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ABSTRACT
This is the first detailed study of a prison in Heathen Street, Kingston upon Thames, once in the ancient County of Surrey. It was known as the “House of Correction” by the bench of magistrates who were responsible for it, but was called the “Bridewell” by local people. The study makes a contribution to the history of Kingston, includes an artist’s impression of the outside of the prison as it would have been in 1840, and adds to the history of local prisons in England. The prison was open by 1762 and closed in 1852. Originally intended to assist the return of apprehended vagrants to their home parishes, it was created at relatively low cost by joining-up with walls the buildings of a small estate in the town called “Wheelbarrow Court”. Later, it was extended by annexing an adjacent estate known as “The Chimney Sweeper’s House”. Although the first two governors were dismissed following misdeeds, later the prison’s management met the requirements of the Surrey justices, and generally satisfied the Prison Inspectors. In 1762, the only officer on the County’s payroll was the governor. By 1851, there were ten officers in post: a governor, a surgeon, a chaplain, a matron, a secretary and five turnkeys. Initially, the establishment held few prisoners, but between 1834 and 1851 there was roughly a four-fold increase in the numbers held annually. There were no facilities for hard labour and generally, the inmates were serving relatively short sentences for petty crimes. From about 1800, a part of the prison was used to detain felons when Quarter Sessions and Assizes were held in Kingston. The felons were held separately from the other prisoners being, until 1840, chained down to the floor at night. The Preamble of the Gaol Act, 1823, confirmed a requirement that a prison provided safe custody of prisoners, preserved their health and effected their reformation. While up to 1830 escapes from the prison occurred, nevertheless, overall it was a healthy place. But, the attempted reformation of convicts from
1837 onwards, mainly through the operation of the “silent system” that was designed to prevent “contamination” of novice criminals by habitual criminals, was by 1846 acknowledged to be a failure. This could not be attributed to bad management. Rather, at Kingston, even with good staff and sound buildings, but without a separate cell for each prisoner, it proved impossible to impose silence on the inmates. Concern about the prison’s costs and a proposal that it should be closed as a house of correction to save money were first voiced in 1825. It was impossible to dismiss the idea that local vested interests were at the root of opposition to, and delayed, its closure. The Kingston House of Correction stayed open until 1852 when the new Surrey House of Correction at Wandsworth, designed economically for operation of the “separate system” for the reformation of prisoners, was ready to receive prisoners.
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INTRODUCTION.
This is a study of a prison in Heathen Street, now called Eden Street, in Kingston upon Thames, then in the ancient county of Surrey. It opened around 1762 and closed in early 1852. While its official name was the House of Correction, Kingston people called it the Bridewell, and the choice of an appropriate name for this study, is discussed below. In her paper, Discovering the Local Prison:
Shrewsbury Gaol in the Nineteenth Century, Helen Johnston [2005] wrote that there was only a small body of published work on local prisons in different parts of the country and that further contributions to research would greatly enhance the knowledge of the diversity in these institutions during the nineteenth century.¹ She indicated that the Shrewsbury prison was local in the sense that it was supervised by local magistrates and served the County of Shropshire rather than being a government-run institution such as the national penitentiary at Millbank or Pentonville prison. It followed that the Heathen Street prison, which served the County of Surrey and which was overseen by the Surrey justices, reasonably could be classified as a local prison. Accordingly, the objective became a study of aspects of a local prison whose ninety years of existence straddled the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. As far as could be determined, no other detailed study of this prison in Kingston ever was undertaken, although a study of the Town Gaol, otherwise known as the Stockhouse, and the Debtors’ Prison was published by the author in 2004.² The sites of these prisons, of which no traces remain, are shown in Figure 1.

Sources

The main primary sources were entries in the Order Books of the Surrey Quarter Sessions between 1750-1852 with associated bills and reports, in the collections known as the Surrey Quarter Sessions Papers, which spanned the period between the Epiphany Sessions of 1750 and the Michaelmas Sessions of 1823. The Order Books provided much detailed information about the prison. In particular, they recorded officers’ salaries and bills for capital works, maintenance, repairs, cleaning materials, candles, coal, gas, stationery, insurance, food, clothing, shoes and bedding. Moreover, they contained reports from the governor, surgeon, chaplain and visiting magistrates. The Order Books also provided information on the recruitment of prison staff, and indicated what sort of people offered themselves for appointment.

Kingston prison from the perspective of independent prison reformers. The reports of Prison Inspectors, between 1837 and 1850, some very detailed, provided information required by senior civil servants and government ministers. Contemporary newspaper coverage of the Surrey Quarter Sessions and advertisements for prison staff also provided valuable evidence.


**Crimes and the criminal process**

During the period 1762-1852, when the Heathen Street prison was extant, crimes were classified as petty offences, felonies and misdemeanours. **Petty offences** could be tried by a single magistrate and convictions were known as “summary convictions”. Courts where petty offences were tried were called “Petty Sessions”. Penalties for petty offences included fines, short terms of imprisonment, whipping and confinement in the stocks. **Felonies** were more serious offences and could be tried only at Quarter Sessions, before a bench of magistrates, or at Assizes, before at least one judge. These were aided by a Grand Jury which examined indictments and decided whether there was a case to answer in court, and a Petty Jury which decided, after a trial, whether a defendant was guilty or not. Punishment for felony included longer terms of imprisonment, transportation and, at Assizes, the death penalty. Some serious crimes were classified as misdemeanors and the difference between a felony and a misdemeanor was a technical one. For example, forgery, although a
serious offence that could be tried at Quarter Sessions and Assizes, with severe penalties, was a misdemeanor. For convenience, all offenders for trial at Quarter Sessions and Assizes are hereafter referred to as felons.

After arrest, a suspect, if they were not taken immediately before a magistrate, was put into safe custody. This could be in within a nearby town prison or village lock-up. Next, the magistrate might remand the suspect to a prison for trial at the next Quarter Session or Assizes. In a village, a suspect might be detained in the lock-up while awaiting transport to the appointed prison. The evidence indicated that, at different times, a suspect was committed to the Stockhouse or Heathen Street prison to await trial. The choice of a name for the prison in Heathen Street is now considered.

A name for the prison in Heathen Street
The prison was usually called The Kingston House of Correction in the Order Books, while an associated bill, dated 1762, from a Kingston blacksmith referred to it as The Bridewell of Kingston in Surrey. A drawing of a proposed new gatehouse by a Kingston builder, dated 1769, showed the Bridewell Yard. John Howard described visits to the Bridewell at Kingston, while James Neild described visits to the Kingston House of Correction. Various records of All Saints’ Church, Kingston, between 1772 and 1830, referred to burials of people from Bridewell, while in Horner’s map of Kingston [1813], the establishment was simply labelled Prison. George Ayliffe, who lived in the Kingston area from 1830-1852 and onwards, called the same establishment the Bridewell Prison. Reports of the Prison Inspectors referred to the Kingston House of Correction and the Kingston Tithe Apportionment called the prison the County Jail. The 1841 Census enumerator’s book called it the Kingston House of Correction, and in 1851 it was called Kingston Gaol. So for the same prison in Kingston, the names, House of Correction, Bridewell and Gaol, or Jail, were used at different times in its history. Joanna Innes used the terms bridewell and house of correction synonymously, but clearly favoured the term “bridewell” to denote her “prisons for the poor”. What sort of prison was the Heathen Street establishment and what was the most appropriate name for it?
Innes stated that gaols primarily were places of detention, housing a heterogeneous collection of prisoners, some awaiting trial, some awaiting punishment, some held for non-payment of fines, while some were held in connection with civil law suits; most commonly for debt. On the other hand, she said, bridewells were quite differently conceived, being designed for people drawn from the ranks of the labouring poor, guilty of petty offences considered to be a special characteristic of this group. Their crimes included idle and disorderly behaviour, unlicensed begging and vagrancy. Bridewells, according to Innes, were intended mainly to be places of punishment and reformation.\textsuperscript{11}

There was evidence that the Heathen Street prison was a place mainly for the punishment of petty criminals, including vagrants. Occasionally felons served sentences of imprisonment there, and part of it was used as a gaol, or house of detention, for felons awaiting trial at the Assizes and Quarter Sessions.\textsuperscript{12} More will be said about this usage, below.

\textbf{Vagrants}

On 12 February 1759 the Order Book recorded that two new houses of correction were needed, one at Kingston and one at Reigate. These would be of “of great service for promoting the peace and good order of the county in saving a great expense in passing vagrants and others”\textsuperscript{13}. Probably, this was a reference to a provision of the Vagrancy Act 1740, which enabled apprehended vagrants to be returned to their parish of origin by passing them from house of correction to house of correction along the route, being therein whipped and set to a few days’ hard labour at each staging point.\textsuperscript{14} The cost of enforcement of the Act, in Surrey, between 1760 and 1770, was revealed by a record that the county’s vagrant contractor, Thomas Buskin, had processed a total of 5,243 persons at a total cost of approximately £2,943, in that period.\textsuperscript{15}

Throughout its existence, vagrants were a common feature of the Kingston prison. For example, a group of sixteen was removed in 1818. Between January 1821 and February 1822, 48 persons were committed to the prison under the vagrancy laws, and in 1845, Inspectors found that vagrants were the most numerous class of prisoner in the prison.\textsuperscript{16} Overall, the evidence indicated that
the Kingston prison functioned as a house of correction up to the time of its closure in 1852, and that, certainly during its later years, it was very much a “prison for the poor”.

**Felons**

The records showed that from about 1801, when felons were brought from the County Gaol in Southwark to Kingston for trial at the Lent Assizes and Michaelmas Quarter Sessions, part of the Kingston House of Correction was appropriated to be a temporary gaol for them [below]. The additional use probably originated from the Assize of Clarendon of 1166, which obliged county sheriffs to provide gaols for felons awaiting trial by itinerant judges. There was evidence that, up to 1800, felons had been confined in the Kingston Town Gaol, also known as the Stockhouse, a prison that was the responsibility of the Kingston Council. After the House of Correction closed in 1852, buildings on the old Heathen Street site were used to hold felons awaiting trial, and remanded prisoners, until 1855 when the council established the House of Detention to service criminal courts.

**House of Detention function**

The existence of a prison in Kingston with a continuous house of correction function, with occasional use as a house of detention, might support Johnston’s observation that in the beginning of the nineteenth century the boundaries between the gaol and bridewell were blurred and that often the different types of prisoners mingled. However, there was no evidence to support this as far as the Kingston prison was concerned. Indeed, in 1841 the justices concluded that, while within the prison, felons remained in the custody of the governor of the County Gaol in Horsemonger Lane, Southwark, who was responsible for employing night watchmen to guard them. Moreover, felons were held separately, being chained down to the floor at night until, in 1840, this practice was stopped at the instigation of the Prison Inspectors.

In summary, after about 1800, during the Assizes and Quarter Sessions, part of the prison was taken over by the Governor of the County Gaol as a house of detention for his prisoners, for which he remained responsible, and steps were
taken to ensure that they did not mix with the other prisoners. Moreover, at
certain times of the year, part of the Heathen Street prison might be seen to
function as an annex of the County Gaol. Evidence to support this was a
payment made, in 1823, to the Governor of the County Gaol for conveying to and
from the Kingston prison the bedding for prisoners at the Assizes.  

This study is not greatly concerned with the use of part of the Kingston prison
site as a house of detention, and there is still a choice to be made of an
appropriate name for the prison. In particular should it be the “Bridewell,” a
locally-used name, or the House of Correction, an officially-used name? Since
most of the primary sources used the official name, it was decided that,
hereafter, the Heathen Street prison would be called the “Kingston House of
Correction”. Some brief notes on the ancient County of Surrey and the town of
Kingston upon Thames follow.

**Surrey and its governance**

The ancient county of Surrey extended 39 miles from east to west and 25 miles
from north to south: its total area in 1841 was 485,122 acres. The River Thames
was its northern boundary, and it had borders with Buckinghamshire, Berkshire
and Hampshire in the west, with Middlesex in the north, with Kent in the east and
Sussex to the south.  

The total population of Surrey in 1841 was 581,935, while in 1851 it was
683,082. Most of the population lived in the metropolitan boroughs close to the
City of London. The population of Southwark in 1841 was 98,098; which rose to
106,930 in 1851. For comparison, in 1841, the populations of Kingston, Reigate
and Guildford were, respectively; 9,760, 4584 and 4074. By 1851, respectively,
the populations of these towns rose to 12,144, 4,927 and 4,835.  

The county was governed by its magistrates, otherwise called justices, sitting
as a bench in General Sessions of the Peace. Known as Quarter Sessions,
these were held at Epiphany in the metropolitan borough of Southwark, at Easter
in Reigate, at Midsummer in Guildford and in Kingston at Michaelmas. Much of
the administration of the county was done at the General Quarter Sessions,
which also acted as a criminal court to try non-capital offences. When the level
of business demanded it, adjourned QS were convened, usually in Southwark. The approximate distance from Southwark to Kingston was 12 miles, from Southwark to Reigate was 20 miles, and from Southwark to Guildford was 29 miles.  

Until the late eighteenth century, because of the bad state of its roads, Surrey had no reliable means always of travelling to London, or between towns within the county. This was recognized as a great obstacle to economic development which needed to be addressed. Accordingly, various turnpike trusts competed to produce, by 1820, the best trunk road system in Europe. The installation of the railway between Southampton and London in 1838 and the subsequent development of suburban rail services improved communication further.  

Clearly, beforehand justices attending Sessions and judges attending Assizes relied on horses for the long-distance travel.  

**Kingston and its governance**  
The Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames, described on signs on its approach roads as a historic market town, now is part of Greater London. But, Kingston was once within the ancient county of Surrey and was an important administrative centre since time immemorial. Its general history was written comprehensively by Shaan Butters [2013]. Until the Municipal Corporations Act, 1835, Kingston was governed by two Bailiffs and a Court of Assembly. Thereafter, it was governed by a Mayor and a Borough Council. As well as the Quarter Sessions [above], Assizes, at which capital offences were tried, were held there regularly during the Lenten period and weekly Petty Sessions also were held in in the town. The Court of Record met on Saturdays to hear pleas of debt and other civil cases.  

**Framework of the study**  
The study focuses on some basic questions about the prison. **Part 1** investigates its development. **Part 2** investigates the officers who were employed there, considering how they were recruited, what qualifications were required and the backgrounds of applicants. **Part 3** explores how many prisoners were confined at different times, their crimes and their sentences. **Part 4** addresses three
specific questions that arise from the Preamble of the Gaol Act 1823; i.e., was there safe custody of prisoners; was their health preserved; and how successful were the arrangements for their reformation? **Part 5** investigates the costs of running the prison and explores the background of its closure. An outline of the development of the prison follows.

**PART 1. DEVELOPMENT OF THE PRISON**

At the Epiphany Sessions of 1750 it was reported that the Southwark House of Correction was too small, was prejudicial to the health of prisoners and was greatly in need of repair. Furthermore, it was concluded that a new prison was needed on “some other more open and airy place”. Following a report on the Guildford prison, at the Epiphany Sessions of 1752 it was recommended that an additional house of correction should be built in Kingston, “a market town situate in a populous part of the county on the banks of the River Thames and nearest to the centre of the county.”

