

CHAPTER 6

DRINK AND PUBLIC ORDER

The key focus in this chapter is how the urban elite in Norwich responded to the perceived danger to social order posed by the consumption of alcoholic drink by the poor, in the context of the new social and political perspectives that had developed with industrialisation and urban growth. There clearly were social problems caused by drinking to excess and anxieties were widespread. These issues, however, were but one element in a wider picture of concern for social order and effective control of the working classes in the nineteenth century. The growth of towns and cities had intensified the fear of uncontrollable masses usurping power. By the time Peel became involved with penal, police and law reform in the 1820s, the political and cultural climate was very different from the eighteenth century with its relative satisfaction with public order.¹

The shadow of the French revolution at the end of the eighteenth century fell over much of the next century; the poor in 1789 had risen against those above them in the social hierarchy – and might conceivably do so in Britain. One effect of the Industrial Revolution had been to concentrate more people than ever before in urban centres. Most people in towns and cities were poor. At times of economic crisis, as unemployment rose, the anxieties of the powerful and wealthy rose too – at Westminster and at the level of urban or county politics. Norwich would have been no exception. The years around the accession of

Victoria in 1837 were particularly fraught. Chartism had been founded the previous year with the drawing up of the People's Charter, a political programme for democracy. At the same time, the worst industrial depression of the century gripped the country, accompanied by a series of bad harvests. By 1842, the sense of crisis was over, albeit returning briefly in 1848, but within the Norwich urban elite there must have been a sense of relief that its city politicians had acted as early as 1836 to set up a new-style police force.²

Yet there had been a measure of direction from Westminster to do so. The terms of the Municipal Corporations Act (1835) had required regular police forces to be established and maintained in all boroughs in England and Wales. The first new town councils were elected in December 1835 and most places appointed Watch Committees in January or February 1836.³ The national standardisation of town councils – now consisting of mayor, aldermen, and councillors elected by local ratepayers – created a new type of local government but urban elites could then shape this according to their own beliefs about the 'common good'. There were in fact considerable variations between urban centres due to this scope for interpretation and the degree of autonomy still exercised at the local level.

As research findings reveal these differences between localities, it becomes more difficult to present a general interpretation. This is the conclusion that David Taylor has drawn after assessing the recent proliferation of local studies of the development of the 'new police'.⁴ Nevertheless, some common features are apparent in the second quarter of the nineteenth century. Taylor observed:

'... there was a continuing and complex debate about police reform, characterised by a wide range of concerns, ranging from fear of a growth of crime (especially theft in its various forms), to concerns about public order, public morality and the efficiency with which local government was conducted'.⁵

Within Norwich, these issues are evident and a concern for cost-saving efficiency is explicit.⁶ In addition, and most importantly, the Norwich urban elite seemed determined to use their new police force, through the Watch Committee, not only to keep public order but also to present to the 'lower orders' a model value-system for them to emulate, based on virtues like sobriety, deference, discipline and duty. As Robert Storch has argued, the new police forces were akin to 'domestic missionaries' sent out to civilise darkest England.⁷

Within Norwich, as elsewhere, considerable difficulties were experienced before this 'missionary' intent could produce a police force that was professional and disciplined enough to serve the ideological purposes for which in part it had been established. The creation of the Norwich police force immediately presented a dilemma for the Norwich city fathers and it is this problem that provides the initial focus in the present chapter. Set up to help control the 'lower orders', the force then constituted a control problem of its own. Drunkenness on duty was to prove a major internal constraint in developing a more professional police force in Norwich that could then serve as an ideological model in the interests of the urban elite.

The formation of the Norwich Police in January 1836 signalled the determination of local politicians to create 'at a less expense a much more efficient police'.⁸ Better and cheaper public order was a political aim likely to find favour with the ratepayers of Norwich. In 1836, that force comprised a Night Watch of thirty-two men supported by six supernumeraries, and a daytime police force of eighteen Ward Constables with three supernumeraries under a superintendent.⁹ By the 1840s, the Night Watch had been incorporated into the police force proper as night constables and by 1851 the Norwich Police comprised around eighty men.¹⁰ Whatever the measure of relief felt with the

creation of this new agency of social control, it was soon mixed with frustration and exasperation at the difficulties in forming an efficient body of men who could be trusted to ensure public order. The need was for professional and disciplined men. Unfortunately for the urban elite, many did not fit that requirement since their efficiency was actually impeded by drink problems. Such issues should not have come as a surprise. The police force in all but its most senior salaried ranks was made up from working-class recruits in the same way as the army or navy. With that background, there was generally a degree of dependence on drink.

The Watch Committee Minutes Book entries record this working-class background. For example, in May 1846, there were four new appointments to the ranks of the supernumerary night constables; all four were Norwich men: a weaver of Union Place; a weaver of Lakenham; a labourer of Colegate; and a labourer of Heigham.¹¹ A decade later, six new appointments to the rank of police constable were made in April and May 1856: the late Turnkey of the Swaffham House of Correction; a Royal Marine; a former member of the Gloucestershire Constabulary, now employed at the Crystal Palace, Sydenham; a Norwich brush-maker, formerly of the armed forces; an Ipswich police constable; and a Bressingham labourer.¹² A couple of decades after its formation, the Norwich police force was beginning to attract recruits from a wider background, almost all from beyond Norwich.¹³ However, these police recruits remained working-class.

The social class of police recruits was of seminal importance to the history of that institution because the working classes shared two fundamental characteristics: they were poor and they drank. Working-class recruits to the Norwich constabulary would have been 'regulars' in local pubs when they were off duty; with the professional development of the

police force still in its infancy, it was bound to be difficult to create a police culture that was separate from the culture of the working class. Discipline was the key as in the army or navy but in practice this proved hard to establish. Yet the police force was an institution that had been set up to keep social order. A paradox facing the governing classes becomes clearer: social order depended on efficient policing and appropriate legislation, including the effective regulation of alcoholic drink, yet the body of men recruited to ensure the law was obeyed were as vulnerable to the temptations of drink as most of the rest of the working class. This was the problem that was never fully resolved in the Victorian period, although from the 1870s the issues diminished in significance.¹⁴

From its inception in 1836, the Watch Committee members had been struggling with the problem of drunkenness in the force. In their paternalism, they could often give the offending constable more than one chance.¹⁵ Yet there is an evident determination to make their force in the image of their own values. The men would learn to do as they were instructed and show due deference. In May 1837, the Committee directed the superintendent to call the attention of the police to the regulations respecting talking to persons when on their duty and to inform them the rule would be strictly enforced.¹⁶ In that same month, P.C. Rust B.3 resigned from the force after being suspended from duty for one month with no pay after being found by his superior officer neglecting his duty and then being 'very insolent'.¹⁷ This insistence on internal discipline remained the constant aim, as later Watch Committee minutes books confirm. Yet drunkenness, neglect of duty and a refusal to defer remain in evidence throughout the 1840s, 1850s and 1860s.

It is impossible to be precise about the extent of the problem of drunkenness within the force over these three decades since the Watch Committee minutes books provide the

evidence only for those cases discovered and reported. There were times when superior officers were clearly more active in reporting lower ranks for drink-offences, although it does seem that reporting became more systematic and common by the late-1840s.

