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Summary

This study attempts to show how education, in its widest sense, developed in nineteenth century prisons. Prison education had its roots in the work of eighteenth century reformers; they provide the background against which later legal developments can be traced.

Factors contributing to the growth of education in prisons are closely interrelated. The roles of those groups of people directly concerned are first examined. In the beginning, there were the voluntary lay preachers; by the end of the century all local prisons had some kind of permanent internal staff to provide education.

Although few in number, the position of the dissenter merits some discussion. Over a period of time limited provision was made available to him.

Next, internal physical facilities, and structural conditions are considered. This includes, for example, the availability and use of teaching space. Education had to adapt to the physical constraints arising from a system based, by its very nature, on control and coercion.

This control is also reflected in the provision of literature and other material. Initially only religious reading matter was allowed, but gradually other categories of books were introduced, and libraries installed. The use of books can be seen both as an aid to education, and as a means of occupying prisoners.

Education was closely linked to the particular system of prison discipline operating at any one time. Separate instruction under the separate system was the predominant pattern.

Not until the end of the nineteenth century, some time after the State took over control of the local prisons, was there a move to link prison education more closely with the national introduction of elementary education in England.

The study moves, therefore, from the work of individual reformers outwards towards the wider social context within which nineteenth century prison education developed.
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Introduction

Essentially this study is concerned with selected aspects of the growth of educational provision for adult male prisoners in English local prisons, during the nineteenth century. Adult males are assumed to be those aged seventeen years and over. Female prisoners were insignificant, both numerically, and in terms of separate provision, and were therefore excluded. I have also omitted, reluctantly, any discussion about convict prisons, because the mass of material involved would have made the study too wide.

The introduction of education into prisons came about through the efforts of various individuals within a climate of intense religious interest and activity. The study starts, in fact, by discussing the changing roles of those involved in prison education in its widest sense, moving on to an examination of the physical environment within which teaching took place. Different forms of prison discipline are then discussed and how education adapted to them.

A short comparative description of the various systems of control may help to provide a useful background against which educational development can be seen to have taken place.

The separate system was predominant in nineteenth century prisons. By the separate system, I mean, a consistent attempt to prevent prisoners from communicating with each other. They were allowed to be in association during labour and instruction, and at exercise and meal times, but every effort was made to minimise personal contact. Partitioning, that is, wooden divisions separating one prisoner from another, was a common feature of instruction in the chapel, and was also used in some of the schools. Towards the end of the century instruction was basically cellular.

For a short period, instruction, in approximately half the prisons, took place under the Classification or Associated system. This meant that teaching took place in groups, and inter-prisoner contact was permitted.
In a few prisons, where the Silent System was introduced, teaching was in groups, but no communication was allowed between prisoners. They could only converse with the teacher. This was a very difficult system to manage as many staff were needed to ensure silence and it rapidly fell from favour. The separate system was the usual pattern of prison discipline and control and was still in existence at the end of the century.

The study concludes by placing education in a wider context, linking it with the general movement for universal elementary education.
Introduction

This chapter explains the various roles of people directly involved with instruction. All contributed in various ways to the development of prison education.

The voluntary lay preachers were the first to enter the prisons to impart religious knowledge. They were gradually superseded by the Scripture Readers, and the Chaplains, both of whom were mainly responsible for religious instruction.

Scripture Readers had additional religious duties. Towards the end of the century it was recommended that an increase in their numbers was desirable.

Because of the importance of the Chaplain's role in education, it has been felt necessary to discuss at some length his early and subsequent influence and contribution to education and prison discipline. As local gaols were composed of two types, that is the County Gaol and Houses of Correction, the Chaplain's role in the two institutions has been compared.

The teacher-prisoner emerged towards the end of the 18th century as an aid to the Chaplain in the provision of secular education. Many were appointed because they had the rudiments of reading and writing skills at least. Their services were eventually terminated in 1859.

Schoolmasters were officially appointed in 1823, and were mainly responsible for secular education. Some were to assume other responsibilities. With the limitations placed on education, the majority of Schoolmasters had a dual role of Schoolmaster Warder. By the end of the century as many of the prisons held fewer prisoners it was found economically desirable to introduce a new grade, that of Clerk and Schoolmaster Warder.
CHAPTER I

1. **The Lay Preacher**

Lay preachers have been associated with the gaols for at least the last two centuries.

Prior to the appointment of clergymen into the gaols, lay preachers were probably the first and only contact prisoners had with those directly associated with religion. It is conceivable that they were the first to introduce the gospel into the gaols. J. Arthur Hoyles suggested that these lay preachers "..... proved that prison was a place where the gospel could be preached with profit to both the prisoners and the community". Furthermore, he was of the opinion that lay preachers ".... prepared the way for the prison chaplain". It is likely that lay preachers were the forerunners to the eventual appointment of full-time scripture readers.

Although clergymen were officially appointed to the gaols in 1773, the role of the lay preacher did not diminish. Indeed they were to continue to make a significant and valuable contribution particularly during the early part of the century when many of the clergymen were only engaged on a part-time basis. Essentially, the lay preachers were concerned with reading the scriptures, taking prayer sessions, visiting prisoners in the wards and cells, and in some cases spending the night with the prisoner(s) in his cell prior to the latter's execution on the following day. A number of lay preachers actually accompanied the prisoners to the public place of execution. This last duty was rarely, if ever, undertaken by the chaplains. Eventually when chaplains were appointed to the gaols on a full-time basis, the lay preachers' contribution and commitment decreased accordingly.

There were many lay preachers that offered their services in the gaols. Some were to become better known than others.

2. Ibid.
3. 13 Geo. III c.58.
Those that achieved some degree of fame included, for instance, the Wesley brothers and Silas Told. Essentially they are to be remembered for the many hours of personal devotion they gave to attending to the religious needs of prisoners, and were to have a great deal of influence in turning the thoughts of many of the prisoners to God through the medium of the gospel. Their success was undoubtedly achieved by their expressed and total belief in God and the gospel, as well as their display of unending enthusiasm which they demonstrated in the course of their contact with the prisoners. Furthermore, they were instrumental in cooperating with many of the gaol authorities in the improvement of physical conditions and therefore relieving the distress of many of those in confinement. Finally, their acceptance by the gaol authorities varied from gaol to gaol. In some they were welcomed and encouraged to continue with their valuable work, whilst in other gaols they met hostility, and were often discouraged or prevented from attending the gaols. They were not always welcomed by the chaplains.

The work and effort of the following lay preachers best illustrate the extent of their devotion to meeting the religious needs, and the well being of the prisoners.

Charles and John Wesley first became involved with religious activities in the gaols as a result of their membership of a religious society known as "The Holy Club". The first gaol they were invited to and permitted to visit was Oxford Castle. Initially, services were arranged in the chapels for those prisoners wishing to attend. Following the services, discussions used to take place, followed by the reading of extracts from devotional books. So successful were the services and discussions that eventually at the request of the prisoners, services became common practice. The Wesleys had scored their first success in prisons. They then extended their religious activities to many gaols throughout the country. They were probably best remembered for their religious activities at Newgate Gaol. Charles, for instance,

---

1. Later to be known as Methodists.
used to spend many nights before an execution took place, praying and singing hymns with the condemned prisoners. On occasions he was known to have travelled in the hangman's cart to Tyburn Tree praying with the prisoners prior to their last moments on earth. (1) During the course of their visits both experienced hostility and opposition to the work they were doing in the gaols by the authorities. Charles wrote on the 11th March, 1739, "I went to Newgate with my usual reluctance". (2) John wrote after his service in Newgate on the 16th May, 1739, "I was informed the Sheriffs had ordered I should preach here in future but once a week. Yea, and this once too often if 'he deceiveth the people' ".(3) Eventually John's popularity turned against him, and he reluctantly had to discontinue his visitations, as the authorities forbade him to enter the gaol. On this matter John observed, "We are forbid to go to Newgate for fear of making them wicked, and Bedlam for fear of making them mad". (4) However, Charles was to continue his work at Newgate, ".... and one of his special delights was to compose hymns and prayers for their use". (5)

Perhaps one of the best known of all the lay preachers was Silas Told. He worked in the London gaols, and spent most of his time at Newgate. His early years were spent in a rather dubious way. He was not a Christian. He went to sea at an early age and succumbed to many temptations. Whilst serving on board H.M.S. Phoenix, he was influenced by a pious Captain. Shortly afterwards, he married, left the sea, became a schoolmaster in Essex and later took a clerical position in London. The turning point came at the age of 29, when he went to a Methodist meeting and met John Wesley. He eventually introduced him to prison visiting. His first years at Newgate were not easy ones. According to Griffiths, "He (Silas Told) preached as often as he was permitted to both felons and debtors. But for the first few years, when attending the malefactors, he met with so

5. Ibid.
many repulses from the keeper and ordinary chaplain, as well as from the prisoners themselves, that he was often greatly discouraged". (1) Silas Told's relationships with the chaplains were not altogether satisfactory. Griffiths recalls, "His most bitter opponent, as was not unnatural, was the ordinary, W. Taylor, who would constantly station himself on Sunday mornings a few doors from Newgate, and wait there patiently for a couple of hours or more to obstruct his entrance, at the time time forbidding the turnkeys to give him admittance. Told's persistence generally got him through, so that most Sunday mornings he had an opportunity of preaching on the debtors side to a congregation of forty or more". (2) It is believed that his severest critic was another chaplain to Newgate, a Dr. Forde (known for his complete disinterest in the well being and religious needs of the prisoners) who said of him, ".... he was an amateur chaplain and was cramming the prisoners with prayers and preaching", (3) Silas Told is probably best known for his excellent preaching talents. On this point Hoyles wrote

".... All sorts of prisoners, papists, as well as protestants, clung to him in the hour of their anguish. He had no official standing in the prison, and at first he was frowned upon by the authorities, but his complete disintereodness became so clear as the years went by that even sheriffs as well as turnkeys and hangmen could be seen in tears as they listened to his exhortations and his prayers". (4) He was equally renowned for the influence he had over the prisoners. Griffiths recalls, "His influence among the debtors was so great that they readily formed themselves, at his request, into a society or organisation, bound by rules and regulations to strict religious observances. In this he was ably seconded by the "circumspection" of two or three prisoners who highly approved of his proposals and exercised a close watch on the others, whom they would not "suffer

2. Ibid.
3. The Life of Mr. Silas Told written by himself (Epworth Press 1954)
to live in any outward sin". For a considerable time the debtors paid regular attention to his preaching and the meetings of the society. After some time, however, the ordinary "raised a great tumult", and managed ever after to shut Silas Told out from that side of the prison. (1)

Silas Told continued his work amongst the condemned prisoners. He preached the gospel, he rode in the cart to Tyburn Tree singing hymns with the prisoners, and prayed with them on the gallows. In recognition of Silas Told's excellent prison work, a Lord Mayor of London once said of him, "... he ought to be appointed to the post of Ordinary, since he had actually done the work for twenty years". (2) Silas Told died at the age of 67 in 1778. John Wesley paid him a remarkable tribute when he wrote, "I buried what was mortal of honest Silas Told. For many years he attended the malefactors in Newgate, without fee or reward; and I suppose no man for this hundred years has been so successful in that melancholy office. God had given him peculiar talents for it, and he had amazing success therein. The greatest part of those whom he attended died in peace, and many of them in the triumph of faith". (3)

As more gaols began to appoint chaplains and assistant chaplains on a full time basis, (4) so the lay preacher was gradually replaced by a trained preacher. This did not minimise in any sense the contribution of the lay preacher, neither did it necessarily reduce their numbers. There was still a need for their services. In fact, lay preachers were to continue to visit the gaols throughout the remainder of the century. However, during the intervening years and certainly towards the latter part of the century, their attendance was no longer as independent individuals. They now belonged to or

4. 2 & 3 Vic. c.56, Sc. XV and XVI.
were representatives of missionary organisations such as the Church Army and the Salvation Army.

In their report the Departmental Committee on the Education and Moral Instruction of Prisoners, 1896 (1) were generally in favour, with certain safeguards, of allowing lectures (2) to be given to prisoners, and to continue the practice by many of the chaplains of inviting outside clergymen to preach in the chapel. (3) They also wished that preachers from the voluntary services should continue to visit (4). Perusal of subsequent annual reports from the Prison Commissioners, showed that two prisons for instance, had made arrangements for lectures to be given by outside speakers. The chaplain for Plymouth Prison reported, "The following gentlemen preached very impressive sermons or gave addresses, which were much enjoyed by the males and females: Rev. Sholto Campbell Douglas, Rev. Vincent Watson (Assistant Diocesan Missioner), Rev. D.J. Davies, Col. Barker, R.A. and Col. Barker (Salvation Army). In February last we were favoured with a six days' mission from the Church Army, London. Captain Davey spoke with much earnestness, and many of the prisoners were deeply affected". (5) Reporting on the favourable effects of the lectures on the prisoners whilst in confinement and following release, the chaplain for Hull Prison wrote, "Our supply of special preachers and special services, and also the secular lectures on moral and intellectual subjects by qualified gentlemen, continue to create much interest, and they are no doubt productive of good. Our mission in November has produced more than transient results; and in my visits inside, and from discharged prisoners, outside the prison, I continually drop on very satisfactory cases". (3)(7)

As the various prisons were reporting favourably on the arrangements they had made, the Chief Chaplain for the Prison Service,

1. Henceforth this Committee will be referred to as the Prisoners' Education Committee, P.E.C.
2. Ibid. Recommendation No.33, "Lectures to be introduced, as an experiment, in two convict and in three or four local prisons".
3. Ibid. Recommendation No.27, "Chaplains to be encouraged to invite outside clergymen to preach in prison chapels on Sundays".
4. Ibid. Paragraph 72.
5. Prison Commissioners' Report, 1898-99. Henceforth to be referred to as P.C.R.
6. Ibid.
7. Ibid.
the Rev. G.P. Merrick, substantiated this by writing, "In some
of the prison chapels special mission services have been held,
the immediate effect of which has been, according to general
report, highly satisfactory. They have been mostly conducted
by special clerical missioners or by dignitaries and other clergy
of the Church, and in a few instances by the licenced lay-
evangelists of the Church Army. Without exception, the special
preachers and missioners have expressed themselves as being pleased
with the behaviour of their congregations, with the generally
satisfactory character of the mission. The utilization of the
services of the Church Army evangelists has been, more or less,
one of experiment and so far, there is every reason for thinking
that this departure from prison precedent has been productive of
good. Their addresses to the prisoners were simple and practical,
and were earnest appeals, not to the emotions, but rather to the
commonsense of their hearers". (1) (2)

In their report for the year 1899-1900, the Prison
Commissioners issued Standing Orders for those missions wishing to
apply for permission to give services in the prison. Essentially,
the missions were to be under the auspices of the Established Church,
with limitations placed upon the number of missions that could be
held in a year. Approval had to be obtained from the Commissioners.
However, addresses could be given in the prison by members of a
religious body other than the Established Church, in which case
permission had to be obtained from the Visiting Committee.

In conclusion, the lay preacher, whether as a separate
individual or as a representative from one of the voluntary missions,
seemed to have played an important part in providing for the
spiritual well being of many prisoners.

Their contribution at the turn of the century was
particularly helpful as an effective substitute or as a valuable
'assistant' to the chaplain.

reported in his report for 1899-1900 in similar terms.
2. See Appendix A, Standing Order for Mission Services and
Addresses in Prison.
Although their commitment decreased following the appointment of full time chaplains to the gaols they were to continue to provide a valuable service to the chaplain and the prisoners throughout the remainder of the century. Unlike their predecessors, towards the end of the century, their involvement with prisoners was not entirely confined to providing an internal service; they were now, through their organisations, actively assisting prisoners following discharge.
APPENDIX 'A'

Copies of Standing Orders

Mission Services and Addresses in Prisons

The following methods of dealing with applications from religious and missionary bodies to hold mission services in prisons, or from missioners or lecturers to deliver religious addresses to prisoners, will be adopted:——

(a) "Missions," strictly so called, may only be undertaken under the auspices of the Established Church and with the previous authority of the Commissioners: they may extend over a period of days, but not more than one such mission may be held in any one year at the same prison, and care will be taken to avoid conflict or competition between rival missionary bodies.

(b) With respect to "Addresses," Rule 30 empowers Visiting Committees to organize lectures and addresses in the prison, provided they do not interfere with prison discipline and are directed to the moral improvement of prisoners. Any application, therefore, to deliver an "address" will be referred to the Visiting Committee, and will be allowed if they see no objection, every case being reported by the Governor to the Commissioners.

(c) Great care will of course be necessary in distinguishing between applications for holding a religious "service" and delivering a religious "address". The former can only be authorised by the Commissioners and is confined to organizations connected with the Established Church. There is, however, no objection to the delivery of a moral or religious address in the chapel by a member of a religious body other than the Church of England, subject to the approval of the Visiting Committee.

(d) A missioner or lecturer may be allowed an interview with any prisoner who may desire to see him during a mission or after an address.

(1)

(1) Prison Commissioners' Report 1899-1900.
The Scripture Reader

Scripture readers, although few in number,\(^{(1)}\) proved to be valuable members of the education department.\(^{(2)}\) They were directly responsible to the gaol chaplain. Their services were limited to the chaplain and prisoners belonging to the Established Church. These appointments were not a statutory requirement. Requests for such appointments were initiated by the gaol chaplain, and approval had to be sought from either the Visiting Justices, or the Justices at Quarter Sessions. All appointments were salaried, and prior to the State assuming control of all local gaols in 1877,\(^{(3)}\) salaries were paid for out of the county rates.

It is not clear where the initiative for appointing scripture readers or lay assistants on a full-time basis came from or precisely when they were first introduced. However, it seems likely that the idea may have originated from the earlier established practice of allowing voluntary lay preachers to visit the gaols.

It was felt that there was a need for such appointments. In the first place, the degree of religious knowledge and morals of the prisoners on conviction was very poor. Secondly, religious instruction was not being made available to all prisoners. There were a number of reasons for this. For instance, in some gaols there were no facilities provided for voluntary lay preachers to visit the prisoners. In other gaols, the voluntary lay preachers were discouraged, prohibited, or the time allocated for meetings and imparting religious knowledge to the prisoners was restricted. In a number of gaols, particularly the smaller ones, chaplains were only appointed on a part-time basis. The chaplains appointed to the larger gaols were quite often too busy with other matters to attend to the religious instruction of all the prisoners. In

---

1. See Appendix A to this section, giving number of scripture readers employed.

2. In some gaols they were referred to as either religious instructors or lay assistants.

3. 40 \& 41 Vic. c.21.
those gaols where schoolmasters (1) had been appointed, not all of them had sufficient knowledge, or the time to devote to imparting religious instruction.

From the beginning of the 1840s onwards, a few of the more progressive gaols, such as at Bath and Reading, were appointing scripture readers. The earliest recorded appointment was made at Bath Gaol in 1842. The chaplain, the Rev. W.C. Osborne, after repeated requests to the Gaol Committee, obtained permission to appoint, on a full-time basis, a male and female lay assistant for the religious instruction of the prisoners. (2) Later, Reading Gaol, which gave priority to the religious instruction of prisoners, not unnaturally engaged the services of scripture readers. The chaplain, the Rev. J. Field, commented on the usefulness of such appointments, stating, "... they are constantly employed amongst these men (railway labourers, renowned for their lack of morals) and we have reason to believe with much good effect" (3) The scripture readers' main function was to assist the chaplain with the moral and religious instruction of prisoners. They were primarily concerned with implementing the programme of religious instruction as laid down by the gaol chaplain. As the programme varied from gaol to gaol, so did the scripture readers' duties. In the main they were required to
(a) organize bible classes,
(b) instruct and expound on the scriptures and
(c) listen to the prisoners, either individually or in groups,
and we have reason to believe with much good effect. (3)

Instruction was either carried out in the cell or in the chapel.

---

1. 4 Geo. IV c.64, 1823. Provisions to Appoint Schoolmasters to the Gaols.
2. Superintendence Committee for Bath Gaol Meeting 11/11/1842. (The Rev. Osborne experienced certain difficulties in having a schoolmaster appointed. For list of names of candidates for both appointments and selection procedure, consult Archivist Office, Bath.)
4. In his evidence to the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Prison Discipline in 1850, Mr. C. Pearson, M.P. recommended the appointment of a Catechist to assist the chaplain and schoolmaster with the religious instruction of prisoners. P.509, evidence given on the 4/6/1850. The Committee did not make a recommendation. See Appendix A to this section for details of other appointments.
Apart from their teaching duties, scripture readers undertook a number of other related activities of which the following were typical examples: visiting prisoners in the prison hospital, distribution of devotional books, and cell visitation. This last-named activity, apart from his teaching duties, was by far the most valuable in so far as the prisoner was concerned, enabling the prisoner to gain the ear of a sympathetic and understanding official with whom he could discuss pressing private matters. Equally, the scripture reader was of particular assistance to the chaplain in that it released the latter to deal with the more difficult or urgent needs of certain prisoners, and at the same time the chaplain was assured that prisoners were at least receiving more frequent visits from a member of his department. Alternatively, it allowed the chaplain to visit the cells more often. In contrast with the normal accepted duties of scripture readers, Coldbath Fields Gaol engaged their scripture reader in the following manner. In his annual report, the Chaplain wrote that the duty of the scripture reader "shall be first to see every prisoner about to be discharged, a sufficient length of time beforehand to enable him to make himself acquainted as far as may be with his position and character, with a view to ascertaining whether he is a fit object for relief by the Visiting Justices through the Agency of the Discharged Prisoners Aid Committee already referred to. Secondly, to devote whatever time remains at his disposal to the religious instruction of the prisoners generally in the two main buildings of the prison. In this part of his duties the Visiting Justices propose that he be placed under the supervision and control of the Prison Chaplain". The scripture reader was appointed in 1864 for this prison and was not to be

1. Their colleagues in the convict prisons assumed wider responsibilities such as taking the service in the absence of the chaplain, interviewing convicts on reception and discharge, and towards the latter part of the century, were giving lectures to prisoners.

2. Chaplains' Report, Michaelmas, 1864.

3. In his Annual Report, Michaelmas, 1870, the Chaplain for Coldbath Fields reported that the scripture reader was to be employed as a part-time prison photographer.
concerned with the instruction of Roman Catholic prisoners, and was paid a salary of £80. p.a. (1)

In a number of gaols, particularly the larger ones, it was quite often the practice for the chaplain to be assisted by a scripture reader and schoolmaster. Coldbath Fields was one such gaol. It is perhaps appropriate to distinguish between the duties of the scripture reader and the schoolmaster. From a teaching point of view the former were primarily concerned with the religious instruction of the prisoners, whereas, the latter were essentially involved with secular instruction. (2) This division of labour applied in the better organised and larger gaols. However, owing to the lack of uniformity in many of the local gaols, this clear distinction of duties did not always apply. In a number of gaols these officers' duties overlapped, and this was particularly the case when it came to non-teaching duties. On perusal of the Inspector of Prisons Annual Reports, it would appear that schoolmasters were often required to teach religious instruction, whereas the scripture readers were rarely called upon to undertake secular instruction. (3) Two reasons are advanced for this. The first was a matter of status (to be discussed later), and the second was concerned with legislation and economic considerations. One of the pre-occupations of the Justices was to minimise expenditure on prisons in an effort to pacify the rate payers. Obviously, as the Justices were required by statute to employ a schoolmaster, it seemed only natural from an economic point of view more advantageous to employ a schoolmaster who could also teach religious knowledge. Furthermore, the salaries of these two officers were identical. As a general rule, both appointments enjoyed equal status. However, there was a tendency for schoolmasters to become scripture readers rather than vice versa. This was due to the generally accepted view that moral and religious instruction was more

1. In his Annual Report, Michaelmas, 1870, the Chaplain for Coldbath Fields reported that the scripture reader was to be employed as a part-time prison photographer.

2. 4 Geo. IV c.64, 1823. Provisions were made for prisoners to receive instruction in reading and writing.

3. See views held by the Chaplains of Convict Prisons as to the interchange of teaching responsibilities of scripture readers and schoolmasters. See Index, evidence to the P.E.C., 1896.
valuable as an aid to the rehabilitation of the prisoners than was secular instruction. Therefore it could be argued that scripture readers enjoyed higher status.

As to the educational background of scripture readers, there is no information. It would appear that provided they were conversant with the scriptures, and were competent to instruct, they were selected and appointed by the chaplain. In an attempt to improve the quality of scripture readers being appointed to the gaols, Lord Norton, in his evidence to the Prisoners Education Committee, suggested that scripture readers ".... should have certificates from Bishops to read and expound the Scripture, and to read interesting books to prisoners". (1) His suggestion was not recommended by the Committee. However, as the Committee was sufficiently impressed by the record of the scripture readers in the convict prisons (2) they recommended the extension of the system to local gaols. The Committee remarked, "In the convict prisons Scripture Readers afford valuable aid, but some increase in their numbers, and the extension of this system to the larger local prisons, especially to those containing a large female population, would perhaps be helpful towards lessening the difficulties mentioned in the preceding paragraph (chaplain's difficulties in finding time to visit cells) and would greatly aid the reformation efforts of Chaplains". (3) The Committee made the following recommendation, "Scripture Readers to be appointed to the larger local prisons, and their number to be increased in convict prisons". (4)

In conclusion, although few in number, scripture readers served as effective auxiliaries to the chaplains. First of all they assisted with the increasing need to provide religious instruction for prisoners. Secondly, they relieved the chaplains

1. See Index, evidence to the P.E.C. 1396.
2. Scripture readers had been employed successfully in the convict prisons since 1850.
4. Ibid. Recommendation No.30.
of the tasks which enabled him to devote more time to either visiting the prisoners in their cells, or to attend to those prisoners requiring special attention from him. Thirdly, they proved to be of particular value to prisoners, especially when the chaplains were unable to visit the cells. In such instances, they were able to listen sympathetically to the prisoner's personal problems, offer him additional religious instruction and comfort, encourage him to come to terms with the existing prison system, as well as the monotony of prison routine. Finally, he acted as a valuable counsellor to the prisoner prior to release.

Local prisons never employed scripture readers in great numbers. The Convict Service employed these officers very successfully since the 1850s and it is difficult to believe that the Justices had not heard of these successes. Obviously, there was a lack of consultation or exchange of views between the Justices and the Director of Convict Prisons between 1850 and 1876. Furthermore, even the Prison Commissioners seemed to have refrained from taking any effective measures until after the Prisoners Education Committee made their recommendations. Regrettably, it has not been possible to find out the reasons why there were so few scripture readers employed in local gaols. Apart from either a lack of concern, or inertia, the reason was more than likely economic.

Finally, although it was encouraging to note that the Prisoners Education Committee recommended an extension of the system, it was regrettable that they were not prepared to improve the quality of the scripture readers. Had they done so, it would have gone some way to improving the standard of religious instruction of the prisoners. Secondly, it would have relieved the chaplain of some instruction and other related tasks, and so enabled him to devote more of his time to personal contact with the prisoners.

Justifying the need for the appointment of scripture readers, Lord Norton stated at the end of the century, in 1896, "The primary object of imprisonment is deterrence, with which education must not be allowed to interfere; but if people are kept
in prison for lengthy periods, education and moral instruction must be introduced. The present system is ineffective owing to the deficiency of staff. Chaplains at large prisons can only see individuals in their cells once in three months; they have too much to do; they should have Assistant Chaplains (1), and Scripture Readers to help them". (2)

1. 2 & 3 Vic. c.56, 1839. Provisions were made for such appointments according to the number of prisoners.
2. See Index of evidence to the P.E.C.
APPENDIX A

Local Gaols

The following gaols appointed Religious Instructors (Scripture Readers): (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gaol</th>
<th>Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County Prison, Abingdon</td>
<td>NIL (visits gratuitously)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Gaol, House of Correction, Leicester</td>
<td>£100 p.a. (The Chaplain contributed this sum from his annual salary of £400)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough Gaol, Hastings</td>
<td>£2.12s. p.a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Abstracts of Returns to the House of Commons on "Religious Instruction in Prisons", dated 10/5/1853.

Bath Gaol, (1) Lay Assistants - Male and Female - Not known
(1) Superintendance Committee for Bath Gaol, Meeting 11/11/1842.

Reading Gaol, Scripture Reader (1) - Not known

Coldbath Fields, Scripture Reader (1) - £80.
(1) Chaplain's Report, Michaelmas 1864.

1st April 1878 (1) (when the State took over control of Local Prisons)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Staff Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were 2 Scripture Readers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(1) Appendix No.5, 1st Report Prison Commissioners 1878.

Clerkenwell Prison, (1) Scripture Reader - Not Known
(1) 3rd Report Prison Commissioners 1880.
According to Home Office letter dated 18/7/1890 – HO 45 A51742, there were 4 Scripture Readers employed in 1890. Names of prisons and salaries not given.

It has not been possible to obtain returns giving the number of Scripture Readers separately as prison staff returns only recorded combined totals of Schoolmasters/Scripture Readers.

For the period 1896 to 1900, the position was as follows:

Year ending 31st March.

1. 1896 68 Scripture Readers, Schoolmasters and Discipline Officers acting as Schoolmasters.

2. 1897 14 Scripture Readers and Schoolmasters.

3. 1898 20 Scripture Readers and Schoolmasters.

4. 1899 21 Scripture Readers and Schoolmasters.

5. 1900 20 Scripture Readers and Schoolmasters.

1. PC's Report 1896 Appendix 8
2. " 1697 8
3. " 1897/8 8
4. " 1899 9
5. " 1900 9
3. **The Teacher-Prisoner**

The Act (1) that was responsible for introducing religious instruction in the gaols was also instrumental in bringing about a situation in which the gaol authorities were able to nominate certain prisoners to undertake the instruction of their fellow prisoners.

Section 39 gave powers to the governors to nominate suitable third class prisoners to act as Servants or Assistants in the management of the prisons, and with the care of their fellow prisoners. It was to these 'privileged' prisoners that the Chaplains eventually turned, and relied upon, for assistance in the provision of instruction for prisoners. Under the supervision and guidance of the chaplain, the teacher-prisoner fulfilled an important function, if only for a short period, from 1779 to 1839, in providing opportunities for many prisoners to receive some degree of instruction especially in reading and writing. (2) At the beginning of the nineteenth century evidence to this effect was provided by two Committees. Sir G.O. Paul, Bart. (3) in his evidence to the House of Commons Committee on the Laws relating to Penitentiary Houses in 1811, when asked,

"By whom were instruction given him (Prisoner)? —

I believe by the Chaplain, and by a fellow prisoner by direction of the Chaplain."

In 1819, Mr. T. Cunningham, Governor to Gloucester County Gaol, in his evidence to the Select Committee on the State of Gaols, was questioned about the provisions and mode of instruction for the prisoners. He was asked,

"Are any of the prisoners instructed in reading and writing? —

In reading they are, but not in writing of late years. Under whose direction is the instruction given to them in reading? —

**References:**

1. 19 Geo. III, c.74, Section 5, 1779.
2. Reading and writing did not become a statutory requirement until 1823. See 4 Geo. IV, c.64.
3. Chairman and Chief Justice to the Penitentiary House at Gloucester.
It is given by one prisoner to others.

Then is this instruction by sufferance, or by appointment?

By sufferance; before trial one instructs another, after trial, and in the penitentiary, they are put together, three in one cell; two that cannot read are put into a cell with one that can, for two or three hours in a day, and he instructs them; that is partly attended by the Chaplain". (1)

From the 1820 onwards, the practice of employing teacher-prisoners was well established. Perusal of the Sixth Report of the Committee of the Society for the Improvement of Prison Discipline and for the Reformation of Juvenile Offenders, for instance, revealed that at Maidstone County Gaol, the Chaplain had established various schools and had selected teachers from among the prisoners. (2)(3) Recalling the early experiences of the Rev. John Clay, Chaplain to Preston Gaol, and how he had to initially rely on teacher-prisoners, his son, the Rev. W.C. Clay wrote, "On his appointment in 1823, he found that there was no School in the prison. Like so many other Chaplains, he had to rely on persuading the better disposed prisoners into mutual instruction. He gave his teacher-prisoners appropriate books, and guidance, and personally supervised the teaching. His initial success encouraged him to continue his efforts, and he eventually established a Sunday and evening school. In each case he had to rely on two or more of the most intelligent prisoners (monitors) with the teaching of the other prisoners. He and his teacher-prisoners were rewarded for their efforts, as many of the prisoners learnt to read. It did not take him very long to realise the limitations of having to rely on teacher-prisoners. He was later successful in appointing a schoolmaster." (4)

1. Minutes of evidence, given on the 11/6/1819, p.395
2. Report for 1824, p.50
3. See Appendix A to this section for other gaols employing teacher-prisoners.
Broadly, teacher-prisoners were appointed for the following reasons:

1) To provide instruction especially in cases where a chaplain was only appointed on a part-time basis, or was otherwise engaged with other duties.

2) To generally improve the proficiency of prisoners in reading (in particular), so that they could benefit more from instruction in religious knowledge being provided by the chaplain.

3) As an interim solution at the time until schoolmasters were eventually appointed to undertake secular instruction, i.e. reading and writing, of the prisoners.

In spite of the fact that the 1823 Act called for the appointment of schoolmasters to provide secular instruction, the position of the teacher-prisoner was still assured. Rule 6 stated, ".... Nothing herein contained shall be construed to extend to prevent the Justices from authorizing, at their discretion, the employment of any Prisoner in the Performance of any Menial Office within the Prison, or for the purpose of instructing others ...." In fact it was probably just as well that the Act did not prohibit the employment of teacher-prisoners, because as subsequent experience was to prove, many of the Justices failed or were slow to appoint schoolmasters.

Prior, and subsequent, to the passing of the 1823 Act, a number of gaols were adopting certain practices which are worth noting. It was not unusual for the gaol authorities to elevate teacher-prisoners to the status of schoolmaster. For instance, Chester Castle County Gaol reported that they had appointed a convict as a schoolmaster who appeared well suited for the office. (1) Furthermore, not only were teacher-prisoners now being appointed as schoolmasters, but in some gaols they were in receipt of payment. This practice had been adopted at the County Gaol and House of

---

Correction for Herefordshire where the Inspector reported, "The Schoolmaster of the male prisoners is selected from the prisoners. This Schoolmaster instructs in reading on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays from twelve to one O'clock". The schoolmaster received 6d. per week.\(^{(1)}\) In some of the gaols where schoolmasters had been appointed, teacher-prisoners were being engaged as assistants to the schoolmaster. One such gaol was the Gaol and House of Correction at Chelmsford. In their annual report to the Justices of the Peace at Quarter Sessions at Chelmsford, the Visiting Justices reported that they had authorized the chaplain to "... avail(ing) himself of the services of Prisoners qualified to become assistants to the Schoolmaster".\(^{(2)}\) In fact this use of prisoners as assistants was the basis upon which the Select Committee of the House of Lords on Gaols in 1835 justified the continued use of teacher-prisoners.

As in the case of all gaol appointments, approval had to be sought from the Visiting Justices. Justices were also instrumental in initiating appointments. This also applied to the engagement of teacher-prisoners, subject to the recommendation of the gaol chaplain. For instance, at Huntingdon County Gaol, the Justices made the order "... that at anytime it may appear to the chaplain that there be amongst the prisoners of any class in the gaol a person competent to instruct, and to be entrusted with education in reading and writing, he may do so, to those who are unable in cases where their commitments are for longer than one month, on any two days in the week".\(^{(3)}\) The qualifying period for those under instruction was to fluctuate over the years, and was to deprive many prisoners of instruction. It also became an issue of some controversy.

---

1. Inspector of Prison Reports, Southern & Western District, 1836. (This same Inspector reported that a prisoner had also been appointed as schoolmaster at Warwick County Gaol). Henceforth these reports to be referred to as I.P.R.


3. I.P.R. Northern District, 1836.
There appears to have been no uniform criteria laid down for selecting prisoners for teaching positions. However, perusal of available literature provides the following differing criteria. In general, it seems that the chaplain selected a prisoner because he displayed what the authorities described as "Superior Education". (This term was sometimes used as a means of classifying prisoners' educational standards on reception for statistical purposes when submitting annual returns as to the degree of education of prisoners.) In practice it would appear that it meant that the prisoner(s) was capable of reading and writing fluently. It was also quite common to select prisoners who were considered to be of "good behaviour" or "model prisoners".

G. Holford recalls that at Millbank, "Wardsmen were selected as teachers on the basis of their good behaviour". (1) Wardsmen were prisoners who already had disciplinary powers vis a vis their fellow prisoners. An unusual criterion was used at the Penitentiary House at Gloucester. Sir G.O. Paul in his evidence to the House of Commons Committee of 1811, when asked about the selection of prisoners as teachers, replied, "But there are generally a number of offenders of the Methodist persuasion in this prison, their tenets are unfavourable to penitence and remorse for past conduct, yet in general these are the most capable and willing to become teachers". (2) Finally, another criterion that was used was the category or class of prisoner. Most commonly the Debtor. (3) The debtor enjoyed a privileged position and was in many respects considered to be the 'elite' of the prison population. They were very often well educated persons. One gaol that used debtors in preference to ordinary prisoners as teacher-prisoners was Maidstone. "Whenever efficient persons can be obtained, teachers are now uniformly selected from the debtors, in preference to the convicted prisoners; such arrangements having been found well calculated for


the regular and skilful performance of the duty of teachers, and conducive to the advantage and improvement of the prisoners". (1)

Very few, if any, of the teacher-prisoners had prior teaching experience. There were no uniform training methods laid down. Each gaol adopted its own particular method. However, some chaplains and schoolmasters did in fact provide their teacher-prisoners with some 'training' in order that they could perform their teaching tasks more effectively. One method that was quite often practiced was used for instance by the Schoolmaster at Bury St. Edmunds County Gaol. "The Schoolmaster would teach one of the prisoners, and after he thought the prisoner was sufficiently proficient, the 'trainee' teacher-prisoner was given a prisoner whom he would then proceed to teach. When the Schoolmaster was satisfied that the 'trainee' teacher-prisoner had had sufficient practice and appeared to be competent, the Schoolmaster would then recommend the 'trainee' teacher-prisoner to be elevated to the position of teacher-prisoner". (2) However, in the majority of the gaols the approach to instruction was usually haphazard. For instance, the chaplain would allocate a group of prisoners to a teacher-prisoner who would then proceed to read and listen to the prisoners read or repeat portions of the scriptures, etc. Another common system adopted in many of the gaols was the reliance placed on mutual instruction by the learners. This was successfully used at Ipswich County Gaol. Although the chaplain undertook some instruction, there was no regular or systematic instruction. The Inspector of Prisons explained, "He (chaplain) gives them tasks and they teach each other". (3) It is important to note that throughout the period during which teacher-prisoners figured prominently in the instruction process, most of the teaching was based on groups or in association. This was due

2. I.P.R. Northern District, 1836.
3. I.P.R. Northern District, 1836.
to the fact that the prison system throughout this period, i.e. 1823-1839, was officially based on the Classified or Association System. However, groups were only composed of prisoners belonging to the same criminal class. (1)

One of the problems that faced a number of chaplains in the larger prisons was how to provide instruction for prisoners, and the best method to use, bearing in mind the limited teaching resources. From the following account, it is of interest to note the confidence that this chaplain placed in his teacher-prisoners. The Chaplain for Winchester County Gaol wrote, "The most practicable method my experience could warrant in recommending in a prison where wardsmen are allowed, and silence enforced, would be to divide the prisoners into three classes, making them always sit together in their divisions. (2) One class should contain those who can read well. These would require no schooling, and should never break silence. The next class should consist of those who cannot read well, and the third, of those who cannot read at all. The last two classes shall have prisoner teachers assisting them in the way the chaplain may direct on Sundays only or other days appointed. This is quite practicable where a 'turnkey' is parading the prison, and keeping watch that order is maintained. A Chaplain under this system may insure in most cases, any prisoners learning to read in three months." (3)

By the middle of the 1830s, the future of the teacher-prisoner, and indeed, the whole idea of employing prisoners in the service of the gaols was under review. This came about because in 1835, Parliament appointed a Select Committee of the House of

1. It is relevant to point out that not all of the gaols adopted the Classified System. Some continued with the Separate System, others with the Silent System, whereas others adopted a suitable mix of Separate/Classified.

2. See Chapter on the Chapels concerning partitioning.

3. I.P.R. Southern-Western District, 1839. Mr. G.L. Chesterton, Governor of Coldbath Fields was of the opinion that three months was too short a time. Annual Report 22/10/1841. Opinions varied on this matter, from 3 to 6 months.
Lords to enquire into the state of the gaols. This Committee was not entirely in favour of abolishing the employment of teacher-prisoners. In fact as a result of one of its recommendations, it relegated the teacher-prisoner to that of assistant to the schoolmaster. The Committee recommended, ".... that in every Prison wherein the number of Prisoners exceeds fifty, a Schoolmaster, not being one of the Prisoners, shall be appointed". (1) The Committee explained the reasoning behind their recommendations by stating, "The Committee attach so much importance to the practical Execution of the Clause of the Gaol Act which requires instruction to be given in Reading and Writing, that they have felt unwilling to recommend the absolute disuse of Prisoners for that purpose, notwithstanding the objections to which it is obviously liable, and which experience shows to be well founded; but they are of opinion, that in all cases comprised in this Resolution the Employment of such Person should be limited to Assistance in giving instruction, and that the substantive control and management of it should be under the Schoolmaster". The recommendation was an important one, and long overdue. The explanation was reasonable and practical, bearing in mind that many of the County Gaols and Houses of Correction had an average number of committals which did not exceed the required numbers necessitating the employment of a full-time schoolmaster. Of course, underlying the recommendations were economic considerations: some of the Justices were to exploit these by not appointing schoolmasters.

In 1839, an Act (2) was passed which effectively terminated the era of the teacher-prisoner. Rule 4 stated, "No prisoners shall be employed as Turnkeys, Assistant Turnkeys, Wardsmen, Yardsmen, Overseer, Monitor, or Schoolmaster, or in the discipline of the Prison or in the service of any officer thereof, or in the service or instruction of any other Prisoner ...." However, the Debtor

1. Second Report, Recommendations No.16. It also recommended the separation of prisoners — Recommendation No.4.
2. 2 & 3 Vic. c.56 Sec.6. Also enacted for the re-adoption of the separate system.
subject to certain safeguards, was to continue to enjoy his privileged position in these roles. The Rule further stated "... but this Rule shall not be taken to prevent the employment of any Debtor in that Part of the Prison in which he or she may be lawfully confined in any Manner in which he or she shall be willing to be employed, and which is consistent with his or her safe custody".

Opinions varied as to whether to continue or not with the use of teacher-prisoners. For instance, the Rev. J. MacLean, Chaplain to Bedford Gaol and House of Correction, stated, "I should wish them (prisoners) to be instructed by a Schoolmaster or Officer, not a prisoner, superintended by myself". (1) Mr. W. John Williams, Inspector of Prisons seemed in favour of the practice when he wrote in his annual report, "Every successive examination of these establishments confirms me in the necessity of providing prisoners with the readiest means of acquiring moral and religious knowledge. The advantage is conspicuous even under the least favourable circumstances. In prisons where unchecked association is permitted, when perhaps, idleness has been tired of its own enjoyment, or from a better motive, I have often seen men engaged with their books, or employed in the task of teaching one another". (2) This issue was to be debated for many years. In fact it was raised, if only briefly, before two Select Committees on Prison Discipline. As some of the views expressed were unusual, they are worth recording. Both contributors were in favour of using prisoners for instruction purposes.

In his evidence to the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Prison Discipline in 1850, Captain Maconochie, R.N., in a discussion concerning the separation of prisoners, stated, "... it occurred to me to try what was long a theory, and what is now, I may say, an established fact, that I would put educated and uneducated together, and give them the task, the one of teaching and the other of learning, and the effect has been most excellent

1. I.P.R. Home District, 1837.
2. I.P.R. Northern and Eastern District, 1838.
indeed; the educated covet extremely, in fact they all covet very much, the privilege of being together rather than separate; the educated thus earnestly seek to teach, and the uneducated to learn, in order to attain this enviable position; a sort of maternal feeling has been developed consequently in the one and a very great amount of docility and anxiety to learn in the other, and so far from being a misfortune, I myself now consider it as a very great benefit in the gaol that we are compelled to break the law; we are compelled to have two together." (1)

Giving evidence before the Select Committee of the House of Lords on Prison Discipline in 1863, Mr. J.G. Perry, Inspector of Prisons was asked,

"Are you aware of any gaols in which prisoners are allowed to undertake any particular duties in the management of the prison, such as instructing other prisoners, or acting themselves as turnkeys or warders?

I have known two or three instances where they have been allowed to assist in the instruction of other prisoners; and I have pointed out that it was contrary to law at present. I have sometimes regretted that the law was so stringent upon that point, inasmuch as I have known men of education who would have been very competent instructors of the other prisoners, and who, I have thought, might have been made to assist in the education of prisoners; but the law is very strict upon that point, that no prisoner should be employed in the management of a prison, or in the control of other prisoners."

Questioned further, he was asked,

"Would it not be very objectionable to relax that rule, and to enable the prisoners to be turned into monitors?

If it were extensively done, it would be very injurious indeed. It is frequently done in convict prisons; and I have known instances where I have thought it would be useful in other prisons; for instance, I have known a clergyman to be in

prison, who, although guilty of an offence sufficient to bring him there, was, generally speaking, a good moral man, and who would not have corrupted the prisoners who were put under his care, and who really might have been made useful in the instruction of the prisoners." 

He was later questioned by Lord Wodehouse, who asked him, "You stated that you thought there might be some advantage in allowing prisoners who are well behave to assist in the education of the other prisoners; do you think that such an arrangement is consistent with the proper punishment of those persons who would be so employed?

In the instances that I have known, and where I have thought it would be desirable, the persons were not capable of doing hard labour, and were not employed at hard labour, and therefore it would have been no alleviation of their punishment to allow them to become schoolmasters to the other prisoners.

Do not you think that it would be a considerable alleviation to their punishment for educated men to be allowed to be employed in the work of instruction?

It would give them a kind of satisfaction, but at the same time it would be a very exalted satisfaction - it would not be an indulgence of a dangerous kind."

The Earl Cathcart then interjected, "Besides which, the cases are so very few in which it could be done?.

Yes.

The Chairman resumed questioning by asking, "Is not a relief granted to one prisoner which is not extended to another, an injustice to the others, and so far prejudicial to your whole system?

I do not think that that kind of indulgence, supposing it is an indulgence, would be looked upon with envy by the other prisoners - they would be extremely grateful for the assistance rendered to them. I do not think they would consider that the man who was put over them as an instructor was particularly indulged by that Act." (2)

2. I.P.R. Midland-Eastern District 1849.
The Committee made no recommendations that would in any way alter the position, and in any case they did not view education playing an important part in prison discipline. Furthermore, the Committee were absolutely in favour of upholding the separate system.

Perusal of the various Inspector of Prisons Reports showed that there were only three infringements of the 1839 Act where prisoners were still being used as teacher-prisoners. They were at the Huntingdon County Gaol and House of Correction, and at Worcester City Gaol. In both cases the Inspector reminded the gaol authorities of their statutory obligations to discontinue the practice, and to appoint a Schoolmaster. A third prison, namely Spalding County House of Correction, employed a prisoner (in the absence of the Schoolmaster) for three months. The prisoner was subsequently dismissed from the appointment on suspicion of having stolen some money from a room to which he had access. On the whole there was a good response to the 1839 Act.

In conclusion, in those gaols where teacher-prisoners were employed, they provided a useful and necessary educational service to many of the prisoners. Secondly, they proved a valuable asset to some of the chaplains in relieving them of teaching tasks so that they could give more attention to their other activities. Thirdly, the teacher-prisoner proved to be a useful interim solution until schoolmasters were appointed in greater numbers.

As to whether prisoners should have ever been given the opportunity to instruct their fellow prisoners is a matter of opinion. The employment of teach-prisoners placed the authorities

1. I.P.R. Midland-Eastern District 1849.
2. Ibid.
3. I.P.R. Midland 1861.
in an invidious position. On the one hand had they not been employed, many prisoners would doubtless have left prison as ignorant or illiterate as when they first arrived. Alternatively, by placing them in a position of authority over their fellow prisoners, it created a potential danger in terms of the prisons authority structure. In fact, the reasons leading to the decline of teacher-prisoner arose from the last point, the gradual appointment of schoolmasters, and directly, as a result of a change in the system of prison discipline from Classification or Associated to the Separate System. Finally, the employment of teacher-prisoners, particularly during the period 1823 to 1839, proved to be an economic proposition in a number of gaols.

As the era of the teacher-prisoner drew to a close, the gaol authorities were faced with two important considerations, of which the first was a statutory requirement.

1) The replacement of the teacher-prisoner by Schoolmasters, and to ensure the continuance of secular instruction.

2) The additional expenditure that would now arise from having to appoint a salaried Schoolmaster.

The issue now was what course of action would the authorities pursue. This should become clearer in the following section which deals with the Schoolmaster.
APPENDIX A

Other Prisons using the Services of Teacher-Prisoners

1. Ilford House of Correction, Essex - prisoner teaches reading.
2. Common Gaol and House of Correction, Hereford - prisoner teaches reading.
5. County Gaol and House of Correction, Morpeth, Northumberland - those who can read and write teach others.
6. Newgate, City of London - one of the prisoners officiates as schoolmaster.
7. Common Gaol and House of Correction, City of Norwich - those who can read teach others.
9. Gaol and House of Correction, Kingston upon Hull - prisoner instructs others.
10. Common Gaol and House of Correction, Portsmouth Town - prisoner teaches others to read.
11. Corporate Prison, Derby - prisoner instructs others.
12. Gaol and House of Correction, Carlisle, Cumberland - prisoner teaches others to read.
14. County Gaol, Winchester - chaplain is assisted by prisoner.

Extracts from evidence to the Select Committee of House of Lords on Gaols, 1835, pp.196.225. (Either there was no instruction given, or it was given by either the prisoner, chaplain, schoolmaster, turnkey, or a civilian volunteer.)
4. The Schoolmaster

"In most of our gaols there are officers called Schoolmasters and Schoolmistresses. Probably they have been appointed as such, and have received their salaries under such designations, but in reality many have been porters, Warders, or Clerks".

Rev. W.C. Osborne, Chaplain of Bath Gaol. (1)

Of those Schoolmasters engaged on a full-time basis there were few. Their main responsibility was to teach prisoners secular education. However, the majority of Schoolmasters were either discipline Officers or Clerks who only devoted a few hours to teaching. Many of the Schoolmasters were to assume other responsibilities. (2)

All were subject to the supervision of the gaol Chaplain when involved with instruction.

It is not known who originated the idea of engaging schoolmasters in the local gaols, or when. However, it is possible that the idea originated from Jeremy Bentham. In 1791 whilst planning his Panopticon, he envisaged engaging a number of competent Schoolmasters who would instruct prisoners in reading, writing, and arithmetic. (3)

---


(2) See Appendix 'A' to this Section showing the miscellaneous duties performed by Schoolmasters.

(3) Report from the Committee on the Laws relating to Penitentiary Houses, Appendix 4 - 31/5/1811. (On the subject of Schooling and Schoolmasters Bentham suggested that Schooling should be on Sundays during all the time not occupied by sleep, meals, or divine services: a moral or religious direction being given to all the exercises. Schooling should be broad based i.e. intellectual, moral and religious. He also felt that the most appropriate day to educate prisoners was on a Sunday as it would not interfere with the economy of the prison. Schooling should be undertaken in the open air amphitheatre with a canvas canopy in case of bad weather. If the weather was very bad, Schooling could be transferred to the Chapel. On no account must the Schoolmaster have his back to the pupils. (1) Bentham also recommended instruction in Music and Drawing.)

(1) A Plan of Management for a Panopticon and Penitentiary House. 1791.
His plans were shelved, but in 1812 an Act (1) was passed which called for the erection of a Penitentiary House. Subsequently Millbank Penitentiary was built along similar lines to that of J. Bentham's Panopticon. The Act required that prisoners be instructed in Reading and Writing, (2) and it is conceivable that the first official appointment of Schoolmasters to the prison service may have stemmed from this Act.

Schoolmasters were first officially appointed to the local gaols in 1823. (3) They were required to instruct prisoners in Reading and Writing. (4)

The teaching of secular education prior to 1823 was either left to 'teacher-prisoners', or the Chaplains. Essentially the appointment of Schoolmasters was to relieve the Chaplain of the responsibility of teaching secular education, and to improve the secular knowledge of a growing number of illiterate prisoners so that religious knowledge would prove more meaningful. The need to appoint suitable Schoolmasters was seen as essential. For instance the Visiting Justices for Chelmsford County Gaol appointed a Schoolmaster in 1820 to instruct in reading with a view to improving the religious knowledge of the prisoners. (5)

(1) 52 Geo.III, c.44.
(2) Ibid. Section 24.
(3) 4 Geo.IV, c.64, Rule 25. "...... and be it further enacted, that it shall and maybe lawful for the Justices assembled at the General Quarter Sessions, and they are hereby empowered and required to nominate and appoint such Keepers, Matrons, Taskmasters, Schoolmasters, and other officers as to them may seem expedient."
(4) Rule 10 stated "..... provision shall be made in all prisons for the instruction of prisoners of both sexes in Reading and Writing, and that instruction shall be afforded under such rules and regulations and to such extent, and to such prisoners as to the Visiting Justices may seem expedient."
(5) See Report to the Justices of the Peace dated 11/7/1820.
Later, two prominent Chaplains stressed the need for the appointment of a Schoolmaster. The Rev. W.L. Clay wrote, "... but from the first he (Rev. John Clay of Preston Gaol) saw the necessity of a regular Schoolmaster, especially in winter, when the prisoners were locked up at dark - sometimes two or three in a cell - to spend the long evenings in solitary idleness or mutual corruption." (1)

The second Chaplain was the Rev. John Field of Reading Gaol who observed "... to numerous inmates of our prison no opportunity of obtaining knowledge has been afforded, excepting that which our workhouse schools have furnished. The importance therefore, of providing suitable Schoolmasters, and of imparting the needful instruction in those receptacles of our poor, cannot be overstated." (2)

By 1824 a report published by the Society for the Improvement of Prison Discipline (3) showed the number of Schoolmasters currently employed in the gaols, and other personnel associated with the instruction of prisoners. Of the 142 gaols visited, there were a total of 6 Schoolmasters engaged solely in the instruction of prisoners. (4) In the remaining gaols (136) instruction was undertaken by either the Keeper, Chaplain, or a prisoner.

An analysis of the findings of the 1835 Select Committee of the House of Lords report into the state of the gaols and Houses of

---

(1) Rev. W.L. Clay, M.A., The Prison Chaplain, 1861, p.112. (John Clay was appointed in 1823. He established a Sunday School to offset the tedium of labour for convict prisoners. The school was run by the prisoners under his supervision, and many of the prisoners learnt to read. Clay also taught in the evenings. Following strong and urgent protestations, he induced the Justices to make an appointment. However, Clay had to change his Schoolmaster on many occasions before he found a suitable one).


(3) 6th Report.

(4) The six gaols were Chester County Gaol; Bodmin House of Correction; Derby County Gaol and House of Correction; Chelmsford County Gaol and House of Correction; Leicester House of Correction, and Devizes House of Correction.
Correction revealed that there had been an improvement in the number of Schoolmasters appointed to the gaols. The return also showed other personnel involved with the instruction of prisoners. Of the 131 gaols, 29 Schoolmasters were engaged on a full-time basis. One attended voluntarily one day a week. In 48 gaols instruction was given in the following way: in 27 gaols by the Chaplain, in 9 by a prisoner, in 6 by a 'turnkey', in 3 by prisoners instructing each other, in 2 by unknown persons, (probably volunteers), and in 1 gaol by a Governor. In 54 gaols no instruction was provided.

In an attempt to increase the number of Schoolmasters and the quality of instruction, the Select Committee made an important recommendation, namely "that in every prison wherein the number of prisoners exceeds fifty a Schoolmaster, not being one of the prisoners (should) be appointed." With the passing of the 1839 Prison Act, Justices were no longer permitted to employ prisoners in any capacity. In those gaols where prisoners had been engaged in the instruction of prisoners, Justices often made alternative arrangements. In fact from this period onwards, it became common practice to employ other grades of prison staff instead of appointing a Schoolmaster. As a general rule it applied mainly to the smaller gaols. The main reason given was that the average number of prisoner confined at any one period did not justify economically employing a full-time Schoolmaster. Writing

(1) See Appendix 'B' to this Section showing other grades of staff other than Schoolmasters involved in instruction of prisoners.
(2) See Appendix 2.
(3) 2nd Report, Recommendation No.16.
(4) 2 & 3 Vic. c.56.
(5) Ibid. Section 6, Rule 4.
in 1850, the Inspector of Prisons responsible for visiting the County Gaol and House of Correction for Huntingdonshire suggested that a Schoolmaster should be appointed, and that preferably he should be a prison warder. The reasons the Inspector gave are of interest. He wrote,

"As there is no Schoolmaster, the drudgery of imparting elementary knowledge to the ignorant prisoners devolves upon the Chaplain, whose time, as it appears to me, would be better employed in supervising the labours of a regular Schoolmaster, in directing the course of education, and in testing, by frequent examination, the progress made by the learners, than in himself performing the inferior details of primary tuition, which would be, probably, better accomplished by a prison officer whose capacity was equal to teaching the mere rudiments, without aspiring to tread in the higher paths of knowledge." (1)

However, in the larger gaols Schoolmasters were appointed on a full-time basis, and in some gaols more than one was engaged. Thus the number of full-time Schoolmasters was few.

The attitude to the appointment of other grades of staff in the smaller gaols, and the engagement of Schoolmasters in the larger prisons had not changed significantly even by 1863 according to Mr. J.G. Perry, an Inspector of Prisons, in his evidence to the Select Committee of the House of Lords on Prison Discipline. When asked by the Chairman whether school instruction was generally carried out by the Chaplain or by a school instructor, Mr. Perry replied,

"In the large prisons there is almost always a Schoolmaster, and there are several Schoolmasters in some. In the smaller prisons there is seldom a separate Schoolmaster, but one of the Warders instructs the prisoners, or the Chaplain or the Governor does it; but even in some large prisons they have no Schoolmaster; the Chaplain does the duty." (2)

(1) I.P.R. Midland & Eastern District, 1850. (In fact this gaol was one of the few that still involved prisoners in teaching other prisoners. The Inspector drew the attention of the gaol authorities to this.)

