MAGISTRATES AND PUBLIC HOUSE MANAGERS 1840-1914: ANOTHER CASE OF LIVERPOOL EXCEPTIONALISM?

ALISTAIR MUTCH

The Nottingham Trent University

We are frequently reminded about the exceptional nature of Liverpool's history, whether this be in employment structure, political allegiance or the depth of religious divides.[1] This article considers what might be taken as another case, at least in part: the dominance of managers as opposed to tenants in its public houses in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. This might seem to be something of a trivial issue when set against the concerns alluded to above, but this was not how it was seen at the time. The 'Liverpool system' was seen as something to be opposed and, as will be seen below, formed the occasion for comment in places as august as *Times* leaders and the House of Commons.[2] Indeed, in 1870 a *Times* leader declared 'Perhaps no town in Great Britain is so deeply concerned as Liverpool, with its frightful mortality and destitution, in a better regulation of the liquor traffic, and none has bestirred itself as actively in promoting a legislative reform of it'.[3] This influence of Liverpool on licensing reform will be examined below. However, one aspect of Liverpool licensing practice which did not meet with the approval of the *Times* was the employment of salaried managers in place of tenants. An 1877 leader pointed out that

> the keeping of spirit vaults has become a gigantic business in which large capitalists are embarked. These persons and firms -- who are brewers, spirit merchants, and wholesale traders -- have many houses in their hands; they

> intrust them to the management of servants, who are paid small salaries, and sometimes commission on the profits, and whose fitness for their situation is, of course, estimated by the largeness or smallness of the "barrels per week" they sell. These servants are liable to instant dismissal at the caprice of the master, and are turned out of the houses as soon as they misconduct the business or fall under police censure.[4]

The validity of parts of this statement and the debates within Liverpool that they engendered are part of the concern of this article. However, what is noticeable is the way that both academic and popular accounts of the place of drink and drinking in Liverpool take the role of the manager for granted.[5] At the time this was not the case, with the debate over management or tenancy taking place at both local and national level. This article is concerned, therefore, with both the unfolding development of management in Liverpool within the context of local regulation and with the impact of these developments at a national level. Liverpool provides a useful context for the examination of the relationship between local regulation, business strategy, and local political debate.[6] What follows, therefore, aims to set the business practices of brewing companies, notably the company of Peter Walker and Son, in the context of social and political developments and to examine the interplay between both. This is done by examining the growth of practices of public house management and responses to these on the part of local magistrates, which are seen to move through three broad phases. In the first, which runs from 1840 to 1870, the concern of the magistrates was with developing the appropriate regulatory framework to cope with the dramatic upsurge of licences in the context of rapid population growth. This saw the infamous experiment in ‘free trade’ in licences and the rapid growth of firms like

Peter Walker and Son through a policy of property acquisition and house management. During this period, magistrates seem to have paid little attention to house management, with their attention being concentrated on coping with sheer numbers of houses no matter how run. By the second phase, running from 1870 to 1890, the strength of local temperance agitation put the focus on house management, but too late for active intervention. Despite this, the magistrates attempted a number of unsuccessful containment strategies, whilst the larger firms continued to consolidate their grasp on trade. In the final phase, from 1890 to 1914, the magistrates became 'converted' to the institution of house management, seeing it as the only way that they could enforce their notions of appropriate behaviour.

These local developments were of national importance, seized upon as they were by both opponents of the public house and industry supporters. In 1872 Vernon Harcourt, M.P. for Oxford, expressed his exasperation in a Commons debate. 'If there had been any town which had done harm to this question,' he expostulated, 'it had been the town of Liverpool. It first went into the violent extreme of Free Trade, and now it was going into the violent injustice of restriction. They had established an unfortunate example in one direction, and it seemed that their policy was equally unfortunate in the other.' [7] We have to set such frustrated reactions in the context of the importance of the Drink Question in political debates of the time. In these debates Liverpool licensing practice and the 'manager question' in particular became crucial symbols. Their exploration helps us to a better understanding not only of the nature of Liverpool, but also of this central debate.

I

1840-1870: free licensing and the growth of the managed house

In 1846 Peter Walker, brewer and former coalmaster, moved to Liverpool from Ayrshire, bringing with him his sons Peter and Andrew Barclay.[8] Peter the elder formed a short-lived partnership with another expatriate Scot, Andrew Morrison, whilst Andrew Barclay took the licence of a public house on Brownlow Hill.[9] Andrew Barclay was also to launch a business as a spirit merchant, and father and son began brewing as Peter Walker and Son of Warrington. They began to acquire public houses in Liverpool and to run these houses using weekly paid managers as opposed to tenants. To understand how distinctive this practice was we need to compare it to the dominant national practices of the time. In turn, to understand why it might have been successful, we need to explore the local context.

To examine national practice first, we have to see this as fragmented into a host of local markets, each supplied by local companies.[10] Before the effective spread of the railway system, which saw the rise of companies like Bass with a national distribution network, beer, as a low value, high volume product, was supplied to houses within a limited radius of the brewery. Most of these houses, outside London, were 'free houses', that is, they were run by independent business owners free to take their business to any local brewer. In London, many houses were 'tied' to brewers through loan ties, which stipulated exclusive supply in return for financial support.[11] Outside London, the dramatic growth in the number of outlets created by the 1830 Beerhouse Act saw the steady rise of the common brewer whose quality and consistency of product saw the decline of the publican-brewer. A good case is that of

the success of Joshua Tetley of Leeds.[12] Such brewers saw themselves as firmly concerned with production, resisting the acquisition of property until late in the nineteenth century. The course of the century did indeed see the rise of the tied tenant, in which most licensed property became the property of more or less willing brewers. However, there remained opposition at a number of levels -- within the trade itself, in political circles, and within the ranks of magistrates -- to any change in the status of the publican as an independent business person. For example, in 1872, Samuel Whitbread M.P. declared that in London, where his family company was a major brewer, 'the brewers were not the owners, and he believed that that was the most healthy form of trade'.[13] However, there were areas of the country where tied houses under the more direct control of brewers became more common. Birmingham was one such area, but Liverpool was most advanced in the direct management of houses. To understand why this might be so, we need to set the local context.