However, there is no doubt that drink was a significant obstacle hindering the Watch Committee's efforts to develop a police force that could be regarded as a professional organisation. Such drink-related problems were also evident in Bradford in Yorkshire and in Portsmouth on the south coast.¹⁸

The extent of the frustration and exasperation of the gentlemen of the Watch Committee, faced with these difficulties in developing an efficient police force, is brought sharply into focus in what may justifiably be termed: 'the purges of 1841'. Although the drink-related offences of the police are not made explicit as a cause of these remarkable demonstrations of the hard edge of paternalism, there can be little doubt that such offences did provide a reason for such punitive action. At a specially summonsed meeting of the Watch Committee in the summer of 1841, with the brewer Peter Finch in the chair, all thirty-seven members of the day police force appeared before the Committee. Three were discharged as inefficient; eight were given warning to be strictly attentive to their duties in future or face discharge; and eight more were generally admonished. This left eighteen whose conduct was generally approved, just less than half of the day constabulary. Then, in the autumn of the same year, the thirty-two members of the night watch were called before the Committee with even more ruthless consequences. Nine constables were dismissed and six were cautioned to be more attentive to their duties in future or face discharge, leaving just more than half of the watch gaining approval. Therefore, as a result of these purges, twelve (17.3 per cent) of the total force of sixty-nine constables had been

summarily dismissed, twenty two (31.8 per cent) cautioned, and only thirty-five (50.7 per cent) found satisfactory.¹⁹

Those judged unsatisfactory, that is inefficient and neglectful of duty, were likely to have been those who had failed to curb the habits of excessive drinking associated with their class. The temptation to disobey police regulations must have been considerable on a Norwich policeman's beat that was likely to take him past so many drinking places.²⁰ The reluctance in 1842 to make the connection explicit between inefficiency and drunkenness could have been due to a feeling within the Watch Committee that drunkenness in the police force was too sensitive and disturbing an issue to open publicly at that time. The fact that an important Norwich brewer, Peter Finch, was in the chair may have played a part in this concealment. Brewers entered local politics for a number of reasons and one of these was to protect the good name of beer and limit the damage caused by drunkenness.

By the end of the 1840s, there were more instances where specific drink-related offences are clearly punished by the Watch Committee. In 1848, for example, the Watch Committee minutes books provide five such cases, with dismissal following in three of these instances, including the case of the inspector who was found intoxicated on duty!²¹ Moreover, during 1848, in addition to these five cases, there were also seventeen constables who were disciplined and their offences might have been drink-related in some instances.²² There were therefore twenty-two different persons – over a quarter of the force – who had appeared before the Watch Committee during its weekly Friday evening meetings in the course of 1848, charged with offences against police regulations. The efficiency of the constabulary, in the opinion of the Committee, seems not to have improved much since 1841.

Taking the analysis of the figures in the minutes book through to January 1849 reinforces the point with some emphasis. In a relatively furious burst of activity from the Watch Committee, seventeen individuals (including another inspector on an intemperance charge) appeared on the 19 January and fourteen more (this time, night constables) on the 26 January. Was this perhaps the seal on a year of anxiety, with fears of Chartist threats at home and news of revolution in Europe heightening class tensions? Rather oddly, only three more cases of police intoxication appear in the rest of 1849, all in September, with one of these concerning the same inspector as in January, again on an intemperance charge.²³

These figures for 1848 and 1849 in fact suggest a degree of arbitrariness in the reporting of offences. It seems implausible that the virtues of temperance and devotion to duty are suddenly achieved for months on end. They also indicate the degree to which the culture of drinking to excess pervaded all ranks. Inspectors had worked their way through the ranks of constable in its various grades, and then sergeant. As sergeants and then as inspectors, they were responsible for decisions concerning reports to the chief constable, and so to the Watch Committee, on drunkenness within the ranks. Who could the Watch Committee trust, if even their senior policemen were unable to escape the clutches of the drink culture? The sense of frustration of the gentlemen on the Committee at not being able to shape their human material in the force as easily as they could dress them in their smart great-coats and boots must have been intense at times, and the personal feelings of a brewer-cum-local politician like Peter Finch difficult to gauge. The idea that brewers had a measure of responsibility for drunkenness in society was beginning to gain some currency.²⁴

The evidence of the Watch Committee minutes books from the 1850s and the 1860s indicates that certainly by the late 1850s drink offences were more likely to be reported explicitly by senior officers than previously. In the early and mid-1850s, the reporting of policemen for drink offences remained arbitrary. For instance, the single most serious case in 1851 occurred when four constables were dismissed because a member of the urban elite, James Everitt, chanced to see them 'coming out of a Public House, in uniform, at Eleven o'clock in the forenoon (after the night duty) in a state of intoxication' and informed the Committee who formally thanked him after summarily sacking them.²⁵ By 1857, it is the duty sergeants and inspectors who are bringing more constables than ever before to book for being drunk. Twenty-one constables (about a quarter of the force) were reported for drink offences in that year and eight (10 per cent) dismissed.²⁶ The punishments indicate a policy of dismissal following a second offence, and a fine of around a week's or half-week's pay for a first offence. The deterrents were in place but alcohol dependence proved hard to break.

This more frequent internal reporting of police intoxication from the late-1850s suggests that there was now even less tolerance for drinking in uniform and therefore increased professionalism. Drink, nevertheless, remained a significant, if declining, problem within the force for a decade or more.²⁷ In 1867, seven policemen were reported for drink offences and two dismissed; in 1868, eight were reported and two policemen were dismissed; in 1869, six were reported and three dismissed and one policeman asked to resign; in 1870, eleven were reported for drink offences and one of these dismissed. The punishments generally became more centred on reform. Dismissal for a second offence by a probationer constable seems automatic, but otherwise the policy in 1867 and 1868 was to reduce the constable to the lowest class of pay for three months and then review the case,

serving both to impose a fine and keep the constable under review. In 1869 and 1870 the policy became at times more lenient still for reasons that were specific to those years.²⁸

Several factors help explain this shift towards a more direct and effective approach to the issue of drink in the culture of the police force in Norwich. The impact of the Temperance movement in the wider society is likely to be a factor in accounting for the greater readiness at times to report officers to the Watch Committee for drink offences.²⁹ There is one instance of temperance influence reported in the minutes books when Mr. Smyth, agent to the Norwich Temperance Society, made a successful application to the Watch Committee in March 1864. As a result, a constable was placed on duty in St. Andrew's Street so he could 'upon passing the Free Library, turn out from the Lobby any persons assembled therein causing any annoyance'.³⁰ Those in favour of others as well as themselves moderating or abstaining from alcoholic drink consumption were almost certain to have strong views about the need for public order. Drinking to excess threatened that order.

