

This is the accepted manuscript published as

Evans, N. J. (2001). Work in progress: Indirect passage from Europe
Transmigration via the UK, 1836–1914. *Journal for Maritime Research*, 3(1),
70-84.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/21533369.2001.9668313>

© NMM London. All Rights Reserved.

Work in progress: Indirect passage from Europe Transmigration via the UK, 1836–1914

Between 1836 and 1914, over thirty million European immigrants entered the United States of America.¹ Millions of others arrived in Canada, South Africa, Australia, New Zealand and Argentina. They left in search of freedom and opportunity of a degree not found in their native Europe. The Europe they left behind was suffering from the effects of rapid urbanisation, agrarian depression and population increase. Life was difficult enough without the extremes of harvest failure or religious persecution, factors that encouraged would-be migrants into taking the decision to migrate to the other side of the world - when most had never ventured beyond their provincial borders. Theodore Blegen, Irving Howe and Philip Taylor have all described those areas within America in which these European immigrants eventually settled.² Charlotte Erickson and William Jones have studied the millions of British emigrants who left Britain during this period.³ Others, such as Thomas Appleton, Francis Hyde, Laurence Dunn, and Wilton Oldham, have highlighted the role played by powerful British shipping lines such as Allan, Cunard, Union and Castle, and White Star, in the movement of millions of migrants across the Atlantic and to the southern hemisphere.⁴ The existing historiographical works provide a detailed explanation of how the majority of European immigrants arrived in New York, Philadelphia, Boston, Quebec, Cape Town, Sydney, Buenos Aires and Auckland and the patterns that emerge through the analysis of their journey to the 'New World'.

The purpose of this paper, and my Ph.D., is to examine those European migrants who made the decision to travel to the US and further afield indirectly via the UK. Such indirect migration represented a sizeable portion of the total number leaving Europe, particularly of those leaving the northern European countries of Finland, Germany, Norway, Poland, Russia and Sweden. Though 30 million European immigrants entered the US between 1836 and 1914, up to five million transmigrants, or 20 per cent of the total number of immigrants, passed through the UK. The migrants entered the UK via the eastern ports of Harwich, Hull, Grimsby, Leith, London, Newcastle and West Hartlepool. From these ports of arrival the transmigrants were then transported by train to the ports of Glasgow, Liverpool, London and Southampton, from where they could embark on the next stage in their journey. Though London served as the main port of entry for the millions of European immigrants entering the UK, it was the Humber ports of Hull and Grimsby that handled the majority of the transmigrants travelling via the UK - because the journey from the Humber to Liverpool was the shortest route in terms of time and distance to travel across the country. Of the five million European migrants who did arrive in the country between 1836 and 1914, over three million (or sixty per cent), did so via the Humber ports of Hull and Grimsby.

¹ Ross, E.A., *The Old World in the New*, (London, 1914), pp. 307 – 310.

² Blegen, T.C., *Norwegian Migration to America*, (Minnesota, 1940); Howe, I., *World of our Fathers*, (New York, 1976); Taylor, P., *The Distant Magnet*, (London, 1971).

³ Erickson, C., *Leaving England. Essays on British Emigration in the Nineteenth Century*, (New York, 1994); Jones, W. D., *Wales in America: Scranton and the Welsh 1860-1920*, (University of Wales, 1993).

⁴ Appleton, T.E., *The Allan Royal Mail Line*, (Toronto, 1974); Hyde, F.E., *Cunard and the North Atlantic 1840-1973*, (London, 1975); Dunn, L., *Ships of the Union-Castle Line*, (London, 1954); Oldham, W.J., *The Ismay Line; the White Star Line, and the Ismay family story*, (Liverpool, 1961).

The significance of the level of this transient or indirect migration begs two important questions. Firstly, why did so many take the indirect route when it would have made more sense to travel directly rather than having the inconvenience of disembarkation, sanitary inspections, overland transport in the UK, and then the embarkation process for a second time? Secondly, why was the Humber to Liverpool route so dominant in this particular type of international migration?

