Muster Table for the Royal Navy's Establishment on Lake Ontario during the War of 1812

Tom Malcomson

In response to the pleas of Governor General George Prevost, in the spring of 1813 the Admiralty sent Commodore James Lucas Yeo and 447 men of the Royal Navy to the inland seas of North America. The war between Britain and the United States had entered its first full year with both sides cognizant of the critical importance control of the Great Lakes would play in the success of any future land campaign. The Americans had sent Commodore Isaac Chauncey and a steady stream of experienced sailors to Lake Ontario in the fall of 1812. On the British side, the Provincial Marine had proved no match for the Americans, who controlled the lake by the end of the 1812 sailing season. The arrival of British sailors was meant to meet the American challenge and to re-establish ascendancy.

Control bounced back and forth during 1813 and 1814. A series of indecisive engagements in August, September and October 1813 failed to resolve the issue on Lake Ontario. Control of Lake Erie was decided in favour of the Americans with Oliver Hazard Perry's victory over Robert Barclay at Put-In-Bay on 10 September 1813.' On Lake Ontario, the two sides turned to their shipyards to produce larger warships to gain the upper hand. Yeo took to the lake in 1814 with two frigates and held the Americans off until the summer, when their large frigates were launched. Yeo returned in the early fall with the 102-gun *St. Lawrence,* causing Chauncey again to seek the safety of his base at Sackets Harbour. The war ended before the opposing fleets of first-rate ships could meet on Lake Ontario.'

While the British officers who served on the lakes have received a good deal of attention, for the most part the men they led have remained unknown. Contemporary works, such as the *Naval Chronicle* and various biographical collections on the British navy, like John Marshall's *Naval Biography,* contain biographical data on the officers.' So do modern works, which unfortunately ignore the men of the lower decks.' Not one of the sailors below a warrant officer who came to Canada during the war left any written record of his experience. No source, with the exception of Robert Malcomson's work, attempts to describe the British seamen who fought on the Great Lakes during the war.'

The present article strives to increase our knowledge about the men of the Royal Navy who were sent out to the Great Lakes during the War of 1812. It accomplishes this through a quantitative analysis of a portion of the muster table created for the squadron on

The Northern Mariner/Le ***Marin*** du ***nord,*** **IX, No. 2 (April 1999), 41** -67.

Lake Ontario on 9 May 1813 as the men left Lachine, just west of Montréal, bound for Kingston, Upper Canada.'

This paper has four goals in studying the muster table of the Lake Ontario establishment. The first is to perform a statistical analysis on a muster table. This preliminary work will establish the usefulness of this approach in helping to further our knowledge of British seaman of the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars. There are no quantitative studies of British seamen from muster tables during the War of 1812. Robert Malcomson compiled a muster roll for the Lake Erie squadron that Captain Robert Barclay led into the Battle of Lake Erie on 10 September 1813.7 Using two American-generated lists of prisoners, and the roster of casualties from Barclay, Malcomson constructed a detailed muster roll of 451 men in the ill-fated squadron. His article included the full muster roll and a discussion of totals for most of the data, concentrating on numbers of men assigned to vessels in the squadron; numbers of RN and Provincial Marine seamen and soldiers from the Newfoundland and 41st Foot Regiments; average age and height; place of birth (British Isles, British North America, United States or other); and numbers and ranks of officers assigned to each vessel. No further statistical analysis was done and there was no comparison to any other description of seamen or soldiers of the era.

Records of American sailors and soldiers of the War of 1812 have, however, been subjected to some statistical analysis. Gerard Altoff examined the prize money list and lists of sailors and soldiers assigned to Perry's fleet, the victors at the Battle of Lake Erie.' His book contains several lists, more than 600 names, including breakdowns by vessel, regiment (for the soldiers) and state of origin. Apart from some totals and percentages concerning volunteer rates, no statistical analysis was performed on the data, nor did he compare it to other information about American sailors or soldiers of the era.

Ira Dye examined British lists of men captured from American ships during the War of 1812 and held at four English prisons.' He analyzed 6537 records, reporting totals, averages and percentages on the variables of age, race, rank, place of birth, stature and physical appearance, body conformation, marks, scars, injuries and other disabilities, plus interactions between variables, such as age and rank, and race and stature. Dye's work is an excellent example of how statistical analysis can generate insights into the characteristics of the American seafarer during the War of 1812.

Similarly, J.C.A. Stagg performed a statistical analysis on a sample of 6370 enlisted men in the American army during the war. [10] Although he was not dealing with seamen, his research further demonstrated the importance of conducting a "systematic quantitative analysis" to get an accurate picture of the members of a particular population during a specific period.

Finally, Nicholas Rodger conducted a detailed study of British seamen in the Georgian navy, reporting the results in tables concerning recruitment, health, length of service, age and rank, and desertion." These data were based on surveys of various ships' muster tables between 1750 and 1782. The size of the sample is different for each characteristic, ranging from five to thirty-one ships. Totals, means and percentages are described in the text, but no further quantitative analysis is performed. Because of the time period, the information does not provide insights into the sailor of the period 1793-1815, although it could be used to compare seamen in the two periods.

The current analysis performed on the Lake Ontario muster table provided a wealth of information from the aggregate group of men studied. The statistical analysis produced data which were easily condensed for presentation and discussion.

The second goal of the current paper is to describe the men who arrived at Kingston in May 1813. The analysis revealed that less than one-quarter were freshly pressed; a handful were volunteers; and the majority came from other warships. The average age was twenty-six years, but there was a group of 134 men who were significantly older than the others. Promotions were awarded to approximately one-third of the 466 men. More died from accident and illness than from enemy action. This statistical analysis produced a comprehensive portrait of the first group of sailors sent by the Admiralty to the Great Lakes.

The third goal is to compare this evidence with similar profiles of British seamen in the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars. While the sample size is small compared to the approximately 130,000 men in the navy at this time, the comparison is still possible. The current profile of British seamen for this period has been gleaned from the general works of Michael Lewis, Peter Kemp, Christopher Lloyd, Dudley Pope and Brian Lavery.12 Using the memoirs of a handful of sailors, letters from officers, and Admiralty figures on manning, recruitment and health, these authors have described the men and the navy in which they sailed. While the annual Admiralty totals provide an overview, they do not allow for analysis of individual crews. The officers' letters seldom contain detailed descriptions of their crews but rather make general statements concerning character, worth, and ability to fight. The memoirs are like case studies: their rich detail can lay the foundations for an answer but do not discuss a sufficient cross-section of the population. Apart from these three sources of information, Lavery also employed the odd statistic to illustrate the distribution of a particular "quality" on a ship or the impact on specific ships of certain issues, such as health and desertion." The composite derived from these general works needs to be verified by examining one of the best sources of information about the individual sailor of the era, the muster tables of the vessels and services in the RN.

The present composite from the above sources for men below the rank of commissioned officer is as follows. Half the men were pressed; the rest were volunteers, or quota men, and a sizable sub-group came from prisons. It was accepted that as many as twenty-eight percent of a ship's compliment had no sea experience (they were labelled "landsmen"). Those with sea experience came from either other naval vessels or merchantmen. Up to fifteen percent of a crew might be foreign-born. A few learned their craft on land (e.g., carpenters and surgeons) and then applied for a warrant to serve on a ship. The men were underpaid, poorly nourished; and lived in unclean, crowded conditions. They were far more likely to die from disease and accident than enemy action. A trip to the hospital was a death sentence for one in thirty. While described as brave in the face of the enemy, they were painted as constantly looking for an opportunity to desert. They could be loyal to a good officer and mutinous to a weak or brutal one. They were largely illiterate and needed strict discipline. The able-bodied seaman could be promoted to petty or warrant officers; if they demonstrated the necessary skills, a few could even become commissioned officers. Many would change ships via a "turnover" where, as their vessel was returning to Britain at the end of its service, they would be given to an outward ship. While the range in

age was from eight to seventy years, no author has calculated an average age for the seamen of the RN in the Napoleonic wars.

It appears that the men who came with Commodore Yeo fit for the most part the composite profile created from the above sources. A number of small variations are noted later in this paper, including the apparent ease of promotion, with the exception of the warrant officers. The number of volunteers was small and only one man appears to have come to the service through the English courts. The small sample size prevents the confirmation of the composite profile or its alteration to include the differences that were found. In order to confirm or challenge the accepted profile of the British seaman for this era, analysis of other muster tables is necessary.

A fourth goal for analyzing the muster table is to see what it can add to our understanding of the larger issues faced by the navy, such as health, desertion and manpower shortages. Keeping in mind the limitations of the small sample size, the current study presents a picture of deadly hospitals, low rates of desertion and raises some questions about recruitment.

