom, but, between 1821 and 1831, there were, on average, 1.2 persons fewer per inhabited house in Grimsby than was the case nationally. In 1845, with the prospect of the imminent development of the port, a hundred houses which were unoccupied the year before were now reported to
be all inhabited\textsuperscript{18} and new building was already underway.\textsuperscript{19} As one historian has put it, 'during the reign of Victoria' the small town was 'swamped by the great fishing town that covered its fields and marshes with bricks and mortar' and eventually spilled over into the surrounding parishes.\textsuperscript{20}

3. The Origins of the 1841 Population

The enumerators' books of the 1841 census do not give the parish and county of birth of individuals, as do those of later censuses. The information they contain is whether a person was born in the county of residence, in another English or Welsh county, in Scotland, Ireland, or abroad. The questions which can therefore be asked about the origins of Grimsby's 1841 population are necessarily limited, as are, also, the opportunities for comparing the 1841 birthplace data with that of the later censuses.

Table 1, below, gives the birthplaces of the inhabitants of Grimsby in 1841. Over 88\% of the 1841 population had been born in Lincolnshire. Due to the inadequacies of the data this percentage conceals the number born within Grimsby itself. Over 10\% of people had been born in other English and Welsh counties and less than 1\% in, both, Scotland and Ireland respectively. A similar percentage had been born abroad and the birthplaces of 0.2\% of the town's inhabitants were, according to the enumerators, unknown.
## Birthplaces of the Population: Grimsby, 1841

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born within Lincolnshire</td>
<td>1,545</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>1,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born outside Lincolnshire</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but in other English or Welsh counties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born in Scotland</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born in Ireland</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born abroad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birthplace not known</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,759</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1,837</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1841 Census of Grimsby

TABLE 1
The difference between the total population shown in Table 1, (i.e. 3,596) and Grimsby's 1841 enumerated population of 3,700, is explained by the fact that, according to the census, this latter figure included fifty-two people on barges and about seventy persons absent at sea on census night who were aboard two Revenue cutters.

The occupations of males born outside the county boundary were examined to see if there was any evidence of the kind of special industrial migration discussed in the Introduction to this study. Among the tradesmen and skilled workers, who, according to the census data, were living in Grimsby in 1841, and who had migrated into the town from outside the county, there was no obvious pattern to suggest that any one occupational group had arrived in Grimsby via this particular process of migration. Indeed, all long-distance migration (meaning, in this instance, all those individuals who had originated from outside Lincolnshire) appeared to be wholly random. In the absence of any industrial migration of the type referred to, it can be assumed - although this is by no means certain because of the physical size of Lincolnshire - that the majority of Lincolnshire-born migrants would have travelled comparatively short distances to the town.21 A study of migration in Victorian Lincolnshire has noted the 'prevalence' of short-distance migration in the populations of Scunthorpe and Grantham.22
Owing to the shortcomings of the 1841 census data on birthplaces only a limited assessment can be made of the characteristics of early nineteenth-century migration into Grimsby. With only a little over 10% of its inhabitants having been born outside the county boundary, and a notable absence of any special industrial migration, it seems most migrants had originated from Lincolnshire's predominantly rural countryside and that many had probably been formerly engaged in agricultural work of some kind.

4. The Occupation Structure of Grimsby in 1841
The following brief textual analysis of the 1841 Occupation Structure of Grimsby is confined to a commentary on the spread of occupations across the employed population in that year. The same information in tabulated form appears in Table 2, below. The conventions followed in the analysis of the occupational data are explained in Appendix 'A', pp.350-359.

In general terms, 60%, or, in absolute numbers 1015, of Grimsby's male population and 15% (268) of all females were listed in the census as being occupied in 1841. In all but the domestic service category the pattern of male employment closely paralleled that of the total occupied population due to the preponderance of males in the 1841
**Industrial Classification of the Employed Population**

**1841**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th></th>
<th>Females</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total Occupied Population</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building/Contracting</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Service I</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Service II</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service/Professional</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Service</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>1,015</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1,283</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: 1841 Census of Grimsby*
labour force. Males accounted for just under 80% of Grimsby's employed population in that year.

Twelve per cent of all employed males were in agriculture-based occupations. Sixteen per cent of the total in agriculture were listed as farmers, 78% as agricultural labourers, the remainder being gardeners, seedsmen, and cowkeepers. Fishing was unimportant in Grimsby before the mid-nineteenth century with only just over 1% of the working population so employed. In 1841 the rise of Grimsby's deep-sea fishing industry was still more than a decade away. Two per cent of all occupied males were in mining/quarrying types of occupation, such men being almost exclusively engaged in the making of bricks and tiles. Sixteen per cent of the male occupied population were in the building/contracting trades; these were bricklayers, stonemasons, joiners and carpenters, painters, plumbers, and almost a third in this sector were described in the census as navvies.23

The manufacturing sector provided employment for over 26% of the total male and female employed population. This sector was the highest employer of male labour and ranked second, after domestic service, for females. Of the female population employed in manufacturing, over 96% of the total number were producing articles of dress; these were the dressmakers, milliners, bonnet-makers and staymakers.
Thirty-eight per cent of all males in manufacturing occupations were, either, cordwainers, boot and shoemakers, tailors or hatters. Occupations connected with food and drink accounted for a further 12% of all manufacturing activity, and another 10% of those categorised as manufacturers were in the metal trades, the majority of these being employed as blacksmiths. There were comparatively few men in manufacturing occupations such as shipbuilders, shipwrights, net makers, sail makers, and mast and block makers; this type of port-related employment accounting for only 8.4% of all manufacturing activity in Grimsby in 1841. Of the other workers in this sector, a high percentage were employed in a spread of comparatively small scale industries catering for the needs of the town's population and the surrounding rural countryside, such as saddlers, watchmakers, cabinet makers, printers, potters, and basket makers.

Land-based transport occupations, that is, carters, carriers, porters, and the like, provided employment for just over 2% of Grimsby's working population, while water based transport occupations (i.e. mariners, merchant seamen, pilots, and other occupations connected with the operation of the dock) accounted for under 5% of all employed males. Less than 1% of all those employed were in industrial service occupations like banking, insurance, and
accountancy. General labourers accounted for 10% of Grimsby's employed males in 1841.

The Public Service and Professional sector was responsible for the employment of 6% of the total employed population. Of this number, education and medical services (the latter including surgeons and druggists) were the highest employers, with each of the two groups mentioned accounting for almost one-quarter of the total employed in the sector. Three further occupational groups included in the Public Service and Professional sector (i.e. clergymen of all denominations, solicitors and attorneys, and customs officials) each accounted for 10%, respectively, of the sectoral total. Over 3% of all employed males were in domestic service. These included male household servants, coachmen, grooms, ostlers, and chimney sweeps. These latter, in the conventions followed in this work, are placed in this occupational category. Just under 65% of all employed Grimsby females were engaged in domestic work of some kind.

Although the men of Grimsby had found work in a variety of occupations in 1841, employment opportunities for women were strictly limited. Four per cent of all employed women were occupied as teachers, and, in a few instances, women were found in predominantly male industries, such as the licensed trade and agriculture.
5. Population Development 1801-1841

Figure 1, below, shows the pattern of Grimsby's population growth between 1801 and 1841, together with that of some other Lincolnshire towns with which it has sometimes been compared. The concordance which exists between the chronology of the ebb and flow of Grimsby's population during the first half of the nineteenth century and the changing fortunes of the Haven Company's dock, goes some way towards confirming that it was this latter, rather than any other factor, which was responsible for the erratic shape of Grimsby's population development during the first four decades of the nineteenth century. For example, in the decade immediately following the opening of the dock (1801-1811) the population increased from 1,524 to 2,747 - a net gain of 1,223. There can be little doubt that this increase was mainly due to migrants who had arrived in the town in response to the short-lived optimism which accompanied the dock's opening in 1801.

The small increase in population between 1811 and 1821 (i.e. 317) - this being a period in time when the trade of the dock, as discussed earlier in this chapter, had shown no sign of gathering momentum - was little more than a natural increase in population, that is, the excess of births over deaths in the decade. There was, however, a boom in the trade of the port in 1824 and 1825, and this level of activity, according to shipping figures (p.30)
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was maintained for, at least, the remainder of the 1820s. This short-lived improvement was almost certainly instrumental in attracting migrants to the town in the 1821-1831 decade, as is evidenced by the spurt in population growth in those years. (i.e. a net increase of 984). A decline in trade again set in between 1831 and 1841 and this reverse economic trend is reflected in there having been a net decrease in population in those years of 348.

An event which may have had some influence, if only marginal, on the pattern of Grimsby's early nineteenth-century population development, is the 1830s establishment - and demise in the same decade - of a large ropery and flax spinning mill. What little information there is about this business venture suggests the project was of no mean size, for, when it was fully operational, it was recalled that 'a great number of workmen were employed there'. Local enthusiasm was high and it was forecast that the business would 'elevate Old Grimsby to its proper rank as a sea port'. Lewis, in 1845, noted that an 'extensive establishment for the manufacture of rope and canvas' was 'now unoccupied' and the Population Tables of the 1841 census, in apportioning blame for the decrease in Grimsby's population which occurred between 1831 and 1841, also described the ropery enterprise as having been 'extensive'.
The period in time when the business was operating (i.e. the 1830s) falls between the censal dates of 1831 and 1841. The manuscript census is therefore of no help as a source for determining the extent to which Grimsby's population found employment at the rope factory and flax spinning mill. However, a comparatively large increase in house-building occurred between 1831-1841 (i.e. 134 compared with ninety-three in the previous decade). Given the uninspiring shipping trends in the 1830s this spurt in building activity is unexpected, but it makes some sense when viewed in the light of the euphoria which had greeted the setting up of the ropery and flax spinning enterprise, and the employment, both anticipated and actual, which the venture may have generated during the short time of its existence. This is not to say the failure of the ropery and canvas business should be seen as the main cause of the depopulation which occurred between 1831-1841, but it may well have been a bigger contributory factor to people leaving the town in the 1830s than it has generally been given credit for.

Between 1831 and 1841, according to the census, there was a net decrease in Grimsby's population of 348. An 'estimate of net population change by migration' appears in Table 3, (below), and this indicates that 574 individuals, or almost 15% of the 1831 enumerated population of Grimsby, left the town between that date and the taking of the 1841 census.
Estimate of Net Population Change by Migration
1831-1841

Enumerated population of Grimsby 1831 4,048
Enumerated population of Grimsby 1841 3,700
Baptisms January 1831 - December 1841 923
Burials January 1831 - December 1841 697

The projected population in 1841 = 4,048 + 923 - 697
= 4,274

Enumerated population 1841 = 3,700

Net migration 1831-1841 = 574 (outward)

Source: Baptismal and Burial Registers:
Grimsby Parish 1831-1841; Grimsby 1831 and 1841 Censuses
When the decision was taken in the early 1840s to construct a railway to Grimsby and to build a new dock, there is no doubt that the old port was in decline. As Jackson has implied, the slow and halting development of Grimsby in the first half of the nineteenth century meant hardship for some of the population, 'a lack of expected opportunities, and, possibly, a move away'. With nearly 90% of the 1841 population having been born in Lincolnshire, and a lack of evidence of any industrial in-migration, Grimsby's apparent want of attraction to migrants of other than a relatively local origin, is clearly demonstrated.

The town's failure to achieve the status of a port of any consequence is confirmed in the characteristics of the 1841 Grimsby occupation structure, discussed above. This is particularly evident when it is compared with aspects of the 1841 occupation structure of Hull - a comparatively successful port on the opposite bank of the Humber. For example, proportionately only half as many Grimsby males were engaged in sea-faring types of occupations as was the position in Hull. Further, in the case of a port, many men described simply as 'labourer' in the 1841 census listings would almost certainly have been employed on work connected with the operation of the dock and associated tasks. While, therefore, only 10% of Grimsby's occupied males were
listed as general labourers, the comparable percentage for Hull was 17%. Less than 2% of occupied Hull males were employed in agricultural type work. In contrast, the percentage so employed in Grimsby in 1841 was over 12%. This was a 1% increase over the 1801 figure and this situation is particularly indicative of the lack of change in Grimsby's industrial infrastructure in the first four decades of the nineteenth century.

Taking into account the characteristics of the 1841 Grimsby population and the strengths of its male labour-force, it is obvious that if the port was to achieve a degree of development commensurate with the scale of the dock building and associated works planned for it during the mid-nineteenth century decades, then there would necessarily be a large inflow of, first, individuals possessed of the skills requisite for the accomplishment of the construction phase of development, and, second, those, who, in due course, would become users of the newly established port facilities.

It is with individuals such as these - many of whom displayed the characteristics of special industrial migrants - together with relevant aspects of the social and economic 'push' and 'pull' factors which dictated the manner, and circumstances, of the arrival of these people at Grimsby, that the remainder of this work is concerned.
PART TWO

THE PHASE OF DOCK CONSTRUCTION
CHAPTER THREE

THE DOCK BUILDERS: THEIR FORMER EMPLOYMENT
AND SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

It can be assumed that the construction phase of the
development of a port, as discussed earlier, would set in
motion changes which would have had the greatest impact on
smaller indigenous communities where large-scale dock and
ancillary construction work was taking place. Mid-
nineteenth century Grimsby, with a population of only 3,700
in 1841, was one such port, and the beginnings of social
and economic changes were apparent there even before the
work of dock building began.

The Grimsby Dock Act became law in August 1845, and dock
and railway construction commenced in the spring of 1846.
It was anticipated that the railway communication would be
completed in twelve months. This proved to be an
optimistic forecast as the East Lincolnshire Railway
Company's line from Grimsby to Louth and Boston, and the
Grimsby/New Holland line of the M.S. & L.R. (which had now
taken over the Great Grimsby and Sheffield Junction
Company) were both opened on Leap Year Day 1848. Grimsby
was connected by rail to Brigg, Barnetby, and Market Rasen
from 1 November 1848, and to Lincoln by the Christmas of
that year. Trains from Grimsby to Sheffield, via Gainsborough, started running on 16 July 1849.

Some idea of the rapid spread of the railway network throughout Lincolnshire can be gained from the fact, that, in the autumn of 1845 there were no lines in the county, but, four years later, there were about 220 miles of route open and a further 510 miles were under construction, most of them double track.¹ The time-scale of railway building in Lincolnshire is relevant to the part of this work which is concerned with, among other matters, the origins, former employment, and aspects of the migrational history of some of the men responsible for the building of the new Grimsby dock which was opened in 1852.

* * * * * * * *

Mid-nineteenth century dock building at Grimsby was centred, initially, on a 20 acres principal dock - later known as the Royal Dock. This incorporated a timber pond of 5 acres and had a quay area of 22,000 yards. Due to a lack of funds a graving dock and a small dock for fishing craft were not completed until some years after the opening of the main dock. It was required that the entrance of the new dock 'should be beyond the limits of low water' and 'afford passage at all times to merchantmen and be capable, towards high water, of receiving the largest vessels'. The
first step taken towards achieving this end was the
reclamation of 138 acres of land from the Lumber
'comprehending' the construction of a coffer-dam of
'unusual magnitude'. A description of the dock and of the
works involved in its construction were the subject of a
paper delivered by Edward Hele Clark to a meeting of the
Institute of Civil Engineers in November 1864.²

A consequence of the imminent development of the port was
that land prices rose. Building lots laid out by the
Corporation in the East Marsh as a result of the opening of
the Haven Company's dock in 1801 stood at a very high
premium, their value being enhanced in direct relation to
their nearness to the site of the new dock. Lots
containing about 360 square yards, which, in the past,
changed hands for twenty-five shillings, were valued at
£100. Those nearest to the site of the new dock were worth
considerably more than that sum.³

A boom in the building trade also set in. According to the
1851 census, nearly 800 houses were built in the town
between 1841 and 1851, with about 600 of these having been
erected in the second half of the decade, that is, since
dock and railway building operations commenced.⁴ In 1845 a
start was made on a hundred houses, these, it was reported,
being 'rapidly taken up, principally by navvies not a few
of whom had migrated from the surrounding villages'.⁵
By January 1846, activities subsidiary to the main task of dock construction had already begun. It was observed that the town was being 'visited by excavators' many of whom were employed at the embankment for the brickyard which was established adjacent to the site of the new dock with the object of supplying 20,000,000 bricks for the dock works.6 The beginnings of population change were also soon apparent. According to a local paper, at one time it was not unusual 'for some persons to know everybody in the town...but a new era fraught with the most important changes' had now begun and 'fresh faces' were constantly being seen in the locality.7

The grandiose scale of the imminent construction work was not lost on local contemporaries. A newspaper said, 'Plans for the new dock' (which, for its time, was technologically advanced) 'excited the astonishment of all who had seen them...the magnitude of the works, as well as the skill displayed in their construction [would] surprise even those...most familiar with such gigantic undertakings'.8 It is evident dock construction on a scale such as that envisaged in mid-nineteenth century Grimsby would require a labour force - numerically, and in terms of skill - far in excess of indigenous labour reserves.

As Table 2 (p.42) shows, the town, in 1841, had an employed male population of 1,015. Of this number, 163
men, or 16% of all occupied males, were in the building sector, which may have been temporarily inflated at that point in time by the presence in the town of fifty-one men described by the 1841 census enumerators as navvies. It is possible that these individuals were digging new drains, this work resulting from recent enclosure, or, alternatively, the men may have comprised a gang of labourers specially brought into the town to scour out the Haven, as was the case on some previous occasions earlier in the century when navvies were recruited for that particular purpose. 9 If this assessment of the situation is correct, and the navvies left the town sometime between 1841 and the commencement of dock building in 1846, then the local building sector, in that year, would have been reduced by almost a third compared with the 1841 figure. With such a small pool of construction labour to draw on, the importation of a sizable dock-building labour force would, perforce, be inevitable. This was the case at other locations in Victorian Britain where dock building was carried on around a small native population. 10

Local hopes were high that Grimsby men desirous of obtaining work when dock-building operations commenced, would be 'engaged to a man'. 11 Such hopes were not realised, it soon being said, '...a great number of men have been put on the works from other places while our own townsmen able bodied and active have been more or less
The validity of this statement probably depends on the interpretation of the term 'our own townsmen'. If, by this, is meant men born in Grimsby, then the statement is no doubt correct and that particular situation remained more or less the same throughout the whole period of the dock contract. This is evidenced by the fact, elaborated on later, that only a very small proportion of Grimsby-born men were found in the group of dock-construction workers whose origins become the subject of analysis at a later stage in this work. This is not to say, however, that some men who moved into the town from surrounding villages, either, recently in prospect of the imminent development of the port, or in earlier years as a result of the fluctuating trade generated by the ill-fated Haven Company's dock, did not find employment at the new dock site. According to the census enumerators' books a number of men from villages within an approximate distance of 12 or so miles of Grimsby were taken on by the dock contractors and were, apparently, working at the construction site in 1851.

The building of the Royal Dock at Grimsby spanned six years, including that of the census year of 1851, but the only indication there is - other than manuscript census evidence - of the size and characteristics of the labour force concerned with the project, is the information, that, when main dock construction ended in the early 1850s,
'Upwards of a thousand hands' were discharged. The strong probability is that an even greater number of men were at work at the construction site in earlier years when dock building was at its height. A large dock-construction labour force was not unusual in Victorian Britain, the contractor for the Furness Docks, for example, having employed about 2,000 imported labourers when work was in progress there between 1863 and 1867.

1. The Dock-Construction Workers
All matters connected with the management of the labouring men who built Grimsby's mid-nineteenth century dock was the concern of their immediate employers, the dock contractors. In common with other public works contractors, those responsible for dock construction at Grimsby apparently left no documentary evidence relating to the work force they employed. Apart, therefore, from the known fact that the contractor responsible for the building of the cofferdam - a Mr. Lynn of Liverpool - brought with him to the town 200 Irish labourers, manuscript census data is the only source of information on the composition of the dock-building labour force and on the origins and some of the socio-demographic characteristics of its members. This lack of knowledge about representatives of an important nineteenth-century occupational group - important, that is, when the scale of dock building and port development which
took place throughout the century is taken into account - is symptomatic of the fact that little, if any, objective analysis has been undertaken on this particular aspect of Victorian labour history.

A point of entry into this unfamiliar ground is via the fact that some nineteenth-century railway contractors, especially as the century wore on and railway contracts diminished, diversified their business interests and took up dock building. Among the better known contractors in this category was the great railway builder Thomas Brassey, who secured, in 1863, the contract for the construction of the Barrow docks. Logan and Hemmingway's work on the Great Central Railway also included the building of docks, among these being the second Grimsby fish dock opened in 1877. As early in the century as 1846, Morton Peto, a prominent nineteenth-century railway contractor, while giving evidence to the Select Committee on Railway Labourers, said, that, in addition to his current railway contracts, he was also building Lowestoft Harbour. Lucas and Aird, another well-known firm of nineteenth-century contractors are known to have covered many fields of construction which included, both, railways and harbours. Thomas Hutchings, the main contractor for Grimsby's Royal Dock, was also involved in the construction of railways before being awarded the Grimsby dock contract.16
The diversification of the business interests of the contractors, when considered in conjunction with a preliminary analysis of manuscript census data relating to a group of men presumed to have been employed at the site of the new dock in Grimsby in 1851, led to the tentative conclusion that many of the men the contractors employed shared their employer's working practice. That is, in broad terms, nineteenth-century docks and railways were not only built by the same contractors, but, often, by the same labouring men.

This work tests this proposition against an analysis of census data abstracted from the 1851 census enumeration books which relates to the birthplaces of a group of 650 men presumed to have been working on dock construction in Grimsby in 1851, and to the birthplaces of their children, where this latter kind of information is available. The unpublished census returns have previously been used by different authors to trace the migration history of individuals and that of members of different occupational groups. The testing of the hypothesis is not an end in itself, but is part of a wider strategy to discover something about the antecedents, including the origins and the migration history, of a group of men who are presumed to be representative of the thousands of other individuals who, throughout most of the first half of the nineteenth
century, laboured around the coasts of Britain - and at some river ports - building docks and harbours.

Given the nature, and limitations, of the information contained in the nineteenth-century census enumerators' books, the evidence for the above proposition is tenuous. There is, however, evidence of a mainly circumstantial nature, which, when considered in conjunction with the Grimsby manuscript census, lends more strength to the argument. This will be discussed as and when it arises throughout this present section of the work. Several authors, for instance, have examined the characteristics, and the role in society and industry, of the men who built Britain's nineteenth-century rail system, and so something is known, among other matters, of the manner in which a large labour force of experienced workers assembled at the site of new rail contracts. This procedure is described below and some analogies drawn between this and what is known about the assemblage of the dock-building labour force in mid-nineteenth century Grimsby.18

Men generally arrived at the site of new rail contracts in one or other of the following ways. First, probably the majority of the experienced men travelled, either singly, or in groups, to the new construction site, knowledge of the start of such work being passed around by word of mouth, 'including its transfer over long distances by
navvies on the tramp'. Such was the confidence of the contractors that sufficient men would be found by this method that they only resorted to advertising in the press in very rare cases of desperation. Second, a contractor might recruit a gang and despatch it to an area where labour was in short supply, and, third, men would follow their current employer to his next job. This latter was a fairly common practice. A witness giving evidence to the 1846 Select Committee on Railway Labourers, said, 'generally the steady men follow the same contractor from place to place'. In 1839 the contractor for the Croydon railway was allowed to commence work on his next contract earlier than originally intended simply because he wished to employ the 'same set again'.

Several broad analogies can be drawn between these descriptions of the manner of arrival of men at new rail contracts and what probably happened in Grimsby at the start of the dock contract there. First, seemingly following the precedent of some rail contractors, the contractor for the Grimsby coffer-dam recruited his own men and brought 200 Irish labourers with him to the town. Second, there is some evidence that a child of Thomas Hutchings, the main dock contractor - who also previously held rail contracts - was born at South Anston in Yorkshire. Some dock-construction workers in Grimsby in 1851 also had children who were born in this South
Yorkshire parish. Since this was not the parish of birth of the construction workers concerned, nor that of their wives, these men had probably been engaged in some kind of work there. South Anston straddled the M.S. & L.R.'s line between Worksop and Retford, and it is concluded that men previously employed by Hutchings on a rail contract worked with him in the area of South Anston, and subsequently followed - or were brought by - him to work on the new dock at Grimsby.

Third, according to census data, only a comparatively small number of the 650 members of the dock-construction labour force under investigation were born in Grimsby, or in the surrounding rural villages. This, as noted earlier, is confirmed by complaints to the effect that local labour was ignored in favour of men from 'other places', and it accords with the situation, where, on large public works contracts indigenous labour was often 'swamped by an influx of strangers drawn in by the prospect of long-term employment at favourable wages'.

The method by which the group of 650 individuals believed to have been involved in the task of dock construction and associated work in Grimsby in 1851 were selected for study, is explained in Appendix 'B', pp.360-371. It is therefore only necessary to say here that the 650 men comprise 186 stonemasons, sixty-four excavators, and 400 dock labourers.
Each of these groups had, among other attributes, different levels of skill and/or work experience, and, also - according to preliminary analysis - the potential for displaying some idiosyncratic group characteristics. The work is therefore somewhat complex in that the 650 men are studied, not as one occupational group, but as three subgroups within the wider concept of a nineteenth-century occupational group of dock-construction workers.

The dock labourer group includes seventy Irish-born labourers, who, it is believed, were part of the original gang of 200 individuals brought to Grimsby to work on the building of the coffer-dam. As there were some marked differences between this group and the other groups in terms of, for instance, family structure, and it was wished to draw attention to this, the seventy Irish labourers are considered as a separate group in the next section of this work which examines some socio-demographic characteristics of the men. This means, for the following part, that four groups of workers are separately analysed (i.e. stonemasons, excavators, dock labourers, and Irish-born labourers). In subsequent sections the Irish labourers are included, for the purpose of analysis, in the dock labourer group.
2. Some Socio-Demographic Characteristics of the Dock Builders

This section includes an analysis of the age structure, household status, family structure, and an overview of the residential patterns of the dock-construction workers. The analysis is based on data abstracted from the enumerators' books of the 1851 Grimsby census and is compared, when appropriate, with similar data relating to a 10% systematic sample of Grimsby households in 1851. A description of this latter set of data is in Appendix 'B', (pp.360-371).

In contrast to 1841, when the Grimsby census showed that less than 12% of the population had been born beyond the county boundary, this proportion had risen to 42% by 1851. For example, over 48% of the household 'heads' in the 10% sample population had been born outside the county. These included accountants, schoolmasters, ministers of religion, civil servants, retailers, engine drivers, carters, and general labourers, to name but a few.

It is clear that long-distance movers who came from a mixture of industrial groupings, such as those noted immediately above, were not special industrial migrants in the sense the term is used in this work. However, they, and others like them, fulfilled an important function in that they augmented Grimsby's existing commercial and industrial structures, which, on their own, could not have
supported or serviced the escalating process of social and economic change. The economy of nineteenth-century Lincolnshire was predominantly agrarian and the county's urban and industrial development occurred later than in many other places.\(^23\) This pattern of development may well have resulted in a shortage of migrants originating from nearby places who possessed the different skills and/or expertise necessary to meet the burgeoning port's professional, business, and other social and economic demands. As Table 37, (Appendix 'A') shows, the percentage of those in occupations in the Public and Professional Service Sector (i.e. in medicine, education, religion, and law) all declined after the start of port development and the onset of special industrial in-migration. This can be regarded as an example of a newly industrialising area out-running, for a time, its professional and public service sector infrastructure.

Jackson points to the variable concentrations, in 1851, of long-journey migrants at different urban locations. He says few county towns and probably all the smaller market towns had less than 25%. There was, however, a more variable concentration in intermediate sized industrial towns. He cites the northern textile towns of Preston, Bolton, and Huddersfield as having relatively few long-distance migrants in their populations. In contrast, the metal-working towns of Wolverhampton, Derby, Merthyr
Tydfil, and Swansea all had more than 25%. This, Jackson suggests, indicates the possibility of a linkage between industrial structure and/or stage of industrial development with long-journey migration. Taking Grimsby, therefore, as representative of other small developing towns experiencing rapid industrial growth, then the pattern of in-migration indicates that long-distance migrants of a general - as well as of a special industrial - nature were probably crucial to the early stages of the development of such places.

The long-distance Grimsby migrants, discussed above, differed from the dock-construction worker special industrial migrants in that the probability existed such individuals had come to the town with the intention of staying for an indefinite period, and can therefore be regarded as part of a relatively settled population. In contrast, by virtue of the work on which they were engaged, the residence of the majority of dock builders was of a finite nature. The findings of the analysis of socio-demographic characteristics of the dock-construction workers are therefore compared (Tables 4 and 5, below) with the results of a similar analysis of the Grimsby sample population. The data in Table 5 relates to the structure of the families of household heads, rather than to the whole household. This follows the practice of Anderson who believes that households containing odd lodgers or servants
tend to conceal the 'family structure pattern'. Figure 2, (p.77), therefore shows the situation regarding lodgers separately.

* * * * * * *

Over 78% of all dock-construction workers in the group studied were aged between twenty and forty years. (Table 4). This is the typical age structure of men employed on nineteenth-century public works contracts. Patmore found that 76% of the labour force building the viaduct over the Nidd gorge at Knaresborough in 1851 - which carried the East and West Riding Junction Railway linking York with the Leeds and Thirsk Railway - were aged between twenty and thirty-nine years. Brooke also found that of men working on the construction of several lines over the Pennines in 1841 and 1851, between 72-78% (the percentage varying according to line) were between twenty and thirty-nine years of age.26

The comparatively high percentage - compared with the other Grimsby dock-builder groups - of stonemasons in the under twenty age group was due to a number of stonemasons having young apprentices working beside them. The very high percentage of Irish labourers in the twenty to thirty years age group (62.9%) is in line with Tansey's findings that a 'disproportionate' percentage of the Irish immigrants in
## Age Structure of 650 Dock-Construction Workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Stonemasons</th>
<th>Excavators</th>
<th>Dock Labourers</th>
<th>Irish Labourers</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Age Group Of Sample Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 30</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>49.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61+</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Grimsby 1851 Census Enumeration Books

TABLE 4
the population of Hull in 1851 were young adults. Almost 63% of the Grimsby male population - which, as discussed above, contained many migrants in addition to the dock-construction workers - were aged between twenty and forty years. This is probably reflective of the generally held view that it was predominantly the 'young' who moved in nineteenth-century Britain.

The main difference between the dock-construction workers and the employed male population of Grimsby in 1851 was in the older age bands. Just under 14% of the Grimsby male sample population were aged over fifty years, with some men still at work in their seventies and eighties. A local farm labourer, according to the census, was still working at the advanced age of ninety-two. In contrast, less than 5% of all dock-construction workers were aged over fifty. This is not surprising when the arduous nature of some of the work is taken into account. Some aspects of dock-building, such as embankment and excavation, resembled that of rail construction. This latter work was so hard that Coleman suggested few railway navvies survived until they were sixty - most dying from exhaustion at forty - 'a good age for a navvy'.

Of the 650 men who made up the dock-construction worker group under examination, 250, or 38.5% were listed by the Grimsby census enumerators as household 'heads'. Table 5
(below) compares the family structure of these heads with that of the 182 heads in the Grimsby sample population. When the dock-construction workers are considered as one group, rather than split into their occupational sub-groupings, there was a high degree of similarity between them and the sample population in terms of the proportions of those heading nuclear family units. (i.e. a married couple alone with children and childless married couples). It is only when the dock-building sub-groups are compared with each other that some differences appear. For example, a comparatively high proportion of excavators and their wives (33.3%) were, apparently, childless - or, at least, had no children living with them.

The nineteenth-century title of excavator, as will be discussed later, was regarded as belonging to the more widely travelled of those engaged on public works contracts. Constant movement with children could not have been easy, and this may have been a reason why a third of the nuclear families in the excavator group comprised married couples unaccompanied by children. This is not to say these people were childless, but they may have elected to leave off-spring in the care of grandparents or other relatives in order to more easily pursue an extreme on the move working life-style. Many married excavators, according to the census schedules, were living as lodgers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Structure</th>
<th>Stonemasons</th>
<th>Excavators</th>
<th>Dock Labourers</th>
<th>Irish Labourers</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>1851 Sample Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married Couples or Widowed Persons with Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childless Married Couples</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Alone or with Unrelated Person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head with a Relative other/or in addition to a Wife and Children</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Grimsby 1851 Census Enumeration Books

TABLE 5
and had presumably elected to follow an itinerant working life unencumbered by dependants of any kind.

In contrast to the excavators, only a few of the Irish labourers who had a wife travelling with them, were, seemingly, childless. There is some evidence that all of the Irish-labourer group in Grimsby in the early 1850s, unsurprisingly perhaps, were Catholics. The comparatively small proportion of childless married couples in this group may therefore have been a reflection of religious convictions regarding family limitation. The situation was also probably symptomatic of the way the Irish, in general, responded to the new conditions which they met on arrival in England. That is, the Irish facilitated their adjustment to new ways and new customs by 'reorganising themselves into family units'. In this connection Lees, using 1851 census data from five London parishes, concluded that 70% of the Irish lived in a household headed by an individual of Irish birth.

A higher percentage of the Grimsby sample families contained relatives other than the wife or children of the head, than did the families of the dock builders. This is not unexpected as it would have been easier for a more settled family, compared with one constantly on the move, to accommodate other, perhaps elderly, family members. Distance travelled may also have been a factor, for example
the dock labourers were the largest of the construction-worker sub-groups under examination and it is notable that families in this group who had travelled only a comparatively short distance to the town, were more likely to contain relatives, other than the wife and children of the head, than were the families of dock labourers who had originated from more distant places.

Proportionately more of the stonemasons than any of the other groups of dock-construction workers were living in a household 'headed' by a relative. This is partly explained by the fact that, according to the Grimsby census data, the trade of stonemasonry appeared to be a traditional occupation in some families. It was not unusual to find a construction-worker family with a son apparently apprenticed to a stonemason-father, or a younger brother apprenticed to an elder sibling who was a stonemason. In these circumstances it would be only natural for the young apprentice to live in the family home rather than as a lodger in the household of some other person.

The household status of nearly 75% of the Irish labourers in Grimsby in 1851 was that of lodger. This was higher than any other of the dock-construction worker groups (i.e. 54% of stonemasons, 56% of excavators, and 46% of dock labourers). Richardson concluded that over 25% of the Irish in Bradford in 1851 lived as lodgers and Tansey
similarly found that 27% of the Irish population of Hull in that same year were listed by the census enumerators as lodgers. It would therefore seem that an itinerant working life-style, such as that followed by the dock builders, served to further exacerbate the already noted tendency of the Irish to travel unaccompanied by dependants, and that those who did so tended to compensate for this by lodging in the homes of people of like nationality.

The extent to which Irish households opened their doors to compatriots is plain. Figure 2, below, indicates that 73% of all Irish dock-construction worker households in Grimsby in 1851 contained lodgers who were, almost without exception, Irish nationals. This was a considerably higher proportion of households than was the case in any of the other dock-construction worker groups. However, a higher percentage of all dock-builder households, irrespective of group, took lodgers into their homes than did the Grimsby sample population, for only 23% of local households contained lodgers.

Although, as mentioned above, over 54% of stonemasons lived in Grimsby in 1851 as lodgers, only 27% of households headed by a stonemason took in such individuals. This was lower than the other dock-builder groups and a tentative conclusion is that the income from lodgers might not have
DOCK-CONSTRUCTION WORKER AND GRIMSBY SAMPLE POPULATION:
HOUSEHOLDS WITH LODGERS

SOURCE: 1851 GRIMSBY CENSUS ENUMERATORS BOOKS

Fig. 2
been so important to the higher earning stonemasons as it was to other groups. A comparative table of weekly wages paid to the employees of a well-known nineteenth-century public works contractor for the years 1843 to 1869, shows that, on average, the earnings of stonemasons in those years were higher than, among others, bricklayers, carpenters, and blacksmiths.³³

Also, as noted earlier, the labour of stonemasons was sometimes in great demand at the site of public works. It may therefore have been the case that stonemasons were more independent in some economic respects than were workers in other groups. Some stonemasons in the Grimsby dock-building labour force might have made their own way to Grimsby, rather than having followed, or been brought to the town as a gang, by a contracting employer, and thus having accommodation found for them. This latter practice seemed to have been the case with some of the other dock-construction workers and it is probable that the provision of accommodation for a married couple may have had certain conditions attached to it.

3. Residential Patterns
Judging by the residential patterns exhibited by a comparatively small number of stonemasons and by many members of the other dock-builder occupational groups, it
may well have been a condition of the contractors finding accommodation for a married couple, that such couples, had, perforce, to agree to take in other workers who were unaccompanied by dependants. There is evidence that temporary dwellings which housed workers on rail contracts 'usually contained a married man who was designated "Head" of the household and whose wife had to look after a dozen or so lodgers'. Thomas Hutchings was the main contractor for the Grimsby dock works and a block of twelve houses - comprising thirteen households - was identified by the Grimsby census enumerator as 'Hutchings Houses'.

These houses contained numerous individuals, some with dependants, who were obviously connected in different ways with dock-construction work, including, a 'dock contractors foreman', two 'land surveyors', and a 'horsekeeper for dock contractor'. Other of Hutchings Houses accommodated (some with the status of head and many others with that of lodger) a few stonemasons, and a miscellany of excavators, dock labourers, blacksmiths, and carpenters. Another property probably leased by contractors to accommodate members of their labour force was that known locally as 'The Ropery'. These properties, together with others known as 'Shell Houses', accommodated half of the excavator group as well as numerous other dock-construction workers.
The habit of the contractors to 'bed and board' a 'vast number of men at the works' was the subject of bitter complaint by the local press, which described it as an 'obnoxious' system. The root of the complaint was that the system prevented the presence of the men from 'doing an atom of good to the town by the expenditure of their money for necessary supplies'. The practice was seen as an extension of the detested 'Tommy Shop' system, already in operation in Grimsby, where the construction workers received part of their pay in the form of vouchers which could only be exchanged for goods at designated shops.

The Tommy Shop system is reputed to have 'almost totally ruined' some newly established Grimsby tradespeople, who, according to a local newspaper, had 'embarked their all' and set up shop in the town in the decade of 1841-1851 in anticipation of the trade which would be generated by the expected influx of a large dock-building labour force. If, it was complained, the Dock Company, when contracting for the works, had stipulated against the Tommy Shop system, 'the town would have been in a much more prosperous condition' than it was at the mid-century. A petition against the practice was submitted by Grimsby residents to the directors of the M.S. & L.R. in 1850, but the Board stated it was not in their power to interfere.
In 1850 the report of a recent inquiry 'into the sewerage, drainage, and supply of water, and the sanitary condition of the inhabitants of the Borough of Grimsby' was submitted to the General Board of Health. The report, when read in conjunction with information abstracted from the 1851 census enumeration books, gives some idea of the sanitary and other conditions under which a majority of the Grimsby dock builders probably resided. These can be compared with Patmore's study - also based on the 1851 census - of the housing conditions under which a large gang of railway labourers lived when constructing a line at Knaresborough. Unlike navvies engaged on rail construction in rural areas where temporary camps were often established, the Knaresborough workers - like the Grimsby dock builders - were living in the town. Patmore found their residence there had 'heightened existing social contrasts'.