The determination of a new chief constable to reduce drunkenness and increase professionalism also helps explain this more frequent internal reporting of police intemperance. Robert Hitchman had been appointed chief constable of Norwich in March 1859, the same year that the Government Inspector's report of Major-General Cartwright directed that 'Drunkenness' in the force was an offence to be 'visited with instant dismissal'.³¹ Hitchman remained in office for almost forty years, retiring in 1897. The record of the previous three principal officers had shown an increasing determination to address the issue of drink and public order within the Norwich community in general and Robert Hitchman might be expected to continue this trend.³² An observable, active policy

of policing within the community and an increase in the standards expected within ones own force had obvious career advantages. The shift towards professionalism during the nineteenth century came in part as a consequence of the internal development of institutions like the police force and such a shift itself contributed in some measure to social control in general and also to a specific reduction in the numbers of those likely to drink to excess. In so far as more members of the working class were caught up in the web of professionalism, there was a corresponding shedding of traditional drinking habits. This trend towards professionalism was gathering momentum in the second half of the century through complex social, economic and political interactions. In particular, the vote was extended to many of the urban working class in 1867, adding some 938,000 to the existing electorate of 1,056,00. Then, in 1870, Forster's Act laid the foundations for a system of efficient elementary education in England and Wales. The working class were becoming part of the political nation.

The increasing determination of the Norwich police force to establish more control over drinking and public order cannot be separated from its own aspirations as an institution to achieve more effective professionalism. The senior members of its hierarchy were critical in the pursuit of these aims, none more so than the chief constable. A document that the then chief constable, Stephen English, laid before the Watch Committee in early March 1859 a few days before he resigned having secured the post of chief constable of Leeds, highlights this trend towards more active policing of the working-class drinking culture. It provided a summary of convictions against licensed victuallers since the creation of the force in 1836.³³ Under Superintendents Wright and Yarrington, between 1836 and 1851, there had been on average only 2.3 convictions of keepers of public houses and beerhouses a year. Under Superintendent Dunne, between 1851 and 1853, there were on average 6

convictions a year.³⁴ Under the high-flying Stephen English, now styled chief constable, between 1853 and 1859 there were on average 25.8 convictions a year. Such an exponential rise in active policing in the area of drink and public order is significant in its own terms and was bound to have consequences for the drink culture within the force. It was under the chief constabulary of Robert Hitchman from 1859 to 1897 that a major shift towards temperance in the force occurred, but by this time changes in the wider political and social cultures are also having an effect.

A detailed study of the entries for 1867-1870 in the Watch Committee's minutes books has been particularly revealing since not only does it indicate a significant if decreasing drink problem within the force but it also seems to capture a moment in the history of that force which marked a sea-change in the approach of the members of the urban elite represented on the committee to the working-class members of its own police force. It has already been noted above that the policy of the force became more lenient at times in 1869 and 1870 for reasons that are specific to those years.³⁵ In the first five months of 1869, six of the seven officers who appeared before the Committee do so on drink-related charges and five are dismissed or asked to resign. Then, remarkably, there were no more cases until 25 February 1870 when P.C. Cullington was reported for being under the influence of drink in the 'Curriers Arms' in Union Place.³⁶

What had happened? The answer is likely to be that the Norwich Election Inquiry Commissioners were due in Norwich from London in the second half of 1869 in order to carry out their investigation into electoral malpractice and evidence of drunken policemen might better be left unreported at such a time. On Wednesday 2 March 1870, a special edition of the *Norwich Mercury* carried the full report of these Royal Commissioners

appointed to investigate the alleged corruption on polling day, 17 November 1868, the first parliamentary election after the Reform Act of 1867. The report concluded that ‘the tradition is still cherished of the high prices which were given for votes at previous elections’; bribery and treating with drink were confirmed. The corruption that took place tended to occur in or around public houses and beerhouses and when money changed hands it was mostly spent in these places.³⁷ It seems plausible to suggest that Robert Hitchman, as chief constable, appreciated that it would be politic not to draw attention to one further illustration of the degree to which the life of Norwich, by day and by night, was shaped by the pressures of alcohol consumption. Robert Hitchman’s pay masters, the members of the Watch Committee, the representatives of the urban elite of Norwich, were likely to have shared his sense of the politic, even perhaps unofficially making their wishes clear to him.

The evidence of the minutes book actually gives the official explanation for these eight sober months. In April 1870, a letter signed by the inspectors, sergeants and constables of the Norwich Police was read to the Committee:

‘thanking them for the liberal supply of Coffee during the Winter months, and to which the inspectors attributed the entire absence of drunkenness in the Force.’³⁸

Listening to this letter and explanation, the eleven members of the Watch Committee may have been forgiven a smile, not least the two brewers – Harry Bullard and John Youngs – and the wine victualler – Philip Back. This would have had to be the longest Norwich winter ever recorded. Nevertheless, examining the way the Watch Committee responded to the related issues of night duty, coffee distribution, and the ban on alcohol is revealing. There was a moment when their official policy changed, and this institutional change may itself contribute to a significantly more temperate police force, ironically by recognising

the need for alcohol rather than, as previously, denying that need. Such a need was linked not only to the habits of class but also to the circumstances of work.

Most of the reported cases of police intoxication occurred on night duty. This was to be expected. There were fewer people about and therefore the risk of being reported for drinking would have seemed less. Some would have needed alcohol to get through the night duty from 10 p.m. to 6 a.m. and that need might be even more pressing for those already tired through working rather than sleeping during part of the day.³⁹ It should always be remembered that, in the absence of a dependable and hygienic supply of water, one of the most effective ways of supplying the bodily need for liquid for the working classes was through beer.⁴⁰ The cold of the winter months would have added to the desire to enjoy the warmth of the pub or beerhouse and the effects of alcohol. Police regulations – the product of the paternalistic culture of the urban elite – forbade drinking on duty, but the police culture – the product, in part, of working-class values – had proved resistant to such temperance ever since the foundation of the force a generation earlier.

In 1855, there was what seems to be the first attempt by those in authority to look after the welfare of the night duty police by providing them with liquid. The chief constable,

Stephen English, reported to the Watch Committee in January that:

‘he had purchased the necessary utensils and provided Coffee for the men on Night duty, the limited number of men preventing a reduction of the hours of duty during the Winter nights.’

Just as cost efficiency had been presented as a rationale for the setting up of the force, so in this instance the provision of coffee was justified in terms of the same financial imperative.

Again, after the Watch Committee members resolved that the provision of coffee should continue ‘whilst the inclemency of the weather may require it’ – thereby satisfying their

sense of acting in a decent manner – they then determined that ‘... the expense thereof be defrayed out of the gratuities received by the men’.⁴¹ It is hard for those with early-twenty first century humanitarian assumptions to understand such apparent meanness.

Then, in 1870, came the moment when a significant change in the approach of the Watch committee to its policemen was apparent. Suddenly, there was the first indication of what seems a ‘modern’ style of institutional management. In early March, a discussion took place in the Watch Committee, with the drink interest represented by Harry Bullard, John Youngs, and Philip Back, on the issue:

‘... as to the propriety of allowing Constables when on duty to take refreshment at public houses’.

It was ordered that a copy of the regulations of the London police on this subject be obtained before the next meeting.⁴² In fact, it was not until the meeting on 27 May, with Harry Bullard, John Youngs, and Philip Back again present, that it was resolved:

‘that every Police Constable may once during his tour of duty (upon first obtaining the permission of his Sergeant) procure moderate and necessary refreshment at a Public House paying for the same on delivery, and that the Sergeant remain on the spot during the time such refreshment is being taken and satisfy himself that the same is not supplied on credit.’⁴³

Although still embedded in paternalistic and hierarchical prescriptions, there is here a touch of modernity – a new sense of pragmatism.