(2) Evidence given on the 12th March, 1863.
The majority of those who performed the task of Schoolmaster were either Warder Schoolmasters or Clerk Schoolmasters. (1) The former were mainly concerned with discipline, but devoted a few hours per day or week to teaching. The latter had a variety of duties such as administration; (2) reading to prisoners; listening to prisoners reading; explaining portions of the scriptures; reading the lesson in the Chapel, and finally playing the organ and taking prisoners for singing. Quoted below is a typical example of a day's work of a Clerk Schoolmaster. This Schoolmaster was employed at Preston Gaol. (3) He had been a master of a Church of England School. There were few Schoolmasters with this educational background employed in the gaols.

"The prisoners for trial, and those in solitary confinement, are the only ones under instruction. I come into the prison at 10 minutes before 8; I go through the yards with the governor, the prisoners being drawn up for him to inspect. If there are any applications granted by him for the writing of letters, he gives me directions to furnish the paper. I then go to chapel, where I act as clerk; after this, prisoners to whom permission to write letters have been accorded, attend me in the school-room, where I superintend their doing so, and write for those who are unable. I then take all fresh committals before the chaplain for his examination, and also any prisoner who may desire to see him. This being done, I take a class in the school-room, the prisoners being divided into two classes, of those who can read, and those requiring elementary instruction. I also attend upon those in solitary confinement, and hear them read, and instruct them to do so. At half-past 12 the singers come to the school-room for half an hour, and we practise singing. I select the singers myself, ascertaining first their knowledge of singing. They

---

(1) See Appendix 'C' to this Section showing the number of Schoolmasters and other grades of staff associated with instruction.

(2) In some gaols Clerks were either employed as Storekeepers or as Governors, Clerks, or as Clerks to the Chaplain.

(3) He was probably the Schoolmaster that the Rev. John Clay finally employed following various unsuccessful attempts to find a suitable person.
seem to take a great interest in the singing. I cannot say whether it is for the extra allowance or not. I go to dinner at one, returning directly after, then to the school again, and the men in solitary confinement." (1)

Of the two main categories of prison staff engaged in instruction, the Clerk was perhaps the best qualified in terms of his educational background and time. Furthermore, there were reasons other than economic ones that demanded his transfer to teaching duties. For instance, because of the large number of prisoners requiring secular instruction, the Justices for Bath Gaol decided to appoint the Clerk to the Governor who in their opinion had the appropriate educational background to act as Schoolmaster. Instead of working for the Governor on clerical duties between the hours of 9 and 11 a.m., this period would now be devoted to the instruction of prisoners. (2)(3)

Commenting on the difficulty of finding suitable Warders, especially with a good educational background, the Inspector of Prisons for the Northern and Eastern District in 1839 made the following observations.

"The difficulty of finding persons of sufficient qualifications for the posts of officers under the silence system has also been put forward as an objection. Those required are the ordinary ones of regularity of conduct, temper, acuteness, and vigilance; while under entire separation, not only are these indispensable, but others must be superadded, such as a higher degree of instruction and mental ability, and a serious and religious frame of mind, in order that both conversation and bearing be always in harmony with the moral training and reforming principle of the discipline. Men so endowed are very

(1) I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, 1841.
(2) Special Committee of the Justices of the Peace Meeting on 3/1/1862.
(3) One gaol that had made a dual appointment of Chapel/Clerk-Schoolmaster was Newgate. For a detailed list of duties for this appointment see Rules and Regulations for the Government of the gaol at Newgate, 1873. Rule 230.
desirable for all establishments, but very difficult to be procured."

Throughout the period during which the local gaols were under the control of the local authorities, the occupational and educational background of Schoolmasters varied considerably. (1) As a general rule no specific qualifications were ever laid down. However, in some gaols such as Guildford and Chelmsford Houses of Correction, the Justices in an attempt to appoint more qualified Schoolmasters required that at least the appointee should have an educational background to at least National School level. However, in the majority of the gaols, provided the Schoolmaster could read and write well, he was usually appointed. Later when the State assumed control of the local gaols attempts were made to improve the educational standards of Schoolmasters. This will be discussed later.

The Schoolmasters' duties were perhaps the least well defined of all the grades of prison staff. There were several reasons. First of all legislation was not specific enough. Secondly, owing to the priority given to labour, instruction was only provided for short periods during the day or week. Thirdly, because many of the Chaplains had other pressing duties, Schoolmasters were often required to undertake some of the Chaplains' duties. Finally, there were economical advantages to be gained by employing Schoolmasters in diverse activities.

Turning to the educational duties and responsibilities of the Schoolmaster, they were primarily concerned with complying with the statutory obligations of imparting secular education to those prisoners deemed in most need of instruction. In the majority of these gaols where a Schoolmaster was employed either on a full-time or part-time basis, secular instruction was restricted to reading and writing, with greater emphasis being placed on reading. However,

(1) See Appendix 'D' to this Section showing the different occupational background of some Schoolmasters.
there were some gaols who provided a wider educational programme, and offered additional subjects such as Accounts, (1) Geography, (2) and English History. (3) The opportunity to teach these and other subjects was primarily dependant on the attitude of the Chaplain and the Visiting Justices. Occasionally the needs of the prisoners were taken into consideration, or in such cases when prisoners were serving long sentences (4) or for the more educated. In 1865 (5) Schoolmasters were required by statute to instruct arithmetic. (6) Instruction in the 3 R's was to remain the Schoolmasters main statutory responsibility throughout the remainder of the century.

Apart from their responsibility for secular instruction, there were numerous instances where Schoolmasters became involved in religious instruction. There were two reasons. First, because the Chaplain was otherwise engaged on other activities and secondly, a number of Schoolmasters were proficient or had expressed a wish to teach the subject. This practice was never discouraged by the prison authorities. However, one Inspector of Prisons seemed concerned about the matter. He observed,

"I have noticed in some prisons what has appeared to me to be an inclination on the part of the Chaplain to employ the Schoolmaster too much as a kind of assistant Chaplain, instead of the Schoolmaster's duties being confined to secular instruction, and the Chaplain himself assembling the prisoners in classes (as is generally required by the rules) to give them religious instruction. In an ordinary school it may be often necessary to combine the two kinds of instruction, because there is frequently no arrangement there for the stated attendance of a Clergyman. But it is not so in a prison; and I think the principle of responsibility would be better enforced, and that more progress would be made both in religious and in secular knowledge if the

(1) I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, 1845. Salford New Bailey House of Correction also taught arithmetic.
(2) I.P.R. Home District, 1849.
(3) Ibid.
(4) I.P.R. Home District, 1849. The Inspector of Prisons for Devizes County House of Correction recommended that arithmetic should be provided for long term prisoners.
(5) 28 & 29 Vic. c.126.
(6) Ibid. Rule 53.
Schoolmaster were always confined to his own special functions." (1)

As a result of their teaching duties, Schoolmasters were to become over a period of time involved in a number of other associated duties and responsibilities. (2) These duties were not statutory obligations. In the majority of cases they were delegated by the Chaplain. On other occasions they were inherited, or the Schoolmaster undertook them of his own volition. With the introduction of secular instruction there was a need to assess the progress of each prisoner under instruction. To this end some Schoolmasters kept a Journal. (3) The Journal served a number of purposes. In the first place it was a means of recording essential information about each prisoner such as his state of knowledge on reception, progress whilst attending school, and level of education achieved prior to discharge. Secondly, the Journal served as a record of the Schoolmasters teaching programme, as the document was frequently referred to by the Chaplains, and the Inspector of Prisons when examining prisoners as to their educational progress. Finally, information was extracted from the document, and used by the Schoolmaster, and the Chaplain in preparing their respective annual reports to the Justices. The Inspectorate often used the Journal to illustrate in their annual reports the state of education for that particular gaol. Criticisms of the Journal were few. When made they were usually made by the Inspector of Prisons, and in most cases they were justified. The usual complaint was lack of accuracy and clarity. Typical criticisms made by the Inspectorate were as follows, "I examined some of the prisoners both male and female, and found that on

(1) I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, 1850.
(2) For details of some rather unusual duties performed by a Schoolmaster see The Schoolmaster's Experiences in Newgate, Fraser's Magazine, Volumes 5 & 6, 1832. For a comprehensive list of duties of Schoolmasters duties see G. Holford, An Account of the General Penitentiary at Millbank, 1828 Chapter 7.
(3) See Appendix 'E' to this Section showing a copy of a Schoolmaster's Journal.
the whole they appeared to have made considerable progress, though
the examination was not so satisfactory as it might have been, owing
to the want of a sufficient record of the state of the education of
the prisoners when they began to receive instruction." (1) Another
complained,
"I examined some of the prisoners on their progress under the
Schoolmaster and Schoolmistress, but owing to the want of more precise
entries in many cases of the state of the prisoner's education on
admission, I had much difficulty in judging of their progress. In
arithmetic, however, the male prisoners appeared to have improved very
satisfactorily." (2)

Another duty the Schoolmaster was called upon to undertake
was that of assessing by interview the state of education of prisoners
on reception. One Schoolmaster, a Mr. Barre explained the procedure,
"I select the pupils for the various classes in this way. I visit
all the prisoners when received into prison, and take a note of their
state of education, and report to the Chaplain in reference to those
who are deficient, and obtain his sanction to their attendance in the
school." (3)

This practice was to later receive some attention by two Departmental
Committees on Education.

Because many of the prisoners were unable to read or write,
Schoolmasters were often required to read and write letters for these
prisoners. There were strict rules governing the receipt and writing
of letters. All incoming and outgoing correspondence for or from
prisoners had to be sanctioned by the Governor. The Schoolmaster at
Preston County House of Correction, when questioned by the Inspector
of Prisons concerning his duties stated,
"......... I go through the gaol with the Governor, the prisoners being
drawn up for him to inspect. If there are any applications granted
by him for the writing of letters, he gives me directions to furnish

(1) I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, 1851. (York County Gaol).
(2) Ibid. (Manchester Borough Gaol).
(3) H. Mayhew & J. Binney. The Criminal Prisons of London
1852. p.561.
the paper. I then go to Chapel, where I act as Clerk; after this, prisoners to whom permission to write letters have been accorded, attend me in the school-room where I superintend their doing so, and write for those who are unable."(1)

In many gaols Schoolmasters were made responsible for the distribution of incoming letters for the prisoners, vetting, and the collection of outgoing letters. For instance, this was the practice adopted at York Castle County Gaol. In other gaols this practice was given to the Chief 'Turnkey'. Essentially this responsibility was the Governor. As there was an element of security involved the issue raised some concern. Raising objection to Schoolmasters undertaking this responsibility, the Inspector of Prisons wrote,

"I am of the opinion that the Schoolmaster should not be intrusted with the important and responsible duty of opening and forwarding letters and deciding upon the propriety of the correspondence of the prisoners, and I recommend the Justices to require this duty to be performed by the Governor in person." (2)

The last of the main duties Schoolmasters were called upon to undertake was the responsibility for the distribution of books. For instance, the Schoolmaster at Knutsford House of Correction, was required to visit all the wards and exchange the prisoners books. (3) Furthermore in many of the gaols Schoolmasters were made responsible for the day to day organisation of the prison library. The Schoolmaster at Guildford County House of Correction was in charge of the library and the distribution of books. (4) Finally, it is important to note that the duties and responsibilities discussed above were by no means undertaken by all Schoolmasters. The extent of these duties varied from gaol to gaol.

(1) I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, 1841.
(2) Ibid. 1843.
(3) Ibid. 1845.
(4) I.P.R. Home District, 1849.
Commenting on the attitude of some prison authorities as to the appointment of Schoolmasters, and the difficulties and conditions under which some had to work, the Rev. W.C. Oehorne wrote, "In some gaols the Schoolmasters services are applied in such a manner as to induce the suspicion that he is considered useless and in the way. His instruction seems to be merely tolerated and permitted in compliance with the Prison Act. Not only is his attention frequently directed from the duties of his office but he is often compelled to instruct the prisoners at unseasonable times, and in a most inefficient way. Portions of the ordinary meal hours are in some gaols assigned for the instruction of prisoners, which method naturally tends to make it unpalatable to them, if not to the Schoolmaster. In some gaols it is imparted in the cells to individuals one at a time. Another mode is that of giving the instruction during the short intervals when the prisoners rest from their work on the treadmill; and another that of stopping all labour in the prison during one hour in the day, and permitting the Schoolmaster to do his best, during that short period, among prisoners of different educational conditions." (1)

An additional difficulty that faced many of the Schoolmasters was the high degree of ignorance amongst a large proportion of the prisoners. This was compounded by the fact that there was usually insufficient time to instruct those most in need of education. Furthermore, Schoolmasters as a whole were not certificated teachers (2) which not only limited their own performance as teachers but ultimately affected the instruction of the prisoners. On the whole there was hardly any criticism made about the teaching performance of Schoolmasters. When it was made it was generally concerned with such matters as too much emphasis being placed on rota learning and not sufficient attention given to understanding. In the main the Chaplains,

(2) The Convict Service only employed Certificated Teachers.
Inspector of Prisons, and prisoners commented favourably about the Schoolmasters' achievements. For instance, an Inspector of Prisons commented in general terms about Schoolmasters when he wrote in his annual report, "The intellectual improvement of the convicts has been most satisfactory, and proves how well the system (separate) is adopted to the development, rather than to the injury of the mental faculties. The Schoolmaster bears unequivocal testimony to this fact." (1) A prisoner at Lincoln Gaol left the following letter with the Chaplain. It read, "I desire to return my sincere thanks to the Governor for the kindness I have received from him. To the Chaplain whose kind admonitions I trust I shall remember as long as I live; to the Schoolmaster for the pains he has taken with me." (2)

The hours that Schoolmasters were required to work varied considerably throughout the gaols. In the majority of cases as Schoolmasters had other duties such as Warders or Clerks, the hours that they were able to devote to instruction were usually short periods ranging from half an hour to 2 hours per day. Because of the priority that was given to labour, and to comply with other matters concerning prison routine, the hours were often staggered throughout the day. In some gaols the Schoolmaster instructed during the mornings, in others during the afternoons, and in some during the evening. In an effort to introduce a greater degree of uniformity, a Select Committee of the House of Lords on Prison Discipline in 1863 recommended that in order to avoid interference with the discipline of the prison, instruction could be given at fixed hours during the day if the Chaplain so desired, but the Committee were of the opinion that instruction should be given in the evenings. The only Schoolmasters who enjoyed some consistency in their hours of work were the few full-time ones who worked in the large gaols. (3)

(1) I.P.R. Home District, 1845.
(2) Extract from Chaplains Journal - Lincoln Gaol, dated 17/4/1849.
(3) See Appendix 'F' to this Section showing Schoolmasters' hours.
As in the case of their duties, and hours, so the salaries of Schoolmasters varied. As the Rev. W.G. Osborne pointed out,

"...but in reality many have been porters, warders, or clerks, giving only a small portion of their time to the work of instruction.......

"Persons are in such places sometimes appointed and paid for one purpose, while they are employed for another." (1)

There was no laid down criteria for determining salary levels. They were not paid on the basis of their teaching qualifications because very few were qualified. Furthermore, their salaries were not usually related to the actual number of prisoners they instructed. Salaries were based on the following pattern. In some gaols Schoolmasters were paid a fixed salary for teaching only. In others a fixed salary was paid for instruction plus an additional sum for undertaking other duties. Whereas in other gaols a fixed salary was paid plus a given sum for teaching. As a general rule they received salaries comparable to warders, with an additional sum for teaching. (2)(3)

Throughout the period during which the local prisons were under the control of the local authorities, the number of appointments, duties, and conditions of service for schoolmasters varied from prison to prison. There were few certificated or full-time schoolmasters. Most were Warders or other officers employed for some hours of the day as teachers.

Reporting on the state of education prior to 1877 with particular reference to staff associated with instruction, the Prisoners' Education Committee in 1896 stated,

"The late prison authorities had so far carried out this provision at the date of the transfer of prisons in 1878, when no fewer than 113 prisons passed into Government control, that over 50 officers (at an approximate cost of £4,300 per annum) were engaged on scholastic duties. In many cases, however, there were no proper teaching staff whatever in prisons.


(2) See Appendix 'G' to this Section showing different salary scales paid to Schoolmasters.

(3) See Appendix 'H' to this Section of copy of a Schoolmasters application for an increase in salary. Authorisation for fixing salaries was that of the Justices at Quarter Sessions. See 4 Geo.IV, c.64 1823 Rule 26.
which are still open, while in others, additional duties, such as those of Clerk, trade instructors, etc., were performed by the Schoolmaster, so that this estimate overrules the amount which was actually devoted to education." (1)

On the 5th March 1879, (2) the Secretary of State, Home Department wrote to the Prison Commissioners stating that a Departmental Committee was being appointed to enquire into the subject of "the educational instruction of prisoners in Local Prisons (within the Prison Acts 1865 and 1877) and to consider questions on which it was necessary to adopt some uniform practice." (3) Of particular relevance here the Committee was to enquire into the various classes of teachers, and their salaries. In fact the Committee went beyond those terms. Fundamental changes were recommended in the provisions for the education of prisoners. It is therefore proposed to deal at this stage with those recommendations specifically affecting schoolmasters. Other recommendations will be dealt with under appropriate Chapters. As a direct result of the recommendations of the Committee, from 1879 onwards a measure of uniformity was achieved.

As to their findings the Committee noted that in only four prisons was there a Certificated Schoolmaster. In the remaining prisons, schoolmasters were either Warders or other officers who spent some hours of the day as teachers. (4) Of those schoolmasters who were employed entirely as teachers their salaries varied from £70 to £120 per annum. A special allowance was awarded to other officers engaged in teaching. No sum was given. (5)

The Committee then made the following recommendations. First, that in each prison there should be a Certificated Schoolmaster. Where more than one was employed, not less than one half of them should

(2) PRO 79667/6/9.
(3) Departmental Committee on Education visited approximately 62 prisons. The total number of schoolmasters in the prison service in 1878 was 63. See Appendix 'C' to this Section.
(4) Ibid. Page 3.
(5) Ibid.
be certificated. The remainder should be Assistant Schoolmasters, and should be men who had served as petty and non-commissioned officers in the armed forces. (1) Secondly, an age limit was placed on all schoolmaster appointments. No schoolmaster could be appointed unless he was at least 23 years of age, and not more than 42 years old. (2) Thirdly, salary differentials were to apply. A Certificated Schoolmaster should be paid £100 per annum with an annual increase of £5 over a period of 10 years. Assistant Schoolmasters should be paid Warder's pay, plus an allowance of £1. (3) Fourthly, the hours schoolmasters would be expected to work when employed on a full-time basis were to be 6 hours daily between the hours of 8 a.m. and 6 p.m., except on Saturdays when they should be so employed for any three hours between 8 a.m. and 12 noon. (4) Finally, the ratio of schoolmasters to prisoners should be one to every 100 or part thereof of prisoners to be instructed.

With the introduction in 1878 of a new system of prison discipline, that of Progressive Stages, (5) prisoners were now to be divided into three groups. Schoolmasters were to be affected in the following ways. The method by which schoolmasters were now expected to instruct prisoners was on a class and cellular basis. In the former case, schoolmasters were to teach those classified in Class I, that is those who could not read, collectively. (6) The class should not consist of more than 6 prisoners. Where there were more than 15 prisoners a Warder should be present. (7) When teaching collectively the schoolmaster would be required to teach two lessons a week of half an hour each. (8) Schoolmasters were to instruct prisoners classified into Class II, that is those who could read, in their cells. (9) When

---

(1) Recommendation 9(A).
(2) Ibid. 9(C).
(3) Ibid. 9(D). A Warder received £70 per annum, rising by £1 per annum to £75 per annum. See Appendix No.5 P.C.R. 1878.
(4) Ibid. 5(C).
(5) For further details of the system see Chapters 4 and 5.
(6) Recommendation 4(A).
(7) Ibid. 4(B).
(8) Ibid. 5.
(9) Ibid. 4(A).
teaching in the cells, the schoolmaster was to give two lessons per week of a ½ hour each. (1) Schoolmasters were not required to teach Class III prisoners, as they were provided with suitable school books, and expected to teach themselves. (2) Essentially schoolmasters were expected to concentrate on Classes I and II, but particularly with Class I.

Although the Elementary Education Act had by now been in operation for nine years, it is likely that for the first time schoolmasters were expected to teach to a particular standard. The 3 R's were to be taught to the following standards:

- reading, as far as Standard III, as set out in the Code of the Education Department; (3)
- writing, as far as transcribing a portion of the book read, and reading the portion transcribed; (4)
- arithmetic, as far as casting simple money accounts, and mental calculations of small money sums. (5)

Of the recommendations that were made, the most encouraging one was the suggestion that more Certificated teachers be appointed. However, this idea was short lived: it was never fully realised.

The recommendations of the Committee were submitted to the Secretary of State, Home Department for his approval. On the 25th June 1880, the Secretary of State wrote to the Prison Commissioners authorising the implementation of the new scheme. (6) It was introduced for a trial period of six months in six prisons. Eventually the scheme was extended for one year to 20 prisons. The new scheme received overall approval. The Secretary of State confirmed the appointment of two classes of schoolmasters. However, he stated that Assistant Schoolmasters would be required to pass a satisfactory examination to be conducted by the

---

(1) Recommendation 5(A).
(2) Ibid. 2(D).
(3) Ibid. 1(A).
(4) Ibid. 1(B).
(5) Ibid. 1(C).
(6) PRO 79667/8/9.
Education Committee. This last point was never raised by the Departmental Committee, and it can only be assumed that they had overlooked the matter. However, in their second and final report the Committee recommended that:

"we consider that no person should be employed as a teacher unless previously passed for the officer by some authority appointed by this Department." (1)

Perusal of subsequent Prison Commissioners reports makes no further reference to such a grade of schoolmaster. It is assumed that the grade of Assistant Schoolmaster was in fact to refer to the Schoolmaster-Warder grade. Evidence to this effect is taken from the report in 1896 of the Prisoners' Education Committee who stated,

"The Schoolmaster-Warders have been tested since the year 1879 by one of the Inspectors of the Education Department, acting under the instruction of the Chief Inspector." (2)

With regard to the educational standard to be expected of these Schoolmaster-Warders, the Committee seemed satisfied with the following assurances made by the Inspector, who stated,

"that it was found by experience that any adult who has retained sufficient knowledge of the rules of arithmetic to be able to work difficult sums in the four rules applied to money is generally a good reader and writer, and also that it was not thought necessary to require a higher knowledge of arithmetic in the teacher of local prisoners, provided they could also read and write within as great readiness as is required in the Fifth and Sixth Standards. In fact, they stand much on the same footing as teachers admitted to serve in elementary schools, who have been good scholars in day schools, and are approved by the Inspector as coming up to a fair level of teaching power under Article 58 of the Code." (3)

In fact the Committee confirmed that before a Schoolmaster-Warder could

(1) Departmental Committee on Education. Report 1882. Recommendation No.11.

(2) Attempts were made to find specimens of the examination papers at the Public Records Office; Home Office, Prison Department; and at the Department of Education and Science but to no avail.

(3) P.E.C. paragraph 32.
be appointed they were required to be "specially selected by the Governor and Chaplain," (1) and then recommended to the Prison Commissioners before being finally appointed.

In 1882 the Departmental Committee published its second and last report. It made a few amendments of which the following are of particular interest. The first was the most disappointing of all in that they recommended that, where possible, only Certificated teachers be appointed to the larger prisons. (2) Secondly, on a more encouraging note, the Committee recommended that the ratio of schoolmasters to prisoners should be one to 70. They pointed out how they had arrived at this ratio. If there were 194 prisoners eligible for instruction, and if that included both class and cellular instruction, 100 prisoners would require 49 hours of teaching a week. As schoolmasters were not supposed to devote more than 33 hours per week to instruction, a teacher could only then be expected to teach on an average about 70 prisoners. (3) Thirdly, the Committee decided to raise the age on appointment from 23 to 24. The age of 42 remained the same as being the latest age at which a person could be appointed. (4) Fourthly, as to the matter of salaries, the Committee recommended an increase. Where a schoolmaster was engaged on a full-time basis, his salary should be that of Principal-Warder, with an additional £1 per month. (5) In addition the schoolmaster was to "wear the distinctive uniform of that rank." As far as is known no further increases in salaries for schoolmasters were recommended throughout the remainder of the century. Fifthly, all schoolmasters were required to teach six hours per day. If a schoolmaster taught for less than six hours per day, the rest of the time should be devoted to helping prisoners write letters or in the distribution of books. If he should even then be underemployed, he should make himself available to the Governor. (6) Furthermore, schoolmasters were to be exempt from

(1) P.E.C. paragraph 33.
(2) Departmental Committee on Education 1882. Recommendation No.10.
(3) Ibid. No.11.
(4) Ibid.
(5) Departmental Committee on Education Report 1882. Recommendation No.11 (Unfortunately it has not been possible to ascertain the salary of a Principal-Warder in 1882. However his salary in 1878 was £85 + £1 per annum to £90 per annum. P.C.R. 1878, Appendix 5.)
(6) Ibid. Recommendation No.5(c).
escort of night duty, if they were employed full-time as teachers. (1) Finally, any schoolmaster employed full-time on teaching, should not be expected to write letters or distribute books. A prison warder should perform these duties under the direction of a Chaplain, and be selected by the Governor. (2) In their general conclusion, the Committee recommended that every facility should be given to schoolmasters for instruction purposes, and that they should not be hindered in any way in the performance of their duties. Moreover all prisoners should be in their cells when wanted for instruction. These along with other recommendations were introduced throughout all the prisons in 1882.

The Committee's report was submitted to the Treasury in May 1882, primarily to obtain permission to meet the increased costs of employing additional teaching staff. On the 7th December, 1882, (3) they sanctioned the increase which amounted to £8,293, an increase of £2,230 more than had been expended by the local authorities. (4) Later in 1894 the Prison Commissioners reported that they had authorised an increase in the number of schoolmasters at an additional cost of £2,000 per annum. (5)

Although the Departmental Committee had been able to achieve a greater measure of uniformity, they were basically relying on the Schoolmaster-Warder to provide the bulk of the teaching. Commenting in 1894 on the state of prison instruction, and the need to appoint better qualified teachers, the Howard Association remarked, "This appears to have somewhat retrograded since the Prison Act of 1877. Latterly, Warders have been appointed as schoolmasters in English jails instead of professional teachers." (6)

In fact by 1895 the pattern as to the composition of the

(1) Departmental Committee on Education Report 1882. Recommendation No.5(c)
(2) Ibid.
(3) P.C.R. 1885, paragraph 52-
(4) P.C.R. 1886-87, paragraph 15.
(5) P.C.R. 1894, paragraphs 52 and 57.
educational staff was as follows: 6 local prison schoolmasters; 19 Schoolmaster-Warders; and 22 Clerk and Schoolmaster-Warders. (1) According to the Prison Commissioners the reasons underlying these changes which had been taken in 1895 and were as follows. First of all the object of instruction was now to provide prisoners with such elementary education, that they could read and write easily, and conduct simple calculations in money, and to enable them to hold a job on discharge. Therefore the full-time schoolmaster per se, inherited from the local authorities, was now no longer required, and in any case they were "dying out". As to the Schoolmaster-Warder, they were more liable to be performing disciplinary duties, and so they too were disappearing as teachers. Secondly, as many of the prisons were small, and as the time allocated for instruction was correspondingly short, it was felt that the new grade of staff of Clerk and Schoolmaster-Warder would best serve the needs of the prison service. In any case the Clerk was well qualified to perform both clerical and scholastic work. They were all specially selected. (2)(3)

In 1896 the Prisoners' Education Committee submitted their report about the state of education in the local prisons. On balance, their recommendations did not alter significantly the role of the schoolmaster. There was to be slight improvement in their status. To begin with schoolmasters were to continue to instruct prisoners in their cells. The dinner hour was still to be used for this purpose, and also, as prisoners were to be allowed an extra half an hour for instruction, lasting 20 minutes instead of ½ hour, it was proposed that a timetable be drawn up especially for those schoolmasters who also acted as Warders, so that their daily tasks could be planned in such a way to accommodate their dual responsibilities. (4) Secondly, when a schoolmaster was employed for 30 hours per week with a daily average of 30 pupils, he

(1) P.C.R. 1897/98, paragraph 72.
(2) Ibid. paragraph 74, 75, 76.
(3) For details of the subjects of examination to be taken by Clerk and Schoolmaster-Warders and which they had to pass, see Appendix I to this Section. Also for details of competitive examination papers for the appointment of Clerk and Schoolmaster in the Prison Service, England, see Memorandum and Questions issued by the Civil Service Commission in October, 1921.
(4) P.E.C. 1896, paragraph 17.
should be exempt from disciplinary duties, and his hours should be from 9 a.m. to 6 p.m. (1) Thirdly, schoolmasters were to be relieved from the distribution of incoming and the collection of outgoing letters. (2) This recommendation finally put an end to a practice common in many prisons prior to 1877. Fourthly, when a schoolmaster acted as a Clerk, and had no disciplinary duties to perform, he was to be allowed to wear plain clothes. (3) Finally, the previous practice of testing the degree of education of prisoners on reception was prohibited for schoolmasters. Now only the Chaplain could examine prisoners on reception and discharge. (4)

In conclusion, the schoolmaster had diversified duties. It was not until the State assumed control of the local prisons, that schoolmasters enjoyed more equitable conditions of service.

Because of the low standard of education thought appropriate for prisoners, plus the fact that most schoolmasters were mainly associated with disciplinary duties, their status was never high. Sir Evelyn Ruggles-Brise stated that it is not "pretended that our schoolmasters can compete in learning and ability to teach with the trained teacher of our public schools, but given the nature of the task they have to perform with a fugitive class, many of whom are not desirous to learn, or to re-learn what they have once been taught, it may be stated that they adequately fulfil the purpose for which they are appointed." (5)

Finally, perhaps, the main problem facing the schoolmasters as a body was that of their ambiguous status. This might well have been remedied had the remarks passed by the Departmental Committee on Prisons in 1895 been heeded. They wrote, "Indeed we are inclined to think that they (schoolmasters) should not be disciplining officers at all, and that sufficient attention has not

(1) P.E.C. 1896 Recommendation No.13
(2) Ibid. No.14
(3) Ibid. No.16
(4) Ibid. No.12
been paid to their position, and to the excellent influence which they might exercise over the prisoners were their authority and position extended. The teachers can sometimes succeed where the Chaplain fails; at least they should be enabled to act in conjunction with and as auxiliaries to the Chaplain." (1)
APPENDIX 'A'

Miscellaneous duties performed by Schoolmasters

1) Selection of prisoners for instruction
   Derby County Gaol and House of Correction - I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, 1843.
   Giltspur Street Compter - I.P.R. Home District, 1849.

2) Principal Turnkey & Schoolmaster - superintends the cooking and delivery of food to prisoners, Clerk at Chapel; assists in locking up and unlocking of prisoners, and attends to the sick and delivery of medicine.
   Surrey House of Correction, Guildford.
   I.P.R. Southern & Western District, 1837.

3) Schoolmaster reads prison rules to prisoners once a fortnight - Ilford County House of Correction.
   I.P.R. Home District, 1845.

4) Schoolmaster attends to the Governor's cows, and superintends the milking, and has to clean up the schoolroom.
   Wakefield House of Correction.
   I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, 1842.

5) Schoolmaster superintends the reception of coals, wheat, and other commodities during the intervals of instructing prisoners.
   Warwick County House of Correction.
   I.P.R. Southern & Western District, 1852.

6) Schoolmaster acts as photographer and taskmaster.
   Devizes County Prison.
   I.P.R. Southern District, 1871.

7) Schoolmaster acts as prison barber.
   York Prison.
   I.P.R. Yorkshire, 1849.

8) Carrying out consultations with the prisoners' Attorney prior to Court appearance. Preparing affidavits and petitions on behalf of prisoners. Defending prisoners in Court.
Schoolmaster at Newgate. See "The Schoolmaster's Experiences in Newgate".
Frasers Magazine, Vol. 5 & 6, 1832.

(An interesting and unusual account of a Schoolmaster's experiences in a gaol).

See also George Holford's account of the varied duties of the Schoolmaster at Millbank - An Account of the General Penitentiary at Millbank, 1823.
APPENDIX 'B'

Grades of Staff other than Schoolmasters involved in instruction of prisoners

1) Taskmaster and wife spent 9 hours per week in teaching prisoners.
   Newcastle Gaol.
   I.P.R. Northumberland & Durham, 1838.

2) Gaol Watchman/Turnkey acted as Clerk to the Chaplain and instructed prisoners.
   Lincoln Castle County Gaol.
   I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, 1844.

3) Deputy Governor (son of the Governor) instructed in spelling and reading.
   Northalleston House of Correction.
   I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, 1844.

4) Governor (entirely responsible for instruction).
   St. Albans Liberty Gaol & House of Correction.
   I.P.R. Home District, 1845.

N.B. Governors, especially those in the small gaols, devoted many hours to the instruction of their prisoners. On the whole this activity received the approval of the main body of the Inspector of Prisons except for one who wrote: "There is no Schoolmaster appointed to afford instruction to the prisoners; but those who are willing to be taught receive lessons in reading and writing from the Governor, much to his, as far as the benevolent intentions are concerned, as this duty is entirely optional on his part. At the same time we question the propriety of a Governor of a prison being at the same time the Schoolmaster; we believe that the close and intimate proximity which must necessarily exist between a teacher and his pupil will tend in a great measure to diminish that absolute authority which it is so essential that a governor should exercise over his prisoners." (1)

(1) Canterbury City Gaol & Bridewell - I.P.R. Home District, 1845.
### APPENDIX 'C'

Number of Schoolmasters and other grades of staff engaged in instructional duties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Clerk-Schoolmasters</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Clerk-Schoolmasters</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Clerk-Schoolmasters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>1866</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1868</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>1869</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>Not Known</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Judicial Statistics.

In their 3rd Report - 1880, Appendix No.18 the Prison Commissioners published a return which dealt specifically with the numbers of Schoolmasters and other officers acting as Schoolmasters as on the 1st April, 1878.

- Total number of gaols in England: 61
- Total number of Schoolmasters: 51 - 6 prisons employed 2 each, 39 prisons employed 1 each

**Other grades**

- Clerk-Schoolmasters: 3 - 3 prisons employed one each of which one was a Deputy Governor.
- Warden-Schoolmasters: 6 - 2 prisons employed 2 each, 2 prisons employed 1 each

Total staff employed on instructional duties: 60

9 gaols had no education staff.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Certificated Schoolmaster</th>
<th>Principal Warder - Schoolmaster</th>
<th>Schoolmaster-Warders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>68 Scripture Readers; Schoolmasters and Discipline Officers acting as Schoolmasters.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>14 Scripture Readers and Schoolmasters.</td>
<td>54 Discipline Officers acting as Clerks or Schoolmasters.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897/98</td>
<td>6 Schoolmasters</td>
<td>19 Schoolmaster-Warders</td>
<td>22 Clerk and Schoolmaster-Warders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>20 Scripture Readers and Schoolmasters</td>
<td>68 Discipline Officers acting as Clerk or Schoolmasters.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>21 Scripture Readers and Schoolmasters</td>
<td>76 Discipline Officers acting as Clerk and Schoolmasters.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>20 Scripture Readers and Schoolmasters</td>
<td>89 Discipline Officers acting as Clerks or Schoolmasters.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Prisoners Education Committee - Appendix No.13 - 1896.
(1) P.C.R. 1896, Appendix No.8.
(1) P.C.R., 1897 Appendix No.8.
(1) P.C.R. 1897-98, paragraph 72.
(1) P.C.R. 1897/98 Appendix No.8.
(1) P.C.R. 1899 Appendix No.9.
(1) P.C.R. 1900 Appendix No.9.
APPENDIX D

Occupational Background of some Schoolmasters

1) Schoolmaster & Chapel Clerk - Woollen Draper. New Bailey Salford County House of Correction.
   I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, 1837.

2) Schoolmaster - Millwright Preston County House of Correction.
   I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, 1837.

   I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, 1837.

4) Schoolmaster - 16th Lancers Knutsford House of Correction.
   I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, 1837.

5) Schoolmaster - Schoolmaster by Profession Wakefield House of Correction.
   I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, 1837.

6) Schoolmaster - Schoolmaster by Profession Kirkdale Gaol and House of Correction.
   I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, 1837.

   I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, 1836.

8) Schoolmaster - Gentlemen's Service Norwich Castle County Gaol.
   I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, 1838.

9) Schoolmaster - Sergeant Major Knutsford House of Correction.
   I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, 1844.
Example of a Schoolmaster's Journal

To: Reverend Sir,

From: "Wakefield House of Correction, June 6, 1845.

I present to you my Report of the improvement of Adult Prisoners, it gives me pleasure to add that their conduct is exemplary in the school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Prisoner</th>
<th>Date of Admittance</th>
<th>State of Knowledge when Convicted</th>
<th>Present State of Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>February 19, 1845</td>
<td>Did not know all the Alphabet.</td>
<td>Now able to read the Testament, and writes alphabet letters; behaves well; seems improved in mind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366</td>
<td>November 22, 1844</td>
<td>Ditto Ditto.</td>
<td>In the Bible class. Greatly improved in religious knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>693</td>
<td>April 7, 1845</td>
<td>Ditto Ditto.</td>
<td>Now reads the Bible. Writes and works Long Division sums. Is sorry for past misconduct; promises, by the help of God, to lead a Christian life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333</td>
<td>February 18, 1845</td>
<td>Ditto Ditto.</td>
<td>In the Testament class. Writes alphabet letters. Is deeply sensible that sin produces sorrow. Learned the Church Catechism to the Ten Commandments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>November 9, 1845</td>
<td>Did not know A. from B.</td>
<td>Now able to read the Psalms and write alphabet letters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504</td>
<td>March 18, 1845</td>
<td>Ditto Ditto.</td>
<td>Ditto Ditto Ditto.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706</td>
<td>February 19, 1845</td>
<td>Ditto Ditto.</td>
<td>Now able to read the Psalms and write alphabet letters, and most Church Catechism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>January 2, 1844</td>
<td>Ditto Ditto.</td>
<td>Now able to read the Psalms and write alphabet letters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>January 2, 1844</td>
<td>Ditto Ditto.</td>
<td>Ditto Ditto Ditto.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417</td>
<td>March 6, 1845</td>
<td>Ditto Ditto.</td>
<td>Now able to read the Psalms and write alphabet letters, and Ten Commandments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1522</td>
<td>July 10, 1844</td>
<td>Ditto Ditto.</td>
<td>Now able to read the Psalms and write alphabet letters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1310</td>
<td>June 17, 1844</td>
<td>Ditto Ditto.</td>
<td>Now able to read the Psalms and write alphabet letters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1092</td>
<td>May 14, 1844</td>
<td>Ditto Ditto.</td>
<td>Now able to read the Psalms and write alphabet letters, and work Subtraction sums.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>651</td>
<td>April 7, 1845</td>
<td>Knew the Alphabet.</td>
<td>In the Bible class, works Long Division sums; has better knowledge of Scripture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>January 13, 1845</td>
<td>Ditto Ditto.</td>
<td>Reads the Bible and works Long Division sums.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2761</td>
<td>December 16, 1844</td>
<td>Ditto Ditto.</td>
<td>Reads the Bible, works Addition sums, and writes a good hand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1452</td>
<td>July 24, 1844</td>
<td>Read Monosyllables</td>
<td>Improves both, also in religious knowledge; works Addition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1648</td>
<td>July 24, 1844</td>
<td>Wrote ditto.</td>
<td>Repeats the Church Catechism to the end of Ten Commandments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>643</td>
<td>April 4, 1845</td>
<td>Same as the above.</td>
<td>Reads the Bible; is in the Rule of Three, and repeats the Ten Commandments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503</td>
<td>March 18, 1845</td>
<td>Read Monosyllables</td>
<td>Reads the Bible; is in the 5th rule; also learned to write.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>614</td>
<td>April 4, 1845</td>
<td>Ditto.</td>
<td>Reads the Bible; is in the 4th rule; also learned to write, and repeats nearly all Church Catechism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326</td>
<td>February 21, 1845</td>
<td>Ditto.</td>
<td>Reads the Bible; is in the 2nd rule; also learned to write.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2760</td>
<td>December 16, 1844</td>
<td>Ditto.</td>
<td>Reads the Bible; is in the 3rd rule; also learned to write, and repeats nearly all Church Catechism.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, 1845.
### Schoolmasters' Hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1) Hertford County Gaol and House of Correction</th>
<th>Schoolmaster/Warden</th>
<th>Six Hours Daily and House of Correction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2) Norwich Castle County Gaol</td>
<td>Schoolmaster</td>
<td>3.30 a.m. Cells &amp; Classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 a.m. – 2 p.m. Chaplain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 p.m. – 4 p.m. Class four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 p.m. – 7 p.m. Front gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Guildford County House of Correction</td>
<td>Schoolmaster</td>
<td>9 a.m. – 5 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Secular Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Knutsford House of Correction</td>
<td>Schoolmaster/Clerk/</td>
<td>School last,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turnkey</td>
<td>3 hours daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Winchester County Prison</td>
<td>Schoolmaster</td>
<td>2½ hours, 5 days a week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Kutor House of Correction</td>
<td>Schoolmaster</td>
<td>2 hours every afternoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Head Turnkey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Devizes County Prison</td>
<td>Schoolmaster</td>
<td>2 hours per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>photographer and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Taskmaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Shepton Mallet Gaol</td>
<td>Schoolmaster</td>
<td>9 hours daily in summer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 hours daily in winter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Leicester County Gaol and House of Correction</td>
<td>Schoolmaster/Clerk/</td>
<td>4 hours per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chapel Clerk/ Clerk</td>
<td>and writing letters for prisoners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Advanced prisoners have 2 days education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Liverpool Borough prison</td>
<td>Schoolmaster</td>
<td>25 minutes per day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Aylesbury County Prison</td>
<td>Schoolmaster</td>
<td>1 hour weekly if they can read.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>½ hour weekly if they cannot read.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) When teaching, 6 hours daily between 8 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and 6 p.m. during weekday; 3 hours on Saturday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between 8 a.m. and noon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) 30 hours per week with an average class of 30 scholars between 9 a.m. and 6 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1) I.P.R. Home District, 1837
2) I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, 1838
3) I.P.R. Home District, 1849
4) I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, 1839.
5) I.P.R. Southern District, 1874.
6) I.P.R. Midland & Eastern District, 1849.
7) I.P.R. Southern District, 1871.
8) " " " 1864.
9) I.P.R. Southern & Western District, 1854.
10) I.P.R. Northern District, 1871.
11) I.P.R. Southern District, 1874.
12) Departmental Committee on Education 1879. Recommendation No.5(c)
### APPENDIX 'G'

**Salary Scales of Some Schoolmasters**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Maidstone County Gaol</td>
<td>12/- per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hertford County Gaol</td>
<td>16/- per week (also acted as a turnkey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Coldbath Fields Gaol</td>
<td>£2 per week (highest recorded weekly paid Schoolmaster. Probably due to the fact that this gaol was a large one).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cheshire County Gaol</td>
<td>£35 + £2 for acting as Chapel Clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Norwich Castle County Gaol</td>
<td>£54.12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Leicester Borough Gaol</td>
<td>£30 (Received £52 when attending both gaols).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Hereford County Gaol</td>
<td>£20 (Received this amount when first appointed in 1837. No mention of an increase in the 1841 report).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Preston County House of Correction</td>
<td>£42 (Also acts as Clerk and takes singing).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>'Knutsford House of Correction</td>
<td>£65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Coldbath Fields</td>
<td>£96.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Clerkenwell Prison</td>
<td>£100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Salaries of Schoolmasters &quot;employed entirely as teachers&quot; when the State assumed control of all local prisons &quot;varied from £70 to £120 per annum.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Certificated teachers</td>
<td>£100 + £5 increase per annum for 10 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Clerk and Schoolmaster Warder to received an additional allowance of £12 per annum in addition to their ordinary pay and allowance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1) I.P.R. Home District, 1837.  
2) Ibid.  
3) Rough Minutes of Coldbath Fields, 8/2/1827.  
4) I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, 1837.  
5) I.P.R.  
6) I.P.R. Southern & Western District, 1839.  
7) I.P.R.  
8) I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, 1841.  
9) I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, 1844.  
10) Report of a Committee appointed by Quarter Sessions 31/5/1849 to investigate general expenditure of the County of Middlesex.  
12) Departmental Committee on Education, 1879.  
13) Departmental Committee on Education, 1879 Recommendation 9(D).  
14) P.C.R. 1897-98.
APPENDIX 'H'

Copy of a Schoolmaster's application for an increase in salary

To the Visiting Justices of Her Majesty's County Prison at Maidstone in the County of Kent.

The humble Memorial of Richard Martin of Maidstone aforesaid Schoolmaster most humbly showeth that your said Memorialist having performed the duties both of Schoolmaster and Chapel Clerk at the said County Prison for the period of nearly two years at a salary of only twelve shillings per week, and in consequence of such duties demanding his entire attention everyday including Sundays, and also in consideration of his having a wife and six children to support, he most humbly and respectfully solicits the favour of the Visiting Justices of Her Majesty's County Prison aforesaid to be pleased to take into their kind consideration to grant unto your said Memorialist some addition or increase to his present salary. And your said Memorialist will for ever pray, etc. Richard Martin, Maidstone, 9th April, 1838.

(On the following day the Visiting Justices in reporting to the of General Sessions recommended an increase from 12/- to 15/- per week following a satisfactory report by the Chaplain, who had stated that Mr. Martin "had been strictly attentive to his duties"). (1)

SIR,

With reference to your letter of the 22nd instant (A59509) I am directed by the Civil Service Commissioners to state for the information of the Chief Authorities of your Department that, subject to the approval of the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury, which they will take the necessary steps to obtain, the Civil Service Commissioners will henceforth regard the subjects of examination and limits of age for the situation of Clerk in the Prisons Service as being fixed as follows, viz:—

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECTS OF EXAMINATION</th>
<th>LIMITS OF AGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Handwriting</td>
<td>18 - 22 but Clerk and Schoolmaster Warders will be eligible up to the age of 30.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Orthography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Arithmetic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Book-keeping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. English Composition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Indexing &amp; docketing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Digesting returns into Summaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Candidates must pass in the first four subjects and in two of the remaining subjects.

I have the honour to be,

SIR,
Your obedient Servant,

The Under Secretary of State

J.S. LOCKHART,

Home Office Secretary
5. The Chaplain

"Oh I would ye would resort to the prisons a commendable thing in a Christian realm, I would there were curates of prisons, that we might say 'The Curate of Newgate', the 'Curate of Fleet'; and I would have them waged for their labour." Latimer.

One of the first recommendations for the appointment of clergymen to the gaols of England arose from a report of a small committee chaired by a Dr. Thomas Bray in 1702 (1) to the newly formed Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge.

Amongst the many 'vices and immoralities' they found in the prisons were 'swearing, cursing, blasphemy, gameing' and in particular 'neglect of all religious worships'. The committee made a number of recommendations (2) of which 3(1) is very relevant at this point as it suggests the appointment of ministers to gaols. It recommended, "That committee of Aldermen, Common Council or some members of the Society for Reformation be appointed, distinctly for this purpose, who shall have power

1) to appoint Ministers

The approbation of the Bishop of London first had and obtained and also officers to all prisons and shall be obliged once a week to visit them and take an account of ye state of each prison and give orders accordingly."

It would appear that some of the practices adopted in the continental gaols may have had some influence in the appointment of clergymen to English gaols. John Howard spent some time visiting gaols in a number of countries on the continent. On his return to England, he expressed himself as having been suitably impressed with the religious facilities offered to prisoners. For instance in Holland he found that it was standard practice to appoint clergymen to the gaols, to conduct religious services and to offer instruction to the prisoners.

(1) This report was at the instigation of the rather militant ecclesiastic Bishop Compton.

(2) See Appendix A for a full copy of the Report and its recommendations 'An essay towards ye reformation of Newgate and the prisons in and about London.'
"At Rotterdam, Howard had attended a service in the prison at 1.30 p.m. on Sunday. It consisted of singing and a sermon, with three-quarters of an hour of catechising. It concluded with the singing of the fifty-first Psalm. During prayer the women stood and covered their faces with their aprons. Although the service had lasted two and a half hours, it had been neither tedious nor disagreeable. What he saw in Holland encouraged him to strive for the improvement of conditions in England. (1)

Another Englishman, Jonas Hanway who had studied Dutch prisons returned to England advocating the appointment of able and earnest chaplains. In fact he went so far as to recommend that the clergymen should be well paid. (2)

In England there were clergymen who were visiting gaols on a voluntary basis, and expressing not only concern with the conditions in the gaols but also for the prisoners. Their main pre-occupation was that there were no full-time clergymen appointed to the gaols, and that the religious needs of the prisoners were being largely neglected. One such minister was Bernard Gilpin from Durham who had the following observations made of him "wherever he came, he used to visit all the gaols and places of confinement, few in the Kingdom having at that time any appointed minister." (3)

J. Arthur Hoyles in his opening paragraph on the 'Chaplain and the Chapel' made the following observations relative to the matter of the non-appointment of chaplains.

"The reason for the delay was that the maintenance of a clergymen and a place of worship involved the expenditure of money." (4)

(1) J. Arthur Hoyles, Religion in Prisons, 1855, Ch.2, p.15.
(2) Ibid. p.16.
(3) John Howard, State of the Prisons, p.28. Gilpin mainly operated as a missionary in the northern counties.
(4) J. Arthur Hoyles, Religion in Prisons, Chap.2 op. cit.
The explanation for this attitude was based on the fact that most of the gaols were run by private owners on a profit basis (1) and the success of the gaols was usually measured by the revenue they yielded. Throughout the period, the whole of the 18th and most of the 19th century, that the Justices of the Peace were to have effective control of the local prisons, they were to be responsible on many occasions for restricting prison expenditure by using the excuse of keeping county rates to an acceptable figure for the purpose of pacifying local rate payers.

The state of the gaols was generally appalling. Physically, there was overcrowding, lack of cleanliness and a serious lack of sanitary facilities. (2) Morally, there was excessive drinking and sexual intercourse was quite common in the wards. (3) In the latter case the gaol officials encouraged such facilities in return for monetary rewards.

Although John Howard was probably best remembered for his efforts to improve the physical conditions of prisons, nevertheless he was also to preoccupy his time with the improvement of the moral side of prison life. On the matter of morals, he records his impressions formed as a consequence of his Rotterdam visit. "This account inspires in me the ardent wish that our prisons also, instead of echoing with profaneness and blasphemy, might hereafter resound with the offices of religious worship; and prove like these the happy means of awakening men to a sense of their duty to Goa and man". (4)

An awareness by Parliament of a deterioration of the physical conditions in gaols, and a consequent decline in the moral standards of the prisoners, forced Parliament to act. In 1773,

---

(1) Charges were made for beds, bedding, food, drink, etc.
(2) 14. Geo. III. Cap. 59 1774. Laid down provisions as to overcrowding, cleanliness, and sanitation in prisons. The intention was to prevent gaol-fever.
(3) 22 Geo. III. Cap. 1 1782. Separation of male and female prisoners.
(4) John Howard, State of the Prisons. op. cit.
Parliament passed the following Act 'providing clergymen to officiate in gaols.' (1) The Justices of the Peace were to be responsible for enforcing its provisions.

The purpose of the Act was to
a) 'alleviate the distress of the persons under confinement'
b) 'and greatly contribute to the purposes of morality and religion'.

The Act contained four main provisions:

1. 'the appointment of proper ministers to officiate in the several county gaols'.

2. 'the prime duty of the clergymen was to officiate and perform divine service according to the Rites of the Church of England.'
   (No other duties were specified: the Justices were given the discretion to 'ascertain what duty shall be performed.')

3. For the first time, clergymen were to be paid 'a proper salary for the due execution of their duty as clergymen'. The sum to be paid was 'not exceeding fifty pounds yearly, and every year.' The salary was to be paid out of the rates.

4. As a means of ensuring continuity in office and some control over the quality of clergymen to be appointed, this provision stated
   'in the event of any such clergymen shall die or shall be thought unworthy by such justices at Quarter Sessions to be continued in such office, then it shall and may be lawful for such justices at the Quarter Sessions to nominate and appoint from time to time as occasion shall require any other clergymen to officiate in the room of such clergymen so dying and so deemed to be unworthy to continue any longer in such office.'

This Act laid down the foundations upon which religion, in a limited sense, began to play an important role within the gaol. Initially, statutory duties were confined to taking religious services. Later it was able to make some contribution to the future rehabilitation

(1) 13 Geo. III c.58. This Act was not to apply to Houses of Correction.
of the prisoners. Secondly it gave official recognition to clergymen and finally specified clergymen’s duties, responsibilities and conditions of service. These were to be extended and improved upon by subsequent legislation. Bearing in mind the prevailing conditions in the prisons at the time, and the vested interests of some of the gaol authorities, this Act can be seen as a step forward.

As to the actual implementation of the Act John Howard was to remark on the matter concerning the appointment of clergymen as follows:

"I had the pleasure to find a chaplain appointed to most of the county gaols; in consequence of the Act inside the thirteenth year of his present majesty." (1)

J. Arthur Hoyles was also to remark

"The ministrations of religion in prison thus received statutory recognition. The maximum allowance was not a large sum but to have a trained man with definite responsibilities was a distinct step forward". (2)

There appears to have been some mixed feelings about awarding a salary for officiating in the gaols. (3) John Howard appeared to have some reservations

"The Act just recited allows a sum not exceeding fifty pounds a year for their services. Many countries have fixed that salary; but I should hope that clergymen might be found who would act from a much nobler motive, a regard for the most important interests of their fellow creatures." (4)

Howard may have had in mind a colleague, a chaplain to Bristol Gaol, the Rev. James Rouquet, who, for twenty years had carried out his duties without a salary. (5) On the other hand there were some clergymen who felt quite strongly that the financial rewards did not compensate for working in such appalling environmental conditions.

(1) John Howard p.20 op.cit.
(2) Hoyle, p.16 op.cit.
(3) See Appendix A about how the salary of a clergyman was made up.
(4) J. Howard, p.29 op.cit.
Another group felt sufficiently rewarded by a small salary.

Similar mixed feelings were also held by the various gaol authorities. For instance some welcomed the idea as they felt firstly that a salary would attract a better quality of clergyman and, secondly, that it would place a moral obligation on the clergyman not only to visit the gaol regularly, but also to respond to the religious needs of the prisoners. Others felt that to have to pay a salary would attract those who were only interested in the financial rewards.

Perhaps one of the failures of the 1773 Act was that there was no commitment by the prisoner to attend Divine Service. Howard found 'that attendance at prayers was very poor', and when he asked the reasons for the lack of attendance was informed 'they are drinking with their friends'. Howard further records that 'on Sundays I have often seen debtors and others lying on their beds in the daytime which I am persuaded would not have been the case if there had been divine service in the chapel.'

Writing about Newgate Gaol, Arthur Griffiths states "It was not incumbent upon the prisoner, except those condemned to death, to attend chapel. Sometimes it was crowded, sometimes there was hardly a soul. In severe weather the place, in which there was no fire, was nearly empty. It was very lofty, very cold, and the prisoners ill clad, did not care to shiver through the service.'

In conclusion this Act offered a unique opportunity for the Church of England to spread its influence in what was becoming recognised as an undesirable situation. It provided the County gaols

---

(1) One of the proposals that Dr. Thomas Bray's committee made was VI(i) 'that the salary of the Ordinary of Newgate and all ministers of prisons be a sufficient maintenance and encouragement for their constant attendance.'

(2) This was to be legislated for in 1779.

(3) J. Howard, p.29 op.cit.

(4) Arthur Griffiths, Chronicles of Newgate, 1884, p.373.
with a trained man who had been given definite and important, if minimal responsibilities; in so far as the prisoners were concerned, the Act provided an independent person to whom a prisoner could turn.

The first clergymen

All clergymen appointed to the gaols had to belong to the Established Church. They officiated on a part-time basis and were, in the main, the local parish priests. In view of their parish commitments, (1) their involvement varied from gaol to gaol. Generally it was minimal. Some visited every day, others only on Sundays. Apart from taking Divine Service on Sunday, some also took services on special religious dates. On occasions, they carried out cell visits, went to see condemned criminals, and officiated at the funerals of prisoners, attending burials in the gaol grounds. (2)(3) Most of the clergymen appointed to the gaols appear to have taken their responsibilities seriously, and seem to have been motivated by a concern for those in confinement.

On the other hand there were a number of gaols, usually the smaller ones where the appointment of a clergymen was never made. (4)

There are three possible reasons for this:

1. A small number of prisoners.
2. The view taken by the authorities, that the prisoners were either unworthy of, or disinterested in, attending religious services.
3. A reluctance to pay a clergymen under such conditions.

Equally some clergymen were reluctant to attend the gaols.

Their reasons centred around such matters as

(1) Apart from their normal pastoral responsibilities, they quite often acted as local schoolmaster.
(2) Burial grounds were to be provided. 19 Geo. III c.14 Sec.14
(3) The provision of religious instruction was not to be provided for prisoners until 1779. 19 Geo. III, c.74
(4) There is plenty of evidence contained in the annual reports of the Inspector of Prisons about the non-appointment of Chaplains to the gaols.
(a) the appalling physical conditions,
(b) the moral degradation of some of the prisoners, who were felt to be beyond 'saving',
(c) indifference shown by gaol officials to the religious well-being of the prisoners, and
(d) lack of appropriate remuneration for officiating in such bad conditions.