A third of the dock-construction worker group under examination were living in census enumeration district 'J' (i.e. the district nearest to the dock works). The 1850 report (referred to above) mentions some of the buildings in which construction workers, according to the census, were residing. The Ropery, for example, was said to have no privvy accommodation. Another group of dwellings inhabited by some members of the dock-building labour force were built 'block behind block' and had privvies 'set within four feet of the doors and windows'. Other
properties in which construction workers were living, and which were situated 'on the coast', were built directly on the sand and had no eaves or guttering. The defects of these properties, however, were no worse than some reported in dwellings in the old town of Grimsby a mile or more south of the new dock, and an area which remained largely untouched by the presence of the dock-building labour force. For that matter, the dwellings accommodating the dock builders probably differed little, in many respects, from the sanitary condition of much of the housing stock in working-class areas of cities and towns throughout most of early Victorian Britain.

More important to the aims of this research is whether, and to what extent, the influx of a large labour force of dock builders would have caused overcrowding in a host community? The shortcomings of the census data - in particular the failure of enumerators to sometimes interpret correctly the instructions of the census authorities regarding the definition of a 'house' - can lead to confusion on the subject of overcrowding. The 1850 report on Grimsby submitted to the General Board of Health is not always reliable in the sense that it sometimes contradicts itself in its description of different properties. It may also have over-stressed, in some cases, certain sanitary and related conditions appertaining in the town, for its aim seemed to be that of
ensuring that the Public Health Act was applied to Grimsby. However, despite some reservations about the overall reliability of the report, it has been possible to test the 1851 manuscript census returns against it, and some interesting conclusions on the subject of overcrowding in Grimsby at the mid-nineteenth century have emerged.

It appears, for example, that the 1851 Grimsby enumerators counted some one-room habitations in buildings - which, according to the report, were apparently tenement blocks - as separate 'houses', totalling them as such in the enumeration books. Lack of space precludes mention of all such cases here. Just one example, no worse than many others, will therefore have to suffice. The report described 'Pincushion, alias Harrison's Buildings' as a 'court...containing thirteen houses, with fourteen rooms'; and said the number of occupants was sixty-two. The dimensions of the rooms were given as 10ft. x 10ft. x 7ft. high.43 This leaves no doubt that the 'houses' in question were, in effect, twelve habitations in a tenement block comprising of one room each, and one dwelling which had two rooms; this giving a mean average occupancy rate of 4.4 persons per room. The 1851 census enumerator, however, had listed Pincushion Square as comprising twelve inhabited houses with one house uninhabited. The number of inhabitants was shown as sixty-seven.
In considering the concept of overcrowding it is all too evident that a household comprising of four or five individuals living in a one-roomed dwelling, for instance, represents a degree of overcrowding far in excess of that experienced by a similar number of individuals residing in even a small 'house' with only two or three rooms. There were many instances of census evidence, which, when compared with that of the report, appears to be misleading as to the precise type of property being enumerated. The assertion that many of the dwellings described as 'houses' in Grimsby in 1851 were really single-room dwellings in tenement blocks, is supported by contemporary newspaper reports. These, in complaining, among other things, that many recently built houses had been constructed without regard to the health of inhabitants, said many owners of small plots of land had 'knocked up a lot of small tenements not fit for dogs to live in'.

It has been suggested that in spite of the poor quality of some of the housing in mid-nineteenth century Grimsby, 'overcrowding was not a major problem', and that, from 1801 until at least 1871 overcrowding never exceeded, and was usually below, the national average. Judgements about overcrowding, however, as Brooke intimated (see next paragraph below) cannot be made unless we know the dimensions of the property concerned. Unfortunately, the census does not provide this kind of information, but, in
the case of mid-nineteenth century Grimsby, it was possible to use another contemporary source (i.e. the 1850 report) to find out something about the spatial quality of the accommodation in which numbers of individuals – in this case the dock builders – were living.

It is predictable that some degree of overcrowding would have been inevitable wherever a large labour force congregated at the site of a public works contract. Brooke reports the 'amazement' of the census authorities at the overcrowding suffered by Irish labourers on a rail contract in Scotland. Although huts erected at some rail construction sites as temporary accommodation for workers contained twenty to thirty men – and in one instance a dwelling sheltered 'eighty-four labourers and three women and children' – Brooke found it impossible to reach any conclusion as to the degree of overcrowding as there was no information about the dimensions of the dwellings concerned. 46 Patmore found 'gross overcrowding' in some of the houses at Knaresborough in which railway labourers were accommodated. One back-to-back dwelling contained six railway labourers plus a further sixteen lodgers in addition to the head of the household and his family. 47

During the dock-building contract at Grimsby, according to the 1851 census, there is no evidence of such large numbers of individuals having lived in a single dwelling as in the
extreme examples quoted above. Five or more construction workers lodging together in Grimsby households was not unusual, and, when the 'head' and his family are added to this number, some households comprised twelve or more people. In the kind of tenement accommodation common in mid-nineteenth century Grimsby, however, even one or two lodgers taken in by a family would clearly constitute a degree of overcrowding.

The construction of docks and the prospect of rapid town growth inevitably attracted the professional speculator. It is impossible to say how much of the property building that went on in anticipation of the development of the port of Grimsby, was the kind of tenement-type accommodation discussed above. Without building on such a scale, however - and despite the shortcomings of some of the properties - it is likely the need to accommodate a large labour force of dock-construction workers during the period of the main dock contract (i.e. 1846-1852), would have presented more serious problems for the town and its indigenous population than, apparently, seems to have been the case.
CHAPTER FOUR

THE ORIGINS OF THE DOCK-CONSTRUCTION WORKERS

Lawton, in his study of the 'Population of Liverpool in the Mid-nineteenth Century' explained that 'birthplace' is not synonymous with 'migrant from'.¹ That is, a migrant may have moved several times between leaving his birthplace and arriving at his present place of residence. The only source of information, at least in so far as the manuscript census is concerned, which can help trace the on-going migratory movement of individuals, is an analysis of data relating to the birthplaces of parents and of their children, where this information is available.

Despite its limitations the study of birthplace is, however, of value in that, among other things, it has the potential for raising questions for further consideration. The areas of birth of the 650 dock-construction workers are given in Table 6 and are further indicated in Figures 3, 4 and 5. Some of the areas of birth in Table 6 are self-explanatory (i.e. Scotland, Ireland, Wales, as are, also, the classifications 'Birthplace unknown', etc.). The historical counties which comprise the remaining areas (that is, discounting Lincolnshire, which, because it contained the study location is shown separately) are
identified on p. 89, below. The following textual analysis of the origins of the Grimsby dock-construction workers is arranged by sub-occupational group, that is, stonemasons, excavators, and dock labourers respectively.

* * * * * * * *

1. Origins of the Stonemasons

Stone was not a traditional building material in Lincolnshire to the extent that it was in some other areas of Britain. This is reflected in the comparatively small number of stonemasons working in Grimsby in 1851 whose origins were within the county of Lincoln (i.e. 7.9%). (Table 6). Yorkshire contributed the largest number of stonemasons to the dock-building labour force, that is, 30.6%, followed by Ireland and Scotland with 18.2 and 8.6% respectively. The importance of Yorkshire in the mid-nineteenth century stone building industry is evident in that out of a total of 18,178 persons employed as stone quarriers in the counties of England and Wales in 1851, 4,861, or over a quarter of the total, were to be found in Yorkshire. In contrast, only seventy-three persons were so employed in Lincolnshire. Apart from those born in the county of Yorkshire, the origins of the stonemasons in the Grimsby dock-building labour force were not proportionate to the relative importance of the different counties in the industry - that is, if the number of persons employed as
### Historical Counties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Counties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NORTH</td>
<td>Northumberland, Cumberland, Westmorland, Durham, Yorkshire, Lancashire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST</td>
<td>Norfolk, Suffolk, Cambridgeshire, Huntingdonshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDLANDS</td>
<td>Cheshire, Derbyshire, Nottinghamshire, Shropshire, Staffordshire, Leicestershire, Herefordshire, Worcestershire, Warwickshire, Northamptonshire, Bedfordshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH-EAST</td>
<td>Essex, London, Oxfordshire, Buckinghamshire, Hertfordshire, Berkshire, Surrey, Kent, Sussex, Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH-WEST</td>
<td>Gloucestershire, Wiltshire, Dorsetshire, Somerset, Devonshire, Cornwall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Areas of Birth of 650 Dock-Construction Workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Birth</th>
<th>Stonemasons</th>
<th>Excavators</th>
<th>Dock Labourers</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlands</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-East</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-West</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincolnshire over 50 miles from Grimsby</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grimsby</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Within 12 miles of Grimsby</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Between 12 and 50 miles of Grimsby</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birthplace not known, illegible, or foreign born</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census Enumerators' Books: 1851 Census of Grimsby

The asterisks denote those who are regarded, for the purposes of this research, as short-distance migrants. Long-distance migrants are those born outside of Lincolnshire, or, within Lincolnshire but at a place 50 or more miles distant from Grimsby. Short-distance migrants are split into two groups (i.e. those born within 12 miles of Grimsby and those born at places between 12 and 50 miles distant).
quarriers is taken as an indicator of that particular county's importance in the national industry. Nottinghamshire and Lancashire, for instance, were each the counties of origin of eleven, or 5.9%, of the stonemasons working in Grimsby in 1851, yet the former county had only 201 workers employed as quarriers while the latter had 2,949.²

Of the fifty-seven Yorkshire-born stonemasons in the dock construction group, the places of origin of by far the greater majority were within the West Riding of the county in an approximate 15 mile arc to the south-west of Leeds which encompassed the towns of Huddersfield and Halifax. This is not apparent in Figure 3, below, as the symbols representing birthplaces have been placed in the approximate centres of the respective counties. The Bramley Fall stone which was used for the arches and piers of the Grimsby dock, and for the coping of the quays, was quarried in the area of Yorkshire defined above, and was a gritstone of the carboniferous formation. The chief characteristics were its coarseness and hardness and its remarkably durable properties made it eminently suitable for use in dock building. Victorian Huddersfield and Halifax were largely built of this kind of stone, as were, too, farms, field walls, and villages in the area.³
The symbols on Figs. 3, 4, and 5 are on identical scales. The symbols are placed in the approximate centre of the county of birth except in the case of the dock labourers born in Lincolnshire (Fig. 5). In this instance two symbols have been placed in the county; the northernmost representing individuals born within 50 miles of Grimsby and the southernmost representing those born 50 or more miles distant. The county of birth of those born in Ireland, Scotland, or Wales were seldom recorded. In these circumstances symbols have been randomly placed within the three countries.
There is little, if any, information about the geographical mobility of stonemasons as a general nineteenth-century occupational group. Evidence dating from earlier centuries suggests that occupational mobility was due to would-be employers seeking out masons, rather than masons 'of their own initiative' moving about in search of work. Hobsbawm, however, believes that stonemasons were involved in the 'tramping artisan' system as early as the eighteenth century and that by the middle of the nineteenth century the practice of masons tramping in search of work was widespread. This, however, conflicts to some extent with evidence that the skills of stonemasons were in great demand at some nineteenth-century rail construction sites and that delays in work often occurred because of a shortage of this type of worker. Contractors and their agents sometimes had to go out of their way to recruit masons from all corners of Britain. If this were the case, then it seems there would have been little need for stonemasons to tramp to seek work, at least for most of the second quarter of the nineteenth century which was one of the peak periods in rail construction.

The situation where there was plenty of work available for stonemasons may, however, have begun to change during the period of the main Grimsby dock contract (i.e. 1846-1852). With the collapse of the second or great 'railway mania' in 1847-1848, rail contracts began to be at a premium, and
stonemasons, like other construction workers, may thus have been less in demand than previously. This is indicated in that trouble over wages erupted between Hutchings, the main contractor for the Grimsby dock, and masons employed at the new dock site. Hutchings was determined on a reduction in wages and this would have been less likely had the labour of stonemasons been in short supply at that time. The men refused to submit to the cut in wages and the contractor recruited other masons referred to as 'blacks'. The matter escalated to the extent that an affray developed during which Hutchings 'presented' a pistol to one of the masons. As a result of this demeanour the contractor was fined ten shillings and costs. 7

Skill levels may have played a part in determining some of the characteristics of that part of a nineteenth-century dock-building labour force concerned with the stonework element of the construction process. If so, then this particular factor might also have been a determinant of the pattern of the migration history of some stonemasons employed at the new Grimsby dock. The art of stone laying, for instance, varied greatly in character and skill, ranging from, at the highest level, the 'setting' of a rose window in an ecclesiastical edifice, to 'building a straight wall'. The construction of a nineteenth-century dock would probably have called for the latter level of skill rather than the former. 8
Stone sent any distance tended to be rough dressed at the quarry so as to reduce the cost of carriage, and quarry workers were sometimes knowledgeable enough — certainly in pre-industrial times — to rank as, at least 'rough masons' and there is no reason to suppose that this practice changed over time in any material sense. It is not therefore unreasonable to surmise that some of the Yorkshire stonemasons working in Grimsby in 1851 were less highly skilled men, perhaps a version of the pre-industrial 'rough mason'. If this were the case, then the possibility exists that such men might have been formerly employed at the Yorkshire quarries which supplied the Bramley Fall stone for the dock, and, therefore, migrated directly to Grimsby from place of previous employment. This issue is pursued further when the migration history of a group of west Yorkshire-born masons is analysed in the next chapter of this work.

As noted above, the counties of Nottinghamshire and Lancashire were each the place of birth of eleven stonemasons. The majority of the Nottinghamshire masons originated from the north-west of the county centred on the Mansfield area, but other Nottinghamshire birthplaces were random. Most of the birthplaces of the eleven Lancashire-born stonemasons were in Preston, Manchester, and Liverpool. The numbers were so small, however, that it would be unwise to conclude that such men had moved to
Grimsby as a consequence of, perhaps, previous dock and harbour building activities at these Lancashire ports. New docks were built and opened in Liverpool at two or three yearly intervals during the second quarter of the nineteenth century, but the Manchester Ship Canal was not opened until 1894. Also, although Preston was created an independent port in 1843, its trade remained insignificant and new docks were not built there until near the end of the nineteenth century.  

The birthplaces of the remainder of the stonemasons in the Grimsby dock-construction worker group were random, although the counties of Northumberland in the north and Cornwall in the extreme south-west, each contributed small clusters of men to the work force.

2. Origins of the Excavators

In terms of skill and experience there is some difficulty in differentiating between the nineteenth-century occupational titles of navvy and excavator. It is believed the term 'navvy' was probably as much descriptive of a way of life as of a particular kind of work. That is to say, besides undertaking the heaviest types of labour in rail construction, such as blasting and tunnelling, a true 'navvy', according to Coleman, resided in a mobile community of fellow workers and indulged in certain peculiarities of diet, such as eating vast quantities of beef and drinking huge amounts of beer.
Excavators were noted as being especially prominent on rail contracts which demanded extensive cuttings and embankments. As excavation and embankment were also techniques associated with dock building it was not unexpected to find, in 1851—five years into the dock-building contract—sixty-four men listed as excavators by the Grimsby enumerators. Between 1845 and 1846 when there would have been a need to shift vast quantities of earth as the embankments and coffer-dam of the new Grimsby dock were taking shape, it would not be surprising if an even greater number of such workers were employed at the dock site.

Apart from anything else, the occupational title of excavator is believed to have belonged to the more widely travelled of those who built nineteenth-century railways. Despite this belief, according to the census, the birthplaces of over 17% of the excavators working in Grimsby in 1851 were within 50 miles distance of the town. (Fig. 4). This includes one man who was born in Grimsby, itself. The seeming conflict between generally held beliefs as to the highly mobile working life style followed by those employed as excavators, and the evidence of the census on birthplaces, is returned to in the next chapter when the migration patterns of some of the excavators in the dock building labour force are examined in detail.
BIRTHPLACES OF EXCAVATORS

Source: 1851 Census of Grimsby

Fig. 4
The birthplaces of nearly half (48.4%) of all excavators working at the construction site of the new Grimsby dock were in the eastern counties of England - that is, Lincolnshire, Norfolk, Suffolk, Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire - with a cluster of birthplaces in the area around Norwich. The preponderance of East Anglian-born navvies working on Great Northern railway lines has been noted by Dickenson in his study of the economic effects of railway building on several south-west Kesteven villages. In the light, therefore, of the proposition that nineteenth-century docks and railways were largely built by the same labouring men, it is feasible that some of the excavators at the dock site in 1851, and who had been born in the eastern counties, had made their way to Grimsby via a spell of work on the Great Northern Railway Company's (hereafter G.N.R.) line running through Spalding, Boston, Louth, and thence to Grimsby. Alternatively, some similarly born excavators may have formerly worked on lines linking the midland cities of Birmingham, Leicester and Derby with York and Lancaster.

The transference from rail to dock construction by all grades of worker would have been a distinct possibility during the period of the building of the Grimsby dock. The collapse of the great 'railway mania' coincided with the completion of the lines connecting Grimsby to the rail network (i.e. 1847-1848). With new rail contracts
therefore beginning to be at a premium, the opportunity to transfer to relatively long-term dock building work would have been a welcome alternative to some of the men formerly employed building the lines of the M.S. & L.R. and the G.N.R. Companies in the Grimsby area.¹⁵

None of the excavators working in Grimsby in 1851 had been born in Scotland or in the extreme south-eastern or south-western counties of England, as was the case with the stonemasons, but a few excavators were Irish by birth and a small number originated from different Yorkshire locations. The birthplaces of some of the excavators born in Gloucestershire and Somerset were close to the route of the Great Western line in the area of Bath and Bristol. The evidence of the census returns suggests that in some parts of Britain, in particular the south-west, the natives 'responded with such enthusiasm' to the chance to work on rail building operations that 30-40 per cent of those who worked on several lines in the west country were born within 10 miles of the 'theatre of operation'.¹⁶

A birthplace in the West Country, however, cannot be taken as conclusive evidence that a man so born, and who was working at the Grimsby dock site in 1851, had gained early experience of public works construction on a rail contract which passed through, or near to, his West Country place of origin. This matter is examined in more detail later, but
it can be hypothesised here that such a man had left
existing employment - this perhaps having been on the land
- to work for a spell on rail construction in his native
area, and had then transferred permanently to rail
construction and followed rail contracts in a northerly
direction before eventually arriving at Grimsby to find
employment connected with the building of the town's new
dock.

3. Origins of the Dock Labourers
Around 10% of the dock labourers working in Grimsby in 1851
were Yorkshire-born. (Figure 5). Unlike the Yorkshire
stonemasons, where the majority of birthplaces were
concentrated in one particular area of the county (i.e. the
West Riding), the origins of the Yorkshire-born dock
labourers were, on the whole, randomly distributed. As
this is not apparent in Figure 5, some brief details of the
geographical distribution of the birthplaces of dock
labourers born in Yorkshire are given below.

A few dock labourers originating from Yorkshire came from
towns or villages situated on, or close by, rivers or
waterways, such as Hull, Goole, Airmyn, Asselby, and
Swinefleet - these places all being on, or near to, the
Humber or Ouse. Other dock labourer birthplaces were at
Tadcaster, Wetherby, Kirkby, and Collingham on, or near to,
BIRTHPLACES OF DOCK LABOURERS

Figure 5

Source: 1851 Census of Grimsby
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the river Wharfe, at Helmsley on the river Rye, and at Pollington and Knottingley on the Aire and Calder Navigation. These birthplaces suggest previous work experience with, either, the operation of water-borne transport, or with canal or dock building which occurred at Hull between 1829 and 1850 and in the Knottingley and Goole area between 1820 and 1840. Importantly, as will be apparent in the course of the discussion in the next chapter of the migration trends of the dock-construction workers, only two dock labourers had been born in the city of Hull - the Yorkshire port situated roughly opposite to Grimsby on the north bank of the Humber.

The pattern of river and/or dock-adjacent origins was not repeated in the case of dock labourers born in the eastern counties of Norfolk, Cambridge, and Suffolk. The birthplaces of thirty-eight of the dock labourers in Grimsby in 1851 were in these counties and were randomly distributed. Twenty dock labourer birthplaces were in the south-western counties of Gloucestershire, Somerset, and Wiltshire. Some of these latter men, like excavators noted above, had places of origin which were adjacent to the routes of Great Western lines constructed earlier in the century. This strengthens the supposition that many men working on nineteenth-century public works contracts, including dock building, first became involved in construction work as railway labourers when line-building
occurred in the vicinity of an existing place of origin or of previous employment.

There was a concentration of birthplaces of thirty dock labourers towards the southern boundary of Lincolnshire. These birthplaces were about 50 or so miles distant from Grimsby. (Figure 5). Assuming dock labouring, like rail labouring, was a largely unskilled occupation, then, mindful of the dock building taking place at the north-Lincolnshire port, some south Lincolnshire-born men might have made a direct move there in the purely speculative hope of obtaining casual employment. Alternatively, it can be surmised that others from the south of the county had gained some limited experience of work on rail construction as this activity passed through their native area, and had then moved to Grimsby, or followed a contracting employer there, on the strength of this earlier experience. This latter situation seems a distinct possibility and is strengthened by the fact, that, where rail construction was relatively straightforward, such as that across much of the flat Lincolnshire countryside, rail contractors were often happy to recruit local labour from towns and villages as construction work passed by these places. 18

Some of the birthplaces of Lincolnshire-born dock labourers were in towns or villages adjacent to the route of the railway line from Boston to Grimsby. The process of
migration through which these particular men arrived in Grimsby, like that of the men from the south of the county, can only be surmised. The fact that a place of origin was close to the site of recent rail construction, may be of no more significance than that individuals living near to the railway might be more likely than those living at a distance from this form of transport, to travel to Grimsby to seek work associated with the construction of the dock.

According to the evidence of the census, many of the dock labourers in Grimsby in 1851 had travelled considerable distances from place of birth to the town. Some originated from Cornwall in the far south-west of England, Dover in the south-east, as well as many from Ireland and a few from the northern counties, and Scotland. These facts call for an explanation of the migration processes through which labourers originating from such diverse, and distant, places, came to be working at a dock-construction site on the north-east coast of Lincolnshire. To put this another way, it would not have been easy, or even practical, for a labourer, especially if his family was travelling with him, to move directly to north-east Lincolnshire from, say, Cornwall or Scotland, 'given the financial and physical burdens involved'. The work now, therefore, turns to an analysis and discussion of the migration processes through which some of these far-travelled labourers, together with some equally travelled stonemasons and excavators in the
dock-building labour-force, made their way to construction work and associated tasks in mid-nineteenth century Grimsby.
CHAPTER FIVE

THE DOCK BUILDERS:
PATTERNS AND PROCESSES OF MIGRATION

Manuscript census data relating to the birthplaces of parents and of their children is sometimes the only source of information on the migration history of a given individual. Many married men in the 1851 Grimsby dock building labour force apparently elected to pursue their itinerant working life style unencumbered by dependants. This is evident in the numbers of married men who were living as lodgers and who, according to the census schedules, were unaccompanied by relatives. The census returns do not enable us to ascertain whether these individuals, as well as the many single men living as lodgers, were more occupationally mobile than were family men.

However, using the birthplaces of the dock-construction workers' children - as far as manuscript census data allows - provides an indication of the main migration flows of members of the three occupational groups (i.e. stonemasons, excavators, and dock labourers) from leaving the place of their birth to their last place of residence before arrival in Grimsby. In doing so it gives an indication of the
migration trends of the many others in this broad occupational group, who, throughout the first half of the nineteenth century, were engaged on similar dock building enterprises up and down the coasts of Britain.

The number of Grimsby dock-construction worker families that can provide evidence of multi-stage migration is limited. This is because such families had to contain a child, or children, born elsewhere than at the father's own place of birth and somewhere other than at Grimsby. Table 7, below, shows the percentages of dock-construction workers for whom information on multi-stage migration is available. The Table excludes those workers in the three occupational groups who were born at places less than 50 miles distant from Grimsby. (i.e. those categorised as short-distance migrants). The reason for the exclusion of these individuals from the analysis is because the mobility of long-distance migrants is compared at a later stage with that of short-distance movers.

There is no evidence to show that a smaller than average number of children was a feature of a construction-worker family following a peripatetic working life-style. The family sizes of the stonemasons, excavators, dock labourers, and the Irish-born labourers were each analysed separately. The mean average number of children in stonemason families for whom there was evidence of multi-
Dock-Construction Worker Families Providing Evidence of Multi-stage Migration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. having children</th>
<th>No. and % with children fulfilling birthplace requirements*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stonemasons</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavators</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dock labourers</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census Enumerators' Books 1851 Grimsby Census

* An explanation of this requirement is on p.108.

Note: This Table includes, in addition to household heads, lodgers having children.
stage movement, was 2.5. The similar figure for the excavator group was 2.7, for the dock labourers 2.1, and for the Irish-born labourers 2.8. In comparison, the mean average number of children (per married couple having children) in the Grimsby 1851 sample population was 2.6. Since there were only marginal differences in family size - apart from the dock labourers - between the Grimsby sample population and the construction-worker married couples known to have followed an occupationally mobile working life-style, it has to be concluded that an unusually small family was not necessarily a distinguishing characteristic of the latter.

It is, however, possible that a man accompanied by a wife and family would have been inhibited in the frequency of his movements, as well as in the distance he would have been prepared to travel between different public works contract jobs. That is, assuming such men had any choice in these matters, for other considerations, such as the need to follow work in order to provide for his family, may have been more important to some men than the disruptive effects of frequent movement on family life. Married men accompanied by dependants may, however, have been over-represented on dock-construction contracts compared with those involving shorter term rail construction.
The building of a large dock, as opposed to the construction of a stretch of railway line, usually meant a longer stay for a worker in one particular place - a period of four or more years not being unusual on a dock-building contract. The exception would have been in those cases of rail building where problems connected with difficult terrain or with tunnel building entailed an extended construction period. The sites of the Box and Woodhead tunnels are well-known examples of this. In addition, most nineteenth-century docks were built in, or near to, towns. Even though some of these towns were small, such as mid-nineteenth century Grimsby, the chance of finding accommodation for a family in a house, notwithstanding the predictable urban housing problems associated with the period, must have been preferable to the huts and temporary dwellings which housed many of the workers on some of the earlier nineteenth-century rail contracts.

* * * * * * * *

Based on the eight geographical areas comprising the historical counties of England, together with Scotland, Ireland and Wales, as in Table 6 (p.90), separate Tables have been constructed in respect of the special industrial migrant stonemasons, excavators, and dock labourers, who met the birthplace of children qualifications already described. These appear as Tables 8, 9, and 10, below.
The geographical areas in which the respective construction workers were born are shown on the vertical axis of each Table. The percentages across the horizontal axes show the geographical distribution of births (according to census data) of the children born to construction-worker fathers originating from the eight designated areas. This conveys an impression of the strength and general direction of the different migration flows - based on the birthplaces of children - between the different regions. It should be noted that the region designated 'East' does not contain any Lincolnshire-born construction workers whether classified as short- or long-distance migrants. This, as noted earlier, is because migrants originating from Lincolnshire will be discussed separately.

The total numbers of children to which the respective Tables refer are shown, and, in some cases, the individual percentages represent a small absolute number of children. With this in mind, Figures 6, 7 and 8 have been constructed. Section (a) of each Figure shows the birthplaces of those members of the respective long-distance dock-construction worker groups who met the birthplace qualification regarding children, and Section (b) similarly indicates the areas of birth of the children of such men. The Figures, when read in conjunction with the percentages in the respective Tables, go some way
towards putting the quantitative information into qualitative perspective.

The following textual analysis of the migration trends of the dock-construction workers is organised in the same manner as was that concerning their origins. That is, the stonemasons, excavators, and dock labourers have each been considered separately.

1. The Stonemasons
The most striking migration trend in the stonemason group, prior to arrival in Grimsby, was the concentration of children's birthplaces in the North region. (Table 8). Of stonemasons originating from the North, 75% of the children of such men had been born at different places in that particular geographical area before the men migrated to Grimsby. Of stonemasons originating from the East, twice as many of their children had been born in the North region, as had been born in their father's native Eastern area. The trend was even more marked in the case of those workers originating in the South-east, for three-quarters of their children had been born in the North and none in the father's own area of birth. Figures 6(a) and 6(b) confirm that the occupational mobility of the stonemason group, irrespective of the father's area of birth, was concentrated in a fairly narrow geographical band ranging
Areas of Birth of the Stonemasons' Children Analyzed by Area of Birth of Father

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Children Born In</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S/E</th>
<th>S/W</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/E</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/W</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

81 Children

Key: N = North, E = East, M = Midlands, S/E = South-East, S/W = South-West, S = Scotland, I = Ireland, W = Wales

Source: Grimsby 1851 Census Enumerators' Books

TABLE 8
PLACES OF ORIGIN OF 36 STONEMASONS ALL HAVING CHILDREN MEETING BIRTHPLACE REQUIREMENTS

BIRTHPLACES OF 81 CHILDREN OF THE STONEMASONS IN Fig.6a

Source: 1851 Census of Grimsby

Fig.6
from Liverpool in the west to the Humber in the east, where it encompassed both north and south banks of that river.

Assuming, as there seems reason to, that some stonemasons - as well as men in the other two dock-construction sub-occupational groups - had previously worked on rail contracts, then the northward movement of stonemasons from the eastern counties is not surprising when the pattern of the development of the English rail network by the end of the first half of the nineteenth century is considered.

Map 3, below, shows railways in operation in England by 1844, that is, two years before the commencement of dock and railway building at Grimsby, and this illustrates the relatively late establishment of rail communication in the eastern counties of England. The Eastern Counties railway was originally intended to connect London with Norwich and Yarmouth but stopped short at Colchester, and the Great Northern line from London through Peterborough and Boston was not completed until 1846.

In contrast, by 1844, as Map 3 shows, the cross-country system of the Liverpool and Manchester, the Manchester and Leeds, Leeds and Selby, and Hull and Selby Railways were already in operation; these linking the cities of Liverpool in the west with Hull in the east. A north-western line of nearly 240 miles in length had also been constructed by that time connecting London with Birmingham, Manchester,
RAILWAYS IN OPERATION IN ENGLAND IN 1844

Source: W.H. Boulton, The Railways of Britain, London 1950

Map 3
and Liverpool. A branch line linked the towns of Leicester and Derby to this system.¹ The amount of rail and associated dock construction taking place in this cross-section of England in the 1830s and early 1840s, would have made the Midlands and the counties of Lancashire and south Yorkshire attractive destinations for men originating from eastern areas where, it seems, rail contracts were at a relative premium at that point in time.

Of the fifty-seven Yorkshire-born stonemasons, evidence of movement prior to arrival in Grimsby was available in the cases of fourteen men, including that of the Stonemason-Contractor for the Grimsby dock. According to the birthplaces of their children, these men - including some born in the West Riding - had been highly mobile within their own, or sometimes in neighbouring northern counties, before moving on to Grimsby. There is also evidence which strengthens the proposition that men on public works contracts tended to alternate between dock and railway building. That is to say, assuming that the residence of a man elsewhere than at his place of birth implies employment in that area, then the birthplaces of children of the Yorkshire-born stonemasons indicate that some men, before moving to Grimsby, had probably been at work on rail contracts and that others had been at locations where possible employment could have been dock-building operations of some kind.
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For instance, the presence of different Yorkshire-born stonemasons, as indicated by their children's birthplaces, (including the 'Superintendent of Masons') in Hull, Liverpool, Birkenhead, and Goole (all three ports having had docks constructed during the first half of the nineteenth century) and at Bridlington (a harbour-town on the Yorkshire coast) suggests the previous connection of these particular men with dock or harbour construction. In contrast (See discussion on pp.63-64), there is evidence that children of stonemasons of Yorkshire origin had been born whilst their fathers had probably been employed by Hutchings (the main Grimsby dock contractor) on a rail contract between Sheffield and Worksop.

The parishes of Stanley, Hillam, and Sandall Magna - all adjacent to railway lines which linked York with Leeds - were the birthplaces of seven children of other Yorkshire-born stonemasons in the Grimsby dock-building labour force. As in the cases cited above, neither the stonemasons concerned, nor their wives, had originated from these parishes. This gives further support to the conclusion that some stonemasons in Grimsby in 1851 had previously been at work on rail construction in the West Riding of Yorkshire prior to migration to Grimsby.

The fact that many of the stonemasons in Grimsby in 1851 had birthplaces in the area of the Bramley Fall quarries -
this stone having been used extensively in the construction of the new Grimsby dock - was commented on in the discussion on origins and the question was raised as to whether such men might have been 'rough', or less skilled, masons who had been recruited directly from the Bramley Fall quarries to work on the Grimsby dock contract. There is no census evidence to show that this was the case. What evidence there is on birthplaces of children suggests many of these men arrived in Grimsby via a process of several-stage migration, with all movements having occurred within the confines of Yorkshire.

Before considering the migration patterns of stonemasons born in areas other than the north region, mention should be made of men whose places of origin were in the far counties of the north of England, that is, Northumberland, Cumberland and Westmorland. Apart from evidence of some movement in their own county of birth, or in adjacent counties, some of these men, according to individual case histories, had apparently, like some Yorkshire-born stonemasons, been at work at the river port of Goole, and at the larger port of Hull, before moving to dock-construction work in Grimsby.

None of the stonemasons originating from Scotland, or from the south-east and south-west areas of England, had fathered children in their own area of birth. Judging from
the birthplaces of their wives and children, such individuals had probably, in the first instance, migrated from place of origin as single men. Later evidence indicates, that, prior to arrival in Grimsby, the paths of stonemasons born at places as far apart as Scotland and the south of England, had crossed in the geographical band defined earlier - which lay between Liverpool in the west and the Humber ports in the east, for this is where, according to the census, many of their children had been born.

The term 'Marriage Horizon' has sometimes been used to indicate the distance between the places of birth of a married couple.² No firm conclusions can be drawn about the degree of significance, or otherwise, of a marriage horizon in the study of migration, mainly because it has been suggested that nineteenth-century females were more migratory than males. This hypothesis, if it is true, negates the value of using the birthplace of a wife as a basis for assessing the probable occupational mobility of her husband.³

It is worth speculating in this connection, however, about the migration history of Thomas Vivian, a stonemason at work in Grimsby in 1851. The case history of this man lends credence to the idea that some married construction-worker couples would have been unlikely to have met had it
not been for the extreme - in terms of mileage travelled - occupational mobility of the husband. It also goes some little way towards answering questions as to the process of migration through which individuals originating from far-distant areas of Britain had come to be building a dock in a fairly remote corner of mid-nineteenth century north-Lincolnshire.

Thomas Vivian, according to the census, was born at Redruth in Cornwall. At the 1851 census he was 52 years of age, and, as none of his children, or his wife, were born in his native county, it is assumed that he left his place of birth as a bachelor. It is possible that early experience of dock and/or rail construction was gained near to Vivian's home town of Redruth, where, in 1824, a floating harbour and a horse traction railway were constructed for the Redruth and Chacewater Railway Company. At that time Thomas Vivian would have been 25 years of age.

The early migration history of this man, after leaving his place of origin, can only be the subject of speculation, but, according to census data he made his way northwards, eventually arriving at Goole, near to the birthplace of his wife. Two children were born at Goole between 1831 and 1833 - these dates coinciding with dock-building activity there. Another child was subsequently born at the small East Anglian port of Wisbech in 1835. From then onwards no
more births are recorded except that of a grandchild born at Ely in 1848. The family then apparently migrated northwards again, presumably in search of work at Grimsby, arriving there sometime between 1848 and 1851.

Almost half of the children of Irish stonemasons at work in Grimsby, had, as Table 8 shows, been born in Ireland. A further quarter of the Irishmen's children had been born in the region designated 'North'. This latter finding reflected, either, the nearness of Lancashire and Yorkshire to the sea crossing from Ireland - this making these counties an obvious destination choice for independent migrants - or, alternatively, the habit of contractors to bring a gang of men directly from Ireland to work in this busy area of England. In the case of many of the Irish stonemasons in Grimsby in 1851, the former may have been the case, for the birthplaces of their children were mostly random throughout Yorkshire and Lancashire - this indicating they had not travelled as a gang. Several children of stonemasons of Irish origin had been born at what might be described as dock-related destinations, such as Newcastle which had quays and jetties built in 1836, and at New Holland in Lincolnshire, a ferry terminal on the south bank of the Humber where John Lyn, one of the contractors for the Grimsby dock, was awarded a contract in 1847 to build a pier and associated works.  
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A number of the children of Irish stonemasons had birthplaces in Scotland, but, owing to the inadequacies of the census data, it is not possible to determine the precise place of birth and there is, therefore, no indication of the likely former employment of the father. There is some evidence of movement backwards and forwards between Scotland and Ireland by some stonemasons born in these countries. Stonemasons of Irish origin had, according to the ages and birthplaces of their children, been in Scotland for periods up to ten years before moving southwards to Grimsby. Similarly, a Scottish stonemason had seemingly spent an equally long period in Ireland before his latest move to north-Lincolnshire. The inadequacies of the census data preclude any attempt to draw any conclusions from this kind of migratory behaviour, but its very inexplicability serves to emphasise the complex nature of the migration patterns displayed by many stonemasons who were at work in Grimsby in 1851.

2. The Excavators
Proportionate to the stonemason and dock labourer groups, there were fewer excavator families in Grimsby in 1851 who fulfilled the birthplace requirements regarding children and for whom, therefore, there was evidence of more than single-stage migration. This situation is indicative of, first, there being, in absolute numbers, fewer excavators
than there were of, either, stonemasons or dock labourers in the Grimsby dock-construction labour force, and second, of the comparatively high percentage of childless married couples in this group. Although, as discussed earlier, it seems occupational mobility was not necessarily a limiting factor in the number of children in a mobile family, it appears the particularly high rate of movement associated with the life-style of an excavator had manifested itself in the large number of this group who lived in Grimsby as lodgers, or, alternatively, were accompanied by a wife, but had no children with them.

Unlike the stonemasons, the birthplaces of the children of the excavators did not indicate that, before moving to dock-construction work at Grimsby, many of their fathers had been working in that busy cross-section of northern England, already described, which was part of a long route of communication linking Manchester and South Yorkshire to the sea. Census information (Fig. 7[b]) indicates that some of the excavators in Grimsby in 1851 may have worked on the construction of the London and Birmingham railway, for there were birthplaces of children at Leighton Buzzard and at Shenley End, both adjacent to the route taken by that particular line. This evidence suggests that excavators previously working in that area may have arrived in Grimsby as a gang. This proposition is supported by the fact, that, as mentioned in the earlier discussion on the
residential patterns of the dock builders, the majority of the excavators were congregated together in accommodation which may have been provided for them by contracting employers.

The birthplaces of children (Table 9 and Fig. 7[b]). indicates that other excavators had probably moved from places of origin in the eastern counties in a south-easterly direction towards Sussex before moving northwards to Grimsby. Of the excavators born in Norfolk, only three men had a family which contained children with birthplaces meeting the requirements needed to give an indication of migratory movement. This small number can therefore only be regarded as suggestive of migration trends. Only one of the three men concerned displayed the characteristics associated with nineteenth-century professional excavators (i.e. widely travelled and highly mobile). The man concerned had children born in three different English counties – that is, Sussex, Berkshire, and Nottinghamshire – before his arrival at Grimsby. The other two Norfolk-born excavators may have been former agricultural labourers as they, their wives, and their children, had all been born in rural areas of Norfolk and appeared to have migrated directly from there to Grimsby. This, however, is not certain as the possibility always exists that a man had been at work elsewhere, but had not had a child born during that particular period of employment to indicate this.
Areas of Birth of the Excavators' Children Analysed by Area of Birth of Father

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Children Born In</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S/E</th>
<th>S/W</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born In</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/W</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23 Children

Key: N = North, E = East, M = Midlands, S/E = South-East, S/W = South-West, S = Scotland, I = Ireland, W = Wales

Source: 1851 Grimsby Census Enumerators' Books

TABLE 9
PLACES OF ORIGIN OF 8 EXCAVATORS ALL HAVING CHILDREN MEETING BIRTHPLACE REQUIREMENTS

BIRTHPLACES OF THE 23 CHILDREN OF THE EXCAVATORS IN Fig. 7a

Source: 1851 Census of Grimsby

Number of persons

Fig. 7
There were only two excavators born in the regions designated south-west and north respectively, and, as in the case of the Norfolk-born men, their movements are not necessarily indicative of any general trend. Taken as case histories, however, neither of the two men appeared to have worked outside their own region of birth before travelling to Grimsby. One of the men in question had been born in Somerset and the other in Lancashire, and the children in both households had been born, in each case, in the head's county of origin. There is thus no indication of the kind of employment these men might have been engaged in before migration to Grimsby.