Various explanations for these questions can be offered. The indirect route split the journey for travel weary migrants who were not used to travelling in ships for up to 24 days, and who had adequate space allocated to them in the 'tween decks (the cramped third class sections of the ship where the transmigrants were usually housed). For those of the Jewish faith, indirect travel allowed them to restock on kosher food for the transatlantic sea journey that traditionally offered limited provision for the kosher diet other than bread and herrings. The dominance of the Humber - Liverpool route could similarly be explained by the Humber's geographic location as a gateway from northern Europe, the provision of regular train services to London and Liverpool, and in the landing facilities that the two ports had developed since the 1840s when the earliest transmigrants began arriving via the two towns.

But it seems that the key to this unusual trading pattern along the Humber to Liverpool route was the provision and cost of shipping from the Baltic and Scandinavia. In particular, the development of highly competitive and efficient shipping services by British shipowners seems to lie at the core of the business. British shipping companies had provided facilities to traverse Britain as early as the 1770s with the opening of canal boat services between Hull and Liverpool via the Leeds-Liverpool Canal.⁵ As demand for North Sea passenger services increased, the British steamship companies began to develop links with some of the earliest railway companies. By the 1880s migrants arriving at Leith, Harwich, Hull, Grimsby, London, Newcastle and West Hartlepool were able to travel from the port of arrival to the port of embarkation with relative ease and speed. At each stage in the evolution of European transmigration, as the number of migrants increased, so did the efficiency with which the rail network handled them.

Transportation systems

Improvements in Trans European passenger services were achieved not only through technological improvements with the steamships, trains and rail services, but also through trade agreements between the steamship and rail operators. The links between the railway and steamship companies were never formalised for transmigrational passenger services alone, but to develop the rail links at the quayside needed for the movement of other goods such as coal, iron and timber.

The NER had run quayside based emigrant specials (trains that ran from Hull to Liverpool) on an as-and-when-required-basis since at least the 1850s. From 1866 onwards the emigrants were landed at the Victoria Dock Pier and taken from there by rail around, instead of passing through Hull, in railway carriages that had been sent to the Victoria Dock, for that purpose.⁶ When the number of passengers was sufficiently great to justify it, a special train would be despatched with them

⁵ Allison, K.J. (ed.), *Victoria History of the Counties of England, East Riding of Yorkshire*, Volume I, (London, 1969), pp. 174-175.

⁶ Page 30, BHH/1/49, Kingston upon Hull City Archives.

immediately on their arrival, a tent or shed being provided by the Local Board of Health for the emigrant passengers whilst waiting the arrival of the train.⁷ The NER also provided an emigrant waiting room at the Paragon Railway Station in Hull from 1871 – facilities that were doubled in size in 1881 as demand for such services increased.⁸ Such improvements continually increased the efficiency with which the thousands of migrants who arrived annually were handled. Although the most extensive work was carried out in Hull, Liverpool facilities were also developed. From 1895 the emigrant trains made use of the Mersey Docks and Harbour Board's Riverside station alongside the Pierhead, thus providing quayside to quayside rail services.⁹ Though the emigrant facilities of the NER were far from elaborate, the size of the traffic grew sufficiently to warrant additional expenditure in 1906 when the NER built a far grander Riverside Quay Railway Station at Hull and in 1907 replaced its entire fleet of emigrant carriages.¹⁰

The NER was not unique in its provision of railway facilities. Even in Hull, the Hull and Barnsley Railway had built an emigrant station at its Alexandra Dock in 1885, and from 1906 the Lancashire and Yorkshire Shipping Company, that was associated with the Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway, had been awarded the right to run passenger services to some European ports. Although they faced increased competition in an ever-competitive business, the NER handled a greater number of European migrants than any other British rail operator during the period. In other ports, railway companies provided similar services. The Manchester, Sheffield and Lincolnshire Railway had provided an emigrant shelter at Grimsby as early as 1854.¹¹ The warden of the shelter was a MS & L employee and not only received the migrants and catered for their overnight needs, but also travelled with them until they arrived safely at the quayside in Liverpool.¹² The London and North Western Railway provided an Emigrants Dining Room at Euston Railway Station in London and in 1852 the London and South Western Railway secured a government contract for the conveyance of emigrants to Southampton.¹³ Other organisations such as the Poor Jews Temporary Shelter in London received telegrams from the railway authorities at Hull, Grimsby and Harwich, when migrants destined to stay under their auspices enroute to Southampton and London arrived at the respective ports of arrival. Even smaller ports such as Harwich were equipped with a hotel for passengers travelling across the North Sea. The hotel at Parkeston Quay, Harwich, was built by the Great Eastern Railway and provided fine hotel accommodation with attached first and second class restaurants, and ladies and general waiting rooms for the use of passengers who did not require hotel accommodation.¹⁴ Thus a clear picture of transportational integration was visible at every port of arrival throughout the United Kingdom. Though migrants may have arrived via one steamship company and departed via another, the Victorian railway network provided the facilities to link the