The justices reconsidered the recommendation later in 1752, but no firm decision was made on provision of more prison accommodation until 1758. Then, the Surrey Grand Jury decided that the Southwark House of Correction, among other deficiencies [above], was too far away from several parts of the county for transport of vagrants and other disorderly persons, and the justices decided that prisons at Kingston and Reigate were needed “for the greater ease of the county in general”. Probably, this referred to the advantage of more prisons situated in populous areas of the county because of the transport difficulties and costs of moving prisoners to the existing establishments.

At the Easter Sessions of 1760 it was reported that a prison site in Reigate could be purchased for £150; but this idea was abandoned. Later, the establishment of a prison in Croydon was mooted, but this was not pursued.

Then, on 8 November 1760, the justices agreed the purchase for £350 of a small estate in Kingston, known as “Wheelbarrow Court”, and approved its conversion, for an estimated £100, into a house of correction. The prison was functioning by 1762, as evidenced by the submission of a bill by the governor for a year’s salary, disbursements and expenses. In 1769 the payment for a new
gatehouse, or portal, to improve security, was approved [Figure 3]. It is noteworthy that in the drawing by Stephen Marks, a builder whose yard and stable were adjacent to the prison, chose to rename Heathen Street, “Christian Street”, possibly to indicate that if some of the street’s inhabitants at the time were regarded as “heathens”, he was not one of them.

At the Sessions on 11 August 1774, in the light of the requirements of the new Gaol Distemper Act [below], it was reported that the prison was “in a very ruinous condition”. At worst, this might suggest that the Wheelbarrow Court estate was in not in good condition when purchased, the work to convert it into a prison was not well done and that maintenance thereafter was skimped. The Act necessitated a new female ward, separate sick rooms for male and female prisoners, and a separate ward for idle and disorderly apprentices. Additionally, increased measures were needed to prevent escapes. At the Michaelmas Sessions of 1775, approval was given for the rebuilding of the prison, which was considered a better option than repairs and modifications to meet the requirements of the Act. Then, at the Easter Sessions of 1819, approval was given for the purchase, for £600, of an adjacent property known as the “Chimney Sweeper’s House”, and an adjoining cottage [Figure 2], with a view to enlargement of the prison. These works, including construction of a section of boundary wall, continued until March 1820, and between 1824 and 1825, a house within the prison walls was converted into a chapel and infirmary. There was no evidence of further major capital works thereafter to develop the prison.

Outlines of the interior layout of the prison were provided by John Howard [1792] and James Neild [1812]. However, the most comprehensive description of the interior was in the 1837 Report of the Prison Inspectors. This is summarised below, with all dimensions given in feet.

**The prison from 1837 onwards**

**The male side** had four sleeping wards or dormitories [17 x 14 x 9 high] and there was a landing on a staircase [8 x 6 x 9 high], that was also used as a receiving or sleeping room for male prisoners designated “unclean” by the surgeon. There was a mess room [16 x 14 x 13 high], that was also used for
picking oakum, and a store room [16 x 14 x 12 high] that was also used for beating hemp and making tent pegs, while in the airing yard [62 x 51] was a pump under which the male prisoners washed themselves.

**The female side** had four dormitories of the same dimensions as those on the male side. One of these also was used as a punishment ward, another also was used as a day room or work room. There was a landing on a staircase [9.5 x 5.25 x 9 high], that was also used as a receiving or sleeping room for female prisoners designated “unclean” by the surgeon. In the airing yard [51 x 40], was a pump, under which the female prisoners washed themselves, and a shed [26 x 16 x 13 high] that was used to store wood, coal and other items.

**Common facilities** included a bake house [15 x 8 x 10] which contained the only bath for prisoners, and an oven that was used to bake their bread and for the fumigation of their clothes. A chapel [30 x 16 x 9.5 high] was provided with a curtain to prevent female prisoners being seen by the males. An infirmary [19 x 16 x 8 high] was situated above the chapel, and there was a chapel yard [47 x 27] that was used for the exercise of occasional male or female prisoners charged with felonies and misdemeanors who had been committed for re-examination. There was also a outhouse [17 x 5 x 7 high], which the prison officers used as a kitchen, and which served for preparation of the prisoners' food and for boiling water for washing clothes. Adjoining this was a cooking house [8 x 5.5] used for boiling the prisoners' meat, and making their soup and gruel, through which female prisoners needed to pass to the chapel or on their admission or discharge. Within the prison walls were a garden yard [100 x 39], a garden [77 x 52] and a slip, or passageway, [80 x 20]. Additionally, there were separate houses for the governor and matron, and lodgings for the turnkeys.

The report of 1837 did not say whether the prison was equipped with privies, but they were mentioned in the Order Books, and probably there were separate arrangements on the male and female sides of the prison. Later reports of the Inspectors indicated that the internal layout did not change significantly after 1837. Horner’s map of Kingston, published in 1813, showed the layout of the prison’s external and internal walls and some buildings within; it also showed the
adjacent “Chimney Sweeper’s House” property [Figure 2]. The Kingston Tithe Map of 1840 showed the outline of the prison, after the enlargement in 1820, and this is how it would have been when visited by the Prison Inspectors from 1837 onwards [Figure 4]. This map shows the outline of the gatehouse that featured in the drawing of 1769, mentioned above, which also shows the outline of the Keeper’s Lodge [Figure 3]. No picture of the prison was found; but an indication of its outside appearance was given by Ayliffe who reported that it was surrounded by a high brick wall surmounted by formidable iron spikes, and had large entrance gates facing the street. Figure 5 is an artist’s impression of the Kingston House of Correction based on Ayliffe’s description, its outline on the 1840 Tithe Map and references in the Order Books. Part 2. Prison Officers.

First, there is consideration of evidence on the officers who were employed at different times, exploring how they were recruited, what qualifications were required, their backgrounds, conditions of tenure and performance in office. This was undertaken because the quality of the officers could have determined the ability of the prison to achieve the safe custody of prisoners, the preservation of their health and their reformation; requirements of the Gaol Act 1823 to be addressed in Part 4. Furthermore, the numbers of officers would have been a factor in the running costs of the prison; a topic investigated in Part 5.

The Order Books showed that in 1762 the only officer on the payroll of the prison was the governor; but various records showed that, by 1851, there were ten officers on the payroll, i.e., governor, matron, and five turnkeys, and visiting surgeon, chaplain and secretary [below]. A survey of the legislation in force from 1761 to 1852 showed that while the qualifications of prison surgeons and chaplains were prescribed [below], the only specific qualification mandated for governors was that they were males. Furthermore, no qualifications for matrons and turnkeys were in the legislation. It was therefore necessary to research the qualifications being sought by the Surrey justices when officers were being appointed. Governors are considered first.
Early governors

The Order Books were silent on the appointment, on 6 October 1761, of William Parker, the first governor, and what qualifications he had. His annual salary was fixed at £25, and it was notable that a salary was paid, because at the time governors generally obtained a living solely from fees taken from prisoners and for sale of goods and services to them. In 1773, John Howard travelled unsuccessfull “through the whole of England” in search of a precedent for the payment of a salary to the governor of Bedford Gaol. Parker was, in 1763, dismissed because he had “greatly misbehaved…by suffering his prisoners to go about at large and for permitting spirituous liquor to be sold contrary to Act of Parliament and other misdeeds”. His successor, Thomas Gough, was dismissed in 1780, following an escape bid. The Order Books said nothing about Gough’s recruitment or background; but they recorded that frequently he had been admonished for being drunk on duty and the prison was not safe in his hands. Parker and Gough clearly did not meet all of Howard’s criteria, that a governor must be honest, active, humane, sober, setting a good example, while restraining drunkenness and other vices in his prison; thus raising doubts about the judgement of those who first employed them. Accordingly, when Thomas Walter, the next governor, possibly a cordwainer, was appointed in 1781, it was upon the condition that he should “well and truly behave and demean himself” in accordance with the relevant statutes, and perhaps this was a reaction to previous failures to spell out an expectation of good behaviour.

The Order Books were silent about Walter’s recruitment, his background or work performance, suggesting that his incumbency was uneventful. He died in office in 1796. His replacement was William Matthews, about whom the Order Books said nothing of his recruitment or background. However, on 6 July 1805, they reported a vacancy “by the removal of William Matthews” and that Thomas Fricker of Kingston was appointed provisionally by magistrates at the recent Petty Sessions to succeed Matthews. Furthermore, the justices investigated the “insufficiency and want of repairs” of the prison and considered an estimate of £300 for putting it right.
suggested that Matthews was suspected of financial irregularities and it stated that he had “absconded”. The Order Books were silent on Fricker’s recruitment; he died, aged 74, in 1813, and was succeeded by Joseph Walter, a plasterer. When Walter resigned in 1823, William Cook replaced him temporarily. The permanent post was advertised, and Cook’s appointment was announced at the Epiphany Sessions of 1824. He was of good character and had given satisfactory service as the Keeper of the Kingston Town Gaol, from which appointment he had resigned. The income of this post-holder included the takings of the adjacent Hand and Mace alehouse, where he was the publican.

Being previously engaged in a trade or business was a common background of governors in the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries. Royall wrote that between 1787 and 1791, the Petworth House of Correction was run by a former wig maker, and Stockdale recorded that between 1711 and 1814, the governors of Bedford Prison were former publicans. In 1834, a hatter was appointed governor of the Guildford House of Correction.

**Newspaper advertisements for prison governors**

Unfortunately, advertisements in contemporary newspapers for governors of Surrey prisons merely stated that more information could be obtained from the County’s office in Lambeth. Elsewhere, specific requirements were stated. For example, in 1822, an advertisement for a governor at Folkingham House of Correction stated that an applicant must be a member of the Church of England, be not less than 25 years of age and a good accountant. In 1834, an advertisement for a governor at Southwell House of Correction, which also specified membership of the Established Church, sought a married man between the ages of 25 and 40. This might indicate a desire for a man who would be a good influence on the prisoners and be compatible with the chaplain, and a belief that a wife would ensure that there was no dalliance with female prisoners. Furthermore, an age range of 25 to 40 years might have tended to select men who were sufficiently mature, while still in possession of sufficient energy for the discharge of their duties. A requirement for accountancy skills surely would have echoed the need for sound financial management of a prison; something
that a man with a background of successful trade or commerce would be likely to possess.

**Later governors**

William Cook died, in office, in 1834, and his performance is assessed below. On 3 February 1834, the Order Books recorded that Joseph Walter was appointed temporarily, and on 8 April 1834 they recorded that William Ritchie, a gentleman, had been appointed to the governorship. He was selected from thirteen candidates who had responded to an advertisement for governorships of the Guildford and Kingston prisons. Seven of the candidates, including Walter, were not short-listed because they were outside the age required for the post, and about forty justices took part in the election which voted William Richie into office. Richie, who would have been about 33 years of age when appointed, gave his address as Red Lion Square in Holborn, and previously, he had been a coal merchant in Shoreditch. The decision to appoint Ritchie proved to be a sound one because, in 1837, the Prison Inspectors reported him to be an intelligent and active officer, who was qualified to manage a better prison.

On 16 October 1849, the Order Books reported that Ritchie was appointed governor at the Brixton House of Correction, and that James Bertolle had been appointed to take over Ritchie’s post at Kingston. The Brixton vacancy was advertised and both officers applied for the post, along with eleven other candidates. Bertolle, was about 50 years of age when appointed at Kingston, and had been a colour-sergeant in the Royal Marines before being the principal turnkey at Brixton, thereafter becoming its deputy governor. Royall stated that between 1824 and 1856, the governor of Petworth prison was a former police constable who beforehand had been a sergeant in the army. McConville wrote that governorship candidates often included those seeking promotion from a subordinate prison officer rank or following a military career. At Brixton, Bertolle was highly regarded by the justices who granted him temporary promotion to the governorship, because he was all respects fit to be entrusted with its charge pending a permanent appointment. Nothing was said in the Order Books, or in the Inspectors’ reports, about his performance while at
Kingston, and he appeared to have discharged his duties to the satisfaction of the justices.

Search for respectability and gentility

McConville wrote that in the early nineteenth century those charged with appointing prison governors searched for candidates manifesting “respectability and gentility”. Sometimes they faced a conflict between applicants offering this status and those with previous experience in prison management. In McConville’s view, respectability was shown by a background of hard work and self-reliance, reflecting a strong sense of duty, correct behaviour and a striving for self-improvement. The notion of gentility was more difficult to define, but included attributes like being of gentle birth, ownership of a landed estate, an income sufficient to permit the enjoyment of leisure, and certain moral qualities that were embodied in a fairly strict code of what should be done and not done. In addition, McConville quoted Thomas Le Breton’s list of desirable characteristics in a prison governor, i.e., “firmness, humility, cool deliberation, some education and a considerable knowledge of human nature”.71

Ritchie’s trade background, and the recognition that he was a gentleman, may well have given him the respectability that was being sought by the appointing justices in 1834. Moreover, the Prison Inspectors, in 1837, reported that he and the other officers all appeared to be “highly respectable according to their respective stations”.72 On the other hand, Bertolle, the last governor at Kingston, demonstrated his respectability by rising previously in the ranks of the military and then in the prison officers’ hierarchy. Bertolle, in particular, appears to have followed a path of self-improvement to enable him to obtain a permanent governor’s post, albeit for a short time, before retirement. In this respect it is perhaps significant that on the baptismal record of his daughter Ann, who was born after he had retired from the Kingston prison, Bertolle was styled “gentleman”; and possibly it was a status that he had been seeking for some time.73

Overall, reviewing the appointments of Cook, Ritchie and Bertolle, the evidence indicated that there was a selection process in place that, through
newspaper advertisements, enabled a choice to be made from a number of shortlisted candidates who met the minimum qualifications required at the time, including the ability to provide a performance bond and sureties [below].

**Surgeons**

The Order Books said nothing about the appointment of any of the surgeons; but the required qualification could be addressed. When, the first surgeon, Trentham Thomas Waterhouse [1772-1776] gained increased responsibilities under the Gaol Distemper Act, 1774, clearly he had the qualifications that made him “an experienced surgeon or apothecary” as far as the statute and the Surrey justices were concerned. Furthermore, he lived close enough to the prison. The surgeon Charles Gilchrist [1805-1810], was dismissed because, in an age without telephones and motor vehicles, having moved to Sunbury, approximately five miles from Kingston, he was considered incompetent to discharge his duties because he lived too far away. Gilchrist was replaced, in 1810, by William Roots of Kingston, who, in 1823, was styling himself “Member of the College of Surgeons”. Formerly, surgeons qualified by serving an apprenticeship, after which they took an examination. In London, after 1745, this was conducted by the Surgeon’s Company, and after 1800 by the College of Surgeons, which awarded a diploma to successful candidates. However, this did not entitle them to use the title “Doctor” because this properly was available only to physicians who had obtained a Doctor of Medicine [MD] degree by a university.