Liverpool had taken enthusiastically to the creation of beerhouses by the 1830 Act. To open such a house simply required the payment of a sum to the Excise, and Hughes claims that Liverpool saw such licences being taken up at the rate of fifty a day. [14] The consequence for existing publicans was a dramatic increase in competition and a collapse, it was claimed, in their profits. [15] In these circumstances, those with capital, such as Andrew Barclay Walker and his father, could buy licensed property relatively cheaply. This particularly suited those in the spirit business, like Andrew Barclay, as much of the drink consumption was in this area. William Duncan, questioned by the chairman of the Select Committee on the Health of Towns in 1840 claimed that spirit drinking was common 'among the females particularly, and among the Irish' whilst, 'the Englishmen in general drink ale'. [16] The large number of outlets

reflected dramatic changes in population coupled with an ever-shifting population. This was made up at different times and in different proportions by large numbers of emigrants on their way to America and sailors manning the passenger and cargo ships that thronged Liverpool's booming docks. This population lived in squalid conditions as graphically outlined by pioneering investigations such as that of John Finch in 1842 and many sought a temporary exit in drink.[17] The drunkenness that this produced became the occasion for note by commentators like Taine. On a visit to Liverpool in the 1860s he recorded his horrified impressions: 'Livid, bearded old women came out of gin-shops: their reeling gait, dismal eyes and fixed, idiot grin are indescribable.' [18]

The problem for magistrates under pressure to take action to curb this drunkenness was their lack of power over the beerhouses. They chose to maintain tight regulation over full licences (that is, over licences to allow the sale of spirits as well as beer) but also came under increasing pressure to upgrade these licences. By 1852 there were about 1400 full licences and 1000 beerhouses, with the magistrates being faced with some 200 applications for full licences each year. [19] The magistrates were faced by crowded courtrooms and what they felt was enormous pressure on their restrictive policy.[20] Accordingly, some of them felt that they needed an alternative to their policy of considering the fitness of the person applying, the fitness of the property and the needs of the neighbourhood. They advocated the bringing of all licensing under their control and the granting of licences without regard to the needs of the neighbourhood, finding the latter too vague and difficult to apply consistently. A committee was established which suggested a parliamentary enquiry, resulting in the Select Committee on Public Houses of 1852-53. At this, the splits in the

magisterial ranks were revealed, with both advocates and opponents of free licensing giving evidence. The free traders argued that market pressures would be a sufficient check on the numbers of public houses, but also revealed a further agenda, which was to curb what they perceived as the over-influence of brewers. They were convinced that the licence should be a contract between themselves and the licencee, but that trade arrangements meant that in practice the owners of the houses were buying and selling licences. Several of them alleged that these owners were large brewers and that this gave them unwarranted political influence.[21] For Robertson Gladstone, 'the brewers in Liverpool become possessed of a vast number of licences in their own persons, and in the case of municipal and Parliamentary elections the power and influence that they have from holding these licences has a most injurious effect.'[22] What we see here is the impact of political divisions in Liverpool on debates over licensing. Actually, it was not the case that at this stage brewers owned significant numbers of houses, although one of the unintended consequences of the shift to free trade was that they would come to. Nor was the association of brewing and Conservatism firmly cemented at this stage although, again, it would be later.[23] The Select Committee did not produce the result that the Liverpool magistrates were looking for, in the shape of any legislative action, but the language of the report gave considerable encouragement to those who saw free licensing as a remedy.

The aftermath of the inquiry saw debates amongst the magistrates as to the best course of action, but in 1861 the free licensers won the argument and twenty eight additional full licences were granted. The process accelerated in the following year, with 128 new licences being awarded. The position was reversed in 1863, but returned to again in the following two years. In 1866 a number of magistrates who

were opposed to free licensing organised to reverse the position and a policy of restriction was returned to. The impact of these years can be seen in Table 1, which indicates an increase in full licences of 440 over the ten years from 1858. Many of these licences came from the conversion of beerhouses, but their numbers did not drop by the same amount. The magistrates came to realise that a policy of free licensing was ineffective whilst beerhouse licences were not under their control. A prime argument of those who argued for restriction was also that police numbers were entirely too low for effective regulation. However, we have to see the actions of the free licensing magistrates in the context of the dominance of free trade ideas in the country generally, and in Liverpool in particular.[24] The great trading port had boomed on the basis of free trade, and 1857 had seen the creation of the Mersey Docks and Harbour Board, removing the docks from the control of the Council in the name of free trade.[25] It is understandable therefore that a remedy which had seemed so successful elsewhere should be advocated against the 'monopoly' power of the brewers. However the irony was that this policy resulted in a greater degree of concentration in the ownership of public houses.

TABLE 1

Liverpool licences 1858-1867

	1858	1859	1860	1861	1862	1863	1864	1865	1866	1867
Full licences	1512	1526	1543	1567	1667	1681	1837	1937	1933	1942
Beerhouses	932	947	926	938	1005	964	879	904	873	819

Source: Lords Select Committee on Intemperance, PP (1877) XI, First Report, Appendix B

The magistrates returned to their policy of lobbying for legislative change. This followed the introduction of a Liverpool Licensing Bill sponsored by the local Licensed Victuallers Association in 1865, which complained of the effects of free

trade. The bill received the support of Stanley who, as the largest landowner in the Liverpool area, despaired of the state of licensing in the town where he might have been expected to have been able to exercise some influence.

> There was one party -- he believed a majority -- among the magistracy which held that all licences ought to be granted or withheld without reference to anything but the character of the person applying. There was, however, a considerable minority holding a contrary opinion; and accordingly when a licensing session was held it was mere chance whether the principle of restriction or free trade was acted on. Both sides were in earnest -- neither would give way. He had known cases where appeals were rejected upon one day by a majority of magistrates who were in favour of the principle of restriction, and on the very next day, the majority being the other way, every appeal was granted, the cases being precisely identical with those rejected on the former occasion.[26]

Despite sympathy for the position, the bill fell on the grounds that this was a general issue. The same fate met a subsequent attempt in 1867, but the pressure coming from Liverpool clearly influenced the Beerhouses Act of 1869, which brought beerhouses under the control of the magistrates.[27] The Liverpool experience thus played an important role in national developments, but what of the advance of the 'managerial system'?

