

Drink in Victorian Norwich

Part III

Rob Donovan

Chapter 5: Drink and public health

In this chapter, one of the key issues explored is the connection between the consumption of alcoholic drink by the poor and the lack of safe drinking water. One reason why the working class poor drank beer was because they had a dietary need for healthy liquid and they must have known from experience that beer made from fermented hops would not lead to the disease and illness in some way linked with an inadequate and unsanitary water supply. There is a causal link between the need to avoid drinking polluted water and the consequent consumption of alcoholic drink made through a process that rendered its water content safe and tasty.

Historians have made this connection before. Brian Harrison did so when he answered the question: 'Why was drinking so widespread in the 1820s (and, by extension, later in the Victorian decades) among those social groups who could least afford it?' He argued that:

Alcoholic drinks were primarily thirst-quenchers. Even in the countryside drinking water was unsafe and scarce, and when pop-

ulation concentration further contaminated supplies, it was natural for town-dwellers to rely increasingly on intoxicants whose water had been pumped from deep wells, or on beverages whose water had been boiled. London's problems in the 1820s epitomise those facing all rapidly growing towns ... So difficult was it for a Londoner even to find drinking water in the 1820s that its scarcity created the profession of water-carrier ... In the 1840s Chadwick's inspectors were ridiculed by London slum dwellers for supposing that the local water could ever be safe to drink ... Even in upper-class households in the 1850s mains supplies were intermittent ... In the 1870s many Londoners still believed that water should not be drunk until purified with spirits ... In 1871 Shaftesbury claimed that there was scarcely a pint of water in London which was not distinctly unhealthy, and ... a great deal was positively unsafe.¹

Richard Wilson also noted that 'beer drinking (was) ... a time-honoured thirst quencher' and acknowledged causes for high levels of alcohol consumption other than 'the handiness of pubs and the force of custom and celebration'. These included 'water supplies ... remaining hazardous to health before public health measures made an impact in the 1870s'.²

Nevertheless, I will argue that the significance of the connection between inadequate, unhealthy water supplies and the proliferation of urban drinking places needs even more emphasis, not least because it remained largely unacknowledged during the Victorian period by those outside the Temperance movement. An exploration of an area in which contemporaries were blinkered can be revealing.

The general issue of drink and public health in Norwich, together with the specific issue of the link between the intake of alcoholic drink and the lack of safe drinking water, need to be analysed within the wider framework of the national picture. Brian Harrison's outline above of the water supply problems of London is common to urban centres across Britain in the nineteenth century. The pattern of water supply in Portsmouth, for instance, is typical: improvements in the supply of water remained restricted to those who could afford the price. By 1811 there were two companies building separate waterworks, one on Farlington Marshes, the other on Portsea Island, to serve those prepared to pay for piped water. Technical advances had produced more reliable, durable pumping-engines and standardised cast-iron pipes that together seemed to make a piped water supply economically viable, even though the water was 'still occasionally unfit to use'. The growth in numbers and the prosperity of at least some businesses and professional men also looked likely to provide both the capital and the market for a

convenient new service. Modest traders like butchers, bakers, drapers, plumbers and carpenters were included among the first customers; the Portsmouth breweries, too, were important investors in this new service and by 1830 ten of the sixteen listed brewers were purchasing piped water, the other six relying solely on their own water supplies.³

Yet for most of the population of Portsmouth these developments were immaterial. By 1840, the two rival water companies had merged but this new waterworks company was meeting less than 10% of the estimated total demand in 1850. In Portsmouth, as elsewhere, there was as yet little recognition of the relationship between the poor quality of water from public wells and the deteriorating health of the town since, with population densities increasing and with the absence of proper drainage, such wells were liable to pollution by sewage seeping through the subsoil.⁴ Even when these issues became the subject of national debate - for instance, with the publication of Edwin Chadwick's *Report on the Sanitary Condition of the Labouring Population* (1842) - long-settled towns like Portsmouth (and Norwich) were resistant to its conclusions.⁵ Both cities opposed the Health of Towns Bill in 1847 on the dual grounds of resistance to state encroachments of their own liberties and because of the increased costs to the urban ratepayers.⁶

The working-class majority in Portsmouth, as in Norwich and all other urban centres,

faced similar difficulties. All such groups depended upon urban elites having the private conscience and the political will to address the degrading and unsanitary conditions in which most citizens lived. In these circumstances, each central government commission and report from Westminster and each piece of public health legislation, albeit permissive rather than mandatory, was a lifeline for the masses. Such measures provided further opportunities for a change of outlook, a shift in the 'structure of feeling'.⁷ Without this shift, a radical pressure for change from below might have been more evident.

In Portsmouth, the urban elite did eventually begin to develop more sense of communal responsibility. By the mid-1870s, it seems that the Borough of Portsmouth Waterworks Company, formed in 1858, was providing a piped supply of water for almost all the inhabitants.⁸ The shift towards a greater sense of responsibility came in Norwich, too, but even more slowly. By the first decade of the twentieth century, a change in the way the powerful were making sense of the world was observed by one of its leading citizens. In 1910, Sir Peter Eade, a Norwich physician and moderate supporter of temperance, yet still one of the leading members of the urban elite as town councillor, sheriff and three times mayor, and now in his eighties, was able to write:

There may be noted the increasing feeling of the whole country of the duty of those in authority to supplement, when necessary, the means of those in the lower classes of life ...

He cited free Board Schools, free breakfasts, and free boots - and continued:

'Socialism', as it is called, undoubtedly demands better conditions for the poorer classes of all classes and the result of investigation into the present condition of any of these fully justifies many of the ends for which socialism is aiming and agitating ... The rapid increase of population (and) the growing scarcity of work and employment, are intending the poverty of large numbers of the working classes with the necessary consequences of home privation and enfeebled health to all, but especially to the young.⁹

Sir Peter Eade had not only noted the shift in the 'structure of feeling' of the period but also itemised those 'present conditions' observable in 1910 that in his mind justified intervention. The irony is that even worse conditions were evident throughout the Victorian period in Norwich and the urban elite proved slow to act effectively to improve matters.

Evidence from the period between 1845 and 1850 is striking in its cataloguing of deprivation. In 1845, the Royal Commissioners charged with investigating the state of Norwich had concluded that the working classes faced poverty, filthy living conditions and 'want of water':

Neglect and decay are now conspicuous in the streets and quarters occupied by the working classes ... narrow streets and lanes where courts and yards were linked by a single opening or doorway ... The system of

building outside the town ... has proved ... most prejudicial to public health. Here is a concentration of all the evils that can afflict the manufacturer: want of employment and its consequent poverty, crowded and badly constructed habitations, filth, want of sewerage and drainage, an impure air, and want of water. It is here that epidemics ... prove the most severe; here also that all other forms of disease appear in their most aggravated forms.

In 1849, the living conditions survey in the *Morning Chronicle* reports gave details of nine families living in the city, north of the Wensum, all suffering appalling living conditions. One, a female gauze weaver living in White Lion court in the parish of St. Paul, saw herself as a 'privileged person'. Usually unemployed for at least four months a year, she still maintained her four children at school. The court contained twelve houses with a common privy; the soil from this privy drained into the court and 'after rain sometimes oozed through walls since the floor of the houses was a foot lower than the ground outside'. In 1850, William Lee's eight-day survey in May presented a similar picture. He was particularly concerned that the city's defective water supply and bad drainage were the causes of disease. He concluded that 'the city is almost entirely dependent upon a polluted river, polluted wells, and utterly inadequate public works for its supply of water'.¹⁰

These three contemporary sketches of working-class deprivation in Norwich

match the devastating eyewitness account of the living conditions for the working class in Manchester given by Friedrich Engels in his *The Condition of the Working Class in England in 1844*. Engels, in concluding, addresses the reader:

On re-reading my description (of the Old Town of Manchester) ... I must admit that ... it is by far not nearly strong enough ... to convey vividly the filth, ruination, and uninhabitableness, the defiance of every consideration of cleanliness, ventilation, and health that characterise the construction of this district, which contains at least twenty to thirty thousand inhabitants. And such a district exists in the very centre of the second city of England, the most important factory town in the world.¹¹

Stephen Marcus has argued that it was around this mid-century period that some within the middle class - and he takes Engels as a radical example - began to be conscious that 'millions of English men, women, and children were virtually living in shit'.¹² This was the reality that those unfortunate millions had to make sense of; it also presented significant problems for the privileged few. Urban elites during the Victorian period did gradually become more conscious of such appalling conditions, one might say more moved by conscience, but within Norwich, despite Sir Peter Eade's sense of a change in outlook, the shadow of the courts and yards stretched further into the twentieth century.¹³ It was true that an Act for the Better Sewering of Norwich

had been passed in 1867, and that the first Medical Officer of Health had been appointed in 1873, following the Public Health Act (1872), but John Pound was still able to conclude:

... the very poor, at least, were affected peripherally, if at all, by the improvements in the city's public health between 1850 and 1900 ... the city had to wait until the twentieth century, and wholesale schemes of slum clearance (in the 1920s), before anything like a satisfactory system was to emerge.¹⁴

Why had this change of outlook taken some three generations? To understand fully how Victorian - and Edwardian - elites adjusted to the poverty that had been produced by industrialisation and urban growth may still present problems for the critical imagination of historians today. Nevertheless, studies of how particular urban elites responded to national initiatives such as commissions, reports and legislation can provide a key to such an understanding. In the case of Norwich, that key opens up the issue of resistance: how backward were the powerful in Norwich in addressing the problems of poverty, and if so, for what reasons? In considering these questions, the importance of alcohol as a drug, as well as a thirst-quencher, will be examined. How tolerable would the conditions of life have been for the majority without the palliative of the pub and the pint?¹⁵ Such a question invites another that will also be examined. How instrumental were brewers in determining the political responses of the urban elite in Norwich?