The Muster Table

All vessels in the Royal Navy were expected to carry a muster table containing the names of the men and officers on board. Commodore Yeo kept a single volume for the "Naval Establishment on Lake Ontario," in which were listed all men and officers who arrived at Kingston between 9 May 1813 and 30 April 1814. The table also contained the names of the British officers and men who had been sent from Halifax prior to Yeo's arrival and those of the Provincial Marine who were retained in the service after the commodore took command. At the later date the book was closed and each ship of the Lake Ontario Squadron began to carry its own muster table.

The muster table was basically a ledger in which the commanding officer recorded vital information concerning the men and officers under his command.14 Facing pages of the book contained lines for twenty horizontal entries, with twenty-five vertical columns to record specific information for each person. The first column recorded whether a bounty had been paid for the recruit and the sum. This column was empty for the first 466 entries. The second was for the number of the entry. Column three contained the date when the person's name was entered. The fourth column gave the date at which the person actually came on board and could be quite different from the "entry" date (the person was paid from the entry date). "Whence and whether Prest or not" was the fifth column and recorded the last ship (it could also be a place, such as a hospital) from which the man came and whether he was pressed into service, under warrant, commissioned, or a volunteer. Column six pertained to the sailor's place of birth. The person's age at the time of entry was noted in column seven. The next column was entitled "No. and Letter of Tickets" and contained the ticket number issued to men discharged before the ship was paid off. For those who were discharged alive, they could claim their pay when the ship was paid off or on specific days for reimbursement in the naval yard or at the Navy Office in London. A ticket for payment was sent to the relative (if known) of those who died. Column nine gave the name of the person being described. "Qualities" of the man were recorded next, listing his rank or assigned duties.

The eleventh column was titled "D," "DD" or R" and referred to the status of the individual: "D" stood for discharged; "DD" for discharged dead; and "R" indicated that the person had "run" or deserted from the ship. The date of discharge was written in the next space. "Whether or for what Reasons" formed column thirteen, indicating where the person was discharged, died or deserted. Column fourteen, "Straggling or Neglect," gave the amount of bounty offered for the capture of stragglers (charged to the person found straggling) or for damaged goods and supplies (the column was blank in the muster table being examined).

The next ten columns dealt with financial matters. The amount of money charged to each man for the clothes he was supplied was recorded under "Slop Cloaths Supplied by Navy." "Cloaths in Sick Quarters" was for the cost of clothes issued after the person was released from hospital, as those they entered with were removed to prevent desertion (this column is also blank in this table). The price for bedding sold to the men by the purser was recorded under the heading "Beds." When a member of the crew died, the others were allowed to buy his belongings if no other arrangements had been made. The cost of the purchase was marked against the buyer under the column "Dead Men's Cloaths." The cost for an allowance of tobacco was recorded under "Tobacco." Some men made arrangements for their pay to be sent to a relative or friend. The date of this decision was recorded under "Date of the Parties Order for allotting Monthly Pay." The amount allotted to another person was written in the column marked "Wages Remitted from Abroad." If a sailor or officer requested an advance on pay, it was recorded in the column titled "Two Months Advance." If a ship supplied food or goods to marines serving ashore, this expense was marked next to the man's name under "Necessaries Supplied Marines on Shore." If money were owed to a man who had died, a remittance ticket was issued and the name to which it was payable recorded under the heading "To whom Tickets were delivered." In this table these last four columns remained empty. The very last column in the table was labelled "When Mustered. Month and Days."

Methodology

This muster table contains a total of 1384 entries and the degree of detail for each varied greatly. Besides recording the man's name, most only listed what ship they came from, when they were entered into the book, when they arrived at Kingston, their "quality," discharge status and date, and to where they were discharged on or prior to 30 April 1814. The most complete section of the table comprised the first 466 entries, the men Yeo had under his command when he arrived in Kingston. [15] The number was larger than that sent out by the Admiralty because it included eighteen volunteers who joined the march to Lake Ontario. Twelve of the volunteers were from the transport ship *Woolwich,* which figured prominently in the early pages of the muster table as the vessel which carried the 466 seamen and officers to British North America. The present analysis is confined to these first 466 names. It is important to note that six men (four able-bodied and two ordinary seamen) were left behind at Québec in *Woolwich* because they were too sick to travel. Their names were still entered into the muster table, but in July 1813 they were discharged with the notation that they had remained with *Woolwich.* Although they did not arrive at Kingston, they were part of the table and are therefore included in the following analysis.

The information contained in this section of the muster table was numerically encoded and run through various statistical analyses using MINITAB statistical software.16 The current article examines all the information available in columns two through eight and ten through fourteen. A future article will deal with the complex data found in the column headed "Slop Cloaths Supplied by Navy" and in column nine, "No. and Letter of Tickets."

Age, Status Upon Entry and Quality

Of the 404 men for whom it was recorded, the mean age was 26.94 years with a standard deviation (sd) of 5.93. The median age was twenty-six and the range was from fifteen to forty-nine." Table 1 shows the frequency distribution by age for this group. The modes were twenty-two and twenty-four (N=thirty-seven for each). The majority were in their mid to late twenties: 334 men (82.7%) were between twenty and thirty-three.

Table 1
Age Frequencies

Age	Frequency	Age	Frequency
15	1	33	10
16	2	34	2
18	5	35	8
19	11	36	13
20	21	37	5
21	29	38	6
22	37	39	2
23	22	40	1
24	37	41	4
25	29	42	2
26	22	43	1
27	24	45	2
28	31	46	2
29	18	47	1
30	22	48	1
31	12	49	1
32	20		

Total: 404

Note: Total ages 15-19 = 19 (4.7% of 404); Total ages 20-29 = 270 (66.8% of 404); Total ages 30-39 = 100 (24.8% of 404); Total ages 40-49 = 15 (3.7% of 404).

Source: See text.

Sources describing sailors in the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars do not give average ages, making the present study the first effort to establish this. Sir Gilbert Blane suggested that the age range for the majority in the RN was twenty to forty.[18] The current study supports this, since the bulk of the men sent out to the Great Lakes were between twenty and twenty-nine. Ira Dye reported that the average age of the American

seafaring prisoner-of-war during the War of 1812 was 27.12 years, with a median of twenty-five. This is very close to the mean age for the men sent out with James Yeo. Dye stated that roughly seventy-five percent were between the ages twenty-one and thirty-nine, while the present study found 91.6% in that range. Dye's sample had a larger number of men under twenty (approximately eighteen percent vs. 4.7%), and while the percentage over forty was closer to that in Yeo's group, it was still double (8.3% vs 3.7%). Robert Malcomson reported that the average age of naval personnel in the British fleet at the Battle of Lake Erie was 28.8 years. Unfortunately, this figure includes all men labelled as seamen and not just the fifty-four men of the RN; the other 134 were members of the Provincial Marine, a group of local men with a variety of experience on the Great Lakes.

Mean ages were calculated for the 466 men by category under the heading "Whether Prest or Not." Table 2 contains these results, plus the range, standard deviation and median age.

Table 2
Recruitment and Age

	Number	Not Recorded	Mean	Standard Deviation	Median Age	Range Min. Age	Range Max. Age
Pressed	89	3	23.67	4.35	22.00	16	42
Under Warrant	3	15	24.00	0.00	24.00	24	24
Under Commission	0	12	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Volunteer	18	0	26.06	7.53	24.50	18	49
Distinction Not Made	294	32	28.01	5.91	27.00	15	48
Total	404	62	26.94	5.93	26.00	15	49

Note: Seamen whose age is "not recorded" are excluded.

Source: See text.

No ages were recorded for those under commission and only three for those with a warrant. Ages for some could have been found from other contemporary sources, but I decided not to contaminate the data in this way. Of the three ages recorded for the eighteen people under warrant, all were twenty-four. As a result very little can be said in terms of age for this subgroup. Men with no distinction formed the largest group with 326 entries, 294 of which provided ages. They had a slightly higher mean age (28.01, sd = 5.91) than the overall group mean (26.94). On the other end of the age range were the men who were pressed (mean age = 23.67, sd = 4.35). A t-test found the age difference between those

pressed and those with no distinction to be significant, t = 4.82 (df = 381), <.001. [19] The pressed men were significantly younger than those who had no distinction by their name.