John Howard, a frequent prison visitor throughout England had the following to report on the behaviour of some of the early clergymen, behaviour consequent on the 1773 Act
"in some prisons where there is a chaplain appointed, no worship is fixed for Sunday: in some, where that day is fixed, the chaplain choosing his hours, comes sometimes too soon in the morning, sometimes between morning and evening service, at the prisoners' dinner time. In some there is no fixed day at all; consequently (as I have too often found) the service is totally omitted. It would be proper to have sermon and prayers once, at least, on the Lord's Day: and prayers two fixed days in the week besides." (1)

The following examples illustrate the behaviour of a few clergymen who were far from satisfactory.
"Some loose parson of insolvent tendencies was commonly hired at a cheap rate, for the office of ordinary. On a weekday he was ready to crack a bottle or shuffle a pack with his flock: on a Sunday he mumbled a service and sermon to them in one of the day rooms." (2)

"The chaplain at Gloucester Prison, finding the conditions so bad that worship was out of the question, accepted his salary, but seldom went near the gaol." (3)

Although there was never any great controversy over the particular character and attributes appropriate to a prison chaplain, two distinguished personalities recorded their own views. First,

(1) J. Howard, p.28. op.cit.
John Howard:

"When this office is vacant, it behoves magistrates not to take the first clergyman who offers his services, without regarding his real character. They should choose one who is in principle a Christian: who will not content himself with officiating in public, but will converse with the prisoners; admonish the profligate: exhort the thoughtless: comfort the sick and make known to the condemned that mercy which is revealed in the gospel". (1)

The second was Sir G.O. Paul. He wrote:

"The character I consider as fitting the situation of Chaplain is peculiar to itself. It is not possible that any man should execute the duties, with advantage to his charge, whose mind revolts at the service; and the temper of mind that will produce an inclination to the duty is rather natural than moral. Many excellent men, who have an honour to their profession, and whose manner and abilities are the charm of society, would very ill fulfill duties which call them to scenes of misery in solitude and suffering; yet there are those whose minds so far from revolting, find indulgence in that expansion which attends duties of this kind. To persons busy and employed in the active and cheerful scenes of life, it may appear abstracted to speak of such an indulgence; but how abstracted so ever it may appear, I believe it to be a truth founded in the harmony of moral dispensation, that there is no positive social duty that has not a corresponding incitement in the affects of the heart. In those whose circumstances or whose disposition fix them to recluse and reflective life, the mind takes the tone of its affecting from its habits, and the nerves become agreeably excited by objects of commiseration. From such only, maybe expected, that earnest exertion which will have a constant effect." (2)

The 1779 Act (3) was passed which contained two important provisions that were to affect clergymen. They were Section V,

(1) John Howard, State of the Prisons, p.28
(2) Address to His Majesty's J.P.s for the County of Gloucester, 1789.
(3) 19 Geo. III, c.74.
under which clergymen were now required to provide religious instruction and Section XLII which laid down in detail what his other duties were to be.

He would have to take morning and evening prayers, sermons on Sunday morning and evening, Christmas Day and Good Friday. All healthy prisoners, officers and servants were required to attend. Anyone, sick or well, who needed the Chaplain, could have a visit from him. There is an interesting proviso at the end that these visits must not 'interfere with their stated hours of labour'. Religion was to be subservient to labour.
Chaplains in the Houses of Correction

The second type of gaol that clergymen were appointed to were the Houses of Correction. Houses of Correction were first known as Bridewells and were first built about the middle of the sixteenth century. The difference between Houses of Correction and gaols lies in their historical beginnings: the former were built for 'dissolute paupers and idle apprentices'. They were used as penal institutions, but had lower status than the county gaols. Clergymen were appointed later, used less vigorously and were paid less, £20 as opposed to £50 per annum.

To illustrate the general unsatisfactory state of those Houses, the following facts were reported in the 1782 Act: "...... from a want of due order, employment, and discipline in such Houses of Correction, the persons sent thither for correction and reformation (the former by means of the prisoner being kept to hard labour, and in the latter case by the provision of divine service) frequently grew more dissolute and abandoned during their continuance in such Houses."

The remedy proposed for dealing with these conditions was contained in the 1782 Act: it recommended the appointment of justice or justices who were required to report as speedily as possible about the state of the Houses, and to make appropriate recommendations.

(1) Most of these Houses were modelled on probably the most famous of all Bridewells, that of the Bridewell Royal Hospital within the City of London.

(2) J. Howard: The State of the Prisons, p.293


(4) 22 Geo.III c.64, Section 12 : 1782. An Act for the amending and rendering more effectively the laws in being relative to the Houses of Correction.

(5) 22 Geo.III, c.64, Section 24: Justices at Quarter Sessions were empowered to nominate one or more Justice or Justices of the Peace within their respective jurisdiction, divisions, districts, when they shall think most proper to examine and inspect the several Houses of Correction.
The control of these establishments and the discretion regarding appointments of clergymen to these Houses of Correction was in the hands of the Justices at Quarter Sessions.

The provisions that were contained in the 1782 Act read as follows:

1) that Justices of the Peace at their Quarter Sessions may, if they think fit, appoint a Minister of the Church of England residing in or near the place where every such House of Correction shall be situate;

2) to perform divine service there every Sunday;

3) and may appoint such salary for his trouble as they shall think fit, not exceeding £20 per annum, to be paid by the Treasurer of the County, Riding, Division or Place where such houses shall be situate, out of the county rates or other public money to be collected therein; but such salary to be diminished at any future Quarter Sessions, if the Justices shall think fit."

The significant difference—and emphasis—between the 1773 Act and the Act of 1782 in their provision of Clergymen can be summarised as follows. Firstly, there seemed to be no underlying specific purpose attached to the appointment of clergy to the Houses of Correction except for, presumably, 'correction' or 'reformation' itself. This was in contrast to the appointment of clergy to the County Gaols, where the purpose was to 'alleviate the distress of the persons under confinement' and would serve to 'greatly contribute to the purpose of Morality and Religion'. Secondly, the salary differential, £20 per annum for the Houses of Correction and £50 per annum for those serving in the County Gaols underline the lower status of the former institutions. Prisoners detained in county gaols were more serious offenders: Houses of Correction detained
the poor and some other categories of person as well as criminals. (1)
The Houses of Correction gradually became more like gaols: in 1811 an appendix to a report from the Committee on Laws, House of Commons recorded that the Secretary of State, Home Department had asked County Justices to receive prisoners that would have normally been sent to a penitentiary House and put them in Houses of Correction. More of the latter were being built or completed at the turn of the 19th Century.

Finally, there was no provision for continuity should a clergyman be unable to attend the House of Correction, unlike the position in the county gaols. (2) Whether its omission was deliberate policy or an oversight is difficult to determine. Whether a substitute was ever provided probably depended on how enlightened the visiting Justices were for a particular gaol.

One of the more progressive of these establishments at the time, Southwell House of Correction, made the following provisions in the case of the absence of the Chaplain:

---

(1) Under 7JAC 1 C4 'Houses of Correction are directed to be provided in every county'. They were used to accommodate 'Rogues, Vagabonds, and sturdy beggars and other lewd and idle persons'. These Houses were 'furnished with all necessary Mills and other implements to set those detained to work at the expense of every such county'. Sidney and Beatrice Webb described the House of Correction as 'originally a place in which persons wantonly idle or disorderly might be compulsorily set to work, partly in order to produce their keep, partly with a view to the reformation of character, but also partly with a view to deterring others.' (Sidney & Beatrice Webb - English Prisons under local Government, 1922, p.13).


See also — Rules proposed for the government of gaols, Houses of Correction and Penitentiary by the Society for the Improvement of Prison Discipline and for the Reformation of Juvenile Offenders, 1820.

(2) See provision 4 of the 1773 Act.
"That the chaplain in case of sickness, or absence on any particular emergency, shall appoint a deputy, whose name, residence, and days of attendance, shall be entered in the chapel book, but that no such deputy be admitted without the approbation of two justices, signified in writing." (1)

Another important development that was to affect clergymen directly and was to become one of their main responsibilities until the end of the 19th Century, was the provision of religious instruction. (2) The success of this facility was largely dependent on the attitude of the justices. In some of the Houses of Correction (3) and indeed in the Penitentiary Houses (4) and County Gaols such matters were taken very seriously, while in others, some attempts were made to provide religious instruction; and again there were some in which it was non-existent. Lord Loughborough was concerned enough to remark about religious instruction in general: "There are not many Houses of Correction which afford any means of instruction or in which there is any public regard paid to the offices of Religion." (5)

As well as the Southwell House of Correction under the remarkable guidance of Rev. J.T. Becker, (6) the Penitentiary House at Gloucester (7) gained prominence as a penal institution. Here the credit was mainly due to Sir G.O. Paul Bart, one of the Justices of

(1) Rules, order and regulations 53 of the Southwell House of Correction. Most of the credit goes to the Rev. John Thomas Becker who was a Visiting Justice. There was a very positive attitude towards the chaplains office. See Rules 51,52, 54 for details of the chaplain's responsibilities. See Appendix to Rpt. from the Committee on laws relating to Penitentiary Houses 1811.

(2) 19 Geo III, c.74, Sec.5 1779.

(3) Southwell, See Rule 54.

(4) The Penitentiary House, Gloucester, noted for its progressive approach to religious instruction.


(6) The Rev. J. Becker was instrumental in introducing employment and religious instruction at Southwell but in contrast believed in a much less strict approach to prisoner segregation than was carried out at Gloucester.

(7) Gloucester County Gaol and /or House of Correction was described in 1812 as the 'highest pitch of perfection in policy then known." Sidney & Beatrice Webb - English Prisons under Local Government, 1922, p.60.
the Peace. In fact many of the rules that were drawn up for clergymen at Gloucester formed the basis upon which future legislation was to be modelled. (1)

Amongst the many rules that were made Rule 26 was the most appropriate for our purpose:

"A chaplain shall be appointed: he shall say prayers every Sunday, Wednesday and Friday morning at regulated hours and preach a sermon every Sunday, Xmas Day and Good Friday. He shall keep a journal in which he shall enter the times of his attendance and such observations as may occur to him in the general execution of his duty; in case of sickness or necessary engagement, he shall appoint a substitute for the occasion and shall specify in his journal the cause of his absence and the name of the clergyman serving in his stead. The chaplain should consider it as his duty frequently to see and confer with the prisoners, without the governor and keeper or other officer being present, to enquire into their situation and to observe the state of their cells. He should also attend any prisoner as well in health as in sickness, who may request or stand in need of his spiritual advice and instruction, provided that such request be not made at improper times or that such attendance shall not interfere with the stated hours of labour. Books of moral and religious instruction shall be provided by the chaplain at the County cost to be distributed at his discretion amongst the prisoners, whom he shall judge to be in a situation to be benefitted by such mode of instruction. The chaplain shall administer the sacrament to such persons as he shall consider in a state of mind fit to receive the same, at or about the times of the three great festivals of the church and at such other times as he shall think proper."

There is no doubt that the above quoted rule together with those at Southwell House of Correction indicated a fairly humane approach to prisoners. They increased the responsibilities and involvement of the chaplain, e.g. the provision of books and the giving of the sacraments. The 1811 House of Commons Committee examined

both Southwell and Gloucester and praised the Rev. Becker and Sir G.O. Paul for their excellent work.

It was anticipated that other gaols would use these two as models to develop on similar lines but according to the subsequent Inspector of Prisons Annual Reports (1) it is evident that few did.

Throughout the 18th Century and part of the 19th Century, a lack of uniformity and common practice in the prison system operated in English gaols. (2) There were several reasons for the ineffective operation of the prison system: there were too many gaols (3) and it was difficult to control them. There was little or no co-ordination of policy between the justices and the various Quarter Sessions responsible for their particular gaols. This was also true of the Visiting Justices themselves. This led to a wide interpretation of the Acts. Some did the absolute minimum, others attempted humane liberal measures. Many remained strictly within the minimal provisions of the Acts. There was the constant problem for the justices of minimising county rates in order to pacify the rate payers. Moreover, it was likely that many justices felt the employment of a clergyman to be unnecessary, and his payment a burden with no financial return. Some justices delayed implementing some of the provisions of the Acts till they saw what practical effects they had in other gaols. (4) The actions and behaviour of the justices were protected by their status in society. Likewise they

(1) Inspecting of Prisons started in 1835: it was taken over in 1877 by the Prison Commissioners.

(2) Some form of uniformity was attempted in 1823 (Peel Act) The Acts of 1839, 1865, followed on similar lines. Finally the 1877 Act ordered local prisons to be taken over by the State.

(3) See S. & B. Webb. Op. Cit. under local government ch. VI, p. 63. (Two to three hundred gaols and Houses of Correction and an undisclosed number of municipal corporation private prisons were entirely under the control of justices).

were virtually immune from any sanctions and penalties that could be imposed on them for their behaviour. The Inspectors of Prisons referred to these matters in their annual report. Indeed these inspectors were often inhibited in making effective changes in the gaols by the power of the justices.

Lastly, provided the justices remained within the terms of the Acts, they were at liberty legally to draw up their own rules, orders and regulations for their respective gaols. There was virtual autonomy within wide limits in gaols.

Clergymen faced many difficulties. Their effective performance and influence was largely dependent on the attitudes of the justices. Some justices became famous for their attention to the religious well-being of the prisoners; others were punitive towards the clergymen and provided them with only minimal facilities. It could be said in the latter case, that they were made to be superfluous.

Towards the latter part of the 18th Century it became increasingly difficult to discover any practical distinction between County Gaols and Houses of Correction. They were receiving the same type of prisoner, the discipline was similar and some even shared the same buildings and staff.

In 1815 an Act was passed which for the first time reviewed the combined positions of clergymen in County Gaols and in Houses of Correction. It had taken 42 and 33 years respectively before the conditions of these clergymen were reviewed.

(1) 5 & 6 W. IV, Cap,38 Select Committee House of Lords on gaols 1835.
1st report, 3rd recommendation 'That Inspectors of Prisons be appointed to visit the prisons from time to time and report to the Secretary of State.'

(2) The background of the justices varied; some were appointed from amongst the clergy, others were eminent laymen.

(3) Not until the Prison Act of 1865 were Houses of Correction made identical with county gaols by statute. From then onwards they were to be known as Local prisons. It was not until the 1877 Act when local prisons were transferred to State control that uniformity throughout English Gaols was finally attempted by the then Prisons Commissioners.

(4) 55 Geo.III, c.48.
This Act was to enlarge the powers of the two previous Acts*, in the provision of clergy in these two types of gaols. Briefly, it set out to establish a purpose for the appointment of clergymen, especially in Houses of Correction; to determine new salary levels; the official introduction of religious instruction in the Houses of Correction; where appropriate, the amalgamation of these gaols and finally, the issue of a licence which the local bishop would use in the appointment of all clergymen to gaols.

Previously, the appointment of clergymen to Houses of Correction was not accompanied by any specific recommendations as to their purpose: under this Act the purpose was "that greater and more frequent attention should be paid to their (the prisoners) Moral and Religious instruction." The position of clergymen was strengthened, particularly in the Houses of Correction where religious instruction was now officially to be introduced. Some had already begun to do so.

As to salary levels, differentials remained: the maximum for clergy in county gaols was set at "any sum not exceeding £100 yearly;" for those in Houses of Correction it was £50. The authorisation for payment remained, as previously, with the "Justices of the Peace, or the major part of them, assembled at the Quarter Sessions."

Parliament recognised the extra duties and responsibilities being undertaken by these clergymen by stating that "on account of the unremitting attention which such clergymen are required to give in the discharge of their duty, it is expedient that the salaries allowed by the justices should be increased."

One important provision was added. The clergyman "in order to entitle himself to receive the same (salary) shall keep a journal or a book to be provided for that purpose............ in which journal he shall enter the times of his attendance at such gaol or House of Correction on the performance of his duty with any observations which may occur to him in the execution thereof; and such journal

(1) 13 Geo III, c.58
22 Geo III, c.64
shall regularly be laid before the Justices of the Peace for their inspection at every Quarter Sessions and shall be signed by the Chairman of the said Sessions in proof of the same having been there produced." (1)

Another provision was made which allowed for the uniting of "the offices of clergymen to gaols and Houses of Correction by appointing one clergyman to the performance of the religious duties of both" at a salary not exceeding £120. It was to be "paid out of the county rates or other public money." (2)

Lastly, and for the first time, bishops were required to issue licences on the appointment of clergymen to any gaols or House of Correction in their diocese. (3)

On balance this Act attempted to correct some anomalies and generally improve the position of the clergy so that ultimately the prisoners should benefit. Like all Acts it had positive as well as negative aspects.

It is appropriate to comment on some of the provisions.

Firstly, all categories of gaols administered by the justices were in principle to have a clergyman. (4) This seemed a forward looking step, bearing in mind that there was still some questioning of the need for clergy in prisons at all and certainly some opposition to the provision of religious instruction and ministration.

Secondly, as the Justices of the Peace were given the option to unite the offices of clergymen, the provision could be interpreted in a number of ways. It was possible as an economy measure to save £30 per annum, regardless of prisoner numbers. For establishments

(1) The Prison Act of 1823 4 Geo.IV, cap.64, Sect. 28, made the following addition concerning the journal: when any chaplain used a substitute 'the name and residence of such substitute shall be specified in the Chaplain's journal.'

(2) Section IV.

(3) Section V.

(4) There were some 150-200 gaols still in existence that were owned by either small municipalities or private owners that were not affected by this Act.
with only small numbers of prisoners (in some gaols the yearly average ranged from 3 to 60) the idea of amalgamation was rational and sensible. It encouraged the full employment of such clergymen, and made a reduction in the number of clergymen possible.

Secondly, for the clergymen it could mean doubling his duties and responsibilities, especially if the number of prisoners was large. Alternatively more attention could be given where the number of prisoners was small.

Thirdly, the status differential between the Houses of Correction and the County Gaols was underlined by the difference in salary paid. The increase in salary, long overdue after the 1779 Act, put the seal of official approval on the presence of the clergy in gaols.

Fourthly, for failure to keep or complete a journal correctly or to the satisfaction of the justices at Quarter Sessions, a clergyman could forfeit part of his salary. Many conscientious clergymen may have defaulted for very good reasons. On the other hand, the justices were attempting some form of control over irresponsible or neglectful clergy.

Howard, and later, the Inspector of Prisons, were to complain quite frequently about such matters as non-attendance and inaccuracies in completing the journals.

Lastly, a clergyman needed a licence to officiate in gaols and Houses of Correction. This meant that the Established Church became more involved with religion in prisons; they also had the opportunity to expand and promote religion. The church itself had some say in the appointment of particular people to serve in the gaols.

(1) Later, in 1823, the salaries of clergymen were to be partly determined according to the number of prisoners held.

(2) There is no evidence available during this period that justices did in fact penalise a clergyman for not meeting this provision. The only known case of a chaplain's salary being reduced at all was at Nottingham Borough Gaol in 1826. The Corporation reduced his salary because they only wished him to take prayers on Sunday, not every day as formerly.
In turn, the State may have been attempting to improve the public image of prisons by calling for a more official stamp on religious activities in gaols. Moreover it was possible to recommend the removal of a clergyman even if the bishop had originally endorsed his licence.

By working in close co-operation with the local bishop, the gaol authorities, mainly the Justices had possibly found a more reliable way of finding suitable clergymen for prisons. From the clergymen's point of view, no doubt this new co-operation between the church and the gaol authorities would mean that their performance would now be monitored by two members of the establishment. Also if there were any grievances between the clergy and the gaol authorities there was a channel of communication that could be used: the bishop could be asked to mediate.

As a result of the 1815 Act (1) the duties of clergymen in the Houses of Correction were increased and became synonymous with those of clergymen in county gaols. However, the salary differential remained. Not surprisingly it became difficult to recruit and retain clergymen in the Houses of Correction. And so, in 1818 an Act was passed to alleviate the matter. (2) Parliament acknowledged the problem thus "it has been found impossible in divers cases to provide clergymen who are fit and willing to undertake the duties of the said office of chaplain to the Houses of Correction for so small a salary."

The Act allowed the justices of the Peace "to assign a larger salary provided always that in no case such a salary shall exceed the sum of £100 a year".

So for the first time the salary for a clergyman in a House of Correction was on a par with his colleague in the county gaol. One of the main anomalies had been removed, though it was more a matter of expediency than principle. For the combined post

(1) 55 Geo.III, c.48
(2) 58 Geo.III, c.22 'An Act to amend so much of an Act of the fifty fifth year of his present Majesty as related to the salaries of clergymen officiating as chaplain in Houses of Correction.'
of chaplain to both a gaol and a House of Correction the salary went up to £150 a year. Previously it had been set at £120.

As no mention was made as to who should be responsible for these increases it is assumed that the money would come either from the county rates or other public money as in the case of the 1815 Act.

During the early years of the 19th Century the moral and physical conditions of the gaols remained very much the same as they had been when described by John Howard in the middle of the 18th Century and later by James Neild (1) at the turn of the century.

The position of clergymen also remained unchanged. Indeed, some of the justices and some clergymen continued to hold negative views on the advisability of religious ministration and instruction to prisoners. Equally, many prisoners found little or no benefit from the religious facilities provided. In many of the gaols the Acts were rigidly applied by the justices, keeper and clergymen, obeying the letter rather than the spirit of the law.

As far as some clergymen were concerned only the minimal degree of contact was maintained with the prisoners. Consequently there was little religious instruction. Many clergy were totally disinterested in their prisoners. (2)

In contrast we find a more positive attitude taken up in other gaols. Here clergymen in particular were encouraged by the justices. Some keepers too became involved with the prisoners. Over and above their religious duties, some clergymen sought closer relationships with the prisoners, working well beyond the time they

(1) Like Howard, Neild spent many years visiting the gaols. For a detailed report on the state of the gaols during the period 1801-1810, See J. Neild: General State of Prisons in England, Scotland and Wales. 1811.

For details of the horrors perpetuated at Lancaster Castle by Sir Francis Bundell see Hansard July 3rd, 1812, Vol.XX III, p.3.

(2) Possible reasons were poor facilities, appalling physical conditions, poor salary and disinterest in religious matters on the part of the prisoners themselves.
were expected to devote to the prisoners and the gaol.

The Rev. John Thomas Becker, a Visiting Justice, felt very strongly about his chaplain. He wrote that the small sum paid 'prevents the Justices from requiring more than the bare performance of the service upon a Sunday. He voluntarily gives instruction to the prisoners but this is quite at his own discretion.'

Increasingly the role of the clergyman was becoming more difficult. Often they were having to prove to the justices, and the keeper too, sometimes, that they were offering an important service. Secondly, because most of the prisoners were illiterate, it was difficult for them to understand, let alone participate in the services. Religious instruction was also difficult for the same reason. Illiteracy became a matter of concern to many clergymen but they were to be assisted later in this task by the appointment of schoolmasters to gaols.

In the meantime it was lawful for the gaol authorities to appoint prisoners to specific tasks within the gaols, and those possessing an understanding of reading and writing or having a superior education often assisted the clergymen in teaching the prisoners to read and write as well as listen to the prisoners reading.

---

(1) Although this sum was small for the amount of work put in by an earnest clergyman, Justices had at their disposal certain charitable funds which in some prisons the justices used to augment the salary of a clergyman. Rpt. for the Committee on the Laws relating to Penitentiary Houses, 1811. He was giving evidence to George Holdford on 15.3.1811.

(2) One of the possible reasons for chapel riots. See Chapter 3 on the Chapels.

(3) This matter will be dealt with in greater detail in a chapter concerning education.

(4) Appointed under the Prison Act of 1823.

(5) See Chapter 1 - section on the teacher-prisoner. See also minutes of evidence submitted to the Select Committee on the State of the Gaols, 12.7.1819.
cases of prisoners being instructed incorrectly by inexperienced prisoner-teachers.

In recognising that extra burdens were now placed on clergymen, the Rev. Becker tried to involve some of the prison staff in tasks to help lighten the load. For example, he had the governor and even the surgeon, instructing prisoners in reading and writing under the general direction of the chaplain. Although the Rev. Becker was the Visiting Justice he himself partook in the instruction of prisoners. (1)

The last major difficulty which faced many clergymen originally arose from the 1779 Act in which prisoners were to be subjected to well regulated labour. Throughout the remainder of the century labour was to take precedence over practically any other major activity in the gaols. It was difficult for the chaplains and later the schoolmaster, to organise religious instruction and the teaching of secular skills without interfering with the hours of labour. (2)

To illustrate the importance attached to labour and how it affected the duties of chaplains it is worth quoting the following, "..... and the said chaplain shall visit with the leave of the Governor, any of the offenders, either sick or in health, that may desire or stand in need of his spiritual advice and assistance provided that such visitation to such of the offender as shall be in health, shall not interfere with their stated hours of labour." (2)

Chaplains could award certificates to prisoners on discharge as evidence of good behaviour and industriousness. This certificate which received approval from the Committee (3) was no doubt used as an incentive to good behaviour whilst in and out of gaol and was meant

---

(1) Becker's evidence to Chairman George Holford, House of Commons Rpt. from the Committee on the Laws relating to Penitentiary Houses, 15.3.1811.
(2) 19 Geo III c.74, Sec.42.
(3) Report from the Committee on the Laws relating to Penitentiary Houses 1816. (It has not been possible to ascertain whether these certificates applied to all the gaols or just merely to the Penitentiary House of Gloucester.)
to help the prisoner in obtaining assistance from influential people in the local community. Equally it acknowledged the generosity of the prison authorities and placed confidence in the prisoner that he would reform and not return to the gaol.

Certificate - (Referred to above).

We, the undersigned, being the Chaplain and ........ of the Penitentiary House for the County of Gloucester, do certify that .......... who has been confined in the said House for the space of ........ has been industrious and obedient; and we have reason to believe that .......... is a sincere penitent, and desirous of pursuing a life of honest industry. As a reward for such behaviour, the visiting Justices have thought fit to direct that .......... shall be supplied with from the prison stores, and shall receive the sum of ...... Shillings, to enable .......... to proceed to the parish of ............... This Certificate to be delivered to the Minister, Churchwarden, or other Overseer of the Poor, within .......... days from the date hereof.

The following is the form of Certificate of good Service for one year, to be delivered to the Court of Quarter Sessions; or to a neighbouring magistrate, and by him returned to the Quarter Sessions.

This is to certify that .......... of the parish of .......... hath served me honestly and soberly during one complete year previous to the date hereof; I declare that I am content with .......... service, and think .......... deserving public encouragement.

I .......... being officiating Minister of the parish of .......... was present at the signature of the above Certificate, and do sincerely declare that I believe the contents to be true. I have observed the said .......... to be regular in .......... attendance on divine service.
By the first Quarter of the century gaols had changed little. The seeds of change had been sown by the 1779 Act but in summing up the position, it is noticeable that religion was seen as secondary to labour and in some places was barely tolerated. Religious instruction was limited by the illiteracy of the prisoners, and the part-time nature of most chaplain appointments. More staff and therefore more expense were called for. Secular instruction was necessary if religious instruction was to have any real meaning for the prisoners.

So the scene was now set for the incoming Home Secretary to institute an enquiry into the state of the gaols and introduce further legislation to effect further improvements.
The 1823 Act

In 1823 Sir Robert Peel (1) became Home Secretary. He set up a committee to investigate the state of the gaols and the various associated statutes. It found the prison laws to be full of blunders, contradictions and anomalies: there was also a serious lack of uniformity in prison practice. As a consequence of these findings Peel introduced a bill for 'consolidating and amending the laws relating to the buildings, repairing and regulating of certain gaols and Houses of Correction in England and Wales.' The bill became an Act (2) on 10th July, 1823.

This Act, apart from consolidating all previous Acts, laid down a statutory code of prison rules and attempted to obtain uniformity throughout the prison system in its administration. One purpose of the Act, which is relevant here was that 'it should tend more effectively to preserve the health and to improve the morals of the prisoners . . . . . . and that religion and moral instruction are essential to the discipline of a prison and the reformation of offenders.' For the first time, religion and instruction were officially recognised as valued contributors, in their own right, to prison discipline.

In so far as clergymen were concerned a number of changes of a minor nature were made. Briefly, there was to be the compulsory appointment of clergymen; their duties were to be extended and spelt out in greater detail; salary levels were increased and were to be related to actual numbers of prisoners. (3) Clergymen were to be given greater freedom throughout the prison and finally the criteria

---

(1) He was one of the great Home Secretaries. One of his successors, Sir Samuel Hoare said of him: 'without his help it would not have been possible for John Howard or Jeremy Bentham or Elizabeth Fry to achieve progress with their reforms and their aspirations.' House of Commons. Hansard, 29.11.1838.

(2) 4 Geo, IV Cap.64. S. & B. Webb said of the 1823 Act that 'it was the first measure of general prison reform to be framed and enacted on the responsibility of the National Executive.' (From English Prisons under local Government, p.73).

(3) Chaplains were virtually placed on a full-time basis if the number of prisoners including debtors was not less than 50 : Select Committee of the House of Lords on the State of the Gaols and Houses of Correction, 1835, Recommendation 15. Later as a result of Act 2 & 3, Vic. c.56, 1839, the number necessary for a full-time appointment to be made was where the prisoners exceeded 100. Rule 16.
for dismissing clergymen were set out. Clergymen were also given added responsibilities such as the distribution of books, and also the overall responsibility for secular instruction. Schoolmasters were now to be appointed to undertake such instruction. Finally, and for the first time, Ministers from denominations other than the Established Church were to be allowed to visit the gaols.

It is appropriate to note that some of these provisions were already being practiced in some of the more forward looking gaols in England. (1)

I would like to comment more fully on these provisions.

The compulsory appointment of clergymen was still a matter for the justices at Quarter Sessions and they could, if it was expedient, nominate a chaplain 'to any two prisons situate within a convenient distance from each other.' Clergymen were still not allowed to officiate without a licence from the Bishop of the Diocese which put them under some kind of dual control. (2)

The duties which clergymen were to undertake were spelt out in great detail and the onus was put upon the clergyman for visiting and directing religious and secular instruction. The bias formerly had been for the chaplain to make himself available at certain times if needed. Now he was to take positive action, and had the freedom of movement necessary to do so. Section 30 of the Act detailed the chaplain's duties.

"... That every chaplain shall on every Sunday and on Christmas Day and Good Friday perform the appointed morning and evening services of the Church of England and preach at such time or times between the hours of nine and five of the day as shall be required by the rules

---

(1) See Rules and regulations for Southwell House of Correction and the Pentitentiary House at Gloucester.

(2) Sidney & Beatrice Webb felt one of the failures of the Act though was to fail to make the appointment of clergy compulsory in the municipal gaols. It was hoped that they would comply voluntarily, but this did not happen.
and regulations to be made as directed by this Act; and shall
catechise or instruct such prisoners as may be willing to receive
instruction; and shall likewise visit the prison on such days, and
perform such other duties as shall be required by the rules and
regulations to be made as directed by this Act; and shall administer
the Holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper to such prisoners as shall
be desirous, and as such chaplain may deem to be in a proper frame
of mind to receive the same and such chaplain shall also frequently
visit every room and cell in the prison occupied by prisoners, and
shall direct such books to be distributed and read and such lessons
to be taught in such prisons, as he may deem proper for the
religious and moral instruction of the prisoners therein; and he
shall visit those who are in solitary confinement; and it shall be
his particular duty to afford his spiritual assistance to all
persons under warrant or order for execution; and he shall have free
access to all persons convicted of murder, any law statute or usage
to the contrary notwithstanding: except to such persons as shall be
of a religious persuasion different from that of the Established
Church(1) who shall have made a request that a minister of such
persuasion shall be allowed to visit them; and every such chaplain
shall communicate from time to time to the visiting justices any
abuse or impropriety which may have come to his knowledge."

The position of chaplain was now officially endorsed and
his place in the prison hierarchy established. His value and
importance were underlined by the provisions made for the removal of
an unsatisfactory chaplain. Dismissal was in the hands of the
justices and if they deemed a clergyman unfit, incompetent or
neglectful of his duties, they could remove him. On the other hand
in cases of incapacity, the clergyman concerned could be granted an
annuity.

He was also linked more firmly with the staff of the prison
through a book which each keeper kept in his prison. All non-resident

(1) See Rule 31 of this present Act.
staff were required to sign it, including the chaplain. It was an attendance book with a description of duties undertaken, kept by the keeper for the justices. The chaplain also had to report to the justices separately,

"...... and the chaplain shall, on every Michaelmas Quarter Sessions, deliver to the justices a statement of the conditions of the prisoners and his observations thereupon." (1)

This last clause was to cause some conflict between chaplains and the prison staff: he was seen as a busy-body with close connections with the justices. (2)

Salaries were made much more rational by this Act, being based mainly on the number of prisoners under the care of a clergyman. Below is a summary of the salary levels.

One Prison (3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Maximum salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not exceeding 50 prisoners</td>
<td>£150 p.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 100 &quot;</td>
<td>&quot; 200 p.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 100</td>
<td>&quot; 250 p.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 200 &quot;</td>
<td>At discretion of the justices</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two prisons

Irrespective of the actual number of prisoners, the salary was to be at the discretion of the justices. (4)

(1) According to S. & B. Webb: *English Prisons under Local Government*. 1922, p.105: 'in few cases did the prison chaplain make the annual report called for by the Act.'

(2) See Rule 34 of the Act.

(3) From 1823 onwards salary scales for Chaplains were not necessarily paid in accordance with the Act. It was not until 1879 that new salary scales were approved by the Treasury, and came into force in practice. See Appendix C for these new salary scales.

(4) See Appendix B for details of how in contrast a chaplain's salary was made up in the 17th Century.
It is worth noting that this Act did make provision for prisoners to receive instruction in reading and writing (1).

According to the Act, it was the visiting justices who were made responsible for determining the extent of secular instruction.

In practice previous gaol reports indicated that chaplains were responsible for secular instruction, when offered, and with the selection of the prisoners and prison warders who undertook this form of instruction.

From 1823 till the end of the century chaplains were to continue to be associated with secular instruction. Although some of them actually taught reading and writing, their main responsibility was with the general organisational and administrative aspects of secular instruction. They were also responsible for the supervision of the schoolmasters' instructional activities. (2)

As a general conclusion it may be said that the changes made by this Act as far as the chaplain is concerned were of an organisational and administrative nature. They were a clever amalgam of previous provisions from other Acts intermingled with successful practices operating in some gaols.

Of particular importance was the freedom of movement now offered the chaplain. He could now visit all parts of the prison where prisoners were situated. He could maintain a degree of supervision over the physical conditions of the prisoners. It also gave him wider contact with prisoners. Not surprisingly, he sometimes

(1) See Rule 10 of this Act.
Under 52 Geo.III, c.44, 1812 instruction in reading and writing was to be provided for offenders convicted within the City of London and County of Middlesex.

(2) See Chapter I, Section on the Schoolmaster.
See also Rule 15 of this Act : appointment of schoolmasters.
came into conflict with the keepers and prison warders. Their usual complaints were that the chaplain interfered with the good organisation of the prison and was being a busy-body. They were now in a much better position to know about any abuses in the prison and had a direct channel to the justices through the Journal and the Gaol Book.

Secular instruction must have been a welcome provision of the Act. Illiteracy hindered both chapel attendance and religious instruction.

A much greater emphasis was now to be placed on religion as a means of reforming prisoners. Every prison was to have its chapel for morning and evening prayers. It became necessary for keepers to organise prison routine to accommodate attendance at religious services. Earlier John Howard had suggested that "the gaoler should not, as some do, hinder any prisoner from attending divine service, (1) yet religious instruction itself was not made compulsory: it was available to those who wished to receive it. This seems rather curious as religion itself is given such a central part to play in reformation.

The Chaplain inside the Prison System after 1825

Prior to the 1823 Act, the gaols functioned on the separate system: it was the separation of prisoners one from another. It had three objectives:

(a) as a means of punishment,
(b) the prevention of 'contamination',
(c) to prevent communication between prisoners.

The only occasions when prisoners were allowed to mix or leave their cells was, in some gaols, during meal times, for instruction and for attendance at chapel. In some gaols they left their cells for the purpose of labour or employment. Later it was possible to keep prisoners in their cells for work purposes.

The 1823 Act abolished the separate system in favour of

(1) John Howard, op.cit. p.29.
classification. Classification involved dividing prisoners up according to their crime, so that they were in groups rather than alone.

The classification system involved opposition and controversy and in the end was singularly short-lived. In 1835, the Duke of Richmond chaired a Select Committee of the House of Lords on gaols. (1) It decided to discontinue classification and re-introduce the separate system. It made the following recommendation:

"That entire separation except during the Hours of Labour and religious worship and instruction is also likely necessary for preventing contamination and for securing a proper system of Prison Discipline." (2) In addition, the committee reinforced the separate system by recommending "that silence be enforced, so as to prevent all communication between prisoners both before and after trial." (3)

This committee virtually ended the era of the part-time chaplain by making the following recommendation:

"That the chaplain shall be appointed to a prison or prisons and the number of prisoners including Debtors, which it is calculated may be received therein shall not be less than 50, it is most desirable that the time of such chaplains should be devoted to the duties of such prison or prisons, that he should not hold any other preferment with the care of souls, and that he should reside as near as possible to the same." (4)

Two other recommendations were to be of particular assistance to chaplains in the future. The first concerned the inspection of prisons. The committee suggested that "inspectors of prisons should be appointed to visit the prisons from time to time and to report to the Secretary of State." (5) Many inspectors were able to suggest changes concerning the appointment of chaplains particularly where

(1) In all this committee produced 5 reports.
(2) Ibid. 4th Recommendation, 1st Report.
(3) Ibid. 5th Recommendation, 1st Report.
(4) Ibid. 15th Recommendation, 2nd Report.
(5) Ibid. 3rd Recommendation, 1st Report. This same recommendation was included in the 2nd Report. Became Law in Act 5 & 6. W.IV c.38 in 1835.
they wished to promote a greater degree of religious and secular instruction. On occasions they mediated between clergy and other members of the prison staff when conflict occurred. On the other hand some of the inspectors became critical of the chaplains if they failed to carry out the provisions of the various statutes.

The second recommendation was

"That in every prison wherein the number of prisoners exceeds fifty (50) a schoolmaster not being one of the prisoners shall be appointed."

This recommendation not only reinforced the 1823 Act in which a schoolmaster might be appointed: more importantly it was a direct attempt to improve secular instruction. It may also have been an attempt to minimise the use of prisoners as teachers.

In 1839 legislation also strengthened and enlarged the position of the chaplain. (1) They were now to be appointed to Borough Gaols, subject of course to a licence being granted by the Bishop of the Diocese. Next, they were to be full-time (2) in all prisons where the average number had not been less than a hundred in the three years prior to his appointment. (3) As his duties had increased he was now to be provided with an assistant where the average number of prisoners confined at any one time during the three years before his appointment shall not have been less than two hundred and fifty. (4) One proviso

(1) 2 & 3 Vic. c.56, 1839.
(2) Ibid. Rule 16.
(3) 2 & 3 Vic. c.56, 1839. Rule 23 "and be it enacted that in this Act unless the context shall require a different construction the word 'prison' shall be taken to mean and comprise every gaol, House of Correction, Bridewell, Penitentiary, Lock up House or other place used for the confinement of persons charged with or convicted of any offence punishable by law.'
(4) Ibid. Rule 16.
was made "that every such chaplain and assistant chaplain shall reside within a distance not exceeding one mile from the prison in which they hold their chaplaincies." (1)

The chaplain was given more control over the purchase of moral and religious books for prisoners belonging to the Church of England. The visiting justices chose the books for the other prisoners. The Keeper was to keep a record of books ordered and any disputes over books for prisoners of the Established Church between the chaplain and the justices were to be referred to the Bishop. (2)

Lastly, the compulsory appointment of clergymen and the greater emphasis put upon religion by this Act increased the status of the chaplain. He now formed part of the official prison hierarchy. In some gaols he was second only to the keeper.

Apart from minor amendments the chaplains from 1839 onwards were to enjoy legislative stability. Nevertheless the remaining 60 years were not to be an inactive period for many chaplains. They inherited a number of statutory provisions all of which required implementing, usually in difficult circumstances. They were to experience conflict with many of those in authority, notably the visiting justices, Governors and subordinate prison staff. They were subject to scrutiny by Inspectors, though in fairness the latter were often instrumental in assisting chaplains to effect improvements in religious facilities for the prisoners.

The main areas which provoked most disagreement centred firstly round the effectiveness of education as a means of rehabilitating prisoners; secondly in the conflict between education and labour, and finally over the ever continuing argument as to the best mode of prison discipline to adopt.

(1) Ibid. Rule 16.

(2) Ibid. Rule 6, Section 8.
As a direct result of previous legislation and, in particular, that of 1839, two important developments are noticeable. First, the improvement in the status of the clergyman. At the turn of the century, W.L. Clay had pointed out that the status of the prison chaplain was at its lowest. From 1823 onwards his status gradually improved until by the end of the 1830s his full-time position and the importance generally given to religion, secured him high status.

Secondly, there was also a change of emphasis in his duties. At the turn of the century they were essentially a matter of officiating at Divine Services and imparting religious knowledge to willing prisoners. The emphasis, however, changed and he found himself required to attend to a growing amount of administration. This work meant he had less time to spend with the prisoners individually. J.A.F. Watson was quite right in remarking that the chaplain now "held the most important office in the prison" (1) second to that of Governor. The chaplain also had administrative responsibilities: he was required for example, to maintain a journal.

The journal had its origins at a time when the visiting justices required a 'check system' of duties done and to have a basis for salary payment. They also used it to decide whether to discontinue employment or not.

This procedure remained in force for many years and was later to be subject to inspection by the visiting inspector of prisons. (2) Most chaplains seemed to have maintained accurate accounts of their activities in their journals. One who did not was the chaplain for the Abingdon County House of Correction (3) who according to the Inspector made incorrect entries. He recorded taking Services which in fact were taken by the Governor. The visiting justices were asked to investigate and take appropriate action.

(2) See Appendix D. Entries in a journal. This is a typical journal with appropriate entries and duties carried out by a chaplain.
(3) I.P.R., Home District, 1045.
Another important document was the chaplain's character book. (1) In essence it was a personal account kept by the chaplain about each prisoner; it contained information about the prisoner's background, education, any previous convictions and a general assessment of him. Information from this book was quite often passed to the schoolmaster or prison medical officer. It also recorded the prisoner's general progress, in terms of his behaviour, educational progress, and any particular difficulties he might have. It was also a means of preparing any special arrangement which might have to be made for a prisoner on his discharge.

It gave the chaplain an opportunity to see each prisoner individually. He was able to form instant impressions of prisoners and explain his own role and accessibility to them. Later it was easier for him to initiate further and more informal contact.

As George Holford pointed out "the most important duty of the chaplain, however, is to visit the prisoners personally and to converse occasionally with each other privately." (2)

In the smaller gaols the prisoners might only be seen once a month; in the larger prisons the position was even worse. A prisoner was lucky if he saw the chaplain once in every three months. So important was this initial and personal contact with the newly arrived prisoners that the chaplain of Warwick Castle was prompted to write that this opportunity to see the prisoners was, in his opinion, the best time to influence the prisoner. (3) In fact the problem of lack of contact with individual prisoners was given consideration by the Prisoners' Education Committee, 1896. They recommended that Chaplains might visit prisoners during the latters' dinner time in the cells, in an attempt to overcome the problem. They further suggested that in those prisons which daily averaged more than 500 protestant prisoners

(1) See Appendix E. Entries made in character book.
(2) G. Holford. An account of the General Penitentiary at Millbank, 1828, p.175.
(See Clay's views on the difficulty in finding time to visit prisoners privately. The Prison Chaplain, p.283.)
(3)I.P.R. Northern District, 1866.
an assistant chaplain should be appointed. Finally the information contained in the chapter book was used as a basis for the chaplain's report to the justices, as well as for discussing any relevant matter about a particular prisoner with the visiting inspector of prisons.

The chaplain needed a separate room, exclusively for his use, in which he could interview prisoners. The chaplain at Warwick Castle made a particular point of seeing sick prisoners prior to discharge to give advice, and for those who could read he would give a testament, prayer book or tract. The chaplain of York Castle, used his room for giving prisoners special instruction in religious knowledge.

Not all gaols were able or willing to provide their chaplains with their own rooms. From time to time the Inspectors of Prisons were to report unfavourably on the lack of suitable accommodation. For instance Messrs. Crawford and Whitworth-Russell, following their visit to Maidstone County Gaol and House of Correction reported: "The Chaplain has no room set apart for his use in the prison where he may see and instruct the prisoners apart from others. One of the day rooms has been appointed for this purpose but it is cold with a stone floor exposed to draughts and is quite unfitted for a chaplain's room. It is also used as the school room and the prisoners occupy it for their meals, so that the chaplain has not even this accommodation apart for his use. In so large and important a prison a comfortable apartment should be provided for the chaplain and entirely appropriated to him."

(1) P.E.C. Recommendation No.28.
(2) I.P.R. Northern District, 1836.
(3) I.P.R. North Eastern District, 1845. (The Chaplain's room was his vestry.)
(4) I.P.R. Home District, 1841.
The chaplain was required to keep yet another written document as a statutory requirement. It was concerned with prisoner education. It was used to record the educational level of all prisoners on reception, the course of their progress at school, and sometimes on discharge. In some gaols certain tests were administered on reception (1) by the chaplain. In theory testing was the sole responsibility of the chaplain, but the practice varied among gaols. In some gaols it was the schoolmaster's task. The testing of prisoners' progress at school also varied. Some chaplains tested prisoners in the classroom, as in the case of the chaplain for Coldbath Fields. (2) Others, like the chaplain for York Castle preferred to test prisoners individually in their own room.

The testing of prisoners was one of the issues considered by two separate Education Committees following the transfer of local prisons to the State. The first Committee set up in 1879, (3) found that in 26 prisons the prisoners were reported to have been examined by the chaplain or schoolmaster or both, but in 9 prisons only a definite examination test seems to have been used. In 34 prisons no record was kept. (4) In brief, the Committee recommended that the chaplain should test all prisoners and that the results should be recorded in the chaplain's Education Register. (5)

In their final report in 1882 they amended the previous recommendation: all prisoners eligible for instruction should be personally tested by the chaplain on reception and discharge from prison and the results should be recorded in a new form of Register. (6)

(1) See Chapter 5, Appendix C
(2) I.P.R. Home District, 1849.
(3) Education Committee 1879.
(4) Ibid. Page 2 of findings.
(5) Ibid. 2th Recommendation.
See Appendix F: The Education Register of Rev. W. Osborne of Bath City Gaol and House of Correction.
I.P.R. Southern & Western District, 1850.
(6) Ibid. 9th Recommendation.
Later in 1896 the Prisoners Education Committee upheld the previous committee's recommendation. It read:

"Examination to be held by the chaplain, personally, on reception and discharge of prisoners eligible for instruction and also whenever the schoolmaster reports that a scholar is fit for promotion to a higher standard." (1)

Although these were basically the three main documents, the Journal, the Character Book and the Educational Register, there were others of less administrative importance. They ranged from records of instructional books used to the reporting of lectures for prisoners. Up to a point, the role of chaplain had changed over the years: earlier in the century he worked at grass roots level; however towards the end he became more and more remote from the prisoners and in effect operated more as a religious administrator. Furthermore he had specialist help from the schoolmaster, scripture reader and clerks. Though they eased his load, they also effectively made a barrier between him and the prisoners.

The chaplain enjoyed one important advantage peculiar to his office, and denied to other prison staff. He had no disciplinary duties. As Hobhouse and Brockway pointed out:

"The chaplain is almost the only official who has no disciplinary duties, and it is his business to use his best endeavour to promote the reformation of the prisoners under his spiritual charge." (2)

Although the first part of the statement may well have been the case, it may also have operated to his disadvantage as witnessed for instance by the behaviour of the prisoners in the chapel during the early part of the century. As to the second part of the statement, the chaplain, perhaps, had the most difficult task to perform in comparison with his fellow prison colleagues. Firstly, it was not universally held in the prison service that education contributed to rehabilitation. Secondly, the chaplain had the unenviable task of trying to effect a change in the behaviour and outlook of a group comprised mainly of

(1) P.E.C. 12th Recommendation.
(2) S. Hobhouse and F. Brockway. English Prisons Today, 1922, p. 79
reluctant non-believers, by imparting religious knowledge. There was little time for the chaplain to use his personal influence as direct contact was limited. His main channel was through the preaching of sermons. The Reverend John Clay describes below his own observations of the impressions sometimes produced by preaching judiciously to criminals. He writes:

"The preacher may speak of heaven but those men cannot understand him. They know of no happiness beyond gross, foul, criminal indulgence. The preacher may speak of hell and they will wince. It would be terrible, if true. But is it true? They harden themselves and won't believe it. But now let him preach Christ crucified, and mark the effect of his preaching, as in vivid, strong words, he tells the story of that life and that Death, the story of that Friday morning at Calvary. Watch those men's faces, brutalised by years of selfishness and lust and gross ignorance. Gleams of intelligence and better feeling pass athwart their features. That strange, novel idea of God having actually suffered to save them from suffering, astounds and bewilders them. Vaguely and dimly they begin to feel that they ought, they must, they will, love this Jesus, who has so loved them. They feel that they should like to do, to suffer, something to prove their love. The old self-love is shaken; the new life from God is stirring within them; and when those men go back to their cells, they kneel down, and in their half-dumb, inarticulate fashion they gasp out a prayer." (1)

As with Clay, many of the prison chaplains that were to follow adopted the attitude that it was a matter of perseverance.

Perhaps the main drawback for many chaplains was the lack of whole-hearted support from those in authority for religion and education as an aid to rehabilitation. Secondly, the system itself forced the chaplain to devote more time to administration than was consistent with his prime task of pastoral care. The impersonal nature of the system made prisoners into numbers instead of unique individuals. Many chaplains, working under such conditions, must have developed a

hardened attitude to their work.

In conclusion, it is fitting to quote evidence presented to the Departmental Committee on Prisons in 1895 of another famous prison chaplain who in the course of his evidence touches upon the need to safeguard against adopting a hardened approach to the performance of the chaplain's work.

The Reverend W.D. Morrison observed,
"The great difficulty with all of us in prison is that we are so accustomed to see people under punishment and under suffering that we are apt to get a little hard in the matter, unless we take very great care. We have to bend our minds as much as possible the other way. That is my experience of prisons." (1)

The following year, Lord Leigh in his evidence to the Prisoners Education Committee said:
"I am strongly of opinion that chaplains ought not to stay above a certain number of years in one prison. I think the effect very often is that they get a little slack; it is an irksome duty, and I think they might be apt to get rather hard." (2)

Eventually chaplains were only appointed to the service for a period of five years. (3) There was the possibility of being re-appointed. However, the Home Secretary was of the opinion that it would be desirable for chaplains to return to parish work. (4)

In 1896, the Chaplain of Holloway Prison, the Rev. G.P. Henick was appointed Visiting Chaplain to H.M. Prisons to assist the Commissioner in
1. the selection of suitable candidates for the office of chaplain;
2. in the selection of local clergymen for the office of acting chaplain at the small prisons;
3. to visit the prisons and see that the religious services are conducted with zeal and that the duties of chaplain, scripture readers and schoolmasters are properly carried out,

---

(1) Page 118.
(2) Page 121.
(3) See Appendix G for details of various returns of the number of chaplains employed in the prison service.
(4) P.C.R. 1896, para. 22
also that the moral instruction of the prisoners is well attended to;

4. to see that the prisoners libraries are suitably kept up;

5. to see to the working of the Discharged Prisoners Aid Society;

6. to preach occasionally in the prison chapels and arrange with the prison chaplain to secure suitable outside clergy to preach and lecture occasionally to the prisoners.
APPENDIX A

Prison Conditions in the Eighteenth Century

NOTE

AN ESSAY TOWARDS THE REFORMATION OF NEWGATE AND THE OTHER PRISONS IN AND ABOUT LONDON

The vices and Immoralities of Prisons appear to be these following.

I. The personal Lewdness of the Keepers and under Officers themselves who often make it their business to corrupt the prisoners especially the women.

II. Their Confederacy with Prisoners in their vices allowing the men to keep company with the women for money.

III. The unlimited use of Wine, Brandy and other Strong Liquors even by condemned Malefactors.

IV. Swearing, Cursing, Blasphemy and Gameing.

V. Old Criminals corrupting Newcomers.

VI. Neglect of all Religious Worships.

For Reforming these Abuses, the following methods are proposed.

1. For the Keepers and Under Officers.
   I. That endeavours be used to procure an Act of Parliament to displace and punish such as are vicious and immoral. But till that can be done
   2. That Application be made to the 1st Mayor & Sheriffs of London to use their Authority for Reforming the Prisons. And as any Officer (who hath purchased his place) dieth, or is removed, they may be desired to have a special regard to the virtue & Morality of his successor.
   3. That Committee of Aldermen, Common Council or Some Members of the Society for Reformation be appointed, distinctly for this purpose, who shall have power,
   1. To appoint Ministers. The approbation of the Bishop of London first had & obtained, and also officers to all Prisons and shall be obliged once a week to visit them & take an account of ye State
of each Prison & give orders accordingly.
2. This Committee to have power to licence all Alehouses and Taverns adjoining to each Prison & they to be in the power of this Committee & visitors & other Power as shall be thought convenient.
3. The Disposal of all Benefactions to Prisons (without a particular Designation of the Donors) to be made by this Committee.
4. That the officers be so ordered as to be made Checks upon each other, and the Superior always made answerable for the neglects of the Inferiour.
5. That officers who are notoriously lewd & vicious & have bought their places, may be obliged by ye Committee to sell their places at such a value as the committee shall think reasonable; & to such persons as shall be approved by the Committee for their good conversation.
6. That a Table of orders, containing the Duty of Officers and Ministers, as well as Prisoners, signed by my Lord Bp. of London, and the Committee, be hung up in every Prison, shewing the Mulcts & Punishments of ye Several offences, together with the names & abodes of ye Committee, and visitors, directing where complaints may be made of Neglects.
(1) That these Orders be read once a month by ye Minister in the Presence of all the officers & as many Prisoners as may
(2) That there may be a short Preface or Postscript setting forth the good design'd to their souls by these orders: and passionatly exhorting the better sort to joyn their endeavours for promoting this good work.

II. Another Abuse is the Confederacy of ye officers with Prisoners in their vices, allowing the McN to keep company with ye Women for money etc.

To prevent this it is proposed.
1. That if possible, provision may be made to Keep every prisoner in distinct cells, as is practis'd in Bethlem Hospital. But till that be done.

That the Women be strictly Kept in Separate Apartments by themselves & a Severe Penalty be paid on any officer that shall permit a man to converse with a woman, except it be his own wife.
2. That the women be employed in such work as they have been bred to, and in case of Idleness or refusal, to be obliged to beat Hemp or any other hard labour.

3. That some expedient be found out that those women whose execution is respited on account of their bellies may not thereby for ever escape the rigor of the Law, for this emboldens them in the commission of Crimes which they would not probably be guilty of were they without hopes of escaping etc.

4. That the officers be restrain'd from taking any money besides their Salary in consideration of their good usage towards the Prisoners; unless in case of such Lodging, Diet, or Apartments as are more for their convenience. But let not money to the officers atone for any Crimes whatsoever committed in the Prison.

III. There is an unlimited use of Wine, Brandy, and other Strong Liquors in all Prisons & sold there to the extraordinary Profit of the Keepers. And neither Prisoner nor such as come to visit him shall be civilly used except they call for great Quantities of Liquor. Nay condemned Criminals go often intoxicated to execution. To prevent which I conceive.

1. That no wine or Strong Liquor ought to be sold in any Prison nor fetch'd from abroad, unless in cases of necessity and that with the leave of one or more of ye Committee.

2. That all Customs which promote Drinking, such as paying Garnish to Newcomers etc. be peremptorily forbidden; and severe Penalties inflicted on the Officers that permit the Continuance of them.

3. That no Kind of Luxury or intemperance be permitted to any Prisoner and Abstinence and Mortification be strictly enjoyn'd to condem'd Criminals in particular from ye very Moment after Sentence passed.

IV. Swearing, Cursing, Blaspheming, Gameing etc are ye dayly Practices both of officers and Prisoners.

And here it is offer'd.

1. That a Register Book be Kept of all the Officers and Prisoners Names, with the time of the Prisoners Commitment and an Alphabetical Direction to each Name.

2. That to each name a mark be affixed with the date of all their Oaths, Curses, Intemperance, etc. As also to the officers names, a note of any Corruption of neglect of orders.
3. That some Mark of Commendation be set to their Names who shall be of good Behaviour, during their Confinement, in which Degrees may be shown, as they shall be more exemplary or usefull towards reforming others.

4. That this Register be always produced in Court at the Tryal and also at the Release of all Prisoners and Consideration be had to these particulars. That an Ill Behaviour in Prison be made an Article at their Tryal and a Punishment adjudged to it distinct from that to their main Crime for which they are tryed.

5. That the Punishment be either Corporal or Pecuniary, mulcts both to prisoner and officer.

1. Corporal Punishment may be ye Stocks for ye under officers. To stubborn profane Criminals a Confinement to so many meals of Bread and Water; or perhaps more weight of Chains, or turning over to the Common side as is usual with the Coalers to inflict where money is not given to buy them off or in some cases a Public Severe whipping before Execution which may be more frightful to some than death.

2. Pecuniary mulcts such as the Act of Parliament requires for Oaths, Curses, Drunkenness etc. out of which the Register & Informers may be considered and after them the poorer sort of Prisoners (if they shall have the mark of Commendation to their Names) for discharging their Fees or Supplying their Necessities.

V. Old and Incorrigible Criminals corrupt the Newcomers.

To Reform this, it's necessary.

1. That such offenders be Kept in Separate Apartments singly, by themselves, and by no means suffered to converse with others.
2. That they be obliged to hard Labour so many hours in a day.
3. That, when such Persons be released out of Newgate, they may be sent to publick Workhouses and so distributed amongst others, that an Eye shall be always had to them and not to be released from thence but upon sufficient security given, and evidence made that they are entering upon an honest Employment. Nor after their
Release suffered to depart from their abodes, without security for their good Behaviour and taking to some business that may maintain them.

4. For the Encouragement of those who have lived regularly during their Confinement and give good hopes of their living honestly; That all good people may be advertised of their abodes and Professions by some publick notice in the sessions Paper and exhorted to help them towards a Livelihood in their Trades that they may not return to their old Courses.

VI. Religious worship is miserably neglected in most Prisons. And therefore it is proposed.

1. That the salary of the Ordinary of Newgate and all Ministers of Prisons be a sufficient maintenance and Encouragement for their constant attendance.

2. That Choice be made of sober pious Divines for this purpose and by no means of the younger sort, or of loose Livers, such as are sometimes in Prisons, and yet their Conscientious Discharge of their Duty in these places be an Effectual Recommendation of them to preferments in the City Gift.