The connections between local and national political elites, brewers and water supply, and a working class whose thirst was quenched and distress assuaged by beer are complex and to a degree speculative. On occasion, however, the link is clear. Brian Harrison noted that in the 1810s:

London brewers, anxious to prevent their own wells from drying up, opposed the sinking of deep wells for public supply; and London publicans were often the only slum-dwellers possessing their own water supply.¹⁶

It seems likely that brewers elsewhere, including Norwich, would have behaved in a similar fashion. But for how long were brewers still seeking to limit and control water supply in the second half of the century? Unfortunately, there seems to be a lack of evidence; the research remains to be done. Historians have been aware of the brewer's role as local politician and member of the urban elite performing time-consuming and important civic duties that on occasions doubtless enabled him to act in the interests of the brewery, say in preserving licences. However, the brewer's role as a councillor using civic power to help shape water policies and political responses to the poverty of the urban masses has received less attention.

It is a fact that water supplies for drinking were hazardous to the health of a large part of the nation's population during a period when breweries were extracting safe and tasty water supplies for their

own production of beer. Any adequate explanation for this seeming paradox is bound to be multi-dimensional but the connection between brewers and water supply does seem to offer particular insights. Brewers did have a vested interest to protect.

They enjoyed, in effect, a monopoly right to act as national 'thirst quenchers'. They manufactured and supplied, for profit, the dietary liquid needs for a rapidly expanding population at a time when the alcoholic content of the drink served as a vital 'panacea' for 'physical and psychological pressures in a harsh new urban and industrial world'.¹⁷ Brewers were serving two important social needs: one dietary, one emotional, and it was vital that both were adequately satisfied if those who held power and wealth in Victorian society were not to be confronted with urban unrest.

Brewers were, of course, interested in making profits, but they were also in a position to see themselves - and be seen by others across the divide of classes - as the friends and support of the working class family. Sir Harry Bullard, for one, did in Norwich and was so billed in election material.¹⁸ Apart from some in the temperance movement, it did not seem to occur to people - perhaps not even to the brewers themselves - that continuing to limit water supplies and failing to improve living conditions further increased the dependence on drink as well as being contrary to one interpretation of Christian moral teaching. The presence and

actions of brewers in a local government that took so long to demonstrate an effective sense of responsibility for all the community suggest a measure of self-interest and hard-edged business acumen, conscious or not.

The analysis that follows of how the urban elite in Norwich dealt with the issues of water supply and sewage disposal, and the associated housing and living conditions of the working-class majority of the city's population, will suggest a collective failure of imagination. There seems to have been for much of the Victorian period an inability to grasp with sufficient strength the nettle of reform and extend local government powers, erode the individual interests of some Norwich ratepayers and, crucially, increase sufficiently the income raised from the wealthy minority to address the needs of the Norwich poor. It does seem significant that some of the key figures within this urban elite, exercising power and influence within the council and its committees, were prominent Norwich brewers.¹⁹

It was not, of course, simply the brewers' vested interest in limiting and controlling the water supply to the city that explains the response of the urban elite. That would be too crude. Rather, it is to argue that the general outlook of the wealthy and powerful in Norwich was at one with the mind-set of the leading brewers. Such traits as civic pride and a resistance to outside interference are evident; so, too, is the businessman's concern to limit

expenditure.²⁰ Also present - and this is more difficult to understand and analyse - is a reluctance to accept the degree of poverty and deprivation experienced by the poor in Norwich. Here is the collective failure to accept the detailed case that was being made by the minority of Victorians who can be grouped together as the Temperance interest.

In part, this inhibited outlook of the Norwich urban elite may be explicable in terms of the polarisation that developed between the temperance and the brewing interests. Once the Temperance movement was active from the 1830s, both nationally and locally within Norwich, the brewing interest then adopted a defensive and conservative position.²¹ This is evident within the Town Council and its Committees, as well as within such a trade body as the Licensed Victuallers Association.²² Such a polarisation led to the practical denial of the human needs of the city poor. Yet the reluctance to expend money on an adequate water supply or in other ways recognise and address the crisis of poverty in Norwich could always be fudged and excused - although never publicly - by the knowledge that over 600 public houses were providing their own municipal supply of liquid, in the form of beer, to the working class. Thirsts could still be slaked and misery depressed; alcohol rather than religion was arguably the real 'opium of the people'.

The need for social control seemed imperative. Faced with the unprecedented increase in urban populations in the

nineteenth century and the consequent threat to order, the wealthy and powerful held control in a society that seemed at times ready to spiral into disorder. The fear of revolution was apparent; Engels' tour of Manchester in 1844 helped lead him to the conclusion that: 'It is too late for a peaceful solution ... soon a slight impulse will suffice to set the avalanche in motion'.²³

If Engels had toured Norwich, he would have seen similar conditions and perhaps drawn the same conclusion. The Norwich urban elite was certainly mindful of the threat. From 1836, the Norwich police force had been developed as an agency through which that elite could seek to control the 'lower orders'.²⁴ Once Edwin Chadwick's *Report on the Sanitary Condition of the Labouring Population* had entered the public domain in 1842, the pressure for a legislative response from central government mounted.²⁵ Helped by an outbreak of cholera, the Public Health Act (1848) was passed. It created a General Board of Health in London and Local Boards of Health with potentially wide powers to enforce standards of public hygiene where the death rate exceeded 23 per 1,000 or where 10% of ratepayers petitioned for a local board.²⁶ Within Norwich, however, opinion was divided as to how far the city should adopt its measures - and the discord centred on the issue of water supply.

William Lee's *Report* in 1850 had drawn particular attention to the defective water supply in Norwich.²⁷ It had actually been

written for the General Board of Health set up in London under the terms of the 1848 legislation and was published in 1851 by the HMSO. Lee had been in favour of taking the water supply under the control of a local Board of Health and was opposed to a profit-making scheme. Such municipal control would no doubt have found favour with Edwin Chadwick who was serving as a commissioner on the General Board of Health in London until he was forcibly retired in 1854 due to resistance to just such inquiries as Lee's. However, for most in the Norwich urban elite, municipal control meant the unacceptable: a sharp rise in rates and control from London through the inspectorate.

Moreover, it seemed that water, as well as beer, had its vested interests. The directors of the new private water company that was set up in Norwich were members of its urban elite and most of these twelve men were councillors and members of those sub-committees concerned with water, sanitation and health. One, H.P. Morgan, was a brewer. As individual shareholders, they stood to make a pecuniary gain from keeping the water supply privatised and out of municipal control.²⁸ By 1851, the new private Norwich Water Company was in operation, its three steam engines pumping water to serve the needs of 38,000 of the around 70,000 citizens of Norwich.²⁹ This still left around 46% of the population of Norwich dependent on the river and wells - or alcoholic drink.

The deficiencies of the water supply in Norwich had been a focus for public

scrutiny since 1848. The passing of the Public Health Act, the fear of approaching cholera, and, no doubt, revolution in Europe and Chartism in Britain, all helped concentrate minds. Many of the poor were obtaining their water from the polluted Wensum, five of the city's ten public pumps were situated close to adjoining church yards with their decomposing bodies, and the previous private water company that supplied the city took its water from a polluted section of the river.³⁰ In these circumstances, the formation of a new water company sited further upstream at a less polluted location and serving the needs of more residents was something of an advance. But it did not meet the needs of the numerous poor.

By 1871, the Water Company claimed that it was supplying three-quarters of the 80,000 citizens of Norwich. This was a significant improvement, but one that still left 25% of the population without a connection to a tolerably safe water supply.³¹ Moreover, the situation was made worse for those without access due to the steady increase in the number of factories after 1850 (an expansion that the 1845 Commissioners had not anticipated). In 1864, White's *Norfolk Directory* recorded factories for dyeing and finishing manufacturing goods, as well as several iron foundries, tanneries, breweries, maltings, soaperies, chemical, brick and tile works. The residue from these industries poured into the Wensum.³² Another pollutant of the river was the discharge from 120 sewers between the New Mills

and Carrow that emptied the contents of the 3,000 houses in Norwich that had water closets in 1864.³³ This still left around 83% of the 18,000 houses in Norwich dependent on other means of removing human excrement.