Because of the lack, compared with the other two construction worker groups, of excavators with children fulfilling the birthplace requirements, and despite the shortcomings (discussed above) of data related to the birthplaces of wives as an indicator of the occupational mobility of a husband, the birthplaces of the wives of excavators have been examined to see if this information might confirm the theory of the high occupational mobility of this group of nineteenth-century labouring men. The result of the analysis would seem to indicate that some spouses had only met as a direct result of this, for there would appear to be no other likely explanation to account for the following married pairings. In each case the birthplace of the husband is given first: Cambridgeshire/
Somerset, Manchester/Whitby (North Yorkshire), Gloucestershire/Leicestershire, Buckinghamshire/North Lincolnshire, South Lincolnshire/North Shields, Ireland/Norfolk, Lincolnshire/Stockton-on-Tees, and Lincolnshire/Carmarthenshire.

Although, in migration studies, there is no set rule for differentiating, in terms of distance travelled from birthplaces, between short- and long-distance migrants, those born within 50 miles of any given study destination would generally – as in this research – be regarded as short-distance movers. The majority of the Grimsby excavating labour force classified as short-distance migrants, that is, those born in Lincolnshire within 50 miles of Grimsby, and for whom census evidence regarding the birthplaces of children was available, did display – despite their comparatively local birth – the well travelled characteristics associated with this particular branch of construction work.

Lincolnshire-born excavators, before arrival in Grimsby, had, between them, a number of children born in Wakefield, Stockton-on-Tees, Leighton Buzzard, Hull, North Shields, and Brewood in Staffordshire. All of these locations lay close to the routes of railway lines constructed prior to the commencement of work on the Grimsby dock. If place of birth of children is indicative of employment in a given
area, then these men had probably worked on the construction of these lines. If the above supposition is correct, then the birthdates of children indicates such men had been engaged on this kind of work in excess of ten years. Since there were no lines in Lincolnshire before 1845, the inference is that some individuals born in rural areas not far distant from Grimsby, had, several years before such work was available in Lincolnshire, been prepared to leave their native county and travel comparatively long distances with the intention of seeking work on rail construction in other areas of the country.

3. The Dock Labourers
Table 10 and Fig. 8(b), (which both relate to the children of the fifty-six dock labourers who met the birthplace of children criteria) show that, in contrast to the excavators, the migration flow of the majority of these individuals was in the same direction as that of the stonemasons. (i.e. towards the geographical area of England which lay between the Humber and the Mersey). For example, although none of the fifty-six labourers concerned, had, themselves, originated from the Humber port of Hull, 23% of their children had been born there. There had been almost continuous dock building in Hull for most of the 1840s, the Railway Dock was opened in 1846 and the Victoria Dock in 1850. There was then a lull for nineteen
Areas of Birth of the Dock Labourers' Children Analysed by Area of Birth of Father

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Children Born In</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S/E</th>
<th>S/W</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/E</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/W</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:** N = North, E = East, M = Midlands, S/E = South-East, S/W = South/West, S = Scotland, I = Ireland, W = Wales

**Source:** 1851 Grimsby Census Enumerators' Books

**TABLE 10**
PLACES OF ORIGIN OF 56 DOCK LABOURERS ALL HAVING CHILDREN MEETING BIRTHPLACE REQUIREMENTS

BIRTHPLACES OF 133 CHILDREN OF THE DOCK LABOURERS IN Fig. 8a

Source: 1851 Census of Grimsby

Fig. 8
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years until the Albert Dock was opened in 1869.\textsuperscript{7} It is likely that the construction of the Victoria Dock had started to wind down around 1849 and it is noteworthy, that, according to birthdates and birthplaces of their children, a comparatively large number of dock labourers moving from Hull to Grimsby, did so between 1849-1850. This chronology of movement suggests that such men may have habitually followed dock, or other, construction work, of which, in 1849, there were still two to three years of employment ahead in Grimsby. The closeness of Hull to Grimsby would have made the latter town a relatively attractive migration destination to redundant Hull dock-construction workers, especially for married men accompanied by a wife and children where the distance between moves might have been an important consideration.

During the earlier discussion of the origins of the dock labourers, it was mentioned that a number of those working in Grimsby in 1851 had been born at Goole and at other locations near to the confluence of the Humber and Ouse rivers. Although birthplaces can never be anything other than suggestive of the nature of a former occupation, it is considered likely that such men could have had previous experience of dock construction, or dock and/or water-borne transport operation, in their native area before moving to Grimsby. This is mainly because there had been an
abundance of both of these kinds of work in the Goole region during the first half of the nineteenth century.

Map 4 shows the canals and major rivers of South Yorkshire. It also indicates the adjacent birthplaces of some of the dock labourers who were in Grimsby in 1851. Some dock labourers whose place of origin was not in that particular region, also had children born at these, and nearby, locations. The history of the development of water-communication in the East and West Ridings of Yorkshire in the first half of the nineteenth century would have meant a continuous demand for water-borne transport and/or construction labour in that area during that period. The Aire and Calder Navigation, for instance, built the Knottingly and Goole canal which had an integrated three acre barge dock and a two and three-quarter acre ship dock at the Goole end. The system was opened in 1826 but it soon became evident that it was inadequate to cope with a growing trade, and a dock especially for steamships was therefore built and opened in 1836.

In the nineteenth century the River Aire was the busiest of the Yorkshire navigations and small ports on that river, such as Airmyn and Rawcliffe, were the birthplaces of some of the Grimsby dock labourers and of some of their children. Selby, too, another dock labourer birthplace, was once the West Riding's major port, but competition from
THE CANALS AND MAJOR RIVERS OF SOUTH YORKSHIRE SHOWING SOME ADJACENT DOCK LABOURER BIRTHPLACES

Source: J.B. Porteus, Canal Ports; The Urban Achievement of the Canal Age, London 1977

Map 4
Other transport undertakings resulted in a decline in Selby's fortunes. In attempts to counteract this, improvements to the Selby cut were made between 1828-1836. The census evidence that many Yorkshire, as well as non-Yorkshire born dock labourers were at work in the East and West Ridings of Yorkshire before moving on to Grimsby, confirms the proposition that some dock labourers working at Grimsby in 1851 had almost certainly had previous experience of water-borne transport and/or related construction work before migration to Grimsby.

The birthplaces of dock labourers' children reveals that many men who had been born south of the Humber, had, before moving to Grimsby, migrated northward from place of origin. This is particularly reflected in the fact, that, although few of the dock labourers had been born at places on the north bank of the Humber, there was a large concentration of children's birthplaces in Hull, this indicating prior employment there. (Figure 8[a] and 8[b]).

A number of the labourers whose origins were in Ireland, had, also, seemingly been at work in Hull before crossing the Humber to Grimsby. Of those for whom data was available, a majority had migrated directly to Hull from Ireland. This was indicated by the fact that all elder children of these particular individuals had been born in, either, Ireland, or else in Hull, with only younger
children born in Grimsby. The popularity of Hull as a destination for Irish migrants is evidenced by the fact that the number of Irish nationals in the population of Hull increased from 1,044 in 1841 to 2,983 in 1851. Over 28% of all economically active Irish males in Hull in 1851 were in unskilled occupations, the majority being listed by the census enumerators as labourer. The occupational mobility of many of the Irish labourers working in Grimsby in 1851 was low compared with other construction-worker groups. This tends to confirm the suggestion that some of the Irishmen were members of the original gang imported directly from Ireland to work on the construction of the Grimsby coffer-dam.

It is difficult, because of the random pattern of movement of many of the dock labourers, to identify other common instances of migratory behaviour in this occupational group. It is, perhaps, the randomness which makes this large group of particular interest. Of the more widely travelled of the dock labourers born outside Lincolnshire, and for whom census data relating to children's birthplaces was available (fifty in number), 63% had had two moves from birthplace, just under 20% three moves, 8% four moves and a similar percentage five moves. Individual case histories indicate the complexity of the migration patterns displayed by these highly mobile individuals. For example, one dock labourer had been born at Weare in Somerset and his wife at
Wellington, also in that county. Before arrival in Grimsby the couple had children born, in order of birth, at Redhills in Devonshire, Stroud in Gloucestershire, Ratcliffe in Lancashire, and at Wolverhampton. Another man born at Leighton Buzzard in Bedfordshire had a wife whose origins were in Linfield, Surrey. This couple had children born - before arrival in Grimsby - at Edenbridge and Folkestone, both in Kent, and at Farnham in Surrey.

In contrast to the variety of movement displayed above, is the low degree of occupational mobility which characterised most of the dock labourers born within 12 miles or so of Grimsby. Many of these men had married women originating from Lincolnshire villages close to their own place of birth, and, taking the birthplaces of children as an indicator of mobility, then it is clear any move from place of birth that such individuals had made prior to migrating to Grimsby, had tended to be within a very limited distance of their village of origin. There can be little doubt that the majority of dock labourers who found work at the dock site in Grimsby in 1851, and who were born within a few miles distance of the town, were former agricultural labourers. The small villages from whence they originated would have offered little chance of employment other than that associated with the land. For men from this kind of agricultural background a short-distance move to nearby Grimsby which offered the prospect of a few years work
associated with the construction of the new dock, would no doubt have been an attractive proposition. Unskilled labourers, such as those employed on railway construction—and, presumably, on other public works like the Grimsby and other dock contracts—could earn around 3/- to 5/- a day. This can be compared with wages earned by agricultural labourers in the second quarter of the nineteenth century which ranged from 9/- to 10/- per week.¹⁰

In contrast to the patterns of short-distance movement just described was that exhibited by some Lincolnshire-born dock labourers whose origins were within 12 to 50 miles distance of Grimsby, and who, according to their children's birthplaces, displayed the same widely travelled characteristics as many of their long-distance fellow migrants. These included men, who, when the ages and birthplaces of their children are conjointly analysed, seemed to have left their native Lincolnshire some years before dock construction had begun in Grimsby. Lincolnshire-born men such as these appeared to have formerly worked at locations as diverse as Southampton, Ingatestone in Essex, Terrington in Norfolk, Leeds, Ashford and Maidstone (both in Kent), Barnet in Middlesex, and Wales and Selby (both in Yorkshire).

The majority of these places were situated on, or close by, railway lines. It therefore appears that some
Lincolnshire-born men, including a few born in towns and villages not too far distant from Grimsby, had - like locally-born excavators discussed above - left their native county several years before the railway arrived in Lincolnshire. It can be speculated that such men had sought employment on rail construction work in other parts of the country, which, as indicated above, offered the chance of better wages than could be earned on the land. For long-term occupationally mobile men like these, there is no doubt that the chance of work at Grimsby - a place not too many miles distant from their area of birth - would have been seen by them as but one more construction job in a highly peripatetic working life-style.

Some of the birthplace locations of the children of dock labourers listed in the penultimate paragraph, were, also, the places of birth of children of stonemasons and excavators also working in Grimsby in 1851. This pattern of shared children's birthplaces is further evidence that a number of the men in the dock-building labour force, whether stonemasons, excavators, or labourers, had been consistently following public works contracts around the country prior to arrival in Grimsby.

* * * * * * * *
This part of the work has tried to discover something about the socio-demographic characteristics, origins, former employment, and the migration patterns and processes of members of a mid-nineteenth century dock-building labour force. The task of analysis has been complicated by the fact that the 650 men under examination comprised three separate occupational groups under the combined group heading of 'dock-construction worker'. Differences existed not only between, but also within, the three sets of workers. This conveys an impression of a variety of human experience which builds into a not inconsiderable body of information about a group of Victorian labouring men who, it is believed, were representative of similar occupational groups involved in the construction of Britain's many nineteenth-century docks and harbours.

Findings have been discussed as different themes have emerged. It is only therefore necessary here to draw together some salient points. Starting with the age structure of the group, this was found to be typical of individuals working on other nineteenth-century public works contracts. Equally predictable, because of the arduous nature of some of the work involved, the main way in which the age structure of the dock-building labour force differed from the 1851 sample population of Grimsby, was that few of all dock-construction workers were aged over fifty years, but a much greater proportion of the
employed males in the Grimsby sample were in that older age group, with a number of local men being still at work at a much greater age.

A notable difference between the mobile dock-construction workers and the 1851 Grimsby sample population was that there were fewer extended families in the former group than was the case in the latter. Other census evidence on family structure suggests, that, in terms of numbers of children, the size of family of the dock builders for whom evidence of multi-stage movement is available, differed little from that of other dock-construction workers for whom there is no evidence of movement. Importantly, the family size of the known movers also did not differ significantly from that of the Grimsby sample population. It can therefore be assumed that the presence of a wife and children did not necessarily curtail the general occupational mobility of men employed on nineteenth-century public works contracts, such as the dock building going on at Grimsby in 1851. There were, however, differences between the occupational sub-groups in some aspects of family structure. In the case of the excavators, for instance, there was a comparatively high proportion of childless married couples. This, no doubt, was due to the noted widely travelled working life-style of such men. The presence of accompanying children in this particular group would almost certainly have exacerbated the problems of the
particularly frequent movement patterns associated with this type of worker.

Unsurprisingly, in view of the essentially finite nature of dock construction and the eventual need to move on, more than half of all the dock builders analysed lived as lodgers. Due to the inadequacies of the manuscript census data it has not been possible to trace the migration history of these latter men. Nevertheless, the available census evidence provides indications of migration trends in respect of a fair proportion of the Grimsby dock-construction workers. The picture which emerges is that the majority of the men building Grimsby's Royal Dock had been highly mobile and that residence in the town, for them, had been little more than another interlude in an ongoing peripatetic working life-style.

The origins of the dock-construction workers have been discussed earlier, but it is necessary to re-state here a point which is relevant to ensuing comments on migration trends. That is, only a very small proportion of the dock-construction labour force had been born in that part of England which lay between Liverpool in the west and the Humber ports in the east. There is evidence, however, that a preponderance of the men for whom migration history is available, had, according to the birthplaces of their children, apparently moved to that busy area and worked
there for a period before assembling at Grimsby in the mid-nineteenth century.

The construction workers already established in that region therefore provided a convenient reservoir of labour for the large dock works when these commenced at Grimsby. According to the birthplaces of children, there had also been an existent pool of construction labour in the Midlands which, too, fed the demand at the developing north-Lincolnshire port. Judging by the census evidence, it would seem this latter pool was created by workers drawn into that region through the building of a railway system, which, by the year 1844, had linked London and Bristol in the south and south-west with the major towns and cities of the Midlands. From this source came men, who, according to the census, had travelled to the Midland region from places of origin in the eastern counties, where, prior to the mid-nineteenth century little rail construction work was available.

There is some suggestion that skill might have been a determinant of the distance a migrant travelled from place of birth to a migration destination. The stonemasons were the most skilled of the occupational groups under consideration, but the evidence contradicts the theory of a positive relationship between skill and distance. For instance, a higher proportion of stonemasons were born in
Yorkshire than in any other of the designated areas of origin, the majority of these birthplaces being towards the south-west of the county. This was comparatively close to the part of England where so many members of the dock-building labour force - including some of the stonemasons born in the West Riding of Yorkshire - were congregated before removal to Grimsby. In those cases where evidence of movement was available, it showed little indication of Yorkshire-born stonemasons moving out of their native county other than into bordering counties. The low mobility of stonemasons, as an occupational group, is further suggested in that a recent study based on the 1851 census enumerators' books, using data on birthplaces and occupations as an indicator of mobility, found that the mean average distance between place of origin and place of residence of 220 stonemasons analysed, was only 15.6 miles.12

This trend exemplifies the idea that a demand for labour of a particular kind confers a degree of independence on those individuals who can satisfy such demand. In the case of Yorkshire-born stonemasons - at least for most of the second quarter of the nineteenth century - demand for their services on rail and other public works contracts meant that those seeking work of that nature would have had no need to travel far from place of origin to find a destination where their skills could be utilised. In
contrast to the Yorkshiremen, however, as well as in stark contrast to the 220 masons analysed in the study just discussed, a minority of stonemasons in Grimsby in 1851, such as those born in Ireland and some in other parts of Britain, did show evidence of greater mobility.

One of the most important points emerging from this section of the work concerns the identification of the geographical areas from which much of the construction labour in Grimsby in 1851 had come. A simple perusal of the birthplaces of the 650 men under examination gives an impression of origins that were patternless, with some being surprisingly remote and far-flung. A more detailed analysis of the migration history of individuals, where this kind of information is available, contradicts the first impression conveyed by the census listing of birthplaces, and reveals that many members of the dock-construction labour force had not travelled directly to Grimsby from place of origin, but had proceeded there by a step-by-step, or stage, process of migration. Some individuals, for instance, although having emanated from widely disparate locations, had seemingly followed works and become established in the part of England which lay between the Mersey and the Humber and which was characterised by a concentration of dock, waterway, and railway building in the first half of the nineteenth century. From this area - even for those born at far-distant places - it would have been a comparatively
small step to travel to dock building and associated tasks at Grimsby.

This pattern of migration is clearly not analogous to that which Ravenstein identified when he propounded the stage theory in his 'laws' of migration. However, the pattern of the congregation of labour in a region followed by, to borrow Redford's term, a subsequent 'wave-like' move of some workers to another destination which offered the chance of work in their particular field of employment, explains the otherwise largely inexplicable processes of movement through which some members of the Grimsby dock-building labour force came to be living and working in the town in 1851.

Although the patterns and processes of the movements of the dock-construction workers, prior to arrival in Grimsby, were complex, two broad streams of migration can be identified. One, that is, the main stream of special industrial migrants, comprised men, who, judging from evidence of movement, appeared to have been habitually engaged in following public works and to whom this practice had become an established way of life. The other stream of migrants were the opportunists, or non-professionals, that is, individuals with origins which lay comparatively close to Grimsby and who evidently saw the prospect of dock construction and associated work there as reason enough to
migrate the short-distance from place of birth - or previous employment - to the developing port.
CHAPTER SIX
THE OUT-MIGRATION OF THE DOCK-CONSTRUCTION LABOUR FORCE IN QUANTITATIVE PERSPECTIVE

The preceding pages have shown that many of the men, who, according to the evidence of the census, were associated with dock construction in Grimsby in 1851, had most likely been previously employed on rail and/or dock contracts at different locations around the country. After the end of main dock building in Grimsby in 1852 it can therefore be expected that the majority of such individuals would have followed precedent, and - taking their dependants with them - left the town to find work on construction projects in progress elsewhere. Census and civil registration data and burial registers are now used conjointly to give a factual dimension to the projected out-migration of these people.

The method used to quantify the expected outward movement of the men who built Grimsby's Royal Dock, rests on the premise, that, if a given individual listed in the 1851 census is not traced in that of 1861, and if his name does not appear in the parish burial register for the intervening decade (the boundaries of the Grimsby Municipa Borough and those of the Grimsby Parish were co-existent a
that period in time) then it is assumed such individual had migrated out of the town at some period between the taking of the two censuses. To attempt to trace all of the 650 men who have been the subject of analysis in the preceding pages - in terms of time and labour - was beyond the resources available for this piece of research. It has therefore been necessary to reduce the task to more manageable proportions.

This was achieved by selecting one enumeration district of the 1851 Grimsby census for intensive study. The results have allowed some conclusions to be reached as to the probable size of the overall out-migration of the dock-building labour force once main construction work ceased. As a first step towards determining which area of Grimsby to concentrate the research on, each enumeration district of the 1851 census was surveyed to ascertain which contained the largest proportion of the original study group of 650 construction workers. This was found to be enumeration district 'J' where a total of 231, or more than one-third, of such persons resided. Predictably, this enumeration district was that situated nearest to the dock-construction site and its position in relation to the rest of the town is shown on Map 5. A list of the names of the 231 men concerned, together with their occupations and places of birth (as given in the census) are in Appendix.
ENUMERATION DISTRICT 'J'
GRIMSBY 1851 CENSUS

River Humber

WEST MARSH

OLD DOCK

EAST MARSH

Pasture Street

1/4 mile

1851 Intensive Study Area

Map 5
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'C'. The men traced in the 1861 census have been indicated.

Although the enumeration district chosen for intensive study was that containing the highest number of those comprising the original study group of 650 men, few of the Irish-born labourers included in the group were resident in that particular enumeration district. Most of the Irish-born labouring population in Grimsby in 1851 were congregated together in the neighbouring enumeration districts of F, G and H. Between them, these latter three districts contained 70% of all Irish-born general labourers noted by the 1851 enumerators. In fact, none of the enumeration districts in the 1851 Grimsby census were equally - or nearly equally - representative, in terms of numbers, occupations, or nationalities, of the four sub-occupational groups which have been the subject of analysis. For example, enumeration district 'I' contained twice as many excavators as did any other enumeration district (i.e. forty), but only four Irish-born labourers were resident there. Conversely, although enumeration district 'H' contained the highest number of Irish labourers, there were no excavators living in that area of the town. In view of all these circumstances the criteria on which the choice of the intensive study area finally rested, was, that it contained a higher number of the 650
men who comprised the main study group than did any other enumeration district.

However, in order to mitigate the unavoidable imperfections of this criteria - specifically that related to the dearth of Irish-born labourers in the chosen area - a separate search of the 1861 census was undertaken to try to trace the eighty-nine Irish-born dock and general labourers in the main study group. The aim of the special search for the Irish was to establish whether the out-migration of this sub-group was in line with that displayed by the stonemasons, excavators, and dock labourers who were living in numbers in the intensive study area.

By 1861 the population of Grimsby had risen to more than 11,000, and a search of this number of census listings in an attempt to trace the 231 construction workers residing in the chosen enumeration district in that year, still represented a fairly formidable undertaking. However, an alphabetical list of all surnames which appear in the 1861 Grimsby census enumerators' listings has recently become available, and the use of this index reduced the amount of time and labour which had to be expended on the search. One of the criticisms levelled at attempts to study out-migration concerns the fact that surnames are not always spelt the same in successive censuses and it is therefore possible that some individuals are inadvertently missed in
the search process. The use of the index meant that all possible spellings of dubious surnames could be investigated with the result that the chances of missing a person, because the spelling of a surname in the 1851 and the 1861 censuses had differed, was considerably minimised. 4

1. Workers Who Died and Were Buried in Grimsby Between 1851-1861

A search of the Grimsby Cemetery Burial Register for the years 1851-1861 revealed that six of the 231 men identified in 1851 as being engaged on work connected with dock construction, and who were living in enumeration district 'J' at that time, had died. There is no means of knowing if, or how many, other men died during the relevant period and were buried elsewhere than at Grimsby. Two of the men for whom there was evidence of death had been employed as stonemasons. The first of these deaths occurred in August 1851 and the second in August 1852. Places of birth were given as Scotland and Yorkshire, respectively. The remaining four men who had died were each described in the 1851 census listings as a dock labourer. These deaths occurred in December 1851, July 1852, December 1854, and September 1860; the respective birthplaces being Claythorpe, Lincolnshire; Kilsby, Northants; Winterton, Lincolnshire, and Louth, Lincolnshire.
The man whose death occurred in 1860 had certainly stayed on in the town for some years after the end of dock construction. There is, however, no means of knowing whether the others, had they lived, would have stayed permanently in Grimsby or left at some period between 1851 and 1861. In view of this uncertainty it was decided to discount the six individuals who had died from the original total of 231 men in the intensive study area, giving a new total of 225 to be used in future calculations as to the extent of out-migration.

2. The Workers Who Stayed
Fifteen of the dock construction workers who were living in the intensive study area in 1851 were traced in the 1861 Grimsby manuscript census listings. There was no one factor, in terms of birthplace or other known demographic characteristic which was common to the fifteen individuals. Six of the men had been born in Yorkshire, one in Bedfordshire, and the most travelled of the fifteen, that is, according to the birthplaces of his children, had been born in Somerset. One of the 'stayers' had been born in Grimsby, another at Cleethorpes, and the remaining five in Lincolnshire villages. The ages (in 1851) of the 'stayers' had ranged from fifteen to forty years with the majority being in the middle twenties age group.
Each of the men concerned were described by the 1851 census enumerator as a 'dock labourer', this showing that all of the stonemasons and excavators who were resident in enumeration district 'J' in 1851 (discounting the two stonemasons who died) had left the town before the taking of the 1861 census. In 1861 only two of the dock labourers traced were still in this same occupation. Two of the remaining thirteen, had, by the time the 1861 census was taken, become mariners, two were brickmakers, one was listed as a joiner, five as labourers, and two were described as railway labourers. The youngest of the group, who was aged fifteen in 1851, had, by 1861, become a mason.

Nine of the fifteen stayers were still living in the same street in 1861 (i.e. Cleethorpe Road) as had been the case ten years earlier. As the houses were not numbered in either census it is impossible to tell whether or not the men had remained in the same house. Two others of the staying group were living in streets close to their previous homes. Three men had moved to Bath Street, a comparatively recently developed area of the town not far from the new dock, and only one man - who, together with wife, family, and in-laws, was now living in Victoria Street South - had moved nearer to the old town of Grimsby.
3. The Out-Migrants

The search of the 1851-1861 Grimsby Parish Burial Registers and the 1861 Grimsby census listings, revealed that 210 of the dock-construction workers who were living in enumeration district 'J' in 1851, had apparently migrated out of Grimsby at some time in the 1851-1861 decade. This gives, for the intensive study area, a death rate of 2.6% and an out-migration rate, based on the discounted figure of 225 (i.e. 231 less the six men who had died) of just over 93%. This percentage was not unexpected bearing in mind the evidence of the highly peripatetic nature of the working life-style, shown in the preceding pages, to have been followed by many of the labouring men who had helped to build Grimsby's mid-nineteenth century dock.

The special search of the 1861 census listings for the Irish labourers, discussed above, revealed that four of the eighty-nine who had been listed in the 1851 census were still in town in 1861. This gives an out-migration rate of around 95% and is in line with the finding of 93% for the main study group. It is believed that the majority of the Irish labourers in the town in 1851 were members of a gang brought directly to Grimsby by one of the dock contractors. (p.59). Such men would therefore have been subject to the same pressures of re-deployment when the dock contract came to an end as would other men employed on dock construction and associated tasks.
There is no obvious reason to suppose that the death rate and the migratory behaviour of the dock builders living in the intensive study area in 1851 would have differed materially from that displayed by the wider study group of 650. This contention is supported by the marked similarity of the findings in the special search for the Irish. If, therefore, the out-migration and death rates for the intensive study area are regarded as typical of the main group of 650 dock builders, and this calculation is applied to that group, then it would appear that a rounded-up total of 588 of the original 650 men studied, would have migrated out of Grimsby when dock construction ended in the early 1850s.

The 210 dock builders who were living in enumeration district 'J' in 1851, and who, it is presumed, left the town sometime between 1851 and 1861, had a total of 276 dependants living with them when the 1851 Grimsby census was taken. This is a mean average of 1.3 dependants per dock builder out-migrating from the intensive study area. Assuming, again, that this mean average of dependants is also typical of the wider group (i.e. the presumed 588 out-migrants), then it would appear that, on leaving Grimsby, the group would have taken with it some 764 dependants; making a total out-migration in the 1851-1861 decade of dock builders and dependants, of 1,352 individuals.
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This number of out-migrants resulting from the process of dock construction is almost certainly an under-enumeration. This assertion is based on the fact that the group of 650 dock-construction workers who were chosen for examination did not include some other occupational groups, some of whose members, it is believed, would also have been working at the dock site; for example, bricklayers, blacksmiths, and carpenters, all of whom, according to the census enumeration books, were in Grimsby in considerable numbers when the 1851 census was taken. Table 11, below, shows changes which occurred between 1841 and 1861 in the numbers of men working in these occupations. The nature of the changes lead to the conclusion that some of the men so employed in 1851 also left the town at the end of the main dock-building contract.

There were, for example, 137 builders and bricklayers listed by the 1851 enumerators, many of whom would have been engaged on building the 300 feet high hydraulic dock tower or constructing the brick arching between the long piers which formed the dock walls. In 1861 the number of men employed as builders and bricklayers in the town had been reduced by almost half, and this was despite the fact that there had been an increase in population and a consequent development of some new housing areas in the decade which would have generated a spurt in building
Changes in Aspects of the Occupation Structure of Grimsby 1841-1861

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1841 Population</th>
<th>1851 Population</th>
<th>1861 Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Builders/Bricklayers</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Trades (Mostly Blacksmiths)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joiners/Carpenters</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Grimsby 1851 Census Enumeration Books

TABLE 11
activity, and, presumably, created a demand for builders and bricklayers.

There were, also, in town when the 1851 census was taken, 127 men working in the metal trades, the largest number of these being blacksmiths. Some of these men would have been employed at the dock construction site on work such as the furnishing with iron shoes, and the hooping with iron, of the 10,000 timber piles which were used in the building of the coffer-dam. At a later stage of construction many blacksmiths would have worked on the iron-work connected with the installation of the pen-gates and flood gates of the dock, which 'at the time of their erection...were considered to be the largest yet constructed'.

By 1861 the number employed in the metal trades (mainly blacksmiths) had dropped from 127 in 1851 to eighty-one, even though, among other changes, the development of a deep-sea fishing industry and ancillary facilities at the port in the intervening ten years, would almost certainly have resulted in an increase in port-related trades and a consequent need for more labour in this particular field of employment. There had also been a small, although not so notable, decrease in the number of joiners/carpenters in the 1861 population compared with the 1851 figure. Bearing in mind the increase in population and other developments which had occurred in the decade, a decrease in absolute
numbers in this occupational group between 1851 and 1861, like that of the other two discussed, was no doubt a result of dock builders leaving the town when main dock construction ended.

Taking note of these additional factors, it would seem the first projected estimate of an 1851-1861 out-migration of some 1,352 individuals (workers and dependants) should be amended because this only took account of the group of 650 men who were selected for study. The probability therefore exists that between 1,500 and 2,000, or up to 20%, of Grimsby's 1851 enumerated population of 8,860, had migrated out of town when main dock-construction work ended in the early years of the 1850s.

The quantitative analysis of the projected out-migration of the Grimsby dock builders was undertaken primarily to confirm the expected cycle of the migratory behaviour of representative members of an important nineteenth-century occupational group. However, the finding that up to 20% of Grimsby's 1851 enumerated population had almost certainly left the town during the 1851-1861 decade - following the completion of the main dock contract - has, among other things, obvious implications for the pattern of decadal population change in a community hosting a large body of special industrial migrants, such as the dock-construction workers. For example, Grimsby's net population increase in 163
the 1851-1861 decade, according to the 1861 census, was 2,207. This increase, broken-down into its twin components of, a) natural increase (i.e. the excess of births over deaths in the period) and, b) increase due to in-migration, produces a natural increase figure of 1,442 and an increase due to in-migration of 765. (See Tables 12[a] and 12[b] below).

The in-migration figure of 765 is much lower than might be reasonably expected when account is taken of the gathering momentum of port development in the 1851-1861 decade and the stimulus this would have given to in-migration. For example, in addition to an up-turn in the general shipping trade by the mid-1850s as a result of the construction of a large new dock, the spectacular rise of the fishing industry (aspects of which are discussed in the next part of this work) occurred in the middle and later years of that decade. This event led to the arrival in the town of many deep-sea fishermen and their families, together with numbers of other individuals concerned with the fishing industry's ancillary trades. The fishermen in-migrants and their dependants, as will be shown, numbered more than the 765 net population change by migration indicated above. 8

It therefore appears that the out-migration of the dock builders and their dependants was the cause of a serious under-representation, in the census, of the extent of in-
**Natural Increase in the Grimsby Population 1851-1861**

Births registered in the Grimsby Municipal Borough between March 1851 and March 1861  
3,625

Deaths registered in the Grimsby Municipal Borough between March 1851 and March 1861  
2,183

Natural increase of population (i.e. excess of births over deaths)  
1,442

Source: Registers of Births and Deaths: Grimsby Registration Sub-district 1851-1861

**TABLE 12(a)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase due to In-migration (Net)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total population increase Grimsby Municipal Borough 1851-1861 (according to 1861 census)</td>
<td>2,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural increase as shown in Table 12(a)</td>
<td>1,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population increase due to in-migration</td>
<td>765</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 12(b)**
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migration to Grimsby in the 1851-1861 decade. That is to say, the apparent anomaly between the pattern of in-migration which might have been expected as a consequence of the economic development of the port in the 1850s, and net in-migration in the period as represented in the census, was due to the out-migration of the dock builders which effectively counter-balanced, and thus masked, population growth by in-migration in the 1851-1861 decade.

If a moderately estimated out-migration of dock builders and dependants of, say, 1,600 is added to the 1861 net census in-migration figure of 765, (Table 13, below), then this calculation produces an in-migration figure of 2,365, which is much more in accordance with the gathering pace of economic development taking place at Grimsby between 1851-1861. In particular, it reflects the arrival, in the 1850s, of Grimsby's second wave of special industrial migrants - that is, the deep-sea fishermen who originated from ports in the south and south-west - and who became 'users' of the town's new dock and of its transport facilities.
Estimate of Net Population Change by Migration: 1851-1861

Total population of the Grimsby Municipal Borough (according to the 1851 census) 8,860

Projected out-migration of population in the 1851-1861 decade based on the findings of this study - 1,600

Natural increase of population between 1851 and 1861 (i.e. excess of births over deaths) (See Table 12a) + 1,442

Population increase by in-migration between 1851-1861 (i.e. 765 net increase according to 1861 census + the 1,600 projected out-migration of the dock-builders) + 2,365

Total population of the Grimsby Municipal Borough (according to the 1861 census) 11,067

Source: 1851 and 1861 Census Population Tables: Registers of Births and Deaths: Grimsby Registration Sub-district 1851-1861

TABLE 13
PART THREE

THE 'USKRS' OF THE PORT
The idea that the development of some nineteenth-century ports occurred in distinctive 'phases' or 'moments', and that each stage was capable of activating special industrial migrations of different kinds, was discussed in Chapter 1. This part of the thesis studies the second wave of special industrial migrants, who, following the departure of those concerned with the construction of the dock, arrived in Grimsby as the newly developed port was in the early stages of becoming - to borrow Leyland Jenks' term - a 'going concern'.

The arrival in mid-nineteenth century Grimsby of a migrant deep-sea fishing labour force, the members of which were to become 'Users' of the newly developed port, was due to a combination of social and economic 'push' and 'pull' factors impinging upon those concerned. These had arisen from the widespread changes occurring in Britain at that time, in particular, the rapid spread of the railway network and changes in the British fishing industry dating from the early nineteenth century, such as the increasing attention being focused on the North Sea fishing grounds.
The nature of relevant 'push' factors which led Grimsby's early in-migrant fishermen to seek relocation to a place where their industry appeared to have a future, will be discussed later in the context of the analysis of the patterns and processes of the migration history of these people. This part of the work is centred upon an examination of the role of the M.S. & L.R., and its associated railway interests, in creating the conditions which helped to 'pull' the deep-sea fishermen to the developing port of Grimsby.

By 1852 the M.S. & L.R. had completed the construction of a large new dock and had engineered Grimsby's connection to the growing rail network. The Company was later to introduce measures specifically designed to attract the fishing trade to the port, such as the provision of a separate dock for the use of fishing craft, houses for fishermen, and cheap carriage rates for fish. A many faceted question which begs an answer is whether or not Grimsby's geographical position in relation to newly discovered North Sea fishing grounds, and, therefore, its potential to become a major deep-sea fishing centre, had been a factor in the M.S. & L.R.'s plans to develop the port?
1. The M.S. & L.R.'s Plans for Grimsby

Frank Bowen of the 'Dock and Harbour Authority', writing in 1945, categorically states that the original plan to develop Grimsby was founded on the discovery of the Silver Pits, an area of the North Sea in the vicinity of the Dogger Bank. This view is supported by George Dow in his work on the 'Great Central'.¹ There is no doubt but that some local people, aware of Grimsby's relative nearness to the Dogger Bank and other North Sea grounds, did see the potential this advantage held for the establishment of a deep-sea fishing industry at the port - provided, that is, the town had a rail communication. Several witnesses giving evidence to the Tidal Harbours Commission enquiring into the state of the Port of Grimsby in October 1845, made this particular point. Robert Drewery, for instance, a pilot for twenty-two years, told the Enquiry that the Silver Pits were about 30 miles from Spurn, or five hours' sail from Grimsby. He said:

If there was a railroad from Grimsby fish might, on some occasions, be in London by it before they could get to Hull; there is 12 hours difference at certain times between landing the fish at Grimsby and Hull. No other port is so convenient as Grimsby for fishermen landing fish...but fishermen go to Hull to enable them to get their fish to market sooner. More fishing vessels have gone to Hull since the railway was opened there, I should say 10 to 1 more.

Another witness, Joseph Croft, said he had been in the
fishing trade and had been acquainted with the port of Grimsby for thirty-seven years. He said: 'There is fishing ground all the way from Yarmouth to Scarborough'. If a railway came to Grimsby 'I know there would be two or three hundred sail come as soon as ever it was opened'.

Gordon Jackson, the author of 'Grimsby and the Haven Company', disagrees with Bowen and Dow and believes that Grimsby was developed as a 'general-trade' port. The M.S. & L.R.'s half-yearly Report of 25 August 1852, issued just a few months after the opening of the Royal Dock, would appear to give support to this view, for in it there is no indication that the establishment of a fishing industry had any part, at least for the present, in the Company's plans for the port. It simply said, the undertaking's 'great features have been perfected; a communication between Manchester and Sheffield and a good port on the Humber have been effected'. In these circumstances the question might be asked as to when the establishment of a deep-sea industry became part of the Company's policy regarding the future development of the port, and what measures did they take to bring such plans to fruition?

Of importance, not only to this question, but, also, to aspects of the evolution of other fishing ports along the east coast of England, such as Yarmouth, Lowestoft, Hull, and Scarborough, was the rapid spread of trawling in the
east and central areas of the North Sea dating from around 1840. (Map 6). There is a debate as to the causes of this phenomenon and the subject has received objective attention elsewhere. However, any discussion of the role of the M.S. & L.R. in the emergence of Grimsby as a major fishing port, needs to be considered against this historical background. The salient points of the debate are outlined below.

Three possible stimulant factors to the spread of trawling in the North Sea in the second quarter of the nineteenth century have been identified. First, Tunstall has suggested that the exhaustion of fishing grounds in the south-west had compelled southern fishermen to move northwards in search of new grounds. This theory, however, has been largely discounted on the premise that high investment was taking place in the Devon fishing fleet at the period in time when the northward migration of the southern fishermen was at its height. Such investment, Northway has argued, would have been inconsistent with the exhaustion of the traditional grounds in the south-west.