This last result takes on meaning as we identify what "no distinction" means. These men were not pressed for the Great Lakes service but were transferred from existing ships' companies; they thus had been at sea for some time prior to their entry onto this muster table. Nicholas Rodger called these men "turnovers," as they were turned over from other ships waiting to depart, returning from a service or acting as a hulk for the crews of vessels that had been paid-off. The pressed group were fresh recruits, most likely gathered for the first time and thus younger than the turnovers. This would also imply that the pressed men had less experience than the turnover men. All the men who volunteered had ages listed, yielding a mean age of 26.06 years, which was in keeping with the more seasoned sailors of the group without distinction in the "prest" column.

In describing the "lower deck" crew of "an average ship of 1812," Michael Lewis stated that half would have been pressed; eight percent volunteers (boys); fifteen percent volunteers (men); fifteen percent foreigners; and twelve percent quota men. Although the muster table does not provide information to make a comparison with Lewis' figures, there were no boys or quota men listed. If we remove the thirty warrant and commissioned officers from the sample, leaving 436 "lower deck" men, we find that only 4.14% were volunteers; 21.15% were pressed; and 74.71% were turnovers. While a portion of the men with no distinction in this column might have originally been pressed, the difference between a freshly pressed man and one who was turned over was more important than simply noting the occurrence of being pressed. The categories used by Lewis were not found in this muster table and may not be a relevant way to understand the nature of an active crew. The foreign component of the muster table will be dealt with below.

In comparing the present study with Rodger's description of the Georgian navy, we find startling differences. In the five crews he researched, Rodger found the overall average to be fifteen percent pressed; 55.6% volunteers and 25.9% turnovers. The men sent to the Great Lakes appear very different from their predecessors in the RN, with the greatest difference in the percentage of volunteers and turnovers.

When men were entered into a book they were assigned a rating, or quality, which was a work position on board. Table 3 contains the ratings and "Prest" status of the 466 men. The two left columns of table 3 contain the category of "quality" and the number of men assigned that rating as of 9 May 1813. For each "quality" the numbers pressed, volunteered, under warrant, under commission or no distinction were calculated.

The physical arrangement of the names in the muster table needs to be noted. The indication of "prest" appeared most often beside the names of able-bodied and ordinary seamen in the first half of the 466 names under study. The middle section was dominated by officers and men under warrant. The final portion again listed more seamen for whom no distinction was made and a handful of volunteers. All 466 men had a designated rank. Perhaps the pressed sailors were entered first, as it probably took more time to decide what quality to assign them. This may be further proof that the men for whom no distinction was made in the "Prest" column were turnovers from other vessels, with service experience and thus a prior rating to which they could be reassigned.20

Table 3
Recruitment

Qualities	**Total** Number	Pressed	Under Warrant	Under Commission	Volunteer	No Distinction
Able-bodied Seaman	206	45			9	152
Ordinary Seaman	179	47			5	127
Landsman	7				4	3
Midshipman	15		1			14
Master	2		2			
Master's Mate	8		1			7
Surgeon	2		2			
Assistant Surgeon	4		4			
Lieutenant	7			7		
Clerk	4					4
Commander	4			4		
Commodore	1			1		
Carpenter	2		2			
Carpenter's Mate	1					1
Carpenter's Crew	3					3
Boatswain	3		3			
Purser	2		2			
Captain Main Top	1					1
Captain Fore Top	1					1
Gunner	1		1			
Quarter Gunner	8					8
Capt. Mast	1					1
Cook's Mate	2					2
Captain After Gundeck	1					1
Quarter Master's Mate	1					1
Total	466	92	18	12	18	326

Source: See text.

Table 4
Age by **Rank**

Quality	Number	Not Recorded	Mean	Standard Deviation	Median Age	Range Min. Age	Range Max. Age
Ablebody Seaman	199	7	27.16	5.04	26.00	18	45
Ordinary Seaman	164	15	26.32	6.24	25.00	16	49
Landsman	7	0	25.71	5.50	27.00	19	35
Midshipman	9	6	23.56	6.39	24.00	15	35
Master	0	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Masters Mate	3	5	22.00	5.29	24.00	16	26
Surgeon	0	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Assistant Surgeon	0	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Lieutenant	0	7	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Clerk	3	1	22.00	3.61	21.00	19	26
Commander	0	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Commodore	0	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Carpenter	0	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Carpenter's Mate	1	0	28.00	N/A	28.00	28	28
Carpenter's Crew	2	1	26.00	8.49	26.00	20	32
Boatswain	0	3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Purser	0	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Captain Main Top	1	0	31.00	N/A	31.00	31	31
Captain Fore Top	1	0	36.00	N/A	36.00	36	36
Gunner	1	0	24.00	N/A	24.00	24	24
Quarter Gunner	8	0	33.87	7.64	32.50	24	46
Capt. Mast	1	0	41.00	N/A	41.00	41	41
Cook's Mate	2	0	37.50	7.78	37.50	32	43
Capt. After Guard	1	0	37.00	N/A	37.00	37	37
Quarter Master's Mate	1	0	45.00	N/A	45.00	45	45
Total	404	62					

Source: See text.

Able-bodied and ordinary seamen formed the body of men who were designated as pressed (forty-five and forty-seven, respectively). These same ratings dominated the 326 entries which did not have a distinction as to whether the men were pressed or not (152 able-bodied seamen and 127 ordinary seamen). Of the whole contingent, the able-bodied seamen constituted 44.2%, ordinary seamen 38.4% and landsmen a mere 1.5%. This seems a richer mix of seasoned men than what is currently regarded as having been the case at the end of the Napoleonic wars. Using data from two ships, Brian Lavery suggested that 28.1% were landsmen, whom he described as fresh recruits without sea experience. The men sent to the lakes did not conform to this.21

There were eighteen men with a warrant in the group sent to the lakes. Twelve commissioned officers were sent out. Forty-four men had no distinction as to their status, but a perusal of table 2 provides their rank: all were warrant or petty officers. Fourteen were midshipmen, whose place was with the warrant officers. Seven were master's mates, who would also be warrant officers. Why these men were not listed as under warrant is unknown. Of the remaining twenty-three who did not have a distinction in the "Whether Prest" column, all appear to be petty officers. Warrant officers (the eighteen listed plus twenty-one others deduced to be warrant officers) comprised 8.4% of the group, commissioned officers 2.6%, and petty officers 4.9%. It is important to remember that the Admiralty was sending these men out to man a small squadron of four vessels, all sixth-rate or less. It appears they were sending only the bare essentials.

The eighteen men who volunteered to join the original 448 on their journey to Lake Ontario included nine able-bodied seamen, five ordinary seamen and four landsmen. No cook was sent along with Yeo, perhaps because they were specifically selected from Greenwich pensioners, and it is highly unlikely that they could have made the difficult trip from Montréal to Kingston. Two cook's mates were assigned to the group. Table 4 gives the mean age, standard deviation, median and range of ages for each quality listed for the first 466 names. There are no ages in any of the qualities that fell under a commission or for most of those under warrant.

It appears that the ordinary and able-bodied seamen and landsmen were roughly of the same ages, with means clustering closely around twenty-six. They also shared the same age ranges: sixteen through forty-nine, eighteen to forty-five, and nineteen to thirty-five, respectively. The mean age for midshipmen (23.56, sd = 6.39) supports Pope's contention that most were in their twenties. [22] The age range for the nine midshipmen whose ages are known was from fifteen to thirty-five. The mean suggests that this group was slightly younger than the ordinary and able-bodied seamen and landsmen whom they at times commanded. In terms of actual ages, one each was fifteen, twenty-two, twenty-five, thirty-one and thirty-five, and two each were twenty-four and eighteen.

While the number of men in categories other than ordinary or able-bodied seamen for whom we know ages is small, it seems that positions of authority, or those with specific skills, were held by slightly older people. The age difference may reflect the fact that the trades required a longer time to master than seaman's skills. Some may have held certain ranks because they were not fit to work aloft. Older men may have been placed in certain positions (i.e., captain of the main top) to teach the younger men and, for their experience under fire, to help steady the others during engagements with the enemy.

Sources of the Men and Period of Recruitment

The men for the Great Lakes service were gathered from thirty-six different sources: thirty-four vessels and two hospitals.[23] The troopship *Woolwich* served as collection point and was the vessel into which all the commissioned officers and ten of those with warrants were directly entered. Eight of those with warrants came from other vessels. Twenty-four of the thirty-six sources were given as "Woolwich late ___," indicating the vessel the person was drawn from for this particular service. The ten other ship names cited in the muster table were given only as "late ___." The two styles of entering from whence a man came were intermixed within the table, including among entries made on the same day.