3. That other ministers as are willing and are allowed of by ye Bishop of London may weekly visit the Prisons and have always free access to the Prisoners.

4. That Books of Devotion be given to all Prisoners — a Bible to every Chamber, many Common Prayer Books, whole Duty's of Hven, Christian monitors, Dr. Isham’s Office for the Sick, Mr. Kettlewell’s Office for Prisoners, etc.

5. That all Prisons (for Debt especially) be considered as Parochial Cures; and it is the Ministers Neglect if they do not come near the practice of what is done in other Parish Churches.

6. That Morning & Evening Prayer be read in all Prisons every day in the week, Suitable Sermons preached twice every Lord's Day & the Holy Sacrament Monthly administered. And here let the minister be very careful to apply himself to each Communicant in examination and Instruction after sufficient Notice given of his Inclination to receive. And to prevent scandal and too
great presumption, it may be a good way (commonly I think taken by
my Lord Bishop of Chichester & others) to enjoy the most notorious
Malefactors to sign a Paper importing a publick acknowledgment and
recantation before they receive. Upon which some great offenders
in Newgate have been admitted by them to the Holy Sacrament before
Execution. This will be a good Lesson of Instruction to others, and
by the Blessing of God, may have good effect upon such as shall be
released & make them Lead better lives for the future.

It is very much hoped the Right Honble. the Lord Mayor and
the Sheriffs of the City of London will take this whole matter into
their Special consideration. Considering that the Reformation of
Prisons may much contribute to the Reformation of the Publick: for
Prisons are one great part of our Correction for Criminals, and if
they are well managed may prove effectual to their amendment; whereas
for want of discipline it now generally happens that Prisoners are
made much worse by them, and if an innocent person be committed by
misfortune or mistake, he is commonly corrupted and turns profligate.

And Care in this affair is more particularly recommended to
the City of London both because Prisoners are here in greater number
than in other places, and because ye Example of this Capital City is
like to have an influence upon the whole Kingdom.


According to R.S.E. Hinde, a deputation was led by Dr. Bray who
initially visited Newgate and later other London prisons in 1702. The
report was not published until 150 years later, and the recommendations
first appeared in a publication by Mr. W. Hepworth Dixon in his
biography of John Howard (John Howard and the Prison World of Europe,

---

APPENDIX B

The Salary of the Rev. Mr. Richardson, as Co-Chaplain of the Gaol, for reading Prayers, and giving a Sermon weekly, originates as follows. Through the politeness of Mr. Gray, I have been favoured with a copy of the Writing of Endowment; and as it is both curious and instructive, a full extract from it is here subjoined.

"16th, January," (1634) "to CHARLES I. PHINEAS HODGSON, D.D. Chancellor of the Cathedral Church of York, by his deed of that date, (after expressing his desire, out of his Commisison and Pity to the Souls of Such Prisoners as then were, or should be in the Castle of York, to provide that they, for ever afterwards, might be instructed in the Knowledge of GOD, to their eternal Bliss and Happiness, which he hoped would be, by providing some Godly Minister or Preacher of God's Word to preach unto them in the said Castle, which, by reason of their Imprisonment, they were hindered elsewhere to hear; and in regard that RICHARD" (NEILE) "then late Archbishop of York, did licence, or allow, that Godly Preachers for ever thereafter might be allowed to preach there to that purpose, although there was no Church or Chapel; GRANTS to John Scott, D.D. the then Dean, and to George Stanhope D.D. and Henry Wickham, D.D. Prebend Residentiaries of the Cathedral of York, a Yearly Rent-Charge of Thirty Pounds, issuing out of a Messuage in Bempton, alias Benton upon the Wouls, in the County of York; and also out of the Chapel and Tithes of Bempton, alias Benton and Newsam, (parcell of the possessions of the late Monastery of Bridlington); and all the Lands and Tenements of the Grantor, in Bempton, alias Benton and Newsam; payable half-yearly, at Whitsuntide and Martinmas, at Haxby's Tomb, in the Cathedral Church of York, with the usual Clauses of nomine paenoe, and Distress on Default of Payment. IN TRUST, to pay Twenty-five Pounds per annum, parcel of the said Thirty Pounds, to such Minister or Preacher of God's Word, according to the True Religion then established in the Church of England, as should be nominated and appointed by the Grantor; and after his death by the Dean and Chapter of the Cathedral of York, to preach weekly, in the Castle of York, to the prisoners there for the time being; such Minister preaching there once every week throughout the year, except only in the Assize weeks, and at such times, by reason of any infection, or otherwise, as he shall
be dispensed with by the Grantor, during his Life, or the Dean and Chapter after his Death. AND to the intent that Five Pounds, residue of the Thirty Pounds, should be distributed weekly, by Two Shillings a week, in Bread, amongst the poorer sort of the Prisoners upon the Sermon Days, to such of them as should be present at the said Sermons; Hoping and Desiring that some others would attend to this pious and charitable work; and in time increase the Allowance and Stipend; and that the work might be acceptable to God, and profitable and comfortable to many distressed and poor Souls."

The INSTRUMENT then goes on to make provision for continuing and perpetuating the Trust, on the Demise of the then Trustees.

STATEMENT, and APPLICATION of the Legacy of the Rev. Chancellor Hodgson.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L.</th>
<th>s.</th>
<th>d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Out of which is deduced, and applied for the purposes directed by the Deed 5.0.0.
And for Land-Tax, on the 25l. per annum 1.5.0. 6.5.0.

Clear Receipt, paid to the Chaplain 23.15.0.

The above Writing, obligingly communicated to me, mentions that Mr. William Hart, a Merchant at York, had formerly bequeathed "One Hundred Pounds to the like use". Nothing certain, however, can now be obtained concerning this Legacy, which, probably, (like many others I have heard of in my perambulation of Prisons) is either lost, or diverted to some other purpose; and, from the lapse of time, it is not likely that any thing more can now be made out respecting it.
ACCOUNT OF CHARITABLE DONATIONS

to the Prisoners in his Majesty's Gaol,
THE CASTLE OF YORK.

£. s. d.

"The Lady Lumley; to be given yearly, on St. Thomas’s Day. Formerly, 61.7s. but since increased to Ten Pounds, paid to the Gaoler every Christmas; and ordered by the Trustees to be laid out in discharging poor Debtors out of Custody, in the same manner as the Money left in his (the Gaoler's) hands by the High Sheriff and Gentlemen of the Grand Jury; and for which he produces proper vouchers at each Assize ............. 10. 0. 0.

The honourable and ancient City of York, weekly, in bread ..................................................... 0. 2. 6.

Mrs. Frances Thornhill, for straw. The Lord Mayor has 30l. in his hands for the purpose; and the Thirty Shillings for Straw are now laid out in other articles for the good of the Prison, by the Clerk to the Justices ................................. 1. 10. 0.


York Castle. The County Gaol. Visited 1809.
APPENDIX G

LOCAL PRISONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK OF OFFICER</th>
<th>CLASSIFICATION OF PRISONS</th>
<th>SCALE OF PAY</th>
<th>ALLOWANCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHAPLAINS</td>
<td>In prisons in which the daily average number of prisoners, plus 10 per cent. is above 1,000</td>
<td>£350 p.a. rising to £450</td>
<td>House, or an allowance in lieu of £52 per annum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>400 up to 1,000 (incl)</td>
<td>£300 p.a. &quot; to £400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>200 and under 400</td>
<td>£200 p.a. &quot; to £300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Above 100 and under 200</td>
<td>£150 p.a. &quot; to £200.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One half of the increment to accrue after 5 years' service, the other after other 5 years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSIST. CHAPLAINS</td>
<td>75 and under 100</td>
<td>£150 per annum (fixed)</td>
<td>Nil.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under 75</td>
<td>£100 &quot; &quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One half the increment to accrue after 5 years' service, the other after other 5 years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£150 p.a. rising to £200.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ DO.</td>
<td></td>
<td>£200 &quot; &quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>House, or an allowance p.a. in lieu of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(London £50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Country £59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Approved by Treasury Letter, dated 14th June, 1878.
+ Approved by Treasury Letter, dated 21st August, 1878.
φ Approved by Treasury Letter, dated 14th June, 1878.

The following Regulations have been approved by the Treasury, with respect to Chaplains and Assistant Chaplains in Local Prisons, viz:

1. That Assistant Chaplains be required to give their whole time to the Service.

2. That Chaplains, whose pay does not exceed that assigned to Prisons having a daily average, plus 10 per cent. of 100 to 200 prisoners, viz: £150 to £200 per annum, be allowed to accept other employment, subject to the sanction of the Commissioners.

3. That Chaplains on higher scales be not allowed to take other employment.

4. That any Chaplain who has other employment, be not allowed a
house or an allowance in lieu, nor medical attendance and medicines, if brought on the New Scale. - (Treasury Letter dated 31st December, 1879).

* In addition to the allowances stated in this column, all officers who devote their whole time to the Service, are subject to such conditions as may from time to time be approved, entitled to medical attendance and medicines for themselves, and, in certain circumstances for their families also.
APPENDIX D.

CHAPLAIN'S JOURNAL

Extracts from the Chaplain's Journal.

"February 14, 1838.—Mr. D. Hodgson, visiting magistrate, here this day. Declined the assistance of a committee of ladies suggested by Miss H., as also any distribution of books or tracts, on the ground of every inmate of the place having some portion of the Word of God explained daily.

March 5.—At sessions from 10 till 5.

March 6.—At sessions from 9 till 5.

March 7.—One to half-past three in prison; at sessions from nine till close.

April 15.—At sessions from half-past 9 A.M. till 6 P.M.

April 16.—At sessions from half-past 8 A.M. till 6 P.M.

July 22.—Half-past 9 to 3 in prison; attended the sessions.

July 23.—Half-past 9 to half-past 2 attended the sessions.

July 24.—Nine to three attended the sessions.

January 6, 1840.—Attended at the sessions the whole day.

January 9.—Attended at the sessions the whole day.

January 10.—Attended at the sessions the whole day.

February 13, 1840.—Visited the hospital. The woman, apparently dying, but she declined conversing with me altogether.

February 16, 1840.—Visited every part of the prison, and now I believe every person in confinement; the hospital, girls' school, and all the wards. Found the women in the untried ward, and in the vagrant ward, reading a story book by way of amusement. These books have obtained an entrance without my knowledge, and are no proper substitutes for the Scriptures on the Lord's day.

July 12, 1840.—Visited the prisoners early this morning for the purpose of examining the girls and boys in the schools, in their understanding of what they read.

The six senior girls I talked up in the first instance; they read three verses between them with some difficulty. As to answering questions, they had not the least notion. One girl refused either to read or speak, evidently upon bigotted principles. I had every possible cause to be dissatisfied with the state of the school, where it is evident the children do not know the meaning of one word they read.

"In the boys' school I had cause for satisfaction; these boys answered plain questions very well, and were attentive and willing to be taught.

"Friday, October 9, 1840.—Visited both the hospitals. One boy wept bitterly; I reported the matter to the governor, being fearful of misrepresentation. One woman, a member of the kirk, lately delivered of a child; I asked her if she should like me to send for any minister of her own persuasion; she declined. One woman, apparently very weak, declined communication with me; I at once left her.

"R. T. conversed with me on his private affairs, in reference to St. John's College, Cambridge, I having formerly interested myself in that business at his request.

Sunday, October 11, 1840. As in reading the entire morning prayers, the Liturgy, and the Communion Service, in the chapel, leaves not time between the service to go to my own residence for refreshment; and as the length of the continued services and sermon were necessarily very fatiguing, I request of the justices to allow me some small refreshment, in the way of a biscuit and wine, as really needful for my support, and commonly supplied in parish ministry. The time away from own dwelling on Sundays will be from half-past 9 until 5.

"I also request most respectfully that I may be supplied with a clean surplice at least weekly; and as the canons of the church enjoin my wearing with it a scarf and the hood of my collegiate degree, that these, together with a black gown for preaching and bands for daily use, may be ordered."
A typical example of an entry in a Character Book

### Specimen of Chaplain's Character Book

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Prisoner</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Offence</th>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Education when received</th>
<th>Course of Life</th>
<th>Conduct, &amp;c., during Confinement</th>
<th>Apparent Effects of Imprisonment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V. R. Washall, Staffordshire.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Game</td>
<td>6 weeks</td>
<td>Ch. R.</td>
<td>Says that he was decoyed by an old poacher, who got a reward from the keepers for putting men into their snares; was on his road to Cocker Iron Works.</td>
<td>Is by no means ignorant on religious matters. Says that he and an elder brother maintain their parents.</td>
<td>I believe that prison has been a great blessing to this man. He expressed himself most grateful for the instructions he has had, and seemed well disposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walsall, Staffordshire.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Game</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>His last one eye from small-pox. Says he has attended the Methodist Chapel, is very ignorant. Says he has had no work for some time.</td>
<td>Did not know a letter when he came; was very desirous of learning. Can now read well, and said a portion of his Catechism tune. Behaved very well.</td>
<td>Says he has made up his mind to go to church; I believe he means what he says.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. S. Bulwell.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Game</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>Seldom attends a place of worship; is very ignorant. Says his family were starving; it is 8 years since he was here before for poaching; trade was then very bad.</td>
<td>Has learnt to read a little, and promises me that he will follow it up. Seems a harmless sort of man.</td>
<td>Says he knows it is his duty to go to church; intends to do so. I think prison has done him good. He speaks very properly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. W. K.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Game</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>Seldom attends a place of worship; is very ignorant. Speaks with tears of his destitute state and want of work. Can say the Lord's Prayer.</td>
<td>Has learnt to read, and improved himself very much. Does not seem ill-disposed. Behaved well.</td>
<td>Speaks rationally about himself. Says he sees his folly, and intends to amend. I think prison has had a beneficial effect upon him. Says he shall attend church.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton in Ashfield.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Game</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>Very seldom goes to church. Is very ignorant. Never prays. Says he has had no work lately.</td>
<td>Has learnt to read. Says he shall soon be able to read well, and intends to follow it up. Seems inclined to learn, and is grateful for his opportunities.</td>
<td>Promises to abstain from poaching if he can get work. I believe his intentions are good. I think prison has had a beneficial effect on him. Gave him a prayer-book.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. W. K. Wife and three children.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Game</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>Seldom attends church. Has been dreadfully bitten by the keeper's dog.</td>
<td>Has been in the infirmary all his time. Seems a very well disposed man. I have had much conversation with him, and I like his manner much. He is very grateful for what has been done for him.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton in Ashfield.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Game</td>
<td>3 months</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Says that he shall go home directly, where he knows he can get work. Says, and I believe honestly, that he shall not go poaching again.

**Southwell House of Correction, Notts.**

I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, 1845.
### Southern and Western District.—Somersetshire.

#### Educational Statistics—continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Lessons Learnt.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Appendix F**

**Source** Bath City Gaol—House of Correction—Rpt. by Rev. W. Osborne

**Chaplain, I.P.R. Southern & Western District, 1850.**

**Reports on Prisons in the...**

Educational Statistics extracted from the Chaplain's Educational Register, for the Year ending September 30th, 1849.

- On the 30th September, 1848, there were in the gaol... 63
- Total number of prisoners in the gaol during the year... 708

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>It was found that on September 30, 1848, of those in the gaol... 536 were anxious to attend the...</th>
<th>It was found that 722 had made various degrees of improvement while in gaol. 536 had not made any, from the sentences being very...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>396 were anxious to attend the gaol school in order to improve themselves. 310 were not anxious.</td>
<td>536 had not made any, from the sentences being very short, and other causes. 18 of those (who could not repeat the Lord's Prayer) on admission had learnt it. 63 had learnt the Catechism on the Lord's Prayer, called No. 2, containing 6 sections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>296 could not...</td>
<td>536 had not made any, from the sentences being very short, and other causes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>194 could not...</td>
<td>536 had not made any, from the sentences being very short, and other causes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>184 could not...</td>
<td>536 had not made any, from the sentences being very short, and other causes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>174 could not...</td>
<td>536 had not made any, from the sentences being very short, and other causes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>164 could not...</td>
<td>536 had not made any, from the sentences being very short, and other causes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>150 could not...</td>
<td>536 had not made any, from the sentences being very short, and other causes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>129 could not...</td>
<td>536 had not made any, from the sentences being very short, and other causes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>118 could not...</td>
<td>536 had not made any, from the sentences being very short, and other causes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>108 could not...</td>
<td>536 had not made any, from the sentences being very short, and other causes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>98 could not...</td>
<td>536 had not made any, from the sentences being very short, and other causes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>88 could not...</td>
<td>536 had not made any, from the sentences being very short, and other causes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>78 could not...</td>
<td>536 had not made any, from the sentences being very short, and other causes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>68 could not...</td>
<td>536 had not made any, from the sentences being very short, and other causes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>58 could not...</td>
<td>536 had not made any, from the sentences being very short, and other causes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>48 could not...</td>
<td>536 had not made any, from the sentences being very short, and other causes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>38 could not...</td>
<td>536 had not made any, from the sentences being very short, and other causes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>28 could not...</td>
<td>536 had not made any, from the sentences being very short, and other causes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>18 could not...</td>
<td>536 had not made any, from the sentences being very short, and other causes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>8 could not...</td>
<td>536 had not made any, from the sentences being very short, and other causes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2 could not...</td>
<td>536 had not made any, from the sentences being very short, and other causes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1 could not...</td>
<td>536 had not made any, from the sentences being very short, and other causes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1 could not...</td>
<td>536 had not made any, from the sentences being very short, and other causes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1 could not...</td>
<td>536 had not made any, from the sentences being very short, and other causes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1 could not...</td>
<td>536 had not made any, from the sentences being very short, and other causes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1 could not...</td>
<td>536 had not made any, from the sentences being very short, and other causes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- Many became acquainted with the consequences of the fall of man in attendance at the chapel and the chaplain's classes.
- Total number of hymns... 396
- 1,807
- Total number of lessons learnt during the year... 7,537
APPENDIX G

Various returns relative to the total number of Chaplain employed with prison service.

1) Chaplains in attendance | No Chaplains in attendance
--- | ---
County Gaol & House of Correction | 69
Town & City Borough Gaols | 8
Total No. of Gaols | 142.

(Where no details were given in the return it has been assumed that no Chaplain had been appointed or was in attendance).

Sixth Report of the Committee for the Improvement of Prison Discipline, and for the Reformation of Juvenile Offenders, 1824.

2) 112 Chaplains
2 Assistant Chaplains
Total No. of Prisons 122

(The position in the remaining 8 gaols was as follows:
1 Religious Instructor; 2 Curates; 4 no appointments; 1 not stated).

See Abstract of return relative to Religious Instruction in Prisons - 10.5.1853.

3) 104 Chaplains
Total No. of Prisons 109

(The position in the remaining 5 gaols was as follows:
3 not stated).

See Return of the County & Borough Prisons in England providing Religious Instruction - 27.3.1868.

On assuming control of local prisons on the 1st April, 1878 by the State, 113 local prisons were transferred, of which 38 were instantly closed on the same day.

The total number of Chaplains and Assistant Chaplains were as follows:
1st Report Prison Commissioners, 1878. Appendix No.5

1.7.78
Chaplains & Prison Ministers 132
2) 2nd Report Prison Commissioners, 1879, Appendix No.7

As at 31.5.1878
Chaplains & Prison Ministers 71
Total No. of Prisons 57

3) 6th Report Prison Commissioners, 1883, Appendix No.13

As at 31.3.1883
Chaplains & Assistant Chaplains 63
Total No. of Prisons 60

4) 7th Report Prison Commissioners, 1884 - Page 3

Statement, showing the number of superior officers of local prisons at various periods, with the gross value of their salaries and emoluments.

Chaplains

On taking over the local prisons in April, 1878 Number 113
Salaries & Emoluments £22,895

On 31st March, 1884 Number 64
Salaries & Emoluments £16,817

When new Scale is completed and carried into effect Number 64
Salaries & Emoluments £16,550.

5) 9th Report Prison Commissioners, 1886, Appendix 12.

As at 31.3.1886
Chaplains & Assistant Chaplains 59
Total No. of Prisons 59

6) 16th Report Prison Commissioners, 1893.

As at 31.3.1893
Chaplains 50
Assistant Chaplains 3
Total No. of Prisons 52
7) 17th Report Prison Commissioners 1893/94  Appendix 20

Proposed Staff 1894.

Chaplains  50
Assistant Chaplains  4
Total No. of Prisons  52

Statement showing the number of superior officers of local prisons at various periods, with the gross value of their salaries and emoluments.

Chaplains

On taking over Number 115
No. local prisons in
April, 1878. Salary £22,895.

On 31st March, 1894 Number 57
Salaries £15,159

When new Scale is completely carried
into effect. Salaries £12,795

8) 19th Report Prison Commissioners 1895/96. Appendix 8

As at 31.3.1896

Chaplains  50
Assistant Chaplains  4
No. of Prisons  50

9) 20th Report Prison Commissioners 1897, Appendix 8.

As at 31.3.1897

Chaplains  50
Assistant Chaplains  4
Total No. of Prisons  50

10) 21st Report Prison Commissioners, 1898, Appendix 8.

As at 31.3.1898

Chaplains  50
Assistant Chaplains  4
Total No. of Prisons  50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>As at 31.3.1899</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chaplains</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Chaplains</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total No. of Prisons</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>As at 31.3.1900</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chaplains</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Chaplains</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total No. of Prisons</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 2

The Appointment of Prison Ministers and the provisions made for prisoners belonging to Other Churches or Religious Persuasions

Prior to the turn of the century, Parliament had made statutory provisions for the religious needs of prisoners belonging to the Established Church by appointing Clergymen and the provision of religious instruction.

During the early part of the century there was an increasing number of prisoners belonging to Other Churches or Religious Persuasions whose religious needs were not being provided for in a large number of the gaols. In recognising this situation, Parliament made the following provisions under the Prison Act of 1823 (1). Section 31 stated "... and be it further enacted that if any Prisoner shall be of a religious persuasion differing from that of the Established Church, a Minister of such persuasion, at the special request of such prisoner, shall be allowed to visit him or her at proper and reasonable times, under such restrictions imposed by the Visiting Justices as shall guard against the introduction of improper persons, and as shall prevent improper communications."

However, as early as 1779, and later in 1781, two gaols had made provisions within their rules for dissenting Ministers to be allowed to visit prisoners of their own persuasion. The first of these gaols was the Penitentiary House for the County of Gloucester where Ministers were only permitted to visit prisoners be it in special circumstances. Rule 27 stipulated "... but if any prisoner under sentence of death, or dangerously sick shall declare himself of a religious persuasion, dissenting from the doctrines of the Established Church, a Minister of such persuasion shall be permitted to visit such prisoner, the name of the Minister so permitted shall be entered by the Governor in his journal". (2)

1. 4 Geo.IV c.64.
2. Appendix 2. Rules, Orders and Regulations for the Control and Government of the Prisons of the County of Gloucester as they relate to the Penitentiary House of the said County - 1779.
The second gaol was that of Southwell House of Correction, Nottingham. Unlike the Penitentiary House, the rule at Southwell was far more flexible. Rule 55 stated "that the Chaplain be the only Clergyman of the Established Church permitted officially to visit any prisoner; but that any prisoner who dissents from the doctrines of the Established Church, may be attended by a Minister of the same persuasion, provided such dissenting Minister shall signify his name and residence to the Chaplain, who is hereby directed to enter the same in the Chapel-book; and that such dissenting Minister shall not attend any other prisoners." (1) (Credit is due mainly to Sir G.O. Paul and the Rev. J.T. Becker respectively for these provisions).

It is perhaps worth noting the differences in the provisions made for prisoners belonging to the Established Church with those belonging to Other Churches. They differed in the following three ways.

1. There were no provisions requiring that the Justices appoint a Minister either on a full or part-time basis.
2. The onus was placed on the prisoner to summons a Minister.
3. There was no provision made for the religious instruction of the prisoner(s) unless a Minister was requested by a prisoner.

The provisions of Section 31 must have been viewed by the religious leaders of the dissenting denominations with mixed feelings. On the one hand the authorities now acknowledged the fact that a Minister should be allowed to visit and attend to the prisoner(s) religious needs. On the other hand, ministration was only possible at the special request of a prisoner. As far as prisoners belonging to the protestant sector were concerned, the provisions were not so serious or restrictive as it was permissible for prisoners to attend the services of the Established Church.

However, in regard to the Roman Catholic Church, the provision must have been viewed with some concern, especially as it

1. Appendix to report from the Committee on Laws Relating to Penitentiary Houses, House of Commons Report 31/5/1811.
was a breach of the Church's rules to attend any non-Catholic Service. Furthermore, Roman Catholic prisoners were in the majority. Without any doubt many Chaplains, Governors and Justices (many of whom were Clergymen) saw Section 31 as a threat to the religious contamination of prisoners belonging to the Established Church in spite of the built-in conditions or safeguards contained in the Section. In fact this general fear of contamination was to prevail throughout most of the century. Indeed subsequent legislation was to reflect this attitude.

The period between 1823 and 1850 was a fairly inactive one. Some of the gaols encouraged their prisoners to take advantage of Section 31, whereas in others, the provisions were either discouraged or overlooked. By the early 1850s there were signs that the provisions of Section 31 were not working satisfactorily. The first indication was intimated in a memorandum submitted by a deputation of Catholic Noblemen and Gentlemen. (1) (This memorandum was unsigned, undated, but probably written about 1850, and possibly addressed to the Home Department). The authors made the following proposals:

1. "The deputation asks for bona fide freedom both in religion and education for all inmates of prisons and work houses.

2. To effect this, the deputation asks for

(A) A registry of the religion of all inmates of prisons and work houses open to the inspection of the Catholic Clergy.
(B) Admission of the Catholic Clergy to visit all Catholic inmates,
(C) The appointment of a Catholic Chaplain to be recognised as an officer of the prison or work house.
(D) Power of assembling Catholics for worship and instruction in a separate place assigned for that purpose.
(E) Separate schools and teachers for Catholic Children attached to prisons and work houses.

---

1. Public Record Office. HO 45 6240.
(F) Restrictions of the Religious communications of the Chaplains, Officers, Visitors to be their respective charges, except upon special requirements."

This document was of particular interest because some of the proposals (1) were eventually incorporated in The Prison Ministers Act of 1863.

The second indication revealed more clearly that many of the gaols were not complying with Section 31 as indicated by a return called for by Parliament as to the State of Religious Instruction in Prisons as on the 25th September, 1852. An analysis of the data shows the following position with regard to the visits of Ministers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total No. of Gaols</th>
<th>122</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total No. of Prisoners</td>
<td>2,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total No. of Prisoners (Roman Catholic Prisoners)</td>
<td>2,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total No. of Prisoners (Other Denominations)</td>
<td>1,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Prisons visited</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Prisons not visited</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Prisons visited (Roman Catholic Prisoners)</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Prisons not visited (Roman Catholic Prisoners)</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Prisons visited (Other Denominations)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Prisons not visited (Other Denominations)</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No payments were made to any of the Ministers.

It is clear from this return and previous information that Section 31 was not receiving the required attention of the gaol authorities. There were a number of possible reasons.

1. There was no legal obligation on the part of the Justices or other gaol officials to summons, or indeed encourage the visit of a Minister.

2. The onus was placed on the prisoner to request the ministration of a Minister.

3. That owing to the restricted educational background of some of the prisoners, there was a lack of awareness that such facilities existed.

4. Owing to inadequate communication on the part of gaol authorities on reception, prisoners were not always made aware of such facilities.

1. Proposals 2(A)(c)(C) were incorporated in The Prison Ministers Act. Eventually the Select Committee to enquire into the operation of the Prisons Act and Prison Ministers Act 1870 recommended part of proposal 2(C), i.e. "recognised as an officer of the prison".
5. That due to a non-religious background, not all prisoners would require or request the ministration of a Minister.

Of the above reasons, the first proved the most serious and significant one, demonstrating the lack of concern and importance that the authorities attached to the visits of Ministers, and the need for the provision of religious instruction for a minority group of prisoners. Not until 1863 did Parliament legislate in an effort to improve the situation.

Following the amalgamation of two Bills, that for "amending the law relating to the Religious Instruction of Roman Catholic Prisoners in England and Wales", (1) and for "amending the law relating to the Religious Instruction of Prisoners in County and Borough Prisons in England and Scotland", (2) on the 28th July, 1863, The Prison Ministers Act (3) was enacted by Parliament.

The Act's main purpose was to appoint Ministers to the gaols, and to offer prisoners a greater degree of religious instruction and contact with their respective Churches. Under this Act Justices were empowered to appoint Ministers to prisons in England. Section 3 stated "In the opinion of the Justices, or other Persons having the appointment of a Chaplain in the said Prison, to require the Ministrations of a Minister of their own Church or Persuasion, the said Justices, or other Persons, may appoint a Minister (4) of such last mentioned Church or Persuasion to attend at the said Prison on the Prisoners of his own Church or Persuasion..."

The Act provided for the appointment of two distinct types of Ministers. One was to be known as an Official appointment and the Minister was either engaged on a whole or part-time basis. These appointments were not automatic, and were left to the discretion of the Justices as to whether they felt that the numbers of prisoners "is so great as" to warrant such an appointment. The second type

1. Bill No. 140.
2. Bill No. 24
3. 26 & 27 Vic. c.79.
4. Roman Catholic Bishop Thomas Grant of Southwark, London made the following suggestion "In explaining to them their privileges the term 'Priest' would be better understood than Minister".
was to be known as a Visiting Minister. The latter visited prisons where an official appointment had not been made or where the numbers of prisoners did not justify or warrant the appointment of an Official appointment. Whereas Official appointments were made by the Justices at Quarter Sessions, the appointment of a Visiting Minister was made by the Visiting Justices. Section 3 further states "The Visiting Justices of any Prison may, if they think fit, without a Special Request being made by, but not against the will of any Prisoners of a Church or Religious Persuasion differing from that of the Established Church, permit a Minister of the Church or Persuasion to which such Prisoner belongs to visit such Prisoner." (At this point in time, the Ministers were usually the local parish priest).

This part of the Act achieved some important changes. First of all it removed the onus on the part of the prisoners from having to summons a Minister, unless it is 'against the will of any Prisoner'. Secondly, greater freedom was to be extended to Ministers to visit prisoners, provided the Visiting Justices 'think fit'. Thirdly, and for the first time, Ministers were to receive payment for their services. The Act empowered Justices "if they think fit", to award to him a reasonable sum as a recompense for his services, such sum to be deemed a Part of the Expenses of the Prison to which he is appointed, and to be paid out of the Funds legally applicable to the Payment of Such Expenses." These payments were in the main to apply to Official Ministers, and not to Visiting Ministers.

Unfortunately there is little or no information available as to the sum that was paid to Ministers immediately following the passing of the Act. It has therefore been necessary to refer to two letters written during the 1850s as a means of gaining some indication of the likely sum that might or would be paid to Ministers. Both letters referred only to Ministers belonging to the Roman Catholic Church. The first letter, which was undated and unsigned, but possibly written about the early 1850s by an Official of the
Catholic Church recommended "...that Roman Catholic Priests should be paid £1. per visit, but that payment should not exceed £30. p.a. For this payment the Priests would have to supply as much religious instruction, including administration of the requirements of their Church as if they were Chaplains of the gaol. Thus religious instruction for 3,000 Roman Catholic prisoners would cost approximately £4,700". The second letter was from Col. J. Jebb of the Convict Service in which he informed Mr. H. Waddington of the Home Department, that it had been agreed to pay Roman Catholic Ministers on the following basis: £150. p.a., provided the Minister devoted his whole-being to his duties, or £50 to £75 p.a. dependent on the number of prisoners, i.e. between 40 to 100.

There are a number of possible reasons why Parliament appeared reluctant to stipulate a salary for these Ministers. In the first place they probably wished to leave the issue 'open ended' in order to give the Justices freedom to negotiate salaries based on 1. the financial position of each particular gaol, 2. the time and extent of the duties that each Minister would be devoting to the prison, and 3. the number of prisoners in custody. Finally, Parliament may have presumed that by not fixing a salary it would possibly 'discourage' or 'embarrass' Ministers from asking for payment. Seven years were to elapse before a Select Committee in 1870 was to determine the salary and the criteria upon which it was to be based.

One problem that faced many Ministers and especially those of the Roman Catholic Church, was the lack of communication between the gaol authorities and themselves, concerning information about the number and the religious denominations of all committals. Furthermore, these Ministers were concerned that prisoners were being deprived of religious ministration as a result of the lack of communication. There was probably some truth in the allegation by

1. Public Record Office H.O. 45 6940.
some Ministers that they were not being informed or were experiencing difficulty in establishing from the gaol authorities how many prisoners belonging to their respective Churches were being held in confinement without their knowledge. In order to comply with prison policy as it affected prisoners belonging to the Established Church namely (that all prisoners are entitled to receive religious ministration), it was perhaps not surprising that provisions were now to be made for the compulsory registration on admission of the religious persuasion of all prisoners. Section 4 required "The Keeper or other person performing the Duties of Keeper of a Prison on receiving into his custody any Prisoner, shall enter his name in a Book to be provided for the purpose with the addition of the Church or Religious Persuasion to which the Prisoner shall declare himself to belong, and the said keeper or other Person shall from Time to Time give to any Minister appointed or permitted to visit Prisoners in the Prison a List of the Prisoners so declared to belong to the Church or Persuasion of such Minister". This provision went some way in minimising the possibility of some prison administrators from failing to inform a Minister of the names of prisoners belonging to his Church. Of course the accuracy of the List was dependant on two factors,

(a) the co-operation and efficiency of the prisons administration and

(b) the honesty of the prisoner stating his religion.

On this last point, Father F.L. Weale wrote "that Roman Catholic prisoners entered themselves as Church of England merely in order to get out of their cells at Chapel time". (1)

From available documentation the Established Church was not apparently adverse to the idea of allowing or discouraging prisoners belonging to the Other Churches from attending Chapel Services. Indeed, part of Section 3 did not help matters, in fact it may well have encouraged the practice. It stated ".... provided that any person shall on request be allowed subject to the Rules of the Gaol, to attend the Chapel or to be visited by the Chaplain of the Gaol."

1. Public Records Office. H.0.45. A52621
In fact, as late as 1890, the Roman Catholic Priest, Father F.L. Weale of St. James's Catholic Church at Reading, expressed some concern about the matter to the extent that he wrote to the Secretary of State, Home Department on the 18th October, 1890, requesting information as to whether Roman Catholic prisoners were attending services of the Established Church in the prison Chapel. Father Weale pointed out in this letter that Roman Catholics should not be allowed under any circumstances to attend any non-Catholic services and that by so doing would commit a serious breach of the laws of the Church to which the prisoners profess to belong. In his reply dated the 11th November, 1890, the Secretary of State wrote, "that I cannot forbid a prisoner entered as a Roman Catholic from attending the Church of England services if he desires to do so, it must rest with you at your weekly visits to put before Roman Catholic prisoners your view of their conscience duty in the matter".

This practice was not confined to Roman Catholics, it also applied to other denominations. According to a Return in 1868 it was found that in 24 prisons out of a total of 109 it was common practice for the gaol Chaplain to provide religious instruction and to visit prisoners belonging to other denominations.

Although it is probably fair to say that the Prison Ministers Act was a genuine attempt on the part of Parliament to improve the provisions for religious ministration of a minority group of prisoners, unfortunately the conditions that were imposed upon the Ministers in many ways obscured the positive provisions of the Act. These conditions were directly related to preventing or minimising the risk of religious contamination of prisoners belonging to the Established Church. In fact the conditions imposed on the Ministers were or could be seen to be a series of carefully

2. Ibid.
3. "Returns of the County and Borough Prisons of England in which Religious Instruction is afforded to prisoners of different Denominations specifying which and at what cost to each."
designed measures to prevent the possibility of Ministers coming into contact with prisoners of the Established Church. The conditions contained in the following Sections confirm this belief.

1. **Section 3** ".... to visit such prisoners at proper and reasonable times, under such restrictions imposed by them (Justices) as may guard against the introduction of improper Persons, and may prevent improper communications".

2. **Section 4** ".... and no such Minister shall be permitted to attend or visit any prisoners belonging to any Religious Persuasion differing from that to which such Minister belongs".

Unlike the Chaplains who had complete freedom to visit any part of the gaol (1) similar privileges were denied to Ministers who were bound by

3. **Section 5** which stated ".... shall not apply to any prisoner who is attended or visited by a Minister of a Church or Persuasion differing from the Church of England".

Taking into account the conditions so far mentioned, the most restrictive was that contained in

4. **Section 3** which stated ".... no Minister shall be appointed under this Act for any Prison in which there is not a Chaplain of the Established Church".

Although the conditions as stated in 4. above were a direct threat to the whole purpose of the Act, (the author is of the opinion) that in actual practice this part of Section 3 was never implemented, because by 1863 all gaols had appointed a Chaplain either on a full or part-time basis. Nevertheless, the need to include such a condition was a clear indication of the authorities' general fear of religious contamination of prisoners belonging to the Established Church.

With the enactment of the 1865 Prison Act (2) (one of the severest of Acts to ever reach the statute books), there were a

---

1. 4 Geo.IV, c.64, Section 30, stated ".... that the Chaplain shall frequently visit every Room and Cell in the prison occupied by Prisoners" "....and that he shall visit those who are in Solitary Confinement".

2. 28 & 29 Vic. c.126.
number of 'surprising' improvements made in the provisions for Ministers and prisoners belonging to the Other Churches. For instance, if the prison had not appointed a Minister under The Prison Minister's Act, the Justices were permitted to approve a Minister of the same Persuasion to visit (subject, of course, to the usual restrictions discussed earlier). Secondly (and for the first time) a prisoner had the choice of objecting to seeing such a Minister (1). Thirdly, if any appointed Minister were to be absent on leave or for any other unavoidable cause, he was permitted to appoint a substitute with the consent of the Visiting Justices. (2) Finally, in the event of the Minister's death the Visiting Justices were required to provide a substitute until the next Meeting of the Justices in Sessions. (3) Suffice to say that these provisions signified a more positive attitude, as well as an attempt of ensuring the continued visit, and the provision of religious instruction for the prisoners.

The first opportunity that Parliament had to assess the position following the implementation of the Prison Ministers Act was in 1868. On the 27th March it called for "Returns of the County and Borough Prisons of England in which Religious Instruction is afforded to prisoners of different denominations, specifying which and at what cost to each": "and of the number of prisoners in each prison, and to what denomination they belong". "Returns to be made up to the 2nd day of April inclusive". An analysis of the data revealed the following position in 109 gaols.

**Roman Catholics**
Total Number of Male and Female prisoners 6,084.
(It has not been possible to give a separate breakdown of male and female prisoners).

In 15 prisons a Priest had been appointed and attended to the prisoners' religious needs. They were paid an annual salary.

In 30 prisons a Minister was allowed to visit. These visits

1. Rule 47.
2. Rule 51.
3. Rule 52.
were either on a regular basis, or as and when they were asked to visit, usually at the request of a prisoner. None of these Ministers were offered any remuneration for their services.

In the remaining 14 prisons there were no Ministers in attendance. Of the 109 gaols, 95 had made provisions for the visit of a Minister, and for the religious instruction of prisoners.

The distribution of salaries amongst the 15 appointed Ministers in relation to the number of prisoners was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Ministers</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Number of Prisoners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>£300 p.a.</td>
<td>563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>£150 p.a.</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>£120 p.a.</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>£100 p.a.</td>
<td>141; 284; 109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>£70 p.a.</td>
<td>890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>£60 p.a.</td>
<td>663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>£50 p.a.</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>£40 p.a.</td>
<td>72; 33; 79; 207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>£30 p.a.</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>£25 p.a.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Salary Bill £1,265

(The highest paid Chaplain (C. of E.) received £525 p.a. for 521 prisoners, Stafford County Prison.

The lowest paid Chaplain (C. of E.) received £10 p.a. for 3 prisoners, Borough Gaol, Barnstaple.) (1)

Other Denominations included Wesleyans, Baptists, Primitive Methodists, Independents, Presbyterians, Lutherans, Mormons, Unitarians, Calvinists, Jews, Bible Christians, Quakers, Plymouth Brethrens, Raniers, Peculiar People, Reformed Greeks, Mowamedans, Countess of Huntingdon (Lewis Prison).

Total number of male and female prisoners 3,010.

(It has not been possible to give a separate breakdown of male and female prisoners).

1. Sources, same Return.
Total number of prisoners with no religion or religion not ascertained 419.

In 73 prisons a Minister(s) visited and provided religious instruction.

In none of the 73 prisons were Ministers offered any remuneration for their services.

In 24 prisons a Church of England Chaplain visited and provided religious instruction. (It is assumed that the Chaplain only provided a service to those prisoners belonging to the Protestant faiths). None of these Chaplains received extra payment.

In the remaining 12 prisons there was no Minister in attendance. Of the 109 prisons, 97 provided contact with a Minister, and some degree of instruction.

The conclusions that can be drawn from the return are:

(a) That in the majority of prisons, prisoners received the visit and ministration of a Minister.

(b) That out of a total of 109 prisons, only 15 prisons had appointed an official Minister, all of which were Roman Catholics.

(c) That in the remaining 94 prisons only Visiting Ministers were attending to the prisoners' religious needs, thus indicating a minimal amount of contact and religious instruction.

(d) As a result of (c), there appeared to be a reluctance on the part of the Justices to summons a Minister, and that visits were only allowed following a specific request by a prisoner.

(e) That in 24 prisons reliance was placed on the Church of England Chaplain for the provision of religious ministration.

(f) That only 15 Ministers (all Roman Catholics) were in receipt of an annual salary, and that there were anomalies in the salaries paid in relation to the number of prisoners.

Within a matter of two years Parliament had appointed a Select Committee House of Commons in 1870 to "inquire into the operation of the Prisons Act and Prison Minister's Act, so far as
respects the Religious Instruction provided for prisoners other than those belonging to the Established Church". In the Chair was Mr. John F. Maguire.

The Committee reported on the 30th May, 1870. It highlighted a number of inequalities and made several recommendations concerning the status and conditions of service of Ministers. The report focused mainly on matters affecting Roman Catholics. With regard to the matter of inequalities, the Committee reported as follows, "In some prisons a Roman Catholic prison minister is appointed with an adequate salary, and is placed on terms of equality with Protestant Chaplains, (1) in others, a Roman Catholic prison minister is appointed with a salary, but is not permitted to assemble the Roman Catholic prisoners for Divine Service (2), but is denied a salary; whilst in a fourth the visits of a Roman Catholic clergyman are only permitted at the express desire of a prisoner. (3). This inequality is specially felt as a grievance by Roman Catholic prisoners, who cannot receive the ministrations of the Chaplain of the Established Church without offending against the laws of their own religious persuasion". (4) Furthermore, the Committee felt that such inequalities were "inexpedient and contrary to sound policy, that such inequality should not exist in the working

1. Applied mainly to large prisons.

2. The following prisons reported assembly facilities for Roman Catholic Priests. "A room is appointed for his use where into assemble the Roman Catholics for religious instruction, he has also access to them in their cells". Louis Prison, see Return of the County and Borough Prisons in England 1868.

The Inspector of Prisons upon visiting Hereford County Gaol reported "Application having been made by the Roman Catholic priest for permission to use the Chapel for the performance of the worship of his Church for the benefit of Roman Catholic prisoners, the magistrates passed the following resolution 'ordered, that whenever Roman Catholic prisoners shall exceed three, the use of the Chapel be permitted to the Priest on Mondays, from half past ten to half past eleven, for the purpose of giving combined religious instruction to the prisoners of his persuasion subject to the regulations and discipline of the gaol'. The Priest has availed himself of this permission several times, a turnkey being always present on such occasions". I.P.R. Southern and Western District, Herefordshire, 1852.

3. See The Prison Ministers Act, 1863, Section 3 where the onus was placed on Visiting Justices to summons a Minister.

4. This was entirely the fault of the Visiting Justices for not arranging for a Minister to either be appointed or visit.
of our Prison System, and that it is desirable that prisoners of all religious persuasion should be, as far as possible, placed upon a footing of equality with regard to religious ministration and instruction.

The Committee then considered the position of other denominations and concluded thus "The cases in which Protestant prisoners have objected to join in Church of England worship, or to receive spiritual assistance from the Chaplain are very rare, and your Committee are of the opinion that when such cases may occasionally occur, they be satisfactorily met by the prison authorities under the powers which the Act of Parliament they at present possess".

On balance the criticisms made by the Committee were fair. As to the matter of equality, this was never achieved in its entirety. There were two reasons for this.

1. Economic considerations, and
2. the restrictions imposed by the Act.

Sufficient to say that certain improvements were to be made especially in relation to salaries, and an increase in the number of Ministers. However, this did not materialise until the State assumed control of the local gaols in 1877 (1) Although the Committee were careful not to apportion any blame at any specific levels for those responsible for the administration of the prisons, it would seem clear that the criticisms were directed at the Justices and Visiting Justices for the delay in implementing the provisions of The Prison Ministers Act. This was evident from the following recommendations made by the Committee.

The Committee made four recommendations, of which the first three were eventually implemented.

1. "That prison authorities should be required by law to appoint Roman Catholic Ministers in prisons in which Roman Catholic prisoners were confined".
2. "That hereafter the Roman Catholic Ministers when so appointed shall be classed as one of the Officers of the prison". (Initially this was to apply to large prisons only. (2) In fact its practice had already been adopted in the Convict Prisons).

1. 40 & 41 Vic. c.21.
2. Liverpool, Coldbath Fields, Manchester, Strangeways, Kirkdale, with an average of 200 prisoners.
3. That Prison Ministers should receive an adequate salary, and when appointed should receive a salary according to the following scale:

"If the average number of prisoners belonging to the Roman Catholic religion during the last three years shall have been

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Prisoners</th>
<th>Minimum Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More than 10 and less than 20</td>
<td>£25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 20 &quot; &quot; 100</td>
<td>£50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 100 &quot; &quot; 200</td>
<td>£100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 200 &quot; &quot; 300</td>
<td>£150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 300</td>
<td>£200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. "Your Committee recommend that the Secretary of State should have power to transfer prisoners of any denomination, whose sentences exceed three months from one prison to another, in order to give greater facilities for religious worship and instruction according to their special tenets".

With the transfer of local prisons to the State, a new and up-dated set of prison rules were introduced following the enactment of the Prison Act of 1877. The rules were in no way detrimental to either the Ministers or the prisoners. The following changes are worth noting. In the first place, it was to the Visiting Commissioners that the Ministers were now to be responsible via the governor. Secondly, two additional provisions were made both of which were to involve Ministers more closely with prisoners, and to have control over the choice of books to be issued to the prisoners. The following rules illustrate the extent of these provisions.

Rule 37 stated
"Such prison minister shall, so far as may be practicable, see and admonish every prisoner of his persuasion, both on admission and on discharge, and he shall visit any prisoners of his persuasion who may require spiritual advice and assistance."

Rule 40 stated
"Such prison minister shall have access to the catalogue of books to be issued to prisoners, and no book to which he makes objection shall be issued to any prisoner of his persuasion."

1. 40 & 41 Vic. c.21
Finally, and of greatest significance, was the provision made for ministers to perform Divine Service. Rule 36 stated "Such prison minister shall perform Divine Service at such times as may be appointed, if it should appear to the Commissioners that there is a substantial number of prisoners to attend, and the circumstances of the prison admit of the necessary arrangements for the purpose being made."

Nine years were to elapse before the Treasury in 1879 finally approved the salary scales for Ministers as recommended by the Select Committee. (1) The delay in approval has not been possible to ascertain, but was possibly linked to the pending transfer of responsibility of local prisons to the State.

The scales that were finally approved differed in one respect from those originally recommended by the Select Committee, in that a distinction was made between full and part-time service of Ministers. The conditions as set out in the following table remained in operation until the end of the century.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank of Officer</th>
<th>Classification of Prisons</th>
<th>Scale of Pay</th>
<th>Allowances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROMAN CATHOLIC PRIESTS</td>
<td>If the daily average number of Roman Catholic Prisoners during the last 3 years shall have been</td>
<td>£25 p.a.</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Approved by Treasury letters, dated 29th April, 1879 and 7th March, 1881.)</td>
<td>* More than 10 &amp; less than 20</td>
<td>£50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* &quot; 20 &quot; &quot; 100</td>
<td>£100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* &quot; 200 &quot; &quot; 300</td>
<td>£150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* &quot; 300</td>
<td>£200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ &quot; 200</td>
<td>£200 rising to £300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Who do not give their whole time to the Service</td>
<td>£39 per annum, in lieu of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ Who give their whole time to the Service</td>
<td>5 years' service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the other after other 5 years.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. It is conceivable that some of gaols may well have started paying their Ministers the salary scales following the recommendations of the Committee.

2. One of the main tasks of the Prison Commissioners was to "Establish a uniform system of payment for Officers." Prison Commissioners Report 1878. (Henceforth these reports will be referred to as P.C.R.)
In their annual report for 1880 the Prison Commissioners confirmed the payment of salaries to Roman Catholic Priests. They reported 'A scale of pay for Roman Catholic Priests proportioned to the numbers in the prisons, and founded on the recommendations of the 'House of Commons Committee on Prison Ministers 1870' having been approved by the Treasury, has been brought into operation. There are now paid priests at the following prisons:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prison</th>
<th>Amount per Annum £</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aylesbury</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birmingham</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlisle</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerkenwell</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coldbath Fields</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exeter</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hull</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntingdon</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkdale</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knutsford</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1888 the Prison Commissioners reported a significant improvement relative to the appointment of Roman Catholic Priests employed in the prison service. They wrote "We have made general provisions for the religious needs of the Roman Catholic prisoners by the general employment of paid Roman Catholic priests. The recommendations of the Committee of the House of Commons on this subject of prison ministers, which reported in 1870, have been fully carried into effect, and whereas before 1878 there were, in spite of the above recommendations, only 19 paid Roman Catholic priests in the 113 prisons, at present there are 40 in the 59 prisons." (2)

The remaining years to the end of the century were uneventful except for one provision contained in the Prison Act of 1898. (3)

This Act contained the usual restrictions of its predecessors. In

1. P.C.R. 1880, para. 72
2. P.C.R. 1888, para. 55
3. 61 & 62 Vic., c.41.
particular it reversed a provision of The Prison Ministers Act of 1863 in that it placed the onus (once again) on the prisoner to request the visit of a Minister. Furthermore it was made clear in the provision that a visit was to be considered as a privilege. This last point had never been stipulated in previous legislation, neither had it at any time been in the thoughts of the Select Committee. In fact the Committee had taken the view that visits were a necessary right. Section 59 read "If any prisoner who is of a religious persuasion different from that of the Established Church specially so requests, the governor shall permit a minister of that persuasion to visit him at proper and reasonable times, under regulations approved by the Commissions. The governor shall cause such prisoners to be made acquainted with this privilege on their admission."

To conclude: It is evident that throughout the period during which the local prisons were under the control of the Justices, efforts were made by some to provide for the religious needs of those prisoners belonging to Other Churches or Religious Persuasions. That more positive measures were not taken earlier was regrettable. Furthermore it was unfortunate that legislation was so restrictive.

However, with such factors to consider, such as diverse religious beliefs, having to deal with minority groups, economic and political considerations, it was probably understandable why improvements were not forthcoming earlier.

Although the main improvements were to materialise following the transfer of the local prisons to the State, it is only fair to point out that the main ground work upon which the State was to benefit from and improve on, was undertaken during the period in which the Justices were in control. Nevertheless, credit should be given to the Prison Commissioners for undertaking to improve the facilities.
Of the Churches that benefitted most was the Roman Catholic Church. There were two main reasons for this:

1. Continued pressure by their Church leaders, and
2. They were larger in numbers.

Regrettably, prisoners belonging to the other denominations never received the attention they probably deserved. This was partly due to their small numbers, inertia on the part of their respective Church leaders, and the diversity of religious beliefs which in effect rendered them virtually powerless. Of those belonging to the protestant sector, some in fact sought and received religious comfort from some of the prison Chaplains.

Finally, the cardinal issue is whether what was achieved was sufficient.
Prison Chapels served a number of important functions. First as a place where staff and prisoners attended for Divine Worship. Secondly, as a centre for religious instruction. Thirdly, as Schools where prisoners received instruction in secular education and, finally, towards the latter part of the century they were used as concert and lecture centres.

The provision for a Chapel varied from gaol to gaol. In 1777 John Howard wrote that some gaols had erected specially built Chapels, whereas others provided alternative and quite often inadequate facilities such as Day-Rooms or odd small rooms (1). Howard was perhaps the first of the prison reformers to suggest that a Chapel is necessary in a gaol. (2) Furthermore, he thought that a chapel "should have a gallery for debtor or women; for the latter should be out of sight of all the other prisoners; and the rest may be separated below. Bibles and prayer-books should be chained at convenient distances from each side; those who tear or otherwise damage them should be punished." (3)

Within two years, the Act of 1779 (4) required the erection of chapels in the penitentiary houses.

At the turn of the 19th Century James Neild had undertaken a similar investigation as Howard, into the state of the gaols. On the whole he found that most of the gaols had either a chapel or substitute facilities. Of those gaols that provided alternative facilities, Neild recalls one which had provided an unusual setting for a chapel. It concerned the County Gaol and Bridewell at Horsham.

---


(2) Ibid. p.25

(3) Ibid.

(4) 19 Geo III c.74 Section XIV.
Neild wrote "The chapel which is in the Keepers house, had a gallery for the gaoler and his family. The pulpit is on the same level. The area below is 17 feet by 15, and has parallel benches for the prisoners; so that Debtors and Felons of both sexes sit opposite each other, but almost close together." (1)

Towards the end of the Eighteenth Century, Jeremy Bentham designed his Panoptican from which the construction of some of the future gaols in the country were to be based. Millbank Penitentiary was one. Briefly, his idea consisted of building a gaol with six converging pentagons, with a chapel standing in the central hexagon. By locating the chapel approximately in the middle of the gaol proved to have a number of advantages. In the first place it minimised security problems, in that prisoners were not required to leave the main building in order to attend Divine Service and instruction. Secondly, it reduced the time and the number of 'turnkeys' required to supervise the movement of prisoners from the cells or wards to the chapel. (In some gaols particularly the larger ones, it could take up to 20 to 30 minutes to carry out such an exercise). (2) Finally, and perhaps most important of all, it minimised to some degree the possibility of communication between the prisoners when being moved to and from the chapel as they were subject to closer supervision.

Many of the earlier chapels were built on a small scale. No account seems to have been taken of a possible increase in the number of prisoners. This lead to a situation where it became impossible for the prisoners to attend Divine Service at one sitting. To overcome this problem some gaols either had two sittings following on from each other, or prisoners were divided into two groups, one group would attend during the morning and the second in the evening. (This last practice contravened statutory requirements). An unusual idea (although common in Scottish Gaols) was introduced by the Chaplain at Shrewbury Gaol and House of Correction to overcome the problem of lack of accommodation in his chapel. Briefly he positioned

(1) James Neild, General State of Prisons in England, Scotland and Wales, 1811, p.278.
(2) Mr. J.A. Gardiner, Governor of Bristol Gaol explained to the Select Committee of the House of Lords on Prison Discipline in 1883 that 'it took half an hour to fill the Chapel and half an hour to empty it.' Evidence given on 24.4.1865.
himself in the corridor where the cells were located and proceeded to conduct the service whilst the prisoners remained in their cells with the doors to their cells left open. (1)

In 1823 Parliament legislated for the provision of a chapel in every prison. Section XLIX stated "A Chapel shall be provided in every prison, in such a convenient situation as to be easy of access to all the prisoners ......." (2) As this Act only affected about 150 gaols out of approximately 300, it was found necessary as late as 1865 for Parliament to legislate again. However, on this occasion legislation only required that alternative provisions be made if a chapel had not been built. Section 44 stated "In every Prison where there is no Chapel a substitute Room shall be set apart for the purpose of the Chapel". (3) No further legislation was enacted requiring the erection of a Chapel. It is probably correct to assume that when the State took control of the local prisons in 1877 those of the gaols that were to remain open (approximately 50) either possessed a Chapel or alternative provisions.

Partitioning and the behavioural problems that were to arise

The idea of partitioning stemmed from the separate system. In 1775 Jonas Hanway had proposed a plan of solitary confinement which consisted not only of separate cells, but separate airing yards, and separate closets in the chapel, so contrived, that the prisoners may see and hear the Clergyman, whilst a double grate prevented them seeing any other person. (4) As mentioned earlier Howard was also in favour of separating prisoners in chapel. The main aim of partitioning was to separate each prisoner and so prevent contact, communication and

(1) See Appendix 'B' to this section for further details of this practice and its consequence.
(2) 4 Geo IV c.64.
(3) 28 & 29 Vic. c.126.
(4) Rev. W.C. Clay M.A. The Prison Chaplain 1861, p.50
In order to do this the Chapel was divided into small stalls, divisions, or wooden boxes, and a prisoner was placed in one. J.A.F. Watson aptly described partitioning as "not unlike upright coffins, each containing a prisoner who could see the altar but not his neighbour." (2)

Opinions varied widely amongst officials concerned with prison discipline on the issue of partitioning. The main argument centred on whether or not partitioning was an effective measure by which to prevent communication. As the subject received considerable attention, the author proposes to quote only a few of the views both for and against the practice.

One of the most influential Inspector of Prisons during the 1830s to recognise the advantage of partitioning was W. Crawford. Because of his deep understanding of penal matters both at home and abroad he was in fact in a position to influence many of the uncommitted gaol authorities to introduce partitioning. Furthermore he believed in the separate system of prison discipline, and had had practical experience of seeing partitioning work successfully at Petworth House of Correction and at Horsham Gaol. He wrote, "the Chapel contains separate stalls in the Chapel. In short, in Petworth House of Correction as originally constructed and regulated (solitary confinement system) we see a complete apparatus for the effectual separation of each prisoner from fellow prisoners". (3) A fellow Inspector writing some ten years later expressed an opposite view. He is quoted at some length because the behaviour of the prisoners in this Chapel was representative of the general behaviour of prisoners in many of the other gaols that had adopted partitioning. He wrote, "Like several other prison chapels which have lately been erected, the Chapel of this prison (Leeds) is divided into separate stalls or boxes with the

---

(1) See Appendix 'B' to this section showing the construction of external and internal designs of chapels; pictures of prisoners sitting in their stalls.