Second, the discovery of the Silver Pits, an area off the Dogger Bank where exceptionally fine soles congregated in large numbers in especially cold weather, is another reason put forward to explain attention being increasingly focused on the North Sea. There is, however, no consensus of
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opinion as to the date of the discovery of the Silver Pits although it is generally agreed that this occurred sometime between the late 1830s and late 1840s. Of more importance to the substance of the debate, perhaps, is evidence that the newly discovered grounds were being commercially exploited in early 1845. The finding, and the early working over of the Silver Pits, however, is not considered to be a wholly satisfactory explanation as to why an essentially winter time activity, such as this, should result in the establishment of a permanent, as opposed to a merely seasonal, trawling industry along the north-east coast of England.8

Third, the spread of the railway network in the second quarter of the nineteenth century is thought to have been a crucial factor in promoting the growth of trawling in the North Sea. The railway thesis, among other things, points to the fact, that, as Tables 14 and 15, below, show, the bulk of a typical trawler catch comprised the cheaper varieties of offal fish, that is, haddock and plaice, rather than cod, soles, halibut, and turbot which were much in demand and commanded higher prices. Not every type of white fish lent itself to traditional methods of curing, and, prior to the advent of the railways, sometimes as much as four-fifths of a trawler's catch of so-called offal fish would be thrown overboard because it proved difficult, if not impossible, to market locally.
Return taken by Mr. Knott, Trawl-Owner, of Great Grimsby: account of one vessel

Weight of Fish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Tons</th>
<th>Cwts</th>
<th>Qrs</th>
<th>Tons</th>
<th>Cwts</th>
<th>Qrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


TABLE 14
**Average Catch of Trawlers Operated by Hull Smack Owner, Alfred Wheatley Ansell**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prime inc.</th>
<th>Offal</th>
<th>Offal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soles &amp; Turbats</td>
<td>Plaice</td>
<td>Haddocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tons Cwts</td>
<td>Tons Cwts</td>
<td>Tons Cwts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>15 5</td>
<td>51 12</td>
<td>36 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>11 15</td>
<td>43 3</td>
<td>61 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>9 4</td>
<td>52 5</td>
<td>49 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 10</td>
<td>36 7</td>
<td>60 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Royal Commission on Trawling, 1885; Quoted in R. Robinson, 'The Rise of Trawling on the Dogger Bank Grounds'.

**TABLE 15**
The comparatively rapid transport system offered by the railways - especially after a national agreement was reached on fish carriage rates in the 1850s - was a major factor in opening up large new inland markets for most types of fish, including that of the offal variety. As a result, the North Sea trawling industry began to experience rapid expansion after the mid-nineteenth century and there can be little doubt that the railways played a key role in bringing this about.

It is against the background of the above debate that the reasons behind the 1844 decision of the M.S. & L.R. to build to Grimsby, and to undertake the construction of a large new dock there, have to be weighed. A comparison of the chronology of the decision-making process which led to the development of the port with that of the time scale of the early commercial exploitation of the Silver Pits, and the extent to which, by the time in question, the railway had been instrumental in creating new markets for fresh fish, can shed some light on the subject.

In the early autumn of 1844 a survey was made by the Sheffield and Lincolnshire Junction Railway of a route between Gainsborough and Grimsby. On 28 October 1844 a meeting was held at the Red Lion Hotel, Caistor, to launch the Great Grimsby and Sheffield Junction railway and a resolution was unanimously passed in favour of building a
line between Gainsborough and Grimsby. By the end of 1844, the assets of the Grimsby Haven Company had been acquired by the newly formed Grimsby Docks Company and plans were drawn up for the construction of a large new dock.\(^9\)

The above dates can be compared with evidence that the Silver Pits were first extensively worked over in the exceptionally cold winter of 1844-1845. At that time a considerable number of soles were despatched by rail from Hull to Leeds, where, although generally a luxury food, they were sold at such a price that the poor were able to benefit. Importantly - in the context of this discussion - this event took place marginally later than the decision to develop Grimsby was taken, and could not, conceivably, have had any bearing on it. The event was not widely reported at the time, at least, not in the local Hull and East Yorkshire press, although it did receive some attention in the Leeds Mercury of 20 January 1845. It is therefore difficult to assess whether the parties concerned with the development of Grimsby might have heard about the harvest from the Silver Pits in the 1844-1845 winter.

However, if the M.S. & L.R. and others with an interest in developing Grimsby had heard about the excessive yield of soles, it seemed it was viewed, by them, as little more than a seasonal phenomenon, and they did not substantially change existing plans for the port. This would explain why
there is nothing in the deliberations of the M.S. & L.R. until after the opening of the Royal dock in 1852 to lead to the conclusion that the Company had any interest in deep-sea fishing at, either, the time when the original decisions to develop the port were taken, or immediately afterwards.

There was, also, little overt local interest in the middle years of the 1840s in linking the proposed plans for Grimsby with the establishment of a fishing industry at the port. A Lincolnshire newspaper in April 1846, however, did say that due to extensive works 'Grimsby will probably become the principal resort of fishing vessels employed on the Dogger Bank as well as on the distant grounds of the North Sea fishery'. Although the Grimsby Town Council's petition submitted to Parliament in March 1845, in support of a railway between Grimsby and Gainsborough, did not use the port's potential to become a major fishing centre as an argument in favour of that railway being built, one year later, in March 1846, the Council did give this as one of the reasons why a railway should be constructed between Grimsby and Boston. Interestingly, the stage of the development of the North Sea fishing industry, and the complementary role of the railway in developing inland markets for fresh fish, had changed little, if at all, in the year which had passed between the submission of the two petitions (i.e. 1845-1846).
The 1845 petition was in support of a Bill for the construction of a railway from Great Grimsby to Gainsborough called the Great Grimsby and Sheffield Junction Railway. This railway company came together with several others to form the M.S. & L.R. in September 1845. On the same date in 1845 that the Town Council petitioned in favour of this line, it also petitioned in favour of the construction of a connecting line from Sheffield to Lincoln and Gainsborough. Both petitions drew attention to the fact, that, if the lines were built, they would complete a direct east and west main trunk route from Liverpool to Grimsby and would furnish to 'most important manufacturing and agricultural districts the double advantage of rapid communication with each other and easy access to a safe and cheap port on the East Coast'.

It was further said that if the route were constructed, then Great Grimsby, and its hinterland, would be connected with the important towns of Sheffield, Manchester, and Liverpool, thus 'securing a large traffic in corn and agricultural products' while the 'present price of coals at Grimsby and throughout North Lincolnshire would ensure a considerable return traffic in coals and coke from the Yorkshire fields to Great Grimsby...at an important saving of cost to the inhabitants'.
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The Council were concerned, that, should the Sheffield and Lincolnshire Junction railway fail to be built, then any benefits Grimsby might derive from the building of the line connecting that town to Gainsborough, would be materially lessened as 'neither the corn nor fat cattle and other produce of these districts can be forwarded to the manufacturing districts of West Yorkshire and Lancaster'. The petition also made the point, that, without the connecting line from Sheffield to Lincoln and Gainsborough, the coal and coke from Yorkshire could only be sent to Grimsby and to North Lincolnshire 'through the present tedious and expensive communication by water'. Since the subject of a fishing industry was not mentioned in either petition, it seems Grimsby's potential for development as a fishing port was still unrealised as late as 1845, at least at a local level, although this seems hardly credible.

However, exactly one year later at a meeting held on 2 March 1846 the Grimsby Town Council decided to submit a petition to Parliament in favour of the East Lincolnshire Railway Company's line southwards from Grimsby to Boston, and in that petition the possibility of developing a fishing trade at the port was referred to. The subject was mentioned at the very end of the 1846 petition, suggesting that its inclusion might have been something of an afterthought. Among other matters of more importance to the Council, it seemed, was the fact that the Manchester
continental trade would travel on the East Lincolnshire Railway Company's line, and, also, that the line would 'form by far the quicker route for the mails from Hamburg and the Baltic to London', both of these issues being accorded precedence over the subject of a potential deep-sea fishing industry at the port. On the subject of fishing the petition said:

If this southern communication was obtained the immense trade in north sea fish which now passes up the Humber for the metropolis must necessarily come into the port of Great Grimsby and be transmitted by this railway at a very reduced cost and in, at the most, half the time that it now takes, and that the commodious docks and other improvements now being made at Great Grimsby at a great outlay of capital will much facilitate such a traffic.\[13\]

There is, however, a feasible explanation as to why the Grimsby Town Council mentioned the possibility of the development of a deep-sea fishing industry at Grimsby in its 1846 petition, but did not do so in the earlier ones of 1845. Contemporaries, it is believed, would have seen the functions of the two lines as to some extent disparate with the east-west trunk route of the M.S. & L.R. not perceived as a potential conveyor of comparatively large quantities of fresh fish. This was because, in the early 1840s when the decision to build it was taken, the post mid-nineteenth century expansion of markets for fresh fish - many of which were to be in South Yorkshire and Lancashire along the
route of the M.S. & L.R.'s line - could not then have been wholly foreseen.

In contrast, as the 1846 petition indicates, it was realised from the outset that the East Lincolnshire Railway Company's southern line from Grimsby to Boston would connect the developing port to Billingsgate, the fish market of the metropolis. Long before the advent of the railways Billingsgate was an important, and growing, distributive centre for fish. It has been estimated that, in 1839, the quantity of fish entering Billingsgate was twenty times that which it had been in 1802, although it is thought this might have been an exaggeration. The London market, however, had only begun to receive its first regular supplies of fresh fish by rail about 1846; the year the Grimsby Town Council petitioned in favour of the southern communication between Grimsby and Boston. The East Lincolnshire Railway Company's southern line from Grimsby had clearly been viewed, from the outset, as a natural carrier of the commodity to an already established market in the metropolis.

The foregoing discussion has indicated, that, when the decision was taken to develop Grimsby in the first half of the 1840s the new North Sea fishing grounds were largely undeveloped, as was, also, the complementary role of the railway as a transporter of fresh fish to inland markets.
This goes some way towards negating the Bowen/Dow thesis that the original plans to develop Grimsby were founded on the discovery of the Silver Pits. The conclusion has to be, therefore, that the building of the M.S. & L.R.'s line from Grimsby to Gainsborough and Sheffield, and the construction of the town's new dock, was originally undertaken - as Jackson believes - with a view to developing Grimsby as a general trade port. In these circumstances some further points require elucidation regarding the nature of the M.S. & L.R.'s role in stimulating the growth of the Grimsby fishing industry and the consequent establishment of a resident labour force of deep-sea fishermen in the town.

2. The First Fish Dock
At some time in the 1850s the M.S. & L.R. began to build a dock for fishing craft together with ice and curing houses. They set up a deep-sea fishing company, offered cheap carriage rates for fish and built houses in an attempt to persuade fishermen to move their businesses to the port. The timing of these measures are important in the context of the circumstances, manner, and chronology, of the arrival of numbers of migrant deep-sea fishermen at Grimsby. A source of information on the activities of the M.S. & L.R. in the four areas set out above are the minutes of the meetings of its directors (1847-1863) and those of
the G.N.R. and M.S. & L.R. Joint Committee (1849-1859). The minutes also contain evidence which modifies the generally accepted chronology for the construction, and subsequent opening, by the M.S. & L.R., of a specialist fish dock at Grimsby for the use of fishing craft.

It has previously been assumed that work on the construction of a fish dock began in the summer of 1855 and that the new dock was opened in March 1857. The source of this information, it seems, was contemporary newspaper reports. For instance, a local newspaper of 13 March 1857, said, 'On Saturday last, (7 March), the fishing dock was opened for the entrance of fishing smacks'. A reappraisal of this report, when read in conjunction with the minutes of the meetings of the directors of the M.S. & L.R., leads to the conclusion that the reported 'opening' of a fishing dock in March 1857, might have been misleading since it is possible that a small dock was opened for fishing craft several years before that date, and, after being in commission for a short time, was then closed to allow extensive alterations to be carried out. In these latter circumstances the fish dock would have been reopened - following alteration - rather than 'opened', in March 1857. The minutes show the M.S. & L.R. were most certainly engaged in the construction of a fish dock in 1852, that is, three years earlier than is generally supposed.
According to the minutes of a meeting of the M.S. & L.R.'s directors held on 18 March 1852, (the same month in which the Royal Dock was opened) Mr. J.M. Rendel - the designer of that dock - was asked to prepare plans and estimates for the construction of a fish dock at Grimsby. Plans of the proposed fish dock were submitted to the directors at a meeting held on 18 June 1852, when it was resolved to carry out the work at a cost not exceeding £3,500. At the end of July 1852, Rendel was told to proceed with the construction of the specialist dock as sanctioned at the earlier meeting. It seems the instructions were obeyed, for, by September 1852, there is no doubt that the construction of a fish dock had commenced. On 24 September 1852 the M.S. & L.R. Board were informed of the occurrence of a slip at the fishing dock at Grimsby. Rendel was requested to furnish, as speedily as possible, a report as to what delay in construction would be likely to arise as a result of the slip and the directors were anxious to know upon whom any loss, resulting from this occurrence, would fall.

At the following Board meeting held on 29 October 1852 Rendel reported that the extent of the slip at the fishing dock was 'superficial'. It had not, he said, affected any of the entrance masonry or important works of the dock and could be 'entirely rectified' for a sum not exceeding £400-£450. He added, 'Of course the Board are aware that there
are no walls around the dock and that the slip is nothing more than a mere sliding in of one of the slopes'. A quantity of chalkstone was ordered to be placed on the weak ground which had caused the slip. This, it was said, would sink into the soft mud and form a protection to the side slope of the dock and 'prevent any further evil'.

Edward Hele Clark, in a paper presented to a meeting of the Institute of Civil Engineers in 1864 entitled 'Description of the Great Grimsby (Royal) Docks' observed that the 'sides' of the current fish dock, (i.e. the dock said to have been opened in 1857) comprised 'clay slopes...covered with chalkstone and roughly pitched'. This tallies with Rendel's description of the walls of the dock he had started to build in 1852 and suggests the two dock were, in fact, one and the same.

On 25 February 1853, Rendel, referring to work on the fish dock and on the Old Dock channel, was able to report that he 'confidently' expected, that, in the course of the next six months, 'the works would have been completed'. In April 1853 the Company's Resident Engineer was instructed to lay the chalk, rails, and sleepers which would form the 'permanent road to the fish craft dock'. At the meeting of directors held on 30 July 1853 a further plan was submitted for a jetty, or pier, from the fishing dock at an estimated cost of £661. It was resolved to carry out this
additional work under the superintendence of the Company's Resident Engineer, Mr. Potter. 24

There is no record in the M.S. & L.R. minutes of the opening of a fish dock in 1853-54 but there can be no doubt that one was in the course of construction in 1852-1853. By December 1853, however, the M.S. & L.R. had proposed, and were subsequently to carry out, some extensive alterations to what, it seems, might have been an already existent fish craft dock. This course of events would have meant that the small dock, started in 1852, had been completed and then opened at sometime before the decision to alter it was taken. In this case, in view of the scale of the proposed work, the dock would certainly have been closed, to allow the alterations to be made, and there is some evidence, discussed below, to suggest this might have happened. Alternatively, the fish craft dock, begun in 1852, may still have been in the course of construction when the M.S. & L.R. had decided to alter and improve the original plans. If so, then a comparatively small fishing dock, by the time it was opened in 1857, had taken almost five years to complete.

According to the M.S. & L.R. minutes, the course of events were that Mr. Adam Smith - who also designed the Grimsby graving dock - was, at the end of 1853, asked to obtain tenders for alterations to the fish dock. Unfortunately,
the nature of the proposed alterations were not recorded. They must, however, have been of some comparative magnitude judging by the sums of the tenders received 'for the execution of the improvements'. Two tenders were considered by the Board; that of Thomas Hutchings, who had been the main contractor for the Royal Dock, was, at £7,152.1.4., slightly lower than that of William Sissons who tendered at £7,158.7.4. In December 1854, an amended tender of Sissons was eventually accepted with the proviso that he undertook to complete the work by 1 August 1855, or 1 September at the latest.

Work on the alterations certainly started, for, by April 1855 the directors were told progress on the part of the contractors carrying out the alterations was not satisfactory and they were 'urged to proceed with greater vigour'. It is suggested it might have been the start, in 1855, of these comparatively large-scale alterations to an already existent dock, which has led to the local supposition that the construction of a fish dock at Grimsby did not commence until the summer of that year. The nature of the evidence which has led to the tentative proposition that the fish craft dock, started in 1852, was opened to smacks, perhaps in late 1853 or 1854, and then closed for a period in order to allow of its extensive alteration, is largely circumstantial. For instance, at a meeting of the M.S. & L.R. directors held on 29 August 1856 there was a
discussion concerned with a number of matters related to the imminent completion of the fishing dock alterations. The Board were told, that, 'with the present construction of the fish craft dock' it was 'impracticable to bring in fishing vessels except in very still weather'. It is considered unlikely that this problem would have been known had fishing craft not previously used the dock.

3. M.S. & L.R. Reactions to the Demands of a Burgeoning Fishing Trade

The chequered, and uncertain, history of Grimsby's first purpose built fish dock is symptomatic of the dilemma facing the M.S. & L.R. when they set out, in the early 1850s, to establish a deep-sea industry at the port. On the one hand it would have been patently obvious that a trade would not develop unless the facilities necessary for it to flourish were provided. On the other hand, the Company could not have been sure, at least in the beginning, of the speed at which the industry would grow. Although there would inevitably have been an accepted degree of speculation attached to the undertaking, the Company would constantly have been in the difficult position of balancing capital outlay against an unknown return. This situation no doubt accounts for the continual programme of alteration and improvement to which the original design of the fish dock was subjected. Despite
the undoubted efforts of the M.S. & L.R. to keep abreast of the requirements of a growing and vociferous fishing trade, it seems - at least during the early and middle years of the 1850s - that the Company's actions were, perforce, more reactive than pro-active in character.

The demands for further alterations to the fish dock did not abate with its opening (or reopening - depending on how the matter is viewed) in March 1857, for, in the May of that year some smack-owners and smack-masters 'associated' with the port were again expressing dissatisfaction with some aspects of the dock's construction. The term 'associated' may be important here in the context of the belief, discussed later in this chapter, that smack-owners from other places used the Grimsby dock facilities to land and despatch catches, but delayed transferring their homes and businesses to the port until the end of the 1850s or beginning of the 1860s.

In the spring of 1857, however, a number of individuals submitted a petition to the M.S. & L.R. requesting the 'present lock be reconstructed' and the 'east pier be filled in with cliff-stone to ensure a smooth entry to the lock'. The directors of the M.S. & L.R. considered the petition at their meeting on 29 May 1857. They concluded that the entrance to the fishing dock was not defective and therefore saw 'no reason to alter it'. The directors did,
however, make one concession to the petitioners. They recommended that the suggestion to fill up the pier and east side with cliff-stone to a certain extent be adopted. The board's somewhat pointed comment was to the effect, that, 'most accidents which occur are due to, or arise generally from, neglect of using proper care'.

Dissatisfaction with the facilities provided did not, it seems inhibit the growth of the Grimsby fishing trade. On Christmas Day, 1857, the fish dock was reported 'crowded with something like fifty vessels'. The trade, it was said, seemed to be extending, but there was a cautionary note to the effect that the nascent industry required 'proper dock accommodation to develop itself further'. Throughout 1858 there were many reports of the increasing prosperity of the industry. Several new fishing companies were set up, the dock was said to be 'animated', and the fishing trade 'quite on the qui vive'. Twenty smacks left other ports in 1858 in order to be registered at Grimsby and this event, it was said, reflected the 'superior accessibility of the port and the great facilities' offered by the rail connections to the metropolis and intermediate towns.

In March 1859 certain owners and captains of smacks connected with Grimsby were yet again petitioning the M.S. & L.R. to the effect that still further alterations and
improvements to the fish dock were required. One complaint was that the dock was much too small for the present trade, and, in consequence, a great deal of inconvenience and loss had been sustained by the Grimsby fishery. During the recent winter months, it was said, the dock was sometimes so full that vessels could not get to the landing place to discharge cargoes. As a result, thousands of baskets of fish lost markets. This, the petitioners said, was a similar situation to that appertaining at Hull and pointedly reminded the M.S. & L.R. of the 'very great injury sustained by that port' as a result of that particular situation being allowed to persist.

The petitioners believed, that, if certain alterations were to be carried out at the fishing dock, 'Grimsby would speedily become the most important fishing port in England'. They asked for the existing pontoon and all connecting woodwork to be removed and replaced with a new wooden platform, this to be furnished with several light, handy cranes, so that five or six vessels could discharge catches at the same time. A connecting covered wooden stage 20 feet wide by 200 feet long was also required which would act as a fish market. A line of rails, it was said, should be laid close to this platform on the west side so that the railway carriages could come alongside for the purpose of taking the fish to the various markets. The harbour, the petitioners said, should also be enlarged
sufficiently to allow room and convenience for 500 sail of fishing smacks. The petition was signed by twenty-five smack-owners or smack captains.\textsuperscript{33}

The theme of the petition was taken up by a sympathetic local paper which felt the Grimsby fishing trade was 'not sufficiently appreciated by the Dock Company'. For this reason, the paper said, the trade was not making the strides it should. If, it went on to warn, 'better facilities for landing fish were not provided, then the trade would leave Grimsby'. Should this happen, then £50,000 a year would be lost to the port.\textsuperscript{34} Despite this gloomy prognosis the trade continued to prosper throughout 1859 and to present a 'very encouraging aspect'. Although the season was only just commencing, a Lincolnshire newspaper said 'There had been double the quantity of fish brought into Grimsby to that of the last year at the same period'.\textsuperscript{35}

In due course Mr. Seymour Clark, the G.N.R.'s General Manager, met representatives of the Grimsby fishing trade to discuss the matters raised in their petition. He reported on this meeting to the Joint Committee of the M.S. & L.R. and G.N.R. on 13 June 1860. The total of the proposed alterations required at the fish dock, he said, would be £4,500.\textsuperscript{36} There is no doubt but that the two associated companies were, at this stage, keen to meet the
demands of the Grimsby fishing trade, it being said, at the meeting, that, if the proposed alterations were carried out 'other fleets and fishing boats will come to Grimsby...and the place will thus sufficiently develop the trade itself...so as to induce carriers to bring fish into Grimsby for transit to London and elsewhere instead of carrying it, as now, direct to the Thames'.

Unfortunately, the M.S. & L.R. could not spare the capital to pay their share of the estimated cost of £4,500. They were, however, prepared to charge the outlay to revenue over a period of years if the G.N.R. would assist them in proportion to the benefit the latter concern would derive. The G.N.R. proposed to meet the M.S. & L.R. in the outlay by allowing them 3/- a ton on all above the first 1,000 tons of fish carried to London until they had paid the £2,250. (i.e. the M.S. & L.R.'s share of the outlay). It was reported, that, during the past year, the G.N.R. had carried 3,622 tons of fish, so that, without any increase in traffic, the payment to the M.S. & L.R. would extend over a period of five and a half years. However, a large increase in traffic was confidently expected. There was no doubt but that the fish traffic 'was of growing importance, and...if fostered, [would] become a large business'.

Within a month of making these decisions a further improvement was added to the plans for the fish dock when it was resolved to form a proper road to and from it at a
cost of £354. This sum was to be added to the original estimated cost of the improvements and divided between the two interested railway companies.\(^{38}\)

In March 1861 only nine months after it was resolved to spend a sum approaching £5,000 on yet another round of alterations to the fishing dock, smack-owners were again complaining about aspects of its construction. They said there was not sufficient water at neap tides outside the dock and also said the bottom of the dock was higher than the lock sill. This situation caused vessels to ground and was a great inconvenience to the fish trade.\(^{39}\) The matter was considered at the May 1861 meeting of the M.S. & L.R. directors, but postponed for further consideration until 28 June. At this latter meeting the response of the M.S. & L.R. to the demands of the fish trade was not so amendable as had previously been the case. The complainants were told, that, in view of the 'present state of the fishing trade' the Board were not prepared to consider any large outlay.\(^{40}\) This latter comment might indicate that the M.S. & L.R. were not entirely satisfied with their return from the fishing trade at that point in time.
4. The Changing Attitudes of the M.S. & L.R. during the Early Development of the Fishing Industry

The M.S. & L.R. minutes, as well as being a source of information on the practical steps taken by the Company - and its associate, the G.N.R. - to establish a fishing industry at the port, also shed some light on the changing attitudes of the Company during the different stages of the early development of the trade. In the autumn of 1856, for instance, the M.S. & L.R. decided to appoint a Superintendent Port Master, Mr. John Whitford, who was to have the entire charge of the port of Grimsby; of the traffic connected with it, and of the railway arrangements. A description of Whitford's many duties was the subject of a letter sent to him by Mr. Watkins, a director of the M.S. & L.R., who outlined the policy of the Board towards the port. The contents of the letter give an insight into how the M.S. & L.R. viewed the budding fishing industry as at 1856, that is, some four years after first beginning the construction of a small fish dock at the port. Whitford was told that the fishing dock, and the arrangements connected with the fishing trade, would require his special attention:

Some time ago we originated a small fishing and curing company in order to entice the fishing interest to resort to Grimsby to land, forward, and cure. This proceeding was quite successful and a considerable part of them will...come to Grimsby during the present winter and spring. We must make Grimsby a successful fishing port and establish a requisite curing house and store. At
Yarmouth they have a daily wholesale market on the beach in the season. Consider this for Grimsby. You will observe that an ice house to hold 1,000 tons is being constructed. Its bearing upon the fishing trade is of immense importance as there is no ice house on the east coast north of Yarmouth.

The substance of the letter confirms that the company had realised from the outset that they would need to entice the fishing trade to Grimsby. Further, the M.S. & L.R.'s early objective, it seems, was to encourage fishermen to use the port to 'land, forward and cure'. This suggests the establishment of a resident fishing community was not necessarily a part of the early plans for the port, the aim being to attract fishing craft registered elsewhere to use the port's new facilities. Even as late as the mid-1850s, there is some indication that the company was still broadly thinking along these same lines. The letter to Whitford makes it clear that the fishermen who had availed themselves of Grimsby's dock facilities during the previous year (i.e. 1855) were seasonal itinerants who were expected back by the company during the present winter and spring season.

At the time the Whitford letter was written in the late autumn of 1856, the fish dock was still undergoing alteration and improvement, or - depending on how the matter is viewed - was still under construction. Fishing craft landing their cargoes at the port during this period
discharged their 'catches' into, either, the Royal or the Old Dock. The 'nuisances' this practice caused, especially in the Royal Dock, had long been a source of complaint. In August 1856 Mr. Seymour Clark, the G.N.R. General Manager, applied to the M.S. & L.R. to have a line of rails put down from the curing house to the east landing slip of the tidal basin so as to allow fish to be landed at that point without it having to go into 'either dock'.

The entrance tidal basin referred to was an area of 15 acres through which the docks were entered and it had a landing pier around it alongside of which steamers embarked and disembarked passengers. The M.S. & L.R. told Seymour Clark that they would be unable to carry out his request for rails until the nearby Graving Dock was completed. He was assured, however, that the work would be done 'when the proper time arrived'. The reference to the 'curing house' implies the line of rails was required to facilitate the landing of fish intended for curing, rather than that of the fresh variety. It is likely, however, that the design of the tidal basin was such that it could be used, and no doubt customarily had been, for the landing of fish pending the availability of a specialist fish dock.

The Whitford letter also reflects the M.S. & L.R.'s attitude towards the provision of the ancillary facilities needed to establish a successful fishing trade at the port.
In this connection the new Portmaster's attention was drawn to those currently available at Yarmouth. The question of the erection of an ice house at Grimsby was first raised in May 1856. It was believed the provision of ice would greatly help in the establishment of a fish trade. The lack of ice at Hull had been noted, as had, too, the consequent opportunity to up-stage the rival Humber port in this respect, it being suggested that the building of an ice house would 'be the means of bringing all the present Hull trade to Grimsby'. The M.S. & L.R. lost no time in putting the plan for an ice house into effect for Watkins' letter to Whitford, penned in the autumn of 1856, drew his attention to the fact that a large facility of this nature was already in the course of construction.

5. Some Positive Steps of Encouragement
Unlike the earlier Grimsby Haven Company which made the mistake of thinking that the provision of a dock was all that was needed to create a successful port, the later railway developers of Grimsby took some practical steps to demonstrate to interested members of the fishing trade Grimsby's potential in this respect. They said they 'deemed it expedient to assist in promoting the deep-sea and other fishing enterprises of Grimsby' from which, they said, they hoped 'to derive a new and important source of traffic'. Early in the 1850s the G.N.R. paid a bonus to
James Howard and Co. to bring their fleet of thirteen vessels, formerly based at Manningtree, to Grimsby. This venture, it seems, was short-lived, for, in reporting the subsequent formation of the Grimsby Deep-Sea Fishing Company in 1854, a Lincolnshire newspaper commented, 'it will be much more extensive than that of the late firm of Howard & Co'.

In April 1854 the M.S. & L.R. started negotiations with the G.N.R. with a view to raising capital to set up the Grimsby Deep-Sea Fishing Company. At the M.S. & L.R. board meeting on 29 June 1854 a draft agreement was presented which had been drawn up to secure the proper working of the proposed new company, and, by November 1854 the details were complete. A small curing house to serve the needs of the business was erected early in 1856 at a cost of £666. In March 1859, five years after the formation of the Grimsby Deep-Sea Fishing Company, the Joint Committee of the M.S. & L.R. and the G.N.R. reached the conclusion that the company had answered the purpose for which it had been chiefly created and that a fishing trade had arisen at the port of Grimsby which was rapidly becoming of magnitude. By November 1859 an attempt was made to sell the vessels which were the property of the company. Table 16, below, shows the sum which had been expended on the purchase of the vessels and the amount of the loss sustained as a result of their sale.
## Result of the Attempt to Sell the Vessels of the Grimsby Deep-Sea Fishing Company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Vessel</th>
<th>Original cost of vessel</th>
<th>Amount sold for</th>
<th>Loss on Vessels sold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Chapman</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmund Denison</td>
<td>1,058</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearl</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Ellis</td>
<td>2,281</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>1,625</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Beale</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hussey Packe</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarborough</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperance</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polly</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Anne</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neptune</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.1.</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**  
£13,459  
£3,333  
£5,521

**Source:** PRO/RAIL/235/2  2nd November 1859

**TABLE 16**  
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Being aware of the dissatisfaction of Hull smack-owners with the treatment meted out to them at that port, the M.S. & L.R., in 1855, set out to entice Hull-based fishermen to Grimsby. The company, together with the London and North Western and G.N.R. Companies invited the owners and agents of Hull fishing smacks to a dinner at the Yarborough Hotel in Grimsby. According to a Hull newspaper 'the viands were excellent and the promises plausible. Every facility which could be desired was offered...and no stone left unturned' to induce the fishermen to move to Grimsby. Amongst incentives offered were a wide range of carriage rates, free rail travel for merchants endeavouring to establish new markets, and the promise of houses for fishermen.51

To the Hull smack-owners and agents who were currently paying treble the ordinary carriage rates for the transit of their fish, and with no guarantees given to them that catches would be despatched from Hull on the first available train, the inducements on offer were tempting. The endeavours of the M.S. & L.R. and its associates were subsequently to meet with a degree of success, although, as will become apparent later, some Hull fishermen, in the first instance, were content to run their businesses from Grimsby but delayed moving their homes and families across the Humber until suitable houses became available at the port.
A shortage of houses during the early years of the fishing industry was consistently blamed for the reluctance of smack-owners to move their businesses to Grimsby. Many more would come, it was said, 'if there was more house-room for them'. The promise to build houses for fishermen became one of the ploys used by the M.S. & L.R. and G.N.R. Companies to persuade them to settle in the town. Residence in the town, or so the developers of the port now thought, would give the fishermen 'a permanent interest in the soil', and, thereby, 'attach them to Grimsby'. The expression of this philosophy indicates that, if they had not done so earlier, the M.S. & L.R., by 1857, were now thinking in terms of the establishment of a resident fishing community in the town.

Early moves began in October 1856 when the Earl of Yarborough and another local landowner, Mr. Thorold, were approached regarding the possibility of building houses for the occupancy of fishermen on their freehold land in the parish of Clee. Both men, however, declined to part with land for that purpose. H.M. Forest and Woods Department was then contacted with a view to finding out on what terms they would be disposed to sell Crown Land to the railway company. As no reply was received from that source it was next suggested an arrangement might be made to obtain some existing cottages which had formerly been part of the old ropery buildings. After the closure of this business the
premises had been converted into dwellings. Some years previously the ropery houses had accommodated numbers of construction workers during the building of the main dock.54

On 29 May 1857 a Memorial was presented to the M.S. & L.R. by Hull fishermen who said they wished to establish themselves at Grimsby provided they could get dwelling houses. The question of the provision of houses for fishermen, the M.S. & L.R. now apparently thought, was pressing. This is evidenced by the fact that renewed efforts were made to find an eligible site.55 By 8 July 1857 it had been decided that the most convenient site was a piece of land close to Cleethorpe Road near to the Pumping Houses. The greatest obstacle, it appeared, would be the £650 it would cost to fill in the land to a proper level. It was recommended that no time should be lost in getting on with this job, and the cost of this work, as well as the question of the erection of the cottages and the method of financing them, was to be brought before the Joint Committee of the G.N.R. and M.S. & L.R. Companies.56

At the meeting of the M.S. & L.R. directors on 13 January 1858 it was reported that the land selected had been levelled and filled and was ready for building operations to begin. It was decided to erect no more than fifty dwellings.57 At a Joint Committee Meeting of the M.S. &
L.R. and G.N.R. held on 5 March 1858 it was resolved to bring the question of the proposed fishermen's houses to the notice of the Earl of Yarborough, as, it was said, '50 votes for the Borough will be created' if the houses be conveyed to the fishermen. On 28 May 1858 it was made known that the Earl of Yarborough had consented to advance the money for the building of the whole, or any part, of the houses. Interest at the rate of $4\%$ was to be paid on such money from time of advance, and $5\%$ of such advance to be paid to the Earl on 1 January each year.

It was agreed the houses were to be 'originally let by the Earl of Yarborough's agent to such parties as the Secretary of the M.S. & L.R. Company shall recommend in writing'. Building, however, must already have commenced pending the Earl's decision to find the money for the venture, for, towards the end of August 1858 twenty-five dwellings known as 'Worsley Buildings' had been erected for 'the smack-owners in the fishing trade'. All the properties were let and there were still 'about twenty applicants who could not be accommodated'.

Some of these twenty individuals, as well as other migrant fishermen requiring houses, were no doubt able to achieve their objective largely due to the Grimsby Freemen, who, in 1858, lowered the letting of their land in the East Marsh to 2d. per square yard. Numerous lettings followed,
especially to Hull fishermen. The Freemen's ground was said to be in 'great requisition' with the whole of that recently released reported 'planned out into building lots'.\textsuperscript{61} By March 1859 about thirty houses, some of them 'very good ones', had been erected on the newly released land.\textsuperscript{62}

The main concern of the M.S. & L.R. and G.N.R. was the provision of houses for smack-owners. A synthesis of information abstracted from the 1861 Grimsby census enumerators' books, together with that of a local directory for 1863, shows that, in the latter year, seventeen of the occupants of Worsley Buildings - the houses erected by the railway company for fishermen - were, in that year, smack-owners or smack-masters. Other residents were an auctioneer, a commission agent, an examining officer (H.M. Customs), a mariner, a dock labourer, and two men listed as fishermen. It is possible that these latter two men were, also, smack-owners, for such individuals sometimes described themselves in the census in this way. Non-seagoing smack-owners with other business interests also tended to use a secondary occupation to describe themselves in the census or in directory listings.\textsuperscript{63}

There is no doubt that there was a shortage of all grades of houses in Grimsby in 1858, not just those adjudged suitable for the habitation of smack-owners, despite the
fact that the general shipping trade was not as brisk as might have been hoped at that time. A local newspaper, in April 1858 commented that, 'notwithstanding this general depression, it is remarkable that houses are in extensive demand, for although many new ones have recently been built...they are all taken up'. The fishermen who most benefited from the letting of the Freemen's land, if not smack-owners, it seems, were clearly among the more affluent members of the fishing trade.

The deep-sea fishermen who used the new facilities at Grimsby during the early years of the 1850s before the provision of a specialist fish dock, were, it seems, itinerants from other places, many of whom used the port on a seasonal basis to land and forward catches. As the industry developed during the middle and later 1850s and smack-owners began to transfer their businesses to the port, the absence of an indigenous pool of experienced labour meant that the crews of fishing vessels had to come in from outside the town. The shortage of dwellings had clear implications for the housing needs of paid hands who might have wished to move to Grimsby.

For instance, it could not have been easy for a fisherman to bring a family with him when the owner of his vessel decided to transfer his business to the port, especially if distance from place of origin, or place of previous
employment, entered into the equation. For men moving to Grimsby from the Thames ports the question of removal was not eased by the refusal of the Joint Committee of the M.S. & L.R. and G.N.R. to accede to a request for a reduction in passenger fares for fishermen between Grimsby and London. The lack of a recent fishery of any consequence at Grimsby made the new deep-sea industry, in all of its aspects, the creation of the M.S. & L.R. and its business associates. As such, most of the new industry's social and economic structures inevitably took time to develop - including the establishment, in the town, of a resident labour force of deep-sea fishermen.
When the M.S. & L. and G.N. Railway Companies began to promote a deep-sea fishing industry at Grimsby in the early 1850s, there was an existent, and long-established, fishery three miles to the south-east at Cleethorpes. Fishing had traditionally been the chief occupation of a large proportion of Cleethorpes men, and, according to the 1851 census, 48% of all occupied males in the town were so employed in that year. In contrast, only 0.6% of Grimsby's male working population were listed in the census as fishermen. This meant there was no pool of experienced labour in Grimsby, itself, on which the nascent deep-sea industry could draw. In the same way, therefore, as men of the North Lancashire inshore fishing communities crewed the sailing trawlers of Fleetwood during the rise of the trawl industry at that port in the later years of the nineteenth century, it has been suggested that it was Cleethorpes fishermen who provided the 'nucleus of the crews' for the deep-sea smacks sailing out of Grimsby in the early period of the industry's development.¹ Men from Lancashire inshore villages sailed on the Fleetwood trawlers to provide an income in the winter, or, alternatively, to save money to buy a boat of their own.²
There is, however, no direct evidence on the response of the traditional Cleethorpes fishery, in particular its labour force, to the development of the Grimsby industry. This chapter examines the manuscript census and other primary sources in an attempt to ascertain whether there was, in fact, any connection between the Grimsby and Cleethorpes fisheries. The nature of the mid-nineteenth century Cleethorpes fishery is discussed, together with the socio-economic characteristics of its labour force, in order to identify any changes which might have occurred during the 1850s - the 'take-off' period of the Grimsby industry - and to establish the relationship, if any, between these and the development of deep-sea fishing at Grimsby.

* * * * * * * *

1. The Origins of the Mid-nineteenth Century Cleethorpes Population

By the end of the eighteenth century the fishing village of Cleethorpes was increasing in popularity as a bathing place. In addition to a recently erected large hotel, the resort also had a number of lodging houses with fourteen such establishments being listed in a local directory of 1826. Six of the lodging houses were kept by fishermen. James Appleyard - the postmaster at Cleethorpes for a large part of the nineteenth century - recollected that, in 1837,
when Queen Victoria came to the throne, the men of
Cleethorpes 'dredged for oysters, cultivated the bivalve in
beds, and went shrimping...Fishing was also pursued in
small open boats [with] smelts and different kinds of flat
fish being mainly caught'.

Nineteenth-century Cleethorpes fishermen landed their catches on their own shore under the cliff and the fish was then conveyed in carts 'to Grimsby and the inland villages for sale'.