One unintended consequence of the magistrates' experiments was to strengthen the hand of some of the larger pub owners, people like Andrew Barclay

Walker who they had intended to weaken. For free licensing reduced the general value of licensed houses and enabled those with access to capital to buy them up. In 1877 the magistrate John Patterson, giving evidence to a Lords Select Committee on Intemperance, commented

> 10 or 12 years ago the largest proprietor of public-houses then in the town made this observation in my hearing: 'If the magistrates continue the free trade system I shall double the number of my houses, and if they stop it will double the value of the houses I have'[28]

The free traders started from the assumption of free and equal competition, but Walker had access to capital, if not from his father then indirectly via his grandfather, who had been a colliery proprietor in Ayrshire.[29] This enabled him to purchase houses and to benefit, thanks to his other business as a wine and spirit merchant, from the upgrading of beerhouses. What he did with these houses was to run them as managed houses. By the end of the 1860s he had purchased or leased at least thirty-two houses, none of which is recorded in the company's records as a beerhouse.[30] Accounts exist for a number of these vaults which consist of half-year or annual statements of profit in which wage costs are clearly monitored as a percentage of takings.[31] The earliest of such statements is one for the Copperas Hill Vaults for 1851, managed by Peter Walker & Son on behalf of the licence holders, Andrew's uncles David and Robert.[32] In 1865, accounts surviving for eighteen vaults indicate aggregate takings of £59,132 with net profits of £8820.[33] These figures give some indication of the scale of the business that was directly managed by Peter Walker & Son at the peak of the free licensing movement, although they do not indicate the wider influence of the

company as expressed through management agreements and tied agreements for the supply of beer. However, just to give an indication as to the scale and existence of the business does not explain why the company adopted this mode of operation, a mode of operation that was so at variance with practice elsewhere. Our attempts at explanation have to start from a recognition that conclusive evidence is simply not available, but we can draw some inferences. One problem is that we cannot say whether Walker was simply adopting and adapting existing practice, or whether he drew upon his familiarity with colliery management to apply techniques of management as opposed to tenancy to his houses. (His uncle David was a colliery manager in St Helens, looking after, amongst other things, Andrew's own investments in collieries there; his uncle Robert also managed collieries). [34] In the initial years it seemed to be that the strategy for obtaining licences was to get them in the names of his own family . However, the expansion of business outran this and some facets of the business suggest that Andrew had a particular approach that demanded tight control over his houses. One was the rebuilding of them in a particularly magnificent form, which we return to below. This focus on the appearance of his retail outlets was coupled with an aggressive employment of tactics to secure business. The *Brewers Journal* explained this in an 1875 leader

> Amongst the Liverpool licensed victuallers -- especially in the brewers' houses -- a practice exists with regard to the sale of beer known as the 'long pull' -- that is to say, when people send for a certain quantity of beer, or buy it in jugs, more than the legal measure is given.[35]

What we would today call a 'volume discount' was employed by Walker, it was alleged by some, in order to establish his houses and attack the competition using his greater resources.[36] The use of managers would mean that such tactics could be employed; a similar, albeit more positively received tactic which also depended on the disciplined following of central policies by salaried staff was the widespread of food in Walker's pubs. 'A marked feature in Sir Andrew's public-house management' noted the *Daily Post* in an obituary notice, 'was that it was mainly due to him and the late Alderman Rigby that public-houses were converted really into victualling houses. In Walker's, as well as Rigby's, public-houses meals and refreshments are furnished to customers at all times, and this innovation became an important portion of his business'. [37]

So there were powerful business reasons why Walker should adopt direct management. However, such tendencies were strongly resisted by magistrates elsewhere, so why was it that such a system emerged in Liverpool? One answer might be that it emerged almost behind their backs. So concerned were they with issues of free trade and drunkenness, and so great were the numbers of houses that they had to deal with, that it seems that relatively perfunctory checks were made on the standing of applicants for a licence. In addition, one might speculate that in a climate where pubs were at the centre of the active and threatening Irish Nationalist organisations of the city that the magistrates might have preferred the operation of houses by managers under the control of a staunchly Conservative Presbyterian – although it should be made clear that there is no direct evidence for such speculation. [38] Whatever the reason, it was not until the 1870s that a sustained questioning of the managerial system occurred – by which time it had become firmly established. This did not,

however, prevent such questioning from becoming a central plank in the temperance attack on the licensed trade.

II

1870-1890: challenging management

The bringing of beerhouses under the control of magistrates in 1869 was only the start of more comprehensive regulation of public houses. In 1872 a licensing act saw the introduction of licence endorsements for misconduct and stricter requirements for licence registration. Although the impact of endorsement was subsequently softened, this legislation gave magistrates new powers to control public houses, powers which the Liverpool magistrates responded to with alacrity. Table 2 shows the impact of their actions.

TABLE 2

Liverpool licences 1868-1876

	1868	1869	1870	1871	1872	1873	1874	1875	1876
Full licences	1926	1921	1929	1934	1913	1934	1929	1921	1919
Beerhouses	807	763	438	437	355	357	383	338	334

Source: Lords Select Committee on Intemperance, PP (1877) XI, First Report, Appendix B

It can clearly be seen that their first target was the beerhouses, with 325 being removed because of misconduct or structural inadequacy in the first year of control alone.[39] This gave Liverpool a most unusual profile of licensed houses, with a much

higher proportion of fully licensed outlets than other towns. [40] Having dealt with the beerhouses, the attention of magistrates turned to the running of the houses that remained, and it was now that the employment of managers became a question of heated debate. In 1874 a special meeting of licensing magistrates heard that

> for some years past it had been a rule or custom with the licensing magistrates not to grant more than one licence to any one person, but practically this rule was inoperative, owing to the fact that many public-houses, though licensed in different names, were in reality owned by the same people, who were often only in the position of servants, and could be dismissed at any time.[41]

The magistrates resolved to only grant licences in future to 'the real tenant or owner', although they held over implementation of this policy to the future. However, in the following year a decision on implementation was once again postponed. [42]The policy seems never to have been put into place, for in 1883 the subject again became one for debate at licensing sessions. As well as the annual licensing session at which new licences were debated, transfer sessions were held throughout the year at which existing licences were transferred from one licencee to another. A request to move from six to eight sessions a year was rejected, with the observation that

> a practice had arisen in Liverpool which contrary to the spirit of the law and contrary to public policy. Some gentlemen who were represented by applicants that day owned a large number of public-houses. They put forward persons who represented themselves as tenants, but who were in no sense of the word tenants.[43]

This was followed up by a case in which the Rev. R. H. Lundie, a prominent Temperance advocate, successfully opposed the transfer of the licence of 37 Berry Street to Joseph Holmes, on the grounds that he was employed by Sykes, Porter and Company. [44] However, he was less successful in the following year. He asked several questions of an applicant 'eliciting that he was manager of the house and that his employer paid rent and rates in respect of the premises', but this occasioned a dispute amongst the magistrates as to whether he was entitled to do this. Several other cases came forward