The institutional means to address these public health problems did not exist. When Chadwick's General Board of Health was abolished in 1858, the initiative for improvement passed to Local Boards of Health who were subject to vested interests and did not necessarily act for the better health of the working classes. In Norwich, the Local Board of Health had been established in 1850, that is to say the Town Council and its relevant committees acted as the local board. In time, the need for a return to more centralised control over local authorities became a national concern; the passing of the Public Health Act (1866), was followed by consolidating Acts in 1871 and 1875, the latter compelling local authorities to appoint a Medical Officer of Health and take action to improve the sanitary conditions of their districts. However, the conservative and protectionist stance that had been moulded in the decade or so of virtual autonomy had long-lasting effects.

The survival of traditional conservative thinking on issues of sanitation is perhaps most revealingly illustrated by the one medical authority, interviewed by William Lee in 1850, who did not argue strongly that unsanitary conditions necessarily led to more disease. He was

Thomas W. Crosse, a surgeon, who served as a councillor and therefore as a member of the Local Board of Health for some twenty years before resigning in January 1873. The occasion for that resignation was nothing less than Crosse's taking up of his appointment as the first Medical Officer of Health for Norwich. In this capacity, Crosse was a dominant and conservative influence on issues concerning the health of Norwich citizens until his death in 1892. The views on sanitation he had held as a young man in 1850 were out of kilter with his colleagues even then; over twenty years later those views seem to have changed little in essence and yet Crosse was appointed to the most influential office concerned with public health in the city and for two more decades his views held sway.³⁴ It is scarcely an exaggeration to suggest that the outlook of the brewers, most of the councillors, and the Medical Officer of Health were broadly at one in Norwich for around four decades. During this time, but especially in the two decades of his office, the public health of the city did not receive the degree of expertise and attention it required.

When in January 1873 the Norwich Town Council agreed to elect its own Medical Officer of Health, the brewer-councillor John Youngs was very much in favour. The council could have made an appointment under the authority of the national Local Government Board - which would have led to the State meeting half the costs - but Youngs was suspicious of intervention from the Board. He claimed

that, if he had thought 'Norwich was negligent as regards sanitary matters', he would not have hesitated to work with the national Board - but Norwich, he insisted, could not be described as 'negligent'.³⁵ Crosse was of a similar mind. In his first annual report as Medical Officer of Health in 1874, he explained that the large number of children dying under one year of age in Norwich, as in other towns, was a serious matter. However, his explanation reveals a mind-set from nearly twenty-five years earlier:

It does not appear to depend so much upon any deficiency in sanitary arrangements (although doubtless in some parts of the District over-crowded dwellings greatly prevail), but seems rather to arise from the ignorance among the poorer classes of the proper way to rear their infants.³⁶

Crosse remained attached to these limited and conservative views until his death in office some twenty years later.³⁷

Thomas William Crosse (1826-92) was an integral part of the upper echelons of the Norwich urban elite. He was the son of John Green Crosse (1790-1850), a distinguished Norwich surgeon and author who was one of the three hundred original fellows of the Royal College of Surgeons in 1843.³⁸ However, William Lee's treatment of the younger Crosse in 1850 had been caustic and perhaps even served to consolidate his prejudices.³⁹ Within the confines of Norwich society, Thomas W. Crosse could enjoy the advantages of a social position that pro-

TECTED his reputation. It is no surprise to find him receiving the deferential accolades granted to any dignitary in Victorian public life. But one source does suggest that not all shared his conservatism:

Since his appointment many sanitary improvements have been effected, the need of them being explained by the facts and conclusions being presented in his reports. Two or three 'rookeries' have been swept away before the expression of public opinion, backed up by the authoritative voice of the Officer of Health. No doubt the public who look to the ideal, as well as Mr. Crosse, would like to see more thorough sanitary improvements effected, but the citizens have only to recall the incidents of various schemes carried through the council to see that private interests often stand in the way to remedial measures being applied at a cost which shall not grieve the ratepayer.⁴⁰

The cost of Thomas Crosse's conservatism could be high too. In his own annual report for 1885, he noted with respect to infant mortality figures for Norwich:

This is the first time I have been able to report any material improvement under this head, and it is very satisfactory to notice an alteration in the unenviable notoriety Norwich has hitherto enjoyed in this direction.⁴¹

In Norwich, private interest, considerations of short-term expense, and outmoded medical ideas were still winning out in a conflict between two different value systems: one entrenched in early Victorian

attitudes that defined the poor and poverty as problems to be contained at minimum expense and explained away as consequences of personal failings and an unavoidable part of God's design; the other, more liberal and moved by a sense of the poor sharing a common humanity, that saw the need for political and social action against poverty and its causes. But the views of medical men such as Crosse, and others of his generation like the brewers, were increasingly anachronistic. The death of Crosse in 1892 marked a sea change in sanitation policies in Norwich. His successor as Medical Officer of Health, Harry Cooper Pattin, set a different tone, more in keeping with the new, more liberal value system.⁴²

Yet the early-Victorian mind-set had survived until almost the end of the reign. The minutes of the various sub-committees of the Norwich Board of Health reveal numerous instances when the members remained reactive rather than proactive, even in times of urban crisis such as a cholera epidemic. The impression is of gentlemen overwhelmed by the scale of the urban problem confronting them. Their bureaucratic organisation was both inadequate for the task of managing a city like Norwich and open to a degree of behind-the-scenes manipulation as a number of instances from the minutes of the Board of Health indicate.

Evidence of inadequate management is especially clear in relation to the disposal of human excrement. In 1853, the

Sanitary Purposes Committee - formed for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Nuisances Removal and Diseases Prevention Acts (1846, 1849) - recommended to the Paving, Sewage, Cleansing and Lightings Committee:

... an increase in the pay of the Scavengers employed in the City for a short period upon condition that they gave all their time to cleansing and removing the filth and Soil not only from the Streets but from the various Courts and Alleys in their respective districts.⁴³

The councillors were at that time responding to the imminent threat of a cholera epidemic. However, such evidence of ineffective cleansing reoccurs regularly in the minutes of various committees concerned with public health for nearly forty years. For instance, in 1876, the Executive Committee of the Sanitary Authority, with the brewers Mr. Youngs and Mr. Morgan playing a prominent part, noted with concern 'the neglect of the emptying of bins (of night soil) by the contractors' and determined to deduct 3s from their payment for each bin reported un-emptied.⁴⁴ Thomas Crosse, through his annual reports as Medical Officer of Health, continued to express his less-than-justified belief that the bin system was working efficiently; Norwich did not need an extension of the more expensive water closet method.⁴⁵ It was left to Cooper Pattin to point out the dangers to health and the degradation of the bin system, to record the £6,000 a year cost of the scavenging system, and to advocate

the 'prudent economy' of the water closet.⁴⁶ Finally, in May 1894, the corporation accepted the recommendation of its own Chief Sanitary Inspector's report, abandoned privatised contracting and accepted municipal control.⁴⁷

Behind-the-scenes manipulation, by definition, is not easy to establish. However, on one occasion such interference with the course of local government became public since the Clerk had felt obliged - or been so instructed - to consult Counsel on the subject. Some member or members of the elite were determined that a decision taken by a committee of the Corporation would not necessarily be final. In March 1873, the ten or so regular members of the Sewage and Irrigation Committee, including John Youngs and Henry Morgan, had met and attempted to bring to an end a year-old dispute with Harriet Martineau and her solicitor over the leakage of sewage into a well at the 'Pine Apple' public house in Trowse. The new sewerage system for Norwich, built in the late 1860s and probably underfunded, was already causing major problems. After a division, the Clerk at the meeting had been instructed to assent to the terms set out in the latest letter from Miss Martineau's Diss solicitor. A week later, the Clerk stated that he had instead consulted counsel who had advised that 'It would be suicidal to agree to the terms unless the Corporation was certain of curing the defect in the well' and that, even if the costs of the Chancery suit went against the Corporation, the bill would probably not exceed £100. On

hearing this, the Committee then backtracked and decided the matter should remain in abeyance for the present.⁴⁸

In this one instance, some of the critical problems facing local government for much of the Victorian period are represented. Members of the urban elite in Norwich, like brewers, solicitors, industrialists, and physicians, would not necessarily have the expertise or experience to be able to make informed decisions on the unprecedented issues facing urban society. Yet they lived surrounded by deference and at times with a provincial suspicion of the initiatives from Westminster. They were fearful of spending too much money and often lacked the political imagination to realise the consequences of spending too little. In addition, their underlying fear of social disorder served to distance many of them from the realities of working-class life and to stifle any serious effort to understand the causes of its poverty. For many of the rich and powerful, the 'lower orders' were typecast as the 'poor' and assumed to be in some sense responsible for their own fate. A routine, tribal opposition to the Temperance interest blinded many in the urban elite to the truths in that movement's social analysis. Such attitudes needed to change if social order was to be maintained and a decent standard of public health achieved, and by the early 1890s a new professionalism was manifest in local government in Norwich. The days of the brewer-councillor were in effect at an end. The structure of feeling was taking a new shape.

Harry Bullard was the last in the substantial line of such brewer-councillors in Norwich. Within his own terms, he no doubt believed that the performance of his public duties was helping shape Norwich for the better, just as his role in the Bullard brewery helped increase its profitability.⁴⁹ Yet his unseating as the elected Conservative M.P., after the 1885 election and the Liberal petition alleging electoral corruption, was symptomatic of his association with the discredited practices of the past.⁵⁰ The future belonged to a new generation of local politicians.