Of the thirty-four ship sources, nine were listed by David Lyon as being hulks in 1812 and 1813. One function the hulks fulfilled was to house men gathered for service in the navy, either as a result of press gang activity, recruitment drives, being taken from merchant ships as they approached British ports, or from naval vessels being paid off. The hulks contributed 216 of the 466 men (46.4%). Eighty-six men marked as pressed came from two of the hulks, while the other six were from two active ships. Twenty-three sources were naval vessels in active service in 1813, ranging from a bomb vessel to first-rate ships. These vessels provided 245 men (52.6%), of which 149 (60.8%) came from *Kent.* One ship, *Donis,* which was not found in Lyon's book, sent one man. The schooner *Phipps* had been broken up some time in 1812 and also sent one man. One assistant surgeon came from Deal Hospital, while two came from Haslar Hospital in Portsmouth.[24] One seaman from the *Namur* hulk had the designation "Habeas Corpus" alongside his source, perhaps implying he had passed through the courts. The three sources which contributed the largest number of men were the hulks *Quebec* (eighty-six) and *Royal William* (sixty-six), and the seventy-two gun ship *Kent* (149). With the exception of the hulk *Namur* and *Woolwich,* which both accounted for thirty-nine, the remaining thirty-one sources passed along only a total of eighty-seven, most sending only one or two each.

What the muster table reveals concerning the sources the men came from speaks directly to the issue of recruitment at this point in the Napoleonic wars. Lewis, Lavery and other modern writers contend that the RN had a critical manpower shortage by 1812. The present muster reveals that the bulk of the first 466 men sent to the Great Lakes came from five sources. The question is how many sources were used in the early years of war with France to raise the same number of men? There is no answer in the literature. Five sources may not be that many, but the thirty-one other sources needed to top-up the group might indicate a severe strain on manpower.

Another measure of a potential difficulty in raising the needed men is the length of the recruitment drive. In the muster table the date on which the men were entered into the service was noted. Assistant Surgeon James Mitchell was the earliest entrant into the inland seas service on 9 March 1812 (his actual muster table entry number was 145). Twenty-seven other men had their entry dates before the end of November 1812. Then eighty-five were entered into the service in December, perhaps as the Admiralty began to respond to a request from the Colonial Office to send sailors to the Great Lakes. Forty-seven of these December sailors came from *Royal William* on 18 December 1812. The real recruiting push came in January 1813, when 209 names were added to the list bound for Canada. On the last

day of the month, all 149 men from *Kent,* three from *Quebec* and five from *Lavinia* were entered. Fifty-two more were recruited in February in ones and twos. With the coming departure from England, eighty-one men were added in March. Twelve volunteers from *Woolwich* joined the group as it departed from Québec.

With the exception of Mitchell and one other man under warrant (who joined in February 1813), all other men under warrant and all commissioned officers were noted as entering the service in March 1813. James Lucas Yeo was entered on 8 March. The pressed men were assigned between 1 December 1812 and 5 March 1813 (nineteen in December, thirty-two in January, forty in February and one in March). Those for whom no distinction was made entered between March 1812 and March 1813. The last date for entry was 27 March 1813 (excluding the twelve volunteers from *Woolwich,* see below). *Woolwich* was part of a convoy that left England at the end of March and reached Québec on 5 May.25

Since the war did not start until June 1812 and Prevost did not request seamen and officers until fall, the "service list" created prior to December 1812 may have been either for another destination or a non-designated group of men to have ready for wherever they were needed. The main activity for this service list occurred after it had been decided that these men would go to the Great Lakes, between December 1812 and March 1813. The question is whether four months was a short or long time to recruit 466 men? Again, we can not answer this question from the literature.

Ships contributed to the force in a rather mixed fashion. Some donated all they were going to on one day, such as *Antelope,* which gave its seven men on 9 October 1812. Others gave one man at a time (or in small groups), like *Victorious,* which gave two men, one on 26 September 1812 and the other on 16 November. The men from *Quebec* arrived throughout the period, which indicates that the officer in charge of the collection went back repeatedly for additional contributions to the group headed for the lakes.

I have also calculated the mean ages of the men sent from each source that contributed to the Lake Ontario service. Individual means can be compared to the overall mean age of 26.94 (sd = 5.93). Of the thirty-six sources, six did not provide ages for the men, one gave thirty-eight ages, twenty-four had fewer than seven ages (the majority being one or two), and one reported twelve ages. Three sources (one active ship and two hulks) supplied ample numbers of men whose ages were recorded to make comparisons feasible. It appears that *Kent* supplied an older group of men than the two hulks, with a mean age of 30.69 (sd = 6.21). *Royal William's* group had a mean age of 26.92 (sd = 4.96), which matched the overall average of the entire group (mean age = 26.94, sd = 5.93). The mean age of the men from *Quebec* was 23.35 (sd = 4.18).

A one-way analysis of variance was performed on the ages of the men from the three ships mentioned above. A significant difference was found between the ages of the men from the three sources ($F = 48.63$, $df = 2, 280$ $p < .001$).[26] In order to establish where the difference lay, a Studentized Range Statistic q test was performed, which revealed that the average age of the men from *Kent* was significantly different from *Royal William* ($q=5.71$; $p<.001$ $q_{280,3} = 5.06$) and *Quebec* ($q = 13.59$; $p<.001$, $q_{280,3} = 5.06$). This result poses the question of whether the captain of *Kent* sent his oldest men to *Woolwich* to secure a younger crew for himself Another possibility is that *Kent* was being brought in for a refit and the crew was distributed to different services. If this were random, it would appear that

they were a little older than most. An analysis of the muster table and captain's log for *Kent* might shed some light on this point. Of the group sent to the lakes, the age range was twenty to forty-eight, with a median age of thirty. This means that half, or sixty-seven, were between twenty and thirty years, while the remaining sixty-seven were between thirty and forty-eight. It seems that not all the men from *Kent* were older than average. The men from *Royal William* were significantly older than those from *Quebec* ($q = 5.41$; $p<.001$ $q_{280,3} = 5.06$). As noted above, the men listed as pressed came primarily from *Quebec,* which may have served as a holding hulk for freshly pressed men, while *Royal William* served as a hulk for experienced crews being turned over. This would account for the difference in age of the men from these hulks.

A review of the other twenty-seven sources that provided ages reveals that they clustered around the overall mean of the sample (26.94), with nineteen having mean ages between twenty-four and twenty-nine. Six sources had means below twenty-four and two above thirty. While the numbers are extremely small, and thus great caution is required, the above analysis suggests that the men recruited were consistently in their twenties. If the men were randomly selected to enter the Great Lakes se rvice, the fact that so many sources sent men in their twenties indicates that the crews were in this age range themselves. If the captains of the various sources had another approach, we should see other examples like *Kent,* where the average age of seamen sent to *Woolwich* was significantly different from other sources.

Table 5
Promotions and Recruitment

	Whether Promoted		
	Yes	No	Percentage Promoted
Pressed	30	62	32.6
Under Warrant	0	18	0
Under Commission	4	8	33.3
Volunteer	7	11	38.9
Not Distinguished	100	226	30.8
Totals	141	325	30.3

Source: See text.

Promotions

Another piece of information contained in the muster table was the indication as to who received a promotion, as well as to what position and the date. The promotion was written into the column containing the promoted man's "quality." There were 141 promotions within the group of 466 men between 9 May 1813 and 30 April 1814 (see table 5). Nearly a third of the men in each category (with the exception of those under warrant) received a

promotion. The lack of promotion among those under warrant underlines the special nature of their trade, which guaranteed them a position of some authority, but no further promotions. Eight men had a notation indicating they had been "promoted" in the column stating where they were on 30 April 1814, but details were not provided in the muster table. All these men had been discharged from the muster table prior to 30 April 1814, and all but one was re-entered at a later date.

The notation SB 1180 denotes Richard Conor's second muster table number. Turning to that number in the table reveals he was made Acting Gunner for *Niagara* on 30 April 1814. George Barnett re-entered as number 1178 and became an Acting Boatswain on *Princess Charlotte.* Although noted as a promotion, the later entry lists John McLaren as Assistant Surgeon for *Montreal,* the same rank he held previously. William Kay re-entered as number 1176, an Acting Purser on *Prince Regent.* George Hugo returned as an Acting Lieutenant on *Charwell.* John Diamond, who was promoted and then demoted, was promoted again to Gunner (per warrant) for *Montreal.* Richard O'Conor had been put in charge of Kingston Dockyard, a post he never liked, and was thus removed from the muster table for the squadron the day it started. He was given command of *Prince Regent* on 30 April 1814 and re-entered the muster table as number 1181. Only James Giles appears to vanish from the table. With the exception of Richard O'Conor, there are no explanations for the discharge dates prior to 30 April 1814. As a result of the manner in which these eight men were first removed and then re-entered into the table, their promotions were not counted among those falling in the time period under consideration.