> in which the applicants were managers for brewers and other owners, objection was taken to the transfers being granted, the grounds of the objection being mainly that a manager was not an occupier within the meaning of the act. In each of the cases the majority of the bench granted the transfer, Mr Patterson expressing his disapproval in each case. [45]

This was to lead to a set piece showdown between Patterson and the rest of the Bench, eagerly heralded in the local press. [46] At the annual licensing session Paterson referred to a resolution of the Newcastle bench in favour of tenancy. This action was not well received by other magistrates, jealous of their local decision making and, for the first time, counter arguments were developed that suggested 'that a plurality of licences were better than others, and that fewer fines were attached to them'. [47] A vote was held, with only four magistrates voting in favour of Patterson, with twelve confirming the acceptability of managers. The focus of the bench would in future be on the workings of the managerial system, rather than on its acceptability as such. In

1885, for example, considerable excitement was caused by the summoning of John Houlding, local brewer and Conservative politician (known as the 'King of Everton') for harbouring a police constable in a public house licensed in his name. The case was dismissed, but the *Post* saw this as 'an argument against the pluralist system. All expediency and common-sense suggest that the man who manages a public-house, and he only, should be the licensee, and should be directly responsible to the community for its good management'.[48] This increasingly became the case, with the licensing justices being quite prepared to accept managers providing that they were the bona fide occupiers of the house. [49]

The advocates of Temperance were not as willing to let the question drop, and this has to be seen in the context of both national and local politics. Nationally the question of house management was taken up by supporters of temperance as an example of how, in their eyes, large brewers were breaking the law by employing managers as opposed to tenants. This culminated in a series of questions being posed in the House of Commons referring to a number of cases, the last involving Liverpool. [50]In this case, the Secretary of State for the Home Department stated that the Liverpool Justices had satisfied themselves that the applicant was a fit and proper person and so there were no grounds for his intervention.[51] The debate about the precise legal standing of managers was, however, a continuing debate at national level, with many local licensing justices refusing to accept them.[52] Locally, the Liverpool temperance advocates continued the debate in increasingly bitter and lurid language. In 1882 a pamphlet 'By a Working Man & and a Non-Teetotaller' declared 'I cannot understand why a few privileged individuals should be permitted to drive any number of brewers' drays through an Act of Parliament, establish an unchallenged

monopoly, deluge the city with beer, amass colossal fortunes, and erect magnificent *art temples*, upon the "*ruins*", the *misery*, and the *degradation* of thousands of the human family'. [53]This was a clear reference to Andrew Barclay Walker, who donated £20,000 in 1873 for the building of a new art gallery. This coincided with his becoming Mayor, having represented South Toxteth as a Conservative since 1867. The temperance advocate Alexander Balfour was called to order by the chairman for suggesting that Walker 'was totally unfitted to act as Mayor because he was a publican' and his mayoralty was confirmed, to be repeated again in 1876.[54] Whilst not a particularly active politician (Orchard asserted that he never 'manifested any talent for municipal work, and [was] not often present at committee meetings' and Rathbone commented 'he possessed to a remarkable degree the gift of silence') this firmly cemented the alliance between Conservatism and the drink trade in the eyes of the Liberals.[55] What it also pointed to was the dominance of Peter Walker & Son in the licensed trade of the city, a dominance partly built on another issue that attracted the displeasure of the magistrates – the magnificence of the Liverpool public house.

'These gin-palaces', declared the *Times* in a major 1875 article on drunkenness in Liverpool, 'with their flaring barrel lamps and other external decorations, are in some respects peculiar to the port. The poorer the locality, the better chance there is, it seems, of the house succeeding, and the wretched customers cannot complain that they are not honoured with splendid establishments'. [56] Many such establishments belonged to Peter Walker & Son, who acquired corner sites with potential for extension and proceeded to reconstruct their houses with much use of large plate glass windows and magnificent pillars. This strategy depended on their ability to acquire sites and to expand them. An indication of how this was done can be

seen in a case which came to the attention of the magistrates in 1875. This was the renewal of a licence for 1 Blundell Street, which belonged to Andrew Barclay Walker. It was opposed on the grounds that it had been extended to take in land which gave it entrances from two other streets, and so this was tantamount to selling on unlicensed property.[57] The decision was that the licence was renewed for the original area and that any trade carried on in the new portion would run the risk of a prosecution for selling in unlicensed premises. Such a prosecution was indeed brought and heard before the Recorder of Liverpool, who ruled that there was nothing to prevent such extensions. This decision was appealed to the High Court, which upheld the decision, much to the discomfort of the magistrates.[58]. Although the case was decided on the facts, rather than the principle, the magistrates felt that the result undercut their power to restrain the size of houses. The restriction of licences encouraged existing licence holders to make more of their premises and the advantage here lay with those with substantial capital resources. Such expenditure was more likely to encourage the direct control of houses through management. This was also encouraged by the danger of losing licences through the actions of the publican, which could be avoided by the tight control and instant dismissal of waged managers.

Thus the institution of house management gained strength and was widely adopted by Liverpool public house owners. The years from 1870 saw a concentration of public house ownership in the hands of a number of large companies, who came to dominate the large central public houses. Table 3 indicates the pre-eminence of Peter Walker & Son amongst their ranks.

TABLE 3

Ownership of Liverpool public houses 1881-1901

	Walker	Cain	Bents	Threlfall	Total	All houses	Walker share %	Major brewers share %
1881	96	47	61	19	223	1904	5.04	11.71
1891	220	138	114	88	560	1843	11.94	30.39
1901	291	147	119	95	652	1795	16.21	36.32

Source: LRO 347JUS Liverpool licensing registers 1881, 1891, 1901

Many of these houses were managed, and management practices here came in for bitter criticism. As the *Liverpool Mercury* complained in 1889,

> A single individual may own a dozen, a score, or fifty houses in various parts of the city, each conducted by a servant of no estate, liable to dismissal at a moment's notice, and held responsible for promoting the success of the concern to which he is for the nonce attached. The master of many may employ or discharge at his personal whim, and not the slightest difficulty is experienced in transferring licences from one to another of the units who come and go as persons who are supposed by a fiction of the law to have entered into a serious contract with the licensing authorities.[59]