While in the Prison Inspectors’ Report of 1837, he was referred to as Dr. Roots, up to 17 October 1843, Roots appeared in the Order Books as “Mr. Roots”, but in the entry for that day, he was styled “Dr. Roots”. Moreover, on 9 April 1844 the Order Books styled him “Dr. Roots, MD”. Thus, around 1843, at the age of 67, Roots was acknowledged to have the degree of Doctor of Medicine, thus signifying his official recognition as a physician. How did this come about? McConville stated that in the eighteenth century the social standing of surgeons was distinctly low in relation to that of physicians and that, as late as 1757, judges had decided that a surgeon was an “inferior tradesman”. Perhaps the low regard for surgeons carried over into nineteenth century Kingston, and
Roots, who wished to raise his status, become a physician. Support for this might be evidenced by Table 6 which shows that the salary of the chaplain was considerably more than that of the surgeon. Biden’s history of Kingston lists “William Roots, Doctor of Physic”, among the justices of the Borough of Kingston. How, and when, did William Roots acquire his MD degree? A record of Marischal College, at Aberdeen University, showed that on 25 March 1801 he was awarded an MD degree by that institution. At the time, Marischal College awarded MD diplomas after receipt of a fee, attestations from established physicians, and perhaps a written opinion from the applicant on medical cases provided by the college. Roots’ attestations came from Dr. John Coakley, MD, and Dr. John Highton, MD, FRS, both of whom were distinguished physicians of London. This might indicate the good connections that Roots had at the time. It was unclear why Roots waited about forty years before he chose to make use of this investment.

Chaplains
The Order Books were silent about the recruitment of the chaplains John Cundall [1811-1815] and Thomas Wilson [1815-1842]. However, the Houses of Correction Act, 1782, specified the appointment of a “Minister of the Church of England”; whereas the Appointment of Clergymen Act, 1815, required that the chaplain held a licence from the Bishop of the diocese in which a prison was situated. This was also a requirement of the 1839 Prisons Act, and after his appointment was confirmed, John Fortunatus Stansbury [1842-1848] decided it was necessary to state that he was licensed to hold the office by The Bishop of Winchester. In 1811, the first chaplain, John Cundall was described as “Curate of Kingston”. Wilson, when appointed in sometime in 1815-1816, after the death of Cundall, was the Master of Kingston Grammar School. This was a post that he held from 1797-1832; during which period additionally he held the office of Bailiff of Kingston thirteen times. In 1839, Wilson, then aged 87, was considered incapable of discharging his duties properly, and an assistant for him was sought. The Order Books recorded that on 4 February 1839, Stansbury,
Wilson’s successor at the Grammar School, was appointed as Wilson’s assistant, without any increased expenditure to the County.\textsuperscript{83} Stansbury’s annual reports at the Michaelmas Sessions of 1839-1841 indicated that he was the \textit{de facto} prison chaplain during this period.\textsuperscript{84} However, Wilson continued to collect his salary, as \textit{de jure} chaplain, until he died, aged 93, in 1842.\textsuperscript{85} The Order Books showed no payments from County funds to Stansbury while he was the acting chaplain, and possibly Wilson paid him from his own pocket. They recorded that on 12 September 1842, Stansbury was appointed to the chaplaincy, and he was the only applicant who had responded to a newspaper advertisement.\textsuperscript{86}

By 1844, Stansbury, still additionally Master of the Grammar School, had acquired an Oxford Doctor in Divinity degree.\textsuperscript{87} What did this entail when simultaneously he was the Master of the Grammar School and the prison chaplain? Ward’s Oxford University Statutes, published in 1845, indicated that a DD candidate had to undertake many hours of preparatory study for the required disputation, sermons and lectures. During Stansbury’s project he would have incurred the expense of journeys between Oxford and Kingston.\textsuperscript{88} Probably, he was seeking a doctorate believing that it would further his career. That Stansbury was able to work part-time for a DD degree might indicate that his duties at the Grammar School, and at the prison, were not particularly demanding of this time and energy.\textsuperscript{89} In 1848, he resigned from both posts upon his appointment as the headmaster of Oundle School.\textsuperscript{90} The Rev. William Rigg, successor to Stansbury as Master of the Grammar School, then was appointed as the chaplain of the Kingston prison. Previously, Rigg had been second master, and acting headmaster at Oundle, before moving to Kingston. Rigg remained in post until the prison closed in 1852.\textsuperscript{91}

\textbf{Matrons}

The Gaol Act, 1823, stated that it was the duty of the matron constantly to supervise the female prisoners and to chaperone the governor when he visited them. Before a matron was employed, possibly the governor’s wife acted as an unpaid matron, and this was the practice at Bedford Prison.\textsuperscript{92} In 1823, the first matron, Mrs. Elizabeth Cook, was appointed provisionally when her husband
was appointed temporary governor.\textsuperscript{93} The permanent post was advertised and subsequently Mrs. Cook’s appointment was confirmed. After her husband died, in 1834, she continued in office. After Mrs. Cook retired, voluntarily, in 1840, Mrs. Richie briefly acted as matron until Mrs. Martha Skellom was appointed.\textsuperscript{94} In 1844, when she resigned, Elizabeth Elford took over, remaining as the caretaker for the site when the prison closed in 1852.\textsuperscript{95}

Up to 1844, a matron at Kingston was the wife of the serving governor, or a widow, and by 1846, the wife of the governor of Petworth House of Correction was matron there for 23 years.\textsuperscript{96} Martha Skellom was widowed in 1837, and at the time of her appointment, the unsuccessful applicants were Mrs. Forsbrook and Mrs. Goff, who presumably were widows.\textsuperscript{97} In 1849, an advertisement for a matron at Aylesbury Prison stated that an applicant must be a widow or a single woman. Moreover, Elizabeth Elford, unmarried matron of the Kingston prison, was aged 49 in 1851.\textsuperscript{98} It appeared that in the nineteenth century, widows and mature spinsters had the qualities perceived by some county justices necessary for appointment as a prison matron.

**Turnkeys**

The Order Books recorded that, on 13 July 1824, the justices appointed Charles Cook, the governor’s son, as the prison’s first turnkey, although perhaps he was helping his father in this capacity beforehand. At the 1841 Census, three resident male turnkeys were in post, and in 1846, a female turnkey was needed to stand-in for the matron because of an increase in female prisoners.\textsuperscript{99} At the 1851 Census, there were three male turnkeys and one female turnkey, all resident, in post. Additionally, one male turnkey was living in Heathen Street. By 1833, the justices had delegated to the governor the appointment of a turnkey, and the Order Books after 1824 said nothing about the recruitment of individual turnkeys.\textsuperscript{100} However, they did refer to a memorial submitted, in 1840, by the chief turnkey, George Chapman, stating that when he was unable to work, as a result of sickness, he was obliged to employ a substitute at his own expense. This might suggest that this situation arose because of his terms of employment.\textsuperscript{101}
What were the qualifications required of a turnkey? While the Order Books were silent in this regard, in 1822, an advertisement for a turnkey at the Folkingham House of Correction specified an unmarried member of the Church of England. Also in 1822, an advertisement for an assistant turnkey at the Reading prison specified “a steady, honest, middle-aged man, who can bear confinement”, that no married quarters were provided and that a single middle-aged man without encumbrances was preferred.102 Helen Johnson wrote that turnkeys had the most daily contact with prisoners and were in the best position to exercise a good, or bad, influence on them. Careful selection of the right people was therefore important.103 The requirement for a member of the Established Church might indicate a desire to find somebody who could create a good impression on the prisoners and be respectful to the chaplain. The preference for an unmarried man might indicate a search for somebody without the distractions that a wife and family would bring. Johnson recorded that at Shrewsbury Gaol, in 1835 the visiting magistrates were seeking an officer who should “not only be of unexceptionable character, but also possessing in no small degree, energy of both body and mind” with an apparent preference for candidates who had been in the army or had been employed in a similar institution, thus having a disciplined approach to their duties. In 1836, the head turnkey at Kingston, Samuel Elmes, was dismissed, despite an appeal to the justices, apparently for improper conduct by fathering a child of the daughter of the late governor. This might suggest a requirement for a senior turnkey to set a good example according to the moral standards of the time.104 As to the social backgrounds of turnkeys, Johnson recorded that there was little distance between the prisoners and the lower ranking officers at Shrewsbury.105

Secretaries to the visitors

In 1823, Francis Stephen Smith, of Kingston, was appointed secretary to the visiting justices when they found it necessary to employ a person “to enter their proceedings and attend to the execution of their orders”106. Upon the resignation of Smith, William Stanton of Kingston was appointed to the post.107 He was still in post when the prison closed in 1852. The Order Books were silent on the
recruitment of the secretaries, and no relevant newspaper advertisements were found. Table 1 provides information on all the recorded officers of Kingston House of Correction.

Tenure

Thomas Walter, Thomas Fricker and William Cook died in office. Walter’s age when he died, in 1796, was about 73.\textsuperscript{108} When Fricker and Cook died, their ages, respectively, were 74, and 63.\textsuperscript{109} Thomas Wilson the chaplain died, technically still in office, but incapacitated, when he was aged 93 and when Dr. William Roots was redundant upon the closure of the prison, his age was 76.\textsuperscript{110} Kingston was not distinguished by this pattern of working into old age. Bill Painter stated that the matron of the Louth House of Correction was 76 year’s old and, because of her deafness and semi-blindness, had to be assisted by a female relative.\textsuperscript{111} That all these officers was still working, suggests that their terms of employment did not specify a retirement age. Moreover, to take Wilson as an example, neither did they require a particular level of efficiency in office. However, there was no evidence in the Order Books of concerns about the competence of any of the others in this regard. On the other hand, the dismissals, earlier, of Parker and Gough indicated that, respectively, breach of a statute and drunkenness which jeopardized the safe custody of prisoners were solid grounds for removal from office. In 1820, Michael Tijou, the first governor of Brixton House of Correction was dismissed, following the escape of two prisoners, for excessive negligence in the discharge of his office.\textsuperscript{112}

The Gaol Act 1791 addressed possible misbehaviour in office by governors and other officers, requiring them to give financial security which, upon default, could be recovered upon legal action; or they could be fined for misdeeds in accordance with earlier statutes.\textsuperscript{113} McConville outlined an incident at Chelmsford Gaol which illustrated the security of tenure which governors’ enjoyed. Here, one of the visiting magistrates knew of misdeeds by the governor without being able to take action against him in the absence of specific violations of the regulations.\textsuperscript{114}
The Order Books reported that when William Cook was appointed permanently in 1824, he had to provide a performance bond of £300 supported by two sureties, and this was the first report of such a requirement for the Kingston prison. Cook’s sureties were from Kingston, one, William Pamphilion, was a cheesemonger; the other, Thomas Fricker, was an auctioneer. William Richie also was required to provide a performance bond, of £500, and he named a silk dyer, George Jacques of Spitalfields, and a navy agent, William Chard of Fleet Street, as his sureties, each for £250. The Order Books reported that James Bertolle was required to provide sureties, of the same order as those provided by Ritchie, upon his appointment at Kingston. When Smith, secretary to the visiting justices, was appointed in 1823, he was required to provide a surety of £50 for satisfactory performance. McConville stated that sureties were largely a guarantee that a prison governor would be diligent in the maintaining the safe custody of the prison, although indemnification of loss by embezzlement might also have been behind this practice. In Smith’s case, work for the visiting justices may have been perceived as an opportunity for appropriation of money. Such a perception was confirmed by an advertisement, in 1834, for a governor at Southwell House of Correction which stated that the appointee would have to provide a security of £500 in view of the monies entrusted to him when in office. The Order Books indicated that, in 1822, the question whether the chaplain and surgeon, at Kingston, should enter into bonds for the faithful execution of their offices was rejected on the ground that they could not be considered to be “officers” within the meaning of the Gaol Act, 1791. The requirement to guarantee a security of a considerable sum of money surely would have favoured candidates who could draw on reserves of accumulated cash, or could obtain credit through good connections, if called to account for default in office.

**The performance of senior officers, 1823-1852**

The evidence on William Cook [1823-1834], William Ritchie [1834-1849], James Bertolle [1849-1852], and Dr. William Roots [1810-1852], enabled an assessment of the performance of each of them. But, in view of their part in the reformation of
prisoners, the performance of chaplains is investigated in Part Three. There was nothing in the Order Books indicating that Cook had managed the prison otherwise than to the satisfaction of the justices. Additionally, he demonstrated entrepreneurial traits, including the initiation of a prisoners’ voluntary labour scheme, which paid him a percentage of the profits, and arranging for his wife to bake the prison’s bread, for which a fee was paid. Furthermore, he involved his son, a turnkey, and his daughter, in the teaching of literacy skills to the prisoners.\textsuperscript{121} Ritchie’s good performance in 1840 was recognised by the Prison Inspectors who stated that the prison was “as well conducted as the defective nature of its construction will admit”.\textsuperscript{122} In 1844 the Justices agreed that he was a highly efficient and valuable officer who, at all times, had discharged his duties with great zeal and ability despite an increasing number of prisoners.\textsuperscript{123} Furthermore, in 1849 the Inspector noted that Ritchie appeared to do everything in his power to maintain order and discipline.\textsuperscript{124}

The Order Books were silent about Bertolle’s performance at Kingston and probably he discharged his duties to the satisfaction of the justices. Moreover, as the entry in the Order Books of 16 October 1849 recorded that he was appointed governor of the Kingston Prison until the completion of the new Wandsworth prison, perhaps the Justices regarded him as a safe pair of hands to undertake the relatively short-term appointment. The Inspector who visited in 1850 said nothing about Bertolle, but noted that the interior of the prison was clean, was orderly and no complaints had been received from the prisoners.\textsuperscript{125} The Order Books said nothing about the performance of Dr. William Roots, but when the prison closed in 1852, he was awarded an annual pension of £50, in recognition of his 42 past years of service and incapacity for further service. This indicated that the justices were suitably impressed with this past performance.\textsuperscript{126} Overall, the evidence indicated that, during the governorships of Cook, Ritchie and Bertolle, i.e., between 1823 and 1852, the prison was well-managed in accordance with the requirements of the justices, and, certainly in the case of Richie, the results met with the approval of the Inspectors. The career histories of the governors Ritchie and Bertolle, indicated a design to better
themselves. Roots’ transition from surgeon to physician, by invoking an MD degree acquired earlier, and Stansbury’s progression to an Oxford DD degree provided objective evidence of this.

**Supervisory management of prison officers**

The bench of Surrey justices had overall responsibility for the Kingston House of Correction and therefore indirectly had to supervise its management by the prison officers ensuring that there was compliance with the prevailing legislation. How was this achieved? Rules for Surrey houses of correction, including duties of officers, first were mentioned in the Order Books in 1799, and thereafter in 1821, 1824, 1835 and 1840.¹²⁷ The rules of 1835 prescribed duties of officers, which could be seen as a yardstick of “good behavior” [above]. For example, the governor had to exercise his office in person and not have any interest in a contract for the supply of goods or services to the prison. The chaplain was obliged to live within two miles of the prison, to perform services there as prescribed in great detail, and to present a written report on the spiritual condition of the prisoners at the Michaelmas Sessions. The surgeon was required to visit the prison every day, to see each prisoner in the infirmary, to supervise the prison hygiene [Part Four], and to report, in person, on the health of the inmates at every Sessions. Moreover, the chaplain and surgeon were obliged to keep written records of their activities and make a signed entry of every attendance at the prison a book kept by the governor. It was mandated that all records were made available for inspection by the visiting magistrates, thereby to enable an objective assessment of “good behavior” if required.¹²⁸ The visitors, first appointed in 1823 as a consequence of the Gaol Act, 1823, reported to the Sessions on the general state of repair of the Kingston prison, its management and any notable event that had occurred since the last quarter. By 1828, the governor was required to provide the Sessions with a certificate that the rules and regulations for the government of the prison had been observed.