For three and a half decades, the representatives of the urban elite on the Watch Committee had battled in vain to produce a sober police force. Now they had adopted what in retrospect may be termed a ‘one step back; two steps forward’ tactic. In 1872, only three policemen appeared before the Committee on drunkenness charges.⁴⁴ The pattern of a handful of cases each year continued to the end of the Victorian period.⁴⁵ The problem still

existed in residual form but much reduced. There may still be an arbitrariness in reporting but the impression is of a much more sober force.

A complex set of social, economic and political factors were shaping new cultural patterns in the last three decades of the Victorian period. There is evidence from the Watch Committee minutes of a new kind of spirit in the constabulary. They are better educated, more conscious of their professional status, and more inclined to petition the committee regarding their pay and conditions.⁴⁶ Although a belief in duty and deference were the prerequisites of successful membership of the Norwich Police, nevertheless a spirit of self-respect and esteem appeared that could lead some into confrontation with the Committee as the stories of P.C. Caleb Page in the early 1870s and P.C. John Easton in the mid-1880s illustrate.⁴⁷ A key problem facing the Watch Committee in the late-Victorian period seems to be that of reasoned dissent, sometimes bordering on insubordination, within its police force rather than, as in the past, the intoxication of officers on duty. Generally men with self-respect drink to excess less than men with lower self-esteem.⁴⁸ That moment in May 1870 when the Committee began to acknowledge the real lives of its policemen and their needs surely helped boost the self-respect of the Norwich police force.

The initial focus in this chapter has been on the issue of drink in relation to the policing institution that had been set up in Norwich to ensure public order. Now the analysis broadens to include general issues of public order and drunkenness in Norwich. Did drunkenness in the city of Norwich mirror the trend in its police force and become less of a problem for the urban elite in the late-Victorian period? To ask this question, invites another. In what senses did drinking to excess pose problems for those who held power in Norwich? In other words, what were the perceived dangers to social order posed by the

consumption of alcoholic drink by the poor? And then, to return to the question posed at the beginning of this chapter, how did the local government of Norwich respond to any such problems of social control?

Norwich was not an island. The patterns of class relationships in Norwich depended on social, economic and political developments at the national level and the specific measures in Norwich taken to curtail drinking and drunkenness were an enactment of legislation passed at Westminster. Life in Norwich, as elsewhere, was being changed forever in consequence of the Representation of the Peoples Act (1867) in the last months of Disraeli's Conservative administration.⁴⁹ The legislation of Gladstone's Liberal reforming ministry from 1868-1874 was also instrumental in beginning to reshape relations between the classes. Specifically with respect to the framework within which the urban elite exercised its control over the drinking of the working classes, Gladstone's administration was especially important in its temperance measures. In 1869, the Wine and Beerhouse Act took effect. A justice's certificate was now required for all on- and off-sales of beer, bringing the 45,000 beerhouses that had been created nationally following the Beer Act (1830) under magisterial control for the first time.⁵⁰ Then in 1872 the Licensing Act followed, amended in 1874, which put the law on the conduct of licensed premises into its modern form.

For the first time nationally there was an exclusion order from licensed premises affecting children and young people. The sale of spirits to anyone appearing under the age of sixteen was forbidden. The Acts of 1872 and 1874 modified slightly opening times at the beginning and end of the day and removed distinctions between public houses and beerhouses in this respect, whilst retaining some between London and other areas. By

1874, Norwich pubs and beerhouses had their weekly opening hours fixed from 6 a.m. to 11 p.m., their Sunday opening hours from 12.30 p.m. to 2.30 p.m. and then from 6 p.m. to 10 p.m. Earlier opening was possible, with local authority permission, for the convenience of certain trades. The 1872 Act also introduced six-day licences, with closing on Sundays. The 'bona fide' traveller was entitled to drink at any time, although by the 1874 Act he had to be at least three miles from his previous night's lodging.⁵¹

The Licensing Act (1872) also brought the law in relation to drunkenness into its modern form. It was made an offence to be drunk in a highway or other place, or, on licensed premises, to be guilty while drunk of riotous or disorderly behaviour therein, and to be drunk in charge of 'any carriage, horse, cattle or steam engine' or of a loaded firearm. It was also an offence when drunk, following provisions in the Refreshment Houses Act (1860), to refuse to leave licensed premises. The 1872 Act had in effect determined the publican's responsibility in relation to drunkenness. It legislated against permitting both drunkenness and/or disorder, selling drink to a drunken person, permitting gaming, serving police constables, allowing the house to be frequented by prostitutes (except to obtain 'reasonable refreshment') or letting it be used as a brothel.⁵²

The urban elite within Norwich responded to this legislative framework by compiling a register of licences issued to victuallers – public house licensees – that survives in two volumes.⁵³ Entries date from 1867. It is unclear why the entries should start from this year but the particular lines under the 1869 and 1872 entries seem to indicate the seminal importance of these specific years of legislation. The beerhouse register from 1869 has not survived although its existence is confirmed by a section of entries in the second volume of the public house register that are for beerhouse licences and which refer to an 'old

register'.⁵⁴ The details that were recorded each year in the folios of these volumes would have provided members of the urban elite with the feeling of a measure of growing control over the drinking practices of the working class in their leisure and recreation time.

The register entries record for each year the nature of the licence, as well as the name of the licensed house and the holder of the certificate/licence, and the name of the parish in which the licensed premise is located. The name of the owner of the licensed premise is also recorded, as are any changes of ownership, so it is clear whether the house is 'tied' to a brewery or is 'free', that is owned by the licensee, or by another individual or institution. Such detailed entries provide valuable primary source material for the historian.⁵⁵ They also make a clear statement about the nature of social control within the city of Norwich as its urban elite developed more effective bureaucratic and professional procedures for the exercise of its domination over the working classes. Licence certificates had been issued, since the Alehouses Act (1828), at the general annual licensing sessions held in August; from 1867 till 1903 (when the annual sessions was rescheduled for February) the licensees attended the summer meeting knowing that their working life was being recorded and scrutinised in an unprecedented fashion.

Perhaps most significantly of all, for both the working-class publican and the gentleman brewer, if there had been a conviction against the licence then that too was recorded in the register with details of the offence and the punishment. In the thirty years between 1872 and 1901, a total of 172 pubs received at least one conviction against the licence, a figure of around a third of the stock of public houses in Norwich. There were 198 licensees convicted, with twenty-eight of these convicted more than once, making a total of 226 convictions – an average of 7.5 convictions a year.⁵⁶ These figures may suggest a policy of

law enforcement that was less than draconian since under Chief Constable Stephen English in the 1850s there had been an average of 25.8 convictions a year.⁵⁷ But it was still strict enough to keep licensees mindful of the consequences of breaking the legislation of 1872 and 1874. It was also the case that 95 (48.0 per cent) of the 198 licensees convicted no longer remained the licence-holder the following year. Working-class licensees risked losing their livelihood if their brewer-employer considered that they were no longer able to run their public house without attracting the attention of the policeman on the beat and so being brought before the magistrates for offending against the licence. The 1872 and 1874 Acts provided the urban elite with the legislative opportunity to keep, through policing and the magistrates court, the consumption of alcohol under their social control. In the twelve years from 1872 to 1884, there was a concentration of 134 (59.3 per cent) of the 226 convictions that were secured. The last seventeen years of Victoria's reign saw only 92 convictions – 40.7 per cent of the total.⁵⁸ Licensees were evidently coming under increasingly effective control.