One of the problems with such a view, however, is that it ignores the self-interest of brewers in selecting managers carefully to avoid such dismissals. An examination of the licensing registers for 1881, which record transfers that occurred during the year, does not confirm the argument of the temperance advocates that these

were rife.[60] 585 transfers of licence were recorded during the year, representing turnover of just over a quarter of the city's 2178 licensed premises. However, the vast majority of these (450, or 77 per cent) were just a single transfer during the year. Whilst it is fair to point out that multiple transfers (those involving more than one change during the year – 113 changed hands twice, forty-five three times and just one four times) were more likely to have involved companies as owners rather than individuals (companies owned 33 per cent of houses, but were 40 per cent of double transfers and 38 per cent of triple transfers) it is important to look at which companies were involved. Thus Peter Walker & Son had just one multiple transfer – 24 Beaufort Street changed hands twice. By contrast the Birkenhead Brewery Company had four multiple transfers, with one house changing hands three times, whilst Bryant & Ravenscroft had a full twelve houses changing hands several times, with three having three occupants during the year. Perhaps significantly, four of these houses were beerhouses. (The company owned twenty-four licensed premises, thirteen being beerhouses.) What this points to is the influence of different business strategies. The temperance advocates were not entirely wrong, but they failed to discriminate between different companies. These can be confirmed by an examination of a sample of Peter Walker & Son's managed houses, drawn from the property registers and cross-referenced to the licensing registers.[61] For the twenty houses for which information has been gathered, the modal number of managers was five over the period 1881-1930. The maximum number of managers was ten, which still does not suggest excessive turnover. Moreover, there was a tendency for the managers who lasted under two years to be clustered together, as if once the manager were established, they tended to stay for reasonable periods. What this suggests is that some companies used their management of houses to exercise considerable control

over their operation, control which increasingly convinced the magistrates that managers were a positive advantage in their efforts to control the city's licensed premises.

III

1890-1914: accepting the manager

An important factor in this conversion was the appointment of a new Head Constable in 1881. Captain Nott-Bower spent his initial period in the job reorganising his force, but he quickly turned his attention to the administration of the licensing laws 'which caused me more anxiety and more trouble than anything' other than prostitution.[62] The policing of public houses had long been a bone of contention in Liverpool, with persistent allegations of corruption and undue influence.[63] These complaints had seen the creation of a force of special inspectors in 1875.[64] Nott-Bower's suggestion, accepted by the Watch Committee in 1889, was to abolish this force on the grounds of ineffectiveness and to subsume its responsibilities under police responsibilities. This was attacked by the temperance lobby as capitulating to the brewers, prompting Nott-Bower to comment that his 'greatest difficulty, however, was with the extreme "temperance and moral " party. … their action often tended to produce the exactly contrary result to that which they really desired'. [65] In particular, they underestimated the feasibility of putting their desires into practical policing. Nott-Bower's approach was to couple improved policing with a reliance on the disciplinary actions of the leading public house owners and, in particular, their control through direct management. Giving evidence to the Peel Commission on Licensing in 1898 he commented that: 'I find that, as the figures show (table 4), the best conducted houses

in the city are the houses conducted by managers. The worst conducted houses in the city are what might be called the tied houses, that is, the houses of brewers let to tenants.'[66]

TABLE 4

Licensing offences by ownership

		Offences			
	Number of houses	Permitting drunkenness	Other	Total	Offences per house
Owner	667	48	104	152	0.23
Tenant of private owner	136	13	12	25	0.18
Tenant of brewer	218	23	29	52	0.24
Total	1021	84	145	229	0.22
Paid manager of brewer	1057	47	60	107	0.10

Source: RC Licensing Laws, PP (1898), XXXVI, Third Report, Appendix C.

Nott-Bower also added that whilst the magistrates tolerated managers, he would not claim that they encouraged them. However, over the next decade the magistrates came to value the managerial system as an agency of control, to the extent that in 1912 the chairman of the licensing bench proclaimed that 'houses managed for brewers are conducted more in conformity with the wishes of the bench than tenanted houses'. [67] Not surprisingly, this prompted an angry response from the city's tenants, a response that prompted a split in the ranks of the Licensed Victuallers Association. A new body, styling itself the Liverpool Tenants Licencees Association, emerged and promptly brought a case against the firm of James Mellor, alleging that a manager had served a customer.[68] As, they argued, he was not a 'fit and proper person' to hold a licence, he had therefore served the customer illegally. They won their initial case, but lost the appeal.[69] The case attracted considerable attention in the trade press, being taken by the *Brewers Journal* to settle the legal position of managers once and for all.

[70]Peter Walker & Son also took considerable interest, being congratulated by the Brewers Association for their support in securing the Q.C. who won the appeal.[71] The decision confirmed the managerial system in Liverpool, reports of the case noting that 1,050 of 1,500 licences were held by managers.

Whilst the magistrates had come to work closely with the major brewing companies to use their managers to enforce their control over drinking in the city, this did not mean that the relationship was always harmonious. The Liverpool magistrates gained a nationwide reputation for the perceived severity of their licensing policy, using their powers to remove licences when opportunity allowed.[72] This reputation saw, for example, an approving delegation from Glasgow looking to learn lessons which could be applied in their own context.[73] The licensing justices clashed with the major firms in particular over the interpretation of redundant houses and the nature of compensation for these following the 1904 Licensing Act.[74] This policy prompted angry exchanges which culminated in a failed attempt by some magistrates to bring charges of criminal libel against Edward Russell, editor of the *Daily Post*. [75]However, the extent to which brewers and magistrates could work together to discipline drinkers was seen in the joint response to attempts to curb women drinkers in 1911. The magistrates that year set down a series of conditions that they expected to be supported by brewers:

> (1) It is necessary that the strictest vigilance should be exercised in serving women at all.
>
> (2) That any woman of known bad character, or of drunken habits, or whose appearance is not respectable, should be refused altogether.

(3) That when women are served they shall only be served once, and shall not be allowed to treat each other to drinks.

(4) That women shall not be allowed to remain an undue length of time upon premises.[76]

These conditions were dismissed by trade opinion as being discriminatory and unjustified,[77] but the manager representing Peter Walker & Son stated that 'they had always been willing to fall into line with the wishes of the bench, especially on this question of serving women. They were as anxious as the bench to discourage excessive drinking among women and to promote the general sobriety of Liverpool.'[78] What this case indicates clearly is the shared focus of both magistrates and company on discipline and control.