Of the 325 men not promoted, 282 had their ages recorded, producing a mean age of 26.51 (sd = 5.69), with a range of fifteen to forty-eight years. Those promoted had a mean age of 27.94 (sd = 6.39), and a range of eighteen to forty-nine. At first they appear to be nearly identical, but a comparison using an independent samples t-test revealed a weak, yet significant difference between these two groups. Those who were promoted were older than those not promoted ($t = -2.15$, $df = 207$, $p = .03$). [27] The difference is very small and may not actually reflect a conscious tendency to promote older men.

Of the twenty-five categories that existed under the column marked "Quality" on 9 May 1813, eleven received all the promotions. The bulk were among the ordinary and able-bodied seamen (seventy and fifty-four, respectively). Forty-three of the ordinary seamen were promoted one step to the rank of "able-bodied seaman." Most of the remaining ninety-eight promotions filled the authority positions necessary to assist the commissioned officers to work the ship. Included in this group were the five men given the task of "Ships Corporal;" acting as policemen they helped to enforce the rules of the ship. Some of the changes simply added men to specific work assignments, such as the carpentry crew.

Most advancements seem to have followed from the quality which the person had as he was entered into the table, such as ordinary seaman to able-bodied seaman, or quartermaster's mate to quartermaster. Others perhaps reflect dissatisfaction with the original classification, or a man being promoted to a more suitable position, such as carpenter's crew to boatswain mate, or quarter gunner to sailmaker.

Another dimension of the promotions is when they occurred during the year. The date of promotion was recorded under the original rank. There were thirteen dates on which promotions were made. The first occurred on 15 May 1813, as the first group approached

Kingston. It was the promotion of able-bodied seaman John Diamond to gunner, under a warrant issued by Yeo. The most significant round of promotions occurred on 30 May 1813, when Yeo promoted 115 men. This was the day after the British squadron participated in the second unsuccessful attack on Sackets Harbour. The promotions represent Yeo's efforts to put the squadron in order. Eleven promotions occurred on 1 October 1813, three days after Yeo's encounter with Chauncey that became known as "the Burlington Races." These may have replaced casualties or rewarded those who exerted themselves. Five men received two promotions. Two men had a double entry under their names, but the second was a demotion. John Diamond's demotion was noted above. William Woodall, aged twenty-four, was promoted to coxswain on 30 May 1813. On 1 January 1814 he was returned to his original rating of ordinary seaman. The causes of these demotions are unknown.

Among the twelve men sent out under commission, four were promoted. Two midshipmen and a master's mate were given commissions by Yeo. Lieutenant Alexander Dobbs was promoted to commander on 25 May 1813, when he was assigned to replace the invalided Commander England, who was to have had command of the brig *Earl of Moira.* Master's mate John Marjoiribanks was promoted to lieutenant on the same day to replace Dobbs in his former position. Little is known of Master's mate John Johnstone's promotion to lieutenant on 12 July 1813. Master's mate John Johnson (promoted to the rank on 1 August 1813 from midshipman) was promoted to lieutenant on 29 March 1814. Lieutenant Charles Anthony gained promotion to commander on 21 September 1813 to replace Dobbs, who fell ill and was sent to hospital in Kingston. Commander William Howe Mulcaster was raised to acting captain by Yeo for his bravery and seamanship during the Burlington Races, when he had brought his ship, *Royal George,* between a badly damaged *Wolfe,* Yeo's ship, and Chauncey's flagship, *Pike.* Mulcaster fired several broadsides into *Pike,* giving Yeo time to escape. Mulcaster later played a key role in defeating the American army at Crysler's Farm on 11 November 1813. Captain Mulcaster was grievously wounded in the British attack at Oswego on 6 May 1814.28

Of the eighteen warrant officers sent out with Yeo, none received promotion in this period. Assistant Surgeon James Mitchell was sent to the Lake Champlain squadron on 13 January 1814 and the notation, "promoted" appears beside his entry, not under his original quality as with all other promotions. Whether the promotion came from Yeo or Lieutenant Pring (commanding on Lake Champlain) is unknown. For the present study I have considered the promotion to be made after he left the muster.

William Ellery was the only "warrant" midshipman on the muster table. He died at the end of the day-long engagement in which Chauncey chased Yeo from the Genesee River to the False Ducks. According to David Wingfield, Ellery had a premonition of his death in battle.[29] With the contest all but over, Wingfield congratulated Ellery for surviving. At that very moment Ellery was cut in half by one of the last shots from the American flagship while Wingfield's hand rested on his shoulder.

This study conforms to the picture of the promotion process for commissioned and warrant officers. Commissioned officers rose through the officer ranks as spaces became available, at the discretion of the commodore. Warrant officers appear to have reached a career plateau when they moved from the assistant to the senior level, for example from

boatswain's mate to boatswain. Their trade skills guaranteed them the position while in most cases preventing them from moving any higher in the chain of command.

Michael Lewis suggested that the muster table information would not be helpful to the historian in describing the professional life of the lower-deck seaman. The present study contradicts this view. The statistical analysis of the muster table reveals that nearly one-third of the men received a promotion, which meant an increase in pay and power. While the pay increase would be minimal, a position of minor authority, or at best a warrant, would raise one's social status and reflect a favourable opinion by the officers, a positive turn of events in an otherwise bleak existence.

There are no studies of the promotion process among the lower-deck sailor from the Napoleonic era. The results from the present study provide the first systematic glimpse at this critical aspect of the life of the early nineteenth-century British sailor.

Discharged, Discharged Dead and Run

On 30 April 1814 the muster table for the Lake Ontario establishment was closed and individual books for the various ships in the squadron opened. At that time a notation was entered as to where each man had been assigned. This column also included a note beside the names of all men who had died (along with any pertinent information), had been sent to other postings, invalided, or otherwise sent away from the squadron. The column also contained the letter "R," indicating that a man had run, or deserted.

Table 6
Ages and Discharges

				Range	
Distinction	Mean Age	Standard Deviation	Median	Min.	Max.
Discharged N=373 (59)	26.99	5.99	26.00	15	49
Discharged Dead N=23 (3)	26.70	6.01	24.00	20	39
Run N=7	26.00	2.58	26.00	23	30

Note: Numbers in parentheses represent those for whom an age was not recorded.

Source: See text.

In the muster there were seven men marked run, twenty-six discharged dead, and 432 listed as simply discharged. One man's record did not contain any indication as to his status. This was John Singer, age twenty-two, from London. An ordinary seaman, he was promoted to able-bodied seaman on 30 May 1813. There is a notation off to the side that states he had not been paid prior to 20 April 1814, and the reader is referred to an explanation in the "Provincial Pay Book." This source was not examined for the present

article, so his destination and status remain unknown. There appears to be almost no difference in the mean ages of the three distinctions. Table 6 provides the mean ages for the men by category.

Lavery and Lewis stated that desertion was a major problem for the British navy. Lewis suggests that nearly eleven percent of seamen deserted between 1803 and 1805. [30] He also noted that more senior men (able-bodied seamen) ran than less senior (ordinary seamen and landsmen). Lavery cited *Alfred* as losing six percent of its crew in four days.[31] During the year the Lake Ontario muster was open, only 1.5% of the men deserted. This seems remarkably low compared to the information provided by Lavery and Lewis. The literature indicates that men appeared to desert in any situation, so that the general wilderness of Upper Canada would not have been a deterrent. It may be that Yeo maintained a fairly good environment aboard his vessels, which may have lowered the motivation to escape.

Of the seven who ran, four were ordinary seamen, two were originally able-bodied seamen and one was a landsmen. This is not in accordance with Lewis' picture of deserters. The four pressed men were from the hulk *Quebec;* one each with no distinction in the pressed column were from *Raisonable* and *Kent,* while one was a volunteer from *Woolwich.* The volunteer from *Woolwich* had been promoted to coxswain before he ran, making him an unusual deserter. Their ages ranged from twenty-three to thirty, which appears to represent the typical seamen in this service.

In studying the Georgian navy, Rodger found a negative correlation between desertion and length of service. That is, men would desert sooner rather than later after joining a ship, contrary to Lewis' conclusion. Rodger examined forty-five musters and found desertion rates ranging from .7% to 34.4%. Some musters were for the same ship under different captains. The rates of desertion differed for each officer.32

In the present study, all but one had deserted prior to the middle of August. This point is particularly interesting as Yeo had written to Lord Melville in December 1813 "that only one desertion has taken place, since I took the command of the Establishment." [33] It is baffling that Yeo would fudge the number of deserters, as it was relatively low anyway.