The most serious sanction available to the magistrates was to decide that the licence should be refused. This loss or forfeiture of the licence meant the drinking house would close. Such an action was only taken by those members of the urban elite who constituted the licensing magistrates in ten of the thirty-five years between 1867 and 1901, and in each of five of these ten years only one public house was closed. However, in the other five years, a total of twenty-five public houses closed. In fact, there were two short periods of relatively draconian activity on the part of the licensing magistrates, the first between 1867-71 (with forty-two closures) and the other in 1893 (with ten closures). These closures affected an almost equal number of 'free' and 'tied' houses.⁵⁹ The explanation is likely to

be linked with temperance activity in Norwich.⁶⁰ It seems, therefore, reasonable to conclude that generally, with the possible exception of these two periods, the urban elite and its representatives in the magistracy were satisfied that they had the drink issue under control in Norwich.

This feeling persisted despite the fact that the temperance lobby was arguing consistently throughout this period, and before, that there were too many licensed victuallers in Norwich. After the publication of the first report of the House of Lords Select Committee on Intemperance (1877), the statistical evidence to support the temperance case for closures was made public within the national arena, not just within Norwich. Norwich did indeed have a higher proportion of licensed houses per head of population than any other of the nineteen boroughs in England and Wales, north of Birmingham, that were cited: one licensed house to every 121 persons.⁶¹ Yet – and herein lay the trump card for those whose interests favoured inertia – that same set of statistics from Appendix C revealed that Norwich had the lowest proportion of population taken up for drunkenness: one drunkard to every 451 persons.⁶² Whatever the problems that drinking to excess by the poor might pose elsewhere, in Norwich the issue was under effective control. This was the message that brewers wished to hear. The Norwich urban elite included its brewers and the interests of the brewers were closely identified with those who determined the corporate life of the city. Brewers were a powerful and active force in urban commerce, society, politics and government. The Norwich urban elite, in general, therefore interfered as little as possible with the infrastructure of drinking in the city.

When the licensing magistrates did choose to interfere, they would have done so, it seems, in conjunction with the brewing interest. The two periods of relatively draconian actions by

the magistrates tend to either coincide with or be closely followed by those again relatively few periods of rationalisation for the brewers when licences are dropped, or not renewed, or surrendered on the grant of a licence elsewhere.⁶³ In Norwich, the urban elite and the brewers seemed to speak with one voice and their joint message was that the lower orders in society were under effective control. Low figures for crime and drunkenness were used to justify this claim. The Recorder of Norwich, W.J. Metcalfe, Q.C., addressed the Grand Jury at the opening of the Norwich Quarter Sessions towards the end of 1878 and claimed, in his self-congratulatory speech on behalf of those in public life in Norwich, that: 'It really was an exceptional thing to find so small a number of cases to be tried'. He then sought explanations and concluded that despite the population increase and the degree of social mobility and the reports of drunkenness, crime was still significantly lower in Norwich than in most other places, 'despite the present great distress of the country'. He therefore further concluded that the reports of drunkenness could not be true. There was not the same amount of drunkenness 'going on here'. Moreover, since he connected crime very closely with poverty, the people of Norwich could not be poverty-stricken. Finally, there must be 'a spirit of sympathy between the master and the employed' in Norwich, as there was an absence of both strikes and 'the poverty entailed by them'.⁶⁴ The Recorder's perception of Norwich was driven by a vision of what ought to be; it denied much that actually was the reality of life in the streets and courts and yards.⁶⁵

Such a tone of complacency reoccurs in the words of those who spoke for the brewing interest as reported in the *Eastern Daily Press* and *Norwich Mercury* during the first half of 1879, both before and after the publication of the final report of the House of Lords Select Committee on Intemperance in March of that year.⁶⁶ However, although it was the dominant tone in the urban elite, the temperance interest did have a voice and its rational

message was being heard and reported. Dr. Peter Eade addressed the inaugural meeting of the South Heigham Church of England Temperance Society in March 1879, pinpointing the degree and cause of poverty and drinking to excess in Norwich. He looked forward to the implementation of the terms of the Artisans Dwelling Act since this would give a great boost to the temperance cause by improving the character of the worst localities in towns. His depiction of that reality was one that was as true for Norwich as other cities, yet it was not acknowledged by most of those who held power in Norwich and who worked and sometimes lived close by the courts and yards:

‘It is notorious that the narrower the streets, the more crowded the courts, and the worse the houses, the more do gin-palaces flourish, and the more does the population give itself up to the artificial stimulus of fermented liquors ... and the reason is not far to seek, for if there be an absence of all comfort at home, if the house be small, and crowded, and dirty; if the water be bad and perhaps unsuited for drinking, if there be no bit of garden in which to lounge, and to grow a few things in which interest can be taken ... then as a matter of course, recourse is had to other neighbouring houses where nearly all these conditions are reversed, and dirt, and squalor, and crowding, are exchanged for light and brightness and space ...’.⁶⁷

This dismal picture of the living conditions of the poor remained a reality that the majority of the urban elite of Norwich was reluctant to recognise throughout the Victorian period.⁶⁸ They could now in the late 1870s rationalise their public view with self-congratulatory references to the relative lack of drunkenness in the city. The Norwich Police had become apparently far less prone to alcohol abuse. Norwich was therefore a sober city and public order well maintained. Yet, in private, at least part of the real world of Norwich would surely have been acknowledged. Brewers in particular, but other members of the urban elite too, would have grasped the truth in Dr. Eade’s conclusion that the drinking house was an escape from the grim reality of appalling living conditions. As such, the drinking house can be viewed as another means of social control. It was actually in the interests of an urban elite to provide and legitimate and control these outlets for the masses because in

doing so those ‘lower orders’ – the source of anxiety – could be placated through their intake of a controlled amount of the drug, alcohol.

Moreover, it was a drug that had economic significance. The urban elite owed part of their wealth and power, either directly in the case of the brewers, or indirectly in the case of others, to the barley, malting, brewing, drink retailing nexus. It might not be too fanciful to suggest that what cocaine is to Columbia today, alcohol was to East Anglia in the Victorian era, particularly before around 1880. The economic importance of alcohol was demonstrated in a leading article in the *Norwich Mercury* at the beginning of the Victorian age in which some telling arguments against the temperance interest were presented. The newspaper quoted from a periodical – *The New Monthly* – the following passage relating to temperance societies:

“My father used to preach that the surest way to ruin the nation was to persuade every body to drink water, and now we have temperance societies lending their enthusiasm to effect this very purpose ... the consequences (would be): All the land under cultivation for barley thrown out of tillage, and the husbandmen employed in ploughing, sowing, harrowing, harvesting, and threshing the barley, thrown out of employment.

All the hop lands in the same condition; all maltsters annihilated; all the distilleries shut up, the capital sunk, and the people turned off.