⁷ Page 30, BHH/1/49, Kingston upon Hull City Archives.

⁸ The dates for the construction of these two buildings were taken from the copies of the original plans of the N.E.R. Hull Emigrants Waiting Rooms in the Kingston upon Hull City Archives.

⁹ Neele, G.P., *Railway Reminiscences*, (London, 1904), p. 190.

¹⁰ Bell, R., *Twenty-five years of the North Eastern Railway, 1898–1922*, (1951), p. 36-37.

¹¹ Gerlis, D. and L., *The Story of the Grimsby Jewish Community*, (Hull, 1986), pp. 8-10.

¹² Dow, G., *Great Central*, volume iii, (London, 1965).

¹³ The Emigrants Dining Room at Euston is shown on a plan of the station in 'The Most Famous Railway Station in the world: its traffic and associations', *Railway Magazine*, Volume 17, no. 203, p.364. The contract to convey emigrants to Southampton is commented on in Simmons, J., *The Victorian Railway*, (New York, 1995), pp. 323-4.

¹⁴ An advertisement for the Great Eastern Railway Hotel, Parkeston Quay, Harwich, is included in the Great Eastern Railway's Continental Time Table for January and February 1900, p. 153, University of Leicester Library.

inward bound migrant with the outward bound ships. The facilities were far from luxurious, but they did lessen the burden of indirect migration, at the same time as bringing additional revenue to the railway companies and preventing the risk of potentially disease-infected migrants mixing freely with the inhabitants of maritime towns and cities.

Within this essentially British-dominated migrational network, it seems that the Wilson Line of Hull was the main player. The Wilson Line enjoyed the unique position of being the main shipping operator at all three of the north eastern ports of Hull, Newcastle and West Hartlepool. At the same time it enjoyed close links with the NER, a company that also held a uniquely advantageous position at the same three ports. Although more work is needed on the relationship between the Wilson Line and the railway companies, the evidence suggests the Wilson Line linked with railways on the continent and at home to provide an integrated railway service that cornered the market. Such links were essential for the Wilson Line, as they prevented the NER from developing steamship passenger services of their own (as the MS&L and GER had done at Grimsby and Harwich respectively).¹⁵ They also enabled the two powerful companies to compete jointly with the intense commercial rivalry that they faced from other companies in the UK and Europe. They had to ensure that indirect migration remained cost effective to the would-be migrant, at the same time as offering a level of service that could compete with the large ocean liners of the Hamburg - American Steamship Company and the Norddeutscher Lloyd who provided direct services from Germany to the US.

As the Wilsons were the main Hull shipping firm, their significant role in the business chiefly explains why Hull was the focal point of the trade. They ensured, through acquisitions, trade links and agency agreements, that they would come to dominate an essentially British aspect of the migrational business, and this helps to explain why business. By 1907, migration via the UK was a fully integrated business that was cheap and effective, yet also profitable. Geographically, it centred around the main players in shipping and rail transport. For those transmigrants arriving in the UK, this led to a domination of Hull as the chief port of entry, with Liverpool serving as the main port of departure. Though Liverpool had increasingly to compete with other British ports such as Southampton and Glasgow, the port would continue to dominate indirect migrational traffic until the move of Cunard to Southampton in the late 1920s.¹⁶