(2) J.A.F. Watson. Meet the Prisoner 1939 p.52

(3) I.P.R. Home District, 1838.
design of keeping all the prisoners quite apart, and of thereby preventing their seeing each other, or communicating in any way. This object, however, is the propriety of which I do not concur, is not attained; on the contrary, notwithstanding a great number of officers are employed in watching the prisoners during Divine Service, it is found that much communication goes on among some of the prisoners, by stooping down and whispering through the crevices of the doors, and by slipping notes through these crevices; the wooden partition served in fact, as so many screws for concealing offences of this kind, and presenting to the prisoners a temptation to exercise their wits in deceiving the officers, instead of gaining their whole mind to the solemn service in which they are engaged. (1)(2)

Amongst the Chaplains that held strong views on the subject of partitioning was the Rev. J. Clay, of Preston Gaol. In fact he was the first Chaplain to abolish partitioning. He wrote "The Preston System, instituted in 1843 continued for several years to be the only example of a discipline which, while insisting upon cellular separation, dispenses with masks, separate airing yards, and separate stalls in Chapel. On the contrary, the prisoners see each other frequently in the course of the day; they take exercise in sight of each other, brisk exhilarating exercise, which makes the blood circulate healthily through the whole system, and which being attended by a sense of companionship, promotes so much of mental tone and cheerfulness as effectually counteracts any tendency to morbid depression. In the chapel the prisoners assemble like an ordinary congregation, with scarcely any other restraints upon them what is imposed of their own sense of propriety."(3) In fact so strongly did the Rev. J. Clay feel about partitioning, that whilst giving evidence to the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Prison Discipline in 1850, when asked by the Chairman,

"Has your chapel separate stalls? Clay replied,

'No! : I think if I were compelled to address prisoners in separate stalls, I should resign my post.'"(4)

(1) I.P.R. Yorkshire 1849. (The governor expressed similar views. See same report).
(2) See Appendix 'C' to this section with details of behaviour problems in some of the Chapels.
(4) Evidence given on the 31/5/1850.
Another Chaplain of similar renown, the Rev. John Field of Reading Gaol held an opposite view. He too, before the same Select Committee, was asked by Mr. Alderman Sidney,

"Would you as Chaplain prefer the prisoners being separated in the Chapel or would you prefer having the prisoners in the Chapel like an ordinary congregation?"

Field replied,

'I would prefer having them separate, most decidedly'. (1)(2)

As might be expected the Select Committee were divided, and allowed partitioning to continue.

In fact prior to the appointment of the Select Committee there were definite signs of a gradual movement towards the abolition of partitioning. Not only had Preston Gaol abolished partitioning in 1843, but Wakefield House of Correction (3) discontinued the practice towards the end of the 1840s, followed shortly afterwards, during the early 1850s, by Manchester Borough Gaol (4) and Knutsford Gaol. (5)

Such was the momentum for change, that a Committee responsible for designing the new chapel at the Surrey House of Correction decided to alter their original plan, in favour of a system based on the plan adopted at Wakefield. The plan consisted of seating prisoners on forms which were placed across the chapel floor, with the back seats being slightly elevated. (6)

Finally, in 1863 the Select Committee of the House of Lords on Prison Discipline considered the issue of partitioning. In short they were

---

(1) Evidence given on the 19/4/1850.

(2) For further differing views on partitioning see evidence submitted to the Select Committee.

(3) This Gaol had the largest Chapel in England. It held 1,000 prisoners. See I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, 1850 for an explanation for discontinuing partitioning.

(4) I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, 1851. Reasons given for ending partitioning.

(5) Ibid.

not convinced by the evidence placed before them that there were sufficient grounds to recommend the abolition of partitioning. They made two recommendations both of which called for the retention of partitioning in Schools and Chapels, as well as in other parts of the prison. However, they stipulated that they did not wish to "limited the cellular and other religious instruction which the Chaplain may think fit to administer to any prisoner." (1) In essence the Select Committee's main aim was to retain the Separate System intact. Not until 1887 (44 years after the Rev. J. Clay, and 37 years after the Convict Service had abolished partitioning) did the Prison Commissioners finally put an end to partitioning. The 143rd Recommendation read "The partition boxes have been removed from the chapels, so that prisoners now sit as in an ordinary chapel." (2)

The Mask

Another product of the Separate System was the wearing of masks. Basically it was an attempt to prevent prisoners from recognising each other. The Inspector of Prisons for the Home District made reference to the use and need for the wearing of masks when he reported "........ and while they are passing thither from their cells, and returning, their features are concealed by a front piece, attached to the prison cap, which lets down over the face, conceals the features, and so prevents recognition. This was originally suggested by us; and the use of it has since been recommended by the magistrates of the Eastern Division of Sussex." (3)

Owing to lack of sufficient documentary evidence, it is not known for certain when masks were first introduced or how extensively this practice was in use throughout the gaols. What can be gleaned

(1) Extract from the 3rd Recommendation.
(2) P.C.R. 1867/1888. Local Prisons.
(3) I.P.R. Home District, 1838. (This was the first occasion that the Inspectorate had mentioned masks.) (For further details regarding the use of masks see various reports by the Directors of Convict Prisons).
(4) In those gaols which adhered strictly to the Separate System.
from available literature, it would seem that the general rule was for masks to be worn whenever prisoners were in association, or in sight of each other. Typical occasions were during labour, exercise, attending chapel or schools. (1)

One gaol that expected its prisoners to use masks was Reading Gaol. The Chaplain, the Rev. John Field justified the use of masks by stating,

"It was politic and kind to invent if possible some means which might not prove offensive: and this has been most charitably and effectually accomplished. The prisoners on leaving his cell and when in sight of others, wears a cap with a peak, so constructed as to hide the greater part of his face, but with holes which allow him to see with as much ease as when without this covering. That such a provision is desirable, surely none can doubt, and that it is necessary for the good of the individual, and for the welfare of society, must be almost equally evident." (3)

Supporting Field's case for the wearing of masks, the Inspector of Prisons reported,

"We can distinctly state that no constraints of any kind is used either to induce the prisoners to use the prison dress, or their own clothing, it being a matter entirely at their own option, and the same may be said of the prison cap, which is properly a part of the prison dress; the unconvicted may either use it or reject it as they please; but scarcely one has failed to adopt it, believing, as they do, that it is supplied with the kind intention of protecting them from recognition by other prisoners after their discharge from the gaol. This peak cap is in all respects, like an ordinary cap, except that the peak is prolonged so as to cover about the half of the face: it is not fastened down, and in no way does it produce the slightest inconvenience to the prisoner; besides, it is only worn when he is at work in any part of

(1) See Appendix B showing a photograph of convicts at work at Pentonville wearing masks.

(2) Unfortunately there are no photographs of prisoners wearing masks whilst in Chapel or in Schools.

the prison or garden, and in passing from his cell to the Chapel, School, or airing yards." (1)

As might be expected, the Rev. John Clay being a strong advocate of an unrestrained environment in the chapel, was completely opposed to the use of masks. He wrote at some length in his annual report for 1847 about the practice at Pentonville. In essence he felt that the practice was useless. Furthermore, he did not believe that the protection it gave prisoners on discharge was a valid argument, because when prisoners appeared in the courts they were not subject to similar protection, although he felt that it might have application to London thieves. Clay discontinued the use of masks about the early 1840s. As some of Clay's reasons for abolishing the use of masks are of interest, it is proposed to quote some of the evidence he gave to the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Prison Discipline in 1850. He was asked by Viscount Mahon:

"Have you ever used in Preston that system which has been tried in other prisons, of masks for the prisoners?

No; the prisoners see each other in chapel; it is a point upon which I should be somewhat earnest.

Earnest as for the adoption of masks, or against it?

No; earnest in favour of treating the prisoners as if he had something good in him; as if relying upon him thus far, that when he is brought to worship God he will behave himself, and acting upon that I have never been disappointed.

Has not, however, the system of masks been defended precisely on the very ground which you allege, of the prisoner having something good in him; has it not been defended on this ground, that if the sense of shame be spread there may be greater hopes of his reformation than if he became known to the convicts with whom he may hereafter meet in the world?

(1) I.P.N. Home District, 1845. (For further comments and correspondence on this subject are footnotes to this Inspectors report. It is doubtful that no pressure was placed on prisoners to use the mask. See Field's interview with a prisoner on page 197).
I am aware that an argument of this kind has been used; that when a prisoner in chapel is in a separate cell, he may with more freedom give way to his emotions that he could do if he were looked upon by all his fellow prisoners. Certainly there is something in that; but what right has he to conceal the evidences of his penitence?

My question referred not to the separate stalls which you have mentioned, to which I never adverted, but to the use of masks; perhaps you will allow me to address my question to that?

I have seen the mask at Pentonville, and it appears to me not to answer the purpose intended. The prisoners know each other's figure; it is merely that the mask conceals the features.

You consider then, that the mask is ineffectual for the object proposed?

I think so.

Is that your only objection to it, or do you object to its principle also, supposing it could be made effectual?

I do not know that I have a right to say that I have a strong objection to it on principle, but I think it useless. With regard to the question of social worship in chapel and isolated worship, I obtained yesterday from the Chapel Clerk a return of the offences committed in Chapel during the 13 weeks ending on the 30th of April; and I find that although we had upon the average 290 men present daily, there were only 19 offences, and that those were, five for looking about, six inattention, six sleeping (that was the Chaplain's fault more than the prisoners') one turning round, and one looking on another prisoner's book, which is no offence. I can only say that when prisoners are spoken to in Chapel earnestly and intelligently (for that is the main point, speak to them so that they can understand you), I never saw a congregation behave so well.

Questioned by Mr. Alderman Sidney.

I think you drew a marked distinction upon the principle of recognition betwixt your population in Lancashire and that which might be in a metropolis like London?
No doubt, I think it is a matter of very great importance to prevent the London thieves recognising each other; I do not hesitate to say that.

Questioned by Captain D. Pelham.

Will not the point with regard to separating the prisoners in the Chapel turn very much upon the question whether the masks are in use or not in the prison: if the masks are in use for the purpose of preventing recognition, will it not be necessary either that the prisoners should sit in masks or be separated in the way you speak of?

Of course it will.

Do you not think with respect to the mask, even if it were not true, though it has been stated that at Pentonville it does operate effectually as a disguise, that there would still be an advantage in the prisoners not getting a habit of looking at each other, and in that respect, to a certain degree, hardening one another?

In our gaol they do not look at each other in Chapel.

I refer to those under separate confinement?

I am speaking of those; when prisoners under separate confinement are brought together in Chapel it is true they may see each other, but they do not look at each other; it would be an offence to do so.

You do not so very much object to the use of the mask or disguise as that you do not attach much importance to it?

I do not attach much importance to it." (1)

Both Select Committees on Prison Discipline took a neutral stand on the issue of masks. The 1850 Committee passed the following resolution "that while it is desirable to prevent the consequences arising from the matter of recognition of prisoners, this Committee does not think it expedient to recommend the adoption of any general rule in that regard." (2)

(1) Evidence given on 3/5/1850.
(2) 23rd Resolution.
The Select Committee of 1863 passed no resolution. However, as in the case of partitioning, they were equally impressed by the measures that had been adopted at Bristol Gaol. According to the evidence of the Governor, Mr. J.A. Gardner, he seemed convinced that he had the answer to the problem of being able to cover the outline of the prisoner.

Mr. Gardner, was asked by the Chairman:
"Do the prisoners wear masks?

They wear a bag down to their shoulder, which they can see through exceedingly well, but they cannot recognise each other's features or the make of the shoulder behind." (1)

It is not known when masks were finally abolished. According to S. & B. Webb the wearing of masks was not discontinued until the end of the century. (2)

Essentially the Prison Chapel served the purpose of providing a place where staff and prisoners attended Divine Worship. Following the enactment of the 1779 Act, Chaplains were required to read Morning and Evening Prayers each day and preach a Sermon both in the Morning and Afternoon on every Sunday as well as on every Christmas Day and Good Friday. For staff and prisoners belonging to the Established Church attendance was compulsory, unless the former could not be spared, or if illness prevented staff or prisoners from attending. (3) In practice absenteeism was quite common amongst staff and prisoners. From 1823 the Holy Sacrament was to be administered to those prisoners who so desired it, should the Chaplain deem the prisoner to be in a proper Frame of Mind to receive it. (4)

With the enactment for the provision of religious instruction it was perhaps only natural that the Chaplains turned to the Chapels as being the most suitable place to instruct the prisoners. Furthermore the Chapel provided the right environment in which to impart religious

(1) Evidence given 24/4/1863.
(3) 19 Geo.III c.74, Section CLII
(4) 4 Geo.IV c.64, Section 33.
knowledge. Although religious instruction was usually imparted in the majority of cases in the Chapels, there were occasions when prisoners were taught in the Day Rooms. There were a number of reasons for using these rooms.

(a) where the gaol did not possess a Chapel, and

(b) the convenience of being able to move from one day room to the next without having to call on the services of the 'turnkeys'. For instance, in the latter case, the Chaplain at Bedford County Gaol instructed his prisoners in several day rooms. He found teaching in the day rooms unsatisfactory, as the prisoners were often unable to benefit from instruction owing to other prisoners being in association in the same room. Eventually he decided to instruct prisoners in their cells, but found this difficult at times because of the poor ventilation in the cells. (1) From the mid-1840s onwards and especially in those gaols which functioned on the separate system, instruction was increasingly given in the cells.

When in 1823 secular instruction was introduced, Chapels were used as Schools. However, as the gaols increased their commitment to secular education, so it was found necessary to provide more appropriate accommodation. By the mid-1840s there was a gradual decline in the use of Chapels as Schools. Instead separate rooms were set apart as Schools, or special buildings were erected. As new school rooms were built so they were fitted out with partitions or divisions. On visiting Carlisle County Gaol, the Inspector of Prisons found that the new school room had been fitted with divisions for each prisoner. Each division contained a moveable board in front which was fixed by a hinge which lifted up to admit the prisoner, and when lowered served the purpose of a desk for working on. (2) Nevertheless, inspite of these various trends there was still a considerable lack of uniformity. As one of the better known Inspector of Prisons, Mr. J.G. Perry in his evidence to the Select Committee of the House of Lords on Prison Discipline in 1863, when asked by the Chairman where instruction was

(1) I.P.R. Home District, 1842.
(2) I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, 1844.
given, replied:

"It is frequently confined to instruction in the cells; it is sometimes given in classes, sometimes in the Chapels, and sometimes in the school rooms, which are occasionally sub-divided so as to prevent the prisoners from seeing each other; but in other cases they are not." (1)

In his evidence to the same Committee, Mr. Perry drew some interesting comparisons in the behaviour of prisoners during Chapel service and in schools as a consequence of partitioning. Although he objected to prisoners being separated by partitioning during Chapel service, he recognised that there were advantages to be gained for having school rooms partitioned.

He was asked by the Chairman:

"You stated just now that you conceived that there was an advantage in having partitions in the school room, in as much as it obliged the prisoners to concentrate his attention more closely upon the Schoolmaster, and consequently gave the Schoolmaster a greater control over the prisoner for the time being; and also that it assisted in preventing communication passing between prisoner and prisoner; why would not the same advantages exist in the case of partitions in Chapels?

Because in the school rooms the men are constantly and positively employed themselves; whereas in the Chapels, they are merely listeners to a service performed by others; and therefore they have much time on their hands in the Chapel to misapply in the way that I have mentioned, whereas they have no inducement to do the same thing in the school room, nor would it be possible to do so without being seen by the Schoolmaster.

In what manner are the prisoners constantly employed in the school room, except in the case of writing and arithmetic?

They are employed in reading, writing, cyphering and so on.

One person only can read at a time, and whilst he is reading all the others must be silent?

But they are all much more under the eye of the Schoolmaster than they are in the Chapels, because where the seats are partitioned

(1) Evidence given on the 12/3/1853.
in the schools the partitions rise from the ground, and are completely open in front, and the prisoner has a table before him, so that he can be perfectly seen by the Schoolmaster, and it can be seen whether he is doing his work or is neglecting it; but in the Chapels where they are completely enclosed, except as to part of their heads, within the separate pews, it is very easy for them to sink down out of sight, and while they are supposed to be listening to the service, to scratch upon the panels messages to other prisoners; I do not mean to say that that is of the prisoners altogether from the service, and causes them to be continually thinking of the other prisoners, and listening for them.

But where is the mechanical difficulty in applying the same form of construction to a partition in the Chapel, which you say is perfectly effective in the case of the school room?

One difficulty would be the enormous size that the Chapels would require to be made. If every prisoner were placed in a partitioned sitting, with his whole person visible, the Chapel would not contain more than half the number, or not so many as half the number it now contains, where the seats are arranged one behind the other, and where it is only the head of a prisoner that appears over the edge of the pew.

Then do your objections really resolve themselves merely into mechanical ones?

No, they do not; the other objection will still remain that the prisoners being only passive during the Chapel service instead of being actively employed in the school room, would be more likely to be making use of their opportunities for listening for other prisoners and communicating with them, than they would be in the school, where such attempts are never made; they are much more interested there, because they are themselves engaged in the operations that are going on in the school room.

Further discussion centred around how best to supervise prisoners in the boxes. In some gaols bridges had been built, and Warders were placed upon the bridge so that they could look down and watch the movements of every prisoner. Other gaols had prisoners
sitting on open benches, and Warders sat at the same level, and were able to effectively supervise the prisoners. Mr. Ferry favoured this last method.

Questioned by Earl of Romney.

Therefore, when at school, it would be his interest to behave himself well?

Yes, certainly.

Would not that be the distinction between the Chapel and the school, that at the school he has an interest to behave well in order to get the privilege of being taken off the tread wheel, supposing that is the hard labour used in the prison, whereas Chapel is part of the discipline which he is compelled to undergo?

That would be an additional reason certainly.

Therefore he would be more likely to behave better at school than at Chapel?

Yes, practically that is so, certainly. (1)

Finally, opinions over partitioning varied. At the time that the Select Committee were taking evidence many of the gaols had abolished the practice.

Amongst those questioned by the Committee the views of Mr. H.P. Vowles, another Inspector of Prisons are worth noting. Like many of his colleagues, he too was in favour of abolishing partitioning, in the Chapel. His main objection as he explained to the Earl of Malmesbury was,

"that the House of God is not the place where they should be made to feel that they are prisoners in that sense: but I think the effect upon the prisoners is bad; they listen to the service in a very different spirit when they are shut up in those separate stalls; with others it is great trial from the difficulty and constant strain in endeavouring to hear what is said; many of them give it up as hopeless." Although against partitioning in schools, he thought there were occasions when it was

---

(1) Evidence given on the 12/3/1865.
desirable. He cited the following reasons. When the number of prisoners was large, say 100, and the Schoolmaster was unable to control the prisoners himself from communicating freely with each other. His second and main reason followed when asked by the Chairman "As a rule, do you approve of the separation of prisoner from prisoner in the school room?

It is desirable, generally, from the want of insufficient supervision in the school"

Vowles shared with other colleagues the view that supervision was more effective if prisoners were in 'open sittings'. However, he explained to the Committee that this method, although very desirable, required sufficient supervision. Questioned further as to whether it was not possible to have the same amount of supervision in the Chapel and the school, Vowles explained that it differed in the following way.

"It would be possible, but you would require a larger staff of officers, the prisoners are only in the Chapel for three quarters of an hour or an hour perhaps, once a day; in the school they are two hours or two hours and a half in the morning, and the same time in the afternoon." (1)

The wearing of masks in schools did not present as many problems as did partitioning. (2) As in the case of partitioning the wearing of masks was not an efficient means in preventing communications in the schools. Schoolmasters were faced with two main difficulties. First of all there was the matter of being able to identify his pupil visually. This was usually overcome as prisoners were required in some gaols to wear numbers or other symbols on their prison dress. The second difficulty was having to recognise the prisoner by the tone of his voice. This usually took a little longer, but eventually the Schoolmaster was able to distinguish one prisoner from another. In fact voice recognition was considered by many to be the main drawback in the use of masks, in that it was not a satisfactory means by which to disguise the voice of prisoners from recognising each other. As H. Dixon pointed

---

(1) Mr. H.P. Vowles evidence was given on the 24/3/1863.

(2) Amongst the gaols that required prisoners to wear masks in school was Reading Gaol.
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out rather appropriately "in the school room, they hear each others' voices, one by one, and again and again reading aloud. What greater facilities for mutual recognition could be given? The isolation of prisoners, even from each other is all a dream." (1)

By 1882, the Education Committee (2) virtually put an end to the Schoolmasters' earlier problems by recommending "that all teaching should be cellular, except to prisoners in Class I, (3) who should be taught reading collectively in a room .........." (4) In their 1st report in 1879 the Committee concluded by stating, "We would suggest that the Prison Chapels should not be used except for religious purposes."

Rules and regulations for dealing with the behaviour of prisoners in Chapel were first introduced in 1779. (5) It was an offence to be absent or for irreverent behaviour. Punishment varied but could consist of moderate whipping, close confinement in the dungeons, or being kept upon bread and water for not more than three days.

One gaol which produced its own set of rules was the Penitentiary House at Gloucester. Two of the rules are cited not to demonstrate their punitive element, but rather what was expected of the prisoner(s) in terms of their behaviour towards the Chaplain, the procedure adopted prior to attendance, and their general appearance. Rule XXXV stated "That they do at all times pay a decent regard to the Chaplains, and that, during the celebration of Divine Service, they behave with reverence and decorum."

Rule XLII required "....... all prisoners shall rise at the first bell-ringing in the morning which shall be at six o'clock, from Ladyday to Michaelmas, and at sun rising from Michaelmas to Ladyday; they shall immediately make their

(1) H. Dixon - The London Prisons 1850, p.157
(2) In their first report in 1879 the Committee made a similar recommendation, i.e. 'those who cannot read easy monosyllables.' 2nd Recommendation.
(3) Those who cannot read Standard I of the National Society's reading book.
(4) Recommendation 4(A).
(5) 19 Geo.III. c.74. Rule XLVI
beds respectively, and wash their faces and hands; and at the second bell-ringing, shall repair to their respective places in the Chapel as decently dressed as their situation will permit. The Governor shall take care that every prisoner be made to appear in Chapel on Sundays, fresh shaved, and in clean linen." (1)

Not all the gaols enforced attendance at Chapel, neither were they punished. According to Griffiths, during the early part of the 19th Century, prisoners only attended the Chapel at Newgate if the weather was good. Also during the winter only if certain fires were lit where they usually sat. By 1847 the Rev. John Clay had removed all trace of punishment or restraints from the Chapel service and refused to make attendance at Chapel a part of the penal system. This was not common throughout many of the gaols.

With the passing of the 1865 Act (2) out of nine possible offences, the following two had a direct bearing on the behaviour of prisoners in Chapels.

1. "Irreverent behaviour at Chapel by any prisoner."
2. "Absence from Chapel without leave by any criminal prisoner." (3)

In comparison with the Act of 1779, punishment was of a milder nature, and for a breach of the rules punishment consisted of "for any time not exceeding three days, to close confinement, to be kept there upon bread and water."

The causes leading to behavioural problems in the Chapels can be identified as being that of partitioning, compulsory attendance at services, the poor quality of Chaplains, especially during the early part of the century, and as a result of long and monotonous sermons. Furthermore, the monotony of the daily prison routine did not help either.

(1) Appendix No.2, Rules, Orders and Regulations, for the control and government of the Prisons of the County of Gloucester; as they relate to the Penitentiary House of the said County. Report for the Committee on Laws relating to Penitentiary Houses, 1811.

(2) 28 & 29 Vic. c.125, Rule 57.

(3) Ibid. Offences 5 & 7.
In many respects attendance at Chapel services offered prisoners the opportunity collectively to express their feelings of frustration and despondency.

Partitioning played a significant part in bringing about misconduct in the Chapels. As indicated earlier, the aims of partitioning were to effect the separation of prisoners and the prevention of communication. In fact in many cases it had quite the opposite effect in that it encouraged prisoners through various means to communicate with each other. Partitioning offered prisoners an opportunity and a challenge to try to beat the system that had been carefully designed to prevent them from communicating with each other. The Rev. John Clay described at some length in his annual report for 1847, his reasons and the futility of partitioning. Not only was he the first to abolish partitioning, he was probably the first to introduce the idea of seating prisoners on open benches. Fundamentally, he believed in having his Chapel services resemble as near as possible that of a normal church service. In so doing he achieved two objectives,

(a) he minimised the incentive for prisoners to try and communicate, and

(b) it eased the job of having to supervise the prisoners which led to a reduction in the number of 'turnkeys' required for supervision.

However, there were still some officials who believed that partitioning during Chapel services was essential in the interest of the prisoners. In his evidence to the Select Committee of the House of Lords in 1863, Mr. J.A. Gardiner, Governor of Bristol Gaol was asked by the Chairman,

"To return to the subject of separation in the Chapel, it has been given in evidence that the effect is very bad upon the minds of the prisoners, because it depresses them, and irritates them, and induces them to pay less attention to the service than they would if they were in close contact with each other; is that your opinion?

It is not: the prisoners look forward to the Sunday with the greatest delight; it is the severest punishment we can possibly inflict upon a prisoner to prevent him going to Chapel on the Sunday. Chairman, Is that for the sake of the service, or for the sake of the sermon?"
It may possibly be for both; we have a very nice service, and a very good Chaplain; and, as a rule, they are very attentive; no congregation can be more orderly.

Chairman. The Committee therefore understand that, in your opinion, separation in Chapel is a most valuable part of your system, that you would not dispense with it, and that you have not experienced any disadvantage from it?

No, we have experienced the greatest advantage from it, the prisoners themselves have told me that if it were not for separation, they would not be able to say their prayers.

Chairman. Is the Chaplain himself equally satisfied with it?

He is perfectly satisfied." (1)

The rules and regulations of prisoners required the compulsory attendance of prisoners at Chapel services. The fact that attendance formed part of prison discipline in itself was quite often sufficient reason for prisoners to misbehave during Chapel service. Furthermore for many prisoners attendance at church was uncharacteristic. This element of compulsion was in the opinion of Mr. J.G. Perry, Inspector of Prisons, a possible reason for the misconduct of prisoners in Chapels. (2)

Writing on this subject and the need to encourage prisoners under compulsion to attend and benefit from Chapel services, the Rev. John Clay wrote,

"The Chapel brings now, the acceptable hour - the welcome and interesting occupation which relieves the severe monotony of a prisoner's daily life. I wish the Chapel services, and especially that of the Sabbath, to be so agreeable, so necessary to the prisoner, that participation in knowing worship, begin under compulsion, maybe continued even after from choice and affection. I would, therefore, have the Chapel present, as far as practicable, even in the minutest particulars, the appearance of a well ordered church, so that some who enter it may be beneficially reminded of the Sundays of a more innocent and happier time; and that many may be so trained during imprisonment to the observance of Sabbath duties,

(1) Evidence given on the 24/4/1863.
(2) Evidence given on the 12/3/1863 to the Select Committee of the House of Lords on Prison Discipline, 1863."
that they must resort, when at liberty, to their own house of prayer, in their hearts still grateful for the comfort received in a similar place and at a time when almost everything else spoke sorrow and disgrace." (1) To offset the element of compulsion, it was necessary for Chaplains to make the Chapel attractive, and the services as interesting as possible. The Rev. J. Clay and other Chaplains strived very hard to do so. However, there were some Chaplains, especially during the early part of the 19th Century, who chose to use the Chapel which by the very nature of the service was not entirely conducive to the prisoners in encouraging or making attendance an enjoyable experience. The following accounts best illustrate this point. Arthur Griffiths in his book, Chronicles of Newgate, described the following scene in the Chapel.

"The condemned occupied an open pew in the centre of the Chapel, hung with black; in front of them, upon a table was a black coffin in full view. The Chapel was filled with a curious but callous congregation, who came to stare, at the miserable people there publicly exposed." (2) In his annual report, the Chaplain for Norwich Castle County Gaol and House of Correction reported,

"An execution in the gaol has always an impressive effect. The Chapel on one occasion was a scene of great affliction, in fact, there were only two men who were not powerfully affected. It was the morning of execution, and those about to suffer wished to take leave of their fellow prisoners. One of the prisoners was so overcome as not to be able to leave the Chapel without assistance. After the execution is over they see the dead bodies, and pass by them in classes. I take the opportunity of impressing upon particular individuals the probable result of their continuing in their evil courses. The impression lasts for a considerable time. On leaving the prison months afterwards, I have adverted to it, and they have said 'o no Sir, I shall never forget that.' I do not preach a condemned sermon, but expatiate upon the principal causes which seem to have led to the miserable conditions of the condemned prisoner,  

(1) Rev. W.L. Clay, N.A. - The Prison Chaplain; 1861, p.281  
(2) Page 361.
and continues the subject and expostulate further on it upon the succeeding Sabbath." (1)

During the early part of the 19th Century some of the Chaplains appointed to the gaols were of poor quality. One such Chaplain was the Rev. Brownlow Forde, LL.D., at Newgate Gaol. According to Arthur Griffiths, Dr. Forde was renowned for his complete disinterest in his prisoners, was particularly hostile to visiting dissenting ministers and lay preachers, and "seemed to have been more in his element when taking the chair at a public house 'free-and-easy'." As to the behaviour of the prisoners in the Chapel during Dr. Forde's time, Griffiths recalls "The most disgraceful scenes were common in the prison Chapel. As the prisoners trooped into the galleries they shouted and hailed to their friends in the body of the church. Friends interchanged greetings, and "How d'ye do Sall?" was answered by "gallows well, Conkey Beau," as the men recognised their female acquaintances, and were recognised in turn. The congregation might be pretty quiet after the Chaplain had made his appearance, but more often it was disorderly from first to last. Any disposed to behave well were teased and laughed at by others. Unrestricted conversation went on, accompanied by such loud yawnings, laughing, or coughing as almost impeded the service. The service was conducted in a very slovenly and irreverent manner. Dr. Forde had no clerk, unless it chanced that someone in the condemned pew knew how to read. If not, there were sometimes no responses, and the whole service was apt to be thrown into confusion." (2) Apart from a few other Chaplains who appreciated the 'bottle', the majority of them were sound.

A further cause for misconduct in the Chapels was often due to the Chaplain preaching long, monotonous, and at times incomprehensible sermons. There were probably quite a few. However, many devoted a good deal of thought and time in an attempt to make their sermons as interesting and short as possible. One such Chaplain was the Rev. Rogers who upon assuming the chaplaincy to Wakefield House of Correction

(1) I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, 1838.
The Rev. W.L. Clay referred to Dr. Forde as "a buffoon in orders, who acquired in his day a sort of notoriety." The Prison Chaplain - p.102.
experienced initially a good deal of hostility from his congregation. He later found out that the lack of attention by prisoners was due to his patronizing attitude, and the length of his sermons. Changes were made. His sermons were reduced to 20 minutes, and within a short period of time he found an improvement in the behaviour of the prisoners. (1) Another Chaplain to the same gaol, the Rev. J. Horsefell Turner, in an effort to make his sermons and services more interesting, decided on the following. He explains "Fearful of wearing men who seldom heard sermons, (I) shortened the morning and evening prayers of the church, and presented them in such an order, that no one might be at a loss to find them in the book. Singing was also introduced which greatly relieved the service. The behaviour of the prisoners in chapel gradually improved, the Chapel soon presented a congregation as orderly and well-behaved as any other place of Christian worship." (2)

Both Rogers and Clay introduced singing in their respective Chapels. Unlike Rogers, Clay involved his prisoners to a greater extent. He was successful in enlisting some of the prisoners in forming a choir, and trained them to read the responses and the hymns. (3) In complete contrast to Wakefield and Preston Gaols, the Governor of Bristol Gaol forbade the prisoners to sing in Chapel. Instead the Warders, both male and female were the only ones permitted to sing. (4)

The subject of singing in the Chapels was discussed by the Select Committee of the House of Lords. The Inspector of Prisons responsible for visiting Bristol Gaol, Mr. J.G. Perry, was questioned by the Chairman on the matter of singing. He was asked by the Chairman:

"You are aware that in some of the prison Chapels singing is made a part of the service?

Mr. Perry replied, It is.

Chairman. Are you not aware that by means of singing it is perfectly easy to hold a very long conversation on any possible subject?


(2) Ibid.

(3) In many of the gaols the Chaplain's Clerk or Schoolmaster often undertook the task of training and leading the choir.

(4) Mr. J.A. Gardiner, Governor. Evidence given on the 24/4/1863 to the Select Committee of the House of Lords on Prison Discipline.
Mr. Perry replied.

Yes, it is; and that is what I more particularly alluded to when I said that communication is made by altering the words in the service; but it is much less likely to take place where the prisoners sit upon open benches, because the Warders have a better opportunity of observing them than they have in the enclosed seats. "(1)

It would seem that singing in Chapel was never discouraged except in those gaols like Bristol which stuck rigidly to the Separate system. (2)

It is perhaps fitting to conclude this part of the Chapter, by quoting the Rev. W.L. Clay, in which he explains the earnest attempts and efforts his father, John Clay, went to in preparing his sermon, and the thought he gave to meeting the numerous inadequacies of his congregation, as a means of making the Chapel service as interesting, comprehensible and spiritually comforting an experience for his prisoners.

The Rev. W.L. Clay wrote,
"But it was on the chapel service that his most loving care was lavished. In the old days of pernicious no-discipline he had struggled hard to make it effective and impressive, and even then not quite in vain. Still for twenty years he seldom spoke or wrote of the service without bitter despondency. He bore, indeed, uniform wondering testimony to the good conduct and unfeigned attention of most of the prisoners; but in the act of preaching, when he masked the fixed look and fugitive tear that indicated the stir of better feeling, he was, he said, often sickened, and almost silenced, by the thought that in a few minutes the short gleam of divine life would render the poor wretch, who felt it, the butt of his ribald class-mates in the yard." You cannot think", he would sometimes say, "how painful it is to labour among these men, with the consciousness ever before you, that the higher you raise them the lower will be the consequent fall." But in spite of his disheartenment he still strove to make the Chapel counteract the accursed influence of the

(1) Evidence given on the 2/4/1863.

(2) The Select Committee were very impressed with the administration and discipline of Bristol Gaol. Some of the Committee's recommendations were based on the system adopted by this Gaol.
yard. And now and then would come a sparkle of rich success to brighten his despondency—a letter, perhaps, from some almost forgotten prisoner, telling of character and happiness regained, and tracing the recovery of both to words heard in the Chapel of Preston Gaol. It would sometimes happen, too, that a prisoner, after maintaining close reserve up to the moment of his discharge, would then urgently beg permission still to attend the Sunday service in the prison. Some conception of the diligence with which he toiled to gain the ear of his congregation, may be gathered from this circumstance, that, for many years after he was ordained, he always carefully studied beforehand the lessons for the day, with a view to reading them as effectively as possible. He took great pains to acquire the habit of "speaking, not reading" the service, so as to convey the utmost possible meaning to his dull, ignorant hearers. His old studies in elocution now served him in good stead. It was a solemn thing to hear him, with his strong clear voice, rolling the verses slowly down the Chapel—so slowly as to enable the prisoners to give to each single word that deliberate attention, without which illiterate hearers, unused to long sentences, lapse into bewilderment. (1) Yet at the same time he read with such just emphasis, intonation, and feeling that even to the educated listener the meaning of the familiar language seemed almost doubled. Similar care was bestowed on his sermon. It was in perfect keeping with his characteristic prisoners to rely rather on "taking pains" beforehand than on the prolific readiness which he undoubtedly possessed, that he allowed fifteen years of his chaplaincy to elapse before he ventured to preach extempore: and even then he spent two years in weaning himself from his previous custom. These written sermons, recasts, for the most part, of the standard discourses of some old English divine—

(1) "recollect in your delivery" was the advice he once gave to a young clergyman recently ordained, "that the poor hear very slowly. If you will only take care to speak deliberately, and to speak, not read your sermons, you may gain the ear of the working class, long before what you have written is really worth attending to." In his own Chapel he only used two of the three services usually read in the morning: the length of time which, on account of his slowness, would otherwise have been occupied, compelled the omission of one.
were all simple, clear, and cogent, but somewhat lacking in warmth and colour. Their efficacy must have lain chiefly in his good elocution. After a few years' practice in extempore preaching, he acquired a faculty for addressing the prisoners in a manner which secured their absorbed attention. The spectacle of those two or three hundred upturned faces—blotched, sin stricken, ugly faces, generally staring with half-stolid animal-like fixedness at the preacher; was one not easily forgotten. Few men, probably, could have cast such a spell as he did, over an audience so dull-brained, so incapable of following the simplest argument. But the chief thing to be noticed was the honest means by which he gained their ears. "I never heard anything so logical from a pulpit before," was the remark of a very competent judge, after hearing him preach. Probably what the critic meant was, that he had never heard such a single-topic sermon; for this epithet, in default of a better, may be coined to describe his style. "It is my plan," was his own account of his sermons, "to be content with one idea; that is quite as much as my poor people can take in at once; but I try to enunciate my one idea as distinctly and as completely as possible. My endeavour is to keep out all other subject, which would only embarrass them, and to make all my reasons and illustrations fit together so as to build up one single complete compact notion for them to carry away." To an educated hearer the impression left by his sermons was, that he had brought some old familiar truth, hitherto but dimly seen (as through an ill-focused telescope) into sharp clear distinctness; and the inference was, that the most stupid in the Chapel, however receptive, would understand his meaning in some vague way at all events. (1) The sermons were so fluent, so nearly eloquent, that one peculiarity would probably escape an uncritical listener—the scanty

(1) It was still very little that may have understood. He writes thus on one occasion in his journal: "April 24, 1843. Upon going my rounds among the prisoners in separate confinement, I took occasion to inquire into the comprehension of yesterday's sermons. Several of them admitted that they only understood a bit of what had been said to them. Others, I am thankful to say, proved that they had attended to my addresses and had comprehended them. One of them said, while the tears rolled down his face, 'I think I know the difference between world of sorrow and godly sorrow.'"
use of any words but monosyllables. The number of words, too, that were employed was extremely small, yet the language never seemed bald and meagre. In fact, his greatest difficulty was to find words that the prisoners could comprehend. It was his often expressed opinion that the vocabularies of many prisoners did not contain a hundred words, beyond those expressive of their animal wants, and those belonging to their trade.

It was, then, on singleness of subject and simplicity of language that he mainly relied. Occasionally there was a passionate appeal to the feelings, or a stroke of irrisistible pathos; but to these he rarely resorted. The emotions of the ignorant are so heady and uncontrollable when once aroused, and the discipline of the separate system rendered the prisoners so susceptible to excitement, that it was only seldom, and then very carefully, that he ventured to play on their feelings. Had he wished it, he might have had a revival in the prison once a month. But when he did touch the heart-strings—when, for instance, pointing to the young lads in the front rows, he appealed to fathers and mothers for mercy on their own neglected children, or when he told some moving tale of sin and misery—simple and unexciting as the language always was, yet there was something in the manner, in the voice, in the whole man, that was quite irresistible; and half the faces in the Chapel, brute faces as they mostly were, would be wet with tears." (1)

Hoyle in his chapter on the Chaplain and the Chapel payed Clay the following tribute

"It would need a superman, however, to improve on the heroic work and witness of the celebrated Preston Chaplain. Even in the twentieth century a clergyman officiating in a prison Chapel would not go far wrong if he became a hero worshipper of John Clay." (2)

From 1873 to the end of the century, the prison Chapels were affected by the following changes. First of all as education was undertaken on a cellular basis, they gradually ceased to be used as schools,

(2) J. Arthur Hoyles - Religion in Prison, 1955, p.29
and reverted to their original function. In 1896, the Prisoners Education Committee recommended that "lectures to be introduced as an experiment, in two convict and three or four local prisons," (1) and by the end of the century chapels were often used for providing such facilities. To lessen overcrowding in Chapels, the Departmental Committee on Prisons in 1895 recommended that "separate services to be held for male and female prisoners respectively, where the latter are numerous." (2)

On the 27th February, 1896, a statement was issued by the Prison Commissioners to the Committee that suitable arrangements had been made on this matter.

Finally, the incidence of misconduct had subsided. The reasons for this are not known, but may well have been due to:

(a) an improvement in the quality of the services,
(b) the fact that outside clergymen had been encouraged to preach in prison Chapels on Sundays, (3)
(c) cellular instruction, and
(d) to the replacement of the separate system by the system of progressive stages.

Following a turbulent beginning Chapels over the latter part of the century enjoyed a greater degree of internal harmony. As to the problems associated with the Chapels, not all of the blame can be levelled at the prisoners. The prison authorities, and those invited to inquire, consider, and make recommendations must share the responsibility. Perhaps the over-riding factor was a rigid and deliberate attempt, certainly at the expense of human suffering, of ensuring the continuance of the separate system. Many Chaplains were earnest and dedicated men; they often had to endure personal abuse, ridicule, and on certain occasions their lives were in danger. Many prisoners never availed themselves of the opportunity that the Chapel offered. Maybe amongst those who did,

(1) 33rd Recommendation
(2) 8th Recommendation
(3) P.E.C. 27th Recommendation.
some received spiritual comfort. The Chapel may well have contributed in part to the rehabilitation of some of the prisoners.
Extracts taken from 'State of the Prisons' - John Howard on the matter of Chapels.

1) County Gaol - Maidstone - Divine Service was performed upon the stairs of one of the prison Courts. Later a commodious Chapel was built by removing the staircase. Page 191.

2) Worcester Castle and Launceston County Gaol - There were no chapels, and as a substitute the gaols used small day rooms or unused rooms. Pages 213 & 223.

3) Bristol - Newgate - He seemed impressed with this Chapel. He found it was very neat, as well as being commodious, and had a gallery. He also found that an unusual idea was used of hanging up a neatly painted board containing the recent provisions made for preserving the health of prisoners. Page 227.

4) London - Newgate - Another chapel that impressed him. He described it as follows "The Chapel is plain and neat. Below is the Chaplain's seat, and three or four pews for the felons, and that in centre is for condemned. One each side is a gallery: that for the women is towards their ward: in it is a pew for the Keeper, whose presence may set a good example, and be otherwise useful. The other gallery towards the debtors' ward is for them. The stairs to each gallery are on the outside of the Chapel. I attended there several times and Mr. Villette read the prayers distinctly, and with propriety; the prisoners who were present, seemed attentive, but we were disturbed by the noise in the Court. Surely they who will not go to Chapel, who are by far the greater number, should be locked up in their rooms during the time of divine service, and not suffered to hinder the edification of such as are better disposed." Page 161.
5) Bodmin Gaol & Bridewell - This gaol was a new one with good facilities, and had a chapel. Of interest was Rule X which stated "The Chaplain will read prayers and preach every Saturday, Government fast, and thanksgiving days in the Chapel, at which all persons on the several wards must attend (if in a condition so to do) otherwise they will be punished at the discretion of the gaoler." Pages 225/226.
Examples of various provisions that were made where no chapels were provided; photographs of the interior design of chapels and with prisoners sitting in the stalls and wearing masks.

(A) Kirkton House of Correction for the Division of Lindsay

"Divine service is performed in the Sessions Hall, where the different classes of prisoners occupy distinct places, the females being screened by a curtain from the view of the males."

The Chaplain commented about these arrangements thus: "This arrangement is defective. No prison, however small, should be without some place set apart exclusively for the worship of God, and any makeshift tends to irreverence. But the Session Hall is particularly ill appropriated for the performance of Divine Service, as the prisoner cannot fail to associate with it all the circumstances of his trial, past or in prospect, by no means consonant with the spiritual exercise in which he is expected to be, or rather ought to be engaged."

(1) I.P.R. Midland & Eastern District, 1849.

(B) Great Yarmouth Borough Gaol and House of Correction

"There is no regularly fitted up chapel, but a day-room is appropriated for the purpose; and the prisoners sit on benches facing the reading-desk. The women are separated from the men by a thick curtain, but otherwise there is no separation."

(1) I.P.R. Midland & Eastern District, 1849.

(C) Shrewsbury Gaol and House of Correction

"The chapel is far too small for the size of the gaol, and, moreover, the limited space within it is not laid to the best advantage. Besides accommodation for the debtors and 50 other prisoners if allowed to sit together, it only contains 26 separate sittings for male and the same number for female prisoners, consequently a second service is required in the day, and is performed by the Chaplain, in another part of the prison, in a manner not usual in this country, though universal in the Scotch prisons. He takes his station in the centre of the Power corridor, immediately below large circular grated
apertures in the corridors above, and by elevating his voice he is heard by the prisoners in their cells, the doors of which are left open for the purpose. In the further most cells he is heard with moderate distinctness; but to ensure being heard he is obliged to use great exertion, which only few persons could accomplish without injury to their health, and any modulation of the voice, so necessary to convey to the listener the true meaning of most passages, cannot be managed; besides which he is deprived of the advantage of seeing his hearers and observing whether they are attentive or otherwise, and they in their turn cannot see him. Consequently, all that can be said in favour of this mode of performing divine service amounts to nothing more than that it is a very bad substitute for the service as performed in the chapel, and scarcely better than having none at all."

(1) I.P.R. Midland & Eastern District, 1849.
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Appendix C

Examples of Behaviour in Chapels

"The Chaplaincy of the House of Correction at Wakefield becoming vacant in the year 1817, Mr. Rogers obtained the appointment, and shortly afterwards entered upon the duties thereof, with a very deep feeling of the importance and difficulty of discharging them aright. He found the prison in a deplorable state of moral disorganisation, its inmates under no moral or religious restraint; kept under only by force. On entering the Chapel the first Sunday morning, he beheld nearly three hundred prisoners, forty or fifty of whom were in irons. The male prisoners occupied the lower part in two divisions, felons and misdemeanours. The women sat in the gallery. Nothing like reverence for the presence of God; nothing like an anxious wish to hear the message of Eternal life; all was restlessness, fierceness and contempt: some whistled, others coughed, and then followed the horror-striking sound of rattling chains. The service ended, Mr. R. left the chapel. Scarcely had he turned his back when he heard the football strike the ceiling, and a wild uproar followed. He wished the governor good morning, and added, 'your will never see me here again Sir', to which he replied, 'why not?'. Mr. Rogers said 'I had never before such an idea of the infernal regions'. The governor answered him 'The prisoners had never behaved so well before'. He could not forget the parting words of the governor on his first visit. (Mr. Rogers decided to remain and "on the following Sunday, he thought he saw some improvement, in external behaviour at least". (1) Following discussions between the governor, Mr. Shepherd and Mr. Rogers they decided that the prisoners should not be patronised, and as soon as the prisoners recognised this an improvement was noticed. Either the same year or later the situation had changed. The following state of the behaviour in the Chapel was reported thus "Besides the Sunday services the Chaplain paid weekly visits to the wards, to the children in the school and to the sick in

hospital. His sermons were short, seldom exceeding twenty minutes, but plain, affectionate and earnest. Fearful of wearying men who seldom heard sermons he shortened the morning and evening prayers of the church, and presented them in such an order that no one might be at a loss to find them in the book. Singing was also introduced, which greatly relieved the service. The behaviour of the prisoners in chapel gradually improved. The chapel soon presented a congregation as orderly and well-behaved as any other place of Christian worship."

2) Borough Gaol - Nottingham

"The debtors very rarely attend Divine Service, they used to do so, they give me (Chaplain) great cause of complaint in consequence of their misconduct. The noise made by them is sometimes so great, that I can scarcely hear myself read. It is some months since I have read to any of prisoners".

(I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District 1838)

3) Stamford Borough Gaol and House of Correction

"The Keeper states. The Clergyman of the neighbourhood used to perform Divine Service within the prison, but were so insulted by the prisoners as to be compelled to decline it".

(I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District 1838)

4) Millbank Prison

"One Sunday morning, when the bread was of poor quality, they threw it out into the corridors and threatened mutiny. The governor was afraid the service would be disturbed, so he deposited half a dozen loaded pistols in his pew. To make matters worse the Chancellor of the Exchequer turned up with a party of friends to observe the effects of religious observances on the prisoners. Before the service had gone very far the men began to throw lumps of bread about the Chapel and to make noises with the flaps of their kneeling benches. At the same time the women in the gallery began to cry: "give us our daily bread". By the time Holy Communion had begun the women had become more demonstrative

(1) Ibid.
in their demand for better bread, and the men were standing on their seats. The governor rose and nervously begged them to be quiet. Many women began to scream. Some fainted. There was no alternative but to have all the women removed. As they passed out they shouted abusive remarks to the male prisoners. The service then continued without interruption. Another riot broke out in the Chapel on Sunday, 3rd March 1827. During evening service, just before the sermon, a rumbling noise was heard, as if the prisoners were stamping their feet in unison. It stopped during the psalm, but as the sermon proceeded it increased in volume. The governor went out and fetched all the spare officers. The service was then stopped and all the prisoners were removed to their cells. Investigation revealed that the ringleader in the disturbance had been a monitor, long distinguished for his pietz, who had been mocking the preacher and using slang expressions in place of the responses. On another occasion an officer on duty during divine service noticed a good deal of winking and nudging going on amongst the members of the congregation. He discovered that a note was being passed round in a little linen bag. It turned out to be part of a conspiracy to murder the Chaplain. It complained of various injustices, and concluded with a demand that the parson be stabbed during the service.

During the Rev. Whitworth Russell chaplaincy he was often shocked at the prisoners' behaviour during divine worship. When he enlisted the services of one of the inmates to read the lesson or announce the hymns, the comments of the rest would be most unseemly. A lesson about Balaam became the occasion for much tittering. It turned out that the name had been changed to Baa Lamb, and as such was being passed along amid peels of laughter. Sometimes an anonymous voice would call on the monitor for a song as he was about to give out a hymn number. Once while Mr. Russell was in the middle of his service a woman stood up on her seat in the Chapel and called out: 'As this may be the last time I shall be in church, I return thanks for all favours.' The Chaplain was horrified at such irreverence
and he told her that she should not address him in the House of God. The male prisoners enjoyed the interruptions and it was only with difficulty that order was restored.

Sometimes rebellion reached alarming proportions. On one occasion there was a commotion in the Chapel and suddenly half a dozen hymn-books were flung at the Chaplain's head while he was preaching. The culprits were removed, but after the sermon when the preacher said 'Let us pray', a voice cried out "No, we've had praying enough." They were to have still more praying."

(J. Arthur Hoyle - Religion in Prison, p.p. 21-23.)

5) Stafford County Gaol and House of Correction

"The Chapel is not only too small for the establishment as it exists at present, but is ill contrived in many respects, especially as regards the means which the prisoners possess when attending service of communicating with each other. The Chaplain alludes to it in his report to the Magistrates as follows:

'I fear that, comparatively speaking, little permanent good will be effected while the prisoners can see each other in the Chapel, which is to many of them a most desirable place of meeting - not for the spiritual good they might derive, but as affording them an opportunity of communicating with each other. And this they do by writing on slips of paper, or in their Bibles and Prayer Books, as well as by signs, by this means they make themselves understood, and keep up a kind of conversation during the performance of divine service. These evils cannot be prevented, nor can they, perhaps in every case, be detected. However vigilant the officers may be, in as much as owing to the smallness of the Chapel, the prisoners are obliged to sit very close to each other, and even then there is not sufficient room for the whole of them to attend at one time".

(I.P.R. Midland & Eastern District 1848).
6) **Guildford House of Correction**

"The prisoners are required to kneel at particular parts of the service, but the pews and seats are so constricted that they can only do so by turning their backs to the Chaplain and Officers. The consequence is that facilities, which ought not to exist, are afforded to them for holding communication together, without the fear of detection. We noticed several with their heads close together, who, seemingly engaged in prayer, were beyond a doubt, in reality, very differently occupied. The Inspector suggested the following, "We think that the practice of kneeling ought to be discontinued so long as it cannot be observed otherwise than by the prisoners turning their backs."

(I.P.R. Home District 1845).
"By education I mean the ability to read and write so as to gain information from books."

The responsibility for the choice of books and other reading material was that of the Chaplain. However, the Justices were required to approve all purchases of books.

With an unavoidable increase in the number and kind of books allowed into the gaols, prison lending libraries soon became established. The Chaplain was almost automatically made responsible for the organisation of the library and was assisted by a Schoolmaster, 'turnkey' or trustee prisoner.

The earliest books ever recommended for use in gaols were devotional. In fact one of the first suggestions that books of a religious nature be made available to prisoners may have followed from an investigation into Newgate and other gaols by a committee led by a Dr. Bray in 1702 of the Society for the Promoting of Christian Knowledge. Amongst the many recommendations the committee made, the fourth is of particular relevance. It stated,

"That books of devotion be given to all prisoners: a Bible to every chamber, morning common prayer books, Whole Duty's of Man, Christian Monitors, Dr. Isham's Office for the Sick, Dr. Kettlewell's Office for Prisoners, etc."

(1) 'Books and tracts of religious and moral instruction shall be provided under the direction of the Chaplain to be used or distributed among the prisoners at his discretion. Each prisoner during divine service shall be allowed the use of a bible and prayer book, and a bible is to be placed in each cell, ward or dayroom. Rules and regulations proposed for the government of gaols, Houses of Correction and Penitentiary Houses.' Society for the Improvement of Prison Discipline, 1820.

The Bible, and prayer book was the first to serve the immediate needs of the prison service. Subsequent legislation centred on these two books: they were part of an Act passed in 1773, \(^{(1)}\) requiring the appointment of a clergyman to officiate and perform divine service in the gaols.

In the meantime, John Howard was actively involved in a major investigation into the state of the gaols. Amongst the many evils he found were "the corruption of morals, enforced idleness and unrestrained and uncontrolled bad company". In his opinion it was through religious instruction that prisoners could be reformed. Furthermore, Howard suggested that Bibles and other books should be provided in the gaols, and that in each chapel, "Bibles and prayer books should be chained at convenient distances on each side: those who tear or otherwise damage them should be punished." \(^{(2)}\)

In 1779, \(^{(3)}\) in fact 2 years after the publication of Howard's book, statutory provisions were made for prisoners to receive religious instruction \(^{(4)}\) and for the erection of chapels. \(^{(5)}\) From this point in time and indeed throughout the remainder of the century the Bible was considered by officials and prisoners alike to be a potent force in the gaols. The Chaplain of Lewes House of Correction stated "no book is so eagerly coveted and so much read of my unhappy charges. The Bible is emphatically the prisoners' book." \(^{(6)}\)

The Schoolmaster for Norwich Castle County Gaol remarked, "The prisoner in solitary confinement is always the first to ask for books. He (the Schoolmaster) is sure that it would lend much to reformation and improve the discipline of the prison, if the prisoners

---

\(^{(1)}\) 13 Geo.III, c.58. (This Act was not to apply to the Houses of Correction).


\(^{(3)}\) 19 Geo.III, c.74

\(^{(4)}\) Ibid. Section V.

\(^{(5)}\) Ibid. Section XIV

\(^{(6)}\) I.P.R. Home District, 1840.
were confined apart and provided with books, especially the Bible". Later in a reference to the use of religious books under the silent system, the Chaplain at the County Gaol of Cheshire expressed the following: "I have the highest opinion of the silent system; it is a most valuable preventative agent to contamination. It has made the prisoners doubly desirous of and attentive to their religious books." By 1791 Justices were required by statute to make rules for the management of their gaols and were also authorised to spend money on all necessary items required by the gaols. Stemming from this Act, Chaplains were required to determine the choice of what kind of literature might be admitted. Wide variations occurred in the choices made in spite of the control measures that were taken. In fact it was not until 1839 that harsher measures were adopted. There was little uniformity in spite of the fact that the literature was mostly of a religious nature in most of the gaols. For instance the justices at Wakefield House of Correction ordered that "no newspapers, pamphlets or books be admitted into the gaol, except such as the Chaplain and Visiting Justices shall deem proper for the religious and moral intentions of the prisoners." In complete contrast was the laissez faire system adopted at Newgate. Arthur Griffiths gives the following account of the type of literature permitted into Newgate. "Most of the Wards took in the daily papers, the most popular being the Times, Morning Herald, and Morning Chronicle, on Sunday, the Weekly Despatch, Bell's Life and the Weekly Messenger. The newsmen had free access to the prison, be passed unsearched and unexamined, and unaccompanied by an officer; went at once to his customers, who

(1) I.P.R. Northern District, 1836.
(2) I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, 1837.
(3) 31 Geo.III, c.46.
(4) The procedure adopted for instance at the County Gaol and House of Correction for Worcestershire for ordering books was for the Chaplain to complete an order book in which he wrote down the books which he wished to purchase: the magistrates would then sanction the order.
(5) I.P.R. Southern Western District, 1836.
bought their paper and paid for it themselves. The newsvendor was also a tobacconist and he had this ample means of introducing to the prisoners the prohibited but always much coveted and generally procurable need. In the same way that Wardsman laid in his stock to be retailed, Other light literature besides the daily journals that were in circulation; novels, flash songs, play-books such as Jane Shore, Grimm's German Tales with Cruikshanks illustrations and publications which in these days would have been made the subject of a criminal's prosecution. One of these, published by Stockdale the Inspector styled 'a book of the most disgusting nature.' There was also a good supply of Bibles and prayer books, the donation of a philanthropic gentleman, Captain Brown, but these, particularly the Bibles, bore little appearance of having been used." (1) Finally, to demonstrate two different attitudes over the same magazine, one can compare two Inspectors' reports. The Inspector for the Northern and Eastern District (2) in visiting East Riding House of Correction at Beverley reported that the governor in the interest of the moral well-being of the prisoners had decided to withdraw The Penny and Saturday magazine from circulation, whereas the Inspector for the Home District, on visiting Sandwich Borough Gaol wrote: "The Penny Magazine and tracts are given out to the prisoners by the Governor after service on Sundays and returned in the evening. They can also have those works any evening, if they desire it, after labour." (3) Generally, the discipline in Borough Gaols was far less strict than that in the County Gaols or Houses of Correction.