All the ships engaged in the importation and transportation of wine, brandies, rum, porter, &c., useless, and all the seamen idle. All the capital and people employed in the manufactures exchanged for these commodities, and all those engaged in growing, procuring, or transmitting them reduced to vacant idleness.

All the public houses closed, and the inmates cast adrift. All the merchants’ clerks, warehouses, cellars, &c. in the same state. All the coopers out of demand; all the officers of excise, and all the revenues gone.

All the rents circulated and employment ensuing from the consumption of fermented liquors, and specially enumerated above, at an end!

Could all these things be accomplished forthwith the nation might be probably ruined. Who would imagine that the simple act of confining our beverage to water would shake off at least one fourth of the commerce and employment of the whole kingdom! Yet such would be the effect of the abstinence inculcated by the societies in the name of temperance.”⁶⁹

The case was thus made in 1837 that a most significant part of the economic and social life of the nation was dependent on alcohol. Around 1870, a more careful calculation reaching

similar conclusions was done for M.T. Bass by a leading economist of the day concerning the benefits to the economy of the brewing industry.⁷⁰ Economists today would recognise that alcohol still plays an important part in the economy and would certainly have been a major element in the nineteenth century.

Indeed it is possible to argue that public order and social control in a sense depended on alcohol. If the Temperance interest triumphed, if the spirit of abstinence prevailed, then those who were not so minded feared that the economy would collapse and social order follow suit. Within Norwich as elsewhere, the brewers were natural leaders in the urban elite and local government. They represented traditional, conservative values; their industry and business symbolised sound economics with a divine blessing since their production was a use of ‘the goods vouchsafed us by Providence’, in the words of the *Norwich Mercury* leader of February 1837.⁷¹ Many Victorians, not just brewers, would have seen the Temperance interest as deeply subversive. Those who were abstainers possessed an entirely different vision of public order and social control. The history of so much of the Victorian period was in fact shaped by the interaction of these two competing models for society.⁷²

In a way, the future lay with the Temperance interest. This was not simply because the working classes began to drink less, though they did, but rather because society and the economy became more diversified and as a consequence working-class leisure and recreation became more varied and less exclusively reliant on the drinking house.⁷³ The issue of public order therefore became more complex as it became less centred on that institution and the conduct of those who worked and drank there.

To conclude, drunkenness did become less of a problem in Norwich during the later Victorian period, partly because the working class were drinking to excess less, partly because the urban elite were exercising more control, and partly because the issue was no longer being defined as a problem by that elite in quite the same way as in the past. Yet if drunkenness had become less of a problem, it was still a problem as various Victorian voices indicated. The leader writer of the *Eastern Daily Press* wrote in April 1879:

‘If we accept the statements of some of our friends, Norwich is not only prosperous but sober. Mr. Pell recently mentioned it in the House of Commons as one of the most temperate of cities. Our excellent mayor (Harry Bullard, the brewer) referred to the same matter, pointing out that we have the largest number of public houses – and the least drunkenness. I am not in a position to deny this statement. I hope it is true. The remark of the Sheriff (Donald Steward, the brewer) that only 100 persons were fined for drunkenness during the year is certainly creditable to the people as well as the publicans ... (for) only 1 in 6 public houses furnish a considerable drunkard during the year ...’.⁷⁴

The writer seems to smile with his readers at the limitations of statistics; the reality of turning-out time on the streets of Norwich was perhaps different from the official picture.

The case of William Harper Stewardson, a printer of Valentine Street, provides another dimension to the problem that drink still posed. He found himself in deep trouble when he remarked in court in April 1879, where he was facing a charge of being unlawfully in a public house after hours, that: ‘He could say that no men were so fond of drink as policemen’. The newspaper report continued:

‘The Town Clerk then said that on behalf of the Police Force he must ask the defendant to withdraw that assertion – which the defendant refused to do. The Town Clerk insisted that the police as a body were a respectable class of men, but the defendant persisted: “I have treated them to hundreds of glasses”. The defendant was fined £1 and 17s 6d costs’.⁷⁵

A particularly heavy fine was one way for the urban elite to remind its citizenry that ‘open secrets’ were best left unexposed. The image of a professional police force in Norwich required sobriety.

Finally, John Abby, the organising secretary for the Norwich diocese of the Church of England Temperance Society, wrote a letter published on January 3 1900 under the heading - 'Drunkenness in Norwich' - in which he noted that:

'... there were few who came into Norwich drunk on Boxing Day, but ... still I know from personal knowledge that there were a vast mass of persons in the city after ten o'clock who were in various stages of drunkenness ...'.⁷⁶

John Abby's picture of drinking to excess in Norwich is supported by at least one other correspondent whose letter was published after the New Year celebrations of 1900.⁷⁷

Drinking remained a problem for those who found themselves sharing the streets with the drunkards.

The quandary facing the urban elite in Norwich in the later Victorian period was that to recognise drunkenness as a problem meant giving ammunition to those in the Temperance camp who in their turn needed to play down the extent to which people were actually drinking less. In such circumstances, objectivity was in short supply.

Footnotes to Chapter 6

¹ V.A.C. Gatrell, 'Crime, authority and the policeman-state', in F.M.L. Thompson (ed.), *The Cambridge Social History of Britain 1750-1950* (Cambridge, 1990), 3, p.249. In Chapter 1, above, there is an extended treatment of the issue of 'social control' in Victorian England.

² See above, pp.36-38, for the introduction of this argument linking the establishment of the police force with deep-seated social and political insecurities.

³ T.A. Critchley, *A History of Police in England and Wales* (London, 1978), p.62.

⁴ David Taylor, *The new police in nineteenth-century England* (Manchester, 1997), Chapter 1: 'Interpretations, problems and themes'.

⁵ Taylor, *New police*, p.6.

⁶ See below and note 8.

⁷ R.D. Storch, 'The policeman as domestic missionary: urban discipline and popular culture in northern England, 1850-1880', *Journal of Social History*, ix (1976), pp.481-509.

⁸ NRO, N/TC 7/1, WCM, 5 Feb. 1836. The entry gives a total figure for previous expenditure per annum of £1,900, made up of £950 each for the Day Police and the Night Watch. The annual wage bill in 1836 can be calculated from weekly wage bills at nearly £600 for the Watch and around £650 for the Day Police. Even allowing for three salaried officers and expenses like uniforms, some cost cutting does seem evident.

⁹ NRO, N/TC 7/1, WCM, 5 Feb. 1836.

¹⁰ J.K. Edwards, 'Developments in Local Government in Norwich 1800-1900', in C. Barringer (ed.), *Norwich in the nineteenth century* (Norwich, 1984), p.82. Edwards' judgement that the Norwich constabulary displayed a 'well-developed professionalism by mid-century' seems tendentious given the force's drink problems.

¹¹ NRO, N/TC 7/3, WCM, 22 May, 29 May 1846.

¹² NRO, N/TC 7/5, WCM, 11 Apr., 18 Apr., 16 May, 23 May 1856.