The discharge column indicates that eighteen men were discharged into one of three hospitals: Kingston, York or Québec. Of the fifteen who went to Kingston, six died. The man left at the York facility died on 2 February 1814. Of the two deposited in Québec, one died in June while the other was discharged in July 1813. It is unknown if the man who died was left in Québec before Yeo headed for the lake, or sent back to the city after becoming ill. The second person, ordinary seaman Timothy Collins, was sent back to the hospital at Québec. An interesting note appeared to the right of Collins' entry. A clerk wrote that "this Man was Wounded in a Gun Boat on the American shore When detached from the Squadron which prevented his Ticket being sent with him." This note, intended to straighten out the pay owed, provides a glimpse at what sent Collins to the hospital.

Of the fifteen men sent to the hospital at Kingston, nine were able-bodied seamen, three ordinary seamen, one quartermaster, one captain's mate, and one midshipman (Joseph Marshall). Four of the able-bodied seamen died, along with one ordinary seaman and midshipman Marshall. The causes of death were not stated in the muster. An examination of dates does not indicate a clear connection between the deaths and engagements with the enemy. Of the remainder, six had the added comment that they were discharged to the

hospital as unserviceable. They were not expected to return and arrangements would be made to send them home. Three were simply discharged to the hospital and would be expected to return to a ship at some point. Except for those who died in the Kingston hospital, all the men shared the same date of discharge, 30 April 1814. Eight of the eighteen men sent to hospital died.

Christopher Lloyd reported that the RN's hospital mortality rate in 1812 was one in thirty.[34] The present study found a rate of 1 in 2.25, a significant difference. Perhaps Lloyd was referring only to hospitals in England and not those elsewhere in the Empire. Little is known of the medical care provided to the seamen in hospitals in Canada, but the current study would indicate that it was not very good.

Five men were discharged and sent directly home because they were considered invalids. Two ordinary and one able-bodied seaman were discharged on 31 October 1813, at the end of the sailing season. Lieutenant John Johnstone was discharged as an invalid on 7 March 1814. As noted earlier, Commander Thomas England was sent home shortly after arriving in Kingston on 24 May 1813.

Eighteen other men died outside hospital during the first year in Upper Canada. Sam Burns was originally assigned to *Prince Regent* on 30 April 1814. At that time he was marked with a "D," indicating he had been discharged alive. A note appears to the right of his entry stating "per Bds Order 27 Dec 1815." A second "D" joins the first, written in the same hand as the note. He was apparently dead before the closing of the muster table and the clerk had gone back and changed the record. The time of his death is unknown, as are the circumstances. Daniel Meade followed a similar path as Sam Burns. He was sent to Lake Erie on 20 May 1813 to serve in Barclay's fleet. A correction dated 8 December 1815 added another "D" to his first discharge. His name appears on the list of dead and wounded after the Battle of Lake Erie. Barclay marked him as dead, having been killed aboard the British flagship, HMS *Detroit.35*

Nine men died in action, six from accidents (including a man who froze to death), one from sickness at sea and two under unknown circumstances. With the eight that died in hospital, the total who died in the group of 466 was twenty-six. Lloyd argued that 81.5% of all deaths in the navy between 1792 and 1815 were due to disease and accident and 6.3% to enemy action.[36] In this group, however, 34.6% were killed in enemy action and 26.9% died as a result of accident or illness at sea. The eight people who died in a hospital cannot be added to either list, as the cause of their death is unknown. It appears that there was a higher proportion of death by enemy action than would have been expected based on the literature. This result is surprising, given the indecisive nature of the running actions between the British and American squadrons on Lake Ontario during 1813. The average age of the men who died was twenty-six, almost identical with the mean age for the overall group (26.94). Death appears to have had no bias for age among these men.

Four men were discharged to the Kingston Dockyard during the year. One man was assigned to the "Flotilla," while another went to the "Gun Boat Establishment." Master's mate Alexander Leslie was sent home to England on 15 June 1813. Joseph Hood, an ordinary seaman, was reported "Missing 29 June 1813 from the Boat at Soudus." The thirty-year-old from York, England, took part in Yeo's June raids along the American shore of

Lake Ontario. As the boat pulled back to the fleet, Hood was not on board, whether through death, capture or desertion.

Information in the first portion of the table reveals that sixteen men were captured by the Americans, all on 6 October 1813 in the flotilla bringing reinforcements to Kingston from York. In their attempt to round the False Ducks and run into Kingston, the boats met an American squadron and all but one were captured or burned. [37] The muster records the fact that thirteen were returned to the British, but when they actually returned was not noted. David Wingfield (age twenty-four), in command of the schooner *Confiance* when he was captured, was returned to Lake Ontario. Ordinary seaman Walter Clancey (age twenty-five), and able-bodied seamen Thomas Ready (age twenty-five) and Alexander Vann (age twenty-four) were not returned. On the day the muster table was closed two entries read, "Prisoner in America," while Ready's was left blank. The remaining twelve were released to the British on Lake Champlain. Six ordinary and five able-bodied seamen stayed there. Master's mate J.A. Jackson travelled from Lake Champlain back to Kingston.

Table 7
Manning of the Lake Ontario Squadron

Ships of the Lake Ontario Squadron	Number of the 363 entered 30 April 1814	Number from Quebec	Kent	Royal William
Princess Charlotte	98	17	32	19
Print Regent	153	26	52	24
Niagara	16	7	4	2
Star	34	7	13	2
Montreal	19	6	4	3
Charwell	12	2	4	1
Netley	23	5	12	1
Magnet	8	3	2	1
Total	363	73	123	53

Source: See text.

Four others were discharged to Lake Champlain from the portion of the muster table under review. On 16 July 1813 three men were sent forth: Lieutenants Charles Creswick (promoted by Yeo 25 May 1813 from midshipman) and William Hicks (promoted 16 July from master's mate) and quarter gunner Will Muckle left Lake Ontario for Lake Champlain. As noted above, James Mitchell, Assistant Surgeon, was sent there on 31 January 1814.38

Fourteen of the original 466 men were sent to Lake Erie by Yeo to serve under Barclay. Twelve were sent on 20 May 1813 with Barclay, who was given the Lake Erie command after Mulcaster refused it. [39] Two more joined other small groups of seamen sent on 3 July and 26 August 1813.

In examining the "List of Killed and Wounded" for the 10 September 1813 action on Lake Erie, six of these men were among the dead and wounded. As noted above, Daniel

Meade was killed. E.W. Buchan, John M. Hoffmieston (Hoffmiester in the Lake Erie list) and Benjamin Hippingstall were listed as dangerously wounded. John Davis and John Donald were slightly wounded. No information was found in the muster about the return of any of these men.

Two men were discharged from the muster table with the notation "from the service per Order of Sir J L Yeo." Midshipmen John Hill and George McFarquhar were forced out of the RN. John Hill was discharged on 23 August 1813, while Edinburgh native George McFarquhar (age eighteen) was sent packing on 11 December 1813. The reason for these discharges is unknown.

The largest number of discharges were to the eight vessels of the British squadron on Lake Ontario at the opening of the 1814 season. Three hundred and sixty-three men from the original 466 who came over to Upper Canada were placed in these vessels. Table 7 lists the vessels into which these men were discharged and the numbers for each vessel. The distribution of the men who had entered this service from the three ships which had contributed the largest number of men to the mission is also shown.

These numbers reveal that 77.9% of the men who came to the lake with Yeo still served in the ships under his command. Of the eighty-six from *Quebec,* seventy-three remained. Fifty-three of the original sixty-six from *Royal William* were assigned to vessels on 30 April 1814. *Kent's* contribution of 149 was down to 123. Of the 301 men drawn from these three ships for the Lake Ontario service, 249 (82.7%) were still serving in Yeo's fleet.

Table 8
Ages on 30 April 1814

Name of Vessel (number of guns)	N	No Records	Mean Age	Standard Deviation	Median	Range Min.	Range Max.
Princess Charlotte (42)	90	8	27.31	6.30	25.50	18	49
Prince Regent (56)	134	19	27.31	5.33	27.00	15	41
Niagara (21)	15	1	26.87	5.28	25.00	15	42
Star(14)	28	6	27.21	7.15	25.50	19	47
Montreal (21)	16	3	24.19	4.61	23.00	18	33
Charwell (13)	9	3	25.00	7.58	23.00	16	43
Netley (9)	21	2	29.95	6.48	31.00	20	46
Magnet (11)	7	1	22.00	5.10	21.00	18	33

Source: See text.