**PART 3. PRISONERS.**

First, there is an analysis of the numbers of prisoners confined at different times. This was undertaken because the number of prisoners, and the food allowance,
also could have been important factors in the running costs of the prison [Part 5]. Second, the nature of their crimes and the lengths of sentences are considered because, possibly, these could have been factors in the effectiveness of custodial measures and attempts to reform prisoners. Lastly, the work carried out by the prisoners is considered.

Numbers of prisoners
When Howard visited the prison in 1776, 1779, 1782 and 1783, on the day of each visit, he found the total number of prisoners there to be four, six, eighteen and twelve, respectively.\textsuperscript{129} When Neild visited in 1805, 1807 and 1810, on the day of each visit, he found the total number of prisoners to be fourteen, one and fourteen, respectively.\textsuperscript{130} Reports of Prison Inspectors of 1837, 1849 and 1850 gave the total number of prisoners confined at on the date of the inspection as 26, 47 and 57 respectively. The 1841 Census enumerator found a total of eighteen prisoners on the night of 6 June 1841 and in 1851 the enumerator found a total of 74 prisoners on the night of 30 March 1851. This increase was because the Lent Assizes were being held at the time and 32 additional prisoners were being held in the prison pending their trials.\textsuperscript{131} The Order Books recorded the numbers of male and female prisoners in confinement as reported at each of the Sessions from Easter of 1829 until the Epiphany Sessions of 1852. The total number of male prisoners during this period was 1772. During this period, the total number of females was 699; and the total of all these prisoners was 2468. During this period, the average number of males was 21 [range, 5-40]; the average number of females was eight [range of 0-24]; and the average total number of prisoners was 29 [range, 11-55]. Regression analysis of the data indicated that from 1846 there was a steady upward trend in the number of female prisoners. This was in accordance with the report of the Rev. William Rigg, which is mentioned below. The data is summarised in \textbf{Table 2}, which shows the relatively low numbers of prisoners at times. These are similar to those of the Dartford Bridewell in Kent between 1776 and 1810, as shown by Chalklin.\textsuperscript{132} \textbf{Table 3}, below, shows the total number of prisoners held at
Kingston between 1834 and 1851. Between these dates, a roughly four-fold increase is evident.

**Crimes and sentences**

Innes wrote that houses of correction served to discipline persons who had offended against their employers, effectively criminalizing a breach of a contract of employment. Moreover, she pointed out, in the eighteenth century imprisonment for trade regulation offences under the Statute of Artificers, 1563, continued. There was evidence that, in the late 1700s, the Kingston prison was part of a framework that, according to Innes, underpinned the authority of masters over their servants.\(^{133}\) For example, in 1789 two farm workers were committed for running away and deserting their master before the expiry of their contracts. In 1792, a man working as a tallow chandler was imprisoned at Kingston for not having served an apprenticeship in the trade; and there was a room for faulty apprentices who had offended against their masters.\(^{134}\) More serious offenders occasionally were confined at Kingston. For example, on 25\(^{th}\) April 1777, Mary Bates, of Egham, and Sarah Sutton, of Epsom, were sentenced to three years imprisonment there. Possibly, they would have been transported for their unspecified felonies had it not been for the war in America which prevented this; instead they were committed to relatively long prison sentences.\(^{135}\)

Military deserters were also confined in the prison. Howard noted one in 1782; in 1809 the Order Books reported that one had escaped, and various Inspectors’ Reports recorded deserters “awaiting a route” for return to their regiments. This referred to the Mutiny and Desertion Act 1833 which enabled deserters to be committed to a public prison to await orders on their disposal from the War Secretary. Moreover, there was evidence that persons apprehended just before scheduled sittings of Kingston criminal courts were remanded to the prison, to await imminent trial.\(^{136}\)

Order Book entries from 12 July 1825 to 14 October 1851 indicated that the majority of prisoners committed to the prison had been summarily committed to relatively short terms of imprisonment without hard labour. Their petty offences
included minor assault, furious driving of coaches, possession of stolen property, willful damage to property, absconding and stealing from a workhouse, infringement of watermen’s regulations, prostitution, vagrancy and unlicensed sale of beer. This tended again to reinforce Innes’ view that houses of correction generally were “prisons for the poor”. In addition, Prison Inspectors’ reports from 1840 onward indicated that some prisoners had been confined for inability to pay fines, some of which were imposed at summary conviction for smuggling.\textsuperscript{137} Table 4 summarizes data on sentences given in Prison Inspectors’ reports.

Analysis of data in Table 4 showed that in 1840, approximately 47% of the prisoners in the previous years had served a sentence of under one month, with 18% serving under fourteen days imprisonment; and one serving six months for smuggling. In 1845, 73% had served a sentence of less than one month, including 47% serving less than fourteen days. And, at the Inspectors’ visit of 1850, approximately 84% of the prisoners were serving a sentence of up to and including one month, including 31% serving up to fourteen days, with one serving six months for non-payment of a fine for smuggling. Furthermore, during the 1851 visit, 64% prisoners were serving a sentence of up to and including one month, including 49% serving up to fourteen days; while 24% were serving a sentence of six months for non-payment of fines, eleven of whom had been convicted of smuggling [below]. In summary, the analysis indicated that while the total annual numbers of prisoners in increased roughly four-fold between 1834 and 1851 [Table 3], up to 1810, the total annual numbers would have been relatively low, based on the data in Table 2. Moreover, generally the prison had been used as a place of committal for petty criminals for sentenced to short sentences of imprisonment, without hard labour, while in the later years there was evidence that it was also a place for prisoners in default of the payment of fines, for which longer sentences of imprisonment were substituted.

**Smugglers**

The presence of convicted smugglers in the Kingston prison, reported in 1840, 1850, 1851, when 11 smugglers were confined, and Biden’s statement in 1852 that the prison was “lately the abode of smugglers...” begged the question,
whether the smuggling had been committed locally?\textsuperscript{138} However, The Morning Post of 29 August 1850 reported that at Thames Magistrates’ Court, members of the crew of the steamship \textit{Caledonian}, trading between London and Hamburg, having been convicted of smuggling foreign-manufactured tobacco, were committed to Kingston House of Correction for six months, each in default of payment of a fine of £100. Thus, it appeared likely that all these offences had been committed in the Pool of London and that the smugglers were \textit{“contract prisoners”} committed to Kingston because it had spare capacity.\textsuperscript{139}

\textbf{Increase in female prisoners}

While the Order Books first mentioned an increase in female prisoners in 1846 to justify the need for a female assistant turnkey, they did not specify the reason for the increase.\textsuperscript{140} However, the Rev. William Rigg, in his annual report of 1849, said that many of the female prisoners had been servants driven to crime to support themselves between leaving one situation and going to another; and in 1850 he stated that a great proportion of the females had been Irish, with scarcely any of them being able to read.\textsuperscript{141} The latter might suggest that the increase in female prisoners had been a result of a local influx of destitute and illiterate Irish women who were escaping from the Potato Famine. This hypothesis was supported by a return from the Wandsworth and Clapham Union, which served an area close to Kingston, which stated that in the first nine months of the year up to 24 June 1848, of the 15,317 persons given relief in the workhouse, more than one-third were Irish, while in the last three months of that year more than two-thirds were Irish.\textsuperscript{142} Furthermore, the 1851 Census showed that of the 74 prisoners in the Kingston House of Correction, nine were Irish and of these five were female; while of the 148 paupers in the Kingston Workhouse, ten were Irish and of these three were female. In her book \textit{The Great Hunger}, Cecil Woodham-Smith wrote of the tens of thousands of destitute Irish people who made their way into the interior of England, Wales and Scotland and which remained a problem for the authorities for years.\textsuperscript{143}
Prisoners’ work
A requirement that prisoners worked was found in the Vagrancy Act, 1609, which mandated that “the rogues shall not be chargeable to the county”. Thus, the prisoners were forced to work to earn their keep. In 1782, the Surrey justices questioned whether “beating hemp for the saddler” was a proper task at Kingston, suggesting that picking oakum was more appropriate for those serving hard labour sentences. In 1785, because it was not always possible for governors to provide suitable materials for hard labour, the Surrey justices ordered that prisoners be obliged to move half-bushel loads of sand forwards and backwards across a prison yard for up to ten hours a day, according to the time of year. McConville wrote of the handicaps of employment in prisons, including a constantly changing labour force with low, variable skills, need for intensive supervision and the impact of any outside trade recession. McGowan stated that the treadmill was being introduced by the eighteen-twenties to address these problems. In 1819, the justices commissioned one for the new Brixton House of Correction; and in 1821 one was ordered for Guildford House of Correction. By 1824, 54 of the English prisons had adopted the device. At Brixton and Guildford, the treadmills were used to power flour mills that ground corn for paying customers.

In 1821, the justices ordered that only prisoners not committed to hard labour should be sent to the Kingston prison because it did not have the necessary facilities. Following the Gaol Act of 1823, employment not considered to be hard labour, was ordered for such prisoners. In 1825, the Order Books recorded that the prisoners worked at flax dressing machines and hand-turned corn mills. Inspectors from 1837 to 1850 reported manufacture of wooden skewers, vent plugs, door mats and knitted stockings at the Kingston prison. Picking oakum, coir and wool, repair of bedding and prison maintenance also were carried out by the inmates.
A part of the textual content is missing or not visible in the image. However, based on the visible content, the following information can be extracted:

**AN ACT FOR CONSOLIDATING AND AMENDING THE LAWS RELATING TO THE BUILDING, REPAIRING AND REGULATING OF CERTAIN GAOLS AND HOUSES OF CORRECTION IN ENGLAND AND WALES, 10TH JULY 1823.**

Whereas the laws now existing relative to the building, repairing, and regulating of gaols and houses of correction, in England and Wales, are complicated, and have been in many cases been found ineffective: And whereas it is expedient that such measures should be adopted, and such arrangements made in prisons, as shall not only provide for the safe custody, but shall also tend more effectually to preserve the health and to improve the morals of the prisoners confined therein, and shall ensure the proper measure of punishment to convicted offenders: And whereas due classification, inspection, regular labour and employment, and religious instruction, are essential to the discipline of a prison and to the reformation of offenders...

**Edited abstract from the Preamble to the Gaol Act, 1823**

Part 2 analysed evidence on the officers who were employed and evaluated how many prisoners had been confined at different times, their crimes and their sentences. This chapter investigates to what extent the prison met some important requirements confirmed by the Gaol Act, 1823; i.e., safe custody of prisoners, preservation of their health and their reformation.

**SAFE CUSTODY**

Evidence in the Order Books and Quarter Sessions Papers, from 1762 to 1840, identified three components of a system of safe custody at the Kingston prison. These were: the security of the walled enclosure, the custodial duties of the officers and the restraint of individual prisoners, e.g., by putting them in irons; a topic that will not be explored further. However, the inherent security of the walls and the custodial duties of the officers will be evaluated, and finally, because freedom from escapes provides an objective measure of safe custody, there will be an analysis of escapes.

**Security of the walled enclosure**

While the First Edition of John Howard’s *The State of the Prisons in England and Wales*, proposed security improvements, this was not published until 1777; i.e., fourteen years after the Kingston prison was established and two years after it...
was rebuilt in 1775 [below]. Therefore, the Justices initially were not able initially to benefit from Howard’s work. Chalklin noted that there had been no tradition of penal architecture until the work of William Blackburn, John Howard’s collaborator, and prisons had been built just like houses.\(^{150}\) In fact, the Wheelbarrow Court estate was converted into a prison merely by joining-up the outlying buildings with walls and by altering some of the buildings to address obvious escape opportunities, e.g., a bar fitted to the inside of a chimney to prevent it being used for escapes.\(^{151}\) The result was an enclosure, in places only the thickness of one brick, with a single gate for entering and leaving the prison legitimately.\(^{152}\) In 1769, the Justices accepted that when the gate was opened to enable the governor and his family, who lived within the prison, to come and go, it was possible for prisoners at liberty within the walls to escape simply by rushing through the opening. Accordingly, they agreed to the addition of a portal, or gatehouse, which enabled people to enter and leave via the keeper’s room at the front of the prison without need for the main gate to be opened.\(^{153}\) The plans for this are reproduced below at Figure 3.

**Custodial duties**

McConville wrote that the governor’s responsibility to prevent escapes was rooted in common law; moreover, while the preamble to the Goal Act, 1823, required the safe custody of prisoners, it did not set out the governor’s custodial duties in detail.\(^{154}\) But the Surrey prison rules of 1835, which were made in pursuance of statutes then in force, stipulated that the governor must, at least once in every 24 hours, visit every ward, see every prisoner, inspect every cell, and must “inspect minutely the state of security of the prison”. Additionally, he had to reside within the prison, never to absent himself on his own business without permission of the visiting Justices, and to ensure that his turnkeys and servants constantly lodged therein.\(^{155}\) Arguably, by 1835, the constant presence of custodial staff within the prison was seen to be an essential security measure. The Inspectors’ report of 1840, provided a detailed picture of the duties of subordinate officers which included locking-up and unlocking of prisoners, calling muster rolls, examining articles delivered to the prison, locking-
up after work of all tools, escorting prisoners to and from the magistrates’ court and ensuring that the prison gate was manned at all times.\textsuperscript{156}

\textbf{Escape attempts}

Up to 1830, the Order Books recorded escape attempts by at least sixteen prisoners and Neild recorded the escape bid by two female prisoners. The attempts are summarised in Table 5. Analysis of the escape attempts for which there was sufficient detail, showed that five involved prisoners working together to attempt escape, one involved a daring attack, by two females, on Thomas Gough who had a history of drunkenness while on duty, and five involved attempts to break through walls.\textsuperscript{157} One involved an army deserter, by definition somebody who had already escaped from military service, and one attempt involved a group of offenders, the description of which might indicate that they were career criminals. Furthermore, in three of the subsequent enquiries there was initial suspicion that the governor had been negligent, and one governor was obliged, at his own expense, to place “wanted” notices in newspapers and to offer a reward of five guineas for the capture of the escapee.\textsuperscript{158} Often the Justices’ post-escape enquiry sanctioned small improvements to prevent recurrence, and in 1825 it was agreed that a stone coping and \textit{chevaux de frize} should be fitted to the east side of the wall of the women’s’ section of the prison to improve security. Moreover, after the escape in 1830, they ordered the removal of all buildings attached to the outside of the boundary wall and the strengthening the wall of the workroom.\textsuperscript{159} This last escape occurred shortly after the death of the only turnkey, and it made the Justices accept that the prison would not be secure without a replacement officer to supervise the prisoners.\textsuperscript{160} The history of escapes at Kingston was typical. Howard’s survey showed that escapes were a feature of the insecure eighteenth century prisons, and this is supported by Stockdale’s study of Bedford Prison where there were a number of escapes.\textsuperscript{161} Moreover, Inspectors who visited Guildford House of Correction in 1837, where many escapes had taken place, were astonished that there had not been more, so great and numerous were the opportunities available to the prisoners. However, this was considered to be
more a consequence of the prisoners’ working arrangements rather than defects of construction.\textsuperscript{162}

Why were there no more escapes from the Kingston prison after 1830? Possibly, by then all the obvious routes had been identified and addressed by building works. This seems unlikely considering evidence throughout the Order Books of the Justices’ reactive approach to escape prevention and their reluctance to spend money on improvements. Until 1823, when a matron was first employed, the governor had no paid resident staff to supervise prisoners and thereafter more subordinate staff were taken-on. Arguably, after 1830, the inmates generally may not have been motivated to escape, lacked the determination and resourcefulness to escape, were more closely supervised, or were not in prison long enough to prepare for an escape. This was supported by the evidence outlined in Part Two which showed that generally the prison was used for petty criminals, serving relatively short sentences. After 1830, perhaps the security of the Kingston prison was good enough for the purpose to which it was put.