After 1892, local government in Norwich seems different. The minutes of the Health and Sanitary Committee from 1892 to 1900 indicate that the direct brewing influence is absent; no brewer appears among the active committee members.⁵¹ Cooper Pattin was elected by this committee to perform all the duties prescribed in the Local Government Board regulations of 1891 for the Medical Officer of Health of an Urban Sanitary Authority; there is now a sense that central direction from Westminster and the increasing flow of mandatory national regulation had irrevocably tilted the balance against local vested interests.⁵² There is still, however, a reminder of local pride, if not defensiveness, in the decision by the Committee not to submit the appointment of Cooper Pattin for the approval or sanction of the Local Government Board.⁵³

In this changing social and political climate, health and sanitation moved closer

to the top of the political agenda. By July 1898, the full council had resolved unanimously that:

- ... provision of the Public Health Acts be rigidly enforced as regards:-
- a) Insufficiency of Water supply.
 - b) Insufficiency of Closet or Privy and Ash Pan accommodation.
 - c) Insufficiency of Drainage.

In the following months a study was made of the duties of the Health Committee that resulted in a private and confidential report in January 1899, read and recommended to the Council in February. In themselves, the proposed changes were minor, the most significant being that there were to be more inspectors with increased pay; the fundamental shifts in policy were still in the future. But the report did signal a new approach, as well as providing powerful evidence of the scale of the sanitation problem in Norwich at the end of a century that had been marked by brewing influence and less than progressive local government. The report observed that the Night Soil Inspector who was 'in charge of 30 night carts and 30 employees of the Corporation ... is lame, is about 70 years of age, and is in receipt of 28s per week'. (He was replaced and given lighter employment at 18s per week.) It seemed that each week there were, on average, sixty complaints about bin collection and thirty fever cases reported. The city of Norwich still had nearly six hundred courts and yards, and there were still about 16,000 people who obtained their

water supply from pumps and wells.⁵⁴ The reason why this health crisis had not become a health disaster was due, at least in part, to the existence of over six hundred pubs and beerhouses.

Alcoholic drink had been traditionally associated with health but the reasons emphasised were other than that it provided a safe means of satisfying the dietary need for water. Victorians, at least outside the Temperance Movement, believed as their predecessors had done that 'generally intoxicants were important aids to physical stamina, virility and health'.⁵⁵ Although those supporting the Temperance cause tended to the view that drink had no place in a proper diet, modern nutritional knowledge would on balance refute this extreme position. Aside from the critically important water content, beer does have considerable food value: '... a pint of beer having a calorific value of between 200 and 400 depending on the strength of the brew'.⁵⁶

Nevertheless, the assessment of the role of drink in Victorian working-class diets remains 'extremely difficult', not only because the reliability of the data is suspect but also because the historian can approach the issue from alternative positions. On the one hand, as Dingle established:

... in families where income was either inadequate or barely adequate to provide for the maintenance of 'merely physical efficiency', drink could be purchased only at the expense of essential foodstuffs.

On the other hand, drink did have its calorific value, and, at least until the greater range of foods and drink became available towards the end of the century, it could serve as an escape not only from the hardship of life but also from 'a monotonous diet'.⁵⁷

In this examination of the Victorian working-class diet, the importance of tea drinking needs to be assessed. Tea made using boiled water provided an alternative to beer as a safe liquid to satisfy dietary needs. To what extent did the working class become tea drinkers? It seems likely that the consumption of tea would have been associated with 'respectability' and only those who aspired to middle class customs and who could afford the associated costs would have drunk tea. However, the price of tea remained relatively high. Not until Thomas Lipton, the prototype of the modern multiple-grocer, began to deal in tea in 1889 and offered it at 1s 7d a pound was there a significant reduction in price. Before then, no tea had sold under 2s 6d a pound.⁵⁸ Throughout most of the first half of the century, tea consumption had remained exclusive and remarkably stable at around 1¼ lb per head a year. Only in the decade 1841-1850 did it reach 1½ lb per head a year, despite a sharp fall in prices following the opening of the China trade to free competition in 1833, and by 1850 some of the working class were evidently drinking tea.⁵⁹

Tea consumption, like that of beer, did rise sharply from the 1850s to the 1870s,

and then continued a smooth upward trend for the rest of the century.⁶⁰ This increase must have been due in part to more members of the working class drinking tea. The growth of the temperance movement had produced, according to one calculation, around 3 million abstainers by the end of the century; many of these were likely to have been tea drinkers.⁶¹ However, members of the British Association for the Advancement of Science made a calculation in 1881 of how much the population spent per head on food and drink that indicates the continuing primacy of beer and spirits over non-alcoholic drinks such as tea and coffee. Beer (1.4d) and spirits (0.75d) accounted for more than 2d (22%) of the 9½d that was the average daily expenditure on all articles of food and drink. Tea (0.29d) and coffee, including cocoa (0.05d) took only just over a farthing (3.5%) of this daily expenditure.⁶² If these figures could be adjusted to indicate expenditure within the working classes alone, the primacy of beer would be even more marked. More tea was drunk by the working class in the last two decades of the century as the standard of living rose, but the general picture of the dominance of beer as the staple liquid to satisfy dietary needs in the Victorian period remained largely unaltered. Rowntree and Sherwell calculated that 20% of working-class family income in 1899 was spent on alcohol.⁶³

1837	1.19
1842	1.38
1847	1.66
1852	1.99
1857	2.45
1862	2.69
1867	3.65
1872	4.01
1877	4.50
1882	4.69
1887	5.02
1892	5.43
1897	5.79
1902	6.07

Table 21. Annual per capita tea consumption (in lb.), 1837-1902.

Source. Mitchell, B.R. (1962) Abstract of British Historical Statistics. C.U.P.: Cambridge, pp. 356-357.

Drink, however, was not a cheap source of liquid, although it may have been a significant one. If the brewers could comfort themselves with the thought of the good health their beer was bringing, their business accounts showed its profitability. For all those in the working class whose incomes were initially only just above the 'poverty-line', expenditure on drink could push them below it. If a person or family could no longer afford to buy food they would otherwise have purchased, their calorific intake was bound to fall below minimum requirements - hence the conclusion of Booth and Rowntree that expenditure on drink was a cause of 'secondary poverty'. Yet, as A.E. Dingle has

argued, the 1880s and 1890s did witness a change. Whilst the U.K. expenditure on drink as a percentage of total consumer expenditure remained between 12 and 13%, the remaining 87% of purchasing power was buying more in real terms as prices fell. After 1900, with the age of 'high mass consumption' firmly established, the total amount spent on drink fell, and by 1910 it was between 8 and 9%.⁶⁴

Although expenditure on drink had fallen, it still remained substantial, and within some of the households of the poor the amount spent on drink was likely to have been a bigger percentage of total expenditure. Nevertheless, the impression in Norwich was that the last decade of the nineteenth century did see the beginning of a new degree of moderation in the consumption of drink. Hawkins (1910) noted that:

Social workers in Norwich, comparing the conditions of the present with 20 years ago (1890) are unanimous that there has been a great improvement in the conduct and sobriety of boot operatives.

He explained this as a consequence of new methods of production and greater efficiency. Previously, the system of out-working had meant that Monday was often kept as a holiday and there were long periods of enforced idleness anyway. As a result, drinking had been encouraged 'among the weaker sort of men'.⁶⁵

Drinking to excess was condemned by those following the Temperance cause

and frowned on by those supporting the Drink interest; for them, drunkenness could only represent adverse publicity. Evidence of drunkenness was always the Achilles heel of a brewing interest keen to minimise its significance, as Harry Bullard, for instance, demonstrated in Norwich in 1879.⁶⁶ The Drink interest understood that the Temperance movement's concern to highlight the dire consequences of drinking to excess threatened its business foundations. There may also have been some grasp that the Temperance mind was working out a prescription for an alternative re-ordering of industrial society, freed from the 'support system' provided by the legalised drug of alcohol and the securities offered by the publican and the public house and its beers and spirits. This was a conflict of ideologies and interests within the elite at Westminster and within urban elites in the rest of the country. For the Prohibitionists who pressed for the passing of the Permissive Bill from the late 1850s, drink was seen 'as the root cause of most social ills'. Dingle's explanations for this perspective captured the absolute divide between the views of the extreme Temperance supporter and the brewer or publican:

Because the nation was becoming morally corrupt, a 'modern Babylon', a dose of abstinence was needed to rejuvenate it. The experiment in political democracy could not work while people were in a drunken and degraded state. Self-interested drink manufacturers and religious apathy were sowing the seeds of social catastrophe ... If

left untouched the 'drink curse' would lead to class conflict by creating (in Cardinal Manning's words) 'a heaving, seething mass of discontented, disaffected, moody passionate socialists ... ready to bury the social edifice in ruins'.⁶⁷

Such sentiments were a world away from those expressed in the undated Norwich election poem, extolling the virtues of Harry Bullard as the friend of the poor and the bountiful philanthropist.⁶⁸

In conclusion, it seems that many of the poor, for a variety of reasons, may have begun to drink slightly less by the end of Victoria's reign. For many in Norwich, though, the necessity of drinking a measure of beer was taken-for-granted. On balance, even allowing for the medical dangers of excessive drinking, public health had almost certainly been improved by beer consumption; in the absence of adequate supplies of safe drinking water for so many, such a conclusion is hard to resist. Brewers had therefore served a public need in supplying their product. However, those same brewers had been in the forefront of a system of local government that at least until the 1890s had proved incapable in the face of an urban public health crisis that had brought death and sickness to the poor for over three generations.