In 1896 Peter Walker & Son issued a triumphalist account of their first fifty years in business.[79] Influenced no doubt by the abrasive nature of debates over licensing in the city, it contained a forthright defence of the 'managerial system'. This was placed firmly in the context of the growth of multiple retail operations, arguing that it 'offers the prospect of order evolved from chaos'.[80] In this it was 'a product of the natural evolution of our commercial system, and has its precise equivalent in other trades in that process which has reduced small traders to the position of managers of large establishments'. [81] This process, based on 'system and principle' had at its heart the discipline and control that could be applied to managers and, through them, to customers.[82] Managers were subject to 'a rigorous system of official inspection' that checked their adherence to a set of rules.[83] These rules were printed into the house takings book which all managers had to maintain, rules which concluded with rule 19

'Penalty for the breach of any of the above Rules, Dismissal'.[84] These rules prevented managers from giving credit and treating, or being treated by, customers. They also emphasised relation with the police: 'Should a Police Officer or other person, at any time, point out any matter in the course of business as being in his opinion an infringement of the Law, whether he intends to report the same to the authorities or not, the Manager or his Assistant shall forthwith procure the names and addresses of any witnesses who may be present.' [85]The tight discipline engendered by these employment relations enabled the company to dominate Liverpool trade in the years up to 1914, although they had rather less success in seeking to expand elsewhere.[86] However, their actions, in conjunction with others in the industry and in relation to the actions of magistrates and temperance advocates, had shaped a very particular form of licensing that marked Liverpool as different from other areas.

IV

Conclusions: exceptional or before its time?

This account of the formation of licensing practice in Liverpool indicates the value of local studies that consider the relationship between regulation, local politics and business strategy. However, what implications did this practice, and specifically the 'managerial system', have, at the national level, for licensing practice and, at local level, the nature of life in Liverpool? To take the national level first, one's initial answer might be 'not many'. Liverpool was not, of course, the only town in which the 'managerial system' was developed, although it has a good claim to be the site of the most far reaching implementation. From the 1890s some companies in other localities began to use managers on a more frequent basis, but the practice was resisted in many

others.[87] However, this acceptance took different forms in different local contexts, and in no case was it as pervasive or as central as in Liverpool. In Manchester, for example, the investigations of the Peel Royal Commission in the 1890s sparked off a debate about the existence and extent of the 'managerial system' which turned on the honesty of declarations to the magistrates.[88] The practice of house management seemed rather more widespread than was allowed, but the magistrates confessed themselves unable to validate claims put before them. [89] However, rather than an open confrontation, as in Liverpool and a clear endorsement of the practice, both sides seemed content to connive in the maintenance of a fiction that most applicants for licences were bona fide tenants. In turn, this reflected the lack of wholehearted support for the managerial system as a strategy amongst the city's brewers. Rather, the employment of managers was a convenience, often resorted to in the absence of satisfactory tenants. Once such could be found, then managers would be cast aside.

There was rather more commitment to the notion of managed houses as a central part of business strategy in Birmingham. Here, especially with the firm of Mitchells and Butlers, a substantial part of the estate was managed. [90] Again, however, the local context was very different. Whilst relations between brewers and regulatory authorities were not without their tensions, there was a more welcoming context given a broad acceptance of the value of managing environments, be they public or private. Indeed, the advocacy of management in the public sphere that marked Joseph Chamberlain's ideas had a considerable impact on that moderate wing of Temperance that saw the 'disinterested management' of public houses as the best weapon against the power of the Drink Interest.[91] This movement, which flowered in the success of the Trust Houses, had the employment of salaried managers as a key tenet.[92] However, such houses were very different in both physical and social

character to those of Liverpool; whilst not exceptional in the practice of house management, Liverpool's particular style of management could claim a good degree of distinction and originality.

Whilst, therefore, making some limited advance in some contexts, resistance to the use of managers on the part of many companies was compounded by the attitude of local magistrates, particularly in London, who continued to oppose managers well into the 1920s. [93] By this time, more companies were seeking to run 'improved' public houses, and with this came a greater openness to the use of managers. [94] However, the practice was still limited by 1949[95] and, in part, this limited use might have been because of its association with Liverpool. The fearsome reputation of its drinkers and the only slightly less fearsome reputation of its magistrates meant that Liverpool practice was often seen as something not to be emulated. However, the years following the Second World War saw a much wider use of house managers and with it changes which were prefigured in Liverpool, notably in the built environment. The Liverpool practice, for example, of large plate glass windows making pubs look like shops has distinct echoes in contemporary bar design.

Clearly, this practice of public house design has left its mark on the built environment of Liverpool. Setting these houses in the context of the strategies of local businesses adhering to the managerial system helps us understand the magnificence of the Philharmonic and the Vines as the product of the intense competition between Peter Walker & Son and Robert Cain (competition which was to see the former swallowed up by its smaller rival in 1921). [96] The full history of the inter-linked nature of Liverpool's pubs and its public house owners and managers remains to be

written, but we might want to finish on two related points. One is that an outcome of the debates and strategies outlined above was the diminution of the ranks of semi-independent licensed victuallers. This might have contributed to the embattled nature of Liverpool politics, reducing the numbers of the local petit bourgeoisie.[97] We have said very little about those who worked in Liverpool's pubs, but the signs of union organisation began to emerge in 1910, contributing in a small way to the widening gap between the classes perceived at this time.[98] This gap in turn leads to the second point, the enduring nature of Liverpool pubs. Mass Observation found this to be in 1942 unremittingly grim.[99] Liverpool magistrates, were, argued an M.P. in 1939, 'really anti-licensing justices, of a very narrow frame of mind'. [100] This was said in the context of their continuing ban on the playing of darts, a position dropped by all other magistrates. [101] A similar attitude of hostility, carried forward from earlier debates, was found in the refusal of the Town Council to allow the building of public houses on new housing estates.[102] The debates that we have explored, therefore, were ones with a continuing resonance for Liverpool well after the heat went out of the temperance movement.

[1] P. J. Waller, *Democracy and Sectarianism: A Political and Social History of Liverpool 1868-1939* (Liverpool, 1981); S. Davies, *Liverpool Labour: Social and Political Influences on the Development of the Labour Party in Liverpool*, 1900-1939 (Keele, 1996).

[2] 'A Decision to be Noted', *B(rewers) J(ournal)*, 15 Oct. 1882, p. 266.

[3] *The Times*, 30 Nov. 1870, p. 8.

[4] Ibid, 26 Nov. 1877.

[5] Waller, *Democracy and Sectarianism*, p. 112; F. O'Connor, *A Pub on Every Corner* (4 vols) (Liverpool, 1995-2001).

[6] N. Alexander and G. Akehurst, 'The Emergence of Modern Retailing, 1750-1950', *Business History*, 40 (1998), 1-15.

[7] *Hansard*, 3rd Series, 1872, CCXII, 1894.