\textbf{HEALTH, 1774-1852}

This section considers whether the health of prisoners was preserved within the Kingston prison. Compliance with the Gaol Distemper Act 1774 is considered first. Then, the sanitation arrangements, provision of water and of food are examined.

\textbf{Gaol Distemper Act 1774}

In 1750, the Justices agreed that the prisons at Southwark were prejudicial to the health of prisoners and that it was necessary to build a new one in “\textit{some other open and airy place}”\textsuperscript{163}. This requirement echoed the prevailing miasmatic theory of contagious disease, contained in the preamble of the Gaol Distemper Act 1774, that the “\textit{malignant fever, that is commonly called the gaol distemper is found to be owing to a want of cleanliness and fresh air}”\textsuperscript{164}. Accordingly, it required that prison rooms constantly should be supplied with fresh air, wherever possible prisoners should not be kept underground, sick rooms should be provided and that inmates should be bathed \textit{before} being allowed to leave the
prison. When the Justices first reviewed the new Act, they concluded that bathing tubs were needed in their prisons and that a committee should be established to look at the ventilation and other requirements. Later, it was concluded that the Kingston prison was “very airy”, was commodious, contained few prisoners, none being kept underground; and therefore the ventilation requirements already were being met there. However, to comply with other parts of the Act, it was necessary for separate sick rooms for males and females to be provided and that the governor, forthwith, should purchase for the use of prisoners in need of them various items of clothing and some shoes. The requirement that prisoners should be bathed before they left the prison supported Richard Smith’s view that the 1774 Act was primarily a public health measure to prevent the spread of a transmittable disease into the community from what was seen to be a reservoir of infection. However, the 1835 prison rules required that all prisoners be bathed on admission, thereby to help to keep disease out of the prison.

**Water and hygiene**

John Howard found prisons that did not have a water supply on the site, or effective sewers. However, a bill of 1762 shows that there was a pump in the Kingston prison, which indicated access to a deep well from the earliest times, and Prison Inspectors, in 1837, reported that there was a pump in each yard with a plentiful supply of “very excellent” water all year round. Water quality at the prison could be judged against any reports of serious outbreaks of enteric infections; and none were found in the Order Books. Such would have been significant events that would have been recorded, as evidenced by the report of cholera in 1849 at Brixton House of Correction, where the water was obtained from a nearby reservoir that contained water pumped from the polluted River Thames. There were bills for emptying of privies at Kingston and in 1833 there was a bill for a …cistern with force water pump and supply of water to be fixed over the privies…with iron hoppers and stop cocks, new barrel drain and cesspool from the same…. This looked like the equivalent of modern flush
toilets were then installed, although the Order Books showed that night soil tubs were provided when the prisoners were locked up at night.

When Howard visited the Kingston prison in 1782 he found it very dirty with many prisoners lying sick on the floors. However, it was clean when Neild visited in 1810. In 1837, the Inspectors reported that all the walls and ceilings were lime-washed annually, and the floors were washed with water once a week. There was a plentiful supply of soap, towels and combs for the prisoners’ use, and they washed at the pumps in the open air: overall, the Inspectors considered the prison to be healthy. Moreover, in 1844, they reported that the prison was “in a state of cleanliness and good order highly creditable to the Governor and his subordinates.”

Food, 1767-1852

John Howard found prisons where there was no allowance of food at all and that this was due to the line taken by the justices which was “let them work or starve”; and since the wretched prisoners were not provided with the wherewithal to work to earn money for food, indeed they starved. The Order Books provided no evidence of a food allowance to prisoners before the Easter Sessions of 1767. Thereafter, they were each allowed a pennyworth of bread each day. Howard noted that each prisoner was allowed a three halfpenny loaf per day which varied in weight according to monetary inflation. In 1779, the loaf had weighed seventeen and one-quarter ounces, in 1782, it weighed twelve ounces and in 1783 it weighed fourteen ounces. In 1795, a local baker was supplying loaves weighing one and one-half pounds each. From 1829 until at least 1837, bread was baked in the prison by the matron. Flour was at times obtained from Brixton Prison and probably this had been ground there using prisoners’ treadmill labour. At other times wheat was delivered to the Kingston prison and probably this was ground into flour by prisoners using a hand-driven wheat mill.

The Gaol Act 1823 required that prisoners be allowed a sufficient quantity of plain and wholesome food apportioned to the nature of the work being done or, in the case of prisoners not in work, sufficient food to maintain health. From 1822,
the Kingston prisoners were allowed a ration of soup derived from cheap cuts of meat and vegetables.\textsuperscript{181} In 1837, men, woman and boys received one and one-half pound of bread and three-quarters of a pound of potatoes every day; with four ounces of cooked meat, one and one-half pints of soup; and one and one-half pints of gruel on specific days of the week: a fare which the surgeon considered sufficient both in quantity and quality.\textsuperscript{182}

In 1843, a committee of Justices reported on a new prison diet proposed by the government, the essence of which was that the daily amount of food should depend upon the length of the sentence. The committee argued that prisoners committed for up to fourteen days were generally destitute vagrants and it would be inhumane to reduce their daily quantity of food, because they would lose even more weight while in prison than currently they did.\textsuperscript{183} Kenneth Carpenter wrote that the official proposal was that very short-term prisoners only should be given fixed amounts of bread and gruel.\textsuperscript{184} Regular bills in the Order Books for meat, vegetables, bread and oatmeal, up to the time that the Kingston prison was closed, evidenced the rejection of the proposed dietary; thus indicating that the prisoners were being fed more than the government proposed.

**A surgeon’s duties**

The appointment, in 1772, of the first surgeon anticipated the requirement of the Gaol Distemper Act 1774 by two years. This is remarkable in the light of Howard’s report that some houses of correction did not have a surgeon in post when he visited them for the first time in 1777, four years after the Act was passed, because the responsible Justices claimed that it did not apply to such prisons.\textsuperscript{185} The 1835 Surrey Prison Rules required that all prisoners, on entering the prison, be bathed, and the hair of males be cut short, before all were examined by the surgeon who decided whether their clothes needed fumigation. Additionally, the surgeon was required regularly to visit all sick prisoners in the infirmaries, and once a week to see every prisoner in custody. As well as making a formal report to Quarter Sessions on the state of health of the prisoners, he was required to attend the visiting magistrates, when requested, and to report whatever was thought necessary to promote cleanliness and the health of the
prisoners. The Rules required the surgeon not to discharge a prisoner “labouring under any acute or dangerous distemper” until safe to do so “unless such prisoner shall require to be discharged”.

**Occurrence of infectious disease**

In 1773, the inmates of all of the County’s prisons were examined for the presence of gaol distemper and it was reported that the health of the prisoners was to be expected given the circumstances and none presented a danger to the public. In 1818, fever was reported in the Kingston prison; while it was not of “an unusually dangerous or alarming kind” it was considered to be “expedient that measures should be taken to prevent its progress by infection”. Accordingly, sixteen vagrants were moved to the Kingston Stockhouse, thus reducing the number of prisoners in the House of Correction, which enabled all of the sick prisoners to be isolated. No specific reports of gaol distemper, or outbreaks of other serious infections, such as cholera, in the Kingston prison were found in the Order Books; and, as said before, such would have been significant events that would have been recorded.

Examination of the incomplete burial records of All Saints’ Church, Kingston, for distinct clusters of deaths that might be associated with a common origin, e.g., a transmittable infection, possibly could provide objective evidence whether the House of Correction was a healthy place. Between 1772-1830, there were nineteen burials of people “from Bridewell”. There is only one cluster, indicated by the burial on the same day in 1784 of three children of “Mary Nash from Bridewell” and this might indicate a common childhood infection as the cause. A bill of 1820 recorded the death of a still-born infant in the prison and the last death in the prison, reported in the Order Books, was in 1848.

For comparison, in 1772 the parish records show there were approximately 160 burials in Kingston, of which twenty were burials of people from the workhouse and two were people from the prison. In 1784, there were 110 burials in Kingston, of which sixteen were people from the workhouse, including one child, and four were people from the prison, including the three children of Mary Nash. In 1784, there were 42 burials of children in Kingston and in 1830, there
were approximately 120 burials, of which only one, a man aged 67, was from the prison. Arguably, the annual total mortality of the prison was relatively low compared with the total mortality of Kingston and certainly was lower than that of the workhouse.\textsuperscript{193} Generally, from 1823, the Order Books recorded few prisoners on the sick list, fewer were reported to be in the infirmary, and when anything was said about the prevailing ailments, they were described as “trifling”. Inspectors, in 1837, reported that only one case of illness originating in the prison had occurred in the previous year, and that the prevailing complaints were colds, venereal disease and “\textit{indisposition arising from dissolute conduct before imprisonment}”.\textsuperscript{194} In 1844, they reported that one death from consumption had occurred in the previous year.\textsuperscript{195} At each Michaelmas Session from 1847-1851, the surgeon presented an annual report on the health of the prisoners and during this period, the few prisoners on the sick list were suffering from \textit{“itch”}, unspecified venereal diseases or diarrhoea.\textsuperscript{196} In two reports, the surgeon said that most of the prisoners on the sick list were afflicted when they entered the prison.\textsuperscript{197}

In the main, the evidence indicated that the prisoners’ infections were those arising from former lifestyle and living conditions. There was no evidence, certainly not in its later years, that the Kingston prison presented any special risk of infections, such as gaol distemper or cholera, and there was much evidence that steps were taken to keep the prison in a healthy state in accordance with the official requirements. Overall, it was concluded that the health of the prisoners, as far as acquisition of infectious disease was concerned, was preserved in the prison. Moreover, with regard to food provision, the prisoners were, from 1843, fed better than the government proposed. It is convenient to review welfare arrangements for the prisoners next.

\textbf{Welfare}

Howard [1792] noted that the county allowed no firing, bedsteads or bedding for prisoners. However, he found one woman in a bed on the men’s side of the prison and two women in the room for faulty apprentices, for which privilege they had paid. From 1812 blankets and rugs were purchased for the prison, and the
first iron bedsteads were delivered in 1824. The Inspectors, in 1837, observed that the prisoners generally slept in separate beds, but sometimes two had to sleep in a single bed because of a general shortage of bedding. Generally, this was "discoloured and not particularly clean" because it could not be washed until the occupants were discharged. From 1826 clothing and shoes were purchased for the prisoners. In 1837, clothing was issued only to those who were utterly destitute, or temporarily while a prisoner’s clothes were fumigated. In 1836 twelve shirts were purchased “for general use”.

In 1782, according to Howard, the wards were “planked around”, had chimneys and two barred and shuttered windows, which were not glazed. Whether fires were lit was in doubt because the first bills for coals did not appear until 1818. The Inspectors, in 1837, noted that the establishment appeared to be dry and well-ventilated. In 1844, apparently following concerns from the Home Department about the welfare of prisoners, the Justices were informed that none of the windows of the Kingston prison was glazed and that there was a need for fires and artificial lighting in the day rooms. However, it was recognised that this would enable the prisoners’ working day to be extended during the winter. By Midsummer of 1844 glazed lights had been fitted throughout the prison. In 1837 the Inspectors observed that at the governor’s discretion a small sum of money, according to the distance they had to travel, was paid to discharged prisoners to enable them to travel back to their homes. Attempted reformation of the prisoners is considered next.

ATTEMPTED REFORMATION, 1823-1852

First, it is necessary to explore some aspects of reformatory theory. William James Forsythe wrote that reformatory movements in the late-eighteenth and early-nineteenth centuries were almost entirely underpinned by two general systems of thought; i.e., evangelicalism and associationism, each of which offered an internally-consistent explanation of the formation of criminal attitude and conduct, such being acquired environmentally and after birth. Broadly speaking, according to Ursula Henriques, evangelical reformers hoped that, in prison, sinners could be converted to abandon a life of sin and live honestly
thereafter; and for the associationist reformer, the task was to condition prisoners to associate crime with punishment, thereby to deter further crimes.200

Another aspect of reformatory theory was the notion that, within a prison, certain intended or random juxtapositions of individual prisoners might prove to be counter-reformatory. To illustrate this point, Henriques stated that late-eighteenth century prisons were seen as schools of vice in which hardened professional criminals corrupted, or “contaminated” young and comparatively innocent first-offenders, instructed novice criminals and generally encouraged anti-social attitudes, so that some prisoners left prison more villainous than when they first entered it.201 The problem of contamination was addressed by a provision of the Gaol Act 1823 which required different specified classes of prisoners to be kept separate and not allowed to intermingle. However, as Henriques pointed out, such classification did not prevent contamination because habitual criminals would be found serving a sentence for some minor offence alongside first offenders, e.g., a career burglar might be sent to prison for begging, and a professional London thief might be jailed for fighting at a country fair.202

This reasoning led to a position that, within a prison, efforts to suppress communication, thereby to prevent contamination, could be seen as measures to prevent a significant counter-reformatory force. Furthermore, if suppression of communication became a punishment in itself, which was dreaded by convicts, it could be seen to be another deterrent in the associationist’s toolbox.203 Two basic methods of suppressing communication between prisoners were tried in the nineteenth century. One of these was the “separate system” in which a prisoner endured solitary confinement for most of the time and, when not in his own cell, efforts were made to prevent him communicating with other prisoners.

The other was the “silent system” in which prisoners were not held in solitary confinement, but were intended to be overseen by officers whose duty it was to prevent communication and to ensure the punishment of those who infringed the rules governing the imposition of silence. Another reformatory idea, a feature of the Penitentiary Act 1779, was the need, within the prison to inure convicts to
habits of hard, honest work, thereby to prepare them, upon release, for a law-abiding lifestyle, rather than to let them return to one of crime. While voluntary relatively light work was available for prisoners at Kingston, its potential reformatory effect will not be discussed in this study. However, two reformatory methodologies that were in use at the Kingston prison will be examined. The first was the ministration of the chaplain aimed at the abandonment of sin. The second was the silent system which was aimed at the prevention of contamination and which had the potential to act as a deterrent effect against re-offending.

Ministrations of the chaplain
The sections of the Surrey prison rules of 1821 and 1835, which applied to the chaplain, stated that much of the hope of the prisoners’ reformation would depend on his zealous, conscientious, and prudent discharge of his duty. Accordingly, he was required to perform prescribed morning and evening services and to deliver an affectionate exhortation to prisoners to consider their situation and to form resolutions of amendment. Additionally, to prisoners willing to receive them, he was required to provide instruction in the catechism and to administer the sacrament; and he was required frequently to visit all rooms occupied by prisoners, to distribute edifying books to them, and to afford spiritual assistance to all prisoners who were seriously-ill, or were dying.204

How effective were the Kingston chaplains? The Order Books are silent on the performance of John Cundall. However, in 1837 the Prison Inspectors generally were scathing about Thomas Wilson’s ministry, observing that no prisoner had chosen to attend his prayer and catechism sessions for the previous four months, that he kept no character book, and that the prison’s bibles, testaments and prayer books were in a torn and dilapidated condition, commenting that “if they were entire, they would be little used”. They concluded, rather pointedly by stating “The chaplain is 85 years of age”.205 The signs were that if Wilson ever had been zealous and conscientious, as required by the rules, his energy was spent when the Inspectors visited. Stansbury appeared to have created a better impression on the Inspectors. In their report of 1845 they noted
that he had a much larger portion of communicants than they had found in other prisons. The Inspector’s report of 1849 did not comment on the effectiveness of Rigg’s ministry. With the introduction of the silent system, in the absence of evidence that chaplains were being urged to try harder, it appeared that much of the hope of the prisoners’ reformation was being placed on this, rather than on the effectiveness of the chaplain.