Chapter 6: Drink and social 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.⁶⁹

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.⁷⁰

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 1836.⁷¹ 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 inter-

pretation. This is the conclusion that David Taylor has drawn after assessing the recent proliferation of local studies of the development of the 'new police'.⁷² 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.⁷³

Within Norwich, these issues are evident and a concern for cost-saving efficiency is explicit.⁷⁴ 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.⁷⁵

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'.⁷⁶ 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.⁷⁷ 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.⁷⁸ 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.⁷⁹ 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.⁸⁰ 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.⁸¹ 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.⁸²

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.⁸³ 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.⁸⁴ 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'.⁸⁵ 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.⁸⁶

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%) of the total force of sixty-nine constables had been summarily dismissed, twenty two (31.8%) cautioned, and only thirty-five (50.7%) found satisfactory.⁸⁷

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.⁸⁸ 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!⁸⁹ 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.⁹⁰ 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 19th January and fourteen more (this time, night constables) on the 26th 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.⁹¹

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 per-

sonal 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.⁹²

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.⁹³ 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%) dismissed.⁹⁴ 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

Date	Name	Offence	Punishment
23 Jan	PC Flood	'intoxicated on duty'	reprimand / caution
6 Feb	PC Wales	'absent from Beat & in pub on night duty'	reprimand / fine 20s
13 Feb	PC Langford (1)	'smoking in pub - 6.30pm - on duty'	'allowed to leave Force in for'n'gt'
13 Mar	PC F. Smith	'drunk and incapable on beat / insubordination'	dismissed
9 Apr	PC Lendall	'fighting in pub'	reprimand / fine 10s
1 May	PC Armstrong	'influence of drink on night duty'	reprimand / fine 20s
29 May	PC Kirkpatrick	'worse for drink when coming off duty'	reduced from acting sergeantry
19 Jun	PC Pooley	'intoxicated coming on duty / insolent conduct'	reprimand / fine 20s
3 Jul	PC Clarke	'worse for drink on duty'	reprimand / any future offence - discharge
10 Jul	PC Rushmer	'found in pub on night duty'	reprimand / fine 9s / any future offence - discharge
10 Jul	PC Gibbon	'worse for drink on night duty'	reprimand / fine 9s / any future offence - discharge
17 Jul	PC Jubby	'under influ' coming off duty at 6am	reprimand / caution
7 Aug	PC Smith (2)	'intoxicated on night duty'	not to continue in force beyond 6 wks. probation
14 Aug	PC Browne	'intoxicated coming off duty'	reprimand / caution / any future offence - discharge
11 Sep	PC Will. Smith	'drunk on duty'	dismissed
23 Oct	PC Burfield	'under influ' attending before Grand Jury at last Qua' Sessions	reprimand / fined 1 week's pay
27 Nov	PC Hazell	'under influ' on night duty	reprimand / fined 1 week's pay / any future offence - discharge
11 Dec	PCs Ecclestone, Perfit, Hillings and Buxton	'drunk on duty'	all dismissed
18 Dec	PC Clarke	'sitting in pub on night duty'	dismissed (same Clarke as 3 Jul)

Total No. of PCs reported = 21; number of PCs dismissed = 8

Table 22. Entries in the Watch Committee Minutes Book for 1857 relating to police constables reported for drink offences.

(1) PC. Langford applied to be reinstated on 27 Feb. and this was granted until 'after the Sessions', but he was then dismissed in early April.

(2) In fact, PC Smith was given another 6 weeks probation on 25 Aug.; it is unclear whether this Smith is the same William Smith dismissed from the Force on 11 Sep. I have assumed he is not.

(3) On 27 Nov., the Town Clerk informed the Committee that they had no power to fine the police for neglect and breach of duty.

Source. NRO, N/TC 7/5, WCM, (1855-59)

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.⁹⁵ 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.⁹⁶

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.⁹⁷ 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'.⁹⁸ 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'.⁹⁹ 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.¹⁰⁰ 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

Date	Name	Offence	Punishment
1867			
Mar	PC King	'under the influence of drink / off Beat'	5s fine / loss of night's pay
Aug	PC Maidstone	'worse for drink'	3 months probation - 18s class
Sep	PC Taylor	'influence of drink'	3 months probation - 18s class
Sep	PC Hennessey	'in pub at 11.10pm on duty and gossiping at 4.20 on Beat'	6 months probation - 18s class
Nov	PC Turner	'drunk on duty on 2 Nov.'	dismissed (Norfolk labourer appted on 25 Oct. - enlisted for a soldier after dismissal)
Nov	PC Gorrington	'in liquor shop for 10 mins on duty gossiping'	10s fine
Dec	PC Watts	'drunk on duty in Walk'	dismissed
1868			
Jan	PC Beals	'worse for drink'	(probationer) dismissed
Jan	PC Blower	'drunk at 12pm'	3 months probation, 18s class
Feb	PC Woodgilt	'drunk on duty & neglect of duty'	dismissed
Apr	PC Hartley	'drunk at 5.40am'	reprimanded
May	PC Hennessey	'asleep on Beat & under influence of drink'	dismissed (Sept. 67 offence)
May	PC Edgoose	'under influence'	3 months probation, 18s class
Jun	PC Broadwater	Reported by Councillor Harvey for entering a pub - when followed said 'All right I am going to have a glass of ale.'	cautioned / no entry in Character Book
Nov	PC Bacon	'under influence'	3 months probation, 18s class

1869

Jan	PC Bacon	'sitting on doorstep asleep & under influence'	dismissed
Jan	PC Gorrington	'drunk & incapable'	resigned on request
Jan	PC Matthew	'smoking in pub'	extra 2 month probation
Mar	PC Matthew	'drunk on beat'	dismissed (see above)
Apr	Inspector Curtis	Had been due to appear as witness against Matthew - when called, 'under influence'	since general good conduct in 21 years of service and 4 days pay lost already, no fine - but reprimand
Apr	PC Sonter	'off Beat / drinking'	resigned
May	PC Whayman	'off Beat / drinking'	dismissed There are no more charges until February 1870

1870

Feb	PC Cullington	'under influence'	cautioned
Mar	PC Barber	'off Beat / drinking'	cautioned
May	PCs. Rodgers & Shoyles	'off Beat / drinking'	cautioned
Jun	PC Scott	'drunk on duty'	cautioned
Jul	Inspector Curtis	'drunk & unfit for duty'	fined 1 week's pay - but initially resigned, complaining of Chief Constable's tyranny - later contrite and reinstated
Sep	PCs. Reeve & Meering	'in pub after hours'	cautioned
Dec	PC Holme	'under influence / unfit for duty'	fined 10s / forfeit 1 weeks pay
Dec	Sergt. Guiett	'intoxicated coming off duty'	fined 1 weeks pay / forfeit 1 weeks pay
Dec	PC Godfrey	'drunk, asleep, and unfit for duty'	dismissed

Table 23. Entries in the Watch Committee Minutes Book between 1867-70 relating to officers reported for drink offences.

Sources. NRO, N/TC 7/6, WCM, (1863-67); NRO, N/TC 7/7, WCM, (1867-71)

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 1,056,000. 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 1836.¹⁰¹ 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.¹⁰² 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.¹⁰³ 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 25th February 1870 when P.C. Cullington was reported for being under the influence of drink in the 'Curriers Arms' in Union Place.¹⁰⁴

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 2nd 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, 17th 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.¹⁰⁵ 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.¹⁰⁶

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.¹⁰⁷ 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.¹⁰⁸ 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 present-

ed 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'.¹⁰⁹ 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.¹¹⁰ In fact, it was not until the meeting on 27th 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 per-

mission 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.¹¹¹

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.¹¹² The pattern of a handful of cases each year continued to the end of the Victorian period.¹¹³ 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.¹¹⁴ 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.¹¹⁵ 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.¹¹⁶ 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 chap-

Under Supt. Wright and Supt. Yarrington:
(from 20 May 1836 to 1 August 1851)

35 Convictions
(Public houses and Beerhouses)

(An average of 2.3 convictions per year)

Under Supt. Dunne:
(from 2 August 1851 to 2 August 1853)

12 Convictions
(Public houses and Beerhouses)

(An average of 6 convictions per year)

Under Chief Constable Stephen English:
(from 3 August 1853 to 11 March 1859)

142 convictions
(110 Public houses; 32 Beerhouses)

(An average of 25.8 convictions per year)

Table 24. Summary of convictions against Keepers of Public houses and Beerhouses from 20 May 1836 - 11 March 1859.