Improvements in transport added greatly to the popularity of Cleethorpes as a resort. The advent of the steamship enabled visitors from Yorkshire and the area served by the Trent to visit Cleethorpes via Grimsby. In 1841, five years before the M.S. & L.R. started the building of its line to Grimsby and the construction of that town's large new dock, Cleethorpes - according to census evidence - was a small township with a population of 803. This was a net increase of 186 on the 1831 census figure of 617. The census authorities said the increase in population in the previous decade was partly 'due to people resorting to Cleethorpes for the Sea Bathing'. However, according to the next census, that of 1851, the population of Cleethorpes, despite the town's growing success as a seaside resort showed a net increase of only thirty-six.

The unexpectedly small increase in population in the 1841-1851 decade was undoubtedly due to the 1841 census having
been taken on 6 June when, as the census authorities said, the sea bathing season had already begun. Many seasonal visitors were in the town and this would have temporarily inflated the 1841 population figure. However, an analysis of census data on the birthdates and birthplaces of children - where this information is available - indicates there was some in-migration into Cleethorpes between 1841 and 1851 when a number of families moved into the town. This was probably in response to the resort's continuing development and to consequent opportunities to set up a business, or to obtain employment there. According to census evidence, people believed to have been in-migrants in the 1841-1851 decade included an oyster merchant and an oyster dealer originating from Kent and Yorkshire respectively. Keepers of lodging - or boarding - houses had been born in Nottingham, Hull and Devonshire. Other likely in-migrants were a boot and shoe maker, sundry grocers and drapers, a coast guard, and several mariners.

In the 1851 Cleethorpes population there were, also, fishermen who had been born in, amongst other places, Scarborough, Hampshire, Hull, and Cambridgeshire, the majority of whom were not listed in the 1841 census. This latter in-migration indicates that resort development in the early and middle nineteenth century did not have the effect of eroding the economic importance of the traditional Cleethorpes fishing industry, and may, even,
have served to stimulate it. It is clear that none of the non-Lincolnshire born fishermen in the 1851 census listings had arrived in Cleethorpes as a result of recent economic developments at Grimsby since deep-sea fishing did not commence in earnest there until several years after the opening of the Royal Dock in 1852.

2. The Occupation Structure of Cleethorpes 1841-1851

The male occupation structure of Cleethorpes, as represented in the manuscript censuses of 1841, 1851, and 1861 (Table 17, below) has been analysed in accordance with the conventions outlined elsewhere in this thesis. (See Appendix 'A'). The occupation structure of 1841 shows that fishing held prime position in the hierarchy of local industries with almost a third of all employed males being listed as fishermen. By 1851, despite the growing popularity of Cleethorpes as a seaside resort, it is notable that the occupation structure shows the fishing industry had increased in importance in the local economy. This is partly explained by in-migration and partly by the fact that the 1851 census was taken in March, when, in contrast to 1841, no summer visitors were present. In 1841 it was their inclusion which had served to distort, not only, as mentioned above, the extent of subsequent in-migration, but, also, the town's occupational structure. It is against this recent background of resort development,
The Male Occupation Structure of Cleethorpes 1841-1861

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>1841</th>
<th>1851</th>
<th>1861</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Service I</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Service II</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service/Professional</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Service</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation unreadable</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census of Cleethorpes 1841 and 1851

TABLE 17
215
modest population change, and changes in the occupational structure, that the question of the response of the Cleethorpes fishery, in particular the labour force, to the rise of the deep-sea industry at Grimsby, is set.

3. Some Characteristics of Nineteenth-Century Cleethorpes Fishermen

Many Cleethorpes fishermen, in the first half of the nineteenth century, were associated with activities of a broadly commercial kind, which, in different ways, were complementary to the primary occupation of fishing. The growing popularity of Cleethorpes as a seaside resort, had, by the mid-century, served to add a number of opportunities for work of this kind. There was a seasonal element to most types of inshore fishing. The propagation of oysters in beds, a feature of the Cleethorpes industry, meant that these could be gathered and sold on the seafront to summer visitors. Some fishermen opened oyster booths to cater for a passing trade in this popular delicacy and this activity provided work for those involved in the oyster trade beyond the limits of the dredging season.

As the resort aspect of Cleethorpes continued to develop, it became increasingly common for local fishermen to become the proprietors of lodging houses; the accommodation of summer visitors and catering for their entertainment being
seen as a way of supplementing income. Other fishermen took visitors for pleasure trips in their boats, or ran donkey or sand carts on the beach, and a few were engaged in the letting of bathing machines. According to the census and to other sources, farming and fishing were also occupations, which, in Cleethorpes, had traditionally been undertaken in combination with each other. Several individuals listed in the occupation columns of the Cleethorpes census were described as 'farmer and fisherman'. This duality of occupation was common in other coastal communities where the inhabitants have been described as of an 'amphibious character', making 'their living by sea and by land, turning to account both elements'.

Cleethorpes fishermen - like similar inshore communities around the coasts of Britain - undertook the salvage of ships wrecked or stranded off the local shore or encountered in the course of fishing voyages further afield. Fishing boats were licensed, not only to fish, but, also, to assist other shipping, and pecuniary or material reward of some kind, was, no doubt, a feature of this kind of activity. In 1844, for example, when a brig laden with coal struck on the Clee Ness sands and subsequently sank, seven of the Cleethorpes oyster smacks were employed by the insurance agent to get out the cargo and to 'weigh' the ship if possible.
4. The Cleethorpes Fishing Labour Force of 1851

There were 105 fishermen listed in the enumerators' books of the 1851 Cleethorpes census. The enumerators were instructed, by the census authorities, to record those individuals absent fishing when the census was taken but had failed to carry out this instruction. There were, however, four women listed in the 1851 Cleethorpes census as a 'fisherman's wife' and none of these four women had a husband at home on the census date. It is therefore presumed that the four men were away on fishing trips at the time. It is not possible to know how many Cleethorpes males, other than husbands, were at sea when the census was taken (for instance the son, or other relative of a household head, or even a lodger). If, however, the four fishermen, who, apparently, had left wives at home on census night are added to the number of fishermen listed by the Cleethorpes enumerators as being ashore, this produces a total fishing labour force of at least 109 men, which number represents just over 48% (Table 17) of all employed Cleethorpes males in 1851.

5. The Nature of Fishing at Cleethorpes in the Early 1850s

There is little statistical evidence relating to the Cleethorpes, or, for that matter, to any inshore fisheries
before the 1860s. Small craft under 15 tons burthen were not recorded in the first class registers kept at local customs houses and it was not until 1869 that the separate registration of fishing vessels commenced. What evidence there is, however, suggests that inshore fishing activities of several different kinds were being carried on simultaneously from Cleethorpes in the middle years of the nineteenth century. In addition to the oyster industry, different kinds of flat fish were caught by Cleethorpes fishermen using small open boats. From early March until the following October shrimping 'alternated' with the use of a 'wide meshed sole trawl' when soles were close in shore. From the month of October onwards cod and skate were caught in the Humber estuary by means of long-lines. Cockle fishing and whelking were other aspects of the Cleethorpes industry. Spratting was one of the oldest of the on-shore fishing occupations conducted from the Cleethorpes beach. Sprats were caught in nets staked to the ground in such a manner that the nets could be emptied at low water, a horse-drawn cart being used for this purpose. Local farmers bought the sprats and used them to manure their land. Herrings were also caught by means of nets staked to the shore. 15

6. The 1851 Cleethorpes Oyster Industry

By the middle of the nineteenth century Cleethorpes had
become noted for its 'large, cheap, and good oysters', considerable quantities being sent weekly to, amongst other places, Sheffield, Manchester, Leeds and Hull. Although this trade was clearly of importance there is little, if any, factual evidence as to how many local people were involved in it at the mid-century, or how important the industry was in the context of the wider Cleethorpes fishery; in particular, there is no information as to what proportion of the total Cleethorpes fishing labour force at that time were oyster fishers.

In 1826, according to a local directory, about twenty boats and fifty men went out from Cleethorpes fishing for oysters. In 1842 twenty boats and (by this time) 120 men and boys were said to be employed in the oyster fisheries. By 1856, the same number of boats, but, in that year, 150 Cleethorpes men and boys were now reported to be working in a mixed industry of oyster, herring, and other fisheries. Writing in 1850, Edward Dobson, a retired Cleethorpes schoolmaster, said seventeen smacks employed in the Cleethorpes oyster trade were registered at the Customs House at Grimsby in that year.

Customs and Excise Registers for the port of Grimsby indicate that, in 1855 - five years after Dobson had been writing - and at a point in time when the Grimsby deep-sea fishing industry was in the early stages of its
development, there were eighteen vessels registered in that year which were owned, or in some cases, jointly owned, by men, who, according to information in the shipping register or to census evidence, were Cleethorpes fishermen. The Customs records contained no evidence as to whether the Cleethorpes-owned boats were being used in oyster, or some other kind of fishing, an important point since at least some of the Cleethorpes smacks might have been engaged in the developing Grimsby deep-sea industry.

The vessels in question were between nine and twenty-one tons 'berthen'. This is slightly small for deep-sea smacks although these could vary widely in size. According to information in the register even the smallest of the Cleethorpes smacks were of a 'decked' type, and a deck, amongst other uses, provided sheltered accommodation for men on fishing trips conducted on other than a daily basis. Much inshore fishing from Cleethorpes, however, was of the daily variety in which open boats were used. These facts, in themselves, do not provide sufficient evidence on which to make a judgment as to whether the smacks in question were being used in oyster, or some other kind of fishing.

The problem of identifying small fishing craft prior to a separate register of such vessels being kept, has been faced by other researchers. Northway, for instance, in his study of the Devon fishing industry resolved the difficulty
'quite accurately' by identifying local fishing family names which had been associated with the industry over a long period of time. The issue of the Cleethorpes vessels was similarly resolved by way of a synthesis of census data and circumstantial evidence related to names of local families, which established beyond all reasonable doubt that all of the fishing vessels concerned were, in fact, connected with the Cleethorpes oyster trade and were not likely, therefore, to have been engaged in deep-sea fishing out of the neighbouring port of Grimsby at that time.

In the oyster fishing season which lasted from 1 September to 30 April in the following year, Cleethorpes fishermen dredged oysters from the Lincolnshire and Yorkshire coasts, in the English Channel, and round the Isle of Wight, and at places in between, such as the Norfolk coast and the Wash. On the return of the boats to Cleethorpes oysters of less than marketable size were deposited to mature in pits on the seashore which were overflowed by the tide at high water. The individual oyster pits were defined by boundaries of rock and large stones, with the corner of each area being marked by floats secured by chains to a mooring. The total enclosed area ran 'parallel to the beach at low water for approximately a mile with a depth of about one-third of a mile', and comprised a stretch of rough, pebbly ground which was free from sand or mud.
These conditions provided an ideal base for laying oysters for 'propagating and fattening purposes'. When the oysters were sufficiently mature they were gathered from the beds at low water and loaded into a horse-drawn cart for transportation to the beach, or, in later years, and at certain tides, boats especially constructed for this purpose were used.21

The shore on which the oyster pits were sited belonged to the Earl of Yarborough who was the 'Owner and Proprietor of the Fishery in the River Humber at Cleethorpes'.22 Lord Yarborough was the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the M.S. & L.R., the developers of the new Grimsby dock - and a member of the committee of management appointed to oversee its development. The oyster pits, or beds, were let by him on a yearly rental to Cleethorpes fishermen, and to a few non-fishermen. Account books which contain details of rents paid in respect of the Cleethorpes oyster pits from 6 April 1855 to Lady Day 1856, show that all the Cleethorpes owners, or part-owners, of the eighteen fishing boats registered at Grimsby in 1855 - with the exception of just two - were renting oyster pits in that year.23

In the case of the two Cleethorpes owners of fishing boats who were not renting pits in 1855, both of these men, judging by census evidence, were related to the tenant of an oyster bed. One owner had a son who was a tenant and
the other, it seemed, a cousin. This evidence confirms that all eighteen of the Cleethorpes fishing boats registered at Grimsby in 1855, were connected, directly or indirectly, with the Cleethorpes oyster trade. This information, however, does not answer the question as to what proportion of the 109 men identified earlier in the 1851 census as comprising the Cleethorpes fishing labour force in that year, were involved in the dredging and propagation of oysters.

The record of the oyster pit rentals, analysed in conjunction with information abstracted from the 1851 Cleethorpes manuscript census, has shed some light on this question as well as on some other aspects of the mid-nineteenth century Cleethorpes oyster fishery. For instance, it gives an insight into the relative importance of the oyster trade compared with other fishing activities being conducted from the Cleethorpes beach at that time. It also provides some factual information on the extent to which the oyster industry was dominated by a comparatively small number of Cleethorpes families.

In 1855 there were fifty-eight tenanted oyster pits on the Cleethorpes shore. Several of the pits had joint tenants, and, therefore, a total of sixty-three names appeared on the Earl of Yarborough's rent roll. Fifty-six of those renting a pit were described as fishermen in the 1851
census. Other tenants, according to that census, were the son of a Cleethorpes fisherman and there were, also, three female tenants. Two of the females were the wives of fishermen and the third female - a widow - was the mother of a fisherman. Two local farmers and a man described as a cottager in the census completed the tally of sixty-three names on the 1855-1856 oyster pit rent account.

In addition to the fifty-six fishermen, noted above, who were tenants, or joint tenants, of oyster beds, there were another seventeen men, also described in the census as fishermen, who appeared, judging from surnames, to be related by ties of blood or marriage to one or more of the oyster pit tenants or smack-owners, and the assumption is that these latter men were also working in some capacity in the Cleethorpes oyster industry. It can therefore be assumed that a total of, at least, seventy-three fishermen, or 67% of the total Cleethorpes fishing labour force in 1855, were involved in the business of oyster propagation. The question now arises as to whether the business of oyster propagation and the seasonal activity of oyster dredging were performed by the same labour force or by different sets of individuals?

Edward Dobson, whose writings have been referred to above, said that returns submitted to the Customs authorities on a twice-yearly basis by the owners of the Cleethorpes fishing
boats registered at Grimsby in 1850, showed that each boat carried a crew of three or four hands. Taking the higher number of four and multiplying this by the number of Cleethorpes smacks registered at Grimsby in 1855 (i.e. eighteen) produces an oyster fishing labour force of seventy-two. This number near enough tallies with the number of Cleethorpes fishermen, who, according to the oyster pit rental accounts, are believed to have been involved in the business of oyster propagation in that year. This leads to the conclusion that the majority of the men who sailed on the Cleethorpes oyster smacks - that is, crew members, as well as owners - each had an interest in their own, or joint, right in the business of oyster propagation.

The combination of information contained in the oyster bed rental records, data abstracted from the 1851 Cleethorpes manuscript census, local directories, and other primary and secondary sources, reveals the close-knit, highly family orientated nature of the town's oyster industry. According to surname, as Table 18 shows, sixty-three, or 60% of the fishermen listed in the 1851 Cleethorpes census came from just ten extended families. Further, that thirty-two, or more than 57% of oyster bed tenants were members of these same families, and that sixteen of the eighteen oyster smacks registered at Grimsby in 1855, were registered in
## Cleethorpes Families Involved in the Oyster Fishery 1851-1861

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Family</th>
<th>No. listed in census as fishermen</th>
<th>No. of tenants of oyster beds</th>
<th>No. of oyster dealers</th>
<th>No. of smack owners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APPLEYARD</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CROFT</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COULBECK</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPMAN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRANT</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACKRILL</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSBORNE/OSBOURNE</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBINSON</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEPHENSON</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRIGHT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** Census of Cleethorpes 1851  
List of Occupiers of Oyster Beds 1855/1856: L.A.O.  
White's 1856 Lincolnshire

**TABLE 18**
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the names of individuals who were also members of these families.

In addition to the ten families noted, there were numerous other fishermen, who - according to rental records - had an interest in the Cleethorpes oyster trade and who shared the same surname with one or more other persons having a similar interest in the local oyster beds. This high degree of close family involvement leads to the conclusion that there was little, if any, division of labour between the fishing and propagation aspects of the Cleethorpes oyster trade in 1851. Additionally, a Cleethorpes directory of 1850, in its list of traders, does not separate fishermen and oyster dealers, all such individuals being included under the joint heading of 'Fishermen and Oyster Dealers'. The directory listing in question contains twenty-one names, twelve of which suggest that the individuals concerned were members of the same ten families referred to above: this adding credence to the belief that the Cleethorpes families who dominated the fishing and propagating aspects of the town's oyster fishery, largely controlled the business of oyster dealing too, at least at the local level.
7. Other Aspects of the Mid-nineteenth Century Cleethorpes Fishery

There were thirty-five men listed in the 1851 Cleethorpes census as fishermen who were not, according to the rental records, the tenant of an oyster pit, and who, judging by surname, had no family connection with the tenant of such a pit. This fact does not prove that these men were not involved in the oyster trade but raises the possibility that they were concerned, instead, with other types of fishing being carried on at Cleethorpes, or, perhaps, at Grimsby. Of these thirty-five individuals, almost half had been born outside of Cleethorpes, the majority in Lincolnshire villages. In contrast, only two men, or 3% of all oyster pit tenants had been born outside of the town. This suggests that the Cleethorpes oyster bed tenancies might have been handed down within the same family. Continuity of tenure would have effectively perpetuated the noted dominance of some Cleethorpes families in the trade. Preference may also have been given to applicants of local origin. This is suggested by the fact that in one or two cases where a man described as a fisherman in the census was not of local birth, an oyster pit was rented, not in his name, but in the name of his wife, and, in another instance, in that of a son. In these cases the wife, or son, in whose name the pit was rented, was of local origin.
The record of rents paid in respect of oyster pits for the year 1855-1856 also contained details of rents paid to the Earl of Yarborough by Cleethorpes fishermen, and a few other local individuals, for nets for sprat and herring fishing and for 'hooking'. The records do not make it clear if it was nets, or net sites, which were being rented, but it seems it is more likely to have been the latter. The term 'hooking', it is believed, refers to inshore fishing with hooks for cod and skate. In the year 1855-1856 nine men were renting herring nets, eleven renting sprat nets, and five men and one woman were paying rents for 'hooking' - a total of twenty-six rentals. Of this number, seventeen of the individuals concerned were also the tenants of oyster beds. This suggests that many of the fishing activities conducted from the Cleethorpes beach in 1855, were, with only a few exceptions, largely operated and controlled by the same group of family interests.

A few of the thirty-five fishermen, mentioned above, who, according to the rental records had no obvious connection with the Cleethorpes oyster trade or with other types of fishing being carried on from the Cleethorpes beach, included some of those, who, census data suggested, had migrated into the town in the 1841-1851 decade. One or two of the comparatively recent in-migrant fishermen had been born in Hull or Scarborough, but neither the census, nor
any other known source, can provide conclusive information as to the particular kind of fishing activities likely to have been pursued by the thirty-five men in question.

However, a local fisherman writing about aspects of inshore fishing at Cleethorpes, recollected that, towards the end of the nineteenth century 'quite a company of men' found fairly regular employment in different aspects of oyster propagation. Even though, therefore, the industry at the mid-century was dominated by a number of Cleethorpes families, it may have been that some tasks connected with the propagation aspect of the trade provided work for casual labourers who might have described themselves in the census as fishermen. If this were so, then it is possible that some of the thirty-five men presently under consideration could be so categorised.

8. The 1855 and 1861 Cleethorpes Oyster Industries in Comparative Context

A record of rents paid by fishermen and other Cleethorpes townsfolk in respect of oyster beds on the foreshore for the year 1860-1861 has been analysed in conjunction with the 1861 Cleethorpes manuscript census returns. The analysis was carried out in exactly the same way as was that concerned with the 1850s data. This gives a body of comparable information about aspects of the Cleethorpes
oyster fishery in the middle years of the 1850s when the Grimsby deep-sea industry was in its infancy, and in 1861, by which time the Grimsby industry had become firmly established. The aim of the comparative analysis was to see if the early development of the Grimsby industry had had any perceptible effect on the Cleethorpes fishery, in particular, on the characteristics of its labour force and the possibility that some of its members had become involved in deep-sea fishing at Grimsby.

The conjoint analysis of data abstracted from the 1861 census and the 1861 oyster pit rental records showed, beyond all doubt, that there had been no decline in the Cleethorpes oyster trade during the early years of the development of the Grimsby industry (i.e. 1855-1861). All of the men describing themselves in the 1861 Cleethorpes census as 'Captain', or 'Captain and Owner' of a smack, were - with the exception of one man - tenants of oyster beds. The odd man out, however, judging by his surname, had family ties with other oyster pit tenants. This indicates that the Cleethorpes smacks in 1861, some years after the commencement of the deep-sea industry at Grimsby, were still being used in oyster dredging rather than in some other type of fishing activity.

There were eighty-five tenanted oyster beds in 1861, a 46% increase on the 1855 total of fifty-eight pits. Some of
the pits, as in 1855, were jointly tenanted, and some people had an interest in more than one pit. A total of ninety-six names appeared on the rent roll - the number of oyster pit lessees had therefore increased by 52% over the 1855 figure. A comparison of the rent roll with the 1861 Cleethorpes census showed that forty-five Cleethorpes fishermen were renting, or jointly renting, an oyster pit in that year, and that a further forty-four fishermen were connected (according to surname) by ties of blood or marriage to one or more of the oyster pit tenants. Among the few tenants who were not fishermen, or, alternatively, had no apparent family connection with a fisherman, were, a grocer, a butcher, and a man who described himself as a grocer and draper. An increase in oyster pit rentals had, however, occurred between 1855 and 1861. The rise in rents, perhaps, being symptomatic of the growing profitability of the oyster trade. For instance, a yearly rental of 15/- in 1855, had, by 1858, been increased to £1.6.0., that of £2.0.0. to £3.10.0., 12/- to 18/-, £1.0.0. to £1.15.0., and 8/- to 12/-.

On the basis of the foregoing it can be assumed that a total of eighty-nine Cleethorpes fishermen, or, 76% of those so listed in the 1861 census, were involved in one way or another with the town's oyster fishery in that year. This was a 9% increase on the mid-1850s proportion of 67% and indicates the increasing importance of the oyster trade.
in the local economy. As Robinson has pointed out 'the transformation of the first-class catching sector [of the British fishing industry] between 1840 and 1870' tends to over-shadow the fact that the inshore fisheries also grew during this period. The arrival of the railways would have provided a stimulus for change in small coastal fishing communities. In the case of Cleethorpes, nearby Grimsby was connected to the rail network in 1848, and it therefore seems certain that Cleethorpes fishermen would have availed themselves of Grimsby's rail links with London and the populous areas of the Midlands to establish new markets. Of four oyster merchants, or dealers, located in Grimsby in 1861, however, only one had any obvious connection - this by name - with old-established Cleethorpes oyster trade families. This, perhaps, is a further indication of the insular nature of the Cleethorpes industry.

9. Changes in the 1851 and 1861 Cleethorpes Fishing Labour Forces

There were 117 fishermen listed in the 1861 Cleethorpes census, and, in contrast to 1851 - when the number of men so listed was 105 - the enumerators had, this time, obeyed the instruction of the census authorities and noted those Cleethorpes individuals absent fishing when the 1861 census was taken. The number of these was forty and this
represents just under 25% of a total fishing labour force of 157.

While some changes had occurred in the demographic structure of the Cleethorpes fishing labour force in the years between 1851 and 1861, other socio-economic characteristics remained relatively stable. A comparative analysis of the age structure of the labour forces of the 1841, 1851, and 1861 Cleethorpes fisheries - i.e. those men ashore when the respective censuses were taken - showed that some progressive changes had occurred in the decades in question. In 1841 less than 14% of all Cleethorpes fishermen were aged twenty years and under. In 1851 the proportion was 18%, and, by 1861, those in this youngest age group had almost doubled to 35%. (See Table 19, below). The 1851-1861 increase in this age group appears to be an acceleration of an established trend, and, in these circumstances was not necessarily due to recent developments at nearby Grimsby.

There is census evidence, that, in 1861, some young men who originated from a Cleethorpes non-traditional fishing family background were now beginning to enter an industry which had formerly been largely based on the tradition of a son following in the footsteps of a fisherman father. Some youths described in the 1861 Cleethorpes census as fishermen were the sons of, among others, local carpenters,
## Age Structure of the Cleethorpes Fishing Labour Force

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1841</th>
<th></th>
<th>1851</th>
<th></th>
<th>1861</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Years and under</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 20 Years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 35</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 - 50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 +</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Census of Cleethorpes 1841, 1851, and 1861*

**TABLE 19**
agricultural labourers, a greengrocer, and a gardener. In contrast, in 1851, all fishermen aged twenty years and under listed in the Cleethorpes census, with one exception, were the sons of fishermen.

The decline in the number of people working in agricultural occupations in Cleethorpes in 1861, (Table 17), may have been partly due to the increased attractiveness of fishing to youths who might otherwise have gone into occupations connected with farming and its derivatives. The recent country-wide changes in methods of fishing, the development of new commercial markets, and technological advances in transport - all of which were contributory factors to the rise of the deep-sea industry at Grimsby and at other east coast ports - might have persuaded some Cleethorpes lads from a non-fishing family background that the industry, in general, whether inshore or deep-sea, was now an occupation with prospects, and, therefore, one worth entering.

According to census evidence, a high fertility rate existed among Cleethorpes fishing families. Of all Cleethorpes fishermen having children in 1861, the mean average number of children per fisherman was 2.5. This was high compared with that found in Grimsby's 1861 migrant fishing families, which, as discussed later, was 2.0. Although, therefore, the 1861 increase in the youngest age group of Cleethorpes fishermen (Table 19) can be partly accounted for by lads
from a non-fishing family background beginning to enter the industry, there would have been no shortage of Cleethorpes fishermen's sons to carry on established family traditions had they been inclined to do so. There were, also, changes between 1851-1861 in the household status of the Cleethorpes fishermen. (Table 20). Fewer fishermen, compared with 1851, were households 'heads' which reflects the younger age structure of the 1861 labour force.

An important question in the context of this research, however, was whether or not changes had occurred in the percentage of the 1861 Cleethorpes fishing labour force who were of local birth. If a perceptible shift of origins had occurred in the decade, then this could have been indicative of the in-migration of fishermen, perhaps as a result of the rise of the Grimsby industry. For instance, the shortage of houses in Grimsby in the 1850s was noted in the preceding chapter, and this could have forced fishermen moving to Grimsby from other ports to seek accommodation for themselves and their families in neighbouring Cleethorpes. Conversely, if Cleethorpes fishermen were sailing on the Grimsby smacks, then some might have moved to Grimsby to facilitate this change in their working circumstances. However, according to the 1861 Grimsby census enumeration books, only one fisherman living in the town in that year had been born in Cleethorpes. If, therefore, Cleethorpes men were sailing on Grimsby smacks,
### Socio-Economic (Household) Status of the Cleethorpes Fishermen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1851</th>
<th>1861</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household 'head'</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sons of Fishermen</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sons of other Household 'heads'</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodgers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>105</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Census of Cleethorpes 1851 and 1861

**TABLE 20**
then it seems they had retained their local residence while doing so.

There was a problem in comparing the origins of the 1851 and 1861 Cleethorpes fishing labour forces due to the nature of the census data. Although the number of Cleethorpes fishermen absent at sea on the date of the 1861 census was recorded by the enumerators, the personal characteristics of the forty men concerned remain unknown. However, there were thirty women described in the census as 'fishermen's wives'. As in the case of the four women so listed in the 1851 census, none of the 1861 'fishermen's wives' had a husband at home on census night, and so it is presumed the women were the wives of some of the men away on fishing trips at the time. An analysis of census data related to these women provides information about the likely origins and migration history of their menfolk.

Northway, noted above, used local fishing family names which were associated with the Devon industry as an aid to some aspects of his research. In a broadly similar way census data related to the names of the thirty fishermen's wives listed in the 1861 Cleethorpes census - and to the birthplaces of their children (where this data is available) - has been used to provide an indication of the likely demographic characteristics of some of the absent Cleethorpes men.
According to census data, sixteen of the women with absent husbands were recognisable - by surname - as being the wives of fishermen who were members of the ten families earlier shown as having dominated the mid-nineteenth century Cleethorpes oyster trade. (Table 18). A further six women were identified, also by surname, as being the wives of men, who - if not belonging to the ten dominant Cleethorpes oyster families - were members of other established fishing families in the town. The birthplaces and ages of the children of another four of the fishermen's wives showed that these particular fishing families had resided in Cleethorpes for many years prior to the taking of the 1861 census. It is therefore considered reasonable to presume that at least twenty-six of the thirty wives in question had been married to men of local origin.

Of the original total of thirty women, this left four fishermen's wives, the origins of whose husbands were uncertain. Two of the four women had been born in Grimsby, one in Hull, and the other in Durham. As the Hull-born woman had a child born in that city, as well as one born in Grimsby, it is possible that the husband had some association with the Grimsby industry, for, as will be discussed later in this work, some Hull fishermen transferred their businesses to Grimsby after the commencement of the deep-sea industry there. In the cases of the other three women, census evidence did not yield any
conclusive information as to the probable origins of their menfolk.

Table 21, below, gives the birthplaces of the members of the 1851 and 1861 Cleethorpes fishing labour forces in comparative context. The Table includes, in the case of the 1851 data, the birthplaces of the 105 fishermen ashore at the time of the census as well as the presumed origins (i.e. based on the birthplaces of wives and children) of the four men absent at sea at the time. In the case of the 1861 data, this includes the birthplaces of the 117 fishermen listed by the census enumerators and the presumed origins of twenty-seven of the forty fishermen at sea when that census had been taken. (This also based on the birthplaces of wives and children as discussed above). The available evidence suggests there had been virtually no change, between 1851 and 1861, in the origins of the Cleethorpes fishing labour force.

The slight decrease between 1851 and 1861 (Table 21) in the number of fishermen born at places elsewhere in England indicates that some men formerly fishing from Cleethorpes could have been seasonal itinerants who had subsequently moved on to pursue fishing somewhere else. Alternatively, a few men may have given up fishing as an occupation in the intervening period. There is no evidence that there had been any influx of migrant deep-sea fishermen, who, because
Birthplaces of the Cleethorpes Fishermen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>1851</th>
<th></th>
<th>1861</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born in Cleethorpes</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>79.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born in Grimsby</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born in other places in Lincolnshire</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Born elsewhere in England</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birthplace not known</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census of Cleethorpes 1851 and 1861

**TABLE 21**
of the difficult housing situation in Grimsby, had arrived at that port from distant places and been forced to seek accommodation at nearby Cleethorpes. In absolute numbers the change in the origins of the Cleethorpes fishing labour force was so small as to be adjudged unimportant in the context of the present discussion. The over-riding impression, therefore, is that not only in its origins, but in its whole way of life, the local fishing labour force had remained remarkably stable in the face of profound social and economic changes occurring in the 1851-1861 decade at Grimsby.

An important point, however, in so far as this discussion is concerned, is that many more Cleethorpes fishermen were, apparently, at sea when the 1861 census was taken compared with that of 1851. (See p.218 and p.234). The two censuses were taken at the same time of year (i.e. 30 March in 1851 and 8 April in 1861) and so it is doubtful if the annual cycle of seasonal fishing had any bearing on the matter. An amalgam of information abstracted from the 1861 census and local directories also suggests that at least fourteen of the Cleethorpes oyster smacks were at home on the census date. In the absence of any conclusive evidence on the subject, the thirty wives of some of those men at sea on the night of the 1861 census (referred to above) were again turned to in the hope that census data
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relating to these women might yield some information on this matter.

An examination of the relevant data shows that 60%, or, in absolute numbers, around twenty of the fishermen's wives concerned were aged thirty years and under. An analysis of the ages of all of the Cleethorpes fishermen ashore on census night in 1861, and that of their respective wives shows that the most common age difference between married couples in the local fishing community was between one and two years. Assuming, therefore, that a similar situation appertained in the case of the thirty married fishermen at sea and their wives, then it would seem that around two-thirds of the men absent fishing in 1861 were aged thirty years or less. This would account for the notable, and otherwise inexplicable decrease in the percentage of fishermen in the 1861 Cleethorpes labour force in the twenty-one to thirty-five year age group compared with the 1851 figure that Table 19, above, shows. It now seems likely that it was men in this younger age group who were predominantly at sea when the 1861 Cleethorpes census was taken.

If, therefore, as Alward said, it was the Cleethorpes oyster fishermen who provided 'the nucleus of the crews' to man the ships of the newcomers to Grimsby in the early years of the industry there, (p.210) then it is probable
that it was the comparatively young, but, no doubt, experienced fishermen, such as the absent Cleethorpes inshore men, who would have been most inclined to try their luck on the Grimsby vessels and who would have been most in demand by incoming migrant smack-owners seeking to make up any short-fall in their crew. If so, then some Cleethorpes men, like fishermen of other inshore communities close to a developing deep-sea port, such as Fleetwood referred to earlier, (p.210) may have seen a spell on the Grimsby smacks as a welcome boost to out of season earnings. For any of the Cleethorpes fishermen wishing to transfer to the Grimsby industry on a temporary, or even more permanent, basis, the nearness of the two towns to each other would have meant that such men would be able to do so with no disturbance to their existing residential patterns.

In summary, Cleethorpes had continued to develop as a seaside resort over the preceding decades and fishing, based on the evidence of the occupation columns of the Cleethorpes 1851 and 1861 censuses, had just about retained its position in the economic infrastructure of the town, despite developments at Grimsby. The majority of fish merchants, fish dealers, and fish buyers who were operating in Grimsby in 1861, had, according to the evidence of the Grimsby census of that year, migrated to the town in recent years from already established fishing stations in Essex, Yorkshire, Sussex and Kent. The distribution arm of the
new Grimsby fishing industry, therefore, appeared to be run by men already experienced in the deep-sea trade who had followed the smacks to Grimsby.

An amalgam of the available evidence suggests that in the take-off period of the Grimsby industry, some in-coming smack-owners - because of a lack of experienced fishermen in Grimsby - had used Cleethorpes inshore men to supplement their crews. This practice, it seems, had not been so widespread as to have unduly disturbed the underlying structures of the traditional Cleethorpes fishery, or, importantly, to negate the pressing need for the establishment, at Grimsby, of a labour force of in-migrant deep-sea fishermen.
By 1861, according to the manuscript census of that year, a sizable body of deep-sea fishermen had taken up residence at Grimsby. The majority of these men displayed the characteristics associated with special industrial migrants in that they were skilled and/or experienced members of an occupational group who had moved long distances from place of origin to a destination where their particular industry seemed to have a better future.

The presence of these special industrial migrants in Grimsby - a port with no recent history of having had an indigenous fishery of any consequence - lends strength to the belief that the general pattern of short-distance movement in Victorian Britain tended to be broken in those areas where there was no existent pool of skilled labour to meet the demands of a new, or expanding, industry. Jackson cited, for instance, the example of the iron workers who had broken the general trend of short-distance movement by migrating to Furness from Cheshire, Ireland, South Wales and Yorkshire, and from the West Midlands to South Wales. He pointed out that in the long-established textile
districts of Lancashire and West Yorkshire, where most migration had been short-distance, there had been an existent reservoir of female and child labour on which the expanding industries could call. This kind of labour — even assuming it was available — was no substitute for the male labour required in the foundries of places like the new iron-making town of Middlesbrough, or, for that matter, to build a large new dock at Grimsby or to crew the vessels of in-migrant Grimsby smack-owners. ¹

There is little factual evidence about the pace of development of the early Grimsby deep-sea industry apart from the practical measures introduced by the M.S. & L.R. and G.N.R. in the 1850s to encourage the fishing trade. (See Chapter 7). However, the chronology of the introduction of such measures tends to confirm that the establishment of a resident community of fishermen in Grimsby did not take place until the later years of that decade. Records of the tonnage of fish despatched by rail from the port in the 1850s are shown below, (Table 22) and their pattern serves to further strengthen this belief.

It is unlikely that all of the fish despatched by rail from Grimsby in the 1850s was caught by Grimsby fishing craft. The fleeting system was still being widely operated in the North Sea in those years and it is certain that Grimsby's new dock and rail facilities were sometimes used by the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1855</th>
<th>1856</th>
<th>1857</th>
<th>1858</th>
<th>1859</th>
<th>1860</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tons</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>1,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Northern</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,362</td>
<td>3,089</td>
<td>3,750</td>
<td>3,787</td>
<td>3,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>1,514</td>
<td>3,435</td>
<td>4,344</td>
<td>4,742</td>
<td>4,842</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Report into the Sea Fisheries of the United Kingdom 1866

**TABLE 22**
fleet operators to get their catches to market. An aim of
the railway companies having an interest in Grimsby at that
time was to attract more of this 'fleeting' business to the
port and this was a reason for making improvements to the
fish dock. (p.195). However, the date of the marked
increase in the tonnage moved by both railway companies
(1857) is coincident - as will be shown in Chapter 11 -
with the projected arrival at the port of the first large
group of migrant fishermen.

Manuscript census data provides the evidence for an
analysis of the social and demographic characteristics and
antecedents of Grimsby's early fishermen-migrants. These
can be compared with the dock-construction workers who have
been discussed in Part II of this work. In the same way as
the dock builders were compared with the 1851 Grimsby
sample population, the fishermen have also been compared,
where appropriate, with a sample of the local 1861
population. (For explanation of sample see Appendix 'B').

** * * * * * * * * *

1. The Social and Demographic Characteristics
of the Early Fishermen

Table 23, below, shows the number of fishermen, who,
according to the enumerators' books of the 1861 Grimsby
census, were resident in the town in that year and who were
The 1861 Grimsby Fishing Labour Force

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smack-Owners</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smack-Master/Master Fishermen</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishermen</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprentice Fishermen</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishermen absent at sea when the census was taken</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(according to the census enumerators)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL                                               | 408  |

Source: 1861 Census of Grimsby
ashore when the census was taken. The Table also shows the number of men the enumerators said were 'absent fishing' at the time. Many of the in-migrant fishermen brought with them to the town a wife and family and other dependants. Taken together, these people can be regarded as a migrant community. In broad terms a 'community' can be defined as 'a body of persons leading a common life'. For the purposes of this thesis the persons regarded as comprising Grimsby's first deep-sea fishing community are the fishermen, their dependants, and other people living in their households. These categories of individuals are set out in Table 24, below. The Grimsby fishing community of 1861 included in the above categories is also presented in quantitative form in Table 25. On the basis of this information, and after taking into consideration the projected under-enumeration of, it is believed, between forty and fifty men, (see Section [b] of Table 24), it seems the fishing community of 1861 accounted for almost 10% of the total enumerated population of that year. (11,067). Two hundred and fourteen Grimsby households contained at least one fisherman and this number of households comprised nearly 9% of all census schedules. The fishermen, in 1861, represented 11.5% of all employed Grimsby males. This can be compared with 1851 when less than 1% of occupied males were engaged in fishing activities of some kind.
The Grimsby Fishing Community of 1861

(a) All those men listed in the census as 'Smack Owner', 'Smack Master', 'Master Fisherman', 'Fisherman', or 'Apprentice Fisherman'.

(b) The 199 males whom the enumerators said were 'absent fishing' on census night in 1861. It is almost certain that the figure of 199 absent fishermen is an under-enumeration as not all Grimsby enumerators had made the all-important distinction between men 'absent at sea' on census night and those 'absent fishing'. When an enumerator had simply stated the number 'at sea', this was disregarded on the grounds, that, although it is believed some of these men would have been away on fishing trips, it was impossible to be sure. The enumerator of District 10 had failed to record any men as being absent fishing on the night in question, and it is considered certain some would have been so absent. This proposition is based on the fact that District 10 was that having the second highest number of fishermen at home on census night. It is therefore regarded as inevitable that some men in this area would have been away on fishing trips at the time. This view is supported by the fact that the enumerator of the adjoining District 9, which contained 50% fewer fishermen's households than did District 10, had listed 21 men as definitely being 'absent fishing' on the census date.