The two largest ships of the Lake Ontario fleet received the majority of these men. In relative terms *Princess Charlotte,* with a ship's company of 220, received ninety-eight men (44.6% of the ship's company) from the 301 still available for service in the squadron.' One hundred and fifty-three joined Yeo's new flagship, *Prince Regent,* with a ship's

company of 367 (41.7% of the ship's company).The surprise is *Netley,* which had a ship's company of thirty-seven, and took twenty-three of the original 301 assigned to the squadron (sixty-two percent of the ship's company). *Star,* with a ship's company of sixty-seven, took thirty-four men (50.8% of its ship's company). *Niagara,* with a ship's company of ninety-nine, took only sixteen (6.1% of the ship's company). Twelve men entered the ship's company of fifty-nine for *Charwell* (20.3% of the ship's company). Muster tables are not currently available for *Montreal* or *Magnet,* so percentages for these ships cannot be calculated.[41] It appears that Yeo made a conscious effort to distribute these men evenly throughout his fleet. Perhaps it was to serve as a backbone of experience for the men who arrived in Kingston between November 1813 and April 1814 and who would be going out on Lake Ontario for the first time.

Table 8 contains the mean ages of the men placed in each of the eight vessels of the Lake Ontario squadron. A perusal of this tables indicates little difference, with the exceptions that *Magnet* received the youngest mean age and *Netley* the oldest. It is important to note that eleven months had passed since the muster table was opened, and most of the men would have been a year older. The ages have not been adjusted in the above table, as precise information as to the birth date of each man was not available. In theory the youngest man could have been sixteen years old, while the oldest could have turned fifty.

Place of Birth

One other piece of information will be dealt with in this article. The muster table contained birthplaces for 413 men. Eighteen warrant officers did not list a place of birth; instead the words "Pr Warrant" appeared. None of the dozen commissioned officers had a place of birth listed; in its place was the phrase "Pr Comn," Six midshipman, four master's mates, five ordinary seamen and eight able-bodied seamen did not give a place of birth. Four of the five ordinary seamen and all the able-bodied seamen without a birthplace came as volunteers from *Woolwich.* These fifty-three men comprised 11.4% of the total. From their names and other biographical information, most appear to have been born in Britain, but because this is uncertain, they are omitted from the following analysis.

One hundred and ninety-four places were listed. The largest group from a single place were the fifty-eight who listed London, England as their place of birth. Most towns and cities appeared only once or twice. A preliminary analysis of what countries the men came from was done by locating the place of birth in a modern atlas. The shortcoming of this approach is that boundaries have changed since the early nineteenth century and some birthplaces may have been placed in the wrong country. Since the vast majority of entries were for Great Britain and Ireland, this error is confined to England, Wales and Scotland. Twenty-six places were not located, although many seem to be British or Irish, such as Argylshire, Bridgmouth, Newberry and Hudderford. Twenty-nine men gave these twenty-six towns as their place of birth. Table 9 contains the preliminary results of this analysis. It reveals the international flavour of the mainly English contingent. Only 3.6% of the men were foreign-born, while 89.3% were British-born. This finding differs markedly from the expected fifteen percent foreign complement suggested by Lewis and Lavery.

Table 9
Birth Places

Country	Number of Men	Number of Places
England	260	108
Scotland	35	10
Wales	12	7
Ireland	52	19
North Britain	10	10
Prussia	3	3
Russia	1	1
St. Kitts	1	1
Curacao	1	1
Jamaica	1	1
Canary Islands	1	1
Denmark	1	1
Norway	2	1
Spain	1	1
Sweden	1	1
United States	1	1
Canada	1	1
Undetermined	29	26
Totals	413	194

Source: See text.

Conclusions

The first goal of the present study was to establish the usefulness of applying quantitative statistical analysis to muster table information. The results show that this evidence can be encoded and analyzed to add to our understanding of the British sailor in the early nineteenth century. Michael Lewis argued that such an analysis would be far too time-consuming relative to the rewards. This study, along with the work of Dye and Stagg, suggests an opposite conclusion. The data in muster tables can provide new insights into the sailors who manned the British fleet during the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars. The advent of personal computers and specialized software makes this type of analysis much more feasible than it was in 1960. I believe that muster tables are an essential element in the study of the British sailor and therefore urge others to explore this rich resource.

The second goal was to describe the men Yeo brought out to the Great Lakes. Their average age was 26.94 years, with a range from fifteen to forty-nine. One group joining the service was significantly older than the rest and may have skewed the mean. The vast

majority were of British birth, with only a handful from foreign places. All the commissioned officers and most warrant officers did not list either their age or birthplace. This was reflective of the privilege afforded by social status to those in command.

Able-bodied and ordinary seamen comprised 82.62% of the men, with only 23.9% being freshly pressed into service. Few were volunteers, while almost seventy percent had been turned over from other vessels. The ordinary and able-bodied seamen were given 124 of the 141 promotions. These were into minor authority positions or to special work details, such as the carpenter's crew. One hundred and fifteen promotions were awarded on 30 May 1813, as Yeo adjusted crews after the defeat at Sackets Harbour. None of the men sent out under warrant received a promotion; this reflected their skill, which was vital to the vessel but seldom led to further advancement. On the other hand, demotions were very rare, and men were far more likely to be released from the service unfit, ill or injured. A trip to the hospital was almost always a death sentence, as one in 2.5 died there. Only six of the 466 deserted during the year under investigation.

The first goal was further buttressed by the results for goals three and four. The third goal was to compare the portrait of the men in the muster table with the current profile of the British seaman in the same time period. The present study produced a profile that resembled the one contained in current sources on the British seamen for the period 1793-1815. But there were some differences that raise questions about the accuracy of the current picture. There were no men listed in the muster table as quota men. The percentages of seamen listed as landsman, foreign-born, convicts, volunteers and deserters were all much lower in the present study than would have been expected from the literature. This evidence, along with the findings reported in Nicholas Rodger's study of the Georgian navy, suggests a need to revise the current profile.

The present study yielded average ages for all seamen and for various subcategories. It also analyzed the promotion experience of the lower deck, looking at the percentage promoted, the timing, who received them and to what positions. In both cases (age and promotion) there are no corresponding data in the current literature on British sailors between 1793 and 1815, so comparisons could not be made. Examination of other muster tables will further delineate these variables.

The fourth goal concerned what the present data could add to our understanding of some of the larger issues facing the navy, such as health, desertion rates and manpower shortages. In terms of health the present study found that men sent to any of the hospitals in Canada had a greater chance of dying than those residing in navy hospitals elsewhere in the Empire. It would appear that a study of the medical service in British-held North America is warranted. The present data do not reveal the exact reason for sending most of the men to hospital. A search through the sick tickets might yield this information.

With regard to desertion, the number of men who ran was much lower than expected from the current literature. It may be that current researchers have focussed on the cases where desertion was rampant, ignoring the instances of little or no desertion. Further study through the analysis of muster tables is required to resolve this question.

Similarly, the issue of recruitment and the possible difficulty that the British experienced over the course of the French Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars will only be truly understood by analyzing the relevant information contained in the muster tables. The

current group was drawn chiefly from five sources, with an additional thirty-one sources providing only 18.67% of the men. Again, the current literature does not provide information on the number of sources from which men were drawn. Neither does any modem source refer to the length of time a recruitment drive took. In the present study, the group was pulled together in about four months. Without other muster tables being consulted, we cannot comment on the manpower situation in 1812-1813. It would be important to compare the number of sources and the length of time taken to gather enough men at different points between 1793 and 1815 to describe recruitment more accurately.

The major shortcoming of the present study is the small sample size. While it is too small to make definitive statements, it is ample enough to show the worth of employing statistical analysis to analyze the muster tables. The results are sufficient to give rise to questions about the current profile and to promote further analysis of muster table information to clarify it.

NOTES

1. For a British view of the engagement, see Robert Malcomson and Thomas Malcomson, *The Battle for Lake Erie* (St. Catharines, ON, 1990). For an American view, see Richard Dillon, *We have Met the Enemy: Oliver Hazard Perry* (New York, 1978).

2. For a description of these engagements see Tom Malcomson. "Sept. 1813: The Decidedly Indecisive Engagements between Chauncey and Yeo." *Inland Seas,* XLVII, No. 4 (Winter 1991), 299-313. For a description of Yeo's first-rate ship, see Robert Malcomson. "HMS *St. Lawrence:* Commodore Yeo's Unique First-Rate," *Freshwater,* VI (1991), 27-36. Classic sources on the struggle for the lakes are A.T. Mahan, *Sea Power in Its Relations to the War of 1812* (Boston, 1905); and Theodore Roosevelt. *The Naval War of 1812.* (reprint, Annapolis, 1987). E.A. Cruikshank wrote two papers on Lake Ontario, "The Contest for the Command of Lake Ontario in 1812 and 1813," *Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada,* X (1916), 161-223; and "The Contest for the Command of Lake Ontario in 1814," *Ontario History,* XXI (1924), 99-159. Information on the vessels used by the British during the war may be gleaned from Richard Preston, "The Fate of Kingston's Warships," *Historic Kingston,* 1 (1974), 3-14; and Barlow Cumberland. "The Navies of Lake Ontario in the War of 1812." *Ontario Historical Society Papers and Records,* VIII (1907), 124-142.