Source. NRO, N/TC 7/5, WCM, 11 March 1859.

ter, 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.¹¹⁷ 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.¹¹⁸ 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.¹¹⁹

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.¹²⁰

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.¹²¹ 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'.¹²² 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 premises 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.¹²³ 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.¹²⁴ 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.¹²⁵ 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%) of the 198 licensees convicted no longer remained the licenceholder 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%) of the 226 convictions that were secured. The last seventeen years of Victoria's reign saw only 92 convictions - 40.7% of the total.¹²⁶ 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

Date	Name	Offence	Punishment
1867			
Apr	PC Gooch	'off his beat in pub after hours'	cautioned
Aug	PC Steggalls	'drunk coming off duty of Saturday night'	severe reprimand and cautioned
Sep	PC Gooch	'drunk on duty' (repeat offence)	finned two days pay and cautioned
Oct	PC Steggalls	'drunk when paraded for duty' (repeat offence)	dismissed for 2nd offence

(In December, PCs. Youngs and Mendham were dismissed from the Force after being sentenced by the magistrates to six months each for stealing port wine, the property of Messrs Bullard and Sons.)

1876: Number of individual police charged for drink offences: 2

1881

Dec	PC Yaxley	'intoxicated on duty'	dismissed
-----	-----------	-----------------------	-----------

1881: Number of individual police charged for drink offences: 1

1886

Dec	Sergt. Lambert	'drunk on duty'	reduced to 2nd class constable / review in 6 months
Dec	PC Lambert	'drunk on duty'	resigned
Dec	PC Elvin	'drunk on duty'	severe reprimand / lost pay during suspension

1886: Number of individual police charged for drink offences: 2

1891

Jan	PC Fustian	'drunk on duty'	forfeit pay during suspension / severe reprimand
Apr	PC Roller (1)	'failed to report for duty - found at home under influence of drink'	severe reprimand but not recorded
Aug	PC Dann	'drinking in a pub on duty'	cautioned
Oct	PC Kemp (2)	'off beat / insubordinate'	reduced salary scale / lost 1 year of reckonable pension
Dec	PC Brown	'drunk on duty'	lost pay during on month's suspension

(1) The Committee heard he had been engaged all day at County Court and having been on duty the night before he had no sleep and so the whiskey he drank before food, 'took effect upon him'.

(2) The Committee heard PC. Kemp acknowledge that at about 1am he had been treated with whiskey and afterwards had lost his temper with the Sergeant.

1891: Number of individual police charged with drink offences: 5

1896

Jan	PC Bush	'drunk on duty'	reprimanded and cautioned - not recorded
Nov	PC Porter	'drunk on duty & using bad language to Mr Snelling and Mr Hill Forster'	dismissed

1896: Number of individual police charged for drink offences: 2

1901

Mar	PC Golden (3)	'drunk on duty'	reduced from 25s/8d to 23s/4d a week, constable for six months
-----	---------------	-----------------	--

(3) In November, PC Golden was requested to send in his resignation at once; the Chief Constable had reported him for 'insubordination and wilful damage to the Police Section house by keeping out all night without permission and, with two other officers, removing screws and splines from a window which had been ordered to be kept closed'. Discipline, duty and deference were still of premium value to the urban elite and within their model police force they would permit no continued deviance.)

1901: Number of individual police charged for drink offences: 1

Table 25. Entries in the Watch Committee Minutes Books at five-yearly intervals between 1876-1901 relating to police reported for drink offences.

Sources. NRO, N/TC 7/9-16, WCM, (1876-1901).

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.¹²⁷ The explanation is likely to be linked with temperance activity in Norwich.¹²⁸ 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.¹²⁹ 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

1872	4
1873	4
1874	11
1875	14
1876	11
1877	15
1878	13
1879	17
1880	6
1881	18
1882	15
1883	4
1884	13
1885	5
1886	9
1887	1
1888	4
1889	4
1890	3
1891	9
1892	5
1893	4
1894	3
1895	4
1896	3
1897	5
1898	7
1899	5
1900	5
1901	5

Total: 226 convictions - averaging 7.5 convictions a year

Table 26. Total annual number of convictions against the licence between 1872 - 1901

Sources. First Register of Victuallers Licences; Second Register of Victuallers Licences

proportion of population taken up for drunkenness: one drunkard to every 451 persons.¹³⁰ 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.¹³¹ 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'.¹³² 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.¹³³

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.¹³⁴ 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

	i		ii		iii		iv		Total: (ex. iii)
	Free	Brewery	Free	Brewery	Free	Brewery	Free	Brewery	
1867	5	3	5	1	7	8	0	0	14
1868	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	8
1869	0	1	2	3	1	0	0	0	6
1870	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	0	7
1871	0	1	3	3	1	8	0	0	7
1872	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
1873	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
1874	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1875	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
1876	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1877	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	4
1878	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1879	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
1880	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	4
1881	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
1882	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
1883	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1884	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1885	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
1886	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
1887	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4
1888	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
1889	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	4
1890	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	3
1891	2	1	0	1	0	0	5	9	9
1892	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
1893	3	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	10
1894	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	4	4
1895	1	0	0	1	0	0	3	5	5
1896	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1

1887	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
1888	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
1889	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
1890	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	3
1891	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	5	5	9
1892	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
1893	3	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	10
1894	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4
1895	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	3	5
1896	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
1897	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
1898	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4
1899	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
1900	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
1901	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total:	15	15	24	39	10	16	22	115*		

Table 27. Licensed premises ceasing trading between 1867 - 1901.

Key: i Refused or Lost;

ii Dropped or Not Renewed;

iii Dropped and then renewed next year, or lost but regained on appeal the same year;

iv Surrendered on grant of licence elsewhere

* A total of 115 licensed premises ceasing trading between 1867 and 1901. There was a drop from 602 premises in 1867 to 542 in 1901 - a decline of 60.

Sources. First Register of Victuallers Licences; Second Register of Victuallers Licences.

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 space¹³⁵

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.¹³⁶ 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.¹³⁷

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.¹³⁸ 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 1837.¹³⁹ Many Victorians, not just brewers, would have been seen the Temperance interest as deeply subversive. Those who were abstainers possessed an entirely different vision of public order and social control. The histo-

ry of so much of the Victorian period was in fact shaped by the interaction of these two competing models for society.¹⁴⁰

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.¹⁴¹ 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 year¹⁴²

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'.¹⁴³

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 3rd 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 drunkenness¹⁴⁴

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 1900.¹⁴⁵ 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.

References

1. Harrison, B. (1994) *Drink & the Victorians: The Temperance Question in England 1815-1872*. 2nd ed. Keele University Press: Keele. p.38 and p.292.
2. Gourvish, T.R. and Wilson, R.G. (1994) *The British Brewing Industry 1830-1980*. Cambridge: C.U.P. pp.31-32, 34.
3. Hallett, M. (1971) 'Portsmouth's Water Supply 1800-1860' (The Portsmouth Papers, No.12). pp.5-15.
4. *ibid.* pp.9, 21-22.
5. *ibid.* p.22. See also Flinn, M.W. (1966) *Readings in Economic and Social History*. Macmillan: London. pp.305-309, for an analysis of the background and significance of Chadwick's Report, as well as details from its pages.
6. Hallett, M. (1971) *op. cit.* p.22. The grounds for opposition were that: '1. If passed into law it would materially interfere with all local management, and tend to increase Government patronage at the expense of Rate-Payers; 2. It would entirely supersede all existing locally elected Representative Boards'. There were similar arguments expressed in Norwich and, in 1850, the Sanitary Committee issued a protest to William Lee, who was conducting an official investigation, claiming that 'the application of the costly process of the Health of Towns Act is not called for, but that the sanitary requirements of the city may be efficiently met at a much less expense'. (W. Lee, Report to the General Board of Health on a Preliminary Inquiry into the Sewerage, Drainage, and Supply of Water, and the Sanitary Conditions of the Inhabitants of the City of Norwich (HMSO, London, 1851), p.13.

7. Williams, R. (1961) *The Long Revolution*. Chatto & Windus: London, was the first to use the expression 'structure of feeling' in an attempt to analyse both continuity and change in the history of culture. He argued: One generation may train its successor, with reasonable success, in the social character of the general cultural pattern, but the new generation will have its own structure of feeling ... the new generation responds in its own ways to the unique world it is inheriting, taking up many continuities ... yet feeling its whole life in certain ways differently, and shaping its creative response into a new structure of feeling.' (p.65).

8. Hallett, M. (1971) op. cit. p.24.

9. Eade, P. (1916) *Autobiography*. Jarrold: Norwich. p.191.

10. Second Report of the Commissioners for inquiring into the state of Large Towns and Populous Districts, PP, (1845) XVIII.1.299, Appendix: Norwich; The Morning Chronicle Reports, The Rural Districts: Norfolk, Suffolk and Essex, Letter XVII, 15 December 1849; Lee, Report, pp.25, 61. Summaries and extracts from all three reports are in John Pound, 'Poverty and Public Health in Norwich 1845-1880', pp.47-71, in Barringer, C. (ed.) (1984) *Norwich in the nineteenth century*. Gliddon: Norwich.