Justices were required to allocate certain monies towards the purchase of books for instruction as they shall deem necessary. All expenditure came out of the county rates. As might be expected the allocation of funds varied from gaol to gaol. In his evidence to the Committee on Laws relating to Penitentiary Houses in 1811 the Rev. John Thomas Becher, Justice to Southwell House of Correction explained that according to the rules, "the Visiting Justices are

(2) *I.P.R. Northern District, 1836*.
(3) *I.P.R. Home District, 1845.*
empowered to expend £4 annually on purchasing Bibles and prayer books and any of the books circulated by the Society for the Promoting of Christian Knowledge." (1) In most gaols the usual sum allowed for the purchase of books was about £5 per annum. Extremes occurred however. For instance, the Chaplain for Bolton House of Correction was only allowed 50 shillings per year and if this sum was exceeded, consent had to be sought from the Visiting Justices. On the other hand, at Coldbath Field in 1855 the Justices expended £30 in the purchase of 30 volumes, with the view to increasing the total number of volumes in the prison to 1,100, possibly the largest prison library in the country. Generally, it would appear that an average sum allocated for books ranged from 1s.6d. and 1s.9d. per head per annum. Further funds for the purchase of books were forthcoming from various private donations. Finally, when the State assumed control for the local prisons, efforts were made to standardise the allocation of funds for books.

However, the use of books in gaols was limited by two major factors: the lack of artificial light and illiteracy. Prior to 1863 (when the Select Committee of the House of Lords recommended the use of lights in prison cells) prisoners were deprived of any form of light in their cells. Usually candles were the only form of light available. Later some gaols installed gas lighting. Not all gaols were sympathetic to the idea of prisoners using up candles for the sole purpose of reading. Others for instance, did make provisions such as Southwell House of Correction where, according to the Rev. J.T. Becher, prisoners were supplied with improving books and encouraged to read to each other round the fire, and that candles were provided for reading in the evenings, all supplied out of charitable funds. (2) The normal practice, it seems, during the winter months was to return all prisoners to their cells at sundown to remain there in total darkness until the following morning. Complaining about the lack of

---

(1) Evidence given on 15/3/1811 to Mr. George Holford, Chairman.
(2) Evidence to the Committee on Laws relating to the Penitentiary Houses, 1811.
light in the gaol and its effects on the prisoners, the Rev. W. Osborne, Chaplain for Bath City Gaol and Bridewell, wrote: "I feel it my duty again to urge the introduction of artificial light into the gaol. I consider it is cruel, especially to the prisoners for trial, to keep him in darkness during the winter season from sunset to sunrise which is in the gaol not less than 15 hours. And as it regards prisoners under punishment, they are obliged to deprive themselves of the benefit of instruction, or the hours of their labour have to be curtailed and with regard to all tried and untried, the system in this respect is highly prejudicial: it either fosters that habit of indulgence too prevalent among the crime population of our city or leads them into it. Man is made for action, morally and physically; and with that class of people who earn, or ought to earn their living by manual labour, this is a most important consideration." (1)

Inevitably lack of light prevented those who wished to read from doing so, and those who did not wish to read, an excuse for not doing so.

It was a continual problem for the education staff in their efforts to combat illiteracy. The situation was not to improve until well into the 1880s and 1890s when it did so partly as a consequence of Forster's Education Act, 1870.

In the meantime, some of the gaols were to take effective measures to try to improve the reading ability of prisoners by providing special reading books. The earliest known attempts to help illiterates was at the Penitentiary House at Gloucester. According to Sir G.O. Paul, spelling books were issued and one of the more competent prisoners was admitted into the cell to give instruction. (2) In fact this practice was a breach of prison rules but was waived under the circumstances. In an effort to improve matters, Parliament in 1825, passed an Act to provide secular instruction to prisoners (3).

---

(1) I.P.R. Southern & Western District, 1845.
(2) Evidence to the Committee on laws relating to Penitentiary Houses, 1811. (At Bedford Gaol & House of Correction because there was no instruction, the Chaplain gave spelling books to those who could read, so that they could in turn instruct their fellow prisoners how to read. I.P.R. Home District, 1837).
(3) 4 Geo. IV, c.64
Prisoners were now to receive instruction in reading and writing (1) under the supervision of the Visiting Justices. Of necessity the Act introduced a new set of books for use in the schools but no standard books were prescribed. Each gaol made its own choice. Perusal of subsequent Inspector of Prisons' reports reveals the following types of school books in use in a number of gaols. Many of the schools books which were bought were published by the Sunday School Union. The following school books were used at the Leicester Borough Gaol and House of Correction: the Bristol Reader which was purely a spelling book, the juvenile reader and the Testament. (2) At the Springfield County Gaol and House of Correction the following were in use: the gospel of St. Matthew (in large print), Varty's Sheet Lessons; State Lessons consisting of Bishop Wilson's Maxims, Shades Sunday School Lessons; Chambers Moral Class book; Chamber's Rudiments of Knowledge and MS Moral Lessons. (3) Finally, the Rev. John Clay, Chaplain to Preston House of Correction, introduced a set of books known as the Himpress System and Baker System, which entitled prisoners to be instructed in religious and secular instruction at the same time. (4) One of the books that was read extensively was 'Baker's Graduates Reading'. (5)

Furthermore the Act required that each gaol complete a return form Schedule B annually to the Secretary of State requesting the following details:
"........ whether prisoners are supplied with bibles, and other books."

Finally, in asking for the appointment of schoolmasters (6) these officers, in some gaols, were to play an active role in the distribution of books for prisoners, and to be concerned with the day to day organisation of prison lending libraries.

(1) 4 Geo. IV Rule 10.
(2) I.P.R. Southern & Western District, 1839.
(3) I.P.R. Home District, 1845.
(4) See Appendix A. to this section for details of the Himpress System.
(5) I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, Lancashire, 1852.
(6) 4 Geo. IV, c.64, Rule 24.
In 1824, the Society for the Improvement of Prison Discipline published a report which revealed that out of a total of 143 gaols, two gaols possessed a library (Bradford County Prison and Reading County Gaol), that 51 gaols provided bibles for the prisoners, and in two other gaols other books were made available. (1)

Nearly all the gaols had a day or ward room where prisoners could be in association, or confined. They had various purposes. Sometimes they were used as general meeting places, sometimes as classrooms. At other times the Chaplain used this facility as an opportunity to converse with prisoners on personal matters. Day rooms in particular were provided with suitable literature, mostly of a devotional nature. In some of the gaols approved newspapers as well as different kinds of pamphlets and magazines were also included. As expected 'undesirable' books and newspapers which were not on the approved list could also be found. The day rooms were in many instances the most convenient and sometimes the only place where prisoners had the opportunity to read. It gave the illiterates a chance to come into contact with books. Occasions occurred when prisoners would read to, or attempt to teach, their fellow prisoners. Where lighting facilities were restricted, day rooms were particularly useful for those who wished to read. Officially all day rooms were supervised by 'turnkeys'. The quality of supervision varied from gaol to gaol and was often correlated with the rate of turnover of 'turnkeys'. Sometimes when supervision was lax, books got mutilated. (3) Elaborate measures were taken to minimize the problem of mutilation: a variety of penalties were imposed on prisoners. (4)

The future of day rooms was in the balance when in 1835 the Select Committee of the House of Lords recommended its discontinuance.

(1) Sixth Report 1824.

(2) Extract from Schedule 'B', Annual Return to Parliament 1826. Common Gaol and House of Correction, Maidstone. 'Bibles and prayer books are placed in every occupied day room throughout the Prison. 12.10.1825.

(3) Examples of mutilation were: taking leaves out, writing messages to fellow prisoners, tearing out leaves to light cigarettes, Bibles were quite often used as footballs, etc.

(4) See Appendix B to this Section for some of the measures taken and penalties imposed.
based on two other recommendations. They were, namely, that from henceforth there should be entire separation of prisoners other than during the hours of labour and of religious worship and instruction. Secondly, they wished to have the silent system adopted in the prisons to prevent all communication between prisoners. In fact many years were to elapse before the gaols ceased using day rooms.

The Library and its early development

The first known libraries were at Bedford and Reading County Gaols. There was never any specific legislation passed for the provision of libraries. Perusal of relevant sources seems to indicate that from the 1830s onwards, there was a gradual development in the provision of lending libraries. There were a number of reasons for their establishment. To begin with there was a gradual build-up of books within gaols following the 1779 and 1823 Acts: the authorities had to provide firstly religious books and secondly books appropriate for secular instruction. With the recommendation that day rooms should be discontinued, libraries may have been seen as an adequate replacement. By the early 1830s many of the gaols had established a satisfactory collection of books albeit of a mainly religious nature. A demand was growing up for other sorts of books. For instance, a schoolmaster writing about his experiences at Newgate Gaol, who was concerned with the instruction of boys, suggested that gaol libraries should also contain books of a general nature.

"How far this taste is brought on by their mode of tuition is not unworthy a consideration: full five-sixths of them are from the National Schools, where they are taught to read entirely from the scriptures, and never see any other works of interest. It is highly probable if books of general history were put into their hands, and their tastes directed to substantial good for the mind, by which they might acquire a desire for the knowledge of facts instead of fiction, they might be excited to a better kind of reading, and much of the..."

(1) 13th Recommendation 2nd Report
(2) Ibid. 4th Recommendation 2nd Report.
(3) Ibid. 5th Recommendation 2nd Report.
mischief avoided. I would not be understood, that the scriptures are not of the first importance, but I object to their being almost the only book put into their hands when learning the first elements of reading. Little works of morality, with natural and general history, are decidedly the most proper for their years, and best calculated to excite a taste for knowledge in general; reserving two days in the week for the New Testament with the junior classes and an extra day for the Old with the more advanced in reading. With the assistance of the Rev. I.J. Cotton and Mrs. Fry, I succeeded in obtaining a stock of these books; and I am satisfied, from my experience with nearly 500 boys, that no other is so well calculated to engage their attention."

From 1832 onwards, demand grew from the prisoners for a greater variety of books. The Inspector of Prisons in his first report in the Borough gaol at Norwich wrote:

"They often ask him (the Chaplain) for the Village Dialogues of the Rev. Rowland Hill, and such tracts as have a tendency to lighten the hours of imprisonment." (2)

The prisoners at Newgate demanded a change in the selection of books being admitted into the gaols in a much more forceful manner. The Inspector wrote:

"There were no bibles or books in the Middle Yard; there was one in the Receiving Yard. When any of the men took the bible to read, it was snatched away and played at ball with. The last day of the session a lady came down and gave some tracts away. Some of the prisoners immediately tore them up to light their pipes with, and when the lady was gone, said "...... religious books; give us some story books, that will be more satisfactory."

The Inspector of Prisons annual reports were useful documents for gauging the extent of library facilities available in prisons. For instance, the Inspector of Prisons for the Northern and Eastern

---


(2) I.P.R. Northern District, 1836.
District in his annual report for 1858 observed 'in several prisons, lending libraries have been established with success, and I most strongly recommend their being extended to the debtors side; the books for their use might be of a somewhat less serious cast than those to which criminals are restricted.' Debtors, unlike felons or criminals were considered superior and enjoyed far more privileges. No restrictions were put upon the availability of books or other reading material such as newspapers for debtors. Felons and criminals on the other hand had to have their reading matter approved by the Chaplain. Occasional exceptions were made for those prisoners who were better educated than the rest. On his visit to Reading Gaol the Inspector of Prisons was to remark critically on the issuing of books which were not religious. The Inspector stated that the Chaplain told him 'that no books are admissible which are not submitted for his inspection and approval. An exception to this rule, however, appears to have been allowed. A prisoner in Ward No.5 of the name of A.G. (a gentleman of education) has been permitted to obtain novels and a variety of other books from the conciliatory library, an indulgence which it is submitted is highly improper, and calculated to produce great laxity of discipline in other respects.'

The greatest influence in the establishment of prison lending libraries was the Inspectorate. The Inspector for the Home District wrote:
"we beg further to suggest that a prison lending library should be established in the gaols. This has been done in several of the prisons at our instigation in our district, and we have published in our 4th and 5th Reports, as well as in the present, a catalogue of the books of which the libraries consist." 

An Inspector on visiting Southwell House of Correction remarked,
"a lending library composed of books of a somewhat lighter but strictly moral tendency, for circulation among the prisoners, would also be found

---

(1) I.F.R. Home District 1837.
(2) I.P.R. Home District 1841. See Appendix C to this Section for list of books.
a useful appendage in this prison as it has in other." (1) The Inspectors were concerned with both establishing libraries and widening the selection of books. Following his visit to the gaol and the House of Correction at Bristol, the Inspector remarked, "The library for the use of prisoners consists almost entirely of religious books. It would be very desirable that there should be added a sufficient supply of books of general information, which would be useful to the more advanced prisoners, and also tempt the beginners to apply themselves. Upon my suggesting to the Magistrates that such an addition to the library would be desirable, they informed me that they intended to make it immediately." (2)

In spite of the movements towards a wider variety of books, certain Chaplains still held the view that religious books were the only really suitable ones for prisoners. The Inspector of Swaffham House of Correction wrote:
"The Chaplain is of the opinion that when the prisoners are not separated from each other they become fond of reading in order to get rid of the irksomeness of solitude, and, therefore, instead of supplying amusing books, he supplies works of religion only." (3)

From the mid 1840s until the end of the century, the number of libraries increased but they tended to be small. Most of the books were devotional, but a wider choice was becoming available. Various reactions could be cited: firstly there was increasing pressure from the prisoners for a lighter form of literature. Secondly, there were recommendations from the inspectorate and thirdly, more liberal attitudes were developing on the part of those responsible for choosing books, together with the realization that prison discipline and control could be improved by prisoners being kept busy reading. Finally, the idea of educating prisoners was growing: the beginning of moves towards education for the working class were taking root in the wider society and no doubt there was some overspill with regard to prisons. A greater variety of books would offer prisoners an opportunity to widen their knowledge.

(1) I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, 1845
(2) I.P.R. Southern & Western District, Gloucester, 1852.
(3) I.P.R. Midland & Eastern District, 1849.
Of particular interest are the following extracts from various Inspector of Prisons Reports. Commenting on his visit to Newcastle Gaol, the Inspector stated, "There is a small library of what appear to be well chosen books; consisting as it does chiefly of such works as travels, voyages, natural history and other matter, which, while free from every species of immorality, is likely to create a taste for reading. The books appear to have been much used." (1)

The Inspector for Newgate noted the following: "The Ordinary has recently established a loan library for the use of the prisoners. The books are distributed by him and circulated from one ward to another. He is of the opinion, that as regards prisons generally it is not desirable to confine the library exclusively to religious works, but that books of general and useful information should be admitted. In the case of prisoners that do not generally remain long, he considers it desirable to confine their attention principally to religious books." (2)

One gaol which seemed to have established an efficient library service as well as a balanced choice of books was the County Gaol at Lincoln Castle. The Inspector reports: "The magistrates have formed a library for the use of the prisoners; it is on the plan and under the same regulations as the Parochial Lending Libraries of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. The prisoners receive a catalogue and make a choice of any book they think proper. A book is kept in which is entered the title, date, when lent, to whom lent and date when returned. The transports under sentence generally read Robinson Crusoe; and the books most in request are Gray's Fables, the History of the Plague, Tales of a Grandfather, Life of Captain Cook, Duke of Marlborough & Wellington, Beauties of History and Book of Trades. The religious books are very seldom asked for." (3)

As to the general benefits to be derived by the use of books, the Inspector of Prisons upon visiting Winchester County Gaol observed:

(1) I.P.R. Northumberland and Durham, 1838.
(2) I.P.R. Home District, 1840.
(3) I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, 1838.
"A good supply of well selected books amongst prisoners unemployed in a gaol or enjoined to silence in a House of Correction, is of all things calculated to assist a Chaplain in the work of reformation. Many will read in a gaol rather than endure the weariness that accompanies confinement before trial. Many will read in a bridewell if restricted to silence, and many in a prison are led to inquiry and the consideration of useful and serious subjects which under ordinary circumstances they might neglect or refuse to notice."

Finally, the Inspector for the Southern & Western District quoted in his report some interesting observations made by the Schoolmaster for the Borough Gaol, House of Correction, Leicester:

"You will observe the small number who have had any superior degree of education and of those who can read and write I have found them generally very ignorant of what they are reading about. The prisoners generally are in a deplorable state of poverty as well as ignorance. You asked me to relate any case or cases where the instruction had been effectual in improving the morals. There have been several who have led a thoughtless life, been allowed by temptation to commit crime, and when sentenced, have fostered a feeling that would destroy self-respect, and felt inclined to abandon themselves to the wide world. We have, by the loan of books and reasoning with them, removed this impression. They have in various ways expressed their gratitude for the pains bestowed upon them and are now occupying respectable situations. By the exertions of the Chaplain, and the regular lending of books out of the library that is forming, in conjunction with the discipline of the school, I believe a salutary good is effected in the conduct of the prisoners, as many will occupy their minds by reading, etc. instead of loose and vile conversation."

In the main most of the libraries relied on English Publishers for obtaining books for their libraries. However, some gaols in an effort to provide a wider choice of books, particularly of a lighter nature, obtained material published by the Kildare-Street Society in Dublin.

(1) I.P.R. Southern & Western District, 1839.
(2) I.P.R. " " " " " "
Two well-known gaols used material from this Society. The Chaplain, the Rev. R. Burnet of Lewes House of Correction wrote in his annual report:
"During the present year the prison library has received some valuable additions, especially the 79 small volumes on general subjects, published by the Kildare-Street Society, Dublin, and some more costly works suitable for the officers, and such prisoners of better education as may be granted the indulgence." (1)

Justifying his use of literature from this society, the Rev. W. Osborne for Bath City Gaol and Bridewell, wrote:
"To those who can read (without an exception) the loan of books from the library has been most acceptable, and as most of the volumes now in circulation are of a religious tendency, I have made application to the bailiff, for the small library of useful and entertaining books, known as the Kildare-Street Library." (2)

The availability of books and library facilities for Roman Catholic prisoners has been difficult to ascertain, mainly because the Inspectors of Prisons were never very forthcoming in recording information about this minority group of prisoners. However, it is known that for instance at York Castle County Gaol, the Schoolmaster reported that: "The Catholic prisoners are supplied with books at the expense of the County, selected by the Priest, but approved of by the justices." (3)

No doubt similar provisions were made in other gaols, of which the Inspectors felt it unnecessary to report.

In 1839 an Act (4) was passed which called for certain amendments to existing laws and enacted further statutory rules for regulating the Gaols and Houses of Correction in England and Wales. Books and other forms of literature were affected in the following way as a

(1) I.P.R. Home District (see also report for Hertford County Gaol and House of Correction, 1841).
(2) I.P.R. Southern & Western District, 1845.
(3) I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, 1845.
(4) 2 & 3 Vic, c.56
result of Section 6, Rule 8.
"No books or printed papers shall be admitted into any prison but those which shall be chosen for the Chaplain for the use of prisoners belonging to the Established Church, and by the Visiting Justices for the use of the other prisoners; and the Keeper shall keep a catalogue of all books and printed papers allowed to be admitted into the prison: provided always that in case there shall be a difference of opinion between the Chaplain and Visiting Justices with respect to the books or papers proper to be admitted for the use of the prisoners belonging to the Established Church, reference shall be had to the Bishop of the Diocese, whose decision shall be final."

This Act required, as in the case of the 1825 Act, a return to be made by each prison regarding the administration of various clauses.

In essence this rule remained in force throughout the remainder of the century apart from a slight modification following a recommendation of the Select Committee of the House of Lords on Prison Discipline in 1865. This will be referred to later. Perusal of subsequent Inspector of Prison Reports reveal that on the whole Rule 8 was complied with. Finally, the Act tried to achieve two objectives: in the first place it attempted to prevent the inflow of undesirable literature, and secondly instituted further administrative controls in calling for a catalogue of all books and printed papers.

Before the State took over control of local gaols in 1877 a number of practices occurred concerning the use of books which are worth recording.

In some gaols it was the practice, since the early 1820s, to provide Bibles and prayer books to prisoners on discharge if the Chaplain "shall think (them) deserving of receiving them." (1)

Another practice was to deny prisoners books unless they attended school. The Schoolmaster for York County Gaol explained: "None, however, who do not go to school (except prisoners of superior

(1) Evidence to the Select Committee of the House of Lords on Gaols in 1855 by the Governor of Springfield Gaol, Mr. T.C. Neale. A similar provision was also made at Bedford Gaol and House of Correction.
education) are allowed to have library books and this causes most of those who are in want of education to come to the school." (1)

In some gaols, where Schoolmasters had not been appointed, or where the Chaplain was only engaged on a part-time basis, prisoners were given books as a substitute for instruction, and a means of filling their leisure hours. (2)

The Select Committee of the House of Lords in 1863 made four recommendations, one of which was to affect a change in the provisions of the 1839 Act and three of which were to have a direct bearing on the matter of books.

There was a suggestion that the availability of books to prisoners might be restricted. "The committee whilst they believe that the judicious distribution of books to the prisoners may often be productive of much advantage, would suggest the importance of preventing any over-issue." (3)

Furthermore the Committee wanted to curb the power of the Chaplains in their discretion over the choice of books and give "the Visiting Justices a joint discretion and responsibility in the selection and issue of all books." (4)

One of the people giving evidence to the Select Committee reported that he had seen "a novel in a prisoner's cell before now."

Apart from this statement, no evidence is available in the literature to suggest that Chaplains were allowing undesirable literature into the gaols. Moreover the Visiting Justices had access to the Keeper's catalogue of books coming into the gaol and would have had plenty of opportunity to keep a check on literature being admitted. The only possible reason for this recommendation is that the Committee may have been concerned about the choice of books coming into gaols.

Subsequently many of the Select Committee's recommendations were incorporated into the 1865 Prison Act (4) and the issue of joint

---

(1) I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, Yorkshire, 1851.
(2) I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, 1836.
(3) Section 9 (7).
(4) 28 & 29 Vic., c.126
discretion was clarified. From henceforth there was to be a split in the responsibilities of the Visiting Justices and the Chaplains. Rule 48 reads:

"No books or printed papers shall be admitted into any prison for the use of the prisoners except by permission of the Visiting Justices; and no books or printed paper intended for the religious instruction of prisoners belonging to the Established Church shall be admitted but those chosen by the Chaplain."

In effect this provision diminished the responsibility of the Chaplain. The usual appeals procedure was to remain in operation, although under this Act it was extended to include books and printed papers relevant to the religious instruction of prisoners.

There were three other relevant recommendations which were also incorporated into the Act. The first concerned the proportion of time allowed for sleep: it was to be cut from $9\frac{1}{2} - 10$ hours or more down to 8. (1) This gave the prisoners more time for reading and study. Secondly the committee recommended that "the evening appears to the committee to be a very suitable time for school instruction, both as following upon the hard labour of the day, and as providing occupation for a portion of the time that is now passed in sleep." (2)

In order that the above recommendations could be effective, the third recommendation stated that "..... all cells should at the earliest practicable time be lighted." (3)

Finally the 1865 Prison Act provided for an extension of secular instruction to include Arithmetic, thereby increasing the range of books in prisons. (4) By this time many gaols were already teaching arithmetic so that this addition made little practical difference.

Upon assuming responsibility in 1877 (5) for all local gaols, the State appointed Visiting Committees to take over the role of the

(1) Section 9 (7).
(2) Section 9 (4). (According to the Inspector for visiting Northampton County Gaol and House of Correction, the hours 6 - 7 p.m. had been allocated for supper and books "for all categories of prisoners." I.P.R. Southern & Western District - Northamptonshire, 1852.
(3) Section 9 (5).
(4) Rule 53.
(5) 40 & 41 Vic, c.21.
Visiting Justices. (1) With regard to the choice and availability of books to prisoners, they were to aid the Commissioners in the selection of library books: all demands for such books shall be submitted to them by the Chaplain, through the Governor for their approval before being sent to the Commissioners. (2)

In order to achieve some sort of uniformity the Commissioners published a series of prison rules. In essence they did not differ from previous rules. Under the heading 'religious instruction', the following rules were to apply.

26 "each prisoner who can read shall be furnished with a bible and a prayer book, such as is approved for the denomination to which he belongs."

For prisoners belonging to other denominations, Rule 40 stated:

"such prison ministers shall have access to the catalogue of books to be issued to prisoners, and no book to which he makes objection shall be issued to any prisoner of his persuasion."

For the first time it was the responsibility of each prison to provide a library, and all newspapers and books were "to be sanctioned by the commissioners," (3) were to be issued through the library.

All these rules made strenuous efforts to control and centralise: the Visiting Committees had less direct power after 1877 than the Visiting Justices had had.

The development of library facilities was well in hand according to the annual report of the Prison Commissioners for 1879. They wrote:

"Your sanction (the Secretary of State) and that of the Treasury (4) has been obtained to the formation of libraries for officers as well as prisoners and instructions have been issued for the supply from time to time of books demanded by the prisoners for that purpose." (5)

---

(1) See Rules with respect to Visiting Committees 1877.
(2) Rule 25.
(3) Rule 42.
(4) The Treasury was to have a significant influence in the running of prisons from this period onwards.
(5) P.C.R. 1879, para. 36.
The undermentioned instructions (1) were issued to all prisons concerning prison libraries on 11th November, 1878:

"1. With a view to the formation of libraries at the various prisons for the use of the subordinate officers and prisoners respectively, the Treasury have sanctioned an expenditure on this account of a sum not exceeding 2s. a year for each subordinate officer on the authorised strength of the establishment, and of 1s. 3d. a year for each prisoner, the latter allowance to be calculated on the estimated daily average number of prisoners in the establishment.

2. The necessary demands on the Stationery Office for books to this value will be made annually, on or before the 1st of March, for the ensuing financial year, on the form provided for the purpose, and governors are directed to see that the instructions given thereon are strictly adhered to.

3. If from any cause any of the books included in the demand should not be supplied, or, if cheaper editions should be supplied, additional books will be furnished, so as to bring the total value of the supply up to the authorised allowance for the establishment.

4. The officers' library, and the choice of the books, will, subject to the general control of the governor, be under the management of a committee of officers of each prison, and the governor is directed to take care, before signing the demand for books, that no works of an unsuitable or objectionable kind are included in it.

5. The prisoners' library will be under the general management of the governor and the chaplain of each prison, who will be responsible to the Commissioners for the selection and distribution to the prisoners of the books contained in it; it being understood that works intended for the use of prisoners are to be only such as are of a useful and instructive kind, and that expensive works should not be demanded unless specially authorised.

6. Such periodical publications as may be demanded, will be supplied for officers' libraries at intervals of not less than one month, and for prisoners' libraries annually."

(1) P.C.R. 1879, Appendix No.18.
Returning to the matter of prison rules and the transfer of Local Prisons under government control an important change took place as the Chairman of the Prison Commissioners, Col. Sir Edmund Du Cane recalled in his book. \(1\) He wrote that a new system called the 'system of progressive stages' had been introduced in the hope of "managing the prisoners by appealing to their better qualities ...... The principles on which this system is founded is that of setting before prisoners the advantages of good conduct and industry by enabling them to gain certain privileges or modifications of the penal character of the sentence by the exertion of these qualities. Commencing with severe penal labour - hard fare and hard bed - he can gradually advance to more interesting employment, somewhat more material comfort, full use of library books, privilege of communication by letter and word with his friends. Finally, the advantage of a moderate sum of money to start again on his discharge, so that he may not have the temptations or the excuse that want of means might afford for facing again into crime. His daily progress towards these objects is recorded by the award of marks and any failure in industry or conduct is in the same way visited on him by forfeiture of marks and consequent postponement or diminution of the prescribed privileges." \(2\)

The system of progressive stages was published in the first report of the Prison Commissioners in 1878. \(3\) This system operated on the basis of marks which prisoners had to earn by industry and good conduct. There were four stages and progression from stage to stage was dependent on marks gained. Literature made available for each stage was as follows:

8) **For prisoner in 1st Stage**
   - No literature made available.

2nd Stage
   - D) Have school books in his cell.

---


\(2\) See Appendix D. to this Section : Mark System at Winchester Prison.

\(3\) Sec Appendix E. to this Section. Copy of Rule 24.
3rd Stage
D) Have school books in his cell.
E) Have library books in his cell.

4th Stage
D) Have school books in his cell.
E) Have library books in his cell.

(1) P.C.R. 1878, Appendix No.12

FOOTNOTE
The system of progressive stages was introduced by regulations passed subsequently to the Act of 1857 (Penal Servitude, 20 & 21 Vic. 3). The idea of progressive reformatory discipline has been largely attributed to Sir Joshua Jebb, who devised the system for the punishment of serious crime instead of transportation. Some of its features were similar to those adopted in the colonies by Captain Maconochie. He introduced it in England in Birmingham Prison while he was Governor. With the increase in crime during the early 1860s, a Royal Commission was appointed to inquire into the operation of the Penal Servitude Act. The Commission recommended the adoption of the Mark System in 1863 as had been introduced by Captain Maconochie during his term of office in Australia. The following year the Penal Servitude Act of 1864 (20 & 21, Vic. C3) was passed in which the mark system featured as the fundamental principle upon which Penal Servitude was to be based. As the convict prisons had been under government control since their inception it was not surprising that when the government decided to assume responsibility for local prisons that they would introduce a system with which they were already familiar.
The system of progressive stages was to remain in operation until the end of the century.

A Departmental Committee on Education submitted its findings in 1879. As far as books were concerned they reported as follows. On reception all prisoners were to be classified into one of three classes depending on their reading attainment. There was further subdivision according to

(i) the length of their sentence,
(ii) the age of the prisoner.

The general effects of the above measures were firstly that prisoners falling into Class I were those who could not read, and they were to be deprived of all library books. (1)

However, prisoners in Classes II and III, who were more proficient were to enjoy all the literature available in the prison. The Committee recommended that the following secular books be adopted in the prisons - National Society's Reading Sheets Primer and first four Reading books: Darnell's Copy Book to No.8 inclusive (for use in prisons where pen and ink allowed) and the National Society's smaller arithmetic. (2) The Committee made the following recommendations with regard to religious books.

"The prisoner's cell should be supplied with Bibles of such a type as is ordinarily supplied to learners in Elementary schools." (3)

Furthermore, "we would recommend 'Church Hymns' published by the Society for the Promoting of Christian Knowledge, Edition No.1. Bourgeois also Edition No.2 for prisoners with defective sight, for general adoption in prisons. This book should be gradually introduced to supersede those now in use." (4)

Later a list of books which were to be used in all prisons was given. It brought up to date those books mentioned in the first report. They recommended the following:

(1) Departmental Committee on Education, 1879, Section 4A.
(2) Ibid. Section 6.
(3) Ibid. Section 10.
1) Alphabet cards
2) Reading sheets (all the series) New series issued
3) Primer by the National
4) Books for Standard I to IV Society.
5) Copy books similar to Darnells to No.8 inclusive.
6) 1st arithmetic used by the Irish Commissioners of Education and a few copies of 'Colenso's complete Arithmetic.'

"We recommend that copybooks should be invariably allowed to prisoners under instruction, each copy book having the same number of pages, and each page numbered."

Finally, they recommended that in addition to Bibles, prayer books and hymn books of a type not smaller than is ordinarily supplied to Elementary Schools, should be placed in every cell. The Committee seemed well satisfied with the scheme and anticipated that it would result in the efficient instruction of prisoners. However, they recognised, as a result of their previous visits, that in some of the prisons the scheme might be seriously hindered by the absence of requisite facilities.

With the passing of Forster's Elementary Education Act 1870, and the general improvement in the educational background of prisoners and the successful implementation of the new education scheme, it was not surprising that there was a growing demand by prisoners for greater and improved library facilities. In their report for 1888 the Prison Commissioners wrote:

"Besides the direct education carried on by the schoolmasters, great additions have been made to the facilities for carrying on, and keeping up the education already possessed by most of those who now come into prison, by the formation of libraries for prisoners and instructions have been issued for the supply from time to time of books demanded by the prisoners for that purpose."

Some six years later the Prison Commissioners reported that they had issued instructions for the supply of books requested by prisoners from time to time and that libraries had been replenished at an annual cost averaging £800.

---

(1) Departmental Committee on Education, Section 6.
(2) Ibid. Section 12.
(3) Ibid. Section 7.
(4) P.C.R. 1888.
(5) P.C.R. 1894.
In 1894 the Home Office appointed a Departmental Committee headed by W. Herbert (later Lord) Gladstone to make a thorough going enquiry into prisons. The following year they reported their findings. In so far as books were concerned, they made the following recommendations:

1. That the prisoners should have a larger supply of books. Any occupation which tends to elevate the mind and which is consistent with order and discipline to be encouraged. (1)

2. Unconvicted prisoners to retain their cell lights till locking up to enable them to continue reading. To be informed on admission that library books will be supplied to them if they desire it. (2)

In the same year the Prison Commissioners published their observations with regard to the recommendations. From their comments on the 1895 Recommendations, it is possible to assess in general terms the present situation on policy and practice concerning the supply of books, the establishment of libraries, current expenditure and potential problems which might arise as a direct consequence of the recommendations.

The Commissioners endorsed the recommendation, "that there should be a more frequent exchange of books" and promised to "devise means for giving effect to it, if possible without any material increase of staff."

As to Recommendation X concerning keeping lights on in cells, they observed, "We concur in this recommendation and propose to give immediate effect to it. This has been allowed since 1895."

With regard to prisoners being informed about books they wrote, "This is already in practice in all local prisons."

Three years later the Prison Commissioners made a statement in which they published what action they had taken to implement the Committee's recommendations. A more flexible system of exchanging their books allowed most prisoners to make frequent exchanges. "With regard to the issue of books to the younger prisoners, the Chaplains are allowed to exercise a wide discretion." (3)

(1) Departmental Committee on Prisons, 1895 VIII Recommendation
(2) Ibid. X(7) Recommendation
(3) Ibid. VIII Recommendation
The other recommendations about lights in cells and information about books to prisoners were also in operation.

In February, 1896 the Prisoners' Education Committee was appointed to inquire into the education and moral instruction of prisoners. Primarily this committee was concerned with secular and moral instruction but it did make a number of suggestions touching on books. For instance the Committee suggested that more modern books should be available. It also recommended that to arouse the interest of illiterate prisoners and to enable them to make sense of the written word, there should be books of an illustrative kind. (1)

Finally, the Committee took what seemed a rather unusual decision. The Committee reported as follows:

"In order to save the time of Schoolmasters, it was suggested by some of the Chaplains that the devotional books, i.e. Bible, prayer book and hymn book, together with the book of moral instructions and the slate, should be made part of the cell equipment, or in other words be placed in charge of ward officers. Though several witnesses supported this suggestion, many experienced officials demurred to it on the grounds that the devotional books would not be so well looked after if there was a divided responsibility, that conveniences for keeping a store of books do not exist as a rule in wards, and that the books would not be left permanently in a cell, as it has to be supplied in accordance with the religion of its temporary occupant. Moreover it was held as a serious objection that discipling officers would not have sufficient time at their disposal for the efficient examination of these books in order to detect damage, and that it would be more difficult to establish proof of damage by prisoners. We think that these disadvantages quite outweigh any possible advantage that might result from such a change, and we do not, therefore, feel ourselves able to recommend its adoption, but we can see no reason why a slate should not be placed in each cell as part of the cell furniture, and we would suggest that in that case, it should be branded with the number of the cell." (2)

(1) P.E.C., 1896 Para. 27
(2) Ibid. Para. 36
The Committee made the following recommendations:

1) Every cell to be supplied with a slate as part of its equipment. (1)

2) More modern school books be supplied as present stock is condemned, (2) and.

3) Prisoners to be supplied with higher class school-books for self-instruction. (3)

Although the Committee may have wished to reverse what was standard practice in most of the gaols, subsequent reports by various Chaplains, indicated that at least Bibles were still provided in each cell. For instance, the Chaplain for Canterbury prison reported: "A bible is in every cell." (4)

The last four years of the century passed by without any significant changes being made in the matter of reading material for prisoners. There were a few encouraging developments however. The use of illustrated books to help illiterates was commented on by the Chaplain of Northallerton Prison:

"The picture books are greatly appreciated by the illiterates." (5)

He went on to say that some prisoners look upon books simply as the means "to kill time or vary the monotony of solitariness; but to others they are a power for generating good principles and are the means for moral and intellectual improvement." He quoted an intelligent prisoner as saying that the library books were an "instructive recreation; silence is enforced but we can talk with men better than ourselves in the pages of these books."

The second encouraging development arose from the rules contained in the 1898 Act in which prisoners were to be given greater access to books and more frequently. Rule 65 of the Act stated:

"A prisoner during the first month of his sentence shall be allowed books of instruction in addition to the usual religious books," (6);...... a prisoner, after the first month of his sentence, shall in addition

---

(1) P.E.C. 1896 15th Recommendation
(2) Ibid. 9th Recommendation
(3) Ibid. 7th Recommendation
(4) P.C.R. 1897/98.
(6) 61 & 62 Vic. c.41 Rule 65 (2)
to the usual books of instruction, secular and religious, be allowed.
Library books and the frequent exchange of such books shall be allowed
according to his conduct and industry." (1)

Special categories of prisoners, those awaiting trial and
offenders of the first division had much more freedom as regards the
reading of literature; they were able also to bring in their own "if
not of an objectionable kind."

Finally, a report by the Chief Chaplain for the Prisons,
the Rev. G.P. Merrick summarized the state of books and libraries in
prisons.
"There is no question that the prisoners regard their library as one
of the greatest privileges and boons to be found within the prison walls.
To bring the library within the tastes and needs of every class of
prisoner, all the books on the library shelves of the prison have been
overhauled, and the books which are obsolete in matter or are generally
unacceptable to the prisoners, have been withdrawn and others more
interesting, suitable and up-to-date have been chosen to take their place.
Few complaints are made by prisoners as to the quality of the books used
for their library. Of all the books which find their way to the prison
cells, the most popular are the periodicals. Their pacific influence
on the minds of the prisoners is remarkable, though perhaps easily
explained." (2)

(1) 61 & 62 Vic, c.41 Rule 65 (3)
(2) P.C.R. 1897-98.
Conclusion

With the introduction of religious instruction in 1779, the Bible, Prayer-Books, and religious tracts were the earliest types of books officially recommended for use in the gaols. These books remained in use throughout the 19th Century, and were to form the basis for religious instruction. Of all the books that were permitted into the gaols, the Bible was to occupy the premier position.

During the early part of the 19th Century the control of books and newspapers allowed into the gaols was lax. Stricter measures were adopted from 1839 onwards. One class of prisoners that enjoyed complete freedom in the choice of literature was the Debtor. By the end of the century those awaiting trial and first offenders were extended similar facilities provided the literature was not considered objectionable.

By 1823 a new set of books was introduced for secular instruction. In 1859 secular instruction was extended to include arithmetic. Following a recommendation of a Departmental Committee on Education in 1879, the use of secular books was standardised.

Up to the end of the 1830s the choice of books was restricted to those of a devotional nature. This can be attributed to the attitude adopted by some of the Chaplains and Visiting Justices, who held the view that only books of a religious nature would contribute to the rehabilitation of the prisoners.

Towards the latter part of the 1830s, prisoners were permitted to have books of a 'lighter' or of an 'amusing' kind. There were a number of reasons which brought about this change. In the first place there seemed to have been a change in the attitude of some of the Chaplains and Visiting Justices. Secondly, by making available a wider choice of books, there was a general improvement in prison discipline. Finally, as many of the books were of a religious nature, some prisoners had actually given up reading.
An increase in books led to the establishment of prison libraries. To some extent the Inspector of Prisons can take the credit for this development. By 1877 when the State assumed control of the local gaols, all prisons were expected to establish a library.

Following a suggestion made by the Prisoners' Education Committee in 1896, illiterate prisoners were to receive additional help by the use of illustrative books. Two years later, the 1898 Act allowed all prisoners to have continuous access to books.

Finally, in his last annual report for the century, the Chief Chaplain had the following to report,

"The experiment of issuing the publisher's catalogue of books instead of a departmental catalogue has stood the test of time and experience. What was hoped of the plan has been realized, and now the prison libraries are duly and quickly furnished with books which in number and kind meet the wants and wishes of every class of reader. "The men show their appreciation of the library by their careful handling of the books and by their silence in the direction of complaints."

It speaks well for the prisoner that "he likes wholesome fiction better than unwholesome when he can get it." "(1)

(1) P.C.R. 1899/1900
APPENDIX 'A'

Mimpress System — Author Robert Mimpress

A series of reading lessons from the New Testament incorporating a new method of teaching reading in direct contrast to the Alphabet Method. There were 34 initiatory lessons from the gospel narratives, arranged in the order of time.

1st Grade (instructions to teachers using the Mimpress system)

"To the teacher

We oppose the teaching of the Alphabet, in learning, as an unnecessary step in the art of Reading, which can be much more readily acquired without. We oppose it more especially in the Sabbath School, because it subjects both the teacher and scholar to a wearisome drudgery, where all should be delightful. As children learn to talk, so will they learn to read, if rightly instructed. Our substitute for the Alphabet and Spelling, is Dictation in Single Words, added to, according to the mental development of the scholar. When the class is assembled, let the teacher declare the subject of the lesson, as — Our lesson is

"The birth of John foretold."

"This must be repeated until thoroughly known by the class. The teacher proceeds as follows:—

Teacher an 1st scholar an

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher an</th>
<th>1st scholar an</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T. angel</td>
<td>2 &quot; angel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. an angel</td>
<td>2 &quot; an angel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. appeared</td>
<td>3 &quot; appeared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. an angel appeared</td>
<td>3 &quot; an angel appeared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. to</td>
<td>4 &quot; to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. an angel appeared to</td>
<td>4 &quot; an angel appeared to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Zacharias</td>
<td>5 &quot; Zacharias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. an angel appeared to Zacharias</td>
<td>5 &quot; an angel appeared to Zacharias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. a</td>
<td>6 &quot; a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. an angel appeared to Zacharias a</td>
<td>6 &quot; an angel appeared to Zacharias a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Priest</td>
<td>7 &quot; Priest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. an angel appeared to Zacharias a priest</td>
<td>7 &quot; an angel appeared to Zacharias a priest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"The whole sentence, to the first full stop must be gone through in this manner."

The whole sentence

"An angel appeared to Zacharias, a priest, in the Temple, and told him that he should have a son, to be called John."

The teacher should then Catechise in every particular, as

Teacher. Who is first mentioned? 1st Scholar. An angel.
T. What is said of the angel? 2nd " He appeared to Zacharias.
T. What was Zacharias? 3rd " A priest.

The teacher should then obtain the whole sentence from each scholar and proceed with the next sentence as:

"Zacharias did not believe the angel."

This second sentence, to the full stop, being gone through, the teacher should then Catechise in this sentence, as in the first, then through both, and then proceed as

Teacher. The birth of Jesus foretold in our next subject.

The class should be exercised as before, first of all understanding that the subject of the lesson is "The birth of Jesus foretold", and having gone through the narrative as printed in the manner recommended above, let there be careful Catechising in both subjects, before proceeding to the third subject, viz:— "The birth of John the Baptist" and having in like manner gone through this, Catechise again through the three subjects.

The Initiatory Series was a graduated simultaneous three grades teaching method for Day and Sabbath Schools. It was designed for scholars from the infant to the adult — who could be engaged in the same subject at the same time.

Other reading material was prepared for more advanced students — such as "One Hundred Lessons".

One hundred easy scripture lessons from the New Testament; the lessons are chronologically arranged from the four gospels in harmonized narrative with the places stated at which the events occurred.
APPENDIX 'B'

Comments concerning the mutilation of books, their causes, measures proposed or taken and punishments awarded.

1) "We found the gaol (Sandwich Borough Gaol) well supplied with Bibles and Psalters, but without Prayer Books, there are also other books for the use of the prisoners, given under the following regulations. The rule is to give to every prisoner a Bible and Psalter Book on admission, with his name written thereon, which he keeps for his own exclusive use during the period of his imprisonment, and consequently, is responsible for its being properly kept. If found defaced when he has to return it, a fine corresponding to the damage is levied, and in every case exacted, if he has money to pay; and the result is that the books are usually well preserved."

I.P.R. Home District, 1845.

2) Complaint is sometimes made of the injury done to books in a prison; and in my inspections, I have frequently to call attention to the bad condition of the books. By strictly adhering, however, to a few simple rules, this evil may be avoided, and a good practical lesson given in care of property. These rules are as follows:—

First, whenever a book is written in, blotted, or otherwise defaced, not to give it to another prisoner, until the injured part is pasted over. Secondly, never to give a book to a prisoner without showing him that it is in a perfect state, and telling him that he will be required to give it up in the same state. Thirdly, always to examine a book when it is received from a prisoner (which may be done in a few seconds, if there are no old marks to allow for) and immediately, to report the prisoner for punishment if the book be injured. Fourthly, never to give a prisoner an expensive book, until he has shown that he takes good care of inexpensive books. The best punishment for injuring a book, is to deprive the prisoner of books for a time, and to compel him, either by additional work or by the loss of part of his food, to pay the cost of the injury. There are now many very good books which do not cost more than a single prison meal".

I.P.R. Northern District, 1848.
3) "In consequence of our remarks relative to the mutilation of the books in the several wards the Ordinary (Newgate) has suggested that a large board should be placed in each ward with a notice thereon that all the prisoners of the ward would be held responsible if any injury was done to any of the books. He has further proposed that a printed address should be placed in each of the books of a similar import. That there may be no inducement to tear the books, he has suggested that paper for necessary uses, which had never been allowed before, should be supplied. These measures having been adopted, but few instances now occur of books being mutilated. There is now a sufficient number in each ward."

I.P.R. Home District, 1840.

4) "The criminal prisoners seldom or ever deface the books, whenever it is done, it is by one of the lowest of the low, and I am sure he would be scouted by the other men. The books were injured at one time when they were made use of as seats, to protect the prisoners from the cold of the stone benches, but since wood has been substituted, this has ceased; nor do I hear any complaints of colds and coughs which were formerly so numerous. There was certainly, now I recollect another occasion when the criminal prisoners wrote in all the books, they could lay their hands on. It was to warn all prisoners coming after them to beware of a certain attorney. I had to take many of the leaves out of the books in consequence."

Schoolmaster - York Castle County Gaol - I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, 1843.

5) "The fly-leaves of all the books are taken out to prevent a correspondence being carried on between different parts of the prison. The tracts and pamphlets are supplied to the prisoners secured in strong boards, to prevent them from being folded and destroyed."

Maidstone Prison - I.P.R. Home District, 1845.

6) "Taking leaves out of Bible and other books." Deprived of books for 14 days and admonished. (Appendix B - Returns of the maker of Punishments for offences within the House of Correction Lewes, Prisoner 55, aged 47).

I.P.R. Home District, 1845.
7) "The library is small, and confined almost entirely to religious books and tracts; but there is much liberality in the plan adopted by the Chaplain in giving away to well-behaved prisoners on their discharge any of the books which may have become defaced or worn, the deficiencies thus caused being made up with new ones".

Norwich Castle County Gaol. I.P.R. Midland & Eastern District, 1849.

8) "I am of opinion that the establishment of a library and reading-room, with a prisoner as librarian in a central part of the prison to which all the prisoners should be admitted only on receiving a ticket from the governor or Chaplain, would be very beneficial and prevent the disreputable and lamentable mutilation of the books reported by the Worthing Chaplain."

Debtor's Prison, Whitecross Street. I.P.R. Home District, 1849.

9) "I should also recommend the establishment of a reading-room, to be furnished with books and newspapers, to which prisoners should be admitted on payment of a small sum, or as a mark of favour for good conduct by the governor and Chaplain. No prisoners guilty of misconduct should be admitted even by payment. The room to be lighted with gas, and kept open until 10 o'clock every evening, and to be under the increasing superintendence of a paid officer, assisted by a well-conducted prisoner. Any measure will be beneficial which will conduce to the better observance of moral and religious duties within the prison, even if obtained by the prospect or realisation of some temporal advantage to the prisoner."

Debtor’s Prison, Queen’s Prison. I.P.R. Home District, 1849.
Sample of books selected as suitable for Prison Libraries, and elementary School books.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>s.d. No.</th>
<th>s.d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Abel, Death of</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Abbott's Fireside</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Corner Stone</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Account of the Human Body</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Advice to Cottagers, C.K.S.</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Aged Couple (The), R.T.S.</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Amusing Stories</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Animal Sagacity</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Anecdotes of the Deaf, Dumb and Blind</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>———— of the Cat</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>———— of Shoemakers</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>———— of Ants</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>———— of Dogs</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>———— of Elephants</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>———— of the Horse</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>———— of Spiders</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>———— of Serpents</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>———— of Providence</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Ancient History, Egypt</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>———— Greece and Rome</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Annals of the Poor</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Anson's Voyage round the World</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Arboriculture</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Arctic Voyages</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Astronomy</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Bees, their Management</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Beren's Young Persons invited to the Lord's Table, C.K.S.</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Betty Brown; or, the St. Giles's Orange Girl, C.K.S.</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Bible (The), the Poor Man's Book, R.T.S.</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Black Giles the Poacher, C.K.S.</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
* These books may be purchased separately bound, at the above prices, at Messrs. Groombridge's, Paternoster Row, London.

THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL BOOKS, published by the National Board of Education in Ireland, are also strongly recommended by the Inspector for the use of prisoners in the Prison Schools of the Northern and Eastern District.

**List of the Books and Maps.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>s. d. No.</th>
<th>s.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Blunt's History of the Reformation</td>
<td>67 Cottage's (The) Wife, C.K.S.</td>
<td>0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Bowen's Companion for the Prisoner</td>
<td>5.0 68 Civil History of the Jews</td>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Book (The) of the Calendar, Months, Seasons</td>
<td>2.0 69 Craik's History of British Commerce, Vol.1</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Bruce's Travels</td>
<td>0.6 71 --- --- --- Vol.III</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress</td>
<td>2.0 72 Crabbe's Poems</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Bunyan's Pleasures of Religion</td>
<td>2.0 73 Cripple of the Railroad, C.K.S.</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Burier's Pleasures of Religion</td>
<td>1.4 74 Curiosities of Vegetation</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Byron's Narrative of the Loss of the Nager</td>
<td>1.4 75 Curiosities of Art - Architecture</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Cabinet of Useful Arts and Manufactures</td>
<td>1.0 76 --- Mechanics and Manufactures</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

32 Blunts History of the Reformation
33 Bowen's Companion for the Prisoner
34 Book (The) of the Calendar, Months, Seasons
35 Brief Account of Thomas Yates, R.T.S.
36 Bruce's Travels
37 Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress
38 Bunyan's Pleasures of Religion
39 Burier's Pleasures of Religion
40 Byron's Narrative of the Loss of the Nager
41 Cabinet of Useful Arts and Manufactures

---

First Book of Lessons, 18mo. wrapper 0.2
Second ditto, 18mo., cloth 0.7
Sequel to Second Book, with Illustrations, 12mo., cloth 0.9
Third Book of Lessons, 12mo., cloth 1.2
Fourth ditto, 12mo., cloth 1.4
Supplement to Fourth Book, 12mo., cloth 1.8
Fifth Book of Lessons, 12mo., cloth 1.8
Reading-Book for Female Schools, 12mo., cloth 1.8
The Art of Reading, 12mo., cloth 1.6
Epitome of Geography, Ancient and Modern, 12mo., cloth 3.0
Compendium of ditto, ditto, 12mo., cloth 1.0.
Lessons on the Truth of Christianity, being an Appendix to the Fourth Book of Lessons, 12mo., cloth 0.6.
English Grammar, 12mo., cloth 0.8.
Key to English Grammar, 12mo., wrapper 0.3.
First Book of Arithmetic, 12mo., cloth 0.8.
Key to ditto, 12mo., cloth 0.8.
Arithmetic in Theory and Practice, 12mo., cloth 2.6.
Elements of Book-keeping, 12mo., cloth 0.10.
Key to ditto, 12mo., cloth 0.10.
Elements of Geometry, 12mo., cloth 0.9.
Mensuration, Gauging, and Land-Surveying, 12mo., cloth 1.6.
Appendix to ditto, for the Use of Teachers, 12mo., cloth 1.0.

I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, 1845. (see Appendix No. 2 of this report for the complete catalogue of Books recommended by the Inspector for use in the libraries and schools in the prisons for the Northern & Eastern District.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Effectives</th>
<th>Non effectives</th>
<th>Marks, Remissions etc.</th>
<th>Relaxations</th>
<th>Restrictions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st month or until 30 marks are gained</td>
<td>Class I</td>
<td>Hard Labour called in the Statute Hard Labour of the First Class</td>
<td>Industrial Labour called in the Statute Hard Labour of the Second Class</td>
<td>Prisoners can earn 1 mark daily towards promotion to Class II</td>
<td>Bible &amp; Prayer Book, slate, 1 Vol. of devotions, and 1 secular book, to a prisoner if convicted for first time. Schooling.</td>
<td>Sleep on plank bed without mattress. No schooling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd &amp; 3rd months or until 55 marks are gained</td>
<td>Class II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th, 5th &amp; 6th months, or until 30 marks are gained</td>
<td>Class III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contd.
## MARK SYSTEM (Contd.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Marks, Remissions etc.</th>
<th>Relaxations</th>
<th>Restrictions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9th to 12th month or until 156 marks are gained.</td>
<td>Class IV</td>
<td>As in Class III</td>
<td>Books and Schooling as above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total labour</td>
<td></td>
<td>Letter writing allowed. One hours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 hours.</td>
<td></td>
<td>exercise daily for those not at</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>outdoor work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remainder of sentence</td>
<td>Class V</td>
<td>Remission of 2 hours per day of penal labour for</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total labour</td>
<td>the days gained by marks in previous Classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 hours.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any</td>
<td>Casual</td>
<td><strong>CASUAL CLASS</strong></td>
<td>One hour open air exercise daily, if</td>
<td>No books, except</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>amenable to control.</td>
<td>Bible &amp; Prayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Book, No Chapel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No School, No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>marks. Sleep on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>plank bed with-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>out mattress.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The money value of marks gained is as follows: For every complete 7 in Class I, one penny; in Class II, two pence; and in Class III to V, three pence.

All prisoners who have received mark money on discharge shall upon re-committal receive only half the pecuniary value of the marks they may gain by industrious conduct.

All payments for marks shall entirely cease on a third conviction.

Prisoners convicted more than three times shall be required to gain double the usual number of marks in order to obtain promotion to Classes II & III.

A prisoner can at any time appeal to the Governor or deputy Governor with regard to his marks.

(I.P.R. Southern District, Hampshire, 1876)
APPENDIX 'E'

Rule 24: Employment of Prisoners - Instructions to be followed

1) A prisoner shall be able to earn on each weekday, eight, seven or six marks, according to the degree of his industry; and on Sunday, he shall be awarded marks according to the degree of his industry during the previous week.

2) A prisoner who is idle in any day will be reported and be liable to punishment.

3) There shall be four stages, and every prisoner shall pass through them or through so much of them as the term of his imprisonment admits.

4) He shall commence in the first stage, and shall remain in the first stage until he has earned $28 \times 8$ or 224 marks; in the second stage until he has earned 224 more marks or 448 in the whole, in the third stage until he has earned 224 more marks or 672 in the whole, in the fourth stage during the remainder of his sentence.

5) A prisoner whose term of imprisonment is 28 days or less, shall serve the whole of his term in the first stage.

6) A prisoner who is idle, or who misconducts himself, or is inattentive to instruction, shall be liable to forfeit gratuity earned or to be earned, or to forfeit any stage privilege, to detention in the stage in which he is until he shall have earned in that stage an additional number of marks, to degradation to any lower stage (whether such stage is next below the one in which he is, or otherwise) until he has earned in such lower stage a stated number of marks. As soon as the prisoner has earned the stated number, then unless he has in the meantime incurred further punishment, he shall be restored to the stage from which he was degraded, and be credited with the number of marks he had previously earned therein.

7) None of the foregoing punishments shall exempt a prisoner from any other punishment to which he would be liable for conduct constituting a breach of prison regulations.
CHAPTER 5

Education within the changing prison system

"Finally the most certain method of preventing crimes is to perfect the system of education. But this is an object too vast and exceeds my plan; an object if I may venture to declare it, which is so intimately connected with the nature of government that it will always remain a barren spot, cultivated only by a few wise men."
Marquis Beccavia. (1)

Education in prisons arose out of a protest against general immorality and the need for more effective control of prisoners. Concern over gaol conditions was shown early in the eighteenth century but it was the 1779 Act (2) which proved a turning point. It brought about the separate system advocated amongst others by John Howard in which prisoners were placed in separate cells to prevent 'contamination'. It also introduced religious instruction as a means of reforming prisoners. Henry Fielding comments that "it is religion alone which can effectively accomplish so great and so desirable a work". (3)

Lastly it emphasised the moral value of hard labour: some reformers, notably Jonas Hanway, saw industry rather than religion as the key to reformation. Prison authorities on the whole favoured hard labour: Chaplains and some reformers supported the case for religious instruction.

However, work and education were to exist side by side throughout the nineteenth century. The form educational provision took varied from gaol to gaol. Very few prisons were built on the separate system in spite of the 1779 Act as it proved a costly changeover, so many still retained their old associational character. Some jails attempted a kind of compromise in which discipline was predominantly based on the separate system but the prisoners were allowed to associate during the

(1) An Essay on Crimes and Punishment with the commentary by Voltaire, 1604, p.165
(2) 19 Geo III, c.74, Sec.V
(3) Quoted from John Howard, The State of the Prisons, p.41 from Henry Fielding Enquiry into the Causes of the Increase of Robbers
hours of instruction and labour. In 1823 the associated system was officially adopted under economic pressure but in a new form. It was also known as the classified system as prisoners were grouped according to their crime and classified under five headings. Better discipline was the aim. But it was a short-lived system. In 1839 the separate system was readvocated with some changes. It was no longer to be synonymous with solitary confinement. Association was allowed in labour, in exercise and in religious worship and instruction; but the strictest precautions were taken to enforce silence at all those times. This contrasts with the silent system in which prisoners were not physically separated into cells. The separation of prisoners was officially endorsed and continued until the State took over the control of all local gaols in 1877 and introduced progressive stages.