¹³ A constable's wage of 18s a week in the mid-1850s was almost double that of an average agricultural worker in Norfolk. However, agricultural wages had made a relative improvement by a couple of decades later, reducing the financial incentive to join the constabulary. Taylor, *New police*, p.49, quotes Robert Titchman [sic.] (Hitchman, Norwich Chief Constable from 1859 to 1897): '... a police constable would rather obtain agricultural employment if he got a shilling a week more than remain a constable at 22s.' (Report of the Select Committee on Police Superannuation Funds, *PP* (1875), XIII, Q 1309) Nevertheless, 22s a week was still way above even the most skilled agricultural labourer's wage.

¹⁴ See below, p.198. In June 1900, the Chief Constable reported Police Sergeant Hardy for drinking in the 'Popes Head' public house on Sunday 17 June at 10 o'clock, in uniform, during the time the house should have been closed. Sergeant Hardy was also accused of not reporting P.C. Golding for being the worst for drink on duty at this time. Both admitted the offences; Golding was fined one pound and Hardy reduced to the rank of a constable at 29s per week. (NRO, N/TC 7/16, WCM, 22 June 1900.)

¹⁵ The first Watch Committee Minutes Book (N/TC 7/1) records the personal case history of P.C. Watts that suggests the flexibility of the traditional paternalism went so far but no further: 1 July 1836 – Watts B.5 was called in and reprimanded for being drunk and ordered to be discharged for a second offence; 26 August 1836 – Watts B.5 suspended by the Superintendent for being drunk on duty, reprimanded by the Committee and to be dismissed for next offence; 23 March 1838 – Watts B.5 suspended till 'Thursday next' for neglecting his duty in allowing a prisoner to drink in a public house when on his way to the

gaol; 29 June 1838 – Samuel Moses Watts B.5 discharged from offices and duties as police constable due to his drunkenness.

¹⁶ NRO, N/TC 7/1, WCM, 5 May 1837.

¹⁷ NRO, N/TC 7/1, WCM, 12 Aug. 1837.

¹⁸ Paul Jennings, *The Public House in Bradford, 1770-1970* (Keele, 1995), p.219.

Jennings noted that, in 1848, eight men had been dismissed and a further three suspended for drinking offences out of the new Force of sixty-eight men. In the 1860s, almost ten per cent each year were reported for being drunk. As in Norwich, the situation improved from the 1870s. In Portsmouth, the published evidence is restricted to the mid-Victorian period but it is clear from this that drunkenness in the police was a significant problem in the 1850s – see F.H. Edwards, *Crime and Law and Order in Mid-Victorian Portsmouth* (The Portsmouth Papers, No.55, 1989), pp.7-8.

¹⁹ NRO, N/TC 7/2, WCM, 2 Aug., 14 Oct. 1841.

²⁰ See above, pp.5-8. In the 1873 rank order of nineteen boroughs north of Birmingham with populations of 50,000 and upwards, arranged in order of ‘Proportion of Licensed Houses to Population’, Norwich heads the table with 1 to 121. (*Lords Intemperance Report*, 1877, First Report, Appendix C)

²¹ NRO, N/TC 7/3, WCM, 21 Jan. 1848: Hastings (Night Constable) – intoxicated on duty – dismissed – (previous reprimand in May 1847 for being in a public house when on duty); 25 Feb. 1848: P.C. Daniels – found in pub – suspended for two weeks; 26 May 1848: Inspector Copeman – intoxicated on duty – dismissed; 21 July 1848: P.C. Fairhead – intoxicated coming off duty - suspended for one week; 17 Nov. 1848: P.C. Smith – intoxicated on duty – dismissed.

²² NRO, N/TC 7/3, WCM, 1848: three suspended for one week for ‘gossiping on duty’ including one ‘gossiping with a female on the street’; one dismissed for ‘misconduct’; two dismissed for ‘neglect of (night) duty’ and not attending the Watch Committee when ordered to by the Superintendent; five suspended for one week for ‘neglect of duty’; one dismissed for ‘neglect of duty’ after an earlier report for same offence had led to one month’s suspension; two reprimanded for ‘irregular conduct’ on duty; one suspended for using ‘improper language’ to his Inspector; one suspended for six weeks for ‘gross neglect of duty’; and one suspended for one week for ‘gross neglect of duty’.

²³ NRO, N/TC 7/3, WCM, 19 Jan. 1849: Inspector Thompson – ‘intemperance’ – admonished and cautioned; P.C. Symonds, Fairhead and Underwood – ‘inefficiency’ – dismissed. Five others were cautioned or reprimanded and threatened with discharge unless they improved within the month; four were cautioned to be ‘more active’; and four were cautioned to ‘improve themselves in intelligence’; 26 Jan. 1849: ten night constables were cautioned by Peter Finch (the brewer) as Chairman to be ‘more active’; one night constable was cautioned to ‘improve himself’; and three night constables were threatened with dismissal unless they ‘improved’; 7/14 Sept. 1849: Inspector Thompson – ‘intemperance’ – suspended one week and both cautioned and reprimanded; 14 Sept. 1849: P.C. Gamble – ‘intoxicated on duty’ – dismissed; 28 Sept. 1849: P.C. Parrish – ‘intoxicated on duty’ – dismissed.

²⁴ See above, pp.38-39 and below, pp.234-35.

²⁵ NRO, N/TC 7/4, WCM, 4 Apr. 1851. Two brewers were present: Peter Finch in the chair, and Councillor Morgan.

²⁶ See below, p.189, Table 6.1. Comparative figures for Bradford that indicate a similar problem are shown above in note 18.

²⁷ See below, p.190, Table 6.2.

²⁸ See below, pp.194-197.

²⁹ See below, Chapter 8, for an analysis of the Temperance movement in Norwich.