11. Engels, F. (1974) The Condition of the Working Class in England in 1844, cited in Marcus, S. *Engels, Manchester, and the Working Class*. Random House: New York. p.192.

12. *ibid.* p.184.

13. Mabel Clarkson's election address in 1912 - she stood as a Liberal but moved to Labour after World War 1 - indicated the continuing problem: 'Those of us who care for the

purity of our homes, for the right of little children to opportunities of health and development, for the prevention of infantile mortality, and of all the unnecessary sickness and suffering caused by overcrowding and bad housing, are bound to make every effort to get rid of the slums ... the Courts and Yards in our poorer districts ... are a disgrace to this city' - see Frank Meeres, *A History of Norwich* (Chichester, 1998), pp.179-180.

14. Barringer, C. (1984) op. cit. pp.70-71.

15. Dingle, A.E. (1972) 'Drink and Working-Class Living Standards in Britain, 1870-1914', *Economic History Review*, 25, made a strong case for the social utility of alcoholic drink: 'Temperance reformers and other middle-class critics of the working-class in Victorian Britain had a valid case when they pointed to drink as an important threat to the material well being of the workingman. But ... they failed to ask why man drank ... It was left to socialists to point out that much drinking was a response to a squalid environment rather than a cause of it ... If the ameliorative and recreational roles of drink are considered, the case against drink in the nineteenth century is by no means overwhelming. Without (it) ... the pressure for change from below might have come sooner and more insistently than in fact it did in Victorian Britain (p.622)'.

16. Harrison, B. (1994) op. cit. p.392.

17. Gourvish, T.R. and Wilson, R.G. (1994) op. cit., p.34.

18. Lines upon Harry Bullard

'Vote for Harry Bullard, for he is one of the best;

He always lends a helping hand, and by the poor he's blest.

When poverty overtakes you, and your heart is full of care,

He'll give you clothes and money too, and plenty of good fare ...'.

(NRO, MS 12858/84, 31F2, B.R.A.833 - undated, but from the other verses evidently post-the Norwich flood of 1878, so possibly the election of 1885 when Harry Bullard was returned as a Conservative M.P. for Norwich only to be unseated following the Liberal petition.)

19. In the 1850s, John Youngs and Richard Bullard sat on the Paving, Cleansing, Sewerage and Lighting Committee of the Board of Health, a committee of the Town Council. (NRO, N/TC 4/14-15) In the 1860s, A.J. Morgan and J.B. Morgan were prominent within the Sanitary Purposes Committee of the Board of Health, as was John Youngs. (NRO, N/TC 4/12) In the 1870s, Harry Bullard, John Youngs and Arthur Morgan were active in the Sewerage and Irrigation Committee of the Board of Health. (NRO, N/TC 4/22-23) The Special Committee of twelve members set up by the Corporation in April 1876 to consider the Artisans Dwelling Act (1875) included four brewers: Henry Morgan, Harry Bullard, Arthur Morgan, and John Youngs. (NRO, N/TC 5/7)

20. See above chapter 3 for Daunton's analysis of the crisis in local government finance as the pressure rose for increased public expenditure. Wealthy businessmen, such as brewers, who were also local councillors elected by rate-payers, were generally intent on limiting expenditure and reducing as far as possible the demand on rates. Their own self-interest would also have tended to make them resistant to any proposals to rationalise the financing of local government through the introduction of new taxes on business turnover.

21. See below chapter 8.

22. See above chapter 6.

23. Quoted by Briggs, A. (1959) in *The Age of Improvement*. Longman: London. p.301.

24. See above chapter 6.

25. Chadwick's Report is indicative of both the Evangelical conscience and a Benthamite philosophy. The latter is evident in his insistence that 'the expense of public drainage, of supplies of water laid on in houses, and of means of improved cleansing would be a pecuniary gain, by diminishing the existing charges attendant on sickness and premature mortality' - see Flinn, M.W. (1966) op. cit. p.308.

26. Public Health Act, 1848, (11 &12 Vic. c.63).

27. See above chapter 5.

28. NHC, N.628.1 (043), Press cutting (un-ascribed), showing the capitalisation of the City of Norwich Waterworks Company, 3 August 1850. The capital was set at £60,000; 6,000 shares at £10 each were to be offered. The twelve directors were: Samuel Bignold (Chairman), John Sultzer, Richard Noverre Bacon, Henry Chamberlin, George Durrant, William Geary, Charles Thomas Lucas, John Brandon, Herbert P. Morgan, Joseph Underwood, William Wilde, and Henry Woodcock (the Mayor). One other leading councillor, Arthur Dalrymple, was the Company Secretary. See also Brian Gibson, 'Water, Water, Everywhere' (B.A. dissertation, Norwich School of Art and Design, 1996), p.94.

29. NRO, MS 10845, 'New Mills Arbitration - Manager's evidence on 3 February 1872', New Mills Miscell. Papers, 1845-92.

30. Barringer, C. (1984) op. cit. p.58.

31. See note 29 above. According to John

Ayris, the Manager, the Company was able to serve the needs of this increased number of customers because it had obtained an Act of Parliament in 1859 that gave them control over the private water fittings of the inhabitants. 'The company at once acted to stop the great waste of water that had been allowed to go on in the city'. However, Armstrong, W.A. (1999) *The Population of Victorian and Edwardian Norfolk*. University of East Anglia: Norwich. p.48, noted that 'the new sewers of 1871 were inadequate in design and construction material' and observed that 'the city's infant mortality rate was signalled out for criticism by the Registrar-General'. In 1873-75, it stood at 183 deaths per 1000 live births, a figure substantially higher than that of Portsmouth (146) or London (159). The poor still lacked a safe water supply. See also Idem, 'The Peopling of Norwich c.1695-1951' in Rawcliffe, C. and Wilson, R. (2004) (eds.), *Norwich since 1550*. Hambledon & London: London. Armstrong records that the infant mortality rate in the period 1896-1900 remained virtually unchanged at 182, but by 1906-1910 had fallen sharply to 127.

32. Barringer, C. (1984) op. cit. pp.62-63.

33. Norwich City Surveyor's Report in NC, 3 Sept. 1864, quoted in Barringer, C. (1984) op. cit. p.63.

34. See below, note 39, for the early views of Crosse. The Council had accepted his offer of resignation, without fine, on 21 January 1873. In this letter, Crosse wrote that his retirement was 'necessitated by the appointment I am now seeking of Medical Officer of Health for the City'. (NRO, N/TC 1/23) Crosse's successful candidature was never likely to have been in doubt. However, his early career had been less auspicious.

Muncaster recorded his failure to be elected to an Assistant Surgeoncy at the Norfolk and Norwich Hospital in 1847 and for the next three years he had assisted his father in private practice. Crosse was trained as a surgeon but did not have a medical degree, unlike his successor as Medical Officer of Health, Cooper Pattin. Muncaster established that 'Whereas less than 10 per cent of all Norfolk doctors who qualified between 1815 and 1850 did so by achieving a medical degree, during the first decade of the twentieth century over 63 per cent had been taking the M.B. or an initial qualification.' (M.J. Muncaster, 'Medical Services and the Medical Profession in Norfolk: 1815-1911' (unpublished Ph.D thesis, UEA, 1976), Vol. I, p.228, Vol. II, p.49) More expertise and more professionalism did eventually emerge.

35. NM, 1 Jan. 1873.

36. NHC, L362.1, First Annual Medical Report of the Medical Officer of Health for Norwich, 1874, p.5.

37. See the Annual Medical Reports produced by Thomas Crosse from 1874 to 1892 for a fuller picture of his achievements as well as further evidence of his limited vision.

(NHC, L362.1)

38. Muncaster, 'Medical Services', II, p.48.

39. 'Mr Crosse differs materially from his more experienced brethren ... his opinions (on the effect of water supply upon health) differ from those of all other medical men I have met with in nearly fifty similar enquiries ...' (Lee, Report, p.32.)

40. NRO, MC 79/ Fol. 38, Press cutting, unascribed and un-dated.

41. NHC, L362.1, Annual Medical Report, 1885, p.7.

42. This is immediately apparent in Cooper

Pattin's first Annual Medical Report in 1893, (NHC, L362.1): 'Among conditions powerfully affecting the Public Health and actually existent in Norwich, a population of some 20,000 to 25,000 people dependent upon wells for drinking water constitutes a source of solicitude to the Sanitary Authority; for pure drinking water is always the sanitarians first line of defence'. (p.10) Cooper Pattin's figures represent 19 to 24% of the approximate population of 103,000 in 1893; in 1871, two years before Crosse's appointment, the figure had been 25%. There had been little improvement in those twenty-two years, far less than the 21% improvement effected between 1851 and 1871. (See above, chapter 5)

43. NRO, N/TC 4/1, 'Sanitary Purposes Committee minutes book', 16 Sept. 1853.

44. NRO, N/TC 5/8, 'Sanitary Executive Committee minutes book', 18 Jan. 1876.

45. NHC, L362.1, 'It may be stated that the present system of emptying bins is working very well, and the contractors are most efficiently doing their work. I should be glad to see the whole corporate district placed under similar provisions ...'. (Annual Medical Report, 1883, p.8)

46. NHC, L362.1, Annual Medical Report, 1897, Preface.

47. NRO, N/TC 15/4, 'Health and Sanitary Committee minutes book', 16 May 1894.

48. NRO, N/TC 4/22, 'Sewage and Irrigation Committee minutes book', 8 May 1872; 3 July 1872; 25 Sept. 1872; 29 Jan. 1873; 31 Jan. 1873; 12 Feb. 1873.