**The silent system at Kingston**

In their First Report of 1835, a Select Committee of the House of Lords recommended that the entire separation of prisoners, except when at work or during religious worship and instruction, was absolutely necessary for preventing contamination, and that silence should be enforced in prisons, so as to prevent all communication between prisoners. This was in the light of evidence given by William Crawford, based on his observations at prisons in the United States, where achievement of silence by solitary confinement was practiced, and on visits to Wakefield and Cold Bath Fields prisons in England where silence was enforced, although without solitary confinement. Crawford thought that a silent system would be achievable in most prisons in England and Wales and would bring about an improvement in discipline; however it would be too costly to provide a separate cell for each prisoner. Furthermore, he understood that in Wakefield and Cold Bath Fields prisons, the inmates dreaded the imposition of silence very much, thus entertaining great hopes of its deterrent effect.

When William Ritchie was examined by the Select Committee, he confirmed that silence was not being enforced at Kingston and was of the opinion that under the prevailing system of discipline, many persons left the prison worse than when first committed to it. Accordingly, he felt that the silent system was very desirable, provided that it could be effectively enforced. In 1837, Inspectors visited the Kingston prison, reporting that the silent system had been introduced there in September 1836. They noted a number of deficiencies in the prison that enabled male and female prisoners to communicate with one another, and there were opportunities for “contamination” to occur. As to the enforcement of the new order, Ritchie, the governor, having only one male
turnkey available, had attempted the use of prisoners within the wards to watch and report on other male prisoners, but this had been abandoned because not the slightest reliance could be put on them; and the matron’s apartments were too far away from the female ward to enable her to detect and act upon disorderly conduct therein. Moreover, Ritchie was of the opinion that to enforce silence it would be necessary to engage four more turnkeys, so that three could be on duty in the daytime and two at night. The Report then considered the effect of imprisonment on the inmates and the criminal population of the neighbourhood. The relevant section is reproduced in full below.

“The governor states that no benefit has resulted from the discipline of the prison, as regards either the moral improvement of its inmates, nor of an deterring influence produced on the criminal population of the neighbourhood; that with respect to the former, their obscene and demoralizing conversation is such, notwithstanding the attempt to enforce silence [an attempt found to be wholly impracticable where the opportunities for association are so great] that not only has the discipline failed to produce either a dread of punishment or reformation, but in nearly all cases the prisoners have quitted the prison more depraved than when they entered it and that, in some cases, the advantages it had afforded them in point of diet, lodging, etc., have even induced a desire to return. He appeals to a large number of recommitments as one proof that no deterring influence or reformation has been produced; and he speaks with confidence that as to the fact [a fact often admitted by prisoners] that when employment cannot be procured they commit petty offences expressly for the purpose of obtaining admission to prison as a home and habitation, losing sight of it altogether as a place of punishment. This latter observation is meant to apply, not only to discharged prisoners, but also to the criminal population of the neighbourhood who have never been in custody; for he states his conviction that it is a common case. Moreover, his statement is strengthened by the respectable testimony
of Dr. Roots, the medical officer of the establishment, who entertains
the same persuasion”.213

Clearly, in 1837, the Inspectors, the governor and the surgeon were agreed that all the reformatory effort being made at the prison was in vain. But did the Inspectors’ report more success in later visits? In 1840, they reproduced a set of rules that was read to prisoners upon arrival, to the assembled classes, once every Sunday and after morning prayers. The first rule, of a total of eighteen, stated ambitiously, “you must understand that you are not allowed, under any pretence whatever, to speak to another prisoner”. The second stated, “you must not make any signs of any kind, nor laugh; neither make any unnecessary noise in any part of the prison”. The third rule stated, “you are not to look about; either to the right hand or left hand, but always look forward, particularly when you are in chapel; you must not sleep or gape aloud there”.214 The predictable ineffectiveness of these measures was demonstrated by a report that punishments inflicted for breaches of silence in the dormitories alone amounted to 35% of the total number of punishments in 1844. Then, the governor admitted that the silent system could only be effectively kept up by “incessant vigilance, harassing supervision and continual punishment”.215

The Inspector’s report of 1841 recorded that the visiting Justices had recognised that a young prisoner upon discharge was vulnerable to the influence of “evil-disposed persons” in the community outside and would benefit if relatives and friends knew of his impending release and were ready to receive them at the prison gate, thereafter to use “their utmost endeavours to prevent their returning to their former vicious pursuits”. Accordingly, there was a printed notice, for this purpose, intended to be delivered at the discretion of the governor, which stated the exact date and time of the release of the named young prisoner. The Inspectors reported that that the practice had been in operation for some time and was considered to be beneficial.216 But the situation did not improve thereafter. In 1846, a committee appointed by the Justices reported that while the Kingston House of Correction professed to operate the silent system, communication between prisoners was easy and constant. Moreover,
enforcement was very imperfectly carried out and that there was strong and explicit evidence that imprisonment there led to contamination, which was distressing considering that most of the inmates were under summary conviction from the neighbourhood.\textsuperscript{217}

**Failure of reformation**

The effectiveness of reformatory effort in a prison, whether by ministration of the chaplain, or the silent system, objectively might be judged against the number of re-committals, and the Governor's statement in 1837, above, demonstrated that the regime of the prison simply was failing to prevent re-committals. For example, the Inspectors' report of 1837 stated that of the 282 prisoners in the previous year, 75 had been in the Kingston, or other prison before. And, of these 57 had been in prison thrice before and four had been committed four or more times before.\textsuperscript{218} What exactly was going wrong? Setting aside the view that the chaplain was not effecting abandonment of sin and that the silent system was not a deterrent, this leaves the Governor's view, quoted above, that living conditions in the Kingston prison might for some prisoners actually be preferable to those outside. This is supported by the Chaplain's report of 1846, in which he mentioned the “deplorable destitution” of prisoners who had no homes to go to upon release.\textsuperscript{219} But, a destitute person could always turn to the workhouse for survival. However, as Norman Longmate stated, while some food and shelter were available there, harsh conditions might prevail and hard work was mandatory for those judged fit and able to do it. Imprisonment in a house of correction, with voluntary light work, might be preferable than being held, at forced hard labour, in a workhouse.\textsuperscript{220} Moreover, Painter wrote, of conditions in Lincolnshire, in the early nineteenth century, that for the destitute poor a house of correction was a place of last resort, preferable to sleeping rough in barns and outhouses, after being denied admission to a workhouse. Punished for being poor, for a vagrant, here at last, in a prison, was food, clothing, medical attention, shelter and somewhere to sleep.\textsuperscript{221}

In 1848, the Rev. William Rigg, was concerned that destitute ex-prisoners would take up with their old associates out of necessity, would undergo
“contamination”, and return to their sinful ways. He called for a place where they could be received immediately upon discharge, still with the good impressions imparted in prison. Thereafter their minds should be subjected “to a system of moral and religious training so that the great truths of the Gospel might be brought to bear on them and their hearts be melted by the love of God”.222 Next year, he sought the establishment of a servants’ home that could accommodate female ex-prisoners between jobs, thus, in his view, saving a great many from ruin and another spell in prison.223 In 1850, he noted that prisoners serving short terms of imprisonment derived little benefit from his ministrations because their minds were unsettled and they did not allow themselves to give way to good impressions. Furthermore, in his view, those serving terms of one month and longer were more receptive to his ministrations.224 In this regard, the analysis of data in Table 3 indicates that in 1849 and 1850, respectively, 31% and 49% of the prisoners were serving sentences of fourteen days or less duration. In summary, there was good evidence that as early as 1837 the governor and the surgeon had recognised that the disciplinary regime at Kingston, in particular the silent system, generally did not have a deterrent effect of reforming prisoners. By 1846, this was the view of the Surrey justices, and by 1850, the chaplain was of the opinion that roughly half of the prisoners derived no reformatory benefit from his own ministrations. Upon reflection, the failure to reform prisoners was not attributable to lack of effort on the part of William Ritchie, as evidenced by the accolades he received from the Prison Inspectors and the justices.225 And, neither did James Bertolle, or Stansbury or Rigg, the chaplains, appear to be at fault, as evidenced by the lack of criticism of their efforts in the Order Books and Inspectors’ Reports. In short, the evidence indicated that the regime that was a failure; not the officers required to operate it.

PART 5. COSTS & CLOSURE
Previously it was concluded that, after 1830, the Kingston House of Correction ensured the safe custody of its inmates, and there were no escapes thereafter. By 1837 arrangements were in place to preserve the health of prisoners through provision of good water, food, sanitation and medical attention. However, by
1837, the governor and surgeon considered that generally, the disciplinary regime did not bring about the reformation of prisoners, and that by 1846 the justices firmly were of this opinion. Moreover, in 1850 the chaplain noted that prisoners serving sentences less than one month in duration, the majority in 1849 and 1850, derived little benefit from his reformatory ministrations.

The Order Books provided evidence that the Justices were concerned about the expense of running the prison long before it was closed. This part will investigate the emerging concerns, as well as analyzing costs. Then, factors that might have contributed to the final decision to close the prison will be evaluated.

**Concerns about suitability and costs.**

Between 1762 and 1852, the Kingston House of Correction was part of the small stock of prisons that were the responsibility of the Surrey bench, whose obligation was to provide custodial accommodation, suitable for petty criminals and felons, in line with changes in legislation and prevailing ideas on prison reform. Additionally, the County was faced with a rising population because of the building expansion in Southwark and neighbouring parishes which brought about an increase in crime. Moreover, in the late 1840s, in the metropolitan counties, there was an influx of destitute Irish people, some of whom became petty criminals, thus increasing the demand for prison accommodation. Chalkin recorded that from the 1760s to 1800 in Surrey there was an increase in crime shown by a rise in indictments before the Grand Jury. Emsley noted an increase in the crime figures for England and Wales from the end of the Napoleonic Wars until the middle of the nineteenth century. The Surrey History Trust's database of trials at Quarter Sessions demonstrated that the number of cases increased by 160% between the five year periods 1811 to 1815 and 1816 to 1820. In 1846 The Prison Inspector, Whitworth Russell, in 1846, showed that the total number of prisoners under summary conviction in Surrey increased by 150% between 1839 and 1843. The Order Books showed that to meet the changing requirements, the Justices had to commission building projects, recruit additional staff and institute changes in prison management. Reasons for the eventual
closure, in 1852, of the Kingston prison could be identified against this background.

Events of 1817-1823

The first concern whether the Kingston prison met the current custodial requirements, or could be made so, was at the Midsummer Sessions in 1817 when the need to provide proper facilities economically for the provision of hard labour sentences was considered. The justices appointed a committee to investigate this. Its deliberations continued until the Easter Sessions of 1819 when it was agreed that the adjacent Chimney Sweeper’s House estate should be purchased, and works carried out, to provide an enlarged establishment with hard labour facilities. The Order Books in 1819 and 1820 evidenced construction of a new section of boundary wall and the installation of gates. However, by 1821, it had been agreed that Surrey magistrates should commit to the Kingston prison only people sentenced to imprisonment without hard labour. Clearly, the idea of hard labour facilities at the Kingston prison had been abandoned by this time. Early in 1823, Judges of Assizes were asked to send prisoners committed for hard labour only to Brixton or Guildford where treadmills were installed, and the sentence effectively could be provided.

Events of 1825-1835

Concerns about the Kingston prison’s expenses first emerged in 1825. A committee was charged to investigate whether potentially expensive works, necessitated mainly by depreciations, and after expenditure on extension of the prison, should be carried out. This followed a resolution that the low numbers of prisoners, and their generally short sentences, did not justify much expense on instruction in literacy as required by the Gaol Act 1823. The committee reported the annual salary costs of the Kingston prison to be about £330; and that great savings would accrue if it were closed, while retaining a gaol on the site for the prisoners brought to the Assizes and Sessions. However, the legality of a change of use was questioned, and the Justices had doubts whether the other Surrey prisons always would have capacity to take on more convicts.
An account of the debate on the committee’s report at the Midsummer Sessions appeared in the Morning Chronicle of 13 July 1825. It reported the following points made by participating justices. There was a claim that in 1769 the Kingston Corporation asked the County for a prison in the town. Now, the Kingston magistrates wished to keep it open for the convenience of dealing with prisoners committed in the neighbourhood, who otherwise would have to be moved to another prison, at the expense of the Corporation. One justice presented a petition against closure of the prison “from several inhabitants of the county”, and it was claimed that the establishment was necessary for the proper classification of prisoners. There were concerns that the money recently spent on enlargement of the Kingston prison would be wasted if it was closed, and it was claimed that its expenses were significantly less than those of the Guildford and Brixton establishments. Doubts were expressed about how the various estimates of prison expenses were derived, and while no expenses of maintaining prisoners were presented, it was claimed that they were “pretty much the same thing” in whatever prison they were lodged. It was claimed that injustice would be done to the chaplain and the other officers if they were dismissed upon closure of the Kingston prison. Indeed, it was held that some officers had been induced to apply for their posts, having quit advantageous positions that they previously held, and had been engaged on the understanding that they would remain in place during good behavior [above].

At the time of the newspaper report, Thomas Wilson, the chaplain at risk of losing his post was a Bailiff of Kingston and, ex officio, a magistrate. An employee who might have been induced to apply for his post was the governor, William Cook, who previously had been keeper of the Town Gaol. This was evidenced by a report in the Order Books that he had resigned from this office, possibly as a condition of his candidacy for the House of Correction position. As for the abovementioned petition against closure of the prison, any of the employees, and anybody who stood to lose if it was closed, might have been motivated to put their names to it. Furthermore, it was impossible to dismiss the idea that Wilson and Cook lobbied the Justices against closure of the prison.
The motion was defeated by a two-thirds majority, and the committee was asked to revisit the situation. Later in 1825 it recommended successfully that the Kingston prison should continue because the capacity of the other prisons was unknown, and its expenses were the lowest achievable.\footnote{The next question about its future was raised in 1835 when Colonel Challoner, one of the justices, in evidence to the House of Lords Select Committee, implied that the County was looking for accommodation for debtors, and the prison, upon its closure as criminal establishment, was a candidate for this. Moreover, he accepted that the deficient construction of the prison made it impossible to classify prisoners in accordance with the Gaol Act 1823, thereby denigrating it further.}{\footnote{Events of 1836 -1841}}

The prison stayed open, with no more concerns about its expenses mentioned in the Order Books, until the Midsummer Sessions of 1836 when a magistrate, Benjamin Hawes, proposed a debate on the desirability of keeping it open in view of the expenses involved.\footnote{This was postponed until the following Sessions when Hawes was permitted to withdraw the proposal.}{\footnote{Why was he so concerned about the expenses of the prison, and why did he withdraw his proposal? Hawes entered the family soap business in 1818, and thereafter, as Member of Parliament for Lambeth, he had championed the declining soap industry in the House of Commons.}{\footnote{Possibly, his manufacturing interests made him appreciate the need to minimise running costs. Why he chose to withdraw his motion was not discovered. If Challoner and Hawes reliably were echoing the views of the whole bench of justices, probably it was, by 1836, beginning to think that the Kingston prison was not fit for purpose, was costing too much to run and should be closed.}}

Hawes again was concerned about the costs of the prison at the Epiphany Sessions of 1841, when he objected to a proposal that a strong room be constructed within for the detention of felons awaiting trial.\footnote{According to Hawes, the establishment held only 23 prisoners, was an unnecessary expense to the County and should be closed, although part of it could be used as a house of detention. Accordingly, the matter was referred to a committee for}{\footnote{52}}
consideration. At the next Sessions, it was reported that the total capacity of the prison was, in fact, 52 persons and the County’s other prisons could not accommodate additional prisoners without expensive alterations. Furthermore, while the premises might raise £1500 if auctioned-off, there would be disposal costs, and the prisoners would have to be accommodated in the interim. Against this background, the committee could not recommend closure of the prison and it stayed open, without change, for the time being.241 In the light of Hawes’ concerns, it is now time to investigate more fully the prison’s costs.