3. John Marshall, *Marshall's Naval Biography* (London, 1831). *The Naval Chronicle,* 1799-1819, was a British magazine featuring news, biography and discussion about the RN.

4. For a list of officers, see L. Homfray Irving. *Officers of the British Forces in Canada During the War of 1812-1815* (Toronto, 1908). The sources in note 1 make reference to the officers but say little about those below them. Edited journals and letters of four naval officers can be perused in Robert Malcomson (ed.), *Sailors of 1812: Memoirs and Letters of Naval Officers on Lake Ontario* (Youngstown, NY, 1997).

5. Robert Malcomson, "The Crews of the British Squadron at Put-In-Bay: A Composite Muster Roll and Its Insights," *Inland Seas,* LI (Summer/Fall 1995), 16-29 and 43-56.

6. According to National Archives of Canada (NAC), Manuscript Group (MG) 24, F18, Wingfield Manuscript (Wingfield), the men arrived at Montréal on 8 May, but were immediately marched another ten miles to Lachine, where they rested for the night. The muster table enters all 466 men studied in this paper on 9 May. The muster table, "Naval Establishment on Lake Ontario Upper Canada Commencing the 9 May 1813 and Including the 30 April 1814 Wages paid in Canada from the Original Entries to All but Those who have Notations against their Names or Discharged with Tickets Provisions Supplied Agreeable to the Custom of the Army from the Different Commissioners, Post to the Date of Their Appearance in

the Ships Expressed Opposite Their Respective Names," may be found in Great Britain, Public Record Office (PRO), Admiralty (ADM) 37/5000.

7. Malcomson, "Crews," 1995.

8. Gerard T. Altoff, *Deep Water Sailors, Shallow Water Soldiers: Manning the United States Fleet on Lake Erie, 1813* (Put-In-Bay, OH, 1993).

9. Ira Dye, "Physical and Social Profiles of Early American Seafarers, 1812-1815," in Colin Howell and Richard Twomey (eds.), *Jack Tar in History: Essays in the History of Maritime Life and Labour* (Fredericton, NB, 1991).

10. J.C.A. Stagg, "Enlisted Men in the United States Army, 1812-1815: A Preliminary Survey," *William and Mary Quarterly,* Third Series, XLIII, No. 4 (1986), 615-645.

11. N.A.M. Rodger, *The Wooden World: An Anatomy of the Georgian Navy* (London, 1986).

12. Michael Lewis, *A Social History of the Navy 1793-1815* (London, 1960); Christopher Lloyd, *The British Seaman 1200-1860: A Social Survey* (London, 1968); Peter Kemp, *The British Sailor: A Social History of the Lower Deck* (London, 1970); Dudley Pope, *Life in Nelson's Navy* (London, 1981); and Brian Lavery, *Nelson's Navy: The Ships, Men and Organization* (Annapolis, 1989).

13. "Quality" was the word used in muster tables for the column bearing the assigned rank for each sailor.

14. For a full description of a muster book (and many other useful records held by the Public Record Office, London), see N.A.M. Rodger, *Naval Records for Genealogists* (London, 1988).

15. The men arrived in Kingston over a period of nearly ten days. NAC, MG 24, F95, William Hull Mulcaster Manuscript (Mulcaster), reports arriving in Kingston on 15 May 1813 while Wingfield suggests his group took two weeks to move from Lachine to Kingston, leaving the former on 11 May 1813.

16. *MINI TAB: DOS Microcomputer Version Release 7* (1989).

17. The standard deviation is an indication of variation around the mean within the sample being studied. The larger the standard deviation the greater the variation. Ninety-five percent of the sample should fall within two standard deviations of the mean. In the case of age, ninety-five percent of the ages were within 11.86 of the mean age of 26.94. The standard deviation (sd) will be given for all means in the present study. The median is the point at which half the sample is larger and half smaller. It is provided as a further indication of the nature of the distribution being studied. This measure will be interpreted when it appears in the results.

18. See Sir Gilbert Blanc, "Observations on the Diseases of Seamen," in Christopher Lloyd (ed.), *The Health of Seamen* (London, 1965).

19. The result, $t = 4.82$ ($df = 381$), $<.001$, indicates that the difference in mean age between these two groups is likely to occur by chance once in 1000 times.

20. For a description of what the qualities in this muster table mean, see Lavery, *Nelson's Navy*.

21. *Ibid.,* 124.

22. Pope, *Life.*

23. David Lyon, *The Sailing Navy List: All the Ships of the Royal Navy, Built, Purchased and Captured 1688-1860* (London, 1993) was used to identify the names of the ships listed in the table. Spelling was left as it appeared in the muster table.

24. *Donis, Phipps* and the two hospitals account for the missing one percent after adding the percentages for those from hulks to those from active vessels.

25. Prevost to Bathurst, 18 May 1813, in E.A. Cruikshank (ed.), *The Documentary History of the Campaign upon the Niagara Frontier in the Year 1813. Part I.: January to June 1813* (9 vols., Welland, 1902-1908), VI, 232.

26. An analysis of variance tests for the existence of differences between the ages found in the three groups of men by establishing the difference within groups and comparing it with the difference between groups. In this case the analysis of variance revealed a truly significant difference. The result is likely to happen by chance less than one in

a thousand times. There was more difference between than within the groups.

27. The result indicates that the difference in the mean ages occurs three times out of every 100 by chance (p = .03). Since the usual level of acceptance is p = .05, this difference is seen as significant. A more conservative level of p = .01 would find no difference

28. NAC, MG 24, Mulcaster, 28-30.

29. NAC, MG 24, Wingfield, 17.

30. Lewis, *Social History*, 134.

31. Lavery, *Nelson's Navy*, 143.

32. Rodger, *Wooden World*, 354-358.

33. NAC, MG 24, F 14, Yeo to Melville, 6 December 1813. A similar letter had gone to Croker much earlier, stating, "that only one seaman has deserted to the enemy." Yeo to Croker, 16 July 1813, in Cruikshank (ed.), *Documentary*, VI, 245-246.

34. Lloyd, *British Seaman*, 263.

35. "A List of Killed and Wounded in His Majesty's Ships & Vessels Undermentioned in Action with an American Squadron on Lake Erie, Upper Canada, 10th September 1813," in William Wood (ed.), *Select British Documents of the Canadian War of 1812* (3 vols., Toronto, 1920), II, 279-281.

36. Lloyd, *British Seaman*, 263. The conclusion that a seaman's death was far more likely to be from accident and sickness rather than enemy action is also found in Pope, *Life;* Lavery, *Nelson 's Navy;* and Lewis, *Social History*.

37. For details of this incident, see Robert Malcomson, "The Captures of the Schooner *Julia/Confiance*," *American Neptune*, LI (Spring 1991), 83-90.

38. The "Return of Killed and Wounded on Board His Majestys Late Ship *Confiance* in Action with the Enemy the 11th Septr 1814," indicates that Joseph Reay was killed and Roger Owens "Dangerously Wounded;" see Wood, *Select*, III, Part I, 478-479. Further examination of the returns for the Lake Champlain squadron in the aftermath of the battle should be examined to find the fates of the other men. During the course of the court martial over the British defeat on Lake Champlain Lieutenant William Hicks' actions were applauded.

39. From the muster table Barclay is noted as taking three other men who had come with him from Halifax. He travelled to Amherstburg with fifteen men to bolster the weak Provincial Marine who manned the Lake Erie squadron.

40. "Ship's company" refers to the sailors and officers on board to run the vessel. This is different from the term "ship's compliment," which includes these men plus the marines and their officers considered necessary for manning the ship. The actual number on board may not equal the compliment considered necessary. The muster table could also carry supernumeraries for wages and/or victuals, who may or may not actually have been on board and were not counted as part of the ship's compliment.

41. The data concerning the ship's compliments for vessels in this paragraph come from the individual muster tables for these ships and vessels, held in Great Britain, Public Records Office: *Star*, ADM 37/5636; *Charwell*, ADM 37/5629; *Niagara* ADM, 37/5377; *Netley*, ADM 37/5642; *Princess Charlotte*, ADM 37/5245; and *Prince Regent*, ADM 37/5128.