(c) All individuals listed in the census who can be presumed with some certainty to have been related to the fishermen ashore on census night by ties of blood or marriage. (i.e. wife, child, mother, father, brother, sister, in-law, etc.).

(d) All females listed by the census enumerators as 'Fisherman's Wife' and the children of these women. The majority of women so described appeared as the first name on the census schedule and would have been the wives of some of the absent men in (b) above.

(e) Resident servants in the households of fishermen.

(f) Boarders, lodgers, and visitors in the households of fishermen. These latter people are included on the premise that they would be likely to be well-known to their host and thus identify, in many aspects of lifestyle, with the household of which they were part.

Source: 1861 Census of Grimsby

TABLE 24
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### The Grimsby Fishing Community in Quantitative Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fishermen as in (a) above</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wives of fishermen (i.e. wives of men in (a) above)</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of fishermen stated by the enumerators as absent fishing</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wives of fishermen who were at sea on census night</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i.e. women described in the census as a 'fisherman's wife' and who did not have a husbands at home on the census date)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children of fishermen (every individual, irrespective of age, listed as the 'son' or 'daughter' of a fisherman)</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relatives in the households of fishermen</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(other than those already noted)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident servants in the households of fishermen</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boarders and lodgers in the households of fishermen (this excludes fishermen lodgers who have been included elsewhere)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitors in the households of fishermen</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1,041</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1861 Census of Grimsby
In 1861, according to the census enumerators, three fishermen and their families and four women—each described as a 'fisherman's wife'—were living in the hamlet of Clee which was situated a mile or so south of Grimsby. The husbands of these latter women were, probably, the four males whom the Clee enumerator said were at sea when the census was taken. These seven families, judging by birthplaces, were of similar origin and displayed the same patterns of migratory movement as did the major streams of Grimsby in-migrant fishermen who have been subjected to analysis in following sections of this work. In these circumstances the presence of these fishing families in Clee is noted, but as the number of individuals concerned is so small, they have been excluded from further discussion and analysis.

Table 26 shows the age groups of the fishermen and compares these with those of all employed males in the 1861 Grimsby sample population. Differences in age between the fishermen and the sample population are most marked at the opposite ends of the age spectrum. The exceptionally high proportion of fishermen aged under twenty years is due to the preponderance of apprentice fishermen in the 1861 Grimsby fishing labour force.

The workings of the infamous nineteenth-century fishing apprenticeship system, especially that operating in
A Comparison of the Ages of the Fishermen with a 10% Sample of the 1861 Grimsby Male Working Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Structure of the Fishermen</th>
<th>10% Sample Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 20</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 30</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 - 60</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61+</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1861 Census of Grimsby

TABLE 26
Grimsby, is fully documented elsewhere and so there is no need to discuss it at length here.\(^5\) The thirty-eight apprentice fishermen are of undoubted interest, however, in that there is little evidence, quantitative or otherwise, relating to the employment of fishing apprentices in Grimsby before 1880, and nothing at all before 1868.\(^6\)

There is, for instance, no record of when the first pauper apprentice sailed on board a Grimsby fishing smack. The census returns show that it is certain some were doing so as early as 1861, for birthplaces of some of the young apprentices were coincident with the locations of Unions and other public institutions, known, at a later date, to have sent pauper apprentices to Grimsby. These places included Chelsea, Nottingham, Greenwich, Wandsworth, Stepney, Dover, Liverpool, Louth, Boston, and Brigg.\(^7\)

The thirty-eight youths identified in the 1861 Grimsby census as fishing apprentices, were, according to the households in which they were living, (i.e. 'headed' by a smack-owner or other sea-faring individual) almost certainly those of the 'indoor' variety. This type of apprentice was clothed by his employer as well as having lodgings provided when ashore. This practice contrasted with the 'outdoor' apprentice who was paid a wage of a few shillings a week and left to find his own lodgings when his vessel was in dock. Census data relating to the ages and birthplaces of some of the other young fishermen listed in
the census suggests that about thirty of those described simply as 'lodger', were, in fact, 'outdoor apprentices', as were, too, several young lads living in the households of parents.

Over a half (52%) of the fishing labour force ashore in Grimsby on census night in 1861 were aged twenty-five years or under and nearly 20% of this number were listed by the enumerators as a household 'head'. Although, in later years, fishing apprentices had to be released from service by the time they were twenty-one, an 1873 report on the 'Treatment of Pauper Apprentices to the Grimsby Fishing Trade' said the ages of apprentices could vary from twelve to twenty-five years. Apprentices, on their subsistence wages, would clearly have been unable to maintain a home and family, but, judging by the census evidence of the number of fishermen household 'heads' aged twenty-five and under, it seems it was by no means uncommon in the early days of the Grimsby industry - despite the apprenticeship system - for some relatively young fishermen to achieve independent economic status.

This situation highlights the anomalies of an industry which kept some of its labour force socially and economically subjugated into adulthood, and yet allowed others to become independent, even to marry and support a family, at a relatively young age. A young man in this
latter category, at least in the early days of the industry, would probably have been the son, or other relative, of a smack-owning family, for not all young lads introduced into the trade came from poor families or public institutions. 9

In the older age groups, few in-migrant fishermen were at work compared with the number of males still in employment in the 1861 Grimsby sample population. Nearly a third of all employed males in the sample were in the forty-one plus age group, but less than 15% of all fishermen. Several of the fishermen in the fifty plus age group were described by the census enumerators as 'Smack Owners' but it is not clear to what extent the role of these older men was entrepreneurial - or shore-based - rather than sea-going. A minority of those listed in the census as 'Smack Owner' also claimed to have a secondary occupation, such as innkeeper and sailmaker. In Grimsby Directories not every smack-owner listed declared himself as such in the census, describing himself, instead, simply as 'fisherman'.

It is likely that some, if not all, of these older men in 1861 were actively engaged in fishing. It was common for the early Grimsby fishermen to become owners, or part-owners, of vessels 'through their own energy and industry' and the general consensus of opinion - certainly of those men giving evidence to the Sea Fisheries Commission of
1866, was that the most successful persons were those who 'themselves go to sea in their boats...personal knowledge and personal supervision [being] necessary to carry on the trade profitably'.

Table 27, below, analyses the household status of the 209 fishermen ashore when the 1861 census was taken. In spite of the reliance of the early Grimsby fishing labour force on apprentice and other fishermen in the younger age groups - and the implications these working practices held for the extent of lodging - proportionately many fewer fishermen (38%) lived as lodgers in 1861 than was the case with the migrant dock builders a decade earlier, (that is, 54% of stonemasons, 56% of excavators, 46% of dock labourers, and 74% of Irish labourers). The difference, no doubt, was partly a reflection of the particularly mobile life-styles of the dock builders but there was, also, another contributory factor. Almost 12% of all fishermen were found to be living in the household of a relative (i.e. the household of a father, brother, etc.) and were not, therefore, described in the census as a lodger.

Prior to economic changes occurring in the middle and later years of the nineteenth century which altered the character of the British fishing industry, a tradition existed whereby 'the owner of a fishing vessel quite naturally looked to his own family for his crew'. In these
### Household Status of the Fishermen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household Head</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>49.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodger (including boarders and Fishing Apprentices)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative of 'Head' (son, brother, etc.)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>209</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1861 Census of Grimsby

TABLE 27
circumstances many lads sailed on vessels with their father or brothers, and some youngsters sailed with uncles and other close relations. In these cases such boys, while learning their trade, lived with their relative (i.e. the master of the vessel on which the lad sailed).

This family tradition, however, was not the only explanation, in 1861, for a number of young Grimsby-based fishermen residing in the household of a parent or other relative since over half of the number of young fishermen living in this way came from families, which, according to the census, had no previous connection with the fishing industry. Non-fishing families having a young fisherman relative living in their household included those headed by an agricultural labourer, general labourer, fish merchant, corn and seed merchant, ship's carpenter, grocer, greengrocer, mariner, and several dock labourers. This suggests, that, by 1861, as the character of fishing changed, the industry was being widely entered by the sons of men who had no prior connection with the sea-going aspect of the trade. This was a tendency also noted in the 1861 labour force of the Cleethorpes fishery. (See pp.235-237 above).

In 1861 the old system of apprenticeship based on the family tradition of a son following his father into the fishing industry, seems to have not yet completed its
transformation into that which attracted so much adverse criticism in later years. This contention is supported by the fact that Fleming's report on fishing apprentices, presented in 1873, found, despite 'exhaustive investigation', no evidence that apprentices were badly treated. On the other hand, the possibility cannot be ruled out that a covert difference existed, even in the early days of the system, between the treatment meted out to pauper apprentices and to those from a different social background.

The low percentage, compared with the earlier dock-construction workers, of fishermen who lived as lodgers, has been discussed above. It remains to be noted, however, that under 15% of fishermen's households contained lodgers compared with 21% of households in the 1861 Grimsby sample population. The households of fishermen provided accommodation for 45% of all fishermen who were described in the census as lodger, boarder, or fishing apprentice and there appeared to be a clear tendency for fisherfolk to take in fishermen lodgers originating from the same geographical area as themselves. The fact that more than half (55%) of fishermen who lived as lodgers found accommodation in households other than those headed by an individual of a like occupation, might be thought surprising. This is because the working life-style of a deep-sea fisherman in the middle of the nineteenth century,
was, as it still is, governed by the changing patterns of tides and weather; this making it somewhat incompatible with the daily routine of most non-fishing households. This would have been the case especially in a place like Grimsby, which, although having strong maritime traditions, had no recent history of a fishery of any consequence.

There were, as already noted in Table 27, above, 104 fishermen 'heads' of households listed in the 1861 Grimsby manuscript census. There were, also, seventy-three fishermen's wives, the husband of each of these women being presumed at sea on census night. Of these seventy-three women, the names of sixty-nine appeared as the first on the respective census schedules. The other four women were probably the wives of fishermen lodgers since they were living in the households of other people. For the purposes of this research the sixty-nine females described above have been regarded as household 'heads'. The structure of these 173 fishing families (i.e. the 104 headed by a fisherman and the sixty-nine headed by a fisherman's wife) is compared, in Table 28, with the structure of the 238 families which comprise the 1861 Grimsby sample population.

Married couples alone with children and childless married couples (nuclear families) accounted for about 90% of all families headed by a fisherman in Grimsby in 1861 but only 74% of families of the sample population. Eight per cent
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Structure</th>
<th>Fishermen</th>
<th>Heads</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Heads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married couples or widowed persons with children</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>60.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childless married couples</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head alone or with unrelated person</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head with a relative other/or in addition to a wife and children</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>173</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>238</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Grimsby 1861 Census Enumeration Books

TABLE 28
of fishermen's families were of the extended type, that is, those containing a relative other than a spouse and children, and, of this number, less than 3% included a mother or mother-in-law of the head and none a father or father-in-law. The majority of relatives in the households of fishermen (i.e. other than the wife of the head and his children) were young persons, such as a nephew, niece, or grandchild. In contrast, twice as many families in the 1861 Grimsby sample population (16.8%) were of the extended variety. In 1851 when the large labour force of dock-construction workers were in town, as Table 5 (p.73) shows, the comparable situation was that 11.0% of families in the Grimsby sample population contained kin other than the wife and children of the head, but only 6.8% of all construction-worker families. It would therefore appear that the families of special industrial migrants, such as those of the dock builders and the fishermen, were less likely than others to have been of the extended type.

This particular feature of the households of the Grimsby special industrial migrant groups of 1851 and 1861, respectively, is even more marked when it is realised that the 16.8% of households in the 1861 Grimsby sample population, and 11.0% of households in the 1851 sample containing kin other than the wife and child of the head, (with which households those of the fishermen and dock builders have been compared) is low in comparison with
other mid-nineteenth century towns such as Preston and York - for instance - where 21.6% and 23%, respectively, of all households were of the extended type. In both Preston and York most in-migration was on a short-distance basis with only about 30% of Preston migrants having travelled more than 30 miles from their birthplace.\textsuperscript{13} In contrast, 57% of all migrants in the Grimsby 1851 sample and 54% in that of 1861, had originated from beyond the county boundaries of Lincolnshire, or had been born in south Lincolnshire parishes more than 50 miles distant from Grimsby, and are therefore classified, in this work, as long-distance movers. This suggests a linkage, in a newly industrialising area like mid-nineteenth century Grimsby, between long-distance migration (whether of the special industrial variety or otherwise) and a particularly low incidence of kinship co-residence.

A contributory factor to the notable absence of grandmothers in the households of the families of fishermen, might have been that there was little opportunity for female employment in mid-nineteenth century Grimsby. According to the census, less than 1% of all fishermen's wives in the town in 1861 were gainfully employed. Anderson, in his study of Preston in 1851, found numerous grandmothers living in households where the mother was at work and it seems likely that the function of some of these older women was that of caring for grandchildren.\textsuperscript{14} This
indicates that the presence of older women in some nineteenth-century households was as much a consequence of employment opportunities for women as the desire of children to provide a home for an aged or widowed parent.

The ages of the fishermen's children are shown in Table 29 and include the children of the seventy-three fishermen's wives with a husband at sea on the census date. The high percentage of children in the younger age groups is to be expected since 75% of all wives in the 1861 Grimsby fishing community were aged forty years and under, and, therefore, still of child bearing age. The mean average number of children per fisherman was 2.0. This is below the range of the average number of children in any of the dock-construction workers' groups who were in Grimsby in 1851 (the mean average number of children in the total dock-building group was 2.3.), and, also, well below the mean average number of children of the Cleethorpes fishermen which was 2.5. Some of the wives of the Grimsby migrant fishermen were still in their teens, others in their early twenties. The youth of these women would have meant, that, in many cases, families were not yet complete and this would partly account for the comparatively low mean average number of children per couple.

Over 10% of the Grimsby fishermen's households contained resident servants, and some households had more than one.
Ages of the Children of the Fishermen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 9 years</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 14 years</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 years +</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1861 Census of Grimsby

TABLE 29
An analysis of birthplaces shows that some servants had been born in the same town or geographical area as their fisherman employer and had probably been brought by him to the town. Predictably, the majority of the employers of servants were smack-owners or smack-masters, but a number of households with servants were those of men described in the census as 'fisherman'. Because of the habit of some men known to be smack-owners to describe themselves in the census in this manner (p.207), it is difficult to know to what extent non-smack owners employed servants. The presence of resident domestic servants has often been regarded as a major indicator of social rank in nineteenth-century Britain, but, for the above reason, it is not possible to assess the social and economic status of the early fishermen migrants in Grimsby in this way.15

There is, however, some suggestion, that, by 1866, the majority of British fishermen were in relatively comfortable circumstances. The Commissioners appointed to inquire into the Sea Fisheries of the United Kingdom in that year reported that several decades earlier, in 1833, the fisheries in the English Channel had been 'in a declining state since the peace of 1815' and that, as a consequence, the families of fishermen were 'in a greater or less degree, dependent on the poor rates for support'. By 1866, according to the Commissioners, the fisheries were 'now in a very different condition' and 'instead of being
dependent on the poor rates for their support' the Commissioners did not think 'that any class of our labouring population [were] now in more comfortable circumstances than the British fishermen'. By 1861 it is likely that much of this improvement had already taken place.

2. Residential Patterns
The large majority of the 1861 fishing community were located a mile or more north of the old town of Grimsby in an area adjacent to the docks. By far the greatest number of fishermen were congregated in a complex of streets and courts east of, and parallel to, the old dock. (See Map 5). The houses in which the fishermen were living were built around the time of, or just after, the opening of that dock in 1801. Separated from this area by the railway was some land leased by Grimsby Freemen in 1858 for the building of new houses. About sixty families of fishermen, including those of a number of smack-owners, were living in this developing housing district in 1861. In both old and new housing districts were found clusters of fisherfolk originating from the same geographical area.

Several writers have commented on the propensity for members of migrant groups to cluster together. Clustering of migrants is generally thought to be due to
persons with a common origin and/or common occupational identity wishing to reside close together, ostensibly for support in a new environment. In contrast to this theory Tansey cites the case of the Hull trawlermen, who, he said, mainly originated from Brixham and Ramsgate, and who, he believed, lived close to each other not because of a wish to reside near to migrants of similar origin, but for the purely practical reason that they all wished to be near the docks.\textsuperscript{18}

Tansey's, and similar explanations of clustering assume that some choice of abode would have been available to newly arrived migrants. To what extent this was true in the case of the in-migrant Grimsby fishermen is open to debate, for the shortage of houses in the latter years of the 1850s has been referred to earlier. (p.204). The area of Grimsby adjacent to the docks, euphemistically dubbed the 'new town' and in which the majority of the fishermen were residing in 1861, was noted in the first half of the nineteenth century for its constantly shifting population. This was the same area which housed the majority of the dock-construction workers from 1846 until the completion of the Royal Dock in 1852 and the subsequent out-migration of this group. Parts of this district were the subject of adverse comment in an 1850 Report to the General Board of Health on the Sanitary Condition of the inhabitants of Grimsby.\textsuperscript{19} The clustering of fishermen in,
what had been a few years ago, a relatively sub-standard housing area, may have been of no greater significance than that in-coming fishing families had little option other than to move into the only available accommodation as, and when, houses became available.

That some, at least, of the observed clustering of the in-migrant Grimsby fishermen was by design rather than by chance, cannot, however, be entirely ruled out. In the newly built, and higher class, housing district east of the railway, where the better-off members of the fishing community - who, presumably, had some control over these matters - were living, many deep-sea fishing families were residing in close proximity to each other. Since, however, the origins of Grimsby's early fishermen, as will be discussed in the next chapter, were far from homogeneous, it is likely that if any clustering was intentional, then it was as much the result of a shared occupational identity - and the implications this might hold for creating and encouraging conditions necessary to nurture Grimsby's nascent deep-sea fishing industry, including the desirability of living near the dock - as to a desire to live close to people sharing a common place of origin.
The literature on the history of the British deep-sea fishing industry contains numerous allusions as to the origins of the pioneer fishermen responsible for the industry's nineteenth-century development. The two groups of deep-sea fishermen generally credited with having been responsible for the exploration and commercial exploitation of the North Sea fishing grounds are the Thames men and those originating from Devon and Kent. Taking Grimsby as representative of other east coast fishing ports said to owe their genesis as such to the fishermen from the south and south-west who colonised them, census data can be used to test the literature on its authenticity as to the origins and migration patterns of the fishermen, who, as the preceding chapter has shown, had established themselves at the newly developed deep-sea port of Grimsby by 1861.

Different older fishing stations have been credited with 'colonising' specific east coast fishing ports. Leather, for instance, claims that smacksmen from north-east Essex - the area around the Colne, Blackwater, and Stour rivers - were among those who colonised Grimsby and Hull. Hoskins says that both Hull and Grimsby were 'poor places until the
Devonshire men came and showed them how to fish'.

Thompson suggests that some fishing families who later settled in Grimsby and Hull had origins in the Thames ports of Barking and Greenwich, but had made their way to the Humber ports via Harwich. Natives of Devonshire, in pointing out that all east coast fishing ports were established as a result of colonisation, believe 'Brixham was responsible for Scarborough, Hull, Grimsby and Lowestoft and that Barking, for instance, colonised Harwich and Yarmouth'.

One reason for the lack of consensus of opinion as to the origins of the fishermen who moved to the east coast ports in the early and middle years of the nineteenth century, is that the social aspects of the transformation of the British fishing industry in that century - like the north-eastward migration of the fishermen which accompanied it - have tended to be an incidental, rather than central, issue in much of the literature. This is especially the case where technological advances such as changes in the size and structure of vessels, new methods of fishing, and the effect of the railways on the development of new markets, have been a major concern of a writer. Despite the imperfections of the literature a brief overview, such as that below, can provide a framework, as well as a contextual background, against which to test the findings of an analysis of census data as to the origins and
migration trends of the deep-sea fishermen who arrived in Grimsby in the decade of the 1850s.

1. The Devon and Kent Men

The tradition of fishing at Brixham goes back for centuries but trawling did not become important there until 1770. Holdsworth's account of the deep-sea fisheries of the British Isles says that seine fishing for mackerel and other surface fish, and sprat seining in winter, were those branches of the industry carried on principally in the waters of Torbay. Walter Smith told the 1833 inquiry into the state of the Channel fisheries, that, forty-five years back, (c.1788) he had been fishing off the Kentish coast with two others, and that they were 'the first from Torbay to go so far east'.

Around the year 1815 Brixham trawlers began spring fishing off the south coast in the region of Dover and Margate. Prime turbot were to be found in abundance on the Varne and Ridge grounds and there was a ready market for these in London. At this time the Brixham boats taking part were about six in number and were very small in size. About 1820 there had begun a regular winter migration of Torbay men to fish the waters of the English Channel. The men left Brixham in the month of October, and some took with them their families, together with goods and chattels, and
returned to the home port in May. This practice lasted for about twenty years. 8

At first, the seasonal migrants from Devon used the harbour at Dover from where catches were conveyed by light van to the London market. The harbour at Dover, however, was unsatisfactory. It was partially blocked by a bar and tides were strong. In certain weather conditions craft were windbound and there was also a danger of collision with cross-Channel packets. By 1828 a good harbour had been completed at Ramsgate, and Ramsgate was also growing in popularity as a watering place for the wealthy. This provided a local market for prime fish and extended the winter fishing season. The advantages of Ramsgate over Dover eventually persuaded the Brixham men to transfer their activities to that port. 9

Before the Devonshire smacks began fishing from Ramsgate in the second quarter of the nineteenth century, less than a handful of local men followed the practice of trawl fishing, most using drift nets. No mention was made of Ramsgate in the 1833 inquiry into the British Sea Fisheries and this omission, it is believed, confirms that the practice of trawl fishing at Ramsgate was negligible before the advent of the Brixham men. When the Devonshire fishermen first began to visit Ramsgate efforts were made by local citizens to induce them to settle there with a
view to establishing the place as a deep-sea fishing port. Some, like Alfred Lanfear, moved to Ramsgate with his trawlers in 1846 and set up a sail and rigging loft and supplied stores to his own trawlers. In 1863 about fifty trawlers were registered at the port. For many Devon fishermen, however, Ramsgate was never much more than a seasonal base which allowed them ready access to the London market. 10

In the early decades of the nineteenth century attention was increasingly being focused on the discovery and exploration of new fishing grounds in the North Sea, and some men from Ramsgate moved northwards and based themselves at places on the Suffolk and Norfolk coasts to be nearer to the centre of activities. Prior to this movement drift net fishing was the principal occupation of Yarmouth fishermen and the Brixham men landed their catches on the beach there. It was around 1840 before trawl fishing began on the Norfolk coast, and then in only a small way. 11

In the early 1830s one or two trawlers from the south and south-west habitually visited north Yorkshire on a seasonal basis as the summer influx of visitors to the popular watering place of Scarborough provided a lucrative market for fish. This was not a large migration for it comprised only around eight vessels, but the fishermen concerned
emulated the example of the Devon men who had earlier made Dover and Ramsgate their forward base, and took wives and families with them to Yorkshire, returning south at the end of the season. At this point in time (i.e. the 1830s) there had, as yet, been no increase in deep-sea trawling at Hull for it was not until 1845 that Hull could muster a small fleet of twenty-nine vessels.12

The discovery of the Silver Pits - an area of the North Sea teeming with fine soles in exceptionally cold weather - has been regarded by some as the event responsible for the rapid spread of trawling in the nineteenth century. This subject has been discussed in another context in Chapter 7 and there is no need, therefore, to reiterate it again here. Word of the discovery of the Silver Pits, however, 'spread like wildfire' among the south coast trawlermen and there was a rush of Brixham and Ramsgate smacks north to Yorkshire.13 Charles Hellyer, a member of the Brixham smack-owning family which migrated from Brixham to Hull, said a few Devon and Kent owners subsequently followed up the winter fishing season by season, some using Hull as their base, others, Scarborough. In the late 1830s and 1840s most fishing vessels would bypass Grimsby owing to the silting up of the Haven and a general lack of transport and other facilities there. The practice of the fishermen from the south was to leave Brixham or Ramsgate, as the case may be, by about October and return to the home port.
by the following Whitsuntide. The removal of family, household goods, and business twice a year, Hellyer recounted, was eventually found to be so onerous that his father and mother, with their family, in 1855 decided to remain in Hull.¹⁴

Hellyer pointed out, that, in Hull fishing was 'prosecuted under the greatest difficulties and hardships'. The vessels had no recognised place to be when discharged and no facilities of any kind were provided for the fishermen. He added, dock officials and 'people of all kinds' regarded the fishing industry as an 'intolerable nuisance'. Until the 1880s, despite the growth of the industry at Hull, no official body considered it worthwhile to treat the fishing trade seriously and thereby get the best out of it. As a result of this other ports were said to have been created by men forced out of Hull by the prevailing conditions there.¹⁵ One of those to benefit was to be Grimsby.

Those smacksmen from the south who settled higher up the Yorkshire coast at Scarborough fared little better than did those making Hull their base. Trawling was looked on with suspicion at Scarborough, lining and drift net fishing being mainly followed by the local men. The Scarborough Corporation was reluctant to foster and develop the fishing industry and the Scarborough harbour was exposed and often difficult to enter in the high seas common on that part of
the north-east coast. A combination of these circumstances persuaded some Scarborough-based fishermen originating from the south, like the Alward family, to eventually transfer their businesses to Grimsby when facilities became available there soon after the mid-nineteenth century.16

2. The Thames Fishermen
Turning now to the Thames fishermen who were also prominent in the development of the modern North Sea fishing industry, Barking was the home port of most such individuals. From the fourteenth century until the middle of the nineteenth century the most important industry at Barking was fishing, and, early in the nineteenth century, the town ranked as one of the greatest fishing ports in England. The port owed much of its fame to the Hewett family who first settled there in 1760. Samuel Hewett took over the family business about 1815, and, by this time, Barking's fishermen were enlarging their craft and extending their line-fishing operations into the open sea. Some smacks went as far north as Iceland and others fished the Dogger Bank. Previously, the small Barking well-smacks worked the deep channels in the Thames and its estuary.17

The great boom in trawl fishing began about 1830 and Barking trawlers, like those from Devon and Kent, pushed out into the North Sea to search the fishing grounds for
the soles so much in favour in the London market. Smacks from the Thames fishing ports were working off the coast of East Anglia in the area of Lowestoft and Yarmouth in the early years of the nineteenth century. Even before the advent of the railway it had sometimes been the practice of Barking owners to land fish at Yarmouth and despatch it to Billingsgate in horse-drawn conveyances which completed the journey in 12 hours. New grounds, ever further out into the North Sea, were being discovered and exploited, and it was Samuel Hewett of Barking who devised the system of fleeting, whereby smacks could remain at sea for from four to eight weeks by putting their haul on board fast cutters which brought the combined catches to the London market. Some Devon and Kent fishermen are said to have joined the Barking smacks in these fleeting operations.

Barking was at its zenith as a fishing port about the middle of the nineteenth century. At that time it boasted a fleet of 220 smacks and 1,370 men and boys were directly employed on the boats. The decline of the port set in soon afterwards for it was the spread of the rail network which sounded the death knell of Barking's fishing industry. The railway opened up direct links between Billingsgate and the new east coast fishing ports and it became quicker and cheaper for fishermen to land catches at these ports and despatch them by rail to London than to attempt the long, and sometimes difficult, navigation up the Thames.
were, however, other causes which hastened the end of the fishing industry at Barking. The trawl used by the Barking men was said to be 'small and inefficient'. The Barking smacks were also expensive to operate because the fishermen 'refused to share in the catch as part of their wages'. By the end of the nineteenth century Barking had ceased to exist as a fishing port, as had other Thames fishing stations. 20

At Greenwich, like Barking, fishing had been carried on for centuries past. As early as 1349 there are reports of nets having been confiscated at both Greenwich and Barking because the fish they contained 'by reason of their smallness, could be of no use to anyone'. Gravesend, too, had close associations with the Barking fishing industry in that the cod chests of the Barking fishermen were moored in the river there. This was the system whereby live cod were taken out of the welled smacks of the Barking men and put in floating containers until such time as the fish was required for market. After transportation up the river to Billingsgate in small hatch boats the fish were then killed and sold as 'live cod'. The practice of storing cod in chests at Gravesend ceased towards the middle of the nineteenth century due to the pollution of the Thames. 21

About 1854 the Short Blue Fleet of Samuel Hewett - this representing a large proportion of the Barking boats -
transferred to Gorleston in Norfolk. This was a permanent move compared with the earlier itinerant activities of the smacksmen from the south who made the Suffolk and Norfolk coast their forward base around two decades earlier. The different nature of this northward move of the Thames men is demonstrated by the fact, that, with the transfer of Hewett's fleet to Gorleston, building slips, ice houses, stores, etc., as well as houses for the men, were constructed there. Around the time of the move of the Hewett fleet other Barking smack-owners began transferring their businesses to east coast ports, and in 1863 only twenty-seven smack-owners remained at Barking. 22

Among places claimed to have been colonised by men from Barking, is Harwich. In 1735 Harwich had its own industry with thirty well-smacks fishing for cod. By the middle of the eighteenth century the fleet numbered sixty-two vessels, and, by the end of that century the number had increased to ninety-six and this was probably the maximum that fished out of the port. The indigenous North Sea fishing industry of Harwich then started to decline, mostly as a result of competition from Barking and Greenwich. From about the middle of the nineteenth century pollution of the river made it impossible to continue the practice of Barking fishermen storing live cod in chests at Gravesend. Barking owners then began to land catches at Harwich, and, in 1852, forty-six Barking smacks were engaged in cod
fishing out of Harwich, compared with only five locally owned vessels. 23

Thompson believes there are families in Harwich today 'who can trace their origins back to the once-prosperous fishing communities of Greenwich and Barking...and whose relatives have moved on to Hull or Grimsby'. 24 This information, based on interviews with men and women from English fishing communities, suggests that Harwich was more a staging-post for migrant fishermen from the Thames fishing stations, than a place from which the pioneers who colonised the new fishing ports higher up the east coast had originated. Importantly, Harwich's experience emphasises the constantly changing nature of the economic forces which drove many nineteenth-century fishermen ever further northwards in search of places where they could establish themselves, and where deep-sea fishing seemed to offer their industry better prospects.

3. The North-east Essex Fishermen
The main branch of fishing carried on in north-east Essex, apart from Harwich, was traditionally shellfish dredging and spratting. For the majority of the smacks based around the Colne, Blackwater and Stour rivers, trawl fishing was a short seasonal activity. Smacks trawled for soles in the spring and for roker and dabs in the autumn. Spratting in
the winter months sometimes alternated with trawling for codling in colder off-shore waters. Some smacks, however, trawled all winter and a very few followed this activity throughout the year.

The prospect of the railways connecting the coast of Essex, particularly Brightlingsea, with the London fish market, stimulated hopes that Brightlingsea might be transformed into a fishing port of the size and status of others higher up the east coast. This prospect never materialised, but, dating from 1857, and in hopes thereof, many smacks of up to forty tons were built. The postulated link between the north Essex smacksmen and the colonisation of the new east coast fishing ports may, therefore, be post-1850s, when, it seems, some owners transferred their businesses further north. According to the literature, not only were Yarmouth smacks 'skippered and manned from Brightlingsea' but a Brightlingsea family 'owned and commanded several large Grimsby smacks'. There is, however, little direct census evidence to support the proposition that there was a significant connection between the small fisheries located in that part of Essex and the colonisation of the Humber ports, particularly Grimsby.

* * * * * * *
Table 30, below, using the 1861 census, groups the fishermen in Grimsby in that year according to birthplace. These geographical groupings - based to a large extent on the literature as reviewed above - also provide the framework for the later analysis of the patterns and processes of movement which brought the special industrial migrant fishermen to the north Lincolnshire port. It is evident, that, in Grimsby in 1861 there were representatives of two important streams of migrant fishermen whom contemporaries described - 'for convenience and distinction' - as, either, 'Thames fishermen' or 'Devon and Kent fishermen'. These comprise Groups 1 and 2 in Table 30 and represent 43.5% and 12.4%, respectively, of all Grimsby fishermen ashore at the time the 1861 census was taken.

Group 3 reveals there were several small clusters of fishermen's birthplaces at Hull, Harwich, and in the area of the Colne, Blackwater, and Stour rivers. These birthplaces comprised 14.5% of the total, and, as will subsequently be shown, were of varying degrees of importance to the two mainstream migrant groupings. In addition, as Group 4 indicates, there were a number of fishermen who had been born in Grimsby and a larger number of migrants whose origins were within the county boundaries of Lincolnshire. Of these latter, a small number of fishermen had been born in the south of the county, and,
Birthplaces of 209 Fishermen Listed in the 1861 Grimsby Census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Barking and other Thames-side towns</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Devon [mainly Brixham])</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Kent [mainly Dover,</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ramsgate and Margate]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Colne, Blackwater, Stour</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(fishery area)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Harwich)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Lowestoft/Yarmouth</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Hull)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(Grimsby)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Lincolnshire [other than (</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grimsby])</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1861 Census of Grimsby

TABLE 30
following the practice used in the case of the earlier
dock-construction workers of similar south Lincolnshire
birth, these individuals have been regarded as long-
distance migrants.

In Group 5 there is a miscellany of birthplaces which do
not appear to have any overt geographical or other
connection with any of the other migration streams
identified, even though some of the miscellaneous origins
were in coastal areas of England possibly associated with
inshore fishing. 'Other' birthplaces in coastal or
maritime areas, but outside the main groupings, were: Rye
(Sussex), North Shields, Brancaster (Norfolk), Aldeburgh
(Suffolk) (2), Liverpool (2), Manchester, and Jersey. The
remaining 'Other' birthplaces were: Exton (Rutland),
Thornhill (Yorks.), Norton (Notts.), Leicester, Norwich,
Scotland, and Holland. There is no census information in
these latter cases which offers any obvious explanation for
the presence of these fishermen in Grimsby in 1861, except
that three were listed by the enumerators as fishing
apprentices. The implications of this occupational title
were discussed in the preceding chapter.

The analysis of the birthplaces of the fishermen in Grimsby
in 1861 contradicts the proposition that it was men from
Devon who were largely responsible for the colonisation of
Grimsby. Although there were a number of men originating
from that county in Grimsby in 1861, the overwhelming number of fishermen listed in the Grimsby census of that year had been born at ports, or places, adjacent to the Thames. Also, 50% of the females described in the census as a 'fisherman's wife' - this term indicating a woman with a husband at sea when the census was taken - had been born in the Thames region. In contrast, less than 14% of the total listed as fishermen's wives had been born in the counties of Devon and Kent.

Birthplace information on its own, as seen in the case of the earlier Grimsby dock builders, reveals nothing at all about movement between leaving place of origin - or place of previous employment - and arrival at the migration destination. The five geographical groupings in Table 30, therefore, are used in the next chapter as the basis for the analysis of census data related to the birthplaces of the wives and children of the Grimsby fishermen - where this latter kind of information is available - and this sheds some light on the patterns and processes of movement which brought this second group of nineteenth-century special industrial migrants to Grimsby.

As Table 30 shows, there were twelve fishermen in Grimsby in 1861 who had been born in the town and a number of others who had been born at places in Lincolnshire other than Grimsby. The former group were clearly not migrants
and the majority of the latter originated from places in Lincolnshire less than fifty miles distant from Grimsby and are thus categorised as short-distance movers. In these circumstances neither the Grimsby, nor the majority of the Lincolnshire-born fishermen belong in the next chapter, the function of which is to examine the patterns and processes of movement which brought the special industrial migrant fishermen to Grimsby. The antecedents of the two groups of fishermen in question, therefore, are discussed below.

4. Fishermen Born in Grimsby and in the Surrounding Villages

It seems that of the twelve Grimsby-born fishermen, six, in all probability, were apprentices. More likely than not they were of the outdoor variety since most were living in the households of parents or other non-mariners, rather than in a household 'headed' by a smack-owning employer or other sea-going, or ex-sea-going, individual, as indoor apprentices tended to do. (See p.258). Not all of the six, however, were designated in the occupation column of the census as apprentices, but their ages, which varied from thirteen to twenty years, strongly suggests this was the case.

Of the remaining indigenous fishermen, some, according to census data, were the sons of fishermen, but were too old
to have been apprentices in 1861. The fishermen fathers of the Grimsby-born men were not, in every case, of local birth, and census data shows that some of these older men had migrated into the town several decades earlier. These facts instigated a search of the 1851 census to see if there was any evidence that these two-generational fishing families had been associated with local fishing activities of some kind prior to the commencement of Grimsby's deep-sea industry.

It was not possible to make a positive cross-censal identification of any one individual, but it is always likely that a given fisherman might have been ashore at the taking of one census and therefore included in it, and at sea at the date of the next and consequently excluded from the listings. In these circumstances positive cross-census identification would have been impossible. There was, however, some indirect census evidence, mainly related to surnames and siblings which suggested a family connection between several Grimsby-born fishermen who were listed in the 1851 census and others similarly born who were listed in that of 1861; these connections, in themselves, suggest the possibility of the continuity of some old traditions of small-scale local fishing in the midst of the profound social and economic changes then taking place in the Grimsby, and wider, British fishing industry. If this was so, then it accords - although in a very small way because
of the relative insignificance of fishing carried on at Grimsby prior to the development of the modern industry - with Thompson's findings, that, in Fleetwood's rise as a great trawler port, new methods of fishing 'intermingled' with the old established practices, and 'in many ways coalesced' with them.27

Just over 16% of fishermen in the 1861 Grimsby labour force had been born in Lincolnshire (other than Grimsby) and the great majority of these men originated from villages less than twenty miles distant from the town. Only one member of the 1861 Grimsby fishing labour force had been born in nearby Cleethorpes and this supports the view (discussed in Chapter 8) that the rise of the Grimsby deep-sea industry had not disturbed, at least to any observable extent, the social and economic structures of the old-established Cleethorpes inshore fishing community.

It is also noteworthy that sixteen, or 50% of the Lincolnshire-born fishermen were in all probability apprentices although not all were described in the census as such. The ages of the youths concerned varied from twelve to twenty years and the birthplaces of ten of the sixteen were coincident with the location of Lincolnshire Unions or other public institutions definitely known to have later sent pauper apprentices to Grimsby. These were, Boston, Brigg, Sleaford, Lincoln, and Louth.28
It is not possible to put forward any one reason to account for the presence in the 1861 fishing labour force of other Lincolnshire men born within a short distance of Grimsby. The birthplaces of two men were in Lincolnshire coastal villages (i.e. Marshchapel and Mablethorpe) but this is of no particular significance in that the north Lincolnshire coast - apart from Cleethorpes - was not noted for its inshore fishing communities. The majority of the Lincolnshire-born men originated from rural villages less than twenty miles or so distant from Grimsby, such as Ulceby, Waltham, Croxby, Keelby, Ludborough, and Market Rasen and it is likely that such men had formerly been agricultural labourers.

One factor, however, which a majority of the Lincolnshire-born fishermen, discussed above, had in common, was that, according to the birthplaces of their children, they had each been resident in Grimsby for some considerable time prior to 1861 - one or two of the older men for periods exceeding twenty years. The fishing industry in Grimsby in the first half of the nineteenth century had been of little consequence, with only thirteen fishermen listed in the 1841 census and eighteen in that of 1851. In view, therefore, of the comparative insignificance of the town's fishing industry in the first half of the nineteenth century and the probability that, according to their origins many of the men in question were previously
employed on the land, it appears unlikely that such men had migrated to Grimsby in the first instance (i.e. several decades earlier) with the express intention of embracing the trade of fishing as a means of making a living.