In 1912, the world's most noted ocean liner, the RMS *Titanic*, left Britain with 320 transmigrants onboard, of whom 139 (or 43 per cent) had entered via Hull.¹⁷ Unlike the majority of the British emigrant vessels, she left via Southampton before collecting more passengers at Queenstown. The patterns of indirect migration had begun to change in an ever increasing attempt to compete with the German and European direct services. The outbreak of the First World War ended an era of patterns of migration that had changed very little since the 1830s. Cost and speed, in the post war era, would end the British domination of indirect travel, as migrants, would now leave via their local port, and travel directly to the 'Promised Land'. The integrated transport system, founded on European transmigration, would now be used by the emerging travel industry. It provided an important source of revenue to rail and steamship operators, just as migrational revenue had added

¹⁵ The history of steamship passenger services to the ports of arrival on the east coast of Britain is covered in Greenway, A., *A Century of North Sea Passenger Steamers*, (London, 1986).

¹⁶ Hyde, F.E., *Cunard and the North Atlantic 1840-1973*.

¹⁷ BT 27/780(b), Public Record Office. The statistical detail of the vessels shipping manifest is taken from a forthcoming publication 'Titanic Travellers' by Debbie Beavis.

to the wealth that they had accrued through the shipment of coal, iron ore, timber and chilled provisions. Unlike in the pre-war era, the steamships arriving or leaving Britain would do so from locations advantageous to the owners of the companies that ran such services. As the Titanic's departure would prove, the transportation system in Britain was now sufficiently developed to handle passengers who arrived via any of the British ports - regardless of the historic patterns of migration.

The Statistics

Though the passenger manifests of the individual ships that carried transmigrants to the British ports of arrival have not survived, other statistical records from official and business records did. These records were maintained in an irregular fashion according to the nature of the organisation which originally collated the data. Despite an inconsistency in the dates they were maintained, the records do provide some detail of the scale and patterns of indirect migration, as well as demonstrating the clear link between the rail and steamship services involved in the business of transmigration.

Though more work has yet to be done on researching the statistics of transmigration, for the purpose of this paper I have included three differing sets of data in order to demonstrate the points raised in the earlier part of this article.

Figure 1 – The Number of transmigrants passing through the port of Hull, 1835–1914.

Period of Arrival	Hull
1835 - 1839	900*
1840 - 1844	*
1845 - 1849	2,537
1850 - 1854	53,458
1855 - 1859	17,843
1860 - 1864	*
1865 - 1869	124,052
1870 - 1874	175,533
1875 - 1879	*
1880 - 1884	197,932*
1885 - 1889	271,351
1890 - 1894	246,378
1895 - 1899	111,553
1900 - 1904	281,249
1905 - 1909	352,891
1910 - 1914	249,332
Total 1,883,640	

NOTE – * Indicates a gap in the original sources for part or all of the period

The statistics for the number of European transmigrants who passed through the port of Hull are taken from the certificates presented by the masters of vessels entering the port from 1836 to 1914. The records were maintained by Her Majesty's Customs and Excise officials under section 2 of the

Passenger Act of 1836. Before the passing of this act such statistical returns had shown a huge disparity in the consistency and accuracy of the data returned. For the period 1836 to 1860, the statistical data from the original Master's certificates' can be found in Home Office Records at the Public Record Office at Kew.¹⁸ After 1865 the fortnightly returns of the statistics were recorded in the minutes of the Hull Board of Health (later to become the Hull and Goole Port Sanitary Authority), with the exception of the period 1875 to 1880.¹⁹

The figures represent the most complete set of statistics for any of the British ports of arrival, or for any of the European emigration ports. Though statistics were often maintained by individual European governments or states, such figures rarely provide a detailed breakdown of the number and nature of migrants passing through individual ports. For the port of Hull, the status of the migrants was maintained from the outset because transmigrants always constituted the majority of the European aliens who passed through the port – even outnumbering the combined number of sailors and immigrants who arrived at Hull in its role as the third largest port in Britain. Altogether, 1.88 million transmigrants passed through the port during this seventy-nine year period. It is fair to estimate that during the years for which no data has survived approximately 320,000 migrants would have passed through the town – making the total number of transmigrants somewhere around 2.2 million.²⁰ This figure represents approximately 8 per cent of the total number of Europeans entering the United States for the same period. Although the US was the destination of the majority of the migrants passing through Hull, many also passed via the port en route to Canada and some even heading for countries further afield such as South Africa, Australia and New Zealand.