- ³⁰ NRO, N/TC 7/6, WCM, 4 Mar. 1864.
- ³¹ NRO, N/TC 7/5, WCM, 11 Feb. 1859.
- ³² See below, pp.193-194 and Table 6.3, p.192.
- ³³ See above, p.192, Table 6.3.
- ³⁴ Dunne's relatively short stay in office in Norwich has as yet no definitive explanation. David Taylor, *New police*, p.80, cited Critchley, *Police in England and Wales*, p.143, and his explanation that Dunne was dismissed for proceeding against a licensee without the express permission of the Committee, an indication that the vested interest of the brewers on the Watch Committee proved too much for the reforming chief constable. However, the Watch Committee minutes do not support this account – see above, p.100 and note 96, p.110 – although they do record that there was a conflict over the extent of the chief constable's authority to act against licensees. Dunne seems to have had the support of a majority of the Watch Committee at the time of his resignation, but this was before news of his highly critical testimony before the House of Commons Select Committee into Policing reached Norwich.
- ³⁵ See above, p.191.
- ³⁶ See above, p.190, Table 6.2. The one drunken officer who managed to avoid dismissal or resignation in 1869 was Inspector Curtis. His drink problem got the better of him in 1870, too, when he refused to defer to Chief Constable Robert Hitchman and resigned in a fit of temper. After an appropriate display of contrition, he was reinstated. The more senior the position in the hierarchy, generally the more flexible and tolerant was the response of the urban elite. Inspector Curtis continued to serve, until his honourable retirement on two-thirds pay in October 1883, aged sixty-six, having served thirty-four years and eight months since joining the force in 1849. (NRO, N/TC 7/10, WCM, 12 Oct. 1883.) Perhaps Inspector Curtis' later period in the force can stand as an example of how an ageing, maturing and increasingly stable Norwich Police was learning to drink more temperately.
- ³⁷ *NM*, 2 Mar. 1870.
- ³⁸ NRO, N/TC 7/7, WCM, 8 Apr. 1870.
- ³⁹ See NRO, N/TC 7/6, WCM, 1 Mar. 1864, for a glimpse of the practice of moonlighting, the more widespread existence of which cannot be confirmed but seems likely. P.C. William Fuller was fined 10s for 'neglect of duty, viz. gossiping in a Butcher's Shop in Rose Lane from 7.10 till 7.55 p.m.' The charge continued: '(Since) the business of a pork butcher, alleged to be carried on by the Daughter of P.C. Fuller, is in reality his own business, and carried on by him in violation of the Rules and Regulations for the Management of the Police Force, such business must be discontinued and the Shop closed within one month'.
- ⁴⁰ See above, Chapter 5 *passim*.
- ⁴¹ NRO, N/TC 7/4, WCM, 26 Jan. 1855.
- ⁴² NRO, N/TC 7/7, WCM, 11 Mar. 1870.
- ⁴³ NRO, N/TC 7/7, WCM, 27 May 1870.
- ⁴⁴ NRO, N/TC 7/8, WCM, 1872.
- ⁴⁵ See below, pp.198-99, Table 6.4.
- ⁴⁶ See NRO, N/TC 7/8, WCM, 7 Jan. 1876, for a reference to a letter from P.C. Fuller Pilch read to the Watch Committee complaining of the portrayal of a policeman in the Pantomime at the Theatre by one George Atkins, an employee of the Sanitary Authority, who had 'used language reflecting upon the conduct of the Police Officers tending to subject them to ridicule by low Characters'. For police petitions, see NRO, N/TC 7/9, WCM, 28 Apr. 1876, which gives details of a petition on wages and conditions, and NRO, N/TC 7/10, WCM, 28 Nov. 1884, that records a petition of complaint against Dr. Mills, the Police Surgeon, alleging negligence and inefficiency. The wheel has turned full circle;

ordinary policemen are now accusing their social superior, a medical professional, of the very failings apportioned to themselves by the urban elite and its representatives on the Watch Committee. Both petitions were, perhaps predictably, unsuccessful.

⁴⁷ In 1873, P.C. Caleb Page was found guilty of insubordination and dismissed after writing an indignant letter to the chief constable urging the removal of what he considered an unreasonable report on him from the Occurrence Book. (NRO, N/TC 7/8, WCM, 28 Mar. 1873.) In 1884, P.C. John Easton presented the unsuccessful petition with ninety-three signatures from the Norwich Police Force against Dr. Mills, the Police Surgeon (see above, note 46). A year and a half later, Easton applied to be made a sergeant and stated that he now 'exceedingly regretted the circumstances and should not have taken the course of action he did, but he was led a way by others'. After discussion, the Watch Committee appointed him a sergeant. (NRO, N/TC 7/10, WCM, 28 Nov. 1884 and NRO, N/TC 7/11, WCM, 4 June 1886.) Deference was still necessary for advancement.

⁴⁸ See Special Committee of the Royal College of Psychiatrists, *Alcohol and Alcoholism* (London, 1979), pp.111-15.

⁴⁹ See above, p.193.

⁵⁰ Jennings, *Public House in Bradford*, pp.107-9.

⁵¹ Jennings, *Public House in Bradford*, p.199 and p.201; *Drink*, Tables 8 and 9, pp.316-17.

⁵² Jennings, *Public House in Bradford*, pp.218-20.

⁵³ First Register of Victuallers Licences, and Second Register of Victuallers Licences.

⁵⁴ Second Register of Victuallers Licences, pp.558-631. Entries on thirty-one of these pages recorded that the nature of the licence was for 'Beer (on the premises) 11 Geo.4 & 1 Wm.4 cap. 64' – the year of the 1830 Beer Act – and a further four pages record those premises opened under the terms of the 1830 Act and the 1860 Refreshment Houses Acts. This latter Act made it possible to take out a further licence to sell wine, subject to a magistrate's power of veto, the nature of the licence being 'Wine (on the premises) 23 & 24 Vic. cap. 27, ss. 7 & 8'.

⁵⁵ The argument in Chapter 4 is based on an analysis of the data provided by the register entries.

⁵⁶ See below, p.204, Table 6.5.

⁵⁷ See above, p.192, Table 6.3.

⁵⁸ See above, p.204, Table 6.5.

⁵⁹ See below, p.206, Table 6.6.

⁶⁰ The Reform Act of 1867 and the extension of the franchise, together with anticipated legislation from the new Gladstone administration, would have helped stimulate the temperance cause and increased the pressure for the closure of drinking places. The specific reasons behind the closures in 1893 remain unclear, however.

⁶¹ *Lords Intemperance Report*, 1877, First Report, Appendix C.

⁶² See above, pp.17-18 and note 7, p.41. An explanation for this exceptionally low rate of drunkenness is more likely to be found in a lenient policing policy determined by an urban elite in which the brewing interest was influential, rather than the weakness of Norwich beers which was the reason offered by Simms Reeve in his testimony before the House of Lords committee in 1877 – see above, p.110, note 89. The great rise in drinking from the late 1850s to the late 1870s had produced concerns about increased drunkenness and led to the further development of the Temperance movement. In these circumstances, the desire to establish effective control over drinking in Norwich could have led, in effect, to a manipulation of the figures for drunkenness through an understanding that the Watch Committee only required an arrest for drunkenness in extreme cases.

⁶³ See above, p.206, Table 6.6.

⁶⁴ *EDP*, 1 Jan. 1879.

⁶⁵ Metcalfe seemed aware that reports of drunkenness and increased drinking in England had become commonplace and took pride in the exceptional (supposed) sobriety of Norwich in these circumstances. Nationally, the per capita level of consumption of beer had increased to its peak in the late-1870s due to an advance in money wages, especially pronounced between 1860 and 1874, which outstripped rises in real wages. The working classes spent much of their increased earnings upon alcohol, in the absence of alternative leisure opportunities. (*British Brewing*, pp.36-37.)

⁶⁶ *EDP* and *NM*, January to June 1879.

⁶⁷ *NM*, 5 Mar. 1879.

⁶⁸ See above, Chapter 5 *passim*.

⁶⁹ *NM*, 18 Feb. 1837.

⁷⁰ See *British Brewing*, p.183.

⁷¹ *NM*, 18 Feb. 1837.

⁷² See below, Chapter 8 *passim*.

⁷³ See above, pp.92-94. Roger Munting, 'Sports and Games in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries' in Carole Rawcliffe and Richard Wilson (eds.), *A History of Norwich* (forthcoming) concluded that 'the late 1880s and 1890s saw a general expansion of the home market but the impact of this was more modest in Norwich ... than in many other parts of the country ... Nevertheless some reduction in working hours with growth in real wages, albeit modest, boosted demand for leisure activities'.

⁷⁴ *EDP*, 12 Apr. 1879.

⁷⁵ *EDP*, 22 Apr. 1879.

⁷⁶ *EDP*, 3 Jan. 1900.

⁷⁷ See above, p.110, note 94.