This, briefly, was the context in which education was developed within prisons during the 19th Century. Let us now look at it in more detail. At the end of the 18th Century, beginning of the 19th Century, one example of a prison built to conform to the separate system of the 1779 Act was the Penitentiary House at Gloucester set up in 1785. The prisoners had two cells, one for sleeping in and the second one to work in. Solitary confinement was not absolute, for prisoners met in chapel every morning and in the exercise yard in the evening. The Chaplain paid daily visits to each cell and the prisoners were given instruction. Later in 1811, in his evidence to the House of Commons Committee on Laws relating to Penitentiary Houses, Sir G.O. Paul explained how prisoners were instructed. Those who could read were instructed separately in their cells: the illiterates were instructed in association, by a fellow prisoner, or occasionally by the Chaplain. On Sundays, those prisoners who could read were allowed a Bible, prayer book and Kelmouth's Importance of Religion and other religious tracts. They were confined to their cells however. Totally illiterate prisoners were provided with spelling books, and contrary to prison rules, some of the better educated prisoners were allowed into their cells to give instruction.

At Southwell House of Correction, the Rev. J.T. Becher applied a much less rigid version of the separate system. There was a great
deal more association encouraged for instruction.

"The prisoners are recommended to read upon a Sunday, after they have attended chapel, when prayers are read and a sermon preached once on every Sabbath day. ............. one prisoner has invariably been able to read in each ward, and those books are pointed out to him, which it is imagined will be most instructive."

Questioned further on how many prisoners did one prisoner read to, he replied

"to no more than 4; there being only 5 in one class."

The Reverend Becher further pointed out that secular instruction was not always possible if numbers dropped too low and where a large number of prisoners were serving short sentences. He further pointed out that the chaplain's low salary of £20 per annum to officiate on Sundays meant that he could not be expected to take on secular instruction as well. However, he did say that the chaplain instructed on a voluntary basis. In spite of these problems the Reverend J.T. Becher pointed out that many prisoners "had learned to read and write" and his policies which included active staff participation at Southwell were praised by the committee.

But overall change was very slow coming. According to J. Neild (1) conditions in gaols were much the same at the beginning of the 19th Century as they had been during Howard's earlier investigations. Complacent Justices at the Quarter Sessions and lack of financial resources contributed to the lack of improvement and uniformity. Above all, it was recognised that to pursue the idea of the separate system would involve colossal expense. Existing gaols would need to be converted to separate cells. Education was affected by different systems. Instruction varied from gaol to gaol as it was: in some it was no more than attendance at chapel. Others confined it strictly to cellular instruction. Yet others based it on a mixture of the two. In some gaols secular instruction was omitted altogether: others provided both religious and secular instruction.

This picture is underlined by the 5th Report by the Society for Prison Discipline which stated "that it appears by parliamentary

(1) J. Neild, General State of Prisons in England, Scotland and Wales, 1811
returns that in the year 1818, out of 518 prisons in the United Kingdom (to which upwards of 107, no persons were committed in the course of that year)" - such a total must include every tiny place of confinement in the 3 kingdoms - " in 23 of such prisons only the inmates were separated or divided according to law; in 59 of the number there was no division whatsoever - not even separation of males from females; in 136 there was only one division of the inmates into separate classes, though the 24 George III, c.54 had enjoined that "such divisions should be made. In 68 there were but 2 divisions, and so on; whilst in only 23 were the prisoners separated according to the statute. Again in 445 out of the 518 prisons, no work of any description had been introduced; and in the remaining 73 the employment carried on was of the slightest possible description. Further in the jails which had been built to contain only 8,545 prisoners, there were at one time as many as 13,057 persons confined." (1)

Furthermore as education was a new element in the concept of prison discipline, it was perhaps not surprising that it did not receive the attention it deserved. In short some of the provisions of the 1779 Act were not being implemented. As Sir Samuel Romilly reminded Parliament,

"the great objects ....... were to reform the criminals, to seclude them from their former associates, to separate those of whom hopes might be entertained, from those who were desperate, to teach them useful trades, to accustom them to habits of industry and to give them religious instruction ....... that plan, however, has remained on the Statute Book, for upwards of thirty years, without any effectual step having been taken to carry it into execution. In the meantime the want of it has been severely felt, and all have confessed that the inconvenience and efficacy of other punishments have rendered but too sensible the impolitic and injurious tendency of the present systems." (2)

At the time Romilly viewed in realistic terms the inadequacy of the present gaol system, Wilberforce was taking an optimistic view

(1) Quoted in English Prisons under Local Government by S. & B. Webb, 1922, p.73
(2) Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, Vol. XVII, p.322
of the separate system. He saw it not only as an economic measure to be welcomed, but also as a means of discipline which would "restore to society the unhappy wretch whose vices had (have) brought him to premature disgrace." Religious instruction and moral precept would bring about shame and repentance and "useful employment" would give him the "means by which he can earn an honest livelihood." The separate system would ensure freedom from "contamination." (1)

Dissatisfaction with the present state of education in gaols was also coming from bodies outside Parliament. In 1818 The Society for the Improvement of Prison Discipline and for the Reformation of Juvenile offenders, published their first report urging the adoption and extension of religious instruction: they felt it to be the most effective measure against vice and depravity.

"Above all, religious instruction is loudly demanded; he who knows not his duty to God, will seldom or ever perform it well towards man." (2)

Education remained mainly religious during the period 1811 to 1823 and was left in the hands of the chaplain. What little secular instruction there was, was left to prisoners possessing superior education, or teacher-prisoners. Officially the prison system was based on the separate system and most instruction was individual or cellular. It was mainly self-instruction but there was some associated instruction.

Individual or cellular instruction, was primarily for those prisoners who were unable to read or comprehend any of the literature put into their cells. Usually the chaplain instructed them but sometimes teacher-prisoners were allowed to enter the cells to instruct too. Those prisoners who could read were allowed appropriate literature usually of a devotional nature. In some gaols, notably the Penitentiary House at Gloucester, a 'turnkey', under threat of being reported, was expected to ensure that the prisoners who could read had done so.

This was the method referred to as self-instruction.

(2) Report by the Committee of the Society for the Improvement of Prison Discipline and for the Reformation of Juvenile Offenders, 1818. See Appendix A to this Section for a list of other recommendations and comments made by the Committee.
Associated instruction took various forms. Most commonly prisoners were instructed as a group by the chaplain in the chapel. Sometimes a prisoner who could not read was allocated to a group of a similar educational background and was instructed, if it was in religious instruction, by the chaplain. Occasionally teacher-prisoners would substitute for the chaplain and teach the group.

The successful implementation of religious education was not uniform: many prisoners were disinterested, and many gaols failed to insist that all prisoners attend chapel, though legally required to do so. Many Chaplains were only engaged on a part-time basis in gaols. High illiteracy rates and a notable lack of secular education was common. Teacher-prisoners were not effective enough: there was a need to appoint a more qualified person to be responsible for secular education; to increase the staff of the chaplain's department, and to make education altogether more broad-based.

An Act (1) passed in 1823 sponsored by Peel replaced the separate system with the Benthamite idea of classified association. Prisoners were to be placed in 5 different groups (according to their crime) for hard labour by which it was intended they should earn their keep. With regard to education, the Act introduced the following provisions: secular instruction in the form of reading and writing was to be made available to prisoners; eligibility for instruction was to be determined by the Justices in consultation with the Chaplain. It was felt the introduction of reading would benefit the long serving prisoners by giving them greater access to religious instruction. To improve the provision of secular instruction, schoolmasters were to be appointed. (2)

Nonetheless, labour was to continue to assume greater importance than education and the time available for education was to be outside labour hours. Of necessity, educational provision suffered through this.

(1) 4 Geo. IV, c.64
(2) Ibid. Section 10, Rule 9.
(3) Ibid.
Instruction was modified but not basically changed by the adoption of the associated system. Now prisoners were classified, or placed in group, according to their criminal background. Classes were no longer therefore based on educational ability and this must have had drawbacks. Instruction generally took place at night, after the evening meal, when the prisoners were tired. On the other hand it occupied prisoners until bed time and prevented too much communication amongst them.

The Inspector visiting Coldbath Fields reported that "the prisoners pass too much time in bed: the number of hours being twelve and upward according to the season. This must prove debilitating in its effects and the practice imbues slothful habits. We would suggest as a remedy, the establishment of an evening school which the prisoners who wished might voluntarily attend." (1)

Furthermore, because of the emphasis that was placed on labour, the prisoners who benefitted most from instruction were those awaiting trial as they were not involved in work.

The associated system was often more economic and efficient than the separate one because of group teaching. The appointment of schoolmasters increased a prisoner's charges of instruction and released the chaplain for other duties: he became more of a co-ordinator and less of an instructor. On the other hand prisoners no longer had individual attention and were often left to organise their own instruction.

The Inspector of Prisons reporting on instruction at Ipswich County Gaol stated: "There is no regular or systematic instruction of the prisoners. He (the Chaplain) gives them tasks and they teach each other; and he holds out the learning to write as a stimulus to exertion." (2)

The Chaplain for Maidstone County Gaol and House of Correction remarked as follows about the undesirability of instructing prisoners under the classified system. He wrote:

(1) I.P.R. Home District, 1836.
(2) I.P.R. Northern District, 1836
"Indeed the best way to impart religious instruction with effect is by private converse with the prisoners; which is impossible under a system of association." (1)

At the time Parliament was considering an extension of education for prisoners, Sydney Smith wrote a rather caustic article in the Edinburgh Review in response to proposals made by the Society for the Improvement of Prison Discipline. In general terms he protested against what he saw to be the pampering of criminals. More specifically he objected to prisoners being taught to read and write.

He wrote "A poor man who is lucky to have his son committed for a felony educates him under such a system for nothing, while the virtuous simpleton who is on the other side of the wall is paying by the quarter for these attainments." He went on, "in prisons which are really meant to keep the multitude in order, and to be a terror to evil doers, there must be no sharing of profits, no visiting of friends, no education but religious education, no freedom of diet, no weaver's looms or carpenters benches. There must be a great deal of solitude, coarse food; a dress of shame; hard, incessant, irksome, external labour; a planned and regulated and unrelenting exclusion of happiness and comfort. We enter our decided protest against these modes of occupation, we would banish all the looms of Preston gaol and substitute nothing but the tread wheel or the capstan, or some species of labour where the labourer could not see the results of his toil, where it was as monotonous, irksome and dull as possible - pulling and pushing instead of reading and writing - no share of the profits - not a single shilling." (2)

His forceful views were representative of certain sections of the community but were not directly effective. Nevertheless it was a continual theme which arose from time to time.

The Inspector of Prisons for the Northern and Eastern District found that, when recommending an increase in educational facilities for

(1) I.P.R. Home District, 1827.
prisoners, he frequently met with the following objections:

"Prisoners are sent to the House of Correction for punishment, not for education." (1)

The Inspector of Prisons for the Home District in 1845, Whitworth Russell, advocated high standards of religious and secular instruction: he felt they were necessary to prevent perpetual criminal careers. "Half measures will not only prove abortive but pernicious." He saw objections to his proposal about educating prisoners in terms of injustice. He saw that it was difficult to accept the raising of the intellectual character and conditions of the very dregs of the people to a degree which contrasted unfairly with that of the honest, industrious and well conducted classes of the community. Whitworth Russell did not agree that prison education should be inferior. He felt that it should at least be equal to that enjoyed by society at large.

Education for the working class itself was hedged round by fears about the danger of allowing working people to learn to read and write. A. Tropp points out,

"In the 1830s and 1840s the great question was whether education could mitigate the dangers inherent in an ignorant industrial population or whether it would by teaching the poor to read and write make them a still greater danger to society." (2)

This attitude was also relevant to the education of prisoners though criminal expertise rather than revolution was felt to be the possible outcome of education. For instance, the education of prisoners at Lewes House of Correction was known for its high standards of achievement. In spite of this, the Governor made the following statement in his annual report into the effects of education on the prisoners:

"In this case I cannot but fear that some who might have done well, have gone out from prison three fold more the children of Satan than they entered it." (3)

(1) I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, 1844.
(3) I.P.R. Home District, 1840.
Finally, it is worth noting that reading was given far greater attention than writing. Reading could assist prisoners in profiting from religious instruction. Moreover, writing was seen as a potentially threatening skill.

In fact whilst lip service was paid to the idea of educating prisoners, many gaols frustrated the carrying out of this purpose. Labour was given priority and instruction was sometimes only available in rest periods. For instance, the Inspector of Prisons responsible for visiting Westminster Bridewell reported, "Moreover the school is not allowed to trench upon the time prescribed for tread-wheel labour; the attendance is therefore limited to from 40 to 50 minutes, four-fifths of which are taken from the hour for dinner and rest. We consider that these restrictions operate as a great drawback upon the utility of the adults school." (1)(2)

There were occasions, although rare, when instruction was not offered at all as the prisoners were constantly engaged in labour. Such was the case at Wymondham House of Correction where the Inspector of Prisons reported:

"There is no provision for instruction, the prisoners are so constantly engaged in labour, that there is no time for it. They are supplied with Bibles, Testaments, and Tracts under the Chaplain's superintendence. Some ladies attended the prisoners during the last year, for the purpose of instructing prisoners but for their being so engaged in labour sufficient opportunity was not afforded." (3) These ladies were promised that they would be able to instruct prisoners as soon as there was sufficient time outside labour hours.

One common practice in many gaols was to instruct prisoners as soon as they came off the tread-wheel for a rest. The Schoolmaster at the Gaol and House of Correction for the Liberty of Bury St. Edmunds explained that in order to teach he had to "attend at the tread-wheel,

(1) I.P.R. Home District, 1845.
(2) As late as 1887 doubts still remained whether it was advisable or not to educate prisoners. See P.C.R. 1887/88. See also views held by the Chaplain to Winchester County Gaol on how education can prevent crime. I.P.R. Southern & Western District, 1839.
(3) I.P.R. Southern & Western District, 1836.
instructing the men as they came down from the wheel, in the intervals allowed them to rest." (1)

Commenting on this unsatisfactory practice and the need to allocate a regular time, he wrote,

"It is the practice to allow prisoners on the wheel to be attended by the Schoolmaster for instruction only during their short intervals of rest. Consequently, much of the effect of the Schoolmaster's attention is lost from the constant interruptions and change; a regular hour and period should be laid down, and the prisoners withdraw from labour while in the school." (2)

Quite out of character, and in complete contravention of statutory requirements, there were a number of gaols that failed to provide labour, but did make provision for the instruction of their prisoners. One such gaol was the Gaol and House of Correction at Ipswich, the Inspector reported,

"The convicted prisoners are confined to their cells, with the exception of the time they are at meals and exercise, and attend the school for nearly 2 hours daily. They have books given them in the cells by the Schoolmaster but have no labour or employment." The Inspector goes on,

"I strongly recommend the justices to lose no time in giving effect to the provision of the Gaol Act, which makes it incumbent on them to provide labour and employment for prisoners. The moral good to be expected from the instruction is entirely lost by its being regarded by the prisoners as a mere amusement to break up the monotony of their prison life." (3)

Another gaol which made no provision for the employment of prisoners was Aylesbury. The Chaplain complained that the lack of labour encouraged the prisoners to turn to reading of a lighter kind. He wrote,

"The instruction is voluntary on the part of the prisoners, having nothing to employ their time, they are delighted to attend. They often ask for something to do; I think it very desirable they should

(1) I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, 1844.
(2) Ibid.
(3) Ibid. 1846.
be employed, and for something to do, and for one reason in particular, that it would prevent the necessity of giving them light reading which would not be required if they had work; and I think they would be much better disposed to the more serious subject of moral and religious instruction, in fact it now seems a part of their punishment for they have nothing else." (1)

By the late 1830s it was becoming apparent to the authorities that the classification system was not proving as successful as had originally been anticipated. (2) One of the main problems was referred to as gaol 'contamination', i.e. contact between prisoners. About this time experiments were taking place in America with a new method of penal confinement which was proving successful. (3) It was known as the Silent System. Briefly the system prohibited prisoners from conversing with, looking at or making signs to their fellow prisoners. The system was particularly adaptable to the existing practice of association or classification in that prisoners were allowed to remain in association most of the time but were required to remain silent. Furthermore it was easily adaptable to those prisons which had been rebuilt on the classification system in 1823. It also permitted the continuance of industry.

Two important prison administrators, W. Crawford and Whitworth Russell visited America to study the silent system. Impressed by what they saw, they immediately pronounced the silent system the answer to gaol contamination. Although it was never incorporated in an Act, it was introduced into a number of gaols in England. (4) According to

(1) I.P.R. Home District, 1850.


(3) At Auburn - Sing Sing prisons - New York.

(4) In 1838 the Inspector of Prisons for Northern & Eastern District reported that 16 prisons had introduced the silent system wholly or partly.
Mayhew and Binney, the Silent System was carried out most completely at Coldbath Fields House of Correction, Middlesex. Its Governor, George Leval Chesterton, who was appointed in 1829, first introduced the system on the 29th December, 1834. Instruction of prisoners under this system is best illustrated by an account of a visit paid by Mayhew and Binney to the gaol's school room. They wrote:

"As we were standing at the entrance of the felon's prison, a gentleman passed us dressed in black, and carrying under his arm a roll of what, from the marbled-paper coverings, were evidently copy-books. We instinctively asked if he were not the Schoolmaster, and learnt that he was then on his rounds to collect together his class. The school hours commence at half-past seven in the morning, and end at half-past five in the evening. Each class consists of twenty-four scholars, and these are changed every hour. All the prisoners who are unable to read and write are forced to submit to instruction. The prison school-room is about the size of an artist's studio, being large enough to admit of twelve desks, arranged in four rows in front of the open space where the master's rostrum is placed. Each desk is sufficient for three scholars, but, to prevent talking, only two are allowed, one at each end; the middle place being kept vacant. Presently the pupils entered, in a long line, headed by the master. Each prisoner seemed to know his seat, for he went there as readily as a horse to his stall. All was silent as in a dumb asylum, the only sound being the rustling of the copy-books on their being distributed. A few minutes afterwards all the 'pupils' were leaning over the desks, squaring out their elbows in every variety of positions, some with their tongues poked out at the corner of the mouth, and others frowning with their endeavours to write well. The Schoolmaster is assisted in his duties by two prisoners, who, by their proficiency and good conduct, have been raised to the position of hearers and to them the scholars repeat their lessons. A big sailor-looking man, with red whiskers growing under his chin, advanced to the hearer's desk. Not a word was spoken as the copy-book was handed in. The prisoner-tutor pointed in silence to a mistake, the pupil nodded, and, on another signal, began..."
to read aloud what he had written, 'give to every man that asketh, and of him that taketh away his goods ask him not again.' "(1)

Like other systems of prison discipline the Silent System had its own drawbacks and critics. Perhaps one of the main disappointments about it was that it never lived up to its expectations of overcoming one of the central problems in the gaols, that of preventing communication. As Mayhew and Binney remarked "..... it fails in its attempt to prevent intercourse among prisoners promiscuously associated." (2)

To enforce the system it had to increase the number of persons supervising the prisoners. As Mayhew and Binney pointed out "..... at Coldbath Fields, no less than 272 persons (54 Warders and 218 prisoners, appointed to act as monitors over their fellow criminals) were employed to superintend 682 inmates, which is in the ratio of 10 officers to every 25 prisoners." (3)

Another gaol which had also introduced the Silent System was Northallerton House of Correction. It too experienced problems of communication. As a means of minimizing the problem, the Governor appointed his son, aged about 18, as Superintendent of Silence, at an annual salary of £50. (4)

In comparing the Silent System with the Separate System, Mayhew and Binney remarked
"..... neither the classified nor the Silent System has any tendency to incline the prisoner to turn his thoughts back upon himself - to cause him to reconsider his life and prospects, or to estimate the wickedness and unprofitableness of crime. The Silent System, we are told, can call forth no new resolves, nor settled determinations of amendment, whilst it fails in wholly securing the prisoner from contamination, and sets the mind upon the rack to devise means for evading the irritating restrictions imposed upon it." (5)

In 1839 the Classification System was replaced by the Separate System again.

(2) Ibid. p.101.
(3) Ibid.
(4) I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, 1837.
(5) H. Mayhew & J. Binney, Ibid. p.102
By 1856 the Silent System was gradually on the decline in those jails in which it had been introduced. (1)

During the early 1820s a novel but short-lived experiment was carried out, that of running a prison as a religious experiment. The prison in question was the newly erected Millbank Penitentiary. Care was taken in selecting the right kind of Chaplain. The rules required that the Chaplain be in Priest's Orders, and be approved by the Bishop of the Diocese. He should have no other profession or other duty, and reside in the prison. Furthermore, he had to be a married man. Amongst his various duties he was required to obtain an intimate knowledge of the particular disposition and character of every prisoner, to direct them to attend religious instruction in such a manner as would be conducive to their reformation. He was also directed to converse with the prisoners individually in smaller or greater numbers provided it did not interfere with the work of the prison. At his discretion, he could direct prisoners to be instructed in reading and writing by someone competent to do so. However, an officer must always be in attendance. (2) The Penitentiary had three Chaplains throughout the experiment period. They were the Rev. S. Bennett, followed by the Rev. Whitworth Russell. The religious experiment reached its climax when the Rev. Daniel Nihil replaced Whitworth Russell who had accepted an appointment as an Inspector of Prisons. Impressed by Nihil's enthusiasm, the management committee appointed him to the combined office of Chaplain-Governor in 1837. He was probably the only Chaplain to have ever been appointed a Governor.

Nihil believed that the reformation of prisoners could only be achieved through the means of religious observances. He devised a new set of rules which aimed at achieving this. For instance, the greatest offence was to disturb the chapel service. (3) He prohibited all conversation on the grounds that it encouraged contamination. Prison

(1) For a short appraisal of the different systems of prison discipline and some of the other objectives of the Silent System see H. Mayhow and J. Binney, pages 99-106.

(2) 56 Geo.III, c.62, Section 40, 1817. Rules and Regulations of the general Penitentiary at Millbank.

(3) See Chapter 3 on the Chapel for examples of the disturbances that occurred at Millbank.
staff were issued with the following directions, that they should
(a) not give offence to the prisoners,
(b) control their temper in every situation,
(c) set a good example of reverence in the chapel,
(d) cultivate the demeanour of true Christians.

Although some warders were sacked for disobeying some of the directives, the majority did their best to co-operate. It is believed that some sought to curry favour with the Governor by carrying Bibles around with them under their arms, and used scriptural phrases whenever they could. The Rev. W.L. Clay recalls that "'turnkeys' were transformed into Scripture-Readers and sent on pastoral visits from cell to cell." (1)

In their account about Millbank, Mayhew and Binney commented briefly about this period,
"...... the Governor of the prison was a reverent gentleman who placed an undue reliance on the efficacy of religious forms. The prisoners independently of their frequent attendance in the Chapel, were supplied, more than plentifully with tracts and religious books, and in fact, taught to do nothing but pray. Even the warders were put to read prayers to them in their cells, and the convicts taking their cue from the reverend Governor, with the readiness which always distinguishes them, were not long in assuming a contrite and devout aspect, which, however, found no parallel in their conduct. As the most successful simulator of holiness became the most favoured prisoner, sanctified looks were, as a matter of course, the order of the day, and the most desperate convicts in the prison found it advantageous to complete their criminal character by the addition of hypocrisy." (2) The experiment failed as Arthur Hoyles suggested, because, "unless a man voluntarily opened his heart to the love and power of God, not all the coercion of a penitentiary could make him religious." (3)(4)

In 1844 Millbank became a convict prison.

---

(4) For further details about Rev. D. Nihil see D. Griffiths, Memorials of Millbank, 1884
Another religious experiment was carried out from about 1845 onwards at Reading Gaol. The Chaplain was the Rev. John Field who was an advocate of the Separate System. Unlike most other gaols under the Separate System, the authorities at Reading removed the element of labour from the discipline of the gaol and developed an environment in which religious education prevailed. The Berkshire Magistrates referred to the new approach as corrective education. Their reason for dispensing with labour was because they felt that by giving the prisoner employment it might give the prisoner an interest in what he was doing, and fearful that they would lose control over the prisoners mind, that the prisoner would think more about his employment than about instruction. To this end prisoners were engaged in nothing but education from morning to night. However, at times, and as a privilege, the authorities provided variations in the daily routine. For instance, if the prisoner became tired of reading he would be allowed to pick a little oakum or knitted stockings, but this was only allowed because the authorities hoped the prisoner would wish to return to his reading and studies keener than ever. Hard labour was definitely discouraged for fear that the prisoners' attention might be distracted from reading.

H. Dixon was of the opinion that the authorities had introduced a religious regime because,

"They considered that the criminal is a criminal because he is without religion. He has fallen into crime because the love of God is not in his heart - the fear of God not before his eyes. If these sentiments are not evoked in him, they regard all other effort as so much waste." (1)

Of the system, Dixon said,

"The 'System', like the style of the architecture, is a mixture of the castellated and the collegiate - that is, it is a mixture of idleness and study." (2)

The prisoner's daily routine was as follows. At six o'clock he woke up, cleansed his cell, washed, and indulged in self-instruction until eight when he had breakfast. At 9 a.m. he put on his mask and went to the chapel for an hour. He then attended school and was taught

(1) H. Dixon, The London Prisons, 1850, p.403
(2) Ibid. p.405
by a competent schoolmaster until lunch time. In the afternoon he attended the Chaplain's class for an hour. He then returned to his cell and continued to read for the remainder of the day. As the system at Reading relied on the prisoner being able to read, the Rev. J. Field in his evidence to the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Prison Discipline in 1850 explained the system and the measures taken for those prisoners unable to read. He stated:

"A prisoner not able to read, would of course be taught the rudiments at once; he would have the opportunity of attending the school twice in the day for about half an hour, and he would also receive instruction from the Schoolmaster in his cell." He went on,

"Supposing the prisoner could read, then if he did not know the Lord's Prayer, which is the case with a very large proportion of the prisoners, that would be his first lesson. But I may be allowed to state on the commencement, that we have nothing like compulsory instruction. It has been stated that at Reading Gaol instruction is given as a punishment, that there is no hard labour, but that instead of that there is hard mental exercise. Now we have nothing like compulsory labour, and I should object to it most decidedly, and consider it wholly subversive of anything like advantage to be derived from instruction." Asked by Mr. R. Palmer,

"Do you mean by compulsory instruction, that in the event of any prisoner having a decided reluctance to be taught, you would not press it upon him?" The Rev. J. Field replied,

"Certainly not; but I have never known such a case; the instruction is voluntarily received." (1)

Instruction was primarily based on the Bible. Prisoners were committed to memorising large portions of the New Testament. Often offences for which prisoners were sentenced were linked to having to memorise a text from the Scriptures. For instance, if a prisoner had been convicted of robbing and had received a sentence of six months, he would be required to memorise four Evangelists. A prisoner doing an 18 months' sentence would be required to commit to memory St. Matthew to Revelation. It was not uncommon for a really studious prisoner

(1) Evidence given on the 19/4/1850.
to learn by rote the whole of the New Testament. Answering the charge that the prisoners merely learnt by rote, and did not understand what they had learnt, Field explained that the Schoolmaster would refer prisoners to him in such circumstances, "and I myself endeavour to catechise the prisoners every day, directing their attention to what they learnt." (1)

Finally, the Rev. J. Field was questioned at some length by the Select Committee. Asked by the Chairman whether he was satisfied with the system, he replied, "Perhaps one of the strongest proofs that could be given of the good effects that it has produced is, that there is no longer the same reluctance in masters to employ those who were in their service, and who had robbed them, after their discharge from Reading Gaol."

The Reading Gaol experiment evoked a good deal of criticism and sarcastic comments. Furthermore, the Secretary of State had indicated some displeasure in the system. H. Dixon was exceedingly sceptical. S. and B. Webb referred to the gaol as the Palace Prison; an unknown peer, in questioning the Rev. Field before the Lord's Committee on Transportation in 1847 was known to have remarked "Really I ought to call your gaol a University of the highest order."

Finally, because prisoners were perpetually reading, the gaol is best known for the nickname "Read, read, reading gaol."

The period from the early 1830s to 1839 was mainly devoted to a re-appraisal of prison discipline in the local gaols. The issue was which system to adopt. Many favoured the re-introduction of the Separate System. In 1835 the Select Committee of the House of Lords on the State of the Gaols, reported its findings, It recommended that there should be 'one uniform system of Prison Discipline,' (2) throughout all the Gaols and Houses of Correction; that there should be 'entire separation except during the hours of labour and of religious worship and instruction,' (3) and that silence should be enforced 'to prevent

(1) See Appendix B to this section with examples of exercises given to prisoners at Reading Gaol. Examples taken from Rev. J. Field, Prison Discipline, 1848, p.122-3. For further details about the system see Field's book; I.P.R. Home District 1845; Select Committee of the House of Commons on Prison Discipline, 1850.

(2) 2nd Report, 1st Recommendation.

(3) Ibid. 2nd Recommendation.
all communication between prisoners both before and after trial." (1) Furthermore, in order to effect uniformity of discipline all rules and regulations of the gaols be submitted to the Secretary of State for approval instead of the Justices of Assize. (2)

The Select Committee made no specific recommendations regarding the education of prisoners. However, the following recommendations were to have a direct bearing on education, and to ensure its continued development. For instance, the Select Committee stressed firstly the importance of instruction in reading and writing as laid down by the Gaol Act of 1823, and recommended that Schoolmasters be appointed where the numbers of prisoners exceeded 50. (3) Secondly, an attempt was being made to improve the quality of secular education by excluding prisoners from being appointed as Schoolmasters. (4) Thirdly, they recommended that where the numbers of prisoners exceeded 50, a Chaplain should devote the whole of his time to the gaol, and that a larger proportion of his time should be devoted "to the Spiritual Instruction of the prisoners, both individually and in classes." (5)

Finally, the Select Committee recommended the appointment of Inspector of Prisons to visit the gaols and report to the Secretary of State. (6) They were to be of some considerable assistance to the Chaplains and their staff in furthering the cause and development of both religious and secular instruction. The Inspectors had a wide brief. Briefly, and as far as education was concerned, they were required to advise and ensure that the gaols were complying with the statutory provisions for instruction and the appointment of staff to the education department. Secondly, they were required to report on the state of instruction. Thirdly, to interview staff and prisoners as to the latters' educational progress. Fourthly, to deal with conflicts that might arise between educational staff and the remainder of the gaol staff.

---

(1) 2nd Report 5th Recommendation.
(2) Ibid. 2nd Recommendation.
(3) Ibid. 16th Recommendation.
(4) Ibid. Ibid.
(5) Ibid. 15th Recommendation.
(6) Ibid. 3rd Recommendation. (See 5 & 6 W.IV. c.38 - re appointment of Inspectors of Prisons.)
Fifthly, to make appropriate recommendations on all matters concerning education. Many of the recommendations of the Select Committee were to be embodied in an Act to be passed in 1839.

In the meantime, Mr. Crawford and Whitworth Russell, now Inspectors of Prisons for the Home District, explained in their report for 1838 how they saw the Separate System contributing to the reformation of prisoners. Basically their views did not differ significantly from those held during the latter part of the 18th Century. They wrote, "Another indispensable characteristic of a good system of Prison Discipline is that the prisoner should be placed in such circumstances as shall most powerfully lead him to reflect upon his conditions and conduct, and dispose him to receive, with docility, and reverence, the instruction and admonitions of those appointed to teach and advise him. Of all the means which a sound system of Prison Discipline employs, moral and religious instruction is that from which the best and most durable effects are most generally and reasonably expected. But it seems to be forgotten that the best religious training depends, so far as human agency is concerned, upon the frame and posture of mind of him who is the subject of it. However earnest or judicious the teacher’s addresses may be, they can make no impression when spoken in the ear of one who is indifferent, unattentive or averse from receiving them. It is obvious that the frame of mind in which offenders in general enter the walls of a prison, is not very favourable to religious impressions, or to the feelings which naturally dispose persons to the reception of such instruction as is fitted to lead them to self-examination and to resolutions of amendment......" They concluded "Thus will the prisoner be led to feel no pain but that which is inflicted by remorse, and to experience no gratification but that which springs from sources never tried before - honest labour, and religious instruction, not imposed upon him as a part of his sentence, but extended to him as an alleviation of its rigour. This, we respectfully submit to your Lordship, is the triumph of the System." (1) Later, the Webbs, however, were not entirely convinced that the prisoners necessarily viewed the system in the same light. They wrote,

(1) I.P.R. Home District, 1838.
"But we imagine that, to the prisoner himself, the most serious point was that, under both systems (solitude and separate), he was locked up alone in his own cell for twenty-two (or even more) hours out of the twenty-four. His cellular isolation was an invariable fact. The extent to which his solitude was in practice mitigated by 'social intercourse' with the Governor, the Chaplain, the debtor and the Warders, on the occasion of their visits to his cells was, we fear, to say the least, uncertain." (1) In short, the Separate System aimed at inculcating a feeling of guilt, and requiring prisoners to indulge in introspection. From the following vivid account of Mayhew and Binney of the Separate System, it is arguable whether reformation would ever be possible. Moreover, was the present education system adequate enough to help the prisoner to cope. Mayhew and Binney wrote, "The Separate System or Cellular System breaks down the mental and bodily health of the prisoners—forces the mind to be continually brooding over its own guilt—constantly urges the prisoner to contemplate the degradation of his position and seeks to impress upon him that his crimes have caused him to be excluded from all society; so that, instead of reforming, it utterly overpowers and destroys. With more vacant intellects and hardened hearts, however, it serves to make the prisoners even more unfeeling and unthinking, for sympathy alone develops sympathy, and thought in others is required to call forth thought in us. In a word, it is urged that this mode of penal discipline cages a man up as if he were some dangerous beast, allowing his den to be entered only by his 'keeper', and that it ends in his becoming as irrational and furious as a beast; in fact, say the opponents of the system, "it violates the great social law instructed by the Almighty, and so working contrary to nature, it is idle to expect any good of it." (2)

With the Solitary System the prisoner is deprived of intercourse with all other human beings. Under separate confinement he is kept rigidly apart from other criminals, but is allowed as much intercourse with instructors and officers, as is compatible with judicious economy.

(2) H. Mayhew and J. Binney, The Criminal Prisons of London, 1862, p.103
A fundamental change in the system of prison discipline occurred in the 1839 Act, (1) which replaced the existing system of Classification by the Separate System. Moreover, prisoners were to remain in silence when in association. The significance of this event occasioned L.W. Fox to remark, "As one consequence of this central activity the 'beginning of the end' of the Battle of the Systems on the local prison front was signalled by the Act of 1839." This Act rendered the Separate System legal. (2)

The effects of this Act on education were as follows. With the original system of separation, prisoners were allowed a certain degree of freedom to converse when in association. Now prisoners were required to remain in silence. This meant that from now onwards warders would be required to be present during education classes to maintain silence. Initially instruction was provided in the Chapels in which prisoners were placed in partitions. Later schools were built. In both instances warders were present. Although some gaols were already instructing prisoners in their cells, cellular instruction was not adopted more generally throughout the gaols until later. Finally, the Act (3) allowed suitable books to be supplied to prisoners. From 1839 to 1865 education was not to be affected by further legislation or changes in the system of prison discipline. Variations in the systems of prison discipline prevailed, although there was a general tendency towards the Separate System. The Rev. W.L. Clay explained,

(1) 2 & 3 Vic., c.56.

However, Fox pointed out that "But for some years to come the adoption of separate confinement and the purely penal concept of hard labour was neither complete nor undisputed. Different authorities continued to take their own line, and the dispute boiled up again in the late forties with violent press campaign against the Separate System and reformatory discipline generally, p.39. Hostility by the general public was partly due to the publication of Charles Reade's novel "It is never too late to Mend" in which he described the appalling conditions in Birmingham Gaol. For instance that sentry boxes were used in the chapel, and when prisoners whispered to the man in the next box he was punished by confinement in a dark cell, etc.

(3) 2 & 3 Vic., c.56, Section 6, Rule 8.
"By degrees, as the value of the Separate System became apparent, it was widely adopted. It appears, from a return which was moved for the House of Commons in 1856, that in about one third of the prisons in England (120 in number) the system was fully carried out; in another third, partially; whilst the rest were either on the Silent System, or else still in the old disorderly state." (1) A typical reaction of some of the Chaplains following the re-introduction of the Separate System was that expressed by the Chaplain to Shrewsbury County Gaol and House of Correction. He wrote,

"The Chaplain begs to state, that several of those prisoners confined in separate cells, have learned the catechism, and some of the collects, and subsequently appeared grateful for their instruction. As far as his experience leads him to form an opinion, he is inclined to believe that such confinement tends to prepare the mind for instruction, and to soften the heart for the reception of religious impressions." (2)

Although there was a statutory obligation to provide instruction, the degree of instruction varied amongst the gaols. Some gaols insisted on compulsory attendance at school whereas in others it was entirely voluntary. The Inspector of Prisons when visiting Cheshire County Gaol wrote that,

"The attendance at the school is compulsory. Every prisoner attends school in turns." (3)

Whereas at Leicester Gaol the Schoolmaster taught reading, writing and arithmetic to those who desired to learn. (4) On the whole attendance was on a voluntary basis. Moreover, instruction was often limited by a number of different reasons: there was no uniform pattern. Cited below are a sample of some of these reasons.

For instance, the Inspector of Prisons on visiting Canterbury County Gaol and House of Correction was informed that there was no instruction other than for boys because the majority of the offenders

---

(2) I.P.R. Southern & Western District, 1845.
(3) I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, 1837.
(4) I.P.R. Southern & Western District, 1841.
were under summary convication, and in the circumstances the gaol authorities did not feel justified in offering instruction. In fact, because the majority of the prisoners remained in the gaol for less than three months, there was no justifiable reason for employing a Schoolmaster. (1)

In some cases the age of a prisoner restricted his entitlement to receive instruction, as did the length of sentence. The Chaplain for Swaffham House of Correction informed the Inspector of Prisons that "if prisoners are young, that is to say under 25, they may be taught to read in about six months; if above 30, the task becomes difficult." Furthermore, the Chaplain did not attempt to teach those whose sentences of imprisonment were less than two months. (2) Instruction for prisoners at Knutsford House of Correction was primarily based on the length of sentence. The Schoolmaster explained that instruction was only made available to those prisoners sentenced to more than four months. This Schoolmaster also expressed the futility and difficulties associated with teaching older prisoners. (3)

In several gaols instruction was only granted as a privilege. For instance, at York Castle County Gaol the Chaplain stated that "Every male prisoner attends the school; it is made a privilege; but all are glad to avail themselves of permission." (4) In some gaols various criteria were used for determining those eligible for instruction. The Chaplain to Lewes House of Correction stated, "As a general rule, the privilege of attending school is confined to those whose sentences are not less than two months; the selection being further made with reference to their hopefulness of disposition and their conduct in prison, as well as their want of instruction. So that, in summer at least, the means of instruction reach to every case, where there is a reasonable prospect of good." (5)

(1) I.P.R. Home District, 1837.
(2) I.P.R. Northern District, 1836.
(3) I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, 1839.
(4) Ibid. 1845.
(5) I.P.R. Home District, 1840.
The hours made available for instruction varied from gaol to gaol. When instruction was carried out in class the hours varied from 1 to 2 hours daily. Ilford House of Correction ran four separate classes of one hour each. "The first class is taught reading, writing and arithmetic; the second, reading and writing; the third, reading only and the fourth the alphabet and spelling." (1) Whereas the school at Lancaster Castle devoted two hours each daily. (2) At Colchester House of Correction "each prisoner was allowed an hour a day for school instruction whether it interfered with labour or not." (3) However, when prisoners received individual instruction, the average time was about 15/20 minutes each.

On the matter of how much emphasis should be given to instruction, and the best time to provide it, in 1863 the Select Committee of the House of Lords on Prison Discipline, recommended that "They are of opinion that in order to avoid interference with the discipline of the prison that all school instruction should be given at a fixed time, and to a fixed proportion of the prisoners in succession." The fixed time was to be averaged between the Chaplain and the Governor. They went on "The evening appears to the Committee to be a very suitable time for school instruction, both as following upon the hard labour of the day, and as providing occupation for a portion of the time which is now passed at sleep." Perhaps of most significance was the attitude the Select Committee took on the matter of instruction. They said, "But they consider school as a boon granted to the prisoner, which should under no circumstances become a substitute for labour. They regard as extremely unsatisfactory a prison system in which instruction by the Schoolmaster, or "self-instruction", is made the substance of penal discipline." (4) As to the effects of moral reformation relative to the prison system they said "We do not consider that the moral

---

(1) I.P.R. Home District, 1845
(2) I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, 1845.
(3) I.P.R. Home District, 1845.*
(4) Recommendation under 9(4). To enable prisoners to have instruction in reading as well as for the great importance of the charge, they recommended that lighting should be installed in all the cells as early as possible. Recommendation 9(5).
reformation of the offender holds the primary place in the prison system; that more industrial employment without wages is a sufficient punishment for many crimes; that punishment in itself is morally prejudicial to the criminal and useless to society, or that it is desirable to abolish both the crank and tread-wheel as soon as possible." (1) Finally, the Select Committee recommended that the hours devoted to sleep should be reduced from the present 9½ to 10 hours to 8 hours. Many of the Select Committees recommendations were eventually incorporated in the Act of 1865. (2) As a result the hours of labour were increased and there was a corresponding cut in the hours allowed for instruction. The Chaplain for Exeter County Gaol reported in 1868 that, "before the new prison Act came into operation, the male prisoners received from 22 to 27 hours of class instruction weekly, which gave to each prisoner about 22 to 27 hours of class instruction weekly, which gave to each prisoner about one hour's daily instruction. It is now reduced to 12½ hours weekly." (3) Critical of the Select Committee's recommendation of providing education in the evenings, the Chaplain for Devon County Prison wrote, "There appears to be no intention of making the experiment; for although gas is laid on in all the cells, it has never yet been lighted (except very rarely in cases of sickness) so that prisoners after supper have only the alternative of going to bed or of sitting up in the dark." (4) Other Chaplains complained that they could now only see prisoners during the evenings.

As compared with religious instruction, the degree of secular instruction varied amongst the gaols. Some provided no instruction. In a few reading and writing was offered. However, reading was provided in the majority of the gaols, whereas only very few gaols taught writing.

(1) Recommendation 12(7).
(2) 28 & 29 Vic., c.126.
(3) T.P.R. Southern District, 1868.
(4) Ibid. 1864.
The Inspector of Prisons for the Midland and Eastern District suggested that the reason for these variations was due to a loophole in the gaol Act of 1823, which only required that instruction be provided "to such extent and to such prisoners, as to the Visiting Justices may seem expedient." (1)

One of the main reasons for introducing secular instruction was as the same Inspector suggested. "Palpably the rudiments of instruction rest in the knowledge of the meaning of the words spoken. Before Christianity can achieve a victory over the heart of the criminal, he must understand what the minister says." (2) Although reading and writing should have been given equal attention, Schoolmasters concentrated mainly on the former. With a view to improving the reading performance of prisoners at least two gaols, had by the early 1850s, introduced the Kimpress System and Baker's Graduate's Reading. The former consisted of instruction in religious knowledge, and the latter in secular knowledge. Each system consisted of three 'grades', "the third in each being calculated to give instruction of a sound and very useful character." (3) The Chaplain to Little Dean House of Correction explained how prisoners were instructed through the Kimpress System. He wrote,

"With regard to instruction, I would make especial mention of the very great advantages the prisoners have derived from the use of Kimpress's Scripture Tablet Lessons and Manual. A vast amount of religious knowledge may thus be most easily and pleasantly conveyed, and a prisoner taught to read well in a very short time. The lesson, printed in large type, is hung up before the prisoners, and read through by the teacher, who all the while points to the words as he repeats them. It is then read through by the prisoners, and as each reads, the rest follow him. The whole is then explained from the Manual, which is drawn up in so plain and simple a manner, that the most inexperienced teacher may use it with advantage. Feeling, as I do, what I believe is now becoming a very prevailing opinion, that the inculcation of

(1) I.P.R. Midland and Eastern District, 1849.
(2) Ibid.
(3) I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, Lancashire, 1852.
religious principles is the grand panacea for, or at least the best preventive of crime, and having had good proof of the excellence of Himpriss's plan of teaching, I could not but speak of it." (1)

The Inspector of Prisons was duly impressed with the system and the results it achieved. He wrote,

"In the instance of a prisoner when examined and who has been committed less than a month before, at which time he did not know his alphabet, the improvement was very marked, he having passed a very creditable examination in a long sentence of words in one syllable." (2)

The provision of writing was on the whole minimal. (3) There were a number of significant reasons for this. As early as 1811, the Chaplain to the Penitentiary House at Gloucester explained that he did not encourage the prisoners in learning to write or cast accounts from an opinion of its being totally unnecessary to their reformation. (4)

It was not uncommon for instruction in writing to be withheld as an incentive to learn to read first. The Schoolmaster at Knutsford House of Correction wrote,

"The method of proceeding in the school is to teach them the elements of reading, and to learn by heart the collects, catechism, etc., and when they have been well grounded in these, they are examined and tested by the Chaplain, and if he is satisfied are allowed to learn to write." (5)

The Inspector of Prisons for Norwich Castle County Gaol reported

"He (Chaplain) thinks teaching prisoners to read greatly facilitates the inculcating of religious and moral principles. In no instance

(1) I.P.R. Southern & Western District, 1850.

(2) Ibid. (It is believed that the first gaol to introduce both systems was Preston Gaol in 1851. For further details of the system see Chapter on Books and the Library).

(3) In those gaols where writing was allowed prisoners were issued with slates and copy books. Both were used as a means of assessing prisoners' progress in writing. It was not uncommon for the pages of the copy books to be numbered to prevent pages being torn out and used for communicating with other prisoners.

(4) Report from the Committee on Laws relating to Penitentiary Houses, 1811.

(5) I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, 1845.
has he suffered them to learn to write, except as a stimulus to further improvement. He promises that they shall learn to write when they have got to a certain point in reading. "(1) At Kirton House of Correction, writing was considered a great boon and only given as a reward for good conduct. (2) Perhaps the most significant reasons for depriving prisoners of writing and of limiting secular education were due to the supposed inherent dangers to society. The Chaplain to Swaffham House of Correction prohibited writing on the following grounds, "He (Chaplain) considers it would be very disadvantageous, and productive of evil, if the prisoners were taught to write." (3) With regard to teaching writing and arithmetic, the Rev. J. Field, Chaplain to Reading Gaol, wrote, "...the Chaplain feels that much discretion ought to be used in communicating this extent of secular knowledge to criminals. Such instruction might prove injurious both to the culprit himself and to society ....... It is only, therefore, when the feelings and conduct of an offender give the hope of his reformation, that instruction, beyond that of teaching to read, is imparted." (4) In contrast to the Rev. J. Field, the Inspector of Prisons responsible for visiting Devizes County House of Correction wrote, "I consider the instruction might be very beneficially extended to the teaching of writing, with a little arithmetic, especially to those prisoners who are sentenced to long terms of imprisonment." (5) Arithmetic had for a number of years been taught in a number of gaols. With the enactment of the 1865 Act, arithmetic was added to the range of secular subjects to be taught in the gaols. The extent of instruction was still to be determined by the Visiting Justices, and the hours allocated for instruction were not to be deducted from the hours prescribed for hard labour. (6) As a general rule instruction was usually only available to prisoners awaiting trial or those serving longer sentences.

(1) I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, 1845.
(2) I.P.R. Midland & Eastern District, 1849.
(3) I.P.R. Northern District, 1836.
(4) Rev. J. Field, Prison Discipline, 1848. Volume 1, p.158
(5) I.P.R. Home District, 1849.
The mode of instructing prisoners varied. The standard practice was for the Schoolmaster to ask prisoners to read parts of a book and then listen to the prisoner repeat what he had learnt. He would then ask the prisoner questions on what he had just learnt. Catechizing prisoners was practiced in some gaols. The Chaplain to Carlisle County Gaol stated in his report that the prisoners took a "great interest in instruction, particularly in the catechizing. I am satisfied that the catechetical method is the only efficient one for imparting instruction in a prison." (1)

To a large extent the learning process was based on memory or rote learning. Little or no attention was given to understanding the content of the material. To some degree this aspect of learning depended on the quality of the Schoolmaster. Moreover there was the time factor. The practice adopted at Lancaster Castle County Gaol was to give prisoners lessons taken from the catechism and Scriptures. The prisoners were then expected to repeat fluently what they had learnt. The practice of acquiring knowledge by heart, led the Inspector of Prisons to comment, "I cannot impress upon prison Schoolmasters too strongly, the importance of never allowing a prisoner to learn anything by heart without at the same time using every endeavour to make him comprehend the meaning of what he acquires." (2)

There were some rather unusual methods used for instructing prisoners which are worth recording. For instance, the Inspector of Prisons for Norwich County Prison reported, "The business of instruction is aided by a practice which exists for the prisoners to read aloud in turn, in each ward for almost twenty minutes after dinner, the Officer in charge being expected by the prisoner to be able to correct any errors in reading, and to reply to any prisoner who asks for explanation." (3)

The Inspector of Prisons upon visiting Stafford County Gaol and House of Correction remarked about a peculiar method which had been

(1) I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, 1844.
(2) Ibid. 1845.
(3) Ibid. 1850.
adopted for instructing prisoners. He wrote, "Sixteen of them sit in a circle in the corridor with one teacher and two warders present, each prisoner bringing from his cell his book and his stool; the instructor sits by each prisoner in turn, and hears him read and teaches him what may be necessary; the two warders, who are present on these occasions, also give their assistance, until the sixteen have completed their tasks, when they move off to their respective cells and make way for another batch." (1) Finally, at Coldbath Fields where prison discipline was based on the Silent System, the following method was used. The Chaplain reported, "In addition to the instruction received by prisoners in chapel, and in their private interviews, with the Chaplain, they are amply supplied not only with religious books but also with those containing entertainment with sound instruction. And much advantage has arisen for some time past from the practice of reading aloud in the work rooms during the hours of labour" ....... "and with the sanction of the Visiting Justices, the practice of reading aloud in the several work rooms during the hours of labour, has been adopted with acknowledged advantage in various respects - the readers being selected from among the best qualified of the prisoners. This has already, for many years past, been the practice upon Sundays." (2)

The success of any teaching programme is to some extent dependent on the ratio of the teaching staff to prisoners. There was no laid down ratio for adoption throughout the gaols. However, in 1838, the Inspectors of Prisons proposed the following mode of conveying instruction under the Separate System. They suggested, "...... let us, for example, take the case of a prison containing separate apartments for 100 prisoners. If the Chaplain devotes two hours on four days, and four hours on two days, in the same week, he will thus give 16 hours a week to visiting the convicts from cell to cell, and if he appropriates ten minutes to each, he will be able to instruct

(1) I.P.R. Midland & Eastern District, 1848.  
(2) Chaplain's Report to the Justices of the Peace dated 15/10/1857.
six in an hour, and 96 in a week. Again, if he devotes eight hours a week (two hours on four days) to the instruction of the prisoners in classes of 25 each, he may see and instruct for an hour each 200 prisoners. By this plan he is enabled to give instruction to the 100 prisoners in class, for two hours a week; and thus a regular and systematic course of instruction may be carried on." (1) The Inspectors explained that from their own experience, advantageous results had been achieved when only one hour had been devoted. Furthermore, with one hour devoted to self-instruction in the cell, and the assistance of a Schoolmaster to visit each cell to check on each prisoner's progress would lead to an effective means of conveying instruction. In fact, by 1841 the ratio had deteriorated to 1 to 696, partly due to an increase in the criminal population. However, by 1849 the ratio had improved to 1 - 200. As to the numbers of prisoners per class, this varied from 15, (2) 20, (3) and 30. (4) In his evidence to the Select Committee of the House of Lords on Prison Discipline in 1863, Mr. J.C. Perry was questioned on what was the average number of prisoners per class. He replied that it was impossible to say, but thought that when instruction was given in the chapel, the figure could be as high as 24 or 30. However, when prisoners were taught in smaller rooms, the numbers decreased accordingly. Questioned about the number of warders that should be present in a class, he replied that in chapel at least two were usually employed. Asked if a Schoolmaster, plus two warders, was sufficient to control and prevent communication passing between 20 to 30 prisoners, he replied that that would depend on the construction of the room. (5) As the use of chapels declined as places for instructing prisoners, and as more gaols began to build special school rooms, it became the general rule for the average size of a class to be not more than 20.

(1) I.P.R. Home District, 1838.
(2) I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, 1852. Preston Gaol.
(4) I.P.R. Southern & Western District, 1853. Gloucester County Gaol.
(5) Evidence given on 16/3/1863.
The size of the class had an effect on the actual performance of the prisoner as well as his continued attendance at classes. The Chaplain to Warwick County Gaol had the following comments to make on this matter.

"The men are not disposed to read aloud nor to be catechised, in general, unless when there are very few present; as the numbers increase, the disposition to attend diminishes: indeed, well disposed prisoners have observed to him that the most severe part of their punishment is to be mixed up with a number of associates whose noise and conversation prevents them from reading and from reflection: they have said to him that they should be glad to be placed quite alone. Others have said to him that it seemed to them more like to hell than to anything else." (1)

The majority of prisoners attended school for constructive reasons. However, there were those who had ulterior motives. The predominant reasons were, for instance, to avoid the tread wheel, or relieve monotony. On this last point the Chaplain of Beccles House of Correction saw the advantages to be gained. He stated, "He thinks that some of the prisoners resort to the Schoolmaster to relieve the monotony of confinement; but even then, it does good, as it is a channel for conveying moral and religious principles, which it would be more difficult to inculcate without." (3) At Ipswich Gaol and House of Correction where there was a school but no labour, the Inspector of Prisons recommended that the Justices provide employment and labour, as soon as possible, because "the moral good to be expected from the instruction is entirely lost by its being regarded by the prisoners as a more amusement to break in upon the monotony of their life." (4)

The educational background of the majority of prisoners was poor. Basically it was due to inadequate or non-existent educational

---

(1) I.P.R. Southern & Western District, 1836.
(2) I.P.R. Home District, 1849.
(3) I.P.R. Northern District, 1836.
(4) I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, 1846.
facilities during their earlier life. For some, prison offered them an opportunity to improve their knowledge, and perhaps most importantly of all, offered the possibility of securing better prospects and a wider choice of employment on discharge. There were many who regarded education as an unnecessary waste of time. Although few in numbers, there were occasions when prisoners were known to have made an application to stay on in prison to perfect their education. The Inspector of Prisons for Wakefield Gaol relates an interesting case. He wrote,

"A curious instance of its power (education) occurred to me a short time since at Wakefield, where a prisoner made application to be allowed to remain there until he had perfected himself in reading. He admitted that the prison was hard, but that he had been brought up as a groom, and that he was quite confident if he could but become a scholar, he should never be without a situation."

Perhaps one of the central problems that faced the Chaplains and Schoolmasters was how to present to the prisoners the need for education. The Rev. John Clay seemed to have a possible answer. He wrote "...... it is necessary to rouse the moral and intellectual

---

(1) In 1853 Parliament called for a return of the number of prisoners then in custody in English gaols who had received their education at different schools. The undermentioned summary shows:

**Number of Prisoners in custody on the 18th April, 1853 in gaols in England**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>10,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>2,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex not Specified</td>
<td>6,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20,152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number who have received their education at:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prison Schools</td>
<td>5,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workhouse Schools</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday Schools</td>
<td>6,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill or Factory Schools</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Public or Private Schools</td>
<td>12,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No education</td>
<td>1,919</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, 1839. (See Abingdon County House of Correction and Reading Gaol for examples of similar requests. I.P.R. Home District, 1842).
faculties into activity. This is done partly by education, and partly by employment. The criminal probably is grossly ignorant, and therefore instruction quite apart from physiological reasons, will be required to assist his cure, to remove one cause of his criminality. But education to the boorish thief must be dealt out in minute doses; or else it will weary and disgust the mind, and aggravate the morbid tendencies it was meant to check."  (1)

The need on the part of the teacher to show an interest in his pupils as a means of achieving the best results was vital. Also the initial and subsequent relationship that he developed with his pupil was equally important. This was particularly so in the case of prisoners who had been deprived of this. Many of the Schoolmasters found difficulty in doing so partly because of their other commitments, but also because many of them had disciplinary relationships with their charges. However, one Schoolmaster who seemed to have been able to do so was a Mr. Barrie at Coldbath Fields. He wrote,

"Sometimes I have a lot of raw recruits in my class. They seem at first a little fidgety, but a few stern or kind remarks have a beneficial effect on them. I never jar their feelings by making any personal remark, but allude to their misbehaviour in a general way, which I find to be preferable. I want them to feel at home with me, and wish them to forget, if they will let me, that they are criminals, and to fancy themselves to be my guests at home in my parlour; that they have come to learn as much from me as they possibly can, and that the boy who makes the greatest progress is the one I shall take the greatest interest in." (2)

Of the need to maintain the interest especially of those more advanced prisoners, Mr. Barrie explained,

"I can always tell when they are interested, and if I see their attention flag on one subject I immediately change to another. The grand secret is to interest them in what they are doing. I try to instil into their minds that if they do not learn something every day it is a day wasted;
and I am in the habit of reviewing the lessons of the preceding day, to impress them more fully into their memory, and to build them up in solid improvement." (1)

The means by which the state of the education of the prisoners was determined on reception was by interview. This was usually the responsibility of the Chaplain, although in some gaols the Schoolmaster performed the task. (2) The main purpose was to assess the prisoner's proficiency in religious knowledge and secular education. From the information gained, the Chaplain allocated the prisoner to a class best suited to the prisoner's needs. Assessment procedures were haphazard. If and when they did occur, it usually consisted of a short interview with the Chaplain, and was based on a question and answer interview. It was not uncommon for prisoners to assure the Chaplain that they were bordering on the illiterate in the hope that they might be given more time at school in order to be relieved of some labour. There were others who were able to convince the Chaplain that their educational standard was satisfactory so as to prevent them from being sent to school. Those of superior education, of which there were few, preferred to spend the time in their cells reading their books. Because of the reliance that was placed on the word of the prisoner, the task of determining into which category to place him often proved difficult. The Inspector of Prisons for Yorkshire expressed concern at the dependence placed on prisoners statements for determining their state of education. He wrote,

"It appeared that the entries respecting the state of education of the prisoners at the time of their admission had hitherto been made from the prisoners own statements, instead of from actual trial. This circumstance renders the annual returns hitherto transmitted and published concerning the state of education among the prisoners, of little value. I recommend that in future no entry should be made, except after actual trial." (3)

The idea of using tests was not common. One Chaplain who used a form of test was the Rev. John Clay at Preston Gaol. He found the


(2) The Schoolmaster at Coldbath Fields, Mr. Barrie, undertook this responsibility in consultation with the Chaplain. See H. Mayhew & J. Binney, p.561. op. cit.