Analysis of costs
How were the expenses of running the prison constituted? Two aspects will be considered. These are the capital building costs of its development, its total annual expenses, in particular the emoluments of officers, and the cost of the prisoners’ food. The expenses are given as the amount received per annum, and generally are rounded to the nearest pound.

Capital building costs
At the Midsummer Sessions of 1823, the Justices reviewed the costs of developing the Kingston prison to date. Roughly speaking, the costs were as follows. Purchase of land cost £1,000; construction of walls and other building works cost £1,149; charges for raising money were £74; and fees of the Clerk of the Peace, County Treasurer and County Surveyor, amounted to £2,223. The net expenditure, after the sale of old building materials, was £4,436. This must have included the original purchase of the Wheelbarrow Court estate, its conversion into a prison, the costs of rebuilding, the costs of remedial work after escapes, the purchase of the Chimney Sweeper’s House and the subsequent enlargement of the prison. The costs of developing the Kingston prison between 1761 and 1823 was low compared with the building costs of early-nineteenth century prisons outside London according to Chalklin. For example, he stated that the net expenditure on the Brixton and Guildford houses of correction, respectively was £54,974 and £24,770.242

Total annual expenses
Bills for goods and services were shown in the Order Books from the years 1762-1852, and it would be possible to obtain a rough estimate of the total annual expenses for most of the years of the Kingston prison’s existence, although there are gaps and inconsistencies in the records. However, some reports of the Inspectors provided exact figures for the total annual expenses of the prison and the data is included in Table 7.

**Officers’ emoluments and food costs**

The Order Books showed that salaries were the most significant recurring cost element, followed by, from 1767, the cost of food for the prisoners. The same picture emerged for the Inspectors’ Reports from 1837 onwards. Salaries and food costs were the most significant items in the Justices’ obligations to meet the custodial, health and reformation objectives imposed by the Gaol Act 1823. For example, in 1762, the governor was the only officer on the payroll and the prisoners had no food allowance. By 1851, there were at least ten officers on the payroll, i.e., governor, surgeon, chaplain, matron, secretary and five turnkeys. Moreover, in 1851, the prisoners food consisted of bread, soup, meat, potatoes and gruel.243

As to the officers’ emoluments, in 1763, the first governor received an annual salary of £25; by 1851, he was receiving £185. In 1775, the surgeon’s salary was five guineas, to include the cost of medicines that he prescribed, and by 1851 he was receiving £60. In 1812, the first chaplain was receiving £20 and by 1851 he was receiving £100. In 1825, the first matron was receiving £25, and by 1851 she was receiving £35. The wages of the male turnkey, in 1826, amounted to £20 annually; by 1851 this had risen to £47, with the principal male turnkey receiving £62 and the female turnkey receiving £34. By 1851, there were five turnkeys on the payroll.244 Additionally, the governor had free family accommodation within the prison from at least 1775; by 1824, his additional emoluments included a percentage of the profits from the prisoners labour and a daily ration of 1½ lbs of the prison bread, with coals and candles at the discretion of the visiting Justices.245 Free accommodation within the prison always had been provided for the matron and turnkeys, and by 1845, each was receiving a
free ration of bread, fuel, candles and soap.\textsuperscript{246} The costs to the County of Surrey for these non-monetary emoluments was impossible to calculate but was likely to have been appreciable. Officers’ salaries between 1763 and 1851 are summarised in Table 6. The total officers’ salaries, the total costs of prisoners’ food and the total expenditure on the prison, between 1770 and 1851, are summarised in Table 7.

Four questions now arose: why were some appointments made after 1823? Why was it necessary to appoint more turnkeys as time went on? Why did the salaries of officers increase, and why did the food costs increase? The first panel of visiting Justices was established at the Easter Sessions of 1823 and at the Midsummer Sessions a secretary was appointed to support them. At the Michaelmas Sessions of 1823, the first matron was appointed.\textsuperscript{247} All of these appointments were contingent upon the Gaol Act 1823; the appointment of a matron to supervise female prisoners being a specific requirement.\textsuperscript{248} Moreover, although not stated in the Order Books, probably the first male turnkey was appointed because of the governor’s need for assistance as a consequence of the Gaol Act 1823. The Order Books showed that by 1839 there was still only one turnkey on the payroll of the prison, however he had petitioned the Bench for an increase in salary; and the visitors were empowered to make as they saw fit.\textsuperscript{249} Later in 1839, it was agreed that the Prison Act 1839 would necessitate the employment of two additional male officers at Kingston, who were appointed shortly thereafter.\textsuperscript{250} It is possible that, in addition to the need for more effective imposition of the silent system, these men provided some of the services to the senior officers that previously had been delivered by the prisoners employed in various offices, and which the Act had made unlawful for the officers to receive.\textsuperscript{251} A resident female turnkey was appointed, to support the matron, in 1847; and it is likely that this had been necessary because of the increase in female prisoners [see Part 2].\textsuperscript{252}

**Increase in salaries and food costs**

Only the salaries of the governor, surgeon and chaplain were considered in detail and no attempt was made to evaluate the possible effects of inflation because
there was no evidence in the Order Books that a salary increase was granted in recognition of an increase in prices. However, local bread prices began significantly to increase from 1779 to 1783 with reference to Howard's [1792] observation of the diminishing weight of loaves given to prisoners. From 1794 to 1800, an escalation of bread prices was shown in Biden's history of Kingston and wheat prices peaked between 1810-1813.

In 1811, the governor's salary was increased by a fixed £15 to compensate him for the loss of variable income from taking prisoners' fees: a practice that would, in the future, be abolished. Therefore, it appeared that the Justices had anticipated the Gaol Fees Abolition Act 1815. In 1823, the Justices offered a salary of £100 to a new governor with regard to the extensive duties prescribed by the new Goal Act 1823. When the Prison Act 1839, at Section VIII, made it unlawful for a prison officer to profit from the work of a convicted prisoner, the salary of the governor was increased to £136 to compensate him for the loss of his share of the prisoners' earnings and the loss of free washing for his family that had been carried out by female prisoners. In addition, the matron's salary was increased to £35 to compensate her for loss of free washing and other services provided by female prisoners. In 1844, the salary of William Ritchie was raised to £170 on account of his good performance in office.

In 1772, when Waterhouse was appointed as the first surgeon, his salary was five guineas, from which he was expected to pay for medicines supplied to prisoners. Later, as a consequence of the Gaol Distemper Act, 1774, he received an additional five guineas for attendance at the Sessions. Hemmings, his successor, was appointed with the same salary and conditions. In 1786, because he had to attend to an increasing number of prisoners, his salary was increased to ten guineas exclusive of the payment to attend the Sessions. The same salary and conditions obtained in 1810 when William Roots was appointed. By 1835, he was receiving £35 annually exclusive of medicines and in 1845 his salary was increased to £70, including £10 for medicines, in recognition of an increase in the number of prisoners in his care and with reference to the
salaries of other prison medical officers. When Roots retired, still receiving this salary, he was granted an annual pension of £50.²⁶²

The first chaplain, John Cundall, was, in 1811, appointed while the Houses of Correction Act, 1782, was in force. This provided that a chaplain’s salary should not exceed £20 annually, which he was receiving. Although the Prison Chaplain’s Act, 1815, empowered the Justices to pay up to £50 annually, Cundall’s successor, Thomas Wilson, continued to be paid £20 until the Michaelmas Sessions of 1824 when his salary was increased to £70. This is attributable to the Prison Chaplain’s Act, 1818, which recognised that it had been found impossible in many cases to provide clergymen who were fit and willing to undertake the office of chaplain “for so small a salary”, i.e., up to £50, and it empowered Justices to pay a salary up to £150. Wilson continued to receive £70 until the Easter Sessions of 1833, when in the light of a report on the chaplains of the Surrey prisons, his salary was increased to £100.²⁶³ His successor, John Fortunatus Stansbury, was receiving £100 per annum until he resigned in 1848. At the Epiphany Sessions of 1850, it was proposed that the salary of the Rev. William Rigg, Stansbury’s successor, should be increased from £100 to £150 because the salary he received was “inadequate for the arduous duties he had to perform”. This was rejected by the justices after considerable discussion during which a number of objections were voiced. In particular, the point was made that many rural curates had to perform harder work for £70 per annum, and that the salary received by Rigg was sufficient for his congregation of only 30 persons.²⁶⁴ Some comment on payments to turnkeys now is merited. In 1824, when Charles Cook, the first, was appointed, his annual salary was £20, but by 1851 there were five turnkeys on the payroll and their combined salaries amounted to about £639 annually.

Turning now to the annual costs of the prisoners' food; clearly this would depend upon the cost of the ingredients of the diet, and the number of prisoners being fed, both of which could vary. For example, the Order Books showed that in 1770 and 1800, when prisoners received only bread, the annual costs respectively were approximately £11 and £116; while in 1825 when they received
bread and soup, the annual cost of the diet was approximately £178. Furthermore, the Reports of Prison Inspectors of 1837, 1840, 1841 and 1845 showed that the annual cost of the diet was approximately £100, £170, £188 and £176 respectively, when the numbers of prisoners was respectively 282, 503, 596 and 719. After about five years with no recorded food costs, in roughly 85 years, the annual cost of the prisoners’ food had risen to £244.

**Sources of income**

Reports of the Inspectors showed that productive labour by prisoners was a source of income for the Kingston prison. For example, in 1838 the annual profit from hand-manufactured items was £31. On the other hand, at the larger Guildford and Brixton houses of correction, where prisoners worked treadmills to grind corn, the annual profits were £111 and £273 respectively. The reports showed also that there could be payments to all of these Surrey prisons, among other things, for the subsistence of military deserters, vagrants and prisoners under contract.265

**Audit of total annual expenses at Kingston**

If, at the time of the closure of the Kingston prison, with reference to Tables 6 & 7, Benjamin Hawes would have seen significant increases, in the governor’s salary, the surgeon’s emoluments and the chaplain’s salary. Moreover, he would have seen that there had been a five-fold increase in the number of turnkeys on the payroll, with a corresponding increase in their total annual salary bill. Additionally, he would have seen that the food costs had increased significantly, with the prisoners, a fair proportion of them being vagrants, generally being fed better than the government recommended.

On the other hand, with reference to the Preamble of the Gaol Act, 1823, Hawes would have seen that there had been no escapes after 1830 and that overall the prison was considered to be a healthy place. However, the 1837 Inspectors’ Report showed that the imposition of the labour-intensive silent system, the ministrations of the chaplain, and the conditions in the prison, simply did reform the prisoners, thus failing to achieve a statutory objective. It seemed likely that Hawes, being familiar with manufacturing accounts, would have
perceived a situation where there was no positive return on the investment in reformatory activity.

**The costs of silence**

Had Hawes wished to estimate the exact costs of the attempted imposition of silence, he would have recognised that while the workforce of turnkeys was the only instrument available for this activity at the Kingston prison, they were also employed in custodial duties, such as were outlined in Part 3. Perhaps he would have had access to the various, now missing, written records, and would have been able to estimate what percentage of the turnkeys’ time was devoted to the silent system. However, it seemed reasonable to assume that an appreciable percentage of the turnkeys’ time was taken up in the supervision of prisoners to impose the silent system in the prison.

**Contribution to the local economy**

McConville observed that, in addition to confirming civic identity, importance and patronage, a prison, through associated legal business, expenditure on commodities, and spending power of officers’ salaries, was a stimulus to local trade. Ayliffe related how busy Kingston was during the Assizes, the demand for lodgings for the duration, and the accompanying pomp and ceremony that attracted county and local dignitaries, as well as the leading gentry. Because part of the House of Correction was used as a gaol for the prisoners [Chapter Three], its closure would have threatened the continuation of this important Court, thus depriving the Town of income and status. The Michaelmas Sessions, where large numbers of Justices gathered for about six days, would also have produced income for Kingston. Possibly, these factors would have generated local resistance to attempts at closure of the prison.

The 1851 Census showed that, with ten officers on its payroll, the Kingston House of Correction was ranked equal second employer in the town, together with a tannery and malting business. The spending power of the prison employees would have been a potential benefit to the local economy. Moreover, throughout its existence, bills in the Order Books evidenced that some leading Kingston citizens benefited financially from the prison. For example, in 1760
Charles Jemmett, Town Clerk of Kingston [1747-1789], sold the Wheelbarrow Court estate to the County of Surrey. In 1761 Stephen Marks, a Bailiff of Kingston five times between 1760 and 1772, converted it into a prison, later obtaining other contracts for building works. The prison’s first supplier of bread, Edward Nettlefold, was a Bailiff in 1761, 1764 and 1766. John Clark, a Bailiff in 1780, carried out bricklayer’s work and Christopher Blythewood, a Bailiff in 1798, carried out glazier’s work on the prison. In 1848, the drapery business of William Shrubsole, the Mayor of Kingston, supplied bedding to the prison. Furthermore, the chaplain Wilson was Bailiff thirteen times; the surgeon, Waterhouse was Bailiff twice, while the surgeons Hemmings and Roots were each once a Bailiff. The Census of 1841 and Order Books confirmed that many of the suppliers to the prison lived in Kingston; for example, John Slawson who provided bread, and Benton Seeley, who supplied stationery. It was impossible to dismiss the idea that local suppliers to, and employees of, the prison would have been motivated to oppose any attempt to close it. And, it was possible that those who were magistrates, such as Thomas Wilson, would seek favourably to influence the decision-making process at Quarter Sessions and elsewhere. An analysis of the factors involved in the eventual closure of the prison follows.