The number of migrants arriving at Hull increased from under 1,000 in the late 1830s to over 300,000 in the period 1905 – 1909, with 100,000 arriving in the year 1907 alone. The number of migrants arriving was mirrored by the provision of the tools designed to facilitate their movement through the city with a degree of ease and speed not seen at any other port in Britain. Transpennine rail services commenced in 1840,²¹ rail services to the dockside started in 1866,²² an emigrant waiting room was built in 1871 and then extended in 1881,²³ an emigrant station (or railway platform with a hut) was opened in 1885,²⁴ an additional landing stage was hired in 1899,²⁵ the Riverside Quay Railway Station was built in 1906,²⁶ and the entire fleet of emigrant specials were replaced in 1907.²⁷ At each stage in the evolution of one of Europe's largest migratory ports, as the number of migrants arriving

¹⁸ HO3/1-104, Public Record Office, Kew. [

¹⁹ Source - the Minutes of the Hull Board of Health (BHH), the Minutes of the Hull Urban Sanitary Committee (TCM), and the Reports of the Hull and Goole Port Sanitary Authority (WHG). All of these collections are housed in the Kingston upon Hull City Archives.

²⁰ This figure is based upon the patterns of statistics for the two five-year periods for which no statistical information is available.

²¹ Gillett, E. and MacMahon, K.A., *A History of Hull*, (Hull, 1989), p. 303.

²² Page 30, BHH/1/49, Kingston upon Hull City Archives.

²³ Plans of the NER Emigrants Waiting Room at the Paragon Railway Station, Kingston upon Hull City Archives.

²⁴ *Eastern Morning News*, 20 May 1885.

²⁵ The landing stage was located at Island Wharf, a wharf located on the River Humber between the entrances to the Albert and Humber Docks. Details of the lease appear in the *Standard Minute Book of the North Eastern Railway*, Hull Local Studies Library, and on a plan of the wharf in the Ellerman Wilson Line Archives, University of Hull Archives and Special Collections.

²⁶ Harrower, J., *Wilson Line*, (Gravesend, 1998).

²⁷ Bell, R., *Twenty-five years of the North Eastern Railway, 1898–1922*, (1951), p. 36-37.

increased, so did the number of quayside innovations designed to improve the efficiency with which the port handled this complex facet of maritime activity.

The Statistics (continued)

Figure 2 – The Number of European migrants entering British ports, 1891–1905

Year	Immigrants	Transmigrants	Total Migrants
1891	28,270	98,705	126,975
1892	22,137	93,801	115,938
1893	12,636	79,518	92,154
1894	28,682	35,512	64,194
1895	30,528	44,637	75,165
1896	35,448	40,036	75,484
1897	38,851	32,221	71,072
1898	40,785	32,177	72,962
1899	50,884	49,947	100,831
1900	62,505	71,682	134,187
1901	55,464	79,140	134,604
1902	66,471	118,478	184,949
1903	193,759	124,591	318,350
1904	182,123	99,278	281,401
1905	182,794	108,408	291,202
Total	1,031,337	1,108,131	2,139,468

NOTE – The Immigration figures exclude the number of foreign seamen who entered the UK on a short-term basis each year.

Like the figures included in Figure 1, the data presented in Figure 2 was derived from the statistical returns made by Masters of vessels to Custom's officials. After 1888 the Board of Trade presented these statistics in an annual report on the statistics of emigration and immigration. For the first three reports, the statistics only distinguished separately the data for the ports of London and Hull, with the figures for all other ports grouped together. From 1891, the reports showed for the first time an accurate record of the number of foreigners arriving at each of the British ports of arrival. Although there is certainly some ambiguity in the status accorded to the migrants, the reports are fairly accurate for all ports except for London.