[8] P. Moynihan, 'Walkers Ales', *Journal of the Brewery History Society*, 46 (1985), 3-8; 47 (1986) 9-16.

[9] *McCorquodale's Annual Liverpool Directory* (Liverpool, 1848), p.265; *Gore's Directory of Liverpool and environs* (Liverpool, 1849), p. 411; L(iverpool) R(ecord) O(ffice), 347 JUS 1/1/3 Licensing Register 1845-46.

[10] T.R. Gourvish and R. G. Wilson, *The British Brewing Industry 1830-1980* (Cambridge, 1994).

[11] P. Mathias, *The Brewing Industry in England 1700-1830* (Cambridge, 1959).

[12] J. Chartres, 'Joshua Tetley and Son, 1890s-1990s: a Century in the Tied Trade' ed. J. Chartres and K. Honeyman, *Leeds City Business 1893-1993* (Leeds, 1993), pp. 112-44.

[13] *Hansard*, 3rd Series, 1872, CCXII, 656.

[14] Q. Hughes, *Seaport* (1964), p. 88.

[15] P. T. Winskill and J. Thomas, *History of the Temperance Movement in Liverpool and District* (Liverpool, 1887) p.41.

[16] *Select Committee on the Health of Towns*, H.C. XI , p.141 (1840).

[17] J. Finch, *Statistics of Vauxhall Ward Liverpool* (Liverpool [1842], 1986).

[18] H. Taine, *Notes on England* (1957), p. 226.

[19] *Select Committee on Public Houses*, H.C., XXXVII p.42 evidence of John Wybergh, clerk to Liverpool magistrates (1852)..

[20] Winskill and Thomas, *History*, pp. 58, 63; The Licensing System', *Liverpool Mercury*, 13 Sept. 1850; 'The Annual Licensing Sessions', *Liverpool Mercury*, 8 Sept. 1851.

[21] *S.C. Public Houses*, p. 46 (Whybergh); p. 83 (Gladstone); but see the counter arguments from Turner, p. 95 and Danson p. 264.

[22] Ibid., p. 68.

[23] B. D. White, *A History of the Corporation of Liverpool 1835-1914* (Liverpool , 1951), p.108.

[24] After all, Finch's investigations were taken on behalf of the 'Liverpool Anti-Monopoly Association', Finch, *Statistics*.

[25] White, *Corporation of Liverpool.* p.75.

[26] *Hansard*, 3rd Series, 1865, CLXXVII, 651-52.

[27] *Hansard*, 3rd Series, 1867, CLXXXVI, 160-66; 1869, CXCV, 1763-767.

[28] *Select Committee on Intemperance*, H.L., XI, Evidence of John Patterson, p. 193 (1877).

[29] B. G. Orchard, *Liverpool's Legion of Honour* (Birkenhead, 1893); 'Andrew Barclay Walker', *Liverpool Mercury*, 28 Feb. 1893; 'Andrew Barclay Walker', *Liverpool Daily Post*, 28 Feb. 1893.

[30] Figures calculated from LRO Peter Walker & Son, 380PWK/2/2/1, leases 1865-1888 and 3/4/6 vault property.

[31] LRO, Peter Walker & Son, 380PWK/2/1/12a Statements for Canning Place Vaults 1858-1866; 380PWK/2/10a-j Bundle of ms statements; 380/1/4/12, Papers of David Walker; 380PWK/1/4/15, Papers of David Walker.

[32] LRO, 380/1/4/212, Papers of David Walker, Accounts with Robert Walker of Copperas Hill Vaults. Robert also had public house interests in St Helens.

[33] Figures calculated from vaults statements.

[34] T C Barker and J R Harris, *A Merseyside Town in the Industrial Revolution: St Helens 1750-1900* (1959), p.341; LRO, PWK380/1/4/13, bill from Thomas Haddock, solicitors, 1860, 'Several attendances on Mr D. Walker on this and previous days conferring on your colliery affairs.'

[35] 'The Long Pull', *BJ*, 15 Oct. 1875, p. 222.

[36] LRO, 942 WAK 40, Wakefield MSS, Benefactors of Liverpool: Sir Andrew B. Walker Bt.

[37] 'Sir Andrew Barclay Walker', *Liverpool Daily Post*, 28 Feb. 1893.

[38] On the centrality of public houses to the organisation of Irish Nationalism, see J. Belchem, *Merseypride* (Liverpool, 2000).

[39] 'The New Beerhouse Act', *BJ*, 15 Aug. 1870, p.160.

[40] *The Social Survey of Merseyside, Vol. 3* ed. D. C. Jones (Liverpool, 1934), p.286; University of Central Lancashire, Livesey Collection, Liverpool (Vigilance) Inquiry Centre, *Liverpool Licensing Housing and Health* (Liverpool. 1929), p.1.

[41] *BJ*, 15 Oct. 1874, p.326.

[42] LRO, 347 JUS 1/7/1, Book of newspaper cuttings relating to licensing matters, *Liverpool Mercury*, 25 Aug. 1875.

[43] Ibid., *Post* 8 Sept. 1883.

[44] Ibid., *Mercury*, 9 Nov. 1883.

[45] Ibid., *Courier*, 7 Mar. 1884.

[46] Ibid., *Alliance News*, 13 Sept. 1884.

[47] Ibid., *Post*, 25 Sept. 1884.

[48] Ibid., *Post*, 18 Feb. 1885.

[49] Ibid., *Courier*, 7 Nov. 1890; *Mercury*, 27 June 1889; *Mercury*, 27 Feb. 1891; *Post*, 25 Aug. 1892.

[50] *Hansard*, 3rd Series, 1891, CCCXLIX, 1390; 1891, CCCL, pp. 675, 1066; 1891, CCCLII, p. 914; 1891, CCCLIII, p.1369.

[51] *Hansard*, 3rd Series, 1891, CCCLIII, p.1369.

[52] Cf 'Recent Decisions and Future Licensing', *BJ*, 15 Oct. 1890, pp. 1-2; 'Magistrates and tied houses', *BJ*, 15 Jan. 1891, p. 17.

[53] LRO, H178.1 SPA, *A Spark from the Anvil: The Liquor Traffic and the Industrial Population; The Publicans' Case Fairly Stated. Are Sunday Closing and Local Option Necessary or Desirable in the Interest of the Working Classes? By a Working Man & and a Non-Teetotaller* (Liverpool, 1882), p. 42.

[54] *Daily Post*, 28 Feb. 1893.