NRO, N/TC 4/23, 'Sewage and Irrigation', 5 Mar. 1873; 12 Mar. 1873; 19 Mar. 1873.

Three years later, after the repair of the city's sewers, Miss Martineau's solicitor reported that she was ready to accept £100 in settle-

ment of her claim and her tenant would accept £115 15s in respect of his. (NRO, N/TC 4/23, 8 Mar. 1876)

49. NRO, N/TC 5/10, 'Sewage and Irrigation', 3 Nov. 1880, 18 Feb. 1884. When the Executive Committee of the Sanitary Authority elected Harry Bullard, then deputy mayor, as chairman in 1880, he thanked them, stating that: 'He had belonged to the Committee for many years and that one and all having the same object in view, namely the Improvement of the City of Norwich he looked forward to working together with them'. He was still taking the chair in the final meeting recorded in February 1884.

50. See below, chapter 9.

51. NRO, N/TC 15/5, 'Health and Sanitary'. There was an occasional attendance by a member of the Morgan family in 1896.

52. Tarn, J.A. (1968) 'The Housing Problem a Century Ago', *Urban Studies*, 5, note 24, p.300, made the point that for much of the Victorian period: 'The powers in Public Health Acts, the Nuisance Removals Acts, and the Building Acts were very often adoptive rather than compulsory'. Armstrong, *Population*, p.67, noted the significance of the Norwich Corporation Act (1889) that 'regulated every aspect of public administration and conferred on the council new powers of borrowing'. New water supply and sewerage arrangements were in place from the mid-1890s. Armstrong, in Rawcliffe and Wilson, Norwich, observes that by 1896, 84% of the city's population enjoyed piped supplies and 98% by 1908. As late as 1893, one quarter of the city's population had still depended on wells for water - see note 42 above.

53. NRO, N/TC 15/4, 'Health and Sanitary', 7 Feb. 1893.

54. NRO, N/TC 15/4, 'Health and Sanitary', 14 Feb. 1899.
55. Oddy, D.J. (1990) 'Food, drink and nutrition' in Thompson, F.M.L. (ed.) *The Cambridge Social History of Britain, 1750-1950*. C.U.P.: Cambridge, p.264. See also, Harrison, B. (1994) op. cit. pp.39-40, and Dingle, A.E. (1972) 'Drink and Working-Class Living Standards', *Economic History Review*. pp.612-622.
56. *ibid.* pp.612-613.
57. *ibid.* p.613.
58. Burnett, J. (1989) *Plenty and Want: A social history of food in England from 1815 to the present day*. (3rd edition) Routledge: London. p.127.
59. *ibid.* pp.14-16.
60. See Table 21.
61. Rowntree, J. and Sherwell, A. (1901) *The Temperance Problem and Social Reform*. (9th edition) Hodder and. Stoughton: London, pp.2-7. Also see above, chapter 2.
62. Burnett, J. (1989) op. cit. pp.112-113.
63. See above, chapter 2.
64. Dingle, A.E. (1972) op. cit. pp.611, 614-615, 621. Also see above, chapter 3.
65. Hawkins, C.B. (1910) *Norwich: a Social Study*. Lee Warner: Norwich. pp.24-25.
66. See above, chapter 1.
67. Dingle, A.E. (1980) *The Campaign for Prohibition in Victorian England*. Philip Lee Warner: London. p.19.
68. See above, chapter 5.
69. Gatrell, V.A.C. (1990) 'Crime, authority and the policeman-state', in Thompson, F.M.L. (ed.) *The Cambridge Social History of Britain 1750-1950*. C.U.P.: Cambridge, p.249. In Chapter 1, above, there is an extended treatment of the issue of 'social control' in Victorian England.
70. See above, chapter 1, for the introduction of this argument linking the establishment of the police force with deep-seated social and political insecurities.
71. Critchley, T.A. (1978) *A History of Police in England and Wales*. Constable: London, p.62.
72. Taylor, D. (1997) *The New Police in Nineteenth-Century England*. Manchester University Press: Manchester. Chapter 1: 'Interpretations, problems and themes'.
73. Taylor, D. (1997) op. cit. p.6.
74. See below 76.
75. Storch, R.D. (1976) 'The policeman as domestic missionary: urban discipline and popular culture in northern England, 1850-1880', *Journal of Social History*, ix, pp.481-509.
76. 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.
77. NRO, N/TC 7/1, WCM, 5 Feb. 1836.
78. Edwards, J.K. (1984) 'Developments in Local Government in Norwich 1800-1900', in Barringer, C. (1984) op. cit. p.82. Edwards' judgement that the Norwich constabulary displayed a 'well-developed professionalism by mid-century' seems tendentious given the force's drink problems.
79. NRO, N/TC 7/3, WCM, 22 May, 29 May 1846.
80. NRO, N/TC 7/5, WCM, 11 Apr., 18 Apr., 16 May, 23 May 1856.

81. 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.

82. See below. 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.)

83. 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.

84. NRO, N/TC 7/1, WCM, 5 May 1837.

85. NRO, N/TC 7/1, WCM, 12 Aug. 1837.

86. Jennings, P. (1995) *The Public House in Bradford, 1770-1970*. Keele University Press: Keele, 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 10% 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 Edwards, F.H. (1989) *Crime and Law and Order in Mid-Victorian Portsmouth*. The Portsmouth Papers, No.55, 1989), pp.7-8.

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

88. See above. 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)

89. 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.

90. 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'.

91. 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.

92. See above chapter 2 and below chapter 7.

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

94. See below Table 22. Comparative figures for Bradford that indicate a similar problem are shown above in note 86.

95. See below Table 23.

96. See above chapter 6.

97. See below, chapter 8, for an analysis of the Temperance movement in Norwich.

98. NRO, N/TC 7/6, WCM, 4 Mar. 1864.

99. NRO, N/TC 7/5, WCM, 11 Feb. 1859.

100. See below chapter 6 and Table 24.

101. See above Table 24.

102. Dunne's relatively short stay in office in Norwich has as yet no definitive explanation. Taylor, D. (1997) *op. cit.* p.80, cited Critchley, T.A. (1978) *op. cit.* 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 chapter 3 - 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.

103. See above chapter 6.

104. See above Table 23. 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.

105. *Norwich Mercury*, 2 Mar. 1870.

106. NRO, N/TC 7/7, WCM, 8 Apr. 1870.

107. See NRO, N/TC 7/6, WCM, 1 Mar. 1864, for a glimpse of the practice of moon-lighting, 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'.

108. See above, chapter 5 *passim*.

109. NRO, N/TC 7/4, WCM, 26 Jan. 1855.

110. NRO, N/TC 7/7, WCM, 11 Mar. 1870.

111. NRO, N/TC 7/7, WCM, 27 May 1870.

112. NRO, N/TC 7/8, WCM, 1872.

113. See below Table 25.

114. 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.

115. 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.

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

117. See above chapter 6.

118. Jennings, P. (1986) op. cit. pp.107-9.

119. *ibid.* p.199 and p.201; Harrison, B. (1994) op. cit. *Drink & the Victorians: The Temperance Question in England 1815-1872*. Keele University Press: Keele, Tables 8 and 9, pp.316-17.

120. Jennings, P. (1986) op. cit. pp.218-20.

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

122. 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'.

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

124. See below Table 26.

125. See above Table 24.

126. See above Table 26.

127. See below Table 27.

128. The Reform Act of 1867 and the exten-

sion 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.

129. Lords Intemperance Report, 1877, First Report, Appendix C.

130. See above chapter 1. 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, chapter 3. 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.

131. See above Table 27.

132. *Eastern Daily Press*, 1 Jan. 1879.

133. 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. (Gourvish, T.R. and Wilson, R.G. (1994) op. cit. pp.36-37.)

134. *Eastern Daily Press and Norwich Mercury*, January to June 1879.

135. *Norwich Mercury*, 5 Mar. 1879.

136. See above, chapter 5 passim.

137. *Norwich Mercury*, 18 Feb. 1837.

138. See Gourvish, T.R. and Wilson, R.G. (1994) op. cit. p.183.

139. *Norwich Mercury*, 18 Feb. 1837.

140. See below chapter 8 passim.

141. See above chapter 3. Roger Munting, 'Sports and Games in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries' in Rawcliffe, C. and Wilson, R. (2004) (eds.) op. cit. 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'.

142. *Eastern Daily Press*, 12 Apr. 1879.

143. *Eastern Daily Press*, 22 Apr. 1879.

144. *Eastern Daily Press*, 3 Jan. 1900.

145. See above chapter 3.