Due to the constraints of this paper, I have only included the summarised national statistics for the years 1891 to 1905. They show that transmigration was the dominant status of the migrants for the period, with the exception of the years 1897 and 1898, and from 1903 – 1905. Although these results demonstrate the high level of European immigration into Britain in the decades either side of 1900, they also provide some indication of why parliament introduced a Royal Commission on Alien Immigration in 1903, and subsequently passed the Aliens Act of 1905. The statistics hide the reality of the level of immigration – which was far less than is implied in Figure 2. When the figures for ports are analysed individually, this national rise in the level of immigration is explained by the increase in the number of Russian immigrants arriving in London. As shown through the census and immigration records in the United States and Canada, many of these so-called immigrants only

passed through London. Unlike the rest of the British ports of arrival, transmigrants passing through London were incorrectly classified as immigrants, and thus affect the results shown in Figure 2. Despite this classification difficulty, the level of European migrants entering Britain is clearly shown to have grown from 126,000 in 1891 to over 300,000 in 1903. During the same period smaller migrant carrying shipping lines were taken over by ever-expanding lines such as the Wilsons of Hull. The acquisitions enabled the company to develop a monopoly in the transmigrant traffic via the UK, a supremacy that was crowned in 1909 when the North Atlantic Conference agreed not to carry any European transmigrants who had travelled across the North Sea in a steamship not under the control of the Wilson Line.²⁸

Fig 3 – The destination of the foreign migrants transported from the north eastern ports of Hull, Newcastle and West Hartlepool by the North Eastern Railway, 1890–1910.

Year	Liverpool	Glasgow	Southampton	London	Total
1890	5,896	937	0	0	6,833*
1891	5,962	935	0	0	6,897*
1892	4,132	411	0	0	4,543*
1893	803	338	0	0	1,141*
1894	1,669	413	0	0	2,082*
1895	1,611	372	0	0	1,983*
1896	18,561	1,209	1,055	522	21,347
1897	13,539	1,008	1,031	263	15,841
1898	15,114	849	712	98	16,773
1899	22,439	1,011	2,690	333	26,473
1900	33,088	2,012	3,200	459	38,759
1901	38,782	1,048	2,460	91	42,381
1902	63,862	2,120	3,930	446	70,358
1903	68,338	2,040	3,690	496	74,564
1904	42,952	986	1,628	138	45,704
1905	51,788	2,184	1,968	83	56,023
1906	61,160	6,734	1,800	51	69,745
1907	69,892	9,804	3,880	109	83,685
1908	21,906	1,302	2,962	97	26,267
1909	42,124	2,199	6,297	363	50,983
1910	53,034	3,064	5,197	150	61,445
Total	36,652	40,976	42,500	3,699	723,827

NOTE – * Indicates a gap in the original sources for part or all of the period and the figures for the pre–1896 period exclude those migrants transported from the Port of Hull.

The statistics included in Figure 3 were obtained through two sets of documents kept by the NER and now stored within the British Transport records at the Public Record Office.²⁹ Though no explanation

²⁸ Detail included in notes taken from the correspondence of Oswald Sanderson, the managing director of the Wilson Line of Hull from 1904 until his death in 1926. DEW 4/10, University of Hull Archives and Special Collections.

²⁹ RAIL 527 1178 and RAIL 527 1179, Public Record Office (Kew).

for their origin has been made, they were clearly part of an increasing attempt by the NER to analyse statistically the patterns of railway use in a region that stretched from the Humber to Liverpool, Newcastle to Carlisle, and the region in between.

Though I have not shown the individual patterns for each of the three railway stations, the overwhelming majority of the migrants travelled from the north eastern ports of arrival to the port of embarkation at Liverpool. Even when the dominance of the port of Hull is excluded (as is unfortunately shown in the original statistics for the period 1890 – 1896) the majority of foreign emigrants travelled across the north of England to Liverpool. Geographic locality provided the company with the opportunity of easymade money. The trains were of the lowest standard of third class carriage and often reached lengths of 13 – 17 carriages.³⁰ They carried the foreign migrants on the same service as the British emigrants also heading for the British ports of embarkation. The trains were run on an as-and-when-required basis, but as the services were linked in with the regularity of the steamship services run by the Wilson Line, they were always run at 11 o'clock on a Monday morning from Hull, and at other times in the case of the three ports.³¹ The lack of toilet facilities and the momentum needed to move such long trains over the complete spectrum of the gradient that the Pennines presented ensured that the trains crossed Britain with a minimal level of disruption or delays.