**Final stages in the closure of the Kingston prison, 1841-1852**

When Inspectors visited the Kingston prison in 1844, they concluded that: “the circumstances of the prison are such, whether as regards its defective construction, the demoralizing association that prevails within its walls, or the importance of the number of prisoners yearly committed to it, that we remain unchanged in the opinion we have formerly expressed, that it requires nothing less than to be entirely rebuilt, if indeed it be necessary to retain a prison at all in this part of the County.” It was becoming clear that an unequivocal decision about the future of the prison soon was needed. At the Epiphany Sessions of 1844-1845, a committee was appointed to enquire into prison accommodation in the County, especially with regard to the separate system of confinement. At the following Easter Sessions, in an interim report, it concluded that the Kingston House of Correction was totally unfit for the separate system of confinement.
Finally, at the Easter Sessions of 1846, the committee concluded that the system of discipline in Surrey prisons neither operated as a punishment nor as a means of reformation, and that while the separate system addressed both these points, it could not be introduced into any of the County’s prisons without their entire reconstruction. Some prisons were in an unsatisfactory condition, being neither in accordance with the recommendations of the Prison Inspectors, nor, in some instances with the strict letter of the law. Thus, soon extensive building works would be needed for compliance with the official requirements, or an entirely new prison for the introduction of the separate system would have to be built. The Kingston prison, the committee observed, was the oldest and smallest of the county’s prisons. It was badly contrived, was inconveniently arranged, and was the one that the county could most easily dispense with. At the Epiphany Sessions of 1847, it was noted that the ground on which the Kingston House of Correction stood was too small to allow the construction of a prison with adequate accommodation of prisoners in separate cells. Therefore, a recommendation was made that it should no longer be used as a prison. The writing finally was on the wall for the Kingston House of Correction.  

275 An outline of the terminal decision-making process was found in the final report of the committee of Surrey justices appointed to superintend the building of the new Wandsworth Prison. It stated that in the light of concerns from the surgeon of the Brixton House of Correction that the spread of a contagious fever that occurred there was exacerbated by the overcrowded state of the prison, at the Michaelmas Sessions of 1846, a committee was appointed to determine the best means of accommodating the County’s prisoners. The committee reported to the Epiphany Sessions of 1847 that, taking into consideration that a decision already had been made in principle to close the Kingston House of Correction, the existing prisons of the County would not be capable of expansion to meet the projected demand for prison cells and consequently a new prison must be erected on an entirely new site. It was necessary that the new prison should be capable of containing 750 prisoners with capacity for expansion to take more if required; furthermore, the houses of correction at Kingston, Brixton and Guildford
should be closed. The committee acknowledged that while the original cost of building the new prison would exceed that of keeping open the existing establishments, “the permanent annual expenditure for the staff and repairs in one large prison would be much less than in three or four smaller ones, as not only to justify the increased outlay, but to render it desirable as a measure of economy”. It was concluded that the additional accommodation should be arranged to be suitable for any system of prison discipline that might otherwise be adopted at a later date.\textsuperscript{276}

The final report indicated that the stimulus actually to implement this grand plan came at the Adjourned Sessions held in March 1847. The Justices heard that the number of prisoners at Brixton prison had increased to such an extent that sometimes it was necessary for up to four prisoners to sleep in one cell, eight feet by six feet by eight feet high, and it had been found necessary for up to 40 to sleep together, on straw with blankets, on the floor of the school room. Additionally, to reduce the gross overcrowding, pardons for 35 of prisoners already had been obtained to enable their release before the expiry of their sentences. Furthermore, the justices heard that at an inquest following the death of a prisoner at Brixton, the jury had requested the Coroner to bring the overcrowding to the attention of the visiting justices “lest a contagious fever should break out, to the great alarm and danger of the inhabitants of the locality”. The feared disease was undoubtedly cholera, which raged in the Metropolis at the time. The Report concluded that this was “a state of things so extensively interfering with the administration of justice, so completely at variance with the enactment, requiring as a general rule, that every prisoner should have a separate sleeping cell, and that every male prisoner, without exception, should have a separate bed – so dangerous to health – so subversive of morality and discipline, and so repugnant to every feeling of delicacy, could not be continued”. The justices resolved that a new house of correction should be erected, arranged as previously recommended, and the committee was re-appointed to carry this into effect. It agreed that the site of the new prison should be within a mile of a railway station, and not further from London than six or eight miles.\textsuperscript{277} Thus, by
economic necessity, fear of cholera and concerns about moral turpitude was Wandsworth Prison conceived and the death knell sounded for the Kingston, Guildford and Brixton Houses of Correction.278

The last visit of the Inspectors to the Kingston prison on the 22nd of October 1850 concluded, “The approaching discontinuance of this prison for the county, consequent upon completion of the new House of Correction at Wandsworth, renders it useless to make any observations or suggestions”.279 Biden reported that the Kingston House of Correction, “lately the abode of smugglers and other delinquents” closed on 17 January 1852.280 Part of the site was designated a house of detention and was used to confine remanded prisoners and felons awaiting trial at Assizes and Quarter Sessions until a new house of detention was built by Kingston Corporation. In 1853 part of the old prison site was taken over by the Third Royal Regiment of Militia as its barracks. There was evidence that the new house of detention, close to the Assize Court, was in use by the end of 1855.281
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Figure 1. Plan of modern-day Kingston upon Thames, not to scale. No. 2 indicates the site of the Town Gaol, that closed in 1829. No. 9 indicates the site of the House of Correction, 1762-1852. No. 10 indicates the site of the Debtors’ Prison or Debtors’ Jail, 1829-1852. The Assize Court was on the Guildhall site [Source: Kennedy, 2004].
Figure 2. Kingston House of Correction shown as “Prison” in a section of Fred Bunce’s [1963] redrawing of Horner’s Map [1813], not to scale. Amended and annotated by David A Kennedy.

The enclosure immediately above was the Chimney Sweeper’s House estate purchased around 1820 to enable enlargement of the prison.
Figure 3. Redrawn plan of a new portal to prevent escapes from the Kingston House of Correction, 1769, QS Papers, February 1769, scale not given [Source: Surrey History Centre, QS2/6/1769/Eph/23].
Figure 4. Section of Kingston Tithe Map, 1840, showing the enlarged prison [hatched area], not to scale. Source National Archives, IR 30/34/75. Amended and annotated by David A Kennedy.
Figure 5. Artist’s impression of the Kingston House of Correction, based on Tithe Map, 1840, entries in QSOBs and Ayliffe, 1914.
## Table 1: Officers of the Kingston House of Correction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Background or reason for leaving office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1761-1763</td>
<td>William Parker</td>
<td>Dismissed for misbehaviour in office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1763-1770</td>
<td>Thomas Gough</td>
<td>Dismissed for misbehaviour in office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1780-1796</td>
<td>Thomas Walter</td>
<td>Possibly, a cordwainer. Died in office, aged about 73.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1796-1805</td>
<td>William Matthews</td>
<td>“Absconded”. Possible financial irregularities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1805-1813</td>
<td>Thomas Fricker</td>
<td>Died in office, aged 74.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1813-1823</td>
<td>Joseph Walter</td>
<td>Previously, a plasterer. Resigned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823-1834</td>
<td>William Cook</td>
<td>Keeper of the Town Gaol &amp; landlord of the adjacent alehouse. Died in office, aged 63.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834</td>
<td>Joseph Walter</td>
<td>Short-term temporary post.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1834-1849</td>
<td>William Ritchie</td>
<td>Gentleman, previously a coal merchant, aged about 33. Resigned to become Governor of Brixton House of Correction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgeons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1772-1776</td>
<td>Trentham Thomas Waterhouse</td>
<td>Resigned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1776-1805</td>
<td>Thomas Hemmings</td>
<td>Resigned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1805-1810</td>
<td>Charles Gilchrist</td>
<td>Dismissed after move to Sunbury on Thames.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1810-1852</td>
<td>William Roots, MD</td>
<td>Also in private practice. Superannuated, aged 76.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaplains</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1811-1815</td>
<td>John Cundall</td>
<td>Curate of Kingston. Died in office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1839-1842</td>
<td>John Fortunatus Stansbury, DD</td>
<td>Master of the Grammar School, 1832 to 1848. De facto prison chaplain from 1839-1842.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1842-1848</td>
<td>As above</td>
<td>Resigned. Became Master of Oundle School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matrons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1823-1840</td>
<td>Elizabeth Cook</td>
<td>Governor’s wife, then widowed. Resigned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>Ann Ritchie</td>
<td>Governor’s wife. Short-term temporary post.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840-1844</td>
<td>Martha Skelom</td>
<td>Widow. Resigned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844-1852</td>
<td>Elizabeth Elford</td>
<td>Unmarried. Redundant, aged 50, upon closure of the prison.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Secretaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1824-1828</td>
<td>Francis Stephen Smith</td>
<td>Resigned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1828-1852</td>
<td>William Stanton</td>
<td>Redundant, upon closure of the prison.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Turnkeys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1824-1828</td>
<td>Charles Cook</td>
<td>Son of the Governor, William Cook, resident in the prison, died in office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>Samuel Elmes</td>
<td>Resident chief turnkey, dismissed for misconduct in office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>Charles Fryer</td>
<td>Resident chief turnkey, appointed in place of Samuel Elmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841 Census</td>
<td>Thomas Chapman</td>
<td>Resident chief turnkey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George Chapman</td>
<td>Resident turnkey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Leney,</td>
<td>Resident turnkey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Cornell,</td>
<td>Resident turnkey and cook.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847</td>
<td>Mary Johnson</td>
<td>Resident turnkey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851 Census</td>
<td>William Marson</td>
<td>Resident chief turnkey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Pond</td>
<td>Resident turnkey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Jessop</td>
<td>Resident turnkey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sarah Nichols</td>
<td>Resident turnkey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frederick Hatley</td>
<td>Turnkey, living at number 127 Heathen Street.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: QSOBs, Ward & Evans, 2000, Census, 1841 & 1851, Morning Chronicle.

Table 2. Numbers of prisoners [males and females] in Kingston House of Correction at different times.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1776</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1779</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1782</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1783</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1805</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1807</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1810</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>74 [Lent Assizes]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quarter Sessions’ reports from 28 April 1824 to 6 January 1852

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average number of males &amp; females</td>
<td>29 [range, 11-55]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of males</td>
<td>21 [range 5-40]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of females</td>
<td>8 [range 0-24]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Howard, 1792, Neild, 1812, RPI 1837, 1849 & 1850, Census, 1841 & 1851, QSOBs.
Table 3. Total annual numbers of prisoners in Kingston House of Correction, 1834-1851.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1834</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1836</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1838</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1839</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1840</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1842</td>
<td>564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1843</td>
<td>641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1844</td>
<td>683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1846</td>
<td>843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1847</td>
<td>1017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1848</td>
<td>1049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>1244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>1135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>1156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: RPI, 1850, QSOB, 1849-1850.
Table 4. Kingston House of Correction, terms of imprisonment reported by Prison Inspectors, 1840, 1845, 1849 and 1850.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term of imprisonment</th>
<th>Number of prisoners, with approximate percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RPI, 1840</strong>, total in previous year = 280</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 14 days</td>
<td>50 = 18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 days and under 1 month</td>
<td>81 = 29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 month and under 2 months</td>
<td>69 = 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 months and under 3 months</td>
<td>68 = 24 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 months and under 6 months</td>
<td>12 = 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RPI, 1845</strong>, total in previous year = 627</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 14 days</td>
<td>296 = 47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 days and under 1 month</td>
<td>165 = 26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 month and under 2 months</td>
<td>129 = 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 months and under 3 months</td>
<td>29 = 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 months and under 6 months</td>
<td>6 = 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 months and under 12 months</td>
<td>2 = &lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RPI, 1850</strong>, total on day of inspection = 46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>3 = 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 days</td>
<td>4 = 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>3 = 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 days</td>
<td>10 = 22% [31%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 days</td>
<td>1 = 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 days</td>
<td>6 = 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 month</td>
<td>12 = 26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>3 = 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>2 = 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>1 = 2% [non-payment of fine]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 days [6 weeks]</td>
<td>1 = 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RPI, 1851</strong>, total on day of inspection = 45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 days</td>
<td>1 = 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 days</td>
<td>5 = 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 days</td>
<td>4 = 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 days</td>
<td>12 = 27% [49%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 days</td>
<td>1 = 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 days</td>
<td>2 = 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 month</td>
<td>5 = 11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>4 = 9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>11 = 24% [non-payment of fines]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Escape attempts at Kingston House of Correction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1778</td>
<td>Thomas Hardiman, committed for trial at the Sessions, escaped and got clean away. No other details were given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1780</td>
<td>Sarah Taylor and Sarah Sunderland, aided by other prisoners, set upon the drunken governor, took his keys and escaped. They were recaptured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1782</td>
<td>A male broke through an old wall, <em>not rebuilt when the last repairs were done</em>. No other details were given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1799</td>
<td>Thomas Stone attempted to escape. No other details were given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1806</td>
<td>Samuel Smith escaped and was recaptured. No other details were given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1807</td>
<td>Daniel Guilley and Alexander Colley broke through a floor into a cellar below; thereafter they broke through the cellar wall and escaped into the street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1809</td>
<td>James Thompson, a deserter from the 3rd Regiment of Dragoon Guards, and three other prisoners attempted to escape by breaking through the south wall of the prison.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1812</td>
<td>Elizabeth Smith and Catherine Burke attempted to escape using a knife and fork to make a hole in a wall, but were betrayed by a fellow prisoner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1830</td>
<td>Charles Brown, Charles Clark and William Smith, 'expert and notorious offenders' escaped though a hole in a workroom wall made, <em>with great dexterity and skill</em> between the visits of the governor, using tools supplied for work and a piece of old iron.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: QSOBs, 1777-1830, Neild, 1812

Table 6. Kingston House of Correction, Officers' annual salaries, 1763-1851.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Governor</th>
<th>Surgeon</th>
<th>Chaplain</th>
<th>Matron</th>
<th>Secretary</th>
<th>Turnkey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1763</td>
<td>£25</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1775</td>
<td>£25</td>
<td>£5-5-0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1812</td>
<td>£45</td>
<td>£10-10-0</td>
<td>£20</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1824</td>
<td>£100</td>
<td>£45</td>
<td>£70</td>
<td>£25</td>
<td>£10</td>
<td>£20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>£115</td>
<td>£45</td>
<td>£100</td>
<td>£25</td>
<td>£10</td>
<td>£42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1845 | £151     | £45     | £100     | £35    | £10       | 1. £62£
|      |          |         |          |        |           | 2. £47
|      |          |         |          |        |           | 3. £47
|      |          |         |          |        |           | [Total = £156] |
| 1851 | £185     | £60     | £100     | £35    | £10       | 1. £62£
|      |          |         |          |        |           | 2. £47
|      |          |         |          |        |           | 3. £47
|      |          |         |          |        |           | 4. £47
|      |          |         |          |        |           | 5. £34£
|      |          |         |          |        |           | [Total = £237] |

Notes: N/A = Not appointed, 1 = principal turnkey, 2 = female turnkey.
Sources: QSOBs, 1763-1851, RPI, 1837 & 1845, Census, 1851.
Table 7. Kingston House of Correction, estimated annual expenditure between 1763 and 1851

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total for salaries [no. of officers on payroll]</th>
<th>Total for prisoners’ food, including officers’ bread</th>
<th>Total for all other items</th>
<th>Grand total of costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1763</td>
<td>£25 [1]</td>
<td>None provided</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>£25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1775</td>
<td>£30 [2]</td>
<td>£11 [bread only]</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>£41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1812</td>
<td>£76 [3]</td>
<td>£142 [bread only]</td>
<td>£16</td>
<td>£234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1837</td>
<td>£337 [6]</td>
<td>£100 [bread, soup, meat, potatoes &amp; gruel]</td>
<td>£179</td>
<td>£616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1845</td>
<td>£472 [8]</td>
<td>£176 [see above]</td>
<td>£237</td>
<td>£885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>£627 [10]</td>
<td>£154 [see above]</td>
<td>£81</td>
<td>£862</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: QSOBs, 1763-1851, RPI, 1837 & 1845, Census, 1851.
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