(3) I.P.R. Yorkshire District, 1846.
tests useful and was able to achieve some measure of standardisation when it came to assessing the state of education of the prisoners. (1)

Mr. G.L. Chesterton, Governor of Coldbath Fields gives an interesting and amusing account of how he tested a prisoner who had claimed to superior education. He wrote,

"Not only, however, were prisoners habitually prone to deny their guilt, but many of them were wont falsely to lay claim to superior connexions, and even to refined education. It was by no means an unfrequent requirement, that I should prepare details setting forth the education of our inmates, in order to illustrate the prevailing impression, that criminality resulted from neglect of teaching. Upon one such occasion I directed the chief warder to visit the yards at a meal hour, ask various specific questions, and collect the numbers under each given category. The first step in the inquiry was to require all to stand up who had been classically educated; and eight male prisoners claimed to have enjoyed that advantage. As it was unwise ever to take for granted the mere declarations of our subjects, we used to institute some sort of test of their fidelity, and in this instance, a very superficial examination disclosed the fact, that only one of the eight had any acquaintance whatever with a single classical author.

Amongst the number of professors was a tall, handsome young man, who under the assumed name of the 'Honourable Mr. Talbot', had swindled many tradesmen out of their property. He had been tried and convicted in the name of Talbot, to which he had thought proper to adhere, and as he had proved most troublesome to me, by his unsteady conduct, I had become rather too familiar with the name. When therefore, I was informed of Talbot's classical pretensions, I became vastly surprised, and summoned him to my office forthwith, when the following amusing scene occurred.

'Well, Mr. Talbot,' I said to him, 'so I find you are a classical scholar.'

'Yes sir,' was the immediate reply.

'Pray, what authors have you read?'

(1) See Appendix 'C' to this Section of the types of questions asked and answers obtained from the prisoners.
'Most of the Latin and Greek authors.'

'Will you name some of them?'

'Why sir, it is so long since, that I have quite forgotten their names.'

'Have you read Ovid, or, Virgil?'

'Virgil, sir.'

'Will you repeat the first line?'

'Why, really sir, it is so long ago, that I have quite forgotten it.'

Of course I began to more than surmise the imposition he was practising, but in order to test the fellow's impudence, I continued the farce of putting questions, to all of which, without the remotest embarrassment, he made the same reply, 'Why, really sir, it is so long ago that I have quite forgotten.'

At length I asked him what grammar he had used, and, as coolly as before, he gave me the same answer. I was too much amused to be angry, but I could not fail to perceive by that unblushing hardihood, with what an imperturbable countenance that young schemer would, in the perpetration of his frauds, confront his dupes, the tradesmen whom he was wont to plunder." (1)

To monitor the state of education and progress made by prisoners, the Inspectors of Prisons were required to examine prisoners. The examination consisted of an interview with the prisoners. If there were any complaints made by a prisoner, or the Inspector was unhappy with the progress of certain prisoners, these were brought to the Chaplain's attention. Concern was often expressed at the state of education of prisoners on reception. A number of gaol authorities were criticized for not complying with the statutory requirements. Typical examples being the non-appointment of Schoolmasters; the need to provide for secular education, and in particular writing. From time to time recommendations were made to extend educational subjects to include such subjects as geography, history, etc. Occasionally

Chaplains and Schoolmasters were criticised for not providing sufficient information in their respective journals, but, bearing in mind the trying conditions and the numerous constraints placed upon the education staff, the Inspectors of Prisons were very supportive.

In conclusion, education in the form of religious and moral instruction developed slowly. Along with labour and the separation of prisoners it was an attempt to improve the morals of the criminal population and to prepare prisoners to lead an industrious life on discharge. Religious instruction was underpinned by the introduction of secular education.

Over a short period, education was required to be given under two completely opposed systems of prison discipline, finally adjusting itself to the Separate System.

Secular education, as a reforming instrument, was to have as its main competition and rival, prison labour. Also it had inferior status compared with religious instruction. There was also a lack of human resources to carry it out.

On the other hand, religious and moral instruction was given the opportunity to play a significant role in the rehabilitation of the prisoners but it suffered from a mechanistic approach.

Finally, education in its broadest sense suffered like other aspects of prison discipline from one of the main problems associated with local gaols under the control of the Justices, namely lack of uniformity.

With the transfer of local gaols to the State in 1877, it was anticipated that many of the problems previously associated with the gaols would be corrected.
Within a year of the State assuming control of the local prisons, a new system of prison discipline, that of Progressive Stages, was introduced by the Prison Commissioners. Briefly, it consisted of four stages with every prisoner required to pass through each stage. Progression through each stage was based on prisoners earning a given number of marks. Any prisoner who was idle, misbehaved, or inattentive to instruction was punished. Punishment consisted of either forfeiture of previous earned marks, or demotion to his previous stage. The principle of separation was to continue. Eligibility for instruction would be available to prisoners from the 2nd stage onwards. (1)

Of particular significance at this point in time was the attitude expressed by the Chairman of the Prison Commissioners towards secular education, and the possible future emphasis that was to be placed on education as a whole. He wrote,

"Experience has shown that literary education has not the reformatory influence on prisoners which was once expected from it, and that moral and industrial instruction are the most potent of the educational influences, which can be employed with that object. It is obvious that it would be bad policy to diminish the deterrent influence of penal discipline in favour of those who are ignorant; and further, that especial care ought to be taken that the education whether literary or technical should be carried out without sacrificing the great moral and disciplinary advantages of the separation of prisoners on which the best modern prison systems are founded." (2)

He went on to explain that as most adult sentences were usually of a short duration, and that the benefits that could be derived from instruction was small, he wondered whether it was right and reasonable to incur considerable sums of money on education and staff. As the Government was expending more money on education than the local authorities had done, he felt that in the circumstances instruction should be devoted to those prisoners who would most profit from such assistance. Furthermore, he was of the opinion that it was only right that every facility and encouragement should

(1) For full details of Rule 24 see P.C.R. 1878, Appendix No.12.
be given to those prisoners of a higher educational attainment to improve upon their present knowledge. In many respects his views were an expression of the attitude that was to be adopted towards education until the end of the century.

In 1878 the Prison Commissioners called for uniformity throughout the prisons. Education was to be effected by this policy. In 1879 the Commissioners appointed a Departmental Committee on Education. (1) On the 13th March the Committee were instructed to enquire into various aspects of education with the aim of adopting a uniform practice.

In short, they were to consider who should profit from instruction and whether there were any grounds on which prisoners should be excluded. Secondly, the mode and time to be given to instruction, what books should be used, and qualifications required and conditions of service needed for the teachers; thirdly, should instruction be cellular or in classes; fourthly, whether instruction should be considered a privilege or available to all, and fifthly, what consideration should be given to testing, recording and in what manner. (2) Of those prisons visited, the Committee found, with a few exceptions, no uniform practice. In fact, the recommendations were to set the pattern of education in the gaols over the next twenty years.

Due to the importance of the recommendations, it is proposed to give some attention to the report. The Committee reported its findings under three headings. First of all as to the mode of teaching, they found that in 29 prisons, instruction was cellular. In 18 prisons prisoners were taught in classes, whereas in 12 prisons it was based on a mixture of cellular and classes. Three prisons provided no instruction. Secondly, the amount of time given to each mode of instruction was as follows: cellular varied from a lesson a week lasting between 3 to 5 minutes, to a lesson twice a week lasting half an hour. Class instruction varied from twice a week for one hour to one hour daily.

---


(2) For details of correspondence and actual questions, see P.C.R. 1879. Appendix No.17.
Finally, as to testing and keeping records they found that in 26 prisons either the Chaplain, Schoolmaster or both examined the prisoners, but in 9 prisons only a definite examination was used. In 31 prisons no record was kept.

Altogether the Committee made ten recommendations of which the following are relevant. First of all instruction was to be based on the Code of the Education Department. Secondly, all prisoners whose sentences do not fall below three months were, on reception, to be divided into three classes, viz. Class I "those who cannot read easy monosyllables" or to Standard I.

Class II "those who can read easy monosyllables, but have not reached the limit recommended in Section II" or can read Standard I but have not reached Standard III.

Class III "those who have reached that limit" or have reached Standard III. (1)

Of these prisoners, Class I were not to receive any instruction unless their sentence was over four months. All Class II prisoners would be instructed. Class III should not receive any personal instruction, but instead would be allowed to use certain recommended school books and the use of a slate and pencil, to enable them to improve themselves. (2)

Thirdly, the Committee recommended that the following classes of prisoners be excluded from instruction on the following grounds. Prisoners in Classes I and II whose age exceeded 40 years be excluded subject to special conditions. Prisoners found to have no capacity for learning or who are idle, are excluded from instruction, the latter, however, only temporarily; and prisoners previously convicted may, if found advisable, be excluded. In each case the Chaplain had to be consulted for his recommendation. (3)

Fourthly, instruction was to be limited to:

(A) Reading, as far as Standard III inclusive.
(B) Writing, as far as transcribing a portion of the book read, and reading what had been transcribed.

(1) Recommendation 2(A).
(2) Ibid. 2(0)
(3) Ibid. 3(A)(B)(C)
(c) Arithmetic, as far as casting simple money accounts, and mental calculations of small money sums. (1)

Fifthly, the method of instruction was to be as follows. Prisoners in Class I are to be taught reading collectively in a room or place provided for the purpose. Furthermore, when prisoners are taught in classes, there should not be more than six prisoners to one Schoolmaster, and if the number of prisoners exceeds 15 there should be a warder present. All other prisoners should be instructed in their cells. (2)

Sixthly, for each method of instruction there should be allocated a specific time. Instruction under cellular conditions for those prisoners in Class II should not be less than two lessons per week of % hour each, with an interval of two days at least. Collective instruction should consist of two lessons weekly of % an hour each, (exclusive of the time occupied in assembling and removing the prisoners) with a like interval. (3)

Seventhly, all prisoners in Classes I and II should be tested by actual examination by the Chaplain on reception, and prior to discharge, the results of each examination being recorded by the Chaplain in his Educational Register. (4)

Eighthly, that instruction be available to all prisoners with the exception of those stated earlier, and that instruction should not be considered a privilege. (5)

Finally, the Committee suggested that if their recommendations were acceptable they be introduced for a trial period of 6 months in the following prisons: Wakefield, Strangeways, Worcester, Warwick, Preston and Liverpool, and for the results to be carefully recorded and reported. (6)

(1) Recommendation 1(A)(B)(C)
(2) Ibid 4(B)
(3) Ibid 5(A)
(4) Ibid. 8 See Appendix 'D' to this Section for a copy of this register, and instructions for its use.
(5) Ibid. 7
(6) Ibid. 10
Although not part of the Committee's terms of reference, they were of the opinion that religious instruction provided on Sundays, and Weekdays, was sufficient for prisoners generally, provided that short expository readings from the Scriptures were given by the Chaplain at least on two days of the week.

With regard to prisoners in Classes I and II, they felt it was desirable that religious instruction should be given immediately after the weekday service by the Chaplain for not more than 20 minutes in the Chapel or Schoolroom once a week.

The new education scheme was introduced in March, 1880 and was later extended for a trial period of twelve months in 20 prisons. In May 1882, the Committee submitted their final report stating that the scheme had met with the approval of all concerned. Following the experimental period, it was found necessary to make some slight modifications which in the Committee's opinion would bring about an increase in economy with the smallest possible loss to education.

The proposed modifications were as follows. For prisoners to qualify for instruction they would now have to be serving a sentence of at least 4 instead of 3 months. Also that copy books should be allowed to prisoners during instruction, and that each copy book should have the same number of pages and that each page be numbered.

The Committee concluded by expressing confidence in the scheme believing that it was well adapted for the purpose, and would ultimately result in the efficient instruction of the prisoners, provided that what had been laid down was fairly and properly carried out. The Committee then pointed out that if the following circumstances prevailed, the scheme would be successful. They wrote,

"...... it is essential that the teachers should be afforded all due facilities for the regular instruction of the prisoners, with which other prison arrangements should not interfere. The teachers should find the prisoners in their cells when wanted for lessons, and should

(1) Recommendation 2(A). (See attached to the original report copies of letters received from various Chaplains expressing views on the new scheme. All replies supported and expressed general satisfaction with the scheme.)
not be under the necessity of making repeated calls for the purpose.

In a few of the prisons visited by us, notably Winchester and Worcester, the arrangements made by the Governors, in concert with the Chaplain, were all that could be desired, but in several on the other hand, we found the success of the scheme seriously hindered through the absence of the requisite facilities."

The Committee's final report was duly approved by the Prison Commissioners and the Secretary of State, and was introduced in all the remaining prisons in 1883. (1)

The relationship between education and the system of progressive stages was briefly as follows. In the first place education featured at each stage. During the first stage which lasted about one month, religious ministration was provided to alleviate the virtually unbroken isolation. On progression to the second and subsequent stages (3 and 4), the prisoner was allowed school instruction. Secular, or as it is sometimes referred to, literary education was provided to three classes of prisoners provided their sentence was 4 months or over. Attention was focused most of all on Classes I and II, being those most in need of instruction. The former being the most ignorant were to benefit from the personal and constant attention of the Schoolmaster whilst being instructed in small groups. A Chaplain explained the difficulties of class teaching and the remedial measures he took. He wrote, "Classes are, of course, held for the instruction of those who are totally ignorant of reading. In a prison of the size of our own, this is, I fear, unavoidable, though from a disciplinary point of view, certainly to be deprecated. It is scarcely possible to entirely prevent all communication, and this communication means the spread of corrupting influences. I do my best to make these classes as small as possible." (2) Class II being of a higher standard, were to be visited in their cells by the Schoolmaster by which the evils of association and the distraction of attention are avoided. A Schoolmaster remarked about the

(1) In 1886 the Commissioners reported that as a consequence of placing education on a more uniform basis, it was necessary to introduce paid teachers. This meant that the cost was now £3,293 or about £2,250 more than was expended by the local authorities.

advantage of cellular instruction as follows,
"... cellular teaching is much more effective than class teaching, as the men are less nervous and have no fear of being laughed at, and are more inclined to give their attention to learning." (1)
Class III's progress was in the main dependent on self-instruction and motivation.

Perusal of Prison Commissioners' Reports from the mid-1880s onwards indicated that the new education scheme was operating satisfactorily, and that prison staff were equally satisfied with the scheme. Prison discipline had also benefitted. An Official reported,
"The new system of education has been in full operation in the various prisons of the district for periods ranging from 18 months to 5 years; with one exception the reports of its successful results have been met satisfactorily, not only as regards the progress of those who have been under instruction, but as forming a part of prison management, fitting in with the other parts without friction....." (2)

Another observer stated,
"Chaplain and Schoolmaster have taken the greatest interest, and have striven to give the prisoners the full benefits to be derived from the system. It has, on the testimony of Governor, Chaplain and other prison officers, not only been in any way a hindrance to carrying on the discipline of the prison, but it has proved a decided incentive to good behaviour." (3)

Although there were some differences of opinion as to the best method of imparting instruction, the Prison Commissioners reported that the general feeling was in favour of individual instruction in the cells. An official reported,
"One Chaplain is in favour of associated instruction, on the grounds that the Schoolmaster can attend as well to six pupils as to one. Another would like to see associated class-rooms, which would enable a single teacher to give several pupils longer instruction. The weight of

(1) P.C.R. 1886.
(2) Ibid. Paragraph 31.
(3) Ibid.
opinion, however, is decidedly in favour of cellular instruction, the superiority of which, more especially from a disciplinary point of view, can hardly be gainsaid." (1)

Finally, of particular interest are the views held by a Chaplain as to the advantages of cellular instruction. He wrote, "The superiority of cellular instruction over that given in class is so obvious that a comparison of the two systems seems almost unnecessary.

The teacher can impart knowledge much more quickly when his attention is concentrated upon one person; the delay often caused by the nervousness or slowness of some of the prisoners is avoided; the teacher knows at once whether the prisoner is making progress, and at what rate; and the person under tuition is free from the distractions caused by the presence of others.

When you have the prisoner alone, you can bring home to him moral lessons from time to time which could not be applied to the individual personally in the hearing of others.

Another difficulty, and, I suppose, an important one, is got rid of by the cellular system, namely, the danger of breaches of discipline sure to be incurred when prisoners are in association." (2)

By the mid-1880s the attitude of the Prison Commissioners towards secular education was not dissimilar to those held by the Justices. Priority was to continue to be placed on moral and religious education combined with industrial labour as the best means of achieving the reformation of prisoners. The system of progressive stages was so designed to achieve this. Their reasoning was based on the following beliefs. First of all, as they pointed out in their reports for 1884 and 1885, they still concurred with the principles of the Prison Act of 1865 which had laid special emphasis on industrial labour as a means of deterring and reforming prisoners, and that on no account was secular education to interfere with prison labour, or that a prison should become a place of secular or literary education. Secondly, they felt that the Education Act of 1870 had made some contribution to the

(1) P.C.R. 1886, paragraph 31.
(2) P.C.R. 1885, paragraph 45.
prevention and the formation of criminal habits, and in the circumstances only proposed to instruct those who for varying reasons had not taken advantage of the scheme, or those who were too old to have benefitted from that Act. They wrote,

"While we shall not fail to do everything that we can to promote such education, we are of opinion that the moral education and training of prisoners by enforcing industry, subordination, self control, regularity, cleanliness, etc., with religious teaching and admonition will be found the most potent reformatory influence which can be applied in a prison."

The Commissioners expressed their attitude to secular education when they reported,

"It is quite clear, therefore, that except in the small number of cases in which the sentences are very long, and except in the few cases of very young people, nothing beyond a moderate amount of literary education can be imparted under any circumstances, and, practically, its effect in checking crime must be comparatively small. Assuming that the prevention and repression of crime are the first objects of imprisonment, it would not be wise, then, as a rule, to conduct the education in such manner as to sacrifice the fundamental and well established principles of prison management by which these results are attained, under any idea that the good which might result from any probable increased amount of learning would more than counterbalance the certain harm which must result, as repeated experience has shown, from setting these principles aside."

The impact of the Elementary Act on the state of education of prisoners occasioned the Chaplain of Wandsworth Prison who had been in the service for 33 years to remark that there had been a "great advance in the state of education of prisoners on reception.

(1) P.C.R. 1884, paragraph 27. (According to the Commissioners the progressive stage system in combination with moral education had combined in reducing punishments for prison offences, viz. "diminution of punishments from 60,000 to 37,000 and of dietary punishment from 40,000 to 17,000." ) P.C.R. 1885, paragraph 49.

(2) P.C.R. 1885, paragraph 39.

(3) P.C.R. 1887/88, paragraph 71.
In the same year another Chaplain felt that the long term effects of the Education Act would decrease the need for an improvement in the facilities for secular education. He wrote,

"Ere long, it may be safely inferred, all prisoners will be found on reception well grounded in the rudiments; already a marked diminution is noticeable in the number of wholly ignorant, due, no doubt, to the working of the Education Acts. Within a few years, probably some four or five, the question will be whether or to what extent prisoners should receive the higher education; all necessity for imparting the lower will have disappeared." (1)

In fact, ten years later the Prison Commissioners explained the purpose of secular education thus,

"Our object is as we before stated, to provide such simple and elementary education as will suffice to enable an illiterate or imperfectly educated prisoner to obtain, during his imprisonment, such instruction as will enable him at least to read and write easily and conduct simple calculations in money, likely to be of service to him on discharge for the purpose of the occupation of his everyday life." (2)

As the Education Act was having some measure of success on the state of education of those on reception, by the end of the 1880s, some concern was expressed about the effects of instruction at the higher end of the scale. If instruction was to have a lasting effect on prisoners on discharge and to reduce the reconviction rate, emphasis should be given to providing opportunities for prisoners to progress to Stage 3. In particular it was felt that by so doing, prisoners would not forget what they had learnt. Furthermore, greater freedom in the selection of prisoners should be available. In 1889 the Commissioners stated,

"Advice, instruction, and the recollection of punishment in very many cases gradually fade away from their minds, and whatever may have been their intentions on leaving prison they become again before very long unable to resist temptation." (3)

(1) P.C.R. 1887/88, paragraph 63.
(2) P.C.R. 1897/98, paragraph 71.
(3) P.C.R. 1889/90, paragraph 25.
Earlier in 1886, an official explained the measures necessary to overcome this problem by stating,
"The men quickly forget what they learn unless they can be taken up to 3rd Standard, and that, therefore, it is a waste of time to teach any that cannot be brought up to that point." (1)
Although agreeing with the previous contributor, a Chaplain argued a case for the more intelligent prisoners to benefit from higher standard. He wrote,
"I find, however, a very general opinion exists that the benefits of instruction should be confined to those prisoners who are found to possess such an amount of intelligence as will insure their reaching Standard III, before they leave prison; there then being no fear that they will forget what they have learned." (2)

Between 1890 and 1895 education continued on an even keel. The Prison Commissioners and prison staff seemed generally satisfied with the progress to date. A measure of uniformity had been achieved.

As over ten years had elapsed since the new education scheme had been introduced, the Secretary of State appointed, on the 11th February, 1896, a Departmental Committee (3) to inquire and report on the education and moral instruction of prisoners generally, and in particular on the following points.

1) Whether elementary education is being usefully and effectively applied in all prisons. Whether any alteration or extension of the present system is desirable or practicable; and, if so, under what conditions, and subject to what limits and regulations.
2) Whether the education given should be conducted in prisoner's cells or in classes.
3) What are the means now existing for the moral instruction of prisoners, and under what conditions, and to what extent, lectures could be introduced with advantage to the prisoners and without impairment to prison discipline."

(1) P.C.R. 1886, paragraph 31.
(2) P.C.R. 1887/88, paragraph 64.
(3) Was officially known as the Departmental Committee on the Education and Moral Instruction of Prisoners. The members of the Committee were Mr. Robert Sidney Mitford, Chairman, also a Prison Commissioner; The Honourable Mrs. Edward Stuart Talbot; Major-General Charles Alexander Sin, Member of the London School Board; and The Rev. George Purnell Merrick, M.A., Chaplain of Holloway and Newgate.
The first point to make is one which the Committee found necessary to state, as illustrating clearly the education scene in English Gaols prior to 1877. They wrote, "It is difficult to determine the extent to which instruction was afforded to prisoners in the county and borough prisons prior to the date on which the Prison Act, 1877 (39 & 40 Vic., c.21) came into force, viz 1st April, 1878. It is certain, however, that the practice in this respect differed as widely in the various prisons as it did in discipline, dietary, employment, etc." (1)

Altogether the Committee made 17 recommendations concerning secular instruction and 7 about moral instructions. The new scheme was to operate within the system of progressive stages. Fundamentally there were no major changes from the previous scheme. The changes that did occur were more a matter of re-inforcing the previous scheme, which over the years circumstances or situations had called for a change.

The enquiry was an extensive one in comparison with the 1879 enquiry. The Committee considered many aspects of education similar to their predecessors. In the circumstances it is only proposed to consider any important recommendations that made any significant changes.

The Prison Commissioners, in their annual report for 1896/97 summarised the object of the new scheme thus,

(a) to increase the number of prisoners eligible for instruction, by making those eligible whose sentences do not fall below three months, four months being the present limit, and to increase the time per week during which they will receive instruction;

(b) to bring the educational requirements into conformity with that prevailing in the public elementary schools by the adoption of the first three standards of the day school code, the object being to provide such simple and elementary education as will suffice to enable an illiterate or imperfectly educated prisoner to obtain during his imprisonment, such instruction as will enable him at least to read and write easily, and to conduct simple calculations in money, likely to be of service to him on discharge.

(1) P.E.C., paragraph 2.
for the purpose of the ordinary operations of his everyday
life." (1)

This last point was the first clear indication by the prison authorities
of the purpose of instruction and its relevance to the external world.

The following were the main recommendations made by the
Committee with additional remarks where appropriate. First of all
instruction was to remain on a cellular basis, (2) and the dinner hour
be used for such purpose. (3) This decision was based on the fact
that as prisoners were out at labour throughout most of the day, it
would prove uneconomical and inconvenient to recall them for instruction.
Further, the dinner period facilitated the work of the Schoolmasters.
Lastly it amended the recommendation of the Select Committee of the
House of Lords on Prison Discipline in 1865 that schooling should be
given after labour.

Secondly, the Committee was of the opinion that the present
limit of 15 minutes twice a week was not sufficient, and recommended
that those prisoners eligible for instruction should now have one
hour's instruction per week divided into three lessons of twenty minutes
each. (4)

Thirdly, those prisoners serving in the 1st Stage of their
sentence, and eligible for instruction should be permitted and encouraged
to work at school books between the hours of 6 and 8 p.m. in their cells,
provided they had completed their work tasks. (5) The Committee took
this decision because whereas the existing practice was for prisoners
to be instructed in classes, it was found that in very few prisons were
there sufficient physical facilities for teaching in classes.

Fourthly, because there had been various changes in the
National Code over the years of which the prison education service had
not kept pace with, the Committee recommended that in the interest
of the prisoners and the need to conform to public elementary schools.

(1) P.C.R. 1896/97, paragraph 60.
(2) Recommendation No.6
(3) Ibid. No.2
(4) Ibid. No.3
(5) Ibid. No.4
prison education should adopt Schedule I of the Day-School Code (1896) of the Education Department. Therefore, it was recommended that teaching should be imparted to Standard IV, and also that Arithmetic Scheme (B) (1) be approved instead of Scheme (A). (2) Furthermore prisoners who had achieved higher standard should be supplied with a higher class of school book for self-instruction. (3)

Fifthly, the age limit for eligibility for instruction was to remain at 40 subject to the present discretionary exceptions. (4)

Sixthly, it was recommended that the length of sentence should be reduced from 4 months to 3 months to qualify for instruction. Briefly, the Committee decided on this action as a direct result of the impact of the Education Act of 1870, because they felt that more prisoners would benefit directly on release. (5)

Seventhly, the Committee recommended that examinations be held by the Chaplain personally on reception and discharge of prisoners eligible for instruction, and whenever the Schoolmaster reports that a scholar is fit for promotion to a higher standard. (6) This recommendation was re-introduced because the Committee found that there was a general lack of uniformity throughout the gaols.

Apart from reinforcing previous recommendations, it amended some anomalies inherent in the previous scheme. On balance the recommendations were more orientated towards preparing the prisoners for discharge. Furthermore there was an element of flexibility in that those prisoners who were of a higher standard of education were given facilities to improve themselves. (7) Finally, of particular importance was the provision of instruction for a greater number of prisoners.

(1) Prisoners to be taught to Standard III.
(2) Recommendation No.7. (See Appendix 'E' to this section for a copy of the Code.)
(3) Ibid.
(4) Ibid. No.14 (Parasual of P.C.R.c from 1883 onwards revealed that some Chaplains were in favour of a reduction in the age to 30 because of the difficulties some prisoners had in learning.)
(5) Ibid. No.11. (Although this issue was not raised often, some Chaplains did refer to the undesirability of this practice.)
(6) Recommendation No.12.
(7) See P.C.R. 1897/98, Appendix No.25 for row set of Rules for Education. See Appendix 'F' to this section showing the new Education Register and a chart of prisoners progress through various stages.
In 1897 the Prison Commissioners reported that the new education scheme was fully operational, and as far as they could judge was likely to prove successful. They further stated that it was hoped that the new education scheme would remedy the defects in the general system of public education by bringing under instruction those who, through neglect or other causes had failed to acquire the rudiments of knowledge. Furthermore, it was hoped that even though instruction was confined to elementary subjects, the measures that had been taken would prove successful.

It is now proposed to deal, if only briefly, with the general state of instruction of prisoners on conviction following the passing of the Education Act of 1870. The under-mentioned table shows the position between 1860 and 1900.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1860</th>
<th>1870</th>
<th>1880</th>
<th>1890</th>
<th>1899</th>
<th>1900</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neither Read nor Write</td>
<td>21,695</td>
<td>35,476</td>
<td>39,274</td>
<td>23,904</td>
<td>16,762</td>
<td>16,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(32.05%)</td>
<td>(51.85%)</td>
<td>(31.40%)</td>
<td>(21.21%)</td>
<td>(15.95%)</td>
<td>(16.66%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read or Read and Write Imperfectly</td>
<td>41,888</td>
<td>71,508</td>
<td>80,605</td>
<td>65,783</td>
<td>81,713</td>
<td>74,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(61.91%)</td>
<td>(64.08%)</td>
<td>(64.25%)</td>
<td>(76.11%)</td>
<td>(77.73%)</td>
<td>(76.69%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read and Write Well</td>
<td>3,362</td>
<td>4,050</td>
<td>4,797</td>
<td>2,855</td>
<td>5,487</td>
<td>5,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5.0%)</td>
<td>(5.0%)</td>
<td>(5.0%)</td>
<td>(2.53%)</td>
<td>(5.22%)</td>
<td>(5.55%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior Education</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.40%)</td>
<td>(0.20%)</td>
<td>(0.21%)</td>
<td>(0.09%)</td>
<td>(0.06%)</td>
<td>(0.06%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction not Ascertained</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1,075</td>
<td>1,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.64%)</td>
<td>(0.20%)</td>
<td>(0.31%)</td>
<td>(0.06%)</td>
<td>(1.02%)</td>
<td>(1.02%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Number of prisoners</td>
<td>67,674</td>
<td>111,276</td>
<td>125,432</td>
<td>112,707</td>
<td>105,119</td>
<td>97,456</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table refers to Male Adults on Summary conviction in England only.

Because of the mass of statistical data available on the state of education of prisoners on conviction, I have decided to show the degree of instruction over periods of 10 years and to see if the 1870 Education Act had any effect on those committed to prisons. Taking the first

(1) Judicial Statistics for corresponding years.
three categories, it is possible to conclude in general terms that the Act did have some impact. For instance of those who could neither read nor write there had been an improvement of 15.93% between 1870 and 1899. In fact the greatest increase. Of those who could read or read and write imperfectly, of whom formed the majority of the prisoners, there had been an increase of 13.65% between the same period. Of those who could read and write well the increase was 1.58%. However, statistical data in general regarding the state of instruction should be treated with some caution. As intimated earlier the criteria and the assessment procedures for determining the degree of instruction was haphazard. In fact as late as 1896 the Prisoners Education Committee reported a lack of uniformity in this matter. Furthermore, perusal of various Prison Commissioners Reports indicated that not all the Chaplains were entirely convinced that the Education Act had made that much of an impact. For instance, the Chaplain for Hull Prison comments, "My examination of every prisoner on admission irrespective of sentence reveals some startling facts. In spite of compulsory education there seems to be much neglect and evasion, while many who have satisfied the requirements of the code retain but little of what they were taught. This applies chiefly to arithmetic, but it is in some degree the case with regard to writing and orthography. Reading is retained."

In contrast it was observed that as a result of the Act that education had in fact contributed to an improvement in furthering an understanding of religious instruction. The Chaplain wrote, "A great ignorance on religious subjects, however, often exists in cases where men have received a fairly good elementary education. The proportion of prisoners found to be acquainted with the 'Ten Commandments' is lamentably small, the religious knowledge of the great majority being limited by the bare ability to say the Lord's Prayer, whilst in some even this limit is not reached. The improved education of prisoners, however, compared with what it was some years back, makes the giving of religious instruction much easier than formerly, so that we are now

(1) P.C.R. 1898-99.
better able to interest our hearers, and to secure their attention
owing to their being now able to take in what they hear, even though
they be not addressed in words of one or two syllables only." (1)
And so opinions varied.

By the end of the century the Prison Commissioners expressed
general satisfaction with the state of instruction of prisoners on
conviction. They also pointed out that as a result of the increased
facilities which were now given to the prisoners that the following
record of progress exemplified the achievements that had been made.
They wrote,
"Of 8,698 prisoners eligible for instruction in local prisons, 1,545
were illiterate on reception, 2,219 were in Standard I, 2,762 in
Standard II and 2,172 in Standard III. Of the "illiterates" under
instruction during the year, 563 passed to Standard I, 321 to Standard
II, 103 to Standard III and 71 passed out of Standard III. Of those
in Standard I on reception, 602 passed to Standard II, 401 to Standard
III and 402 passed out of Standard III. Of those in Standard II on
reception, 1,052 passed to Standard III and 916 passed out of Standard
III. Of those in Standard III on reception, 1,382 passed out of
Standard III." (2)

However, in spite of these encouraging developments, the
Commissioners were mindful of the fact that amongst some of the prisoners
there were those whose amount of previous learning was so small that it
would be necessary to have to begin teaching them all over again.
Additionally, there was another drawback, namely the factor of limited
intelligence especially amongst the agricultural classes, and in order
to overcome this problem a great deal of patience would be needed in
instilling even a rudimentary knowledge of elementary subjects. In fact
in his annual report the Chief Chaplain drew attention not only to the
problem of the "unimpressionable" intellects of some of the prisoners

(1) P.C.R. 1888.
(2) P.C.R. 1899/1900, paragraph II.
which virtually rendered them incapable of learning, but also suggested that there were other causes which limited the acquisition of knowledge. He suggested the cause may well lie in the fact that many of the adult prisoners were not disciplined when children, and were often found to be slow in receptiveness, weak in memory and wanting in desire. Furthermore "there are some, too, who do not care about instruction, or make use of that which they were taught in earlier days."  

With the passing of the 1898 Prison Act every prisoner eligible for instruction would be kept from labour, and would receive instruction for not less than four hours in each week.  

Finally, it was anticipated that with the increased library facilities, a group of capable and painstaking Schoolmasters, that slowly and by degrees the prison education department would be able to make a contribution in the improvement of those prisoners most in need of education, as well as encourage those of a higher standard in the pursuit of further knowledge.

In conclusion, as a consequence of two Departmental Committee reports on education, instruction was placed on a more uniform basis than had been the case in prisons prior to the State assuming control in 1877. Furthermore, additional expenditure had been incurred in the provision of additional Schoolmasters, and library facilities. In furthering the education of prisoners, lectures were now provided.

Although the Education Act had made some contribution to the improvement in the degree of instruction of those on reception, there were still over 16,000 prisoners who were unable to read or write on admission. Nevertheless the Prison Commissioners seemed generally satisfied with the impact of the Act, but were not complacent about the fact that there were still problems needing attention particularly amongst the less intelligent prisoners.

(1) P.C.R. 1897/98.
(2) 51 & 62 Vic., c.41. Rule 69(2).
Finally, instruction was to be confined to elementary subjects in line with the general system of public education. It was hoped that the new education scheme which was proving successful would fulfill two objectives. First that it would provide instruction for those prisoners who had for various reasons failed to acquire the rudiments of knowledge provided by the public sector of education and secondly, to place the prisoners on discharge in a more favourable educational position.
APPENDIX 'A'

Report of the Committee of the Society for the Improvement of Prison Discipline and for the Reformation of Juvenile Offenders. 1818

"The Committee cannot too urgently pray the attention of the community to those objects which they esteem indispensable to protect the rising generation from guilt and wickedness. They are convinced that Education and Religious Instruction will do more to stay the irruption of vice and depravity than all the regulations which they wisdom or ingenuity of legislators can invent. They urge, therefore, the support and extension of Schools, wherever they now exist, and their speedy establishment where there is an entire want of them. More still is requisite: the attention and exertion of individuals to enforce a correct system of management, and to promote and encourage all advance in those branches of knowledge which the lower classes require. Above all, religious instruction is loudly demanded; he who knows not his duty to God, will seldom, or ever, perform it well towards man."

The Committee recommended the following requisites a Prison ought to possess.

1) Security.
2) Salubrity.
3) Classification according to age, sex and crime.
4) Employment.
5) Means of instruction.
6) Opportunity and space for exercise.
7) Proper sustenance.
8) Clothing.
9) Cleanliness.
10) Attendance and convenience for the sick.

The first and principal cause of youthful aberration from the path of virtue, is the neglect of moral and religious education. Liability to error is part of man's nature; perseverance in honesty
and integrity, therefore, can never be expected, where there is a systematic neglect of all endeavours to impress a knowledge of the Divine Being, of the absolute obligation to reverence His decrees, and obey His Holy Word: whoever thinks that moral instruction, by enabling us to distinguish right from wrong, and thereby better to obey our Maker, is necessary to keep us from error and transgression, must be convinced that total ignorance is the fruitful parent of crime. Hence all reasoning, as well as experience, justifies us in saying that first and principally to the neglect of moral and religious education, is to be ascribed youthful depravity."
"Our Father which art in Heaven." In what sense is God our Father?

1. God is our Father, for from him we receive our being.
   Rom. xi. 36. Psalm civ. 30.

2. God is our Father, for he supplies our bodily wants.
   Matthew vi. 31, 32. Isaiah lviii. 11. Psalm civ. 28.

3. God is our Father, for he helps us in the time of trouble.
   Psalm cvii. 6. Jonah ii. 2. Psalm xxx. 2.

4. God is our Father, for he bids us trust in him.
   1 Peter v. 7. Hebrews xiii. 5. 2 Cor. xii. 9.

5. God is our Father: He shews his pity and spares us.

6. God promises to be a Father to all that trust in him.
   Psalm v. 11. Psalm xxxvii. 3.

7. God gave us power to become his sons if we believe on his Son.
   John i. 12. Rom. viii. 17. 1 John iii. 1.

Give reasons why we should not frequent the public-house?

1. Because we can get no good there.
   Luke xi. 4.

2. Because we should not go into bad company.
   Psalm i. 1. 1 Thess. v. 22. Proverbs i. 10.

3. Because we should not set a bad example.

4. Because we can employ our time better.
   Ephes. v. 15, 16. Titus ii. 11, 12. 2 John xi. 11.
   Psalm xc. 12.

5. Because we shall have to render a strict account of our lives at
   the day of judgment.

6. Because we should not encourage drunkenness, folly, and vice.
   1 Cor. vii. 31. Psalm ix. 17. Proverbs iv. 14, 15.

W.H., 35, Reg. No. 637. - Convicted of felony about five months since,
and had been three times previously convicted. His mental
improvement has been surprising, and his general conduct such as to
encourage the hope of reformation.
Give reasons why we should always speak the truth?

1. Because it is the express command of God.

Lav. xix. 11. Eph. iv. 25.

2. Because lying and hypocrisy is certain to draw down upon us the anger and judgments of God.

Job viii.13 - xi. 7. Rom. i. 18.
- xv. 34,35. - xii. 3. 2 Thess. ii.9,12.
Ps.v. 6. - xxxi. 20. Rev. xxi. 8.

3. Because however we may succeed in deceiving our fellow men by lying, we cannot deceive God.

Numb. xxxii. 23. - cxxxix. 5. 1 Cor. iv. 5.
2 Kings v. 22,26.

4. Because those who are careful to speak the truth are promised the enjoyment of God's favour.

Ps.vii.11. Ps.xxv. 3,4. Ps. xxxiv. 12,13.
- xv. 1, 3. - xxv. 2. - xl. 5.

5. As lying is one of the principal weapons wherewith the devil seeks to destroy men's souls, we must be watchful and pray for God's grace to enable us to resist temptation.

Ps. xvii. 5. Matt. xxvi. 41. Eph. vi. 18.
- cxxi. 3. - xxii. 40.

I annex a copy of the questions ordinarily put by the Chaplain in his examination of ignorant prisoners, with the answers given by a prisoner.

**Questions put in the Examination of Ignorant Prisoners.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Age?</td>
<td>32. Ever hear of Jack Sheppard? Dick Turpin? What were they?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Trade?</td>
<td>33. Ever hear of the battle of Waterloo? Who fought there?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Parents living?</td>
<td>34. Queen's name?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Legitimate?</td>
<td>35. Her husband's name?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. If at school - how long?</td>
<td>36. Last king's name?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Able to read, or know the alphabet?</td>
<td>37. What are the Chartists?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Able to repeat the Lord's prayer?</td>
<td>38. What are the Tories?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Saviour's name?</td>
<td>39. What are the Whigs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. What is meant by the Scriptures?</td>
<td>40. Half-pence in one shilling?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. What are the Bible and Testament about?</td>
<td>41. Farthings in one shilling?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Where do we go after death?</td>
<td>42. Shillings in a guinea?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Have you been good?</td>
<td>43. How far can you count?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Where do you expect to go?</td>
<td>44. How many are two and two, three and three, four and four, etc.?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. How often do you go to a place of worship?</td>
<td>45. How many are twice two, three times three, etc.?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. How often do you go to the public-house?</td>
<td>46. Where does woolen come from?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. How often do you go to the play, etc.?</td>
<td>47. Where does linen come from?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. What is the meaning of virtue, vice, iniquity, righteousness,</td>
<td>48. Where does cotton come from?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>holiness, repentance?</td>
<td>49. Where does iron come from?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Did you ever hear of France? Where is it?</td>
<td>50. Where does coal come from?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Ireland? Do people go to it by land or water?</td>
<td>52. Name of this year?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Dublin? What country is it in?</td>
<td>53. How many months in a year?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Wales? What country is it in?</td>
<td>54. Name them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Indies?</td>
<td>55. Days in a year?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Did you ever hear of the Duke of Wellington? Is he living? What is</td>
<td>56. What day of the month is New Year's Day?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Ever hear of Lord Nelson? Living? What was he?</td>
<td>57. What day of the month is Christmas Day?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12th June, 1843 - Examination of T.H. - Married, with 6 children - Committed for 1 Month for selling Ale without Licence.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Labourer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Two or three years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>About another world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Some go to the good spot; and some to the bad one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I can't tell how things will be, but if I don't mend I shan't go to the better spot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Too often.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Aye, I've heard of good 'vice (advice), ignorant of all the rest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Heard tell of it; don't know where it is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Same.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Don't know.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Only heard his name; don't know if alive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Heard of him; was a great soldier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Heard books read about 'em: they were thieves - clever chaps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Heard the name, but don't know who fought there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Men as stands up for their rights, and for sending who they like for parliament-men.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>They are gentlemen; they are against the poor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Same way as Tories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Twenty-four.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Forty-eight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Twenty-one shilling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Imperfectly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Imperfectly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Imperfectly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Don't know.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Don't know.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Don't know.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>I've heard 'em say they get it out of the ground, but I never believ'd 'em.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>From the pits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Ignorant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Ignorant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>Ignorant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) I.P.R. Northern & Eastern District, 1843.
Instructions to be observed in using this Register

I. The attainments of prisoners on their reception and discharge from prison as ascertained by actual examination by the Chaplain, will be recorded in this Register, the entries in which are to be confined to prisoners entitled to instruction.

II. The "Class" distinguishes prisoners according to the teaching they are to have, collective or cellular, and is determined solely, by the result of the examination in Reading.

III. In recording the proficiency in each subject, the following signs will be used, viz:--

**Reading**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>wholly ignorant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>ability to read Primer, or easy monosyllables.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Book, Standard I of the Education Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>II &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>III&quot; &quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Writing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>wholly ignorant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>ability to form letters (Capital and Small) from dictation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>write from Copy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>transcribe from a book.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Arithmetic**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>wholly ignorant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>ability to do a short sum in Addition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>simple rules and short Division, inclusive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>work easy money sums.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. To pass in any Standard in Reading, the prisoner must be able to read the book with some ease and fluency.
## APPENDIX 'D'
### SCHOOL REGISTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reg. No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Standard attained on</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>in</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reception</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reception</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reception</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reception</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reception</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reception</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discharge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Departmental Committee on Education, 1879*
The Day School Code (1866).

### SCHEDULE I: STANDARDS OF EXAMINATION IN THE ELEMENTARY SUBJECTS. Article 101 (c). (The Schemes A. and B. are alternative.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading</strong></td>
<td>To read a short passage from a book, accompanied to words of one syllable.</td>
<td>To read a short passage from an Elementary reading book.</td>
<td>To read a passage from a reading book, or history of England.</td>
<td>To read a passage from some standard author, a reading book, or a history of England.</td>
<td>To read a passage from one of Shakespeare's historical plays, or from some other standard author, or from a history of England.</td>
<td>To read a passage from Shakespeare or Milton, or from some other standard author, or from a history of England.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Writing</strong></td>
<td>Copy in manuscript characters a line of print, corresponding with a capital letter. Copy books (large or half text hand) to be shown.</td>
<td>A passage of not more than six lines, from the same book, slowly and clearly, and then dictated. Copy books (large and half text hand) to be shown.</td>
<td>Six lines from one of the elementary books of the Standard, slowly and clearly, and then dictated. Copy books (large and half text hand) to be shown.</td>
<td>Eight lines of poetry or prose, slowly and correctly, and then dictated, Copy books to be shown.</td>
<td>Writing from memory the substance of a short story not twice, spelling, handwriting, and correct expression to be considered. Copy-books to be shown.</td>
<td>A short theme or letter on an easy subject; spelling, handwriting, and composition to be considered. Copy-books to be shown.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arithmetic</strong> (Scheme A.)</td>
<td>Notation and numeration up to 1000. Simple additions and subtractions of numbers of not more than three figures. In addition not more than five lines to be given. The multiplication table to 12.</td>
<td>Notation and numeration up to 1000. The four simple rules to short division. The multiplication table and the periods to 12.</td>
<td>The former rules, with long division. Addition and subtraction of money.</td>
<td>Compound rules (money) and reduction of common weights and measures.</td>
<td>Practice, bills of parches, and simple rules of three by the method of cast.</td>
<td>Fractions, vulgar and decimal; simple proportion and calculation of simple interest upon a given principal. (Questions involving recurring decimals will not be put to除夕, common weights and measures. Measurement of quantities and commercial weights; the extraction of square roots and cube roots in not required. (Only on.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arithmetic</strong> (Scheme B.)</td>
<td>The four simple rules. Divisors and multipliers not exceeding 6. No number higher than 10 to be employed in the questions or required in the answers.</td>
<td>Compound rules (money). Divisors and multipliers not exceeding 6. Sums of money in the questions and answers not exceeding 600.</td>
<td>Simple rules and compound rules (money). Divisors and multipliers not exceeding 6. Sums of money in the questions and answers not exceeding 600.</td>
<td>Compound rules applied to the following weights and measures (inch, foot, yard, quart, peck, bushel, gallon, quarts, gallons, etc.) in length, area, and capacity; inches, feet, yards, miles, etc. in time, hours, minutes, seconds, the only terms that will be required in this and in the Fifth Standard. Divisors and multipliers not to exceed 6.</td>
<td>Values fractions (simple fractions only). Practice. Bills of Parcels. Common weights and measures.</td>
<td>Decimal fractions (excluding recurring decimals). Simple proportion, and simple rules of three by the method of cast. Calculation of simple interest upon a given principal. Common weights and measures. Measurement of quantities, and commercial weights; the extraction of square roots and cube roots is not required. (Only on.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- In Welsh districts—
  - All illiterate reading books and exercise books may be used, and the instruction generally may be held to meet the requirements of the various subjects as defined in the English and Welsh.
  - In the Arithmetic the standards set in Standards I. and IV., inclusive, the problems to be used here in English and Welsh.
  - Reading with intelligence will be required in all the standards, and increased speed and expression is required as the years advance. Two sets of reading books must be provided for Standards I. and II., and three in small schools only. One of which should be in English history, for which Standard III. above the second. The Inspector may examine any of the books in use in the Standard, and in Standard III. and upwards from any book or passage suitable for the purpose which he may select. The intelligence of the reading will be tested partly by questions on the meaning of what is read.
  - The writing and arithmetic of Standards I. and II. may be omitted on the discretion of the Managers, in Standard III. and upwards it must be shown.

**Source:** P.E.C. Appendix 2
APPENDIX 'F'

New Educational Register to be maintained by the Chaplain for yearly returns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Receptions on Conviction</th>
<th>Number Eligible for Instruction</th>
<th>Illiterates</th>
<th>Standard I</th>
<th>Standard II</th>
<th>Standard III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

(1) Recommendation No. 8 of the Prisoner's Education Committee

Progress through various stages were as follows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Progress of Illiterates</th>
<th>To Standard I</th>
<th>To Standard II</th>
<th>To Standard III</th>
<th>Passed Standard III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard I</td>
<td>Standard II</td>
<td>Standard III</td>
<td>Passed to Standard III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard II</td>
<td>Standard III</td>
<td>Passed to Standard III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard III</td>
<td>Passed to Standard III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) A prisoner who passes through more than one Standard during the year will be shown only in the last Standard he attains.

Conclusions

Prison education in the nineteenth century can be divided into religious and secular instruction. Early in the century, religious teaching was the only education that was available: there was some opposition to its introduction and this was reflected in the position of the chaplain. Initially, he was a peripheral figure with ambivalent status. By the end of the century, however, he was a firm establishment person, second only to the governor in status. Thus religion in prisons became respectable and accepted.

The status of secular education also underwent a change over time. It began with an emphasis on learning to read and was justified as a means of underpinning and reinforcing religious inculcation, rather than as a useful skill in its own right. As the century passed writing was also encouraged and arithmetic was introduced in 1865. The opportunity to learn basic skills, though limited, was seen eventually as a good in itself which would help prisoners to rehabilitate themselves on discharge. The early instructors were teacher-prisoners, that is prisoners who were themselves able to read. They aided the chaplains some of whom also undertook secular teaching. By the end of the century, secular instruction was carried out by qualified, non-religious prison staff. Secular education was officially endorsed.

It would be easy to exaggerate the effects of education in prisons. General overall evidence is difficult to find and the statistics which were produced relied on inefficient, haphazard, non-standardized methods of testing. There is some evidence that fewer illiterates were entering prison after the Forster Act but improvements by individual prisoners during their sentences seems to have been slight and superficial.

Many factors militated against education in prisons, particularly in the early years. Firstly, only limited provision was envisaged. Secondly, the time and resources allocated to
education for each individual prisoner were very meagre. There
was an improvement towards the end of the century. Thirdly,
education often took place in difficult circumstances, for example,
after a hard day's labour or in the dinner hour. Conditions
improved as time went on and education was finally allowed during
working hours. Fourthly, the precedence of labour over education
was continually stressed: work was felt to be a moral good in
itself which outweighed the dubious benefits of education. Lastly
and most important of all, it was used as a means of control in
the maintenance of prison discipline. This is particularly true
of the religious aspect.

Religion served to justify primitive methods of control,
for example, in the use of the separate and silent systems. It
was felt that prisoners could best be rehabilitated by being forced
to reflect on their evil ways in solitude and thus be led to try to
atone for their sins. Men were seen as personally responsible for
their own position in life. Criminal behaviour was assumed,
therefore, to be the direct result of wrong doing, if not innate
badness, and authoritarian control and firm guidance were needed to
help check it.

Although the link between religion and control was less
powerful by the end of the century, it continued to survive in some
form well into the twentieth century.
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<p>| Statutes |
|----------------------|----------------------------------|
| 13 Geo.III, c.58 1773 | &quot;An Act for providing Clergymen to Officiate in gaols within that Part of Great Britain called England.&quot; |
| 19 Geo.III, c.74 1779 | &quot;An Act to explain and amend the Laws relating to the Transportation, Imprisonment and other Punishment of certain Offenders.&quot; |
| 22 Geo.III, c.64 1782 | &quot;An Act for amending and rendering more effectual the Laws in being relative to Houses of Correction.&quot; |
| 31 Geo.III, c.45 1791 | &quot;An Act for the better regulating of gaols and other Places of Confinement.&quot; |
| 52 Geo.III, c.44 1812 | &quot;An Act for the erection of a Penitentiary House for the Confinement of offenders convicted within the City of London and County of Middlesex and for making compensation to Jeremy Bentham, Esq., for the non-performance of an Agreement between the said Jeremy Bentham and the Lords Commissioners of His Majesty's Treasury, respecting the Custody and Maintenance of Convicts.&quot; |
| 55 Geo.III, c.48 1815 | &quot;An Act for enlarging the Powers of Two Acts of His present Majesty, for providing Clergymen to Officiate in gaols and Houses of Correction within England and Wales.&quot; |
| 56 Geo.III, c.32 1818 | &quot;An Act to amend so much of an Act of the Fifty fifth year of His present Majesty, as relates to the Salaries of Clergymen Officiating as Chaplains in Houses of Correction.&quot; |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Act Code</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Geo.IV, c.64</td>
<td>1823</td>
<td>&quot;An Act consolidating and amending the Laws relating to the building, repairing and regulating of certain gaols and Houses of Correction in England and Wales.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 &amp; 6 W.IV, c.38</td>
<td>1835</td>
<td>&quot;An Act for effecting greater Uniformity of Practice in the Government of the several Prisons in England and Wales, and for appointing Inspector of Prisons in Great Britain.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 &amp; 3 Vic., c.79</td>
<td>1839</td>
<td>&quot;An Act for the better ordering of Prisons.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 &amp; 27 Vic., c.79</td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>&quot;An Act for the Amendment of the Law relating to the Religious Instruction of Prisoners in County and Borough Prisons in England and Scotland.&quot; This Act was known as 'The Prison Ministers Act, 1863.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 &amp; 29 Vic., c.126</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>&quot;An Act to consolidate and amend the Law relating to Prisons.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 &amp; 41 Vic., c.21</td>
<td>1877</td>
<td>&quot;An Act to amend the Law relating to Prisons in England.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 &amp; 62 Vic., c.41</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>&quot;An Act to amend the Prisons Act.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Miscellaneous Articles and Reports

The Schoolmaster's Experience in Newgate (anonymous). Fraser's Magazine, Volume 5 1832, Volume 6 1833 (A copy can be obtained from the Institute of Criminology, Cambridge).


Rules proposed for the Government of gaols, Houses of Correction, and Penitentiaries, 1820.

Howard Association Defects in the criminal administration and Penal Legislation of Great Britain and Ireland, with remedial suggestions, 1872.
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A Select Bibliography on Education in relation to prisons and other institutions for the custodial treatment of offenders

Institute of Criminology.
The under-mentioned libraries were visited. Brief details are given of where research material was found. The main research material was obtained from Section 1.

1) **British Government Publications**
   
   (A) **Public Records Office** Minutes and letters from and to Secretary of State, Home Office.
   
   (B) **The British Library**
       **Official Publications Library:** State papers
       **British Library Reference Division:** Books, this section has a copy of every book published.
   
   (C) **University of London, Senate House**
       Special section dealing with British Government Publications.

   A, B and C contain the following documents: Select Committee Reports; Departmental Committee Reports; Inspector of Prisons Annual Reports (the most comprehensive source of information about conditions in the prisons between 1536 - 1877); Annual Reports from the Prison Commissioners; House of Commons Returns; Annual Statistics; Statutes, etc.

2) **County Archivist**

   Information on specific gaols. Contain the following documents:
   - Minutes of various gaol committees; Reports by Visiting Justices; Governors, Chaplains, Medical Officer, and Schoolmasters. Journals kept by Governors, Chaplains and Schoolmasters. Prison Registers, Prison Rules and Regulations, Prison Accounts, Earnings from Prison Labour, Diets, etc.
   
   (A) **City and County Borough of Bath, Guildhall**
       Letters written by the Rev. W.C. Osborne - Chaplain of Bath Gaol on various gaol matters. Little information on education.
   
   (B) **County Archivist - County Record Office, Bedford**
       Re Bedford County Gaol & House of Correction.
(C) County Archivist - Chelmsford, Essex Record Office
Re Springfields Gaol and House of Correction for Chelmsford,
Halstead and Colchester.

(D) Guildhall Library, City of London
Valuable information on London prisons.

(E) Archivist Office, The Castle, Lincoln
Re following gaols - Boston, Lindsey, Kirton, Louth and
Spilsby House of Correction.

(F) Archivist Office, Middlesex Area Quarter Sessions
Probably the best collection of information on Coldbath Field
Gaol.

(G) County Archivist - County Hall, Maidstone
Re Maidstone and St. Augustine Gaols.

(H) City and County Archivist, Great Yarmouth
Of particular interest are the various documents kept by
Sarah Martin re her accounts book, prison school journal,
notes about prisoners visits, and scripture notes.

3) Miscellaneous Libraries

(A) Home Office - Mitchell - General Library various books on prisons.
- Departmental Record Office: Home Office
papers. Open/Closed. Permission can be obtained to view
closed papers.

(B) Department of Education and Science, London
Minutes and Reports of the Committee of Council on Education
(England & Wales), documentation concerning the training of
teachers, examination subjects, salaries, etc.

(C) Howard League, London
Wide selection of books, and articles, reports and recommendations
issued by the league.

(D) National Union of Teachers, London
The Union's journal The Schoolmaster contains short articles and
reports about general progress of education in prisons for 1872
onwards.
(E) Society of Friends' Library, London

Known as the Society for the Improvement of Prison Discipline and for the Reformation of Juvenile Offenders. The Society published seven reports on prison conditions between 1818 and 1827. Reports 2 to 5 are missing. Reports 6 and 7 are held at Friend's House. University of Warwick Library holds the only available copy of the 1st Report published in 1818. Also produced "Rules proposed for the government of gaols, Houses of Correction and Penitentiaries" in 1820. Variety of articles, reports, and recommendations regarding prisoners and their conditions.

(F) Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, London

Holds the following original books: Reading Book for Beginners, Standard I first published in 1845/46; revised code 1st Reading Book, Standard I & II Reading Book Standard II 1851/52; Reading Book, Standard I to IV new code 1871; instruction to teachers in Standard II for children ages 8 & 9. Variety of books of a religious nature.

(G) University of Warwick Library, Modern Records Centre

Holds all Howard Association and Howard League historical documents pre 1948.

(H) Workers' Educational Association, London

Had no material for the 19th Century. However, plenty of valuable material from approximately 1912 onwards regarding educational classes organised by the various districts for numerous prisons in England.

The following libraries were not visited, but the librarians were very helpful in locating important sources of information.

1) Librarian. Staff College, H.M. Prison Service, Love Lane, Wakefield.
2) County Archivist Lancashire Record Office, Sessions House, Lancaster Road, Preston for reports on Preston Gaol.
3) Librarian, University of Reading, Whiteknights, Reading.

Contains a good selection of books on prisons during the 19th Century. Details about Reading Gaol and its Chaplain, the Rev. J. Field.
Main Abbreviations used in the text

I.P.R. Inspector of Prisons Reports
P.C.R. Prison Commissioners Reports

Departmental Committee into the Education and Moral Instruction of Prisoners, in the Local and Convict Prisons of England and Wales (Prisoners' Education Committee, P.E.C.)