It is more reasonable to assume that such individuals had originally been attracted to the port - as doubtless had many other in-migrants emanating from the surrounding Lincolnshire countryside - as a result of the employment opportunities generated by one or other of the temporary upsurges of trade which had occurred at the old dock in Grimsby. Fluctuating periods of prosperity and stagnation, and the rise and fall of new industries (see Chapter 2) had been a feature of the port in the early part of the nineteenth century. If this supposition is correct, then some of the older Lincolnshire-born men listed as fishermen in the 1861 census may have been attracted into the deep-sea industry only recently as a result of the local and wider developments in the trade.

The total number of Grimsby and Lincolnshire-born fishermen in Table 30 is forty-six. If the twenty-two identified as apprentices are deducted from this number, then it seems that only twenty-four men, or under 12% of the adult Grimsby fishing labour force ashore when the 1861 census was taken, were of local, or relatively local, birth. This meagre response to new labour demands is testimony to the
assertion that long-journey migrants (in this case those of the special industrial variety) were crucial to the take-off of the modern Grimsby fishing industry, as, doubtless, they were to other new industrial sites of different kinds in Victorian Britain.

The overall migration pattern of fishermen - in the 1850s - into the developing deep-sea port of Grimsby, was very much a one-way flow of individuals from the declining fisheries of the Thames and other places, to a new and expanding area. Alternatively, some men had arrived via the Yorkshire ports of Hull and Scarborough. These latter were the multi-stage migrants of Devon and Kent origin, who evidently saw the facilities on offer at the regenerated port of Grimsby as offering better prospects to their businesses than did their existing Yorkshire ports of residence.
CHAPTER ELEVEN

THE IN-MIGRANT DEEP-SEA FISHERMEN: PATTERNS AND PROCESSES OF MOVEMENT

1. The Thames Fishermen: Direct Movers

By far the largest group of the in-migrant fishermen in Grimsby in 1861, as Table 30 has shown, were the 43.5% who have been described as 'Thames fishermen'. This finding was contrary to expectations since Grimsby is not noted, in the literature, as having been a place 'colonised' by men originating from the Thames ports. The Thames birthplaces of the fishermen are given in Table 31, below, and Figure 9 indicates the geographical distribution of the Thames-side origins - the majority of these being on the north bank of the river.

Twenty, or 22% of the Thames fishermen in Grimsby had been born at the noted and long-established fishing port of Barking, eight at Greenwich, and five at Gravesend. A further twenty-one (23%) had been born in the area of the metropolis described in the census as 'Middlesex London' and thirty-seven (40%) at a number of small towns and locations broadly adjacent to the river. These latter miscellaneous Thames birthplaces have been indicated at the foot of Table 31.
**Birthplaces of the Thames Fishermen**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barking</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwich</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravesend</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Other Thames birthplaces</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>63.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Other Thames-area birthplaces given in the census were:

- Bromley
- Chelsea (4)
- Deptford (5)
- Hammersmith
- Lee Bridge
- Rainham
- St. George's East (4)
- Westminster (2)
- Middlesex London (21)

**Source:** 1861 Census of Grimsby
THE RIVER THAMES SHOWING THE BIRTHPLACES OF THE THAMES FISHERMEN IN GRIMSBY IN 1861
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As in the case of the dock-construction workers who had been in Grimsby at the time of the 1851 census, it is the birthplaces of children of the migrant fishermen, as given in the census enumeration books, which provide evidence of the movements of their parents. Fifty-one of the ninety-one Thames-born fishermen in Grimsby in 1861 were described by the census enumerators as household 'heads'. Forty-two of this number, or more than 82% of them, had children, the number of the fishermen's children totalling 111. Seventy-three women were listed by the census enumerators as a 'fisherman's wife' and it is presumed the husband of each of these women was at sea at the time the census was taken. (Table 25). The birthplaces of the children of these latter families can also provide information regarding the migratory movements of the absent fisherman-father.

In order to differentiate, when this is necessary, between the women with a husband at sea and those with a husband at home at the time, the former, following the practice of the enumerators, will be referred to as 'fishermen's wives', and the latter as the 'wives of the fishermen'. It has been established that thirty-eight, or 52% of the fishermen's wives in the 1861 Grimsby census had been born at Barking, Greenwich, Gravesend, or at some other Thames-side town, and twenty-nine of these women had children - the total number of their children being seventy-four. This number, added to the 111 children of the Thames-born
fishermen, gives a total of 185 children available for the analysis of birthplace data.

Table 32, below, shows that more than 76% of the children of these Thames fishing families had been born at Barking, Greenwich, Gravesend, or at some other Thames-adjacent location. It also reveals that over 21% of their children had been born at Grimsby. This means that a total of over 97% of all births of children to the Thames fishing families had occurred, either, in the area of origin of the migrants (i.e. the Thames region), or, in Grimsby (i.e. the migration destination). This being so, there can be little doubt that the majority of Thames fishermen in Grimsby in 1861 - assuming the birthplaces of their children are taken as indicative of movement - had migrated directly to Grimsby from the Thames ports.

The census data relating to the birthplaces and birthdates of the children of the Thames fishing families provides evidence of the time-scale of the arrival of the Thames-men in Grimsby. None of the thirty-nine children born in Grimsby to parents of Thames origin were more than four years of age at the time of the 1861 census. The youth of the majority of wives in the 1861 Grimsby fishing community has been commented on earlier (see p.269). This was particularly marked in the case of the Thames wives and it meant that a high number of these women were in the younger
### Birthplaces of 185 Children of the Thames Fishermen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barking</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>Greenwich</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwich</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>Gravesend</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravesend</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>Barking</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greenwich</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gravesend</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Barking</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greenwich</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gravesend</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Barking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Greenwich</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Other Thames</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>*Other Thames</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Towns</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grimsby</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Grimsby</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Other Places</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>+Other Places</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+Other Places</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Other Thames Towns (above) were: Deptford, Romford, and those described in the census as 'Middlesex, London'.

+Other Places (above) were: Mistley in North-east Essex, and Cleethorpes, Lincolnshire.

Source: 1861 Census of Grimsby
child-bearing stage of life. This fact has implications for high fertility rates in the group. Bearing this in mind it can be argued with some confidence, that, had many fishing families of London origin been in Grimsby much before 1857, then the census would surely have shown a number of Grimsby births to them of children who would have been older than four years in 1861.

The evidence of the enumeration books, in fact, suggests that for 38% of the families of Thames origin, the move to Grimsby from the London area had taken place around only two years before the 1861 census; that is about two years after the opening (or re-opening, depending on how the matter is viewed - see p.188) of the port's first fish dock. Many of the families in question had children aged under one year, and others had children aged between one and two years, all of whom, according to the census, had been born at Barking, or, in a very few cases, at other towns in the Thames area. The sum of the evidence conclusively shows that the move of the Thames fishermen to Grimsby did not begin before 1857, at the earliest, and was probably at its height around 1859-1860. Table 22, below, which shows increases in the tonnage of fish despatched from Grimsby by rail in the 1850s, reflects this time-scale of movement.
The census evidence of the birthplaces of the Thames fishermen, taken in conjunction with that of their wives and children, suggests that a relatively high degree of residential stability had probably existed in Thames fishing communities before the force of economic circumstances had compelled London smack-owners to move their businesses to the east coast. Taking, first, the case of Barking, it would appear, from the census evidence of birthplaces of children, that a majority of all Thames fishermen in Grimsby in 1861 - irrespective of Thames town of birth - were living at, and more likely than not, sailing out of Barking before migration to Grimsby.

It seems the Barking fishery - apart from the 22% of the Grimsby migrants who had been born in that town - had drawn its crews almost exclusively from the surrounding Thames region, for a high proportion of the Barking-born children had been fathered by fishermen originating from different Thames-side towns or villages. Sixty per cent of the wives of the Thames fishermen ashore in Grimsby at the time of the 1861 census, and 52% of the Thames fishermen's wives, had also originated from Barking. These marriage and birth patterns indicate that many young men from other Thames towns had moved into Barking as bachelors, taken up (or followed) fishing there, and subsequently married a female of local birth and raised a family in the town.
Tansey, in his study of residential patterns in Kingston-upon-Hull in 1851, concluded that the Hull fishermen were congregated around the docks because they wished to live in close proximity to their business interests.\textsuperscript{1} This, presumably, can be interpreted as meaning, among other things, the desire of a fisherman to reside near to the point of sailing and return of his vessel. Had the Barking fishermen habitually migrated between the different Thames fishing stations, then, following Tansey's reasoning, it can be assumed that, purely as a matter of convenience, some men would have moved their homes to accommodate their changing occupational circumstances. The evidence of the birthplaces of the children of the Thames fishermen shows this did not occur. That is to say, in the fifty-one cases where the eldest child of a Thames fisherman had been born at Barking, then all subsequent children born to that particular family - before migration to Grimsby - had also been born at that Thames port.

The number of fishermen in Grimsby in 1861 who had originated from the Thames ports of Greenwich and Gravesend - eight and five respectively - is too small for any firm conclusions to be reached as to the social stability and cohesion of these particular Thames fishing communities prior to their decline. However, the individual case histories of the fishing families concerned are of interest in this respect. Of the eight Greenwich-born fishermen in
Grimsby in 1861, three were married and had children. In each of these cases, all three wives had been born at Greenwich, as had all of the children. Of the five fishermen born at Gravesend, three were married and all had a family. Two of the wives, and all of the children of these men had been born at Gravesend. The available evidence leads to the conclusion that social and residential stability had probably been a characteristic of nineteenth-century Thames fishing communities.

2. The Devon and Kent Fishermen: Multi-stage Migrants

Fishermen originating from the counties of Devon and Kent, as discussed earlier, are noted as having participated in the exploration of fishing grounds in the English Channel, and, later, in the North Sea. The history of the two groups is largely inseparable and they are generally referred to collectively in the literature, as, for example, 'Devon and Ramsgate men', or 'Devon and Kentish fishermen'; this latter definition being that used by George Alward, the veteran Grimsby fisherman whose smack-owning family had been involved in the early nineteenth-century migration from the south-west of England to the new east coast fishing ports. The Alward family had settled, first, at Scarborough, and later moved on to Grimsby.² It is against the background of the north-eastward movement of such fishermen, which had started in Torbay at the end of
the eighteenth century, that the analysis of the migration patterns of the Devon and Kent fishermen resident in Grimsby in 1861 has to be set.

It is clear that as long as the practice of the seasonal migration of the Devon fishermen to the Channel ports continued, some of the children of these men would have been born at the home port of Brixham and others in Kent during the course of the annual family exodus there. (See pp.277-278). When, however, the Torbay pioneers pushed out into the North Sea in search of new grounds and sought bases higher up the east coast at which to base themselves, then the pattern of Devon/Kent births would be modified. An analysis of the birthplaces and birthdates of the Devon and Kent-born fishermen in Grimsby in 1861, and of their children, will confirm this reasoning.

The change in birth patterns becomes evident when the ages of fishermen in Grimsby in 1861 who had been born in Devon and Kent, respectively, are subjected to comparative examination. Assuming, for instance, that a Torbay-born smack-owner working seasonally out of Ramsgate in 1820 had been aged around thirty at that time, he would have been nearing seventy years of age by the time Grimsby began to develop as a fishing port in the middle years of the 1850s. It is unlikely, therefore, that any of the earliest West Country pioneer fishermen would have been among Grimsby's
first deep-sea migrants, for the oldest Devon-born
fisherman in Grimsby in 1861, according to the census of
that year, was fifty-nine years of age. However, some of
the sons of the early Torbay pioneers may have been part of
Grimsby's first resident fishing community.

As Table 30 has shown, eight of the in-migrant Grimsby
fishermen had been born in Devonshire, but a larger number
(eighteen) had been born in the county of Kent. Of the
eight men in the 1861 Grimsby fishing labour force with
origins in Devon, five were in their late forties or
fifties, and the other three were approaching forty years
of age. The mean average age of the Devon fishermen was
forty-five. In contrast, of the eighteen fishermen with
birthplaces in Kent, only two were over forty years of age,
three were in their early thirties, and the remaining
thirteen in their teens and twenties. The average age of
the Kent-born men (discounting the four teenage apprentice
fishermen in the group who, because of possible
institutional origins may not have come from a traditional
Devon/Kent fishing family background) was twenty-nine
years. These facts reflect the on-going time-scale of the
movement of the fishermen out of Torbay and into the waters
of the English Channel which had started about 1820 and
lasted until around 1840.
Census information on the birthplaces of the Kent fishermen - assuming that some, at least, of the Kent men in Grimsby in 1861 had been the descendants of the early Devon pioneers - indicates that Ramsgate was almost certainly more important to the Torbay men as a forward base than either of the Kent ports of Dover or Margate. This assumption is based on census evidence that fourteen, or over 77% of Kent-born Grimsby migrants had originated from Ramsgate, with the remaining Kent birthplaces being equally divided between Dover and Margate.

Although there were only eight Devon-born fishermen listed in the 1861 Grimsby census, and eighteen with origins in coastal areas of Kent, there is sufficient evidence related to the birthplaces and birthdates of the children of these men to test the validity of variously held assumptions about the direction and chronology of the multi-stage migration route these people had followed to the north-east coast. All eight of the Devon men were described in the census as household heads and seven of the eight had children. Seven fishermen's wives (women with a husband presumed at sea when the census was taken) were also listed by the enumerators, and all of these women, with one exception, had been born at Brixham. Six of the women had children. Taken together, these thirteen families (i.e. the seven headed by a Devonshire-born fisherman and the six
by a Devonshire-born fisherman's wife) contained a total of thirty-nine children.

Unlike the Devonshire men, all of whom were listed in the census as household heads, the household status of the fishermen born in Kent was more diverse. Twelve of the Kent fishermen were listed as household heads and nine of this number had children. Only one fisherman's wife had been born in Kent - at Dover. Including the family of this latter woman there was a total of twenty-two children from Kent families in Grimsby in 1861. The preponderance of Hull births in both Devon and Kent fishing families is indicative of the importance of Hull as the final leg of the multi-stage migration route which had brought these people to Grimsby. (See Table 33, below).

The criterion used in the earlier study of the dock-construction workers to identify a family able to provide information about the migration history of its 'head', was that such a family had to contain at least one child born somewhere other than at the father's place of origin and such place had to be other than the migration destination. (In this case Grimsby). Of the thirteen Devonshire-born fishermen and fishermen's wives having children, twelve of these families met this requirement. Of the ten families of Kent origin having children, seven of these also qualified. One of the Kent families, however, was
### Birthplaces of the Children of the Devon and Kent Fishermen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Devon Fishermen</th>
<th>Kent Fishermen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brixham</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramsgate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hull</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarborough</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grimsby</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1861 Census of Grimsby

**TABLE 33**
eventually discounted on the grounds, that, for the wife, the current marriage might have been a second one. The two elder children, according to surname, appeared to be the issue of a previous marriage of the wife, and their birthplaces could not, therefore, be regarded as representative of the migratory movements of that particular family's head. This left a revised total, for the purposes of analysis, of twelve families of Devon origin and six of Kent origin. The families had, between them, a total of fifty-seven children whose ages, according to the census, ranged from one month to twenty-seven years. These children have been analysed by year of birth and birthplace. (Figure 10, below). The analysis provides evidence, not only about the geographical direction and chronology of the migration route which brought these people to Grimsby, but, also, about the likely arrival date of the first fishermen of Devon and Kent origin at the port.

The pattern of births shown in Figure 10 mirrors, in addition to the main migration route followed by the Devon and Kent men, the earlier seasonal habits of the Devonshire pioneers whose practice it was to leave their home port of Brixham in October and locate themselves, with their families, at their forward base of Ramsgate for the winter - and later summer - fishing in the Channel. The concentration of birthplaces in Hull, beginning in 1845, is
### Birthplaces of 57 Children of Devon and Kent Fishing Families Analyzed by Year of Birth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Born</th>
<th>1840-1844</th>
<th>1845-1850</th>
<th>1851-1856</th>
<th>1857-1859</th>
<th>1860-1861</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRIMSBY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCARBOROUGH</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HULL</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAMSGATE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRIXHAM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** 1861 Census of Grimsby

**Fig. 10**
consistent with the build-up of a small fleet of deep-sea fishing vessels at that port, as well as the belief that the Silver Pits, by that year, were being extensively worked over by smacks originating from the south, and that Hull was being used as a base by the southerners to land and forward catches to market. 3

Some of the earlier Hull-born children shown in Figure 10 (i.e. those with birthdates in the 1840s) may have been born during the course of the winter migrations to Yorkshire which followed the initial discovery of the Silver Pits. Later Hull births would have occurred as the Devon and Kent men decided to base themselves permanently at that port. The three births occurring at Scarborough during the same period are indicative of the habit of some of the Devon and Kent men using the north Yorkshire port in preference to Hull. The earliest birth at Grimsby of a child of Devon/Kent parentage, as Figure 10 shows, was in 1857, but the majority of Grimsby births to this group occurred between the beginning of 1860 and the date of the 1861 census. The dates of the Grimsby births accord with other evidence (see below) relating to the transference of the families and businesses of some Hull-based smack-owners to Grimsby.

Before this evidence is discussed, however, the term 'Hull fisherman' (or Hull smack-owner) needs to be defined, for
the usage of this terminology, by contemporaries, did not necessarily mean that men so described were natives of Hull. The reason why Hull-born fishermen in Grimsby in 1861 have not been included in the Devon and Kent group—despite Hull's undoubted importance in the migration history of these people—is that the majority of the fishermen in Grimsby in 1861 who had been born in Hull were extraneous to the migration history of the Devon and Kent group. Of the fishermen listed by the 1861 Grimsby enumerators as having been born in Hull, eight of these individuals, according to the census, were apprentice fishermen and all were teenagers. The youths were living together in numbers in the Grimsby households of their smack-owner employers and none of the eight lads were seemingly related to the household head. It can be surmised, therefore, that the youths had been taken on as apprentices by their fisherman employer before he had removed his business from Hull to Grimsby. The remaining three fishermen of Hull birth appeared to have no obvious connection with the Devon and Kent group except that one was married to a woman who had been born in Brixham. Although, therefore, eleven of the Grimsby in-migrant fishermen had been born in Hull, they were peripheral to the main body of men of Devon and Kent origin who had transferred their homes and businesses from Hull to Grimsby at some time between 1851 and 1861.
There are references in the local literature to Hull smacks having arrived in Grimsby in the middle years of the 1850s and there is no census evidence of Grimsby births of children to any family in the Devon and Kent group before this time. This lack of evidence of births, however, is consistent with the inference (See para. immediately below) that many Hull fishermen, although no doubt taking advantage of the facilities offered by Grimsby for landing and forwarding catches dating from the year of the opening of the Royal dock (i.e. 1852), did not move their home and family to the port until later in the decade when suitable housing became more readily available.

The scission of business and domestic residence was not, apparently, peculiar to Hull fishermen, for the 1866 Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the Sea Fisheries of the United Kingdom cited an instance of Goole registered fishing smacks sailing out of Grimsby, but whose owners kept their residence at Goole. In further support of the belief of a division of business and domestic interests by Hull fishermen in the early years of the Grimsby industry, some witnesses - themselves fishermen - giving evidence to the Royal Commission indicated that, although they had been 'associated' with the port of Grimsby for some years, they had not come to live in the town until comparatively recently. One witness, for instance, who had taken up residence in Grimsby in 1858, said, 'As our experience
taught us that Grimsby had more natural facilities than Hull we came here to reside'. Another Royal Commission witness, Thomas Newby, a Grimsby resident of long-standing who would therefore have been in a position to observe events as they occurred, recalled that a quarrel in Hull in 1859 had resulted in what he described as 'the greatest flush we ever had' of fishermen migrants from Hull in that year.5

The analysis of the census evidence confirms that, in contrast to the Thames fishermen who had arrived in Grimsby by a single-stage process of migration, the Devon and Kent men had come to the port via a multi-stage, and circuitous, pattern of movement. In the case of the Devon and Kent men, the older the individual, then the more peripatetic a working life-style he would tend to have led. For some of the older Devon-born fishermen in Grimsby in 1861, migration could have begun in childhood with the early nineteenth-century seasonal movement of the Torbay smacks to the Channel ports; this experience being followed in later years by winter fishing off the Yorkshire coast with a seasonal base at Hull or Scarborough, and, later, a semi-permanent period of residence at one of these latter Yorkshire ports before final settlement at Grimsby. In one family, for example, both husband and wife had been born at Brixham, and their children born at Ramsgate, Brixham, and Hull, in that order.
3. North-east Essex and East Anglian Fishermen

As Table 30 indicates, there were seven fishermen resident in Grimsby in 1861 with origins in the area of the Colne, Blackwater, and Stour rivers, six fishermen who had been born at the port of Harwich on the north-east coast of Essex, and six born at, or near to, the East Anglian ports of Lowestoft and Yarmouth. There were, also, seven fishermen's wives with origins at locations in coastal regions of north Essex. An examination of the antecedents of this comparatively small number of people who were members of the early Grimsby deep-sea fishing community, reveals some information which is also pertinent to the migration history of, in particular, the Thames fishermen in Grimsby in 1861.

Taking, first, the case of the Harwich-born fishermen. Census evidence confirms the existence of a three-way pattern of movement of fishermen between Barking, Harwich and Grimsby. (p.276). That is to say, in Grimsby in 1861 there were a few fishermen with origins in Harwich, but who, judging from the census evidence of birthplaces of wives and children, had resided, and more likely than not, spent some of their working lives fishing out of Barking before moving northwards to Grimsby.

It has been suggested (p.275) that 'some Essexmen' from the Colne, Blackwater, and Stour fisheries had shared the
credit for populating the Humber ports of Grimsby and Hull. There is some limited census evidence to support this contention. When the M.S. & L.R. first attempted to encourage the growth of a deep-sea industry at Grimsby, their associate, the G.N.R., persuaded James Howard and Company to bring their fleet of vessels, then based at Manningtree, to Grimsby (p.201). It seems this business did not last long, but the 1861 Grimsby census contains evidence of birthdates and birthplaces of children of fishermen which puts the arrival date of the Manningtree smacks at the port as about 1854. The fact that fishermen of the Manningtree connection remained at the port after the demise of the Howard organisation is testimony to the shortage of, and consequent demand for, experienced fishermen in the early years of the Grimsby industry.

4. 'Other' Fishermen in the 1861 Grimsby Fishing Labour Force

Of the sixteen fishermen shown in Group 5 of Table 30 as having been born in 'Other' areas of the country, seven of this number were apprentices - three being described by the enumerators as such and four adjudged so in view of their ages, birthplaces and lodging arrangements. These latter youths originated from locations as geographically diverse as Manchester, Exton (Rutland), Scotland, and Holland; this information, in itself, indicates that what was destined to
become the much criticised fishing apprenticeship system, was already spreading its net wide as early as 1861 - that is, some years prior to records relating to aspects of its workings being kept at Grimsby.6

Some of the younger men in the 1861 Grimsby fishing labour force who were in their early twenties, and who had been born at places outside of the mainstream fishermen's migration routes, may have been time-served fishing apprentices. This is suspected because the places of origin of such men included Norwich, Nottingham, and Liverpool. Institutions in each of these cities are known, from later records, to have apprenticed pauper and other lads in their charge to the fishing industry.7

5. The Thames and Devon and Kent Fishermen in Comparative Context

Pertinent to any differences which may have existed between the Devon/Kent and Thames migrant fishermen in Grimsby in 1861, is the fact that census evidence points to there having been little, if any, social interaction between the two groups during, or before, their migration towards the east coast ports. Although some of the Devon and Kent fishermen used to join the Thames men in their 'fleeting' operations in the North Sea, it seems unlikely that the
former group had habitually used the ports of the latter for any purpose. This is based on the finding that the census contains no evidence - except in one case only - of marriages having been contracted between Devon and Kent men and Thames-born females, or between Devon/Kent females and Thames men.

An analysis of the birthplaces of the wives of the Devon/Kent fishermen, Table 34, found that over 95% of the women such men had married had been born in Devon, in the English Channel ports of Dover, Ramsgate, and Margate, or in the Yorkshire ports of Hull or Scarborough. This pattern of marriages accords with the geographical route taken by the fishermen from Torbay as they made their several-stage migration to the different east coast ports. None of the Devon/Kent group had married Grimsby-born females but just under 5% had married women born in other areas of Lincolnshire. These latter marriages may have occurred in Grimsby as the women concerned could have moved into the town from the surrounding rural areas of Lincolnshire in order to take up work of some kind there. There was, however, little opportunity for female employment in mid-nineteenth century Grimsby save that of a domestic nature. The most likely explanation for so few Devon/Kent men having married local - or relatively local - females, is that the majority of the men in this group were, in general, in an older age group. The mean average
## Birthplaces of the Wives of the Devon/Kent Fishermen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Devonshire</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent (Dover, Ramsgate, Margate, etc.)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire (Hull, Scarborough, etc.)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames Ports</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-east Essex</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grimsby</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincolnshire (other than Grimsby)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1861 Census of Grimsby

**TABLE 34**
age of the combined Devon/Kent group of men in 1861 was thirty-nine years, and, therefore, they were likely to have arrived in Grimsby already married.

Table 35 shows that just under 70% of the wives of the Thames fishermen had been born at Barking or at other Thames-side ports or locations. Only one Thames man had married a woman originating from one of the home ports of the other group. Over 11% of Thames men had married Grimsby, or other Lincolnshire-born females. This is more than double the percentage of the other group and reflects the fact that, according to census evidence, over half of the Thames fishermen in Grimsby in 1861 were aged between twenty and thirty years, which is generally considered to be a marriageable age.

The comparatively high number, compared with the Devon/Kent group, of Thames fishermen in Grimsby in 1861 who were in the younger age groups, (disregarding the apprentices) was largely the result of a combination of differing socio-economic factors appertaining to the two groups. Firstly, Thames smack-owners, faced with the prospect of the irreversible decline of the Thames fisheries, had little option other than to transfer their businesses to an east coast port where deep-sea fishing appeared to have a future. It must have seemed no less important to the young
Birthplaces of the Wives of the Thames Fishermen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birthplace</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Devonshire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent (Dover, Ramsgate, Margate, etc.)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire (Hull, Scarborough, etc.)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thames Ports</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>69.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-east Essex</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grimsby</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincolnshire (other than Grimsby)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Elsewhere</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Elsewhere*: Stornaway, Yarmouth, Barnet, Aldburgh, Cornwall (2), Bagshot.

**Source**: 1861 Census of Grimsby

**TABLE 35**
Thames paid hands to move with their employer in the interests of their own long-term employment prospects.

In contrast, despite the fact that there appeared to have been important economic reasons for the Devon and Kent men based at Hull and Scarborough in the 1850s to move to Grimsby, it is clear the fishing ports and stations associated with the north-eastward move of the Devon and Kent fishermen (i.e. Brixham, the Kent ports, Hull, and Scarborough) had all retained varying degrees of importance during the early nineteenth-century commercial exploitation of the central North Sea fishing grounds. Migration to Grimsby for men of Devon or Kent origin - the majority of whose move to the port had been via Hull - would, therefore, whether smack-owners or employed hands, have been more a matter of choice than of the pressing economic necessity which faced the Thames men.

Secondly, the presence in Grimsby in 1861 of a higher number of young fishermen of Thames origin than of those of Devon and Kent birth, was partly due to differences in the methods of fishing pursued by the two groups and the consequent different crew requirements of the vessels operated by them. As trawling had traditionally been the method of fishing followed by the Devon and Kent men, it is almost certain that the majority of sailing trawlers at
Grimsby in 1861 would have belonged to this group and the bulk of the 'liners' to the Thames men.

The line-vessels carried a crew of around eleven hands compared with a trawler having five hands. In the case of the 'liners', five or so of the crew would have been apprentices. Taking into account the skipper and second hand, this leaves a short-fall of four crew places of lesser responsibility in the Thames vessels which would have been filled by younger, and less experienced, fishermen. Unlike the line-smacks, however, the trawlers had no need of these latter hands. The crew complement of a sailing trawler was that of a skipper, second hand, third hand, and two apprentices - an apprentice often acting as the third hand. In these circumstances the skipper and the second hand (i.e. two experienced men) plus the apprentices, would have been the only crew required. 8

Assuming, therefore, that both groups of smack-owners had brought some, if not all, of their own crews to the port, the different crew requirements of line-smacks and sailing trawlers, as well as the different economic pressures impinging on the two sets of fishermen for movement to a new port, would have been contributory factors to there having been many more younger fishermen of Thames birth in Grimsby in 1861, than there were of Devon and Kent origin.
Apart from some evidence of social insularity—this based on marriage patterns—and differences in the age structure and numerical size of the two groups of fishermen, there were also indications of variations in socio-economic status. Eight of the twenty-six Devon and Kent fishermen in Grimsby in 1861 (i.e. 30%) were listed in the census as smack-owner, compared with less than 9% of the Thames men. A comparison of census data with directories and other sources has shown that not all smack-owners described themselves as such in the census. Some such men evidently preferred to use the occupational title of 'fisherman' and it is not therefore clear as to how much should be read into this as an indicator of socio-economic status.

However, 10% of all households of fishermen in Grimsby in 1861 contained domestic servants and the presence of servants, as noted earlier, (p.271) was regarded as a major indicator of social rank in nineteenth-century Britain. There was a marked difference between the percentage of Devon and Kent households and the percentage of Thames households with servants. Of the combined households of the Devon and Kent group, 41% had servants, but less than 5% of all Thames households were in this category. This situation may have been partly indicative of the older age range of the Devon and Kent fishermen compared with that of the Thames men, and the superior financial position which a more mature stage of life might have brought.
A comparative analysis of the residential patterns of the fishermen in Grimsby in 1861 provides further evidence of what could be interpreted as the differing socio-economic status of the Thames and the Devon and Kent groups. For example, 85% of the Devon and Kent fishermen household heads lived in recently built properties. That is, in Worsley Buildings - a block of properties built especially for smack-owners by the M.S.L. and G.N. Railways - or in Kent Street, Church Street, or Bath Street, which were all in a newly built area of the town.

Although 33% of the Thames fishermen households were located in properties similar to those of the Devon and Kent men described above, 52% of the Thames households were in accommodation in the same area as that which had housed the dock-construction workers ten years earlier. This area had suffered from the predictable sanitary and other conditions common to much nineteenth-century urban housing. Some of the Thames families lived in King Edward Street, others in Fisher's Buildings, Upper Burgess Street, and Albert Court. Properties such as these, according to an 1850 Report of the Board of Health, were built, among other defects, without back doors and windows, without eaves guttering, and with damp walls with 'water continually rising to the surface'. A reason why some Thames fishermen household heads were living in sub-standard housing, that is, compared with that occupied by the vast
majority of the Devon and Kent men, may have been that a combination of the pressing economic need to move, as discussed above, and the distance involved, would have meant that fishermen migrating to Grimsby from the Thames ports would have little other alternative than to move into whatever housing was available when relocation, to them, seemed to be imperative.

In contrast, there is evidence that fishermen moving their businesses to Grimsby from Hull might have taken advantage of the dock and transport facilities Grimsby could offer for some time before coming to reside in the town. Moving home and family, it seems, may have been delayed until suitable housing was available. In view of the close proximity of the two Humber ports this would have been an option open to such men while separation of business and domestic arrangements would have been more difficult for the men of Thames origin.

* * * * * * * *

This part of the work has analysed the social, economic, and demographic characteristics, origins, and the patterns and processes of movement of the deep-sea fishermen who comprised the second wave of special industrial migrants to arrive in mid-nineteenth century Grimsby. Dyson sees fishermen as almost 'a race apart' and says until about the
1920s fishermen were 'unique' in that their way of life allowed them to 'transcend' the 'diversity of regional characteristics in her people' for which Britain is remarkable. Thompson, however, disagrees, and believes that differences exist between different fishing communities. The differences, he says, are the result of the changing nature of fishing over time and the consequent need to seek new grounds, new markets, and to learn new techniques.

Thompson's belief accords with the situation found in Grimsby in 1861, for it seems many of the characteristics of the in-migrant fishermen had been determined less by a common occupational identity than by a system of geographical sub-groupings which was the result of, among other things, different origins, varying degrees of economic pressures to migrate, and a different time-scale of movement - these factors operating within the wider concept of a community of in-migrant deep-sea fishermen.

Taking Grimsby as broadly representative of other east coast fishing ports said to have owed their nineteenth-century genesis as such to the fishermen from the south and south-west who colonised them, census data has been used to test some generally held beliefs as to the identity and movement patterns of the migrant-fishermen who had settled in Grimsby by 1861.
The literature, in general, has been found wanting in that its conclusions are largely based on migrations, seasonal and otherwise, which occurred before the mid-nineteenth century and little, if any, account has been taken of those which took place later. The time-scale of the combined north-eastward movement of the fishermen from Torbay and the Thames ports spanned a period of more than fifty years, this dating from the end of the eighteenth century. The new east coast fishing ports developed independently of each other, and the relationship between the changing patterns of migration and the stage of development of a given port has not always been taken account of when claims have been made as to the identity of the fishermen who settled there.

Deep-sea fishing at Grimsby, for example, developed later than on the Norfolk coast and Hull, and by the time Grimsby was able to offer facilities to fishermen in the middle and later years of the 1850s, it is highly likely that migration from Devon and the Channel ports had passed its peak. The evidence of the census shows that fishermen of Devon and Kent origin in Grimsby in 1861 had not migrated directly to the port from their bases in the south, as the literature sometimes implies, but had done so via a process of several-stage movement which included seasonal migration as well as a spell of semi-permanent settlement at Hull or Scarborough. The men from Devon and Kent subsequently
transferred across the Humber to Grimsby as a result of their dissatisfaction with the conditions offered at the two Yorkshire ports. Had disillusionment with conditions at these places not arisen, then it is, perhaps, doubtful if such men would have figured at all in the history of Grimsby's rise as a deep-sea port.

The migration of the Thames fishermen to the east coast, on the other hand, did not begin until the early part of the 1850s, probably around 1854 when Samuel Hewett moved his short blue fleet from Barking to Gorleston. It was not until the middle to late 1850s that fish dock and ancillary facilities were sufficiently advanced to allow the railway company developers of Grimsby to offer inducements to smack-owners to transfer their businesses there. The projected arrival date - and the direct and decisive manner of arrival - of the Thames fishermen at Grimsby, as shown earlier in this chapter, is testimony to this.

It has mainly been the failure of the literature to take account of migrations after the mid-1850s, or thereabouts, that has resulted in Barking and other Thames fishermen not having been credited with furthering the deep-sea industry at Grimsby - which census evidence shows they undoubtedly did. Judging by the Grimsby experience, it seems the patterns and processes of the north-eastward movement of fishermen from the south, south-west, and the Thames, will
not be fully explained and understood until the relevant
nineteenth-century manuscript census returns relating to
the antecedents of individuals who settled at other east
coast fishing ports, have been objectively analysed.
PART FOUR
The aim of this thesis has been to explore aspects of special industrial migration, a nineteenth-century population movement first identified by Arthur Redford nearly three-quarters of a century ago.\(^1\) Ravenstein used published census data to arrive at conclusions as to the extent, and character, of long-distance movement in Victorian Britain, but the census gives no indication of whether a migrant proceeded to his destination directly or in stages. The enumerators' books have therefore been used in this research to examine the movement of family 'heads'. Ravenstein believed that 'families rarely migrate out of their county of birth'\(^2\), and Redford concluded that a 'weakness' of special industrial migration was that even a skilled industrial worker, when thinking of moving in search of work, would be 'influenced more by considerations of distance than of previous training'. That is to say, a prospective migrant would be more inclined to move into a nearby town which offered the prospect of employment to his children than to migrate a long distance to a destination where his own skills could be utilised.\(^3\)
It appears, however, that the long-distance movement of families - especially those comprising a married couple alone with children - was not uncommon within the broad concept of special industrial migration. In fact, in the case of the two Grimsby experiences studied, (i.e. dock-construction workers and deep-sea fishermen) such movement was relatively common. Surprisingly, perhaps, there is evidence that even families who had formerly been part of a stable residential community, such as those of the Thames fishermen, were prepared to move a long distance to a newly developing area in order to allow the 'head' to follow there an established way of earning a living. (pp.305-307). This conclusion goes some way towards supporting the idea that 'links between areas sharing a common form of industrial activity - as was the case with the Thames fishery and the new Grimsby deep-sea industry - were likely to be stronger than those between other areas'. This being so, it follows that a man with a family would have been more likely to 'uproot' if he knew something of the conditions at a prospective migration destination. 4

Following Ravenstein (i.e. based on evidence of birthplace) many of the men 'heading' the special industrial migrant families studied would have been designated as long-distance movers. However, most of the individuals so categorised - discounting the Thames fishermen - had, according to the birthplaces of their children, made a
comparatively short-distance move to the study location from a previous place of employment, rather than a long-distance move from place of origin. It is therefore concluded that a step-wise process of movement was relatively commonplace in much so-called long-distance migration, particularly that of the special industrial variety.\footnote{5}

In considering Chapters 3 and 9 of this work which analyse, respectively, the socio-demographic characteristics of the dock-builders and the fishermen, the thought arises as to how far these individuals were representative of a special industrial migrant 'type'? Both the dock builders and the fishermen displayed the essential characteristics of special industrial migrants (p.8) but there were disparities between - and, in the case of the fishermen, within - the migration processes of the two occupational groups.

Prior to arrival in Grimsby, as discussed in Chapter 5, many of the construction and associated workers connected with the building of the dock had travelled by stages from divers places of origin to become, if only in the short term, established as a broad occupational group in south Yorkshire and adjacent counties. Before arrival in mid-nineteenth century Grimsby, it seems, the movement patterns of the majority of the dock builders had been essentially
peripatetic in character, and, for most group members, as Chapter 6 has indicated, no doubt continued to be so on completion of the main dock contract. This research has therefore amply demonstrated the truth of Lawton's statement that birthplace is not synonymous with 'migrant from'.

In contrast to the patterns of movement of the dock builders, the Thames fishermen, many of whom, by 1861, were established in Grimsby, had migrated directly to the port as a result of the decline of the fishing industry in their native area. Other fishermen - the Devon and Kent men - had arrived in the town via a multi-stage process of movement including seasonal, and later, semi-permanent migrations, the whole operation spanning a period of several decades. In these latter circumstances it is not surprising that the 1850s indigenous population of Grimsby tended to regard, in general, the fishermen who had recently arrived in their midst as 'wandering proletarians from the south who might easily disappear with their fishing craft as suddenly as they had come'.

In view of this wide diversity of migration experience it could be expected that the dock builders and the fishermen - especially as the arrival of the two occupational groups at the port was separated in time by something approaching a decade - would have had different perceptions of the host
town as a place of work and residence, and might, therefore, have adapted their individual social structures to take account of this. There is evidence that, in some cases, this might have occurred. These matters have been discussed in Chapters 3 and 9 and so this is not the place for detailed comparisons. It was noted, however, that a high number of the married dock-construction workers were alone in the town, apparently without dependants, and lived as solo lodgers. In contrast, a greater proportion of the married fishermen had brought wives and families with them to the port and were described by the census enumerators as 'household heads'.