Although the close relationship of the shipping companies and the NER can be seen by the number of migrants using the services from the port of arrival, the statistics also show how the patterns of transmigration changed as shipping lines moved their operations from Liverpool to Southampton, and as they developed links such as those with the Poor Jews Temporary Shelter in London.³² Thus in 1907 when the White Star Line had moved its operations to Southampton, the number of transmigrants heading for Southampton saw a dramatic increase.³³ The sporadic number of migrants heading for London can be explained by the role of Donald Currie, who secured shelter at the Poor Jews Temporary Shelter in London for the migrants who occasionally passed through Hull enroute to the Union and Castle ships heading for South Africa.³⁴ Glasgow similarly showed exceptional numbers of migrants heading towards the port in 1906 and 1907, due no doubt to the involvement of the Allan Line in securing additional migrants for the Glasgow to Canada transmigrational route. Though the NER did not gain vast profits from the emigrant specials, even with a nominal charge per

³⁰ Fraser, N., 'Postscript to the Liverpool-Hull Passenger Services – Emigrant Traffic' that appeared in *Railway Observer*, January 1961.

³¹ Fraser, N., 'Postscript to the Liverpool-Hull Passenger Services – Emigrant Traffic', *Railway Observer*, January 1961.

³² Professor Aubrey Newman has demonstrated how the records of the Poor Jews Temporary Shelter of London highlight the attempts made by the shelter authorities to develop close links with Donald Currie and the Union and Castle Steamship Company. Such links were essential for both organisations to continue to facilitate the movement of transmigrants via the Port of London between 1885 and 1928. The records for the period between 1896 and 1914 can be found in the London Metropolitan Archives. They show how migrants entering via the ports of Hull, Grimsby, Harwich and London were met at the quayside by representatives of the shelter, or the railway companies, and then transported by foot or rail to the shelter in London. Those migrants travelling by train were met upon arrival at the railway stations in London.

³³ Patterson, A.T., *A History of Southampton 1700–1914*, volume iii (Southampton, 1971), p.122.

³⁴ At least 517 migrants who arrived via the port of Hull, and 1327 migrants who arrived via the port of Grimsby, stayed under the Shelter's auspices during the period 1897 to 1914. The figures were prepared for me by Dr. John Graham Smith of the University of Leicester from The Poor Jews Temporary Shelter Database.

head, 723,000 migrants over a twenty year period clearly brought added commercial profitability to railway commerce in Victorian Britain.

The three sets of statistics demonstrate the integrated transport system of rail and shipping that had evolved by the end of the nineteenth century to facilitate indirect migration via Britain. Integration was essential if British steamships were not to be deprived of the European migrational traffic that other powerful maritime nations such as Denmark and Germany benefited from commercially. The Aliens Act of 1905 and Merchant Shipping Act of 1906 handed over the legal responsibility for ensuring the migrants were transient in status to the shipping lines that brought them to Britain. But it was commercial rivalry that ensured by 1903 that any would-be immigrants did not get the opportunity to “just wander off” at the port of arrival in the UK. Pooling and trade agreements between those lines bringing in the migrants, and those who shipped them from Britain, guaranteed that the shipping lines at Liverpool, Glasgow, Southampton or London were not deprived of any migrant who could help fill the massive ocean-going liners that embarked from the British ports. Such liners were needed to compete with the likes of Norddeutscher Lloyd and the Hamburg-America, but also necessitated an integrated transport system to the British port of embarkation capable of filling the potentially loss-making liners of the likes of the *Titanic* and *Mauretania*. Integration was thus not a luxury developed for the migrant, but a commercial safeguard designed to protect commercial shipping interests from both the government and commercial rivals.