[55] Orchard, *Liverpool's Legion*, p. 689; *Daily Post*, 28 Feb. 1893.

[56] 'The Licensing Laws in Liverpool', *The Times*, 2 Sept. 1875, p.6.

[57] *Liverpool Mercury*, 25 Aug. 1875; Sept. 1875.

[58] *S.C. Intemperance*, evidence of Edward Lawrence, p.56.

[59] *Liverpool Mercury*, 27 June 1889.

[60] The following figures are calculated from LRO, Liverpool licensing registers, 1881-82 347 JUS 1/1/38 (full licences) and 1/3/7 (beerhouses).

[61] The sample was initially drawn from the Peter Walker & Son property registers as noted above and compared to the 1881-82 full licence register (LRO, 347JUS/38) and tracked through to the registers which finish in 1930 (LRO, 347JUS/1/53). 1881 was chosen as the initial to align with the census. Ownership information is not presented in the registers until 1875 and prior to that date address information is vague. One problem that reduces the available sample from the seventy-eight managed houses was precisely this one of address information – compounded by the widespread existence of corner houses that could have two addresses. Thirty-two houses on which complete information could be identified were isolated, but this was reduced further either by the closure of the house before the end of the period or by mixed operation – some houses moved between management and tenancy.

[62] W. Nott-Bower, *Fifty-Two Years a Policeman* (1926), p.133.

[63] Winskill and Thomas, *Liverpool Temperance*, p. 62; *S.C., Public Houses*, pp. 47, 49, 57, 265(1852); *S.C. Intemperance*, p.73, (1877); *BJ*, 15 Jan. 1880, 9.

[64] 'Liverpool crime and drunkenness', *The Times*, 8 Oct. 1875, 3.

[65] Nott-Bower, *Fifty Two Years*, pp. 133-34.

[66] *Third Volume of Evidence, Royal Commission on the Licensing Laws*, H.C., XXXVI, p. 4 (1898).

[67] 'Brewers' Managers versus tied and free tenants', *L(icensed) V(ictuallers) G(azette)*, 14 Apr. 1912, p. 8.

[68] 'Brewers' Managers v. Tenants', *LVG*, 13 Mar. 1914, p. 9.

[69] 'The Manager System Judgement', *LVG*, 7 Aug. 1914, p.6.

[70] 'The Managerial System', *BJ*, 15 Aug. 1914, pp. 437-38, 467-68.

[71] LRO, 380PWK/3/1/2, Minute book 1898-1916, 8 Oct. 1914.

[72] '1901', *BJ*, 15 Jan. 1902, pp. 1-4; 'Cranks in Committee', *LVG*, 3 Nov. 1911, p.8.

[73] Glasgow Record Office, D-TC 6/520 *Report of the Sub-committee of the Magistrates who Visited Liverpool in March, 1902, to Enquire as to the Administration of the Licensing Acts in that City*, 1902.

[74] 'The Brewster Sessions', *BJ*, 15 Sept. 1915, pp. 613-16.

[75] Waller, *Democracy and Sectarianism*, p.221.

[76] 'Liverpool Justices' Stringent Conditions', *BJ*, 15 Mar. 1911, p.138

[77] 'The adjourned brewster sessions', *BJ*, 15 Mar. 1911, p.134; 'More Justice's Justice', *LVG*, 17 Mar. 1911, p. 9.

[78] 'Liverpool Justices' Stringent Conditions', *BJ*, 15 Mar. 1911, p.176.

[79] Peter Walker & Son, *Walker's Warrington Ales* (Warrington, 1896).

[80] Ibid., p. 56.

[81] Ibid.

[82] Ibid.

[83] Ibid., p.55.

[84] LRO, 380PWK/3/9/2, house takings ledger book.

[85] *Ibid*.

[86] For their problems in London, see *LVG*, 29 Sept. 1911, p.9; LRO, 380PWK/3/1/2, minute book 1898-1916: 29 Mar. 1912; 3 June 1913; 7 July 1914.

[87] For an example, see N. Hyde, *Brewing Was a Way of Life* (Hales, 1999), p.94.

[88] *Second Volume of Evidence, Royal Commission on the Licensing Laws*, H.C., XXXV, evidence of Henry Haggis, brewery and hotel broker of Manchester, pp. 441-43, (1897).

[89] Ibid., letter from William Murray, chairman of Liverpool magistrates, p.460.

[90] A Mutch, 'Managing Managers: an Early Twentieth Century Service Industry Information System', *Management Decision*, 40(3) (2002), 288-96.

[91] For Chamberlain's advocacy of municipal control of the drink trade in the name of temperance see 'An idea from Birmingham', *BJ*, 15 June 1876, pp. 143-44.

[92] 'Disinterested Management', *BJ*, 15 Jan. 1913, p. 20.

[93]For magisterial resistance in Bewdley, *BJ*, Apr. 15 1915, pp.179-81; in Wolverhampton, *BJ*, Oct. 15 1917, p.404; in Willesden *BJ*, May 15, 1921, p.217; in Pontypridd, *BJ*, Apr. 15 1922, p.153; in Maidenhead *BJ*, Jan. 15 1923, p.4; in Crewe, *BJ*, July 15 1923, p.371; in Marylebone, *BJ*, Nov. 15 1924, p.585.

[94] R. G Wilson, *Greene King: A Business and Family History* (1983), p.202; T. Gourvish, *Norfolk Beers from English Barley, a History of Steward and Patteson 1793-1963* (Norwich, 1987).

[95] Gourvish and Wilson, *British Brewing Industry*, pp. 436-442.

[96] M. Girouard, *Victorian Pubs* (1975), pp. 193-200; Hughes, *Seaport*, pp. 92-93.

[97] *The Lower Middle Class in Britain*, ed. G. Crossick (1977) has little to say about publicans.

[98] *BJ*, 15 Feb. 1910, p. 76; 15 July 1910, p. 401.

[99] Mass Observation, *The Pub and The People* (1970 [1943]), pp. 304-5.

[100] *Hansard*, 4th Series, 1939, CCCXLVI, 495.

[101] 'Ban on Darts in Public-Houses', *BJ*, 15 Apr. 1939, p. 452; 'Dart Playing and the "Anti Licensing Justices"', *BJ*, 17 May 1939, pp. 551-2.

[102] 'Ban on Licensed Premises on Housing Estates', *BJ*, 15 May 1930, p. 249; M. McKenna, 'The Suburbanization of the Working-class Population of Liverpool Between the Wars', *Social History*, 16(2), (1991) 173-89.