There was some indication of differences in socio-economic status between the men from the Thames ports and those originating in Devon and Kent, this contention based on evidence of differing residential patterns. (pp.329-330). There were, also, differences in the family structures of the construction-worker groups. Excavators, for instance, were renowned for their highly mobile working life-style, and, as discussed on p.72, it is notable that there were, proportionately, more childless married couples in the excavating group than in any other of the construction-worker sub-occupational groupings. Differences were also found between the two mainstream groups of migrants in terms of the mean average number of children per family—that of the fishermen being the lower.\textsuperscript{8} This situation, it
seems, may have been less the result of an adaptation by two different occupational groups to the demands of a particular variety of industrial migration, as to the youthfulness of many of the fishermen's wives, especially those women originating from the region of the Thames. (pp.302-304). This latter fact, in itself, would have meant that many of the migrant families in the 1861 fishing community had yet to be completed.

In contrast to the above group differences, there were some similarities in the socio-demographic characteristics of the dock-construction workers and the deep-sea fishermen. There was, for example, a low incidence of extended families in both migrant groups. This is particularly evident when compared with the Grimsby sample populations of 1851 and 1861 respectively. (Tables 5 and 28). Some of the sample population families, like the dock builders and the fishermen, were also long-distance migrants - this assertion based on evidence of the birthplace of the family 'head' - and they provide an interesting contrast to the special industrial migrants who are the subject of this study.

It seems special industrial migrants, who, no doubt, shared with numerous other individuals of a similar occupational calling, mores created by a commonality of work, migration patterns and experiences, and, often, similar origins,
could have had access to a network of informal group support systems. If this hypothesis is correct, then it may have gone some way towards negating the need of special industrial migrant families to rely on accompanying relatives for comfort and/or assistance in new and strange surroundings; this being reflected in the overwhelmingly nuclear, as opposed to extended, structure of such families.

Unlike the special industrial migrants, however, many sample population migrant families were independent long-distance movers in the sense that they had not moved from place of origin - or previous employment - as members of a large migrating occupational group. In these circumstances it is doubtful if such families would have had ready access to support systems such as those, which, it seems, were available to the Grimsby dock builders as well as to the fishermen, and, conceivably, to other large migrating industrial groups. Independent long-journey movers may, therefore, have tended to compensate for this lack of extraneous support by migrating as an extended family unit which would act as an autonomous source of assistance in times of need.

There is no census evidence that numbers of children inhibited movement in any group other than that of the excavators, noted above, for there was little, if any,
difference in the numbers of children in those special industrial migrant families for whom there was evidence of continuous movement, and in those for whom there was no such evidence. Bearing in mind, too, the absence of work suitable for women and children in mid-nineteenth century Grimsby, it seems that the prospect of employment for family members other than that of the 'head', was not a matter of major concern to special industrial migrant families.

The observed differences in the socio-demographic characteristics of the two groups of migrants in mid-nineteenth century Grimsby, as well as those within the two main migrant fishermen groupings, indicates that it would be unwise, despite there being evidence of some similarities, to claim that the individuals who have been the subject of this study were representative of a special industrial migrant, or sociological, type. In view, however, of the complex patterns of movement displayed by those studied, it seems a common attribute - as distinct from socio-demographic characteristic - of most special industrial migrants, may have been the ability and/or willingness to adapt individual and family social structures to meet the demands of different kinds of specialised industrial migration.
Other conclusions have been formulated and discussed as different themes have arisen throughout the work. It remains here, however, to enlarge on a matter which underlies much of this thesis. That is to say, Grimsby was broadly representative of lesser nineteenth-century ports which underwent development and/or regeneration, and, to a limited extent, of other new industrial areas where specialised workers - particularly those with construction-type skills whose residence might have been for a finite period - were scarce. It is therefore possible to assess some of the effects that the phenomenon of special industrial migration could have had on certain of the social and economic structures of other receiving populations. Table 36 (See Appendix 'A', below) shows changes in the male occupation structure of Grimsby between 1841 and 1861, and Table 37, also in Appendix 'A', is a more detailed break-down of this information.

Using 1841 as a bench-mark, as discussed in Chapter 2, it seems that Grimsby, before the beginnings of its mid-nineteenth century development, was predominantly a small market town. It also had an ailing dock. The manufacturing sector was the highest employer of labour with 27% of all occupied males so employed. Well over a third of those in this sector were making items of dress. Others were engaged in a spread of small manufacturing industries catering for local needs and those of a limited
hinterland. However, manufacturing occupations in areas such as ship-building, sailmaking, and mast and blockmaking, industries associated with most ports, accounted for only 8.4% of all manufacturing activity in 1841. In that year more than 12% of Grimsby males found employment in occupations connected with agriculture.

Twenty years later, when the 1861 census was taken, as is evident in Table 37, there had been two separate, yet related, economic forces combining to shape the town's industrial structure as it, and its moribund dock, underwent discrete stages of a social and economic metamorphosis. Taking, first, the census evidence of industrial change between 1841 and 1861 and disregarding, for the moment, the 1851 occupation statistics, the occupational structure of the town, in 1861, was consistent with - after nearly two decades of development - it being on course towards ranking in importance (after 1865) as the fifth general port (immediately after Glasgow) in Britain, and, eventually, with some justification, to claiming the distinction of being the largest fishing port in the world.10

The town's industrial structure, as represented in the occupations of its employed male population in 1861, (Table 37) reflects not only the general port development which had taken place in the space of nearly two decades, but,
also, the decline of agriculture in the local economy and the in-migration of the fishermen in the 1851-1861 decade which accompanied the rise of the deep-sea fishing industry. Nearly 20% of all manufacturing occupations in 1861, compared with only 8% in 1841, were of the port-related variety. An entry in the 1861 Grimsby enumeration books refers to a George O. Hawke, ship builder and manager to John Dalton, employing seventy men and forty-seven boys. Port-related dealing occupations, such as ship's chandlers and marine store dealers, had also increased from 0.8% of the sectoral total in 1841 to nearly 8% in 1861. Fish mongers and others connected with the handling of fish accounted, in the latter year, for nearly 9% of all dealers compared with only 3% twenty years earlier. This was despite the fact that the fishing industry had not started to develop in earnest until the later years of the 1850s. Census evidence of changes in occupations are also reflected in the entries in local directories of the period. 11

The twenty years of overall social and economic development between 1841 and 1861, however, had clearly been interrupted, as the 1851 occupation statistics in Table 37 show, by the demands of major dock building. There is little doubt that the presence in the town, in 1851, of a substantial dock-building labour force had created a discontinuity - or aberration - in the longer term pattern.
of development of Grimsby's industrial and demographic structures. The dock builders and associated workers in the town in 1851 inflated the building sector, particularly the stonemason group, which had increased from 6% of the sectoral total in 1841 to nearly 29% in 1851. It then decreased to a little over 7% in 1861. According to the census, there were no excavators (another sub-division of the building sector) in the town in 1841, but this occupational group represented 10% of all those employed in the sector in 1851. In 1861, by which time the main dock contract had ended, there were no excavators listed in the census of that year.

The sub-division of the Manufacturing Sector designated as Metal Trades - this largely composed of blacksmiths, many of whom would have been working at the new dock site, (p.162) - increased from 12% of all occupations in the sector in 1841 to over 20% in 1851 and then decreased to 10% in 1861. This fact is concealed in Table 36 as only the sectoral totals are given, but is apparent in Table 37. Dock construction also had the effect of creating, in the 1851 census, a disproportionately large general labouring class as indicated in Industrial Service II. In addition, nearly 11% of all employed males in Grimsby in 1851 were listed by the enumerators as dock labourers, but only 4.5% in 1861. (An explanation of this occupational
category, and its significance in the 1851 occupation statistics, is in Appendix 'B').

The arrival of the dock-construction workers in the town also caused, among other things, an inversion of the male/female sex ratio. That is, the proportion of males to females in the local population increased from 970 males per 1,000 females in 1841, to 1,100 males per 1,000 females in 1851. This is somewhat unusual for a mid-nineteenth century town. The male/female sex ratio then dropped to 1,030 males per 1,000 females in 1861. These changes occurred because the large labour force of dock-construction workers in the town in 1851 contained a high number of males who were unaccompanied by female dependants, and who consequently lived as lodgers. The fact that the 1861 male to female ratio was still relatively high compared with other mid-nineteenth century communities - and despite the fact that the majority of the dock builders had left the area some time before the taking of the 1861 census - was due to many young, unmarried fishermen, and fishing apprentices, living as lodgers in the town in that year. (pp.258-259).

The construction project underway in Grimsby at the mid-nineteenth century was, no doubt, responsible for a temporary increase in the proportion of the total population - both males and females - in employment. In
1841, before dock building began, 55% of all Grimsby males and 14% of all females were, according to the census, at work. By 1851, with main dock construction still underway, the proportion had risen to more than 67% and nearly 17%, respectively. There can be little doubt that this increase reflected the labour demands in all sectors of employment that major dock building had generated. Ten years later, with the Royal Dock completed, and despite evidence of industrial growth, the proportion of the population in employment in 1861 had fallen to 59% of all males and 14% of all females. In the case of females this was a reversion to the pre-dock construction figure.

The inference has previously been that the 5,160 net increase in Grimsby's population, which, according to the census, occurred in the 1841-1851 decade, was a response to the general development of the port and the range of employment opportunities this would create. There has been little recognition of the fact that - as this work has shown - much of the increase in Grimsby's population that occurred between 1841 and 1851 had arisen from the influx of dock-construction and associated workers, many of them accompanied by dependants, who had converged on the town with the comparatively short-term residential aim of building a large new dock.14
The disturbances caused to some of the social and economic structures of mid-nineteenth century Grimsby by a relatively large in- and out-migration of population, is a demonstration of the fact that census data suffers from a 'serious but unavoidable limitation'. That is to say, the gross movement of population has always been greater than the final net balance in any one decade, and it can, therefore, be hazardous to use net figures as an indicator of the pattern and/or chronology, of the social and economic development of a given community.15
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THE OCCUPATIONAL DATA

The occupational structure of Grimsby in 1841, 1851, and
1861 has been analysed on the basis of a scheme of
industrial groupings devised by W.A. Armstrong which arises
out of the work of Charles Booth.¹ The scheme was
originally designed to facilitate the handling of printed
data but it has been used in this research in conjunction
with the manuscript census. Several schemes of
classification of occupations have been devised and some
are more tinged than others with the concept of social
status.² As this research was primarily concerned with the
employment structure and economy of the study location, the
Armstrong/Booth scheme was chosen because it provided the
opportunity to keep economic function and social class
separate. A further advantage of the scheme was that its
classifications were amenable to modification so that
account could be taken of some special circumstances
appertaining in Grimsby during the period under review, and
which were of interest to this work. Such modifications,
however, do not preclude the opportunity of reverting to
the original industrial groupings should this work be used
in comparative context with other nineteenth century
communities which have been analysed under the same scheme.
The Armstrong/Booth scheme has been fully explained elsewhere (see Ref. 1 of this Appendix). It is only necessary here, therefore, to note changes made to accommodate the aims of this research. Briefly, the scheme entails the allocation of all members of a given employed population to one of nine industrial classifications. These are: (1) Agriculture and Fishing; (2) Mining; (3) Building; (4) Manufacture; (5) Transport; (6) Dealing; (7) Industrial Service; (8) Public Service and Professional; (9) Domestic Service. This research particularly wished to examine the extent of changes in the industrial structure of Grimsby in the mid-nineteenth century decades due to major dock building and to the development of the deep-sea fishing industry.

In order to take account of these aims Armstrong's combined category of 'Agriculture and Fishing' has been split into two so as to show fishing separately. Another change made to the original scheme is that the Industrial Service Sector has been sub-divided so as to keep general labourers in a separate category. (i.e. Industrial Service II). This is because, as will already have become apparent, those listed by the 1851 census enumerators as dock labourers are of particular interest to this research and it was wished to avoid the possibility of confusing them with general labourers. The result of the amendments are
that the nine original industrial classifications have become eleven. (See Table 36, below).

In the Armstrong/Booth scheme occupations allocated to the different Industrial Sectors are further classified under a system of seventy-nine sub-headings. These were originally designed to take account of the national census abstracts which contained a vast amount of data. In the extended analysis of the Grimsby occupational structure (Table 37, below), a few modifications were made to some of the sub-groups. That is, some of the original seventy-nine sub-groupings were not used as they referred to occupations which were not encountered in the Grimsby census data, and, in other cases, one or two sub-groupings have been created in the interests of identifying and stressing certain occupations which seemed to be particularly relevant to the aims of this research. For example, manufacturing occupations which could be termed 'port-related', and which contained such work as ship building, sailmaking, and mast and blockmaking, was one.

The Armstrong/Booth conventions also require that dealers be allocated to different sub-groups depending on whether they deal in, for instance, food, dress, furniture, stationery, household utensils, raw materials, and so on. Had dealers in Grimsby been allocated under this strict principle the result would have been a number of sub-
## OCCUPATIONS IN GRIMSBY

### MALE OCCUPATION STRUCTURE: 1841-1861

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>1841</th>
<th>1851</th>
<th>1861</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGRICULTURE</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FISHING</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINING</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#BUILDING</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANUFACTURE</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*TRANSPORT</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEALING</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDUSTRIAL SERVICE (I)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*INDUSTRIAL SERVICE (II)</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLIC SERVICE and PROFESSION</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOMESTIC SERVICE</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

100.0 100.0 100.0

**Key**

# The 1841 Building Sector includes a group of fifty navvies. The precise kind of work these men were engaged on is uncertain. (See p.57).

* For the explanation of this sector see pp.358-359 below.

+ This sector was created to show general labourers separately. (This is explained on p.352).

**Source:** Grimsby Census Enumerators' Books 1841, 1851, 1861.

**TABLE 36**

354
### Occupations in Grimsby: 1841-1861

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>1841</th>
<th>1851</th>
<th>1861</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of Total Males Occupied</td>
<td>% of Total Males Occupied</td>
<td>% of Total Males Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Farmer</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Agricultural Labourer</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Others</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Brick Making</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>82.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Quarrying</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Management</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Bricklayers</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Joiners, Carpenters</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Stonemasons</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Plumbers, Glaziers</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Painters</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Rail Labourers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Excavators</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Navies</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Others</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>16.1**</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Port-Related</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Dress</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Food Preparation</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Baking</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Drink Preparation</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Smoking</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Metal Trades</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Woodworkers</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Watch, Clock Makers</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Carriages &amp; Harness</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Plan and Hemp</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Furniture</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Printing</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Leather, Fur, Feathers</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Machinery</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Others</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>52.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector</td>
<td>% of Males Occupied</td>
<td>% of Total Sector</td>
<td>% of Males Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Males</td>
<td>1841</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total Sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males Occupied</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>52.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transport**

1. Dock Operation
   - 1841: 2.7%
   - 1851: 6.7%
   - 1961: 6.5%

2. Ocean and River Navigation
   - 1841: 67.6%
   - 1851: 52.1%
   - 1961: 53.7%

3. Road
   - 1841: 29.7%
   - 1851: 20.2%
   - 1961: 18.6%

4. Rail
   - 1841: -%
   - 1851: 21.0%
   - 1961: 21.2%

5. Dock Labourers
   - 1841: -%
   - 1851: 10.0%
   - 1961: 10.9%
   - 1961: 4.5%

**Dealing**

1. General Dealers
   - 1841: 54.6%
   - 1851: 51.0%
   - 1961: 46.0%

2. Wines and Spirits, Hotels
   - 1841: 16.9%
   - 1851: 12.3%
   - 1961: 8.2%

3. Lodging and Coffee Houses
   - 1841: 2.4%
   - 1851: 2.7%
   - 1961: 1.5%

4. Timber Merchants
   - 1841: 0.8%
   - 1851: 6.2%
   - 1961: 8.2%

5. Fish Traders
   - 1841: 3.8%
   - 1851: 3.1%
   - 1961: 8.8%

6. Port-Related
   - 1841: 0.8%
   - 1851: 2.7%
   - 1961: 7.4%

7. Unspecified Merchants
   - 1841: 6.2%
   - 1851: 1.7%
   - 1961: 3.8%

8. Coals
   - 1841: 3.8%
   - 1851: 9.0%
   - 1961: 6.5%

9. Others
   - 1841: 10.7%
   - 1851: 12.6%
   - 1961: 9.6%
   - 1961: 14.2%

**Industrial Service 1**

Banking, Insurance, Accountancy
- 1841: 100.0%
- 1851: 0.2%
- 1961: 0.4%
- 1961: 100.0%
- 1961: 0.2%

**Industrial Service 2**

General Labourers
- 1841: 100.0%
- 1851: 10.8%
- 1961: 15.3%
- 1961: 100.0%
- 1961: 9.7%

**Public Service and Professional**

1. Medicine
   - 1841: 27.7%
   - 1851: 22.5%
   - 1961: 18.8%

2. Education
   - 1841: 13.9%
   - 1851: 8.3%
   - 1961: 9.1%

3. Religion
   - 1841: 10.7%
   - 1851: 8.9%
   - 1961: 9.1%

4. Law
   - 1841: 13.9%
   - 1851: 7.7%
   - 1961: 10.8%

5. Revenue, Customs, Coast Guards
   - 1841: 12.3%
   - 1851: 23.6%
   - 1961: 25.5%

6. Other
   - 1841: 21.5%
   - 1851: 29.0%
   - 1961: 26.7%

   - 1841: 100.0%
   - 1851: 6.4%
   - 1961: 5.5%
   - 1961: 100.0%
   - 1961: 5.3%

**Domestic Service**

- 1841: 100.0%
- 1851: 3.6%
- 1961: 1.3%
- 1961: 100.0%
- 1961: 1.5%

- 1841: 100.0%
- 1851: 100.0%
- 1961: 100.0%
Bad all fishermen at sea on census night been enumerated, (See p. ), it is believed this would have been nearly 14t

This includes the navvy group. See Ref. 23 to Chapter 2, also p. 23, for the explanation of this group and its significance in Grimsby's pre-development labour force.

The 'Others' group in the Public Service and Professional Sector contains a miscellany of occupations, such as, Police, Royal Navy, Army, Musician, Parish Clerk, Parish Sexton, and Civil Service.

Note: The sectoral breakdown of the 1841 data in this table is not strictly comparable with the textual analysis of occupations in Chapter 2. This is because this table refers to male occupations only, whilst the commentary on the 1841 data in Chapter 2 sometimes takes into account the occupations of employed Grimsby females.

**TABLE 37**
headings containing the occupations of one, or, at the most, two individuals. The solution, therefore, was to create a sub-heading, i.e. 'General Dealers', in which category were placed all dealers not allocated elsewhere. The result was a large classification, but, as dealers in port-related goods have been kept separate, factual evidence has been obtained of the increasing importance, as port development progressed, that these latter types of occupation were assuming at the expense of the kind of dealing associated mainly with the satisfaction of local needs; this having been a particularly salient feature of Grimsby's 1841 economic infrastructure.

It is recognised there is a degree of ambiguity inherent in the occupational title of dock labourer and this posed a problem as to which occupational category such individuals should be counted under. It is believed, (see Appendix 'B', below) that many dock labourers were working on unskilled tasks associated with the building of the dock and some others may have been unloading materials used in the construction process. In this latter case such men, under the Armstrong/Booth scheme, would have been consigned to the Transport Industrial Sector. As it was impossible, due to the shortcomings of the census data, to separate the two groups - in terms of tasks performed - all dock labourers have been placed in the Transport Industrial Sector (Table 37). This is not an entirely satisfactory
solution but was one way - among others equally imperfect - of resolving the problem.
APPENDIX 'B'

DESCRIPTION OF CENSUS DATA AND THE METHOD OF COLLECTION
APPENDIX 'B'

DESCRIPTION OF CENSUS DATA AND THE METHOD OF COLLECTION

The Dock-Construction Workers

It was impossible to determine, from the census enumerators' books, the precise number of individuals working on dock construction in Grimsby in 1851. This was because the occupation column in the books did not contain the all-important (in so far as this research is concerned) information as to whether a man who might reasonably be supposed - because of his occupational title - to be working at the dock-construction site, was, in fact, doing so. It is certain that a number of stonemasons, bricklayers, carpenters, and sundry other tradesmen listed in the 1851 Grimsby census, would have been engaged on domestic building work in the town, rather than on dock construction. There was no certain way of determining this and so some assumptions had to be made. Three groups of workers were finally selected, who, for the reasons set out below, were considered likely to have had all, or, in some cases, a majority, of members engaged on dock construction and associated tasks, and it is these individuals who have been subjected to intensive study.
Stonemasons

There were 186 stonemasons (including stonemasons' labourers and apprentices) listed by the 1851 Grimsby enumerators. There were only ten stonemasons enumerated in the 1841 census (i.e. five years before the commencement of dock construction) and only twenty-two in 1861, almost a decade after main dock construction had ended. As stone was used extensively in the building of the dock it can be assumed, with some degree of certainty, that the bulk of the stonemasonry workers in Grimsby in 1851 were in the town as a direct result of dock building.

Excavators

This occupational title is explicit, such workers being generally found on nineteenth-century public works projects like rail building. Predictably, there were no excavators listed in the 1841 Grimsby census returns - that is, before dock and rail construction commenced - and there were none in the town when the 1861 census was taken. Since the lines linking Grimsby with the rail network had been completed several years before the 1851 census was taken, it seems reasonably certain that the excavators in Grimsby in 1851 were engaged on work connected with the construction of the new dock.
Dock Labourers

This was the category of worker which presented the greatest difficulty of selection because it is believed some ambiguity was inherent in this occupational title. There were no dock labourers in Grimsby in 1841 but there were 330 such individuals listed in the 1851 census. This situation is not unexpected since most types of labourer were counted, in the 1841 census, under the general occupational title of 'labourer'. In 1851 some distinctions were made between different types of labouring occupations, one of these was 'dock labourer'. The occupations of stevedore and lumper were not encountered in the Grimsby censuses of 1851 or 1861. Much of Grimsby's shipping trade in 1851 was concerned with the importation of large quantities of timber and other materials required for the construction of the new dock. It is almost certain therefore that some of the dock labourers in the town when the 1851 census was taken would have been handling cargoes of this kind.

A high proportion of the men described by the 1851 enumerators as dock labourers (or, in the case of one enumerator 'labourer at the dock') had, according to census information related to the birthplaces of their children, travelled long distances from place of birth. Such men had seemingly arrived at Grimsby, judging from the birthplaces of children, via a process of multi-stage migration during
which they appeared to have been at work in areas characterised by almost continuous dock and/or railway building. Also, many of the dock labourers were lodging together in groups and others appeared to be in accommodation which had been provided for them by a contracting employer. These residential patterns are characteristic of labouring men working on nineteenth-century construction projects. (See p.79 above).

It also seemed important, in the context of the above discussion, that the proportion of the Grimsby male labour force employed as dock labourers had dropped from 10.9% in 1851 to 4.5% in 1861. In absolute numbers these percentages represent 330 and 151 individuals, respectively. Technological advances in the handling of cargoes between 1851 and 1861 may have reduced the numbers required for this type of work, but the general development of the port, as well as the rise of the fishing industry in the decade, would have increased, probably substantially, the demand for dock labour. In these circumstances the drop in absolute numbers which had occurred between 1851 and 1861 lends strength to the proposition that a high proportion of those described in the 1851 Grimsby census as dock labourers - whether discharging cargoes of construction materials or employed on unskilled construction work of some kind - were mostly representative of other such workers who habitually travelled the country.
to find employment at the site of large public works contracts.

Irish Labourers

It is known that a dock contractor brought 200 Irish navvies to work on the construction of the dock's coffer-dam and seventy labourers of Irish birth were still in Grimsby in 1851. The residential patterns of these men (i.e. lodging together in numbers, many of them in households headed by a person of Irish nationality) suggested they were members of the original gang.

The 1851 group of dock-construction workers upon which the quantitative and analytical aspects of this study have been based, therefore comprise 186 stonemasons (including their labourers and apprentices), sixty-four excavators, 330 dock labourers, and seventy Irish-born labourers, a total of 650 dock-construction workers in all.

The Deep Sea Fishermen

There were no problems of selection with the migrant fishermen who were in Grimsby in 1861 and who are the subject of Part III of this work. Commencing with Enumeration District 1, the census enumeration books were systematically searched and full details abstracted of
every individual described in the census as smack-owner, smack-master, master-fisherman, fisherman or fishing apprentice. In those cases where the individual following one of these occupations was the head of the household, or where a 'fisherman's wife' was the first person listed on the schedule (the husbands of these latter women are presumed to have been at sea when the census was taken), full details of every other person in the household were recorded. It was therefore possible to abstract the whole of the census data related to this occupational group for subsequent analysis.

The Grimsby Sample Populations of 1851 and 1861
The study also uses 1 in 10 samples drawn on a household basis from the enumerators' books of the Grimsby 1851 and 1861 censuses. This method of systematic sampling is an established practice in research using nineteenth-century census enumeration books. The technique can reveal the broad parameters of a given population's age, household, residential, socio-economic, and industrial structures. The intention of the sampling was to create a body of information with which to compare (where appropriate) the characteristics of the two groups of special industrial migrants at the heart of this work with those of the Grimsby populations of 1851 and 1861 respectively.
The 10% samples of households were drawn from the enumerators' books in the following manner. Starting with Schedule No. 1 in Enumeration District 'A' in the 1851 Grimsby census, and Schedule No. 1 in Enumeration District 1 in the 1861 census, the full details of every individual in every tenth household were recorded; a separate recording being kept for each census. The abstracted details comprised the address of the household, and, for each member of the household, the name, relationship to head, marital condition, age, sex, occupation, and birthplace.

When the samples had been collected the information relating to each household (i.e. age group, birthplace, and migration pattern of the household head, and, similarly, of the head's wife, the numerical size of the household, and of the family unit within such household, number of children, servants, lodgers, visitors, etc.) were tabulated under a system of coding which was designed to facilitate later counting. Where information was required in respect of every individual, as opposed to every household - for instance, in the case of the compilation of tables showing the age structure of the total sample population - information was obtained by counting relevant data.

The systematic sampling of a population usually involves the practice of disregarding any household which proves to
be an institution, such as a hospital, workhouse, or prison, or quasi-institution, like a large lodging house, and replacing it with the next acceptable household. This is because if the focus of attention is the household, then the inclusion of such an establishment would distort conclusions relating to household size or composition. In the drawing of the Grimsby samples the position did not arise where a tenth household proved to be an institution of this kind. This result was not surprising since there were few, if any, institutions of the type referred to above in mid-nineteenth century Grimsby. Lodging houses in the town at the relevant dates, also, were not so large, in terms of the number of residents, as to render them outstanding in comparison with the many private households which also took in lodgers.

The census data related to the dock-construction workers selected for study, and to the in-migrant fishermen, was recorded in the same manner as was the data which comprised the two systematic samples described above. It was not, however, coded before analysis. This was because different questions were being asked of the two sets of data concerning the two different special industrial migrant groups. That is to say, while the thrust of the research in connection with the dock-construction workers was designed to obtain information about matters such as, former employment, migration patterns and working life-
style, that of the research on the fishermen, whilst still concerned with these matters, wished to know more about the origins and the timing of their arrival in the town. In these circumstances there were not enough common questions to make the coding of this data a worthwhile undertaking.

* * * * * * * *

A description of the four sets of census data upon which the research is based is set out below:

SET 1

1851 Grimsby Census Population 8,860
Ten per cent systematic sample of households abstracted from the Enumerators' Books of the 1851 Grimsby census = 182 households.
Full details of every individual listed in each of the sample households had been recorded = 850 records.
(441 males - 409 females)

SET 2

1861 Grimsby Census Population 11,067
Ten per cent systematic sample of households abstracted from the Enumerators' Books of the 1861 Grimsby census = 238 households.
Full details of every individual listed in each of the sample households has been recorded = 1,053 records. (531 males - 522 females)

SET 3

1851 Grimsby Census - Dock-Construction Workers
Full details of 186 stonemasons, 64 excavators, and 400 dock labourers (including Irish-born labourers) have been abstracted from the Enumerators' Books - 650 Dock-Construction Workers. Where the dock-construction worker was described as the household head, details of all other members of that household were recorded = 1,476 records.

SET 4

1861 Grimsby Census - Fishermen
Full details of every individual listed in the census as, either, smack-owner, smack-master, master-fisherman, fisherman, or fishing apprentice, were abstracted. Where the individual in any of these occupations was listed as household head, or 'fisherman's wife' (the husbands of these women being presumed at sea when the census was taken) full details of all other members of that household were also recorded = 1,041 records.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SET</th>
<th>Records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SET 1</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SET 2</td>
<td>1,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SET 3</td>
<td>1,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SET 4</td>
<td>1,041</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 4,420
APPENDIX 'C'

A LIST OF THE 231 DOCK-CONSTRUCTION WORKERS LIVING IN ENUMERATION DISTRICT 'J' AT THE TIME OF THE 1851 CENSUS

KEY

'T' Indicates workers traced in the 1861 census

'D' Indicates those who had died and for whom there is evidence of burial in the town between 1851 and 1861
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Parish Of Birth</th>
<th>County or Country Of Birth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amson, John</td>
<td>Congleton</td>
<td>Cheshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, James</td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson, Peter</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savannah, John</td>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>Ireland (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daws, Charles</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Middlesex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eccles, William</td>
<td>Smeaton</td>
<td>Yorks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firth, Robert</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>Yorks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garside, John</td>
<td>Littletown</td>
<td>Yorks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goddard, James</td>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>Yorks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goddard, William</td>
<td>Hook</td>
<td>Yorks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwood, John</td>
<td>Adwalton</td>
<td>Yorks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwood, William</td>
<td>Adwalton</td>
<td>Yorks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartley, William</td>
<td>Drig</td>
<td>Cumberland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herman, John</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Somerset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holdsworth, George</td>
<td>Farnley</td>
<td>Yorks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunt, Robert</td>
<td>Hook</td>
<td>Yorks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hudson, John</td>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hutchinson, James</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, John</td>
<td>Newcastle</td>
<td>Northumberland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson, Thomas</td>
<td>N/K</td>
<td>Yorks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendal, Aaron</td>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>Somerset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk, Thomas</td>
<td>Bentley</td>
<td>Yorks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence, Thomas</td>
<td>Wakefield</td>
<td>Yorks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lear, John</td>
<td>Bilton</td>
<td>Gloucester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liversedge, Richard</td>
<td>Tadcaster</td>
<td>Yorks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailom, William</td>
<td>N/K</td>
<td>Yorks (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMillan, William</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Parish Of Birth</th>
<th>County or Country Of Birth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overton, Thomas</td>
<td>Grimsby</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overton, Thomas W.</td>
<td>Soweston</td>
<td>Suffolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker, John</td>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>Notts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parry, James</td>
<td>Monmouth</td>
<td>Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross, George</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, John</td>
<td>Mosburn</td>
<td>Yorks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith, John</td>
<td>Dover</td>
<td>Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sykes, Joseph</td>
<td>Little Hulton</td>
<td>Lancs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoburn, Titus</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Middlesex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Dewsbury</td>
<td>Yorks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson, Thomas</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>Lancs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thorp, George</td>
<td>N/K</td>
<td>N/K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toy, William</td>
<td>Prestel</td>
<td>N/K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turner, George</td>
<td>Gosport</td>
<td>Hants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weston, William</td>
<td>Penzance</td>
<td>Cornwall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winn, John</td>
<td>Sheffield</td>
<td>Yorks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright, Matthew</td>
<td>Clown</td>
<td>Derby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright, Matthew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXCAVATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Parish Of Birth</th>
<th>County or Country Of Birth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beeton, Solomon</td>
<td>Ashwellthorpe</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burrows, David</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Northants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curtis, Thomas</td>
<td>Ludborough</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dowling, Peter</td>
<td>Newport</td>
<td>Shropshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumelow, Joseph</td>
<td>N/K</td>
<td>N/K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall, Joseph</td>
<td>Legbourne</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall, William</td>
<td>Brewd</td>
<td>Staffs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison, George</td>
<td>Leek</td>
<td>Staffs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollingworth, James</td>
<td>Harrogate</td>
<td>Yorks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson, John</td>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>Notts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mason, Richard</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newstand, Henry</td>
<td>Elmham</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ready, Charles</td>
<td>Watton</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgeway, Elijah</td>
<td>Grimsby</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson, Phillip</td>
<td>Ludborough</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Parish Of Birth</td>
<td>County or Country Of Birth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw, Thomas</td>
<td>Nettleton</td>
<td>Middlesex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spavings, William</td>
<td>Louth</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephenson, John</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warby, George</td>
<td>Lewes</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, William</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sussex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anders, Stephen</td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Askey, Joseph</td>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athon, James</td>
<td>Long Sutton</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atkinson, George</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aylesbury, Richard</td>
<td>Whittlesea</td>
<td>Cambs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bailey, Alfred</td>
<td>Keinton</td>
<td>Somerset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bannister, William</td>
<td>Toft Newton</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barker, John</td>
<td>North Walsham</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnes, Henry</td>
<td>Houndsley</td>
<td>Northants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barsby, Thomas</td>
<td>Owersby Moor</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartel, Thomas</td>
<td>Towlerton</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellamy, Joseph</td>
<td>Brickhill</td>
<td>Bucks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackburn, John</td>
<td>Barnoldby-le-Beck</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blake, William</td>
<td>Fossdyke Bridge</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolden, George</td>
<td>Pollington</td>
<td>Yorks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bollans, James</td>
<td>Grimsby</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booth, John</td>
<td>Croxton</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booth, Richard</td>
<td>Croxton</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broughton, Thos Ward</td>
<td>Fulstow</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, William</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cambs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown, William</td>
<td>Ludford</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckingham, John</td>
<td>Leighton</td>
<td>Beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckingham, Thomas</td>
<td>Leighton</td>
<td>Beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckingham, William</td>
<td>Leighton</td>
<td>Beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckingham, William</td>
<td>Leighton</td>
<td>Beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckingham, William</td>
<td>Wing</td>
<td>Bucks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckle, George</td>
<td>Tuxby</td>
<td>Gloucs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burrill, George</td>
<td>Kirton Lindsey</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler, Richard</td>
<td>Esher</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooks, George</td>
<td>Lynn</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chambers, Joseph</td>
<td>Bruton</td>
<td>Somerset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claybourn, Joseph</td>
<td>Goole</td>
<td>Yorks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claybourn, Benjamin</td>
<td>Knottingly</td>
<td>Yorks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clayton, James</td>
<td>Bearsby</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobb, Charles</td>
<td>Burham</td>
<td>Suffolk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Parish Of Birth</th>
<th>County or Country Of Birth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coggrave,</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Asselby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook,</td>
<td>Enoch</td>
<td>Garthorpe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook,</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Heath &amp; Reach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook,</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooper,</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrott,</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Nettleham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coulbridge,</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Luddington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coulbridge,</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Luddington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coulbridge,</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Luddington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coy,</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Keadby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customs,</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Stratham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangerfield,</td>
<td>Jerry</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean,</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Hull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deen,</td>
<td>Isaac</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dobson,</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Nth. Somercotes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dobson,</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Nth. Somercotes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durbin,</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Wear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drewry,</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Boston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmery,</td>
<td>Afraim</td>
<td>Kilsby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eves,</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>Burton Latimer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewster,</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Hemsley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findbanet,</td>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>Wexford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flinton,</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Ashby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flower,</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Bristol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreman,</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>North Cotes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortune,</td>
<td>Laurence</td>
<td>Wexford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox,</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Sutton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin,</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>N/K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frost,</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Hadleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frudling,</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Northampton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pryer,</td>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>Wallsend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambley,</td>
<td>Isaac</td>
<td>N/K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibbons,</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Killingholme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goode,</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Littleport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graham,</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Hutton Bushel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green,</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Milford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green,</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Heath &amp; Reach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greensmith,</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Burton-on-Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hargrave,</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Wetherby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris,</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>N/K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris,</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>N/K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haylett,</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Timberland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helsher,</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Thorpe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill,</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>N/K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holmes,</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>N/K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Parish Of Birth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson,</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Hatcliffe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson,</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Hatcliffe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson,</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>N/K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson,</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Eastoft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jarvis,</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Wainfleet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones,</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Stratford-on-Avon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendall,</td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td>Killingholme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King,</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>N/K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladrack,</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Goole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latimore,</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Wakefield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundin,</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Thorney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leary,</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Hawthorne Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leechman,</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>N/K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mableson,</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Old Leake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margrave,</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Airmyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsh,</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Awkley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall,</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Scotton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metcalf,</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Keelby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metcalf,</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Keelby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell,</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Slough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell,</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Swinefleet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell,</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Airmyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moody,</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Rudstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumby,</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Whyham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munton,</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Market Deeping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakes,</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>N/K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer,</td>
<td>Samuel</td>
<td>Grafton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Underwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker,</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>N/K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkinson,</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Barrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parrott,</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Winterton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsons,</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>Beccles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paxton,</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>Anslip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popple,</td>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Caistor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctor,</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Collingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rafferty,</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>N/K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reict,</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Dublin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson,</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Claythorpe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodds,</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Penzance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowney,</td>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Epworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Parish Of Birth</td>
<td>County or Country of Birth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rowson,</td>
<td>Cleethorpes</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryall,</td>
<td>Derrythorpe</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sargent,</td>
<td>Barton</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savoy,</td>
<td>Friskney</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saye,</td>
<td>Kirmingham</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarborough,</td>
<td>Billinghay</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarborough,</td>
<td>Billinghay</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott,</td>
<td>Howden</td>
<td>Yorks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharp,</td>
<td>Leverton</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvester,</td>
<td>Hawthorne Hill</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simons,</td>
<td>Brigsley</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sims,</td>
<td>Winthorpe</td>
<td>Notts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith,</td>
<td>Quadring</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith,</td>
<td>Nth. Somercotes</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephens,</td>
<td>Luton</td>
<td>Beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephenson,</td>
<td>Thedalethorpe</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stocks,</td>
<td>Grimsby</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stones,</td>
<td>Ludford</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stringer,</td>
<td>Thirsk</td>
<td>Yorks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summerfield,</td>
<td>London</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacey,</td>
<td>Marshchapel</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor,</td>
<td>N/K</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taylor,</td>
<td>N/K</td>
<td>N/K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas,</td>
<td>N/K</td>
<td>Wilts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took,</td>
<td>Winterton</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucker,</td>
<td>Dunheaton</td>
<td>Wilts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vickers,</td>
<td>Cleethorpes</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waddingham,</td>
<td>Billingborough</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waller,</td>
<td>Somercotes</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waller,</td>
<td>Rothwell</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waller,</td>
<td>Fulstow</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward,</td>
<td>Glentham</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward,</td>
<td>Roughton</td>
<td>Norfolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watson,</td>
<td>Leith</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waulmsley,</td>
<td>Cleethorpes</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waulmsley,</td>
<td>Cleethorpes</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster,</td>
<td>Marshchapel</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welsh,</td>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmoreland,</td>
<td>Fossdyke</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitcomb,</td>
<td>Gloucester</td>
<td>Gloucs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wibley,</td>
<td>Derby</td>
<td>Derbys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wibley,</td>
<td>Derby</td>
<td>Derbys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkinson,</td>
<td>Louth</td>
<td>Lincs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson,</td>
<td>Colne</td>
<td>Lancs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolf,</td>
<td>Blackwell</td>
<td>Somerset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright,</td>
<td>Kirkby</td>
<td>Yorks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Parish Of Birth</td>
<td>County or Country Of Birth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/K</td>
<td>George  N/K</td>
<td>N/K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/K</td>
<td>Edward  N/K</td>
<td>N/K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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G. Jackson, Grimsby and the Haven Company, p.46.
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